

TRAFFIC COMMISSION MEETING

October 28, 2021

IN ATTENDANCE: Chair Elena Proakis Ellis, Councilor Eccles, Commissioner Rossi, Commissioner Peart, Commissioner Parenti, Chief Mike Lyle, Commissioner Krechmer, Former Mayor Former Mayor Infurna; Sgt Jon Goc – Technical Advisor, Martha Grover, and Lori Timmerman

I. Continued Business

None

II. New Business

1. Request to designate parking spaces at recently installed pole-mounted electric vehicle (EV) charging stations as EV-only, as follows (each location will be voted upon individually):

- Kimball Court Parking Lot, near 75 Myrtle Street, adjacent to Pole #3577 (1 space is currently EV only; proposing to make one more space EV-only)
- Berwick Street, near 133 Berwick,, adjacent to Pole #2290 (2 spaces)
- Franklin Street, near 200 Franklin Street, adjacent to Pole #3967 (2 spaces) charger is not installed.
- Belmont Street, across from the corner of Belmont Place, adjacent to Pole #3315 (2 spaces)
- East Foster Street, between 242 and 248 E. Foster, adjacent to Pole #2093 (1 space)
- Green Street, at Farwell Ave., adjacent to Pole #172 (1 space)

As project proponents, Martha Grover and Lori Timmerman are here to speak about the project.

Martha Grover, Sustainability Manager for the City of Melrose and Planning Department outlines where we are today with the project and requests to make the remaining nine locations EV only parking designating them as such. In June 2020, we approved the installation of 15 charging stations on 9 poles. Some poles have 2 units, some have 1 unit. Of the 15, the Traffic Commission (TC) authorized 2 EV only parking spots as a single unit on Tremont St. and the one spot at Kimball Ct. behind Shaw's. 4 other spots are already EV only because they are at Whole Foods Parking lot and Mt. Hood for a total of 6. They are requesting that the remaining 9 be designated EV only. She provided data that shows the number of charging sessions to date at each location. The number of charging sessions has gone up and we are now at 363. This number went up quite a bit in the last week. The average charging session at any one of these poles is about 90 minutes with another 15 minutes of idle time before unplugged and the driver moves on. Over the last few months, several residents/station users have contacted Martha to complain about non-EV vehicles being parked in these spots which prevents them from being able to charge. The cord reaches 25 ft. and during one incident, someone was trying to reach their car and was yanking hard on the connector. It didn't disconnect, however Martha received error messages. Martha shared some comments from a few users that she hopes everyone has received regarding their experience anecdotally at trying to charge at the single unit locations at Green St. and E. Foster. EV ownership right now in Melrose is about 1% of all vehicles but increases monthly. She hears from people buying their first, second and even third EV and it's increasing statewide. For the people that visit Melrose to attend sport games, eat dinner and shop here they appreciate having access to charge. She has heard from people and notes that a few residents that live in condos or apartment buildings that don't have access to charging on their property like having access to these chargers use them regularly. Martha mentions that the EV market is getting ready to explode with 59 new EVs coming out in the next 2 years and several manufacturers committing to all EVs or a significant portion of their cars being EV by 2030. She notes that the city police fleet will increase by 1 EV next year, a Ford Mustang Mach E.

Elena points out that Franklin St. is not installed yet because we are waiting for make ready work to be completed. Installation work is scheduled for the week of 11/15/2021.

Martha notes that signage needs to be improved at all locations. Some chargers are hard to see while driving down the street because the charger is on the back of the pole. They have ideas about improving signage and increasing the awareness of these units. Signage will be Phase 2 after installation is complete.

Councilor Eccles asks about whether we have other EV spots in Melrose and Martha responds that we have two ground mounted chargers, one set at City Hall and one at Cedar Park Commuter Station.

Former Mayor Infurna thanks Martha for all her work on this and thinks that it is great. She expects that most people in the next few years will be switching to EV, as she may possibly for her next car as well.

Commissioner Peart asks if someone does park in an EV only spot illegally, is it enforceable by the police and asks if that is how violations are noted.

Elena responds that if we vote on it as a commission and it goes in the traffic code then it is enforceable. The traffic code has specific fines listed in a couple of places. She reached out to the police to find out if the fines listed are consistent with what is on their ticket books/records which they are, however, does not believe that we have a category for EV. Elena then asks Sgt. Goc and Chief Lyle what this would fall under.

Chief Lyle responds that they do have a category and it's classified as "other", so if there is a new ordinance instead of purchasing new books, they can use that category until books run out. New code could be established after that.

Sgt. Goc mentions that they have ticketed cars in Cedar Park that have been parked that are not EV, but he could be mistaken the way we would like to see it. He does not know what was voted on prior to this, but if all the spots are going to be marked EV charging only that will allow us to use that "other" category. If there is no marking or signage, Sgt. Goc does not think that we could do that. He also wants to point out that overnight parking would exist, but for those cars would be restricted. Additionally, at least for now, any current signage or regulations on streets would stand such as Belmont which is on tonight's agenda. One hour parking is currently signed there for 6am – 10am; we would expect that EV be restricted to those purposes as well. He states that it will get very convoluted if we don't do it that way.

Elena mentions that the wording of the agenda items does not indicate us changing any existing parking restrictions/time limits, overnight parking, etc., but it would designate EV only.

Elena asks Martha what we have for signage at City Hall and Martha states that all of the signage is in line with existing parking, generally 3 hours. Elena asks if it says EV only and Martha states that it does. On Berwick side it is 3 hours.

Chief Lyle asks to make it simple and asks Martha if most/all of EV stations are on utility poles and she replies that they all are. The easiest way would be to mount signs and asks Martha if she still has the ability to do this. Martha confirms that they do this in house or through DPW. One other thing they have done to make sure EV's abide by parking limitations is that within the app, we are charging them to charge, fees for electricity, also at 3 hours or 1 hour they get charged with a \$5 surcharge. They get a notice stating that they have reached the limit and have 20 minutes to move. If you don't you get an extra \$5 fee. In most cases it adds up to more than double the fee to charge their car and states it is good incentive since it typically only takes a couple of dollars to charge their car.

Chief Lyle asks about whether we are going down to someone who was going to seek a hearing and abatement because we issue a parking fine with a violation and you are also a member of the app does that give them a defense for either? That's a legal question.

Elena asks Martha about when people sign up on the app, if they need to agree to any terms and if so hopefully this would be covered then. Martha states that they do and they are notified and given warnings through the app by email and text. Also, there is the existing signage that is there.

Elena asks Chief Lyle if when they fill out tickets in the "other" category do you fill in an amount or does it have a specified amount. Chief Lyle responds that he can do either. Typically, every parking ticket except for Handicap Parking and fire hydrants and such is \$25. If we post as EV only, that's a restricted parking space, we could also use restricted posted as another option. He thinks the best thing for everyone, such as the users and people with gasoline powered vehicles, is to warn them that this is for EV parking only, include a short script on what the regulations are for each EV area and vehicles parked in overnight parking as well just to educate them all. That's fair and there is no defense for their staying beyond their time or overnight parking.

Commissioner Rossi asks about the currently marked EV spaces if we ever voted on those.

Elena states that they have discussed all the stations. All these stations were going onto utility poles and then as part of that discussion we concluded that the commission didn't really need to vote on the attachments to the poles unless we were changing the parking regulation. At that meeting when discussing all the various locations, before any of the chargers went in, we had decided that the one behind Shaw's and one of the ones on Tremont St. would be good places to restrict because otherwise they would have someone parked in them all the time and wouldn't be available for EV's. The others we decided to take kind of a wait and see approach. So now we have waited and seen and Martha is returning with the requests.

Commissioner Rossi replies that he was actually referring to the spaces that pre-dated that meeting and Elena responds that those spaces pre-date her time on the commission, so that Commissioner Rossi and Chief Lyle would know better, however Elena states that she does know that they do not appear in the traffic code.

Martha replies that those are parking lots maintained by the city, so she does not believe it went before the TC, however Elena responds that they do fall into our jurisdiction though. Commissioner Rossi responds that this is what he was saying and asks if we should vote on them just to make them legal and Martha responds that she thinks they already are.

Elena states that they are not listed in the traffic code, so that makes them potentially unenforceable. She mentions that we have done this before and would be happy to include them. We have updated the traffic code to match existing signage in several locations, so if we wanted to throw that into this vote, Elena states she has no objection.

Chief Lyle points out that there are EV stations at Mt. Hood Park, so we would need a letter from Mt. Hood Park Association requesting that the PD enforce this regulation at their 2 EV stations. He doesn't know if there are EV stations at Pine Banks or if they are coming. Martha replies that they are not coming because those poles did not work. Elena makes a note of this and tells Martha that she might want to talk to Joan Bell about what is required to enforce those.

Commissioner Rossi asks if we know if any of these locations are high demand parking locations, since we are essentially taking a spot away from non- EV's which most vehicles still are. He states that he saw some of the letters that say that they weren't high demand but admits he didn't have a chance to go around and look.

Elena responds that the only one that she knows of that is high demand is the Green St. location and opens public comment in case there is anyone on the call that has a comment who may bring into light something that is high demand that we aren't aware of.

No motion to open public comment as no one from the public is present for this item.

Elena states that Green St. is a neighborhood where there is a lot of parking by local merchants and people going to the businesses in Franklin Sq. and on Green St. It is one area that she knows has ongoing parking issues and not enough parking for the number of people that live, work and shop there. She is not aware of issues at the others.

Chief Lyle would like to make a motion to move this forward and asks if we can include any existing sites that we may have missed at previous meetings. Councilor Eccles seconds the motion.

Elena states that on the agenda we had stated that we would vote these individually, but asks if anyone sees a need to vote them individually or has an issue with a particular site.

Commissioner Rossi states that he was thinking Green St. as well. He recollects that when we were voting on the changes, when the roundabout went in, that there were some people there that were worried about the parking loss. He wonders if we should take that one separately. We may vote to install it anyway, but maybe makes sense to keep it separate.

Elena agrees that would probably be wise and asks if we amend the motion then. Chief Lyle states that he will amend it and have Green St. be separate, Councilor Eccles seconds the motion.

Elena then proceeds and states that we have an amended motion on the floor made by Chief Lyle to accept the EV only spaces in the following locations:

Kimball court parking lot near 75 Myrtle Street, one space, Berwick St. near 133 Berwick St. two spaces, Franklin St. near 200 Franklin, two spaces, Belmont St. across from the corner of Belmont Place, two spaces, E. Foster St. between 242 and 248 one space, as well as the existing spaces that have not been voted on. Two Spaces in the city hall parking lot, 2 spaces in the Cedar Park parking lot.

Elena then states as a reminder that this is keeping all other parking regulations in effect.

Elena calls the role; all are in favor. Motion carries.

Councilor Eccles makes a motion for the Green Street spot to make that EV only, seconded by Commissioner Krechmer.

Elena asks if there is further discussion on the Green St one and states that she is interested in the PD's thoughts because they probably know the parking challenges in that area best. Sgt. Goc states that historically they don't prohibit too much parking up there long term because there doesn't seem to be an alternative for the businesses, employees, etc., if they don't have private parking. The area is generally full Monday through Friday during business hours, but states since we are not up there enforcing the regulations then he does not see why there would be an issue. Elena asks Martha if there is any benefit to having it be EV only on the nights/weekends but leaving it available for merchants and customers on weekdays. Martha replies that she thinks it is better than nothing. It is one spot just at the end right before Farwell St. right at the corner, an awkward spot. Since being installed we have only had 8 charging sessions, in 6 months, because the signage is poor, and the charger is behind the pole.

Chief Lyle received a letter today from Erik's barber shop that sometimes drives an EV and he didn't even know the charging station was there, so we need to improve signage. That could be one of the issues, but nights/weekends would be better than nothing.

Elena mentions that she thought it was odd that when she went by today it was the only spot that was open. She wonders if people are saving it for the last spot because they know it has the EV option.

Martha states that a year ago they consulted with the natural food store across the street, and they were in support of making that EV only. There is parking right in front of their store, so that wouldn't impact that.

Commissioner Rossi asks if we provided any sort of notification to the abutters about the potential change.

Elena states the tricky thing about this neighborhood is that we did all of the notification for this meeting through Everbridge. We wanted to cast a wide net especially with the discussion on S. Main Street, so she included a large section of the southern portion of the city and then cast a wide net around each of these parking spaces. The tricky thing about Green St. and Franklin Sq. is that a lot of the people using the parking are not people that live there. The people work there or are customers, so without going around to businesses and handing out flyers to distribute to their employees it would have been very difficult to hit those folks.

Commissioner Rossi then states he hates to vote it down and then not be able to reconsider it for a while if we decided to vote it down. If we voted for it now and we got a lot of negative feedback later because we have gotten negative comments about removing parking in that area. He wonders if it would be possible to table this one spot until our next meeting to get input from the businesses.

Chief Lyle states that he supports this if even just one business owner owns an EV. Parking is a premium in that area. We have tried to resolve parking on many occasions with folks up there, especially new businesses. Chief Lyle knows that Sgt. Goc has gone up there and Officer Brown just to appease and work with them because there is only street parking up there. Chief Lyle states if there is push back from any business owners, he, Sgt. Go or Officer Brown will go up there and work with them. It's just taking a space off Main St. where Erik's Barber Shop is and moving it over to Green St. There's still the same number of business vehicles up there, we're just moving it. He knows it is right in front of the Green St. Baptist church and assumes on weekends that there is someone attending service there that has an EV.

