

Appendix A—Project Prioritization and Scoring

Eligibility for Regional Target Funding

As described in Chapter 2, the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) development and project prioritization and funding process consists of numerous phases and is supported by several different funding sources. This appendix includes information about transportation projects that the Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) considered for funding through the Highway Discretionary (Regional Target) Program in the federal fiscal years (FFYs) 2027–31 TIP. To be considered for funding by the MPO, a project must fulfill certain basic criteria. Projects evaluated through the MPO’s Bicycle Network and Pedestrian Connections, Complete Streets, and Intersection Improvements investment programs must meet these criteria:

- The Massachusetts Department of Transportation’s (MassDOT) Project Review Committee must have approved the project or must plan to review it.
- The project proponent must be a municipality or state agency.
- The project proponent must have submitted a pre-25 percent design to MassDOT, or the project must be at a later design stage.

For projects evaluated through the MPO’s Transit Transformation program, the following criteria apply:

- The project proponent must be a municipality, regional transit authority (RTA), or state agency.
- The RTA that serves the project area or would operate the facility must have approved the project or must plan to review it.
- The project proponent must identify the source of 20 percent matching funding for the project.

For projects evaluated through the MPO’s Community Connections program, the following criteria apply:

- The project proponent must submit a complete application for funding to MPO staff along with supporting documentation, such as geographic files depicting the project area and budgeting worksheets.
- The proponent must be a municipality, transportation management association (TMA), or RTA. Other entities, such as nonprofit organizations, may apply in partnership with a municipality, TMA, or RTA that has agreed to serve as a project proponent and fiscal manager.

- The proponent must demonstrate that the project will have a positive impact on air quality, as the Community Connections program is funded using federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality funds.
- The proponent must demonstrate readiness and institutional capacity to manage the project sustainably.

Evaluation Criteria

Once a proponent provides sufficient design documentation for a project and the municipality or state is actively prioritizing the project for funding, the project can be evaluated by MPO staff. The evaluation criteria used to score projects are based on the MPO's goals and objectives. After the projects are evaluated, the scores are shared with project proponents, posted on the MPO's website, and presented to the MPO board for review and discussion.

The scores for projects evaluated during development of the FFYs 2027–31 TIP for programming in the MPO's Bicycle Network and Pedestrian Connections, Complete Streets, and Intersection Improvements programs are summarized in Table A-3. Scores for projects that applied for funding through the MPO's Community Connections program during the FFYs 2027–31 TIP cycle are summarized in Table A-4.

Following the adoption of the Long-Range Transportation Plan, *Destination 2050*, in July 2023, the MPO revised the TIP evaluation criteria to better align with the MPO's updated goals, objectives, and investment programs. These criteria were employed during the project selection process for the FFYs 2027–31 TIP. The final criteria were informed by robust public engagement conducted during the development of *Destination 2050* and developed through an update process that engaged MPO members, staff, and external stakeholders. This update also created separate criteria for different project types within the Community Connections program given the diverse array of first- and last-mile projects that can be funded through the program.

The project selection criteria for each investment program are shown in separate tables in this appendix as follows: Bicycle Network and Pedestrian Connections (Table A-5); Complete Streets (Table A-6); Intersection Improvements (Table A-7); and Transit Transformation (Table A-8).

Community Connections project selection criteria are shown in separate tables in this appendix as follows: Bicycle Lanes (Table A-9); Bicycle Racks (Table A-10); Bikeshare Support (Table A-11); Microtransit Pilots (Table A-12); and Wayfinding Signage (Table A-13).

Other Considerations in Project Selection and Programming

More details about the MPO's FFYs 2027–31 Regional Target projects are available in the funding tables included in Chapter 3. Performance-related information for these projects, including their relationships to the MPO's Long-Range Transportation Plan, is included in Chapter 4. Information about greenhouse gas emissions for these projects is available in Appendix B.

TIP Programming Policies

TIP Project Cost Policy

In the spring of 2021, the MPO board voted to create an Ad Hoc Committee to explore the causes and consequences of cost increases for projects that the MPO funds and recommend possible policy changes to the full MPO board.

In September 2021, the MPO adopted a series of policies based on the findings and recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee. These policies included requiring that projects be at the 25 percent design stage before they are funded on the TIP and the creation of a mechanism for the MPO board to request that projects be rescored when costs increase beyond a designated threshold. These thresholds are increases of \$2,500,000 or 25 percent of project cost, whichever is triggered first.

More information on the 2021 TIP Project Cost Policies may be found on the MPO's website ([PDF](#))([HTML](#)).

In summer 2025, MPO staff worked with the TIP Process, Engagement, and Readiness Committee to address needed improvements to the 2021 TIP Project Cost Policies. These improvements were adopted by the MPO in fall 2025, and were in effect beginning with the FFYs 2027–31 TIP.

Revised TIP Project Rescoring Policy

In October 2025, staff worked with the TIP Process, Engagement, and Readiness Committee to reinforce the rescoring policy set under the 2021 TIP Project Cost Policies. These improvements were in response to structural issues in implementing the policy that discouraged its enforcement. Despite numerous projects surpassing the cost thresholds set by the policy, the MPO board did not request rescoring or reconsideration of any project between the FFYs 2023–27 and FFYs 2026–30 TIPs.

The policy update focused on the creation of an automatically initiated rescoring framework for projects that were evaluated using outdated criteria that were based on a Long-Range Transportation Plan that is five or more years old. During development of the FFYs 2027–31 TIP, staff scored 13 funded projects that were either scored under the FFYs 2021–25 or earlier TIPs, or had never been previously scored. Cohorts for project scoring are outlined in Table A-1.

**Table A-1
TIP Project Rescoring Cohorts**

Rescoring Cohort	Relevant TIPs	Number of Projects	TIP Cycle for Rescoring
Cohort 1 (Complete)	FFYs 2021–25 and older	13 projects	FFYs 2027–31
Cohort 2	FFYs 2022–26, 2023–27, 2024–28	11 projects	FFYs 2029–33
Cohort 3	FFYs 2025–29, 2026–30, 2027–31, 2028–32	5 projects	FFYs 2033–37

Automatic project rescoring for Cohort 2 will take place for the development of the FFYs 2029–33 TIP. The number of projects in Cohort 2 will decrease over time should projects successfully advertise or be removed from the TIP. The number of projects in Cohort 3 will increase over time should the MPO fund new projects through the FFYs 2028–32 TIP.

More information on the Revised TIP Project Rescoring Policy can be found on the MPO’s website ([PDF](#))([HTML](#)).

Revised TIP Project Readiness Requirements

Following adoption of the TIP Project Cost Policies in 2021, there was no mechanism in place to require that project proponents continue progressing designs past the 25 percent stage to retain TIP funding. Moreover, the 25 percent threshold only applied to new projects, allowing several TIP projects to remain on the TIP without 25 percent submissions—some through the FFYs 2026–30 TIP.

MassDOT’s adoption of a new [Project Development and Design Guide](#) in October 2023 shifted more components of project design to earlier, pre-25 percent stages. On average, this increased the time required for projects to reach 25 percent design but decreased the time required to attain later design stages. These process improvements, when combined with a minimum threshold of 25 percent design to receive TIP funding, had a net effect of reducing the eligibility for new projects to be funded through the TIP without effectively addressing the design risks of currently funded projects.

In response to these changes, the MPO adopted Revised Readiness Requirements in December 2025. These requirements established a minimum design requirement for a project to be funded in each programming year of the TIP, alongside two additional milestones (“Next Stage” and “Cost Estimate”) to provide a more objective basis for assessing project risk. These thresholds are listed in Table A-2.

**Table A-2
Five Year Readiness Guidelines**

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Minimum Requirement	100% design submitted	75% design approved or combined 75% / 100%	25% DPH held	25% design received with comments	Pre-25% submission
Next Stage	PS&E within 9 months	100% design within 6 months	75% design within 6 months	25% DPH scheduled	25% submission within 3 months
Cost Estimate	New cost estimate	Cost estimate less than 1.5 years old	New cost estimate	Cost estimate less than 1.5 years old	New cost estimate

DPH = Design Public Hearing. FFY = Federal Fiscal Year. PS&E = Plans, Specifications, and Estimates.

Any project that does not meet the minimum required design milestone for TIP programming, a pre-25 percent design submission, is not eligible for funding through the Regional Target Program of that TIP in accordance with this policy.

More information on the 2025 TIP Project Readiness Requirements can be found on the MPO's website (PDF)(HTML).

The Universe of Projects

Starting with the FFYs 2027–31 TIP, the Universe of Projects is now maintained through an online [TIP Project Dashboard](#). The dashboard provides project descriptions and information for both programmed and unprogrammed projects and a breakdown of funding by subregion.

Table A-3
FFYs 2027–31 TIP Project Evaluation Results:
Multiple MPO Investment Programs

Bicycle Network and Pedestrian Connections Program															
Proponent	Project Number	Project Name	Total Score	Total Base Score	Total Scaled Equity Score	Safety	Safety Equity Score	Mobility and Reliability	Mobility and Reliability Equity Score	Access and Connectivity	Access and Connectivity Equity Score	Resilience	Resilience Equity Score	Clean Air and Healthy Communities	Clean Air and Healthy Communities Equity Score
Concord	612870	Concord- Assabet River Multi-Use Trail and Bridge Construction	59.9	55.5	4.4	14	3.5	11	2	12.5	1.5	11	2	7	2
Revere	S13406	Revere- Revere Beach Connector (Design Only)	71.4	61	10.4	14	9	12	4	12	4	14	6	9	3
Newton	613594	Needham-Newton- Bridge Replacement on Christina Street	74	64	10	13	7	12	5	11	4	15	3	13	6
Brookline	613683	Brookline- Pedestrian Bridge Replacement, B-27-017, Davis Path over MBTA	73.65	66	7.65	14	6.75	11	2.625	13	3	15	3.75	13	3
Cambridge	613568	Cambridge- New Bridge and Shared-Use Path Construction over Fitchburg Line at Danehy Park Connector	85.3	73.5	11.8	14.5	7.5	15	6	13	5	17	6	14	5
			100	80	20	16		15		17		16		16	

Complete Streets Program															
Proponent	Project Number	Project Name	Total Score	Total Base Score	Total Scaled Equity Score	Safety	Safety Equity Score	Mobility and Reliability	Mobility and Reliability Equity Score	Access and Connectivity	Access and Connectivity Equity Score	Resilience	Resilience Equity Score	Clean Air and Healthy Communities	Clean Air and Healthy Communities Equity Score
Malden	613244	Malden – Broadway Reconstruction Everett to Melrose City Line	78	67	11	12.5	6	16.5	8.5	12	5	14	2	12	6
Marblehead	612947	Marblehead- Village Street Bridge Replacement M-04-001	44.4	41	3.4	8	2	11	3.5	1	1	11	0.5	10	1.5
Wakefield	613145	Wakefield- Comprehensive Downtown Improvements	63.8	59	4.8	12	3	17	4	12	2.5	9	1	9	1.5
Everett	613585	Chelsea- Everett- Reconstruction of Vine Street and Third Street, from Chelsea Street to MBTA Station	67.1	59	8.1	14	6	12	5.25	12	3	12	2.25	9	3.75
			100	80	20	16		19		15		14		16	

Transit Transformation Program															
Proponent	Project Number	Project Name	Total Score	Total Base Score	Total Scaled Equity Score	Safety	Safety Equity Score	Mobility and Reliability	Mobility and Reliability Equity Score	Access and Connectivity	Access and Connectivity Equity Score	Resilience	Resilience Equity Score	Clean Air and Healthy Communities	Clean Air and Healthy Communities Equity Score
CATA	S13388	CATA Access for All	39.8	35	4.8	0	0	10	5	8	2.5	8	0.5	9	4
CATA	S13389	Cape Ann Dialysis Transportation	39.8	35	4.8	0	0	10	5	8	2.5	8	0.5	9	4
MWRTA	S13390	Procurement of 10 Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) Vehicles	49.5	42	7.5	4	0	12	7.5	10	5.25	8	0.75	8	5.25
MWRTA	S13391	Construction of Vehicle Maintenance and Fueling Facility	55.6	46	9.6	5	0.75	14	7.5	12	8.25	5	0.75	10	6.75
MWRTA	S13392	Procurement of Hydrogen Fuel Cell-Powered Transit Vehicles	50.8	43	7.8	4	0	12	7.5	10	5.25	8	0.75	9	6
MBTA	S13393	Symphony Station	50.6	41	9.6	8	2	11	10	9	5	7	2	6	5
MBTA	S13394	Downtown Crossing Vertical Transportation Improvements Phase 2	42.6	35	7.6	5	2	10	8	9	4	7	2	4	3
MBTA	S13395	Operational Enhancement of Bus Routes 714 and 716	34.8	31	3.8	3	1	10	5	7	1	7	1	4	1.5
MBTA	S13396	Bus Priority and Accessibility Improvements	53.6	47	6.6	11	1	12	5	19	9	2	0	3	1.5
MBTA	S13397	Franklin Line Double Track Improvements - Phase 3	43.6	39	4.6	9	0.5	13	5	7	4	6	0.5	4	1.5
MBTA	S13398	Unit Substation Upgrade/Replacement	45.4	40	5.4	10	1.5	11	5.25	6	2.25	6	0.75	7	3.75
MBTA	S13399	Haverhill Line Double Track Improvements	43.8	39	4.8	10	1	12	5	7	4	6	0.5	4	1.5
MBTA	S13400	Locomotive Procurement	41	35	6	6	1.5	12	7.5	6	2.25	6	0.75	5	3
MBTA	S13401	Better Bus Project - Operational Safety Improvements at Bus Stops	44.6	39	5.6	10	1	12	4	11	7.5	3	0	3	1.5
MBTA	S13402	High Priority Stations Accessibility Improvements Program	44.8	37	7.8	5	1.5	11	7.5	11	7.5	6	0.75	4	2.25
MBTA	S13403	Power Systems Reliability Program	44.4	39	5.4	10	1.5	10	5.25	6	2.25	6	0.75	7	3.75

Transit Transformation Program continued															
MBTA	S13404	Silver Line Tunnel Flood Mitigation	47.8	44	3.8	11	1	11	4	5	1	13	1.5	4	2
MBTA	S13405	Blue Line Tunnel Airport Flood Mitigation	51.6	44	7.6	11	2	11	8	5	2	13	3	4	4
MBTA	S13420	North Station Flooring Replacement	38.1	33	5.1	7	1.5	8	3.75	9	4.5	7	1.5	2	1.5
CATA	S13413	Vehicle Replacement	21.6	19	2.6	3	0.5	8	4	5	1	1	0	2	1
CATA	S13412	Magnolia Shuttle	28.6	25	3.6	2	0	5	3.75	7	1.5	5	0	6	3.75
			100	79	21	16		16		16		16		15	

Abbreviations

CATA = Cape Ann Transportation Authority. CNG = Compressed Natural Gas. MAPC = Metropolitan Area Planning Council. MBTA = Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority. MWRTA = MetroWest Regional Transit Authority. N/A = not applicable. PRC = MassDOT's Project Review Commi

Table A-4
FFYs 2027–31 TIP Project Evaluation Results: Community Connections Program

Proponent	Project Name	Total Score	Connectivity	Regional and Interlocal Coordination	Plan Implementation	Transportation Equity	Climate Change Mitigation	Performance Management
Malden	Malden Bicycle Rack Expansion	78	16	8	8	20	18	8
Brookline	Brookline Bluebike Expansion	76.5	15	8	16	13.5	16	8
Brookline	Brookline Bicycle Rack Expansion	79.5	14	7	16	19.5	16	7
MAPC	Boston, Brookline, Cambridge, and Somerville Bluebikes Replacement of 60 Stations	81	15	12	18	13	14	9
Quincy	Quincy Bluebikes Expansion, 10 Stations	63	13	6	12	18	6	8
MAPC	Joint Municipality Bluebikes Expansion, 1500 ebikes, 25 classic bikes, 17 stations	85	14	13	14	20	15	9
			18	16	18	20	18	10

Abbreviations

CATA = Cape Ann Transportation Authority. CNG = Compressed Natural Gas. MAPC = Metropolitan Area Planning Council. MBTA = Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority. MWRTA = MetroWest Regional Transit Authority. N/A = not applicable. PRC = MassDOT's Project Review Committee

Table A-5
FFYs 2027–31 TIP Evaluation Criteria: Bicycle Network and Pedestrian Connections Program

Safety: Transportation by all modes will be safe.	Equity Multiplier?
<p>The project design has a significant effect on improving safety for all users. Disqualifying - The project design does not improve safety for all users, or hinders user safety. 1 - The design of the project has a minor impact on improving safety for a limited number of potential facility users. 2 - The design of the project has a moderate effect on improving safety for all users of the facility, or improvements are primarily directed towards either pedestrians or micromobility, not both. 3 - The design of the project has a high effect on improving safety for all potential users of the facility, including the creation of entirely new facilities.</p>	<p align="center">Yes</p>
<p>The project addresses a statewide Top 5% Bicycle Crash Cluster or Top 5% Pedestrian Crash Cluster. 0 - The project does not address a Top 5% Bicycle Crash Cluster or Top 5% Pedestrian Crash Cluster. 2 - The project addresses a Top 5% Bicycle Crash Cluster and/or a Top 5% Pedestrian Crash Cluster.</p>	<p align="center">Yes</p>
<p>The proposed design provides for physical separation of facility users from other forms of traffic, and prevents obstruction. 0 - The proposed design either affords no physical separation for the facility, or the separation is horizontal and striped only. 1 - The proposed design has some physical separation for the facility in the form of a flexible barrier, but does not adequately prevent obstruction (ie: parking in bicycle lane). 2 - The proposed design affords full physical separation of the facility and its users from other forms of traffic, including vertical separation and fixed barriers.</p>	<p align="center">Yes</p>
<p>Where vehicles and pedestrians or micromobility users share a facility, the project improves the safety of interactions between these users. 0 - The project does not take steps to reduce conflict and hazards between vulnerable users and vehicles. 1 - The project makes some steps towards reducing conflicts and hazards between vulnerable users and vehicles, such as flexible posts. 2 - The project reduces conflicts and hazards between vehicles and vulnerable users where they currently exist, or eliminates these hazards entirely.</p>	
<p>The project connects to existing pedestrian or micromobility facilities. 0 - The project does not connect to any current pedestrian or micromobility facilities, and the applicant does not provide any information as to how future connections may be made. 1 - The project does not connect to any current pedestrian or micromobility facilities, but the applicant describes how future connections will be made and any action to date towards those connections. 2 - The project connects to other micromobility or pedestrian facilities, including painted bike lanes or sidewalks. 3 - The project connects to safe micromobility and pedestrian facilities, or functions as an extension of an existing facility.</p>	
<p>The project improves safety and accessibility for people with disabilities. Disqualifying - The proposed project introduces potentially unsafe elements for people with disabilities. Alternatively, the project does not address identifiable issues with Americans with Disabilities Act Compliance in the Project Area. 0 - The project makes no significant improvements or creates incidental enhancements to safety for people with disabilities. 1 - The project makes minor improvements to safety for people with disabilities. 2 - The project makes significant improvements to safety for people with disabilities.</p>	<p align="center">Yes</p>

Safety: Transportation by all modes will be safe.	Equity Multiplier?
<p>The project effectively addresses safety for transit operations and users. 0 - The project makes no significant improvements or creates incidental benefits to safety for transit operations or transit users. 1 - The project makes minor improvements to safety for transit operations or transit users. 2 - The project makes significant improvements to safety for transit operations or transit users.</p>	
Mobility and Reliability	
<p>The applicant thoroughly describes deficiencies in the current design of the corridor or intersection, and how the project addresses these deficiencies. 0 - The proposed project includes minor improvements to roadway mobility, or focuses primarily on the preservation of existing assets. 1 - The project primarily upgrades existing active transportation infrastructure within the current right of way and street footprint that addresses some of the deficiencies along the corridor. 2 - The project upgrades and modernizes infrastructure, including improvements that create active transportation connections where none currently exist. 3 - The project thoroughly addresses deficiencies in a corridor or network of assets to provide broader regional active transportation or intermodal connections.</p>	
<p>The project improves pedestrian safety near a high-utility corridor to promote walking. 0 - The project does not involve significant pedestrian safety improvements. 1 - The project improves pedestrian safety on a corridor with moderate utility. 2 - The project improves pedestrian safety on a high utility corridor.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>The project improves safety near a high-utility corridor for other active transportation modes other than walking. 0 - The project does not involve significant safety improvements for other active transportation modes. 1 - The project improves active transportation safety for other active transportation modes on a corridor with moderate utility. 2 - The project improves active transportation safety for other active transportation modes on a high utility corridor.</p>	
<p>The applicant details how the facility may be maintained and upgraded throughout its useful life, including plans to ensure accessibility of the facility year round by users (ex: snow plowing, root management). 0 - The applicant does not describe their approach towards maintaining and supporting the asset. 1 - The applicant describes the process by which the asset may be maintained, and access supported. 2 - The applicant describes the process by which the asset may be maintained and access supported, and includes a plan for future improvements to the asset or along the network.</p>	
<p>The project improves travel time reliability by investing in measures that reduce dependence on single-occupancy-vehicle trips. 0 - The project does not improve travel time reliability, or does not significantly invest in non-SOV transportation modes. 1 - The project has some impact on travel time reliability through minor investments in non-SOV transportation modes. 2 - The project has some impact on travel time reliability through moderate investments in non-SOV transportation modes. 3 - The project has a significant impact on travel time reliability through rigorous investments in non-SOV transportation modes.</p>	

Safety: Transportation by all modes will be safe.	Equity Multiplier?
<p>The project invests in safe pedestrian facilities. 0 - The project does not invest in pedestrian facilities, or establishes facilities that are disconnected from other pedestrian infrastructure with no plans for connections. 1 - The project makes some investments in pedestrian facilities, such as beacons and sidewalks, but investments are limited to the immediate project area (ex: intersection). 2 - The project makes comprehensive investments in new and upgraded pedestrian facilities in the project area, and establishes safe connections to a greater pedestrian network.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>The project includes complementary investments from bikeshare facilities. 0 - No bikeshare facilities are present along the route or near the asset. 1 - Bikeshare facilities are present along the route or near the asset.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
Access and Connectivity	
<p>The project serves sites targeted for future development (Up to 2 points). 0 - The project does not serve a site targeted for future development. 1 - The project serves a site for future development. 2 - The project serves a site targeted for future development that includes transit-supportive mixed-use or residential sites.</p>	
<p>The project serves sites included within a municipal Section 3A 'MBTA Communities' zoning district or other transit oriented development. (Up to 2 points). 0 - The project does not serve a TOD or MBTA Communities site. 1 - The project is near to or indirectly serves a TOD or MBTA Communities site. 2 - The project directly intersects with or serves a TOD or MBTA Communities site.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>The project serves existing employment and population centers (Up to 3 points). 0 - The project does not serve an existing employment or population center. 1 - The project serves an existing employment or population center. 2 - The project serves an existing employment and population center. 3 - The project serves an existing employment and population center with significant affordable housing opportunities.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>The project improves navigability at or along the work area through signage. 0 - No signage improvements are incorporated into the project. 1 - Signage improvements, which may include interpretive signage, are included in the proposed project.</p>	
<p>The project addresses safety concerns near to key public community assets. 0 - The project is not near to any key public community assets. 1 - The project addresses safety concerns near to one or more community assets. 2 - The project addresses safety concerns near key public community assets with a large population of vulnerable users, such as schools, libraries, or senior centers.</p>	

Safety: Transportation by all modes will be safe.	Equity Multiplier?
<p>The project is a product of or fulfills recommendations identified in a regional or statewide study. 0 - The project is not consistent with or the applicant does not cite a regional or statewide corridor study or Road Safety Audit. 1 - The project is thematically consistent with a regional or statewide study, such as a corridor study or Road Safety Audit. 2 - The project is explicitly called for in a regional or statewide study, such as a corridor study or Road Safety Audit.</p>	
<p>The project is listed in the Massachusetts Priority Trails Network. 0 - The project is not included in the MassDOT Priority Trails Network. 2 - The project is included in the MassDOT Priority Trails Network</p>	
<p>The project involves collaboration between multiple municipalities. 0 - Only one municipality is involved in the project. 1 - One or more municipalities are involved in the project.</p>	
<p>The asset can be safely accessed by non-SOV modes of transportation. 0 - Access to the asset is predominantly conducted by SOV modes. 1 - Access to the asset can be performed by walking, but facilities are either unsafe or are located in lower volume areas. 2 - Access to the asset can be performed by a variety of methods, including by transit.</p>	
<p>(Penalty) The project applicant is an MBTA Community not in compliance with Section 3A. 0 - The municipality is in compliance with or not subject to Section 3A. -5 - The municipality is not in compliance with Section 3A.</p>	
Resilience	
<p>The project reduces the risk of flooding in the project area through adaptation and resilience improvements. 0 - The project does not address flooding. 1 - The project reduces flood risk using structural adaptation/gray infrastructure. 2 - The project reduces flood risk using nature-based adaptation/green infrastructure, or a combination of green and gray infrastructure.</p>	Yes
<p>The project reduces the risk of extreme temperatures by reducing pavement cover, planting shade trees, providing shade structures, increasing green space, etc. 0 - The project does not address extreme temperatures. 1 - The project reduces extreme temperature risk using structural adaptation/gray infrastructure. 2 - The project reduces extreme temperature risk using nature-based adaptation/green infrastructure, or a combination of green and gray infrastructure.</p>	Yes
<p>The project implements recommendations or addresses needs identified in the respective municipality's Hazard Mitigation Plan, Municipal Vulnerability Plan, or Climate Adaptation Plan. 0 - The project does not address needs or recommendations. 2 - The project addresses needs or recommendations.</p>	

Safety: Transportation by all modes will be safe.	Equity Multiplier?
<p>The project improves stormwater infrastructure beyond MassDEP's MS4 standard. 0 - The project meets minimum standards. 1 - The project includes one design element to go above minimum stormwater improvement standards (adopts stormwater BMPs, prepares pollution and/or erosion prevention plan, adopts environmentally sensitive site design practices, is expected to remove high amounts of TSS, etc.). 2 - Project adopts more than one design element to go above minimum stormwater improvement standards.</p>	
<p>The project applicant demonstrates regional coordination or partnership on resilience improvements and project impacts with neighboring municipalities, environmental or EJ advocacy groups, local community organizations, regional or state agencies, etc. 0 - The applicant does not demonstrate regional coordination. 1 - The applicant demonstrates regional coordination with neighboring municipalities and/or regional or state agencies. 2 - The applicant demonstrates regional coordination with neighboring municipalities, regional or state agencies AND local community organizations/advocacy groups.</p>	
<p>The applicant details the expected useful life of the improvements, provides a plan for maintenance of resilience improvements, and/or references current and future climate conditions. 0 - Applicant does not reference current and future climate conditions and does not provide a plan for maintenance. 1 - Applicant references current and future climate conditions AND/OR provides a plan for maintenance.</p>	
<p>The project proposes improvements and reduces climate risk along evacuation routes and/or roadways that provide emergency access to critical facilities such as police stations, fire stations, and hospitals. 0 - The project does not propose improvements to an evacuation route or along roadways that provide emergency access to critical facilities. 1 - The project proposes improvements along an evacuation route OR along a roadway that provide emergency access to critical facilities. 2 - The project proposes improvements along an evacuation route AND along a roadway that provide emergency access to critical facilities.</p>	
<p>The project design is expected to address multiple hazards and/or provide multiple environmental benefits such as risk reduction, ecological restoration, aquatic connectivity, improved water quality, groundwater recharge, etc. 0 - Project design is not expected to address multiple hazards or provide multiple environmental benefits. 1 - Project design is expected to address multiple hazards or provide multiple environmental benefits. 2 - Project design is expected to address multiple hazards and provide multiple environmental benefits.</p>	
<p>(Penalty) The project is located in an existing or projected flood zone and/or the project site has flooded in the past and the applicant does not specify how the project will address flooding. 0 - Project is not located in an existing or projected flood zone and site has not flooded in the past OR project is located in a flood zone and the applicant specifies how the project will address flooding. -3 - Project is located in an existing or projected flood zone or site has flooded in the past and the project does not specify how it will address flooding.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Safety: Transportation by all modes will be safe.	Equity Multiplier?
<p>(Penalty) The project is located in an area that is vulnerable to extreme heat and the applicant does not specify how the project will address heat. 0 - The project is not located in an area vulnerable to extreme heat OR project is located in a vulnerable area and the applicant specifies how the project will address heat. -3 - The project is located in an area vulnerable to extreme heat and the project does not specify how it will address heat.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
Clean Air and Healthy Communities	
<p>The project includes design elements aimed at reducing the amount of Single-Occupancy-Vehicle (SOV) trips (Up to 3 points). Disqualifying - The project does not provide effective reductions in the amount of Single Occupancy Vehicle trips 1 - The project provides some reductions in Single Occupancy Vehicle trips, but the extent is unclear or the primary usage of the facility will be for recreation. 2 - The project reduces Single Occupancy Vehicle trips to a moderate or greater extent, and includes viable non-recreational uses for the facility. 3 - The project not only includes reductions in Single Occupancy Vehicle trips by improving facilities for pedestrians and micromobility users, but complementing connections for other non-car modes such as transit or other trails..</p>	
<p>The project reduces greenhouse gas emissions (Up to 3 points). 0 - The project does not support a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. 1 - The project supports a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions primarily by reducing travel time delay. 3 - The project includes a variety of elements aimed at reducing emissions such as low or no emission mobility improvements, innovative technologies or methods, and travel demand management.</p>	
<p>The project is expected to have a positive impact on adjacent communities and natural areas through low impact design, pavement reduction, nature-based adaptation, and other improvements that protect air/water/soil quality, provide ecological restoration and functioning, improve aquatic connectivity, etc. -1 - The project is expected to have a negative impact on adjacent communities or natural areas. 0 - The project is not expected to impact adjacent communities or natural areas. 2 - The project is expected to have a positive impact on adjacent communities or natural areas. 3 - The project specifies native species for any added vegetation or green space.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>The proposed project incorporates or will incorporate a meaningful community outreach and engagement process (Up to 3 points). 0 - The proposed project will incorporate all legally required community outreach and engagement necessary for the use of federal funding. 1 - The proposed project will incorporate additional community outreach and engagement as necessary, including public meetings within the served municipality or municipalities. 2 - The proposed project has already utilized community outreach and engagement, and the applicant will continue to engage stakeholders in the project process as it develops. 3 - The proposed project is the result of a rigorous community engagement process, and the proposed scope of work reflects the feedback or input received by the applicant from the community. The applicant will continue to engage stakeholders in the process, and the applicant has novel or innovative strategies to improve community engagement.</p>	

Safety: Transportation by all modes will be safe.	Equity Multiplier?
<p>The project effectively engages all community members in its outreach strategy and access for the service, specifically persons with disabilities or those with limited English proficiency (Up to 2 points). 0 - The project performs all legally required measures to ensure compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. 1 - The applicant has identified a strategy to bring community members of all abilities and language proficiencies into the project outreach process and to ensure their access to services. 2 - The applicant has implemented an effective strategy to engage community members of all abilities and language proficiencies into the project engagement process and into offered services, while also identifying areas for potential improvement.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>The project improves access to open space or sites for active recreation. 0 - The project does not improve access to open space or sites for active recreation. 2 - The project does improve access to open space or sites for active recreation.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
BONUSES	
<p>CAHQ: Pursuant to the improvement of the capacity of the transit asset or supportive facilities to capture/process/treat carbon emissions, the project utilizes nature-based solutions to improve air quality/treatment.</p>	
<p>CAHQ: Pursuant to the improvement of the capacity of the transit asset or supportive facilities to capture/process/treat contaminated water, the project utilizes nature-based solutions to improve water quality or treatment.</p>	
<p>Resilience: The project design is expected to address multiple hazards and/or provide multiple environmental benefits such as risk reduction, ecological restoration, aquatic connectivity, improved water quality, groundwater recharge, etc. 0 - Project design is not expected to address multiple hazards or provide multiple environmental benefits. 1 - Project design is expected to address multiple hazards OR provide multiple environmental benefits. 2 - Project design is expected to address multiple hazards AND provide multiple environmental benefits.</p>	
<p>Resilience: The project design includes provision of educational material for the public related to environmental improvements and aspects of the project/area. 0 - Project will not provide educational material. 1 - Project will provide educational material.</p>	
<p>Resilience: The primary purpose of the project is to improve resilience and reduce risk to climate hazards. 0 - The primary purpose of the project is not resilience. 1 - The primary purpose of the project is resilience.</p>	
<p>Resilience: The project proponents have used RMAT's Climate Resilience Design Standards Tool to demonstrate the value of resilience improvements in the project area. 0 - Proponents have not shared results from RMAT's Climate Resilience Design Standards Tool. 1 - Proponents have shared results from RMAT's Climate Resilience Design Standards Tool.</p>	

**Table A-6
FFYs 2027–31 TIP Evaluation Criteria: Complete Streets Program**

Safety: Transportation by all modes will be safe.	Equity Multiplier?
<p>The project addresses a location with severe crashes.</p> <p>+2 EPDO value of 100 or more +1 EPDO value of less than 100 +0 No EPDO value"</p>	<p align="center">Yes</p>
<p>The project addresses a location with a high frequency of crashes.</p> <p>+2 Crash rate between 0.78 or greater +1 Crash rate between 0.20 and 0.78 +0 Crash rate below 0.20</p>	<p align="center">Yes</p>
<p>The project addresses a statewide Top Crash Location.</p> <p>0 - The project does not address a Top 200 Crash Cluster, Top 5% Intersection Crash Cluster, Top 5% Bicycle Crash Cluster, or Top 5% Pedestrian Crash Cluster. 1 - The project addresses one of the following: a Top 5% Intersection Crash Cluster, a Top 5% Bicycle Crash Cluster, or Top 5% Pedestrian Crash Cluster. 2 - The project addresses two of the following: a Top 5% Intersection Crash Cluster, a Top 5% Bicycle Crash Cluster, or a Top 5% Pedestrian Crash Cluster. 3 - The project addresses three or more Intersection, Bicycle, and/or Pedestrian Crash Clusters, or contains a Statewide Top 200 Crash Location.</p>	
<p>The project addresses a truck-related safety issue.</p> <p>0 - The project does not directly address truck safety in the project area. 1 - The project directly addresses truck safety in the project area, including improving the safety of vulnerable users navigating in mixed traffic with trucks.</p>	
<p>The project effectively addresses safety for micromobility users.</p> <p>-2 - The project introduces potentially unsafe elements for micromobility users. 0 - The project makes no significant improvements or creates incidental benefits to safety for micromobility users. 1 - The project makes minor improvements to safety for micromobility users. 2 - The project makes significant improvements to safety for micromobility users.</p>	
<p>The project effectively addresses safety for pedestrians.</p> <p>- 2 - The project introduces potentially unsafe elements for pedestrians. 0 - The project makes no significant improvements or creates incidental benefits to safety for pedestrians. 1 - The project makes minor improvements to safety for pedestrians. 2 - The project makes significant improvements to safety for pedestrians.</p>	<p align="center">Yes</p>

Safety: Transportation by all modes will be safe.	Equity Multiplier?
<p>The project effectively addresses safety for people with disabilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 5 - The proposed project introduces potentially unsafe elements for people with disabilities. Alternatively, the project does not address identifiable issues with Americans with Disabilities Act Compliance in the Project Area. 0 - The project makes no significant improvements or creates incidental enhancements to safety for persons with disabilities. 1 - The project makes minor improvements to safety for people with disabilities. 2 - The project makes significant improvements to safety for people with disabilities. 	Yes
<p>The project effectively addresses safety for transit operations and users.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 - The project makes no significant improvements or creates incidental benefits to safety for transit operations or transit users. 1 - The project makes minor improvements to safety for transit operations or transit users. 2 - The project makes significant improvements to safety for transit operations or transit users. 	
Mobility and Reliability	
<p>The project improves pedestrian safety near a high-utility corridor to promote walking.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 - The project does not involve significant pedestrian safety improvements. 1 - The project improves pedestrian safety on a corridor with moderate utility. 2 - The project improves pedestrian safety on a high utility corridor. 	Yes
<p>The project improves safety near a high-utility corridor for other active transportation modes other than walking.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 - The project does not involve significant safety improvements for other active transportation modes. 1 - The project improves active transportation safety for other active transportation modes on a corridor with moderate utility. 2 - The project improves active transportation safety for other active transportation modes on a high utility corridor. 	Yes
<p>The applicant thoroughly describes deficiencies in the current design of the corridor or intersection, and how the project addresses these deficiencies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 - The proposed project includes minor improvements to roadway mobility, or focuses primarily on the preservation of existing assets. 1 - The project primarily upgrades existing infrastructure within the current right of way and street footprint that addresses some of the deficiencies along the corridor. 2 - The project focuses on upgrades and modernization of infrastructure, including improvements to accessibility by non-SOV modes, both within the current street footprint or beyond existing right of way. 3 - The project thoroughly addresses deficiencies in the design of the corridor or intersection, and also addresses potential deficiencies elsewhere on a corridor. 	
<p>The project addresses an unreliable corridor with significant travel time delay.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 - The project does not address an unreliable corridor. 1 - The project improves the safety along an unreliable corridor, but the benefits of the improvements are difficult to quantify. 2 - The project significantly improves the safety of travel along an unreliable corridor. Travel time delay may be improved due to a reduced crash frequency. 3 - The project thoroughly improves the safety of travel along an unreliable corridor, and directly reduces travel time delay through the proposed street design. 	

