

Cape Cod Canal Transportation Study

TENTH Working Group Meeting

Date and Time: February 1, 2018, 3:30 PM -5:30 PM

Location: Sandwich Town Hall Auditorium, 139 Main Street, Sandwich, Massachusetts

Attendees: See end of document

Meeting Notes

Introduction

Ethan Britland, MassDOT Project Manager, began the presentation for the Cape Cod Canal Transportation Study Working Group meeting. He reviewed the schedule for the meeting and introduced Craig Martin from U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) to present the initial portion of the agenda.

USACE Status Update

Mr. Martin is the Project Manager of the Cape Cod Canal Bridges Major Rehabilitation Evaluation Report (MRER). He provided an update of the Evaluation Report. He provided a brief overview of the study, and provided the current the status of the study activities.

In his overview, he noted that the Army Corps of Engineers is authorized to study rehabilitation or replacement of two four-lane bridges. The study authorization specifies that the bridges will have no tolls and encompasses the spans from abutment to abutment.

The MRER process is used when a projected bridge project would have a budget of \$20 million dollars or more and would take about two years or longer to construct. In the meantime, the Army Corps of Engineers will continue to do regular maintenance on the bridge on a regular basis, including short-term projects like joint replacement on the Sagamore Bridge.

The MRER is evaluating both bridges from a rehabilitation and replacement standpoint. He recognizes that these structures were built in the 1930s and originally had a 50 -year design life. The Corps is trying to establish a new long-term view looking ahead on the next 50 years in a holistic way. For this purpose, the Corps is using modern structures and modern bridges for comparison as replacement options. If they do recommend replacement, the projects will require additional authorization and additional design studies. This study will provide information to reach the next decision point – to proceed with rehabilitation or replacement.

Some of the tasks the Corps have completed for the MRER are structural engineering. These included evaluating the components, the current conditions, how much they have degraded, and how they can be improved to extend their performance life. They have completed the cost engineering component

which is currently being reviewed. This work has been evaluating all the components of a rehabilitation project.

The project undertook traffic modeling last fall. They have used a consultant contract with TrafInfo to determine the potential traffic impacts associated with rehabilitation or replacement. This helps evaluate what the public would experience under different scenarios. There may be significant lane closures, for example. So, the analyses considered more than a monetary standpoint, but also considered public safety and the quality of life for the residents of the Cape and visitors. They would be impacted by the traffic produced by some of the potential lane closures. The traffic study will probably be complete in February 2018.

In addition, the Corps' economists are starting to get data from the traffic model. From the qualitative perspective, traffic has a huge impact on the cost of rehabilitation versus replacement. This analysis considers the relative benefit/cost ratio of someone waiting in traffic to go to work versus someone waiting in traffic to go on vacation. They are different metrics. This information will be a component of the public involvement later in the spring.

They are also evaluating other social effects that do not have a monetary value but will be extremely important to the public. This considers factors such as disaster management – what happens if lanes are closed on a bridge and there is an approaching hurricane. The analysis will also consider how Joint Base Cape Cod (JBCC) may be impacted if the bridge project begins to close lanes and manipulate traffic.

The environmental analysis has been started. The Corps' is bringing a consultant on to help us with the NEPA process. Aspects of that consultant's work will be included in the public involvement process in the spring.

The next steps will include public involvement meetings – working groups similar to the kinds of meetings that MassDOT has already started. The Corps' is going to follow up with our own bridge-oriented meetings and provide the information gathered thus far to get public and stakeholder input. These meetings will be held around the Cape and the Islands and South Shore. He reiterated that the Corps will continue the maintenance required for the bridges – regular routine tasks. Mr. Martin then concluded his comments, noting that there will be more information as they get a contractor on board for the NEPA process. Also, there will be more public meetings scheduled in the spring and extend through the summer and fall to obtain public input and feedback.

Questions and Responses

State Representative Hunt asked, "What kind of weight does the qualitative pieces of this get versus the quantitative pieces of this analysis?" Mr. Martin answered that he does not know if there is an assigned weight such as a 50/50 or an 80/20 proportion for example. The evaluations of the other social effects are intended to provide the full story of the Cape Cod Canal bridges.

State Representative Hunt asked. "So, is it fair to say, the qualitative pieces could end up being the tie breaker?" Mr. Martin responded that yes, potentially, which is why we want to get public participation and information about how people's lives are affected by the bridges and lane closures.

