

**City of Salem
Traffic and Parking Commission
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, June 25, 2020**

A meeting of the Salem Traffic and Parking Commission was held remotely on Thursday, June 25, 2020 at 6:30pm, pursuant to Governor Baker's March 12, 2020 Order Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law, G.L. c. 30A, §20, and the Governor's March 15, 2020 Order imposing strict limitation on the number of people that may gather in one place.

Present: Commission Chair Tanya Shallop, Commission Vice-Chair Eric Papetti, Commissioner Todd Waller, Commissioner Robin Seidel, Commission Lt. David Tucker, Director of Traffic and Parking David Kucharsky, and Assistant Director Nick Downing.
Absent: None

CALL OF MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 6:33pm by Chair Shallop. Chair Shallop explains how members of the public may participate during the remote meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Commission Chair Shallop opens the floor to public comment but there is none.

TRAFFIC AND PARKING DIRECTOR UPDATE

Traffic and Parking Director David Kucharsky explains that the restriping of the Church Street East and West parking lots was recently completed, which added an additional 16 spaces to the larger Church Street West lot, as well as two additional accessible parking spaces. The restriping is also meant to help with circulation. Mr. Kucharsky indicates they are still waiting for DPS to install additional signage.

With respect to Salem's bike share program, Mr. Kucharsky notes that Zagster, the vendor running the program, no longer exists. Mr. Kucharsky indicates that prior to the pandemic, the City was working with neighboring towns on a regional procurement. An RFP will be reissued later in the year to obtain more bids, as only two were previously received. Currently there is no active bike share program. Mr. Kucharsky adds that the company that leases the bikes will be removing the bikes and docks over the next several weeks.

Regarding the ongoing Museum Place Garage work, Mr. Kucharsky states that things are going well and that a top coat is being laid down on one side. Issues and additional work have been identified, and it should all be completed by mid-July. Mr. Kucharsky adds that work will begin on the new wraps and lighting in both elevators in July as well.

Vice Chair Papetti asks if the additional phases of work on the Museum Place Garage are in the CIP. Mr. Kucharsky says they are not, but that there are funds available to move forward with the design of the roof, which Council approved earlier in the year.

Mr. Papetti asks how much the remainder of the work on the garage will cost. Mr. Kucharsky says in total the work should cost two to three million dollars. He also notes staff are developing an ongoing maintenance plan to ensure the garage is kept in good shape.

Mr. Kucharsky next states he and the Chair spoke with the Chair of the Subcommittee on Ordinances, Licenses, and Legal Affairs (“OLLA”) to discuss some of the outstanding recommendations submitted by the Traffic and Parking Commission, as well as strategies on moving forward.

Chair Shallop provides some background, noting that the ordinance that created the Traffic and Parking Commission anticipated they would be able to implement rules and regulations that City Council could adopt, so that certain matters could come directly before the Commission, rather than having to go through the process of voting for two passages in Council. Chair Shallop explains that currently matters must come before the Commission, and then still go to Council for two passages. OLLA is a subcommittee of City Council that looks at new rules and ordinances before they go to the full Council.

Chair Shallop indicates that this year City Council was looking more agreeable to passage of some of the rules and regulations that would be moved under the Commission. Council appears to be supportive of some of the measures, but they are currently stuck in OLLA, where there are two councilors in support of moving the measures forward, two councilors opposed, and one undecided. Chair Shallop suggests the Commission provide education to help the Councilors better understand the work done by the Traffic and Parking Commission, and says she would love to come up with thoughts and strategies regarding approach.

Mr. Kucharsky suggests inviting new Councilors to a Commission meeting to hear their thoughts, and for them to understand the Commission’s role better. Chair Shallop agrees, and additionally suggests having casual discussions with Councilors to explain what the Commission does, hopes to achieve, and the benefits of moving some items from the Council to the Commission’s purview, while still giving the Council an opportunity to overrule any decisions they may disagree with. The intent, Ms. Shallop notes, is to expedite certain processes and remove decisions from a political realm. Vice Chair Papetti notes it could be helpful if the Mayor indicated her support, and showed a willingness to engage in a discussion about this either at OLLA or a Commission meeting.

