

Massachusetts Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Board Meeting Notes
Wednesday, May 31, 2023, 1:00 – 3:00 PM
Virtual Meeting

Welcome & Introductions: Pete Sutton, ex-officio, called the meeting to order, called roll and motioned to accept minutes from the previous meeting.

Update on MassDOT's Beyond Mobility Long Range Transportation Plan

Derek Krevat - Manager of MPO Activities within MassDOT's Office of Transportation Planning - provided an update on this initiative (attached). Beyond Mobility will serve as a strategic plan for MassDOT, guide the future of our capital program, and document the most pressing transportation priorities for Massachusetts to address between now and 2050. Putting public feedback at the center of the Plan, the Beyond Mobility project team is conducting robust public engagement that includes community activations across Massachusetts, focus groups with traditionally underrepresented communities, web-based surveys, and mapping exercises, and more.

In the past year, focus has centered around six priority areas:

- Safety
- Destination Connectivity
- Travel Experience
- Reliability
- Supporting clean Transportation
- Resiliency

Extensive public engagement (public surveys with over 3,500 responses as well as focus groups, stakeholder interviews, and workshops with a focus on EJ communities) identified the areas above as the most important priorities for MassDOT to address. The final Plan will be structured by these six priority areas. Each one will have a vision statement, values statements, and a set of problem statements. "Social & Geographic Equity" and "Financial & Staff Resources" are considered "cross-cutting themes" that underlie all seven priority areas. The following items rose to the top of the public engagement priorities list:

- Car-free connectivity
- More bicycle, pedestrian and transit infrastructure
- Improved bike/pedestrian connections and wayfinding to transit stations
- More frequent bus and commuter rail service

Questions and comments included:

- As far as the public engagement angle, what was the most successful tool - was there one? Was it just a combination of everything that you threw out there? Or was there one that you were just like - oh, this made such a difference?
 - Quite simply, meeting with people in person again. MassDOT had a survey which I think is a pretty common public engagement tool. But I think those activations we did of actually going out and meeting people where they were was really helpful in getting the response rate up and making sure that we were getting responses from communities that we haven't heard from before. I'd say that one was probably biggest. Also, the focus groups we did - being willing to go out and that principle of meeting people where they are, I think, was really key
 - Another best practice we learned was to actually not go to transit locations or transportation hubs. Because that's when people are trying to go to and from places, and they're in a rush, and they're trying to catch their train or do what they're trying to do. It was much better when we were just out on the sidewalk, or in a supermarket parking lot, or on the corner and intercepting people that way
- As the lead consultant on public engagement for Go Boston 2030, (Boston's 15 year Transportation Plan) we were making a conscious decision to center equity, and how we did public engagement. We made a conscious decision that the first year of the process we wouldn't do any meetings and we were strictly going out to meet people where they were at, which might have been a back to school fair or Thanksgiving turkey giveaway, or farmers market or a senior center. And work just like MassDOT did - connect with a network of local partners that would also help extend our outreach efforts

- It just shows in your data between phase one and phase two: how different the population of responses was, and I think learning (for all of us) is around public engagement and transit issues or transportation planning issues to do that from the outset, right? Because the first phase is setting the priorities essentially, which is in some ways the most important part; and the importance of getting those voices in the mix in terms of shaping, setting the agenda essentially, and shaping the priorities. It's so key
- I'm so happy to see that those were some approaches you took, and that it really yielded success. And I'm always happy to be a resource or sounding board if it's ever useful for lessons learned, as with Go Boston 2030 and its public engagement piece
- For context - in East Boston, where I live - I look at my white middle class neighbors and the conversation they're having around transportation - it's about parking. We need more car free options. It's so different. I'd also love to make a pitch for a water connection, water connectivity, to be a piece of the conversation here, because we are just struggling so much around that in this neighborhood
 - That was a big inspiration for MassDOT - Go Boston 2030 plan: we looked at that as a reference and acknowledge that water transit is definitely going to play a role this summer once the Summer Tunnel closes for 2 months – very timely
- I'm intrigued with the meeting in a box concept. Can you briefly describe what that was, and were you present at that? Or was it really something that you just handed off to somebody else?
 - MassDOT was present. We had at least one staff member present at all of them as well as other groups to co-lead the meetings. We were there in a facilitator's role. I think a big part of that was partnering with different organizations. We had great input in particular from MA Healthy Aging Collaborative, and MA Independent Living Centers
 - We developed meeting materials and a survey to distribute while they were doing the focus groups, then using that as a basis of the discussion for the focus group. We got some great results from that as well. We want to scale it up in the future to make it more of that traditional meeting in a box which is giving people sort of a facilitator guide and then having them conduct the meetings
- It seems like one thing that MassDOT is doing really effectively is leveraging data: you've got 2023 at your fingertips in a lot of ways from a technology standpoint. But you're understanding all the people who aren't using that level of technology to do things - and I think it really jumped out at me
- You were talking about things you learned in phase 2, i.e. people wanting wayfinding, and just the number of people who can't or aren't relying on a smart phone for mobility and wayfinding. It's great that we have all these digital tools, but for all the people who aren't accessing digital tools or new to the space, or that aren't in their language - I think that you guys seem to have nailed down a lot of that. And I'm hoping we can see more of that moving forward, like how do we continue to have high quality analog for people or things, either in multiple languages or using clear symbols?
- A good example: some commuter rail stops that are not in the right place on Google Maps, if you're trying to get there on foot for the first time. If you go the wrong way, you're on the wrong side of the track and then you're not in a place that you can even get to the station - little things like that even for people who have the technology but aren't familiar with a place. That's really the important part, I think, as well
 - MassDOT's Rail and Transit Division has been great about helping us to come up with ways to address that and think about ways to bring that into programming. They're focusing much effort around trip planning and ride match programs. But thinking about ways that we can help folks get around more easily
- Has place-based infrastructure risen to the level that MassDOT was predicting last year, or have other needs just become more of a priority?
 - The needs assessment task kind of morphed from being partly about site specific locations to being more of an assessment of what are the broader problems - sort of like flipping it around. Instead of identifying locations, we're defining a broader problem, then saying which locations are driving this problem. Phase 2 will address this more in depth
- What is the timeline overall for this whole study/initiative?
 - We're aiming at the end of the calendar year – December 2023 – for the study to be completed

