**City of Salem**

**Traffic and Parking Commission**

**Meeting Minutes**

**Thursday, November 21, 2019**

A meeting of the Salem Traffic and Parking Commission was held on Thursday, November 21, 2019, at 6:30pm at 98 Washington Street, Salem. **Present:** Commission Chair Tanya Stepasiuk, Commission Vice-Chair Eric Papetti, Commissioner Todd Waller, Commissioner Robin Seidel, and Director of Traffic and Parking David Kucharsky. **Absent:** Commissioner Lt. David Tucker.

**CALL OF MEETING**

The meeting was called to order at 6:31pm by Commission Chair Tanya Stepasiuk.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Commission Chair Stepasiuk opens the floor to public comments.

*Andy Lyle 40 Columbus Ave.*

Mr. Lyle thanks Mr. Kucharsky for coming to the Willows neighborhood meeting and acknowledges that there was good communication. He notes that some suggestions were made, some which are feasible, and some that are not. He indicated Mr. Kucharsky’s changes to traffic patterns have been helpful in reducing speeds.

Mr. Lyle adds that he would like to see if there can be raised crosswalks or speedbumps installed. He states his city councilor says it cannot be done in Salem, but Mr. Lyle expresses doubt. He indicates there are ones that can be removed in winter with rubberized bottoms, and he would like to see those considered, particularly on his street. He expresses concern that some people drive down his street, Columbus Avenue, upwards of 50 to 70mph and that it is dangerous. Mr. Lyle notes it is mostly neighborhood offenders, not tourists, and adds that it is easy to not realize how fast one is traveling going down Fort Avenue towards, and onto, Columbus.

**TRAFFIC AND PARKING DIRECTOR UPDATE**

**Local Transportation Improvement Plan (LTIP) Project Update**

Director of Traffic and Parking David Kucharsky discusses the status of various transportation and parking related projects, and presents a table with information for each project. Mr. Kucharsky indicates the last time an LTIP Project Update was done was around August. The following projects are discussed:

**ADA Transition Plan:**

Mr. Kucharsky explains the consultant hired by the city of Salem that has worked on the Salem’s evaluation and plan has finished all inspections with the exception of two locations. Draft reports have been submitted to pertinent departments, which will then be revised and then posted for public comment, culminating in a meeting scheduled for December 17 at the CLC, which will be coordinated with the Commission on Disability.

**Bates Elementary School SRTS:**

Mr. Kucharsky explains this is a Safe Routes to School project, and indicates that earlier in the year the state held a public hearing to get feedback, which resulted in revised plans. He notes staff have been meeting with MassDOT and consultants to address the Right of Way process in order for the project to be advertised by the end of February with the intent of construction beginning Summer 2020. He says staff has been working with the state and City Solicitor’s office to get letters out to abutters to notify them of their property rights.

**Bike Master Plan Preliminary Design Estimates**:

Mr. Kucharsky states these are preliminary designs started earlier this year. Bike committee and city staff have reviewed and provided comment on preliminary design plans for North Street, Bridge Street, and Jefferson Avenue corridors. He indicates comments have been incorporated into the designs by the consultant. Mr. Kucharsky adds that the Bike Committee and city staff have also reviewed and provided comment on both short and long term recommendations for bike accommodations near the Riley Plaza Area, focusing around Mill, Margin, Norman, and Washington. The consultant is currently incorporating the Committee and staff comments, and still working on the designs for the Washington Street plans from New Derby to Bridge Street.

Vice Chair Papetti asks if there is specificity regarding the schedule, particularly with respect to North Street. Mr. Papetti expresses uncertainty as to how definitive plans were and whether the design would be such that car parking spaces would be taken away or not. Mr. Papetti states he is not sure where we are in the design process, and asks if Mr. Kucharsky can coordinate with Tom Devine to pin down the schedule and budget.

