Mobility Working Group Meeting 4
December 7, 2017
Process update

**Topic-focused Working Groups**

Meeting #1, May
- Reviewed existing conditions, issues, and opportunities
- Set preliminary goals

Meeting #2, June
- Refined goals
- Reviewed existing City policies
- Developed strategies and actions

Meeting #3, July
- Refined strategies and actions
- Identified indicators and targets

Prioritization Survey

**Advisory Committee**

September
- Reviewed synergies and conflicts
- Provided feedback on proposed and prioritized actions

**Topic-focused Working Groups**

December
- Identify a final list of actions to include as plan recommendations (both near-term and aspirational).
- Identify a final list of 3-5 indicators that are most effective and feasible to track progress along goals.

**Topic-focused Working Groups**

Winter ‘18
- Discuss overall actions within the context of the citywide plan and scenario analysis
- Set targets based on the preferred scenario.

**Community feedback**

Fall ‘17
- Public engagement on goals

**Community feedback**

Winter ‘18
- Public workshop on scenarios
Today’s agenda

**Meeting objective:** Gain consensus on actions that will be written into the plan as recommendations, and select 3-5 indicators that the City will measure on an ongoing basis after the plan has been released.

- **Session overview**
  - 10 mins

- **Actions:** Discuss Working Group feedback on the Priority Matrix developed by City and consultant teams. Identify a final list of actions to include as plan recommendations.  
  *(Facilitated exercise)*
  - 75 mins

- **Indicators:** Present indicators recommended by the planning team that are most effective and feasible to track progress along goals. Discuss indicators and identify a final list of 3-5 to be included in the plan.
  - 45 mins

- **Next steps**
  - 10 mins
Essential Definitions

**GOAL**

- Broad, aspirational statement of what we want to achieve

**Strategy**

- Approach or approaches that we take to achieve a **goal**

**Action**

- Specific policy, program, or tool we take to achieve a **strategy**

**Indicator**

- Quantitative measure(s) used to assess performance against goal

**Target**

- Desired level of performance
Summary of public feedback on goals

- All the goals were evenly prioritized by respondents.
- Many raised concerns about the increasing traffic on Alewife Brook Parkway and Mass Ave, advocating to stop development and look for more ambitious transit solutions.
- Respondents advocated for streets to be designed with equal consideration for users of all modes.
- Some thought the goals needed to be more specific and distinct from each other.

Larger and more drastic transportation discussions are important. Traffic at Alewife worsens and development expands. We need a subway that extends beyond Alewife.

Approving more development in Alewife and East Cambridge area without effective public transportation solutions will exacerbate grid-lock that's already nightmarish.

Where are the other transit options? Placing such emphasize on biking as a replacement for cars in our current climate is problematic.

The built environment should be kept dense or densified to make transit, biking, and walking more efficient.

A. Connectedness and User-friendliness

B. Climate Resilience and Environmental Health

C. Equity and Accessibility

D. Safe and Active Transportation

E. Reliability and Efficiency

F. Community Character and Vitality

Survey on draft goals: https://envisioncambridge.consider.it/
### Session overview: Determining plan priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Easy wins</strong> (high impact + low difficulty)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions that are easier to accomplish and of a high impact. Should be a high priority for implementation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major projects</strong> (high impact / high difficulty)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions that are difficult to accomplish but of a high impact. Worth doing, but may take more time to implement and should be prioritized carefully.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fill Ins</strong> (low impact + low difficulty)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions that are easy to accomplish but of a low impact. Low priority but could be worthwhile.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low impact/High difficulty actions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions that are hard to accomplish and of a low impact. Not worth the time nor effort and should not be considered.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sorting:** Working with the City, the actions generated at the end of meeting #3 have been sorted into 4 categories based on expected impact and difficulty.

**Streamlining:** To bring the actions into a parallel style across all working groups, some of them have been rephrased or combined. We intended to make them more specific, and to sharpen them by replacing verbs such as “explore” or “encourage” with concrete actions that the City can pursue.
Actions
Action categorization (Facilitated exercise)

Do you agree with the current placement of each action along the four quadrants?

- **Easy wins** (high impact + low difficulty)
  - Actions that are easier to accomplish and of a high impact. Should be a high priority for implementation.