Safety: Transportation by all modes will be safe.	Equity Multiplier?
<p>The project improves travel time reliability by investing in measures that reduce dependence on single-occupancy-vehicle trips.</p> <p>0 - The project does not improve travel time reliability, or does not significantly invest in non-single occupancy vehicle transportation modes. 1 - The project has some impact on travel time reliability through minor investments in non-single occupancy vehicle transportation modes. 2 - The project has some impact on travel time reliability through moderate investments in non-single occupancy vehicle transportation modes. 3 - The project has a significant impact on travel time reliability through rigorous investments in non-single occupancy vehicle transportation modes.</p>	
<p>The project invests in safe pedestrian facilities.</p> <p>0 - The project does not invest in pedestrian facilities, or establishes facilities that are disconnected from other pedestrian infrastructure with no plans for connections. 1 - The project makes some investments in pedestrian facilities, such as beacons and sidewalks, but investments are limited to the immediate project area (ex: intersection). 2 - The project makes comprehensive investments in new and upgraded pedestrian facilities in the project area, and establishes safe connections to a greater pedestrian network.</p>	Yes
<p>The project invests in safe micromobility facilities.</p> <p>0 - The project does not invest in bicycle facilities, or proposed facilities do not offer significant levels of safety (ex: painted bicycle lanes with no separation). 2 - The project invests in safe bicycle facilities.</p>	Yes
<p>The project invests in safe transit facilities.</p> <p>0 - The project does not invest in any transit facilities. 1 - The project makes some transit-supportive investments (ex: bumpouts near bus stops). 2 - The project directly invests in transit facilities (ex: transit signal priority).</p>	Yes
Access and Connectivity	
<p>The project serves sites targeted for future development (Up to 3 points).</p> <p>0 - The project does not serve a site targeted for future development. 1 - The project serves a site for future development. 2 - The project serves a site targeted for future development that includes transit-supportive mixed-use or residential sites. 3 - The project serves a site or sites targeted for future development that include transit-supportive mixed-use or residential sites, and are included as part of compliance with Section 3A of the Massachusetts Zoning Act from the community in which it is located.</p>	
<p>The project serves existing employment and population centers (Up to 3 points).</p> <p>0 - The project does not serve an existing employment or population center. 1 - The project serves an existing employment or population center. 2 - The project serves an existing employment and population center. 3 - The project serves an existing employment and population center with significant affordable housing opportunities.</p>	Yes

Safety: Transportation by all modes will be safe.	Equity Multiplier?
<p>The project addresses safety concerns near to key public community assets. 0 - The project is not near to any key public community assets. 1 - The project is near to one or more community assets. 2 - The project addresses safety concerns near key public community assets with a large population of vulnerable users, such as schools, libraries, or senior centers.</p>	Yes
<p>The project addresses safety concerns in multiple locations. 0 - Project improvements are concentrated at a specific site. 1 - The applicant details how the project is expected to have network improvements at other sites along the corridor. 2 - The project directly addresses multiple concerns at different locations.</p>	
<p>The project improves navigability at or along the work area through signage. 0 - No signage improvements are incorporated into the project. 1 - Signage improvements, which may include interpretive signage, are included in the proposed project.</p>	
<p>The project is a product of or fulfills recommendations identified in a regional or statewide study. 0 - The project is not consistent with or the applicant does not cite a regional or statewide corridor study or Road Safety Audit. 1 - The project is thematically consistent with a regional or statewide study, such as a corridor study or Road Safety Audit. 2 - The project is explicitly called for in a regional or statewide study, such as a corridor study or Road Safety Audit.</p>	
<p>The project involves collaboration between multiple municipalities. 0 - Only one municipality is involved in the project. 1 - One or more municipalities are involved in the project.</p>	
<p>The project is near to or on a primary thoroughfare for regional freight travel. 0 - The project is not listed on a roadway with significant freight volumes. 1 - The project is on a roadway with significant freight volumes.</p>	
<p>(Penalty) The project applicant is an MBTA Community not in compliance with Section 3A. 0 - The municipality is in compliance with or not subject to Section 3A. -5 - The municipality is not in compliance with Section 3A.</p>	
Resilience	
<p>The project reduces the risk of flooding in the project area through adaptation and resilience improvements. 0 - The project does not address flooding. 1 - The project reduces flood risk using structural adaptation/grey infrastructure. 2 - The project reduces flood risk using nature-based adaptation/green infrastructure, or a combination of green and gray infrastructure.</p>	Yes

Safety: Transportation by all modes will be safe.	Equity Multiplier?
<p>The project reduces the risk of extreme temperatures by reducing pavement cover, planting shade trees, providing shade structures, increasing green space, etc. 0 - The project does not address extreme temperatures. 1 - The project reduces extreme temperature risk using structural adaptation/grey infrastructure. 2 - The project reduces extreme temperature risk using nature-based adaptation/green infrastructure, or a combination of green and gray infrastructure.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>The project implements recommendations or addresses needs identified in the respective municipality's Hazard Mitigation Plan, Municipal Vulnerability Plan, or Climate Adaptation Plan. 0 - The project does not address needs or recommendations. 2 - The project addresses needs or recommendations.</p>	
<p>The project improves stormwater infrastructure beyond MassDEP's MS4 standard. 0 - The project meets minimum standards. 1 - The project includes one design element to go above minimum stormwater improvement standards (adopts stormwater BMPs, prepares pollution and/or erosion prevention plan, adopts environmentally sensitive site design practices, is expected to remove high amounts of TSS, etc.). 2 - Project adopts more than one design element to go above minimum stormwater improvement standards.</p>	
<p>The project applicant demonstrates regional coordination or partnership on resilience improvements and project impacts with neighboring municipalities, environmental or EJ advocacy groups, local community organizations, regional or state agencies, etc. 0 - The applicant does not demonstrate regional coordination. 1 - The applicant demonstrates regional coordination with neighboring municipalities and/or regional or state agencies. 2 - The applicant demonstrates regional coordination with neighboring municipalities, regional or state agencies AND local community organizations/advocacy groups.</p>	
<p>The applicant details the expected useful life of the improvements, provides a plan for maintenance of resilience improvements, and/or references current and future climate conditions. 0 - Applicant does not reference current and future climate conditions and does not provide a plan for maintenance. 1 - Applicant references current and future climate conditions OR provides a plan for maintenance. 2 - Applicant references current and future climate conditions AND provides a plan for maintenance.</p>	
<p>The project proposes improvements and reduces climate risk along evacuation routes and/or roadways that provide emergency access to critical facilities such as police stations, fire stations, and hospitals. 0 - The project does not propose improvements to an evacuation route or along roadways that provide emergency access to critical facilities. 1 - The project proposes improvements along an evacuation route OR along a roadway that provide emergency access to critical facilities. 2 - The project proposes improvements along an evacuation route AND along a roadway that provide emergency access to critical facilities.</p>	

Safety: Transportation by all modes will be safe.	Equity Multiplier?
<p>(Penalty) The project is located in an existing or projected flood zone and/or the project site has flooded in the past and the applicant does not specify how the project will address flooding. 0 - Project is not located in an existing or projected flood zone and site has not flooded in the past OR project is located in a flood zone and the applicant specifies how the project will address flooding. -3 - Project is located in an existing or projected flood zone or site has flooded in the past and the project does not specify how it will address flooding.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>(Penalty) The project is located in an area that is vulnerable to extreme heat and the applicant does not specify how the project will address heat. 0 - The project is not located in an area vulnerable to extreme heat OR project is located in a vulnerable area and the applicant specifies how the project will address heat. -3 - The project is located in an area vulnerable to extreme heat and the project does not specify how it will address heat.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
Clean Air and Healthy Communities	
<p>The project includes design elements aimed at reducing the amount of Single-Occupancy-Vehicle (SOV) trips (Up to 3 points). 0 - The project does not support a reduction in single occupancy vehicle trips. 1 - The project provides indirect support to reductions in single occupancy vehicle trips through supportive infrastructure for transit or active transportation, such as signage, web applications, educational campaigns, or personnel improvements. 3 - The project supports a reduction in the amount of single occupancy vehicle trips by improving the condition or accessibility of existing transit or active transportation assets.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>The project reduces greenhouse gas emissions (Up to 3 points). 0 - The project does not support a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. 1 - The project supports a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions primarily by reducing travel time delay. 3 - The project includes a variety of elements aimed at reducing emissions such as low or no emission mobility improvements, innovative technologies or methods, and travel demand management.</p>	
<p>The project is expected to have a positive impact on adjacent communities and natural areas through low impact design, pavement reduction, nature-based adaptation, and other improvements that protect air/water/soil quality, provide ecological restoration and functioning, improve aquatic connectivity, etc. -3 - The project is expected to have a negative impact on adjacent communities or natural areas. 0 - The project is not expected to impact adjacent communities or natural areas. 2 - The project is expected to have a positive impact on adjacent communities or natural areas. 3 - The project is expected to have a positive impact AND specifies appropriate plant species for any added vegetation or green space (native species, flood/drought tolerant, diverse range of species, etc.).</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Safety: Transportation by all modes will be safe.	Equity Multiplier?
<p>The proposed project incorporates or will incorporate a meaningful community outreach and engagement process (Up to 3 points).</p> <p>0 - The proposed project will incorporate all legally required community outreach and engagement necessary for the use of federal funding.</p> <p>1 - The proposed project will incorporate additional community outreach and engagement as necessary, including public meetings within the served municipality or municipalities.</p> <p>2 - The proposed project has already been subject to community outreach and engagement, and the applicant will continue to engage stakeholders in the project process as it develops.</p> <p>3 - The proposed project is the result of a rigorous community engagement process, and the proposed scope of work reflects the feedback or input received by the applicant from the community. The applicant will continue to engage stakeholders in the process, and the applicant has novel or innovative strategies to improve community engagement.</p>	
<p>The project effectively engages all community members in its outreach strategy and access for the service, specifically people with disabilities or those with limited English proficiency (Up to 2 points).</p> <p>0 - The project performs all legally required measures to ensure compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act.</p> <p>1 - The applicant has identified a strategy to bring community members of all abilities and language proficiencies into the project outreach process and to ensure their access to services.</p> <p>2 - The applicant has implemented an effective strategy to engage community members of all abilities and language proficiencies into the project outreach process and into offered services, while also identifying areas for potential improvement.</p>	Yes
<p>The project improves access to open space or sites for active recreation.</p> <p>0 - The project does not improve access to open space or sites for active recreation.</p> <p>2 - The project does improve access to open space or sites for active recreation.</p>	
BONUSES	
<p>CAHQ: Pursuant to the improvement of the capacity of the transit asset or supportive facilities to capture/process/treat carbon emissions, the project utilizes nature-based solutions to improve air quality/treatment.</p>	
<p>CAHQ: Pursuant to the improvement of the capacity of the transit asset or supportive facilities to capture/process/treat contaminated water, the project utilizes nature-based solutions to improve water quality or treatment.</p>	
<p>Resilience: The project design is expected to address multiple hazards and/or provide multiple environmental benefits such as risk reduction, ecological restoration, aquatic connectivity, improved water quality, groundwater recharge, etc.</p> <p>0 - Project design is not expected to address multiple hazards or provide multiple environmental benefits.</p> <p>1 - Project design is expected to address multiple hazards OR provide multiple environmental benefits.</p> <p>2 - Project design is expected to address multiple hazards AND provide multiple environmental benefits.</p>	
<p>Resilience: The project design includes provision of educational material for the public related to environmental improvements and aspects of the project/area.</p> <p>0 - Project will not provide educational material.</p> <p>1 - Project will provide educational material.</p>	

Safety: Transportation by all modes will be safe.	Equity Multiplier?
<p>Resilience: The primary purpose of the project is to improve resilience and reduce risk to climate hazards. 0 - The primary purpose of the project is not resilience. 1 - The primary purpose of the project is resilience.</p>	
<p>Resilience: The project proponents have used RMA's Climate Resilience Design Standards Tool to demonstrate the value of resilience improvements in the project area. 0 - Proponents have not shared results from RMA's Climate Resilience Design Standards Tool. 1 - Proponents have shared results from RMA's Climate Resilience Design Standards Tool.</p>	

**Table A-7
FFYs 2027–31 TIP Evaluation Criteria: Intersection Improvements Program**

Evaluation Criteria: Intersection Improvements Program	Equity Multiplier?
<p>The project addresses a location identified in the Boston Region MPO Regional Safety Action Plan. 0 - The project does not address locations in the Regional Safety Action Plan. 1 - The project is located on the high injury network (HIN), but is not directly identified in the Regional Safety Action Plan. 2 - The project is located on the high injury network (HIN) and is identified in the Regional Safety Action Plan.</p>	
<p>The project addresses a truck-related safety issue. 0 - The project does not directly address truck safety in the project area. 1 - The project directly addresses truck safety in the project area, including improving the safety of vulnerable users navigating in mixed traffic with trucks.</p>	
<p>The project makes comprehensive safety improvements for all road users. 0 - The project makes no significant improvements to safety for all road users. 1 - The project makes some minor improvements to safety for automobiles. 2 - The project makes some moderate improvements to safety, but these improvements are primarily directed for automobiles. 3 - The project makes some minor improvements to the safety of vulnerable roadway users and automobiles. 4 - The project makes some moderate improvements to the safety of vulnerable roadway users, but improvements are primarily directed at automobiles. 5 - The project makes comprehensive improvements for all roadway users, such that all users may navigate through the corridor safely, including the elimination of mixed traffic between vulnerable users and automobiles where practicable.</p>	
<p>The project effectively addresses safety for micromobility users. -2 - The project introduces potentially unsafe elements for micromobility users. 0 - The project makes no significant improvements or creates incidental benefits to safety for micromobility users. 1 - The project makes minor improvements to safety for micromobility users. 2 - The project makes significant improvements to safety for micromobility users.</p>	
<p>The project effectively addresses safety for pedestrians. - 2 - The project introduces potentially unsafe elements for pedestrians. 0 - The project makes no significant improvements or creates incidental benefits to safety for pedestrians. 1 - The project makes minor improvements to safety for pedestrians. 2 - The project makes significant improvements to safety for pedestrians.</p>	Yes

Evaluation Criteria: Intersection Improvements Program	Equity Multiplier?
<p>The project effectively addresses safety for people with disabilities. - 5 - The proposed project introduces potentially unsafe elements for people with disabilities. Alternatively, the project does not address identifiable issues with Americans with Disabilities Act Compliance in the Project Area. 0 - The project makes no significant improvements or creates incidental enhancements to safety for persons with disabilities. 1 - The project makes minor improvements to safety for people with disabilities. 2 - The project makes significant improvements to safety for people with disabilities.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>The project effectively addresses safety for transit operations and users. 0 - The project makes no significant improvements or creates incidental benefits to safety for transit operations or transit users. 1 - The project makes minor improvements to safety for transit operations or transit users. 2 - The project makes significant improvements to safety for transit operations or transit users.</p>	
Mobility and Reliability	
<p>The project improves pedestrian safety near a high-utility corridor to promote walking. 0 - The project does not involve significant pedestrian safety improvements. 1 - The project improves pedestrian safety on a corridor with moderate utility. 2 - The project improves pedestrian safety on a high utility corridor.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>The project improves safety near a high-utility corridor for other active transportation modes other than walking. 0 - The project does not involve significant safety improvements for other active transportation modes. 1 - The project improves active transportation safety for other active transportation modes on a corridor with moderate utility. 2 - The project improves active transportation safety for other active transportation modes on a high utility corridor.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>The applicant thoroughly describes deficiencies in the current design of the corridor or intersection with regard to safety, and how the project addresses these deficiencies. 0 - The proposed project has minor improvements to roadway safety, or focuses primarily on the preservation of existing assets. 1 - The project primarily upgrades existing infrastructure within the current right of way and street footprint that addresses some of the deficiencies along the corridor. 2 - The project focuses on upgrades and modernization of infrastructure, including improvements to accessibility by non-SOV modes, both within the current street footprint or beyond existing right of way. 3 - The project thoroughly addresses deficiencies in the design of the corridor or intersection, and also addresses potential deficiencies elsewhere on a corridor.</p>	
<p>The project addresses an unreliable corridor with significant travel time delay. 0 - The project does not address an unreliable corridor. 1 - The project improves the safety along an unreliable corridor, but the benefits of the improvements are difficult to quantify. 2 - The project significantly improves the safety of travel along an unreliable corridor. Travel time delay may be improved due to a reduced crash frequency. 3 - The project thoroughly improves the safety of travel along an unreliable corridor, and directly reduces travel time delay through the proposed street design.</p>	

Evaluation Criteria: Intersection Improvements Program	Equity Multiplier?
<p>The project improves travel time reliability by investing in measures that reduce dependence on single-occupancy-vehicle trips. 0 - The project does not improve travel time reliability, or does not significantly invest in non-SOV transportation modes. 1 - The project has some impact on travel time reliability through minor investments in non-SOV transportation modes. 2 - The project has a significant impact on travel time reliability through rigorous investments in non-SOV transportation modes.</p>	
<p>The project invests in safe pedestrian facilities. 0 - The project does not invest in pedestrian facilities, or establishes facilities that are disconnected from other pedestrian infrastructure with no plans for connections. 1 - The project makes some investments in pedestrian facilities, such as beacons and sidewalks, but investments are limited to the immediate project area (ex: intersection). 2 - The project makes comprehensive investments in new and upgraded pedestrian facilities in the project area, and establishes safe connections to a greater pedestrian network.</p>	Yes
<p>The project invests in safe micromobility facilities. 0 - The project does not invest in bicycle facilities, or proposed facilities do not offer significant levels of safety (ex: painted bicycle lanes with no separation). 1 - The project invests in safe bicycle facilities.</p>	Yes
<p>The project invests in safe transit facilities. 0 - The project does not invest in any transit facilities. 1 - The project makes some transit-supportive investments (ex: bumpouts near bus stops). 2 - The project directly invests in transit facilities (ex: transit signal priority).</p>	Yes
Access and Connectivity	
<p>The project serves sites targeted for future development (Up to 3 points). 0 - The project does not serve a site targeted for future development. 1 - The project serves a site for future development. 2 - The project serves a site targeted for future development that includes mixed-use or residential sites. 3 - The project serves a site or sites targeted for future development that includes mixed-use or residential sites, and are included as part of compliance with Section 3A of the Massachusetts Zoning Act from the community in which it is located.</p>	
<p>The project serves existing employment and population centers (Up to 3 points). 0 - The project does not serve an existing employment or population center. 1 - The project serves an existing employment or population center. 2 - The project serves an existing employment and population center. 3 - The project serves an existing employment and population center, or a population center that has significant affordable housing opportunities.</p>	Yes
<p>The project addresses safety concerns in multiple locations. 0 - Project improvements are concentrated at a specific site. 1 - The applicant details how the project is expected to have network improvements at other sites along the corridor. 2 - The project directly addresses multiple concerns at different locations.</p>	

Evaluation Criteria: Intersection Improvements Program	Equity Multiplier?
<p>The project addresses safety concerns near to key public community assets. 0 - The project is not near to any key public community assets. 1 - The project addresses safety concerns near key public community assets with a large population of vulnerable users, such as schools, libraries, or senior centers.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>The project improves navigability at or along the work area. 0 - No signage improvements are incorporated into the project. 1 - Signage improvements, which may include interpretive signage, are included in the proposed project.</p>	
<p>The project is a product of or fulfills recommendations identified in a regional or statewide study. 0 - The project is not consistent with or the applicant does not cite a regional or statewide corridor study or Road Safety Audit. 1 - The project is thematically consistent with a regional or statewide study, such as a corridor study or Road Safety Audit. 2 - The project is explicitly called for in a regional or statewide study, such as a corridor study or Road Safety Audit.</p>	
<p>The project involves collaboration between multiple municipalities. 0 - Only one municipality is involved in the project. 1 - One or more municipalities are involved in the project.</p>	
<p>The project is near to or on a primary thoroughfare for regional freight travel. 0 - The project is not listed on a roadway with significant freight volumes. 1 - The project is on a roadway with significant freight volumes.</p>	
Resilience	
<p>The project reduces the risk of flooding in the project area through adaptation and resilience improvements. 0 - The project does not address flooding. 1 - The project reduces flood risk using structural adaptation/grey infrastructure. 2 - The project reduces flood risk using nature-based adaptation/green infrastructure, or a combination of green and gray infrastructure.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>The project reduces the risk of extreme heat by reducing pavement cover, planting shade trees, providing shade structures, increasing green space, etc. 0 - The project does not address extreme heat. 1 - The project reduces extreme heat risk using structural adaptation/grey infrastructure. 2 - The project reduces extreme heat risk using nature-based adaptation/green infrastructure, or a combination of green and gray infrastructure.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>The project implements recommendations or addresses needs identified in the respective municipality's Hazard Mitigation Plan, Municipal Vulnerability Plan, or Climate Adaptation Plan. 0 - The project does not address needs or recommendations. 2 - The project addresses needs or recommendations.</p>	

Evaluation Criteria: Intersection Improvements Program	Equity Multiplier?
<p>The project improves stormwater infrastructure beyond MassDEP's MS4 standard. 0 - The project meets minimum standards. 1 - The project includes one design element to go above minimum stormwater improvement standards (adopts stormwater BMPs, prepares pollution and/or erosion prevention plan, adopts environmentally sensitive site design practices, is expected to remove high amounts of TSS, etc.). 2 - Project adopts more than one design element to go above minimum stormwater improvement standards.</p>	
<p>The project applicant demonstrates regional coordination or partnership on resilience improvements and project impacts with neighboring municipalities, environmental or EJ advocacy groups, local community organizations, regional or state agencies, etc. 0 - The applicant does not demonstrate regional coordination. 1 - The applicant demonstrates regional coordination with neighboring municipalities and/or regional or state agencies. 2 - The applicant demonstrates regional coordination with neighboring municipalities, regional or state agencies AND local community organizations/advocacy groups.</p>	
<p>The applicant details the expected useful life of the improvements, provides a plan for maintenance of resilience improvements, and/or references current and future climate conditions. 0 - Applicant does not reference current and future climate conditions and does not provide a plan for maintenance. 1 - Applicant references current and future climate conditions AND/OR provides a plan for maintenance.</p>	
<p>The project proposes improvements and reduces climate risk along evacuation routes and/or roadways that provide emergency access to critical facilities such as police stations, fire stations, and hospitals. 0 - The project does not propose improvements to an evacuation route or along roadways that provide emergency access to critical facilities. 1 - The project proposes improvements along an evacuation route OR along a roadway that provide emergency access to critical facilities.</p>	
<p>(Penalty) The project is located in an existing or projected flood zone and/or the project site has flooded in the past and the applicant does not specify how the project will address flooding. 0 - Project is not located in an existing or projected flood zone and site has not flooded in the past OR project is located in a flood zone and the applicant specifies how the project will address flooding. -3 - Project is located in an existing or projected flood zone or site has flooded in the past and the project does not specify how it will address flooding.</p>	Yes
<p>(Penalty) The project is located in an area that is vulnerable to extreme heat and the applicant does not specify how the project will address heat. 0 - The project is not located in an area vulnerable to extreme heat OR project is located in a vulnerable area and the applicant specifies how the project will address heat. -3 - The project is located in an area vulnerable to extreme heat and the project does not specify how it will address heat.</p>	Yes
Clean Air and Healthy Communities	
<p>The project includes design elements aimed at reducing the amount of Single-Occupancy-Vehicle (SOV) trips (Up to 2 points). 0 - The project does not support a reduction in SOV trips. 1 - The project provides indirect support to reductions in SOV trips through supportive infrastructure for transit or active transportation, such as signage, web applications, educational campaigns, or personnel improvements. 2 - The project supports a reduction in the amount of SOV trips by improving the condition or accessibility of existing transit or active transportation assets.</p>	Yes

Evaluation Criteria: Intersection Improvements Program	Equity Multiplier?
<p>The project includes design elements aimed at reducing greenhouse gas emissions (Up to 3 points). 0 - The project does not support a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. 1 - The project supports a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions primarily by reducing travel time delay. 2 - The project includes a variety of elements aimed at reducing emissions such as low or no emission mobility improvements, innovative technologies or methods, and travel demand management.</p>	
<p>The project is expected to have a positive impact on adjacent communities and natural areas through low impact design, pavement reduction, nature-based adaptation, and other improvements that protect air/water/soil quality, provide ecological restoration and functioning, improve aquatic connectivity, etc. -3 - The project is expected to have a negative impact on adjacent communities or natural areas. 0 - The project is not expected to impact adjacent communities or natural areas. 2 - The project is expected to have a positive impact on adjacent communities or natural areas. 3 - The project is expected to have a positive impact AND specifies appropriate plant species for any added vegetation or green space (native species, flood/drought tolerant, diverse range of species, etc.).</p>	Yes
<p>The proposed project incorporates or will incorporate a meaningful community outreach and engagement process (Up to 3 points). 0 - The proposed project will incorporate all legally required community outreach and engagement necessary for the use of federal funding. 1 - The proposed project will incorporate additional community outreach and engagement as necessary, including public meetings within the served municipality or municipalities. 2 - The proposed project has already been subject to community outreach and engagement, and the applicant will continue to engage stakeholders in the project process as it develops. 3 - The proposed project is the result of a rigorous community engagement process, and the proposed scope of work reflects the feedback or input received by the applicant from the community. The applicant will continue to engage stakeholders in the process, and the applicant has novel or innovative strategies to improve community engagement.</p>	
<p>The project proposes design elements aimed at improving water quality and reducing pollutant runoff to adjacent water resources. (Up to 1 point). 0 - The project does not propose any measures that address water quality, or contaminants generated by the facility or along the transit route. 1 - The project directly improves water quality through technologies or strategies that improve treatment capacity or limit contamination, including investment in expanded stormwater treatment facilities or reductions in impervious surfaces.</p>	
BONUSES	
<p>CAHQ: Pursuant to the improvement of the capacity of the transit asset or supportive facilities to capture/process/treat carbon emissions, the project utilizes nature-based solutions to improve air quality/treatment.</p>	
<p>CAHQ: Pursuant to the improvement of the capacity of the transit asset or supportive facilities to capture/process/treat contaminated water, the project utilizes nature-based solutions to improve water quality or treatment.</p>	

Evaluation Criteria: Intersection Improvements Program	Equity Multiplier?
<p>Resilience: The project design is expected to address multiple hazards and/or provide multiple environmental benefits such as risk reduction, ecological restoration, aquatic connectivity, improved water quality, groundwater recharge, etc.</p> <p>0 - Project design is not expected to address multiple hazards or provide multiple environmental benefits. 1 - Project design is expected to address multiple hazards OR provide multiple environmental benefits. 2 - Project design is expected to address multiple hazards AND provide multiple environmental benefits.</p>	
<p>Resilience: The project design includes provision of educational material for the public related to environmental improvements and aspects of the project/area.</p> <p>0 - Project will not provide educational material. 1 - Project will provide educational material.</p>	
<p>Resilience: The primary purpose of the project is to improve resilience and reduce risk to climate hazards.</p> <p>0 - The primary purpose of the project is not resilience. 1 - The primary purpose of the project is resilience.</p>	
<p>Resilience: The project proponents have used RMAT's Climate Resilience Design Standards Tool to demonstrate the value of resilience improvements in the project area.</p> <p>0 - Proponents have not shared results from RMAT's Climate Resilience Design Standards Tool. 1 - Proponents have shared results from RMAT's Climate Resilience Design Standards Tool.</p>	

**Table A-8
FFYs 2027–31 TIP Evaluation Criteria: Transit Transformation Program**

Evaluation Criteria: Transit Transformation Program	Equity Multiplier?
<p>The proposed project supports dedicated rights of way for transit, or mitigates interference from other facility users (Up to 2 Points). 0 - The project does not address any shared right of way 1 - The project makes minor improvements to safety on existing rights of way used by transit operators. 2 - The project makes significant improvements to safety on existing rights of way used by transit operators, or creates new dedicated right of way for transit vehicles.</p>	
<p>The proposed project improves system responsiveness during emergency events (Up to 2 Points). 0 - The proposed project does not improve emergency response times. 1 - The proposed project makes improvements to emergency response times within the facility 2 - The proposed project makes improvements to emergency response times within and beyond the facility</p>	
Mobility and Reliability	
<p>The project reduces transit passenger delay (Up to 5 points)</p>	Yes
<p>The project invests in new transit assets or expanded service (Up to 5 points)</p>	Yes
<p>The project performs state of good repair improvements that extend the useful life of the facility (Up to 2 points) 0 - The project does not incorporate state of good repair improvements for existing facilities. 1 - The project incorporates state of good repair improvements for existing facilities. 2 - The project incorporates state of good repair improvements for existing facilities, and the proposed mobilization and construction strategy avoids closures to transit facilities or disruptions to transit operations.</p>	
<p>The project improves conditions for personnel that support transit operations (Up to 2 points). 0 - The project does not directly incorporate improvements for personnel involved in transit operations. 1 - The project incorporates improvements for non-customer-facing transit operations personnel. 2 - The project incorporates improvements for customer-facing transit personnel.</p>	
Access and Connectivity	
<p>The project serves sites targeted for future development (Up to 3 points). -3 - The project does not serve a site targeted for future development due to noncompliance with Section 3A of the Massachusetts Zoning Act from the community in which it is located. 0 - The project does not serve a site targeted for future development. 1 - The project serves a site for future development. 2 - The project serves a site targeted for future development that includes transit-supportive mixed-use or residential sites. 3 - The project serves a site or sites targeted for future development that include transit-supportive mixed-use or residential sites, and are included as part of compliance with Section 3A of the Massachusetts Zoning Act from the community in which it is located.</p>	

Evaluation Criteria: Transit Transformation Program	Equity Multiplier?
<p>The project serves existing employment and population centers (Up to 3 points). 0 - The project does not serve an existing employment or population center. 1 - The project serves an existing employment or population center. 2 - The project serves an existing employment and population center. 3 - The project serves an existing employment and population center, or a population center that has significant affordable housing opportunities.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>The project improves intermodal connections, and the ability of users to navigate those connections. 0 - The project does not improve intermodal connections. 2 - The project improves intermodal connections.</p>	
<p>The project invests in pedestrian connections to transit facilities or routes (Up to 3 points). -1 - The project does not invest in pedestrian connections to transit facilities, and no pedestrian connections are present. The applicant has sufficient jurisdiction or authority to provide such improvements. 0 - The project does not invest in pedestrian connections to transit facilities or routes, but connections to the facilities and routes exist and are in fair or better condition. Or, if a lack of connectivity exists, it is due to a lack of jurisdiction on the behalf of the applicant to improve. 1 - The project improves the condition of an existing pedestrian facility in the project area. 3 - The project adds a new, safe pedestrian connection for transit access in the project area.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>The project invests in bicycle connections to transit facilities or routes (Up to 4 points). -1 - The project does not invest in bicycle connections to transit facilities, and no pedestrian connections are present. The applicant has sufficient jurisdiction or authority to provide such improvements. 0 - The project does not invest in bicycle connections to transit facilities or routes, but connections to the facilities and routes exist and are in fair or better condition. Or, if a lack of connectivity exists, it is due to a lack of jurisdiction on the behalf of the applicant to improve. 2 - The project improves the condition of an existing bicycle facility in the project area. 3 - The project improves the condition and user safety of an existing bicycle facility in the project area. 4 - The project adds a new, safe bicycle connection for transit access in the project area.</p>	
<p>The project improves ADA accessibility for transit facilities or routes (Up to 4 points). -2 - The project does not invest in ADA accessibility upgrades for a facility where deficiencies can be identified. 0 - The project does not invest in ADA accessibility upgrades for a facility or route. 2 - The project invests in ADA accessibility upgrades for a transit facility. 4 - The project invests in ADA accessibility upgrades for a transit facility and adjoining features, such as sidewalks or pathways.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
Resilience	
<p>The project reduces the risk of flooding in the project area through adaptation and resilience improvements. 0 - The project does not address flooding. 1 - The project reduces flood risk using structural adaptation/grey infrastructure. 2 - The project reduces flood risk using nature-based adaptation/green infrastructure, or a combination of green and gray infrastructure. 3 - The project adopts green infrastructure and specifies appropriate plant types for any added vegetation (native species, flood/drought tolerant, diverse range of species, etc.)</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Evaluation Criteria: Transit Transformation Program	Equity Multiplier?
<p>The project reduces the risk of extreme heat by reducing pavement cover, planting shade trees, providing shade structures, increasing green space, etc. 0 - The project does not address extreme heat. 1 - The project reduces extreme heat risk using structural adaptation/grey infrastructure. 2 - The project reduces extreme heat risk using nature-based adaptation/green infrastructure, or a combination of green and gray infrastructure. 3 - The project adopts green infrastructure and specifies appropriate plant types for any added vegetation (native species, flood/drought tolerant, diverse range of species, etc.)</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>The project implements recommendations or addresses needs identified in the respective municipality's Hazard Mitigation Plan, Municipal Vulnerability Plan, or Climate Adaptation Plan. 0 - The project does not address needs or recommendations. 2 - The project addresses needs or recommendations.</p>	
<p>The project improves stormwater infrastructure beyond MassDEP's MS4 standard. 0 - The project meets minimum standards. 1 - The project includes one design element to go above minimum stormwater improvement standards (adopts stormwater BMPs, prepares pollution and/or erosion prevention plan, adopts environmentally sensitive site design practices, is expected to remove high amounts of TSS, etc.). 2 - Project adopts more than one design element to go above minimum stormwater improvement standards.</p>	
<p>The project applicant demonstrates regional coordination or partnership on resilience improvements and project impacts with neighboring municipalities, environmental or EJ advocacy groups, local community organizations, regional or state agencies, etc. 0 - The applicant does not demonstrate regional coordination. 1 - The applicant demonstrates regional coordination with neighboring municipalities and/or regional or state agencies. 2 - The applicant demonstrates regional coordination with neighboring municipalities, regional or state agencies AND local community organizations/advocacy groups.</p>	
<p>The project addresses risk to rider health and safety posed by climate hazards. 0 - The project does not address risk to rider health and safety posed by climate hazards. 3 - The project proposes improvements that will reduce risk to rider health and safety posed by climate hazards.</p>	
<p>The applicant details the expected useful life of the improvements and provides a plan for maintenance of resilience improvements beyond the construction phase. 0 - The applicant does not provide a maintenance plan and/or clear information as to the expected useful life of the asset. 1 - The applicant does provide a maintenance plan and/or clear information as to the expected useful life of the asset.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>(Penalty) The project is located in an existing or projected flood zone and/or the project site has flooded in the past and the applicant does not specify how the project will address flooding. 0 - Project is not located in an existing or projected flood zone and site has not flooded in the past OR project is located in a flood zone and the applicant specifies how the project will address flooding. -3 - Project is located in an existing or projected flood zone or site has flooded in the past and the project does not specify how it will address flooding.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Evaluation Criteria: Transit Transformation Program	Equity Multiplier?
<p>(Penalty) The project is located in an area that is vulnerable to extreme heat and the applicant does not specify how the project will address heat. 0 - The project is not located in an area vulnerable to extreme heat OR project is located in a vulnerable area and the applicant specifies how the project will address heat. -3 - The project is located in an area vulnerable to extreme heat and the project does not specify how it will address heat.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
Clean Air and Healthy Communities	
<p>The project supports a reduction in the amount of Single-Occupancy-Vehicle (SOV) trips for a given area (Up to 3 points). 0 - The project does not support a reduction in SOV trips. 1 - The project provides indirect support to reductions in SOV trips through the implementation of transit-supportive infrastructure, such as signage, web applications, education campaigns, or personnel improvements. 2 - The project supports a reduction in the amount of SOV trips by improving the condition or accessibility of existing transit assets, or reliability of existing service. 3 - The project supports a reduction in the amount of SOV trips by improving the accessibility or capacity of existing transit assets, making investments that improve the frequency or capacity of service, or expand service area or hours of operation for transit.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>The project directly supports a reduction in Greenhouse Gas Emissions from transit operations or facilities (Up to 3 points). 0 - The project does not support a reduction in Greenhouse Gas Emissions from transit operations or facilities, or the support is indirect. 1 - The project supports reductions in Greenhouse Gas Emissions from transit operations or facilities through an investment in low emission technologies. 2 - The project supports reductions in Greenhouse Gas Emissions from transit operations or facilities through investments in both low emission technologies and no emission technologies. 3 - The project invests exclusively in the adoption and installation of zero-emission technologies or facility electrification.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>The project is expected to have a positive impact on adjacent communities and natural areas through low impact design, pavement reduction, nature-based adaptation, and other improvements that protect air/water/soil quality, provide ecological restoration and functioning, improve aquatic connectivity, etc. -1 - The project is expected to have a negative impact on adjacent communities or natural areas. 0 - The project is not expected to impact adjacent communities or natural areas. 2 - The project is expected to have a positive impact on adjacent communities or natural areas. 4 - The project specifies native species for any added vegetation or green space.</p>	
<p>The project proposes design elements aimed at removing air pollutants and improving air quality. (Up to 1 point). 0 - The project does not propose any measures that address air quality. 1 - The project proposes design elements that remove air pollutants and improve air quality.</p>	
<p>The project proposes design elements aimed at improving water quality and reducing pollutant runoff to adjacent water resources. (Up to 1 point). 0 - The project does not propose any measures that address water quality, or contaminants generated by the facility or along the transit route. 1 - The project directly improves water quality through technologies or strategies that improve treatment capacity or limit contamination, including investment in expanded stormwater treatment facilities or reductions in impervious surfaces.</p>	

Evaluation Criteria: Transit Transformation Program	Equity Multiplier?
<p>The proposed project incorporates or will incorporate a meaningful community outreach and engagement process (Up to 3 points). 0 - The proposed project will incorporate all legally required community outreach and engagement necessary for the use of federal funding. 1 - The proposed project will incorporate additional community outreach and engagement as necessary, including public meetings within the served municipality or municipalities. 2 - The proposed project has already been subject to community outreach and engagement, and the applicant will continue to engage stakeholders in the project process as it develops. 3 - The proposed project is the result of a rigorous community engagement process, and the proposed scope of work reflects the feedback or input received by the applicant from the community. The applicant will continue to engage stakeholders in the process, and the applicant has novel or innovative strategies to improve community engagement.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
BONUSES	
<p>CAHQ: Pursuant to the improvement of the capacity of the transit asset or supportive facilities to capture/process/treat carbon emissions, the project utilizes nature-based solutions to improve air quality/treatment.</p>	
<p>CAHQ: Pursuant to the improvement of the capacity of the transit asset or supportive facilities to capture/process/treat contaminated water, the project utilizes nature-based solutions to improve water quality or treatment.</p>	
<p>Resilience: The project design is expected to address multiple hazards and/or provide multiple environmental benefits such as risk reduction, ecological restoration, aquatic connectivity, improved water quality, groundwater recharge, etc. 0 - Project design is not expected to address multiple hazards or provide multiple environmental benefits. 1 - Project design is expected to address multiple hazards OR provide multiple environmental benefits. 2 - Project design is expected to address multiple hazards AND provide multiple environmental benefits.</p>	
<p>Resilience: The project design includes provision of educational material for the public related to environmental improvements and aspects of the project/area. 0 - Project will not provide educational material. 1 - Project will provide educational material.</p>	
<p>Resilience: The primary purpose of the project is to improve resilience and reduce risk to climate hazards. 0 - The primary purpose of the project is not resilience. 1 - The primary purpose of the project is resilience.</p>	
<p>Resilience: The project proponents have used RMAT's Climate Resilience Design Standards Tool to demonstrate the value of resilience improvements in the project area. 0 - Proponents have not shared results from RMAT's Climate Resilience Design Standards Tool. 1 - Proponents have shared results from RMAT's Climate Resilience Design Standards Tool.</p>	

**Table A-9
FFYs 2027–31 TIP Evaluation Criteria: Community Connections–Bicycle Racks**

Evaluation Criteria: Community Connections	Bicycle Racks
Work locations for the project complement transit operating routes.	0 - Proposed work locations are not near transit routes. 1 - Only one work location in the project is located near a transit route with limited accessibility or utility to and from that point. 2 - One work location in the project is located near a major transit route, but the location provides some utility to and from that point. Or, more than one work location is near a transit route, but the locations are not well connected to one another. 3 - The proposed work locations effectively mirror one or more transit routes, and improve accessibility to and from that route.
The work location or locations are safely accessible by walking.	0 - Proposed work locations are not near safe pedestrian infrastructure, such as sidewalks and crosswalks. 1 - Less than half of proposed work locations are near safe pedestrian infrastructure. 2 - More than half of proposed work locations are near safe pedestrian infrastructure. 3 - All work locations are near safe, pedestrian-accessible sites that include signalized crosswalks and continuous sidewalks.
The work location or locations are near to safe bicycle-supportive infrastructure.	0 - Proposed work locations are not near safe bicycle infrastructure. 1 - Most proposed work locations are near bicycle infrastructure that does not provide physical separation for users. 2 - Most proposed work locations are near bicycle infrastructure that provides some on-road separation for users. 3 - Most or all work locations are near bicycle infrastructure that provides full physical separation, including vertical or horizontal separation, for users.
The project includes a substantial public engagement process.	0 - The municipality or municipalities applying for the project are the primary stakeholders in the project development process. 1 - The municipality or municipalities have engaged their communities for the purpose of implementing the proposed improvements, specifically entities responsible for ensuring the continuing operations of the project (ROW, local operating costs, etc.) 2 - The municipality or municipalities have held public meetings on the proposed project, in addition to the above. 3 - The municipality or municipalities have engaged stakeholders in their communities for the purpose of soliciting feedback to improve the planning and prioritization of the project, in addition to the above. 4 - The project involves a rigorous public engagement process that addresses multiple public and private groups at the local level. The public engagement process specifically led to the identification of sites included in the project.
The project demonstrates collaboration between different components of the municipality for site prioritization.	0 - The applicant is not working with other business units within the municipality as part of the project. 1 - The applicant has received support from elected officials within the municipality for the project beyond the budget process. 2 - In addition to the above, the selection of sites as part of the project was performed in consultation with other municipal units, including for example school committees, Councils on Aging, Parks Departments, etc.
The project demonstrates collaboration between multiple municipalities.	0 - No direct support from other municipalities is provided. 1 - The applicant is a regional organization providing bicycle parking for one or more municipalities. 2 - The project involves collaboration between one or more municipalities.
The project demonstrates collaboration with other state or federal agencies.	0 - The project does not involve any direct coordination with state or federal agencies in a manner unrelated to the TIP process. 1 - The project involves a state or federal facility, and support for the applicant to improve that facility has been provided by the facility owner. The owner is not otherwise involved in the project. 2 - The project is a direct partnership between a municipality and a state or federal agency, which may be demonstrated through providing bicycle racks at State/National Parks, publicly-accessible state/federal buildings (including universities), or other facilities.
Project demonstrates collaboration across multiple sectors	0 - No direct support from private entities is listed. 2 - The project proponent coordinated with the private sector in the development of the project as part of selecting site areas. 4 - The project includes extensive support between the public and private sectors, including private funding contributions.

