

2025 Cambridge Bike Safety Candidate Questionnaire

Cambridge's transportation choices shape public health, climate emissions, affordability, and mobility justice for residents of every age and ability. Because road-space is finite, each mile of sidewalk, bike lane, or bus lane represents a deliberate policy trade-off, one that either widens or narrows opportunity for children walking to school, older adults crossing the street, or workers commuting without a car. This questionnaire, developed by Cambridge Bicycle Safety (CBS), lets voters see where you stand on those trade-offs. We appreciate you taking the time to share your views with potential voters.

- **Candidates must submit this form no later than Friday, August 8, 2025 (11:59 p.m. EDT).**
- Responses received by the deadline may be published and/or shared with our membership.
- Final endorsement decisions will be made shortly after the deadline based on questionnaire responses along with candidates' backgrounds, voting records (if applicable), advocacy work, platforms, and public statements.
- CBS will not coordinate election strategy or messaging with any City Council candidate or committee, and endorsements will not be negotiated.
- For questions about this questionnaire or process, please contact us at info@cambridgebikesafety.org.

Section A – Candidate & Campaign Details

What is your full name as it appears on the ballot? *

Ned Melanson

Please upload a headshot photograph cropped to a square format that may be used for publication. *

Screenshot 2025...

↑ Add file

What is the URL of your official campaign website? (If applicable)

www.ned4cambridge.com

Please provide the name of your primary point of contact. (This information will be kept confidential and not published.) *

Ned Melanson

Please provide the email address of your primary point of contact. (This information will be kept confidential and not published.) *

[REDACTED]

Please provide the phone number of your primary point of contact. (This information will be kept confidential and not published.) *

[REDACTED]

If offered, would you accept an endorsement from our organization? *

☒ Yes

☐ No

Section B – Background Questions

Use this section to share your personal travel habits, top three transportation priorities, and any other ideas that highlight your approach to transportation. **Please keep each response under 1,500 characters.**

How do you typically get around Cambridge, and how does that shape your policy outlook? *

Cycling is my primary way to get around Cambridge and into surrounding communities. I cycle to get to my office in Central Square, for exercise (typically along the Charles or out the Minuteman pathway), to go to dinner in Harvard Square, to get coffee in Inman or East Cambridge, and to grocery shop in Cambridgeport. If I'm not cycling, I'm usually walking or taking the Red Line into Boston.

Being on a bicycle every day in Cambridge shapes my policy outlook in many ways. I've been riding around Cambridge and Boston for a decade and have seen how much safer the streets can be for riders, rollers, and walkers when protected infrastructure like separate bike lanes is implemented. I've also seen what happens when such infrastructure is not present. I've been struck by drivers several times (right-hooked on Main Street in Cambridge, doored in front of South Station in Boston), luckily never resulting in serious injury, but definitely some mental scars. I've also been deeply affected by the deaths of cyclists like Minh-Thi Nguyen, John Corcoran, and others who were riding their bikes when they were killed by drivers of cars and trucks.

These deadly crashes were entirely preventable through policy decisions. We decide how safe our streets are for cyclists and walkers, and sadly, we often only make piecemeal changes after tragedies. If elected, I promise to make forward-looking safety decisions, rather than scrambling after another cyclist dies.

If elected, what would be your top three transportation priorities? *

1. Complete the Cycling Safety Ordinance (including Cambridge St., Broadway, Main St., Mass Ave.) and keep Garden Street one-way for cars (i.e., keep it's current configuration rather than change to a two-way car traffic street).
2. Study, draft, and pass a new Cycling Safety Ordinance ("CSO 2") that greatly expands and connects our protected bike lane network. Priority streets include Magazine through Prospect Street, Putnam Avenue, Brookline Street, Concord Avenue, Rindge Avenue, Central Square, Windsor Street, and more. I would also work with the MBTA to create a bike path along the Grand Junction Railway.
3. Intersection safety--hardening pedestrian and bike safety infrastructure in our intersections is crucial, as many deadly crashes happen in intersections. I would explore and utilize a range of tools to make intersections safer, including: bumpouts and curb extensions, centerline hardening (increasing turning angles and slowing down turning speed), daylighting corners (especially by restricting parking near intersections), high visibility and raised crosswalks, changing over-sized or irregularly sized intersections into smaller "T" shapes, implementing roundabouts where feasible, and adding slow turn "wedges." Overall, the goal is to reduce driver speeds, increase cyclist and pedestrian visibility, and make intersections as safe as possible for everyone by utilizing permanent infrastructure.