Councilor Eccles states that he would prefer it to be always, rather than just nights/weekends because he thinks that when the parking is not being utilized all that much, the need for an EV only spot is less desirable. The whole point is we are trying to make it so that EV has a place to park. If it's a night/weekend and no one is using those spaces, then that space is literally open anyway. He prefers it to be always if we go forward with it.

Elena asks if anyone else would like to make a motion and Chief Lyle responds that he will make a motion to accept the EV Station on Green St. at Farwell, Former Mayor Infurna seconds the motion.

Elena states that we have a motion by Chief Lyle, seconded by Former Mayor Infurna. This is for an EV only parking space on Green St and Farwell at the charging stations, in affect at all times, with all existing parking regulations still in effect.

Elena calls the role; all are in favor.

2. Requests to add crosswalks across Main Street at the following locations (each of which will be voted upon individually):

- **Mt. Vernon Street**
- **Potomac Street**
- **Lodge Ave**
- **Woodruff Avenue**
- **Ledgewood Avenue**

Elena notes that Kingsley is not included on the list because there is an existing crosswalk, so it has already been considered in effect, but mentions that we have some choices to make in terms of how we handle public comment for the remainder of the meeting. If we want to take comments just on crosswalks right now and then take comments just on bus stops? She states that would be more consistent with our typical arrangement. It may mean that some people may have to comment multiple times to comment on the various aspects of the project, but it might also keep our discussion and our votes more focused.

Commissioner Peart states that she would like that to be approved. Chief Lyle then asks if she needs a motion and Elena states that they do not. What they can do is open public comment just on the crosswalks after she presents the information on the crosswalks and would open public comment just for item #2.

Elena states that in the recommended plan we had on the website, distributed to the public and the commission we showed additional crosswalks at a couple of these locations. She decided for the vote we would list all cross streets on Main St. in this corridor, so that we could discuss them all. She didn't want to exclude any and then we decide that one was a good location. Former Mayor Infurna had thought that Mt Vernon St. should be on that list because of the Charter School bus stop and kids crossing the street there. Elena states that we have all of the locations on the list, and we will vote on these individually unless it's obvious that we have sort of a consensus on certain locations that we can group.

Elena opens public comment for the crosswalk element.

Finn McSweeney lives at 160 W. Wyoming, and he is here on behalf of the Ped Bike Committee. He sent consolidated comments however given that we are just doing public comment on the crosswalks he will briefly say that we endorse the requested crosswalks at Ledgewood, Woodruff, Lodge and Potomac. He encourages the commission to thoughtfully consider a crosswalk at Mt Vernon on the northern side of that intersection. They understand that the northern side is potentially complicated with the presence of the driveway at 288 Main St. and the existence of a fire call box that we aren't sure is operational but given potential sight lines we do encourage the city to install enhanced pedestrian safety measures for that crosswalk if it is approved.

Ryan Williams wants to add that for all these crosswalks he would ask for the consideration of the DPW to make sure they are all day lit appropriately. We need to make sure that there are no parking spaces allowed directly in front of the broach edge, the lane that's closest to where people are entering the crosswalk. We don't want to have a situation where a person with a visual impairment, a child, or a disabled person is coming out from behind a giant lifted F250 super duty truck and no one can see them until they are right in the middle of the bike or parking lane. The best way to do that is to just make sure we aren't allowing any parking within 8/9 feet or however the engineering works out. This is something that he has heard from some of the abutters that he talked to, is their desire to have these crosswalks day lit appropriately. He wants to make sure that we put that in the plan that we are going to strip that or otherwise barricade it, so that it prevents parking from happening right up against the crosswalk line.

William Gordon of 178 Main St. states that he's been working the neighbors of lower Main St. and there is consensus that crosswalks are positive. The concern is if they lose all of the parking on the southbound side from 278 Main St. down they don't know what the impact is reducing the number of parking spaces that would be on the northbound side. Asks what is the impact? How many spaces are we going to lose on the northbound side? Other than that they think it is a great idea to add crosswalks. They are generally in favor of them, but are concerned about the elimination of parking which is not really an issue here, but these issues are inter related, only to that extent.

Elena then proceeds with comment letters. She states that she has sent out everything that she had received today and mentions that has received some additional letters since then. She feels that now may be a good time to read those even though they touch on multiple issues. Some may touch on crosswalks and she doesn't want to not have heard a good point about one before we discuss them.

Elena reads a resident email from Andy Monat, Jonathan Berg, Kara O'Berg, Meghan McDonough and Carl Condolano (**refer to TC folder**).

Elena mentions that she has a letter from Ryan Williams as well; however since he has already spoke about crosswalks she is not going to read that at this time. All of the letters not in the packet earlier have been read.

Resident Jonathan Burg states that whether it is crosswalks or anything else, this was poorly planned. Strongly opposed and will go to court on this.

Chief Lyle is in favor of the crosswalks, but states that at certain times during the day they may not be as lit up as we would like. He is going to request that they do this for them. He is also unsure if they make them for people with hearing disabilities, but if they did he would like this added in as well. The style would be the same as they have out in front of the Lincoln School, but is not sure if everyone is familiar with them.

Elena then asks if any of our commissioners know if there are versions of the RFBs that do anything for a hearing disabled person to know where to push the button.

Commissioner Parenti states that you can get an audible pedestrian signal (APS). They have a locator tone which is intended to be audible within 10 feet of the pole. In an urban environment like ours it is difficult to get the volume right so that it's not audible within 11 feet of the pole or the houses just beyond. He states that it is a good idea, but you just have to make sure it's installed and adjusted properly so it doesn't produce noise pollution for abutters.

Elena mentions how when they did Lebanon St., one of them when the wind would blow continuously or blow in a certain direction the houses next door could hear the beeping of the crosswalk signal 24/7. Then when wind would die down they wouldn't hear anything. It was hard to get the right volume. It is not something that we have looked at doing on any of our other RFBs, but certainly on busy corridors it is something to consider.

Chief Lyle asks how many are in the proposal of the project now and Elena responds that she thinks that 3 of the 5 were shown in the recommended plan. Chief Lyle then asks if the existing crosswalk have them now, for example Kingsley. Elena asks if he means an RFB and Chief Lyle responds yes. Elena replies back no, and then asks for clarification on whether Chief Lyle wants to know if it is how many crosswalks were in the plan or how many with RFB's are in the plan? Chief Lyle responds that it is actually a two part question. He wants to know how many are in the overall project and how many are existing?

Elena states that Kingsley already exists, so it is not included in the request. In the recommended plan we are showing 1 at Lodge, 1 at LedgeWOOD, and we were not showing 1 at Woodruff just because they were close together, but now we are recommending having them at each intersection. We are showing the 1 at Woodruff

is in addition to what we had in the recommended plan. We were showing one at Potomac and not showing one in the plan at Mt. Vernon, which we are now proposing. Elena states that she measured with the wheel the site lines at Mt. Vernon and you can see it just fine because that lines up nicely with the front walk of the Caruso apartment building. It would be a good landing spot for a new ramp on that side and would line up with the existing ramp on the corner of Mt. Vernon and Main St. We would only need to install one new ramp. Also, we always prefer if it is just a T intersection that the crosswalk is to the left rather than to the right. This is because a lot of times when it is to the right drivers only look to the left because that is the only direction cars would be coming from and then start to pull out before they look where they are about to pull out into. The south side would also avoid that issue and was also the best placement. It avoided the hydrant, fire box, and a few obstructions there. Elena mentions that she measured with the wheel 166 ft. that she could see from with existing cars parked in the pilot striped bike lane. Those cars were so far out into the street that they made the visibility very different and very hard to access how much further back she would have been able to see a pedestrian, if those cars had been on the curb. With that said, 166 ft. would be the worst case scenario for when you would see a pedestrian, but once the cars are moved back to the curb she thinks that would increase substantially. For the other directions the site lines were great all the way from Wyoming. All of the other crosswalks had site lines pretty much to forever.

Former Mayor Infurna asks a question about what is the least number that you can have for a site line and is curious as to how the 160 number fits in. Elena responds that its speed/slope related, so a lot of times it is a table in MUTCD. In a lot of cases, they have just gone with the worst case for safe stopping distance. Normally when we approve these we have 250 ft. plus getting into the range where it's not an issue. Elena admits that she has not looked at this table in a while.

Former Mayor Infurna just wants to clarify that they are referring to the S. East corner and Elena responds that she is correct. Former Mayor Infurna states that it works out perfectly because this is where most people cross whether they are coming down from Mt. Vernon Ave or Mt. Vernon St. they will go straight right across there. Some will go right and some left, but for the kids that get the charter school bus that's where they cross and that would work out nice if the sight lines work. She thanks everyone for considering that.

Chief Lyle states he has no other questions and that he is supporting the order.

Councilor Eccles responds that is not a deal breaker for him, but just wants to address something that was mentioned in public comment as far as the northbound side parking that would be lost with the crosswalks. He asks if it is two spaces per crosswalk.

Elena looks at the aerial plan from the meeting and states that if they are already close to a hydrant or a driveway then parking is already restricted, so it might not make the difference of a whole space. The one at Ledgewood would not result in any loss of parking because it's no parking already up until the spot where the ramp would connect. Woodruff we will have to measure in the GIS because there is the parking lot where Melrose Glass is in that building, so the crosswalk couldn't be on that side, it would have to be on the other side. We would have to make sure that we could fit it with the driveway that is there. If that were to shift down just a tiny bit to the corner of Rockview that might result in no parking loss as well on the northbound side. The one at Lodge looks like it would likely result in the loss of one space. Kingsley similarly would likely result in the loss of one space. Potomac would kind of be right on the edge of the 20 ft. setback where someone could park near Potomac itself. It would be just beyond that, so it might shift the spaces down, but is not sure of the total length of that block. It really depends on how people are parking whether it is zero spaces or one. Mt. Vernon wouldn't lose anything on the northbound side where we are proposing.

Councilor Eccles states that he is in full support of all the crosswalks, but just wanted to address this as it has been brought up. Elena states that it's a very good question and it looks like two/three spaces will be lost.

Commissioner Peart asks that if we day lit those crosswalks, which means to put paint or curbing, at those crosswalks to bump out into the travel way, would it be paint, a raised curb, or something different?

Elena states it would most likely be paint because to bump out those crosswalks, we would have to consider drainage. It can be tricky to do a bump out without considering drainage. You may end up with just a puddle outside the curb ramp or water that flows to the bump out that doesn't have anywhere to go. Ideally you would be adding catch basins next to the bump outs like we had done on Essex St. The other complication is that with the addition of bike lanes we could bump out as far as parking lanes, but we wouldn't want to bump all the way out because we wouldn't want to restrict cyclists and push them into the road. This is a complaint we sometimes get on the bump outs on Franklin. We could do it with paint and do essentially the same type of striping that creates a bump out. Also, with parking lanes we can taper them off like we do at side streets north of downtown on the way to Wakefield where the parking lane dives into the curb before each side street. It clearly shows that if you are parking too close to the cross street you end up parking over that line and it's obvious that it is not legal parking.

Commissioner Peart thanks her for the explanation and then makes a comment that she thinks that the introductions of these crosswalks along Main St. are also going to have the added benefit of traffic calming and slowing people down. We have heard from everyone here that has spoken about safety and is supportive primarily from that point of view. If the parking was going to be eliminated on the west side or the southbound side it also gives you a very safe passage if you had to park on the northbound side. You can then walk back across the street safely unlike today.

Councilor Eccles makes a motion to approve. He states that if we are going to do them individually that he makes a motion to approve a crosswalk on the south side of the Mt. Vernon St. /Main St intersection, Former Mayor Infurna seconds the motion.

Elena calls the roll to approve the motion, all are in favor. She then states that we have a unanimous support for the crosswalk at Mt. Vernon St. and asks if we want to vote the rest individually?

Former Mayor Infurna makes a motion to vote them all concurrently, Councilor Eccles seconds the motion.

Elena then states that we have a motion by Former Mayor Infurna, seconded by Councilor Eccles to approve all four of the crosswalks at Potomac St; Lodge Ave; Woodruff Ave; and Ledgewood.

Elena called the roll to approve the motion, all are in favor.

3. Request to amend the traffic code to accurately reflect the existing locations of MBTA bus stops on Main St. from Wyoming Ave to the Melrose/Malden city limit

Elena states that the reason for this item is the Traffic Code spells out the length and location of every bus stop in the city. When she did the north/south bike route down to Wyoming, she found that they are not accurate because the signs/stops have moved. She thought that while we were making all these other changes that we would be remised in skipping over making the bus stop locations accurate in the code. We want this whole corridor, whatever gets voted tonight to all accurately reflect the signage that's there and whatever decisions we make. Elena mentions that one little wrinkle in this although it is not really up for consideration tonight is that the MBTA had approached us about two months ago about some bus stop improvements they wanted to make and one of them is at the intersection of Main and Kingsley. The MBTA would like to move the stops that are just south of Kingsley and put them a little closer to Lodge. It is a very minor change, but she informed the MBTA that it would require a vote of the TC. Since the MBTA wasn't quite ready yet to have us voting on that change if we do any paint that says bus stop like we did along this corridor, we would just skip that one because we know that they want to come before us in December. If not in December, then they certainly will in March. Elena states that we will just make sure that any cross walk changes they have given us are at 30% design package. They are well on their way to their design, so we are going to make sure that we don't do anything that contradicts what they are doing.