NEW/OLD BUSINESS

Transportation and Systemic Racism

Vice Chair Papetti asked that the Commission discuss the general role of transportation policies/planning in systemic racism. Mr. Papetti explains that in the recent weeks with the outpouring in response to the killing of Black Americans, he was reflecting on whether words surrounding transportation might be perpetuating systems of power that oppress people. Mr. Papetti contends it is important to take initiatives to include people of color and others traditionally excluded from decision making in planning processes. Mr. Papetti suggests focusing on outreach, examining ways to reduce the need for police involvement in traffic and parking enforcement, increasing city wide traffic calming, and coordinating with other City groups like the Race Equity Task Force.

Commissioner Seidel thanks Vice Chair Papetti for suggesting the conversation. Ms. Seidel indicates she is interested in several of the measures mentioned and would like to learn more.

Commissioner Waller also thanks Mr. Papetti, and says the topic of systemic racism and oppressed individuals should become an important part of all discussions, thoughts, and decisions, both big and small.

Chair Shallop also says she is in support as well, and adds that it is vitally important to use this lens when coming to decisions about spending money and implementing new things in Salem. Chair Shallop adds that just because the Commission does not regularly hear certain voices, it does not mean that they are not important and that their neighborhoods would not benefit from traffic and parking improvements.

Mr. Kucharsky states the Mayor has talked to all department heads and requested they participate in these discussions. He also notes immediate opportunities are being taken through the Solomon Foundation and grants to implement shared streets and traffic calming in more areas with a more vulnerable population.

Mr. Downing references the adage “the squeaky wheel gets the grease,” acknowledging that the “squeaky wheels” are often individuals who have the time and resources to make their voices heard. Mr. Downing notes there has been increased participation since the meetings have gone digital during the pandemic, and that while this does not mean everyone is being reached, it is one way to broaden what public engagement looks like. He suggests this will be pushed further with more digital tools, but also acknowledges that even that only goes so far. Mr. Downing says it is important that all City decisions be made with this lens constantly, and that staff will continue to research what is being done elsewhere successfully to see how Salem can continue to do better.

Chair Shallop mentions an MAPC webinar on tactical deployments during COVID-19, where someone from the Somerville Traffic and Parking Department discussed Mayor Curtatone’s directives to focus work on some of the poorer neighborhoods that have more minority residents first. She opines that kind of thinking should happen here in Salem as well.

Commissioner Seidel states that she managed the outreach for the Cambridge climate change plan for the Port neighborhood, noting that the neighborhood was chosen as an

environmental justice community, as there are a high number of Black residents, residents that speak English as a second language, and residents under the poverty level. Ms. Seidel notes the most successful engagement involved meeting people where they were, at community events, hosting barbecues in the park, and that she received great ideas and feedback. Ms. Seidel acknowledges the difficulty that currently exists with the pandemic, but suggests it might be a good idea in the future.

Vice Chair Papetti says he is interested to hear city staff feedback after participating in task forces and initiatives over the next couple of weeks. Mr. Papetti maintains that community engagement requires a lot of thought and a decision about whose voices are being heard. Mr. Papetti contends it is up to city staff to determine whose voices get heard.

Mr. Kucharsky says he will provide an update and let the Commission know about any other relevant initiatives

Chair Shallop opens the floor to public comment but there is none.

Outdoor Dining

Mr. Kucharsky explains that when staff found out about the possibility of outdoor dining via new state and local regulations, they met with Creative Collective to determine various restaurant needs. Mr. Kucharsky states that after conducting research, staff came up with an application process for requested street closures, removal of parking or the use of sidewalks for outdoor seating. With the help of the City Solicitor and Building Inspector, staff utilized smart sheets to work together and figure out the best approach.

Mr. Kucharsky indicates in some cases sidewalks are closed and signage has been installed to divert traffic. In certain locations carpenters are building ramps and platforms. For some areas, one side of the roadway has been closed off. A variety of measures are being taken, and several more are being reviewed.

Mr. Kucharsky notes that the efforts have been received positively overall, as the community has an interest in supporting local businesses. He acknowledges some parking spaces have temporarily gone away and some individuals need to take detours, but otherwise it has been going well.

