

---

To:	Ken Kirwin Project Manager	Date:	August 3, 2016
From:	Hannah Brockhaus Howard Stein Hudson	HSH Project No.:	2015136.0
Subject:	DCR Mount Auburn Street Corridor Study Stakeholder Group Meeting 3 Meeting Notes of July 21, 2016		

---

## Overview

On July 21<sup>st</sup>, 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 third 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, long-term solution draft concepts were presented for the intersections of Mount Auburn at Fresh Pond Parkway and Mount Auburn at Brattle. These two major intersections have been chosen as the most needful of change, and so have become the project's starting point with the rest of the study area's intersections and connecting roadways to fill in over the course of the summer. Within the presentation of these concepts, the feasibility of transit and bicycle facilities along Mount Auburn was also discussed. Reaction to this concept was mixed, with some group members initially challenging it as not doing enough to calm traffic along Fresh Pond Parkway and others stating that it responded to their input regarding adding pedestrian, bicycle and transit benefits as was requested in stakeholder and public input. After an initial look at the concept for the intersection of Mount Auburn and Fresh Pond Parkway a number of key questions came out of the discussion: the possibility of connecting bikes heading eastbound on Mt. Auburn to the proposed two-way protected bike lane Fresh Pond Parkway; the possibility that the crosswalk on the northern side of Fresh Pond Parkway may hurt traffic operations

at this intersection; and lingering questions about the possibility of a tunnel, underpass, or traffic roundabout replacing this intersection.

To address the latter, at the next stakeholder meeting, information on the footprints of such solutions will be presented as part of the presentation. The Brattle and Mount Auburn intersection concept was received with many fewer questions, with the exception of concern about the ability for cars to make a right turn from Brattle onto Mount Auburn and desire for a signalized intersection. Community members who reside on Fresh Pond Parkway vocalized their concerns that neither of these designs addressed the speeding on Fresh Pond Parkway. A concept for the section of the parkway north of Mount Auburn will move forward and be presented at the next stakeholder meeting, in order to address these concerns. Finally, a larger conversation emerged regarding prioritizing the desires of neighborhood residents versus commuter and traffic volume needs versus balancing the two.

## Agenda

I. Welcome

II. Long-Term Solution Draft Alternative Concepts

a. Intersection of Fresh Pond Parkway and Mount Auburn

b. Intersection of Brattle Street and Mount Auburn

III. Feasibility of Transit and Bicycle Facilities along Mount Auburn

IV. Design Charrette and Report Back

V. Next Steps

## Detailed Meeting Minutes<sup>1</sup>

---

C: Pete Stidman (PS): Welcome back! I'm glad that so many people showed up. It's super nice out - I don't blame anyone for being somewhere else tonight. We want to get your feedback on some draft concepts tonight. These slides review the leadership of the DCR. We're starting to get a little bit behind schedule, but I think we're going to make a jump and catch up. Some of the tasks on here are weirdly scheduled, such as assessing the feasibility of adding bike and transit facilities. We're looking at that right now, and the three lane section of Fresh Pond Parkway will be next. Our focus has been

---

<sup>1</sup> Herein "C" stands for comment, "Q" for question and "A" for answer. For a list of attendees, please see Appendix 1. For a listing of received comments, please see Appendix 2.

advancing concepts quickly, and that will get into proposed long and short improvements that will take us through October, so we're getting into that stage now. Then we'll be analyzing the improvements and looking at how they work.

First, we want to know if you like the concepts we're coming up with. We'll talk a lot about two of the long-term alternative concepts for Fresh Pond Parkway and Mount Auburn, which we think is a key intersection for our study area. Everything else is going to be contingent on what we do there. Then the intersection of Mount Auburn and Brattle which is probably the second most important to the community – mainly the difficulty of the bicycle movements which was our most liked comment on the wikimap and at meetings. If we have time, you guys get to color. At the end we have a design charrette, because there are certain parts of the corridor that we don't want to assume where to begin. The plaza in front of Star Market is one of those places. If we don't get to that it's no big deal, but I thought it would be a fun activity to get you out of your seats, and let some creative input happen. If we don't have time for it this time we'll do it next time. We'll leave you with the next meeting and all of that information.

### *Presentation of the Draft Concepts*

Big warning – these are draft concepts. This is also for the people at home who are looking at this presentation via the website. These are concepts, we're showing them to you tonight so that you can make changes, and we expect there to be changes. In fact, since designing these concepts I already have a couple changes I want to make, so I want to see if you all pick up on those ideas.

We are going to zoom it on this in a bit but first I want to explain the overall concept. This is Mount Auburn and Fresh Pond Parkway. Elmwood comes up here, Mount Auburn comes through, Fresh Pond Parkway going North/South, and this loop is Coolidge Hill. We're trying to do something that would be relatively low cost, but enhance the intersection for pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit, as well as maintain automobile traffic flow that's out there today. It will take a few minutes to explain all of this – I have a lot more slides. The big overview is we looked at Brattle Street and Fresh Pond Parkway, where we want more of a traditional parkway treatment – it's about 22 feet wide per direction plus the median. At that intersection we propose in this concept to take out the median and give some room to the southbound side of the street. Then we follow the upper side of the median, where you all know there is a grade difference. As you move south, we shave into the lanes, and that gets more extreme as you approach the intersection. We eliminate the right turn lane on the southbound side that's disorganized now. That calms traffic, because the lanes are narrowed; organize the traffic better, because the intersection is more organized; adds to parkland; and widens these pedestrian paths. There are more benefits to this design I'll go through.

At the lower half of the intersection, we put the road on a diet, reducing the number of lanes, this time keeping the lines on the east side of the street. That idea, plus on the northern side following the median, is to save cost. The drainage is always one of the more expensive things to move. If we can

follow that line, we will, and it's a way to keep cost down. In this concept we also take out two lanes, take out the medians that are here today, and thus we connect the street that is now in three sections. That allows us to add a bike path to one side, decrease the length of this crossing considerably, and organize the traffic.

The most important thing is this over here, a transit lane. It is a bus only lane that would go back to just east of Brattle Street and it will use transit signal priority at Coolidge Avenue for bus to be able to advance before the rest of the traffic at the approach to the intersection of Mount Auburn at Fresh Pond Parkway. The bus can make its move to get to the straight across lane, and all of the rest of the traffic will follow behind it. The traffic at the approach to Mount Auburn at Fresh Pond Parkway will flow basically as it did before, with the addition of the bus jump.

Now we're going to walk through this more slowly. We'll go through Fresh Pond Parkway and Mount Auburn, and pause for questions, and then we'll move to Brattle. Quickly before we go into the details, this is the Brattle Street concept. This is where the transit lane starts. We'll get more into it later. There are significant changes here to make the bank movement smoother, and slow cars down so that pedestrians can get through easier.

Here's what the intersection of Mount Auburn and Fresh Pond Parkway looks like today: a lot of pavement, disorganization, pedestrians are running across the street. This is what it would look like under this concept. The top goal to us was to calm traffic, provide clarity, and use those things to reduce crashes and the severity of crashes. I want to go through how we're addressing that goal. This is a top level analysis called a conflict point analysis. It looks at every possible place where there could be a vehicle conflict, or a bike - pedestrian conflict, and all of those options, and then compare the two different concepts. The way the intersection is today, there are more vehicle conflicts. There's a high speed conflict points at Fresh Pond Parkway, when people are either turning right or whipping through the intersection. There are a lot of points where one vehicle may be traveling at a high speed, and another vehicle is pulling out and therefore traveling at a low speed. Or if someone is making one of a few turning movements, such as a right on red, there could be a conflict there. Does that make sense? For the totals, we have eight points where one vehicle is moving at high speed, and one point where both vehicles are moving at high speed.

When we get to the new design, we get rid of all the both vehicle high speed conflict points and we have seven of the one vehicle high speed conflict points, which is similar to before. One point becomes both vehicles at low speeds because someone is coming out of a driveway and the other driver is in a right turn only and slowing down to make the maneuver.

Next is pedestrian conflict points - this is when someone is moving with the signal. You're not allowed to take a right turn on red onto Fresh Pond Parkway. These conflicts are all people walking across driveways. We know that people are crossing on the Northern side of the intersection (even though there is no crosswalk), and that can be high speed. Additionally, a person turning right as someone is

crossing is a conflict in several places. In terms of totals, there are two high speed, one medium speed, and eight low speed crossings. In the new design that becomes zero high speed zero moderate speed, and nine low speed crossings.

At the northbound Fresh Pond Parkway turn onto eastbound Mount Auburn, we lowered the radius of the curb and moved the crosswalk to the middle. The exact placement of it is not determined but the radius will slow the traffic. On the south side of the intersection along the turn from Mount Auburn onto southbound Fresh Pond Parkway, we reorganized the driveways so that first of all we eliminate one conflict by combining the entrance to two driveways. Drivers coming around the right turn from Mount Auburn westbound onto Fresh Pond Parkway are slowed down because that curve is now steeper. Does everyone follow?

Q: Elizabeth Westling (EW): What is going on with Fresh Pond Parkway northbound approach to the intersection, with the two lanes that go straight and two that turn left?

A: PS: This is actually the same configuration that is out there today, without the medians. There are two through lanes, two turn lanes, and we did take off a lane going in the other direction. So there were three lanes and now we have two.

Q: Franziska Amacher (FA): Pedestrians will still have that long cross distance?