Commissioner Krechmer asks for clarification on whether this discussion is about the southbound stop and if it's in the same block, but just further down from Lodge toward Kingsley? Elena states that they want to move the northbound one closer to Kingsley and the southbound one closer to Lodge. She states it's just flipping the locations to the other side of the street. The northbound one goes where the southbound one is and the southbound one goes to where the northbound one is.

Commissioner Krechmer states that he sees that Google has already changed the southbound one and Elena states that maybe that is why they are showing it as part of the proposed plan and that is actually where people are currently boarding the bus and mentions that that doesn't change the vote.

Commissioner Parenti asks what the coordination is between the city and the MBTA is on the location of their bus stops. Elena responds that in the past it has been that someone reaches out with an email that they want to change a bus stop location and we go back and forth with them and make sure that they notify the neighborhood and get feedback. It's been sort of an informal process. Elena mentions that now she realizes that the traffic code actually stipulates the location of every bus stop, as well as the dimensions and that's in the traffic code. With that it is clearly something that needs to come before the TC if they move a bus stop. Commissioner Parenti states that it has been his experience too that the T does like to know what is happening on the ground. They have a big database of their own, google aside, with bus stop locations, and the bus barn likes to know so that they can notify their drivers that the bus stop has changed, so they know where to stop the next day.

Elena states that in the time that she has been here the city has not initiated moving bus stops. It has always been the T approaching us requesting a move. She knows they have some on the near side which they like to have on the far side after you cross an intersection to not get in the way of turning movements in the like. She concludes that those are the ones that she has seen since she has been here.

Commissioner Parenti states that he asks only because if we take this vote and then we do coordination with the T and then they come back and state that they are not really in support of moving this one there we have to come back. Elena then states that this vote would just keep them where they are and just have the code accurately reflect the dimensions and the placement. Commissioner Parenti states that that makes it fair.

Elena states that the T puts the signs in, so in theory if anything has been moved then they have been the ones to move it. She then asks if there is any further discussion or motions.

Chief Lyle mentions that in the past when the rebuild of Wyoming and Main was done with the traffic lights, we attempted to move that bus stop to the other side of the intersection, so we could have a dedicated right hand turn onto Wyoming Ave west bound and it's still there. They were very reluctant to cooperate with the city. Elena states that the T wanted to move it to the other side, and it was the abutters that opposed it. Former Mayor Infurna states that Elena is right and states that they also did move it further north on Main St. but still doesn't make a nice clean right turn, but they did move it down a little bit. The bench is still there but the signs have moved down a little bit. Elena then states that she was here for that, and it was largely an abutter rebellion from the corner building. corner. Former Mayor Infurna states that Elena is correct and says that when they had it up across the way going south, on the southwest corner, the neighbors there did not like that. She states that she completely shares Chief Lyle's thought that the stop would be better located across the intersection.

Chief Lyle then states that he would like to move this forward at the existing locations, Commissioner Krechmer seconds the motion. Elena calls the role; all are in favor.

Elena states that she is very excited to say that the traffic code updates that have not been formally made in the written code that appears in e-code since 2009 are now up to date up through February 2021. We are then going to work on getting this year's votes all into the traffic code. She announces that it is great even having a traffic code that is up to date through 2021. It was a herculean effort, by some engineering employees and some interns.

4. Request to change parking on the west side of Main St. (southbound), beginning with the frontage of 278 Main St., continuing south to Sylvan St., from 2 hour parking to Parking Prohibited (Section 220-109 of the Melrose Traffic Code; note that the portion from Ledgewood to Sylvan is already included in the code as Parking Prohibited).

Elena informs everyone that there is one sign on that stretch that allows for parking but is contrary to the code and her impression from reading the code and looking at other language in that corridor is that there used to be parking from Sylvan up towards Wyoming and it was consistent. At some point a regulation went into effect that went from the Malden line to Ledgewood and was never accurately signed, one sign was missed. Everything else is signed as no parking on that stretch. There is this one sign that says one hour or two hour parking, just south of Ledgewood. Elena states that she included up to Sylvan in the vote, but the Ledgewood to Sylvan stretch is a gray area because it is technically already prohibited by one part of the code. In terms of the city being the project proponent for this she gives a little background before opening public comment and offers an opportunity for the commissioners to ask questions about why this is the city's recommendation. Elena states that in the presentation the key points are we can't fit the alignment that we did north of Highland Ave on Main St in this section. We can't have parking and dedicated bike lanes on both sides and two 11 foot travel lanes. We have gone with 11 foot travel lanes as our standard where there are bus routes. The MUTCD and Nacto guide recommendation for bus routes are 11 feet. Bike lanes when they are in the street inside parking are ideally supposed to be 5 feet. A lot of work was done on the north side of Main St to determine if we could safely do them at 4 1/2 ft. which is what we have. Typical parking lanes would be 7 feet. The parking lanes that were already striped before we did any bike lanes on the north side of Main St. were mostly 6 1/2 ft. The north side of Main St., north of Highland is the absolute minimum we felt we could safely stripe and accommodate all road users. The road south of Wyoming on Main St. is about 1 to 2 ft. on average narrower than on the north side, so we can't make the bike or parking lanes any smaller. Elena states that given it's a bus route she is hesitant to make the travel lanes any smaller, so it really doesn't leave us an option to safely have parking and dedicated bike lanes on both sides with travel lanes. She goes on to talk about parking utilization that we talked about on Monday night, when the bike committee looked at parking along Potomac to Sylvan. From Potomac to Sylvan the average usage was 3.7 cars and they came out about 15 different times. Different times of day, different days of the week and typically there is nobody parked along the vast majority of this stretch. Northbound and southbound the total was 3.7 cars on average. Elena also pulled up google street view imagery from 2007, twice in 2012, 2017, 2019 and 2020 which were all available in street view and there were one or two cars that you could see parked along on that whole corridor in each image. Similarly we have aerial imagery, and our GIS from 2017-2021. If you look at those aeriels there is hardly anyone parked along this stretch. From a utilization standpoint there is definitely the capacity to eliminate parking on the southbound side. We have made a lot of changes to how we striped the pilot program including moving the parking back to the curb on the northbound side. She will not go through the long list of why we did that because we went through all that on Monday night, but city staff, public safety, DPW operations, as well as a lot of members of the cycling community commented in the survey. We had 366 respondents. They commented that they did not like the arrangement with the parking out from the curb. Some of it was there aren't enough parked cars to really provide a fully protected lane. Some was safety of an unexpected car parked that far out into the street. Emergency vehicles didn't like that when you pull up there and you don't pull into the bike lane when you are exiting your vehicle you are right in the travel lane. Fire trucks can't get as close to homes, can't get the ladder as close, so we felt that there were a lot of safety driven concerns that outweighed the safety benefits of the bike lane being on the inside of the curb along that stretch. We also felt the abutters had a lot of concerns about pulling out of their driveways. Elena said that she pulled in and out of some driveways to see what that felt like when the cars were parked that far out and it really is that you can't see whose coming until you are in the travel lane especially if you are backing out of a travel lane. You can't see the cars at all until you are in the travel lane. We even striped those parking spaces as defined spaces that were five plus feet from the driveway opening, so it wasn't even that people were parking too close to the driveways. Elena states that we addressed those concerns by moving the parking back to the curb along the corridor of the 22 homes that would lose parking in front of their homes. We realized that that is a hardship for those properties, but again the whole project is a balancing act trying to figure out what's the best way to accommodate as many interests as we can. Of those

22 homes, they all have offsite parking, the majority of them have at least a single car garage, and 7 of them are along the corners of side streets, so they can park along the side of their house. Another 7 of them are one house away from a side street. The side streets do have some restrictive parking from 6am-10am due to commuter issues, keeping people from Oak Grove from parking there. They did have a lot of questions about using alternate routes and states that she went out today with the wheel and she measured Mt. Vernon, Derby and Waverly. Mt. Vernon is only about 22 feet wide, so it doesn't fit. Even the two traffic lanes with parking on both sides which is what is allowed, doesn't even fit two traffic lanes and parking on one side never mind adding bike lanes. There is really no option of adding a bike lane. You could add sharrows, but you are supposed to stripe those 11 feet out from the curb. They would literally be in the middle of the street in both directions when parking is allowed. Derby does not have an option again of putting a travel lane, even though it's one way. On Derby you could fit a travel lane, a parking lane on one side and a bike lane, but you would have to eliminate parking on one side and the bike lane would have to be with the flow of traffic unless you were going to eliminate parking on one whole side and paint a contraflow bike lane. The problem with the contraflow is when you get up to Waverly there is absolutely no room to have contraflow because it is so narrow. Elena believes that it is 17 feet, so once you park a car on one side of Waverly you can barely get by in the travel lane, so that is not an option either. Elena states that she is of the mindset of alternate routes like we did on the north side of town, don't replace the Main St. corridor route. We still have to put something that accommodates all users on Main St. whether its bike lanes, sharrows or the like. It's not an either/or, so Elena does not feel it really solves the Main St. problem, however it's also not feasible to put dedicated infrastructure. Elena fully recognizes that this is not a trade off or going to be an easy decision. She knows that some folks feel that the city has been dismissive with their comments and she thinks we have really taken everybody's comments to heart. We read every comment from the 366 survey respondents and emails received. We are just trying to come up with the best plan for the whole community and for the abutters understanding that we can't address 100% of everybody's needs and concerns.

Commissioner Parenti states if we are taking these items separately, it's conceivable that we vote yes on the item removing the parking and vote no on one of the two items to add bike lanes. If you have something to say about this proposal, you should say it now than risk waiting because no one knows what the vote will be until we get to the end of this item. He doesn't want to leave us in a position where we vote yes on the parking and no on the bike lanes and then have ten feet of no man's land to hatch out. He just wants to make sure that we come out of this meeting with a proposal that makes sense.

Elena states that this is a really good point and when we were talking about how to do the public comment, she wasn't thinking about these three items. Items #4, 5 and 6 really need to hear public comment on all three at the same time because there is no way to separate the discussion on them. They are all contingent upon each other. They were deliberately put in this order on the agenda because the parking decision drives the bike lane decisions. If we approve the parking reduction, then the bike lanes fit in both directions, and we could conceivably vote yes on the other two items. If we deny the parking reduction, then it gives us the choice and we can vote because we can fit a bike lane in one direction or the other. It gives us the opportunity to then deliberate which direction that should be and vote on item #5 and 6 accordingly. We tried to order it in a very logical way that leaves us the ability to make decisions to any combination of them.

Councilor Eccles states that quite a few people have asked questions in the WebEx and wants to make sure if someone wanted to be heard that they would make themselves heard or we could read them.

Elena asks Councilor Eccles to read those questions after we take all the public comments from people that have their hands raised. Elena states that she will read the three items for what public comment is going to be open for: Request to change parking on the west side of Main St, request to add dedicated bike lanes on the east side of Main St. (northbound) from 338 feet north of the Melrose/Malden City limit which is right after the left turn lane to Oak Grove Village to Mt Vernon Ave, approximately 3,700 ft. or .7 miles. Request to add dedicated bike lanes on Main St. (Southbound) west side from 510 feet south of Wyoming Ave to the Melrose/Malden city limit approximately 3,540 ft. or .67 miles.

Elena then asks if she has unanimous consent to open public comment which she does.

Adam Serafin of 25 S. High St. states that he is here tonight to speak in favor of the proposed bike lanes/roadway markings on S. Main St. Prior to the closure of his office due to covid he commuted 1,500 miles per year from his home in Cedar Park to the hood office park in Charlestown. He plans to do this again when his office reopens. Commuting by bike has allowed his family of 4 to go from two cars, down to 1. They have maintained single car ownership for six years and plan to do so indefinitely until circumstances change. The entirety of his 12.5 mile roundtrip commute to Charlestown is on designated bike infrastructure except for this roughly $\frac{3}{4}$ mile section through Main St. in Melrose being discussed tonight. He takes everyone step by step through his commute to highlight the wonderful improvements that have been made by our neighboring communities that have been made over the past several years that have allowed him to make this trip safely. Malden has constructed bike lanes from the Melrose city limit south to Malden Center, Malden and Everett have done their part by building the northern strand community path through their respective cities, Everett has done their part by putting grade separated cycle paths along 1.7 miles of Broadway, from Sweetster circle to the Mystic River and Boston has done their part by putting dedicated bike lanes over the Mystic River through Sullivan Sq. and beyond. It is now time for us here in Melrose to do our part to construct bike lanes on Main St; to build safe connections to Oak Grove south to neighboring communities and further on to Boston. He commends the city staff for developing these complete streets design that seeks the compromise and accommodates all roadway users and he asks to approve the S. Main St. plan as proposed.

Estelle McDonough states that as we were discussing the lanes on both sides of the road and entertaining a cross walk being added to so many areas, she states she could see discussion also about the MBTA, and the buses and emphasizes that there is very little parking left on Main St. You can't park at a bus stop; you can't park before or after a crosswalk, on the other side of the street, the south side, and on the north side there is a problem there. There is no room for any parking period. She wants someone to count the number of spaces being lost on the street and she thinks that you will find out that there are very few left. She states that we have counted the feet from the street, the number of crosswalks and doesn't know where people are going to park in order to receive the services that they deserve because they live in the city that everybody receives everywhere else. She is glad there are commuters that like to use their bicycle to commute. With that she thinks this is a consideration, but thinks that it needs to really be looked at much more closely than what we are doing. She thinks every councilor should write down the number of spaces being eliminated tonight.

Elena thanks her and states that she is going to get that answer for her during the course of the meeting.