Chair Shallop asks if many more measures or closures are in the pipeline, or if most have been completed. Mr. Kucharsky states requests have slowed as indoor dining is on the horizon, but that some are being processed and implemented.

Chair Shallop asks if there have been issues caused by reduced parking, and Mr. Kucharsky indicates there have not been issues raised to date, as the level of activity in town has been lower. He says staff will remain vigilant to see if any issues arise, but thus far has received no push back or complaints.

Chair Shallop asks if there are any restaurants that are owned by people of color or in disadvantaged neighborhoods that have not had an opportunity to make a request but that should be helped. Mr. Kucharsky notes there likely are, and that he has been meeting with restaurant owners on Congress Street and other nearby areas, as well as neighborhood associations to get more information. Mr. Kucharsky also notes staff are updating the application to be bilingual, and that there have been other modes of outreach but that they are open to additional efforts.

Mr. Kucharsky also notes staff have been working to make everything as accessible as possible for those with sight and mobility issues, and that staff are cognizant of these concerns as procedures are rolled out, utilizing platforms and ramps where appropriate. Mr. Downing adds that on Derby Street sidewalks were closed and pedestrians are directed to cross the street and cross back in order to be ADA compliant, and that other creative solutions are being examined.

Vice Chair Papetti mentions the Derby Street location, and suggests the thru lane between Liberty and Canal be closed to widen the area for pedestrians. Mr. Papetti acknowledges concerns regarding traffic congestion, but states that should not be the current priority. Mr. Kucharsky states that was not an option that was examined at the time, and that the focus was working with restaurants to provide them the space they were seeking, however, he will take a look at it. Mr. Papetti states he appreciates what has been done to accommodate restaurants, but is frustrated that closing the travel lane was not looked at initially, and suggests moving the concrete barriers and letting drivers who are upset take the initiative to try to change it. Mr. Kucharsky repeats that he will look into the option, and notes that decisions were made quickly due to the last minute nature of everything occurring. He adds that outdoor dining is authorized until November 1st, so it will be with us for a while and there can certainly be tweaks and improvements made.

Chair Shallop asks about outdoor dining during October, and Mr. Kucharsky states the City is still grappling with how October will proceed at this point. He believes people will visit the City, but he is unsure what kinds of volumes will be encouraged.

Chair Shallop opens to floor to public comment but there is none.

Shared Streets Pilot Program

Chair Shallop explains that the shared streets concept in neighborhoods where traffic calming requests have been made has been a regular discussion topic, and that sidewalks have been extended in some areas to promote social distancing.

Mr. Kucharsky explains staff is in the process of looking at and applying for various grants to help with the evaluation and implementation of these types of shared streets and open streets projects. He also notes there are traffic calming measure intended to reduce the volume and/or speeds on certain roads, and roads that are blocked to thru traffic. Mr. Kucharsky indicates the initiatives are largely neighborhood based. Mr. Kucharsky notes that roadways have been and continue to be identified, and he discusses other potential

measures. Mr. Kucharsky also mentions the Solomon Foundation grant, which the City is applying for to assist certain locations and neighborhoods that normally do not have a voice or are unable to advocate for themselves. Some areas include the combined streets of Peabody and Ward Streets, as well as Fairfield Street. Mr. Kucharsky says he hopes to get further community engagement to determine what ideas might work best and how to implement them, and mentions other potential grants. Mr. Downing adds that some funding would go toward developing signage for clear messaging regarding priority for pedestrians and cyclists, as well as lower speeds.

Vice Chair Papetti asks about the MassDOT grant opportunity and if anything has been considered regarding supporting bus routes, noting that for many in this crisis busses are a lifeline despite historically lower ridership than the commuter rail. Mr. Papetti mentions the 450 and 456 bus routes that go down Highland Avenue specifically as being vital routes, as well as ones on Lafayette Street. Mr. Kucharsky says busses have not been as high on the list of priorities as looking at adding bike lanes and pedestrian accommodations, but that he will look into the matter.

Chair Shallop notes that while grants are great, they are not a necessary component to think about many of these projects. She acknowledges they can help enable more, but that we should be taking initiatives to do the things that are important anyway. Chair Shallop asks if there is a range, goal, or general philosophy/plan regarding shared and open streets. Mr. Kucharsky indicates staff are establishing criteria for where we want to implement and how. He notes staff are looking at demographics, population, roadway speeds, access to transit and city services. Mr. Kucharsky also states that volume and speed data are being obtained to see how they compare with anecdotes and requests from the public.