Introduction to the Presentation Agenda

Mr. Britland introduced the slide presentation and reviewed the next agenda items. The presentation components included a summary, key findings, and relevant conclusions that will be useful in subsequent steps. Tonight's presentation will include an economic analysis, prepared and presented by Frank Mahady of FXM Associates. The presentation topics also included noise and air quality, and cost. As part of the Alternatives Analysis task of the study process, an associated evaluation matrix had been prepared as a handout for attendees. This matrix compared the no-build condition and all the alternatives.

Mr. Britland spoke briefly in advance of the presentation to discuss the next steps in the process. He noted that the presentation is intended to wrap up the review of the analytical work, so that at the next meeting they may be able to present their initial recommendations for consideration by the working group. Next steps will include a final public meeting and distribution of the study report for a 30-day review period. He emphasized that this is not the last opportunity for input, but it is a juncture where MassDOT can begin advancing draft recommendations.

He noted that the slide presentations must be understandable as stand-alone documents, so there is some repeated information from previous discussions. This includes a recapitulation that the design goal for the traffic evaluation is to provide acceptable traffic operations during the non-summer weekday peak period, and will also consider improvements to the summer peak conditions, as feasible. The study will not seek to resolve all peak-season conditions.

Results of Travel Demand Modeling and Analysis

Mr. Britland introduced Mr. Paiewonsky from Stantec for the next portions of the presentation.

Mr. Paiewonsky presented the results of the alternatives development, analysis, and regional traffic modeling. He noted that there are two ways that are used to express the results of the analyses; queue lengths and vehicle delays. Vehicle delays is the average difference from an ideal "free flow" condition to the predicted travel time during the peak period. He noted that the length of queues and delays are calculated as averages, and not maximums. People may observe conditions today that exceed some of the predicted averages. However, the methods and basis of analysis using averages is the appropriate, standard methodology.

He explained that a logical grouping of transportation improvements (known as cases) was modeled to determine future traffic operations and identify changes in traffic patterns. The emphasis remains on improvements to the non-summer PM weekday period. Mr. Paiewonsky presented the seven cases in a table showing the different project components associated with each case.

Mr. Paiewonsky showed maps of both the future no-build conditions during the summer and non-summer period. He noted that this information is included in the handouts as well. He showed another map with the no-build scenario for the Sagamore Bridge area, down Route 3 and Route 6. The no-build scenario is the consistent basis for evaluating the comparative changes associated with different Cases.

The presentation was handed over to Fred Mosley. Mr. Mosley focused on summer travel patterns on Main Street in Bourne and access Route 25. He began by talking about motorists' destinations in this

area. He noted that many people traveling west on Main Street have destinations like Providence or Worcester. The Case 2 analysis indicates that, with improvements at Belmont Circle, there will be changes in travel on Main Street under future conditions. Currently, there are a percentage of travelers heading to Route 6 travel west on Main Street to Exit 2 rather than the more direct of traveling east through Belmont Circle. However, as traffic conditions improve at Belmont Circle under Case 2, some drivers will change their travel routes and travel east through Belmont Circle to Route 25. These additional trips will dampen the overall reduction in travel delays associated with the improvements to Belmont Circle.

Mr. Paiewonsky continued the presentation. He provided a summary of the overall travel demand analysis. He presented a bar-chart that showed the cases that were examined and the predicted 2040 average delays for both Belmont Circle and the Bourne Rotary in PM conditions. He briefly reviewed the relationship among the various cases. Case 1B improvements include the ramp to Scenic Highway, and a ramp to Route 28 northbound and the Bourne Rotary to Sandwich Road. Additional improvements have been added under Cases 2, 2b, 3, and 3a.

The graph generally indicated that improvements associated with Cases 1B through Case 3A result in a decrease in delays compared to the future no-build condition. The graph shows that during the non-summer Case 1B and Case 2 shows substantial improvement relative to the no-build case. However, the summer period for most cases show more modest improvements compared to the no-build comparison. Mr. Paiewonsky reiterated that the goals of the study are to enhance the non-summer traffic conditions.

He then presented a graph showing the contrast between no-build, Case 1, and Case 3A at the Sagamore Bridge area. Case 1 and 3A both include the relocation of Exit 1C on Route 6. Under Case 1 at Route 6 westbound, there is a considerable drop in traffic delay. Yet, Route 3 southbound does not show significant improvements unless additional improvements are completed. For example, in Case 3A, improvements would include the replacement of both bridges, construction of an additional lane on Route 6 to Exit 2, and reconstruction of Bourne Rotary as a highway interchange.