Mr. Kucharsky explains there were internal discussions, as well as some with the mayor, about the next steps regarding North Street based on the findings from the pop-up bike lane. He contends the plan is to pursue creating conventional bike lanes, along with some additional crosswalks, while still pursuing a longer study looking at the feasibility of resetting curb lines.

Vice Chair Papetti expresses frustration with the term “long term”, and requests specificity (down to the year, month, and day if possible) if we are putting off building separated bike lanes. Mr. Papetti also expresses a desire for quality over quantity, and that he would rather have a block of protected bike lane than the entire corridor of conventional bike lanes. He suggests starting downtown and seeing what can be done in the next one to two years to start the process of creating high quality connected bike lanes. Mr. Papetti also suggests estimating staff resources, planning for purchasing easements, planning for loss of parking, and budgeting. He reiterates that he does not like the descriptions “short, medium, and long term”, and again notes the need for specificity. Mr. Papetti says we need to stop building door zone bike lanes in Salem, as it is ten or fifteen years behind the times.

Mr. Kucharsky says he will take Mr. Papetti’s concerns back to staff and discuss what that effort would entail. He notes he sees this as an interim step, something that reduces perceived lane width to reduce speeds and introduce more comfort for bike riders. Mr. Kucharsky states he understands protected bike lanes are the way to go.

Chair Stepasiuk suggests that Vice Chair Papetti, in conjunction with the Bicycle Advisory Committee, come to a future traffic and parking meetings to discuss conventional versus protected bike lanes, demonstrating pros and cons, as well as why it is preferred amongst bikers and a general discussion of best practices.

Vice Chair Papetti agrees with Chair Stepasiuk’s recommendation, but stresses he does not want to see the city doing the same work twice. Mr. Papetti contends that building the correct separated bike lanes will not be any easier in the future, noting it will always be difficult but it is about timing and when you get started. He adds that it is difficult everywhere, so he insists the city must plan for the resources to make it happen. He expresses there is no natural evolution from door zone lanes to protected lanes, and maintains it only happens when people get injured or killed.

Commissioner Seidel mentions work done on piped infrastructure on the street in Cambridge, and states that when infrastructure is replaced they are simultaneously putting in protected bike lanes. She suggests it should be standard practice when opening streets to do these kinds of projects at once, despite acknowledging it may not be the best way to link the work.

Chair Stepasiuk reiterates the importance that the public understand why this is imperative, so she notes a presentation would be very useful, and asks the committee to put it on the calendar in the future.

**Canal Street Bike Path Phase 2:**

Mr. Kucharsky indicates he has spoken with Dave Knowlton and states a contractor is in place, but so far no work has been done to date. Mr. Kucharsky notes this section of trail has 22 months to be completed, and that work near the MBTA property adjacent to the rail lines will not begin until Spring 2020.

Vice Chair Papetti asks Mr. Kucharsky if he got in touch with the Salem Trolley owner to see if their concerns about the project preventing the trolley’s from getting out of the barn were resolved or not. Mr. Kucharsky responds that he does not recall, and there is a general discussion amongst the Chair and Vice Chair recalling the trolley owner’s concerns being present at a previous bike committee meeting.

**Boston Street Design:**

Mr. Kucharsky states the consultant is working on getting the 25% design submittal to the MPO for the TIP, but notes he does not know exactly where they are in the process.

**Bridge Street Complete Streets:**

Mr. Kucharsky clarifies that this project is from Boston Street to Flint Street, and contends that final plans are being developed, which he intends to provide at the December meeting for review. He states the intent is to have that go out to bid in early January, after the project is reactivated the through Mass Works (he notes there have been some DEP issues causing lags that now require a letter from the Mayor). Mr. Kucharsky says the goal is to present something soon to the commission for review.

**Derby Street Neighborhood Complete Streets:**

Mr. Kucharsky states the consultant VHB is working on design plans from Kosciusko Street to Blaney Street, which are scheduled to go out to bid in January. He notes plans will be available for review prior to going out to bid, and says Mr. Knowlton has indicated a public meeting with the Derby Street neighborhood is also being planned prior to bidding.