A: PS: Not exactly, I have a slide that talks about the distance to cross. It gets narrower but I'll show you the exact numbers. Bicycle - pedestrian conflict points comes up a lot. Cycle routes are hard to predict when there's no infrastructure for them. When you're going through this crosswalk, you don't know which if any of these lanes a bicycle will be in. They could be coming at any time. This is pretty straight forward. Also all the sidewalks on Fresh Pond Parkway are conflicts, because people ride their bicycles on it since they're scared of riding in the road. In the new concept, because we have the bike path, we can take all the bikes off either sidewalk on Fresh Pond Parkway south of the intersection. The number of bicycle-pedestrian conflict points has down slightly.

This is bicycle-vehicle conflict. If someone is coming along Mount Auburn and trying to go straight they're in conflict with the driver making a right turn, since they tell you in bicycle school to stay in the right lane. That's a big conflict area. A lot of the other conflicts are driveways along Mount Auburn. Totals are five high speed points and six low speed, and the new concept goes down to two and nine because we've slowed vehicles with the altered turning radii, and we've organized the traffic. We might be able to get rid of one more, if we channelize the bike lane heading into the bike lane along Fresh Pond Parkway. Next is crossing distances.

Q: Nina Coslov (NC): What time frame are those numbers from?

A: PS: there's no data on this; this is actually a simpler analysis than that. It's showing where conflicts could happen - the points which, if everyone is following signals, can become conflict points. The idea is if you lower the spots where something could happen, it will lower the actual number of crashes.

Q: Jill Forney (JF): If you go back to bicycle and vehicle conflicts. Now there will be a designated bus lane down Mount Auburn, but for bike commuters, where do bikers go?

A: PS: That's a very good question. One thing that we want to look at is what the roadway would look like if we took a bike lane all the way down Mount Auburn. And also, the same thing for a bus lane all the way down Mount Auburn. That's what we're thinking for the other concepts, so that we can test all of them in VISSIM, which simulates the traffic model. Our guess is that it will not be easy. But we do have the ability to road diet at least one lane off of Mount Auburn, we think. We still need to test that. How we divide that space up is up to you guys and DCR.

Q: EW: What about the design where buses and bicycles share a lane?

A: PS: That is done. In Boston, for instance, it is done on Washington Street, where there's a bus-bike lane. That's out there as an option. That's something we should decide together.

Q: Aaron Dushku (AD): If you go back, to the concept, since the cars from Mount Auburn are turning right and you have created green space, could you pull the bike lane further west to connect with Mount Auburn?

A: PS: I saw that too.

Q: AD: Or what about a bicycle lane in the middle of that section?

A: PS: Yes. After I finished the conflict point analysis I started to notice things like that as well. An option we could have would be to have a bicycle lane inside the street to protect cyclists going straight through the intersection. We could also have a lane that pulls off on the right side and connects in the green space to the southbound Fresh Pond Parkway bicycle lane. That would eliminate conflict.

Q: Katherine Rafferty (KR): What is a designated bus lane, how does that work?

A: PS: I have some more on transit priority coming up, but the lane ends at Coolidge Avenue, and there would be a transit signal priority at that intersection to let them out before the rest of the traffic. These are the crossing distances. This is what we have today - a whopping 137 feet to get across the south side of Fresh Pond Parkway, and 53 plus 78 feet on the north side. To walk in this direction is a three phase crossing and in total it takes almost five minutes. Walking back is a little easier because of the way the traffic works. The way this intersection works as a whole right now, because traffic can't clear that fast because the intersection is so long, is that the intersection is allowing traffic through at the

expense of pedestrians. You notice people running across the street, because right now there's really not enough time to get across now. That's one of the huge benefits of this design, that we lower these distances dramatically. We cut the long crossing in half distance wise, and we made it into a one phase crossing. The signal will operate roughly the same, but you won't have to run to make it. Crossing Mount Auburn goes down to 22 feet, and on the north it will be cut to 34 plus 35 feet.

Q: JF: I'm wondering if there's a reason, either for traffic or pedestrians, to have two sets of crosswalks.

A: PS: On our site walk, we noticed a "goat trail"<sup>2</sup> on the median, and we've witnessed people walking across there.

Q: JF: Would there be a benefit to pushing everyone to the crosswalk on the south side, which will be safer, quicker, and shorter? Is there a benefit or efficiency to putting the crosswalks there?

A: PS: We know that there is demand for a crosswalk on that side, and from what I understand from our traffic engineer, there's not much of a drawback for having the crosswalks on both sides. I'll ask here to be specific about that for you guys. As far as operations, it wouldn't make much of a difference if we took those out.

Q: JF: Would that crosswalk on the north side be timed with the other crosswalk?

A: PS: It would be concurrent with the flow on Mount Auburn. When that traffic moves, the pedestrian can also go.

Q: Alexis Belakovskiy (AB): Is there a reason why they're not straight across? Can you angle the crosswalk?

A: PS: Yes, because we want to keep the crosswalk short. To angle it would increase the length of the crosswalk significantly. There are standards of road design that don't allow us to do that.

Q: AB: But aren't you creating the same problem you got rid of on the other side, with having to wait in the median?

A: PS: Yes, that's true, but before they were crossing a much greater distance without the benefit of a crosswalk. People are doing it, so we wanted to incorporate something in the design to make it safer for those folks. The design isn't hurt by it, in terms of traffic flow. There's not a significant trade-off. If you like this concept, we can test it in VISSIM with pedestrians.

---

<sup>2</sup> The term "goat trail" in transportation planning circles denotes a worn pathway, usually through landscaping near an intersection. Typically, it suggests a pedestrian desire line not being served by the built infrastructure.

Q: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis (NCC): I've asked our host to suppress the air conditioner but in the meantime for the benefit of Hannah could you use your playground voices?

A: PS: I was actually going to ask you guys if I can go through a few more slides before taking some more questions. I think some of your questions will be answered in the slides I have. The other thing that makes intersection way more efficient is that we brought the stop bars closer together, so that cars can get through faster. This one is the most dramatic.

The Coolidge Avenue crossing is similar on the conflict points, but we added another crosswalk on the eastern side of the intersection, and we think there's an opportunity for treatment at the intersection to slow people down. Other places in Cambridge use speed tables and this might be a place for that. With the new space on the side of the Parkway, we can add to the park and widen this path.

Q: AD: Sorry I missed the last couple of meetings and you may have said this before, but this is low cost?

A: PS: This is long term. We were trying to improve the physical environment, for instance, the median is grade separated...

Q: AD: The reason I'm asking is I'm wondering if we already threw out the idea of putting Fresh Pond Parkway underground.

A: PS: If you guys want to discuss it we can. That will bring more traffic through here, because you'll make the route a lot more efficient and so more traffic will want to come this way.

C: NCC: The other issue that we noted at the last meeting is we heard about that concept at an earlier public meeting and one issue is that you run the risk of introducing a ventilation structure into the neighborhood. It wouldn't be as big as the big dig ventilation tunnels but you would have to find a place to put that to exhaust the tunnel. That's another issue to consider.

Q: Jan Devereux (JD): Are you going to tell us how if you're coming from Harvard Square on Mount Auburn as a pedestrian or cyclist how to continue on Mount Auburn? I'm not seeing much.

A: PS: The sidewalk is where it is today. This driveway will need to be added but we envision someone being able to walk across here.

Q: JD: What about going through other way, and on a bicycle?

A: PS: They will be able to walk along this existing sidewalk and then cross here (as a pedestrian). On a bike, you would come either way. I ride a bicycle, as you guys know. I struggled to figure out a way. I looked at having a protected intersection all the way around, but that was difficult to fit in with the problem of the median and having pedestrians and bicyclists there together. Also, if you put a crossing



on the west side of Mount Auburn, you have to move the stop bar back. The gentleman's idea to have a bicycle lane that cuts the corner from Mount Auburn to Fresh Pond Parkway southbound to the bicycle lane is a good one for this direction. But one of the other things I kept hearing for cyclists was that people prefer Brattle Street. We did a desire line study at the Brattle intersection. About 30 percent of bicyclists went down Mount Auburn, but 60 percent go up Brattle from that direction to get to Harvard Square.

Q: JD: I think that's probably because you have to be insane to cross this intersection<sup>3</sup> on a bicycle. You look for an easier way. Do we want to give them a better way or say that people will continue to use Brattle?

A: PS: I'm open to suggestions here. I considered many different options. In the eastbound direction we can make a good improvement and improve that connection.

C: Janice Gould (JG): I wanted to comment on the crossing at Mount Auburn. The south crosswalk is great. I'm through there a lot back and forth. It seems to me that Brattle Street is not much further and you have one crosswalk there (for westbound pedestrians). Compared to here, where you have a median between the two sections of crosswalk, I would imagine you want to use Brattle. For efficiency, I would imagine that the crosswalk on the northern side of Fresh Pond Parkway might not be as well used as the one on the southern side. That's the one to use.

A: PS: We'll see when we go into testing. If we didn't leave it in for the test we wouldn't find out if it would hurt traffic.

Q: Arthur Strang (AS): Could you summarize her comment?

C: PS: She's asking about the efficiency of these crosswalks for traffic

C: Xander Dyer (XD): As a resident of that side of Mount Auburn Street, I would say that for us, if you're coming down the other side of Mount Auburn you have to do a circle to get to the right side of the street. For anyone walking from Harvard square, that's great.

C: Brendan (Last Name Not Given): I like the second crosswalk on that side. Coming from Harvard, it gives people the option of which side to cross on.