Chair Shallop next asks about the available budget and how many projects are realistic, and Mr. Kucharsky indicates the aforementioned factors will be reviewed to prioritize what can be done, and what makes the most sense to do cost-wise. He adds that paint and post projects are less costly than raised crosswalks and reset curbs, so the number of projects that are completable will determine on how costly each is. Chair Shallop asks if every street would be done if unlimited funds were available, or what would make sense in Salem. Mr. Kucharsky says radar feedback signs certainly would not make sense on every street as people would eventually ignore them. He adds that the plan is to look at the data that gets collected and see what makes sense.

Chair Shallop says she appreciates traffic calming measures, but would like to turn the focus to Shared Streets in more detail. Chair Shallop notes that the pandemic brought the idea more to the forefront, and questions what we envision for the future. Mr. Kucharsky indicates he views Shared Streets as an extension of traffic calming. He discusses some of the obstacles and available options, and how areas are being determined with the limited resources. Mr. Kucharsky asserts he reached out to City Councilors for feedback but only received a response from two, and indicates that justification for projects requires public feedback and requests. Chair Shallop indicates she is concerned that if we only hear from people who are privileged and have the time and resources to reach out, then we will only improve those areas. Ms. Shallop suggests creating a plan, where a goal is determined

along with a way to approach it equitably. Chair Shallop and Vice Chair Papetti emphasize the importance of a city-wide equitable distribution of services, resources, and implementations, and not perpetuating inequalities. Mr. Papetti suggests looking at traffic calming more generally rather than on a neighborhood basis.

Commissioner Lt. Tucker adds that he gets inundated with complaints of speeding and loud motorcycles, and that resources are deployed only to find, in many instances, that the issues or complaints are not valid. Lt. Tucker also discusses difficulties surrounding enforcement, and mentions Chestnut Street as an example.

Commissioner Seidel suggests looking at Little Hawthorne Boulevard as a potential shared street area. Ms. Seidel also agrees that we need to use a different lens to look at how we are selecting projects.

Chair Shallop asks that the Chestnut Street example be described further. Mr. Kucharsky explains that Councilor Madore submitted a traffic calming application for Chestnut Street, arguing it has high volumes and speeds, making the street unsafe for pedestrians and bikers. Mr. Kucharsky says one issue is the wideness of the street and the fact that it is one-way. The timing of traffic signals on adjacent streets are also a contributing factor, and during rush hour many drivers use it as a thru-street. Mr. Kucharsky indicates residents on Chestnut Street submitted a petition with 61 signatures from 35 homes asking for a pilot to cut or eliminate thru-traffic at peak times, namely 4PM to 7PM, over the Summer. Residents suggest posting “No Thru Traffic” signs, cones, and saw horses, as well as rubber speed cushions at various locations along the street.

Lt. Tucker indicates data is being collected and that it will be reviewed to determine the best approach. Chair Shallop asks if we know actual volume and speeds currently, and Mr. Kucharsky states they have no data yet, just resident anecdotes. He adds that certain proposals, like speed cushions, need to be examined as road width and placement can end up causing unintended consequences. Mr. Downing states that in parts of the street they can have the opposite impact of slowing, as drivers have a tendency to speed up after slowing down for a speed bump. If not installed properly, they can also create unwanted noise. Mr. Downing notes that those aspects, along with considerations regarding the very large width of the road, will need to be examined. Mr. Kucharsky states he is looking at measures around the city regarding limiting thru-traffic to see whether it has been effective. He adds that the goal is ultimately making the street safer for pedestrians and cyclists.

Vice Chair Papetti asks to pull up the traffic calming applications in the LTIP for context. Mr. Papetti agrees that some kind of traffic calming measure could be beneficial for Chestnut Street, and also suggests narrowing the road with some type of buffer. Mr. Papetti asks about prioritization with respect to all other projects, and states he would like more information regarding plans, deadlines, and locations. Mr. Papetti adds that he thinks all projects could be completed if there was an appetite for moving funds around, and says he would appreciate more management of the projects. Chair Shallop asks if the requests have been mapped out across the city and tied to information regarding income and race.