**Essex Street Reconstruction:**

Mr. Kucharsky explains the project will be re-bid at the end of December for a Spring 2020 construction start.

**Museum Place Garage Restoration Project:**

Mr. Kucharsky indicates he has been working with Mike Lutrzykowski in the Building Department for the last few months to bring on one of our on-call engineers to evaluate the garage, focusing on the first floor level with the goal of preventing water from continuing to go into the tenant spaces in the mall. Mr. Kucharsky explains that this has been an ongoing issue anytime it rains or snows, and that this is an attempt to address it. He states the goal is to replace all of the control and expansion joints, install expansion joints around the stair towers, and apply waterproof coating across the entire first floor level of the garage. The work will include replacing all parking stops and re-striping, as well as flushing the drains on the level. Mr. Kucharsky is preparing documents for the Finance Director to put towards City Council to request funds so the work can start early March or early April. Mr. Kucharsky adds that he is also proposing doing the same process to the top level of the garage.

Vice Chair Papetti asks how much of the $1.2 million budget is bonded through the CIP. Mr. Kucharsky responds saying none, and that he will be going to council to ask for short term funds, and will explore if there are other funding mechanisms available. Mr. Kucharsky notes he has met with the Finance Director and the Mayor, as well as the Capital Projects Director, who are all in support of going forward.

Mr. Papetti also inquires whether there was something in the last CIP for the garage, and Mr. Kucharsky explains there was approximately $200,000, which is being used to continue inspections and identify what the underlying issues are that need to be addressed, and to continue designs and specifications. Mr. Papetti goes on to state that two years ago the conclusion was the project would take $4.5 million to get the garage to a state desirable by the city, and asks for clarification on how the $1.2 million relates to that amount. Mr. Kucharsky explains that the $1.2 million figure is for the first deck. He also notes that the third and fourth levels have more concrete erosion and punch-throughs that need to be addressed, and so the costs for the first floor will assist in determining the proper amount to put in the following year’s CIP. Mr. Papetti asks for the total cost over the next two to three years to address the garage, and Mr. Kucharsky indicates it could be between $4 million and $5 million, but that the final figure is not known at this time and that costs may be a bit higher than initially estimated. Commissioner Seidel notes that a recent analysis of construction costs indicate they have increased substantially every year, and Chair Stepasiuk affirms this fact.

Commissioner Waller asks why the first floor was chosen to begin with, rather than

another floor, and Mr. Kucharsky states the reason is to stop the existing issues (which cost city resources and dollars to address) affecting the retail space and tenants. Mr. Kucharsky says there are attempts to foster a better working relationship with the property owners, and that by stopping the water from penetrating into the mall, there can be some control which will allow the rest of the facility to be worked on.

Chair Stepasiuk asks about the level of support from the administration, and Mr. Kucharsky explains there is a realization that the structure must be maintained in order to properly assess other long term plans, such as what will be done with the Church Street lot parking, etc.. He notes those are under SRA control, but the intent is to maintain this facility. Mr. Kucharsky also notes that South Harbor is completing their maintenance evaluation, which is similar to the Walker Report but done by a different firm. Once the document is complete, the goal is to determine what the annual maintenance requirements will be for both facilities, and identify what staff can do on a weekly, monthly, and quarterly basis and what requires being outsourced. Mr. Kucharsky indicates the South Harbor plan is due to be done at the end of the year, at which point it can be reviewed in order to put together a CIP for long term maintenance.