Mr. Paiewonsky presented the overall findings for mid-term improvements, before any bridges would be rehabilitated or replaced. The analysis found during the non-summer period, delays could be substantially reduced at both Belmont Circle and Bourne Rotary, particularly with the improvements that are included in Case 1B and 2. More modest reductions of delays could be achieved at those locations during the summer peak periods. The traffic analysis showed that under Case 2B, though better results were expected, this scenario was found to be less affective that Cases 1B or 2. This was caused by the projected buildup of traffic at Head of the Bay Road and Buzzards Bay Bypass. Case 2B includes Belmont Circle fly-over to Scenic Highway. As vehicles would attempt to enter Belmont Circle from the east side, there would be fewer gaps in traffic, so people will be delayed trying to get into the Circle from the west side.

He next reviewed key findings for the long-term improvements. Case 3A includes a long-term model of conditions after the bridges and the Bourne Rotary interchange would be built. The difference between Case 3 and 3A would be that Case 3A includes reconstruction of Bourne Rotary as a highway interchange. This case would be necessary to reduce summer delays. Once the new Bourne Bridge is replaced, traffic would increase dramatically. During the summer peak period, there would be an additional 725 or more cars passing over the Bourne Bridge, compared to the no-build condition. Additional improvements would be needed to reduce delays.

The Route 6 Exit 1C interchange would need to be relocated when a new Sagamore Bridge is constructed because it would be built with a lower profile (less steep) and longer than the existing bridge. The existing Exit 1C would not be able to be used since it would be at a completely different grade.

Economic Analysis

Mr. Paiewonsky handed the presentation over to Frank Mahady to present the economic analysis. Mr. Mahady asked the audience to look at the handout to help illustrate the economic analysis. He stated that these graphs and information are a tool to assist with comparisons. The numbers in the cases are conceptual; absolute numbers are not important in these graphs. He discussed the method of the economic study. It uses a comparison of travel time savings under the various Cases to the future no-build scenario. The study examined all trips including commuting and peak seasonal. Monetary value of travel time savings and annualized construction costs were examined as well.

Mr. Mahady said that travel time savings is important because it enhances personal satisfaction. It also affects business productivity and it can expand labor, freight, and visitor markets. When assigning dollar values, the value of saving for commuters is different than savings for peak season visitors, non-business local travelers, and trucks.

Mr. Cannon asked if these economic numbers assume that the bridges are replaced. Mr. Britland said the numbers include new bridges for Case 3 and 3A.

Mr. Mahady showed graphs depicting travel time savings for all Cases. Then he displayed commuter-only information and Case 2 and Case 2b stood out as benefiting commuters more than any of the other cases. He stated that having better commuter times can expand the labor market and provide opportunities for Cape businesses to expand.

Mr. Mahady then showed a graph with all vehicles during the summer peak period. Case 3A had the largest savings, and the second case with the largest saving was Case 1A. He stated that these graphs will be available on the website. These charts are a way to compare alternatives whether a person is interested in examining values for summer or non-summer commuter drives.

He presented a graph with aggregate values. Cases 2 and 2b were found to have the most travel time saved. In each case, the benefits to users exceed the annual construction costs. Mr. Mahady stated that for the most part as more money is spent on construction, more travel time benefit is gained. Case 1A provides the greatest cost-benefit ratio, but all cases provided a positive benefit.

Noise Impact Analysis

The presentation returned to Mr. Paiewonsky to speak about several environmental and social impacts that have not been discussed at previous presentations. A noise analysis was completed to understand the impact of noise from each case. It is based on potential location of the roadways and uses traffic models of the various cases. Cases 2 and Case 3A were analyzed to represent the potential full mid-term and long-term improvements and these results were compared against existing future no-build models. He stated as engineering designs move forward, a more detailed noise study will be conducted for required environmental studies.

Mr. Paiewonsky said the results are reported in average decibel changes (dBA). He said highway noise fluctuates constantly. These models were able to average that and get a single value. When describing increasing or decreasing highway noise, from 0 - 3 dBA change is measurable, but not perceptible by the human ear. A 3 - 5 dBA increase is noticeable in a normal quiet neighborhood setting and a 10-dBA increase is perceived as 'twice as loud' and considered a significant increase by MassDOT and FHWA regulations.

