MEMORANDUM |

To:	Ken Kirwin Project Manager	Date:	August 26, 2016
From:	Hannah Brockhaus Howard Stein Hudson	HSH Project No.:	2015136.00
Subject:	DCR Mount Auburn Street Corridor Study Stakeholder Group Meeting 4 Meeting Notes of August 18, 2016		

Overview

On August 18th, members of the Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) Mount Auburn Street Corridor Study project team and DCR staff associated with the job held its fourth Stakeholder Group meeting. The meeting took place at Russell Youth Community Center, located at 680 Huron Avenue in Cambridge. The stakeholder group is composed of local residents, representatives of major institutional and business stakeholders in the area, cycling, pedestrian, and green space advocates, as well as members, both elected and appointed, of local, state, and federal government for the project area.

The purpose of the stakeholder group is, through the use of its members' considerable local knowledge, to assist and advise the DCR in developing short- and long-term recommendations for the improvement of the Mount Auburn Street corridor and its abutting roadways. Through this project, the agency seeks to create a corridor which is friendlier to transit users, cyclists, and pedestrians, and to strengthen connections between abutting neighborhoods and the key green space of the Charles River, while ensuring calm, efficient vehicle operations.

At the meeting documented herein, updates to the long-term solution draft concepts for the intersections of Mount Auburn at Fresh Pond Parkway and Mount Auburn at Brattle were discussed, and long-term draft concepts for Fresh Pond Parkway (from Huron Avenue down to the Charles River) were presented. Within the presentation of the former, footprints of roundabout and underpass options for the intersection of Mount Auburn and Fresh Pond Parkway were discussed, in order to address lingering questions on those options. After significant discussion, the group was satisfied with the decision to abandon the roundabout and underpass ideas.

The entirety of Fresh Pond Parkway has been brought up several times as the significant factor in addressing need for cues of a neighborhood in the corridor. Reaction to the concept for the three legged interchange section was positive, with a few key pieces for further review: the BB&N drop-off/pick-up area, and accommodations for boathouse access from Cambridge; strengthening the connection with the existing bicycle route under Eliot Bridge. After some discussion of the shared goals, concerns over fear of congestion

were alleviated in favor of calm, predictable traffic and significant improvements for bicyclists and pedestrians. Further north, at Huron and Fresh Pond Parkway, remaining items that the stakeholder group asked the project team to review further are signal protection for bicycles, and a consideration of bus and bicycle facilities on the east side of the intersection. The proposed crosswalk at Larch Road was well received, although there are questions over functionality of the proposed Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon including there were several requests for a passively activated pedestrian detector which allows the signal to operate by detecting a pedestrian rather than actuation through the use of a call button. The possibility of connecting bicycle lanes on either side of the Parkway was brought up at the intersection at Brattle, as it is the preferred route for bicyclists. There was a request for further suggestions for private property owners on landscaping elements for house fronts that would promote a pedestrian context for Fresh Pond Parkway.

Agenda

I. Welcome

II. Updates on Mount Auburn at Fresh Pond Parkway and Brattle Intersection Long Term Concepts

III. New Long Term Concepts for Fresh Pond Parkway

IV. Design Charrette and Report Back

Detailed Meeting Minutes[1]

C: Pete Stidman (PS): Okay, let's get started. Thanks for coming out on such a beautiful night. We want to start with a bit from DCR about some local issues that are being dealt with in the short-term. Here's Rob Lowell.

C: Rob Lowell (RL): Thanks. I'm the chief engineer at DCR. After our conversation following the last meeting there were a couple of points brought up, and I want to make sure you know we're taking action. There's a chance for some police enforcement along the Fresh Pond Parkway corridor. I want to let you know we have had some progress working towards better results there, and working with community on some places for vehicles. As far as signage, orders for signs are working their way through our sign shop. At this point we're working with Ken on locations and quantities. There is an order for residential area signs. Also speed limit signs, we had questions about signs, and we have two missing signs out there. They will be replaced. We are in the process of coming up with a uniform speed limit, we're in conversations with the Commissioner about that. There has been good progress on many elements despite the fact that its summer. The other element that we talked about was where the

[1] Herein "C" stands for comment, "Q" for question and "A" for answer. For a list of attendees, please see Appendix 1. For copies of meeting flipcharts, please see Appendix 2.

Watertown Cambridge Greenway to Fresh Pond Parkway will end. Arthur Strang made a comment about a potential crosswalk there. That crosswalk is outside the study area for this project, but we've spoken to the traffic engineer working on the Greenway and that crosswalk will be factored into greenway design. It seems like that makes sense for that project, because it will allow access for that.

Q: Gabriela Romanow (GR): Where is that crosswalk?

A: RL: The crosswalk is at Cambridge Waterworks, North of Huron, where there is a bike path to be built, that's the Greenway. There was a request to get people across the street.

C: PS: Thanks. This is a pretty basic agenda but it covers a lot of stuff. We have some Mount Auburn concept draft updates; you can see where your feedback made it into the design. We have new draft concepts for Fresh Pond Parkway from Huron down to the river, so that's exciting. And if we can get to it, we'd really like to, the design charrette for the two plazas in the neighborhood: one on Brattle and one by Star Market. We're curious about what your thoughts are on what might go there in the future, and gage your interest on it as well.

Without further ado, here we go. Mount Auburn is what we looked at last time – Brattle and Aberdeen, and Fresh Pond Parkway and Mount Auburn, and so today we'll be looking at Fresh Pond Parkway all the way from North to South. Next time we'll come back and talk about the little bit left at the intersection at Belmont. There's an opportunity for transit priority treatments, which is an issue that a lot of people were concerned about when we started. That's what's ahead. Also next time we'll start talking about short-term options for parts of the corridor.

This is where we are in the schedule. We're actually a little behind the schedule as it's printed here but we're around here. We looked at the feasibility of a three lane section of Fresh Pond Parkway, we've been looking at bicycle and transit facilities, and we're getting close to submitting the Initial Conditions Report (later this month or early September). We have a couple more stakeholder meetings coming up and we'll have a public meeting that you can tell your friends about in November. These are all in flux, in terms of the schedule. We'll be keeping up with you all via email. This is our standard disclaimer: everything we're going to show you tonight is a draft concept, and the only reason we show it is so that you can change it. We want your comments.

Presentation of Updates to Mount Auburn at Brattle and Fresh Pond Parkway Intersections

Here are updates from last time. This is the intersection of Brattle and Mount Auburn Street. You can see the treatment we had before, you guys can recall that. People were interested in a signal here because they were worried that people coming out of Brattle Street would have a hard time taking the right because of peak traffic. We looked at the traffic volumes and there is enough traffic. Bob is one of our traffic experts here tonight. Our best guess right now is that a signal would be warranted. It would be coordinated with the other signals along Mount Auburn and would ensure that people can get

through. The other thing we added was a little bicycle connection at the intersection of Mount Auburn and Fresh Pond Parkway. That connection is something you requested last time as a way to get through Mount Auburn. I think it might have been your comment, Jan, maybe? Now you can come along Mount Auburn in one direction, cross at the protected crosswalk at Fresh Pond Parkway, and continue down Mount Auburn entirely protected. Those are the things we added from last time.