Baystate Bike Month recap

Pete Sutton gave a recap of events MassDOT participated in during the month of May, including:

- South Coast Bikeway Alliance annual summit in New Bedford
- Bruce Freeman Rail Trail groundbreaking ceremony in Sudbury
- Mattapoisett Rail Trail completion and soft opening

- Groveland Community Trail opening ceremony

Galen Mook from MassBike provided some additional highlights from around the state:

- 190 official events through 70 municipalities
- 4-foot passing law ride to raise awareness in Springfield
- New bike comfort station and repair facility named in honor of Kitty Knox at REI Co-op in Cambridge
- Mayor's ride in Holyoke
- Bike breakfasts in Northampton and Boston

Pete also provided some additional details regarding the MassDOT roll-out of the 4-foot passing signs (attached) and will follow-up to see if signage can include pedestrian symbols as well. Some communities have been enquiring about this issue on roads where no sidewalks exist.

Vulnerable Roadway Users (VRU) safety assessment findings

Stacey Schwartz – GIS Specialist within MassDOT's Highway Division Traffic Safety section – provided the most recent findings ([here](#)) using a data-driven approach to identify vulnerable road users, such as pedestrians and cyclists. Stacey posed two questions to MABPAB at the outset: How can these findings be used to drive solutions to effectively reach address and protect vulnerable road user communities in Massachusetts? And, what additional methods and approaches do you propose be included in the next VRU assessment? The public-facing online site contains extensive data and analysis focused on the following headers:

- Background
- Crash Hotspots
- Systemic Data
- Crash Tree
- Transit Proximity
- School Proximity
- Home Proximity
- DPH Hospital Data
- Environmental Justice Data
- Outreach
- Data Citations

Questions and comments included:

- How is this going to be incorporated into the next Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) conversation currently being formulated; and is this baseline data coming out soon enough so that it can be incorporated into what this next safety plan looks like in the current administration?
 - Identifying the demographics where these crashes have occurred and most impacted different communities was challenging for our team. Access to the regional environmental justice plus communities (REJ+) data definitely benefited us with being able to do that and going beyond standard criteria and looking at how this can be built into the Strategic Highway Safety Plan (a major component and requirement of the HSIP). This data is very much part of it, as an appendix for the current plan that was just released this year. It is aligning with FHWA's Safe Systems Approach - making the roadways safe for all road users - vulnerable road users in particular. These communities most affected have more transportation needs, including many of our underserved communities
- Is Executive Office of Public Safety and Security (EOPSS) participating in this? I feel like their agency would help with the messaging (such as sign boards) once we figure out exactly what kind of messaging we're trying to get at
 - Yes, we're currently in talks with various groups regarding effective marketing of these VRU-related findings. Social media will play a prominent role. However, MassDOT acknowledges the technology divide that still exists within some communities: the conversations may need to be more face to face, or pamphlets, or if there's other more effective ways of getting the messaging out
- How can this data inform an action plan? One of the goals coming out of the 2023 SHSP is an action plan to talk about how the safety initiatives identified can actually be implemented and who owns them