Chair Stepasiuk asks if there is a work order system, or some sort of tracking, and if not if there is a plant to implement one. Mr. Kucharsky notes the intent is to bring someone on board who will be responsible for the larger efforts to maintain the garage. Ms. Stepasiuk recalls that DPW did not previously have a work order system as of a few years ago, and notes it would be great if Mr. Kucharsky wants to lead the way with a work order system. She notes it would be a great ask for the CIP to go along with this. She also mentions the use of the Facility Dude software, which Mr. Kucharsky states is being rolled out. He notes the findings of the South Harbor maintenance plan will be input into Facility Dude. Mr. Kucharsky explains it was not available when the Walker Report was done, but it is being worked on.

Mr. Papetti ask if whether when parking rates were raised last year, a portion of the justification included the need for additional money (approximately $5million) to shore up the garage. Commissioner Seidel clarifies that was part of the conversation regarding the Parking Benefit District (“PBD”). Chair Stepasiuk adds it may have been part of the general justification, and Ms. Seidel mentions part of the justification for the PBD was to retain money for ongoing maintenance and issues with the garage. Vice Chair Papetti suggests looking at the materials that were presented back when a vote was taken to identify and remind of some of the capital needs that were in mind. Chair Stepasiuk expresses that she hopes this does not require a lot of selling, and Mr. Kucharsky states that the Mayor is on board with the first phase, and that it is now a matter of bringing it to City Council. He indicates they understand the revenue the facility brings in, as well as the potential for negative consequences in the absence of maintenance. Ms. Seidel brings up the Alewife garage and previous issues regarding falling concrete.

**Museum Place Garage:** – **Elevators**:

Mr. Kucharsky explains that some of the CIP funds will be used to develop an RFP to have new interior walls and lighting installed in the elevators. He notes the mechanical work has been completed so they are operating properly, but the final work on the interior needs to be completed.

**Parking Benefit District (“PBD”):**

Mr. Kucharsky states the intent is to bring on a facilitator to work with the stakeholder group to determine what the PBD would look like, what the percentage of revenue would be coming in from garages, parking lots, and on street parking, what the revenue would be used for, and who would oversee it. The overall administrative structure would need to be determined. Mr. Kucharsky notes he has made some initial outreach and starting the process to engage potential stakeholders. He adds the first step is to get council to adopt the sections from the Municipal Modernization Act, passed in 2017, which allows communities to do this in the first place.

**Norman/Chestnut/Summer Street Roundabout:**

Mr. Kucharsky notes the city is moving forward with a more definitive design, and that there is a public meeting scheduled in the large meeting room for December 9th. Stantec consultants will go over design elements and materials. Mr. Kucharsky states the roundabout has been shown to work, slow down traffic, and help pedestrians. The plans are to make a more permanent structure, and once a survey is completed curb and crosswalk locations can be determined, as well as any need for additional streetlights.

**North Street Bridge Work:**

Mr. Kucharsky relays that Dave Knowlton has indicated the North Street Bridge work has been completed. Mr. Kucharsky notes that some undercarriage work was done, and that the work had caused some closures.

Vice Chair Papetti notes that early on it looked like some of the work was remediating some of the concrete, but in other areas there remains exposed rebar and other exposed areas that look unsightly and incomplete. He asks if the scope of work changed or the work will be resumed later. Mr. Kucharsky indicates he will check in with Mr. Knowlton regarding the Vice Chair’s concerns.

**Paving Program:**

Mr. Kucharsky informs that the information is available on the engineering web page. In terms of sidewalk projects, he notes those completed include Peabody Street, Ward Street, Brown Street (new crosswalks), Conan Street, and Buffum Street. Mr. Kucharsky indicates there is a list of other items to be coordinated with engineering in order to hit the ground running once the moratorium on road work ends.

Commissioner Seidel asks if the city owns the street that goes into the public housing at Lee Fort Terrace by Collins Cove, noting that the catch basin nearby back flows into the street and floods during high tides. She states there is no backflow preventer and it is causing the road to slowly degrade.