Now I want to talk about some of the other ideas that came out last time. There was lots of talk about a roundabout and an underpass. I'm going to go through some of the analysis that we did to look at those two other options and talk about their feasibility. How many of you know Bill Warner, who's on this group? He's a crazy map guy – crazy in the fact that he loves maps. I love maps too. He brought out this 1952 map that is an aerial photo that shows the old roundabout, more a rotary, which used to exist here. It was probably built in 1940s and lasted until the early 1960s. We also had a transit line going straight through the center.[2]

Take a look at Fresh Pond Parkway as I flip back and forth between now and the 1950s. The sections of Fresh Pond Parkway north and south of the intersection were significantly expanded and are much wider now. These two lanes come to one road in the 50s, whereas now we have two roads with grade separation in between. If you look at where the rotary was, with that expansion, you couldn't replicate the 1950's condition. The inbound lanes of the Parkway would hit the rotary almost tangent which would allow for high speed. To make a modern roundabout you'd have to move it to the center of things as they exist today.

For a minute I want to step back and look at the difference between the rotaries that used to be built and the roundabouts people build today. Rotaries were built for speed, and to process a lot of traffic quickly. The people coming in can jump in and merge in and out quickly. That's the idea, but sometimes they don't work all that well. In a roundabout, you come in at more of a perpendicular angle, so you slow down and the traffic already in the roundabout has the priority. You have to wait to enter the roundabout. Also, the radius is different. Roundabouts are much smaller than rotaries typically, and everyone has to slow to about 20 miles per hour. They can still process a good amount of traffic because everyone's going 20 so cars don't need as much buffer space. In a rotary, cars stay clear of each other because they're moving so fast.

This is what the roundabout size would be, about 168 feet in diameter, which breaks down into two 15 foot lanes, a little sidewalk about six feet, a three foot buffer, and roughly 90 foot center island. That's the one of the configurations we looked at. That would require land takings on the south side of Mount Auburn, including two house lots and a strip of land along here which today is sidewalk. We looked at another configuration that wouldn't affect existing houses. You can see that here: we'd have to pull the roundabout up. Because the different lanes have to interact in a way that makes sense we turn Fresh Pond Parkway up at the approach. That exact angle isn't necessary, but that's the concept. That would

[2] Here, Pete paused to recognize Senator Patricia Jehlen and Councilor Jan Devereaux.

require about a half-acre of land, some of which is historic parkland, some of it is a sliver of Lowell Park and some belongs to Harvard, it's the home of Drew Gilpin-Faust, their president. Both options have a lot of impacts on parkland and private property. We also looked at traffic – would it work with the amount of traffic moving through the corridor. Bob, jump in if I make any mistakes. One of the easiest ways to illustrate how this works is to show traffic queues, because you feel that viscerally, how far you are backed up. The queues are enormous with a roundabout. This one isn't so bad, it extends past Larch Road, which means you might have gridlock at Brattle. On Gerry's Landing, however, the queue extends all the way down onto Soldiers Field Road and the North Harvard Street Bridge. That's significant. Mount Auburn doesn't look too bad; it's similar to today's conditions, maybe a little better in some places.

We also wanted to look at Franziska Amacher's idea, La Rotonda, which is a sunken roundabout which you can hold community events in. It looks amazing. This is in Switzerland, its super cool. You can fit an enormous amount of stuff in the middle, but one of the reasons for that is that it's really big. This is a bit artificial because there are variable sizes, but we took the size of La Rotonda to compare it with the 168 foot roundabout. La Rotonda with sidewalks is 465 feet in diameter. It's a bit hard when you're out there, because this intersection looks like a vast expanse, but that's significant. We'd have to eliminate part of Coolidge Hill Road. Both the smaller roundabout and La Rotonda also suffer from the grade issues out there since the land slopes up heading towards the Harvard President's house. We'd have to find a way to even out the grade, because you don't want a roundabout that's not flat. That would mean further land takings. We didn't even start to look at that

Other things to sort out with these designs would include transit, bicycles and pedestrians. Roundabouts do well with bicyclists and pedestrians if you can take them away from the roundabout, so that cars in the roundabout don't interact with pedestrians as well. You can do interesting things but that would require additional space. For transit, the catenaries would need significant changes. We're not talking about a cheap project. Some takeaways are: the old version is a rotary and the new version is a roundabout and we looked at roundabouts. By the way, you don't want to build roundabouts bigger than two lanes, because they get crazy inside and get worse for pedestrians and bicyclists. A roundabout can't handle the traffic volumes. There would be a 40 percent diversion of traffic, so up to 40 percent of drivers would look for a different way to go, and some will find neighborhood cut-through options. Some will find longer routes around here, but that only applies to folks farther away – many local folks need this connection.

Q: FA: Thank you for studying this. Did you consider a more oval shape?

A: Ps: Yes. I looked at your design. An oval shape would require more land takings than a round shape.

A: Bob Stathopolous (BS): The oval roundabouts are often called race track roundabouts, because the longer size promotes higher speeds. Pedestrians and bicycles are a bigger conflict when vehicles are

moving at higher speeds. Even if you look at the space we have, it won't work by our traffic modeling, which just look at vehicles trying to get into the intersection.

C: FA: But pedestrians would go underneath the roundabout in my design.

A: PS: These are images of the pathways from the roundabout in Switzerland, they lead to the middle of the roundabout. It's very cool. I like this, but it takes even more space because you have to create path that goes down the grade to get in there. You can't use a staircase, because of ADA, so it has to be a grade. An oval as opposed to round roundabout would require more land takings in Lowell Park, which is not only a park but a historic resource. If we were to do this project, it would likely because of the size and construction involved, turn into a MassDOT project because they have greater resources for engineering. At that point you would have to go through a process called article 97 at the state level, or article 4f at the federal level. Anytime you take parkland you have to prove that there's no other alternative to doing so. That would be difficult to prove, because the intersection that we've designed so far does work. It does take care of the traffic issues. With the open space of Lowell Park nearby it would hard to call out the need for new pedestrian space. Usually they have a net benefits section in the application.

C: FA: But that area is not a high value, in terms of the parkland.

A: PS: People do walk through there though.

C: FA: But the pedestrians can go across the center of the roundabout.

A: PS: But it's still park - the federal law is strict about that. I'm writing an application for Milton where they want to add parking to a park, and that's a 700 page document. It's laborious to create and needs a strong argument to get through. We have to prove that there is no alternative. They won't approve it if there's another option. We have a history of park protection in this country. But I appreciate that you brought the idea forward.

Q: Stacey Beuttell (SB): What's diameter of the roundabouts currently on Fresh Pond Parkway near the Alewife Brook Parkway, just to get a comparison?

A: BS: I don't know the dimensions but they're rotaries. It's wider than it would be here.[3]

C: FA: But you gain parkland in the middle.

A: PS: But it's not that you shift it, it's that you change it. It's that you lose that bit of park - you can't trade it.

[3] The larger of the two Fresh Pond rotaries is approximately 185 feet in diameter.

C: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis (NCC): I know people are having problems hearing. You may notice we're using our own projector today. We received a call this afternoon that the whole system blew, so they've had electricians come in trying to fix it. The speaker isn't working. We would normally have a mic, but we've had the air conditioning switched off, and that's the best we can do. I'm sorry.