- MassDOT is actively working on developing the action plans and the outcomes of the VRU safety assessment definitely helps inform some of what those actions should be (e.g. looking at results shared earlier about lighting conditions for pedestrian crashes that occurred at non intersections) that did stand out
 - Crash codes are being updated with a lot more information at the crash report level. This is being actively developed and proposed and reviewed and going into effect early next year. But we are lacking a lot of the information like the contributing circumstances to these crash events: there aren't any codes that really exist for a lot of what we see happening out there
 - I did notice one of the proposed crash codes was also to show the origin destination - whether or not the individual was traveling from a transit public transit, or a school, or from home - where they're traveling to and from so that we can get a better level of capture
 - Action plans are being developed with the goal of completion by the end of this year, and these findings from the VRU safety assessment will be included
- WalkBoston really appreciates MassDOT's open crash data portal. What's missing is how fast the person was driving. You only know what the speed limit of the roadway is. What were the drivers doing? What was the vehicle? Size? - all those different pieces here
 - Contributing circumstances of the driver does at times capture the speed and aggressive driving. What that speed was, though, is not so much the case. Capturing speed data is a major data initiative we've been taking on, particularly for the lane departure crashes in rural areas
 - Dynamic speed feedback signs have been placed to address those locations, and with that data we can capture and see what the actual speeds are. Other platforms: probe (motorist) data, feedback signs for school zones in municipal locations - those have been proven to be very helpful in reducing speeds in general. We'll also be able to capture what the observed speeds are at those locations
 - There's a lot of talk about the technology available for automated enforcement at intersections and there are capabilities to also capture what the speeds are. I am personally a proponent of that. I know there's been a lot of arguments about the equity of placing those automated enforcement technology devices. But our data shows that it's consistent with the locations where these issues are occurring. Could there be more equitable way of distributing those devices if we were ever to be allowed to use them?
 - Any plan or process with municipalities to include this information in current Safe Streets for All Action Plans or use/direct the implementation funds for these locations specifically?
 - Great question. Using this data for your own action plans is encouraged. And using the findings to help fund your implementation plans, use it as a "crosswalk" against your action plan (if you have already developed it) and to determine - are you observing the same level of crashes? And of these types? And where are they occurring in your community and then being able to use that to really zoom in and target those locations to help address the problem
 - Our findings continue to show a large percentage of these crashes are occurring locally on municipal roadways and intersections – all the more reason to make this data available to you to use in your plans

Other Announcements

- John York is requesting MABPAB discuss and provide input at the next meeting for improved multimodal accommodations on both Cape Cod bridge replacement projects. There is an opportunity to present these improvements at an upcoming MassDOT stakeholder advisory group meeting in September
- Pete Sutton suggested MABPAB members review the MassTrails [Priority Trails Network map](#) before the next meeting to provide input on the proposed alignment through southeastern MA
- Next MAPBPAB meeting: Wednesday, July 26, 1-3 pm at Mattapoisett Fire Station

- List of board members in attendance (see below)
- Other attendees:
 - Dan Murphy (Easthampton)
 - Tracy Zafian (Amherst)
 - Roger Woodbury (Beverly)
 - Laura Hanson (MassDOT D2)
 - Ben Muller (MassDOT D6)
 - Alexandria Papadimoulis (DPH)
 - Liz Williams (MassDOT)
 - Jacob Stern (MassDOT OPMI)
 - Kayla Sousa (MassDOT)
 - Lorenzo Varone (MassDOT)
 - Barbara LaChance (MassDOT D5)
 - Cheryl Ann Senior (MassDOT D5)
 - Alexis Hosea-Abbott (PVPC)
 - Michael Trepanier (MassDOT)
 - Josh Levin (MassDOT D4)
 - Doug Johnson (MassDOT)
 - Hung Pham (MassDOT)
 - Francisco Lovera (MassDOT)
 - Brian Pigeon (City of Worcester)
 - Sheri Bean (MRPC)
 - Anthony Vona (MassDOT D1)
 - Ian Adams (MassDOT)
 - Tom Ruta (MassDOT D2)
 - Nicholas Russo (BRPC)
 - Sarah Cannamela (MassDOT)
 - Leah Grodstein (MassDOT)
 - Pedro Hernandez (MassDOT)
 - Peter Robie (MBTA)
 - Josh Grzegorzewski (FHWA)
 - Karl Alexander (MyRWA)
 - Beth Giannini (FRCOG)
 - Kyle Mowatt (OCPAC)
 - Jon Gray (SRPEDD)
 - John York (Bourne)

MA BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY BOARD

Board Member Sign-In Sheet May 31, 2023 – Virtual Meeting

Member Name	Attended	Notes
Tom DiPaolo MassDOT-Highway	yes	
(vacant) MBTA	yes	
Pete Sutton MassDOT-Planning	yes	
Kurt Gaertner EOEEA	no	
Gerald Autler DCR	no	
Jackie DeWolfe MassDOT	yes	
(vacant) DPH	yes	

Phyllis Cahaly MOTT	no	
(vacant) EOPSS	no	
Jeff McCollough MARPA	no	
(vacant) MARPA	no	
Jackie Jones MARPA	no	
vacant – public member	no	
Keith MacDonald – public member (South Coast Bikeway Alliance)	no	
Galen Mook – MassBike	yes	
Karin Goins – public member (Walk/Bike Worcester)	no	
Seun Oluwole – public member	yes	
James Fuccione - public member (Mass. Healthy Aging Collaborative)	no	
Cheryl Casper – public member	no	
Sam Squalia – public member (Fitchburg City Council)	yes	
Brendan Kearney - WalkBoston	yes	
Maureen White - public member	yes	
Ed Sinofsky – public member (Cape Cod Cycling Club)	yes	
Karen Foster – public member (All Out Adventures)	yes	
Meg Robertson – public member	yes	
Alice Brown – public member (Boston Harbor Now)	yes	