Q: NC: On the tunnel thing, it seems like we should consider it. I've had so many conversations with people about the tunnel. I think it's worth looking at.

---

<sup>3</sup> Here, Councilor Devereux means the crossing of Mount Auburn and Fresh Pond Parkway.

A: PS: I think we do need to answer this as a group. We had a very serious discussion last time about speeding on Fresh Pond. Right now one of the strategies we have is to make the lanes narrower to slow people down. If we were to build a tunnel for them to go under, they could go 90 miles per hour down to the river. I think the two things conflict.

Q: NC: Wouldn't pedestrians and cyclists be above, so they would be separated from the traffic?

A: PS: I'm not saying no. If we look at any underpass across the city and see how fast people are driving through them, I think you'd find speeding. Right now a huge discussion is happening about Rutherford Avenue (in Charlestown) that wasn't to slow traffic and they want to get rid of the underpass, while another group wants to drive through there quickly. It's a reverse of our conversation. If you want speed reduction, that might not be the way to go

C: NC: We don't need speed reduction. Maybe we're not all talking about the same tunnel?

A: PS: The cars would be above ground until they get to a tunnel.

C: Joe Barr (JB): I'll comment on that. There's a general experience that's common with grade separation, if you look at someplace like Harvard Square, where the end result isn't what people wanted when they asked for it. It doesn't solve the intended problems. There are several other intersections which will become higher speed. It's worth looking at. Also with a park on either side, it will be difficult to build grade separated access from the parkway to Mount Auburn and the other side roads. You wind up with a wider cross section than you have now. The goal is to make the area more pedestrian friendly, and if you look at someplace like the Harvard Square underpass, most people don't think that's a positive for pedestrians and bicyclists.

A: PS: That's a good point about the width. The street is so narrow on the north side of the intersection that you would probably end up cutting into the park. The only public land in this area is the park, so that's probably where the ventilation shaft would be.

C: AS: You're pre judging.

A: PS: Okay. We can look more into it. Anyone else have a comment?

C: FA: I had a comment. As you know, I proposed a traffic circle at grade with a sunken plaza inside, which allows you to go underneath the road into a space that could be a park or have community buildings, and then cross the middle of the very big traffic circle by bike or as a pedestrian safely, and go under the other side. This means there is no need for a ventilation system because the traffic is on top. You also gain space as a public space that you can use for whatever the community would like.

A: PS: We did look at a roundabout, admittedly an above ground one. The right of way isn't there because you have two lanes coming in from three sides. You'd have to have a pretty wide roundabout, even with the modern design. It would cut into right of ways that don't belong to the DCR, which means you're talking about private property takings.

C: AS: You would need land from the Harvard president's house.

A: PS: Exactly, that would be a private property taking.

C: FA: They might agree because of the public space gained, and this plan makes it safe for pedestrians and bikes.

Q: PS: You're talking pedestrians and bicyclists going underground?

A: FA: They would cross at a sunken area. It would be much more space. And it would be open.

Q: PS: So the traffic circle is above grade, or slightly? There are examples like that in Holland that I've seen. But again with that design there isn't the right of way, so we would need to, as you say, take some land from the Harvard president.

C: FA: It's public good.

A: PS: I'd welcome you to have a conversation with Harvard.

C: Russ Windman (RW): I live on Fresh Pond Parkway. This discussion started because of the discussion of speed which would increase with the underpass. The speed originates at the intersection of Huron at Fresh Pond Parkway. That's where people speed. That's not this intersection that you're concentrating on. Without addressing the speed that accelerates down the parkway, I don't know how we can address this intersection.

A: PS: Crashes at intersections aren't always related to speed.

C: RW: Please don't try to misdirect my comment. The concentration here is good; we've had good thoughts about how to improve one intersection. But that is not in isolation from the speed on the parkway at the earlier intersections.

A: PS: There is a difference between Huron at Fresh Pond Parkway and this intersection. I just wanted to explain that. The speeding starts when people get a green light at Huron, they know that it widens here and they know how much space there is down by the interchanges.

C: RW: I disagree. I think they're reacting to their immediate surroundings. I don't think they're thinking ahead to the next intersection.

A: PS: The lanes get wider in their immediate surroundings. One of the main factors that contribute to speed is lane width.

C: RW: The space I'm describing is very narrow – nine feet lanes.

A: PS: Down here lanes are fourteen feet.

C: EW: We live there we know its eight.

C: RW: The speed is coming from that intersection.

Q: EW: On the new design, you brought the intersection closer together. Did you say you were going to remove that steep grade?

A: PS: No.

C: EW: Right now you have these juxtaposed sidewalks and that takes up about eight feet. So, the other thing you have not factored in at all is handicap accessibility. There's no way that someone in a wheelchair or a bike or even an old person could get across the first intersection, and then walk to the second crosswalk.

A: PS: That's a good point. The grade difference starts further up from the intersection. The old median ends there.

Q: EW: Is this to scale?

A: PS: The median ends there, so the grade starts further up. If you look at the median in person its flat here so we're just extending that. At the narrowest point that median is twelve feet wide and its fourteen feet wide at the intersection. There's a lot of room for a ramp and turn, and another ramp and turn.

Q: EW: You are taking the median out?

A: PS: The grade isn't there at this section. It starts farther north and gets greater further up.

C: EW: I'm confused maybe. There are two big mistakes, and they're mistakes we've been harping on. This is a residential neighborhood and it seems that the DCR, the City of Cambridge, and everyone and the commuters do not want to acknowledge that they're in a residential neighborhood. For those us of who

actually live on this road, and even on Mount Auburn, it's hard to get into our driveways and cross the street. When you talk about efficiencies, what you're really saying getting as many cars across the intersection as possible. At some point especially when you're dealing with pedestrians, bikers, *and* cars, you'll need to adjust priorities and say no, safety first. Slowing down traffic is important, and it would be nice to have a speed limit sign. It would be nicer if people got speeding tickets. That's the first thing. You have to see this fundamentally not as public space but as a residential neighborhood. The other thing is in my vision I said that this is not a four way intersection it's actually five way. That's why I was asking about the two turn lanes. The difficulty starts at Eliot Bridge where there are a lot of people crossing really fast. You need to treat this not like a four way intersection, and not just cram this intersection into a smaller space, but as a five way intersection. If you do that at least some of these solutions drawn here will change.

Q: PS: what would be the fifth way?

A: EW: It is five ways now, even though it appears to be four. You have traffic going up, to the left, coming from Mount Auburn you have a right turn but also crossing and going into Harvard Square. You might even call it six way intersection. You have many more lanes. You should have put them in different lanes, and should've put vehicles there so you can see where the traffic wants to go.

A: PS: Yes. We are going to be doing VISSIM, which is a simulation of the cars. That's a later stage, once you come up with a solution you want to test, up to three, we'll test them and see the traffic flow.

C: EW: I'm interested in doing it the old fashioned way. I know how to do this. I didn't want to create a design. That's what you're being paid to do, is come up with two to three designs that are different ways of solving the problems. I don't think this solves the problems at all. It doesn't show the lanes clearly, it doesn't show turns clearly, and you have lots of crossovers between bikes, pedestrians, and cars. For example, on Storrow Drive, the Arthur Fiedler Bridge is something you could do – there are a number of pedestrian and bike crossovers on Storrow Drive. For a pedestrian bridge you don't need the same clearances that you would need for a traffic circle or a tunnel or any of that. It's something to consider.

A: PS: Okay. Any other comments?

C: FA: The traffic circle doesn't actually take much land from Harvard.

A: PS: We can look at that.

C: AS: I want to go back to the concept of the neighborhood, and also the tunnel or underpass which are two different things. If you look on the web you might still be able to find some designs that were done by five Cambridge residents called "City Without Traffic" which had a tunnel from Fresh Pond and the waterworks all the way to Boston University underground, and near the river there was parking.

On the surface there was much less traffic. These are concepts to look at. My particular problem is this: we're looking at crashes, and intersections. I don't think that relates to the conditions we're facing. The speeding is the issue. Fresh Pond Parkway was just paved looks terrific. For a whole week, there were no lines and the traffic actually traveled 25 to 30 miles per hour. When lines were back, they sped back up to 40 or 50 miles per hour. That's the problem. It's not so much that you need to slow people down with narrow lanes. Up toward Huron Avenue lanes are narrow. That's one concept. The other thing is this: there's a MassDOT site where you can look through the crashes over the last thirteen years of traffic for anywhere. From Fresh Pond Parkway at the River to Huron Avenue, between 2001 and 2013 there were over 500 or 600 crashes. The difference between Huron Avenue (which is a simple intersection) and Mount Auburn (which is very complex) is only 15 percent, next to nothing. We're going to spend a ton of money to reduce crashes here by a miniscule amount and make the intersection as simple as Huron Avenue? Reduction of crashes isn't what we're trying to get at here. We're talking about making the area safe for kids to walk.

Q: PS: Wouldn't that be the same thing?

A: AS: No. When my kids were young, they walked and cycled. They could cross the street. Now they're not comfortable. It's not safe. When I pull out of my driveway now, people honk, they're upset. There's a whole different aggression out there.

A: PS: I hear speed.

C: AS: It's speed, inattention, and aggression. It's those things that make us fearful for our children and grandchildren. Just fixing an intersection isn't going to do much for that.

A: PS: My strategy for that was to narrow the lanes. Like you said it's not huge but it is a difference.

