

Cambridge Net Zero Transportation Plan Potential DRAFT Actions (July 31, 2024)

| Tag | Action | What could this look like? | GHG Emission Reduction Estimate |
|-------|---|--|--|
| BT-1 | Enable better bus frequency and reliability by installing bus priority projects on important routes (signal priority, queue jumps, or bus lanes). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More bus-only lanes to support 3 times as many buses per hour on half the routes in Cambridge (the MBTA is requiring this to be eligible for better bus service) • Queue jumps at intersections and signals that give buses priority at some intersections • People driving private cars might have fewer travel lanes and/or less parking on some streets. • More street space could be used for modes that move more people. • Bus stop could be more comfortable, ex. shelters. • Cambridge could take on a regional leadership role to develop funding and design solutions to support the MBTA • Cambridge could advocate for earlier and later bus service hours | 3.6% |
| BT-2 | Collaborate regionally to improve service on the Door2Door service and expand eligibility | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide 25% more rides on the Door2Door service • Increase service hours. • Ensure Door2Door uses electric vehicles • Expand the eligible trip purpose and riders' eligibility criteria, but maintain priority for the most essential trips in case capacity is constrained. | Less than 1% |
| RCT-1 | Apply the Parking and Transportation Demand Management Ordinance to more people. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More people who work in Cambridge could have access to discount T passes and other incentives for non-car mobility options • More people could use buses, trains, carpools, bikes, and walking to get to destinations • Traffic congestion on streets could be reduced. • There would be improved safety for vulnerable road users. • More properties would be required to limit driving trips, including residential properties and commercial properties with 20 parking space. • Less driving could mean less competition for parking. • Options could include increasing the emphasis on parking cash-out, potentially starting with larger properties first, then later including smaller properties, or consider changing program eligibility for different types of employers or employee income levels. • Costs could increase for business owners, if property owners pass costs on to them. • Considerations: Some people will need to continue to drive due to the nature of their work (e.g. cleaning crews) or disability needs | 6.7% |
| RCT-3 | Provide a mobility wallet to residents with low-incomes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents with low incomes receive a mobility wallet, which they can use for transportation expenses, such as bus/train fares, Bluebikes membership, bicycle purchase and maintenance, carshare membership, etc. • This action has anti-aid amendment implications • Because people still need some access to a car occasionally, even if they don't own one, the mobility wallet can be used for ride-hailing services like Lyft/Uber/taxi and carsharing services like Zipcar/Turo/Getaround • The mobility wallet provides extra relief to low-income Cambridge residents; while there are programmatic and technological reasons for not issuing extra <i>discounts</i> for low-income Cambridge residents, the wallet grows spending power, thereby reducing the percent of spending on transportation | Less than 1% |
| RCT-4 | Participate in State and regional discussions about a Greater Boston congestion or emission pricing scheme (road-pricing) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinate with neighboring municipalities to advocate for regional congestion- or emission-pricing scheme (not possible without state involvement) • If the state created a congestion- or emission-pricing scheme: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – All cars might pay a fee to enter Cambridge, with gas-powered cars paying more than electric and hybrid cars, with discounts available for people with low incomes – There could be a significant reduction in traffic and air pollution, with potential for improved traffic safety, increased funds for transportation improvements. • Conduct a study on the emissions reduction potential of road pricing, <u>potentially in partnership with Boston</u> • It is important that Cambridge's input in these conversations is reflective of the community's needs and desires. | Supportive Policy - no measurable emissions reduction; reduction potential of 5-20% |