Finn McSweeney states that he is going to read the rest of the Ped Bike letter which is an endorsement of the items currently being discussed. The Ped Bike committee was part of the complete streets working group, which in collaboration with the public, city staff and elected officials first identified this section of Main St. as community priority back in 2017. In 2019 understanding how critical Main St. is a multi-modal public way for all of our nearly 30,000 residents they began creating a detailed set of design recommendations. The committee considered numerous options. One option looked at installing an elevated multi-use pathway running along the street. Another option looked at in street protected bike lanes using a parking protected configuration on the northbound side, safe hit posts to create traffic buffers and traffic calming effects and raised islands ahead of mixing zones. A third option considered was striping alone using high visibility green paint at conflict zones and bike botches at intersections. All options included day lit crosswalks at locations convenient to residents and transit riders. They delivered these recommendations to the city in May of 2020 and circulated an online petition to the public asking them to support enhanced pedestrian/bike safety along Main St. They did attach that petition along with the many hundreds of local signatures they received in support to this letter. Within our letter we also included highlights from a survey conducted earlier this year by Mass Inc. polling the riders inside of 128. It found clear enthusiasm for these types of projects. 75% of voters surveyed within route 128 indicated that they supported creating bike lanes even if that means removing some parking. Proposals like the one before you tonight enjoy tremendous support, both locally within Melrose and within the larger regional community from which we are inseparable. While we are disappointed that the city is not considering a number of the other traffic calming recommendations we included in our proposal, our members very much feel that the city's

designs represent an important and meaningful first step in creating a safer Main St. that works for more people. The city's design clarifies acceptable driver movements, clearly alert motorists to the presence of pedestrians and cyclists and reallocates space to the public way in a manner that is more right sized for Melrose. Critically these plans are also compatible with many possible other traffic calming implementations be they quick build or capital intensive. We urge the commission to not only consider where we are as a community currently but where we must go. In the coming year, Melrose is expected to pass a housing production plan and net zero plans. We must immediately begin making rapid progress towards the goals those plans outline. It is highly likely that these plans will urge existing residents to reduce reliance on auto trips, while also aiming to encourage more production of housing in transit oriented neighborhoods. The city's requests are compatible with these goals and we urge the commission to grant them.

Garrett Nelson of 76 Linden Rd. states that he uses this corridor every day, primarily on bike, though occasionally by car or on foot. He encourages the commission to adopt the following three recommendations. The plan before you tonight represents a wise compromise by city staff. As a biker he knows that it is not the maximal bike plan that he knows many in the biking community would like but it represents clear efforts by the city staff to address abutters concerns, while also making a plan that allows Main St. to be used by a different number of road users. He thinks the plan that is proposed is also conformant with three key commitments that have been endorsed by Melrose's elected leaders which includes designing streets in accordance to modern street designs, to accommodate many different kinds of users, Melrose's goal toward climate adaptation, and finally a goal to make Melrose safe for families and residents. He thinks if the commission were to reject this plan merely to keep a super abundant amount of parking on Main St. it would call all three of those city's commitments into serious question. He thinks it's appropriate that this issue is being considered by a commission that represents all of Melrose. It is literally in the name Main St. It is a Main St. for the city. It is of concern for all residents and to non-residents as well for that matter. He thinks it is appropriate what the city has done in terms of its feedback process so far and for the TC to make its choice in light of the city's overall needs. He strongly encourages the commission to support these three proposals.

Heather Calette lives at 160 W. Wyoming Ave. speaks in support of the plan for S. Main St, especially including the bike lanes. She states that her family bikes in Melrose as their primary form of transportation and although they also have a car, they try to ride bikes everywhere. One of her sons goes to daycare at the Y Academy, so someone in her family is always biking down Main St. with their son on the back of their bike every day. This is something that would make that bike ride a lot more pleasant and more importantly a safer one, so she encourages the commission to vote in favor of bike lanes on S. Main.

John Cooley states he is the owner of 250-252 Main St. and the resident of 250 Main St. He would just like to touch on some of the comments that his neighbors made earlier especially, Estelle and Megan McDonough. They brought up some very valid points that represent a consensus of the concerns of this neighborhood. The focus of his discussion tonight would be of some unique circumstances that are specific to his address and property and how they affect the issue of safety of cyclists as well as equity for all stakeholders. He states that the bike path is a positive step and from what he can see was very well planned, however as well planned as it was there is some significant safety/equity flaws in the amended proposal. The most critical flaw that he can see puts cyclists in potentially mortal danger. Just listening to the comments earlier from the cyclists that made very well based cases for their support, he sees a concern that they probably are oblivious too because they can't see it from the prospective here. To elaborate, because the bicycle and vehicle traffic flow under the pilot program now flows several feet closer to the curb, a tremendous blind spot has developed creating a situation where when he exits his driveway that a cyclist is not visible to him until they are a few feet away from his vehicle. He asks Elena if she ever had an opportunity to come in and out of his driveway. Elena states that she has and he is thankful both for that and that Chief Lyle took the time to speak to him the other day and let him demonstrate his concerns. He states that if a cyclist starts out at Wyoming, he wouldn't see them at all until they are a few feet from his car. He understands the trees have been there for a long time, but the traffic hasn't been flowing or cyclists being forced to cycle so close to the curb. One factor is that the residents next to me at 256 Main St. had two trees next to their house, and the symmetry of the girth of the tree in combination with the curvature of the road has effectively blocked having an adequate warning of a cyclist in particular coming

towards him. He thanks Chief Lyle that took a look at that as well and they both came to the same conclusion regarding that and he appreciates the efforts of Councilor McMaster the other night. He had asked a few questions to Elena regarding the situation and he did ask Chief Lyle what type of mitigation is possible in a situation like that. Elena he states at a minimum recommended at least a sign that would give a cyclist a warning that they are not visible to those that are exiting driveways. Before considering the proposed plan he urges everyone to visit his property with your fellow commission member Chief Lyle and make a decision that you feel is in the best interest of safety. He is not against it and thinks the plan is great. His concern is that there is a safety oversight that could have some mortal danger and it really upsets him. With that he asks everyone to strongly consider. Mr. Cooley states that regarding the formation of the plan, Elena cited many favorable statistics regarding the parking impact to southbound abutters. His take on that is that the plan assumes that southbound side street parking isn't a major inconvenience given that many properties as you cited just a little earlier being close to corners and only one house away from corners doesn't really present too much of an inconvenience. His home especially if you went into the driveway is seven house lengths from any side street parking and of those seven house lengths, two of which are double lots 244, 246 and 238 , so he is nine house lengths from side street parking. This is a gross oversight and again it's the type of thing that happens when all stake holders are not included in the formation of a plan. He knows that Elena mentioned earlier the topic of balance; there does have to be some balance in terms of equity. Chief Lyle he states had expressed a concern for residents in the need of home health aides. Mr. Cooley states that his mother is 85 years old, has been a resident here for 45 years and resides at 252 Main St. She requires a home health aide on a daily basis. The aide that she has is someone that has worked out well in regards to her needs; however the aide is fearful of crossing the busy street. His mother is very anxious because she feels that she may lose the aid and given the current labor shortage be left with no assistance. So that's a real equity issue in terms of the infirmed, the elderly, the somewhat handicapped as well as the equity that his house is now nine house lengths from side street parking. To summarize a remedy that he seeks and that he would like the commission to consider is what Megan McDonough suggested to put it in a hiatus and reevaluate. If that is not an option he would like the committee to consider and put into motion starting the no parking zone at Potomac St. It would alleviate that unique safety situation that he faces with visibility because he would no longer have to deal with that curvature in the road. It would alleviate the equity for side street parking, not just for him but also for the residents of 256 and 262 Main St. that are upwards of eleven house lengths away from side street parking. More importantly a move to Potomac St. is a turning point and would allow a senior citizen to have consistent home health care. He states that if we can't put the whole thing to the table and reconsider the whole project, he would appreciate if someone could raise the motion for considering the no parking zone starting at Potomac. With that he asks each committee member to reflect and act upon his comments and do it in good conscience regarding the safety of the cyclists who he understands are very enthused about the project. He states that sometimes in enthusiasm the slight details can be very dangerous and overlooked.

Elena asks a question in response to his comments asking if there is a possibility for the home health aide to park in the driveway. He responds that it is a two family house and has to consider the long term feasibility of this property not just for its current utilization but for its future. There are two tandem driveways on this location which exacerbates the problem if the house is used for its actual purpose and has tenants. Because then there is the whole issue that has been discussed in the past with tandem parking by people who are just in single homes. Further down the road then it becomes a real struggle as you shuffle vehicles. So is the home health aide a possibility yes, but that's an inconvenience for him having to make space for that. He goes on to say that he is looking for concession for certain things that affect his property.

John Chrisley states he is actually a resident of Wakefield and is one of the two co-chairs of the safe streets working groups here in Wakefield. The group has met with the Ped Bike committee many times about the S. Main St. project, so they understand that we have a significant amount of data gathering and public outreach with the development of the plan. He hears the comments from some of the other cyclists in the community that this is a compromised plan that we have come up with and he just wants to offer his strong support for the plan in consideration tonight. A lot of our concerns are a lot of the communities in the south end of Wakefield about Melrose. Our group up in Wakefield has had ongoing discussions about putting bike lanes into Wakefield to complete the connection with Melrose because the communities are so close. He thinks the plan on S. Main

St. would enhance connectivity between Wakefield and Melrose particularly with the Oak Grove MBTA station being a major commuter destination. He states that the Ped Bike Committee is in support of this plan and he would also like to mention that before moving to Wakefield he was a resident of 3 Mt. Vernon St. and was a bike commuter in Melrose on this very corridor. He would have liked to have seen these pedestrian crosswalk improvements and bike lane improvements when he was a resident of Melrose.

Lonnie Nelson resides at 76 Linden Rd. and states she travels on S. Main St. almost every day to bring her daughter to daycare down at Oak grove. She does this by bike, bus or driving. She has also walked when it was really nice, so she has used all the different modes and is excited about the plan tonight and fully supports it. It would absolutely make this safer for folks like her, commuting with children on bikes or walking. She mentions that even as a driver she has enjoyed driving in the new configuration and that it feels a little safer in terms of it being better delineated where you are supposed to be driving. Whether it's one lane or two lanes, the speeds she can tell personally that people are driving slower because of the narrowing of the lanes. She thinks that is a benefit to all and fully supports the plan. She thinks public safety should be the number one concern on the TC and she thinks this plan will improve safety for all. She understands what previous comments were made about bike safety being a concern with blind spots, but she states as a biker we already are experiencing unsafe conditions, the danger of people backing out into the road already exists. In her opinion, she thinks having a bike lane will make it safer, not less safe. She also likes the idea of a sign to let people know that people may be backing out. She doesn't think that should get in the way of this plan.

Maggie Abdow thanks the TC for the meeting tonight and for all the meetings that have happened this week. She is an abutter in this corridor and wants to acknowledge that she respectively supports the revised plan. She has been excited from long ago about the installation of a bike path. She states that she is a biker, a MBTA Transit user and a one car family. This is something that resonates with her family. She does want to address John Cooley's comments about the parking. The design maybe being reconsidered for the Potomac spot she raises because what she has observed during the pilot is an extreme amount of parking from the apt buildings. She knows that the redesign did take this into consideration by reinstating some of that. It seems to be that the larger amount of parking is that larger building inside the southbound side which is right before where the residential houses begin (278 Main). There is a large amount of parking there and she doesn't think the redesign accommodates that particular building and also the configuration of the street, the curvature, the driveways that aren't entering in to that particular stretch, but particularly the ones between Mt. Vernon and Potomac. They are blind driveways coming in from steep inclines on the northbound side. Somewhat blind on the south bound side and also as John pointed out we don't have a crosswalk for quite a distance on the southbound side. It's been a question for her throughout this process and has not actually brought up in any communications up until now. Having John state it again makes her think that she does want to lift up all of the neighbors in this section. She knows that it is a problematic and challenging change, but applauds the city for taking it on and how receptive the city has been throughout this process. It's been pretty complicated and she just wants to express her gratitude. We are in support of the plan as revised and do ask for reconsideration of looking at the plan against Potomac and want to thank the city for the consideration of the parking blocks out from the curb. She recognizes that it works in other models and thinks that it is particularly difficult for the way that Main St. is designed.