What do you think is working well about bike lanes that are being installed as part of the CSO?

If you build it, they will come. There's both hard data and an undeniable feeling that the people are getting out there--more every year. Every time we protect and connect a major thoroughfare, we open up cycling and micromobility to a new neighborhood, to new destinations. A network effect is emerging, and the results are hard to deny (some will try, though!).

BlueBike volumes, which constitute a reliable and longitudinal source of information on this, are way, way up. That's amazing and represents several things--more freedom for those who can't afford or don't want a car, low-cost trips that decrease traffic and are easier on our infrastructure, and, of course, less pollution.

Data was recently released showing that at peak travel times, in some intersections in Kendall, bike trips constitute something like 40% of traffic. That's the tip of the iceberg. The more we connect, the higher that number goes.



What do you think is not working well about bike lanes that are being installed as part of the CSO?

I feel like every cyclist will have a list!

First of all, excessive delays in implementing the CSO don't help anyone. There is already a lengthy process for things like community involvement, public comment, and design improvements. In fact, I know these processes have actually materially improved first-draft proposals from the City on multiple occasions. We should not introduce additional delays without very good reason.

Of course, intersections need improvement. There are several designs that could help improve safety for cyclists and pedestrians and save lives, including Protected Intersections and improved daylighting.

Next, flexposts are fine for quick builds, but they are much less safe than harder infrastructure. For example, the yellow posts that indicate bike lane openings in places like Brattle Street may as well have been painted that color for target practice. Most of them end up in the gutter, and cars end up in the bike lane on a regular basis. Where appropriate, we need proper bollards for cyclist and pedestrian safety.

There are options that are not cost-prohibitive and allow for ease of use by emergency vehicles. For all of the above, I'd like to work closely with City Staff, including transportation engineers, to find those cost-effective and safe solutions.

A note on that--when I inevitably do disagree with a proposal from City Staff, I believe the burden will fall on me to clearly explain my process and earn trust.

Section C — Questionnaire

For each question, select your position on a scale from 1-5, where **1 means you strongly oppose this item** and **5 means you strongly support it**.

You may also provide up to 700 characters to briefly explain your position or describe how you would implement or address each topic. **Explanations are optional, and you are welcome to share additional context or priorities that can help voters better understand your perspective.**

Part A – Improving the safety of walking and biking on our streets

The [Cycling Safety Ordinance \(CSO\)](#) sets a schedule to install separated bike lanes throughout the entirety of [Cambridge St.](#), [Broadway](#), [Main St.](#), and [Mass Ave.](#) by November of 2026. Completing the Cycling Safety Ordinance will require *some* on-street parking removal. *

Do you support completing the Cycling Safety Ordinance by November of 2026?

☒ Yes

☐ No

You may elaborate on your response (optional):

I strongly support. These improvements are necessary to ensure the safety for all street users and will encourage more people to use non-automotive means to travel around and through Cambridge. Any further delays put people at risk of serious injury or death.

*

The [Cambridge Bicycle Plan](#) is a citywide vision for a connected bike network that includes both separated bike lanes on major streets and bicycle priority streets designed to have lower speeds and traffic volumes. In addition, the Council has requested an updated bike plan that includes building north-south connectors to close key network gaps. **Would you support an ordinance requiring the City to complete any remaining lanes in the existing Bicycle Plan, and to complete at least three separated north-south connectors by 2030?**

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly oppose ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒ Strongly support

You may elaborate on your response (optional):

I frequently cycle along north-south routes in Cambridge and have personal experience with the lack of safety infrastructure on these streets, including Magazine, Brookline, Prospect Street, and First, Second, and Third Street, among others. I would push add separated bike lanes to these and other north-south routes to improve connectivity in the cycling safety network. I also support improvements that would lower vehicle speeds on north-south streets like Inman.