| Tag | Action | What could this look like? | GHG Emission Reduction Estimate |
|-------|--|---|---|
| RCO-1 | Explore meaningful ways to acknowledge residents with no registered vehicles, including eligibility for households that reduce the number of cars per household. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City wants to encourage people to own fewer cars for a number of reasons: people are more likely to take walk, bike, and take transit if they don't own a car, and there could be less competition for parking as well as less car traffic. • Considerations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Providing a financial incentive would have anti-aid amendment implications – this program could potentially be prohibitively expensive (31% of households currently do not own a car) – It will be important to avoid giving more to people who are already financially well off. – People who don't own cars are likely already taking transit, but this action could make it easier to live a car-free life. • If we can't provide a high enough financial incentive that would encourage a significant number of people to give up a car or delay getting one, is there another way for the City to take a meaningful action to encourage residents to reduce car ownership? If so, what do you want that to look like? • This program could apply to homeowners, renters, college students and un-housed individuals in Cambridge. • Alternatively, City could consider implementing a vehicle buy-back program | Less than 1% |
| EV-1 | Create public-private partnerships that significantly increase the availability of publicly accessible EV and micromobility devices (e.g. scooters) charging and fast charging, either curbside or following “gas station” model | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EV charging would become much more accessible than today—publicly owned, privately owned, curbside, or off-street, as long as they are available to the public • Cambridge will have 100 publicly accessible chargers by 2027, and 475 Level 2 chargers and 25 DC fast chargers by 2050 • Some parking spaces could be reserved for charging EVs only • Some sidewalks space could be used for EV chargers • Ensure that there are plenty of chargers that are accessible for people with mobility limitations (without creating restrictions for EVs only in accessible spots) • People could charge their e-scooters and e-bikes in public charging areas in commercial areas | 2.2% |
| EV-2 | Work with affordable housing sites to add electric vehicle charging stations and micromobility charging for site residents. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Install 4 Level 2 chargers at 20 locations (to charge a total of 80 vehicles) • Residents at affordable housing locations could have more access to chargers • Visitors to CHA residents who drive electric vehicles or e-bikes/e-scooters could more easily charge them | Less than 1% Very important equity measure, but minimal emissions reductions due to small number of people this affects |
| EV-3 | Investigate options for providing discounted EV charging rates at off-peak times by Eversource | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People with low incomes could receive discounts for charging their electric vehicles • Owning an EV might feel more possible to residents who have low incomes • Charging an EV at off-peak times could cost less than charging at peak times • Considerations: There is little research on the impact of charging incentives, and because charging is already comparable in price to purchasing gas, and often cheaper, this is expected to have a small impact on encouraging people to purchase EVs | 1.5% |
| EV-4 | Provide high degree of support to help residents who want to buy electric vehicle access existing state and federal incentives and rebates and learn more about using and charging EVs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EV-buyers would be able to more easily understand and access incentives that bring down the cost of buying a new electric vehicle • Cambridge residents could switch from owning gas vehicles to electric vehicles more quickly with this program | 1.9% |

| Tag | Action | What could this look like? | GHG Emission Reduction Estimate |
|------|---|--|---|
| EV-5 | Require new developments install EV charging (Level 2 or DC fast charging) to serve 25% of total number of parking spaces, make the remaining 75% of spaces will be EV-ready (wiring installed to support installation of an additional EVSE in the future), and ensure sufficient capacity in the electrical panel and transformer(s) to support future installation of chargers serving all parking spaces. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More buildings could provide EV-charging and prepare for the future when all vehicles are eventually electric. • Cambridge's zoning requirements will match Boston's EV Readiness Policy for New Developments. | 1.9% |
| CE-1 | Provide a high degree of support and encouragement to help residents access and navigate transportation options and discounts. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide direct individual support to enroll in income-eligible programs and other opportunities (make available remotely/via phone and also go to where residents are to offer support. Tie this to assistance in enrolling in other services (e.g. food assistance.) • Cambridge City staff provide transportation information and workshops, and produce informational materials to share widely and accessibly • Residents of all income levels could learn more about the transportation options available. • Special efforts would be made to reach underheard, underserved, and historically excluded people. • Residents with low incomes could take transit and use Bluebikes more affordably. • City staff follow example of how the Cambridge Economic Opportunity Committee works to share information and assist with program signups | <p>Less than 1%</p> <p>Income-eligible Bluebikes memberships This would have minimal impact on GHG reduction due to small enrollment increase.</p> |
| CE-2 | Conduct a transportation insecurity index survey | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gather information on how people's lives are impacted by their transportation needs and options • This includes understanding more about how safe, easy, reliable, and comfortable people's transportation experiences are • Examine potential disparities (for example, racial disparities) in the transportation experiences of different groups of people • Track progress in closing those disparities over time • Use a wide range of tools to gather input so that participation is accessible for everyone • Report back the findings of the survey in a transparent and accessible way | Supportive policy - no measurable emissions reduction |
| CE-3 | Encourage community-led initiatives that improve low-carbon transportation options and support deepening relationships between the City, residents, employers, and property owners. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a dedicated funding source and staff resources for relationship-building, such as an expanded Community Engagement Team, neighborhood ambassadors, or other initiatives. • Could expand opportunities to bring communities together to try sustainable transportation and find joy in their city (for example, community bike rides). • Could create ongoing conversations so people hear each other across groups and perspectives • Could lead to community relationship-building by the transit, bike, pedestrian, and climate committees. • Communication between City government, neighborhoods, and local businesses could lead to mutually beneficial solutions that reduce driving. • Community members could be more aware of and share power in transportation decisions that happen in the City. | Supportive policy - no measurable emissions reduction |
| AT-1 | Improve and maintain walking infrastructure | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure sidewalks in low-income and historically burdened neighborhoods receive equal maintenance and attention. • Enhance walkability and provides safe connections to other modes • Install more crosswalks, flashing beacons at high-traffic locations, and smooth sidewalk surfaces. • Continue funding and implementing DPW's Five-Year Plan for Sidewalk and Street Reconstruction and the Miscellaneous Sidewalk Program. • More infrastructure to help people walk comfortably in hot weather such as water fountains, shade, and general public benches will be added. • Sidewalks will be constructed to be easy to walk and roll on. | Less than 1% |