Vice Chair Papetti, based on his observations on Buffum St, enquires about a potential targeted education and enforcement roll out on some streets where sidewalks and curb ramps are being added for the first time. He notes residents parking on curb ramps will destroy them over time. Mr. Papetti suggests having staff flyer the street and put out warnings. Chair Stepasiuk recommends providing an update on all enforcement issues (parking on sidewalks, etc.) at the next meeting or two.

Mr. Kucharsky lists roads that have been repaved this year, including Fort Avenue, Turner Street, Carlton Street, Boston Street from Bridge Street to Nichols Street, all of Harmony Grove Road, Cloverdale Street, Glen Avenue, Conan Street, Pacific Street, and Springside Avenue.

**South Harbor:**

Mr. Kucharsky states the report is being drafted and indicates additional chloride testing is underway. The hope is it will be finalized by the end of the year.

**Salem Harbor Connection Path:**

Mr. Kucharsky articulates the project went out to bid last week, but there was some addendums submitted because CONCOM findings were not yet included. He notes that engineering is still reviewing the overall project but that the intent was to start the bidding process.

Vice Chair Papetti states the project came before the bike committee at one point, and expresses surprise that the project was out to bid since his recollection was that certain questions were left unanswered. As an example, Mr. Papetti states it was unclear why the path was only ten feet in width, which he considers excessively narrow. He notes that if cost is an issue then that should be quantified. Mr. Papetti also notes that the path crosses some roadways at strange angles, and that the bike committee did not consider the design acceptable. He asks Mr. Kucharsky to track down the designs and look for answers, indicating these issues have been brought up repeatedly. Mr. Kucharsky explains he has had preliminary discussions with engineering to see if they could look at reevaluating the budget to see what might be feasible because costs are coming in higher than expected, even with the DCR grant that was awarded. Regarding the ten foot width, Mr. Kucharsky states that some of the issue may be that the path crosses over some contaminated soil, and he offers that they may be attempting to limit disturbance, but he is ultimately unsure. Mr. Kucharsky states he can obtain more information. Mr. Papetti concedes that may be the reason for the limited width, but insists he would like to see numbers and justification.

**Salem Willows:**

Mr. Kucharsky explains that this is part of the work being done to restore the hill at Salem Willows. He notes that he brought concepts to the commission earlier this year, and that currently a consultant is being procured to conduct a study on transportation improvements, looking at bicycle, vehicle, and pedestrian circulation. Mr. Kucharsky indicates the intersection at Restaurant Row with Bay View and Fort Avenue is of particular interest, and that parking management strategies will be looked at. He also notes they will be continuing the bidirectional bike lane on the park side of Fort Avenue. The hope is the work can be done in conjunction with what the landscape architects are doing for the hill.

**On Demand Ride Share Service:**

Mr. Kucharsky conveys that the RFP was released this week, and that it is seeking a turnkey on demand service where individuals can call rides with their phone. He explains the service can be a node based system, where the app would indicate where to meet the vehicle, and can also pick up individuals using algorithms to use the best routes. Mr. Kucharsky adds that they have applied for a MassDOT workforce transportation grant to help subsidize some of the costs. Much of the scope for the RFP was based on a similar service being provided in Newton, but the hope is this service would be broader as in Newton it only services the senior population. Mr. Kucharsky also notes there is a potential for marijuana sale revenues to help with costs.

Vice Chair Papetti asks how many vehicles are expected, and Mr. Kucharsky responds that the RFP includes a range of four to nine vehicles with varying service hours to get a sense of what might work best. Mr. Kucharsky explains that many companies will run a simulation to determine needs based on demographics, land use, etc. Chair Stepasiuk asks what companies were included, and Mr. Kucharsky identifies Via (currently providing the service in Newton), Transloc, and others that recently submitted proposals to the MAPC.