Evaluation Criteria: Community Connections	Bicycle Racks																								
Project collaborators submit letters of support to MPO	0 - The applicant has not attached letters of support. 2 - Letters of support are attached to demonstrate fulfillment of the above criteria.																								
Project is included in local plans or studies	0 - The project is not included in any local plans or studies. 2 - The project is thematically consistent with the contents of a local plan or study, but the applicant does not cite those documents. 4 - The project is thematically consistent with the contents of a local plan or study, and those documents are cited by the applicant. 6 - The project is explicitly called for in the contents of a local plan or study.																								
Project is included in regional plans or studies, including those created by the Boston Region MPO and Metropolitan Area Planning Council	0 - The project is not included in any regional plans or studies. 2 - The project is thematically consistent with the contents of a regional plan or study, but the applicant does not cite those documents. 4 - The project is thematically consistent with the contents of a regional plan or study, and the applicant cites those documents. Alternatively, the applicant developed this project or identified the need being addressed by the project through direct consultation with MAPC or a similar body. 6 - The project is explicitly called for in the contents of a regional plan or study, or is located at a regionally significant junction for the Bluebikes network as identified by MAPC or a similar entity.																								
Project is included in statewide plans or studies	0 - The project is not included in any statewide plans or studies. 2 - The project is included in a statewide planning document, but is not cited by the applicant. 4 - The project is included in a statewide planning document cited by the applicant.																								
Project acts as an 'anchor' for development of a sustainable bicycle network.	0 - The project does not add racks to an area of at least low-moderate utility. 1 - The project expands into an area of low-moderate utility, or add racks where none currently exist to an area of low utility. 2 - The project expands into an area of moderate or greater utility.																								
Transportation Equity: Ensure that all people receive comparable benefits from, and are not disproportionately burdened by, MPO investments, regardless of race, color, national origin, age, income, ability, or sex.																									
Project serves one or more transportation equity populations, as identified by the Boston Region MPO	Each population's index scores are based on the percent of the population group within the service area relative to the MPO regional average. For example, the higher percentage, the higher the index. <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">Equity Score Look-up Table</th> </tr> <tr> <th>If the sum of the Indices Greater than...</th> <th>...And Less Than...</th> <th>The Project Score is...</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0.99</td> <td>6</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5.99</td> <td>11</td> <td>6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10.99</td> <td>16</td> <td>9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>15.99</td> <td>21</td> <td>12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>20.99</td> <td>27</td> <td>18</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Equity Score Look-up Table			If the sum of the Indices Greater than...	...And Less Than...	The Project Score is...	0	1	0	0.99	6	3	5.99	11	6	10.99	16	9	15.99	21	12	20.99	27	18
Equity Score Look-up Table																									
If the sum of the Indices Greater than...	...And Less Than...	The Project Score is...																							
0	1	0																							
0.99	6	3																							
5.99	11	6																							
10.99	16	9																							
15.99	21	12																							
20.99	27	18																							
The project expands or maintains direct access to a safe bicycle facility.	0 - Work locations for the project are not near to a safe bicycle facility. 1 - Work locations for the project are near to a safe bicycle facility.																								
The project serves a community with a low rate of automobile ownership.	0 - The project does not install bicycle racks in an area with low rates of automobile ownership. 1 - The project installs bicycle racks in an area with a low rate of automobile ownership.																								

Evaluation Criteria: Community Connections	Bicycle Racks
Climate Change Mitigation	
For new racks, does the project further promote mode shift? For repair/replacement projects, how many users utilize the facility?	<p>0 - The extent to which the project creates new trips is unclear or lacks sufficient supporting information. For rack repair/replacement projects, the applicant does not provide data for existing ridership at the involved stations.</p> <p>2 - The project creates a moderate number of new trips that would otherwise be taken by an automobile. For rack repair/replacement projects, the stations being replaced are of moderate utility and consistent ridership levels.</p> <p>3 - The project creates a large number of new trips that would otherwise be taken by an automobile, or increases the accessibility of an alternative transportation mode/route (ex: existing trails, routes parallel to transit operations). For rack repair/replacement projects, the stations being replaced are of significant utility with strong ridership levels, and are first priority investments.</p> <p>4 - Pursuant to 3 above, but does so in area with disproportionate air quality burden.</p>
Estimates for project demand are realistic and grounded in thorough analysis.	<p>0 - Future demand projections do not seem realistic, or the methodology as to how they were calculated is not explained.</p> <p>2 - Future demand projections seem reasonable and support the above argument for substituting single occupancy vehicle trips.</p> <p>4 - The applicant has provided realistic demand projections and accounted for possible variations in demand (seasonal variation, new enabling infrastructure, etc.) in their estimate.</p>
The rack investment is complementary to an ongoing or planned surface transportation investment.	<p>0 - The investment does not complement any planned or nearby projects.</p> <p>2 - The investment is somewhat related to a planned or nearby project, but the connection between the two is limited.</p> <p>4 - The investment is related to a planned or nearby project that offers some bike-supportive infrastructure.</p> <p>6 - The investment is directly and deliberately related to a planned or nearby project that offers safe and accessible bike-supportive infrastructure, such as a shared-use-path.</p>
The rack investment reinforces access to an existing surface transportation facility.	<p>0 - The investment does not complement any nearby bicycle facilities.</p> <p>2 - The investment complements an existing low to moderate utility link for biking.</p> <p>4 - The investment complements an existing moderate to high utility link for biking, or a physically separated and safe pathway for all users (ex: shared use path, rail trail).</p>
Performance Management	
The project application includes a budget worksheet that outlines the sources and uses of the project.	<p>Disqualifying - No budget worksheet is attached.</p> <p>0 - A budget sheet is included, but the costs associated are unrealistic.</p> <p>3 - The budget sheet is attached, and the applicant describes the expenses, including the rationale behind the selected unit type.</p>
The project proponent broadly outlines expected activities necessary for asset maintenance.	<p>0 - No description of maintenance activities are provided.</p> <p>3 - An anticipated maintenance schedule is provided.</p>
The estimates for the usage rates on the bicycle racks are sound.	<p>0 - The applicant does not describe how demand was estimated.</p> <p>2 - The process for estimating demand for the bicycle racks is vague.</p> <p>4 - The demand estimates for the bicycle racks are sound.</p>

**Table A-10
FFYs 2027–31 TIP Evaluation Criteria: Community Connections–Bikeshare Support**

Evaluation Criteria: Community Connections	Bikeshare Support
Work locations for the project complement transit operating routes.	0 - Proposed work locations are not near transit routes. 1 - Only one work location in the project is located near a transit route with limited accessibility or utility to and from that point. 2 - One work location in the project is located near a major transit route, but the location provides some utility to and from that point. Or, more than one work location is near a transit route, but the locations are not well connected to one another. 3 - The proposed work locations effectively mirror one or more transit routes, and improve accessibility to and from that route.
The work location or locations are safely accessible by walking.	0 - Proposed work locations are not near safe pedestrian infrastructure, such as sidewalks and crosswalks. 1 - Less than half of proposed work locations are near safe pedestrian infrastructure. 2 - More than half of proposed work locations are near safe pedestrian infrastructure. 3 - All work locations are near safe, pedestrian-accessible sites that include signalized crosswalks and continuous sidewalks.
The work location or locations are near to safe bicycle-supportive infrastructure.	0 - Proposed work locations are not near safe bicycle infrastructure. 1 - Most proposed work locations are near bicycle infrastructure that does not provide physical separation for users. 2 - Most proposed work locations are near bicycle infrastructure that provides some on-road separation for users. 3 - Most or all work locations are near bicycle infrastructure that provides full physical separation, including vertical or horizontal separation, for users.
Regional and Interlocal Coordination	
Project demonstrates collaboration between multiple entities within the municipality or municipalities.	0 - The municipality or municipalities applying for the project are the primary stakeholders in the project development process. 2 - The municipality or municipalities have engaged entities within their communities for the purpose of implementing the proposed improvements, specifically entities responsible for ensuring the continuing operations of the project (ROW, local operating costs, etc.) 3 - The project is a joint effort between one or more municipalities (minimum score for joint applications). 4 - The municipality or municipalities have engaged stakeholders in their communities for the purpose of soliciting feedback to improve the planning and prioritization of the project, in addition to securing any local support for ROW. 6 - The project involves a rigorous public engagement process that addresses multiple public and private groups at the local level, including direct involvement from community based organizations to help shape the scope of the project.
Project demonstrates collaboration between multiple municipalities.	0 - No direct support from other municipalities is provided. 2 - The application refers to the Bluebikes Council as providing support, but there is no written documentation. 4 - The project has the written approval of the Bluebikes Council, or letters of support from neighboring communities, or involves work spread across multiple municipalities.
Project demonstrates collaboration across multiple sectors	0 - No direct support from private entities is listed, or the applicant refers to private collaboration that is within the existing scope of the Bluebikes contract (ex: vendor, sponsorships) 2 - The project proponent coordinated with the private sector in the development of the project beyond the private stakeholders already involved in the Bluebikes contract. 4 - The project includes extensive cooperation with the private sector, including the direct contribution of local, private funding from local businesses, fundraising, etc.
Project collaborators submit letters of support to MPO	0 - The applicant has not attached letters of support. 2 - Letters of support are attached to demonstrate fulfillment of the above criteria.
Plan Implementation: Support local, regional, and statewide planning efforts.	
Project is included in local plans or studies	0 - The project is not included in any local plans or studies. 2 - The project is thematically consistent with the contents of a local plan or study, but the applicant does not cite those documents. 4 - The project is thematically consistent with the contents of a local plan or study, and those documents are cited by the applicant. 6 - The project is explicitly called for in the contents of a local plan or study.

Evaluation Criteria: Community Connections	Bikeshare Support																								
Project is included in regional plans or studies, including those created by the Boston Region MPO and Metropolitan Area Planning Council	0 - The project is not included in any regional plans or studies. 2 - The project is thematically consistent with the contents of a regional plan or study, but the applicant does not cite those documents. 4 - The project is thematically consistent with the contents of a regional plan or study, and the applicant cites those documents. Alternatively, the applicant developed this project or identified the need being addressed by the project through direct consultation with MAPC or a similar body. 6 - The project is explicitly called for in the contents of a regional plan or study, or is located at a regionally significant junction for the Bluebikes network as identified by MAPC or a similar entity.																								
Project is included in statewide plans or studies	0 - The project is not included in any statewide plans or studies. 2 - The project is included in a statewide planning document, but is not cited by the applicant. 4 - The project is included in a statewide planning document cited by the applicant.																								
Project acts as an 'anchor' for development of a sustainable bikeshare network.	0 - For expansion projects, the project does not expand into an area of at least low-moderate utility, or is located in an area saturated with bikeshare. For repair projects, the project does not address an asset nearing the end of its useful life in a priority location, or in a location of at least moderate utility. 1 - For expansion projects, the project expands into an area of low-moderate utility. For repair projects, the project addresses an asset nearing the end of its useful life in a location of at least moderate utility. 2 - For expansion projects, the project expands into an entirely new part of the Boston Region, or expands into an area ranging from moderate to high utility. Alternatively, the proposed expansion seeks to link together more 'disconnected' nexuses of stations back into the larger regional system. For repair projects, the project addresses an asset nearing the end of its useful life in a high utility or critical area.																								
Transportation Equity: Ensure that all people receive comparable benefits from, and are not disproportionately burdened by, MPO investments, regardless of race, color, national origin, age, income, ability, or sex.																									
Project serves one or more transportation equity populations, as identified by the Boston Region MPO	Each population's index scores are based on the percent of the population group within the service area relative to the MPO regional average. For example, the higher percentage, the higher the index. <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">Equity Score Look-up Table</th> </tr> <tr> <th>If the sum of the Indices Greater than...</th> <th>...And Less Than...</th> <th>The Project Score is...</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0.99</td> <td>6</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5.99</td> <td>11</td> <td>6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10.99</td> <td>16</td> <td>9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>15.99</td> <td>21</td> <td>12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>20.99</td> <td>27</td> <td>18</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Equity Score Look-up Table			If the sum of the Indices Greater than...	...And Less Than...	The Project Score is...	0	1	0	0.99	6	3	5.99	11	6	10.99	16	9	15.99	21	12	20.99	27	18
Equity Score Look-up Table																									
If the sum of the Indices Greater than...	...And Less Than...	The Project Score is...																							
0	1	0																							
0.99	6	3																							
5.99	11	6																							
10.99	16	9																							
15.99	21	12																							
20.99	27	18																							
The project expands or maintains direct access to a safe bicycle facility. The bikeshare model supports access to these facilities for individuals who do not own a private bicycle.	0 - Work locations for the project are not near to a safe bicycle facility. 1 - Work locations for the project are near to a safe bicycle facility.																								
The project incorporates pedal-assist or fully electric bikes in an area with a high share of older adults.	0 - The project does not incorporate any pedal-assist or fully electric bikes. 1 - The project incorporates pedal-assist or fully electric bikes.																								
Climate Change Mitigation																									
For expansion projects, to what extent does the expanded service encourage new trips that would otherwise be taken by an automobile? For repair/replacement projects, how many trips does the existing service support?	0 - The extent to which the project creates new trips is unclear or lacks sufficient supporting information. For station repair/replacement projects, the applicant does not provide data for existing ridership at the involved stations. 2 - The project creates a moderate number of new trips that would otherwise be taken by an automobile. For station repair/replacement projects, the stations being replaced are of moderate utility and consistent ridership levels. 3 - The project creates a large number of new trips that would otherwise be taken by an automobile, or increases the accessibility of an alternative transportation mode/route (ex: existing trails, routes parallel to transit operations). For station repair/replacement projects, the stations being replaced are of significant utility with strong ridership levels, and are first priority investments. 4 - The project performs all work necessary for 3 above, and does so in an area with disproportionate air quality burden.																								

Evaluation Criteria: Community Connections	Bikeshare Support
Estimates for project demand are realistic and grounded in thorough analysis.	0 - Future demand projections do not seem realistic, or the methodology as to how they were calculated is not explained. 2 - Future demand projections seem reasonable and support the above argument for substituting single occupancy vehicle trips. 4 - The applicant has provided realistic demand projections and accounted for possible variations in demand (seasonal variation, new enabling infrastructure, etc.) in their estimate.
The bikeshare investment is complementary to an ongoing or planned surface transportation investment.	0 - The investment does not complement any planned or nearby projects. 2 - The investment is somewhat related to a planned or nearby project, but the connection between the two is limited. 4 - The investment is related to a planned or nearby project that offers some bike-supportive infrastructure. 6 - The investment is directly and deliberately related to a planned or nearby project that offers safe and accessible bike-supportive infrastructure, such as a shared-use-path.
The bikeshare investment expands access to an existing surface transportation facility.	0 - The investment does not complement any nearby bicycle facilities. 1 - The investment complements an existing low to moderate utility link for biking. 2 - The investment complements an existing moderate to high utility link for biking, or a physically separated and safe pathway for all users (ex: shared use path, rail trail).
The investment incorporates improvements for bikeshare electrification.	0 - The investment does not incorporate or support current and future electrification of the bikeshare facility (or facilities). 1 - The investment incorporates electrification of the bikeshare fleet, but not for the facility itself. 2 - The investment incorporates electrification for the bikeshare facility.
Performance Management	
The project proponent outlines expected sources of funding to support the costs of operation associated with the project.	-3 - No sources of potential operating costs are provided. 0 - Sources of funding for operating costs are indicated, but are vague. 2 - Sources of funding for operating costs are indicated and seem secure. 3 - The proponent identifies sources of funding for operating costs that are secure and innovative in some manner.
The project proponent outlines expected sources of funding to support the maintenance or replacement of the asset. In the case of Bikeshare projects seeking capital support for station repair or replacement, the project proponent outlines their plan for keeping the asset in a state of good repair.	0 - The applicant does not describe the sources of funding necessary for long term maintenance of the asset, or describe any plan to maintain the asset. 1 - The applicant describes how they intend to maintain the asset, but does not indicate sources of funding for maintenance. Alternatively, the source of maintenance funding described is from other state or Boston Region MPO programs that have a local match requirement (which is not indicated). 2 - The applicant describes a plan to maintain the asset and identifies sources of funding to do so to some detail. 3 - The applicant thoroughly details a plan to maintain and continue to fund the maintenance of assets included in the proposed project.
Project application includes completed budget worksheet that demonstrates financial viability of project	Disqualifying - No budget worksheet is attached. 0 - The project application includes a budget worksheet, but it is missing information or does not demonstrate the financial viability of the project. 2 - The project application includes a complete budget worksheet, but some concerns around the financial viability and sustainability of the project remain. 4 - Pursuant to the above criteria, the budget worksheet demonstrates the near term and long term fiscal viability and sustainability of the project.

Appendix B—Determination of Air Quality Conformity and Greenhouse Gas Monitoring

Introduction

This chapter documents the latest Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) air quality conformity determination for the 1997 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and carbon monoxide (CO) NAAQS in the Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) area. It covers the applicable conformity requirements according to the latest regulations, regional designation status, legal considerations, and federal guidance. This chapter also addresses the MPO’s work toward achieving greenhouse gas emissions reductions mandated by the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2008.

Air Quality Conformity

Legislative and Regulatory Background

The 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA) require MPOs within nonattainment and maintenance areas to perform air quality conformity determinations prior to the approval of Long-Range Transportation Plans (LRTPs) and TIPs, and at such other times as required by regulation. CAAA Section 176(c) (Title 42, United States Code [USC], Section 7506 [c]) requires that federally funded or approved highway and transit activities are consistent with (“conform to”) the purpose of the State Implementation Plan (SIP). Conformity to the purpose of the SIP means that Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funding and approvals are given to highway and transit activities that

- will not cause or contribute to new air quality violations;
- worsen existing violations; or
- delay the timely attainment of the relevant NAAQS or any interim milestones (42 USC 7506[c][1]).

The United States Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) transportation conformity rules establish the criteria and procedures for determining whether metropolitan transportation plans, TIPs, and federally supported highway and transit projects conform to the SIP (Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations [CFR], Parts 51.390 and 93).

A nonattainment area is one that the EPA has designated as not meeting certain air quality standards. A maintenance area is a nonattainment area that now meets the standards and has been redesignated as maintaining the standard. A conformity determination is a demonstration that plans, programs, and projects are consistent with the SIP for attaining the air

quality standards. The CAAA requirement to perform a conformity determination ensures that federal approval and funding go to transportation activities that are consistent with air quality goals.

Conformity in Massachusetts

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts was previously classified as a nonattainment area for ozone and was divided into two nonattainment areas. The Eastern Massachusetts Ozone Nonattainment Area included Barnstable, Bristol, Dukes, Essex, Middlesex, Nantucket, Norfolk, Plymouth, Suffolk, and Worcester Counties. The Western Massachusetts Ozone Nonattainment Area included Berkshire, Franklin, Hampden, and Hampshire Counties. With these classifications, the 1990 CAAA required the Commonwealth to reduce its emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides (NO_x), the two major precursors to ozone formation, to attain the ozone standard.

The 1970 Clean Air Act defined a one-hour NAAQS for ground-level ozone. The 1990 CAAA further classified degrees of nonattainment of the one-hour standard based on the severity of the monitored levels of the pollutant. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts was classified as being in serious nonattainment of the one-hour ozone standard and was required to achieve attainment by 1999. The attainment date was later extended, first to 2003, and a second time to 2007.

In 1997, the EPA proposed a new eight-hour ozone standard that replaced the one-hour standard, effective June 15, 2005. Scientific research showed that ozone could affect human health at lower levels and over longer exposure times than one hour. The new standard was challenged in court, and after a lengthy legal battle the courts upheld it. The new standard was finalized in June 2004. The new eight-hour standard is 0.08 parts per million (ppm) averaged over eight hours, and this level is not to be exceeded more than once per year. With this new standard, nonattainment areas were again further classified based on the severity of the eight-hour values. Massachusetts was classified as being in moderate nonattainment for the eight-hour standard and again was separated into two nonattainment areas—Eastern Massachusetts and Western Massachusetts.

In March 2008, the EPA published revisions to the eight-hour ozone NAAQS, establishing a level of 0.075 ppm (Volume 73, Federal Register [FR], page 16438; March 27, 2008). In 2009, EPA announced it would reconsider this standard because it fell outside of the range recommended by the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee. However, EPA did not take final action on the reconsideration, keeping the standard as 0.075 ppm.

After reviewing data from Massachusetts monitoring stations, the EPA sent a letter on December 16, 2011, proposing that only Dukes County be designated as a nonattainment area for the new proposed 0.075 ppm ozone standard. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts concurred with these findings.

On May 21, 2012, the final rule (77 FR 30088) was published in the Federal Register. This rule defined the 2008 NAAQS as 0.075 ppm, the standard that was promulgated in March 2008. A second rule (77 FR 30160) published on May 21, 2012, revoked the 1997 ozone NAAQS effective one year after the July 20, 2012, effective date of the 2008 NAAQS.

Also, on May 21, 2012, the Federal Register published the air quality designation areas for the 2008 NAAQS. Dukes County was the only area in Massachusetts designated as a nonattainment area. All other Massachusetts counties were designated as attainment/unclassifiable for the 2008 standard.

On March 6, 2015, the EPA published the final rulemaking, “Implementation of the 2008 National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for Ozone: State Implementation Plan Requirements; Final Rule” (80 FR 12264), effective April 6, 2015. This rulemaking confirmed the removal of transportation conformity to the 1997 ozone NAAQS and the replacement with the 2008 ozone NAAQS, which actually set a stricter level of allowable ozone concentration than the 1997 standards and designated Massachusetts (except for Dukes County) as in attainment/unclassifiable.

However, on February 16, 2018, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit in *South Coast Air Quality Management District v. EPA* (“South Coast II,” 882 F.3d 1138) held that transportation conformity determinations must be made in areas that were designated either as nonattainment or maintenance areas for the 1997 ozone NAAQS and in attainment for the 2008 ozone NAAQS when the 1997 ozone NAAQS was revoked.

On November 29, 2018, the EPA issued Transportation Conformity Guidance for the South Coast II Court Decision (EPA-420-B-18-050, November 2018), which addressed how transportation conformity determinations could be made in these areas. According to the guidance, both Eastern and Western Massachusetts, along with several other areas across the country, were defined as orphan nonattainment areas—areas that were designated as nonattainment areas for the 1997 ozone NAAQS at the time of its revocation

(80 FR 12264, March 6, 2015) and as attainment areas for the 2008 ozone NAAQS in EPA's original designation rule for this NAAQS (77 FR 30160, May 21, 2012). As of February 16, 2019, conformity determinations are required in these areas.

Conformity Determination

Ozone

After February 16, 2019, as a result of the court ruling and the subsequent federal guidance, transportation conformity for the 1997 NAAQS now applies to both Massachusetts orphan areas. (This requirement is intended as an anti-backsliding measure.) Therefore, a conformity determination was made for the 1997 ozone NAAQS in all of the Massachusetts MPOs' FFYs 2024–50 LRTPs. The latest conformity determination was finalized in July 2023, following all of the MPOs' endorsements of their LRTPs, and approved by the Massachusetts Divisions of FHWA and FTA on October 13, 2023. This conformity determination continues to be valid for the Boston Region MPO's FFYs 2027–31 TIP, and Massachusetts' 2027–31 State Transportation Improvement Program, as each is developed from the conforming FFYs 2024–50 LRTPs.

The transportation conformity regulation in 40 CFR § 93.109 sets forth the criteria and procedures for determining conformity. The conformity criteria for TIPs and LRTPs include a demonstration of fiscal constraint (§ 93.108), a basis on the latest planning assumptions (§ 93.110), use of the latest emissions model (§ 93.111), consultation (§ 93.112), provision for the timely implementation of transportation control measures (TCMs) (§ 93.113[b] and [c]), and consistency with an emissions budget and/or interim emissions tests (§ 93.118 and/or § 93.119).

For the 1997 ozone NAAQS areas, transportation conformity for TIPs and LRTPs for the 1997 ozone NAAQS can be demonstrated without a regional emissions analysis, per 40 CFR § 93.109(c). This provision states that the regional emissions analysis requirement applies one year after the effective date of the EPA's nonattainment designation for a NAAQS and until the effective date of revocation of such NAAQS for an area. The 1997 ozone NAAQS revocation was effective on April 6, 2015, and the court for South Coast II upheld the revocation. As no regional emission analysis is required for this conformity determination, there is no requirement to use the latest emissions model, budget, or interim emissions tests.

Therefore, transportation conformity for the 1997 ozone NAAQS for the Boston Region MPO's FFYs 2027–31 TIP can be demonstrated by showing

that the remaining requirements in 40 CFR § 93.109 have been met. The following requirements regarding the use of the latest planning assumptions, consultation, timely implementation of TCMs, and fiscal constraint are defined in Section 2.4 of that guidance and addressed in the following sections.

Latest Planning Assumptions

The requirement to use the latest planning assumptions in 40 CFR § 93.110 generally applies to regional emissions analyses. In the areas subject to the 1997 ozone NAAQS, this requirement applies to assumptions about TCMs in an approved SIP. (See the section titled Timely Implementation of Transportation Control Measures below).

Consultation

The consultation requirements in 40 CFR § 93.112 for interagency consultation and public consultation were addressed. Interagency consultation was conducted with FHWA, FTA, EPA Region 1, the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), and the other Massachusetts MPOs on March 6, 2019, when the latest conformity-related court rulings and resulting federal guidance was discussed. Regular and recurring interagency consultations have been held on (at least) an annual schedule. The most recent conformity consultation was held on March 19, 2026. Ongoing consultation is conducted in accordance with the following items:

1. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts' Air Pollution Control Regulations 310 CMR 60.03, "Conformity to the State Implementation Plan of Transportation Plans, Programs, and Projects Developed, Funded, or Approved Under Title 23 USC or the Federal Transit Act"
2. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts' Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between DEP, the Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT), and Massachusetts MPOs, and Regional Transit Authorities, titled "The Conduct of Air Quality Planning and Coordination for Transportation Conformity" (dated September 16, 2019)

Public consultation was conducted consistent with planning rule requirements in 23 CFR § 450. Title 23 CFR § 450.324 and 310 CMR 60.03(6)(h) requires that the development of the TIP, LRTP, and related certification documents provide an adequate opportunity for public review and comment. Section 450.316(b) also establishes the outline for MPOs' public engagement programs.

The Boston Region MPO's current Public Engagement Plan was endorsed by the MPO board in October 2021 and amended in September 2022. The Public Engagement Plan ensures that the public will have access to the TIP and LRTP and all supporting documentation, and provides for public notification of the availability of the TIP and LRTP and the public's right to review and comment on the document. The Public Engagement Plan provides for a 21-day public review and comment period prior to the adoption of the TIP and a 30-day public review and comment period for the LRTP. The plan is available at <https://www.bostonmpo.org/public-engagement>.

The public comment period for this TIP, including this air quality conformity determination, will commence on or around May 8, 2026, and conclude 21 days later, on or around May 29, 2026. This will allow sufficient opportunity for the MPO board to review comments and make any revisions to the document. The Boston Region MPO is expected to endorse this TIP and air quality conformity determination on or around June 4, 2026. These procedures comply with the associated federal requirements.

Timely Implementation of Transportation Control Measures

Transportation control measures were required in the SIP in revisions submitted to EPA in 1979 and 1982. All of these TCMs have been accomplished through construction projects or through implementation of ongoing programs. All of the projects have been included in the Boston Region MPO's TIPs (present and past) as recommended projects or projects requiring further study.

Fiscal Constraint

Transportation conformity requirements in 40 CFR § 93.108 state that TIPs and LRTPs must be fiscally constrained so as to be consistent with the United States Department of Transportation's metropolitan planning regulations (23 CFR part 450). The Boston Region MPO's FFYs 2027–31 TIP is consistent with the required fiscal constraints, as demonstrated in this document.

Carbon Monoxide

On April 22, 2002, the EPA classified Waltham as being in attainment for CO emissions. Subsequently, an EPA-approved CO limited maintenance plan was set up through the Massachusetts SIP to ensure that emission levels did not increase. While the maintenance plan was in effect, past TIPs and LRTPs included an air quality conformity determination against a “budget test” (using “hot spot” analyses as needed at the project level) for Waltham. As of April 22, 2022, the 20-year maintenance period for this CO area expired and

transportation conformity is no longer required for this pollutant in this municipality. This ruling is documented in a letter from EPA dated April 26, 2022.

Conformity with the State Implementation Plan

In summary and based on the entire process described above, the Boston Region MPO has prepared this conformity determination for the 1997 ozone NAAQS in accordance with EPA's and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts' latest conformity regulations and guidance. This conformity determination process demonstrates that the FFYs 2027–31 TIP meets the Clean Air Act and Transportation Conformity Rule requirements for the 1997 ozone NAAQS and has been prepared following all the guidelines and requirements of these rules during this period.

Therefore, the implementation of the Boston Region MPO's FFYs 2027–31 TIP is consistent with the air quality goals of, and in conformity with, the Massachusetts SIP.

Greenhouse Gas Monitoring and Evaluation

The Global Warming Solutions Act of 2008 (GWSA) required statewide reductions in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions of 25 percent below 1990 levels by the year 2020, and 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. As part of the GWSA, the Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs (EEA) released the Massachusetts Clean Energy and Climate Plan for 2025 and 2030 (CECP) in June 2022, which outlines programs to attain GHG emissions reduction goals—including an 18 percent reduction attributed to the transportation sector by 2025 and a 34 percent reduction by 2030. EEA released an updated CECP in December 2022, which specified an emissions reduction target of 86 percent by 2050 for the transportation sector.

The Commonwealth's 13 metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) are integrally involved in achieving GHG emissions reductions mandated by the GWSA. MPOs work closely with the Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) to develop common transportation goals, policies, and projects that will help to reduce GHG emissions levels statewide and meet the specific requirements of the GWSA and its requirements for the transportation sector, defined in state regulation 310 CMR 60.05. The purpose of this regulation is to assist the Commonwealth in achieving its adopted GHG emissions reduction goals by requiring the following:

- MassDOT must demonstrate that its GHG emissions reduction commitments and targets are being achieved.
- Each MPO must evaluate and track the GHG emissions and impacts of both its Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).
- Each MPO, in consultation with MassDOT, must develop and use procedures to prioritize and select projects for its LRTP and TIP based on factors that include GHG emissions and impacts.

The Commonwealth's MPOs are meeting the requirements of this regulation through the transportation goals and policies contained in their LRTPs, the major projects planned in their LRTPs, and the mix of new transportation projects that are programmed and implemented through their TIPs.

The GHG tracking and evaluation processes enable the MPOs and MassDOT to identify the anticipated GHG impacts of the planned and programmed projects, and to use GHG impacts as criteria to prioritize transportation projects. This approach is consistent with the GHG emissions reduction policies that promote healthy transportation modes through prioritizing and programming an appropriate balance of roadway, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian investments, as well as policies that support smart growth development patterns by creating a balanced multimodal transportation system.

Regional Tracking and Evaluating Long-Range Transportation Plans

MassDOT coordinated with the Boston Region MPO and other regional planning agencies to implement GHG tracking and to evaluate projects during the development of LRTPs starting in 2011. Working together, MassDOT and the MPOs have attained the following milestones:

- The MPOs completed modeling and developed long-range statewide projections for GHG emissions produced by the transportation sector. These results are in a supplement to the Boston Region MPO's LRTP, *Destination 2050*. The Boston Region MPO's travel demand model and the statewide travel demand model were used to project GHG emissions levels for 2019 No-Build (base conditions). These projections were developed as part of amendments to 310 CMR 60.05 (adopted in August 2017 by the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection) to demonstrate that aggregate transportation GHG emissions reported by MassDOT will meet established annual GHG emissions targets.

- All of the MPOs have discussed climate change, addressed GHG emissions reduction projections in their LRTPs, and prepared statements affirming their support for reducing GHG emissions as a regional goal.

Tracking and Evaluating Transportation Improvement Programs

In addition to monitoring the GHG impacts of larger-scale projects in the LRTP, it also is important to monitor and evaluate the GHG impacts of all transportation projects that are programmed in the TIP. The TIP includes both the larger, capacity-adding projects from the LRTP and smaller projects, which are not included in the LRTP but that may affect GHG emissions. The principal objective of this tracking is to enable the MPOs to evaluate the expected GHG impacts of different projects and to use this information as criteria to prioritize and program projects in future TIPs.

In order to monitor and evaluate the GHG impacts of TIP projects, MassDOT and the MPOs have developed approaches for identifying anticipated GHG emissions impacts of different types of projects. Since carbon dioxide (CO₂) is the largest component of GHG emissions overall and is the focus of regulation 310 CMR 60.05, CO₂ has been used to measure the GHG emissions impacts of transportation projects in the TIP and LRTP.

All TIP projects have been sorted into two categories for analysis: 1) projects with quantified CO₂ impacts and 2) projects with assumed CO₂ impacts. Projects with quantified impacts consist of capacity-adding projects from the LRTP and projects from the TIP that underwent a Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) program spreadsheet analysis. Projects with assumed impacts are those that would be expected to produce a minor decrease or increase in emissions, and those that would be assumed to have no CO₂ impact.

Travel Demand Model Analysis

Projects with quantified impacts include capacity-adding projects in the LRTP that were analyzed using the Boston Region MPO's travel demand model set. No independent calculations were done for these projects during the development of the TIP.

Off-Model Analysis Methods

MassDOT's Office of Transportation Planning provided spreadsheets that are used to determine a projects' eligibility for funding through the CMAQ program. These spreadsheets contain emissions factors produced by the EPA's MOtor Vehicle Emission Simulator (MOVES) model that are used to

calculate emissions reduction as a result of mode shift to active or public transportation and/or reduction of single-occupancy vehicle trips. Typically, MPO staff uses data from projects' functional design reports to conduct these calculations. Staff used these spreadsheets to calculate estimated projections of CO₂ for each project, in compliance with GWSA regulations.