Mr. Kucharsky states all requests have been mapped out, and that income and demographic data can be layered and reviewed. Chair Shallop emphasized she believes this would be important in making things more equitable in Salem.

Chair Shallop opens the floor to public comment.

Andy Lippman of 28 Chestnut Street introduces himself and states the request for Chestnut Street is specific, cheap, and easy to do quickly. Mr. Lippman says a critical point to consider is that it is an experiment, and opines that waiting to study the street and collect data would be a missed opportunity. Mr. Lippman also states he appreciates everything the City and the Commission have been doing regarding antiracism and equity. Mr. Lippman also contends that the Chestnut Street neighborhood is more diverse than one would think, and that many people come to the street because of its width, noting that bikers, dog walkers, and pedestrians from all over the City come to enjoy it. Mr. Lippman argues there are no equivalent parks nearby, which is why many come to Chestnut Street to take advantage of the width. He also suggests traffic patterns have evolved over the last five years, and that Chestnut Street has gotten worse over time. Mr. Lippman reiterates that this would be an experiment, and that it could be low cost. He acknowledges there may be negative consequences or changes, but that the time to speculate is over, and it is time to experiment.

Liz Moulton of 37 Chestnut Street introduces herself and asserts she is particularly sensitive to all of the traffic building up in Salem. Ms. Moulton opines that it is a great experiment that could be championed on Chestnut Street. Ms. Moulton suggests dissuading people from an “us versus them” mentality where there exists privilege and racial inequality, and states she would love to volunteer to help calm traffic across the entire City. Ms. Moulton insists no one on Chestnut Street is trying to make this an instance where a “rich white” street receives a benefit that others cannot. Ms. Moulton says she lives in Salem because it is diverse and that she does not live here to be a part of any kind of privilege. Ms. Moulton also asks if she can accompany Lt. Tucker when he comes to count cars and collect data. She insists there are highway levels of speeding, and that she is certain Lt. Tucker will witness high speeds and volume. Ms. Moulton also asks to speak to Mr. Downing separately about speedbumps, as she is very sensitive to noise.

Nina Cohen of Chestnut Street introduces herself, and states she has been involved with the traffic calming program since its inception. With respect to the Commission’s concerns on equity, Ms. Cohen states that any program that benefits or privileges pedestrians enhances equity in all neighborhoods. Ms. Cohen agrees with Mr. Papetti’s comments about fitting in an overall program of traffic calming that is city-wide, recognizable, and actionable. Ms. Cohen states two recent walk audits were completed by Walk Boston, the second of which was conducted in the Point neighborhood. In the report, they noted certain crosswalks that needed attention, and she urges that the traffic calming program concentrate on areas it can make pedestrians safer. Ms. Cohen suggests doing more to make sidewalks safer, and with reference to Chestnut Street, states the main issue is the 60 foot width, which is generally unsafe for crossing. In our quest for equity, Ms. Cohen states we must remember that public spaces are for everyone.

Valerie Fox Chestnut Street introduces herself and reiterates that the Chestnut Street pilot proposal would be easy to accomplish and benefit the common good. Ms. Fox contends that many children ride bikes on Chestnut Street, and that with changes in traffic over the years the street has become overburdened and unsustainable. Ms. Fox suggests that acting now over the Summer when there is not too much traffic would be appropriate for a pilot in order to obtain data. She urges that the Commission support the initiative.

Jeff Beale of 40 Chestnut Street introduces himself and states he has lived at 40 Chestnut for 22 years. Mr. Beale states in that time, traffic has gotten particularly bad in recent years. Mr. Beale asserts the street and its use have evolved over time, and that many people utilize it to walk, walk dogs, jog, and ride bikes, noting that Chestnut Street has almost become a park in a sense. He contends the people who come to Chestnut street are diverse and of all ages and demographics, and that he believes the proposed pilot would be a perfect experiment by turning the street into a safe place for a few hours a day.