Vice Chair Papetti asks about the preliminary budget, and Mr. Kucharsky indicates somewhere between $300,000 and $400,000. Mr. Papetti asks if that is for limited service hours, and Mr. Kucharsky notes the low end estimates are based on a 9AM to 5PM schedule, and that more expanded hours could cost $600,000 to $700,000, which is why the RFPs asked for a range. Mr. Kucharsky explains this would be a new service, and states it would be difficult to pinpoint what the need would be exactly. He says he is seeking flexibility based on the recommendations from the city of Newton, and that bids will be based on service hours. Vice Chair Papetti indicates he would expect such service to cost upwards of $1 million a year under the presumption of $60 to $90 per service hour. Mr. Kucharsky responds that the cost will ultimately depend on how robust the service is, and that nothing is set in stone as the RFP was just issued.

Vice Chair Papetti thanks Mr. Kucharsky for the work he has done and for communicating with the city of Newton, but indicates he feels conflicted. Mr. Papetti says he both grateful for the work, but also concerned since this originated as a senior shuttle study; he worries about the direction the project might be going in. He notes that if the purpose is to serve senior citizens, and low income/high need individuals, then a high cost per trip would be tolerable, but is concerned that it would not attract many riders, and suggests this service would have no impact on traffic congestion or the ability of the city to develop more land. Mr. Papetti adds that he is concerned about how the city would market the service, and stresses that the city should target and understand what the service is for. If too expansive and successful, he also worries it would quickly become too expensive to be sustainable and require a transition to a whole new business model.

**Community Car share service:**

Mr. Kucharsky states the Mayor had approached him and other staff with idea of offering an option for people with no car, or single car households, an opportunity to rent a vehicle. He explains this would be similar to Zip Car, but would be phone based and easier to rent (hourly basis, low cost). He conveys the Mayor wanted to pursue a model where the city owns or leases the fleet of cars, rather than have a company come in. Commissioner Seidel proclaims she does not like the idea.

Mr. Kucharsky explains the RFP was released in October and that submissions are being reviewed. He adds the purchasing agent is exploring leasing and purchasing options, looking at a maximum of 12 vehicles that would be located throughout city.

Chair Stepasiuk and Mr. Kucharsky discuss and clarify that the city will own or lease the vehicles themselves, but not the technology. The vendor would operate, service, and maintain the vehicles. Mr. Kucharsky notes there are some models where dealerships own the vehicles and the vendors distribute them in a location, as well as peer to peer models. Commissioner Seidel suggests they be Priuses or electric vehicles. Mr. Kucharsky states electric vehicles were initially considered, but that the supporting infrastructure does not currently exist. Chair Stepasiuk suggests this would be a great reason to get the necessary infrastructure.

Mr. Kucharsky states it may just end up being a pilot with a few vehicles, and if the program is not successful the vehicles could be folded into the city’s fleet of vehicles used by inspectors. Chair Stepasiuk asks if a company/vendor would come into Salem anyway even if they owned the vehicles, and Mr. Kucharsky notes a company could come in but would likely be citizens renting peer to peer.

**Church Street Lot:**

Vice Chair Papetti asks about the Church Street lot, for which he notes there was $400,000 in the CIP. Mr. Kucharsky states he has had discussions with Tom Daniel and that they are looking to sit down with the Mayor to understand the long term vision. He notes he was not involved with the request for the $400,000, so is currently unaware of what the funds are for. Mr. Kucharsky notes he will add it to the LTIP and work to get more information.

**Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program (NTCP) Project Update**

Chair Stepasiuk asks what was spent during FY19 and where we are YTD in our budget for spending for the NTCP. Mr. Kucharsky indicates approximately $125,000 was split between bike infrastructure and design spending, traffic calming projects, and signage in FY19. He notes the same amount was requested for FY20, and that some funds remain but that they are allocated to traffic calming projects that have not yet been executed. Mr. Kucharsky estimates that year to date about $40,000 has been spent so far, but states he would need to check. Chair Stepasiuk wonders if new requests should be added, or if they should be suggested for 2021 instead. Vice Chair Papetti adds that he is in favor of creating a back log, as that is how more funding gets allocated. Chair Stepasiuk clarifies that she is interested in managing expectations.