C: NCC: Hang on folks. I'm mindful of a project that I did some years ago where the community told our traffic engineer, that's not Pete: please think outside the box. He came back with two very much outside the box solutions. They were angry for the whole meeting because they were way too out there. I just want to take a moment and say please take a look at this. We're hearing a lot of no, no, no. I've sat here for two meetings. Part of my role here is the core values and shared goals and that's why I'm quiet tonight because those are set and documented.

You talked about wanting to make it safer for people to cross Fresh Pond Parkway. The chief crosswalk used to be three phases, now it's down to one. The crosswalk on the far side seems like it's debatable. Some people really like it, others don't. This to me, as Pete tried to show you, does hit on some of the goals you offered. I'm hearing the tunnel discussion; we can talk about underpasses and tunnels. But this concept hits on some of the things you told us. We also heard that you want us to try to come up with things we can do now. You're suffering now. There are things we can do with landscaping treatments, which DCR is very good at, that could cue people better that they are arriving in a

neighborhood. Some of the enhanced green space, which we could have made greener in our diagram, could house those things.

To your point, Elizabeth, we now have spaces we didn't have before. We enshrined the word enforcement in our shared goals because you asked for it, by which we mean providing a place for a cop to sit and use a radar gun and hand out tickets. Some of these enhanced spaces go to providing a spot for a cop to sit.

I have one last point. We have to start somewhere. I understand you want to look at the whole corridor, and we will. I've sat through a lot of meetings and I've driven this corridor a lot. I do find that when people know that it's opening out and they're ready to go, they do tend to step on it. We have to start somewhere on the corridor. Pete's starting with an intersection that you identified as really bad. I apologize for taking a long time. I think this gets at some of what you had. If you have things you want to change, or other things to look at, please let us know. But I'm hearing a lot of "this is a total mistake - you didn't listen to us" and think if you look closely I don't think that the case. Okay I'm done.

C: PS: If I could hold you for a minute, there are a few more slides that will fill in some of other goals.

C: AS: We can do all we want to this intersection but it will never be as simple as Huron Avenue and it will therefore never be as safe as Huron Avenue and Huron Avenue is not safe. So what are we doing?

Q: PS: What would you propose Arthur?

A: AS: Some way to reduce aggression speed volume, and inattention. At that intersection you can have nice crosswalk but what if a driver's on his phone?

C: AB: You can't prevent that.<sup>4</sup>

A: PS: That's a difficult thing to prevent with design.

C: RW: At beginning of the meeting you said in discussing this intersection that everything we do in the corridor is contingent upon this intersection. Then you said we have to maintain auto flow out there today.

C: PS: No.

C: RW: We take issue with maintaining flow.

---

<sup>4</sup> This comment was repeated by several attendees.

- A: PS: This was part of the shared goals we all agreed on to go forward through the slides. This is something we heard from your neighbors. “Maintain mobility for motor vehicles.” We got a lot of comments from earlier meetings from people that were worried if we put a transit or bicycle lane here about, that they wouldn’t get through the intersection. We’re not increasing the flow of traffic. That is not the goal. Right now it’s backed up to Belmont on Mount Auburn, and it might well still be. But we were tasked with reducing transit delays, improving bicycle connectivity, improving pedestrians and resident environment, and measuring people not cars. What we set out to do was fix everything but the traffic and that is what this design is built to do.
- C: RW: That’s news to me. We were led to believe we might see some improvement of the hazardous conditions on Fresh Pond Parkway.
- A: PS: I understand your frustration. I have friends that live on the Arborway in Jamaica Plain, it’s the same kind of situation. Actually it’s worse because there are four lanes.
- C: EW: That’s not true there are not upwards of forty residents on the Arborway. Count number of houses between Brattle and Huron and you cannot say that the Arborway is worse.<sup>5</sup>
- C: PS: I was speaking more to the condition of the road.
- C: AB: I think you actually *are* addressing some of these things. It looks like you’ve extended the park, which will make the area a lot safer. Instead of people flying through turns, they will have to slow down. You’re improving traffic flow because people will come to a full stop and no one will be stuck in the middle of that intersection. You’ll improve pedestrian traffic in almost every direction. The only thing I can see is the bicycle issue on Mount Auburn, and you can’t win all the time. This will add a lot of new green space, the road will be much narrower, and no one will be able to gain the speed that we’re worried about. Maybe the roads are small and people have gotten used to driving faster on the small roads, but maybe drivers will get used to seeing people crossing all the time and this corridor not just being a way to quickly cross through the area. If you put a tunnel in to make traffic move faster, then the neighborhood will be awful. I feel like people aren’t seeing the good parts of this concept. The road is much narrower, people are going to have to come to a complete stop and people will be able to cross at the crosswalk and drivers will have to be more cautious. I just needed to defend you guys because it feels like you checked a lot of these boxes. It’s a tough intersection no matter what you do. This looks like it could improve instantly, and why don’t we see if it works, and if it doesn’t we can try other things.

---

<sup>5</sup> Along Fresh Pond Parkway between Huron and Gerry’s Landing (excluding between Brattle and Mount Auburn where there are no residences facing the Parkway), there are 37 homes facing the Parkway. This length of the Parkway measures approximately one half mile. Along the Arborway, between South Street and Custer Street, also approximately a half mile distance, there are 37 homes.



- C: PS: We're looking forward to seeing how much we can do in the short term. You said that we extend the park on the left side, but we will also extend the park on the east side, it's just not as dramatic of a change.
- Q: AB: You mentioned raised intersection for Coolidge Avenue. Maybe you could throw that improvement somewhere else, because that does seem to really slow the traffic.
- A: PS: When we get up to Huron that's one of the things we'll think about that. We're not at Huron yet but we're going there.
- C: AB: I think you all are missing it. There are little things that will slow people down. Today they can start to speed on the southern side of this intersection on Fresh Pond Parkway, but if they don't speed through this intersection they won't speed up as much after they go through this intersection.
- A: PS: If you think about the design tools we have on a roadway, they are: lane width, turning radii, and the design of the edge. If you put, for instance, vertical elements like trees, or you have more of a pedestrian environment where it looks like kids may be running around, people slow down.
- C: AS: Traffic signals as well.
- A: PS: Yes, exactly. We can make sure there's a full stop. We can also include speed humps and those types of interventions.
- C: NCC: The number of lanes is reduced in this concept.
- C: PS: I've looked at Melnea Cass and Massachusetts Avenue a lot because it's a horrible intersection. More people run red lights there on average than most other intersections in the city because it's the entrance to the highway. That's a phenomenon that's repeated all over. Down towards river Fresh Pond the street is built like a highway. The concept here is to make this section not built like a highway and more like a parkway, like Charles Eliot originally designed it. That's the lane width portion, and we've also significantly changed the turn radiuses here, which is another tool to use. We haven't started to talk about the edge yet, but we have a landscape architect on our team to deal with that, but we need to get through the nitty-gritty first. I understand your frustration, but I need more guidance on actual proposals to improve this design. I think we've gotten the suggestion to connect the bike path to the transit lane. Overall we need to get on same page.
- C: XD – I think an elevated table to break up Fresh Pond Parkway somewhere near Larch Road perhaps would help. In a way, it's a long run people can accelerate.
- A: PS: That's an interesting idea.

- C: NC: An elevated table on Fresh Pond Parkway would signal that this area is residential. That's the conflict here, between those of us wanting to take back our neighborhood and the people that want to accommodate all the traffic. We don't want to accommodate that commuter traffic; we don't care about making it more efficient. Those types of ideas, like the speed table maybe at Huron or Larch Road would break up the efficiency but that's a signal that this is residential.<sup>6</sup>
- A: PS: Okay, that's on the record. We're also talking about the right turn from Fresh Pond Parkway to Mount Auburn eastbound for that kind of treatment.
- C: AS: Another place for a speed table would be where the Watertown - Cambridge Greenway ends at the Alewife water plant.
- C: NCC: He's talking about beyond the limits of work.
- C: AS: The Greenway is another project that DCR is doing. The greenway ends at the water plant and there's no way to cross the street for people who will want to get to the Greenway.
- A: PS: Okay, we'll capture that in the notes and make sure Ken and Rob have a copy.
- C: Gideon Schreiber: I have a couple points but I'm also excited to write on paper in the charrette. I think that the Mount Auburn Street corridor would be the preferred bike route if there was infrastructure to support it there. On the Cambridge side towards Watertown, it looks like there's some space to accommodate a bicycle lane, and then bicyclists would be able to bike through all the way to Watertown and Belmont. I think that would fit with the Complete Streets model and with the expansion of Hubway we want people of all skillsets to be able to know where and how to go. That connection would help a lot. Right now I see it but its making you take the crosswalk. There's no connection to Mount Auburn. They can go to the river but not keep going on Mount Auburn which is the desire line.
- A: PS: We do need to address that. I was looking at the super safe stuff, and not thinking about sharrows yet.
- C: GS: Maybe for the cautious cyclists doing a shared bike and pedestrian crossing for Fresh Pond Parkway even if its two stage. Then you're getting people across, because there are destinations like the Hospital and Star Market all over.
- A: PS: Admittedly we leaned on Brattle in this design, because Elmwood connects to Brattle. It connects the entire neighborhood, because the streets up there feel pretty safe.

---

<sup>6</sup> There was general agreement on this point.