*

Safe routes to school help children have the freedom and independence to move around the community and reduce car trips for parents. **Would you support an ordinance that requires each school to be connected with a safe route to the bike network?**

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly oppose ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒ Strongly support

You may elaborate on your response (optional):

Yes! Parents should be confident letting their kids out the door in the morning (or riding with them), knowing they will get to and from school safely on their bicycle. This should be one of the top priorities for the City as it not only protects some of the most vulnerable road users, but also reduces congestion during rush hour. Any gap in connectivity in the bike-to-school network, no matter how small, is a huge safety issue and should be filled ASAP.

For example, there are a lot of daycares and schools on Broadway. Leaving even one stretch of Broadway out of the network prevents many parents/schoolchildren from riding to school.

Quick-build separated bike lanes improve safety, but many use temporary materials that are less durable and visually appealing. [Pre-cast concrete curbs](#) and concrete planters would create more permanent, attractive barriers and would slow turning traffic near intersections. **Would you support an ordinance requiring the City to upgrade quick-build separated bike lanes with pre-cast concrete curbs and concrete planters over the next 2 years?**

*

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly oppose	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	Strongly support

You may elaborate on your response (optional):

Is there a level 6 of support? Flexposts serve a purpose but they should be very temporary. I've seen trucks parked on top of them and they're often beat up in a matter of months, if not weeks, signs that drivers are entering the bike lane and putting cyclists at risk.



Cambridge has many intersections with high crash rates. There are many tools that could be employed to improve safety at these intersections, including [daylighting](#), [turn hardening](#), [raised crossings](#), [curb extensions](#), [corner refuge islands](#), and [leading cyclist and pedestrian intervals](#). **Would you support an ordinance requiring the City to improve at least 5 dangerous intersections per year, with priority given to areas near schools, libraries, and other community centers?**

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly oppose	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	Strongly support

You may elaborate on your response (optional):

Yes, please see my ideas on this above. Intersections are probably the most dangerous place to be on foot or bicycle, and we need to make them as safe as possible using permanent infrastructure.



The original Garden Street design emerged from a comprehensive public process. This year, the City Council voted 5-4 to change the design, counter to safety advice from staff and a significant neighborhood petition opposing this change. **Would you insist on a robust public process that centers transportation experts and input from a broad range of neighbors, that does not have a pre-defined outcome?**

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly oppose	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	Strongly support

You may elaborate on your response (optional):

Yes. Changing Garden Street back to two-way traffic after years of study, community input, and then successful implementation in this slap-dash manner will lead to less trust, less calm, and more confusing streets.

I'm not against revisiting design or implementation. But what happened was not that. There was no concomitant study to support "Option 4." It was a feel-good vote for the Council that leaves nearly everyone worse off, and does not mirror the public feedback process that went into the original, one-way redesign. I was disappointed that the Council gave City Staff practically no runway to deliver and then blamed them when they couldn't.

*

There is a gap in the network between the existing Garden Street bike lanes and Fresh Pond. **Would you support building a separated bike lane on Garden Street north of Huron to connect existing Garden Street bike lanes to Fresh Pond and Danehy Park?**

Strongly oppose 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly support

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

You may elaborate on your response (optional):

Yes, I would! Connections are incredibly important, and this connection would link two important sections of the network, plus it would protect the many children and teenagers who use this route to get to Danehy Park for recreation and sports practices.

*

[Low Traffic Neighborhoods](#) (LTNs) use significant road design interventions such as [traffic diverters](#), one-way streets, and traffic calming to prevent cut-through car traffic while preserving access for residents, emergency services, and deliveries. LTNs typically create large reductions in traffic and injuries, making streets much more walkable and bike-friendly. **Would you support implementing LTN interventions on low-volume, low-speed streets specified in the Cambridge Bicycle Network Plan?**

Strongly oppose 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly support

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

You may elaborate on your response (optional):

As we saw in this year's Participatory Budgeting voting results, there is a lot of demand for things like traffic calming in the neighborhoods. For safety's sake, we need to lower the top speeds of cars in Cambridge's neighborhoods.