Ryan William states that he has used this pilot program as a driver, cyclist, pedestrian and transit user. He has used it before and during the pilot and he wants to echo some of the comments of people that have actually used it and their usage of it. Yes it is safer to drive on, everybody drives slower, and it is safer to bike on. There are cyclists on this street every day and whether or not there is a bike lane present is a question of whether we want them to be safe on their usage of the street. Right now the discussion about the parking block further up north towards the apartment buildings reminds him that when he's cycling, that is a section that probably produces the most anxiety and fear. This is where there is always a couple cars parked and as soon as the apartments end there is really no parking that happens on the other part of that street. The most dangerous spot is one car that will occasionally park along the south portion of Main St. He is one of the people that did the parking count, so he knows that there's almost never cars parked on that portion of the street, but when you have that one car that is what creates the blind spot and creates danger. He mentions that Commissioner

Peart stated earlier that having no parking on one side of the street means that it will be safer for people to cross because it will be a shorter crossing distance. Having the bike lane without parking on that side of the street also makes it easier to bike. This to me is a classic complete streets project. We are thinking about everybody that uses the street and thinking about how we can accommodate all of them and really think about each group of users individually. We are putting their needs into the mix of ideas instead of just disenfranchising a bunch of people that uses the street and say well you guys don't have this special qualifier so we don't want to listen to anything that you have to say. He has been really impressed with how well everyone has navigated the need to hear from the abutters and make changes based on their many recommendations. How about the need to listen to the cyclists who are already using Main St. and want to be safer and to see how this all plays into the current streets policy that Melrose passed in 2016. The mayor signed it, the city council saw it, voted on it, a copy of it is attached to his comments. He's not going to read the policy but it is on the city of Melrose's website. He encourages anyone who is thinking about needing to learn more about the way that Melrose has started treating all of their street projects repaving, restriping, to google city of Melrose complete streets, go on the website and get educated. He has heard from people that have said that they have never heard of this policy, I've never heard from policy makers in Melrose that they didn't know that this policy existed. This has been the policy that has been our guiding force for our public works for over five years. It has 800,000 dollars of funding into this community. We got into the program by gathering a huge amount of public input, coming up with dozens of ideas and then putting together a working group. Sgt. Goc was on the working group, we had members of DPW, Engineering, Public Schools, the Mayor's Office, the planning department and someone from the Ped bike committee. We even had the woman who is the current state representative, Kate Lipperbedian. There was a very large public input process. We ended up with 25 projects and we ranked them by weighted domains. Safe school access, connectivity to transits and parks, businesses, all of this stuff is on the website. This was without a doubt the most data driven, carefully considered and thoughtfully planned public works planning process he has ever seen. It was approved by a huge cross section of leadership in this community and here are two of the top five ranked projects on that list. The number two ranked project was a safe bicycle network that went from Wakefield to Malden. The number 4 on the list of 25 was narrower the travel lanes of S. Main St. and giving it a road diet. He knows the TC started as a body that was focused on parking cars and driving but he sees the way that it has evolved as the necessity of this goal we have that Melrose should be a safe place to travel without a car. We talk about a lot about walkable communities but what we are really talking about is letting people get around Melrose without needing to buy lots of cars, they are expensive, cost lots of money and they are hard to insure and they are dangerous. Tonight he heard Chief Lyle say that about the 1% of the Melrose owners that drive an EV about 300 people he said "if there is one EV parking in that spot on Green St, let's make that road space be set aside for EV only. Ryan states that he totally agrees that when we see something that meets our goal as a community when we see a low barrier to entry we should make a move on it. There's definitely more than one bicycle riding on Main St. there are lots of bicycles riding on Main St. there is not a lot of cars parking on Main St; so we should really do what we can to bring the complete streets vision here and make it a reality. If he had one thing to ask of the TC tonight is to please give respect to the work that this community has done to make Melrose a complete streets community. Please look at the list of 500 people, most of who live in Melrose who signed that petition for a safer Main St. Think about the complete streets working group and the people that put work into these ideas and all the data that went into this and the five year history of this project. Trust the engineers on the panel, the safety commission experts and the planners on the panel and approve this request, all of these items that remain on the agenda to make Main St. a complete street.

Sgt. Goc asks Ryan Williams if we have bike data in that corridor, anything relevant in regards to this project. Ryan responds that they have not done the same quantity of bike as the parking counts but were out there pre-pandemic. We did 15 visits with the bike counts. What we have done is that we have had several tours and we have had members that go out there and take photographs anecdotally report on the rate of bicycles that they see per hour. He thinks it might be a little depressed at the moment because the bike commuters going to oak grove are definitely like half of what they were pre-pandemic. In the peak morning hours though you might see 6/ 7 bicycles in an hour if you are talking rush hour traffic. He states that through his personal experience, he has never been on Main Street where he didn't see at least another cyclist or maybe two travelling up the street. He states that he does not use Main St. every day as a cyclist so he would love to have that question answered

by follow up studies and have an actual bike count come out and be done at that corridor, hopefully after the bike lanes go in, so that we can see exactly.

Sgt. Goc states that he just wanted to follow up on this because he has spoken to Chief Lyle and Elena about this entire project. He knows there were approximately 15 times that the Ped bike committee went out and did parking evaluations. There has been a ton of work that has gone into this project and he's extremely curious as to why there has been no bike data. With that being said is bike data relevant to this project or not?

Ryan Williams responds that there are a lot of experts on the committee, so he wants to give them the floor because he feels they will add more value on this than him.

Elena then asks about the numbers that Ryan Williams was citing since he was so involved with the counts on the parking, the stretches where it was something like 12 cars on average. She asks if it was Wyoming to Potomac and then 3.7 cars on average was on Potomac to Sylvan. Is that accurate? Ryan states not quite Potomac but some of the folks have mentioned the Americana Apartments and so that was maybe the next two houses. One or two houses past that would occasionally have a car, most of it really focused on the apartment buildings.

Elena then states that the break in those two numbers on the report was really around the apartment buildings not Potomac. Ryan states that he thinks it was easier to break that data up, however we have a spread sheet somewhere and we can double check on that. He is pretty sure that they broke it up by street just because it's easier to kind of visualize the needs street by street rather than going address by address.

Councilor Eccles has a question regarding bike data. The condition of the road is so bad right now he thinks that bike data is a little bit different before and after paving and its worth mentioning that.

Sgt. Goc states that he is right, but the parking utilization speaks to 15 times that. The committee went out and that's prior to the pandemic just so we are all aware of that.

Commissioner Krechmer points out one data point on one of the tours they did count rolling conveyances because they weren't all bikes. There was somewhere around 35 in an hour Sunday morning. They were mostly bikes and a few scooters using the bike lanes during the pilot, not including the ones riding with his group. He points out that Councilor Eccles point is good regarding the condition of the road. A lot of bikes can't handle it right now until it gets repaved.

Elena states that she had been told in the past anecdotally that the cage at Oak Grove used to fill up and that is why when they did the redesign at Oak Grove they were considering putting more bike parking. She is wondering if anyone here pre-pandemic was a daily commuter to Oak and would like to know if that is true.

Ryan Williams states that it is 100% true as he was a daily bike commuter. He states that he is kind of a late riser at times and would frequently get either the last spot on that cage or parking at the outside and locking. The MBTA was did end up adding additional bike parking to the station as part of the reconstruction project. Elena then asks if he knows how many bikes fit in the cage that is currently there and Ryan states that he believes it is more than 50.

Commissioner Parenti states that it is more like 100 because people use the second level. The orange line station attracts a lot of bikers.

Ryan states that on the MBTA website that it has parking for 150 bikes. He mentions that he has additional data on parking that was done during the pilot. There were 30 observations between Sept. 17th and Oct 3rd, broken down into four sections. The section of Wyoming to Mt. Vernon which we have said is now going to have full parking averaged 4 people parking there. We went out morning, afternoon and evening. It sounds low, it's highly variable there in the afternoons, after work it tends to be 7 – 9 cars parked there. In the mornings, it's very low

utilization. Mt. Vernon to Potomac had the highest utilization with an average of 4.7 cars parking there. Potomac to Rockview had an average of two cars parked there and Rockview to Sylvan had an average of 1.5 cars parked there. Rockview to Sylvan tends to be more heavily utilized in the am. The people that go to the gym there use it a lot and then later on in the day, there is not much utilization. Mt Vernon to Potomac tends to be the most consistently used parking area. You can go there at any time of day, and find a pretty consistent 3- 7 cars parked there whereas Wyoming to Mt. Vernon is more boomer bust. Potomac to Rockview is very low.

Elena then asks for confirmation on the most utilized and Commissioner Parenti states that Mt. Vernon to Potomac is the most consistent with the lowest number of cars being parked there as 2 and the most is 7 whereas Wyoming to Mt. Vernon has sometimes zero, sometimes 9 to 10 people parked there.

William Gordon who resides at 178 Main St. states that he agrees with the recommendations of Megan McDonough.. He appreciates that there has been some adjustment in the plan based on feedback and the terrible accident that happened two days after the abutters said that is dangerous both ways. Parking cars into traffic, doesn't take into account that people don't always act exactly the way they are supposed to on the road. They develop patterns. Car was going to take a left to they figured that they could go around the right and that's when they slammed into that car, totaled that car that was sitting there and totaled the car that was driving. The abutters concerns for the southbound side of Main St., if you have a house on Main St. which he does and are not on a corner, they can't park there. If you are going to back into the driveway, so when you leave your driveway you pull out frontwards you have to pull over to the curb which puts you over this bike lane. Cars don't stop to let you back in they go around you. When they go around you because the double yellow line moved, they go well over the double line. Prior to this project, cars went up to and sometimes over the yellow line. He knows that some of our comments about that were heard, and the double yellow lines can be moved, but based on what they saw before and what they are seeing now, they are still going to go over that line. They are concerned for potential accidents there just as we feel parking cars in the middle of traffic is going to generate an accident. He is not the only driveway like this. After the abutters meeting he realized that when he comes home after work it's a real strain on his wife because she can't leave the car out front any more. No one went and counted the cars parked in the evening. Because of the two hour limit, no one would park their cars for the two hour limit unless it was for a few minutes. When its high usage parking and he hasn't heard a count on that, you would look down the street and see cars parked on both sides of Main St. in the evening after 6 pm because parking was allowed. His wife would park her car and he would come home from work and park his car without disturbing her. His neighbor has mobility issues and he has a health aide. It's going to be difficult for him to get the services he needs. His family comes to visit and they don't all fit in the driveway. If he needs to leave and it's not one of the cars that fit in the driveway, he's not going to have easy access to that. This is going to make life for those with disabilities or advanced age more difficult. You don't want to make lines that people are just going to ignore because then they don't work. People are not respecting those lines, but did when we had enough space. If they went around us they were still on our side of the road. If they go onto that side and there is an oncoming car there's an accident and where these cars wind up you can't control that. He also mentions the renters and how that apartment building would lose on-site parking and how they heavily use it, but they have parking in the back. He states that he walked in the back and yes they have parking but hill space is all numbered which means they go to the tenants. It is 12 spaces for tenants. The reason you see people parked on the street is because people are coming to visit with little kids. Where are they going to park? They have to cross the street to park. It's a real inconvenience and we really don't like it. He knows that the city professionals work hard on this, but the gap has been, the bike stakeholders but the abutters, the residents that live on S. Main St. are stakeholders too. They became aware of this when the pilot project started and they felt assaulted because this was dangerous. They understand that there is a need that has to be addressed here and just wants to be a part of the process not an afterthought. They are concerned about safety and the needs of people that are not being factored in. You can't measure the bikes at Oak grove and say they all went down Main St. You can get there through Washington St., you can get there through Malden, so they come from a lot of feedings and they come from S. Main as well. He was a regular commuter pre-covid every day. Also, in regards to the bus stop, you can't get any closer to Lodge than it already is. It's at the corner of Lodge. What shows on Google is where the bus stop is. In regards to accessibility, he doesn't usually have a lot of people visit him and need parking, but when he lost his parents he had thirty people come and park all up and down Main St. This is

evening parking and no one has counted it and taken it into account. People have events and holidays that people come for and that's when it gets used and that's gone. If you have someone that needs to come visit you and it's 6am, there's no side street parking because of the commuter rules on Derby, Kingsley and Lodge. It's just not allowed from 6am to 10am, so there is no alternative parking. You have really taken away something that we need.

Ellen Catz of 70 Lyons St. wants to bring the conversation back to the idea that she understands that it is a change for people, but this is a street that belongs to all of us, and change is hard. She encourages the commission to support the plan. A lot of people say well how many bicycles are there really there, you say no one bikes so that's why we shouldn't add a bike lane. She is one of the people that are pretty fearful of riding in traffic, so if there are no bike lanes or a bike lane that is not separated from traffic at all chances are she is not going to do it. She thinks that a lot of people like her will do it if they feel safe and if there is a lane where they don't have to constantly worry about being doored or being hit on both ends. It is not just about getting to Oak Grove, but getting to the northern strand trail which is a great amenity and it's just over the Malden line. If we can get to Malden safely then she thinks that would be a great amenity for the city. She also has questions for Elena. For the southbound side, the proposal is for a buffer bike lane which is painted buffers. Is that what the plan is?

Elena responds that the idea of the buffer was to address concerns of people on the south side pulling out of their driveways. It gives them about 7 feet to pull out which would be comparable to a parking lane, so they wouldn't be pulling into the travel lane. It would be nice to have it in the door zone on the other side, but then the center line would get too far making it more of a hazard for those that live on the street.

Ellen Catz responds that she thinks that that will make cyclists feel safer. The striping will help narrow the lanes which has shown in traffic publications that it forces cars to go slower. She prefers a more physical separation because they wouldn't be able to ride over the striping but feels it's a start. She hopes the commission votes for it. She adds that people have been talking about how it's so dangerous now and losing the parking is going to be tough. She realizes it's an inconvenience, however the whole idea of having all these extra crosswalks is to enable people to cross Main St. safely. If you are parking on the northbound side and you have to cross the street to park instead of right in front of your house at least it will help people feel safer.

Frank Perry speaks next and states that Sgt. Goc's point to not having the data on the bicycles is pretty significant considering this major change that the city is going to take. He wants to mention that people are parking on the southbound side even though there is no parking there and that creates a very dangerous situation not only for bicyclists coming down that lane but for vehicles. They have to swerve around the parked car and then basically come into the northbound side. Another point he wants to make is about parking on the side streets. People that live on the side streets, park there, so coupled with the fact that there is limited parking when there is the commuting hours, there really aren't many extra spots for people that are living on Main St. Again, this was mentioned before but people that live on Main St. have family and friends that come visit them often and look forward to using those spots. Now trying to find a spot on a side street for a large event is pretty difficult. He is definitely supportive of the bike lanes, but he just thinks there are a lot of other considerations that need to be factored in, one that Sgt. Goc said about the data on the bicycles. We are probably going to vote on it this evening, but not having that seems like more of a confirmation bias to me and there are other issues regarding safety about people parking on the southbound side. People are going to park on that side where they are not supposed to park. He doesn't know if an uptick of enforcement needs to happen but the reality is people are going to park there. Additionally, the bus stops at Lodge are right on the corner on both sides and he is not really sure where that could be moved. He mentions that the crosswalk in front of Lodge that was just previously approved is literally right in front of the bus stop so that actually creates yet another safety concern. Where you have a bus that is going to stop directly in front of the crosswalk because that is where the bus stop is, potentially having someone walk right in front of the bus and then peering their head into oncoming traffic holds true to both sides of Lodge.

Elena then corrects herself from her previous statement about the bus stops at Lodge saying that one is right at Lodge and one is right before Lodge if you are going south. They are both moving towards Kingsley. So thank you for clarifying because that is the proposal to have both of them move towards Kingsley.

Chief Lyle raises his hand to address the parking in the restricted area on the southbound side. There are two conflicting signs so it is impossible for the police to enforce the two hour parking or the temporary one below it. We have requested that the two hour one be bagged so we can enforce it on the right hand.

Jeanine Finnerty states that she feels we are not doing enough for the whole community because that bike lanes are only good for a small group. She states that even a small segment of bicyclists, because a lot of bicyclists won't put themselves at risk and bike on the street with a car or a truck driving 30 mph. We would rather see a cross track in that area. It is more money but also knows that there are state grants for that. All of these cities around Melrose are doing more than Melrose or far more than Melrose. Stoneham and Malden have community paths and Wakefield now has their first mile of their community path. These places are not just for bicyclists, but for walkers, roller skating, strollers, with the dog. A cross track would be a compromise. It's not a path away from cars but at least it's separated because it is on the level with the sidewalk. It is a curb, so it does put a physical barrier between you and the car. It is far safer for everyone and would be far more used than just the bike lane. It would be handicap accessible which is a big thing. For families that live down there she sympathizes with them who are dealing with elder care. She would never want to do anything to put any family at risk because she knows how hard it is to get someone reliable. Malden not only has the northern strand community path, but they are also taking it a step further and designing the spot pond brooks extension which would go to the edge of Melrose. It would be a separated path, right by the oak grove train station. You would think that Melrose would take the next step and realize its 2021 and at least to something equivalent to what their neighbors are doing and put something out there that is far safer than bike lanes and far more useable for everyone in the community. The other thing about the cycle track for the homeowners in the area, it functions more as a sidewalk. Because it is not a barrier parking it is just a wider sidewalk. They would just have a slightly longer driveway; there would be no cars three feet away from the curb thus blocking your vision. It would also look and function nicer, with the residents in that area. We need to realize that it's not just Main St., it's not just a place for people to cut through in Melrose, and it's someone's community. It's somebody's home and we should be paying more attention to their needs as they live there 24/7. When she is biking through on a Sunday, she is just passing through. She stresses that we need to have more inclusion; we need to have more access for bicyclists, but it can't just be for bicyclists. Not everyone rides a bike; people use scooters, walk dogs. We need to build infrastructure that can be used by everyone.

Jeremy speaks next and thanks the city for this process. It has been an open one and has been on the drawing board for quite some time and there have been plenty of opportunities for people to get involved. It should be a model of how we do projects going forward. He wants to say that it seems that people have an understanding that living in Melrose entitles you to a piece of city land to park cars and it doesn't. He thinks one of the great things about this project is that we are adding all these crosswalks and people can park on the other side of the street and cross the street safely. The one thing that S. Main St. doesn't have nearly enough of, frankly barely any is crosswalks and certainly no curb cuts, so if you are mobility impaired or using a stroller, a walker or anything like that it's awfully hard to cross the street. This project will make that possible, so it will really help S. Main St. and the residents there. He thinks a lot of the people that we have heard from tonight have been homeowners who have lived in the area for a while, and they have private driveways and they can certainly use those to park all the cars they want. If they have visitors they can cross the street, use a side street, park in the driveway, certainly no limit to options for parking. He states that he uses this route every day to bring his son to daycare and to commute into the city both via bike, via jogging stroller, via walking, via driving and has felt much safer over the course of this pilot, especially driving because the lanes are thinner. A report just came out from the Federal Highway Administration (FHA) that states narrow lanes and the addition of bike lanes actually reduce crashes. It slows cars down. It is what we want to see on this stretch of road where speeding is a concern as it is in many areas of Melrose. He thinks there has been a lot of discussion about this project and thinks it is great to have that. Now it's time to vote on it.

Jonah Kieran, a professional transportation planner lives in a two-family home with a single width driveway at 515 Lebanon St. which like Main St. is a major regional thoroughfare and there is no on street parking. They park on side streets or shuffle cars in driveways on the occasions that they need to. He has never had a problem pulling out of his driveway. They wait for a gap and pull out safely. Countless streets in Melrose only have parking on one side of the street which is the proposal at hand here. You aren't voting to eliminate parking on Main St. The crosswalks that you already approved tonight are going to make it safer and more convenient to cross the street and reach that parking on the north side of the street. As the chair noted and Finn McSweeney detailed, Ped bike committee studied parking use pre-pandemic and September during school 2019 and found that outside of the high demand locations where parking is being retained as part of this proposal, an average of 6 cars were parked along 1 and a ¼ miles of curb space. You can park 330 cars in that much space. That is over 5000% more space than there is demand in the corridor. This proposal will reduce the parking to half that or about 2,500%. There is more than enough space to park all of the cars on this corridor in that remaining space. As Jeremy just noted, the FHA has stated that with a road diet and lane narrowing it will reduce the rate of crashes by on average 30%. Narrowing lanes and making space for people to ride bikes outside of the traffic lanes, so they are not getting in the way of vehicles driving in their own dedicated space it will be safer and more convenient for everyone. He personally prefers driving on a street with separate space for bikes because you don't have to worry about bikers weaving in and out of the driving lane. Leaving the road as is with hardly any parked cars on the street effectively create traffic lanes that are almost 20 feet wide. 20 feet is wider than the shoulder lane on an interstate highway where cars drive upwards of 90 mph. That is not appropriate on Main St. Before the pilot project, and certainly once the road is repaved configures Main St as a dragstrip. It will be much more dangerous for road users, including people backing out of their driveways. Just one more note regarding the bikes on the corridor, that he knows comes up a lot in these projects, how many people are really using it? Do we really need to put in bike lanes for that many people? In traffic transportation planning they talk about the law of induced demand, and basically if you create more space for a certain type of travel, like adding more traffic lanes for example, it encourages more people to use that mode. It's more convenient. It's more important to have a count on people who currently use a pothole ridden Main St. with no accommodations to think about the future we want to have in Melrose. Is that a future where it is safe to ride your bike where cars travel the speed limit, and the police aren't constantly being hounded to sit in their patrol cars giving people tickets? We want to let the road do the work and adding bicycle lanes will undoubtedly increase the number of people riding bikes on Main St. It will reduce the speed of average vehicles on the streets. The crosswalks will make it safer to walk. This is a no brainer from his perspective and appreciates everyone listening. He appreciates the process that the city has run to pilot this project and not just have it be conceptual, but actually let us get to try it out and that the city has changed the design in response to real world feedback. He strongly encourages his support for this proposal.

Resident Paula Burg states that the previous gentleman that spoke states that it is a mile and a half and 300 cars and she doesn't know where he is coming up with that number. She doesn't know where those spaces ever were. She lives on Main St. between Potomac and Mt. Vernon and on the north side; cars are parked in front of her house and the houses in front of her, all day. Aside from that, her thought when she was listening to everyone tonight has to do with the southbound side and the fact that cyclists have to weave in and out of this bike lane area because there are vehicles parked even if it is temporarily for Amazon drop off or picking up somebody with the ride or something else of that nature. How safe is that for the cyclists to be weaving in and out and around a proposed bike lane she asks. Wouldn't it be safer for them just to be traveling in the travel lane? In the streets downtown there is no designated bike lanes. It's a small area that we talking about it and the abutters that are paying taxes are being disadvantaged by the proposed bike lanes. On Franklin St. she noticed that they had markings on the street that identified them as bike traffic. Can't the lower part of Main St. be marked as that instead of having the individual bike lanes and no parking?

John Cooley speaks again. He would like to point that a lot of the cyclists have called with some well thought out suggestions, but he's fearful that the commission isn't swayed to feel that all the cyclists are of the same ability, as these well-seasoned individuals. He is afraid the new cyclists that saw the new lanes, saw the new road, got a bicycle and said here I am and doesn't learn through trial and error what these individuals have learned from being very proficient cyclists. He hopes the commission realizes that if the plan is successful it will

bring a lot more cyclists than just the current community of experienced cyclists and that is where that safety issue to his property is very relevant.

Elena then moves on to following up on some questions we have before getting into the Q and A and the chat. She states that the number of spots that would be lost on the southbound lane with the current recommended plan is 40. The number of spaces that would be lost if we started the bike lane at Potomac would be 24 instead and would be a difference of 300 feet. The bike lane would start 300 feet down if we started at Potomac rather than 278 Main St. Elena also points out that the numbers of 40 and 24 spaces that Scott Dixon provided does include having daylighting at all of the crosswalks.

Councilor Eccles then reads the Q & A.

Steve Lombardi states – My suggestion would be to prohibit parking on the southbound morning commute and northbound evening commute. This will be added safety for the bike hours during peak use hours and equitable parking for the south side residents.

Frank Perry states that one additional issue he would like to raise is that although parking is limited to one side of the street people are continuing to park on both sides. This is a huge safety concern because the side of Main St. that technically has no parking is a smaller lane for some vehicles to drive into the oncoming lane. He states there are already two stops on Lodge, one on either side. This is talking about the bus stops. He also mentions that just as an FYI that keeping the crosswalks right at the spot where you just voted to add a crosswalk on Lodge is dangerous. Having a bus stop right at the crosswalk will cause a significant blind spot for vehicles and people crossing the street.

Maggie Moore Abdau asks if we can clarify again currently on Potomac there are two spots with the pilot. Are you suggesting it would be a loss of one or two of those spaces?

Steve Lombardi states – It is my observation that cars are not driving slower. I fear that when the new paving is complete, the speeding vehicles will increase.

Paula Berg states– You are speaking of 4, 6, 9 cars parked but how many spaces are there?

Don and Lynn Stead state – Quick thought, it appears that many bikers don't actually live on Main St. and do not know the dangers of living on Main St. I agree that it is not just a safety concern for bikers but also for residents and pedestrians as well. Speeding is still a concern.

Craig Molway states – I would like the committee to count an active cyclist over a parked car. How many drivers, bikes, would that be on a given day? Let's also please stop talking about the accident last week. If we reconfigured to the caller's request, the cyclist would have been killed instead of a fender bender. Also, the needs of the community weigh more than a single member with a single issue.

Elena reads a comment about an aerial view of the property of 250-252 Main St. It would appear to have a large driveway with capacity for two plus cars. Is a blind driveway sign not an option for the 250-252 Main Street site lines here?

Elena reads a comment - Hi my name is Tom Blazej and I am a Melrose resident and a year round bicycle commuter for the last ten years from my home on Damon Ave to my office in Boston. The pilot program has been a welcomed addition to a dangerous high stress section of my commute. The removal of parking that was removed for the bike lane stripping substantially lowered the stress placed on cyclists. Speeding is still an issue but at least there is room for an out. The new road diet markings not only alert drivers, but they will need to pay attention that they are in a residential area. Data is available that proves this point. On Monday there were comments made that very few cyclists use this stretch. That is just not true. Today on a dreary cold morning, there were over 30 bikes at the Oak Grove bike cage. Before the pandemic during good weather both the lower

and upper racks at the bike cage were near capacity. These cyclists are returning. There are absolutely cyclists using lower Main and they want to get to work and home to their families safely. Let's choose a public space for all, make it safe for all and I urge the commission to adopt this plan.

Elena then reads a comment from Frank Perry who just wants to mention that the corner of Main and Lodge has significant road depression caused by a water main break that happened during the water main replacement project. I just want to make sure that this section is repaved because when it rains it creates significant pooling forcing people outside the crosswalk.

Elena states that this would be addressed when paving. By unanimous consent public comment is now closed.

Elena announces that they will be discussing Items #4, 5 and 6 altogether and asks if anyone has any thoughts or questions.