C: GS: I like the moved pedestrian crosswalk at the right turn onto Mount Auburn Eastbound. It still has the curve, and I'm wondering if that's safe, rather than putting the crosswalk at the beginning of the ramp onto Mount Auburn. The crossing is mid-block, and I was wondering what the logic for that was. I see that you made the crossing sharper so vehicles will slow some.

C: PS: We discussed making this a raised crossing.

C: NCC: Pete and I sat with our traffic engineer in advance of this meeting. The reason the crosswalk is there is that Pete is hoping to make that a raised crossing, and if you do that, you move the crosswalk to the center so a car length can fit behind and in front of the crosswalk. To reduce conflict one of the things we talk about is making sure people can see each other. We've tightened the turn radius so cars slow down, and we have placed the crosswalk where a driver making that turn only has to look for one thing at a time. That's very purposeful.

C: GS: Also, I thought that the MBTA buses couldn't handle speed cables? Mount Auburn Street further back need to be looked at in terms of the distances.

C: Phil Groth (PG): If it is high enough, yes that could be an issue. You'd have to talk to the power guys.

C: EW: Those buses are always losing power through here.

A: PS: Maybe it would be good if I skipped to the transit priority section. I'll take your question soon, I just want to progress because we're getting far behind. Obviously we have much more discussion but this is a conversation about connectivity, air quality, and mobility choices. Here again are the stop bar distances. There are new bicycle connections, new crosswalks, and potential sidewalk and buffer improvements. The sidewalk now has a large buffer from the street which helps with noise as you walk. We can also think about ways using shrubbery or other landscaping elements that would buffer air quality as well. These are new sidewalks.

Next is reducing transit delay. There are all kinds of ways to do this. This is the full menu, and from this menu we selected transit signal priority and a bus only lane. As a described earlier, the bus only lane starts after Brattle Street and continues to the Coolidge Avenue intersection. There will be a bus priority signal (maybe not this kind) at that intersection so that the bus can jump maneuver the lane shift and then traffic will follow behind it. This is how it works. The bus generates a request, transmits the request, the signal is received, signal processes and reacts to the request and gives a green extension, a red truncation or nothing. That will depend on the traffic situation. Our transit expert Connor Semler couldn't get a babysitter for tonight. The bus has a priority request generator on it. The intersection receives that priority request in a modern server. This would mean changing out the signal which belongs to DCR.

I was hoping we could check off some of these goals I don't know if you all are ready to do that. Goal three was address cut through in Huron Village, Larchwood, and Coolidge Hill neighborhoods, and I don't think we did a lot for that.

Q: NCC: What about the speed table? Isn't that helping some of the Coolidge Hill area?

Q: PS: Could be. When we get to the broader plan we will take a look at the cut through spots that are common. There may be some other ways we can deal with that, just maybe not in this intersection.

C: XD: Quick question on bus priority. What happens if you're coming from Watertown down Mount Auburn and want to turn right onto Coolidge Avenue? What's the rule about cutting across the bus lane?

A: PS: It would be a bus lane and a turn lane as well, so shared.

A: NCC: If you're not familiar with what that looks like you can go down to Washington Street and Massachusetts Avenue in Boston.

C: PS: Washington Street would be pretty similar to this. We don't know if this would allow bicycles, and there's no parking on the side, but otherwise it's very similar. Goal 4, offer short and long-term solutions we can't check off because this is long-term. There are a couple things in Goal 5, acknowledge the special uses. We heard a lot from Shady Hill School parents. We added a crosswalk on the eastern side of the intersection at Coolidge Avenue, and we've talked about treatment to the intersection to make it more of a pedestrian environment. We've also talked about widening this path significantly from Fresh Pond Parkway and that would continue almost to Huron.

C: NC: Those are huge improvements. One thing I don't know if you noticed, there are lots of bicycles on that path. A lot of those cyclists going down Mount Auburn on the north sidewalk want to get down toward Fresh Pond Parkway as well, so that's something to note as we think about delineating that path. Right now its narrow and pedestrians scoot off for bicycles.

A: PS: That's the tough part; this will increase the demand somewhat. Even though we're not fully connecting it because of the heavy traffic, there will be more people coming down this way. We could treat this with bicycle sharrows or guidance around the intersection.

C: AS: This plays into the other DCR discussion regarding Lowell Park. The walk that comes across the park on the left side could be extended to the other side of intersection, because kids cross there to get to Shady Hill because it's the only sidewalk up there. The Lowell Park Discussion had us moving the sidewalk and opening the walk for that purpose. Also the cemetery side of Coolidge Avenue has no sidewalk.

A: PS: Okay, that's all noted. Also with this intersection getting a lot better, I thought for that desire line to the schools it might be better to go through the Coolidge Hill neighborhood and take the pedestrian crossing at the major intersection. That would be something to develop organically. We took you all seriously in looking for opportunities for police enforcement. We're looking for places where they could be stationed to watch this light, as I'm sure there will still be occasional problems. Where the right turn lane going southbound from Fresh Pond Parkway to Mount Auburn used to be might be a good place for that. We could treat the ground with permeable pavement, pavers that grass can grow through that would also support a vehicle without dying.

C: Rob Lowell (RL): The other thought is that could serve as a space for break downs, so someone can get out of the way, and it would also serve as a relief for police trying to pull someone over.

A: PS: Right. We did go a few things toward this goal. Operations for the hospital stay the same. Now can we move to Brattle Street?

C: JG: Is there anything you can do down a little further toward BB&N?

C: PS: There will be.

C: JG: The entrance to the high school is slowed down because of lights, but the traffic at the gym entrance goes so fast. It's an unprotected left turn across three lanes. When you're approaching you don't really see the school gym there.

A: PS: We're taking this like puzzle pieces. We thought this would be the hardest piece to solve and then we're going down that way, and through rest of Mount Auburn then at the end we'll have up to three concepts that address the whole area.

C: NCC: Don't forget I'm class of 1998, we won't forget BB&N. Go knights.

C: PS: This is Brattle Street at Mount Auburn today. Right now we've heard there are merging problems, queues gets backed up, pedestrians don't have a way to get through, bicyclists have a hard time turning left, and there are funky things going on with the intersection at Aberdeen because of the bus turns. Also this island is hanging out and can't be used.

This is our first draft. We decided to figure a way to make a safe left for cyclists. Like I mentioned previously, we did a desire line study. One of our co-ops drew a line for every cyclist that made each maneuver turning. Out of about 80 cyclists, 15 are trying to avoid the whole area entirely by traveling up the north sidewalk of Mount Auburn to Brattle, 35 were taking the left onto Brattle from Mount Auburn, and the final 25 were going straight. We decide to make the dominant move onto Brattle safer and facilitate those going straight. Hopefully the people that are currently avoiding the intersection will have a safe option to do so.

The first goal is to reduce crashes and the severity of crashes. This intersection was one of the crash clusters we showed before, the three being Huron at Fresh Pond, Mount Auburn at Fresh Pond, and this one. I haven't mentioned this previously, but we're also doing a roadway safety audit for all three of these intersections, which will bring together all the people that interact with these spaces including law enforcement, and emergency services, and we'll be sitting down to figure out what kinds of crashes are happening and what are the things we can do to improve the situation. That discussion may change the design as well. We'll be bringing that information back. These are the conflict points, again. High speed location left turns, including into and out of the cemetery

C: EW: I like what you did here much better, but there's something that's been bothering me. I live right here, I do these maneuvers all the time. There are many instances where it seems like you don't know the neighborhood and don't drive or walk through here. You don't know that if you can't make a left there and go onto Brattle, you have to go all the way down to Mount Auburn Hospital. It's the same with cutting through the neighborhoods off of Fresh Pond; they are so dangerous that I never do the left turns.

Q: PS: So you don't make this left turn?

A: EW: No I take this left all the time. But there's a lot of jeopardy of being rear ended. Also if you make a right turn into that turn ramp, people cut you off. They think this is an area to do a u-turn. They do it all the time, I don't know why. The new way to do this is to make a T junction but you need a signal light because otherwise you'll never be able to get through because no one will let you go.

A: PS: That's something we can look at, and when we get to the test stage we can look at what a signal does. We can decide together either way.

C: NC: At the crosswalk below Brattle, you have to basically jump up and down and get four cars to stop to cross there. It is an important crossing but it's very dangerous. Cars see it as a straight shot, that I would think maybe raising it would be a good idea? The bikers wouldn't be protected to take that left either, so it would naturally help bikers and pedestrians.

A: PS: Okay. I'm going to try and get through a few more slides. There are five high speed both vehicle points today, that goes down to four by eliminating the merge. The rest stays the same; there is one low speed point from a driveway. In the concept these driveways still have access. Another focus point is this little pedestrian refuge, which we can add because this becomes a left turn only lane. That way we can have guidance further back to cut down on rear ends.

Q: NC: Can you still go straight along the medical area?