LNTs are an interesting case and a good opportunity for a hyperlocal community process. Ideally, LNT design and implementations--particularly for details like traffic diverters--could come down to neighborhoods' decisions. There's even a case to be made for communities to design and maintain the art and landscaping around such areas.

*

Neighborhood streets are often used as cut-through routes by high-speed traffic, creating unsafe conditions for people walking and biking and reducing the quality of life for residents. A citywide traffic circulation plan could redirect cars and trucks to main roads, discouraging dangerous shortcuts and prioritizing local streets for people over through-traffic. **Would you support the development of a citywide traffic circulation plan that directs cars and trucks away from neighborhood streets to discourage high-speed cut-through traffic, even if it would adjust the directionality and connectivity of roadways?**

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly oppose	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	Strongly support

You may elaborate on your response (optional):

As we saw with the Garden Street, some of the biggest pushback came from people living not on Garden Street, but a few or even several streets away. Folks on Appleton Street, with its own traffic cut-through problems, felt that changes to Garden Street were the source of their woes. A comprehensive circulation plan (including LNTs) could assuage some of those concerns.

The true source of the problem--in this case, the massive traffic sink emanating from the Alewife rotaries--was not systematically addressed. Again, this is an area where we would need to leverage our assets of general multimodal transit connectivity and the expertise of City Staff.

*

Snow and ice can block sidewalks, curb ramps, bus stops, and protected bike lanes for days, making it difficult for people who walk, roll, bike, or rely on transit to travel safely. Clearing these areas quickly is essential for maintaining year-round accessibility. **Would you support a policy requiring the City to clear these areas within 24 hours of snowfall, even if it means reallocating staff, hiring private contractors, or deprioritizing on-street parking clearance?**

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly oppose	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	Strongly support

You may elaborate on your response (optional):

Yes, I strongly support. It is a myth that bike lanes are not used in the winter, and there are many cities colder than Cambridge that have high numbers of winter cyclists. With the right winter policies, Cambridge can be a winter cycling city as well.

I also view this through a lens of equity, access, and accountability. I often think about the impacts on my neighbors in wheelchairs who rely on cleared sidewalks, ramps, bus stops, and bike lanes, to get around. The winter months can be an absolute nightmare for them, and clearing these areas quickly after a storm is crucial for their mobility.

Part B — Access and storage of bikes

*

Bluebikes, Cambridge's municipally-owned bike share system, has seen rapid growth; in 2024, total ridership [increased by 28%](#) compared to 2023, reaching 4.7 million trips. Adding additional Bluebikes stations near city or city-funded facilities would further improve access to the system. **Would you support a policy that requires the installation of Bluebikes stations near all public schools, libraries, municipal buildings, Cambridge Health Authority facilities, Cambridge Housing Authority residential developments, and community centers over the next 4 years?**

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly oppose	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	Strongly support

You may elaborate on your response (optional):

I'm a big supporter of Bluebikes. It's a massive asset to Cambridge and the broader region. They make the city more accessible for people of all ages and economic backgrounds, and are often many people's introduction to cycling. I'd like to double the number of Bluebike stations in Cambridge. Schools, municipal buildings, health facilities, housing developments, and community centers are obvious low-hanging fruit sites for expansion.

*

[Cambridge Bike Give Back](#) expands access to mobility options for residents in need by refurbishing donated bicycles and distributing them at no cost through community events. Part of this work is being supported by the city this year. **Would you support continuing public funding for the Cambridge Bike Give Back program?**

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly oppose	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	Strongly support

You may elaborate on your response (optional):

Great program, great results, run by the community for the community. Hats off to them. They deserve continued public funding!



Electric bikes make biking more accessible and comfortable for people of all ages and abilities, particularly in hilly areas or on longer trips. They also enable residents to forgo a car or a second car by making it easier to carry children and larger cargo. **Would you support continuing the public funding of our city's [e-bike and e-cargo bike lottery programs](#)?**

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly oppose	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	Strongly support

You may elaborate on your response (optional):

Strongly support. E-bikes are a terrific way to reduce short car trips--you can drop kids off, run errands, commute, do deliveries, and more without breaking a sweat. They reduce car ownership and save families tons of money. We should be encouraging e-bike use as much as possible, and the lottery program is a great way to do that.