These estimates are shown in Tables B-1 and B-2. A note of "to be determined" is shown for those projects for which a functional design report was not yet available. Table B-3 summarizes the GHG impact analyses of highway projects completed before FFY 2027. Table B-4 summarizes the GHG impact analyses of transit projects completed before FFY 2027. A project is considered completed when the construction contract has been awarded.

Table B-1
Greenhouse Gas Regional Highway Project Tracking:
FFYs 2027–31 Programmed Project

MassDot Project ID	MassDOT Project Description	GHG Analysis Type	GHG Impact Description	GHG CO2 Impact (kg/yr)	Additional Information
Federal Fiscal Year 2027					
605168	HINGHAM- IMPROVEMENTS ON ROUTE 3A, FROM OTIS STREET/COLE ROAD INCLUDING SUMMER STREET AND ROTARY, ROCKLAND STREET TO GEORGE WASHINGTON BOULEVARD	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from Complete Streets Project	284,736	
606901	BOSTON- BRIDGE REPLACEMENT, B-16-109, RIVER STREET BRIDGE OVER MBTA/AMTRAK	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
607977	HOPKINTON- WESTBOROUGH- RECONSTRUCTION OF I-90/I-495 INTERCHANGE	Quantified	RTP project included in the statewide model	0	
608067	WOBURN- BURLINGTON- INTERSECTION RECONSTRUCTION AT ROUTE 3 (CAMBRIDGE ROAD) & BEDFORD ROAD AND SOUTH BEDFORD STREET	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from Traffic Operational Improvement	168,263	
609204	BELMONT- COMMUNITY PATH, BELMONT COMPONENT OF THE MCRT (PHASE I)	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	TBD
609437	SALEM- PEABODY- BOSTON STREET IMPROVEMENTS	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from Complete Streets Project	1,758	
609532	CHELSEA- TARGETED SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS AND RELATED WORK ON BROADWAY, FROM WILLIAMS STREET TO CITY HALL AVENUE	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease from safety improvements.
610680	NATICK- LAKE COCHITUATE PATH	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure	2,625	
610823	QUINCY- INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS AT WILLARD STREET AND RICCIUTI DRIVE	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from Traffic Operational Improvement	288,401	
611954	BOSTON- GUIDE AND TRAFFIC SIGN REPLACEMENT ON I-90/I-93 WITHIN CENTRAL ARTERY/TUNNEL SYSTEM	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
611974	MEDFORD- INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS AT MAIN STREET/SOUTH STREET, MAIN STREET/MYSTIC VALLEY PARKWAY RAMPS AND MAIN STREET/MYSTIC AVENUE	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from Traffic Operational Improvement	389,745	
612076	TOPSFIELD- BRIDGE REPLACEMENT, T-06-013, PERKINS ROW OVER MILE BROOK	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
612100	REVERE- IMPROVEMENTS AT BEACHMONT VETERANS ELEMENTARY (SRTS)	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease from Safe Routes to School improvements.

MassDot Project ID	MassDOT Project Description	GHG Analysis Type	GHG Impact Description	GHG CO2 Impact (kg/yr)	Additional Information
612816	BROOKLINE- IMPROVEMENTS AT WILLIAM H. LINCOLN SCHOOL (SRTS)	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease from Safe Routes to School improvements.
613318	BURLINGTON- WOBURN- INTERSTATE PAVEMENT PRESERVATION AND RELATED WORK ON I-95	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease from pavement resurfacing.
613343	FOXBOROUGH - INTERSTATE PAVEMENT PRESERVATION AND RELATED WORK ON I-95	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease from pavement resurfacing.
613921	BOSTON- BRIDGE DECK PRESERVATION OF B-16-259 AND B-16-260 ON I-93	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
614227	MEDFIELD- SIDEWALK REPLACEMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS ON PLEASANT STREET	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Not enough information yet for a quantitative analysis. Qualitative decrease from pedestrian improvements.
616290	LINCOLN TO ARLINGTON- GUIDE AND TRAFFIC SIGN REPLACEMENT ON A SECTION OF ROUTE 2		No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
616325	DANVERS- BEVERLY- PAVEMENT PRESERVATION ON SR128 (MM 42.09-47.14)		No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
S12963	CHELSEA-REVERE- REGIONAL ON-DEMAND MICROTRANSIT PILOT PROJECT	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from New/Additional Transit Service	4,055	Estimated 58 passenger trips per day, vendor would use electric vehicles.
S13386	BROOKLINE- BLUEBIKES EXPANSION, 5 STATIONS	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure	2,967	
S13395	MBTA- OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENT OF BUS ROUTES 714 AND 716	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from New/Additional Transit Service	41,045	
S13400	MBTA- LOCOMOTIVE PROCUREMENT	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
S13401	MBTA- BETTER BUS PROJECT, OPERATIONAL SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS AT BUS STOPS	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from New/Additional Transit Service	182,747	
S13406	REVERE- REVERE BEACH CONNECTOR (DESIGN ONLY)	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	

MassDot Project ID	MassDOT Project Description	GHG Analysis Type	GHG Impact Description	GHG CO2 Impact (kg/yr)	Additional Information
S13410	QUINCY- BLUEBIKES EXPANSION, 10 STATIONS	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure	7,934	
S13412	CATA- MAGNOLIA SHUTTLE	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
S13414	Framingham - Bruce Freeman Rail Trail (Federal Earmark for Design - MA292)	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
S13415	Belmont Community Path Phase II - Federal Earmark for Design (MA293)	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
S13416	Hull - Nantasket Beach Two-Way Traffic Flow Conversion - Federal Earmark for Design (MA294)	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
S13418	Wakefield - Main Street Corridor Improvement Project (Federal Earmark for Design - MA 297)	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
S13447	MAPC and City of Boston- LEVERAGING INNOVATIVE NETWORKS TO KEEP URBAN PATHWAYS UNCONGESTED (LINKUP) IN GREATER BOSTON (FFY 2024 Congestion Relief Program)	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
S13463	Quincy - Reconstruction of Traffic Signals at Sea Street and Coddington Street Along Southern Artery (Design Earmark - MA295)	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
S13497	MAPC- BOSTON, BROOKLINE, CAMBRIDGE, AND SOMERVILLE BLUEBIKES REPLACEMENT OF 60 STATIONS	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
S13498	CATA- ACCESS FOR ALL	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
S13499	CATA- CAPE ANN DIALYSIS TRANSPORTATION	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
S13500	CAMBRIDGE- NEW BRIDGE AND SHARED-USE PATH CONSTRUCTION OVER FITCHBURG LINE AT DANEHY PARK CONNECTOR (DESIGN ONLY)	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
Federal Fiscal Year 2028					
604564	MAYNARD- BRIDGE REPLACEMENT, M-10-004, ROUTE 62 (MAIN STREET) OVER THE ASSABET RIVER	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	

MassDot Project ID	MassDOT Project Description	GHG Analysis Type	GHG Impact Description	GHG CO2 Impact (kg/yr)	Additional Information
606728	BOSTON- BRIDGE REPLACEMENT B-16-365, STORROW DRIVE OVER BOWKER RAMPS (PHASE 2)	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
608952	CHELSEA- BRIDGE SUPERSTRUCTURE REPLACEMENT C-09-013, WASHINGTON AVENUE, CARTER STREET & COUNTY ROAD/ROUTE 1	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
609467	HAMILTON- IPSWICH- BRIDGE REPLACEMENT, H-03-002=I-01-006, WINTHROP STREET OVER IPSWICH RIVER	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
610660	SUDBURY- WAYLAND- MASS CENTRAL RAIL TRAIL (MCRT)	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	TBD
610676	WRENTHAM- INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS ON ROUTE 1A AT NORTH AND WINTER STREET	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from Traffic Operational Improvement	105,187	
610782	DANVERS- MIDDLETON- BRIDGE REPLACEMENT, D-03-009=M-20-005, ANDOVER STREET (SR 114) OVER IPSWICH RIVER	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
612028	STONEHAM- BRIDGE REPLACEMENT, S-27-006 (2L2), (ST 28) FELLSWAY WEST OVER I-93	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
612173	BELLINGHAM- BRIDGE REPLACEMENT, B-06-022, MAPLE STREET OVER I-495	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
612178	NATICK- BRIDGE REPLACEMENT, N-03-010, SPEEN STREET OVER RR MBTA/CSX	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
612182	NEWTON- BRIDGE REPLACEMENT, N-12-040, BOYLSTON STREET OVER GREEN LINE D	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
612523	REVERE- STATE ROAD BEACHMONT CONNECTOR	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	TBD
612804	DEDHAM- IMPROVEMENTS AT AVERY ELEMENTARY (SRTS)	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease from Safe Routes to School improvements.
612884	CHELSEA- IMPROVEMENTS AT MARY C. BURKE ELEMENTARY (SRTS)	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease from Safe Routes to School improvements.
612889	SHARON- COTTAGE STREET SCHOOL IMPROVEMENTS (SRTS)	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease from Safe Routes to School improvements.

MassDot Project ID	MassDOT Project Description	GHG Analysis Type	GHG Impact Description	GHG CO2 Impact (kg/yr)	Additional Information
612894	FRAMINGHAM- IMPROVEMENTS AT HARMONY GROVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (SRTS)	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease from Safe Routes to School improvements.
612989	BOSTON- BRIDGE PRESERVATION, B-16-066 (38D), CAMBRIDGE STREET OVER MBTA	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
613082	MEDFORD- WELLINGTON GREENWAY CONSTRUCTION (PHASE IV)	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	TBD
613099	BOSTON- SLOPE STABILIZATION AND RELATED WORK ON I-93	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
613121	EVERETT- TARGETED MULTI-MODAL AND SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS ON ROUTE 16 (DESIGN ONLY)	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
613356	SHARON- INTERSTATE PAVEMENT PRESERVATION AND RELATED WORK ON I-95	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease from pavement resurfacing.
613388	FRANKLIN- MEDWAY- MILFORD- INTERSTATE PAVEMENT PRESERVATION AND RELATED WORK ON I-495 (MM 44.5-50.5)	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
616313	FRANKLIN- PAVEMENT PRESERVATION ON I-495 (MM 42.5-44.5)		No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
S13391	MWRTA- CONSTRUCTION OF VEHICLE MAINTENANCE AND FUELING FACILITY	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Decrease from construction of facility to support deployment of low emission vehicles.
S13396	MBTA- BUS PRIORITY AND ACCESSIBILITY IMPROVEMENTS	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Decrease from traffic operational improvements at various locations. Sites to be identified as design advances.
S13460	MBTA- SYMPHONY STATION ACCESSIBILITY IMPROVEMENTS	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Decrease in emissions from new accessible elevators, raised platforms for faster boarding, accessible bathrooms, improved station flow.
S13501	NATICK- COCHITUATE RAIL TRAIL EXTENSION (MBTA STATION TO MAIN STREET) (DESIGN ONLY)	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
Federal Fiscal Year 2029					
605857	NORWOOD- INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS AND RELATED WORK AT ROUTE 1 & UNIVERSITY AVENUE/EVERETT STREET	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from Traffic Operational Improvement	1,092,131	

MassDot Project ID	MassDOT Project Description	GHG Analysis Type	GHG Impact Description	GHG CO2 Impact (kg/yr)	Additional Information
606449	CAMBRIDGE- BRIDGE REPLACEMENT, C-01-008, FIRST STREET AND C-01-040, LAND BOULEVARD OVER BROAD CANAL	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
607684	BRAINTREE- BRIDGE REPLACEMENT, B-21-017, WASHINGTON STREET (ST 37) OVER MBTA/CSX RAILROAD	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
607981	SOMERVILLE- MCGRATH BOULEVARD CONSTRUCTION	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from Complete Streets Project	136,345	
608052	NORWOOD- INTERSECTION & SIGNAL IMPROVEMENTS AT US 1 (PROVIDENCE HIGHWAY) & MORSE STREET	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Not enough information yet for a quantitative analysis. Qualitative decrease from traffic improvements.
608158	WESTWOOD- NORWOOD- RECONSTRUCTION OF CANTON STREET TO UNIVERSITY DRIVE	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from Complete Streets Project	5,693	
608954	WESTON- RECONSTRUCTION ON ROUTE 30	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from Complete Streets Project	922	
610543	REVERE- MALDEN- IMPROVEMENTS AT ROUTE 1 (NB) (PHASE 1)	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease from pavement resurfacing.
610666	SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure	138,430	
612027	IPSWICH- RESURFACING OF ROUTE 1A		No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
612196	BRAINTREE- BRIDGE REPLACEMENT, B-21-067, JW MAHER HIGHWAY OVER MONATIQUOT RIVER	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
612499	MEDFORD- SOUTH MEDFORD CONNECTOR BIKE PATH	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	TBD
612599	LYNN- TARGETED SAFETY AND MULTIMODAL IMPROVEMENTS (PLAYBOOK PRIORITY CORRIDORS)	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease from safety improvements.
612616	MILTON- INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS AT ROUTE 138 AND BRADLEE ROAD	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	

MassDot Project ID	MassDOT Project Description	GHG Analysis Type	GHG Impact Description	GHG CO2 Impact (kg/yr)	Additional Information
612990	SALEM- RECONSTRUCTION OF BRIDGE STREET (ROUTE 107), FROM FLINT STREET TO 150 FEET WEST OF WASHINGTON STREET	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Not enough information yet for a quantitative analysis. Qualitative decrease from Complete Streets improvements.
613124	BOSTON- DECK/SUPERSTRUCTURE REPLACEMENT, B-16-054 (4T2), BEACON STREET OVER I-90 (STRUCTURE 50, MILE 132.2)	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
613125	BOSTON- DECK/SUPERSTRUCTURE REPLACEMENT OF BRIDGE B-16-051 (4T5), MASS AVENUE OVER I-90 & MBTA (STRUCTURE 54, MILE 132.84)	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
613154	WELLESLEY- DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS ALONG ROUTE 9 AND CULVERT REPLACEMENTS OVER BOULDER BROOK FOR FLOOD MITIGATION	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
613166	ACTON- SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS AT ROUTE 2A/119 (GREAT ROAD)	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease from safety improvements
613319	SUDBURY- FRAMINGHAM- BIKE PATH CONSTRUCTION OF BRUCE FREEMAN RAIL TRAIL, FROM THE SUDBURY DIAMOND RAILROAD CROSSING TO EATON ROAD WEST	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure	18,348	CMAQ consultation 2/20/2024
613468	NEWTON- IMPROVEMENTS AT PARKER STREET FOR THE OAK HILL MIDDLE SCHOOL (SRTS)	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease from Safe Routes to School improvements.
613477	HOLLISTON- LINDEN STREET IMPROVEMENTS AT ROBERT ADAMS MIDDLE SCHOOL (SRTS)	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease from Safe Routes to School improvements.
613564	READING- OAKLAND ROAD AT READING MEMORIAL HIGH SCHOOL AND COOLIDGE MIDDLE SCHOOL (SRTS)	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease from Safe Routes to School improvements.
613640	NATICK- RESURFACING AND RELATED WORK ON ROUTE 9		No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
613882	DISTRICT 4- ACCESSIBILITY IMPROVEMENTS AT MULTIPLE LOCATIONS (SOUTHERN PROJECT)	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease from accessibility improvements.
614264	LEXINGTON- BURLINGTON- PAVEMENT PRESERVATION ON I-95 (MILE 44.9-51.5)		No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
614266	WELLESLEY- NEWTON- WESTON PAVEMENT PRESERVATION ON I-95 (MILE 37.2-40.8)	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	

MassDot Project ID	MassDOT Project Description	GHG Analysis Type	GHG Impact Description	GHG CO2 Impact (kg/yr)	Additional Information
Federal Fiscal Year 2030					
608498	QUINCY- BRAINTREE- RECONSTRUCTION AND RELATED WORK ON ROUTE 53	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease from pavement resurfacing.
609252	LYNN- REHABILITATION OF ESSEX STREET	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from Complete Streets Project	411,006	Consultation Committee 3/03/2019
609257	EVERETT- RECONSTRUCTION OF BEACHAM STREET	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from Complete Streets Project	9,708	
610650	BOSTON- SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS ON GALLIVAN BOULEVARD (ROUTE 203), FROM WASHINGTON STREET TO GRANITE AVENUE	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease from safety improvements
610665	STONEHAM- INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS AT ROUTE 28 (MAIN STREET), NORTH BORDER ROAD AND SOUTH STREET	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Not enough information yet for a quantitative analysis. Qualitative decrease from traffic improvements.
610932	BROOKLINE- REHABILITATION OF WASHINGTON STREET	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from Complete Streets Project	36,431	
611983	CHELSEA- PARK STREET & PEARL STREET RECONSTRUCTION	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from Complete Streets Project	10,214	
611997	NEWTON- HORACE MANN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IMPROVEMENTS (SRTS)	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease from Safe Routes to School improvements.
612001	MEDFORD- MILTON FULLER ROBERTS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (SRTS)	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease from Safe Routes to School improvements.
612534	MELROSE- LEBANON STREET IMPROVEMENT PROJECT	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure	8,907	
612607	DANVERS- RAIL TRAIL WEST EXTENSION (PHASE 3)	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	TBD
612613	NEWTON- INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS AT ROUTE 16 AND QUINOBEQUIN ROAD	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Not enough information yet for a quantitative analysis. Qualitative decrease from traffic improvements.
613088	MALDEN- SPOT POND BROOK GREENWAY	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure	77,012	

MassDot Project ID	MassDOT Project Description	GHG Analysis Type	GHG Impact Description	GHG CO2 Impact (kg/yr)	Additional Information
613639	FRAMINGHAM- RESURFACING AND RELATED WORK ON ROUTE 9		No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
613654	FRAMINGHAM- BIKE PATH CONSTRUCTION OF BRUCE FREEMAN RAIL TRAIL, FROM EATON ROAD WEST TO FROST STREET	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	TBD
613730	EVERETT- DARTMOUTH STREET/HARVEY STREET IMPROVEMENTS (SRTS)	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
616341	WRENTHAM- PAVEMENT PRESERVATION ON SR1A (MM 11.35-13.55)		No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
Federal Fiscal Year 2031					
605276	BEVERLY- SALEM- BRIDGE REPLACEMENT, B-11-005=S-01-013, KERNWOOD AVENUE OVER DANVERS RIVER AND B-11-001, BRIDGE STREET OVER BASS RIVER (HALL-WHITAKER DRAWBRIDGE)	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
606226	BOSTON- RECONSTRUCTION OF RUTHERFORD AVENUE, FROM CITY SQUARE TO SULLIVAN SQUARE	Quantified	RTP project included in the statewide model	0	
606453	BOSTON- IMPROVEMENTS ON BOYLSTON STREET, FROM INTERSECTION OF BROOKLINE AVENUE & PARK DRIVE TO IPSWICH STREET	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from Complete Streets Project	527,474	
607748	ACTON- INTERSECTION & SIGNAL IMPROVEMENTS ON SR 2 & SR 111 (MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE) AT PIPER ROAD & TAYLOR ROAD	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease from safety improvements.
608396	LYNN- REVERE- BRIDGE RECONSTRUCTION, L-18-015=R-05-008, ROUTE 1A OVER SAUGUS RIVER	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
608397	GLOUCESTER- BRIDGE RECONSTRUCTION, G-05-002, WESTERN AVENUE OVER BLYNMAN CANAL	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
609246	LYNN- REHABILITATION OF WESTERN AVENUE (ROUTE 107)	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from Complete Streets Project	902,708	Funding programmed in 2027 and 2028.
609527	READING- STONEHAM- WAKEFIELD- IMPROVEMENTS ON I-95 (NB), FROM I-93 TO NORTH AVENUE	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease from pavement resurfacing.
610545	WAKEFIELD- MAIN STREET RECONSTRUCTION	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from Complete Streets Project	3,506	Consultation committee: 03/13/2023

MassDot Project ID	MassDOT Project Description	GHG Analysis Type	GHG Impact Description	GHG CO2 Impact (kg/yr)	Additional Information
610662	WOBURN- ROADWAY AND INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS AT WOBURN COMMON, ROUTE 38 (MAIN STREET), WINN STREET, PLEASANT STREET AND MONTVALE AVENUE	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from Traffic Operational Improvement	736,275	
610675	CHELSEA- RECONSTRUCTION OF SPRUCE STREET, FROM EVERETT AVENUE TO WILLIAMS STREET	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Not enough information yet for a quantitative analysis. Qualitative decrease from Complete Streets improvements.
611987	CAMBRIDGE- BRIDGE REPLACEMENT, C-01-026, MEMORIAL DRIVE OVER BROOKLINE STREET	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
612046	GLOUCESTER- RESURFACING ON ROUTE 128		No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
612496	SOMERVILLE- BRIDGE PRESERVATION, S-17-031, I-93 (NB & SB) FROM ROUTE 28 TO TEMPLE STREET (PHASE 2)	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
612519	BOSTON- BRIDGE REPLACEMENT, B-16-165, BLUE HILL AVENUE OVER RAILROAD	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
612615	CANTON- MILTON- ROADWAY RECONSTRUCTION ON ROUTE 138, FROM ROYALL STREET TO DOLLAR LANE	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Not enough information yet for a quantitative analysis. Qualitative decrease from Complete Streets improvements.
612634	SOMERVILLE- BRIDGE REPLACEMENT, S-17-024, ROUTE 28/MCGRATH HWY OVER SOMERVILLE AVE EXT & MBTA	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
612963	BELLINGHAM- ROADWAY REHABILITATION OF ROUTE 126 (HARTFORD ROAD), FROM 800 NORTH OF THE I-495 NB OFF RAMP TO MEDWAY TL, INCLUDING B-06-017	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from Complete Streets Project	2,558	
613130	BOSTON- BRIDGE REPLACEMENT, B-16-033, MORRISSEY BOULEVARD OVER DORCHESTER BAY	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
613282	BOSTON- DEDHAM- INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS AT VFW PARKWAY AND SPRING STREET	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease from safety improvements.
614238	LYNN- IMPROVEMENTS AT BRICKETT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (SRTS)	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	

MassDot Project ID	MassDOT Project Description	GHG Analysis Type	GHG Impact Description	GHG CO2 Impact (kg/yr)	Additional Information
S12113	BOSTON REGION - TRANSIT TRANSFORMATION PROGRAM	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
S12124	BOSTON REGION - COMMUNITY CONNECTIONS PROGRAM	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	Impact on emissions will be calculated specific projects chosen for funding through this program
S12820	BOSTON REGION - BIKESHARE SUPPORT SET ASIDE	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
S13145	BOSTON REGION PROJECT DESIGN SET-ASIDE	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	

Table B-2
Greenhouse Gas Regional Transit Project Tracking: FFYs 2027-31
Programmed Projects

MassDot Project ID	MassDOT Project Description	GHG Analysis Type	GHG Impact Description	GHG CO2 Impact (kg/yr)	Additional Information
Federal Fiscal Year 2027					
Cape Ann Transportation Authority					
RTD0010579	CATA - -Preventive Maintenance	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0010583	CATA - -buy misc small capital	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MetroWest Regional Transit Authority					
MWRTA011707	METROWEST RTA- BLANDIN HUB OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE EXPANSION - CONSTRUCTION	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MWRTA011948	METROWEST RTA- ACQUIRE HEAVY DUTY 30 FOOT REVENUE VEHICLE	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease from fuel-efficient bus procurement
RTD0011137	MetroWest RTA - ACQUIRE REVENUE REPLACEMENT VEHICLES CUTAWAYS TYPE D CNG Consider For Statewide 5339 Funds	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Not enough information yet for a quantitative analysis. Qualitative decrease from assumed procurement of more efficient vehicles.
RTD0011195	MetroWest Regional Transit Authority - OPERATING ASSISTANCE NON FIXED ROUTE ADA PARA SERV	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0011196	MetroWest RTA - TERMINAL, INTERMODAL (TRANSIT) - BLANDIN/FCRS	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0011197	MetroWest Regional Transit Authority - TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT/CAPITAL OUTREACH	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0011198	MetroWest RTA - ACQUISITION OF BUS SUPPORT EQUIP/FACILITIES	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0011267	MetroWest RTA - Fleet and Facility Carbon Reduction and Electrification	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease from carbon reduction and electrification of fleet and facility
Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority					
MBTA053	5307 Bridge & Tunnel Program	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA054	Revenue Vehicle Program	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Not enough information yet for a quantitative analysis. Qualitative decrease from assumed procurement of more efficient vehicles.

MassDot Project ID	MassDOT Project Description	GHG Analysis Type	GHG Impact Description	GHG CO2 Impact (kg/yr)	Additional Information
MBTA055	5307 Signals/Systems Upgrade Program	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA056	Stations and Facilities Program	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA057	5337 Bridge & Tunnel Program	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA058	Revenue Vehicle Program	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Not enough information yet for a quantitative analysis. Qualitative decrease from assumed procurement of more efficient vehicles.
MBTA059	5337 Signals/Systems Upgrade Program	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA060	Stations and Facilities Program	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA061	5339 Bus Program	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA063	RRIF/TIFIA Financing Program	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MassDOT					
RTD0010035	MASSDOT - STATEWIDE -RTA FACILITY AND SYSTEM MODERNIZATION		No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0010037	MASSDOT - STATEWIDE - RTA PLANNING ASSISTANCE		No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0011143	MASSDOT - STATEWIDE -RTA TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0011147	5311 RURAL OPERATING ASSISTANCE		No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0011148	MASSDOT - STATEWIDE - BUS AND BUS FACILITIES		No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0011149	MASSDOT - STATEWIDE -MOBILITY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM		No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD012034	TMA Grant Program		No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	

MassDot Project ID	MassDOT Project Description	GHG Analysis Type	GHG Impact Description	GHG CO2 Impact (kg/yr)	Additional Information
Federal Fiscal Year 2028					
Cape Ann Transportation Authority					
CATA012144	CATA--fare collection equipment	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0010579	CATA - -Preventive Maintenance	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0010583	CATA - -buy misc small capital	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0010591	CATA - -Revenue Vehicle Replacement.	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Not enough information yet for a quantitative analysis. Qualitative decrease from assumed procurement of more efficient vehicles.
MetroWest Regional Transit Authority					
MWRTA011705	METROWEST RTA - PASSENGER TRANSFER STATION	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MWRTA011706	METROWEST RTA- Vehicle Maintenance Facility/Hydrogen Fuel Generation and Dispensing Depot	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MWRTA011707	METROWEST RTA- BLANDIN HUB OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE EXPANSION - CONSTRUCTION	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MWRTA011948	METROWEST RTA- ACQUIRE HEAVY DUTY 30 FOOT REVENUE VEHICLE	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease from fuel-efficient bus procurement
RTD0011137	MetroWest RTA - ACQUIRE REVENUE REPLACEMENT VEHICLES CUTAWAYS TYPE D CNG Consider For Statewide 5339 Funds	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Not enough information yet for a quantitative analysis. Qualitative decrease from assumed procurement of more efficient vehicles.
RTD0011195	MetroWest Regional Transit Authority - OPERATING ASSISTANCE NON FIXED ROUTE ADA PARA SERV	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0011196	MetroWest RTA - TERMINAL, INTERMODAL (TRANSIT) - BLANDIN/FCRS	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0011197	MetroWest Regional Transit Authority - TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT/CAPITAL OUTREACH	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0011198	MetroWest RTA - ACQUISITION OF BUS SUPPORT EQUIP/FACILITIES	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0011267	MetroWest RTA - Fleet and Facility Carbon Reduction and Electrification	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease from carbon reduction and electrification of fleet and facility

MassDot Project ID	MassDOT Project Description	GHG Analysis Type	GHG Impact Description	GHG CO2 Impact (kg/yr)	Additional Information
Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority					
MBTA011475	5307 Bridge & Tunnel Program	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA011476	5307 Revenue Vehicle Program	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Not enough information yet for a quantitative analysis. Qualitative decrease from assumed procurement of more efficient vehicles.
MBTA011478	5307 Signals/Systems Upgrade Program	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA011481	5337 Bridge & Tunnel Program	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA011484	5307 Stations and Facilities Program	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA011486	5337 Revenue Vehicle Program	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Not enough information yet for a quantitative analysis. Qualitative decrease from assumed procurement of more efficient vehicles.
MBTA011487	5337 Signals/Systems Upgrade Program	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA011488	5337 Stations and Facilities Program	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA011489	5339 Bus Program	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA011490	RRIF/TIFIA Financing Program	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MassDOT					
RTD0010035	MASSDOT - STATEWIDE -RTA FACILITY AND SYSTEM MODERNIZATION		No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0010037	MASSDOT - STATEWIDE - RTA PLANNING ASSISTANCE		No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0011143	MASSDOT - STATEWIDE -RTA TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0011147	5311 RURAL OPERATING ASSISTANCE		No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	

MassDot Project ID	MassDOT Project Description	GHG Analysis Type	GHG Impact Description	GHG CO2 Impact (kg/yr)	Additional Information
RTD0011148	MASSDOT - STATEWIDE - BUS AND BUS FACILITIES		No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0011149	MASSDOT - STATEWIDE -MOBILITY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM		No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD012034	TMA Grant Program		No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
Federal Fiscal Year 2029					
Cape Ann Transportation Authority					
RTD0010579	CATA - -Preventive Maintenance	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0010583	CATA - -buy misc small capital	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MetroWest Regional Transit Authority					
MWRTA011705	METROWEST RTA - PASSENGER TRANSFER STATION	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MWRTA011706	METROWEST RTA- Vehicle Maintenance Facility/Hydrogen Fuel Generation and Dispensing Depot	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MWRTA011707	METROWEST RTA- BLANDIN HUB OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE EXPANSION - CONSTRUCTION	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MWRTA011948	METROWEST RTA- ACQUIRE HEAVY DUTY 30 FOOT REVENUE VEHICLE	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease from fuel-efficient bus procurement
RTD0011137	MetroWest RTA - ACQUIRE REVENUE REPLACEMENT VEHICLES CUTAWAYS TYPE D CNG Consider For Statewide 5339 Funds	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Not enough information yet for a quantitative analysis. Qualitative decrease from assumed procurement of more efficient vehicles.
RTD0011195	MetroWest Regional Transit Authority - OPERATING ASSISTANCE NON FIXED ROUTE ADA PARA SERV	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0011196	MetroWest RTA - TERMINAL, INTERMODAL (TRANSIT) - BLANDIN/FCRS	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0011197	MetroWest Regional Transit Authority - TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT/CAPITAL OUTREACH	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0011198	MetroWest RTA - ACQUISITION OF BUS SUPPORT EQUIP/FACILITIES	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	

MassDot Project ID	MassDOT Project Description	GHG Analysis Type	GHG Impact Description	GHG CO2 Impact (kg/yr)	Additional Information
RTD0011267	MetroWest RTA - Fleet and Facility Carbon Reduction and Electrification	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease from carbon reduction and electrification of fleet and facility
Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority					
MBTA011826	5307 Bridge & Tunnel Program	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA011827	5307 Revenue Vehicle Program	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Not enough information yet for a quantitative analysis. Qualitative decrease from assumed procurement of more efficient vehicles.
MBTA011828	5307 Signals/Systems Upgrade Program	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA011829	5307 Stations and Facilities Program	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA011830	5337 Bridge & Tunnel Program	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA011831	5337 Revenue Vehicle Program	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Not enough information yet for a quantitative analysis. Qualitative decrease from assumed procurement of more efficient vehicles.
MBTA011832	5337 Signals/Systems Upgrade Program	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA011834	5339 Bus Program	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA011836	5337 Stations and Facilities Program	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA011837	RRIF/TIFIA Financing Program	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MassDOT					
RTD0010035	MASSDOT - STATEWIDE -RTA FACILITY AND SYSTEM MODERNIZATION		No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0010037	MASSDOT - STATEWIDE - RTA PLANNING ASSISTANCE		No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0011143	MASSDOT - STATEWIDE -RTA TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	

MassDot Project ID	MassDOT Project Description	GHG Analysis Type	GHG Impact Description	GHG CO2 Impact (kg/yr)	Additional Information
RTD0011147	5311 RURAL OPERATING ASSISTANCE		No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0011148	MASSDOT - STATEWIDE - BUS AND BUS FACILITIES		No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0011149	MASSDOT - STATEWIDE -MOBILITY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM		No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD012034	TMA Grant Program		No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
Federal Fiscal Year 2030					
Cape Ann Transportation Authority					
CATA011695	CATA - APC, AVL	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0010579	CATA - -Preventive Maintenance	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0010583	CATA - -buy misc small capital	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MetroWest Regional Transit Authority					
MWRTA011706	METROWEST RTA- Vehicle Maintenance Facility/Hydrogen Fuel Generation and Dispensing Depot	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MWRTA011948	METROWEST RTA- ACQUIRE HEAVY DUTY 30 FOOT REVENUE VEHICLE	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease from fuel-efficient bus procurement
MWRTA011964	MetroWest RTA - Hydrogen Vehicle Procurement	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease from fuel-efficient bus procurement
RTD0011137	MetroWest RTA - ACQUIRE REVENUE REPLACEMENT VEHICLES CUTAWAYS TYPE D CNG Consider For Statewide 5339 Funds	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Not enough information yet for a quantitative analysis. Qualitative decrease from assumed procurement of more efficient vehicles.
RTD0011195	MetroWest Regional Transit Authority - OPERATING ASSISTANCE NON FIXED ROUTE ADA PARA SERV	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0011196	MetroWest RTA - TERMINAL, INTERMODAL (TRANSIT) - BLANDIN/FCRS	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0011197	MetroWest Regional Transit Authority - TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT/CAPITAL OUTREACH	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	

MassDot Project ID	MassDOT Project Description	GHG Analysis Type	GHG Impact Description	GHG CO2 Impact (kg/yr)	Additional Information
RTD0011198	MetroWest RTA - ACQUISITION OF BUS SUPPORT EQUIP/FACILITIES	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0011267	MetroWest RTA - Fleet and Facility Carbon Reduction and Electrification	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease from carbon reduction and electrification of fleet and facility
Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority					
MBTA012045	5307 Bridge & Tunnel Program	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA012046	5307 Revenue Vehicle Program	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Not enough information yet for a quantitative analysis. Qualitative decrease from assumed procurement of more efficient vehicles.
MBTA012047	5307 Signals/Systems Upgrade Program	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA012048	5307 Stations and Facilities Program	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA012049	5337 Bridge & Tunnel Program	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA012050	5337 Revenue Vehicle Program	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Not enough information yet for a quantitative analysis. Qualitative decrease from assumed procurement of more efficient vehicles.
MBTA012051	5337 Signals/Systems Upgrade Program	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA012052	5337 Stations and Facilities Program	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA012053	5339 Bus Program	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA012054	RRIF/TIFIA Financing Program (Potential)	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MassDOT					
RTD0010035	MASSDOT - STATEWIDE -RTA FACILITY AND SYSTEM MODERNIZATION		No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0010037	MASSDOT - STATEWIDE - RTA PLANNING ASSISTANCE		No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	

MassDot Project ID	MassDOT Project Description	GHG Analysis Type	GHG Impact Description	GHG CO2 Impact (kg/yr)	Additional Information
RTD0011143	MASSDOT - STATEWIDE -RTA TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0011147	5311 RURAL OPERATING ASSISTANCE		No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0011148	MASSDOT - STATEWIDE - BUS AND BUS FACILITIES		No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0011149	MASSDOT - STATEWIDE -MOBILITY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM		No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD012034	TMA Grant Program		No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
Federal Fiscal Year 2031					
Cape Ann Transportation Authority					
RTD0010579	CATA - -Preventive Maintenance	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0010583	CATA - -buy misc small capital	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MetroWest Regional Transit Authority					
MWRTA011706	METROWEST RTA- Vehicle Maintenance Facility/Hydrogen Fuel Generation and Dispensing Depot	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MWRTA011948	METROWEST RTA- ACQUIRE HEAVY DUTY 30 FOOT REVENUE VEHICLE	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease from fuel-efficient bus procurement
RTD0011137	MetroWest RTA - ACQUIRE REVENUE REPLACEMENT VEHICLES CUTAWAYS TYPE D CNG Consider For Statewide 5339 Funds	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Not enough information yet for a quantitative analysis. Qualitative decrease from assumed procurement of more efficient vehicles.
RTD0011195	MetroWest Regional Transit Authority - OPERATING ASSISTANCE NON FIXED ROUTE ADA PARA SERV	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0011196	MetroWest RTA - TERMINAL, INTERMODAL (TRANSIT) - BLANDIN/FCRS	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0011197	MetroWest Regional Transit Authority - TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT/CAPITAL OUTREACH	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0011198	MetroWest RTA - ACQUISITION OF BUS SUPPORT EQUIP/FACILITIES	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	

MassDot Project ID	MassDOT Project Description	GHG Analysis Type	GHG Impact Description	GHG CO2 Impact (kg/yr)	Additional Information
RTD0011267	MetroWest RTA - Fleet and Facility Carbon Reduction and Electrification	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease from carbon reduction and electrification of fleet and facility
Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority					
MBTA012281	5307 Bridge & Tunnel Program	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA012282	5307 Revenue Vehicle Program	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Not enough information yet for a quantitative analysis. Qualitative decrease from assumed procurement of more efficient vehicles.
MBTA012283	5307 Signals/Systems Upgrade Program	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA012284	5307 Stations and Facilities Program	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA012285	5337 Bridge & Tunnel Program	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA012286	5337 Revenue Vehicle Program	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Not enough information yet for a quantitative analysis. Qualitative decrease from assumed procurement of more efficient vehicles.
MBTA012287	5337 Signals/Systems Upgrade Program	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA012288	5339 Bus Program	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA012289	RRIF/TIFIA Financing Program	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MassDOT					
RTD0010035	MASSDOT - STATEWIDE -RTA FACILITY AND SYSTEM MODERNIZATION		No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0010037	MASSDOT - STATEWIDE - RTA PLANNING ASSISTANCE		No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0011143	MASSDOT - STATEWIDE -RTA TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0011147	5311 RURAL OPERATING ASSISTANCE		No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	

