

2 Center Plaza, Suite 430 Boston, MA 02108-1928 T: 617-338-0063 F: 617-338-6472

www.nitscheng.com

MEETING MINUTES

Date: 13 November 2025 Location: Virtual (Zoom)

Project: Circuit Drive Traffic Safety and Drainage Improvements

Nitsch Project #: 16118

Attendees: +/- 50 public attendees

(7 hosts) Amy Linné (Parks) Lydia Gikas Cook (Reed Hilderbrand)

Lauren Bryant (Parks) John Kett (Reed Hilderbrand)

My'kel McMillen (Parks) Sydnie Picard (Nitsch Engineering)

Madeline Augustine (Nitsch Engineering)

Jeff Bandini (Nitsch Engineering)

Below is a

summary of the feedback received at this meeting:

Summary

Public Meeting #3 was a presentation of the existing conditions and a review of the work proposed. The project will be split into multiple phases. The project team determined that the goals of this project would be most effectively addressed by splitting the project into multiple phases. Phase 1 work will focus on traffic calming and the addition of crosswalks and speed tables along the corridor. Phase 1 will also include pipe investigation and cleanout. Additional traffic calming, dedicated bicyclist infrastructure, and longer range stormwater improvements will be addressed in future phases.

Placement and quantity of speed tables

Participants requested clarification of the location and number of speed tables. Participants also requested additional striping and signage at the speed tables to make them more visible to drivers.

Speed tables have been located throughout the corridor to slow motor vehicle traffic while permitting comfortable bus travel for transit riders and permit traversing by emergency vehicles. Speed tables have been located to best slow traffic near crosswalks. The project team will explore the addition of speed tables to the ten that are currently proposed. Speed tables will extend through the bike lane to prevent drivers from encroaching on the bike lane to avoid the speed table. Speed tables will be consistent deterrent to fast traffic compared to traffic enforcement.

Speed tables were selected as opposed to speed humps based on the presence of buses and the daily traffic volumes. Speed humps are six feet long and are typically placed along lower volume residential streets, with a design speed at the device of approximately 15-18 miles per hour. Speed tables are twenty-two feet long and are typically utilized along higher volume streets along which buses travel. The design speed for traversing a speed table is approximately 20-25 miles per hour. To achieve the design speed along the corridor, the project team is investigating placing additional speed tables along the corridor.

Crosswalk design

Participants requested clarification on the location and design of crosswalks, including the potential addition of raised crossings and flashing beacons.

Date 13 November 2025 Page 2 of 2

Crosswalks have been proposed throughout the corridor where field observations and existing trails indicate the most frequent pedestrian desire lines. Crosswalk installation will include accessible ramps and advance warning signage. No flashing beacons are proposed at this time due to budget constraints and to focus emphasis on vertical deflection to slow drivers, but the current work does not preclude future addition of flashing beacons. Crosswalks will not be raised during Phase 1 to maintain existing drainage patterns.

Future investments in bike lane improvements.

Participants requested additional investments to provide separation for bicyclists. Suggestions were made to add flexible bollards or armadillos in key locations and to narrow the width of travel lanes to create space for bicycle infrastructure.

Future phases will investigate relocating curbs and adding separation for bicyclists. Because of city-wide concerns about flexible bollards, that treatment was considered to be an inefficient use of construction funds.

If any of the attendees feel these Minutes do not accurately reflect the discussions, please notify the writer within one (1) week of receipt. Nitsch Engineering will determine if edits will be made and, if so, the Minutes will be reissued.

Prepared by: Madeline Augustine

MCA/JTB

cc: All Attendees

\\jnei.local\dfs\projects\15000-16999\16118 circuit dr\transportation\project data\public engagement\public meeting 1\meeting notes-public meeting 1-20250514-rev.docx

00:20:51	Boston Parks: Webpage: boston.gov/circuit-drive
00:21:18	Boston Parks: Project manager: amy.linne@boston.gov
00:24:04	Amy Linné: www.boston.gov/franklin-park-initiatives
00:39:54	I'm a little unclear: Will the crosswalks themselves be raised onto the table?
00:41:36	Will any of the crosswalks have pedestrian lights to stop traffic?
00:41:46	Can crosswalks signs with flashing lights be added in this historic landscape?
00:42:26	What is the timeline for the next phase?
00:43:29	When you say speed table what does that mean or look like? Is this a speed hump? Sorry don't know what it is.
00:43:43	Why are you not making any improvements to bike lane infrastructure in Phase I? In your in-person meeting in July, there were significant options proposed of how to make the (current, dangerous) bike infrastructure safer in a quick, cost-effective way.
00:43:53	Can you please paint the speed tables yellow so drivers can see them? The speed humps are great but they should be painted so all can see them.
00:46:12	•
00:46:12 00:46:13	Are there any plans to further prioritize the experience for people experiencing the park as a park, not a road to drive through—raised crossings, and narrowing the roadway as much as possible? The flex-post-separated bike lanes make sense to me for basic city streets, but in a park, I would sooner expect a separated multi-use path and a minimized roadway. I understand the first phase is limited to quick-build, but are those sorts of improvements planned for a later phase?
	as a park, not a road to drive through—raised crossings, and narrowing the roadway as much as possible? The flex-post-separated bike lanes make sense to me for basic city streets, but in a park, I would sooner expect a separated multi-use path and a minimized roadway. I understand the first phase is limited to quick-build, but are those sorts of
00:46:13	as a park, not a road to drive through—raised crossings, and narrowing the roadway as much as possible? The flex-post-separated bike lanes make sense to me for basic city streets, but in a park, I would sooner expect a separated multi-use path and a minimized roadway. I understand the first phase is limited to quick-build, but are those sorts of improvements planned for a later phase? Replying to "Why are you not making any improvements to bike lane infrastructure in
00:46:13	as a park, not a road to drive through—raised crossings, and narrowing the roadway as much as possible? The flex-post-separated bike lanes make sense to me for basic city streets, but in a park, I would sooner expect a separated multi-use path and a minimized roadway. I understand the first phase is limited to quick-build, but are those sorts of improvements planned for a later phase? Replying to "Why are you not making any improvements to bike lane infrastructure in Phase I?"
00:46:13	as a park, not a road to drive through—raised crossings, and narrowing the roadway as much as possible? The flex-post-separated bike lanes make sense to me for basic city streets, but in a park, I would sooner expect a separated multi-use path and a minimized roadway. I understand the first phase is limited to quick-build, but are those sorts of improvements planned for a later phase? Replying to "Why are you not making any improvements to bike lane infrastructure in Phase I?" I would also like to know this. Additional question re. phase 1, if the initial micromobility safety improvements are planned to just be paint and flex posts, why are they being separated from the other
00:46:13 00:48:32 00:49:44	as a park, not a road to drive through—raised crossings, and narrowing the roadway as much as possible? The flex-post-separated bike lanes make sense to me for basic city streets, but in a park, I would sooner expect a separated multi-use path and a minimized roadway. I understand the first phase is limited to quick-build, but are those sorts of improvements planned for a later phase? Replying to "Why are you not making any improvements to bike lane infrastructure in Phase I?" I would also like to know this. Additional question re. phase 1, if the initial micromobility safety improvements are planned to just be paint and flex posts, why are they being separated from the other phase 1 quick-build work? How much additional vehicle pollution is anticipated in the park due to slowing down