C: PS: Please let me know if you can't hear me. Everyone satisfied with this section? Okay, let's move on to the underpass.

This is a speed study, which is useful because all the data was collected at the same time. It was done by MIT, with little radar guns on all the local roadways. They measured speeds and put them on a bell curve. There's a whole range of speeds, and so they can pick out the range from the 50th percentile speed to the 85th percentile. That's the range of speeds that you see. I know you aren't going to believe this but the study showed 36-40 miles per hours at Fresh Pond Parkway. One of the things you have to remember is those were taken over the course of the day. The traffic might have been coming through when it's slow at rush hour. The speeders are in the 90th percentile. Other comparable parkways are Greenough Boulevard, which was a little faster, Soldiers Field Road, faster, Soldiers Field Road under Western Avenue, which was much faster. Soldiers Field Road happens to be another underpass in the system.

This is similar to the lane configuration we would use for this underpass, because you still need the turning movements onto Mount Auburn. These are built differently nowadays – there are some structural elements that are different, for potential emergency vehicle access you need more width. But simply based on how they used to build these, and there's a much higher volume over here, this is the cross section it would need to have. It would need a median in the middle, the sides of the underpass, and the outside lane needs 16 feet. I added 18 because of the city versus DCR regulations. That is so that an emergency vehicle can get through past a pulled over car. These are minimal sidewalks. This is 120 feet based on the old design. Ken says these days it would need to be wider. This is how that would look.

Bob helped me with determining the grades that would be needed. This is a very aggressive grade to get under Mount Auburn, not counting the approach that you would need. That would have to be tapered out to get to the turn lanes. That's the bulk of the underpass. We think that the grade is a little bit dangerous because it's so aggressive. To make it safe, it would be extended a bit, because of sight lines: you don't want to speed in if someone's stopped under there. This is best case scenario. It would encroach significantly on the hospital, and on the north side land takings of Lowell Park, which again touches 4f or Article 97. That's before talking about the historic resource issues of the park.

Q: FA: What if you start it lower down the hill?

A: Ps: There would be more land takings. When you start it is when you need take the turning lanes out to the edges.

Q: FA: But can't the lane come in earlier?

A; PS: You need to still have to get under the lanes. This is based on how low the bridge is, based on the model of Storrow Drive.

A: NCC: The other thing to note is that in prior meetings we talked about a tunnel. One of the issues with a tunnel includes the fact that you have to have a ventilation structure with a tunnel. If you start the underpass much earlier you creep towards needing fire suppression, ventilation, and accompanying structures. As Pete told you, we gave each of these the best opportunity to succeed. We could have drawn something much bigger and said that you need a ventilation structure in Lowell Park or at the location of someone's home, but we didn't do that.

C: PS: You have to go in far back, but then the approach needs to be farther back and all the sudden you're crossing Brattle, and it gets complicated quickly.

Q: GR: I missed the last meeting, I'm sorry, but I thought there was a discussion about an overpass just for pedestrians and bicycles.

A: PS: That's something we could look at, but the alternative we have now accomplishes the crossing in a single phase. When you design a pedestrian overpass these days, although it's still open for debate, it's seen as a design failure for the street: you made the street so unfriendly for pedestrians you have to go over it. I think we have someone here from Walk Boston tonight – Stacey - is Walk Boston a fan of pedestrian bridges?

A: SB: You're putting me on the spot here. It depends. It's important to look at other options as well. We hear complaints about the Fiedler pedestrian bridge but that's a tougher situation. The fact that this is at an intersection helps, because there's a signal.

Q: Joanne Bauer (JB): I want to follow up on that question. What about a pedestrian underpass? And would it be any different if Mount Auburn went under Fresh Pond Parkway instead?

A: PS: IT would be a similar size, but turned for Mount Auburn. But you can see on the map that there's a narrower passage for the street on Mount Auburn because of the hospital and houses. There would be more land takings.

A: BS: It's not only the amount of lanes you'd have, but also Mount Auburn is laid out as an "S" curve, meaning you're dealing with horizontal and vertical curves. Without signals you're inviting higher speeds, so that's a safety issue to look out for.

A: NCC: Also on Mount Auburn there are buses, so you would have to bring the buses under the Parkway, which would take some interesting catenary. And again, the bus is a vehicle that's bigger so you'd have to drop the underpass down deeper, adding more space

Q: PS: This configuration is how deep Bob?

A: BS: At least 11 feet, but when you're accommodating emergency vehicles and buses you need at least 14 or 14 and a half feet.

C: PS: That means that this would get longer, to get further down for higher clearance on the underpass.

C: Elizabeth Bierer (EB): We're talking about a street, Mount Auburn. The parkway isn't a park, by DCR's definition. We're talking about a street meeting a park, and we're introducing highway vocabulary is an error. The best thing to do is make Mount Auburn much more like a street: narrower with slower speeds. I think narrowing vehicle lanes on Fresh Pond Parkway would help slow traffic.

A: NCC: We're getting a nod from our traffic engineer.

A: BS: Narrower lanes equal traffic calming which is a usual measure for slowing them down.

Q: Elizabeth Westling (EW): On that speed study you showed, Greenough Boulevard was 45 to 50 miles per hour. When is that from?

A: PS: This is before the road diet, 2001.

Q: EW: Have speeds decreased - do we know?

A: PS: I'm not aware of any new study. But I would guess that traffic has slowed down. On Nonantum Road, which had a road diet, I believe DCR looked at that and speeds did slow? I think I've seen a presentation that talked about that. We do have some lane narrowing on Fresh Pond Parkway. Another thing on the underpass: Bob identified that underpasses amplify noise. They function as echo chambers. Cars go down and the noise bounces off of them.

Presentation of Memorial Drive- Gerry's Landing – Eliot Bridge – Greenough Boulevard Interchanges

Here are concepts for Fresh Pond Parkway. As processed, Elizabeth, I have some history slides in here for you. This is in 1938. It's pretty decent for not having the Eliot Bridge yet. The bridge was built mid to late 1940s. You can see that they started out with roundabouts down here too.

C: Tegin Bennett (TB): Rotaries, not roundabouts.

C: PS: Yes, thanks. Very quickly they spent a lot of money to start changing the rotaries out. This is only ten years after the first one was put in. This configuration processes traffic faster. They take some of the turning movements out of the flow. By 1969 the rotaries are gone. When we started looking at the traffic in today's interchanges we discovered why. The flow of traffic is enormous. At peak 1,200 vehicles per hour in each direction roughly. There are still enough people turning off and onto Memorial Drive and on or off Greenough Boulevard that complicate a roundabout situation. We did look at it. We can show you if you want next time, but we ran the roundabout option through SIDRA which is a modeling tool for roundabouts and they have significant problems. Whereas 40 percent of cars would be diverted if we did a roundabout at Mount Auburn and Fresh Pond Parkway, it would be more like 20 percent of cars down here. It's the same problem of cut-throughs.

So we looked at some other options. We flirted with a cross flow pattern that didn't quite work, and we came up with the best option which is the Two-T alternative. It emphasizes the main flow of traffic. Some of details in these curves would be adjusted in the final design, but the idea is that the through traffic is accommodated and turns are accommodated as well. It creates four acres of new contiguous parkland; whereas before the parkland was medians in the interchange, now there are big swaths that you can do something with.