MassDot Project ID	MassDOT Project Description	GHG Analysis Type	GHG Impact Description	GHG CO2 Impact (kg/yr)	Additional Information
RTD0011148	MASSDOT - STATEWIDE - BUS AND BUS FACILITIES		No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0011149	MASSDOT - STATEWIDE -MOBILITY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM		No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD012034	TMA Grant Program		No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	

**Table B-3
Greenhouse Gas Regional Highway Project Tracking: C
ompleted Projects**

Project ID	Project Name	GHG Analysis Type	GHG Impact Description	GHG CO2 Impact (kg/yr)	Additional Information
607342	Milton- Intersection Improvements at Route 28 (Randolph Avenue) & Chickatawbut Road	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from Traffic Operational Improvement	1148458.52	
607420	Natick- Superstructure Replacement, N-03-012, Boden Lane over CSX/MBTA	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
607977	Hopkinton- Westborough- Reconstruction of I-90/I-495 Interchange	Quantified	RTP project included in the statewide model	0	
608940	Weston- Intersection Improvements Boston Post Road (Route 20) at Wellesley Street	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from Traffic Operational Improvement	818732.6491	
609204	Belmont- Community Path, Belmont Component of the MCRT (Phase I)	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure	26347	
609388	Wenham- Safety Improvements on Route 1A	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease from safety improvements.
609399	Randolph- Resurfacing and Related Work on Route 28	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease from pavement resurfacing.
609531	Arlington- Stratton School Improvements (SRTS)	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	
610537	Boston- Ellis Elementary Traffic Calming (SRTS)	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease from Safe Routes to School improvements.
610544	Peabody- Multi-Use Path Construction of Independence Greenway at I-95 and Route 1	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure	24423	Consultation Committee: 03/04/2020
611940	Somerville- Bridge Replacement, S-17-016 (3Gf), Webster Avenue over MBTA and BMRR	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
611974	Medford- Intersection Improvements at Main Street/South Street, Main Street/Mystic Valley Parkway Ramps and Main Street/Mystic Avenue	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from Traffic Operational Improvement	389744.7512	
611982	Medford- Shared Use Path Connection at the Route 28/Wellington Underpass	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure	4308.78	
612050	Braintree- Weymouth- Resurfacing and Related Work on Route 3	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease from pavement resurfacing.
612184	Revere- Bridge Replacement, R-05-015, Revere Beach Parkway over Broadway	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
613163	Lynnfield- Peabody- Rail Trail Construction, from Ford Avenue to Nichols Lane (Phase 1)	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure	2748.23	
613383	Lynnfield- Wakefield- Interstate Pavement Preservation and Related Work on I-95	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease from pavement resurfacing.
613727	Braintree- Reconstruction of Allen Street (MA285)	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	

Project ID	Project Name	GHG Analysis Type	GHG Impact Description	GHG CO2 Impact (kg/yr)	Additional Information
613921	Boston- Bridge Deck Preservation of B-16-259 and B-16-260 on I-93	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
613994	Burlington to Reading- Guide and Traffic Sign Replacement on a Section of I-95/128	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
614226	Sherborn- Reconstruction of Route 27 and Route 16 (Design Only)	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
614244	Holliston- Improvements at the Intersection of Route 16 (Washington Street) and Whitney Street and Approaches (Design Only)	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
S12807	MWRTA Catchconnect Microtransit Expansion Phase 2	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from New/Additional Transit Service	102845.14	The project adds complementary transit service to existing MWRTA bus connections in Framingham and Natick, and extends service hours for the existing CatchConnect service. Funding programmed in 2024, 2025, and 2026. Consultation Committee: 03/13/2023
S12963	Chelsea-Revere- Regional On-Demand Microtransit Pilot Project	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from New/Additional Transit Service	4054.53	Estimated 58 passenger trips per day, vendor would use electric vehicles.
S12970	CATA- Vehicle Replacement (4 Vehicles)	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from Bus Replacement	5.657	Bus replacement of four vehicles past their useful life. Corresponds with RTD0010591 in CATA's program.
S12971	MWRTA- Blandin Hub Redesign Initiative	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease due to increased public transit accessibility.
S13048	Hudson- Bike Path Construction of Mass Central Rail Trail, from Felton Street to Priest Street (Design Only)	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	Design funding.
S13129	Salem- Broad Street and Dalton Parkway Corridor Project (Design Only)	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
S13146	Lexington- Design of Safety Improvements at the Interstate 95 and Route 4/225 Interchange	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
S13147	Framingham- Preliminary Design of Intersection Improvements at Route 126/135/MBTA & CSX Railroad	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	

Project ID	Project Name	GHG Analysis Type	GHG Impact Description	GHG CO2 Impact (kg/yr)	Additional Information
S13152	Better Bus Project - Operational Safety Improvements at Bus Stops	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease resulting from transit operating safety improvements. Quantitative approach may follow with additional information from MBTA.
S13153	MBTA- Bus Priority and Accessibility Improvements	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Decrease in emissions from bus accessibility improvements that will increase access to MBTA services.
S13179	Brookline- Bluebikes Expansion, 3 Stations and 20 Electric Bikes	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure	689.95	Quantified decrease from new investments in bikeshare assets.
S13180	Boston- Bluebikes Station Replacement, 20 Stations	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease from bike sharing replacement
S13181	Somerville- Bluebikes Station Replacement, 5 Stations	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease from bike share replacement.
S13182	Cambridge- Bluebikes Station Replacement, 7 Stations	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease from bike share replacement.
S13183	Newton- Installation of 67 Bike Racks, 2 Shelters, and 12 RRFBs	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative reduction in GHG emissions from active transportation investments (bicycle assets, vulnerable user safety)
S13184	Marblehead- Installation of 22 Bike Racks	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Decrease in emissions from installation of small bicycle infrastructure assets.
S13194	Chelsea- Bluebikes Expansion, 3 12-Dock Stations, 36 Classic Bikes	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure	2138.85	Quantified decrease from installation of new bikeshare assets.
S13291	Ctps- Procurement and Installation of Six Air Quality Sensors for Ghg Monitoring (Performance Based Planning Program)	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
S13292	MBTA- Operational Enhancement of Bus Routes 714 and 716	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from New/Additional Transit Service	188594.08	
S13293	Acton- Reconstruction of Route 2A/119 (Great Road), from Davis Road to Harris Street [Design Only]	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
S13294	Malden- Improvements on Eastern Avenue (Route 60), from Franklin Street to Lynn Street (Design Only)	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	

Project ID	Project Name	GHG Analysis Type	GHG Impact Description	GHG CO2 Impact (kg/yr)	Additional Information
S13295	Cambridge- New Bridge and Shared-Use Path Construction over Fitchburg Line at Danehy Park Connector (Design Only)	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
S13301	MBTA- Fairmount Line Decarbonization (Flex to FTA)	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	Decarbonization project by definition should result in GHG reduction.
S13323	Belmont Community Path (Federal Earmark for Design)	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
S13325	Lynn: Lynn Safe Streets Projects (SS4A)	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
S13326	Peabody: Lynnfield Street Corridor Safety Demonstration Project (SS4A)	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
S13335	Quincy SS4A - Pedestrian Crossing Safety Improvements In Senior and School Zones Demonstration Program	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
S13336	Watertown SS4A - Watertown Safe Streets Initiative	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
S13340	Needham SS4A - Great Plain Avenue Multimodal Corridor Demonstration Project	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
S13341	PPPP - Prioritization Improvement Program for the Greater Boston Region	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
S13344	Boston - Safety at Nine Key Intersections (SS4A Implementation Grant)	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
S13345	Somerville - Quick Build Protected Bike Lanes Pilot (FY 2023 SS4A Supp/Demo Grant)	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
S13346	Boston - New Traffic Signal Operations (FY 23 SS4A Implementation Grant)	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
S13347	Everett - Planning and Demonstration Activities (FY 2023 SS4A Demonstration Grant)	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
S13363	MAPC- Leveraging Innovative Networks to Keep Urban Pathways Uncongested (Linkup) In Greater Boston (FFY 2024 Crf)	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
S13374	MWRTA- Blandin Hub Redesign Initiative	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Design of modernized transit facility including passenger facility upgrades
S13375	MWRTA- Procurement of Nine 29-Foot Buses (CNG)	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative improvement from procurement of new low emission fleet vehicles.
S13377	Quincy - Reconstruction of Traffic Signals at Sea Street and Coddington Street Along Southern Artery (Design Earmark - MA295)	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	

Project ID	Project Name	GHG Analysis Type	GHG Impact Description	GHG CO2 Impact (kg/yr)	Additional Information
S13381	Cambridge - Neighborhood Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure for Cambridge Residents (Federal Earmark, Demo ID MA 287)	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	
S13382	Arlington- Mystic River Path to Minuteman Bikeway Connection Design (Federal Earmark MA 284)	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
S13383	Medfield - Reconstruction of the West Street / Route 27 Intersection (Federal Earmark for Design - MA280)	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
S13388	CATA- Access for All	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
S13389	CATA- Cape Ann Dialysis Transportation	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
S13390	MWRTA- Procurement of 10 Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) Vehicles	Qualitative	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from Bus Replacement	0	
S13394	MBTA- Downtown Crossing Vertical Transportation Improvements Phase 2	Qualitative	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from New/Additional Transit Service	0	
S13407	Framingham - Chris Walsh Memorial Trail (Federal Earmark for Design - MA 283)	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
S13411	MAPC- Joint Municipality Bluebikes Expansion, 1500 Ebikes, 25 Classic Bikes, 17 Stations	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure	105217.43	
S13464	Marblehead Border to Boston Trail Engineering & Design	Not Applicable	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	

Table B-4
Greenhouse Gas Regional Transit Project Tracking: Completed Projects

Project ID	RTA	Project Name	GHG Analysis Type	GHG Impact Description	GHG CO2 Impact (kg/yr)	Additional Information
MBTA012042	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	Green Line CIG-Core Capacity (Proposed Funding)	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA012043	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	North Station Draw 1 Bridge Repl. (FFY26 MEGA)	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	Bridge replacement, no impact
MBTA012044	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	Fairmount Line Decarbonization (CRP)	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Procurement of electric vehicles, not enough details
MBTA012118	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	Attleboro Station Improvements (GATRA)	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Decrease from station accessibility improvements
MBTA012119	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	RRIF Financing - PTC/ATC/Fiber	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA012120	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	Lynnway Multimodal Corridor (RAISE)	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease due to expanded transit service, details not yet known
MBTA012121	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	Lower Broadway Everett Corridor (RAISE)	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease due to expanded transit service, details not yet known
MBTA012122	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	Quincy Squantum Point Park Ferry Pier (Ferry)	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Decrease from station accessibility improvements
MBTA012123	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	JFK/UMass Station Improvement - Planning (RCP)	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA012124	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	Lynn Broad Street Corridor TSP (CPF)	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Should be quantitative, not yet enough information, decrease from transit signal priority
MBTA012125	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	Procurement of 40ft BEBs (CRP)	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Procurement of sustainable fuel buses
MBTA012126	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	Quincy Bus Maintenance Facility (CRP)	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA012127	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	Systemwide Flood Mitigation (PROTECT)	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	Resilience improvements, no impact
MBTA012128	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	Lynn Station Improvements (STP)	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Decrease from station accessibility improvements
MBTA012129	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	Columbus Ave. Bus Lane Ph. II (CMAQ)	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Qualitative decrease due to expanded transit service, details not yet known
MBTA012130	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	Lynn Broad Street Corridor TSP (CMAQ)	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Decrease due to transit signal priority, not enough information yet
MBTA012131	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	Jackson Sq. Station Access Impr. (CMAQ)	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Decrease from station accessibility improvements

Project ID	RTA	Project Name	GHG Analysis Type	GHG Impact Description	GHG CO2 Impact (kg/yr)	Additional Information
MBTA012132	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	Rail Transformation - Early Action CMAQ)	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Decrease from actions supporting more frequent transit service
MBTA012133	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	Central Station Accessibility Project (CMAQ)	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Decrease due to station accessibility improvements
MBTA012134	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	Nubian Square Bus Circulation Improv. (CMAQ)	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA012135	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	Pedal & Park System Modernization (CMAQ)	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Decrease due to installation of bicycle racks
MBTA012136	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	Bus Priority and Accessibility - PATI (CMAQ)	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Decrease due to transit accessibility improvements
MBTA012137	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	MBTA Catamaran Overhaul (CMAQ, FBP)	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA012138	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	Natick Center Station Accessibility (CMAQ)	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Decrease due to station accessibility improvements
MBTA012139	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	Wellesley Station Upgrades (CMAQ)	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Decrease due to station accessibility improvements
MBTA012140	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	Railroad Crossing Elimination Program (FRA)	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA012141	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	714/716 Bus Route Extension (CMAQ)	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Quantitative, covered by line item in the Regional Target Program (\$13292)
MBTA012142	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	South Salem Station - Planning (RAISE)	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	Planning only
MBTA012143	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	Wellesley Commuter Rail ADA Compliance (CPF)	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Decrease from station accessibility improvements
MBTA012240	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	Mystic Valley Elder Services - Mobility Assistance	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Additional transit service, not yet enough information for quantified calculations
MBTA012270	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	City of Boston - Buy Replacement Vans (2) Type A	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	Need more information on vehicle type
MBTA012271	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	Milton COA - Buy Replacement Van (1) Type Cb	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	Need more information on vehicle type
MBTA012272	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	Watertown Department of Senior Services - Buy Replacement Van (1) Type Cb	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	Need more information on vehicle type
MBTA012273	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	S.C.M. COMMUNITY TRANSPORTATIO Inc. - Buy Replacement Vans (2) Type E	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	Need more information on vehicle type

Project ID	RTA	Project Name	GHG Analysis Type	GHG Impact Description	GHG CO2 Impact (kg/yr)	Additional Information
MBTA012274	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	Town of Bedford - Buy Van (1) Type A	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	Need more information on vehicle type
MBTA012279	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	40Ft Enhanced Electric Hybrid Bus	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Procurement of sustainable fuel vehicle
MBTA012280	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	Mobileye Shield+ Collision Avoidance Phase 2	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA012293	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	Downtown Crossing Vertical Transportation Improvements Phase 2 (CMAQ)	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	Decrease from station accessibility improvements
MBTA041	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	5307 Revenue Vehicle Program	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from Bus Replacement	4,386,686	
MBTA042	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	5307 Signals/Systems Upgrade Program	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA043	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	5307 Stations and Facilities Program	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA044	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	5337 Bridge & Tunnel Program	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA045	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	5337 Revenue Vehicle Program	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from Bus Replacement	4,386,686	
MBTA046	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	5337 Signals/Systems Upgrade Program	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA047	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	5337 Stations and Facilities Program	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA048	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	5339 Bus Program	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MBTA050	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	RRIF/TIFIA Financing Program	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
CATA011694	Cape Ann Transportation Authority	CATA - Rehab/renovation of existing facility	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
CATA011695	Cape Ann Transportation Authority	CATA - APC, AVL	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0010579	Cape Ann Transportation Authority	CATA - -Preventive Maintenance	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0010583	Cape Ann Transportation Authority	CATA - -buy misc small capital	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0010591	Cape Ann Transportation Authority	CATA - -Revenue Vehicle Replacement.	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from Bus Replacement	5.657	
T00073	Cape Ann Transportation Authority	CATA-Rehab/Renovation Administration & Operations Facility	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MWRTA011707	MetroWest Regional Transit Authority	METROWEST RTA- BLANDIN HUB OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE EXPANSION - CONSTRUCTION	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	

Project ID	RTA	Project Name	GHG Analysis Type	GHG Impact Description	GHG CO2 Impact (kg/yr)	Additional Information
MWRTA011815	MetroWest Regional Transit Authority	MetroWest RTA - BLANDIN HUB OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE EXPANSION - DESIGN	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
MWRTA011948	MetroWest Regional Transit Authority	METROWEST RTA- ACQUIRE HEAVY DUTY 30 FOOT REVENUE VEHICLE	Qualitative	Qualitative Decrease in Emissions	0	
MWRTA012255	MetroWest Regional Transit Authority	MWRTA - Buy Replacement Vans (4) TYPE E	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	Need more information on vehicle type
MWRTA012256	MetroWest Regional Transit Authority	MWRTA - Buy Replacement Vans (8) TYPE E2a	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	Need more information on vehicle type
RTD0011117	MetroWest Regional Transit Authority	MetroWest RTA - TERMINAL, INTERMODAL (TRANSIT) - BLANDIN	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0011118	MetroWest Regional Transit Authority	MetroWest RTA - TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT/CAPITAL OUTREACH	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0011119	MetroWest Regional Transit Authority	MetroWest RTA - ACQUISITION OF BUS SUPPORT EQUIP/FACILITIES	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	
RTD0011137	MetroWest Regional Transit Authority	MetroWest RTA - ACQUIRE REVENUE REPLACEMENT VEHICLES CUTAWAYS TYPE D CNG Consider For Statewide 5339 Funds	Quantified	Quantified Decrease in Emissions from Bus Replacement	432335.305	
RTD0011195	MetroWest Regional Transit Authority	MetroWest RTA - OPERATING ASSISTANCE NON FIXED ROUTE ADA PARA SERV	Qualitative	No assumed impact/negligible impact on emissions	0	

Greenhouse Gas Analyses

As part of the development of the FFYs 2027–31 TIP, analyses were done for the types of projects described below. A summary of steps performed in the analyses is provided.

Traffic Operational Improvements

For an intersection reconstruction or signalization project that typically reduces delay and, therefore, idling, the following steps are taken:

- Step 1: Calculate the AM peak hour total intersection delay (seconds).
- Step 2: Calculate the PM peak hour total intersection delay (seconds).
- Step 3: Select the peak hour with the longer intersection delay.
- Step 4: Calculate the selected peak hour total intersection delay with improvements.
- Step 5: Calculate the vehicle delay in hours per day (assumes peak hour delay is 10 percent of daily delay).
- Step 6: Input the emissions factors for arterial idling speed from the EPA's MOVES model.
- Step 7: Calculate the net emissions change in kilograms per day.
- Step 8: Calculate the net emissions change in kilograms per year (seasonally adjusted).
- Step 9: Calculate the cost effectiveness (first year cost per kilogram of emissions reduced)

Pedestrian and Bicycle Infrastructure

For a shared-use path that would enable more walking and biking trips and reduce automobile trips, the following steps are taken:

- Step 1: Calculate the estimated number of one-way trips based on the percentage of workers residing in the communities served by the facility and the communities' bicycle and pedestrian commuter mode share.
- Step 2: Calculate the reduction in vehicle-miles traveled per day and per year (assumes each trip is the length of the facility and that the facility operates 200 days per year).
- Step 3: Input the MOVES emissions factors for the average commuter travel speed (assumes 35 miles per hour).
- Step 4: Calculate the net emissions change in kilograms per year (seasonally adjusted).

- Step 5: Calculate the cost effectiveness (first year cost per kilogram of emissions reduced).

Bus Replacements

For a program that replaces old buses with new buses that reduce emissions or run on cleaner fuel, the following steps are taken:

- Step 1: Input the MOVES emissions factors for the average bus travel speed (assumes 18 miles per hour) for both the old model year bus and the new model year bus.
- Step 2: Calculate the fleet vehicle-miles per day based on the vehicle revenue-miles and operating days per year.
- Step 3: Calculate the net emissions change in kilograms per year (seasonally adjusted).
- Step 4: Calculate the cost effectiveness (first-year cost per kilogram of emissions reduced).

Other Types of Projects

Calculations may be performed on the project types listed below:

- **New and Additional Transit Service:** A new bus or shuttle service that reduces automobile trips
- **Park-and-Ride Lot:** A facility that reduces automobile trips by encouraging high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) travel via carpooling or transit
- **Alternative Fuel Vehicles:** New vehicle purchases that replace traditional gas or diesel vehicles with alternative fuel or advanced technology vehicles
- **Anti-Idling Strategies:** Strategies that include incorporating anti-idling technology into fleets and using light-emitting diode (LED) lights on trucks for the purpose of illuminating worksites
- **Bike-share Projects:** Programs in which bicycles are made available for shared use to individuals on a short-term basis, allowing each bicycle to serve several users per day
- **Induced Travel:** Projects associated with a roadway capacity change that gives rise to new automobile trips
- **Speed Reduction Projects:** Projects that result in slower vehicle travel speeds and, therefore, reduced emissions
- **Transit Signal Priority Projects:** Technology at signalized intersections or along corridors that affect bus travel times

- **Truck Stop Electrification:** Technology that provides truck drivers with necessary services, such as heating, air conditioning, or appliances, without requiring them to idle their engines

Analyzing Projects with Assumed Impacts

Projects Impacting Carbon Dioxide Emissions

Projects with assumed CO₂ impacts are those that could produce a minor decrease or increase in emissions, but the change in emissions cannot be calculated with any precision. Examples include a bicycle rack installation, Safe Routes to School projects, or transit marketing or customer service improvements. These projects are categorized as producing an assumed nominal increase or decrease in emissions.

Projects with No Carbon Dioxide Impact

Projects that do not change the capacity or use of a facility are assumed to have no CO₂ impact. Examples include a resurfacing project that restores a roadway to its previous condition, or a bridge rehabilitation or replacement that restores the bridge to its previous condition.

Appendix C—Public Engagement and Public Comments

Public Engagement

In the course of developing the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), the staff of the Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) regularly engages with municipalities, community-based organizations, and the general public to provide information and solicit feedback around milestones and key decision points. MPO staff publishes materials and information used by the MPO board for decision-making via the TIP development web page, bostonmpo.org/tip-dev, and shares updates via email and social media communication channels. This process affords interested stakeholders and members of the public opportunities to provide input to the MPO board during the development of the TIP and prior to the release of the draft TIP for the official public review period. This appendix documents the input received during the development of the Federal Fiscal Years (FFYs) 2027–31 TIP and comments received during the public review period.

MPO staff initiated public engagement activities for the FFYs 2027–31 TIP in October 2025. Staff held and participated in a variety of events, including MPO board and committee meetings, public information sessions and workshops, in-person pop-up engagement activities, and meetings with municipalities and organizations. Staff made particular efforts to encourage community-based organizations and members of the public to advocate for their communities' priorities by providing feedback to the MPO about proposed TIP projects and engaging directly with municipalities and project proponents to support project development.

The following are highlights from public engagement during the development of the FFYs 2027–31 TIP:

- Staff launched a new [Virtual TIP Project Dashboard](#) to support understanding and awareness of roadway projects funded in the Boston region.
- Staff attended several in-person events, including farmers' markets and open streets events, throughout the year to engage members of the public directly, discuss local priorities, and share information about current and proposed TIP projects.
- Staff provided information and facilitated discussions with the Community Advisory Council about the TIP development process,

including the Advisory Council's role and new project readiness guidelines.

- Throughout the TIP development process, MPO staff connected with municipal stakeholders in each of the Boston region's eight subregions by attending subregional group meetings hosted by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC) to discuss the TIP. Staff attended meetings of other locally and regionally focused transportation stakeholder groups to discuss the TIP. These events offered municipal and elected officials and other interested stakeholders the opportunity to directly engage with staff to ask questions, voice concerns, provide suggestions, and propose new projects for funding.
- Staff facilitated discussions about the TIP and solicited feedback from MPO board members, project proponents, members of the public, and other interested stakeholders at meetings of the TIP Process, Engagement, and Readiness Committee throughout the development of the FFYs 2027–31 TIP. Staff continued and broadened the availability of TIP Office Hours to support this effort.
- MPO staff hosted three virtual public subregional TIP Readiness meetings in January 2026. These meetings provided opportunities for municipalities with projects currently programmed for funding to provide direct updates about the status of their projects and for other interested stakeholders to learn about projects and participate in TIP development.

In addition to the specific meetings and engagement activities listed above, staff held numerous one-on-one and small group meetings with municipal stakeholders and community-based organizations to share detailed information about the TIP development process, solicit input and discuss priorities, and provide opportunities for deeper engagement on specific projects currently programmed on the TIP or proposed for funding in future years. These conversations also helped inform the development of additional engagement materials, strategies, and activities to effectively address local needs expressed by stakeholders.

Moreover, the MPO board held a series of discussions at its regular meetings as the TIP was developed in stages that focused on project solicitation, project evaluation, and programming of funds. Staff informed the public at each stage via its standard communication channels (email, social media, and the MPO website) and solicited public comment at each meeting. Staff regularly shared comment letters and emails received from members of the public, municipal and elected officials, advocates, and other stakeholders

with the MPO board during meetings to help inform TIP planning and programming decisions.

Public Comments Received During TIP Development

During in-person engagement events conducted during the development of the FFYs 2027–31 TIP, staff collected information about public priorities for project funding and for transportation infrastructure improvements in general.

The MPO received a number of specific oral and written comments while developing the draft TIP. These comments are summarized in Table C-1.

Table C-1
Public Comments Received during Development of
the FFYs 2027–31 TIP

Project	Name	Municipality/ Affiliation	Support/Oppose/ Request/Concern	Comment
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Emily Andreano	Swampscott	Support	I am writing in support of completion of the Swampscott Rail Trail. I have lived in Swampscott for 20 years and have also lived in Marblehead, where the entire trail was completed a number of years ago, running from the Salem line to the Swampscott line. Salem's trail is heavily used by Salem State University students who live nearby or in one of the on-campus dorms, and Lynn's trail is used by commuters to Boston. Swampscott's trail is right in between, and is partially completed. I am so grateful that Swampscott Town Meeting members have consistently supported creation of the Rail Trail. I am asking the Metropolitan Planning Organization to continue its support of the Swampscott Rail Trail by including this project (#610666) for funding in 2029 or even sooner if possible. Use of the trail has grown following completion of the first two sections. Many residents, including me have contributed to "Friends of the Swampscott Rail Trail" enabling the group to make a donation toward design and engineering work. Volunteers can regularly be seen picking up litter, planting shrubbery and flowers. As a former rail bed, the Rail Trail in particular is prone to having invasive plant species, because nothing was ever deliberately planted on the train tracks. The Friends of the Swampscott Rail Trail has worked with the Swampscott Conservancy identifying and removing invasive plants and replacing them with native species. The aim of this effort is to complete this recreational trail while adding more native trees and plants than have ever existed along this beautiful pathway. Our Rail Trail is prominently featured as one of the "Green Corridors" in Swampscott. I look forward to seeing the trail completed and thank you in advance for your support for this project!
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Irene and Jonathan Leamon	Swampscott	Support	Letter in concern about the Swampscott Rail Trail (Project #610666)
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Jennifer Honig and Christopher Muntiu	Swampscott	Support	In anticipation of your upcoming March meetings on MPO funding, I want to register my and my husband's strong support for the Swampscott Rail Trail. The trail is essential to addressing traffic problems in town which are potentially dangerous to walkers and bicyclists, including commuters to our schools. There are narrow sidewalks and many walkers and bikers who have to enter the streets to maneuver. We desperately need the trail to provide a safe path for travel, and a recreational asset to our small town. I know there are people who challenge the trail for all sorts of questionable reasons. But, the fact is that the vast majority of townspeople are eagerly and sometimes impatiently waiting for the remainder of the trail to be created. We love the small new segment but we want to be able to travel through our town, not just to Marblehead's trail!. Please make all efforts to expedite our funding.

Project	Name	Municipality/ Affiliation	Support/Oppose/ Request/Concern	Comment
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Suzanne Wright	Swampscott	Support	I am writing in support of completion of the Swampscott Rail Trail. I have lived in Swampscott for more than 30 years and have always been an active community volunteer, the Rail Trail was the first project I became involved with, in 1995(!). I envisioned walking my children, safely, surrounded by nature, to Marblehead, to their grandparent’s home. Parents are dead, children have grown and flown and still no completed rail trail through Swampscott. I am grateful that Swampscott Town Meeting members (including myself) have consistently supported creation of the Rail Trail. We are asking for the Metropolitan Planning Organization’s continued support of the Swampscott Rail Trail and the inclusion of this project (#610666) for funding in FY29 or sooner if feasible. As a runner, bike, rider and dog walker, the trails in surrounding communities have been important to my health and wellness. I regularly bike the Northern Strand Trail and the Danvers and Topsfield trails. It has been a blessing to experience life along the trails and to commute almost all the way to Boston, quickly, quietly and safely. I absolutely love the little portion we have completed in Swampscott and eagerly await more! It is not just me waiting, as Chair of the School Building Committee, one promise I made to my community was safe routes to school. The Rail Trail runs through the middle of our small town, connecting the three neighborhoods where our elementary schools were once located, before they were consolidated in 2024. The proposed trail would run close to Swampscott High School, behind Swampscott Middle School and to the new Swampscott Elementary School. Families, students and teachers will have a protected, safe, and stress free way to travel to school (we bus less than 10% of elementary school children). Residents will experience less congestion and stress commuting through town. We need the MPO’s support to get the Swampscott Rail Trail built. Our community needs and desperately wants the trail. I respectfully ask the MPO to continue to support our project Thank you in advance for your support, we look forward to seeing the trail completed!
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Jenny Galacar	Swampscott	Support	I’m writing to ask that you please keep the Rail Trail project in the TIP and not remove the \$9.8 million allocated for construction. The pedestrian bridge over Paradise Road alone would make a huge safety difference for our kids and families. This project has strong community support and has already faced multiple delays. Please allow it to move forward as planned.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Maura Carroll	Swampscott	Oppose	It has come to my attention that our state rep, Jenny Armini was made aware of the proposal to drop the Swampscott Rail Trail from this coming year’s TIP, and that she has possibly contacted the MPO to challenge this. I am hearing this third-party, so I cannot confirm its validity. If this is the case, I find this disconcerting after all the work the MPO has done to calculate the readiness of a project. As you know, I’ve joined many meetings over the years, and am impressed by the dedication to a fair process shown by both MPO and MassDOT. As you may recall from my letters in prior years, I feel this project was ill conceived and poorly planned since its inception back in the late 90s. Each year I have sent a letter to MPO outlining my concerns and I plan to do so again this year. I think I have mentioned that I am one of 30 land owners from Humphrey Street to Marblehead that have had our deeds corrected by National Grid, which show we do indeed own this land. Under the design plan, the town would be forced to take this by eminent domain, which is no small nor inexpensive feat. I certainly appreciate the work you and your team have done and your willingness to answer any questions I have had in the past. It’s always been very helpful. If you could, please let me know the status of this project at your earliest convenience I would greatly appreciate it. I intend to tune in to tomorrow’s meeting as I have been these past few meetings.

Project	Name	Municipality/ Affiliation	Support/Oppose/ Request/Concern	Comment
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Dan Albert	Marblehead	Support	I was alerted today that the BRMPO Board may decide to remove the project from the TIP at a meeting on March 19. As a member of the BRMPO Vision Zero Task Force and resident of Marblehead, I am writing with surprise and confusion having heard that this project might somehow be defunded. It is integral to the Marblehead Rail Trail and the Northern Strand Rail Trail. Without it, Marblehead vulnerable road users are cut off from the city of Boston. As there is still no agenda posted for the 3/19 Meeting, I am at a loss as to the details, so will leave it there: fund the project.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Deb Newman	Swampscott	Support	I'm a frequent user of the Swampscott and Marblehead Rail Trails, and I've been hoping to bike beyond those this summer. I'm more than disappointed by the news that the Rail Trail has been targeted as a funding cut. So many municipalities have invested time, money, work, and advocacy to get their parts of the trail built. It's shocking that this project will become a failure and lead to dead ends. Losing the opportunity to expand open space that can be used and appreciated by many diverse people of all ages is a crime. Please, what can be done to retain the funding?
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Elliot Rushton	Beverly	Support	I am an avid cyclist who makes terrific use of projects like the upcoming Swampscott Rail Trail. I was looking forward to having more safe routes between my home in Beverly and Boston. So much progress has already been made, and I am hoping that efforts like that will not be wasted. Please do what you can to keep the project on the TIP. This supports not only recreational cyclists like me, but also commuters I know who would now be able to ride from points more north, keeping our cars off the road, getting exercise, and enjoying more of the beautiful North Shore.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Joan Honig	Swampscott	Support	I seek your support for the timely construction of the Swampscott Rail Trail, keeping the project on the TIP. The Trail will benefit local families, seniors, and commuters and open up new green space for the community. Delaying or removing funding would significantly harm a broadly supported community project.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Kevin Young	Rockport	Support	While I'm not a resident of Swampscott, I'm very familiar with the trails that connect Marblehead to Swampscott. Last year, a good friend and I did a 100 mile walk from Cape Ann through Swampscott, up to Newburyport and back to my home town of Rockport. The Swampscott Rails to Trail was an important part of this walk, as were the trails in many of the towns we passed through. I fully support the timely construction of the Swampscott Rails Tail and keeping the project on the TIP. The trail will benefit local families, Seniors (of which I'm one), as well as commuters and open new green space for the community at large. Delaying or removing funding would harm a broadly supported community project, at a time when creating safe trails for everyone is critical to supporting the health and enjoyment of the public. I sincerely request you work to maintain this timely funding.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Molly Conner	Swampscott	Support	I am writing in response to hearing that our future state funding for the continued effort to get our beloved rail trail might be cut. Please help by keeping the project on the TIP. The rail trail will benefit so many families, commuters, and nature lovers. A fantastic opportunity to breathe in fresh air! Delaying or removing funding would harm a broadly supported community project. Please help us!

Project	Name	Municipality/ Affiliation	Support/Oppose/ Request/Concern	Comment
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Richard Simmons and Carol Roberts	Lynnfield	Support	I am writing to voice my disappointment with the decision to drop the funding for the Swampscott Rail Trail. There has been so much time and effort put into this endeavor. To drop the funding at this time flies in the face of reason and is an affront to all of us who have set aside time promoting its construction. Rail Trails tend to connect a community, bringing individuals together, and providing citizens with a venue for exercise and relaxation. Bicycle trails also provide a safer option for commuters to bicycle to work. The trails tend to remove bicyclists from busy streets, that are cluttered with drivers whose attention is not always focused on safety as much as centered on their cell phones. Rail trails also connect communities. The proposed trail in Swampscott will not only service people from the local community but will also be used by people from Marblehead, Lynn and Salem and beyond. Delaying funding will literally take the wind out of the hard work that has gone into promoting trails, getting them designed and partially built. Please reconsider this ill conceived decision to remove funding for this trail.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Anthony John Bonner	Marblehead	Support	I would like to add my support to the timely construction of the Swampscott rail trail. A few years ago, I even made a film about it, that I understand was influential in getting the first part of the construction done. Many people dismiss such projects because they question their use as a means of getting from a to b, but really, it's better to look at them as ribbon parks, multi-use amenities for school walkers, dog walkers, joggers, moms with prams, ramblers, myriad exercisers, as well as bikes etc. Please consider NOT vetoing this project that many people have already contributed financially to, as well as backed in other ways.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Gail Smith	Gloucester	Support	Please keep the Swampscott Rail Trail improvement project on the Transportation Improvement Project list. I have been looking forward to its completion for many years and am disappointed that it may removed from the list. It has broad community support and and will improve many lives in this area by offering more outdoor recreation area.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Roberta Sherman	Lynn	Support	I recently received the extremely disappointing news that the funding for the Swampscott and Marblehead rail trails is on the chopping block to be removed from the state's Transportation Improvement Project (TIP) list. The rail trail became one of my favorite places to walk last summer and fall. It was heartening to see so many other people enjoying it as well, some with their entire families (dogs included). So much time and thousands of grant and donated money has already been spent on design and engineering over the last four years but there's so much more work to be done to complete this project. I hope there is something that can be done to retain the funding.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Shelley Sloboder	Gloucester	Support	I'm a frequent user of the Swampscott and Marblehead Rail Trails, and I've been hoping to bike beyond those this summer. I'm very disappointed by the news that the Rail Trail has been targeted as a funding cut. I travel to use these trails and it's often with a group of friends. Then we further support the community by getting a bite to eat locally. So many municipalities have invested time, money, work, and advocacy to get their parts of the trail built. It's shocking that this project will become a failure. The project expands green space and offers recreation for Marblehead and Swampscott and beyond. It's an extremely valuable community resource. Please retain the funding!
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Toni Bandrowicz	Swampscott	Support	Letter in concern about the Swampscott Rail Trail (Project #610666)

Project	Name	Municipality/ Affiliation	Support/Oppose/ Request/Concern	Comment
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	"Edward ""Ted"" Dooley"	Swampscott	Support	I am writing to express my support for the timely construction of the Swampscott Rail Trail and to urge the MPO to keep the project on the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) as scheduled. The construction of the Swampscott Rail Trail has long been identified as one of the community's top priorities and remains a central goal of the Town of Swampscott's Master Plan. The project enjoys broad support from residents, community organizations, and local officials. To date, approximately \$1 million in local and community funding has already been invested in the planning, design, engineering, and easement work needed to advance the project—including \$850,000 authorized by Town Meeting and \$150,000 contributed by the Friends of the Swampscott Rail Trail. Removing or delaying the project at this stage would risk wasting these substantial investments and undermining years of community planning and commitment. Delaying or removing funding would harm a broadly supported community initiative that has been years in the making. I respectfully urge the MPO to maintain the project's funding and timeline so the Town of Swampscott can move forward on this important community and regional priority. Thank you for your consideration.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Loyce and Peter Lawlor	Swampscott	Support	As Swampscott residents, my husband and I are reaching out to voice our strong support for the long-planned Rail Trail to remain on the state's Transportation Improvement Project (TIP) list for funding. Delaying or removing funding would harm a broadly supported community project. So long in the planning, this two-mile community path located on a former rail corridor, will run the length of Swampscott and link neighborhoods, schools, parks, and the MBTA Commuter Rail Station. The proposed rail trail's off-road access and connection to three schools, including a new 900 student district wide K-4 grade school, will also provide parents and students a safe active transit solution that would reduce air pollution, encourage fitness and healthy lifestyle. The Swampscott Rail Trail will provide much needed open space in Town and will fill a recognized critical gap in the regional trail network. Constructing this gap will meet goals established by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council as well as add additional off-road mileage to the East Coast Greenway and the Border to Boston Trail. In closing, we hope that the Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization will keep this multi-beneficial project at the forefront for funding.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Nick Connors	Swampscott	Support	Letter in concern about the Swampscott Rail Trail (Project #610666)
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Rick Smyers	Marblehead	Support	I am writing to express my concern regarding the potential removal of the Swampscott Rail Trail project from the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) list. This project is a vital link in the North Shore's transportation network. With the near completion of the Northern Strand Community Trail, the planned bike/pedestrian bridge over the Mystic River, and ongoing trail upgrades in Salem and Peabody, it is crucial that the Swampscott and Marblehead segments are finished. These "missing links" are essential to the integrity of the overall trail system; completing them would significantly enhance the value of the entire regional network. Bike and pedestrian infrastructure on the North Shore has been underfunded for decades. It is long past time to prioritize investment in these essential car-free modes of transportation.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Steven Fafel	Swampscott	Support	I am kindly writing to request that you continue the funding for the Swampscott Rail Trail. This trail runs very close to my home and near the middle school and the new elementary school. This trail would not only provide for the continuation of the wonderful trail from Salem and Marblehead into Swampscott, but would also be a safe alternative for students in our community to safely get to school. Thank you for your consideration.

Project	Name	Municipality/ Affiliation	Support/Oppose/ Request/Concern	Comment
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Toni Bandrowicz	Swampscott	Support	<p>I am writing on behalf of the Swampscott Conservancy, a 501(c)(3) nonprofit dedicated to the protection and enhancement of natural resources on the Northshore, to strongly urge the Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization to keep Swampscott’s Rail Trail project on the state’s Transportation Improvement Project (TIP) list for funding. So long in the planning, this two-mile community path located on a former rail corridor will run the length of Swampscott and link neighborhoods, schools, parks, and the MBTA Commuter Rail station. Given the state’s interest and recent efforts in encouraging sustainability and improved access to public transportation, Swampscott’s Rail Trail, by linking a large part of the town to the commuter rail, will help the state meet its objectives in this regard. The proposed rail trail’s off-road access and connection to three schools, including a new 900 student district wide K-4 grade school, will also provide parents and students a safe active transit solution that would reduce air pollution, encourage fitness and healthy lifestyle. By getting people out of their cars and starting to bike and walk more, trails like Swampscott’s will help fight climate change in a meaningful way given that the transportation sector generates the largest share of greenhouse gas emissions. Thus, Swampscott Rail Trail also supports the state’s interest and efforts, through policy initiatives and legislation, to combat climate change, in particular the new bill that would push the state’s transportation system to reduce vehicle miles traveled. The rail trail will provide non-polluting forms of transportation, such as cycling and walking, and so help decrease the amount of carbon dioxide and other global warming gases emitted into the atmosphere. Even though the fuel efficiency of our cars may be improving in recent years, it’s negated by the fact that we’re driving more. To drive less, we need safe alternatives for cycling and walking. Providing these alternatives will be an important part of managing climate change. The Swampscott Rail Trail will provide much needed open space in Town and will fill a recognized critical gap in the regional trail network. Constructing this gap will meet goals established by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council as well as add additional off-road mileage to the East Coast Greenway and the Border to Boston Trail. The Swampscott Conservancy actively collaborates with Town of Swampscott committees, boards, commissions, and departments, as well as other non-profit entities, to maintain and improve public open spaces. We intend to work with the Town in designing and providing native plants along the trail. Such plantings have multiple benefits. They create a low maintenance border, saving costs for ongoing upkeep of the trail. Native plantings also provide sources of food for insects (butterflies, honeybees, etc.) and animals (birds, chipmunks, and other small warm-blooded animals) that live in the area and forage these plants. Such plantings also provide opportunities for education regarding native planting, which is particularly important during our era of climate change. And, of course, such vegetation provides evidence of the beauty that exists in nature in New England. We hope that the Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization will keep this multi-beneficial project on the TIP list for funding.</p>
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Annie Harris	Essex	Support	<p>Letter in concern about the Swampscott Rail Trail (Project #610666)</p>
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	David Westcott	Swampscott	Support	<p>I commute to Boston via bicycle during the warmer months. Completing the Swampscott Rail Trail would help me and many others safely navigate this commute. It would also benefit folks commuting to the Swampscott Commuter Rail Station (which I also do), connect the neighborhoods like Salem, Peabody, Marblehead and Lynn for kids and bicyclists of all ages. I know by completing the project it would have a very beneficial effect on the town forever.</p>

Project	Name	Municipality/ Affiliation	Support/Oppose/ Request/Concern	Comment
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Matt Burdge	Swampscott	Support	I would encourage you to proceed with efforts to revitalize the Swampscott rail trail. Substantial amount of planning work have already been completed, and would serve as a pedestrian byway for the region, connecting Marblehead Swampscott all the way through Lynn. As a local resident, I would find this very appealing. I have read there have been questions as to whether to continue with this project, change is hard, and hard for some to see the benefits this would provide.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Susan Namet	Swampscott	Support	The citizens of Swampscott have waited patiently for the completion of a Rail Trail in our community. Not often a project comes along that benefits all, from babies to our many seniors. It has been proven that a connection with the natural world plays a major role in humankind's' mental, emotional and spiritual well being. Please keep our Rail Trail Project #(610666) on TIP's list for funding.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Tara Gallagher	Swampscott	Support	I write in strong support of timely construction of the Swampscott Rail Trail and to ask you to keep the project on the TIP. The Trail will benefit local families, kids going to school, seniors, and commuters and open up new green space for the community in addition to relieving roadway congestion, reducing greenhouse gas emissions, and promoting mental and physical well-being. Delaying or removing funding for this project would harm a broadly supported community project. The Swampscott Rail Trail is the weak link in an already mostly completed system that runs along the North Shore. I used to ride from my office next to the Salem Rail Trail from Salem, into Marblehead and then to the spot where the Swampscott Trail should continue where I would just turn around and go back.. It minimizes the value of these other rail trails not to be able to have one longer, continuous system, I would have ridden to work from my home near the Swampscott Train Station to Salem State's Central Campus every day had the trail been available. Please retain the funding and allow this trail to be built. Thank you for your consideration.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Vance Perry	Swampscott	Support	I am writing to express my strong support for the Swampscott Branch of the rail trail project. When completed, this trail will be a tremendous upgrade to the region's transportation network and recreational infrastructure. The vision of being able to bike safely from Salem, Peabody, and Marblehead all the way into Boston on a connected rail trail is incredibly exciting. Projects like this promote healthy transportation, reduce traffic congestion, and create meaningful connections between our communities. It would be very disappointing if funding for this project does not move forward. The Swampscott Branch represents an important step toward a safer, more accessible regional trail network, and I hope it receives the support needed to become a reality. Thank you for your consideration.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Maura Carroll	Swampscott	Oppose	Letter in concern about the Swampscott Rail Trail (Project #610666)
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Michael Cardinali	Swampscott	Support	I am writing to express my strong support for keeping the Rail Trail project on the State Transportation Improvement Program and moving it forward without delay. After years of planning, collaboration, and public engagement, this project is ready to deliver meaningful benefits to our community. The Rail Trail represents far more than a path. It will provide a safer way for people of all ages to get around town. It strengthens connections between neighborhoods, expands access to outdoor recreation, and reduces traffic by offering a practical alternative to driving. As someone who regularly uses the Marblehead Rail Trail for running and walking with my family, I've long looked forward to this extension and the improvements it will bring. Connecting our communities through a continuous, safe, and accessible trail network is an investment in our health, mobility and overall quality of life. Delaying or removing TIP funding at this stage would jeopardize a broadly supported, once-in-a-generation project. I urge you to maintain funding and allow this important project to move forward as planned. Thank you for your consideration.

Project	Name	Municipality/ Affiliation	Support/Oppose/ Request/Concern	Comment
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Terry G Lorber	Swampscott	Support	I support the Swampscott Rail Trail, as a property owner, volunteer, and town meeting member. My family moved to Swampscott in 2009, around the time of the first public votes approving this project. It's time to get this done! The loss of state funding will greatly harm this project and delay the possibility of connecting Lynn to Salem through Swampscott and the existing Marblehead trail. The Northern Strand project has created much excitement and increasing access for bike and foot traffic along this beautiful corridor should be a priority.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Amanda Boyd	Swampscott	Support	Please ensure the Swampscott rail trail is fully funded for expansion. This rail trail is essential for a safe place for kids to ride bikes and walk, for runners to enjoy a shaded and car free place to run, and for members of the community to enjoy nature and get to places in Swampscott and Marblehead. We are so grateful that it exists and have been looking forward to its expansion so it can be closer to our house. It encourages good health and fitness, places for humans and animals to connect with nature, and a vital pathway for all to enjoy. It also allows seniors a safe place to get out and even a way for commuters to get to school and work. Please ensure the project moves forward and gets the necessary funding to continue.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Brian Barrows	Somerville	Support	I hope you will join me in supporting the timely funding and construction of the Swampscott Rail Trail. The Swampscott trail provides an important link from Boston to Salem and beyond as part of the Border-to-Boston and East Coast Greenway trail systems. As a regular user of the Northern Strand trail, I know from experience that there is no obvious safe route to continue north beyond Lynn. This gap in the system worsens road traffic, restricts access to recreation, and endangers the local community. Delaying or removing funding would harm a project that the overall community supports and wants to use as soon as possible.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Brian McDonald	Malden	Support	I'm writing in support of the Swampscott Rail Trail and asking you to move it forward without further delay. This project has broad community backing: kids biking to school, seniors, runners, cyclists. It fills a real gap in the regional trail network connecting Boston to Salem as part of the Border-to-Boston and East Coast Greenway systems, and the Northern Strand from Everett to Lynn and Nahant doesn't reach its potential without it. It's been almost ten years. The funding should be there. Let's get it built.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Carrie and Erik Sylven	Swampscott	Support	As a Swampscott resident I am writing in strong support of the timely construction of the Rail Trail, keeping the project on the TIP. The Trail will benefit local families, seniors, and commuters. I commute to Boston for work 3-4 days a week and feel strongly that a rail trail would assist in avoiding traffic and dangerous intersections for both pedestrians, cyclists and motorists. Delaying or removing funding would harm this broadly supported community project. I hope you'll consider this in your decision-making.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Charmaine Champagne	Swampscott	Support	I support timely construction of the Rail Trail, keeping the project on the TIP. The Trail will benefit local families, seniors, and commuters. Delaying or removing funding would harm a broadly supported community project.

Project	Name	Municipality/ Affiliation	Support/Oppose/ Request/Concern	Comment
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Daniel Fava	Swampscott	Support	I write to you as a Swampscott resident asking you to please continue to support the timely funding, design, and 2029 construction of the Swampscott Rail Trail #610666 within the TIP. The rail trail is supported by the greater community at large and should remain on the Transportation Improvement Program as scheduled. Swampscott has local elections coming up on April 28, 2026 and hopefully any potential risk to having this project funded in 2029 as planned has been a much needed inspiration to get things moving with the town's elected Select Board. I hope this project will be designed, funded, and built as scheduled in 2029 so we can finally begin using this vital connection to local schools and the commuter rail. Without this crucial Swampscott connection between Lynn/Nahant and Marblehead/Salem, the highly debated Northern Strand Bike-to-the-Sea trail sections in Lynn and Nahant will not reach their full potential. This rail trail is needed promptly to provide a safe route to school for children who can walk or bike, which will reduce automobile traffic and pollution from parent drop-offs and lessen the risk of children getting hit by cars on main roads. Swampscott's children, seniors, dog-owners, walkers, local running clubs (Marathon Sports, Notch, Wicked, etc.), and cyclists have been anticipating this project for over a decade. Will another generation of children be denied the opportunity to use this trail to get to school safely? Shouldn't cyclists be able to safely commute south towards Boston and the Northern Strand Bike-to-the-Sea trail from points north in Salem, Marblehead, and Swampscott safely using rail trails? Delaying or removing funding would harm a project that the overall community supports and wants to use as soon as possible. I hope the Boston Region MPO TIP and Swampscott's Select Board can work together to keep the project's funding, design, and construction on track for 2029 (or sooner!). Thank you.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Drew Deppen	Swampscott	Support	I am writing to express my support of the Swampscott rail trail. It recently came to my attention that the funding is in jeopardy and I am writing to see what can be done to rectify this situation. The Swampscott rail trail has been held up and blocked for random reasons for years, and this is really disturbing to me. The town voted in support of the rail trail years ago. The trail would allow students to travel to and from school in a much more safe fashion. It would also allow for the active community members the ability to walk, run, and cycle off the streets of the town and enjoy a more peaceful environment. It would be a huge addition to the town and improve the quality of life and build equity for the community. Please do not allow the funding to expire. Thank you for your time and consideration.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Dustin Doss	Melrose	Support	I'm a resident of Melrose, and a frequent user of the Northern Strand trail. It's not hard to see that I'm not alone in this -- any day you'll see pedestrians and cyclists, children and families, using this trail for recreation, exercise, commuting to work, and to get to stores and restaurants. But it's also pretty obvious that the trail isn't perfect, especially as it abruptly ends in Lynn, with little connection to other nearby trail routes. The Swampscott rail trail project would be a huge boon to all of the towns and residents along the entire northern strand. It's currently slated for construction in 2029, and I'm writing in because I've heard that there is discussion of a delay. I'm asking clearly: please do not delay funding for this project any longer than it has been already. The investment-to-benefit here is cheap and will pay off for a long time, and delays tend to compound. This is a very popular project and me and the other users of the trail want to see it done as soon as possible.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Jace LeBlanc	Swampscott	Support	I'm writing today in support of the completion of the Swampscott Rail Trail Project. I've seen reports that there is a possibility of further delay, and I'd like to see those involved with planning this project to leverage your mandate and authority to move forward to complete this leg of the Northern Strand. It connects communities and provides opportunity for those of all walks of life to enjoy being outdoors and traveling/commuting/exercising in a space that is mercifully not designed with vehicular traffic as the primary force on infrastructure.

Project	Name	Municipality/ Affiliation	Support/Oppose/ Request/Concern	Comment
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	John Buchholz	Malden	Support	I hope you will join me in supporting the timely funding and construction of the Swampscott Rail Trail. The rail trail is supported by the greater community, and I hope this project will be built as soon as possible. Please do not further delay this vital connection to local schools and the commuter rail. The Swampscott rail trail provides an important link from Boston to Salem and beyond as part of the Border-to-Boston and East Coast Greenway trail systems. Without this link, the Northern Strand trail from Everett to Lynn and Nahant will not be fully utilized. Local children, seniors, dog-owners, walkers, running clubs, and cyclists have been anticipating this project for almost a decade. Will another generation of children be denied the opportunity to use this trail to get to school safely? Delaying or removing funding would harm a project that the overall community supports and wants to use as soon as possible.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Kyle Bouchard	Westford	Support	I'm writing to express my support of the subject project. Massachusetts is leading New England in so many facets of society, and has shown such great advancement in fighting car-dependency. This project will support an important link from Boston to Salem and beyond as part of the Border-to-Boston and East Coast Greenway trail systems. Getting pedestrians and cyclists off the streets and supporting exercise for people across age demographics is vital to the health of our communities. I've spent years riding similar trails across the state. Whenever I bring along friends from out of state they're always blown away by the volume at which these spaces are used-rain or shine. They often remark how desperately they wish they're towns had similar infrastructure. Thank you for your time and I hope you put your support behind this effort.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Layne Jacobs	Beverly	Support	I hope you will support the timely funding and construction of the Swampscott Rail Trail. The rail trail is supported by the greater community, and I hope this project will be built as soon as possible. The Swampscott rail trail provides an important link from Boston to Salem. Without this link, the Northern Strand trail will not be fully utilized. I and many other north shore residents have been anticipating this project for almost a decade. Delaying or removing funding would harm a project that the overall community supports and wants to use as soon as possible.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Mark Degatano	Swampscott	Support	Please continue to fund, without delay, the Swampscott Rail Trail Project, #610666. My wife and I use the trail often, and wish it continued through Swampscott as it was planned. Furthermore, if the trail continued as intended to the Swampscott Elementary and Middle Schools, then families and school children could more easily and safely get to and from school. On the Marblehead end of the trail, many school children use it to get to and from their schools. Why is Swampscott left out?
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Michael Gilmore	Swampscott	Support	I am writing to express my strongest possible support for the Swampscott Rail Trail Project. I am a Swampscott resident and greatly appreciate what rail trails contribute to the quality of life for the residents of communities fortunate enough to host them. These are financially highly tractable opportunities to add tremendous value for families, those with pets, and those who simply want a few minutes to casually reflect away from the hustle and bustle of urban life. The trails branching in both directions from Alewife, the trail that connects Ayers to Nashua and others across the state are exactly what makes Massachusetts and the Boston area in particular such a special and nationally unique place to live. Please help put people first in supporting this initiative in every way possible.

Project	Name	Municipality/ Affiliation	Support/Oppose/ Request/Concern	Comment
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Mitchell DiPanni	Arlington	Support	I hope you will join me in supporting the timely funding and construction of the Swampscott Rail Trail. The rail trail is supported by the greater community, and I hope this project will be built as soon as possible. Please do not further delay this vital connection to local schools and the commuter rail. The Swampscott rail trail provides an important link from Boston to Salem and beyond as part of the Border-to-Boston and East Coast Greenway trail systems. Without this link, the Northern Strand trail from Everett to Lynn and Nahant will not be fully utilized. Local children, seniors, dog-owners, walkers, running clubs, and cyclists have been anticipating this project for almost a decade. Will another generation of children be denied the opportunity to use this trail to get to school safely? Delaying or removing funding would harm a project that the overall community supports and wants to use as soon as possible. Thanks for your consideration and support.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Sam Ellington	Boston	Support	Please fund this. This area is incredible for biking and that has positive cascading effects on the entire region. Don't listen to NIMBYs.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Trevyn Langsford	Boston	Support	I'm writing in support of the funding and construction of the Swampscott Rail Trail. This project has the potential to be an asset to both the local community and the broader metro area. Studies have shown, time and time again, that rail trails bring economic, safety, and health benefits to the communities they run through. Whether giving children a safe place way to get to school, providing a comfortable place for active recreation, or encouraging bicycle tourism from being a part of Border-to-Boston and East Coast Greenway trail systems, the Swampscott Rail Trail would fulfill needs that so often go unaddressed. Please make the decision on 3/19 to move forward with the project. We've been waiting for it since 2017.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Tyler Nelson	Salem	Support	I heard that there will be an upcoming decision on the timeline for the Swampscott rail trail, and that this email address is where I should write to express support for the project. I hope the trail can be completed as soon as possible with no further delay. It would be a valuable resource not only for Swampscott itself but also for the entire region, connecting communities and enhancing opportunities for safe, healthy transportation. As a Salem resident, I experience firsthand the benefits of the Salem-Marblehead rail trail and the Northern Strand trail. The Swampscott rail trail would link these routes, making the whole system better and safer. There are so many advantages of having an off-road multi-use path stretching all the way from Salem to Boston, for everything from recreation to commuting to economic development and more. The sooner this vision can be realized the better for Massachusetts—and really beyond, as the trail will be a key link in the entire East Coast Greenway.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Andrea Rovaldi	Swampscott	Support	Our family is writing to ask you to please keep the Swampscott Rail Trail project on the TIP without any postponement. Many in town and our family are eagerly awaiting the completion of this Trail.

Project	Name	Municipality/ Affiliation	Support/Oppose/ Request/Concern	Comment
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Christopher Yip	Boston	Support	I hope you will join me in supporting the timely funding and construction of the Swampscott Rail Trail. The rail trail is supported by the greater community, and I hope this project will be built as soon as possible. Please do not further delay this vital connection to local schools and the commuter rail. The Swampscott rail trail provides an important link from Boston to Salem and beyond as part of the Border-to-Boston and East Coast Greenway trail systems. Without this link, the Northern Strand trail from Everett to Lynn and Nahant will not be fully utilized. As a cyclist, I hope that this will be constructed, as it will allow me to more easily and safely access biking along the North Shore from Boston. Delaying or removing funding would harm a project that the overall community supports and wants to use as soon as possible.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	David Bronstein	Newton	Support	I hope you will join me in supporting the timely funding and construction of the Swampscott Rail Trail. The rail trail is supported by the greater community, and I hope this project will be built as soon as possible. Over the years I have lived in Arlington along the Minuteman Rail Trail, and in Wayland near the MCRT. The arguments and discussions are always the same in that a vociferous few are concerned on the impacts of the trail on there proximity. Yet in every case when the trails get built, they quickly become huge asset to the local community and the broader population at large. The MCRT through Weston took nearly 25 years to finally get built. Let's not let this happen to the Swampscott Trail. Please do not further delay this vital connection to local schools and the commuter rail. The Swampscott rail trail provides an important link from Boston to Salem and beyond as part of the Border-to-Boston and East Coast Greenway trail systems. Delaying or removing funding would harm a project that the overall community supports and wants to use as soon as possible.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Ed Robinson	Swampscott	Support	I'm a Swampscott resident and want very much for Swampscott to be part of the Rail Trail. Not having the necessary funding for completion will not only negatively effect Swampscott, but the value of the network as a whole--the more connections, the greater the value overall, as I'm sure you realize.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Erin Ryan	Swampscott	Support	I am writing to urge you to please keep the Swampscott Rail Trail project on the TIP without any postponement. The project will improve quality of life for all residents, improve non-engine transportation throughout the community, including providing a safe way for many students to travel to and from school. As a Swampscott resident who has driven to both Salem and Marblehead rail trails and cycles to Nahant with my young children, I look forward to the day when my family can hop on our own in town trail to bring us to any of these communities to enjoy their vibrant town offerings and our own growing towns shops and restaurants. I recall being very excited about this project when I first moved to Swampscott over ten years ago, and am hopeful that we do not need to delay the project any longer. I along with many in town are eagerly awaiting the completion of this Trail.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Frances Freiman	Swampscott	Support	Please keep the Swampscott Rail Trail project on the TIP without any postponement. Many in town are eagerly awaiting the completion of this Trail.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Jason O'Sullivan	Swampscott	Support	Please keep the Swampscott Rail Trail project on the TIP without any postponement. Many in town are eagerly awaiting the completion of this Trail.

Project	Name	Municipality/ Affiliation	Support/Oppose/ Request/Concern	Comment
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Matt Weinberg	Swampscott	Support	Please keep the Swampscott Rail Trail project on the TIP without any postponement. Many in town are eagerly awaiting the completion of this Trail.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Abby Muti	Swampscott	Support	I am weighting to urge you to please keep the Swampscott Rail Trail project on the TIP without any postponement. When we moved to Swampscott 6 years ago one of the elements we loved was the idea of having a completely rail trail that we could run on, ride bikes on and a way for my children to get safely to school. Many others in town are eagerly awaiting the completion of this Trail.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Andrea Rossi	Swampscott	Support	I'm writing to support keeping the Swampscott Rail Trail project on the TIP and moving forward with the funding that was already approved. This project will be a real benefit to the community, providing a safe path for walking and biking and improving connections for residents of all ages. As a Swampscott parent, I've seen firsthand how limited safe biking options are—last summer, my son broke his arm riding on a sidewalk after hitting a tree root. A dedicated trail would provide a much safer place for kids and families to ride. This project has strong local support, and delaying or removing funding now would be a setback for the community. Thank you for your consideration.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Ashley Grullemans	Swampscott	Support	I'm writing to express my support of the Swampscott Rail Trail Project and to urge those on the MPO to keep it on the TIP. The Trail will benefit local families, seniors, and commuters, improving quality of life for the community and reducing vehicle traffic in a congested area. Delaying or removing funding would harm a broadly supported community project that took years to set in motion.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Beth Isler	Swampscott	Support	I am writing to show my support for the Swampscott Rail Trail and to ask that it remain on the TIP without postponement. My family and I are excited for the completion of the trail, especially as it will connect our neighborhood to my daughter's elementary school and this will serve as an important safe route to school.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Beth Whittam	Swampscott	Support	It's come to my attention that the Swampscott Rail Trail Project (#610666) is suddenly in jeopardy. As a new resident of Swampscott who values public use spaces, I sincerely ask: Please keep the Swampscott Rail Trail project on the TIP without any postponement. There are many in this town who are eagerly awaiting the completion of this project, and I know it will benefit people of all ages and encourage an active, healthy lifestyle for our residents. Thank you for consideration and for fighting for our town's rail trail, public health, and the common good.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Craig Della Penna	Florence	Support	Letter in concern about the Swampscott Rail Trail (Project #610666)
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Dan Whittam	Swampscott	Support	It's come to my attention that the Swampscott Rail Trail Project (#610666) is suddenly in jeopardy. As someone who has nearly been killed by cars many times while riding my bike, I sincerely ask: Please keep the Swampscott Rail Trail project on the TIP without any postponement. There are many in this town who are eagerly awaiting the completion of this project, and I know it will benefit people of all ages and encourage an active, healthy lifestyle for our residents. Thank you for consideration and for fighting for our town's rail trail, public health, and the common good.

Project	Name	Municipality/ Affiliation	Support/Oppose/ Request/Concern	Comment
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Elisabeth Knudsen	Swampscott	Support	I am writing to request that you keep the Swampscott Rail Trail Project (#610666) on the TIP without any postponement. The rail trail will provide easily accessible and safe access for residents to be physically active The rail trail will provide a safe route for children to walk to the elementary and middle schools, which has the added benefit of decreasing traffic congestion around those schools, which is a huge issue Connect Swampscott to Marblehead and Salem via the existing rail trail, strengthening the local economy Enhance the quality of life, foster community pride and preserve valuable outdoor space in a small town that does not have a lot of open space. It's extremely important to me that we do everything in our power to keep this project moving forward. Thank you for your consideration.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Erin Pierce	Swampscott	Support	I am a resident of Swampscott and a board member of the Friends of the Swampscott Rail Trail. I would like you to support the continued funding of the rail trail by keeping it on the TIP. I got involved in the rail trail project when I moved to Swampscott about 4 years ago. The trail crosses my street, Walker Road, a few houses down from where I live. Once completed, my kids will be able to take the trail to the middle and elementary school without having to cross any roads, and almost all the way to the high school. It would really make me feel better as a parent knowing they have a safe path to take. And it will keep me from having driving them to and from school daily. Nearly everyone I have talked to in town is in favor of completing the trail. I often work on the completed section that connects to Marblehead. I volunteer to maintain the plantings along the trail and to keep it clean. I am constantly engaging with people who use the trail as I'm working, and they tell me they wish it would go all the way through town. Many of them say the same thing: "When is the trail going to be finished? Sometime in my lifetime I hope!?" The Friends of the Rail Trail have put in countless hours trying to make this happen. The people of the town have overwhelmingly supported this project through their votes and donations. Please help us make the completed trail a reality and vote to keep Swampscott on the TIP.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Frances Weiner	Lynn	Support	Letter in concern about the Swampscott Rail Trail (Project #610666)
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Iris Goldy	Swampscott	Support	Please keep the Swampscott Rail Trail project on the TIP without any postponement. Many in town are eagerly awaiting the completion of this Trail. It has been years since the citizens of Swampscott overwhelmingly voted in favor of having a Rail Trail. Please do not cause further delay.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Joseph Palone	Swampscott	Support	Please keep the Swampscott Rail Trail project on the TIP without any postponement. Many in town, including my young family, are eagerly awaiting the completion of this Trail. It will add safety to our recreational options and has been long-awaited.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Justin Thompson and Ryan Graf	Swampscott	Support	Please work to keep the Swampscott Rail Trail project on the Transportation Improvement Plan without any postponement. I, among many others, are eager to see this trail completed and connected to other hub spots - not just for recreation, but also for a practical alternative to driving and to provide kids in the area the level of autonomy (kids should be able to safely bike or walk to school in a town our size without needing their parents zooming them around and idling in a drop-off/pickup line).

Project	Name	Municipality/ Affiliation	Support/Oppose/ Request/Concern	Comment
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Kaitlyn Krauskopf	Swampscott	Support	I am writing today as a concerned citizen of Swampscott to let you know that I wholeheartedly support the timely construction of the Swampscott Rail Trail and keeping the TIP project on time. I fondly remember voting in favor of this wonderful community trail just a few short weeks after moving to Swampscott in 2017, and for many years I have been looking forward to seeing it come to fruition. I live not even one block away from what is to hopefully become the final section of the proposed trail, and I can't tell you how excited my two little boys are to ride their bikes down it when it is finished. Walker Road (where we live) is an extremely busy street with cars that often go dangerously over the speed limit, so having a safer place for my boys to walk and bike is incredibly important to me. I have also been looking forward to walking our beloved family dog down the trail for years, as well. Delaying this trail and/or taking away its funding is going to be harmful for a very highly-supported community project and will be such a serious disappointment to so many folks in Swampscott, including my family and me. Please please please do not revoke funding for this wonderful project, and keep it moving forward on schedule. Thank you so much for your time and consideration,
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Katie Hurley	Swampscott	Support	I am writing in hope of continued support of the timely construction of the Rail Trail. This project would greatly benefit the community, especially students, since a large number of students walk/bike to schools. Delaying or removing funding would harm a broadly supported community project.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Kendra Browne	Swampscott	Support	It has been brought to our attention that the Swampscott rail trail may lose its funding and halt/end the continuation of this for our community. It is vital we get this completed to the safety of our children. Currently, we have to cross a state highway, which is a death trap. Allowing us to complete this will allow safe commutes for adults and children together, as well as encouraging families to get outside and exercise. It has passed years ago, before my youngest was born. He is now 5 an we have to travel somewhere to ride bikes because our streets are not safe. Please consider in moving this project along as fast as possible for our community!
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Kristin Saccoccio	Swampscott	Support	I would like to express my strong concern over possible funding cuts/delays for the Swampscott Rail Trail. As the town becomes more congested due to the development of several large apartment complexes over the past several years, the need for the trail has become even more vital for our community. The trail will provide a safe alternative to cars on what are becoming very congested roads in our small town.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Leah A Bartlett	Swampscott	Support	I'm writing to support keeping the Swampscott Rail Trail project on the TIP and moving forward with the funding that was already approved. The trail is widely supported by the community. In the past there was a town vote and the trail and the majority of the town voted yes. We continue to get support through monetary donations from community members. It would make a safer path for kids to get to both sides of town, especially getting to school without crossing major roads. It will reduce traffic and make fewer cars on the roads, esp at school pick up and drop off. It is good for all community members and makes us a healthier town. We are one of the only towns on the north shore without a rail trail. Other towns have benefitted greatly and this will help us connect with them. As someone who has a yard that will but up to the trail, I could not be happier to support something so beneficial for our town and our children's safety. I appreciate you taking this into serious consideration.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Michael Ragozin	Swampscott	Support	Please keep the Swampscott Rail Trail project on the TIP without any postponement. Many in town are eagerly awaiting the completion of this Trail. In particular, school children need safe bike access throughout the town. Whether commuting to school or simply getting around the in the summer, the streets and sidewalks range from not ideal to unsafe for children. The rail trail is the solution for youth bike transportation in Swampscott. Further, with the Swampscott Rail Trail connection to the Marblehead trail (which connects to the Salem Trail), this will provide youth and adults with safe bike access through multiple towns on Boston's North Shore.

Project	Name	Municipality/ Affiliation	Support/Oppose/ Request/Concern	Comment
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Nelson Knudsen	Swampscott	Support	Please keep the Swampscott Rail Trail project on the TIP without any postponement. The proposed rail trail project will have an incredible generational impact on Swampscott and surrounding communities. The trail will serve as a new artery of car-free transit for our community directly linking all three public schools (elementary through high school) with other parts of town. The link to the Marblehead and Salem trails will connect us with neighboring towns. The trail will greatly reduce traffic during school times. It will provide a great recreational activity for all members of our community and utilize important open space. It will also connect our busy commuter rail transit station to the rest of town. I personally cant wait to ride though town on the trail with my children to the elementary school. Please don't delay the project any longer.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Nichole Millea	Swampscott	Support	I'm reaching out today to share my strong support for the timely construction of the Rail Trail and to urge you to keep the project on the TIP. I truly believe this trail, will be a wonderful resource for our local families, seniors, and commuters alike. Delaying the project or removing funding would be a real loss for a community effort that has such broad support. I appreciate you taking this into serious consideration.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	P. Douglas Burgess	Swampscott	Support	I am writing in support of the Swampscott Rail Trail Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The Swampscott Rail Trail is part of the East Coast Greenway, a 3,000 mile biking/walking trail from Maine to Florida which is 65% complete or under construction. Rail trails have proven to be very popular places for citizens to hike, bike, walk dogs, enjoy the outdoors. They also provide unique, cost-effective facilities for handicapped citizens to enjoy the outdoors. Please keep the Swampscott Rail Trail project on the TIP without postponement. Many in town are eagerly awaiting the completion of this important project.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Randall Hughes	Swampscott	Support	I am writing to express my strong support for the timely completion of the Swampscott Rail Trail, and keeping the project on the TIP. The Swampscott community has demonstrated a broad base of support for this project, which will benefit local families and seniors, and open up needed green space in the community. The delay or removal of funding will jeopardize the many hours of planning, town discussions, and fundraising that has already gone on for this valuable project.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Richard Gilberg	Swampscott	Support	Please keep Swampscott Rail Trail on the TIP Program. I have been waiting over 20 years to do something with this unused land. I grew up living adjacent to it, even remember the running train passing when I was 5 years old. Bicyclists and walkers would greatly enjoy it, every other city and town in the country seem to have made the conversion. Why not Swampscott? Please help us.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Thomas Whittam	Swampscott	Support	It's come to my attention that the Swampscott Rail Trail Project (#610666) is suddenly in jeopardy. As a new resident of Swampscott who values public use spaces, I sincerely ask: Please keep the Swampscott Rail Trail project on the TIP without any postponement. There are many in this town who are eagerly awaiting the completion of this project, and I know it will benefit people of all ages and encourage an active, healthy lifestyle for our residents. Thank you for consideration and for fighting for our town's rail trail, public health, and the common good.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Adam Leamon	Marblehead	Support	Just writing to voice support for the rail trail project. We live in Marblehead and have young kids and the rail trail is how our kids are able to get around Marblehead and Swampscott in a safe and efficient way. It's an incredible resource to the community and would be a shame to let it become a failed or incomplete project.

Project	Name	Municipality/ Affiliation	Support/Oppose/ Request/Concern	Comment
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Brittany Brady	Somerville	Support	Please keep the Swampscott Rail Trail project on the TIP without any postponement. Many in town are eagerly awaiting the completion of this Trail. We often take our niece and nephew there on the weekends when we visit them, and it has been such a treasured place!
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Cliff Charney	Swampscott	Support	Please keep the Swampscott Rail Trail project on the Transportation Improvement Project ("TIP") without any postponement. Many in town including me are eagerly awaiting the completion of this trail. Thank you very much.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Don Whittam	Swampscott	Support	It's come to my attention that the Swampscott Rail Trail Project (#610666) is suddenly in jeopardy. As a new resident of Swampscott who values public use spaces, I sincerely ask: Please keep the Swampscott Rail Trail project on the TIP without any postponement. There are many in this town who are eagerly awaiting the completion of this project, and I know it will benefit people of all ages and encourage an active, healthy lifestyle for our residents. Thank you for consideration and for fighting for our town's rail trail, public health, and the common good.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Emily Paskewicz	Maine	Support	Letter in concern about the Swampscott Rail Trail (Project #610666)
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Joseph Singer	Swampscott	Support	We are writing in support of funding for the Rail Trail Project. As a Massachusetts family from Swampscott with two small children who love to bike, we are anxiously awaiting the completion of this project. We believe projects like this offer great exercise while fostering community and a commitment to sustainable travel for the North Shore. Please keep the Swampscott Rail Trail project on the TIP without any postponement. Many in town eagerly await the completion of this trail.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Kathleen MacNichol	Georgetown	Support	This email is in reference to the Swampscott Rail Trail Project (#610666). I am asking you to help keep the Swampscott Rail Trail project going forward without any postponement. This project is eagerly awaited by the residents of Swampscott and the surrounding towns. My grandchildren live in Swampscott and as an occasional caretaker, I would love to see this project completed to help enhance our lives. Thank you for your assistance.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Ken MacNichol	Georgetown	Support	Please keep the Swampscott Rail Trail project on the TIP without any postponement. Many in town are eagerly awaiting the completion of this Trail.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Kenneth Macnichol	Lynn	Support	Please keep the Swampscott Rail Trail project on the TIP without any postponement. Many are eagerly awaiting the completion of this Trail.