Annie Harris of 28 Chestnut introduces herself, and states that there is a wonderful variety of activity on the street, but that every time a traffic light changes there is a barrage of cars. Ms. Harris says it would be great to have a couple of hours a day where people would not have to jump out of the street for their safety. She emphasizes, as others have, that this would be an experiment over the Summer.

Chair Shallop asks if the request is to add Chestnut Street to the traffic calming program queue. Mr. Kucharsky says it would go on the list of projects, and volume and speed data would be collected. Data would then be reviewed, and actions could be taken based on information gathered.

Chair Shallop reminds the audience, in an attempt to manage expectations, that traffic calming initiatives can sometimes take months or even years, and Mr. Kucharsky states that is correct. Mr. Kucharsky provides some examples of traffic calming measures and notes the timeframe often depends on the difficulty or complexity of action being taken.

Chair Shallop expresses concern about the Chestnut Street proposal jumping to the front of the line when there is a long list of projects, and it is not obvious that the street should have a shared streets pilot program since it has not yet been evaluated with data. Chair Shallop suggests collecting data first, and seeing what kinds of experiments might work best before determining if the street is a good candidate.

Vice Chair Papetti indicates other cities are getting these types of projects done quicker than Salem. Mr. Papetti acknowledges it is difficult work and he appreciates community input, but suggests deploying informal strategies to get work done sooner. He suggests thinking creatively and holistically to increase the pace.

Commissioner Seidel asks about informal strategies with respect to traffic calming, such as the use of sawhorses, and who would be responsible for putting them out and moving them. Mr. Kucharsky states he has seen examples where individuals in the neighborhood

volunteer or are designated to, perhaps as part of a neighborhood association discussion. Another option is to have them brought out by the appropriate department each morning and pulled in the evening. Ms. Seidel states she would like to make sure there are no liability issues by allowing residents to put out traffic direction measures rather than City staff. She suggests having the City Solicitor look into the matter.

Chair Shallop says it is clear that Chestnut Street has been identified as a candidate for shared streets, but the question is whether and why the project should go to the front of the line. If the reason is because it would be quick and easy, then other streets and projects need to be identified accordingly to promote equity.

Mr. Kucharsky says other locations are being identified, and that all complaints and issues are mapped when received. Mr. Kucharsky says three of his 19 staff members are dedicated to this task, and that they rely heavily on police, engineering and DPS to implement and deploy these measures. He further discusses some of the limitations, noting that they try to utilize tools and resources as best as possible.

Chair Shallop emphasizes wanting to see traffic calming and shared streets packaged as a whole and rolled out holistically. Commissioner Seidel agrees and states she appreciates the work done and the comments from residents. Ms. Seidel indicates she is interested in seeing the roll shared streets play in the City, and would like to see a bigger mix of activities going on. She suggests mixed uses so that many people can be accommodated. Ms. Seidel also mentions that a holistic approach would be beneficial, as there is always the risk of closing one street and thereby creating more congestion on nearby streets.

Lt. Tucker echoes Commissioner Seidel's comment with respect to the consequences of closing certain streets. Lt. Tucker states that both speed and volume data are collected and both issues are targeted to be addressed, but notes that if volume is removed or reduced, it has to go somewhere so any decisions have to be thoughtful.

Vice Chair Papetti pushes back, arguing that traffic volume redistribution is not a zero sum game. Mr. Papetti contends that if traffic diverts to another street or area it does not always necessarily result in more traffic, as sometimes people decide to take shorter routes or carpool. He notes that when City Council converted Endicott Street to one way, traffic volumes did not increase elsewhere.

Mr. Kucharsky says he will collect speed and volume data, and identify several streets to roll into a comprehensive program. With respect to Chestnut Street, if an issue is identified in the data staff can determine if it should be rolled into the program. He acknowledges that the road is uncharacteristically wide, even wider than some highways, and that he will look at the issue objectively, with data, and discuss with staff. Chair Shallop and Commissioner Seidel state that they are in favor of that approach.

Mr. Lippman clarifies that he does not think Chestnut Street should necessarily jump the queue, and that he is in favor of the idea of implementing measures on a group of streets.

Mr. Lippman again argues, however, that this would be a pilot, and opines that it would be a pity to miss the opportunity to do a pilot this Summer.