Q: GR: Where are you?

A: PS: This is Memorial Drive, Fresh Pond Parkway coming down, BB&N boat house, Mount Auburn Hospital, and Greenough Boulevard over on the right. This is how it looks today, versus with the change.

Q: Jan Devereux (JD): Are the green lanes bicycle paths?

A: PS: We started with green being bicycle paths and the light gray sidewalks or mixed use paths, where we don't have the width to continue the full separation. Some of the cool things about this design include: obviously the parkland, there is more on the Greenough side, and one stage pedestrian crossings. If you're coming from Mount Auburn or Elmwood, cross Mount Auburn and Fresh Pond Parkway and come down here, you have one crossing to get to the river, whereas before it was a three stage crossing. If you're going west, you still have one crossing to the river for the new project completed over there. Also on Eliot Bridge the lanes are wide enough to provide a bicycle lane. We didn't look at the other side of the bridge since it's out of scope. But it's feasible to add that bicycle lane and connect to the system. All the sudden you have a route to Allston that isn't so bad. If you're coming back from Allston, there is one crossing to the path. I think for pedestrians and bicycles, this does a lot even if you just are walking to sit by the river. How would it affect traffic, Bob?

C: BS: Since we are taking lanes out, there's little decrease in operation but it's manageable; they still work and we are preserve the character of parkway. They're going through at a lower speed.

C: PS: The signals keep them moving.

Q: EW: Is that the gym at BB&N? They have an access road which comes in and out at the bottom.

A: PS: It comes in here and exits here. Is Janice here tonight?

A: NCC: No.

C: PS: We need to continue to work with BB&N because of the pick up - drop off lane. We are thinking about that with extra parking in a few places. We need to talk to them to see if that works

C: EW: I haven't written this out, but I have an idea. Turning right off Mount Auburn in front of Gerry's Landing Road and in front of BB&N, you sort of accommodate it. I would call it BB&N road, which would be one way going in front of school, so that the buses can park.

Q: PS: Something like this?

A: EW: Yes. It's protected from the Parkway and from Mount Auburn Street, and the right turn would also be protected.

C: PS: Because of the significant amount of land on the river side, we can explore alternatives down here. The narrowest roadway you could provide would be 16 feet. That's a bit more than one of these lanes added, so not much.

C: EW: You still have three lanes at the intersection. Two are turning left right?

A: PS: One right and two through lanes, and then two through and two right lanes.

Q: EW: That's Fresh Pond Parkway? I don't understand why you need two turn lanes.

A: BS: It's based on traffic volumes. We have to follow standards based on the amount of turning vehicles. You have to provide enough space for them to move and hopefully clear in one cycle. The minimum for one lane is 100 vehicles per hour. Today you have 407 cars in the afternoon and about 500 in the morning, so one lane won't cut it because you're impacting the through movement. We're not providing three lanes all the way. We're providing two lanes and opening them up at the intersection to clear the as many cars through the intersection as possible. It should help with slowing of vehicle s and having storage for the intersection. At all times we have sufficient times for pedestrians to cross as well.

C: PS: At Fresh Pond Parkway its six lanes here, but further up (if you remember when we discussed Mount Auburn and Fresh Pond Parkway) we have two lanes carried down a significant portion of the Parkway.

Q: JD: If you're coming from Boston over the Eliot Bridge there's an awkward merge. Does this design correct that?

A: BS: Yes we are correcting that. Two through lanes are going to two through lanes between the two intersections, and the two lanes turning left have their own space.

Q: JD: So now, if you come over the Eliot Bridge and want to go to Greenough or the other BB&N parking lot, how would you make that maneuver?

A: BS: The two left turns will help you.

Q: JD: Okay, and my other question is that it looks like you have parking spaces here?

A: PS: The way we drew this is a bit different than the way I envisioned it, but this was conceived as (if this had more of a curve) someone could pull out of traffic and then back into a reverse angel parking space. They're protected from traffic when they make that movement and it would help provide for pick up drop off activity. That's something that we need to start a discussion with BB&N about to see what they need and how that would work.

Q: GR: You have no lane delineation in the intersection. You would put lane markings?

A: PS: Usually we would do that if the lanes shift significantly, for example at the left turn unless you aligned it better.

C: GR: That's a big cause of accidents. It seems to me like an easy way to make it safer would be painted lanes.

A: PS: Over here, these two lanes keep a consistent curve into where they're received, so the center line is preserved. That's the goal of the final design. But if it's a lateral shift they would need guidance. That's by the standards; I'm not saying we couldn't do that outside of those standards.

A: NCC: Also if you're redoing the whole intersection, that's an opportunity for new signage.

C: PS: This design continues down Greenough because there's significant stuff going on there, and there's a chunk of parkland there. How you put pathways through the area, how they go and the landscaping is variable. Right now, a lot of parents do a U-turn on Greenough here, so we provided a turn-around

area with parking for the park. This is a starting point. There's parking along here to accommodate that situation as well.

C: Sheila Fay (SF): As a bicyclist, there's no connection under Eliot Bridge. Current pathway is great toward Memorial Drive it's great. Keep that connection in mind because that means you don't have to cross the roadway.

A: RL: It exists now and will be preserved. It's just not shown here.

C: SF: Bicyclists will take the easiest direction to go.

A: PS: I see what you're saying. You're saying that we should strengthen that connection, so that people take the better way. That makes sense. Are there any other comments on this?

Q: EB: Could you show the existing aerial one more time?

C: Alexis Belakovskiy (AB): Can you go back to the new view? For the BB&N Boathouse and the Cambridge Boathouse, is there an opportunity to make that a four way light, so that it's easier to get in and out? I believe that's also a public parking lot. Basically, that would be moving the exit/entrance to the light instead of having them come out on ongoing traffic and crossing the paths.

A: BS: We'd have to look at that. To me it looks like it would need a separate phase, which would increase the timing for all movements and increase delay. That would affect pedestrians and vehicles. There aren't a lot of vehicles, but if it's traffic at peak hour it would mess with the coordination of signals.

C: AB: That's what I'm saying; they would exit at peak hour. Most people leave around 7am, so how would they go around? Right now people come out and make a U-turn.

C: Igor Belakovskiy (IB): It's pretty awkward. If you look at the existing connections now, it's virtually inaccessible from Cambridge. Most people go bottom corner do the sharp U-turn and then go into boat club, there's no other way.

C: AB: They all exit into all the traffic that we want to keep flowing.

A: PS: Tell me more, I need to understand this.

C: AB: It's one way in and one way out. So they come out right as the bridge traffic is moving at peak hour.

C: IB - And incoming traffic on the Cambridge side has to turn around before Eliot Bridge.

C: AB: It's all similar to the parents and kids at the high school that are also having the issues at peak.

A: BS: This makes it easier because you're coming into only two lanes (which will be stopped) during peak hour, versus the mess that exists today. It should be easier. But I see your point about being able to turn around, and we will look at that access.

A: PS: Okay, making that left turn.

C: IB: Also, there are many boat trailers coming in and out there, maybe some of those turns could be more forgiving.

Q: PS: How long are those?

C: AB: Boats are about 80 feet, plus traffic?