He showed a map with the various results. The areas examined were neighborhoods that would be adjacent to the transportation improvements, the Route 3 and 6 corridor and the Route 25 and 28 corridor. Many of the increases were only 1, 1-2, or 1-3 dBA so most are in the measurable but not perceptible range. There were two exceptions. Just south of the Bourne Rotary, in the area of Bourne high school, the noise would decrease assuming the bridge will be built to the east of the existing bridge. There was a forecast moderate increase in noise (4 to 6 dBA) at homes on Head of the Bay Road in the summer due to increased traffic.

Air Quality Analysis

Mr. Paiewonsky then spoke about the air quality analysis. He stated the transportation study is within an "attainment" area for federal air quality standards. This means Barnstable County currently does not exceed federal standards for air quality. The two cases examined for the air quality study were the same as those used for the noise study, Cases 2 and 3A during summer peak periods. This was done to understand the worst potential conditions. The analysis examined carbon monoxide, mobile source air toxics (MSAT - which is a suite of toxins related to vehicles), and greenhouse gases. There will be more detailed air quality study completed as part of future environmental studies.

The study found that for carbon monoxide, there may be a minor summertime increases at intersections due to higher traffic volumes. There should be a nationwide reduction in mobile source air toxics as, over time, newer cleaner cars will replace older cars. There may be a decrease of greenhouse gases from a reduction of queuing during the summer. It is forecast that the county would remain in attainment for air quality.

Conceptual Cost Estimates

Mr. Mosley returned to discuss conceptual cost estimates of the various improvements and cases. These cost estimates are based on unit costs which MassDOT has used in the past. The study added additional costs of 30% to 40% for the unknown costs such as environmental mitigation, traffic management, or retaining walls. These estimates do not include design or engineering costs.

Mr. Mosley reviewed the conceptual costs of the short-term improvements, such as new ADA-compliant connections to the Canal Bikeway. New bikeway approaches to the Bourne Bridge would be \$25,000 to \$50,000 per location. The cost for the sidewalk reconstruction at the Sagamore Bridge, including a 'complete street' reconstruction of Adams Street would be \$3.9 million (2017 cost). Sidewalk improvement at the Bourne Bridge approaches would be \$800,000. Some other short-term improvements include enhanced signal timing (or adaptive signals), including at the Scenic Highway at Canal Road/State Road, and Scenic Highway at Nightingale Road. Costs for each one of these signal timing/adaptive signal improvements are \$50,000 per location. The conceptual cost of geometric improvements at the intersection of Route 6 at Cranberry Highway/Sandwich Road in Bourne, including ADA-compliant sidewalks, is \$2.8 million. Installing a traffic signal at the Route 130 at Cotuit Road

intersection, including ADA-compliant sidewalks would cost \$2.9 million (2017 cost). Reconstructing and installing signals at the Sandwich Road at Bourne Rotary Connector intersection would be \$4.7 million (2017 cost). A park-and-ride lot at Route 6 Exit 6 (Route 130) would be \$3.6 million in 2017 costs.

Mr. Mosley then discussed mid-term improvements, which include Scenic Highway westbound to Route 25 westbound Ramp, Route 28 Northbound to Sandwich Road Ramp, Belmont Circle three-leg roundabout with signalized intersection, and the Bourne Rotary - three signalized intersections. He presented a map indicating the locations of the various mid-term improvements. Since these types of projects would take longer to design and construct, costs were provided for the years 2030 and 2040. An annual inflation rate of 3.5 % was included.

The Scenic Highway westbound to Route 25 westbound Ramp would cost \$6.4 million in current dollars, \$10 million in 2030, and \$14 million in 2040. The Route 28 northbound ramp to Sandwich Road (at Bourne Rotary), which also includes the relocation of the high school driveway, would cost \$7 million in 2017, \$10 million in 2030, and \$15 million in 2040. The three-signalized intersection alternative at Bourne Rotary would cost \$34 million in 2017, \$52 million in 2030, and \$73 million in 2040. Improvements at Belmont Circle that would include a three-leg roundabout and a signalized intersection would cost \$26 million in 2017, \$40 million in 2030, and \$56 million in 2040. This cost estimate does not include the cost of the Scenic Highway to Route 25 ramp.

Andrew Gottlieb, Association to Preserve Cape Cod, asked if the \$7 million is for the Route 28 northbound ramp to Sandwich Road and the signalized intersection. Mr. Paiewonsky confirmed that was correct. Mr. Mosley proceeded to the long-term improvements.

Mr. Mosley stated that the long-term improvements include Route 6 Exit 1C relocation, the addition of a Route 6 eastbound travel lane between Exits 1 and 2, and the Bourne Rotary Interchange. Long-term improvements assume construction of new canal bridges, but the costs of new bridges are not included in cost estimates for this study. These costs are assumed to be the responsibility of the USACE.