The Bluebikes system introduced e-bikes in December 2023 and they quickly proved popular, [accounting for 30% of all rides during the winter of 2024](#). Powered charging stations and increased availability of e-bikes would enhance access to mobility options within the system. **Would you support a policy that pilots at least five Bluebikes stations that can recharge e-bike batteries within Cambridge, requires that future system contracts include a larger proportion and equitable distribution of e-bikes, and ensures that fees remain low for residents with low incomes?**

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly oppose	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	Strongly support

You may elaborate on your response (optional):

Yes I would support this. I think e-bike charging platforms are important for many reasons, such as equity and safety. Many delivery riders rely on e-bikes to deliver take-out, groceries, medicine, and more. They need a safe and efficient way to charge their e-bike batteries and Bluebike stations could provide that.

Also, it is a net public benefit when someone rides an e-bike rather than, say, an Uber (since there will be less congestion and air pollution). We should be encouraging this mode shift by 1) putting more e-bikes in the system and 2) keeping e-bike fees as low as possible for everyone, especially low-income residents.



Many Cambridge residents, especially people living in multi-family homes such as triple-deckers, lack access to secure, weather-protected bike parking. This can make biking less practical, disproportionately impacting people who don't have access to private storage like a garage or shed. **Would you support a citywide strategy to install high-quality, secure, and covered bike parking throughout Cambridge, such as at schools, transit stations, commercial areas, and residential buildings? If so, how would you prioritize these projects within the public realm such as parking spaces, sidewalks, and parks?**

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly oppose	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	Strongly support

You may elaborate on your response (optional):

Bike storage is a crucial piece of developing a cohesive cycling ecosystem. It should be a central part of the City's strategy to shift people away from cars and towards cycling, and should be added wherever possible near transit stations, schools, jobs, and homes. Since you can fit a large number of bikes in one parking space, I would explore replacing parking spaces with covered bike storage facilities. We can get a lot of bike storage at minimal cost to parking this way. If space allows, I would add covered bike parking facilities to sidewalks and parks, but would want to make sure we're not taking up too much pedestrian space, especially if there are a few parking spaces available.

Part C – Improvements and access to Memorial Drive



Memorial Drive is currently unsafe for people walking, biking, and driving. In the last decade, there have been over 1,200 crashes on Memorial Drive, including at least 446 injuries, 29 serious injuries, and 4 fatalities. Improving safety will require a slower design speed, which could be achieved through traffic calming and lane reductions. **Would you support a policy that requests that the DCR significantly redesign all of Memorial Drive to achieve a design speed of 25mph in order to improve safety for all users?**

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly oppose	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	Strongly support

You may elaborate on your response (optional):

Yes, I would support this policy. DCR has been neglecting their responsibility to the public to make Memorial Drive a safe place to walk, ride, or drive. After so much death and destruction on this road something major, including lane reduction and traffic calming, needs to be done.



From 2020 to 2022, the DCR expanded access to Riverbend Park by closing part of Memorial Drive to cars on Saturdays (in addition to the pre-existing closure on Sundays), allowing people to enjoy open space along the river. **Would you support a policy that requests that the DCR restore this expanded access while committing to mitigation measures to reduce traffic impacts on nearby neighborhoods?**

Strongly oppose 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly support

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

You may elaborate on your response (optional):

Yes, I would. I love Riverbend Park and I think the Memorial Drive closures have been great for people to get outside, learn to ride bikes, rollerblade, and more, in an area of Cambridge where it can often be hard to do those things. Kids and older folks, especially, seem to benefit the most from the road closures. In my opinion, anything the government can do to encourage recreation and physical activity is a good thing. Closing parts of Memorial Drive on both Saturday and Sunday gives people more opportunities to do so. Of course, there are traffic impacts to this policy, so I would support mitigation efforts in surrounding neighborhoods.

