

Massachusetts Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Board Meeting Notes
Wednesday, July 22, 2026, 1:00 – 3:00 PM
Virtual

Opening Remarks: Jaclyn Youngblood, MassDOT's Deputy Chief Innovation Officer and MABPAB Co-chair acknowledged the recent spate of bicycle and pedestrian-related fatalities in addition to an uptick in vulnerable use crashes in general. Normally, MABPAB meetings begin with celebrating new infrastructure and great group ride, roll, and stroll events, and that is part of the work. While it is important to be joyful in our walking and biking, and to hold space for progress, part of the work that MABPAB does, in our organizations, and out in our neighborhoods and communities is to make room for the painful and sad parts, too - to be in community together when we're grieving the loss of life across our state. Jaclyn closed with thanking board members for showing up today, and every day, and for taking some time to sit with the gravity of the work we're trying to do

MABPAB Co-chair, Alexa Gomberg, asked for a moment of silence for the victims and shared a tribute song played at Louisa Gag's recent vigil (click [here](#) and scroll to 5:04). Gag was a City of Boston official struck and killed by a truck while cycling on July 9

Roll Call: Pete Sutton, ex-officio, called the meeting to order and called roll

Golden Gears: Jaclyn gave some background on this new statewide initiative. [Golden Gears](#) is an AARP-funded program that MassDOT will be launching in Worcester, Everett, and Springfield specifically to support adults 50 years old and older to use local bike share in their communities and to connect to the path infrastructure that's there. This is coming out of the Special Commission on Micromobility, trying to encourage and increase usage of various micromobility modes, and also aligns with the Governor's executive order on age-friendly communities. The program will be free-of-charge: it will provide free cycling equipment in the form of helmets or gloves for those who need it. There's also some community building and social cohesion elements of the program, including group rides on shared use path infrastructure, followed by post-ride coffee and social time. To encourage continued use, free bike share passes will be offered as an incentive to see how it might fit into your day-to-day trips where it makes sense

A kit of all curricular materials will be made available, teaching folks how to use the app or the kiosk, how to dock and undock the bikes, various tips and tricks of using bike share, which is a little bit different from personal bike usage, and highlighting the benefits of using bike share as an alternative to owning and maintaining your own bike. Jaclyn encouraged board members to help spread the word, welcoming folks in the surrounding communities as well. You don't have to live in Worcester, Everett, or Springfield explicitly, but certainly, nearby communities, if they're able to take advantage of the bike share program, we'd like to invite them to participate as well, and wanting to make sure that other communities can run a version of this program after the grant funding concludes

Follow-up Discussion for 2027 Strategic Highway Safety Plan & Vulnerable Road User Assessment:

Mike Knodler, Director of Transportation at UMASS Amherst's Transportation Center (UMTC) provided a recap (attached) on input received thus far regarding public outreach being conducted over the summer for the MA Strategic Highway Safety Plan – required to be updated every five years and scheduled for release in 2028. The latest version will also require a vulnerable roadway user (VRU) assessment that has previously been a separate initiative. VRU are defined by law as either a pedestrian, a bicyclist, another cyclist, or a person on a personal conveyance (such as a wheelchair). Development of the SHSP will include:

- Historic data and analyses
 - Overall Trends – Who, What, Where, When
 - Process / consultation
 - Strategies
 - Implementation
- VRU focus backed by data
 - VRU definition/restrictions/education
 - Lighting
 - Speed
 - Vehicle Design including e-bikes/e-mobility

Input was sought from MABPAB during the previous meeting on what to focus on, what new items to include and best paths to implementation:

- Accounting for unreported VRU incidents (such as crashes and near misses)
- More accurate data collection
- Speed management (the single most powerful lever for VRU safety)
- Proactively Identifying High-Risk Areas

The strongest recurring themes were:

- Overall Transportation Education
- Automated enforcement and supporting legislation
- Micromobility
- Pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure improvements
- Better use of data and technology

Questions and comments included:

- Referencing the new law *The Act to Reduce Traffic Fatalities*, which will apply to, obviously, large trucks and vehicles owned by the Commonwealth. I think figuring out a way to get more trucks to have side guards, to be thinking about these blind spots. They're so dangerous, I know. I just think this is something we can fix and should be included, something where we're thinking about these large vehicles and how do we make those safer, especially if they're in our small neighborhoods
- In the previous Strategic Highway Safety Plan there was, under Section 3, 3.1 an active role to effect change in vehicle design features and use. I'm just wondering if we can be stronger with that and really think about the purchasing power that the state has, and that municipalities have, and if we can really insist on types of designs that they can choose from, and also that they should be implementing side guards when they are buying those vehicles
 - Seeing as this is a statewide plan there's opportunities to work with our colleagues, who purchase vehicles for other state agencies and those who purchase their own vehicles to make sure that everyone is in compliance...there's sort of a whole-of-government approach on that
 - When that initiative was added previously, it was a bit of a conversation because it circled back to, well, the state doesn't really have the ability to change vehicle specifications and vehicle design, and so it was added, not necessarily knowing what could really be done. In fact, if you look at the sub-initiative, it more or less says do it. We should just have a voice. And I think one takeaway since 2023 is it's actually been effective in terms of implementing change, and I think the strategy of taking it further is really a really good idea, and something that definitely should be part of the conversation moving forward. I think we realize the potential of that recommendation, and we can do more
- What are the hooks that we can have to get private companies to have that be a mandate in order for safety features on trucks that we know will save lives? Is that something that we could do through the RMV level? Is that something that we could do through purchasing power? Can we find some bullet points that might be specific?
 - We have invited the RMV come talk about the truck safety law and the implementation thus far, tentatively slated for November, so we can have maybe a broader discussion about that then, in addition to working asynchronously on it. In the supplemental budget that passed for the Fair Share Act, there will be \$1 million for municipal truck safety retrofit devices - that's new in this budget cycle, so looking forward to supporting municipalities on that, but also noted on the private company side
- I wanted to put a strong voice in for retesting, and to some extent, also re-education of seniors. I think that at 65 you should have to be tested, and then every 5 years, and maybe at 75, every 3 years. I live in senior housing. When I have voiced this opinion, you can imagine my neighbors were not very happy. But, you know, they say it's age discrimination. Yes, it is. And we discriminate at the other end, too. We don't let 13-year-old kids drive, not because they don't have the acuity, but their sense of responsibility to be in charge of a vehicle. At my age, we have a very good sense of responsibility, but our skills are deteriorating. There's no one who wouldn't say they aren't
 - Illinois requires retesting: a road test for renewal for every test after 75. Might be worth looking at some of their experience with that as part of the next steps of the conversation
- I would encourage a use of AI in doing comparisons between the previous plan when updating, at least for the beginning level set. Of course, checked by humans so you don't get slop - so that we could see what the big deltas are and be more efficient in creating our report