A: NCC: We can get the dimensions and run it through program called Autoturn which will determine what we need to make the turn. We can fix that.

C: PS: Okay, moving ahead. Anything else? Here are the takeaways: approximately 4.5 acres of new parkland; single stage crossing to the river; low stress bike connections from Mount Auburn all the way to the Paul Dudley White Path, school pickup and drop off zone and safe parking area; U-turn for school folks coming back around. We need to do more work on BB&N; we knew that coming in here. Finally we have a road diet on Fresh Pond Parkway from Mount Auburn down, plus road dieting of a lot of the pavement from the interchanges. So we did pretty good.

Q: FA: I have a question, have you proposed a road diet on Memorial Drive?

A: PS: That's outside of our scope, not that we wouldn't want to look at it, but we're not getting paid for that.

Q: GR: You mentioned 500 cars in the evening and 400 cars in the morning, and road diet won't create congestion and slow-downs?

A: BS: You'll see friction. We're hopefully proving queues storage for them to be out of the through movements, and stay there until their light. When you break it down, if those vehicles aren't able to get to their turning lanes, there will be friction but if you want a road diet you will see a decrease in operations. It's within what we feel comfortable with. Compared to today it might be bad, but you have to think about it in terms of operations - how long you're waiting and how far back the queue extends.

Q: NCC: So given what you've seen, do you see this producing calmed, predictable? Will it be predictable, will queues clear, and will it not have gridlock?

A: BS: There won't be gridlock but there will be some queues. Southbound at Memorial Drive there is some queue. 50 percent of peak hour, the queue will run about 900 feet, but that will depend on the coordination of the corridor.

C: PS: That doesn't cross intersections, right?

A: BS: Yes. If you coordinate it well you won't have a problem with the queue spill-back. Today it's working great for vehicles. There's a single left on the southbound Gerry's Landing movement to the Eliot Bridge. It's a capacity thing going from three lanes down to two, and that will create different circumstance. It's a capacity issue. It won't crash the corridor.

C: PS: Once we get an idea about the concept, we'll test it further with VISSIM to simulate the traffic and look more. When I started working with Bob for this design we wanted to carry forward the idea of calming traffic on the corridor. We weren't focusing on getting cars through quickly. Another thing to note is that it can handle many more cars than can get into it because it's so wide and the interchanges are meant to process huge traffic flows. It's overbuilt

C: EW: I hear from everyone that with a series of signal lights and two lanes that are narrower and road dieted we will have more calmed traffic and order the traffic. That was one of major goals. You will have a large volume moving from signal to signal in an orderly slower fashion and makes for better processing of the vehicles through the neighborhood. It sounds like that's exactly what the design is showing. Am I correct?

A: NCC: Yes.

C: PS: It changes the experience of driving through. There's a signal. In the current design there's no signal unless you're taking a turn. The people that could fly through now have to stop. It's not out of context with the rest of the city. Typically, when you're driving in the city there are signals, it's not ever free flow traffic. It's not any worse than intersections nearby.

C: NCC: Pete, we're in danger of losing the charrette again. Let's move north.

Presentation of Fresh Pond Parkway at Huron Avenue

C: PS: Up here, because of the constrained situation, there's not a ton we can do to the geometry but we tried. I'm going to talk about raised crossings in a bit. This is a raised crossing the way we have it drawn, but there are some concerns about that from our partners. This is a ramp on all sides, and how we treat the middle is up for question. We created a little pedestrian refuge on Huron on the east crosswalk. You cross the bike lane, and have a safe place to wait before crossing the rest of the way. It helps bicyclists as well, but then it transitions to the way Huron is designed today. We're talking about

signal improvements here. We've gotten suggestions from Cambridge, such as signal protection for bicycles, with the phasing, but we're just getting into that.

C: TB: Also getting bikes to outside so they don't conflict with vehicles making a right turn lanes. That's similar to the intersection at Galileo.

A: PS: Right. Moving the bike lane to the right and protecting it with signal, to prevent conflict with right turning cars

C: TB: Yes, removing conflict with all right turning vehicles, with that green right arrow. I don't know if it's feasible because it takes different phasing for signals. They have to look at that. It may or may not be feasible with the volumes. It's a very different context from where they have it now.

C: PS: We started talking about it this week so Bob hasn't had a chance to look over it yet.

C: BS: Since you're already taking bicycles to the left of the right turning lane, bicycles won't be in conflict with anyone turning right.

C: TB: That's the conflict; it just happens a little further up. It's difficult to explain. When you're on Broadway approaching the cross at Galileo Galileii Way you are in right bike lane and you stay in the right bike lane and right turn vehicles stay on the right of you. Then with the signal timing first you get through movements for both bikes and cars, and right turning vehicles have a red turn arrow so that bikes can cross. Its counterintuitive to the way you usually design intersections, but people are getting used to it. As long as drivers don't turn right on red, there's never any cross with bikes.

Q: BS: In that case, please correct me if I'm wrong, the bicycle lane is on the left of the vehicle lane?

A: TB: No, it's on the right.

C: BS: Okay. My point is that back over here you need to have the crossing happen, but after the approach these bikes can go because they're going straight through, so there won't be any conflict.

C: TB: I understand where you're coming from. The crossing happens further up. I'm talking about through signal phasing, so that there never a time when that crossing is allowed.

A: BS: I think I was misunderstanding where you were talking about.

C: TB: I know it's complicated and you have to look at it more. Another comment I had, there's a bus stop on the east side of that intersection, right? So there would need thinking about bicycle versus bus facilities there.

C: EW: I would like to add some information. I live on Fresh Pond Parkway and my neighbors say that from Huron down these days there are huge numbers of bicycle riders on the sidewalks.

A: PS: Russ was just talking about that this morning

C: EW: It's not just him. I guess it's pretty bad; they ride on the sidewalk because the streets are too dangerous.

A: PS: I was talking with Russ about signage and markings on the sidewalks to notify them to slow down in the neighborhood, but it's tough for design. Normally you want to provide a safe place to ride in street but there are such high volumes without causing diversions and other things that we were talking about before.

C: EW: Make Fresh Pond Parkway two lanes, one in each direction and you could have a bicycle lane and a nice sidewalk.

A: PS: Okay, we need to cycle through these slides. We looked at the geometry of the turns to tighten them wherever we could. We're also talking about raised intersection. We're not sure about it at this intersection. There are other options such as stamped asphalt, which they've used on Huntington Ave (on the right). This is a raised intersection in Cambridge on the left. There are a couple reasons people have concerns. One is you typically don't use raised crossings at signalized intersection because people are stopping most of the time anyway. There are also issues sometimes with snow removal and those types of issues. We're having those conversations. Something like stamped asphalt is more feasible so that's the fall back position, and I go through Huntington quite a bit and it really changed that intersection. There are some long term maintenance issues but it works pretty well.

Presentation of Fresh Pond Parkway at Larch Road

This is the existing configuration of Fresh Pond Parkway at Larch Street. You need to give me on guidance on the left turns that are causing problems. I looked at one of these streets, trying to eliminate the left turn. We could put signage there saying No Lefts, but we could also geometrically make them harder to do, even with signage, like here at Larchwood.