Commissioner Krechmer states that spending a decade on the commission he feels that a lot of things we deal with our one off. We must bring whatever history or knowledge we have to solve the problem and not too many things are controversial because controversy makes us uncomfortable. A lot of times when things get controversial, we don't have sort of a guiding principle or policy to help us along to figure out what to do. That's not the case here, we do have one. It's the complete streets policy and he thinks Ryan Williams went into a lot of detail about it but thinks that policy clearly emphasizes traffic calming and safe accommodations for all users of the transportation system. He gives credit to the Mayor and city staff for doing a pilot option that tested these principles. It went pretty far in terms of things that hadn't been tried before and based on feedback from the public primarily feedback of the abutters, the pilot was modified and some of the elements the bicycle community wanted were eliminated including the protected curb lane and the physical delineation. This represents a fair compromise. There are people on different sides of the issue that are not entirely happy with what's there and some are willing to accept it, and some aren't. He recognizes it's an inconvenience; even a hardship for some people but the city has documented very well the light demand for parking and the fact that it can be accommodated on one side of the street and on the side streets. Since there are no physical barriers anymore to the bike lane, people are going to pull over and they are going to use the lane, whether it's to drop off an elderly person who is not comfortable crossing the street or put a mattress on a truck. It happens all the time; it happens on Upham, on Porter, it happens on Howard. Streets that have no parking at all. It is just something that people are going to have to deal with and get used to and if you learn to ride a bike and you ride a bike frequently, you know that is going to happen and you go around it. It's not going to be a perfect solution. The other thing that is clear is that it just is not an option to put it back the way it was. The condition of the road has made sort of been a weird traffic calming option over the last decade or more and once you repave with huge spots of empty parking on both sides you're going to encourage faster traffic. The bike lane is not a 100% solution to all that, but he thinks it is a better option than lost use of parking on a repaved road. He supports it because he feels it is a safe and fair compromise that accommodates and makes the corridor safer for everyone which encourages the use of alternate modes of transportation.

Former Mayor Infurna states that this has been a tough one for her, as she does live in this neighborhood. She thanks Elena and her team and states that she felt that the pilot program was great. It was opened up to a lot of feedback/options and really made it transparent. She was intrigued by the protective lane, but she did realize that there were safety issues with it especially coming out of Mt Vernon and Potomac. She is very familiar with the neighborhood and states that she lives in a condo on Mt Vernon that overlooks Main St. and Mt. Vernon St; so she sits out there quite often. She has listened to the public and has attended some of the meetings virtually. She listened to the council meeting the other night; we've received lots of emails and have been reading those, and certainly have been hearing the concerns from the neighbors. It is really their neighborhood in a sense, even though it's Main St. and is open to everybody. It was said tonight by somebody in the public, build it and they will come. She does believe that. If we make a good bike lane more cyclists will go down it. She thinks that once the road is paved they will come. She has no problem with the count of bicycles and says she has taken little counts from her balcony and it does average out to be 6/7 an hour on a given day. On the weekends, during the nicer weather and pandemic, it was probably a little bit more because people were just out more. Now that we

are sort of back in the workforce it's not as much especially with the colder weather. She feels that it is hard to survey parked cars unless you have something electronic doing it because cars come for short periods of time on Main St. She thinks when they did the survey it didn't really see that many cars coming and going. She knows coming in and out of her garage that the cars that are parking by our garages change constantly. She mentions that she went back to the thinking board once she saw that the protective lanes were done and was trying to figure out how we can have bicycles, the pedestrians and the cars all sharing a road and working together with that. She is hesitant to support something that's going to take parking away from long time or newer residents that chose to live there because they could park in front of their house. They chose to live On Main St; and it's a busy street but they also knew that someone could pull up in front of their house, run out do something, and have a short visit. When visiting nurses come, they have equipment, therapists have equipment, so she is concerned with the cutback in the parking down at that end. They do have driveways, we've said that but that's for them, we're talking about the visitors that come. She states that she bought her house knowing she could park in front of it. It was a big thing and wanted it to be that people could pull up in front of the house. The people on Main St. had that and now that's gone. Yes we can go on side street parking but that's impacting them. We look at that one when we try to make roads one way. We have to look at it because we think if we make such and such a one way that's only going to impact one street and say that parking can go on the side streets. However, people bought on the side streets, so they could have parking in front of their house, for their visitors. Where the present plan has restricted parking along the southbound lane it's going to be much more difficult for delivery and service vehicles to have a safe delivery. There are also those apartment houses and a couple of two families. They always have some type of service truck/repair man. Mr. Gordon was correct saying that they have parking in the back but that is just for them. That is not for visitors so we do see a lot of parking on Main St. up by here. She is glad that that was sort of being retained but there is still going to be a lack of parking. You always have to go to a compromise, so she was thinking that a compromise would be to use Mt. Vernon for the northbound so that we would reverse and put the bike lane and the parking on the south bound lane and then when you are coming up from Malden you would just take that right onto Sylvan over to Mt. Vernon Ave. She still thinks it's something to look at even though she knows they can't have a bike lane but it's a street that doesn't have a lot of traffic that they could share the road. That would bring back the parking on the northbound lane of Main St. so that would go just back to the way it was and the southbound lane now would have parking on the curb, then a buffer and a bike lane on that side. You could do it all the way down because you aren't disturbing the parking. It is the least disruptive. They could come down on Mt. Vernon St. or they could continue over to Chestnut St. and down E. Wyoming. Bicycles will still use Main St., just like downtown. We made a neighborhood route for upper Main St. to avoid the square to go through and it puts them a mile and a half out of their way to go down all of those side streets and it really takes you out of the way. Using Mt. Vernon Ave it's parallel there to Main St. She really feels for the people that are going to lose the parking and loves the ideas of the crosswalks because she walks Main St all the time. She appreciates the crosswalks, but they will eliminate a couple of more spaces. She just feels that it is a loss of a lifestyle for the people on Main St. and it really will depreciate their home values when people can't pull up and park in front of your house. The people on Lebanon St. or Upham St, that's how they bought their houses. That's not what's going on Main St; so it's a very unpopular stance. She love bikers and thinks bicyclists are the way to go, but doesn't think that we should do it at the expense of our homeowners that have lived there.

Commissioner Rossi states that obviously if we vote to accept the proposal you go out and stripe it that way. If we reject the proposal you'll have a way to stripe it to accommodate the parking. What would happen if we voted to table it? He's not making a motion to do that, but asks if they still have to go pave it?

Elena responds that we are paving it either way. The paving has been set into motion and needs to get done before the winter because the condition of the road is so bad. Elena states that her concern for not having a plan for striping is that we can do something temporary, but something temporary involves just tape, and we can't have that for the winter, we need to stripe something with paint within the next few weeks. We can't have temporary line tape down and start plowing. She mentions that the other thing is she knows some people have raised questions about how we could take time, do this or do that, count bikes or what not. The city staff has spent countless hours on these and months on this project and she personally as the person that has spent the most time on it doesn't think that there is any new information that is going to be relevant to this decision.

There's no new information, so a decision we make tonight is as good as a decision we make three months from now. So with the fact that we have to stripe the road in the next few weeks she very strongly encourages a decision tonight.

Commissioner Rossi states that he does not want to do that, he actually just wanted to hear that it's a problem which he did.

Councilor Eccles states that he has spent a lot of time thinking about this and mentions it has been a long and transparent project. He thanks Elena for all of her hard work. He has been following every step from the July forum on WebEx to the survey, to the shared streets and to the abutters. There has been a lot of opportunity for input and thinks we ended up with a solution that plenty of people didn't get everything they wanted, but that is the outcome of almost every participatory process. He has specific points about the project and on the process. One being that we talk a lot about the crash; it's come up many times, but since 2008 there have been about 15 such crashes on the MASSDOT database where someone is on that stretch and has hit a parked car. That is just a parked car; it's not a car in traffic or a pedestrian which there were also those, so when we talk about changing from status quo it's important to recognize we're not changing from a completely safe street to a street that poses risk. Ultimately, he states that he instinctually is for streets that make space for all modes of transportation and abilities, so he wants to make space for people who ride their bikes. We're not talking about a street with no bike lanes and no cyclists; we're talking about cyclists and no dedicated space for them or a street with cyclists and a dedicated space. We've heard talks about blind spots and he states that he really does empathize for people that would lose parking. He thinks that's a significant change, but that being said thinks it would be a different story if we were in a community that allowed on street parking as your main mode of storing your car. We're not taking a spot away from someone who purchased a car with the impression that they could store it on the street. Ultimately, we have talked about some of the alternatives, Derby or Mt. Vernon. He states that he has heard Elena say a few times this week that the neighborhood paths just don't replace the main paths and he thinks that plenty of cyclists wouldn't make that turn and just go down Main St. in the middle of the street. He'd like to create a dedicated space for people to get to Oak Grove and to get to other community bike paths. It is unfortunate that we couldn't create that dedicated sidewalk grade space. That is something that he would like to see in the long term. That being said it would still eliminate the parking on the south side. There is no real way to create a dedicated space for cyclists on both the north and south bound sides and still having parking on both sides of the street. When he looks at a street that has underutilized parking, that it's just not parking that is utilized and there is the data that backs it up. From what he has observed he thinks that when it comes to making space for underutilized parking or making space for cyclists who are using the road he's in favor of making space for cyclists to use the road and will vote for the 3 items before us tonight.

Sgt. Goc states that he finds Former Mayor Infurna's idea interesting. He says that he has many children and knows if there was a bike lane on Main St, he would not encourage them to use it. He would rather have them on side streets still getting to where they need to go, so he doesn't feel that Mt. Vernon is something that should be off the table. Frankly, it would be much safer in his opinion for families and kids. It appears that the consensus tonight is if there is no bike data, just build it and they will come. He feels that it is a lot to ask of people when so many are being inconvenienced. We have zero data. He states that he has been on this commission for over 20 years. All we do is hit data when it comes to crashes, so he doesn't understand why there's none. He thinks another alternative if it's going to pass as currently stated on the agenda is that we would start the lanes at Potomac, open 16 more spots and allow the Caruso apts. 278, 282 and 296 to all have parking out front. His understanding is that there is upwards to 200 people that live there.

Elena states that she is not averse to extending the parking down to Potomac in front of the last building of the Caruso apt. building which is 278 which she had said was restricted parking as part of the proposal. One thing she keeps going back to is that the house immediately after is the only house along the entire corridor on the southbound side that has a driveway that only fits one car. They have a tiny one car garage and a driveway that fits one car. She thinks extending at least in front of the last apt building really helps accommodate that homeowner. She doesn't think we've heard from that homeowner at all during this process. Maybe they filled out a survey, but she sees that as the worst case out of all the homes on that stretch. They don't have any side

streets on their side of the road, and they don't have room for more than one car in their driveway. There really is no option if someone needs to come and help whoever lives there. They would have to park across the street. The other thing she wants to mention is that that we keep saying we have no data. She mentions that we have a little data and states that at the peak hour was something like 10 bicyclists through the Sylvan intersection. We do have traffic counts for peak hours on that. She thinks that is consistent with the anecdotal information that Former Mayor Infurna stated was 6 to 7 cyclists an hour. She also wants to mention that there are concrete data points on the survey result. 137 people cycled the pilot route in the two months of the pilot. In the survey we asked if you used the pilot route for cycling, for driving, or for parking. We had 137 respondents who said that they biked in the pilot route during the pilot. A lot of those people are probably bike commuters who bike through it every day and some are probably just ones who decided to take their bike out and see how they liked it. Elena stated that she rode the route on her bicycle as well because she wanted to see if she liked it and she thought it was comfortable. We do have that data. It's not like we have no idea how many people are using it. Again, on where the parking should start she thinks there is discussion that needs to happen. What motion gets made to vote one way or another?

Commissioner Peart speaks regarding the one house that Elena mentions that has the one space and the short driveway. Perhaps the reason we haven't heard from them, and this is speculation, is that maybe they are not concerned. As you pointed out they are the ones that have the least amount of pavement. She states that she was in favor of this before the meeting as a complete street improvement and she appreciates everyone's time and comments, but her opinion has not been swayed and will let her vote speak for itself.

Commissioner Parenti speaks and would like to express his appreciation for the amount of work that the DPW has put into this project to get us here tonight. He fully understands how many hours it takes to do this kind of work, to hear the differing opinions of the public, to go through the pilot step which a lot of municipalities would not do because it is so much extra design work to do the layout, to put the lane lines down, and then go back to the public and the survey as well. It's a lot of work and we should be grateful that we have a DPW that devotes this amount of time, energy and thought to a project like this. So thank you. Also, thank you to the Melrose Biking and Pedestrian community who also did a tremendous amount of work that brought this idea to the table to begin with and of course it's a volunteer group so thank you for all the time you put in to get us to this place. Another thing that we should be thankful for is that many people on the TC have professional experience as Traffic Engineers, as transportation planners and experts in traffic safety which gives us a group when we consider ideas like this, proposals like this; we have a good amount of knowledge to bring to the table. For him coming at it as a member of the commission, like a lot of the speakers that spoke tonight he is a bicycle commuter. Main St. is not part of his regular route to Boston but he did take it when he knew this was going to be on the agenda. He is very excited about the paving project. The bike lane itself is great but those of you that to go into Boston know that Malden further down has down some paving and in front of Oak Grove. It's made a big difference. He has experienced it as a cyclist, has walked it, has driven it and taken the bus, He mentions that like a lot of people he doesn't own property on Main St; but does have a family friend that lives on the West Side of Main St and we have visited them and parked there by car he has experienced the corridor in several different ways. He is very sensitive to the needs of the people that need the parking on the west side of Main St. It certainly is easy to take away someone's parking for your project, it's a slightly different conversation when someone wants to take your parking away for their project and as Mayor Infurna and Dan have mentioned as well on the west side of Main St. they will continue to do business, they will continue to have visitors, the need to take deliveries and service. Oil deliveries will continue and cannot go on the side streets. They can go across the street. Vehicles will park in the bike lanes. That is something that we are going to have to accept. Cyclists are going to have to accept a vehicle in a bike lane from time to time. If we accept perfection, from our transportation facility we are going to be sorely disappointed. So he thinks it represents a good compromise, it's a good project, it does follow complete streets guidelines and it is exactly the sort of thing our transport network direction should be going in. All that said the parking on the west side is a loss. It is true that we have shown the demand for parking is much lower than capacity, but parking not strictly a math problem. The people do and although it is a public street, Main St. has pointed out that it does belong to all of us, but it is human nature to look at the frontage in front of your house and the stretch of Main St. out your front door as belonging to you. We all do it. We feel that it is ours. And when it goes away it is a sense of loss. There are a few work

around that people talked about. There are regulations on the side streets that discourage commuters from walking down towards the train station. We have the ability to alter those so if people are needed work arounds or mitigation for what we are doing tonight we can do that in this forum and adjust things to help people make up for the loss of parking if that is what we do tonight. What has been discussed a few times is where the limit of parking is. One speaker suggested that we start it at Potomac instead of 278 and he states he is interested in that. It might be an interesting amendment to Item 4 because if you look at what Elena said it's about 100 yards further south and that would accommodate some of the denser populated buildings on the north side of the corridor. Bringing it 100 yards to the south would take care of the demand that we were talking about tonight. Not all of them of course. The further south you go the number of side streets do pick up and frequency and then there's more, a little bit more parking available off Main St. At the end of our discussion, we are trying to get to a motion and would be very much in favor of making that adjustment to move the regulation of the no parking area down to Potomac.