Part D — Addressing limited parking within residential areas and commercial districts



Cambridge currently allows each resident to request up to four residential parking permits plus a visitor permit, with no household cap or progressive fee structure for multiple vehicles. This has previously led to inequitable allocation of our limited public parking space, including long-term storage of inoperable vehicles, abuse of residential parking permits for commercial operations, and long-term use or rental of visitor permits to non-residents.

Would you support capping residential parking permits at one per adult and adopting a progressive pricing structure, adjusted for household size to ensure that this public resource is allocated more fairly?

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly oppose	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	Strongly support

You may elaborate on your response (optional):

Parking is a limited resource, and Cambridge needs parking regulation reform in order to save the parking space we have and make sure it is distributed equitably to those who truly need it, such as people with disabilities. A progressive pricing structure will also lead us in the direction of accurately pricing parking spaces and reducing long-term vehicle storage on our streets. People who need their cars to commute or ferry children will have better access to parking spaces, while those who were just storing vehicles will likely find other places to do so.

I would also want to consult with the City Solicitor to see what could be done with and without a Home Rule Petition.



Curbside space is precious in commercial districts, and small businesses suffer when metered spaces are occupied for long periods. Dynamic meter pricing, which adjusts rates to maintain parking availability, has been successfully implemented in various cities throughout the country, such as [San Francisco](#). **Would you support implementing dynamic meter pricing with rates adjusted at fixed intervals (e.g. each six months) to ensure that approximately 15% of spaces are available within business districts?**

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly oppose	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	Strongly support

You may elaborate on your response (optional):

Yes, I strongly support this. Spaces in commercial districts should primarily serve businesses, and everyone, from shoppers to business owners, suffers when parking spaces are occupied for long periods of time by someone storing their vehicle. Dynamic meter pricing is a proven way to address this issue and helps put an accurate price on parking.

Part E — Automated enforcement for dangerous driving and parking



Dangerous driving, such as red light running and excessive speeding, poses a major threat to people walking and biking. Automated camera enforcement can help deter these violations and improve safety when focused on the most hazardous intersections. **Would you support automated camera enforcement by asking our state delegation to pass legislation or a home rule petition to allow their use at Cambridge's most dangerous intersections?**

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly oppose	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	Strongly support

You may elaborate on your response (optional):

Yes, I support this with the caveat that I would push for the automated camera enforcement to be handled in-house (by the Cambridge Police Department). If we contract this out to a third party, the data could be subpoenaed without our knowledge. If privacy safeguards were implemented, I would support this type of enforcement, as our current methods are clearly ineffective in reducing dangerous driver behavior. Automated camera enforcement has been shown to be an effective way to address reckless driving.



Illegal parking, such as blocking bus operations, fire hydrants, crosswalks, or bike lanes, creates serious safety and accessibility issues. Automated camera enforcement can help deter these violations and keep critical spaces clear. **Would you support automated camera enforcement by asking our state delegation to pass legislation or a home rule petition to allow their use for illegal parking in Cambridge?**

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly oppose	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	Strongly support

You may elaborate on your response (optional):

Yes, with the privacy safeguards mentioned above as a caveat. Illegal parking is a hazard for all types of road users, from drivers to cyclists to walkers to people rolling in wheelchairs. It should be addressed and punished as much as possible, while ensuring privacy is protected and enforcement is equitable.

Part F — Mode Shift



Open Streets programs create car-free spaces by pedestrianizing entire streets or segments of streets, allowing people to walk, bike, and gather in a safer, more welcoming environment. Limited motor vehicle access may still be allowed for emergencies, accessibility needs, or deliveries during defined periods. **Would you support developing an Open Streets program in Cambridge? If so, which streets or areas would you prioritize, and how would you ensure the program's success and responsiveness to community needs?**

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly oppose	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	Strongly support

You may elaborate on your response (optional):

Yes, I strongly support Open Streets programs and believe they are an amazing way to increase our physical activity. They're great for local businesses, as they increase foot traffic, and they make the city more livable overall, as car noise and air pollution are reduced and other modes of travel are encouraged. When I was out canvassing last week, I walked down a street that was closed, and there was a big game of street hockey going on. The kids loved it, and the parents watched and socialized without the anxiety of looking out for speeding cars. It was a great sight, and I hope it's something we can replicate all over Cambridge.