C: EW: Now I have to speak up. I live just below Grozier, that second house off the corner. You can't turn right on Grozier and you can't turn right on Larch, and so you have to go all the way to Huron and then you can only turn right and then you have to go all the way around to get to Brattle. You can't ever make a left, even at Huron. You can't make a left at Larch. For those of us who live in the neighborhood there has to be some way to get off the Parkway.

Q: PS: Did we misunderstand some feedback we got earlier? I thought there was a problem with left turns coming off of the parkway and causing accidents.

A: EW: That's Larch. I make a left turn out of my driveway and I have to stop the traffic. But with the curvature of the road, if I'm stopped, cars coming fast behind me, the ability to get rear ended is high. And unless someone really nice, they won't let you go, and it can be forever.

Q: PS: Are you asking for help to make the left turn or are you asking us to get rid of the left turn?

A: EW: I'm asking for help to make that turn because you can't turn right. It would be nice if we could turn right, but you're not allowed to. Unless you eliminate the one way streets, which I think are excessive. You wouldn't need to make the left turn which takes longer if you could turn right

Q: PS: You're coming out of your driveway and trying to go to Brattle?

A: EW: I'm trying to get to the other side of the Parkway, to come here, or go to Star Market.

C: EW: I can't take a right on Rosier or on Larch because it's not allowed. You can turn left on Huron only very rarely, so you have to turn right on Huron and make a U-turn so you can come this direction.

A: PS: Okay; we'll take that back to the drawing board and see what we can do.

C: BS: Not knowing the history of the one-ways here, it might have been done in the past to not allow cut through traffic. If you allow those turns to happen you might invite cut through traffic that's waiting on the parkway. Keep that in mind, but yes we can look at it.

C: EW: Cutting through your own neighborhood to try to get out of it seems not unreasonable.

A: BS: But it won't be only you that's cutting through, it will be everyone else as well.

C: PS: We can look at it though, and show you what happens. Maybe we can find a balance

Q: Russ Windman (RW): Is that a crosswalk?

A: PS: Yes: a way to cross Fresh Pond Parkway in between the intersections. It would have to be done with Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon (RRFB) or a device like it. You press the button and it starts flashing and you can cross the street. They have interim approval from FHWA because they have been effective at slowing people down. You can use them with a raised or without. We picked this location because it's a curvy street so it was hard to find a good place with sight lines. We're looking for guidance on the placement and in terms of where people try to cross. Where do you naturally try to cross?

A: EW: You don't.

A: RW: I like this.

C: PS: We can look at it more. There's a lot that would have to go into it – there are regulations about sight lines, and other things.

Q: Melissa McGaughey (MM): The point would be traffic calming and pedestrians being able to cross in the middle of Huron and Brattle. Does it calm traffic?

A: PS: As a raised crossing it would have to slow down traffic. There are no statistics on RRFB's just being there, but if you get the beacon there are statistics on it and it works.

A: NCC: I can back Pete up on that. We installed one on Belmont Street in Worcester. Very quickly it's by UMass Memorial Hospital, and there's a long hill that comes down from Bell Pond and I-290 is at the bottom. You can imagine, cars are heading down to I-290. We installed one at a crosswalk where, after one of our meetings, one of the doctors went across to the convenience store and got hit. These RRFBs have a compliance rate of around 90 percent. There's on installed in my own neighborhood, just south of Ukraine Way in Forest Hills. Drivers have come through a series of signals, they have a straight shot to Roslindale Square, and they've come down a hill. There's a new market, a new bar, and, oddly enough, a cat hospital all of which receive pedestrians and drivers do comply with it. They tend to work well.

C: PS: Another feature I want to point out is that you can have them with a warning light that it's coming up, as well.

C: SB: I would recommend that you look at passively activated ones. One of the issues that we see is that people don't press the button. There was a crash several years ago at Brandeis where one of these are located, and students were hit because they didn't want to press the button.

A: PS: Okay, we can look at different detectors.

Q: RW: I like a raised crosswalk. What else can we do to reduce the effect of the raceway experience regardless of whether there's a pedestrian crosswalk?

A: PS: Definitely. After we look at Brattle, I have more on the raceway experience.

C: BS: The Federal Highway Administration recommends raised intersections as a traffic calming measure.

Q: Katherine Rafferty (KR): Is the one at Concord Ave a RRFB?

A: TB: That's a hawk. Believe Massachusetts Ave is different. FFRB's work well. There is concern when people are crossing four lanes of traffic. I can check in with Joe on that.

Q: FA: Speaking of traffic lights they installed new traffic light near me they're huge; they look like they're built for super highways. Why do they need to be so big?

A: PS: When we start talking about what we would use here, we can get into that. I'm not sure why for that one.

A: NCC: Actually, I can answer that. I dealt with this on a project in Arlington job. You're talking about the mast arm that holds the signal, right? They've suddenly gotten very beefy. The reason behind that is that there are new standards for how much wind and weather they need to tolerate. As a result they've gotten more robust. If we get into this deeper, there are things you can do to make them more graceful. The new standards are based on new wind speeds more frequent and aggressive storms; it's about keeping the infrastructure up and running when things get nasty weather-wise.

C: PS: To be clear that's after the scope of this study.

C: Angeline Kounelis (AK): There are a couple of these in front of Tufts Health Plan in Watertown. They both were put into be solar powered, but that didn't work. They were also pedestrian activated but people weren't pressing the button. Now they're constantly activated, and they are very visible at night but they're harder to see during the day.

A: PS: Okay. We can look at the pedestrian detector. If it comes to design, this will be looked at in further detail.

C: AK: Also there will be people saying enforcement and the need for police officers. In Watertown center, there's an island park and crosswalks on either side and in the last three to four months they installed pedestrian flashing lights and enforcement is difficult in that area.

Presentation of Fresh Pond Parkway at Brattle Street

C: PS: Okay, good comments. I want to quickly touch on Brattle. There's not a lot we did here except taking a look at the turning radius on the corners. Here we took a narrower radius and we drew in the raised crossing idea because we're going to talk about a treatment there. As you remember from the Mount Auburn and Fresh Pond Parkway we took the median out on Fresh Pond, so we can add to the sidewalk on the left side where people are crossing from Shady Hill

Q: JD: Last time you acknowledged that most of the bike traffic coming from Watertown to Harvard Square would go Brattle rather than Mount Auburn. Anticipating that bikes may decide to use Brattle going west to east was there any thought on creating a bike lane?

A: SF: There's a bike lane on Brattle Street, it's just not on the side away from Cambridge.

A: TB: I ride there every day. There's a distinct gap between Fresh Pond Parkway and Mount Auburn. You have to share a lane with parked cars.

C: JD: I just wonder what about that leg?

A: PS: We can take a closer look at it again, but the width is constraining.

A: TB: We had some data that we shared with you that examined the on-street parking. That's something that should be discussed based on the priorities and needs. There are very distinct needs on that segment in a variety of ways.

Q: EB: You said we'd be picking up some space in the lower section of Lowell Park, in sidewalk. Is that possible to take the guardrail out? When they installed it, it was a temporary fix. It's not very park-y. It's one park, not two separate parks. It's bisected and the barrier makes it look like two separate parks.

A: PS: That's a conversation for you guys really, to give us guidance. From going out there I know that parents wanted to get that guardrail where kids are crossing particularly at the corner because it feels like you're trapped against the brick wall behind you and the dangerous street.