- A: PS: If you're coming down Brattle and want to get onto Mount Auburn moving westbound, you have to take the turn, so you're slowed down
- C: NC: That's good. And what's going on with the crosswalk?
- C: PS: It's a pedestrian refuge. You only have one lane of traffic to look out for before you get to safety, and then you look again for two lanes and can get the rest of the way across. We were talking about whether we signalize this or whether a rapid flashing beacon would be an option, or other types of signals?
- Q: EW: What about arrows for the turn?
- A: PS: Yes, or a signal arrow.
- C: EW: You would make it orderly if you had a left hand turn lane and a green arrow for it.
- A: PS: Definitely something we're going to look at.
- C: JF: This is beautiful. I have a question about bike traffic. It looks like this suggests that this concept sets up clear and attractive brattle street biking situation. I don't bike downtown but the people who are bike commuters are either going to Harvard Square or to all the way to Boston, so they're looking to get to the bike paths along the river. This sets up Brattle Street as easy and safe direct way to get to Harvard, but I'm wondering if you need two ways to get to there. Maybe you don't want someone on Mount Auburn Street as a bicycle commuter and instead you make it really safe, great, and efficient on Brattle. That way you don't bog up Mount Auburn trying to accommodate bicycles, you don't encourage it but you facilitate the Storrow Drive commuter connection and Brattle.
- A: PS: There's a state law that provides guidance on this, we try to provide bike accommodation on arterial roads. With a road like this with lots of traffic you want to do everything you can. Like I was saying earlier regarding the desire line study, 35 people took Brattle, 25 took Mount Auburn and while we might be able to switch some people to the safer route, some people will still go Mount Auburn. We can't forget about them or dissuade them but there are definitely limitations on what we can do.
- C: JF: It's hard to create safe and smooth in that direction onto Mount Auburn.
- A: PS: We do have a safe way through the intersection, and in between the two intersections we have a transit lane, which if all parties agree could allow bikers, as well. Then you have a professional class of drivers to deal with as opposed to the general public.
- C: JF: The bus lane doesn't take you through the intersection at Fresh Pond though, that makes me nervous.

A: PS: It's not perfect.

C: EW: One thing that you have to deal with here for the bike lane right hand turn is that it's very narrow and there's parking for the apartment building on the right. I don't know how you can accommodate them because you can't widen the road.

A: PS: These are bump outs that disappear up at Brattle.

Q: EW: What's a bump out?

A: JB: We have smaller curb extensions all over the place.

A: PS: The idea is that where there the curb comes out to meet the crosswalk. It's the same idea. They don't actually have to be this long, but parking does happen here. I also know that the City of Cambridge is studying that parking area.

A: JD: We probably don't need all of that to be parking.

C: EW: That will be difficult.

A: PS: We don't need to take a lot of parking here. It's another conversation.

C: GS: I used to do a lot of travel between Harvard Square and Watertown. I know the current layout at Brattle is awkward but it allows people from Brattle Street to get to Mount Auburn. You've created a ninety degree angle so I think it will more difficult to get into the primary traffic on the Mount Auburn Street Corridor. I'm concerned that there will be substantial car backup on Brattle, since that's the main access to Mount Auburn from Fresh Pond?

A: PS: One thing to note is that Aberdeen pulls out a lot of traffic. The traffic counts after Brattle are much lower; that's what allows us to put in the bus lane. We're going to study the idea of one lane coming westbound and a bus lane going east.

C: GS: I'm referring to Brattle westbound, not Mount Auburn.

A: PS: Right. That something we'll be testing - if you like this idea, we'd look at how it affects that queue.

C: GS: Maybe a signal would help. The problem with the ninety degree angle is that it makes it harder to merge. On Belmont Street a lot of these intersections have been straightened out and it's a much harder merge. You have to push in to get through.



A: PS: It creates a safer situation but there is that drawback.

Q: NCC: Given that this option is getting a better reaction from you all, Gideon would feel better with the road coming in not at 90 but at 70 or 60 degrees? The way it is today, I can take that merge in third gear, versus this concept would have me come to a complete stop, so what about splitting the difference?

A: GS: I'm bringing it up because the only movement is a right turn out of Mount Auburn, and someone might try to turn left onto Mount Auburn.

C: PS: I wonder how many people would do that, given this pedestrian buffer. It could happen.

C: David Teller (DT): People will take a right at Fresh Pond and Mount Auburn instead of going down Brattle.

A: PS: It could have that effect. These are questions that will be answered once we decide we want to test it with animation. With VISSIM we'll be able to see how cars are affected in this whole project area. We'll see how far people back up and if people are encouraged to take the right, the model will show it.

Q: NC: Is a light a possibility there?

A: PS: Yes, that's something we'll look at.

C: JD: I like this idea. The right turn reminds me a little bit of what happens to Massachusetts Ave and Main Street in Cambridge, the new gray blob could be a public plaza. There is a light at Massachusetts and Main.

A: JB: It's a logical place to look at a signal. It's a city intersection so it's a question of whether its warranted, and what the delay is for all users. There are definitely some things worth looking at. In the evening peak outbound point, to the point that was made, there are limited gaps on Mount Auburn because of both the heavy through traffic and the heavy volume turns of Fresh Pond Parkway. There is very limited time when there's no traffic going westbound on Mount Auburn, so it could be harder to find natural gaps.

Q: AD: I like the way it was before. For the experienced driver traveling westbound, like me, it's never a problem. My question is on the eastbound lanes - you now have a turning lane, so now only one lane going straight. When you're coming from the west what does that do for transit and any other cars coming inbound?

A: PS: Here transit is part of traffic so they'd come with everyone else. To explain our process a little more we did daily traffic counts, and turning movement counts at all signalized intersections plus this one.

We determined that Brattle is where a lot of traffic turns off or comes in, so it's very different in terms of volumes. East of this intersection, volumes are about 23,000 per day versus 28,000 further west, closer to Belmont Street. That is the dividing line on road diets. Alex, our traffic engineer, says we could have two lanes in this direction and one going the other direction (or vice versa). We're not sure, we'll need to model it to understand, but there is extra capacity.

C: EW: But if you kept the westbound lane on Brattle merging with Mount Auburn the way it was you could still have some kind of island. If you put in a left turn lane on Mount Auburn eastbound and a good crosswalk with a signal light, that could work. You could maybe make the lane a little wider, it would be safer and have a signal so people would be able to turn and children can cross. You could compromise this.

A: PS: That's an interesting idea. Maybe one of the alternatives could include the existing merge continuing.

C: GS: I like this better.

C: NC: Another issue with the merge is that some people are looking to get out of the traffic at Aberdeen. Half of the people coming in at Brattle want to be in the cemetery lane because they're going straight to Watertown, but the other half need to right on Aberdeen. It slows down everything.

A: PS: This would extend that merge and might make it more efficient. That's the kind of thing that traffic modeling will tell us.

C: AS: This intersection mirrors Aberdeen, where inbound there is a left turn lane and only one lane for through traffic. Very few cars actually turn left off Aberdeen. Having one lane here seems reasonable. But it does need a signal

C: AB: Wasn't one of the goals to reduce cut through traffic, wouldn't this be against that?

Q: PS: Would you all consider Brattle an arterial or residential street?

A: AB: It's surrounded by homes; I think they would consider it a residential street.

A: PS: That's the same as Fresh Pond Parkway. Almost every street has houses on it.

C: AB: But one of the goals was to reduce cut through traffic.

A: JB: From the city's perspective, we consider Mount Auburn an arterial. It carries a decent amount of traffic. We certainly want it to be slower than it is, but in terms of routes. Putting traffic on Brattle

isn't really a cut through issue. People on that street might feel differently but in the hierarchy of the streets it's more of an arterial.

C: PS: Thanks Joe.

Q: FA: Have you considered having Mount Auburn going one way and using Brattle as the one way pair? It would allow a bus lane.

A: PS: We can think about that, but when you get further east they're far enough apart that it would be hard to get people to do that movement.

A: NCC: One of issues for that would be the catenary for the transit buses. One of the things we see frequently when we discuss one way pairs, is that when people get on a bus they want to get back on the bus somewhere that's close by. One of the things in our goals is encourage transit ridership. If you separate the inbound and outbound stops significantly, people wind up not taking the bus and drive. That's something to think about

C: PS: I get the sense that you're not too impressed with the conflict points, but there are a couple interesting things here. It's a nice way to think about this. With vehicles, you calm things a bit. Bike-pedestrian conflict points go down from twelve to eight. This is bikes and vehicles. It's pretty crazy today, and becomes a lot more organized. What do you all think - did we calm traffic?

Q: NC: I'm confused about these 4 conflict points? Bikes can go straight, right? Are they going into Mount Auburn?

A: PS: That's right. Yeah I was thinking about tourists that like to go to Mount Auburn Cemetery. Although they can't cycle within, they could park their ride out front. One of the things that I like about this design as well is that it could help the cemetery with concerns they had voiced about people blocking funeral processions. This sets up places for related signage, because it is a very impressive place. This pedestrian desire line is now accommodated – in the old design you had to longer multi-stage cross, whereas now you can just go straight. Bicyclist and pedestrian safety and comfort improve. You can implement the same kind of things for noise and air quality buffer, depending on what you want to put in. There are some places where you wouldn't want anything vertical for visibility, but there are opportunities. You could also think about relocating or improving bus stops.

We've done a lot to expand mobility choices with this concept, a little for air quality, definitely improved connectivity for pedestrians and bicyclists. Like I said earlier, I don't think we've addressed cut through traffic directly, that will come in other parts of the plan. The final goal, we've talked about ways we can help the cemetery and also opportunities for police enforcement and monitoring.

That's the presentation. I don't know where we are with time.