I'd also explore pedestrianizing our major squares.



Reliable and accessible public transportation is essential for ensuring that all residents can travel affordably and safely. Investments in transit can improve equity by connecting more people to jobs, schools, and essential services. **Would you support additional investments to improve public transportation in Cambridge? If so, what specific improvements would you prioritize to increase reliability, accessibility, and ridership?**

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly oppose	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	Strongly support

You may elaborate on your response (optional):

Yes I would! Public transit is used by so many in Cambridge, and we should do everything to increase usage. I would push to invest in new bus/shuttle routes, work with the T to ensure Cambridge's voice is heard when decisions regarding MBTA bus or train routes in Cambridge are made, and improve our signage and digital applications to ensure that riders are actually aware of their options (like EZRide and other public/private partnerships), where they are, and when they're coming. I would also advocate for initiatives such as bus signal priority, enhancing our bus shelters (or creating new shelters where none exist), and implementing bus lanes where they make sense.



Most vehicles traveling on major roads like Massachusetts Avenue and Memorial Drive are driven by non-Cambridge residents. To reduce traffic and parking impacts, the city has long-standing [Parking and Transportation Demand Management \(PTDM\)](#) programs that limit the amount of commercial and employer parking and support sustainable transportation options. **Do you support the city's PTDM programs? If so, how would you expand or improve them to better manage traffic and promote sustainable travel?**

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly oppose	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	Strongly support

You may elaborate on your response (optional):

We should do everything in our power to reduce the number of single-occupancy cars driving into and through Cambridge, in order to reduce traffic, noise, and air pollution, and lower the risk of crashes. PTDM plans have been a big part of this effort. There are a lot of tools being used that I would expand upon: Bluebike memberships (free or subsidized) and station funds, pre-tax transit benefits, market-rate parking charges paid directly by employees/patrons, and ensuring there are showers/locker facilities on site, among others. Overall, anything we do to promote alternative modes of transit for residents of Cambridge will also benefit those commuting to or through the city.



Making sustainable and affordable transportation options more attractive can encourage residents to choose alternatives to car ownership, helping to reduce traffic congestion and parking demand. **Would you support a mode-shift incentive program that would provide benefits such as discounted Bluebikes memberships, transit pass subsidies, or other tangible alternatives for residents who choose to reduce their social impact by not owning a car?**

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly oppose ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒ Strongly support

You may elaborate on your response (optional):

Yes, I would strongly support mode-shift incentive programs. If we combine them with expansions of the Bluebike station network, increased public transit reliability and frequency, and an expanded and connected protected bike lane network, we can see multiplied returns on investment from these programs and a significant reduction in car ownership. These benefits are all interdependent with one another--if we neglect one, the others will suffer, but if we encourage mode shift across the board with all the tools available, we can make great strides in reducing car dependency in Cambridge!

Part G – Final thoughts

Is there anything else you would like to add about your vision for mobility and street safety in Cambridge? (Limit 1500 characters.)

I started cycling in Cambridge and Boston during law school, entirely by chance. Another driver had totaled my car, so I bought a bike, and it changed my life for the better (I guess I should thank the driver who hit my parked Mercury Sable and drove off into the sunset with red paint on their grill).

The freedom, exercise, and sheer joy of cycling around Cambridge are something I want everyone to experience if they are able. However, many do not even consider ditching four wheels for two because of the very real safety risks associated with cycling in a car-dependent world. We've made significant progress in building a protected bike lane network in Cambridge, but there are still too many gaps, too many dangerous intersections, and too many cyclist deaths. We need to continue our progress in connecting our bike lanes to form a cohesive and safe protected network.

We need to expand public transit reliability and frequency. We need to double the number of Bluebike stations. We need to do a lot, but the payout will be well worth the investment. We'll have a cleaner, safer, more active, and more livable city we call home. There will be less noise and smog from cars and more smiles on kids' faces as they bike to school. There will be less fear in those who roll in wheelchairs and people crossing the street. If elected, I promise to fight as hard as I can to achieve this vision of a safer and more sustainable Cambridge.

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms