

Memorandum for the Record

Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization Meeting

July 20, 2017 Meeting

10:00 AM – 12:20 PM, State Transportation Building, Conference Rooms 2 & 3, 10 Park Plaza, Boston

Steve Woelfel, Chair, representing Stephanie Pollack, Secretary and Chief Executive Officer, Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT)

Decisions

The Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization agreed to the following:

- approve the minutes of the meeting of May 18, 2017
- approve the minutes of the meeting of May 25, 2017
- approve the minutes of the meeting of June 15, 2017
- approve the work program for *North-South Rail Link Feasibility Reassessment*
- approve the work program for *Traffic and Parking Analysis to Support Potential Dedicated Bus Lanes*
- approve Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2017 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Budget Adjustments
- release the Draft FFYs 2017–21 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment Four for a 21-day public comment period
- approve the 2017 Title VI Triennial Report

1. Introductions

See attendance on page 13.

2. Public Comments

Yvonne Lalyre (United Neighbors of Lower Roxbury) expressed opposition to the design of Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) project #605789 (Reconstruction of Melnea Cass Boulevard) programmed in FFY19. She noted that community members would like minor improvements that protect existing trees and green space. Y. Lalyre stated that a climate report by the City of Boston indicated that the area is a heat island. Y. Lalyre requested that the city slow down its public process and pay attention to the concerns of the neighborhood.

Carl Seglem (Boston Resident) commented on the Draft 2017 Title VI Triennial Report, thanking staff for the public engagement process. C. Seglem also submitted a written comment on the report. Regarding section 3.4.2 of the report, Analysis of TIP Public

Transit Investments, C. Seglem noted the finding that investments per person in non-low income and non-minority areas are greater than investments in low income and minority areas, which he stated was troubling. Regarding section 3.3 of the report, Identification of Benefits and Burdens, C. Seglem stated that the analysis does not take into account existing differences in condition, only considering whether future plans would constitute a disparate impact or disproportionate burden. The analysis considering build and no-build scenarios does not reflect existing inequities which might be replicated by improvements. C. Seglem urged the MPO to reconsider how these analyses are done for Title VI and the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). C. Seglem also noted that in his personal analysis low-income and minority communities are the recipients of fewer Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) studies. C. Seglem encouraged the MPO to consider this in future UPWP development cycles.

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

There was none.

4. Committee Chairs' Reports

There were none.

5. Regional Transportation Advisory Council Report—*Tegin Bennett, Chair, Regional Transportation Advisory Council*

T. Bennett reported that the Advisory Council did not have a formal meeting in July. Instead, the Advisory Council toured Massport's Conley Freight Terminal. T. Bennett thanked Massport for this opportunity.

6. Executive Director's Report—*Karl Quackenbush, MPO Executive Director*

K. Quackenbush stated that the next MPO meeting will be August 17. There will be no meeting on August 3. K. Quackenbush noted that the September 7 meeting will likely be held in Bedford.

7. Approval of Meeting Minutes—*Róisín Foley, MPO Staff*

A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of May 18 was made by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (Eric Bourassa) and seconded by the Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood/NVCC) (Steve Olanoff). The motion carried.

A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of May 25 was made by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (E. Bourassa) and seconded by the Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood/NVCC) (S. Olanoff). The motion carried.

A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of June 15 was made by the South Shore Coalition (Town of Braintree) (Melissa Santucci Rozzi) and seconded by the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (Tom Bent). The North Shore Task Force (City of Beverly) (Denise Deschamps) abstained. The motion carried.

8. Action Item: Work Program for North-South Rail Link Feasibility Reassessment—K. Quackenbush, MPO Executive Director

The North-South Rail Link project is a proposal to connect Boston's North Station and South Station by rail. This study is a feasibility reassessment that will update prior work. CTPS (Central Transportation Planning Staff) will work with MassDOT and its consultant team to perform a market analysis and provide modeling support for examining existing roadway and transit conditions and future-year forecasts. Under the direction of the project team, CTPS will conduct a second market analysis focused on areas in the vicinity of commuter rail stations. The project team will analyze development-policy interventions, identify the areas, and provide Staff with the land use data needed for the market analysis. CTPS will perform air quality and environmental justice analyses, as well as supply data to the project team to support analyses that will determine economic impacts. CTPS estimates that it will complete the work in eight months, at an estimated cost of \$251,765.

Vote

A motion to approve the work program for *North-South Rail Link Feasibility* was made by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (E. Bourassa) and seconded by the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (T. Bent). The motion carried.

Discussion

Micha Gensler (MBTA Advisory Board) asked whether the market analysis will include Amtrak service. K. Quackenbush responded that CTPS's work concentrates on the MBTA Commuter Rail. Scott Hamwey (MassDOT Project Manager) added that MassDOT's consultant, Arup, will be doing some ridership analysis related to Amtrak, looking at which cities or suburbs have high levels of traffic.

S. Olanoff asked how staff will analyze Commuter Rail trip flows. K. Quackenbush responded that this has not been entirely specified, but the market analysis will look at trip flows between areas to the north and south of Boston in order to advise the team on which commuter rail line pairings make the most sense to model from a trip demand perspective. S. Olanoff noted that there would be a huge number of possible station-to-station combinations to consider. K. Quackenbush replied that it is whole lines on the north that would get paired with whole lines on the south, so the number of possible combinations of north-south lines is governed by the number of lines, not stations.

Nonetheless, in determining which north lines to pair with which south lines, the market analysis might examine trip flows down to the station-group level. Various sources of data will be used, including the regional travel demand model, census data, and state travel surveys.

S. Olanoff asked whether the work will consider how many vehicles building the link might take of the road. K. Quackenbush replied that this will come out of the forecasting process.

Laura Gilmore (Massport) asked whether new modes will be included. K. Quackenbush replied that an enormous amount of thought is being given to this, despite the fact that transportation network companies (TNCs, like Uber and Lyft) are unforthcoming with data. S. Hamwey added that the project team will be very cautious about any assumptions regarding TNCs or autonomous vehicles (AVs).

Jay Monty (At-Large City) (City of Everett) asked whether the impact of a North-South Link on the overall capacity of the MBTA system will be considered. K. Quackenbush replied that the possible relief of congestion on existing lines will come out of model runs. S. Hamwey added that the project will look at the existing universe of stations, including the expansion of S. Station.

S. Olanoff asked about the level of service that will be assumed when modeling Commuter Rail trips. S. Hamwey replied that the project team has a universe of potential service plans which includes a minimum service plan and an aspirational plan. The modeling will be done on the basis of weekday travel only.

Rafael Mares (Conservation Law Foundation) asked whether the environmental analysis includes greenhouse gas emissions. K. Quackenbush replied that it does.

9. Action Item: Work Program for Traffic and Parking Analysis to Support Potential Dedicated Bus Lanes—*Nick Hart, MPO Staff*

MPO Staff (CTPS) previously conducted a *Prioritization of Dedicated Bus Lanes* study with MassDOT to identify which roadway segments in Greater Boston would provide the greatest benefit to bus passengers if existing roadway space were reallocated to accommodate dedicated bus lanes. The purpose of *Traffic and Parking Analysis to Support Potential Dedicated Bus Lanes* is to provide continued support for the installation of dedicated bus lanes. Staff will analyze traffic and parking on seven roadway segments identified in *Prioritization of Dedicated Bus Lanes*, and one additional segment identified at a later date. The additional roadway segment to be included is between Park Street at Pearl Street and Hawthorne Street at Broadway in

Chelsea. The objective is to support MassDOT's strategy for providing municipal stakeholders with resources to inform the reallocation of existing roadway space for dedicated bus lanes in the Greater Boston region. CTPS estimates that this project will be completed eight months after work commences at a total cost of \$95,000.

Vote

A motion to approve the work program for *Traffic and Parking Analysis to Support Potential Dedicated Bus Lanes* was made by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (E. Bourassa) and seconded by the Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood/NVCC) (S. Olanoff). The motion carried.

Discussion

L. Gilmore asked whether any thought is being given to loading zones for freight and delivery. N. Hart responded that this study is looking at the morning peak period and freight is not being considered in this particular analysis.

10.Action Item: Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2017 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Budget Adjustments—*Bryan Pounds, MassDOT, UPWP Committee Chair*

B. Pounds, Committee Chair, introduced FFY 2017 UPWP Budget Adjustments. This UPWP was developed in the spring of 2016, at which point MPO staff made the best guess possible regarding the funds needed for tasks. In the 4th quarter, staff reviews project budgets and expenditures and recommends needed adjustments. The adjustments presented largely shift funding from the work on two certification documents (UPWP and LRTP) to the TIP program. These changes were approved by the UPWP Committee. K. Quackenbush added that this is a routine process that allows staff to make modest adjustments at the end of the 3rd quarter of the FFY in order to end the year meeting budget targets and thereby using the MPO planning funds effectively.

Vote

A motion to approve Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2017 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Budget Adjustments was made by South Shore Coalition (Town of Braintree) (M. Santucci Rozzi) and seconded by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (E. Bourassa). The motion carried.

11. Action Item: Draft FFYs 2017-21 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment Four—*Alexandra (Ali) Kleyman, MPO Staff*

Handouts posted to MPO meeting calendar

1. Draft Amendment Four to the FFYs 2017-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP): Full TIP tables
2. Draft Amendment Four: Summary of Proposed Changes

Amendment Four programs changes to two projects: #604761 (MultiUse Trail Construction (South Bay Harbor) From Ruggles Station to Fort Point Channel, Boston) and #604173 (Bridge Replacement (B-16-016) North Washington Street over Boston Inner Harbor). Both projects have cost increases, and there are changes to the Advance Construction (AC) cash flow of #604173. The project description for #604761 would also change with this amendment. Both projects are programmed with MassDOT's share of federal funds and this amendment does not impact MPO target funds.

Discussion

Jim Gillooly (City of Boston) (Boston Transportation Department) explained the reasons behind the changes to the South Bay Harbor Trail project. Along the Fort Point Channel there is a shared-path that brings users to the Gillette Parking lot. This trail is intended to extend from the South Boston waterfront to Ruggles Station. The City has struggled to secure the right of way for a section of the trail which would link the South End to South Boston.

T. Bennett asked whether cost increases for the N. Washington Street bridge project impact funding for other bridge projects. S. Woelfel replied that he did not know of any impacts at this point. B. Pounds added that changes in FFYs 2017-21 will not impact the current MassDOT bridge list.

Vote

A motion to release Draft FFYs 2017–21 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment Four for a 21-day public review period was made by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (E. Bourassa) and seconded by the Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville) (T. Bent). The motion carried.

12. Action Item: Draft 2017 Title VI Triennial Report—*Betsy Harvey, MPO Staff*

B. Harvey reintroduced the Draft 2017 Title VI Triennial Report, which the MPO voted out for a 30-day public review period on June 15. The public comment period lasted until July 18, during which MPO staff held two Office Hours (July 6 and July 13), open-

house-style public meetings. Staff received two written comments by the deadline, one from the MBTA Rider Oversight Committee (ROC) and one from member of the public Carl Seglem. There are no substantive changes proposed by staff to the final report from the public review draft report. Subsequent to the MPO's approval, the report will be submitted to MassDOT, FHWA (Federal Highway Administration,) and FTA (Federal Transit Administration).

Vote

A motion to approve the Draft 2017 Title VI Triennial Report was made by the City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department) (J. Gillooly) and seconded by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (E. Bourassa). The motion carried.

13. Systemwide Title VI and Environmental Justice Assessment of TIP Projects—*Betsy Harvey and Grace King, MPO Staff*

K. Quackenbush introduced the presentation on the *Systemwide Title VI and Environmental Justice Assessment of TIP Projects*. MPO Staff currently conduct an equity assessment as part of the LRTP process. For the TIP, staff conducts an assessment that meets with federal approval. These analyses are not sufficient to fully understand the long-term equity implications of TIP programming and, thus, this work was conducted to create a more rigorous methodology for ascertaining the equity implications of TIP roadway projects. The new approach is designed to assess equity on the basis of who actually drives on newly improved roadways and therefore enjoys the time savings and enhanced safety associated with those projects. In addition, this new approach seeks to assess benefits and burdens to people living in the neighborhoods containing TIP projects, The assumption that people living near a project benefit from it doesn't fully capture project impacts— such as safety, air quality, or noise— which may in fact constitute a burden.