Request for Traffic Ordinance Recommendation

Hampton Inn Hotel Parking and Traffic Circulation Changes

Mr. Kucharsky explains that parking and traffic circulation changes were proposed in 2014 prior to the Traffic and Parking Commission being created. The hope is that the Commission can approve the recommended changes, which include: 1) amending meter zones along portions of Washington Street and Dodge Street adjacent to the new hotel; 2) converting Dodge Street Court between New Derby Street and Dodge Street from two-way to one-way southbound; and 3) establishing stop controls on Dodge Street Court for both the northbound and southbound approaches at Dodge Street.

Chair Shallop acknowledges that this process has been discussed previously, and that while there were initial frustrations that TPC were not included in discussions, it was discovered that the decision was made in 2014 before the Commission's existence.

Commissioner Seidel asks to walk through the changes on a map and Mr. Downing presents a plan with the changes. He notes the metered zones and new one-way.

Commissioner Waller asks about the parking spots in the hotel garage, and Mr. Kucharsky indicates there will be 38 spaces for public use, but that he will need to obtain more information on signage and communication. Mr. Waller asks if it is part of the proposed ordinance, and Mr. Kucharsky says it is not, but that the hotel agreed to make the spaces available. The spaces are not under City jurisdiction, and traffic and parking will have no control over the rate as it is privately owned, but being offered to the public. Vice Chair Papetti asks if the City Council will have to do anything, and Mr. Kucharsky states they will not. Mr. Papetti asks if the Commission is to weigh in on the parking spaces, and Mr. Kucharsky indicates they are only weighing in on the three items previously mentioned.

Commissioner Seidel asks about sidewalk improvements, noting that the sidewalk near the Starbucks is very narrow and she does not see how the area can accommodate pedestrians, parking, and drivers. She expresses she would like to make sure pedestrians are properly accommodated in the area. Mr. Kucharsky explains that the sidewalk adjacent to the Starbucks is not part of the improvements, but that parking spots are being removed to add space.

Vice Chair Papetti asks about the status of the project for the nearby Washington Street intersection and the bike path. Mr. Kucharsky indicates the purchase order was approved for Tool Design to design the intersection and provide a continuation of the bike infrastructure. Mr. Papetti recalls there were a number of different concepts, some of which would allow parallel parking and some that would not, for example, and that he is concerned about voting to allow parallel parking due to loss aversion. Mr. Kucharsky indicates Tool Design will be looking to tie into the recently striped bike lane since the

curbs are new and set, and the intersection was part of a MassWorks project. Mr. Papetti interjects to claim that MassDOT's poor planning of this intersection should not be the Commission's problem. Vice Chair Papetti contends the only acceptable solution for this section of roadway is a separated protected bike lane. Mr. Papetti says he will not vote to give any recommendations to approve parking on Washington Street.

Chair Shallop asks for clarification regarding the recommendation process. Mr. Kucharsky explains the contractors are building to the design, and that if the Commission does not go forward with the recommendations, City Council could still approve them. With respect to meters, Mr. Kucharsky notes that unless it is clear, the area will likely become unregulated parking.

Chair Shallop asks if there is a motion to approve the recommendations as written or with modifications.

Mr. Downing presents the ordinance language, and notes what part is specific to Washington Street.

Commissioner Waller asks if establishing a metered zone necessarily prevents a bike lane. Vice Chair Papetti says it would not, but that a plan would need to be in place from engineering and the Commission as to how the two could work together, and in the absence of such a plan there is no guarantee a bike lane would ever come to be.

Lt. Tucker and Commissioner Seidel briefly discuss whether plans can be modified or not, and Ms. Seidel notes she would like to make sure that things move forward appropriately. Vice Chair Papetti suggests extending the scope of the project and combining recommendations. Mr. Papetti asks that if the Commission is to vote tonight, to evaluate the feasibility of expanding the scope of work with Tool Design to incorporate a protected bike lane on Washington Street.

Mr. Kucharsky says it can certainly be evaluated, and that he can explain the concerns raised by the Commission regarding Section 5 of the ordinance.