C: NCC: It's five past eight. I don't know if people want to try doing the exercise now? I feel like we have a lot of affection for this concept. I hear your concerns about the turn and desire for a signal. We got some debate back and forth about the validity of the outbound crosswalk on Fresh Pond Parkway (towards Arlington). That's something we need to think about. We had some folks talking about the big intersection, after an initial look, that there may be some valid things associated with that. We'll revisit it a little bit to see if we can tighten some bicycle connections, and we talked about some ways to make it feel more like a neighborhood. Some of those things may be hard to see in plan view. We'll definitely be getting into that when we bring in our landscaping folks later on. We'll generate renderings that show some of the vertical elements like trees. I feel like we've gotten guidance on both of these. Am I right in saying we can build further on these; you don't want us to throw them out entirely? Is that a fair statement?<sup>7</sup>

C: RW: We want the discussion to expand.

A: NCC: Keep in mind that we're starting from two big intersections and we're growing out between them. We're starting at nodes and we're going from there, and there are other pieces we are going to get to. Eventually we're going to show you a whole concept. We're going to show you each piece and how it hangs together. We just had to pick a place to start.

A: PS: The loudest comment we heard today was about the speed on Fresh Pond and doing something directly about that, so I think for next time we'll enhance in that direction.

C: RW: Traffic tables would help.

C: EW: I have a homework assignment that I would like you to do. I'm a landscaper by training and I've done a lot of landscape history. Mount Auburn Cemetery was designed by Olmsted<sup>8</sup> and knowing about Central Park and the emerald necklace. One of Olmsted's greatest feasts was to design not just areas and neighborhoods but also the roadways that go there. I would like to know if you can find a map, the historic maps of what the roadways looked like here.

Q: NCC: Didn't we show that in an earlier presentation?

A: PS: In an earlier presentation we showed some historic map I can show you.

C: EW: That wasn't a real historic map. I'm talking about real ones. There might be some in the Olmsted archive.

---

<sup>7</sup> Here there was general agreement with a few comments.

<sup>8</sup> 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](https://www.nps.gov/nr/travel/massachusetts_conservation/mount_auburn.html).

A: PS: Do you know Bill Warner on the stakeholder group? He created a website called Map Junction that he has maps available going back to the 1700s.

C: EW: Everything you're now is shrinking the intersections and the roadways to some extent. I'm sure that before 1940/50 the roadways were much smaller and I'd be interested in seeing where the desire lines were then. Then we hit a point in more modern history when they were all widened out and now we've hit the limits because we can't afford to buy up the property to make roads wider. That's not happening. I'd like to see what it was and how they moved traffic back in the days when there were trolleys and horse and buggies. We're talking about 1880s when there were still horse and buggies.

C: PS: We do have some really interesting historic roadway plans even that wouldn't be on a map (from DCR). That's one of the ways we came up with this design that I didn't show you. That's a good comment.

Q: EW: But what year are they from?

C: PS: 1940s is the last time they changed the roadways. On this road they did some big changes at Mount Auburn and Fresh Pond in the 1950s and 1960s.

C: EW: I'm not talking about that. The Mount Auburn Cemetery was consecrated in 1831. These roadways were all there. Let's look to see what the configuration was back then, because I have a suspicion that what you're trying to get back to is much more like the old intersections.

A: PS: That's what we're trying to do.

A: JB: We can also talk to Charlie Sullivan at the historic commission to see if he has any information about that. He has some impressive presentations about the history of some of these roads like the Alewife Brook Parkway, so he might have similar information about these roads.

C: EW: Our house for example was built in the 1890s. There were houses here, not just roads. This was all here.

C: NCC: We can dredge some of that stuff up. I don't know if you were here for our very first meeting but Pete did give a pretty decent history presentation.

C: PS: It was quick though. Sometimes I'll pull out every map and do the progression through the years.

C: EW: I read your proposal. There isn't much history there.

A: NCC: The proposal is a different document than the first presentation and the first set of meeting minutes. Take a look at those as well. I'm not saying we won't bring more, I'm just saying start there.

C: PW: I like history. I'll come back with something for you.

Q: AD: Were you going to talk about a dedicated bus lane on Mount Auburn?

A: PS: The transit lane that we're proposing for one of the alternatives starts just after Brattle and ends at Coolidge Avenue. There's a transit signal priority there that will get it ahead of traffic into the Mount Auburn/ Fresh Pond Parkway intersection. We think it will save three to four min on bus run time.

C: PG: I'm curious to see if you can go to one lane in each direction at Brattle, with the pedestrian refuge. I want to see if it doesn't take away the efficacy of the bus lane if the area between brattle and Aberdeen is a pinch point. Also, similarly the efficacy of the queue jump if that area gets clogged up.

A: PS: We're thinking about that. Also with the placement of bus stop could also factor into that. We'll include the transit signal priority in VISSIM.

C: NCC: Pete, show the final slide.

C: PS: Okay we'll skip ahead here. We'll get to the charrette at the next meeting. Your next stakeholder meeting is August 18<sup>th</sup>. We're also going to be working on the Initial Conditions Report, which won't be done by the 18<sup>th</sup>, but by the end of August. That will be the existing conditions we've talked about plus your comments. We're shooting for the next public meeting in October. At that meeting we'll be discussing the proposed long and short-term improvements, provided we can agree on what they are.

Q: AS: Will there be a September meeting?

A: PS: We haven't scheduled that yet, but there will be one, mid to late September.

A: NCC: Since everyone wants to know and because Hannah and I book this facility significantly back from the meeting date I can let you know our current plan. Currently we're looking at September 15 or the 29<sup>th</sup>. That's what we're looking at right now, but don't wed yourself to those dates. We will get back to you soon on that.

Q: AS: You raised some questions and got responses from us, but it's not clear you have agreement from us.

A: PS: You're right, we don't. There are people asking for different things. We will make up to three alternatives and then we'll test them. Hopefully we can get everyone's thoughts into one of the alternatives. Then we can look at the differences between the three, and that will help us make choices about the final proposals.

Q: AS: Could you clarify three?

A: PS: For the entire project area we'll have up to three different alternatives. We'll look at what they do for traffic and those kinds of issues. For instance, we had some alternatives come out of our discussion at Brattle, like keeping the existing merge.

Q: RW: Those alternatives will include Huron Avenue down the Fresh Pond Parkway?

A: PS: That will include Huron Avenue down to the three legged interchanges down by the Eliot Bridge on Fresh Pond Parkway, and from Traill Street to Belmont Street on Mount Auburn.

Q: NC: I don't know where we're coming out on the tunnel/underpass. I don't think there's agreement on what it is, from those of you that understand this stuff. If we could get an outline of where would it go and what it would look like, and the pros and cons, because this will keep coming up as different people come to these meetings.

A: PS: Right, and the public meeting as well. We could dip our toe in slowly, and maybe look at the structural requirements of an underpass, how wide it would have to be, what kind of venting structure it would be, in rough terms. Then we can see where we go from there.

Q: NCC: Let me ask a question just because I've been through this in Forest Hills. One of the options we investigated when we began the Arborway project was taking Hyde Park Avenue where it passes Forest Hills underneath the Arborway, to create an underpass. That wasn't a tunnel and wouldn't have required a ventilation structure, but it would have been one road ducking under another. There we had many of same goals: calm traffic, get more green space, raise connectivity, and help out pedestrians and bikes. We showed a very simple aerial diagram which showed that like here you'd have a main line going underneath, with a table on top which would provide for the turning movements and connectivity. That showed that the underpass would pull back a certain distance, there would be walls, and beyond those would be bypass roads for turns, and in total how much real estate it would need. Would that help you envision it?

A: NC: I think it would.

A: PS: It's a very similar roadway, in dimensions.

C: NCC: It is fairly similar. The underpass gobbles up an awful lot of room. We'll draw it up for you.

C: FA: With the traffic circle you don't have to do that, because it would be at grade for cars and a sunken plaza for pedestrians. You don't have a long tunnel or anything.

A: NCC: I'm aware of that. In the same Arborway project, we had a beautifully landscaped rotary island that no one could get to and no one wanted to visit.

C: PS: We can draw it up.

C: FA: That's different because it would be used for pedestrians and bikers to cross.

C: AS: I like to suggest that you take some of her ideas.

A: PS: Yes, definitely. It's not that I don't appreciate the design. I've seen the examples in Holland and other places of precisely what you're talking about – its great design. What if we take one of those that can handle these traffic volumes and project it over the map to see what we're thinking about.

C: AS: I'd like to go back to volume, which is what you just said about the rotary. At the other end of Cambridge, there's another DCR Parkway, McGrath.

A: Ken Kirwin (KK): It's now owned by MassDOT.

C: AS: On that highway which is elevated, the discussion now is to ground it into a boulevard. The analysis I've seen suggests it will reduce flow volume of traffic and yet the state is moving ahead.

A: PS: There is some diversion with that plan.

C: AS: I don't know why you think that volume is some kind of god. We're of a different mood, we want a neighborhood.

A: NCC: Both Pete and I are members of that design team. Volume is not a god to us. We have to show and demonstrate to federal highway through environmental documentation that while we are reducing throughput, we're still processing queues, and we won't have standing traffic creating the air quality issues that some of you and some of your neighbors have expressed concern about to us. We are going to have to demonstrate that it still works and that the traffic that will divert won't make people's lives miserable elsewhere. It's a significant process. We didn't just say we'll divert it and it will fine.

Q: AS: Why federal highway? What involvement do they have in the DCR project?

A: PS: Money: they fund the project.

Q: AS: So we'll have to go to the Boston MPO and ask for funding?

A: NCC: On McGrath we have to go through Federal Highway.



C: AS: I'm talking this project.

A: PS: We haven't gotten to funding yet.

C: AS: So in our case, if we don't go through Federal Highway, we don't take their money, we won't have to deal with that issue.