C: MM: I can speak to that. Nina and I advocated for that guardrail. I understand that it's a park but the reality of the roadway is different.

A: Ps: Finding a solution doesn't necessarily mean what's out there today.

C: MM: I would advocate for pedestrians. There will be heavy pedestrian traffic. It doesn't have to be a guardrail, it can be a brick wall, but pedestrians need a physical barrier there.

C: EW: One of DCR engineers pointed out to me when I asked the same question, why the ugly guardrail, and he said that it's to keep vehicle traffic in the road not on your front yard.

C: Xander Dyer (XD): Or on your child.

A: PS: Lots of streets in the city have parked cars along the sidewalks.

C: EW: It could have that.

C: RL: In taking another look at that, our desire is to keep the protection for the pedestrians; that's our focus.

C: PS: We'll keep that in mind as we go forward

C: GR: On Fresh Pond Parkway turning left on Brattle is only accepted during certain hours. People don't notice that you're allowed to take the left turn. Better signage or a lane indication is needed. There's terrible honking and bothering Elizabeth all the time, and it's terrifying, and you can't turn left at any of the other streets. It's an important turn and there's nothing that shows that it's acceptable at times.

C: PS: Okay, so facilitating the left turn.

C: EW: That's an important left turn lane. On Brattle there is a place where all cars that want to turn left stay in the left lane and all other cars go straight ahead in the right lane, and it keeps traffic moving.

Q: XD: By the water fountain at Craigie Street?

C: EW: I don't know. There should also be a left turn lane turning toward Harvard Square and left toward Star Market from Fresh Pond Parkway. That would be very helpful.

C: EB: I am strongly opposed to a left turn lane at this intersection. That's also my objection to guardrail. It's a visual cue that cars are on a highway so they can go fast. Introducing left turn lanes on parkways and streets visually it's a highway vocabulary, they know it means speed

Presentation of Traffic Calming Measures for Fresh Pond Parkway

C: PS: This is a good segue for our next section which is traffic calming. So first I have the concept takeaways. There are pedestrian centered intersections, left turns at Larch was misunderstood so we'll take another look at that. But I wanted to talk about private property owners and how you can contribute to the feel of the Parkway. This isn't to criticize, but to be aware. There are things we can do with street with pavement, markings, and signage but there are things you can do as individuals, and some of you are already doing good things. They do have an effect on traffic. When you look at the frontage of your building, is it designed for a pedestrian context, or a higher speed context? It's a good conversation to have because we can only do so much.

Q: EW: Could you give us examples? What enhances?

C: PS: Yes. This is a strong pedestrian context because there is depth to the situation: you can see plantings in the yard, and there are things that draw your eye as you're going down the parkway and remind you that you're in a neighborhood. Similar to this, in this case, you can see everything that's going on. It looks like a neighborhood. There are also sections of Fresh Pond Parkway that have these

tall fences and I understand why you want to do that for noise, but it also creates the context of speed because there's not as much interest to ponder and look at as they drive slowly through a neighborhood. It's the same fence no matter what speed you're going, and you can see the fence a mile away.

C: RW: We know the reasons for the fences. If DCR could come up with suggestions for landscaping and ways to enhance it, we'd love to see that.

A: PS: We can come back with images next time. We're laughing because Tamar put some of those in the presentation but I took them out. I also want to have come Tamar come up to talk about some landscaping elements.

C: Tamar Zimmerman (TZ): Okay, this of course is not Fresh Pond Parkway, but it shows the concept that was designed. The parkway originally had and does still have a generous planting strip and a continuous row of street trees. I can remember when there were trees along the parkway, and it had a sense of a continuous canopy. They were all red oaks, which get very large. Given the width of the street they get large enough and meet at the top and they bring a sense of enclosure, bringing the scale of the street down. This is the concept of the parkway edge, or the original concept.

Right now as you know, the edges are a bit of a patchwork. You can see here in the upper left a removed tree. North of Brattle many trees have been removed like the lower right. The trees have been coming down that are aging out, some are hit by cars. On September 5th a bunch of trees were taken out because they were old and there was concern that they might fall; large branches were coming down. Some trees died out and some have been replaced. The planting edges along the area are in various states. Some of them are green, they have lawn in them, and some people have come out and planted grasses or perennials to bring the eye to the edge of the street. That helps to make the street slower for traffic.

On either side you can see some examples of planting strips: one with trees and groundcover, some come out to a garden planting along the back of curve. The image in the middle is an example of more incentives to bring pedestrians on to the street. Another thing is to replace and replenish the trees to make it more comfortable, creating shade and separation for pedestrians. There are also a number of opportunities for stoppings. Here I'm thinking of the Larch Road rain gardens. There isn't room for seating, but maybe signage describing what it is and how it functions could draw some interest. This photo is Grozier Road, where the end of street has been widened. There's space there, there's a little plaza, but there's no reason to stay there one could add planters or seating in the area to make it a spot to stop. Perhaps one could add planters or seating in this area to make it a place to stop.

C: EW: That's right in front to my house. There are two things that are very important. I don't know how the brick got there, but I had talked to a woman who was the landscape architect for Cambridge and she told me that the city would like to have more holes in that and more plantings. However, our house is so old, we have 150 feet of frontage, and underneath there used to be rocks, but when they changed

out the utilities, the public gas line now goes under private property. When engineers came through to look at it they said to not plant anything there because if anything happens they'll rip through it for access to the gas line. Just on the other side of the rain garden on Larch, there was engineer who told me that all the rain gardens including that one were improperly graded and will have to be redone because water isn't going in like it's supposed to. The ones on Larch, Lakeview, and Lexington need new rain gardens. I'm a landscape designer myself, so I'm in favor of all of the trees and landscaping but I've never known how to contact in the DCR or the city of Cambridge. I wrote an email called death stops the parkway. The trees came right across the parkway in front of cars and we're lucky that no one died. The point is, you don't know who to go to. No one's there to support you as far as plantings. I would be happy to plant trees. We have over a hundred trees on our property. If you have ideas we're all with you.

Q: PS: If we put a planter there, you'd go crazy?

A: EW: I maintain that space, which is DCR property, all by myself for my neighbors. We take care of the sidewalks. I'm out there sweeping it with a broom. I don't want to buy planters that someone will take away, but I'd be happy to plant in the ground if we got permission. I'd love to see the whole thing planted up with trees and shrubs; that was the original plan. If you look back 150 years to when Olmsted was designing the cemetery,[4] it's a signature thing that was everywhere that we haven't maintained.

C: TZ: More people have been inhabiting the sidewalks. There's a distinct difference when you're coming up Fresh Pond Parkway on the North side.

C: EW: There's a huge consideration here and the traffic speaks to it. We haven't actually gone out to measure but these lanes are not more than eight or nine feet, and there's no median, so the whole street is only 41 feet wide. I want to give a shout out to the state police because we asked for them to do more to get trucks off the Parkway and I noticed the other day that they were ticketing – they had them pull over below BB&N, and we noticed, so thank you.

There are narrow roadways, narrow lanes, it's very curvy. An odd thing about the trees is that the vibration of cars and trucks on the Parkway is considerable and after many years ruins the roots of trees. The trees are old and they're vibrating, and the trees can't stand that. You have to make two lanes with bikes and then plant more, and put in a pedestrian crossing I think then you'll make some progress.

