

2017-06-21

**Mobility Working Group #2**

---

Committee Attendees

Dave Allen, Michelle Danila, Chris Featherman, Nate Fillmore, John Gintell, Greg Heidelberger, Mark Jensen, Steve Miller, Rob Ricchi, Ruthann Rudel

Staff / Consultant Present

**Staff:** Stuart Dash, Susanne Rasmussen, Stephanie Groll, Joe Barr

**Utile:** Nupoor Monani

**HR&A:** Jason Schreiber, Cynthia Lin, Susie Birdshell

Committee Members Absent

Rachel Dias Carlson, Caitlin McMurtry, Emma Sandoe, Melissa Shakro, Stacy Thompson, Annie Tuan, Dustin Weigl, Ruth Allen, Bethany Stevens

One member of the public present.

**Meeting overview**

Jason Schreiber presented challenges facing Cambridge related to mobility, following which he led a facilitated discussion of revised goals, existing indicators, and collected suggestions from the group about new indicators. The presentation is available [here](#).

**Committee Discussion**

**Goals discussion**

- Members thought the combination of safety and health is more appropriate as a topic name for Goal A (Safety and Active Transportation). Another member thought that from public health perspective, having active transportation is the most important part of health in a mobility perspective.
  - City team clarified that these were combined to allude to encouraging active transportation while being safe.
- Members asked to reconsider the word “residents” in Goal B (Equity and Accessibility) and expand it to include everyone who live, work, play, or study in Cambridge. They also suggested rewording to say, “Ensure a diverse set of travel options are available to...”
- Goal C (Reliability and Efficiency): members thought education about diverse modes should be addressed as a part of this.
- Goal D (Community Character and Vitality): Members asked that this goal address regionalism more directly to combat issues like the high number of through trips that detract from the sense of community.
  - The City responded saying that goals should reflect what the city aspires to be rather than focusing on what not to be.
  - To this another member suggested adding “protect neighborhood streets” to the goal language.
- Goal F (Resilience and Environmental Health): Members suggested removing the phrase “is already occurring” and asked to broaden the goal to address more pollutants including noise.

### Indicators and Targets discussion

#### Goal A: Safety and Active Transportation

- Members suggested to measure of connectivity of the network itself, rather than percent of streets with reduced speed
- A member commented that the indicators are focusing too much on commute mode and missing out on majority trips. They referred the team to the MAPC travel survey and suggested measuring the no. of trips that end in a parking lot.
  - City staff responded that the City is currently doing bike counts. However developing a robust survey to measure this metric is very difficult. It would also be challenging to put a numerical value on things like comfort.
- Members suggested moving away from the focus on commute data as it only represents one trip type.
- Members felt strongly that considering sidewalk conditions was not adequate and wanted to see this expanded to study the quality of intersections as well.
  - The consultant team identified a few challenges with this approach: pedestrian signal cycle length easy to measure based on data that is tracked by the City, other than that individual data for this at every intersection is hard to track.
- A member asked if the indicators proposed as a part of the working group process will really be tracked by the City.
  - City staff assured them that they would.
- Members suggested considering cardiovascular indicators since this is about public health.
  - City staff responded that the Needs Assessment study already lists indicators related to this.
- Top indicators
  - Collisions made by geography
  - Degree of connectedness by mode
  - Modal choice / satisfaction of all trips

#### Goal B: Equity and Accessibility

- Members suggested measuring time taken to get to work based on income
  - City staff responded changing the goal to address workers including people who work late makes it hard to measure. That's why the goal is focused on residents. It could be rephrased as "access/time taken to reach key community resources" and these should include City Hall, neighborhood park, fresh food, also
- Another suggestion was to look at equity based on who suffers the brunt of peak hour traffic by evaluating how many communities get cut off because of this.
  - The consultant team suggested using Inrix data to understand average speeds, which areas are most affected
- Top indicators
  - Travel time to work by income
  - Access to community resources

#### Goal C: Reliability and Efficiency

- Members asked about maximum bus headway across the city. They would like to know the longest to wait for a bus going anywhere.
- Members suggested measuring the efficiency / utilization rate of parking spaces by counting the percentage of spaces occupied at different times of the day.

- Another member asked if this could be further refined to measure the potential off-street parking to be moved into private spaces.
- Members suggested measuring the percentage of ROW that is devoted for public use.
- Members the City about their relationship with the MBTA
  - City staff responded that they have a good relationship with regular meetings and check ins.
- Top indicators
  - Delay / frequency of transit.
  - Mode of access to transit by geography
  - Utilization of space dedicated to parking

#### Goal D: Community Character and Vitality

- Members asked about potential goals / strategies to make all the parking at Porter Square underground.
  - City staff responded that this is a land use question, not directly transportation question. They discussed if making streets more walkable to discourage people from driving might be a proxy for achieving this.
- Members asked how the city could keep through traffic on the arterial roads and wanted to know what percentage of it cuts through neighborhoods.
- They wanted to see any indicators that measure level of stress while driving. Separately, they were curious to know how people are getting to neighborhood services. Could intercept surveys by types of business get at this?
- One member suggested counting how many local businesses are within a quarter mile of residents.
  - Another suggestion was to count how many dollars coming to a business by a particular mode.
  - City staff chimed in to say that the Economic Development Division does similar surveys to assess the impact of online surveys, and these contain mode share questions. Fr example Access survey from 2007, showed that Central Square is the most used in the morning, most people walked, most in 15 mins or less.
- Top indicators
  - Percentage of through traffic in neighborhoods
  - Mode of access to neighborhood resources

#### Goal E: Connectedness and User Friendliness

- Members suggested counting no. of public buildings that are equipped with real time transit information. They thought it important to let the community know busses are an important piece of transit infrastructure.
  - Currently, members noted that there few around the city but they malfunction and are confusing to passengers. They identify routes as “inbound” and “outbound” but the buses display names of destinations instead. They would also like to see clear maps showing how different modes integrate with each other citywide.
  - City staff responded that this initiative is bring prioritized near senior centers, stops high number of people boarding.
- Members asked if it was possible to measure the correlation of transit routes to desire lines of travel in some way
- They suggested including “average distance to Hubway stations car sharing stations” as an indicator.
- One member wanted to measure the effectiveness of wayfinding to public parking facilities, but all agreed that this is hard to define and measure. They asked the team to consider as a strategy to achieve this goal.
- Members wanted to measure the quality of infrastructure along a road or corridor.
- Other metrics included “percentage of bike plan that is at level comfort 1, 2, 3..”,
- Top indicator
  - Regional transit mode share