# Summary of Comments for the Metropolitan Planning Organization's (MPO) Revised Vision, Goals, and Objectives
## January 17, 2019

| WRITTEN COMMENTS | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Commenter** | **LRTP Goal** | **Comment** | **MPO Staff Response** |
| Sarah Hamilton, Medical Academic and Scientific Community Organization (MASCO) | Economic Vitality Goal and Objectives | Objective talks about addressing targeted development site; however, Focus 40 identifies "Priority Places" where transportation is not currently sufficient. The objectives should cross-reference Focus40 and add criteria for investments that serve locations like the Longwood Medical Area | Proposed Change to Economic Vitality Objective: Prioritize transportation investments that serve residential, commercial, and logistics targeted development sites and "Priority Places" identified in MBTA's Focus 40 plan |
| Len Diggins | Multiple | 1) In System Preservation the notion of "modernization" needs more detail. Would like to see an emphasis on modernization that includes a focus on: (a)  Interconnectivity among various transportation/transit systems, especially regarding data sharing (b) Setting up systems with the intention of data mining rather than figuring out how to mine data after the systems have been implemented (c) Better asset management across all transportation/transit systems (d) Interoperability with future technology (which may require collaboration with industry and educational institutions) | Details will be considered when reviewing evaluation criteria and performance measures |
| | | 2) Under Transportation Equity goal suggests changing "sex" to "gender" | Title VI protection is based on sex, not gender |
| | | 3) Liked the emphasis on emerging technologies in the vision—hoping the MPO won't wait until a technology has been fully developed, because it may be harder to use the technology in a way that meets the MPO's goals. | No response required |
| | | 4) Liked the emphasis on transit system safety events that are not crashes | |
| | | 5) Supports the emphasis on sidewalks in the System Preservation section. Beyond preservation, he supports any effort that encourages walking and makes it safer. 6) Agrees with managing auto/bicycle parking rather than building more spots; also add more bicycle parking spots wherever it can be done in a cost-effective manner | |

# Summary of Comments for the Metropolitan Planning Organization's (MPO) Revised Vision, Goals, and Objectives
## January 17, 2019

| SURVEY COMMENTS | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Commenter** | **LRTP Goal** | **Comment** | **MPO Staff Response** |
| Survey | System Preservation | Resiliency needs to be emphasized | Staff is proposing the System Preservation goal be strengthened to include resiliency in goal and objectives. Resiliency was also added to the vision. |
| Survey | Capacity Management and Mobility | Needs more emphasis on multi-person vehicles—more emphasis should be on pooling—either commuter, shuttles, or cars | The Capacity Management and Mobility goal for the roadway objective supports non-single-occupant vehicle travel options |
| Survey | Capacity Management and Mobility | Needs more emphasis on multi-person vehicles with a goal for a significantly larger portion of commuters attracted to multi-person vehicles | The Capacity Management and Mobility goal for the roadway objective supports non-single-occupant vehicle travel options |
| Survey | Clean Air and Clean Communities | Transportation must lower greenhouse gas emissions | This is included as an objective in the Clean Air and Sustainable Communities goal |
| Survey | Economic Vitality | Private businesses should be brought into the mix | The MPO accounts for private businesses in its evaluation criteria used when selecting transportation investments and projects in its Community Transportation Program. |
| Survey | Vision | The scope of the vision needs to be greater, and the geographic area covered needs to be bigger | The MPO is responsible for the 97 municipality area; however, it coordinates with the state and adjoining MPOs when considering transportation investments in the region. |
| Survey | Vision | Vision has too many buzzwords—questioning equitable access for whom and what is excellent mobility? We should be specific so we can derive performance measures | Equity populations are defined in the Transportation Equity objectives. Excellent mobility is defined in the Capacity Management and Mobility objectives. |
| Survey | Vision | The vision is OK | No response required |
| Survey | Technical Assistance | Include a specific objective to assist communities with regional negotiation of rail trail or other trail acquisition work | This could be covered through the technical assistance program. |
| Survey | Performance Measures | There should be a metric to measure emerging technologies. Also, transit should be "free" for riders, paid for by the huge international corporations | Details will be considered when reviewing evaluation criteria and performance measures |

**Thank you for taking the Boston Region MPO's survey about the MPO's vision, goals, and objectives. Please review the draft language (pdf) (html) before taking the survey. This survey should take approximately 5 minutes to complete.**

1. How well does the following proposed vision align with your own vision for transportation in the region?

*The Boston Region MPO envisions a modern, well-maintained transportation system that supports a sustainable, healthy, livable, and economically vibrant region. To achieve this vision, the transportation system must be safe and resilient; incorporate emerging technologies; and provide equitable access, excellent mobility, and varied transportation options.* *

| Not at all | Somewhat | Very well |
|---|---|---|

## Please use the following boxes to provide your feedback about the MPO's proposed vision, goals, and objectives?

2. What aspects of the proposed vision, goals, and objectives, if any, require clarification?

3. What changes or additions, if any, would you make to the proposed vision, goals, and objectives?