C: RW: The irony of the photograph you showed is that's Chip's house and a tree fell down right through the second story.

[4] The Mount Auburn Cemetery was designed by Henry A.S. Dearborn, President of the Massachusetts Horticultural Association at the time (https://www.nps.gov/nr/travel/massachusetts_conservation/mount_auburn.html).

A: TZ: He does have two new trees planted in front.

C: PS: Okay, everyone, its 8:00pm. We're skipping the design charrette again, so next time. Are there any final questions? It feels like you're into the Fresh Pond Parkway concept and we can move forward with it for testing the traffic more rigorously?[5] Excellent. To skip to the end, the next meeting is Sept 15th, same place same time. We're looking at the next public meeting sometime in November, and we possibly will have another stakeholder meeting in October, for a preview. These are in flux right now but definitely the 15th is scheduled. Thanks for coming out.

C: NCC: Thanks a lot everyone.

Next Steps

The next Stakeholder Group meeting will be held on September 15th, at the Russell Youth Community Center located at 680 Huron Avenue, Cambridge 02138. The meeting will include a discussion of long-term solution alternative draft concept for the intersection at Belmont and Mount Auburn Streets, presentation of updates to Fresh Pond Parkway elements, and beginning the discussion on short-term draft concepts. Since there was not time for the design charrette during this meeting, it will be postponed to the next session. All stakeholder group meetings are open to the public.

[5] There was agreement on this point from attendees.

Appendix 1: Meeting Attendees

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
Franziska	Amacher	Community Member
Joanne	Bauer	Stakeholder Group
Alexis	Belaovskiy	Stakeholder Group
Igor	Belakovskiy	Community Member
Stacey	Beuttell	Stakeholder Group
Tegin	Bennett	City of Cambridge
Elizabeth	Bierer	Stakeholder Group
Hannah	Brockhaus	Howard Stein Hudson
Mark	Burke	Community Member
Nathaniel	Cabral-Curtis	Howard Stein Hudson
Andre	Campagna	Community Member
Jan	Devereux	Stakeholder Group
Aaron	Dushku	Stakeholder Group
Xander	Dyer	Stakeholder Group
Arcady	Goldmints-Orlov	Stakeholder Group
Patricia	Jehlen	Stakeholder Group
Angeline	Kounelis	Stakeholder Group
Ken	Kirwin	DCR
Stuart	Levinson	Community Member
Rob	Lowell	DCR
Steve	Magoon	Town of Watertown
Melissa	McGaughey	Stakeholder Group
Mary Catherine	McLean	DCR
Mark	Peterson	Stakeholder Group
Katherine	Rafferty	Stakeholder Group
Gabriela	Romanow	Stakeholder Group
Pete	Stidman	Howard Stein Hudson
Elizabeth	Westling	Community Member
Russ	Windman	Community Member
Tamar	Zimmerman	Crosby Schlessinger Smallridge

Appendix 2: Received Comments

Good afternoon Anne,

I hope this note finds you well and having a good day. Thank you for your comment regarding labeling of streets in our graphics; we will certainly try to apply those in the future while keeping the images from becoming too cluttered to read. I would note that we have posted detailed meeting minutes with each presentation that note which intersections are being discussed and what is proposed for each location. Many of your questions, such as the exact nature of new bicycle connections would find their answers there. Nonetheless, we can certainly do more with labels to make our online versions more readily comprehensible.

Best,
Mary Catherine

From: Anne McKinnon
Sent: Tuesday, August 16, 2016 3:49 PM
To: McLean, MaryCatherine (DCR)
Subject: Mt. Auburn study

Hello. I tried looking at this slide show http://www.mass.gov/eea/docs/dcr/news/public-meetings/materials/projects/2016-7-21-mt-auburn-stakeholders-presentation.pdf to find out about this study. I found this very hard to follow because none of the streets on the slides are labeled. If the slides are going to be shown at meetings and posted online they really need to be easy to understand. For example: What is the "Overall concept"? Green lines? What is "stop bar distances" saying? What is the green line for "new bicycle connections," bike lane or bike path?

gave up trying to figure what the slides were trying to say.

Anne McKinnon

Thanks, that sounds good. Appreciate your quick reply.

Jan

Jan Devereux
City Councillor
Cambridge, MA

All emails to and from this City address should be considered subject to Massachusetts Public Records Laws.

From: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2016 10:00:21 AM
To: Devereux, Jan; Pete Stidman
Cc: McLean, MaryCatherine (DCR)
Subject: RE: Mt Auburn study meeting rules and scheduling

Good Morning Councilor,

I hope this note finds you well and having a good day. Please note that I am copying MaryCatherine McLean from DCR on this reply just so that we ensure that DCR is fully aware of all of our communications with elected officials. Thank you for your kind words regarding the concepts presented. We will continue to have more to show you next month.

With regard to the meeting rules, you're quite correct. When I came into our last session, I was prepared to be a good bit more stringent with the airtime enforcement than I had been in June, but allowed the party in question a bit more leeway than I'd thought I originally would because the commentary delivered was generally supportive and helpful as opposed to negative and aggressive the way it had been at the prior session. Towards the end of the meeting, you're correct that it did get to be a ramble which is one of the reasons we wrapped when we did. I will begin the September session with remarks that folks need to give everyone a turn.

As to the timing of the September session, we actually have already reached out to Melissa and in comparing notes on out two sessions, she gave us the opinion that we should go ahead and proceed as planned due to the fact that her meeting is also a stakeholder session and we only share one group member between our two bodies. Likewise she said that she hardly ever gets a larger audience of interested general public. She noted that had she been going for a public meeting, she would have wanted us to shift our date.

In light of that, we are taking the following steps to avoid future conflicts:

1. We are going to get all subsequent sessions of our process, be they stakeholder or public information meetings out of Thursdays.
2. Both Melissa's initiative and ours are considering our next public meeting for the early November timeframe. We have agreed by mutual consent that whoever picks a public meeting date first will telephone the other right away to make sure there is no overlap.

I hope this helps with your concerns. Thank you for your strong and constructive participation in the process. Yours is a wise and helpful voice.

Regards & Good Wishes,
-Nate

From: Devereux, Jan
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2016 9:32 AM
To: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis; Pete Stidman
Subject: Mt Auburn study meeting rules and scheduling

Hi Nat and Pete,

I was impressed with last week's concept designs. Great work.

I continue to be frustrated with the discussion being dominated by one or two people. I think others feel shut out. Last week we again ran out of time because of one person's insistence on commenting on every slide based on how the design impacts her own daily movements. At the outset you set some ground rules for what makes a good meeting. I respectfully suggest that at the next meeting you review the rules and emphasize that you would like to hear from more people. "Watch your air time" is a good ground rule for everyone to follow.

Also the 9/15 meeting unfortunately conflicts with the public Alewife Working Group meeting connected with Envision Cambridge. There is stakeholder and neighborhood interest overlap. Could you talk with Melissa Peters at CDD and try to avoid future scheduling conflicts with these two groups?

Thanks for all your creative ideas and patience --

Jan

Jan Devereux
City Councillor
Cambridge, MA