Motion and Vote: *On a motion duly made by Vice Chair Papetti and seconded by Commissioner Seidel, the Traffic and Parking Commission moves to recommend the ordinances as written to City Council with a note from the Commission to check with staff and evaluate the feasibility of additional bike infrastructure on Washington street prior to full adoption of Section 5. **The vote is five (5) in favor and none (0) opposed. The motion passes.***

Hawthorne Boulevard Service Zone Request

Mr. Kucharsky explains that the developer at 13 Hawthorne Boulevard has requested two on-street parking spaces in front of the building be designated as a pick-up and drop-off zone, which would require a change to the ordinance. The item was tabled at the last meeting as the Commission requested more information.

Mr. Kucharsky states that the seven (7) on-site parking spaces are intended for visitors to the site, tenants with mobility issues, and that there will be an accessible space as well. Mr. Kucharsky conveys that the two on-street spots would be for Uber and Lyft drop-offs/pick-ups, as well as deliveries. Mr. Downing presents a map demonstrating the area in question.

Chair Shallop says she is still confused and that not much more clarity has been provided, but opens the floor to the rest of the Commission.

Mr. Papetti asks when the building is scheduled to open, and Mr. Kucharsky states it is uncertain at this time. It was approved by the Planning Board, and the determination on the service zone would need to go through the Commission and City Council. Mr. Kucharsky reminds the Commission that they do not have to approve the proposal, and can always recommend that it is not prudent.

Vice Chair Papetti claims it is premature to make such a recommendation if the project could take years to construct and the service zone will not yet be needed. Commissioner Waller suggests the developer may want spaces for contractors to access the building in the interim. Chair Shallop indicates if that were the case, they should be forthcoming so that a temporary solution could be evaluated.

Mr. Kucharsky indicates the developer wanted to approach the Commission early, but that it is possible to table the issue until a later date. Chair Shallop says she is inclined to table the matter, because currently her inclination would be to vote against it.

Lt. Tucker notes the building will have 25 units, some residential and studio spaces, but no parking. He notes this is one reason for the request, but agrees it may be premature.

Chair Shallop suggests tabling the issue and asks if the developers could come to a Commission meeting to hear from them directly.

Commissioner Seidel asks about the service zone hours, and Mr. Kucharsky indicates they would not have specific hours. Ms. Seidel notes she would hate to recommend something where overnight parking could not happen, and says she agrees with tabling the matter.

The Commission agrees to table the matter to a future meeting.

Lafayette Street Resident Sticker Parking

Mr. Downing explains that through Ward 7 Councilor Dibble, the residents at 410 Lafayette Street requested to be included in the resident sticker parking area on Lafayette Street. The property had previously been owned by Salem State University and so was excluded from the resident sticker parking area. The building was sold and subsequently become a residential home. Mr. Downing explains that the current owner enquired about resident sticker parking, as the signage shows they should qualify but they were told the property was not eligible. After it was brought to staff's attention, they researched the issue and discovered the history that led to the circumstance today.

Mr. Downing indicates the proposed change in ordinance language would adjust the designation of the resident parking area so that it starts farther down Lafayette Street so the residents in question would be eligible for sticker parking.

Chair Shallop notes that this sounds like a cleanup issue, and does not see an issue. No other Commissioners or members of the public commented.

Motion and Vote: *On a motion duly made by Commissioner Lt. Tucker and seconded by Vice Chair Papetti, the Traffic and Parking Commission moves to recommend that the residents at 410 Lafayette Street be included in the resident sticker parking area on Lafayette Street. **The vote is five (5) in favor and none (0) opposed. The motion passes.***

OTHER BUSINESS THAT MAY LEGALLY COME BEFORE THE COMMISSION

None

UPCOMING MEETINGS SCHEDULE

The next meeting is scheduled for July 16, 2020.

MEETING MINUTES APPROVAL

Staff begin to review and discuss the minutes for the April 6, 2020, April 16, 2020, and May 21, 2020 meetings.

Motion and Vote: *On a motion duly made by Commissioner Papetti and seconded by Commissioner Seidel, the Traffic and Parking Commission moves to approve the three meeting minutes as presented. **The vote is five (5) in favor and none (0) opposed. The motion passes.***

ADJOURNMENT

On a motion duly made by Commissioner Waller and seconded by Commissioner Papetti, the Traffic and Parking Commission meeting was adjourned at 9:21PM.