A: PS: It's possible, it could go different ways. That project has kicked off the Upper Mystic transportation study which is looking at Rutherford Avenue and McGrath and other roadways up there so think about how the traffic diversion will affect everything. There's a lot that goes into that.

C: EW: I'd like you to factor in two places that are nice. One is Greenough Boulevard. I understand the volume is not as great, but it accommodates everything we've talked about: only two lanes of traffic, a dedicated bike lane, a pedestrian lane, a whole row of trees. The second is the parkway along the mystic river to Medford.

A: NCC: The Mystic Valley Parkway?

C: EW: The Mystic Valley Parkway and Greenough Boulevard. The mistake you're making is that DCR is going to insist that we need to keep four lanes (two in each direction), but if you put in well placed left hand turn lanes and do the thing where you stripe lanes to go in and out, the through traffic stays going all the time. It moves and doesn't back up. There are two places where that happens all the time. On the Mystic Valley Parkway there are lots of residences on one side. Granted the other side is park and river, but you should consider those solutions.

A: PS: Those are things we can model.

A: NCC: When we get to those sections we can look at that.

Q: JF: I have a meta question. Does this project because of where the funding is coming from have to be accountable to the commuter traffic and those interests? Part of the reaction that happened tonight was people wanting to prioritize the neighborhood. Is it possible to say that the whole priority is to reestablish cues that this is a residential neighborhood, that we're not going to worry about meeting the commuter needs. That's what people want to do. Is that possible, or because of where the money comes from, does this project have to take account of the commuter traffic whose interests are very different, and we're not hearing from them. Or, is this wide open, so that we can focus on reestablishing the residential neighborhood?

A: PS: That's a broad question that is being wrestled with in many places across the country, including on McGrath. That diversion is pushing the envelope, and that project is leading the way with that thinking. However it is still six lanes in some places, five in others.

A: NCC: It's nuanced. It's effectively, at its crucial sections, six lanes wide.

C: PS: The thinking is coming around that we can start to approach that thinking. That's reflected in the design where we zippered up some lanes and got rid of some turn lanes at this intersection. The thinking is that the place is more important than going through. We're also thinking about this politically. The governor is ultimately the boss of this job and his electorate is everywhere. When people are talking about these things, it's all new territory.

C: AS: I'm perfectly comfortable with that. We haven't had a conversation like this since 1940, 50, or 60?

C: PS: And the conversation went a different way then.

C: AS: For the first time we're saying that there ought to be a balance which is not what it is today.

C: JB: I just have two things. One, if we're going to look at that, we'd need to look at whole length of the Alewife Brook Parkway and Fresh Pond Parkway, from Route 2 to the river. If we just narrow this stretch, in this study area, from Huron to the river, you still would have all the traffic coming down through the rotaries from the Alewife Brook Parkway onto Fresh Pond Parkway. And this leads to my second point, which is the end result of that is more people cutting through neighborhood streets.

C: AS: That's why we need more parking at the Alewife T.

C: JB: If I could finish please. From the city perspective, we are very interested in reducing commuter traffic. I don't know exactly here, but less than 20 percent of traffic on this corridor of the Alewife Brook Parkway Route 2 to Route 16 has an origin or destination in Cambridge. The vast majority of people are just traveling through. From our perspective we're interested but we need to look at that as a corridor wide solution, beyond the scope of this study area, because otherwise we will end up with all these people trying to cut through the neighborhoods.

C: PS: Multi modal issues are important to this discussion too. The city of Cambridge has a really great plan to address some of these issues.

C: JB: I agree with you Arthur. I didn't cut you off because I disagreed; I just wanted to finish my point.

C: EW: I want to say something. I have a ten page paper on the subject and I put out a plan in writing. I don't think anyone has read it. You haven't made any reference to it. I keep coming back to the point that if you start at Alewife there's a large commercial section but once you starting up the hill toward Huron Avenue and all the way to Brattle you have a residential district. There are also schools and that's a mitigating factor. But if you had to put this road in today it would be illegal: four lanes with all the egress and entrances. It would be illegal. And yet when it comes down to it you still want four

lanes, you want to accommodate the volume of traffic, you want the commuters to get through here and for the rest of us it isn't fair. You're not spending money on a tunnel or buying up the property to widen the road and make it a real highway. In the design books when you're designing parkways, they're synonymous with highways. This is not defined as a highway. It's only historically a parkway. Please factor that into your design.

A: PS: One of the things we are testing is the road diet idea you expressed in the paper. We're looking at that and we'll look together at those results. That's part of the bigger conversation like I said. It's not an easy question, but I do hear what you're saying, and I did read your paper.

A: NCC: And the paper is immortalized online.

C: RW: Your own figure said a road diet on Fresh Pond Parkway is impossible.

A: PS: I'm saying we're going to model the traffic; it's not the end of it. I said: here's the range of road diets that have been done in the country, and here are the average daily traffic counts. The range was between 12,000 to 28,000 cars.

C: RW: You dismissed road diets at that volume.

A: PS: Fresh Pond has counts over 40,000 in that section. I didn't dismiss it, I said its going to be hard

C: RW: That's not what you said.

A: NCC: I'm sorry, as the keeper of the minutes, I have to interject. Pete said "that's a sad story," which may have been a bad choice of words on his part, but the intention was certainly never to dismiss it out of hand. I will again refer everyone to the ground rules. When you go to a public information meeting, you're seeing things being presented as cut and dry – we figured it out and it's done. Here, you have tight access to the consultant team, you can ask all the questions you want, and one of the things that results in is that you are looking closely at the sausage being made. When we tell you that something is difficult, which is what Pete's intention was, it is not to say that we won't do it, we won't try, or we shouldn't have the conversation. It's just being upfront with you, and that's what the intention was.

C: RW: This proposal removed a lane from Fresh Pond Parkway.

C: EW: Only in that small section. There are no houses there

C: NCC: that's more lane than removed than anyone has proposed thus far to date.

C: PS: Further down towards the river, we do have room and the volumes to deal with that and we are already talking about reducing it by two lanes, one in each direction.

C: EW: That's not the stretch we're concerned about.

A: PS: I understand.

C: We're concerned about where we live and children need to cross the street. What are we supposed to do?

C: AB: But this will slow people down and divert people from that stretch.

C: NCC: We didn't say we wouldn't look at. Pete has said several times tonight that that section is going to be discussed at a forthcoming meeting. I've written down a sketch for our next meeting and we need to start joining the intersections and see how it works.

C: DT: This meeting was focused on two intersections. He reduced the number of lanes in both directions at these two intersections, so give the guy a break!

C: EW: What I find interesting is that the logic you used for Mount Auburn Street is a good logic. I would apply that same logic about a road diet to Fresh Pond Parkway.

A: PS: We will do the best we can on that and I promise that we'll illustrate that for you and we can talk about it together

Q: RW: That is part of the conversation going forward, right?

A: NCC: Absolutely. Thanks for staying late everyone.

C: PS: Thanks a lot everyone.

## ***Next Steps***

---

The next Stakeholder Group meeting will be held on August 18<sup>th</sup>, 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 concepts for Fresh Pond Parkway, including traffic calming elements. Since there was not time for the design charrette during this meeting, it will be postponed to the next meeting. All stakeholder group meetings are open to the public.

## Appendix 1: Meeting Attendees

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
Franziska	Amacher	Community Member
Joe	Barr	Stakeholder Group
Alexis	Belakovskiy	Stakeholder Group
Igor	Belakovskiy	Community Member
Hannah	Brockhaus	Howard Stein Hudson
Nathaniel	Cabral-Curtis	Howard Stein Hudson
Jane	Carroll	Stakeholder Group
Nina	Coslov	Stakeholder Group
Bill	Deignan	Stakeholder Group
Jan	Devereux	Stakeholder Group
Aaron	Dushku	Stakeholder Group
Xander	Dyer	Stakeholder Group
Jill	Forney	Stakeholder Group
Janice	Gould	Stakeholder Group
Phil	Groth	Stakeholder Group
Jonathan	Hecht	Stakeholder Group
Brendan	Kearney	Walk Boston
Ken	Kirwin	DCR
Rob	Lowell	DCR
Mary Catherine	McLean	DCR
Katherine	Rafferty	Stakeholder Group
Gideon	Schreiber	Stakeholder Group
Pete	Stidman	Howard Stein Hudson
Arthur	Strang	Stakeholder Group
David	Teller	Community Member
Elizabeth	Westling	Community Member
Russ	Windman	Community Member

## ***Appendix 2: Received Comments***

**From:** Jane Carroll

**Sent:** Friday, July 22, 2016 8:56 AM

**To:** McLean, MaryCatherine (DCR)

**Subject:** RE: Mt. Auburn St. Corridor Study Meeting Minutes + July Meeting Reminder

Hi Mary Catherine,

I went to the meeting last night, and stayed for most of it. I don't know if you are the right person to address with these issues/suggestions, if not can you let me know who I should contact.

On the agenda, it would be helpful to have the name of the person who is presenting and/or the names of the consultants. (The names were on the June 1 agenda.)

Last night the main presenter (I think it was Pete Sidman,) did not repeat questions or comments, despite numerous requests to do so. It resulted in him having conversations with individuals without the rest of the group knowing what they were discussing. He either needs to re-phrase the questions or get a microphone for questions.

Finally, on my name card Cemetery was spelled incorrectly.

Thanks,

Jane