00:53:04	For longer crosswalks was there still any plan to add an 'island' mid-crosswalk? Or might that be a consideration for later phases given the budget?
00:56:37	Yes this is a road through a MAJOR PARK!
00:56:41	Replying to "Why are you not making any improvements to bike lane infrastructure in Phase I?"
	Me too. My whole family would
00:57:14	Agreed! Narrowing the roadway is really important to explore. And would be an important downpayment on future work.
00:57:17	Totally agree about better visibility of speed humps & tables!! Already the arrows on speed humps in the city are fading and hard to see. Reflective or brightly painted arrows will draw much more attention (sadly) than signs I think.
00:58:40	Recommend the speed tables not be in the bike lanes.
00:59:34	Thanks for the presentation. Sorry, I have to drop off now. I appreciate all you do.
00:59:57	That's really frustrating to hear about the flex posts: When the mayor publicly criticized them it was presented as if their biggest problem is that they were supposed to be temporary. Now we can't even get them as a temporary solution?
01:00:26	They are obviously not as good as a permanent solution but they are absolutely better than nothing on a short term basis.
01:00:46	Since speeding is typically addressed by ticketing, can you explain why the city is approaching this as a road design problem?
	Is there a risk of over-engineering a remedy if traffic enforcement isn't central to the strategy?
01:01:56	Can you avoid putting the speed humps in the bike lane?
01:02:04	Replying to "Since speeding is typically addressed by ticketing, can you explain why the city is approaching this as a road design problem?"
	The issue is that non-automated ticketing has very poor efficacy.
01:04:28	So separate them! ©
01:04:46	Sounds like a great use for bollards or armadillos!
01:09:34	If the wider shoulder could give the illusion of being an additional travel lane, could you not add add stripes in the buffer to indicate it isn't a travel lane?

01:10:59	Yes Eric! Preach!
01:11:13	Keep those motorists at 25 or below!!
01:11:40	Lets also not forget about the increasing prevalence of very large vehicles on our roads
01:13:10	All of these are great arguments for treating the roads a neighborhood street
01:13:20	My name is Lorraine Payne Wheeler and I am attending the meeting on behalf of the District 7 City Council Office. Residents in D7 have showed so much interest in making the road through the park safer and accesible for all users. Please contact the District 7 office at 617-635-5310 with any comments.
01:13:32	She answered that perfectly!!! Community!!!
01:14:27	Thank you Rep Holmes!
01:14:32	Thank you representative Holmes!!
01:14:34	If the speed table only slows vehicles to below 30, they will be traveling faster between them. So how can Amy say that 20 is the design speed
01:15:11	10 speed tables seem like a lot and looks promising for keeping traffic slower.
01:16:16	I worry that the speed tables will make drivers annoyed/angry and will lead people to accelerate rapidly between the tables —> more noise, more pollution
01:16:28	That is not an issue if the roadway is narrowed
01:19:17	Russell Holmes: I agree. Slower speeds would be much better
01:19:42	Russell Holmes: 30 is too fast
01:21:28	Russell Holmes: Got it.
01:24:11	Narrowing the width with consistent physical constraints, or at least frequent chicanes, could provide more continuous speed control and avoid the challenges to buses with frequent speed humps. Traffic tables very desirable for accessibility at major ped crossings but narrowing could be the better approach elsewhere
01:24:53	Replying to "Narrowing the width with consistent physical constraints, or at least frequent chicanes, could provide more continuous speed control"
	Agreed, and a great use of bollards if used temporarily!
01:28:35	Will there be a bus shelter for the 16 bus at valley gates?

01:28:36	There is an existing high-throughput, high-speed East-West route in this neighborhood: Morton Street!
01:28:41	I agree. I'm not asking for it to be a cut through
01:30:07	Exciting to see the work getting going on Circuit Drive
01:30:23	The slower vehicle speeds will be much appreciated
01:30:32	It's worth pointing out at least according to Google Maps, starting at Columbia road and driving southwest, driving through the park (not at rush hour) changes the journey from 5 minutes to 7 so it's very possible that speed humps will significantly reduce the overall traffic volumes during off peak hours.