- I'd like to challenge the assumption that the state doesn't have the ability to influence design. I would offer up the state of California in the 1970s affected the implementation of catalytic converters on every single vehicle. They were the only state at the time. I do believe we have the ability, and maybe we need to find the right levers to pull
- I would add that I would like to see e-bike manufacturers in the same category. Yet again, at a store recently, saw an e-bike sign, and it's clearly an e-moto. The pedals don't move, they're fixed, and the wattage is way above a Class 3 e-bike. So, I would like, in the interest of furthering micromobility gains, to add e-bike as well as vehicle modifications that our state requires if you want to get a state contract, drive in the state, not pay a fee, whatever the lever is
- How can this act create faster and more comprehensive legislative action? Because where the last act made specific recommendations, only two of five were implemented. What can we do in the creation of this new revision to ensure that we get more comprehensive legislative action to put things into reality quickly?
- MassBike are happy to work with our legislative allies to file bills, and for folks who are unfamiliar, the legislative session's wrapping up this year, so we'll have the opportunity to file bills early in 2027, which I think could coincide well with the release of this. If we want to start the work now to get some draft language and some key allies, but one of the challenges we face as advocates is that we can only push things so far, and we really would appreciate the backing of the administration in a lot of this stuff. Letters from the secretary are very helpful, letters from the administrator are very helpful
- Much credit goes to Jonathan Gulliver for getting the Act to Reduce Traffic Fatalities bill after a decade's worth of work. So, it's incumbent on everybody here to make sure this is moving forward. Some stuff the governor files on her own, which is great. She filed a Traffic Safety Cameras bill, which was for work zones and school zones - more limited than what we were trying to seek, but it's something that shows that the administration is supportive
- Advocates need to work with their legislators. You've got good connections who are also traffic safety oriented, and micromobility oriented, too. Senator Fernandez is really big on the e-bike stuff. So it's incumbent on us to ask them to file, but I think that's only the first step. The chasing down does require everybody here to support the bills as they move forward
- That was the good thing about the Micromobility Commission: It set the stage stating these are things we need, with the recommendations. So, I'd hope we could do something similar with the Strategic Highway Safety Plan
 - MassDOT has a legislative affairs team that works very closely with the legislature, and they have lots of work to do once the plan comes out - making sure we're aligned and going to the Joint Committee on Transportation co-chairs, and all of the pieces
- Can we write letters from this group in that advocacy capacity to legislators, or on behalf of, or to the governor to suggest that she file legislation?
 - Yes, MABPAB has written letters of support in the past and is well situated to do so
- Can UMTC elaborate on pushback they've heard so far regarding automated enforcement?
 - Privacy issues, big brother watching, surveillance and to a lesser degree the financial aspect: whether or not this was a true safety measure or more of a revenue scheme
- We really have to do the hard work of fixing the streets and getting the vehicles smaller and not rely so much on in-vehicle technology. New laws should have safeguards so that cities and towns can't use the money for revenue enhancement, for example, or that it can't be used for racial profiling. I think there'd be support here in Brockton, because the speeding and the red-light running is so rampant
- What's our mode shift goals? And how are those overlapping with not just to be safer, but trying to convert away from the need to drive as much. (e.g. older drivers) Is there a way that we can align our safety measures, our safety standards, our climate goals, and our mode shift goals, and kind of think along those lines? Is that something that we can incorporate into this Strategic Highway Safety Plan? Or at least, if we can't file it for the federal purposes, is that something that can be a running thread in the background of the conversation? Because I think we all need to think of the bigger picture here of having fewer drivers is ultimately going to make the road safer
- is there any precedent for the SHSP to advise adopting congestion pricing models? That's something that has worked really well in New York City for lowering the number of drivers
 - No, that did not come up in conversation this round. It's a very politically charged issue and would likely detract from all the other strategies proposed
- Could you define vulnerable road user?
 - It ranges from pedestrians, cyclists, hand cyclists, people on a horse - just a category of users who are more vulnerable. Anyone outside of the vehicle is a vulnerable user (road worker, officer, EMT, etc)

- Any major differences in public outreach in regards to urban vs rural concerns?
 - Not much, though the virtual settings pulled from a wide array of audiences, so it was difficult to determine locations of those participants. Of the in-person meetings, the rural ones were more advocacy-focused while the urban ones were more policy-driven

New Member Spotlight: Liam Gousios Liam serves as a member of Walk/Bike Springfield and has been involved in improving infrastructure throughout the city, including safety crossing upgrades in front of the public library on State St – the site of previous pedestrian fatalities. Working for years in bike retail, Liam has spent hundreds, maybe thousands of hours talking with people one-on-one about why they want to ride a bike, but also why they don't want to ride a bike - their concerns of safety or difficulty. Liam provides an invaluable service to his community through years of helping people get set up cycling for the first time, advising on taking their first commute to work, helping them find route recommendations, and ultimately helping them consider transportation in a new way that makes it possible for them

Trails for All: Paul Jahnige, Director of the MA Office of Outdoor Recreation (OOR) provided an overview (attached) on his agency and the Trails for All initiative. OOR was established a little more than two and a half years ago and is part of a national movement to create offices of recreation within states, MA was the 18th, there's now 25 across the country. About half of them are on the environmental side of administrations, and about half are on the economic development side. A couple of the pillars OOR seeks to establish are:

- growing the outdoor recreation economy in Massachusetts. For the past two years, MA has had the fastest growing outdoor recreation economy in the country
- To make Massachusetts one of the most welcoming, accessible, diverse, equitable places to play outside in the nation

Phase 1 of the Trails for All initiative involves extensive public outreach, with the three discussion topics being posed to MABPAB for input:

- *Should accessible trail gap analysis become a standard part of Regional Bicycle & Pedestrian Plans?*
- *Where do you see yourselves relative to wetlands permitting and other barrier revision as it relates to trail access?*
- *s MABPAB the right venue to help shape the Transit to Trails and Safe Routes to Trails recommendations?*

Question and comments included:

- I certainly really appreciate the report's acknowledgement of regulatory barriers related to wetland permitting. There's draft regulatory reform that's been released recently and noticed that unpaved accessible paths (i.e. stone dust paths greater than 3 feet) were not exempt. Mystic River Watershed Association want to help to advance these accessible spaces and streamline permitting, but it seems like a lot of the barriers, maybe at least in these draft regulations, were still existing, so I'm wondering if you might be able to elaborate on that
 - I would encourage folks to really think about leaning into what this might mean for accessible trails. As you note, up to 3 feet is not an accessible trail. There is no one with an assistive device who can use an up to 3-foot trail, so that particular wording limits that provision - minor activities in the buffer zone exemption to trails that do not meet people with disabilities. I think there is real room within these wetland regulations to include that comment to widen that provision at least to 4 feet, if not wider.
- Can you explain what an RDA is?
 - It's a request for determination of applicability, and you're basically asking the local conservation commission whether they need to issue you a permit or not. It's a lower level before an NOI, which is a notice of intent, which is a full filing, which requires sometimes, depending on your CONCOM and your project - stamped engineered plans, tight specifications. So, when we're talking about trail projects, it can be complicated - we certainly have had trail projects where the permitting costs are several times the trail construction costs
- As a municipality, we don't have grant writers. We don't have grant administrators. I would beg you to get formula funding, and wouldn't it be fab if it went into a Chapter 90 and it had its own little category of - here's what you can use this funding for, here's a two-page form to submit in the portal, and a quick OK, and we roll

- Micromobility is another area. We're going to have to build infrastructure. Don't know how we're going to get there yet. So I'd ask for funding, formula base, chunked into Chapter 90, or whatever simplistic mechanism we can devise
 - I think both those are really great points. I would love to think more and learn more about the Chapter 90 possibility, just the eligibility around that, because I think that would be really interesting to think about - across both the trail itself, but also the connection to the trail
- Falmouth has a lot of beautiful, open space with beautiful, big, wide, crushed gravel trails. The problem is access from the parking lot to the trail, or from the street to the trail, or transport from Cape Cod Regional Transit Authority to the trail (referring to non-fixed route paratransit). So, it would be great to value connectivity as much as we value a brand-new trail, because they're there, they're gorgeous, they're well used, they add a ton of value, but sometimes existing infrastructure can't get you there
 - On the flex paratransit, issue, one other thing we heard from various customers is that some regional transits will only take you to a street address, and not all accessible trails or parks are accessed from street addresses. They're accessed from GPS lat-long coordinates
- Will there be signage telling people what to expect for someone who is not disabled and isn't familiar, with what that's like and what they might see on the trail? A good example would be *No dogs allowed except for service animals*
 - Yeah, I think it does make sense. Both of sides of those issues came up in our process, in our public meetings. The one side being – no, you really need to think about signage that says dogs not allowed, right? That signage needs to say, accept service animals, or whatever it is
 - You need to communicate appropriately to other users, to able-bodied users. The flip side that we highlight a lot is the information that needs to be provided both on the web, before coming, and on posted signage and materials. For people who come to it with different mobility - different abilities because everybody comes to accessibility with a different need. Just having a checkbox that says accessible/not accessible doesn't work for most users, because they have specific needs, and so we really need to think about the kind of information that we're providing so people can make decisions
 - Another example are for folks who may be sensorially sensitive: Low voices, and not too much activity, and things like that, right? I don't think you can tell people exactly how to use the space as long as they're using it within the allowed rules, so that gets a little trickier. But you can try to be clear about what people can expect when they arrive, and what experience they might find when they get there
- Conflicts with other users is always going to be an issue. If a path is going to be accessible, it's going to be wide enough for bikes, right? There is a new project that is just listing a walking path – perhaps to deter dirt bikes? Dogs on leashes can also be a hazard for cyclists
 - Ultimately, it is up to the owner what trail user rules to establish. The report focuses more on the importance of having trails that provide access to natural areas and the benefits they provide
- There was some content on design guidance for soft surface trails, and that is something here in the Pioneer Valley we've struggled with. We always seem to come up a little short, on that design spec that really holds up, especially if there's any grade involved in the trail. Having something along those lines that would reinforce those efforts would be wonderful
- For Chapter 90, there's so many other eligible categories other than paving roads. I don't know why adding mileage for accessible trails couldn't be a component of that formula, and it would be a wonderful addition, especially for maintenance
 - Yes maintenance is a real challenge for many of these trails. The report does go into some detail on soft surface and specs. It is a challenging thing, because it also gets to installation and installer knowledge and into quarry material and things like that, so it's not a simple issue
- Transportation to outdoor recreation is so crucial. Can we have bus service to trail destinations like they have in Albany, New York? I often want to go but can only get so far on the commuter rail. Is there any type of program or agency that would serve this need?
 - Boston's [Age Strong Commission](#) would be an ideal place to reach out to regarding potential trips to recreational areas using their buses
 - MassDOT's Community Transit Grant Program also provides funding for service through Councils on Aging and other transportation providers to do infill or other specific trips and

will follow up to see if there's a subcategory that could be for recreation. Houghton's Pond service from the MBTA is a good example

- MABPAB is the right venue to continue to help shape the Transit to Trails and Safe Routes to Trails recommendations
- A new Safe Routes to Trails pot of funding would be welcome if it allows for those connections within a quarter mile to outdoor recreation, allowing those types of small projects to be eligible as well, I think would be very valuable and help to save lives. You have people walking their dogs at dusk trying to cross these parkways. I'm thinking about South Border Road in Medford as well, that doesn't have a single crosswalk between the Middlesex Fells and Medford and Winchester neighborhoods. There are endless examples of that, and so not only the accessible trails themselves. That adds up to a big safety picture - I think this would be really valuable in advancing safety for everyone
- One item not mentioned in Trails for All Report that I think is relevant for MABPAB is that in some cases, MBTA owns old railroad right-of-ways which may be suitable for accessible trails but are somewhat in a gray area due to potential future MBTA use of the corridor. In Southeastern Mass, the right-of-way proposed for South Coast Rail Phase 2 is in this sort of gray area of not knowing if that Phase 2 will ever come to fruition. I think the MBTA could also be more proactive about engaging with communities around stewarding their right-of-ways as accessible trails as an interim use of the corridor
 - MABPAB can certainly bring up the rails-with-trails issue internally with the MBTA to get better clarity about the current state, and then how could we maybe shift that going forward
- Glad to see that wayfinding and signage has been addressed in the report. Oftentimes these trails are hiding in plain sight, and a lot of people don't even know that they exist unless you sign them and guide people in the right direction
- Is there something that MA Office of Travel and Tourism or DCR or others could do to actually provide cycling or hiking equipment to reduce the barriers for people who might otherwise not have the ability to access trails - even if trails are there in the first place?
 - There is a lot of potential regarding gear share, access to equipment, but also access to information - how do you find out where equipment is? All Out Adventures and Waypoint Adventures are both programs that do a lot of great work in this space. DCR now has four different kinds of accessibility equipment across the state that one can take out. Various land trusts have some different, adaptive equipment
 - Some questions we still need to answer: Where do you put the database together for this stuff? How do people find out about it? What's the role for libraries and libraries of things? But also, there's that comfort piece - maybe you haven't used that piece of equipment before. How do you learn how to use that piece of equipment? Is it right for you? All that kind of stuff. I think there's a lot of work to be done

Some closing remarks from Paul Jahnige:

- One of the things we're doing at this stage is just encouraging other stakeholders to really spend time with the report and see about where they can lean in, and ideally think about making some commitments, whether that's landowners, regional planners or others
- I hope that we will be forming an advisory council, which will continue to guide implementation, but also will work to advance certain elements that have been identified. We've talked about an evaluation tool that landowners or communities might be able to use to look at their existing trails and see where there's the most strategic opportunities for upgrading
- I think, again, to continue to help to advance some of the things that we talked about today, whether that's the Transit to Trails or the Safe Routes to Trails kinds of initiatives, so we would look forward to collaborating with MABPAB on that going forward
- On the funding side, I think it'd be great to continue to think about that from a couple of different angles. Such as, what are the existing funding sources and maybe there's a Chapter 90 connection here for certain kinds of these things?
- What are some of the other existing funding sources? Where can health systems begin to think about leaning into this as well, and potentially providing some funding?
- I do think there needs to be advocacy for some new pots of funding that are more targeted towards these topics we've discussed today, because this is something that cannot happen without resources, particularly achieving that vision statewide

Other Announcements

MassDOT Golden Gears Events:

Date - Sunday, September 27

Location - The Gazebo at Rivergreen Park, Everett

Time - 9:30a.m. - 12:30p.m., optional "ride refresh" at 8:00a.m.