Chief Lyle comments that he is certainly in favor of Items #5 and 6 however he has some real reservations about Item #4. He states that he went to upper Main St. and measured the area. The numbers he's looking at would move the bike lanes on lower Main St. from 5 ft. to 4 ft. and the numbers work. It is an option. He's open to adjustments to Potomac. He states that he knows we have dealt with 277 Main St. for decades. There are only 3 spaces for that building. There will always be vehicles on the street. If they are out on Mt Vernon the residents are complaining they are out on Main St. There will be challenges there. Additionally, he knows that when a road gets paved, speeds absolutely go up. Right now, it's a rumble strip. When that gets repaved and striped the speeds will go up and calls will be coming into the PD. With that being said he will not support item #4 but will support items #5 and #6.

Elena asks the chief to go over the numbers because she knows that they both measured. He states that his equipment is not certified but starts from the Wakefield line. Morgan St. is 42 feet wide approximately with no markings, so he didn't really have anything to go by. Boardman Ave., he had at 41.6 with a bike lane of 4 ft. and a driving lane of 11 ft. On Highland Ave East and West, travel lanes were a little larger, approximately 43 ft. with a bike lane of 4.3 ft. Elena asks if he got the width of the parking lanes of 5.4 ft. up at Boardman. Morgan didn't matter because there was nothing to go by. She states that when you get down to East and West Highland it was approximately 6.5. She asks Chief Lyle what he measured on the south side.

Chief Lyle states that was a little different. In the Rockview area going straight across was 41 ft.; Lodge, Kingsley and Potomac were anywhere from 40.5 ft. to 40.8 ft. and Mt. Vernon was the widest at 41.3 ft. Based on all of the information and the principles that we have talked about, going any less than a 4 ft. bike lane we just can't do that. We were already stretching it on the north side and we tried to get it up to 4.5 and we couldn't. The interesting thing on the parking lanes on the north side is that because the parking utilization was so little, the parking lanes were always striped very lean. The 5.4 ft. is not even legitimate parking lane. The 6.5 ft. is about as lean as we would want to go anywhere, so because there was so little parking, and those lanes were already striped we left them there. But that extra foot that we don't have, that difference of 40 and 5 inches or 40 and 8 inches, up to the 41 and 6 inches to me makes all the difference because we are stretched as absolutely thin as we can on our lanes on the north side and you take away that one foot and the only place you can really even consider taking it out of is the travel lanes and then we get below 11 feet for the bus route and then he gets very uncomfortable. He is interested in the perspective of the other traffic engineers on this call but at a road that's under 41 ft., but I get very nervous about two bikes lanes, two parking lanes and two travel lanes. Chief Lyle asks if we have 2 ft. to play with if we went with a 4 ft. bike lane.

Elena states that if you are at 41 ft. being best case scenario, if you have the 4 ft. bike lanes, you are down to 33 ft. Then if you take out 13 ft. for parking at the 6.5 feet which is the narrowest parking lane you would want to strip, then you are at 20 ft. for the entire road including the double yellow. Essentially you are at an under 10 ft. travel lane in each direction with tractor trailers and busses. She states that she is not comfortable with it and that is why she has been saying that it doesn't fit with bike lanes in both directions.

Commissioner Krechmer speaks from a cyclist's perspective. The 4ft. lane on the north side of Main St. doesn't get a lot of use at least not yet because there aren't good riding conditions and when you get up into Wakefield people tend to go side streets up there. There are always trucks and large vehicles overlapping the parking lanes up there, so you really don't have 4 ft. You might be lucky to have 3 or 3.5 sometimes. It's even a little tighter here so he doesn't really see how it works to put in a substandard lane like that.

Commissioner Parenti speaks to one case study in Cambridge on Hampshire St. between Inman Sq. and Kendall Sq.; where public works happens to front on Hampshire St. at #147. It is 44 ft. curb to curb. There is 7 ft. parking lanes, 5 ft. bike lanes, and 10 ft. travel lanes and there are two bus lines. Cambridge really stretches the limits. She concludes that at 41/42 ft. we just don't have it.

Commissioner Krechmer states that he truly came in undecided and thought there were benefits and dis-benefits on both sides. His profession is to build models of travel demand including road choice models where we try to estimate how people will use different travel modes. Bars, transit, bicycles, pedestrians, and from his experience thinks the truth is somewhere in between what we hear. There is certainly going to be more demand for bicycles if the bike lanes go in, by paving the road and making it smoother. Modeling bicycle travel is difficult. It's a lot more complicated than any other mode. He developed a model for LA and states you had to consider the fact that unlike drivers, all bikers aren't the same. The variety of behavior of bicyclists is much more variant though, lots of people are just fearless and will bike in conditions with traffic and other people really need to have protection. A lot of potential bicyclists probably will not use this even with painted lanes there. With this he thinks we will see an increase in bicycling if this project goes through with the bike lanes but doesn't think it will be as large and increased as we are thinking. In terms of the parking, he states that he has been on the commission as long as anybody and its always different when you are taking something away from someone as opposed to just deciding whether to allow something and that is the case here. It really is a tradeoff of whether taking away the parking is more of a hardship than the benefit we are getting. One of the other things that we have always come down to is that safety is the most important thing. It is hard for him to say that putting in the bike lanes would not make things safer overall and so after not knowing how he was going to come down on this, the safety issue is going to be paramount. He is sad that some residents are going to lose parking but is glad that the demand is not as high as it would be in some places. He feels that in this case the safety benefits are where it is has come down to in his decision.

Commissioner Krechmer comments that he was going to make a motion unless someone else has anything.

Elena states that before we make a motion, we do have one quick point to make. She states that if some folks want to entertain whether this should start at Potomac or not, we could consider a motion from Potomac to Sylvan and then separately from 278 to Potomac. She just wants to throw it out there so people think about it before making a motion in case there is a way you want to frame it.

Commissioner Krechmer states that if we said either one, from Potomac or the original proposal, if we voted that down could we then vote on the other ones. For example, if someone makes a motion to do it exactly as in the agenda item and we voted that down, could someone then make a motion to say starting at Potomac? Discussion takes place by all as to whether you amend it first and then vote or if you vote it down or not and then vote again with amendments?

Former Mayor Infurna explains that if the amendment were to get voted down you would just vote item #4 as is. The group discusses voting on the two separate start points separately.

Commissioner Krechmer votes to adopt item #4 modified with the northern starting point being Potomac, Commissioner Parenti seconds that motion.

Councilor Eccles states that it is less than a half mile long and we are taking away quite a bit of it and if this is what it takes as a compromise he is willing to entertain it but thinks that there is a middle ground of maybe the

end of the apartments at 278. Commissioner Krechmer seconds the motion and Commissioner Peart asks what the next step is if this doesn't pass.

Elena states that if we vote from Potomac to Sylvan, she believes we can still vote separately on any portion north of Potomac with its own separate motion. Whether that's Potomac to 278, it could be whatever configuration we want. Everyone agrees and Elena then asks if there is any other further discussion.

Councilor Eccles then asks just to be clear there will be an opportunity to vote to extend it beyond what we vote after this. Elena states that it is the letter of the law if someone wants to make a motion to also restrict parking from Potomac to "X" then we can vote on that motion.

Elena asks Former Mayor Infurna for guidance and she states that we can make a motion as it is and then on discussion someone makes the amendment.

Councilor Eccles states that it's one way to do it. He thinks Commissioner Krechmer was stating that we can then do a motion to extend it beyond Potomac. Kind of piece mail and essentially do it in two parts. Is that also procedural possible? Elena thinks it is consistent with how we have done things in the past and thinks that we can vote if there is no more discussion.

Elena calls the role. All vote yes, except Former Mayor Infurna who votes no.

Elena states that the motion passes and parking is restricted then from Potomac St. to Sylvan St. and that she would entertain any other motions that anyone would like to make on parking of the remainder.

Commissioner Krechmer moves to prohibit from southbound Main St. from 278 to Potomac St., inclusive of 278 frontage. He asks if item #4 includes 278. Elena states it does and Commissioner Krechmer responds back then yes.

Councilor Eccles seconds the motion and states that he thinks that this was the boundaries of the compromised proposal, and it is what has been discussed all week. He is totally fine, and he doesn't see any issues with going with what was proposed. He thinks we have already paired dedicated bike spaces back quite a bit from the pilot and he was fine with the proposal, and he is going to stick with the way the boundaries were proposed originally.

Commissioner Krechmer asks if there is an estimate of how long this section is that is mentioned in the proposal. Elena states that it is 300 feet and 16 parking spaces.

Chief Lyle asks if the gentleman that lives at 252 Main St. that has a line of site problem, would be impacted by this. Elena states that he would still have parking in front of his house. He's beyond Potomac heading towards Wyoming Chief Lyle states. Elena states yes so this would be from Potomac to the north up to the apt building up at 278. With that Chief Lyle then states that he would be impacted.

Elena responds that he is included in this section of the street and would lose parking if we voted affirmatively on this section; however, he has not lost parking on the first vote. He could lose parking in this second vote. Elena posts the street addresses up on the screen so everyone can see. She states that right now the original proposal was to go from 278 to 244 (which have a lot of parking in the back), that's the 300 ft. and the bike lane would pick up around 244. If we vote affirmatively, we would be prohibiting from in front of these houses.

Commissioner Krechmer states that if we vote to approve this than 278 would be the only apt building without parking because north of that would retain the parking and Elena states that he is correct.

Chief Lyle asks if there is another building and Elena states that we put the parking back in front of two of the buildings. We have reinstated in front of two of the three.

Councilor Eccles asks to explain himself just a little bit more and kind of talk about the line of site issue. It's come up before for this specific stretch of road and his concern again is for cyclist safety as well. He doesn't think a cyclist in the street and a car parked there is any safer. If we are going to have a car parked in the southbound travel lane and someone is pulling out of their driveway looking and trying to see beyond a parked car and there is a cyclist in the street, he sees that as far more dangerous, especially having walked up and down that section of Main St., stood in a few driveways and looked down the street. He didn't see anything that was of specific concern, or anything that would be enhanced by having car parked next to someone's driveway. That is why he feels this way about this stretch.

Elena states that there are no further questions or comments and clarifies that a vote in the affirmative is to restrict parking along those four and a half properties. A negative vote is to keep parking in front of those properties.

Elena called the role. Chief Lyle No, Commissioner Peart Yes, Former Mayor Infurna No, Commissioner Rossi No, Councilor Eccles Yes, Commissioner Krechmer Yes, Commissioner Parenti No, Elena yes. The vote is 4/4 so the motion does not carry, so parking will be maintained from 278 to Potomac.

5. Request to add dedicated bike lanes on the east side of Main St. (northbound) from 338 ft. north of the Melrose/Malden City limit to Mt. Vernon Ave. (approx. 3,700 ft., or 0.70 miles)

On the northbound side we can still fit the entire bike lane that was proposed and on the southbound side we just have to adjust how many feet south of Wyoming. Elena asks if the TC would like her to measure that now, otherwise we can vote on Potomac and adjust the wording in that way.

Chief Lyle makes a motion to accept Item #5 as written, seconded by Commissioner Rossi. Elena calls the role; all are in favor.

6. Request to add dedicated bike lanes on Main St. southbound (west side) from 510 ft. south of Wyoming Ave to the Melrose/Malden City limit (approx.. 3,540 ft., or 0.67 miles)

Chief Lyle makes a motion to accept item #6 as modified and states he will leave that to the measurements of DPW or consultants, Councilor Eccles seconds the motion.

Elena called the role, all are in favor.

7. Request to amend the Melrose Traffic Code for consistency with existing signage on Main St., both sides, south of Wyoming Ave to the Melrose/Malden City limit as it pertains to parking restrictions and time limits, except as otherwise established by the votes on prior items on this agenda.

Elena states that this is purely procedural. We do have to provide the opportunity for public comment. Elena states to be clear that this is just to make change in the traffic code; it doesn't change anything out on the ground from signs, to time limits.

No one has public comment.

Chief Lyle makes a motion, seconded by Commissioner Krechmer to accept item #7 as written.

Elena calls the role; all are in favor. Elena praises the TC and hopes the residents appreciate everyone's hard work.

Meeting adjourned at 10:14pm.