Project	Name	Municipality/ Affiliation	Support/Oppose/ Request/Concern	Comment
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Kevin MacNichol	Swampscott	Support	Please keep the Swampscott Rail Trail project on the TIP without any postponement. Many in town are eagerly awaiting the completion of this Trail. My family is counting on this, please help us improve our community!
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Kyle MacNichol	Somerville	Support	Please keep the Swampscott Rail Trail project on the TIP without any postponement. Many in town are eagerly awaiting the completion of this Trail. This is a huge benefit to the community and it would be a great disservice for any delays or incompletions. Kids in the town and families need this to spend time outdoors and exercise Thanks for your help.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Leah and Albert Gallo	Swampscott	Support	We are writing this letter in support of the completion of the Swampscott Rail Trail. We have lived in Swampscott for more than 70 years, and we look forward to the improvement of the landscape of our beautiful town the Rail Trail will bring. We are grateful to the Swampscott Town Meeting Members who have supported the creation of the Rail Trail and anxiously await the completion.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Liana Feldman	Swampscott	Support	It's come to my attention that the Swampscott Rail Trail Project (#610666) is suddenly in jeopardy. As a new resident of Swampscott who values public use spaces, I sincerely ask: Please keep the Swampscott Rail Trail project on the TIP without any postponement. There are many in this town who are eagerly awaiting the completion of this project, and I know it will benefit people of all ages and encourage an active, healthy lifestyle for our residents. Thank you for consideration and for fighting for our town's rail trail, public health, and the common good.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Loretta Connolly	Swampscott	Support	Please keep the Swampscott Rail Trail project on the TIP without any postponement. I use the Rail Trail and am grateful I can ride without the fear of traffic. Many in town are eagerly awaiting the completion of this Trail.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Stephen Young	Swampscott	Support	Letter in concern about the Swampscott Rail Trail (Project #610666)
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Tim Burke	Swampscott	Support	It's come to my attention that the Swampscott Rail Trail Project (#610666) is suddenly in jeopardy. As a new resident of Swampscott who values public use spaces, I sincerely ask: Please keep the Swampscott Rail Trail project on the TIP without any postponement. There are many in this town who are eagerly awaiting the completion of this project, and I know it will benefit people of all ages and encourage an active, healthy lifestyle for our residents. Thank you for consideration and for fighting for our town's rail trail, public health, and the common good.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Alexis Runstadler	Swampscott	Support	Letter in concern about the Swampscott Rail Trail (Project #610666)

Project	Name	Municipality/ Affiliation	Support/Oppose/ Request/Concern	Comment
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Debbie Boggs	Swampscott	Support	I am writing to voice my strong support for the funding of the Swampscott Rail Trail (SRT) by the State Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The Rail Trail has had the enthusiastic support of the Swampscott Town Meeting (of which I have been an elected member for over 35 years) since 2002. Town Meeting has consistently voted in support of the trail, recognizing the enormous benefit the trail will confer on local families, commuters and seniors. Parenthetically, I would say, my support for the trail began when I was the mother of a young student, with whom I rode bicycles regularly--now I am a senior citizen who looks forward to long and lovely walks on the trail; it has been THAT long in the making! My young student is now well into her 30's, lives in Swampscott and runs marathons-the trail is ideal for her training. Additionally, the value the trail will have to the many town residents using the Commuter Rail is very significant. Countless residents have been involved over the years in the exhaustive effort to advance the trail to the point where it is now. The volunteer hours which have been devoted to this project since 2000 must total well into the tens of thousands. The hope for the completion of this project is very strong and the anticipation of the same is very high. Funding by TIP is critical to the successful advancement of this project. The completed portions of the trail are lovely and very popular with North Shore locals (and others), but we very much need TIP funding to complete the remainder of the trail. I respectfully urge TIP please to provide such funding.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Grace Whittam	Swampscott	Support	It's come to my attention that the Swampscott Rail Trail Project (#610666) is suddenly in jeopardy. As a new resident of Swampscott who values public use spaces, I sincerely ask: Please keep the Swampscott Rail Trail project on the TIP without any postponement. There are many in this town who are eagerly awaiting the completion of this project, and I know it will benefit people of all ages and encourage an active, healthy lifestyle for our residents. Thank you for consideration and for fighting for our town's rail trail, public health, and the common good.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Jason Calichman	Swampscott	Support	Letter in concern about the Swampscott Rail Trail (Project #610666)
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Lauren Shrestha	Swampscott	Support	I am writing to express my strong support for maintaining construction funding for the Swampscott Rail Trail through the State Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). As Chair of the Swampscott Commission on Disability and a mom of three autistic boys who thrive when they have access to safe, accessible outdoor spaces, I see firsthand how critical projects like this are. The Rail Trail will provide an inclusive, predictable, and safe environment for individuals with disabilities, as well as families, seniors, and commuters across our community. After years of planning and broad community support, this project represents more than just infrastructure - it is an investment in accessibility, equity, and public health. Delaying or removing funding at this stage would significantly impact those who rely on safe, sensory-friendly outdoor spaces and would undermine the progress already made. I respectfully urge you to keep the Swampscott Rail Trail on track and fully funded in the TIP. Thank you for your time and consideration.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Michael Proscia	Salem	Support	I am writing to you to support the Swampscott Rail Trail project and keeping it in the TIP without postponement. We called Swampscott home for 6 years and we still visit the town regularly. As chair of the Swampscott Planning Board, I worked to ensure new developments in town were bicycle friendly. The Swampscott Rail Trail project is the key missing piece to the puzzle to stitch together our coastal town. It will be the backbone of active transportation, connecting all of the town's schools (High School, Middle School, and Elementary School) and nearly all of the town's neighborhoods. I fully support this project and hope that you will consider keeping the Swampscott Rail Trail Project on the TIP without any postponement. I know many others in town are eagerly awaiting the completion of this trail, and soon! Thank you for your time and attention.

Project	Name	Municipality/ Affiliation	Support/Oppose/ Request/Concern	Comment
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Nancy Schultz	Swampscott	Support	Citizens of Swampscott are learning that after years of planning, collaboration, and community support, the Swampscott Rail Trail is facing a serious threat: its construction funding through the State Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is suddenly in jeopardy. As a citizen of Swampscott I find this alarming and very disappointing. The Rail Trail would provide a safer way for people to get around town, improve connections between neighborhoods, and remove cars from the road. Losing this funding would mean significant delays and the potential loss of a once-in-a-generation investment. I urge you to: Keep the Swampscott Rail Trail project on the TIP without any postponement. Swampscott citizens are eagerly awaiting the completion of this Trail. Please--do not endanger this crucial community project! We ask for your continued support to keep the Rail Trail moving forward!
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Paula Claridge	Swampscott	Support	I'm writing to express my support for the Swampscott Rail Trail and to urge to you to please keep the Swampscott Rail Trail project on the TIP without any postponement. I, along with many others in town, eagerly await the completion of this Trail. I use the completed portion to walk and bike to Marblehead and connect to their portion of the rail trail. I also commute to Boston using the MBTA commuter rail. The completion of that portion of the rail trail will make the walk to the commuter rail station safer and more direct. The completion of the Swampscott Rail Trail will allow myself and other community members, and especially children, to safely get from one end of town to the other by not having to interact with vehicular traffic. I hope you continue supporting the completion of this highly desired community asset.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Richard Frenkel	Swampscott	Support	Way back when I moved to Swampscott I learned about the Marblehead Rail Trail and would bike through Swampscott to reach it with whichever of my kids was of bike seat age. I joined a group of fellow Swampscotters to push for the creation of a connecting path through Swampscott. After all, the rail line that the Marblehead trail follows also ran through Swampscott. Town meeting voted over 2/3 for our proposal back then, and did so several times. My kids are now in their mid-to-late thirties, and we have about 2 blocks of trail. Needless to say, I want to see the trail finally completed. I don't know much about how funding works for projects like this. It might be possible to reduce costs by using stone dust as in Marblehead, for example. But I know a lot of work has gone into planning and a lot more work and time would probably have to go into modifying those plans. The Swampscott trail would very effectively tie the town together: it runs by the middle school and ends near the high school. It would provide a safe pedestrian corridor over busy 1A. I really would like to see it funded. In short I strongly support funding of the Swampscott Rail Trail by the State Transportation Improvement Program.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Tania Lillak	Swampscott	Support	Letter in concern about the Swampscott Rail Trail (Project #610666)

Project	Name	Municipality/ Affiliation	Support/Oppose/ Request/Concern	Comment
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Aaron Berdofo	Swampscott	Support	I am writing to express my strong support for the Town of Swampscott's request for funding of the Swampscott Rail Trail via the State Transportation Improvement Program. When I moved to Swampscott in 2018, the idea of the rail trail was finally beginning to come into reality for the town and as a new parent, this was a selling point on choosing the town to live in; knowing this would be coming along. We currently have just a tease of the rail trail completed and it's honestly saddening to watch the project being stalled knowing we have an army of volunteers in town willing to care for and maintain it as they currently already do for this little stretch. A few years back I was asked by a town employee to take some drone video of the anticipated route of the trail which I obliged and if nothing else, I would really like your assistance in finally being able to take the "after" shots once it is completed. Extolling the general virtues of a rail trail seems superfluous, so specifically to Swampscott this will help us: Create a safe transportation route for non-motorists through a good portion of town of which we currently have none. My children (5 and 8 shortly) have nowhere to bike around safely except for on our short dead end street and we are lucky to have that here. Serve as a route to school for many students. The site of our recently completed new elementary school was chosen in part due to its proximity to this rail trail route. Serve as a route to the commuter rail station. Help get us so much closer to connecting to the Northern Strand Trail. Improve our access to the deficit of open space we currently have. I know public comment generally only engages those highly motivated for or against something, but this really is a project in town that enjoys widespread support amongst the general public, even amongst those directly abutting the proposed project. Being a town of only 3 square miles carries both its benefits (we only need 2 miles of trail!) and curses (that's ~90% of the way from Marblehead to Lynn: imagine the scope of a project like that in a larger town) and at this point this funding is crucial to helping us getting it completed in a timeframe that my children will be able to use it before they are adults. With that, I respectfully ask that this project be selected for funding.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Anne M. Potts	Swampscott	Support	I am writing today in support for funding the Swampscott Rail Trail by the State Transportation Improvement Program. I am a town meeting member in Swampscott. I am an active person and part of an active family. I regularly ride the trails we have available to us starting near the Swampscott/Marblehead line and extending into Salem. I am desperate for easier access to these trails and the safety they provide to me and my fellow riders. Drivers everywhere are either less cognizant or disinterested in following bike-related traffic laws and I and my fellow local riders can report close calls we're glad to have survived. I would welcome a confident way to ride from my neighborhood to the train station and to more comfortably extend my travels to Salem. One aspect of life in our small town is that we have a number of beautiful beaches and natural access points. Our layout, including a beautiful but winding historic zone designed by Frederick Law Olmstead, precludes safe bike travel across town to the shoreline. With the rail trail in place, a number of neighborhoods would have easier, safer and car-free access to the beaches and open spaces that make our town a beautiful place to live. I urge you to support this funding to advance us to completing the Swampscott Rail Trail.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Anne-Marie Hakstian	Swampscott	Support	I am writing to voice my strong support for the funding of the Swampscott Rail Trail (SRT) by the State Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The Rail Trail has had the enthusiastic support of the Swampscott Town Meeting. Town Meeting has consistently voted in support of the trail, recognizing the enormous benefit the trail will confer on local families, commuters and seniors. Countless residents have been involved over the years in the exhaustive effort to advance the trail to the point where it is now. The volunteer hours which have been devoted to this project over the years must total well into the tens of thousands. The desire for the completion of this project is very strong and the anticipation of the same is very high. Funding by TIP is critical to the successful completion of this project. We are so close to the finish line, however, we are not there yet and we need TIP funding to make this project a reality. I respectfully urge you please to provide such funding.

Project	Name	Municipality/ Affiliation	Support/Oppose/ Request/Concern	Comment
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Braxton Haake	Salem	Support	I hope you will join me in supporting the timely funding and construction of the Swampscott Rail Trail. The rail trail is supported by the greater community, and I hope this project will be built as soon as possible. The Swampscott rail trail provides an important link from Boston to Salem and beyond as part of the Border-to-Boston and East Coast Greenway trail systems. Without this link, the Northern Strand trail from Everett to Lynn and Nahant will not be fully utilized. As a Salem resident, walker, and cyclist, I am excited to have a trail connection to the Northern Strand and to Boston.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Brendan Crighton	Swampscott	Support	Letter in concern about the Swampscott Rail Trail (Project #610666)
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Chelsea Longin	Swampscott	Support	Please keep the Swampscott Rail Trail project on the TIP without any postponement. Many in town are eagerly awaiting the completion of this Trail.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Eli Cleveland	Swampscott	Support	I am writing to voice my support and desire to see the Swampscott Rail Trail come to fruition. My family moved here in 2017 and we were delighted to learn about the plan for the trail. We have two children who absolutely LOVE to ride their bikes, but we live on Walker Road which is an extraordinarily busy cut-through. Our oldest child just started kindergarten at the new elementary school and we would love to ride our bikes for drop-off and pick-up. Unfortunately, we are too close for the bus and too far for the kids to get there in a reasonable time. The rail trail is planned to cross Walker Road about 100 feet from our house. It also passes very near the new elementary school and the middle school. It would be such a delight to have a safe and direct route to-and-from school for the kids in our neighborhood. I admit that I have not kept a close eye on the project. I check for updates once or twice a year and it seemed that we were going to receive funding for this coming year. I am now being told that the funding may be directed elsewhere. Please let me know if there is anything we can do to keep the funding on track and get this project completed!
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Elizabeth A. Smith	Swampscott	Support	I am writing to voice my strong support for the funding of the Swampscott Rail Trail (SRT) by the State Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The Rail Trail has had the enthusiastic support of the Swampscott Town Meeting (of which I have been an elected member for over 30 years) since 2002. Town Meeting has consistently voted in support of the trail, recognizing the enormous benefit the trail will confer on local families. I used to live in Groton, MA, and frequently enjoyed the rail trail there. I would love to see Swampscott and area residents have the same ability to enjoy the benefits of a rail trail. Countless residents have been involved over the years in the exhaustive effort to advance the trail to the point where it is now. The volunteer hours which have been devoted to this project over the years must total well into the tens of thousands. The desire for the completion of this project is very strong and the anticipation of the same is very high. Funding by TIP is critical to the successful completion of this project. We are so close to the finish line, however, we are not there yet and we need TIP funding to make this project a reality. I respectfully urge you please to provide such funding.

Project	Name	Municipality/ Affiliation	Support/Oppose/ Request/Concern	Comment
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Emily Westhoven	Swampscott	Support	I am writing to express my strong support for keeping the Swampscott Rail Trail on the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) list currently under consideration and being voted on today! As a longtime Swampscott resident, and someone with roots in Europe where biking and walking is a widely supported and an integrated part of daily life, my family and I have been eagerly anticipating the completion of this trail! We see it as a transformative and important project for our community, and one where Swampscott can also lead the way: The proposed trail is ideally situated within a populated area and would provide a safe, accessible space for both walking and biking! Importantly, it would create a perfect connection between the train station and local schools, improving safety and mobility for students, commuters, and families alike while reducing car traffic. I strongly urge you to ensure that the Swampscott Rail Trail remains on the TIP list. Eliminating funding would jeopardize a broadly supported project that our community has been expecting and looking forward to for many years.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Galen Mook	Boston	Support	Letter in concern about the Swampscott Rail Trail (Project #610666)
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Geraldyn Falco	Swampscott	Support	I have just heard that Swampscott Rail Trail project is proposed to be removed from the state's Transportation Improvement Project (TIP) list, eliminating the \$9.8 million programmed for construction of the remainder of the trail and wasting the tens of thousands of grant and donated dollars (not to mention time) that has been spent on design and engineering over the last four years to keep us moving along the TIP process. As a resident of Swampscott and avid cyclist, I support timely construction of the Swampscott Rail Trail, keeping the project on the TIP. The Trail will benefit local families, seniors, and commuters, getting cars off the road. I will allow school children to walk to school on off-street pathway (similar to the path in neighboring Marblehead). In addition, delaying or removing funding would harm a broadly supported community project. We have been waiting for years for this money to continue construction on this rail trail and I find it disheartening to hear that it may never come to be in our town.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Heidi Whear	Swampscott	Support	The Swampscott for All Ages Committee is writing to express our strong support for the timely construction of the Swampscott Rail Trail and to urge that the project remain on the region's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The Swampscott Rail Trail represents a broadly supported community investment that will benefit residents of all ages. When completed, the trail will provide a safe, accessible corridor for walking, biking and mobility devices. It will serve families seeking safe recreation, older adults who value accessible outdoor spaces, and commuters looking for healthier and more sustainable transportation options. Over the past several years, substantial time, effort and financial resources have been invested to advance this project through design and engineering. Tens of thousands of dollars in grants and donations, along with significant volunteer and municipal effort, have helped bring the project to this point in the TIP process. Removing the project now and eliminating the \$9.8 million programmed for construction would undermine those investments and delay a project that has strong community support. For these reasons, the Swampscott for All Ages Committee respectfully urges the Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization to keep the Swampscott Rail Trail on the TIP and support its timely construction. Thank you for your consideration and for your continued work to advance transportation projects that improve the health, mobility and quality of life for communities across the region.

Project	Name	Municipality/ Affiliation	Support/Oppose/ Request/Concern	Comment
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Jim and Trudi Olivetti	Swampscott	Support	This email is sent to you in support of the continued funding of the Swampscott Rail Trail. My wife and I, both retired senior citizens, make regular use of the Marblehead rail trail and the connecting portion of the trail that has been extended into Swampscott for walking and bike riding. Further development into Swampscott of the trail will allow us to start at our Swampscott home and continue through Marblehead into Salem without having to walk and/or ride on busy Swampscott streets. Funding by TIP is essential to the completion of the final sections of the Swampscott Rail Trail. Please lend your support on our behalf to provide TIP funding for this effort.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Kathy Anamisis	Swampscott	Support	Please keep the Swampscott Rail Trail project on the state’s Transportation Improvement Project (TIP) list for funding. The Trail will benefit local families, seniors, and commuters and open up new green space for the community. Delaying or removing funding would harm a broadly supported community project.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Kelsey Henry	Swampscott	Support	I am a resident of Swampscott and a mom of 3 little kids who all love to ride their bikes. We have been patiently (some days impatiently!) waiting for work to continue on our rail trail for several years. Completing the rail trail will provide my kids a safe and fully protected path to ride their bikes back and forth to school, back and forth to downtown where they can buy ice cream at Popo's and candy at Richdale's, and back and forth to friends' houses. To be able to do these things safely and independently is so important. It doesn't matter what improvements are made to our roadways and intersections, nothing would make them as safe as fully protected paths far from cars. Everyone is driving bigger and bigger cars, many of which tower over my kids and completely block visibility drivers' visibility. These giant SUVs and trucks crowd the roads and never provide a safe berth when passing people on bikes. We love to take family bike rides but roads are just not safe anymore. We need this rail trail! Thank you for your time and consideration. Please support our rail trail funding!
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Kevin Shields	Swampscott	Support	I am writing as a member of the Swampscott Disability Commission and wish to endorse the request for funding to allow those less abled to use the trail.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Lucy Emple	Swampscott	Support	I am a long time resident of Swampscott, writing to ask for your support in funding for the long dreamed of Rail Trail in our town. For at least 30 years many volunteer efforts and hours have gone into trying to move this great idea forward. A rail trail would be a wonderful asset for people of all ages and abilities within the town, and it would connect us for walking and biking to nearby communities. The benefits are indisputable, and I am very hopeful that the State Transportation Improvement Program will help to bring this project to fruition.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Maggie Barmack	Swampscott	Support	Letter in concern about the Swampscott Rail Trail (Project #610666)

Project	Name	Municipality/ Affiliation	Support/Oppose/ Request/Concern	Comment
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Martha Dansdill	Swampscott	Support	I want to express my enthusiastic support for funding the Swampscott Rail Trail. This project, so far, has provided immeasurable enjoyment for residents - walking, biking, strolling etc., and more importantly allows for a safe, green, non-polluting way to get around. Expanding the Trail will allow car-free access to our elementary and middle schools and also ease in accessing our downtown, local retail district and the Newburyport/Rockport T stop in Swampscott. Financial support will reflect an investment in a 21st century lifestyle! Over the years I have been a team volunteer on the Trail, improving the corridor by clearing out much invasive vegetation and planting natives. I have seen first-hand the steady stream of folks using the Trail and it's clear there is broad support. Even abutters who have spoken out against the trail utilize the pathway. Our Town responded favorably to Governor Healey's MBTA Communities Zoning Act overwhelmingly supporting the State's vision for development and walkability to public transportation. Funding the Swampscott Trail will continue this forwarding-thinking vision by creating a convenient segment near the Swampscott Train station. Please keep the funding on the docket.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Michelle Graham	Swampscott	Support	Please keep the Swampscott Rail Trail project on the TIP without any postponement. Many in town are eagerly awaiting the completion of this Trail. I moved to Swampscott 8 years ago, and have been looking forward to the day the Trail is completed since we got here. We enjoy the Trail in other towns, and really hope to have ours completed as soon as possible. The Trail would provide a safer way for people to get around town, improve connections between neighborhoods, and remove cars from the road. Losing this funding would mean significant delays and the potential loss of a once-in-a-generation investment. Please help us build our Trail!
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Shauna Guidici	Swampscott	Support	We have been waiting nearly a decade for the rail trail to be apart of our community here in Swampscott. My daughter was two then when it was being discussed. So many other Massachusetts residents benefit from riding their bikes in their communities-why can't we? My daughter will be entering an age when she no longer wants to ride bikes. It's not safe to ride in the streets here! Please help make this dream a reality!
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Suzie Cheatham	Swampscott	Support	Please keep the Swampscott Rail Trail project on the TIP without any postponement. Many in town are eagerly awaiting the completion of this Trail.
610666 - SWAMPSCOTT- RAIL TRAIL CONSTRUCTION	Trevor Henry	Swampscott	Support	I am writing to express my strong support for the Swampscott Rail Trail Project (#610666) and to urge the Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization to maintain its funding in the Transportation Improvement Program. As a Swampscott resident and a member of the town's Master Plan Committee, I have seen firsthand the importance of this project to our community's long-term vision. The rail trail represents a critical investment in safe, accessible, and sustainable transportation infrastructure. It will provide meaningful connections between neighborhoods and North Shore towns, support active transportation, and enhance public health and environmental outcomes. It is also important to note that while a vocal minority has expressed opposition, multiple town votes, planning processes, and community surveys have consistently demonstrated that the rail trail is a top priority for Swampscott residents. The project reflects years of community engagement and a clear, data-informed mandate for investment in this type of infrastructure. Beyond its transportation benefits, the rail trail is an important community asset that aligns with Swampscott's goals around livability, economic vitality, and climate resilience. Projects like this are essential to building a more connected and equitable region. Given the significant planning, community engagement, and local support that have gone into this effort, removing the project from the TIP at this stage would represent a major setback. I respectfully urge the MPO to retain funding and allow this important project to move forward. Thank you for your consideration and for your continued leadership in advancing transportation investments across the region.

Project	Name	Municipality/ Affiliation	Support/Oppose/ Request/Concern	Comment
S12983 - SHERBORN - RECONSTRUCTION OF ROUTE 27 AND ROUTE 16	Heidi Doyle	Sherborn	Support	<p>This is a comment for TIP Amendment Three: Project S12983 Sherborn- Reconstruction of Route 27 and Route 16 (Design Only). Sherborn faces significant challenges at this heavy commuter route balancing traffic flow, safety and residents' desire to maintain the historic small town feel. Traffic is only expected to increase with the addition of 300+ dwelling units at the Medfield State Hospital property, right by the town line on Route 27 in the next 3 years. Sherborn, a town of @4500 residents, does not have the staff or funds to design/improve these intersection conditions. Improvements in this area will yield regional benefits the many residents of surrounding towns that commute through Sherborn to reach the Mass Pike, Commuter Stations and other Greater Boston locations. Project costs have increased rapidly- increasing the funds would allow all parties to get the maximum benefits from redesigning this area. Thank you for your vote to support this increase at last week's meeting. We are ready to get to work and look forward to improving this commuter route.</p>

Source: Boston Region MPO staff.

Summary of Public Engagement and Public Comments Received During the Public Review Period for the Draft FFYs 2027–31 TIP

MPO staff conducted a 21-day public review period for the draft FFYs 2027–31 TIP between May 8 and May 29, 2026. During this time, staff solicited comments via email and social media communication channels and at meetings and in-person events. Staff attended four in-person public engagement events during the public review period, engaging with approximately 400 individuals in total. During the public review period, the MPO received 11 written comments and letters and one petition. These comments are summarized in Table C-2.

Table C-2 Public Comments Received during the Public Review Period for the Draft FFYs 2027-31 TIP

[Information about engagement conducted during the public review period and comments received will be included in the final version of the document when it is posted to the MPO's website following a vote for endorsement.]

Source: Boston Region MPO staff.

Appendix D—Geographic Distribution of TIP Funding

Overview of contents


Appendix D provides information about the geographic distribution of federal highway funding in the Boston region in the Federal Fiscal Years (FFYs) 2027–31 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) as well as for all years since 2011. It includes the distribution of the Boston Region MPO’s Regional Target Program funding (the MPO’s discretionary funding) and funding for projects and programs prioritized by the Massachusetts Department of Transportation. Funding amounts shown include the state’s matching funds that leverage the available federal funds.

Figures D-1 through D-4 summarize the distribution of the MPO’s Regional Target Program funding and all federal highway funding by subregion. Funding is shown for the time period covered by this TIP (FFYs 2027–31) and a longer time period (FFYs 2011–31). Table D-1 shows the breakdown of this data for each municipality in the Boston region for FFYs 2027–31.

Purpose

The analysis presented here provides details about how the MPO has allocated its federal transportation highway dollars across its geographic region by showing which municipalities and areas of the Boston region have received highway funding for the construction of transportation projects. These data were first compiled for FFYs 2008–13 in response to the Boston Region MPO’s 2014 Certification Review by the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration.

Figure D-1
Distribution of Regional Target Funding by Subregion (FFYs 2027–31)




FFY = Federal Fiscal Year.

Subregions: ICC = Inner Core Committee. MAGIC = Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination. MWRC = MetroWest Regional Collaborative. NSPC = North Suburban Planning Council. NSTF = North Shore Task Force. SSC = South Shore Coalition. SWAP = SouthWest Advisory Planning Committee. TRIC = Three Rivers Interlocal Council.

Source: Boston Region MPO.

Figure D-2
Distribution of All Federal Highway Funding in the Boston Region by Subregion (FFYs 2027-31)




FFY = Federal Fiscal Year.

Subregions: ICC = Inner Core Committee. MAGIC = Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination. MWRC = MetroWest Regional Collaborative. NSPC = North Suburban Planning Council. NSTF = North Shore Task Force. SSC = South Shore Coalition. SWAP = SouthWest Advisory Planning Committee. TRIC = Three Rivers Interlocal Council.

Source: Boston Region MPO.

Figure D-3
Distribution of Regional Target Funding by Subregion (FFYs 2011-31)




FFY = Federal Fiscal Year.

Subregions: ICC = Inner Core Committee. MAGIC = Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination. MWRC = MetroWest Regional Collaborative. NSPC = North Suburban Planning Council. NSTF = North Shore Task Force. SSC = South Shore Coalition. SWAP = SouthWest Advisory Planning Committee. TRIC = Three Rivers Interlocal Council.

Source: Boston Region MPO.

**Figure D-4
Distribution of All Federal Highway Funding in the
Boston Region by Subregion (FFYs 2011–31)**



FFY = Federal Fiscal Year.

Subregions: ICC = Inner Core Committee. MAGIC = Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination. MWRC = MetroWest Regional Collaborative. NSPC = North Suburban Planning Council. NSTF = North Shore Task Force. SSC = South Shore Coalition. SWAP = SouthWest Advisory Planning Committee. TRIC = Three Rivers Interlocal Council.
Source: Boston Region MPO.

Table D-1
Federal Highway Programming for Municipalities in the
Boston Region (FFYs 2027-31)

MPO Municipality	Subregion	Community Type	Pct Pop.	Pct Empl.	Aid Roadway Miles (2016)	Target Funding F FY 2027-31)	Prioritized Target Funding	State Prioritized Funding	Prioritized Funding	(Regionally Prioritized and State Prioritized)	(Regionally Prioritized and State Prioritized)	FFYs 2011-2030 (Target)	FFYs 2011-2030 (State)	FFYs 2011-2030 (All)	Pct FFYs 11-30 Target	Pct FFYs 11-30 State	Pct FFYs 11-30 All
Boston	Inner Core	Inner Core	20.1%	33.3%	11.1%	\$112,982,427	16.6%	\$383,145,158	17.7%	\$496,127,585	17.4%	\$383,145,158	\$496,127,585	\$251,924,812	22.55%	16.98%	16.98%
Somerville	Inner Core	Inner Core	2.4%	1.5%	1.2%	\$129,010,608	19.0%	\$349,050,568	16.1%	\$478,061,176	16.8%	\$349,050,568	\$478,061,176	\$222,864,836	20.55%	16.36%	16.36%
Hopkinton	SWAP	Developing Suburb	0.6%	0.5%	1.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$7,213,705	0.3%	\$7,213,705	0.3%	\$7,213,705	\$7,213,705	\$11,346,584	0.42%	0.25%	0.25%
Beverly	NSTF	Regional Urban Center	1.3%	1.2%	1.2%	\$0	0.0%	\$233,271,001	10.8%	\$233,271,001	8.2%	\$38,972,530	\$233,271,001	\$272,243,531	2.29%	7.98%	7.98%
Natick	MetroWest	Maturing Suburb	1.1%	1.0%	1.2%	\$250,000	0.0%	\$4,181,688	0.2%	\$4,431,688	0.2%	\$4,181,688	\$4,431,688	\$27,413,832	0.25%	0.15%	0.15%
Cambridge	Inner Core	Inner Core	3.5%	7.1%	1.8%	\$1,125,035	0.2%	\$89,626,182	4.1%	\$90,751,217	3.2%	\$89,626,182	\$90,751,217	\$54,236,163	5.28%	3.11%	3.11%
Wilmington	NSPC	Maturing Suburb	0.7%	1.1%	1.3%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$43,894,003	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Salem	NSTF	Regional Urban Center	1.3%	0.9%	0.7%	\$26,767,823	3.9%	\$243,163,800	11.2%	\$269,931,623	9.5%	\$38,566,572	\$248,615,238	\$287,181,810	2.27%	8.51%	8.51%
Lynn	Inner Core	Regional Urban Center	3.0%	1.3%	1.3%	\$78,813,139	11.6%	\$126,050,857	5.8%	\$204,863,996	7.2%	\$126,050,857	\$204,863,996	\$105,083,630	7.42%	7.01%	7.01%
Norwood	TRIC	Regional Urban Center	0.9%	1.1%	1.0%	\$34,208,923	5.0%	\$16,217,137	0.7%	\$50,426,060	1.8%	\$16,217,137	\$50,426,060	\$42,161,203	0.95%	1.73%	1.73%
Milton	TRIC	Maturing Suburb	0.9%	0.1%	1.3%	\$393,750	0.1%	\$12,951,168	0.6%	\$13,344,918	0.5%	\$12,951,168	\$13,344,918	\$862,500	0.76%	0.46%	0.46%
Peabody	NSTF	Regional Urban Center	1.6%	1.1%	1.4%	\$2,974,203	0.4%	\$0	0.0%	\$2,974,203	0.1%	\$50,305,978	\$17,874,888	\$68,180,866	2.96%	0.61%	0.61%
Chelsea	Inner Core	Inner Core	1.2%	0.8%	0.6%	\$11,071,880	1.6%	\$23,358,447	1.1%	\$34,430,327	1.2%	\$23,358,447	\$34,430,327	\$23,573,018	1.38%	1.18%	1.18%
Framingham	MetroWest	Regional Urban Center	2.2%	2.1%	2.5%	\$25,711,037	3.8%	\$25,838,372	1.2%	\$51,549,409	1.8%	\$25,838,372	\$51,549,409	\$54,703,873	1.52%	1.76%	1.76%
Brookline	Inner Core	Inner Core	1.9%	0.9%	1.3%	\$39,830,753	5.9%	\$1,552,103	0.1%	\$41,382,856	1.5%	\$1,552,103	\$41,382,856	\$47,199,925	0.09%	1.42%	1.42%
Watertown	Inner Core	Inner Core	1.1%	1.0%	0.6%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$28,577,051	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Medford	Inner Core	Inner Core	1.8%	1.1%	1.5%	\$0	0.0%	\$30,225,111	1.4%	\$30,225,111	1.1%	\$30,225,111	\$30,225,111	\$49,499,689	1.78%	1.03%	1.03%

MPO Municipality	Subregion	Community Type	Pct Pop.	Pct Empl.	Aid Roadway Miles (2016)	Target Funding F FY 2027-31)	Prioritized Target Funding	State Prioritized Funding	Prioritized Funding	(Regionally Prioritized and State Prioritized)	(Regionally Prioritized and State Prioritized)	FFYs 2011-2030 (Target)	FFYs 2011-2030 (State)	FFYs 2011-2030 (All)	Pct FFYs 11-30 Target	Pct FFYs 11-30 State	Pct FFYs 11-30 All
Revere	Inner Core	Inner Core	1.9%	0.5%	1.3%	\$731,904	0.1%	\$128,648,391	5.9%	\$129,380,295	4.5%	\$128,648,391	\$129,380,295	\$1,375,868	7.57%	4.43%	4.43%
Woburn	NSPC	Regional Urban Center	1.2%	2.1%	1.5%	\$24,221,545	3.6%	\$2,572,500	0.1%	\$26,794,045	0.9%	\$2,572,500	\$26,794,045	\$64,298,471	0.15%	0.92%	0.92%
Everett	Inner Core	Inner Core	1.5%	0.8%	0.6%	\$13,003,872	1.9%	\$12,380,227	0.6%	\$25,384,099	0.9%	\$12,380,227	\$25,384,099	\$42,251,070	0.73%	0.87%	0.87%
Braintree	SSC	Maturing Suburb	1.2%	1.3%	1.4%	\$0	0.0%	\$38,914,578	1.8%	\$38,914,578	1.4%	\$38,914,578	\$38,914,578	\$0	2.29%	1.33%	1.33%
Randolph	TRIC	Maturing Suburb	1.0%	0.4%	1.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$2,000,000	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Quincy	Inner Core	Regional Urban Center	3.0%	2.4%	2.1%	\$3,900,629	0.6%	\$1,774,979	0.1%	\$5,675,608	0.2%	\$1,774,979	\$5,675,608	\$13,528,469	0.10%	0.19%	0.19%
Canton	TRIC	Maturing Suburb	0.7%	1.1%	1.1%	\$393,750	0.1%	\$9,978,900	0.5%	\$10,372,650	0.4%	\$9,978,900	\$10,372,650	\$3,429,820	0.59%	0.36%	0.36%
Newton	Inner Core	Inner Core	2.6%	2.6%	2.6%	\$0	0.0%	\$14,267,229	0.7%	\$14,267,229	0.5%	\$14,267,229	\$14,267,229	\$30,244,216	0.84%	0.49%	0.49%
Belmont	Inner Core	Inner Core	0.8%	0.4%	0.6%	\$18,934,961	2.8%	\$1,250,000	0.1%	\$20,184,961	0.7%	\$1,250,000	\$20,184,961	\$64,435,075	0.07%	0.69%	0.69%
Lexington	MAGIC	Maturing Suburb	1.0%	1.1%	1.9%	\$0	0.0%	\$13,507,560	0.6%	\$13,507,560	0.5%	\$13,507,560	\$13,507,560	\$6,850,000	0.80%	0.46%	0.46%
Weston	MetroWest	Maturing Suburb	0.4%	0.3%	1.3%	\$19,999,712	2.9%	\$0	0.0%	\$19,999,712	0.7%	\$0	\$19,999,712	\$34,892,173	0.00%	0.68%	0.68%
Reading	NSPC	Maturing Suburb	0.8%	0.4%	0.8%	\$0	0.0%	\$37,484,180	1.7%	\$37,484,180	1.3%	\$37,484,180	\$37,484,180	\$34,093,721	2.21%	1.28%	1.28%
Stoneham	NSPC	Maturing Suburb	0.7%	0.3%	0.8%	\$0	0.0%	\$23,752,071	1.1%	\$23,752,071	0.8%	\$23,752,071	\$23,752,071	\$2,606,520	1.40%	0.81%	0.81%
Waltham	Inner Core	Inner Core	1.9%	3.2%	1.6%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Burlington	NSPC	Maturing Suburb	0.8%	2.4%	1.3%	\$616,816	0.1%	\$20,252,676	0.9%	\$20,869,492	0.7%	\$20,252,676	\$20,869,492	\$15,179,990	1.19%	0.71%	0.71%
Hingham	SSC	Maturing Suburb	0.7%	0.8%	1.3%	\$35,778,882	5.3%	\$0	0.0%	\$35,778,882	1.3%	\$0	\$35,778,882	\$45,218,139	0.00%	1.22%	1.22%
Wrentham	SWAP	Developing Suburb	0.4%	0.3%	1.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$10,176,157	0.5%	\$10,176,157	0.4%	\$10,176,157	\$10,176,157	\$18,692,390	0.60%	0.35%	0.35%
Boxborough	MAGIC	Developing Suburb	0.2%	0.2%	0.4%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$101,660	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Bellingham	SWAP	Developing Suburb	0.5%	0.3%	0.9%	\$16,414,000	2.4%	\$5,080,778	0.2%	\$21,494,778	0.8%	\$5,080,778	\$21,494,778	\$23,128,278	0.30%	0.74%	0.74%