Marie Oliva, Cape Cod Canal Region Chamber of Commerce, asked whether Exit 1C is considered a long-term or short-term improvement. Mr. Mosley said it is considered long-term. It would be a time-consuming project to design and permit.

Mr. Moseley presented a map of the locations of the long-term improvements. The Route 6 Exit 1C relocation would cost approximately \$41 million in 2017, \$64 million in 2030, and \$91 million in 2040. The construction of a third eastbound travel lane on Route 6 to Exit 2 would cost approximately \$43 million in 2017, \$65 million in 2030, and \$92 million in 2040. Reconstructing the Bourne Rotary as a highway interchange (as proposed under Case 3A) would cost \$136 million in 2030, and \$191 million in 2040. This does not include cost of the three signalized intersections at the Bourne Rotary as proposed in Case 2.

Mr. Mosely presented a chart summarizing all conceptual costs, describing it as a menu of improvements. The chart includes costs for 2017, 2030, and 2040. Then he showed a chart of the summary cost estimates by Case. These estimates do not include costs related to reconfiguring the Canal bridge approaches as likely required during the reconstruction of each bridge. This approach work is estimated at \$25 million per bridge.

Ms. Oliva asked if there will be access to this slide presentation. Mr. Britland said confirmed that the presentation would be available on the website, but it will take a week to make it ADA-accessible.

Mr. Mosley turned the presentation over to Mr. Paiewonsky. Mr. Paiewonsky said the purpose of this study is to identify transportation improvements. This requires not just looking at traffic operations, but a whole suite of other considerations from environmental impacts to access to emergency vehicles. There are a lot of considerations. A matrix was created (included in the handouts) which helps examine all alternatives at once and makes sure that all considerations are viewed. The matrix uses a Consumer Reports-type ratings system with full, half, or empty circles to indicate whether a certain issue is a minor, moderate, or substantial impact/benefit. The matrix will be in the final report.

Key Findings

Mr. Paiewonsky presented the key findings. There would be a notable reduction in non-summer delay at Belmont Circle and Bourne Rotary with mid-term improvements under Cases 1b and 2. A major benefit is that the improvement in these Cases can be broken into smaller pieces. They can be done one at a time and each stage would have a benefit. For example, the Scenic Highway to Route 25 ramp could be constructed as a stand-alone project, or the Route 28 north to Sandwich Road ramp at Bourne Rotary could be constructed as a single project, and later Bourne Rotary with the 3-signalized intersections can be built. None of these cases would involve reconstructing previously constructed improvements so would be no waste of transportation dollars. The long-term cases (the full build) would address most long-term delay problems in summer and non-summer, but Belmont Circle would maintain some summer delay.

The key environmental findings are surprising since they are very modest. There would be no residential or commercial structure property takings. Some of the improvements would involve minor land takings. No improvements, except the Bourne Rotary Interchange under Case 3A, would include a larger land taking. There would be modest wetland impacts at Belmont Circle. There would be minor noise impacts. Most of these projects would not require the preparation of a major environmental document, such as an EIR, which can be time consuming.

He said relocation of Route 6, Exit 1C could be either a mid-term project or long-term as it is a standalone project. It will ultimately need to be done prior to the reconstruction of the Sagamore Bridge. The utility corridor in that area is a substantial wildlife habitat for many rare species. Based on coordination with the Massachusetts Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program, this project would likely require a Conservation Management Permit (CMP) with associated rare species mitigation. CMP's require detailed wildlife studies and often require acquisition of land to replace the land that was taken and, depending on the species, a wildlife tunnel.

He said the key findings of economic analysis state that improvements would result in substantial reduction in annual travel time for residents and visitors, and the value of this time savings far exceeds the annualized construction cost.

Final Questions and Comments

Mr. Britland asked if there were any questions. Mr. Gottlieb asked about air quality impacts and whether the analysis relies on future cases with no action. Mr. Britland said yes, it includes a no-build

scenario. The presentation provided general overall findings. There is a more detailed memo on air quality available.

Mr. Britland went onto say that part of today's meeting is to discuss the presented alternatives. He stated that he wants the Working Group's feedback. The team did not show recommendations yet because feedback from the Working Group is needed. All the alternatives have trade-offs and the need to balance many factors. He stated there will be another Working Group meeting in late February or early March then there will be a public meeting with draft study recommendations. This will be the final public meeting. The draft report may be released around the time of the public meeting.