Mr. Kucharsky provides updates on the following NTCP projects:

**Chestnut Street Pedestrian Improvements at Pickering Street:**

Mr. Kucharsky explains this project was on the books to get done before he started. The project had been designed, had gone out with a potential contractor, and given the quoted cost, it required a procurement but nothing was received. Mr. Kucharsky notes another attempt will be made, and that perhaps the work will be tied in with the roundabout at some point. He indicates there has been difficulty with contractors. Commissioner Seidel agrees that if it is a small budget project, tying it to something else could help.

Mr. Kucharsky adds that an on-call maintenance and repairs contract that has not been fully executed, which may help address some of these projects. Hopefully once fully executed, the city will have contractors available that can do smaller jobs. Mr. Kucharsky hopes the project will be completed by Spring/Summer 2020.

**First Street Pedestrian Improvements:**

Mr. Kucharsky explains the project is located from Trader’s Way to Highland Avenue, and that traffic data counts indicate there is speeding at the location. There is a proposal to put in radar feedback signs, and DPS will be relocating the crosswalk to a safer and more visible location with new ADA compliant ramps. Some signage has been purchased to notify motorists of pedestrians. Regarding bike lanes, Mr. Kucharsky states when the road is up for repaving there will be a striping plan to put them in and see how they connect with the larger area.

**Valley Street:**

Mr. Kucharsky indicates for this, and other projects, police have been deploying devices that capture speeds and traffic data, which has been helpful to get a sense and figure out what the actual speeds should be, and what the signs say compared to existing ordinances. As an example, he states Memorial Drive is posted as 30MPH but should be 25MPH. DPS has pulled all the signs and replaced them with correct signs. Mr. Kucharsky also notes that they will petition the state to lower the speed and proposes to do some tactical work to narrow the roads so cars slow down.

**Columbus Avenue:**

Mr. Kucharsky explains that a staff member is now on board with experience in CAD, so he hopes to do design plans in house to save time and money. The initial thought for Columbus Avenue was to lower speeding by making a portion where it meets Columbus Square one way (North bound). Mr. Kucharsky states he is trying to see if it is feasible, and plans to get feedback from the neighborhood. He says some have seen speeds during day as high as 60MPH and over, similar to Fort Ave. Once these projects are implemented, the intent is to go out after a normalization period to see how successful the work has been with additional data collection.

Chair Stepasiuk and Mr. Kucharsky briefly discuss if there are additional proposals that might come in soon. Mr. Kucharsky indicates he would like to sit down with a map to go through what work can be done and match it up with budgets. Chair Stepasiuk agrees it would be great to see everything collectively on a city map to ensure we are using resources equitably across the city.

Commissioner Seidel states she noticed new flashing signs (solar powered) at the crosswalk near the Common. Mr. Kucharsky confirms that is new, and that another is going in at Congress Street at Harbor Street, noting that the latter crosswalk is used heavily by kids at school, as well as by individuals at the nearby clinic and Shetland Park. He indicates funds for these projects came from the Transportation Network Company Funds (Uber/Lyft taxes).

Vice Chair Papetti asks if the project list could be made available to the public on the traffic and parking website, and Mr. Kucharsky indicates he can do that. Mr. Papetti asks about the process of prioritizing projects based on safety risks that exist as a next steps. He suggests as more projects come in we should carefully choose from within the list which represent the greatest safety risk.

**Endicott Street at Margin Street and Winthrop Street at Broad Street:**

Mr. Kucharsky explains that for both projects tactical work has been done, and the goal now is to have engineering, as part of their sidewalk work, reset curbs and update drainage.