- **Major projects** (high impact / high difficulty)
  - Actions that are difficult to accomplish but of a high impact. Worth doing, but may take more time to implement and should be prioritized carefully.

- **Fill Ins** (low impact + low difficulty)
  - Actions that are easy to accomplish but of a low impact. Low priority but could be worthwhile.

- **Low impact/High difficulty actions**
  - Actions that are hard to accomplish and of a low impact. Not worth the time nor effort and should not be considered.

**Major Projects**

(High impact / High difficulty)

- Actions that are difficult to accomplish but of a high impact. May be worth doing, but only considered after top recommendations are completed.

  - Improve multimodal access to key public facilities such as parks, community centers, recreation centers, and libraries by adding crosswalks, bus shelters, bike lanes, and bike parking.

  - Require truck sideguards and other vehicle safety devices that reduce the likelihood of pedestrian and cyclist fatalities on City vehicles and for companies contracting with the City.

  - Prepare for the introduction of autonomous vehicles by developing policies that address equity and incentivize autonomous vehicles that are shared and electric.
Indicators
Characteristics of a Good Indicator

An indicator is a quantitative measure used to assess performance against a goal. To guide the Working Group’s development of indicators, the following general characteristics of good indicators have been identified.

Simple to understand and communicate

Historic data is available and readily accessible

Indicator is a true reflection of performance

Indicators That Do Not Meet These Criteria

Greenhouse gas emissions per capita

Number of people enjoying shared places

Travel time to work
Recommended mobility indicators

Which of these indicators seem most compelling in measuring progress against the goals?

Are there any other indicators that should be considered as a better way to measure progress against goal(s)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Potential Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatality / injury by mode and geography</td>
<td>Cambridge Police / EMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of residents by socio-economic group with 5-minute access to community resources (such as parks, schools, etc.) by transit, walk, or bike</td>
<td>Network Analyst / Better Bus Buffers, Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode share of all trip types by neighborhood</td>
<td>New surveying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional through trips on arterials versus locals</td>
<td>Streetlight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of citywide network connectivity by mode</td>
<td>Network analyst v. jobs + population (Census)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alternative mobility indicators

Which of these indicators seem most compelling in measuring progress against the goals? Are there any other indicators that should be considered as a better way to measure progress against goal(s)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Potential Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recorded traffic speed of roadways with traffic calming</td>
<td>INRIX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity and access to community resources (such as parks, schools, etc.) by mode and income</td>
<td>Network Analyst / Better Bus Buffers, Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of public ROW dedicated to the proportion of users by mode</td>
<td>Cambridge GIS + Intensive data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people enjoying shared places (e.g. sitting in a parklet)</td>
<td>Soofa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of greenhouse gas emissions (per capita) from transportation sources (trains, buses, cars, EV, fuel efficiency, etc.)</td>
<td>CTPS / MassDOT model outputs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next steps
Upcoming citywide scenario analysis

- Envision Cambridge will be testing land use mixes and densities to determine the level of development under existing zoning compared to three alternative scenarios.

- The alternative scenarios will focus on the corridors and selected areas likely to have a higher propensity for change.

- The scenarios will be compared based on urban form outcomes and performance on citywide metrics such as:
  - Housing Units
  - Affordable Units
  - Jobs
  - Traffic impacts
  - GHG Emissions (MT CO2e)
  - Net Revenue ($)
Study areas for citywide scenarios

- Mass Ave. Corridor
- Inman East
- Prospect St.
- Cambridgeport South
- K2C2
- North Point
- Cambridge St. Corridor
- Lechmere West
- Cambridgeport Riverfront
- Star Market
- Alewife Area Plan
- Alewife study area
- Recent planning areas
- Proposed areas for corridor analysis
- Potential areas of change
Next steps for Working Groups

- Envision Cambridge will be testing land use mixes and densities to determine the level of development under existing zoning compared to three alternative scenarios.
- The alternative scenarios will focus on the corridors and selected areas likely to have a higher propensity for change.
- The scenarios will be compared based on performance on citywide metrics such as:
  - Housing Units
  - Affordable Units
  - Jobs
  - % Sustainable Modes
  - GHG Emissions (MT CO2e)
  - Net Revenue ($)

Public meeting on scenarios, Winter ’18

Working Group meetings #5, Winter ‘18
- Discuss overall actions within the context of the citywide plan and scenario analysis
- Set targets based on the preferred scenario