Ms. Oliva asked if the public meeting was for everyone. Mr. Britland responded that the meeting would be for everyone and confirmed that it would be in March 2018.

Mr. Gottlieb asked about the increased volume on the bridges and whether it included weekend trips and more development. Mr. Britland said the increase in the volume of trips is held constant. As part of the future no-build scenario, there was an assumption of increased visitor traffic as well as commuter traffic. These volumes are 'baked into' the analysis. The no-build volumes might be a little overstated, but the volumes are not inaccurate.

Mr. Gottlieb asked why the assumption was that volume would increase. Mr. Britland stated that future traffic forecasts were based on the existing volumes projected to grow at a standard annual rate. The annual increase was established based on coordination with the Working Group, the local town, and discussions with the Cape Cod Commission. Ultimately, there was a decision to go with the higher growth rate.

Mr. Cannon of the Cape Cod Commission said it was a more conservative approach.

Mr. Phil Logan asked what the assumptions were if they do not replace the bridges.

Mr. Britland said that Cases 1 through 2b represent the future condition without replacement bridges.

Mr. Logan asked what the Army Corps is likely to do. Mr. Martin said Case 1 through Case 2b involve use of the bridges as they are now. The traffic modeling is looking at traffic costs over 50 years.

Mr. Logan asked if major rehabilitation would extend the life of the bridges for 50 years. Mr. Martin said yes. It includes complete replacement of parts of the bridges with the same lane widths.

Mr. Britland said that rehabilitation was always a consideration if the bridges were not replaced. Cases 1 through 2b do not include replacement bridges for this reason.

Mr. Baron stated that there should be a study of a third bridge and it would remove 50 to 60 percent of traffic. Mr. Britland reiterated to Mr. Baron that the study has focused on improvements to existing infrastructure. A third bridge would involve very substantial impact to environmental resources and property takings. Examining existing infrastructure showed that there are alternatives that can benefit the entire area.

Mr. Cannon said that he can easily endorse all the short-term improvements. His personal option is for Case 3A. It is the number one alternative. He said he wants to hear from the Army Corps regarding how realistic is Case 3A is.

Mr. Britland said there will probably be two options. One if the bridges are replaced and another if they are not replaced. Representative Hunt asked if projects would begin after the report was issued and whether further action depended on a decision from the Army Corps.

Mr. Britland said he cannot make those decisions. The idea is that Case 1 through 2b can be advanced while the Corps is completing their study. Case 2b, the three signalized intersections at Bourne Rotary, could begin and then be repurposed for Case 3A.

Representative Hunt said that infrastructure should not be installed and then removed and asked if funding existed for any of the projects. Mr. Britland said we could construct the mid-term projects without knowing what the Army Corps is doing. Implementation of transportation improvement will be discussed at the next meeting.

Bill Reed said traffic signals proposed at the Bourne Rotary under Case 2 can be repurposed under Case 3A. Mr. Britland said they would also be beneficial during the construction of Case 3A as this design would allow traffic to be directed around the rotary.

Mr. Martin how the state works regarding funding. Mr. Britland said this is a planning document is a set of recommendations. It is conceptual; it must go through the capital planning process. The projects need design engineering before they can be funded. This report is just the beginning.

He thanked everyone for coming.

Attendees

Attendees are listed by name followed by their affiliation.

- Tom Baron, Cape Cod Citizen
- James Jodice, MassDOT District 5
- Hardy Patel, MassDOT Boston
- James Plath, Mass State Police
- Andrew Gottlieb, Association to Preserve Cape Cod
- Nathaniel Trumbull, SMART
- Teri Stanley, Sandwich Chamber of Commerce
- Marie Oliva, Cape Cod Canal Region Chamber of Commerce
- Craig Martin, USACE
- Glenn Cannon, Cape Cod Commission
- Michael Paiewonsky, Stantec
- Bill Reed, Stantec
- Fred Moseley, Stantec
- Jennifer Siciliano, Harriman
- Bill Travers, MassDOT District 5
- Frank Mahady, FXM Associates

- Scott Campanella, State Senate Office of Julian Cyr
- Randy Hart, Vanasse Hangen Brustlin (VHB)
- Kathleen Palmer, State Representative Office of David Vieira
- Stephen Mellin, Cape Cod AFS
- John Hession, BSC Group
- Bill Husten, SMART Citizens Task Force
- Paul Rendon, Joint Base Cape Cod (JBCC)
- Sam Jensen, Town of Sandwich
- Randy Hunt, State Representative