| Tag | Action | What could this look like? | GHG Emission Reduction Estimate |
|------|---|---|---------------------------------|
| AT-2 | Complete building the Citywide Bicycle Network Vision | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The city will have a network that connects bike lanes and streets that are comfortable for people of all ages and abilities to ride on so they can access all destinations in the city. ● Some car lanes and/or street parking will be reduced. ● Congestion on roadways could decrease in the future, Note: during busy times, traffic fills the space it has, so congestion might not appear to decline during those times until more people shift from driving to bicycling. ● Could reduce reliance on private cars and buses for school- and activity-related trips if more people bike with their children and more youth are able to bike independently ● Considerations: Need solutions for integrating safer crossing of bike lanes for people with disabilities (to be developed with CCPD) | 2.6% |
| AT-3 | Continue adding Bluebikes stations until all Cambridge residents live within a 2.5-minute walk of a Bluebikes station | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 100% of residents could walk to a Bluebikes station within 2.5 minutes (adding about 170 Bluebikes stations) ● People could have convenient, affordable access to a bike, making it easier to choose not to drive, and have high-quality connections to transit ● Could reduce parking slightly if curbs are extended to make space for new stations. ● As more e-bikes are added and the system expands to farther out municipalities, it will be possible to replace more car trips with e-bike trips. ● Staff will evaluate the need for more stations as we add them. | Less than 1% |
| AT-4 | Collaborate with existing organizations to increase access to bikes and bike repair, and other micromobility | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● More people will be able to own a bike and understand how to ride and repair them, and ride safely, along with the City's education efforts. ● Community organizations, such as Cambridge Bike Give Back, could transition from being mostly volunteer to a sustainable organization. ● This would need to find a way to overcome anti-aid amendment issues. If this is a public purpose, the City should be able to provide easy access to nonpolluting vehicles. ● | Not quantified |

| Tag | Action | What could this look like? | GHG Emission Reduction Estimate |
|------|---|---|--|
| CP-1 | Maintain a policy of allowing and promoting mixed-use development near transit stops including more affordable housing. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More housing and mixed-use development would be built in squares and along bus routes. • There would be more affordable housing, due to current rules for inclusionary zoning and the Affordable Housing Overlay • Having more schools, businesses, and housing closer together would make it easier to walk and bike between destinations and drive less. • Having more residents would create more demand for desirable things like more frequent buses and more retail stores. • Some people who currently live in Cambridge who are drivers could be more likely to switch to walk, bike, and transit if there is better bus service and more mixed-use development. • More people using public transit could cause more crowding if frequency and capacity are not increased. | 5.6% |
| CP-2 | Create better physical connections between transportation modes. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There would be more secure bike/scooter parking, Bluebikes availability, and carshare parking along bus routes and at train stations • Residents could more easily switch between different types of transportation • Could reduce the number of on-street parking spots along bus routes | 1.8% |
| CP-3 | Expand existing coordination with neighboring municipalities to shift commute trips out of cars | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There could be more communication between neighboring cities, such as quarterly meetings with representatives from municipalities • This could result in unified advocacy to state officials on policies needed for the region • Could expanding connections to multi-use paths and better bus services • Better coordination could lead to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Less traffic on Cambridge streets when fewer people commute alone in cars – Reduced air pollution – Increased traffic safety – Fewer pass-through car trips in Cambridge | Supportive policy - will reduce regional emissions from transportation but not quantified |
| CP-4 | Charge developers a fee for new development relative to a project's traffic impacts, to be used to support non-car infrastructure and traffic safety improvements | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Charge a fee related to the amount of traffic there is before and after development • Similar to existing linkage fees that fund affordable housing citywide and community fees that fund city improvements | Supportive policy - no direct emissions reduction |
| P-1 | Increase residential parking permit fee, with discounts for people with low incomes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fee would be increased from current amount of \$25 per year. Current calculation increases it to \$300. • Car ownership could become slightly more expensive for Cambridge residents who don't qualify for low-income discount. • Some people might decide to not own a car, although the cost that could make a difference in car ownership or parking demand is likely higher than the cost the City would charge. | Less than 1% |
| P-2 | Increase fees at parking meters, with discounts for people with low incomes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meter parking could cost more in some locations. Currently fees are \$1-1.50 per hour, and the current calculation show them increasing to \$3 per hour. • Some people might decide to arrive by another mode, decide to park farther away, or decide to go to a different destination. • If higher meter prices cause people to change where they park, there could be more availability of on-street parking, which helps reduce emissions from people circling the block looking for parking. • A system would be in place to allow people with low incomes to easily access a lower parking rate (e.g. via placard, sticker, or status associated with license plate, etc.) | 1.9% |