**NEW/OLD BUSINESS**

Chair Stepasiuk notes this concludes most agenda items, and states she has small list of items to get on subsequent agendas. She asks about the plan for rolling out enforcement in North Salem regarding parking on sidewalks and crosswalks. Mr. Kucharsky states he is down a full time staff parking enforcement officer, but will try to provide an update at the next meeting or two.

Chair Stepasiuk also mentions the capital improvement items for FY2021, as well as the renewal of rules and regulations with the new council coming in January for upcoming discussion.

Chair Stepasiuk also indicated she learned through social media about things that never came to the Commission (e.g. snow parking ban from schools, speed cameras, etc.), and expressed that learning about these solely via social media felt wrong. She asks if anything big is coming down the pike to make efforts to make sure the commission is aware.

Commissioner Seidel discusses an event by SAFE she attended. She notes there was an RFP released this past week – essentially a pre-RFP coming from the state’s transportation and climate resilience initiative, that has to do with cities receiving funding. She indicates she had trouble finding the RFP, and asks Mr. Kucharsky to forward it if he finds it.

Vice Chair Papetti asks if snow clearance is on the yearly list of things to discuss. He notes it is likely past time to do anything about it, but suggests having a written update about what steps are being taken for improvement. Mr. Kucharsky notes he was not directly involved with the snow and school parking lot changes, and states DPS was working with police to oversee snow events. He notes the Mayor had asked them to look for ways to avoid using schools, as school has been cancelled at times not because roads were not clear, but because parking was not available. Mr. Kucharsky states DPS and police worked with the School Department to identify the number of spaces at each sight, and tried to identify comparable sites in the vicinity that were not adjacent to residences that could be used for parking. Mr. Kucharsky next states he has been asked to issue parking permits for the Footprint site and for a Shetland Park lot on Congress Street. He explains it is a first come, first service basis, with the goal of not having to call school for parking issues.

Vice Chair Papetti requests a written update explaining how traffic and parking enforcement staff can be deputized to issue tickets to people who do not shovel. He would like to see a contract including standard operating procedures, and consequences. Commissioner Seidel notes there are locations where snow gets placed in the path of travel on city owned property, and expresses frustration. Mr. Papetti adds that bike baths get blocked with snow as well.

Chair Stepasiuk suggests a meeting in winter, maybe in February, with the Bike Committee, Disability Commission, and Traffic and Parking Commission, to discuss how things are going. Vice Chair Papetti agrees with the concept of a mid-winter check-in.

Vice Chair Papetti requests a follow up on what the traffic and parking department is doing to get signal program under control. He references an incident where a dangerous situation persisted at North Street and School Street while signals were being reprogramed, noting that traffic and parking should be coordinating the whole thing - communication, PR, enforcement, performance metrics, etc. He expands that the situation involved the audible warning telling people to go into traffic at a crosswalk, and that it was unacceptable.

Commissioner Seidel suggests Mr. Kucharsky get another staff person, as during city council elections many people used traffic and parking as discussion points and issue, despite many not attending meetings. She suggests asking some of them since they all ran on the issue. Chair Stepasiuk agrees.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

Vice Chair Papetti states he was at the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and learned they are revising their project criteria by which they select projects for the TIP, and that they sent surveys to member communities but only received five responses. There is a brief discussion between the Chair, Vice Chair, Commissioner Seidel, and Mr. Kucharsky about looking into whether the survey is still open and how it may have been missed. Mr. Kucharsky indicates he will check in with Dave Knowlton as he is the TIP coordinator.

**UPCOMING MEETINGS SCHEDULE**

The next meeting scheduled is for December 19, 2019.

**MEETING MINUTES APPROVAL**

There were no meeting minutes to approve.

**ADJOURNMENT**

On a motion duly made Vice Chair Papetti and seconded by Commissioner Seidel, the Traffic and Parking Commission meeting was adjourned at 8:00 PM.

The following documents were used at the meeting and can be viewed by making a request to the Traffic & Parking Department:

* City of Salem Local Transportation Improvement Program (LTIP) Project List.