

2018-04-25

**Mobility Working Group #5**

---

Committee Attendees

Nate Fillmore, Michelle Danila, Ruth Allen, Greg Heidelberger, Rob Ricchi, Ruthann Rudel, Emma Sandoe, Mark Jensen, Chris Featherman

Staff / Consultant Present

Staff: Susanne Rasmussen, Melissa Peters, Cliff Cook, Stephanie Groll, Joe Barr

Utile: Jessica Robertson

Stantec: Jason Schrieber, Liza Cohen

Committee Members Absent

Dave Allen, Rachel Dias Carlson, John Gintell, Caitlin McMurtry, Steve Miller, Melissa Shakro, Stacy Thompson, Annie Tuan, Dustin Weigl, Bethany Stevens

**Meeting overview**

Melissa presented an overview of feedback received at the Joint Working Group meeting. Jason Schrieber led the group through a discussion of updated mobility indicators and targets, indicating rationale behind changes in targets as previously discussed. Melissa closed the meeting with next steps, including finalizing targets and developing an implementation plan identifying near-, medium-, and long-term actions. There will be another meeting to review the draft action plan.

[The presentation is available online.](#)

**Committee discussion**

**Indicators and Targets**

Initial Reactions/General Discussion

- A committee member discussed advertising of various plans in Cambridge. The member observed that neighbors don't always know what is in the Bike Plan until it is built. They noted that advertisement of Envision Cambridge has been done very well, and wondered if there is room for more.
- A committee member noted that cars must be included in the plan along with other modes.
- A committee member observed that the community needs to hear from consultants/city staff as trained professionals to explain assumptions and findings.
- Another committee member stated baselines are important, and found it hard to discuss the targets without knowing the baseline for each indicator.
- A committee member suggested that the City needs a pedestrian plan for certain areas. City staff noted that one exists, but it needs to be updated.
  - Staff suggested that an action to update the pedestrian plan be added to Envision Cambridge
- A committee member suggested that if bikes had to be registered, we would know how many people biked in Cambridge.
  - Consultant staff added that owning a bike doesn't translate into use unless there is safe infrastructure.

Indicator 1: Fatalities and Serious Injury

Working group supported Vision Zero target.

Indicator 2: Modal Access

- A committee member noted that an increase of 10% over total for bike lanes is too modest, and noted that the target should be 100% completion of the Bike Plan.
  - City staff noted that this would require a very significant change, as much of the bike plan requires significant reconstruction.
  - The committee member also asked about Cambridge Street, which is halfway done. The suggestion was that it would count as “0.5” in tally of completed bike infrastructure.
- A committee member wondered if the indicators could account for gaps in the bike network. They wondered if the target could be number of “critical intersections” done – Inman, Portland Street, Broadway, Mass Ave.
- A committee member asked how to change the number of people who live near transit.
  - Reaction from the committee included:
    - add more buses to increase the bus target.
    - Adding more housing near the subway (included as housing recommendation)
- A committee member suggested that for the bicycle plan target, we should break it down into miles that are protected bicycle lanes v. bike priority, and grade them accordingly. They also suggested that for protected bicycle lanes, the plan should also subdivide between permanent reconstruction and temporary, because temporary can happen much more quickly. They finished by observing that there is strong political support to do the 20 mile network, and that many other cities have put in a lot of bike mileage in a rapid fashion with the idea of creating a network.
  - Another member reacted and said that raw miles also have a meaning
- A committee member expressed “another vote” for changing the bike plan target to 100% completion. They noted that prioritizing high volume streets is essentially creating a connected network. They thought this seems realistic both politically and financially.
  - Consultant staff suggested that the target could be 100% completion of the temporary network, with 25% fully constructed, or something similar.
  - City staff added that the assumption at the time was that the network would be built out along with street reconstruction, but now the City does temporary facilities.
- A committee member asked what the definition of “high frequency bus routes” was, noting that waiting for 43 minutes during the middle of the day is useless, even if the bus comes every 10 min during peak.
  - A committee member responded that reliability has a different set of solutions.
  - City staff noted that planning is happening with the MBTA imminently. The “Better Bus Project” should be completed by the end of the year. The City of Cambridge is going to supplement the MBTA’s public process to be sure Cambridge concerns are heard.
- A committee member asked about measuring transfers, as they believe these prevent people from taking the bus.
  - Consultant staff noted that one way to do this is a trip diary.
  - A committee member noted that with automated fare collection, the MBTA will have more detailed data on trip origin and destinations
  - City staff added that the MBTA has limited data on trips with transfers. You could potentially use this to look at transfers in Cambridge, but it’s complicated.
- Another committee member requested that targets for Indicator #2 be separated out by mode. They added that targets for high frequency buses should be 100%. There was general agreement on this.
- Another committee member suggested that we use time as access measurement, not distance.
- A committee member asked if the plan could have something about bus access to new places?
  - City staff responded that the City has been talking about the Route 68 service to Kendall from Alewife.

Indicator 3: Mode Share of All Trip Types by Neighborhood + Indicator 4: Commuting Mode Share for Cambridge Employees and Residents

- A committee member asked if the plan would look at traffic.
  - City staff responded that Indicator 3 would be about every mode, as it seeks to understand how people move around (car, transit, bike, ped).
- A committee member asked to clarify what “drive alone” means? They observed that parents driving their kids around are a kind of driving alone. Those people should have better options to getting where they are going than driving.
  - Consultant staff responded that the citywide survey tries to distinguish who is in the car.
  - City staff responded that for PTDM, City counts family carpools as “drive alone,” unless there are kids from two different families. Uber/Lyft with no other passengers would count as drive alone, while Uberpool/Lyftline with other passengers would count as carpool.
- A committee member requested that for mode share of commute trips it should be a reduction of 5% by 2020 and 15% by 2030 from the total drive alone rate, with general agreement from the committee
  - Consultant staff suggested that the plan also use this for the all trip types indicator as a hypothetical
- A committee member asked about trips that people don’t take because of difficulty or lack of access.

Indicator 5: Connected Mobility Options

- Consultant staff stated that simply being near a Hubway station does not mean that any bikes will be available, and being near a bus stop does not mean that buses are running in the middle of the day. It also does not indicate if the network is useful.
  - A committee member suggested that the indicator could capture time.
- City staff suggested that the bus headway should be 15 min max all day, which addresses the time-of-day issue. They noted that this could include a diagram of how accessibility changes over time.
- A committee member asked about ride-hail companies (Uber, Lyft, Fasten), and how to measure impact.
- A committee member asked about future parking needs of autonomous vehicles.
  - Another committee member responded that the city may actually need less parking for autonomous vehicles. They added that in general, the City needs a plan for autonomous vehicles.
- A committee member noted that they would like the target to be at least 4 transportation options that the average Cantabridgian has access to.
  - City staff added that the target should change so transit is either / or
  - The committee also agreed that it should be clear that Lechmere is included, also Union Square.
- The committee requested that the Plan clarify that a “bike facility” is a bike lane, etc. In addition, they noted that words like “headways” are hard to understand. They said that “Connected transportation option” is a little unclear and requested it be rewritten.
- A committee member said that they would advocate for bus and train being separated in indicator #5, as they believe people should have that option.
- Another committee member suggested that the target could be something like 4.5 with no more than X disparity between neighborhoods. This was met with general agreement from the committee.
- The group discussed looking at Cambridge-to-Cambridge travel flows separately. City staff noted that the CTPP (a data source) comes out every 5-7 years, and City doesn’t want to rely on that as a source.