Transportation Impact Study (TIS) Update - Adam Shulman TP&T transportation planner

- Required by zoning from development project proponents for city staff and the zoning board using standard accepted transportation standards for large projects (e.g., over 50,000 sq ft) or large parking areas
- Study must include all modes - estimates new trips, impacts, relation to other projects, evaluates 5 planning board special permit criteria, any adverse effects on city traffic (all modes) to estimate future cumulative transportation impacts including all other projects in the area
- TIS impact criteria - 1. Project vehicle trip generation, 2. Change in level of service at intersections (ends up in a letter grade), 3. Increased volume of trips on residential streets. Daily and peak hour trips, rush hour level of service. 4. Vehicle queues at intersections, 5. Lack of sufficient pedestrian and bike facilities
- For (5) - PLOS - pedestrian level of service, Safe pedestrian facilities, safe bicycle facilities - must exist or be preserved if sufficient ROW exists
  - “Safe bicycle facility” not specifically defined
- Current bicycle evaluation in a TIS
  - Existing conditions - bike counts, bike parking, bike crash data at intersections, identify conflicting vehicle movements
  - Requirements - zoning required bike parking and proposal
  - Impact - estimate number of new peak hour bike trips
- Includes diagrams of adjacent roads with bike counts at various points, and proposed bike parking plan, with space between racks, aisle widths, etc
- Opportunity to change factors used in a TIS
  - Add new criteria? E.g., replace “vehicle trips” with person trips, and establish impact thresholds by mode
  - Modify existing criteria
- What do we want to know about a projects impacts on bikes and other modes? Could develop metrics and thresholds for impact on buses or trains? Determine appropriate mitigation for various impacts?
- Potential metrics and thresholds
Q&A

- Like the idea of thresholds for more review. Bike committee could review these thresholds and metrics again at future meeting after thinking about it more, eg. BLC to include # of crashes, vehicle speeds, Vehicles entering exiting? More truck traffic? More drop offs? → High or medium bike impact → review by bike committee? - A, BLC defined in bike plan, idea of threshold for requiring committee review is appealing. Cara will discuss with Adam.

- Traffic models tend to overestimate # of new car trips - but fewer people now driving? Eg old Kendall Sq estimates were 3X what has actually been seen. Estimates for bikes/peds even less developed. Can city figure out how accurate these are? - city tries to get them as accurate as possible, but hard to predict the future

- Who determines mitigation measures required? For transit, eg. require work with MBTA to improve service? A- usually mitigations recommended by traffic dept. To planning bd. Planning bd usually accepts the recommendations - they are typically reviewed with developer in advance. Not common for developer to work with MBTA.

- BLC important - including crashes (which are under reported). PTDM data - is it publicly available?

- BLC should focus on wide range of demographics. A - it does, please see the Bike Plan definition - https://www.cambridgema.gov/Departments/communitydevelopment/2020bikeplanupdate

- Target - bike plan targets and design for 10% of trips by bike now? Not high enough - should be 20% or 30% for new development, so overall city level gets to 20% by 2030? A - Past 2 years has corrupted data, some metrics show blue bike trips have soared for example. Not sure where we really are right now. Need to push towards goals, but can't push too much based on speculation.

- If BLC would be decreased by a development, that could be a trigger for more review and mitigation required. Also, developer required rebuilding of streets must be tied to bicycle network vision.

### Potential Bike Metrics and Thresholds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metrics</th>
<th>Low Impact</th>
<th>Medium Impact</th>
<th>High Impact</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># peak hr. bike trips</td>
<td>&lt; 20 bike trips</td>
<td>20-50 bike trips</td>
<td>&gt;50 bike trips</td>
<td>But more bike trips is better and &quot;high impact&quot; sounds negative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bikes level of comfort (BLC)</td>
<td>BLC 1-2</td>
<td>BLC 3</td>
<td>BLC 4-5</td>
<td>How far from the project site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for bike infrastructure</td>
<td>X% of project costs toward bike infrastructure.</td>
<td>Agree to maintain bike infrastructure.</td>
<td>No bike infrastructure commitments.</td>
<td>Is the project adjacent to a proposed separated bicycle facility?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New auto trips on biking comfort</td>
<td>&lt; 60 peak hr. auto trips</td>
<td>60-120 peak hour auto trips</td>
<td>&gt; 120 peak hour auto trips</td>
<td>More auto trips = higher impact on biking comfort.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Committee Bike Ride - May 21

- [https://docs.google.com/document/d/1UkyjAYgzyXk3AVZSBVKsqrqwJqaZ0NBLeCKN0ozSr2w/edit#](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1UkyjAYgzyXk3AVZSBVKsqrqwJqaZ0NBLeCKN0ozSr2w/edit#) - Guido’s doc on ideas and background
- Anna worked on flyer/poster -
- Mark worked on a route, with some additions by Randy, still needs some updating - needs to be review by DPW for potential upcoming construction
- Will be one stop, maybe two, but one is best. Needs a lot of space for 200 people - Danehy or Fresh Pond is good. Restrooms are good too.
- Tentative name - “Trails to Rails”
- Might be able to get clementines or bananas from the city. Other Food - we could try restaurants who have helped up in the past - e.g., BonMe, Felipes, Redbones. - or just pass on food.

Subcommittees

- E-bike legislation - define pedal assist e-bikes vs mopeds/electric bikes, give input to the legislature with an updated letter. In support of H.3457 and S.2309
  - Unanimous committee support for Scott to write a letter on behalf of the committee
  - Drafts here [https://docs.google.com/document/d/1aPZyWqUbXznb-w3KyznHbLGaMNs4DsvM_1H9EeuWnNw/edit#heading=h.3u087oo4gegv](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1aPZyWqUbXznb-w3KyznHbLGaMNs4DsvM_1H9EeuWnNw/edit#heading=h.3u087oo4gegv)
- Other things people would like to work on?
  - More guidance needed for new members, eg Alewife Project.
  - Please sign up, and indicate whether you can be point person - [https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1s2hQNwBYfUhk3dAvDuEnaq9EalBsW3xn1-HcFRTK-DQ/edit#gid=0](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1s2hQNwBYfUhk3dAvDuEnaq9EalBsW3xn1-HcFRTK-DQ/edit#gid=0)

Project Updates - TP&T - Stephen Meuse

- Tomorrow - Harvard Sq meeting re CSO
- Next Tuesday - Porter Sq community meeting
- Sat 3/19 - pop up session at Roseland and Mass Ave
- In next month, will announce next quick build projects
- Delay in porter Sq - “couple of extra weeks to a month” delay planned
- Many flexposts knocked down? Will repair after final snow storm of spring

Project Updates - DPW - Jim Wilcox

- Commonwealth Connect very helpful to report pot holes, or call DPW, 617-349-4800 (24/7)
- Still work at Broadway and Ames, through June
- Eversource still digging many test pits in preparation for large substation project
- Inman Sq work continue - aiming for September completion
- Port infrastructure planning/community engagement ongoing
- River St - hope to start in June, same for Willard St
- Mass Ave/Harvard Sq project meeting tomorrow
- Contract 24 streets - 5 or 6, streets rebuilt starting this June, Contract 25 community engagement starting
- Q&A
  - Brattle St - what is happening? A - Gas main work will continue all summer. After that some CSO related work planned
  - Vincent St? - gas main work

Public Comment

- None

Upcoming meetings/announcements