Date - Sunday, September 20

Location - Blackstone River Greenway Visitor Center, Worcester

3 Paul Clancy Wy, Worcester, MA 01607

Time - 9:30a.m. - 12:30p.m., optional "ride refresh" at 8:00a.m.

Date - Sunday, September 27

Location - UMass Amherst Henry M. Thomas III Center, Springfield

1500 Main St, Springfield, MA 01115

Time - 9:30a.m. - 12:30p.m., optional "ride refresh" TBD

- Rainbow Day: Saturday, September 5 in Andover. The run finishes at the 3rd annual Rainbow Day celebration in the park. Rainbow Day will have free fun kids activities from face painting to crafts to bubbles, yoga, a bike rodeo, touch a truck and so much more. <https://www.therainbow.fund/rainbowday>
- Next MAPBPAB meeting: September 16, Natick Town Hall (hybrid) 1-3 pm
- List of board members in attendance (see below)
- Other attendees:
 - Lorenzo Varone (MassDOT)
 - Barbara LaChance (MassDOT D5)
 - Michael Knodler (UMTC)
 - Chris Sorensen (MassDOT D1)
 - Nick Daigle (MassDOT D3)
 - Kyle Mowatt (OCPC)
 - Nick Russo (BRPC)
 - Cheryl-Ann Senior (MassDOT D5)
 - Adam Wriggins (CMRPC)
 - Tom Ruta (MassDOT D2)
 - Sarah Freeman (Boston)
 - John York (Bourne)
 - Mike Murphy (MassDOT)
 - Colleen Medeiros (CCC)
 - Betsy Johnson (Walk/Bike Springfield)
 - Alexis Hosea-Abbott (MassBike)
 - Pedro Hernandez (MassDOT)
 - Jon Gray (SRPEDD)
 - Joshua Grzegorzewski (FHWA)
 - Tim Paris (MassDOT D4)
 - Beth Giannini (FRCOG)
 - Melissa Santley (MassDOT D6)
 - Leah Goddard (MassDOT)
 - Amanda Lewis (DCR)
 - Jonah Williams (MassDOT)
 - Jessica Ballard (Analog Devices)
 - Bonnie Polin (MassDOT)
 - Charlotte Fleetwood (City of Boston)
 - Isabella Gilmartin (City of Boston)
 - Allon Dubler (City of Boston)
 - Sam Klugherz (City of Boston)
 - Thomas Gex (City of Boston)
 - Meera Deean (City of Boston)
 - Michael Evans (City of Boston)
 - Alejandro Gonzalez (City of Boston)

- John Monacelli (City of Boston)
- Daniel Milbrandt (City of Boston)
- Michelle Slater (City of Boston)
- Riley Moran (City of Boston)
- Jeff Kaplan (City of Boston)
- Michael Huang (City of Boston)
- Caroline Filice Smith (City of Boston)
- Rihabe Oulal (City of Boston)
- Bryce Wiley (City of Boston)
- Rachel Elmkies (City of Boston)
- Hernan Schlosman (City of Boston)

MA BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY BOARD

Board Member Sign-In Sheet

May 27, 2026 – Salem City Hall Annex

Member Name	Attended	Notes
VACANT MassDOT-Highway		
Matt Warfield MBTA	no	
Pete Sutton MassDOT-Planning	yes	
Kurt Gaertner EOEEA	yes	
Gerald Autler DCR	no	
Jaclyn Youngblood MassDOT	yes	
Kirby Lecy DPH	no	
Charlie Ticotsky MOTT	no	
Lt. Sean Reardon EOPSS	yes	
Jeff McCollough MARPA	yes	
Amanuel Regassa MARPA	yes	
Jackie Jones MARPA	yes	
Mary Beth Ellis – public member	yes	
Nathan David Obeng-Amoako – public member	yes	
Galen Mook – MassBike	yes	
Bonnie Roalsen – public member	yes	
William Gousios – public member	yes	
Katherine Jansen - public member	yes	
Jed Hresko – public member	yes	
Kristine Acevedo – public member	yes	
Brendan Kearney – WalkBoston	yes	
Mike Brousseau - public member	no	
Eleni Christofa – public member	yes	
Alexa Gomberg – public member	yes	
Chery Pavlik – public member	yes	
Karl Alexander – public member	yes	