Staff is proposing that this assessment using the new method be done following next year's TIP development and approval and for every year thereafter. If the results of this analysis indicate a concern for equity issues in TIP programming, the board may reconsider its equity criteria or take other steps as deemed necessary. This methodology does not currently include non-motorized trips and only looks at roadway projects.

B. Harvey presented the methodology that staff has designed. The objective of the study was to develop a methodology for examining the system-wide benefits and burdens of TIP projects for roadway users and those who live in neighborhoods adjacent to projects, and to test the methodology on a set of representative TIP projects. The aim of this study was not to determine if the TIP considered in the analysis

causes disparate impacts but to develop a usable methodology, which could be further refined.

The methodology consists of several steps:

1. Select metrics to evaluate the TIP. Staff chose travel time and safety, as those metrics are commonly used to evaluate travel impacts and data was readily available.
2. Use the regional travel demand model and other off-model analyses to determine the impacts of each metric on each demographic group: minority, non-minority, low-income, and non-low-income.
3. Determine whether disparate impacts or disproportionate burdens exist for low-income populations and for minority populations by comparing the impacts on them to those on non-low-income and non-minority populations.

Minority populations include those persons who identify on the Census as Black/African American, American Indian or Alaskan Native, Hispanic of any race, and/or Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander. For this study, staff used a definition of low-income as 200% of the national poverty level to better reflect the higher cost of living in the MPO region; this definition correlates strongly with the household definition of low-income.

To test the methodology, staff analyzed the impacts of MPO target-funded highway projects in the FFYs 2016-2020 TIP. Information was sourced from each project's functional design report. Because of data quality concerns, particularly with crashes, the findings only illustrate the methodology and are not the actual impacts of the 2016-20 TIP. Staff feels strongly the need to finalize the methodology before using it in determining results.

One of the goals of this study was to analyze the effects of the TIP on the surrounding neighborhoods – those within a half-mile of each project. Staff compared the demographics of these neighborhoods to that of the MPO region as a whole. Overall, minority populations make up about 28% of the MPO's total population, but are 43% of the TIP neighborhood population. The low-income population makes up about 23% of the total MPO population, but make up 34% of the population in the surrounding neighborhoods. This example indicates that minority and low-income populations are over-represented in the neighborhoods near TIP projects compared to their representation in the entire MPO region. If you assume that people living near a project will use it, then the takeaway would be that minority and low-income populations are well-served by projects in the TIP. However, this assumption doesn't fully capture

project impacts – such as safety, air quality, or noise. Staff wants to develop more robust metrics to fully capture the impacts of the TIP. The purpose of this analysis is to analyze the effects of projects in the aggregate given federal requirements to do so. The methodology can't be used to analyze the impacts of individual projects.

This analysis will not replace the MPO's project evaluation criteria. Rather, it will serve to confirm that the MPO is complying with its Title VI and EJ requirements. If analyses show that TIPs consistently cause disparate impacts or disproportionate burdens, mitigation would be warranted in future TIP programming. Staff must complete updates to the travel model and develop additional metrics for TIP neighborhoods and roadway users before implementing the methodology. Finally, staff must develop a disparate impact/disproportionate burden policy and bring it to the MPO for approval.

Discussion

T. Bennett noted that an issue that often surfaces is low-income populations having to travel farther to access services, and asked whether this could be accounted for. K. Quackenbush replied that this phenomenon is something that enters into this analysis as well as the equity analysis for the LRTP. In terms of income, staff can model characteristics of different income brackets. What is distinctive about this particular methodology is the marriage of model estimates related to roadway users with off-model methods of determining accident-reduction and travel time impacts of TIP projects.

Dennis Crowley (South West Advisory Planning Committee) (Town of Medway) stated that it appeared the analysis indicated a need to shift the way TIP projects in minority and low-income communities are scored to give more weight to environmental justice. He felt that if the MPO were to go that route it would put suburban areas at a disadvantage for TIP funding.

K. Quackenbush replied that staff does not think there is a specific problem with how funding for TIP projects are currently allocated, but wish to add to the MPO board's understanding of the long-term impacts of its decision-making. He reiterated that this work serves to demonstrate a methodology and does not comment on TIP project evaluation criteria. Using this methodology has the potential to assure the MPO that it is not creating or perpetuating inequity. K. Quackenbush added that the current equity criteria only look at the proximity of certain populations to projects. This approach does not consider who actually benefits from a certain projects. The spatial location of an investment does not tell the entire story. Staff is making no recommendations about changing project intake criteria at this point. One of the MPO's six goals relates to equity and the decision to make any changes to the evaluation criteria are up to the board.

T. Bennett stressed the need to look at environmental health benefits. K. Quackenbush responded that the environmental health analysis is something staff is still actively pursuing.

R. Mares applauded staff for undertaking this work and asked how staff would determine that a project is a burden on a community if the analysis is done in aggregate. B. Harvey responded that the assumption of staff is that a robust public process has been undertaken by project proponents on the local level. Staff has a draft policy on disparate impacts for the LRTP. The general approach for this policy is the difference between build and no-build scenarios. R. Mares suggested that staff consider testing this methodology with existing or proposed projects.

Bill Singleton (President, United Neighbors of Lower Roxbury) commented that minority and low-income communities do not view transportation projects in their neighborhoods as a benefit because of the disruption to daily life associated with construction. The history of highway construction has negatively impacted ownership and community vitality. B. Singleton referred to the design of TIP project #605789 (Reconstruction of Melnea Cass Boulevard), which would require the removal of trees on the corridor, criticizing this approach. While B. Singleton stated his appreciation for the MPO board's equity concerns, he noted the lack of representation for people of color on the board. He stressed that the City of Boston should value neighborhood opinions and opposition to the disruption associated with reconstruction of Melnea Cass.

S. Woelfel thanked B. Singleton for his comments and for attending the meeting, adding that the board values this input and needs representatives from minority communities at the table in order for the MPO to make good decisions.

14. Scenario Planning for Developing the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)—*Anne McGahan, MPO Staff*

A. McGahan previously presented recommendations for an initial round of scenario planning for the next LRTP as well as a schedule for LRTP development. The tasks involved in developing an LRTP include:

1. Updating transportation needs in the region
2. Conducting scenario planning
3. Updating demographic and land use information
4. Reaffirming or revising the MPO's vision, goals, and objectives
5. Adopting transportation policies and selecting investment projects and programs for the recommended LRTP

Staff Recommendation

During previous discussions, members expressed an interest in pricing (including tolling and congestion pricing), alternative land uses, and financial constraint. To incorporate the board's input, staff formulated a new recommendation for an initial round of scenarios.

One of the first steps in the LRTP development is (1) updating the Needs Assessment and (2) establishing a baseline for scenario planning (using the travel demand model), in order to identify current and future needs. To do this, staff will conduct two separate model runs:

1. Base-year model run to look at current conditions for comparison to all future-build model runs and the final analysis for recommended LRTP
2. Year 2040 No-Build model run to assess future needs without additional transportation improvements.

The No-Build network includes completed projects, projects currently under construction, projects currently advertised, and projects in the first year of the FFYs 2018-22 TIP. This will allow staff to look at a number of measures such as: capacity constraints on specific transit lines and at park-and-ride lots, congested highway corridors, congested corridors with bus transit service, carbon dioxide and other air quality emissions, vehicle miles traveled, and vehicle hours traveled. Staff would also look at off-model information to identify transit and bicycle gaps, high crash locations, and issues such as pavement and bridge condition. Some of these are performance measures used in the scenario planning process for the previous LRTP and others are part of the performance-based planning process.

Contextual factors in these scenarios include demographics, land use, and transportation system features. The baseline scenario will use 2016 demographic and land use allocation and current conditions. The 2040 No-Build scenario will use the same demographic projections used in *Charting Progress to 2040* (the current LRTP). The Baseline scenario will use the 2016 transit and highway network; the 2040 No-Build scenario will use the 2040 No-build transit and highway network.

These results will provide baseline information, allowing staff to identify specific needs and issues which can be explored through future scenario planning.

Discussion

E. Bourassa asked about the utility of scenario planning with old demographics and land-use estimates. A. McGahan replied that the expectation is that new demographic

projections are not expected to change the future mobility needs drastically from the current demographic projections. There will be time to review the early rounds of scenario planning when new demographics are available. A. McGahan added that MPO staff is working with MAPC and the UMass Donahue Institute to update the demographic projections, which are based on current census data and American Community Service data. Staff is also working with MAPC to update the MassBuilds land-use development tool.

15.Members' Items

E. Bourassa announced that elections for four municipal MPO seats will take place at MAPC's Fall Council meeting on October 25. The seats up for election are one municipality (city or town) from the North Shore Task Force (NSTF) subregion, one municipality (city or town) from the South West Advisory Planning Committee (SWAP) subregion, one town from any part of the Boston region, and one city from any part of the Boston region. Nominations are due by end of September.

D. Crowley asked MassDOT to provide the board with an update on the Green Line Extension (GLX) project at a later meeting.

J. Gillooly provided an update on the reconstruction of Melnea Cass Boulevard. The City of Boston will present to the MPO regarding the project's design in the fall. There have been a series of public meetings over the past year with the Friends of Melnea Cass. The biggest outstanding issue is the need to remove trees along the corridor to create a balanced amount of space on both sides of the road and allow for protected intersections. There are currently over 400 trees on corridor, 50 of which would be impacted by the design. Another 200 would eventually be installed, yielding a net increase in the number of trees in the corridor. Without removing trees, there is no ability to widen bike facilities. The project's 25% drawings are under review by MassDOT. There will be meetings with other city departments, including the Environment department that authored the climate report that indicated the neighborhood around the project is a heat island, to clarify issues around tree removal and storm water drainage. There will be many more opportunities for public dialogue. The City is actively pursuing opportunities to leave trees on the corridor while creating a safe, complete streets corridor. The MPO will be made aware of the direction of the design process.

16.Adjourn

A motion to adjourn was made by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (E. Bourassa) and seconded by MassDOT Highway Division (Marie Rose). The motion carried.

Attendance

Members	Representatives and Alternates
At-Large City (City of Everett)	Jay Monty
At-Large City (City of Newton)	David Koses
At-Large Town (Town of Arlington)	
At-Large Town (Town of Lexington)	Richard Canale
City of Boston (Boston Planning & Development Agency)	Jim Fitzgerald
City of Boston (Boston Transportation Department)	Jim Gillooly
Federal Highway Administration	Nelson Hoffman
Federal Transit Administration	
Inner Core Committee (City of Somerville)	Tom Bent
Massachusetts Department of Transportation	Steve Woelfel
	Bryan Pounds
MassDOT Highway Division	Marie Rose
	John Romano
Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA)	Eric Waaramaa
	Victor Rivas
Massachusetts Port Authority	Laura Gilmore
MBTA Advisory Board	Micha Gensler
Metropolitan Area Planning Council	Eric Bourassa
MetroWest Regional Collaborative (Town of Framingham)	
Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (Town of Bedford)	David Manugian
North Shore Task Force (City of Beverly)	Denise Deschamps
North Suburban Planning Council (City of Woburn)	Jay Corey
Regional Transportation Advisory Council	Tegin Bennett
South Shore Coalition (Town of Braintree)	Melissa Santucci Rozzi
South West Advisory Planning Committee (Town of Medway)	Dennis Crowley
Three Rivers Interlocal Council (Town of Norwood/NVCC)	Steve Olanoff

Other Attendees	Affiliation
Carl Seglem	Boston Resident
Yvonne Lalyre	United Neighbors of Lower Roxbury
Marilyn Wellons	RTAC
Travis Wojcik	Town of Danvers
Ashley Price	Livable Streets Alliance
Rafael Mares	CLF
Bill Singleton	United Neighbors of Lower Roxbury

MPO Staff/Central Transportation Planning Staff

Karl Quackenbush
Lourenço Dantas
Annette Demchur
Róisín Foley
Nick Hart
Betsy Harvey
Sandy Johnston
Ali Kleyman
Robin Mannion
Anne McGahan
Jen Rowe
Michelle Scott