MPO Municipality	Subregion	Community Type	Pct Pop.	Pct Empl.	Aid Roadway Miles (2016)	Target Funding F FY 2027-31)	Prioritized Target Funding	State Prioritized Funding	Prioritized Funding	(Regionally Prioritized and State Prioritized)	(Regionally Prioritized and State Prioritized)	FFYs 2011-2030 (Target)	FFYs 2011-2030 (State)	FFYs 2011-2030 (All)	Pct FFYs 11-30 Target	Pct FFYs 11-30 State	Pct FFYs 11-30 All
Cohasset	SSC	Developing Suburb	0.2%	0.1%	0.5%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$11,258,807	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Milford	SWAP	Regional Urban Center	0.9%	0.9%	1.2%	\$0	0.0%	\$5,080,778	0.2%	\$5,080,778	0.2%	\$5,080,778	\$5,080,778	\$6,467,944	0.30%	0.17%	0.17%
Dedham	TRIC	Maturing Suburb	0.8%	0.8%	1.1%	\$0	0.0%	\$7,736,142	0.4%	\$7,736,142	0.3%	\$7,736,142	\$7,736,142	\$16,090,272	0.46%	0.26%	0.26%
Weymouth	SSC	Maturing Suburb	1.7%	1.0%	1.5%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$25,040,879	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Swampscott	NSTF	Maturing Suburb	0.5%	0.2%	0.3%	\$8,316,000	1.2%	\$0	0.0%	\$8,316,000	0.3%	\$8,316,000	\$1,762,074	\$10,078,074	0.49%	0.06%	0.06%
Middleton	NSTF	Developing Suburb	0.3%	0.2%	0.5%	\$0	0.0%	\$9,572,178	0.4%	\$9,572,178	0.3%	\$0	\$20,701,706	\$20,701,706	0.00%	0.71%	0.71%
Danvers	NSTF	Maturing Suburb	0.8%	1.3%	1.5%	\$0	0.0%	\$17,931,299	0.8%	\$17,931,299	0.6%	\$8,836,648	\$52,062,844	\$60,899,492	0.52%	1.78%	1.78%
Winchester	NSPC	Maturing Suburb	0.7%	0.4%	0.6%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$1,809,703	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Ipswich	NSTF	Developing Suburb	0.4%	0.3%	0.7%	\$166,779	0.0%	\$8,187,107	0.4%	\$8,353,886	0.3%	\$1,441,296	\$8,187,107	\$9,628,403	0.08%	0.28%	0.28%
Foxborough	TRIC	Developing Suburb	0.6%	0.6%	1.3%	\$0	0.0%	\$8,034,130	0.4%	\$8,034,130	0.3%	\$8,034,130	\$8,034,130	\$0	0.47%	0.27%	0.27%
Acton	MAGIC	Maturing Suburb	0.7%	0.5%	1.1%	\$0	0.0%	\$27,544,004	1.3%	\$27,544,004	1.0%	\$27,544,004	\$27,544,004	\$16,737,768	1.62%	0.94%	0.94%
Winthrop	Inner Core	Inner Core	0.6%	0.1%	0.3%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$6,617,959	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Littleton	MAGIC	Developing Suburb	0.3%	0.4%	1.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$7,108,563	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Lynnfield	NSPC	Maturing Suburb	0.4%	0.3%	0.6%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$5,311,191	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Wakefield	NSPC	Maturing Suburb	0.8%	0.7%	0.9%	\$30,603,120	4.5%	\$34,401,140	1.6%	\$65,004,260	2.3%	\$34,401,140	\$65,004,260	\$30,603,120	2.03%	2.22%	2.22%
Ashland	MetroWest	Maturing Suburb	0.6%	0.2%	0.5%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$19,589,554	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Nahant	Inner Core	Maturing Suburb	0.1%	0.0%	0.2%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Malden	Inner Core	Inner Core	2.0%	0.7%	1.0%	\$7,983,824	1.2%	\$1,221,159	0.1%	\$9,204,983	0.3%	\$1,221,159	\$9,204,983	\$11,162,617	0.07%	0.32%	0.32%
Stow	MAGIC	Developing Suburb	0.2%	0.1%	0.6%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$101,660	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

MPO Municipality	Subregion	Community Type	Pct Pop.	Pct Empl.	Aid Roadway Miles (2016)	Target Funding F FY 2027-31)	Prioritized Target Funding	State Prioritized Funding	Prioritized Funding	(Regionally Prioritized and State Prioritized)	(Regionally Prioritized and State Prioritized)	FFYs 2011-2030 (Target)	FFYs 2011-2030 (State)	FFYs 2011-2030 (All)	Pct FFYs 11-30 Target	Pct FFYs 11-30 State	Pct FFYs 11-30 All
Topsfield	NSTF	Developing Suburb	0.2%	0.1%	0.6%	\$0	0.0%	\$6,478,718	0.3%	\$6,478,718	0.2%	\$0	\$9,287,283	\$9,287,283	0.00%	0.32%	0.32%
Hudson	MAGIC	Developing Suburb	0.6%	0.5%	0.7%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$12,103,924	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Marlborough	MetroWest	Regional Urban Center	1.2%	1.6%	2.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$6,908,380	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Medway	SWAP	Developing Suburb	0.4%	0.2%	0.6%	\$0	0.0%	\$1,693,593	0.1%	\$1,693,593	0.1%	\$1,693,593	\$1,693,593	\$12,062,567	0.10%	0.06%	0.06%
Sudbury	MAGIC	Maturing Suburb	0.6%	0.3%	1.0%	\$6,399,329	0.9%	\$0	0.0%	\$6,399,329	0.2%	\$0	\$6,399,329	\$18,019,416	0.00%	0.22%	0.22%
Wayland	MetroWest	Maturing Suburb	0.4%	0.2%	0.7%	\$0	0.0%	\$5,270,386	0.2%	\$5,270,386	0.2%	\$5,270,386	\$5,270,386	\$0	0.31%	0.18%	0.18%
Hamilton	NSTF	Developing Suburb	0.2%	0.1%	0.4%	\$166,779	0.0%	\$6,143,463	0.3%	\$6,310,242	0.2%	\$365,061	\$6,143,463	\$6,508,524	0.02%	0.21%	0.21%
Maynard	MAGIC	Maturing Suburb	0.3%	0.2%	0.3%	\$0	0.0%	\$7,402,470	0.3%	\$7,402,470	0.3%	\$7,402,470	\$7,402,470	\$0	0.44%	0.25%	0.25%
Sharon	TRIC	Maturing Suburb	0.6%	0.2%	1.1%	\$0	0.0%	\$18,063,987	0.8%	\$18,063,987	0.6%	\$18,063,987	\$18,063,987	\$42,000	1.06%	0.62%	0.62%
Arlington	Inner Core	Inner Core	1.4%	0.5%	0.8%	\$0	0.0%	\$729,288	0.0%	\$729,288	0.0%	\$729,288	\$729,288	\$11,191,631	0.04%	0.02%	0.02%
Scituate	SSC	Maturing Suburb	0.6%	0.2%	1.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$1,572,496	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Westwood	TRIC	Maturing Suburb	0.5%	0.6%	0.7%	\$16,528,952	2.4%	\$0	0.0%	\$16,528,952	0.6%	\$0	\$16,528,952	\$28,304,369	0.00%	0.57%	0.57%
Bedford	MAGIC	Maturing Suburb	0.4%	0.9%	0.8%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$24,507,736	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Bolton	MAGIC	Developing Suburb	0.2%	0.1%	0.7%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$101,660	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Carlisle	MAGIC	Developing Suburb	0.2%	0.0%	0.4%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Concord	MAGIC	Maturing Suburb	0.6%	0.6%	1.1%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$22,592,311	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Dover	SWAP	Developing Suburb	0.2%	0.0%	0.5%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Essex	NSTF	Developing Suburb	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	\$166,779	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$166,779	0.0%	\$365,061	\$10,659,471	\$11,024,532	0.02%	0.36%	0.36%

MPO Municipality	Subregion	Community Type	Pct Pop.	Pct Empl.	Aid Roadway Miles (2016)	Target Funding F FY 2027-31)	Prioritized Target Funding	State Prioritized Funding	Prioritized Funding	(Regionally Prioritized and State Prioritized)	(Regionally Prioritized and State Prioritized)	FFYs 2011-2030 (Target)	FFYs 2011-2030 (State)	FFYs 2011-2030 (All)	Pct FFYs 11-30 Target	Pct FFYs 11-30 State	Pct FFYs 11-30 All
Franklin	SWAP	Developing Suburb	1.0%	0.8%	1.2%	\$0	0.0%	\$12,113,370	0.6%	\$12,113,370	0.4%	\$12,113,370	\$12,113,370	\$0	0.71%	0.41%	0.41%
Gloucester	NSTF	Regional Urban Center	0.9%	0.5%	1.0%	\$359,987	0.1%	\$94,557,060	4.4%	\$94,917,047	3.3%	\$2,843,269	\$110,035,793	\$112,879,062	0.17%	3.77%	3.77%
Holbrook	SSC	Maturing Suburb	0.3%	0.1%	0.3%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$3,036,628	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Holliston	MetroWest	Developing Suburb	0.4%	0.3%	0.5%	\$0	0.0%	\$1,012,500	0.0%	\$1,012,500	0.0%	\$1,012,500	\$1,012,500	\$600,000	0.06%	0.03%	0.03%
Hull	SSC	Maturing Suburb	0.3%	0.1%	0.4%	\$393,750	0.1%	\$1,062,500	0.0%	\$1,456,250	0.1%	\$1,062,500	\$1,456,250	\$9,085,922	0.06%	0.05%	0.05%
Lincoln	MAGIC	Maturing Suburb	0.2%	0.1%	0.6%	\$0	0.0%	\$729,288	0.0%	\$729,288	0.0%	\$729,288	\$729,288	\$22,492,311	0.04%	0.02%	0.02%
Manchester	NSTF	Developing Suburb	0.2%	0.1%	0.4%	\$166,779	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$166,779	0.0%	\$365,061	\$5,589,309	\$5,954,370	0.02%	0.19%	0.19%
Marblehead	NSTF	Maturing Suburb	0.6%	0.2%	0.5%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$742,534	\$0	\$742,534	0.04%	0.00%	0.00%
Marshfield	SSC	Maturing Suburb	0.8%	0.3%	1.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$5,682,660	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Medfield	TRIC	Maturing Suburb	0.4%	0.2%	0.5%	\$0	0.0%	\$624,497	0.0%	\$624,497	0.0%	\$624,497	\$624,497	\$0	0.04%	0.02%	0.02%
Melrose	Inner Core	Inner Core	0.9%	0.3%	0.4%	\$10,453,885	1.5%	\$0	0.0%	\$10,453,885	0.4%	\$0	\$10,453,885	\$14,858,915	0.00%	0.36%	0.36%
Millis	SWAP	Developing Suburb	0.3%	0.1%	0.4%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Needham	TRIC	Maturing Suburb	1.0%	1.1%	1.2%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$100,365,195	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Norfolk	SWAP	Developing Suburb	0.3%	0.2%	0.5%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$697,500	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
North Reading	NSPC	Maturing Suburb	0.5%	0.4%	0.6%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Norwell	SSC	Developing Suburb	0.3%	0.5%	0.8%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Rockland	SSC	Developing Suburb	0.5%	0.4%	0.6%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Rockport	NSTF	Developing Suburb	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%	\$166,779	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$166,779	0.0%	\$472,449	\$775,913	\$1,248,362	0.03%	0.03%	0.03%

MPO Municipality	Subregion	Community Type	Pct Pop.	Pct Empl.	Aid Roadway Miles (2016)	Target Funding FY 2027-31)	Prioritized Target Funding	State Prioritized Funding	Prioritized Funding	(Regionally Prioritized and State Prioritized)	(Regionally Prioritized and State Prioritized)	FFYs 2011-2030 (Target)	FFYs 2011-2030 (State)	FFYs 2011-2030 (All)	Pct FFYs 11-30 Target	Pct FFYs 11-30 State	Pct FFYs 11-30 All
Saugus	Inner Core	Maturing Suburb	0.9%	0.5%	0.8%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Sherborn	SWAP	Developing Suburb	0.1%	0.0%	0.4%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$1,787,550	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Southborough	MetroWest	Maturing Suburb	0.3%	0.4%	1.2%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$7,294,520	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Walpole	TRIC	Developing Suburb	0.8%	0.5%	1.2%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$25,808,571	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Wellesley	MetroWest	Maturing Suburb	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%	\$0	0.0%	\$25,020,053	1.2%	\$25,020,053	0.9%	\$25,020,053	\$25,020,053	\$78,350,868	1.47%	0.86%	0.86%
Wenham	NSTF	Developing Suburb	0.1%	0.1%	0.4%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	\$9,906,121	\$9,906,121	0.00%	0.34%	0.34%

Appendix E

Regulatory and Policy Framework

This appendix contains detailed background on the regulatory documents, legislation, and guidance that shape the Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization's (MPO) transportation planning process.

Regulatory Framework

The Boston Region MPO is charged with executing its planning activities in line with federal and state regulatory guidance. Maintaining compliance with these regulations allows the MPO to directly support the work of these critical partners and ensures its continued role in helping the region move closer to achieving federal, state, and regional transportation goals. This appendix describes the regulations, policies, and guidance taken into consideration by the MPO during development of the certification documents and other core work the MPO will undertake during federal fiscal year (FFY) 2027.

Federal Regulations and Guidance

The MPO's planning processes are guided by provisions in federal transportation authorization bills, which are codified in federal statutes and supported by guidance from federal agencies. The Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) was signed into law on November 15, 2021, as the nation's five-year surface transportation bill, and covers FFYs 2022–26. This section describes provisions established in the IIJA.

Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act: National Goals

The purpose of the national transportation goals, outlined in Title 23, section 150, of the United States Code (23 USC § 150), is to increase the accountability and transparency of the Federal-Aid Highway Program and to improve decision-making through performance-based planning and programming. The national transportation goals include the following:

1. **Safety:** Achieve significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads
2. **Infrastructure condition:** Maintain the highway infrastructure asset system in a state of good repair
3. **Congestion reduction:** Achieve significant reduction in congestion on the National Highway System

4. **System reliability:** Improve efficiency of the surface transportation system
5. **Freight movement and economic vitality:** Improve the national freight network, strengthen the ability of rural communities to access national and international trade markets, and support regional economic development
6. **Environmental sustainability:** Enhance performance of the transportation system while protecting and enhancing the natural environment
7. **Reduced project delivery delays:** Reduce project costs, promote jobs and the economy, and expedite movement of people and goods by accelerating project completion by eliminating delays in the project development and delivery process, including by reducing regulatory burdens and improving agencies' work practices

The Boston Region MPO has incorporated these national goals into its vision, goals, and objectives, which provide a framework for the MPO's planning processes. More information about the MPO's vision, goals, and objectives is included in Chapter 1.

Federal Planning Factors

The MPO gives specific consideration to the federal planning factors, described in Title 23, section 134, of the US Code (23 USC § 134), when developing all documents that program federal transportation funds. In accordance with the legislation, studies and strategies undertaken by the MPO shall

1. Support the economic vitality of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competition, productivity, and efficiency
2. Increase the safety of the transportation system for all motorized and nonmotorized users
3. Increase the ability of the transportation system to support homeland security and to safeguard the personal security of all motorized and nonmotorized users
4. Increase accessibility and mobility of people and freight
5. Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, improve quality of life, and promote consistency between transportation improvements and state and local planned growth and economic development patterns

6. Enhance integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight
7. Promote efficient system management and operation
8. Emphasize preservation of the existing transportation system
9. Improve the resiliency and reliability of the transportation system and reduce or mitigate stormwater impacts of surface transportation
10. Enhance travel and tourism

The Boston Region MPO has also incorporated these federal planning factors into its vision, goals, and objectives.

FAST Act: Performance-Based Planning and Programming

The United States Department of Transportation (USDOT), in consultation with states, MPOs, and other stakeholders, established performance measures relevant to the national goals established in the FAST Act. These performance topic areas include roadway safety, transit system safety, National Highway System (NHS) bridge and pavement condition, transit asset condition, NHS reliability for both passenger and freight travel, traffic congestion, and on-road mobile source emissions. The FAST Act and related federal rulemakings require states, MPOs, and public transportation operators to follow performance-based planning and programming practices—such as setting targets—to ensure that transportation investments support progress towards these goals.

1990 Clean Air Act Amendments

The Clean Air Act, most recently amended in 1990, forms the basis of the United States' air pollution control policy. The act identifies air quality standards, and the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) designates geographic areas as *attainment* (in compliance) or *nonattainment* (not in compliance) areas with respect to these standards. If air quality in a nonattainment area improves such that it meets EPA standards, the EPA may redesignate that area as a *maintenance* area for a 20-year period to ensure that the standard is maintained in that area.

The conformity provisions of the Clean Air Act “require that those areas that have poor air quality, or had it in the past, should examine the long-term air quality impacts of their transportation system and ensure its compatibility with the area’s clean air goals.” Agencies responsible for Clean Air Act requirements for nonattainment and maintenance areas must conduct air quality conformity determinations, which are demonstrations that

transportation plans, programs, and projects addressing that area are consistent with a State Implementation Plan (SIP) for attaining air quality standards.

Air quality conformity determinations must be performed for capital improvement projects that receive federal funding and for those that are considered regionally significant, regardless of the funding source. These determinations must show that projects in the MPO's Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) will not cause or contribute to any new air quality violations; will not increase the frequency or severity of any existing air quality violations in any area; and will not delay the timely attainment of air quality standards in any area. The policy, criteria, and procedures for demonstrating air quality conformity in the Boston region were established in Title 40, parts 51 and 53, of the Code of Federal Regulations (40. C.F.R. 51, 40 C.F.R. 53).

On April 1, 1996, the EPA redesignated the cities of Boston, Cambridge, Chelsea, Everett, Malden, Medford, Quincy, Revere, and Somerville from nonattainment to attainment for carbon monoxide (CO) emissions. Subsequently, the Commonwealth established a CO maintenance plan through the Massachusetts SIP process to ensure that emission levels did not increase. While the maintenance plan was in effect, past TIPs and LRTPs included an air quality conformity analysis for these communities. As of April 1, 2016, the 20-year maintenance period for this maintenance area expired and transportation conformity is no longer required for carbon monoxide in these communities. This ruling is documented in a letter from the EPA dated May 12, 2016.

On April 22, 2002, the EPA classified the City of Waltham as being in attainment for CO emissions with an EPA-approved limited-maintenance plan. In areas that have approved limited-maintenance plans, federal actions requiring conformity determinations under the EPA's transportation conformity rule are considered to satisfy the conformity test. The MPO is not required to perform a modeling analysis for a conformity determination for carbon monoxide, but it has been required to provide a status report on the timely implementation of projects and programs that will reduce emissions from transportation sources—so-called transportation control measures—which are included in the Massachusetts SIP. In April 2022, the EPA issued a letter explaining that the carbon monoxide limited maintenance area in Waltham has expired. Therefore, the MPO is no longer required to demonstrate transportation conformity for this area, but the rest of the maintenance plan requirements, however, continue to apply, in accordance with the SIP.

On February 16, 2018, the US Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit issued a decision in *South Coast Air Quality Management District v. EPA*, which struck down portions of the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) SIP Requirements Rule concerning the ozone NAAQS. Those portions of the SIP Requirements Rule included transportation conformity requirements associated with the EPA's revocation of the 1997 ozone NAAQS. Massachusetts was designated as an attainment area in accord with the 2008 ozone NAAQS but as a nonattainment or maintenance area as relates to the 1997 ozone NAAQS. As a result of this court ruling, MPOs in Massachusetts must once again demonstrate conformity for ozone when developing LRTPs and TIPs.

MPOs must also perform conformity determinations if transportation control measures (TCM) are in effect in the region. TCMs are strategies that reduce transportation-related air pollution and fuel use by reducing vehicle-miles traveled and improving roadway operations. The Massachusetts SIP identifies TCMs in the Boston region. SIP-identified TCMs are federally enforceable and projects that address the identified air quality issues must be given first priority when federal transportation dollars are spent. Examples of TCMs that were programmed in previous TIPs include rapid-transit and commuter-rail extension programs (such as the Green Line Extension in Cambridge, Medford, and Somerville, and the Fairmount Line improvements in Boston), parking-freeze programs in Boston and Cambridge, statewide rideshare programs, park-and-ride facilities, residential parking-sticker programs, and the operation of high-occupancy-vehicle (HOV) lanes.

In addition to reporting on the pollutants identified in the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments, the MPOs in Massachusetts are also required to perform air quality analyses for carbon dioxide as part of the state's Global Warming Solutions Act (GWSA) (see below).

Nondiscrimination Mandates

The Boston Region MPO complies with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the American with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA), and other federal and state nondiscrimination statutes and regulations in all programs and activities it conducts. Per federal and state law, the MPO does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin (including limited-English proficiency), disability, age, sex, and [additional protected characteristics](#). The MPO strives to provide meaningful opportunities for participation of all persons in the region, including those protected by Title VI, the ADA, and other nondiscrimination mandates.

The MPO also assesses the likely benefits and adverse effects of transportation projects on protected populations (populations covered by federal regulations, as identified in the MPO's Community Transportation Access program) when deciding which projects to fund. This is done through the MPO's project selection criteria. MPO staff also evaluate the projects that are selected for funding, in the aggregate, to determine their overall impacts and whether they improve transportation outcomes for protected populations. The major federal requirements pertaining to nondiscrimination are discussed below.

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 requires that no person be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin, under any program or activity provided by an agency receiving federal financial assistance. In recognition that there are people who, as a result of their nationality, have limited English proficiency and that courts have historically interpreted "national origin discrimination" to include language-based barriers, and continued USDOT requirements to provide language assistance, the MPO provides resources to allow people with limited English proficiency to meaningfully participate in the transportation planning process. This includes the development of a Language Assistance Plan that documents the MPO's process for providing meaningful language access to people with limited English proficiency who access the MPO's services and programs.

Americans with Disabilities Act

Title III of the ADA "prohibits states, MPOs, and other public entities from discriminating on the basis of disability in the entities' services, programs, or activities," and requires all transportation projects, plans, and programs to be accessible to people with disabilities. Therefore, MPOs must consider the mobility needs of people with disabilities when programming federal funding for studies and capital projects. MPO-sponsored meetings must also be held in accessible venues and be conducted in a manner that provides for accessibility. Also, MPO materials must be made available in accessible formats.

Other Nondiscrimination Mandates

The Age Discrimination Act of 1975 prohibits discrimination on the basis of age in programs or activities that receive federal financial assistance. In

addition, the Rehabilitation Act of 1975, and Title 23, section 324, of the US Code (23 USC § 324) prohibit discrimination based on sex.

State Guidance and Priorities

Much of the MPO's work focuses on encouraging mode shift and diminishing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions through improving transit service, enhancing bicycle and pedestrian networks, and studying emerging transportation technologies. All of this work helps the Boston region contribute to statewide progress towards the priorities discussed in this section.

Beyond Mobility

Beyond Mobility, the Massachusetts 2050 Transportation Plan, is a planning process that will result in a blueprint for guiding transportation decision-making and investments in Massachusetts. MPO staff continue to coordinate with MassDOT staff so that *Destination 2050*, the MPO's Long-Range Transportation Plan, is aligned with the *Beyond Mobility* plan.

Choices for Stewardship: Recommendations to Meet the Transportation Future

The Commission on the Future of Transportation in the Commonwealth—established by former Massachusetts Governor Charlie Baker's Executive Order 579—published *Choices for Stewardship* in 2019. This report makes 18 recommendations across the following five thematic categories to adapt the transportation system in the Commonwealth to emerging needs:

1. Modernize existing transportation assets to move more people
2. Create a mobility infrastructure to capitalize on emerging transportation technology and behavior trends
3. Reduce transportation-related GHG emissions and improve the climate resiliency of the transportation network
4. Coordinate land use, housing, economic development, and transportation policy
5. Alter current governance structures to better manage emerging and anticipated transportation trends

Beyond Mobility builds upon the Commission report's recommendations. The Boston Region MPO supports these statewide goals by conducting planning work and making investment decisions that complement

MassDOT's efforts and reflect the evolving needs of the transportation system in the region.

Massachusetts Strategic Highway Safety Plan

The *Massachusetts 2023 Strategic Highway Safety Plan* (SHSP) identifies the state's key safety needs and guides investment decisions to achieve significant reductions in highway fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads. The SHSP establishes statewide safety goals and objectives and key safety emphasis areas, and it draws on the strengths of all highway safety partners in the Commonwealth to align and leverage resources to address the state's safety challenges collectively. The Boston Region MPO considers SHSP goals, emphasis areas, and strategies when developing its plans, programs, and activities.

Massachusetts Transportation Asset Management Plan

The Massachusetts Transportation Asset Management Plan (TAMP) is a risk-based asset management plan for the bridges and pavement that are in the NHS inventory. The plan describes the condition of these assets, identifies assets that are particularly vulnerable following declared emergencies such as extreme weather, and discusses MassDOT's financial plan and risk management strategy for these assets. The Boston Region MPO considers MassDOT TAMP goals, targets, and strategies when developing its plans, programs, and activities. MassDOT's TAMP was most recently updated in 2023.

MassDOT Modal Plans

In 2018, MassDOT released the related *Commonwealth of Massachusetts State Rail Plan*, which outlines short- and long-term investment strategies for Massachusetts' freight and passenger rail systems (excluding the commuter rail system). In 2019, MassDOT released the *Massachusetts Bicycle Transportation Plan* and the *Massachusetts Pedestrian Transportation Plan*, both of which define roadmaps, initiatives, and action plans to improve bicycle and pedestrian transportation in the Commonwealth. These plans were updated in 2021 to reflect new investments in bicycle and pedestrian projects made by MassDOT since their release. In 2023, MassDOT released the *Massachusetts Freight Plan*, which identifies short- and long-term improvements and strategies for the state's freight systems. The MPO considers the findings and strategies of MassDOT's modal plans when conducting its planning, including through its Freight Planning Support and Bicycle/Pedestrian Support Activities programs.

Global Warming Solutions Act

The GWSA makes Massachusetts a leader in setting aggressive and enforceable GHG reduction targets and implementing policies and initiatives to achieve these targets. In keeping with this law, the Massachusetts Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs (EEA), in consultation with other state agencies and the public, developed the *Massachusetts Clean Energy and Climate Plan for 2020*. This implementation plan, released on December 29, 2010, and updated in 2022 to reflect new interim targets, establishes the following targets for overall statewide GHG emission reductions:

- 33 percent reduction below statewide 1990 GHG emission levels by 2025
- 50 percent reduction below statewide 1990 GHG emission levels by 2030
- 75 percent reduction below statewide 1990 GHG emission levels by 2040
- 85 percent reduction below statewide 1990 GHG emission levels by 2050

In 2018, EEA published its GWSA 10-year Progress Report and the GHG Inventory estimated that 2018 GHG emissions were 22 percent below the 1990 baseline level.

On June 30, 2022, EEA certified its compliance with the 2020 emissions limit of 25 percent below the 1990 levels, noting that there was an estimated emissions reduction of 31.4 percent below the 1990 level in 2020.

MassDOT fulfills its responsibilities, defined in the *Massachusetts Clean Energy and Climate Plan for 2050*, through a policy directive that sets three principal objectives:

1. To reduce GHG emissions by reducing emissions from construction and operations, using more efficient fleets, implementing travel demand management programs, encouraging eco-driving, and providing mitigation for development projects
2. To promote healthy transportation modes by improving pedestrian, bicycle, and public transit infrastructure and operations

3. To support smart growth development by making transportation investments that enable denser, smart growth development patterns that can support reduced GHG emissions

In January 2015, the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection amended Title 310, section 7.00, of the Code of Massachusetts Regulations (310 CMR 60.05), *Global Warming Solutions Act Requirements for the Transportation Sector and the Massachusetts Department of Transportation*, which was subsequently amended in August 2017. This regulation places a range of obligations on MassDOT and MPOs to support achievement of the Commonwealth's goals through the programming of transportation funds. For example, MPOs must use GHG impact as a selection criterion when they review projects to be programmed in their TIPs, and they must evaluate and report the GHG emissions impacts of transportation projects in LRTPs and TIPs.

The Commonwealth's 10 MPOs (and three non-metropolitan planning regions) are integrally involved in supporting the GHG reductions mandated under the GWSA. The MPOs seek to realize these objectives by prioritizing projects in the LRTP and TIP that will help reduce emissions from the transportation sector. The Boston Region MPO uses its TIP project evaluation criteria to score projects based on their GHG emissions impacts, multimodal Complete Streets accommodations, and ability to support smart growth development. Tracking and evaluating GHG emissions by project will enable the MPO to anticipate GHG impacts of planned and programmed projects.

Healthy Transportation Policy Initiatives

On September 9, 2013, MassDOT passed the Healthy Transportation Policy Directive to formalize its commitment to implementing and maintaining transportation networks that allow for various mode choices. This directive will ensure that all MassDOT projects are designed and implemented in ways that provide all users with access to safe and comfortable walking, bicycling, and transit options. MassDOT's design justification process, which established controlling criteria for bicycle and pedestrian facilities, transit provisions and the length of off- and on-ramps, has helped to operationalize and further the goals of the original Healthy Transportation Policy Directive.

In November 2015, MassDOT released the *Separated Bike Lane Planning & Design Guide*. This guide represents a step in MassDOT's continuing commitment to Complete Streets, sustainable transportation, and the creation of safer and more convenient transportation options for Massachusetts' residents. This guide may be used by project planners and

designers as a resource for considering, evaluating, and designing separated bike lanes as part of a Complete Streets approach.

In the current LRTP, *Destination 2050*, the Boston Region MPO continues to use investment programs—particularly its Complete Streets and Bicycle Network and Pedestrian Connections programs—that support the implementation of Complete Streets projects. In the Unified Planning Work Program, the MPO budgets to support these projects.

Congestion in the Commonwealth 2019

MassDOT developed the *Congestion in the Commonwealth 2019* report to identify specific causes of and impacts from traffic congestion on the NHS. The report also made recommendations for reducing congestion, including addressing local and regional bottlenecks, redesigning bus networks within the systems operated by the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA) and the other regional transit authorities, increasing MBTA capacity, and investigating congestion pricing mechanisms such as managed lanes. These recommendations guide multiple new efforts within MassDOT and the MBTA and are actively considered by the Boston Region MPO when making planning and investment decisions.

Regional Guidance and Priorities

Focus40, The MBTA's Program for Mass Transportation

On March 18, 2019, MassDOT and the MBTA released *Focus40*, the MBTA's Program for Mass Transportation, which is the 25-year investment plan that aims to position the MBTA to meet the transit needs of the Greater Boston region through 2040. Complemented by the MBTA's Strategic Plan and other internal and external policy and planning initiatives, *Focus40* serves as a comprehensive plan guiding all capital planning initiatives at the MBTA. These initiatives include the Rail Vision plan, which will inform the vision for the future of the MBTA's commuter rail system; the Bus Network Redesign (formerly the Better Bus Project), the plan to re-envision and improve the MBTA's bus network; and other plans. The next update of the Program for Mass Transportation began in July 2025 and is expected to be completed by the summer of 2027. The Boston Region MPO continues to monitor the status of *Focus40* and related MBTA modal plans to inform its decision-making about transit capital investments, which are incorporated into the TIP and LRTP.

MetroCommon 2050

MetroCommon 2050, which was developed by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC) and adopted in 2021, is Greater Boston’s regional land use and policy plan. *MetroCommon 2050* builds upon MAPC’s previous plan, *MetroFuture* (adopted in 2008), and includes an updated set of strategies for achieving sustainable growth and prosperity in the region. The MPO considers MetroCommon 2050’s goals, objectives, and strategies in its planning and activities.

MetroCommon 2050 is the foundation for land use projections in the MPO’s LRTP, *Destination 2050*.

The Boston Region MPO’s Congestion Management Process

The congestion management process (CMP) is a systematic approach for managing congestion that provides accurate, up-to-date information on transportation system performance and assesses alternative strategies for congestion management. Its purpose is to provide for safe and effective integrated management and operation of the multimodal transportation system in the Boston region. The CMP formulates solutions for congestion management by

- establishing performance metrics,
- analyzing congestion on the regional transportation network using the metrics,
- identifying problem areas,
- recommending strategies to reduce congestion,
- moving those strategies into the implementation stage by providing decision-makers in the region with information and recommendations for improving the transportation system’s performance, and
- evaluating the recommendations and effectiveness of projects.

Coordinated Public Transit—Human Services Transportation Plan

Every four years, the Boston Region MPO completes a Coordinated Public Transit—Human Services Transportation Plan (CPT—HST), in coordination with the development of the LRTP. The CPT—HST supports improved coordination of transportation for seniors and people with disabilities in the Boston region by guiding transportation providers in their development of proposals for funding from the Federal Transit Administration’s Section 5310

Program (known in Massachusetts as the Community Transit Grant Program). To be eligible for funding, a proposal must meet a need identified in the CPT–HST. The CPT–HST contains information about

- current transportation providers in the Boston region;
- unmet transportation needs for seniors and people with disabilities;
- strategies and actions to meet the unmet needs; and
- priorities for implementing those needs.

The MPO is developing the next CPT-HST, which is expected to go into effect in FFY 2027.

MBTA and Regional Transit Authority (RTA) Transit Asset Management Plans

The MBTA and the region’s RTAs—the Cape Ann Transportation Authority (CATA) and the MetroWest Regional Transit Authority (MWRTA)—are responsible for producing transit asset management plans that describe their asset inventories and the condition of these assets, strategies, and priorities for improving the state of good repair of these assets. The Boston Region MPO considers goals and priorities established in these plans when developing its plans, programs, and activities.

MBTA and RTA Public Transit Agency Safety Plans

The MBTA, CATA, and MWRTA are required to create and annually update Public Transit Agency Safety Plans that describe their approaches for implementing Safety Management Systems on their transit systems. The Boston Region MPO considers goals, targets, and priorities established in these plans when developing its plans, programs, and activities.

Appendix F

Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization Membership

Voting Members

The Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) includes both permanent members and municipal members who are elected for three-year terms. Details about the MPO's members are listed below.

The **Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT)** was established under *Chapter 25 (An Act Modernizing the Transportation Systems of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts)* of the Acts of 2009. MassDOT has four divisions: Highway, Rail and Transit, Aeronautics, and the Registry of Motor Vehicles. The MassDOT Board of Directors, composed of 11 members appointed by the governor, oversees all four divisions and MassDOT operations and works closely with the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA) Board of Directors. MassDOT has three seats on the MPO board, including seats for the Highway Division.

The **MassDOT Highway Division** has jurisdiction over the roadways, bridges, and tunnels that were overseen by the former Massachusetts Highway Department and Massachusetts Turnpike Authority. The Highway Division also has jurisdiction over many bridges and parkways that previously were under the authority of the Department of Conservation and Recreation. The Highway Division is responsible for the design, construction, and maintenance of the Commonwealth's state highways and bridges. It is also responsible for overseeing traffic safety and engineering activities for the state highway system. These activities include operating the Highway Operations Control Center to ensure safe road and travel conditions.

The **MBTA**, created in 1964, is a body politic and corporate, and a political subdivision of the Commonwealth. Under the provisions of Chapter 161A of the Massachusetts General Laws, it has the statutory responsibility within its district of operating the public transportation system in the Boston region, preparing the engineering and architectural designs for transit development projects, and constructing and operating transit development projects. The MBTA district comprises 178 communities, including most of the 97 cities and towns of the Boston Region MPO area.

The MBTA Board of Directors provides oversight for the agency. By statute, the board consists of nine members, including the Secretary of Transportation as an ex-officio member. The MBTA Advisory Board appoints one member who has municipal government experience in the MBTA's service area and experience in transportation operations, transportation planning, housing policy, urban planning, or public or private finance. The Governor appoints the remaining seven board members, which include an MBTA rider who is a member of a population protected by nondiscrimination regulations, and a person recommended by the President of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

In 2024, the **Regional Transit Authorities (RTA) of the Boston Region, the Cape Ann Transportation Authority (CATA), and the MetroWest Regional Transit Authority (MWRTA)** earned a shared seat on the MPO Board. CATA was founded in 1976 and operates public transportation for Gloucester, Rockport, Ipswich, Essex, Manchester-by-the-Sea, and Hamilton across 12 bus routes. CATA offers fixed-route, microtransit, and dial-a-ride service. The MWRTA was formed in 2006 and commenced service on July 1, 2007, making it the youngest of the RTAs in the Commonwealth. The MWRTA serves 16 communities across the MetroWest Region from its headquarters in Framingham. The MWRTA operates fixed route, microtransit, and paratransit service, and offers a shuttle service that provides connections to the MBTA Green Line at Woodland Station.

The **Massachusetts Port Authority (Massport)** has the statutory responsibility under Chapter 465 of the Acts of 1956, as amended, for planning, constructing, owning, and operating such transportation and related facilities as may be necessary for developing and improving commerce in Boston and the surrounding metropolitan area. Massport owns and operates Boston Logan International Airport, the Port of Boston's Conley Terminal, Flynn Cruiseport Boston, Hanscom Field, Worcester Regional Airport, and various maritime and waterfront properties, including parks in the Boston neighborhoods of East Boston, South Boston, and Charlestown.

The **Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC)** is the regional planning agency for the Boston region. It is composed of the chief executive officer (or a designee) of each of the cities and towns in the MAPC's planning region, 21 gubernatorial appointees, and 12 ex-officio members. It has statutory responsibility for comprehensive regional planning in its region under Chapter 40B of the Massachusetts General Laws. It is the Boston Metropolitan Clearinghouse under Section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 and Title VI of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968. Also, its region has been

designated an economic development district under Title IV of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended. MAPC's responsibilities for comprehensive planning encompass the areas of technical assistance to communities, transportation planning, and development of zoning, land use, demographic, and environmental studies. MAPC activities that are funded with federal metropolitan transportation planning dollars are documented in the Boston Region MPO's Unified Planning Work Program.

The **City of Boston**, six elected cities (currently **Beverly, Everett, Framingham, Newton, Somerville, and Burlington**) and six elected towns (currently **Lexington, Arlington, Brookline, Hull, Wrentham, and Norwood**) represent the 97 municipalities in the Boston Region MPO area. The City of Boston is a permanent MPO member and has two seats. There is one elected municipal seat for each of the eight MAPC subregions and four seats for at-large elected municipalities (two cities and two towns). The elected at-large municipalities serve staggered three-year terms, as do the eight municipalities representing the MAPC subregions.

The **MBTA Advisory Board** was created by the Massachusetts Legislature in 1964 through the same legislation that created the MBTA. The Advisory Board consists of representatives of the 178 cities and towns that compose the MBTA's service area. Cities are represented by either the city manager or mayor, and towns are represented by the chairperson of the board of selectmen. Specific responsibilities of the Advisory Board include reviewing and commenting on the MBTA's long-range plan, the Program for Mass Transportation; proposed fare increases; the annual MBTA Capital Investment Program; the MBTA's documentation of net operating investment per passenger; and the MBTA's operating budget. The MBTA Advisory Board advocates for the transit needs of its member communities and the riding public.

The Boston Region MPO supports a **Community Advisory Council** to advance public engagement in the 3C planning process. As a public forum that guides MPO planning and decision-making, the Advisory Council includes and elevates diverse perspectives from community organizations and stakeholders representing areas and interests throughout the region. The Advisory Council's mission is to create opportunities for knowledge-building and productive discussions about regional transportation issues, advise the MPO board and staff, and ensure that planning and policy decisions are responsive to public priorities and consistent with the MPO's long-range vision and goals.

The **Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)** and **Federal Transit Administration (FTA)** participate in the Boston Region MPO in an advisory and nonvoting capacity, reviewing the Long-Range Transportation Plan, Transportation Improvement Program, and Unified Planning Work Program, and other facets of the MPO's planning process to ensure compliance with federal planning and programming requirements. These two agencies oversee the highway and transit programs, respectively, of the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) under pertinent legislation and the provisions of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA).