MassDOT Cape Cod Canal Transportation Study.
Public Informational Meeting, December 1, 2016.

Cape Cod Canal Area Transportation Study.

RE: Third Public Meeting.

Date and Time: December 1, 2016, 7 PM -9 PM.

Location: Massachusetts Maritime Academy, Admiral's Hall, 101 Academy Drive, Buzzards Bay.

Attendees: See end of document.

Meeting Notes:

Ethan Britland, MassDOT Project Manager, welcomed attendees and thanked them for attending the third public meeting of the Cape Cod Canal Transportation Study. Mr. Britland reviewed the meeting's agenda. He stated that this study is a conceptual study and not an engineering study. Army Corp of Engineers staff were in attendance and are serving as partners in the study. Mr. Britland introduced the project team: Craig Martin, Project Manager from US Army Corp of Engineers, Bill Reed, Principal-in-Charge (Stantec), Michael Paiewonsky, the Team Project Manager (Stantec), Fred Moseley, Transportation Engineer (Stantec), Sudhir Murthy, Transportation Modeler (TrafInfo), Frank Mahady, Economist from FXM Associates and Jennifer Siciliano, Public Participation Specialist from Harriman. Mr. Britland reviewed the study process and framework, which are 1) Goals and Objectives, Evaluation Criteria, and Public Involvement Plan, 2) Existing Conditions, Future Conditions, and Issues Evaluation, 3) Alternatives Development, 4) Alternatives Analysis, and 5) Recommendations. Mr. Britland stated that most of the night's meeting would be devoted to discussing alternatives development. The purpose of the meeting is to show what has been completed so far and to gather input from the Working Group and the public.

Mr. Britland specified the goals of the study. They are to improve transportation mobility and accessibility, to provide reliable year-round connectivity over the canal and between the bridges, and to create/improve multi-modal mobility in the Cape Cod Canal area. These goals have been revised from those previously presented which focused more on establishing an alternative or replacement highway crossing of the Canal. The study area contains a larger regional range and a smaller focus area directly surrounding the Bourne and Sagamore Bridges. He showed the various travel corridors in the region that were included in the study. Then he turned the presentation over to Michael Paiewonsky.

Mr. Paiewonsky began the presentation by showing the dramatic difference between driving in the summer season versus the non-summer season in the Study Area. Daily traffic volumes were collected in the summer and non-summer seasons for the various traffic corridors. They included the Scenic Highway, Bourne and Sagamore Bridges, Sandwich Road, and Routes 3, 25, 28, and 6. He pointed out the percent of change in volume between the seasons. The traffic volumes impact the length of the queue for the Bourne and Sagamore Bridges. The queue backups are often several miles long which means a considerable delay in traffic. Based on the 2040 traffic forecast, queues will be significantly longer in the future than they are now.

The Study is examining eight year-round problems intersections in the Canal Area. Mr. Paiewonsky defined a problem intersection in the study as having a level of service (LOS) of E or F, and/or being a

high crash location. Future (2040) traffic projections forecast an increase in the number of year-round problem intersections in the Study Area from eight to thirteen. These intersections are generally clustered in the north and south of the two bridges.

The Cape Cod Canal area has various issues, constraints, and opportunities. Mr. Paiewonsky indicated that these issues include severe congestion at the bridge approaches and nearby intersections, the need to balance visitor and resident needs, and the lack of bicycles and pedestrian accommodation. Constraints include extensive areas of sensitive environmental resources, previously developed residential and commercial areas, and the Joint Base Cape Cod. The opportunities include collaboration between MassDOT and US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), enhanced multimodal accommodations, and additional infrastructure.

Mr. Paiewonsky stated that any proposed alternative development scenarios are intended to satisfy the goals and objectives of the study, will be based on identified issues, constraints, and opportunities, will minimize property, community, and environmental impacts, and be focused primarily on modifying or expanding existing infrastructure and, if necessary, the construction of new infrastructure. Additionally, the study will consider the USACE plan for bridges, the examination of prior alternatives developed for the public-private partnership (P3) process, the review of outside submissions, and the development of new short, medium, and long-term alternatives.

Mr. Paiewonsky specified that the USACE manages the Canal. They own the Bourne and Sagamore Bridges and much of the land adjacent to it. The USACE are conducting a 'Major Rehabilitation Evaluation Study' to determine if rehabilitation or replacement of both Sagamore and Bourne Bridges is the most appropriate action. The MassDOT's study will be completed first, therefore, for the purpose of analysis in MassDOT's study, it will be assumed that both bridges will be replaced and will be toll-free.

The prior P3 alternatives were developed in response to increasing USACE maintenance of the Canal bridges and were intended to compliment the aging infrastructure. These alternatives were developed before the USACE's study began. P3 alternatives proposed connections between Route 3 and Route 25, and between Route 25 - with a new bridge across the canal - to Route 6. MassDOT's study has examined the environmental constraints along all these connections and determined that the proposed alignments would impact important environmental resources including wetlands, open space, Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) areas, residential property, and Joint Base Cape Cod. For any development to move forward, a NEPA Environmental Impact Study would be required in compliance with NEPA and the Clean Water Act. These federal laws require a comprehensive alternatives analysis to identify a practicable alternative with the least overall impact to social and environmental resources. The two preliminary P3 concepts were dismissed from further consideration in the MassDOT Study due to their potential significant environmental impacts, and their inability to meet federal environmental requirements.

Next, Mr. Paiewonsky stated that short-, mid, and long-term alternatives have been evaluated. The assumptions for these alternatives include a focus on year-round safety and mobility problems. These alternatives would be developed to not preclude the construction of a new Bourne or Sagamore bridge. Study alternatives will focus on improvements to existing infrastructure and will be designed to accommodate forecast traffic volumes for the future (2040) fall weekday evening peak period. While the

proposed alternatives will not be designed to resolve all peak-season traffic problems, they will also be examined with summer peak period traffic. Then Mr. Paiewonsky handed the presentation over to Fred Moseley to discuss short-term alternatives.

Mr. Moseley specified that short-term alternatives are intended for development in a 1- to 3-year time period and would incur no or few environmental impacts. Short-term alternatives include transportation system improvements such as signal timing upgrades and adaptive signals, which can adapt their signal timing based on real-time traffic volumes. These alternatives may also include the introduction of turning lanes, improvement to roadway striping and signage, and improved bicycle, pedestrian, and transit facilities. If more people were to walk and bike, this would alleviate some of the automobile traffic.

Mr. Moseley identified the eight locations that have year-round operational safety issues. The first intersection is the Scenic Highway at Canal Road/ State Road. The proposed short-term improvements include signal timing optimization and/or adaptive signal control that could reduce travel time delay from 45 to 35 seconds. The second location is Route 6A at Cranberry Highway and Sandwich Road. A short-term alternative to improve this intersection involves the construction of an exclusive left-turn lane on the Cranberry Highway westbound approach. These improvements could reduce delay from 74 to 30 seconds.

Mr. Moseley stated that the third intersection, Route 130 at Cotuit Road, is currently unsignalized. This intersection would benefit from a traffic light. Signalization of this intersection would reduce delay for vehicles exiting Cotuit Road from 242 seconds to 32-seconds and reduce the crash rate present at this location. In addition, to create a more pedestrian-friendly area, sidewalks should be introduced into the area; there are none currently.

The fourth problem intersection - Sandwich Road at Bourne Rotary Connector is an unsignalized intersection immediately east of the Bourne Rotary. Based on the traffic analysis, this intersection does warrant a traffic signal which may worsen queues at the rotary. Thus, a traffic light is not recommended for this location. The introduction of sidewalks would be recommended to make better pedestrian connections. This intersection will also be evaluated as part of the overall Bourne Rotary improvements. The fifth problem area, Sandwich Road at Harbor Lights Road, is another unsignalized section that does not warrant a traffic signal, and sidewalk installation is recommended.

Mr. Moseley stated that the sixth year-round problem intersection - Scenic Highway at Nightingale Pond Road - is a signalized that would benefit from signal timing adjustments to reduce queuing on Scenic Highway. The seventh problem location, Belmont Circle, will benefit from the MassDOT-proposed short-term multimodal improvements that will include lane stripping and signage, sidewalks, and a shared-use bike path. These improvements are on the regional 2017 to 2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The eighth identified year-round problem intersection is the Bourne Rotary. MassDOT intends to implement short-term improvements for the Rotary including new signage denoting appropriate lanes to use, which would reduce congestion. The Mr. Moseley turned the presentation back over to Mr. Paiewonsky to discuss short-term bicycle and pedestrian recommendations.

MassDOT Cape Cod Canal Transportation Study.
Public Informational Meeting, December 1, 2016.

Mr. Paiewonsky presented the existing bike facilities within the study region. There are seven miles of off-road bicycle paths along on each side of the Canal. There are some roads in the Study Area that are designated bicycle routes, including Route 6A. Bus routes were also inventoried for this study. These are important to consider together as people often take bicycles to a bus stop or take a bike from the bus to their final destination. Buses are an important part of the bicycle connectivity.

The study examined connections between the bicycle path and the local roadway. Mr. Paiewonsky presented a map showing the existing pedestrian/bicycle access between the roadway network and the Canal trail. There are various access points that are considered pedestrian only access; these are pathways that include stairways. An access gap exists between Main Street in Bourne that could benefit from an additional entrance. Some of the paths are overgrown dirt paths that can be upgraded to an ADA-compliant entrance. Old Bridge Road, on the west side of the canal, is a candidate for new bikeway access point. On the east side of the canal, there are two additional potential new access points, at the Bourne Ball field and at Pleasant Street.

The study also examined and inventoried roadways and sidewalks in the Study Area for ADA compliance. Many of the roads in the Cape Cod Canal area are narrow or do not have shoulders. Some of these narrow roads are on bus routes, which is especially concerning since people usually walk to bus stops.

In addition to these short-term alternatives, there are mid-term design alternatives for the area. These recommendations would be a higher cost with greater potential impact to the environment and property. Mr. Paiewonsky passed the presentation over to Bill Reed of Stantec to speak about potential mid-term alternatives.

Mr. Reed said that mid-term alternatives could be implemented on a 3- to 8-year time period, will cost more than short-term alternatives, and may have more environmental or property impacts. Travel patterns in the Study Area were presented to inform the influence they have on mid-term alternatives. Mr. Reed presented some of the areas travel patterns. On a summer morning on Saturday, 59% of vehicles traveling east on Route 25 are destined for Route 6; 35% are destined for Route 28. On the Sagamore Bridge side of the Canal, 82% of vehicles traveling south on Route 3 are destined for Route 6 and 9% are destined for Route 28. Traffic patterns for vehicles traveling off-Cape during on a mid-day summer Sunday is different. There is an even 48%-48% spilt of vehicles going to Route 3 and those continuing towards Route 6. Of those vehicles traveling north on Route 28, 8% travel towards Route 3, and 86% continue to Route 25.

Mr. Reed discussed the various mid-term alternatives. One alternative is the relocation of the Route 6 Exit 1C Interchange from its existing location at the base of the Sagamore Bridge (at the Christmas Tree shop) to a utility corridor 3,400 feet to the east. A new 1,900-foot-long roadway is proposed to link this new interchange to the Route 130 at Route 6A intersection. Relocating this interchange further east would provide drivers more distance to accelerate to highway speed and merge safely into traffic.

Another conceptual alternative is to add an additional travel lane to Route 6 eastbound. Building a third travel lane from Exit 1A to Exit 2 (extends approx. 1,000 past exit 2) on Route 6 would relieve some of the congestion around Market Basket. Doing this is not expected to have substantial environmental or right-of-way impacts.

Mr. Reed mentioned that the Sagamore Rotary was reconstructed in 2006. Minor modifications to this interchange may be necessary to accommodate a future bridge.

Mr. Reed presented mid-term alternatives for Belmont Circle, which include a proposed westbound on-ramp from Scenic Highway to Route 25 at the Nightingale Pond Road intersection. This is anticipated to divert approximately 780 vehicles automobiles from Belmont Circle in the summer peak period and potentially improve safety in the Circle. Further, Belmont Circle would be reconstructed as a modern roundabout. All access to abutting properties would be maintained. If these proposed alternatives do not satisfactorily improve traffic operations, a Route 25 eastbound to Scenic Highway eastbound fly-over ramp would be evaluated. This ramp would divert about 1,000 vehicles out of the Circle.

Mr. Reed then transitioned the presentation to the Bourne Rotary. He said that Bourne Rotary reconstruction is more difficult because of its proximity to the Bourne Bridge, and will take a lot of coordination with USACE. One alternative under consideration involves the construction of a new ramp connection from Route 28 northbound to the Bourne Rotary Connector, and the reconstruction of the Sandwich Road/Bourne Rotary Connector Intersection. An additional alternative involves the construction of an underpass of Old Sandwich Road under the Bourne Rotary Connector, which would eliminate the need for a traffic signal at this location. This may be considered a long-term alternative. Mr. Reed then turned the presentation back to Mr. Paiewonsky for pedestrian, bicycle, and freight improvements.

Mr. Paiewonsky presented the mid-term alternatives for pedestrian, bicycle, and freight. Some of these ideas were advanced by the community includes the Bourne Rail Trail (which connects the Shining Sea Bikeway to the Canal Bikeway) and the Wareham Community Path. This could fill in a seven-mile gap that would create a 25-mile off-road bicycle trail from Scusset Beach to Woods Hole.

Mr. Paiewonsky spoke about the existing park-and-ride lots in the study area. There are two park-and-ride lots on Route 6, one in Barnstable and one in Bourne. These lots are usually at 90- to 100-percent capacity. For example, one of the park-and-ride lots on a Tuesday in October was 99% full, with 374 out of 377 spaces filled. There is a demand to build additional park-and-ride lots. There is an advantageous parcel at Route 6 and Route 130 interchange. It is property already owned by MassDOT, and there is a bus route that passes by this location.

Mr. Paiewonsky continued the presentation and discussed ferry issues. He said the bridges don't just connect to Cape Cod; they connect to Martha’s Vineyard and the Nantucket as well. Ridership has remained pretty stable, yet the number of trucks on the ferry has increased. This is becoming more and more disruptive to the residents of Falmouth. The Steamship Authority completed a draft study this past April, which looked at diverting freight trucks to a new terminal in New Bedford rather than Woods Hole. The study found that the cost to truckers would be more expensive and the Steamship Authority did not want to subsidize the cost to make the fees the same. This initiative would need State or other funding.

Mr. Paiewonsky went on to speak about long-term alternatives. These are alternatives that would take over eight years to develop, be a higher cost, and have a lengthier environmental review and design period. There were several ideas submitted to us from the public regarding long term alternatives. This

shows that the study has a high level of engagement and the Study Team is taking these ideas seriously. Various community members submitted input including Tom Baron from South Yarmouth, Burton Pearlstein from North Falmouth, David Oakley from Chatham, and Steve Voluckas from Barnstable. Ideas included a rail tunnel, a 3rd bridge crossing, and the reconstruction of Bourne Rotary which would close off the north and south and making it a more direct path.

Regarding the canal tunnel idea, there are many challenges regarding this alternative. Due to topography, a much longer tunnel would be needed compared to the length of a bridge. A tunnel requires substantial ventilation equipment and structures, and the preparation of a major environmental study (EIS). Further, it is difficult to accommodate bicycles or pedestrians in tunnels, and the construction cost would be more than double or more compared to a bridge.

Mr. Paiewonsky said regarding the concepts proposed by the public, evaluation of modifications to Bourne Rotary would continue. The mid-canal bridge crossing and rail tunnels were dismissed for environmental, costs, and JBCC right-of-way impacts. Mr. Paiewonsky then handed the presentation over to Mr. Reed.

Mr. Reed stated that links between the two bridges, on Sandwich Road and Scenic Highway, are very important for any mid-term or long-term proposals. An important consideration is the amount of development along Scenic Highway and Sandwich Road.

Mr. Reed presented three different long-term proposals: a Route 28 Fly-Over, an Interchange Alternative concept previously developed by MassDOT and the USACE, and a Modified Interchange Alternative. The first alternative, the Route 28 Fly-Over, has the potential of diverting approximately 2,100 vehicles destined to the Falmouth area out of the Rotary. This rotary reconfiguration will need to be closely coordinated with USACE because of its proximity to the Bourne Bridge. The second alternative is an Interchange Alternative developed by MassDOT and the Army Corps. This is a 'big build' alternative that would likely have substantial land impacts and be very expensive. It would replace the rotary with a highwayinterchange . The construction of this interchange would necessitate numerous project stages. The third alternative is a modification of the Interchange Alternative which would provide better access local roads and businesses adjacent to Route 28.

The study will also continue to evaluate potential additional infrastructure, including HOV lanes or High Occupancy Toll (HOT) lanes. This may involve a single reversible lane in the highway median or or two dedicated HOV lanes. On Routes 6 and 3, because the first exits on both sides of the Sagamore Bridge are too close to HOV lanes, it is likely that a HOV lane would extend from Exit 2 on Route 3 to Exit 2 on Route 6. This is a very complex and potentially expensive alternative and will only be considered if other alternatives are not effective enough. Another alternative is installing HOV lanes on Route 25 to 6, but this is hard to do on curvilinear roads as opposed to straight roads. Mr. Reed then passed the presentation back to Ethan Britland.

Mr. Britland spoke about the schedule and next steps in the study. He explained, as part of our process, the study wants feedback on the alternatives presented today, before deeper analysis is conducted. Traffic volumes and directionalities were not shown on the maps since this analysis have not been completed. Next steps will include testing short-, mid- and long-term alternatives on an individual basis.

After this analysis, these alternatives will be modeled as a complete network using the Travel Demand Model. Since making changes to transportation networks shifts travel patterns, testing and analysis might not answer all questions. The study team wants to hear what might be missing from any proposed alternatives.

Mr. Britland mentioned that a large working group has been guiding the study, and they examine the alternatives in more detail. He presented the study schedule and said that recommendations for alternatives should be coming out by the end of June, yet this may change over time. He said this was not a public hearing and opened the floor for questions.

A member of the public, Bob from North Falmouth, stated that the bridges were built in 1935 and have a 50-year lifespan. He asked, "it has been over 80 years, are the bridges safe?, is the study considering rebuilding the bridges"? He also asked "Who would rebuild the bridges, the USACE or will the community wait for a federal study that might take 8 or 10 years?

Craig Martin from USACE answered. The USACE owns both bridges and is working in concert with MassDOT on the study. The bridges are safe and are tested on a routine basis. If the USACE was concerned about the safety of the bridges, there would be a weight limit on vehicles going over the bridges. This has not happened, and the bridges are safe as is. MassDOT would be the first to know if we needed to implement safety measures. USACE bridge study will be completed not too long after the MassDOT study.

Another member of the public asked if Route 44 was being studied since a lot of money was spent enhancing it. Traffic may be diverted north. It is already built it, so why not take advantage of it? Mr. Reed answered and said Route 44 is well outside the study area and will not be considered.

Kathleen Regan, from the Friends of the Bourne Rail Trail, commented and thanked the study group for the consideration of the connection to the Shining Sea Trail. She stated that an extension of the Shining Sea Trail is not only great for aesthetic value but for recreation and transportation value as well. The study should examine sidewalk connections as well.

Bill Carpenter from Buzzards Bay stated that, to him, a new bridge in the middle of the Canal would be the proper alternative. He understood that it had been ruled out due to environmental concerns. He doesn't know why this couldn't be overcome. If that were an option, would the USACE build the bridge or could the state build the bridge?

Mr. Britland said that potential environmental impact is not the only reason a mid-canal bridge alternative was dismissed for further consideration for this study. We believe that substantial transportation improvements can be achieved through improvements to the existing transportation infrastructure.

Mr. Carpenter also asked about commuter rail. He said Cape Flyer has been a success. Mr. Britland stated that MassDOT was not looking at the extension of commuter rail as part of the study. He asked if there was anyone else to speak about the commuter rail.

MassDOT Cape Cod Canal Transportation Study.
Public Informational Meeting, December 1, 2016.

Glenn Cannon from the Cape Cod Commission (CCC) stated that a pilot program is still being worked on with MassDOT. The CCC will sit down with MassDOT in December or early next year to get the process going.

A member of the audience made a comment regarding the problem of curb cuts in commercial developments that led to a lot of backup traffic. Mr. Britland said MassDOT is limited in their regulatory authority over developments like that. Curb cuts are under local jurisdiction; MassDOT just reviews them. The Town should be approached to review the planning process before the development is built. Unfortunately, this isn't in MassDOT purview.

Stephen Mealy, a Bourne Town Selectman, said he wants the third bridge to be considered again. In the long term, it might be 8 to 10 years before the bridges get replaced or repaired. He asked how long it will take.

Mr. Martin answered that their study is not a fast process. The bridges would cost several hundred million dollars each.

Mr. Mealy said he didn't want to talk about cost since it this might be 15 years from now. Environment concerns in 10 years might not be an issue. By putting the third bridge in the plan, it might push it from 15 years out to only 10 years out and encourage the federal government to fund it. He said if we didn't have the environmental issues and funding issues over our head, this is what the result would be, that is my request. Mr. Martin stated he couldn't put a timeframe on bridge replacement. Mr. Mealy said it would probably take 15 years. Ethan Britland said that he would have a discussion with his staff regarding the third bridge.

A member of the public stated that they knew the study wasn't looking at commuter rail, but asked if buses and light rail fit into your options. He said this might alleviate the traffic problems. Commuter rail could encourage more people that would increase traffic issues. Ethan Britland said that the study is not incorporating ideas of commuter rail; it hasn't progressed far enough.

A member of the public said that he just bought a ferry and is just talking with the USACE. Mr. Britland said that he and MassDOT staff would speak with him after the meeting.

Another person in the audience asked if acceleration lanes really work because people do not often yield to traffic. Mr. Britland answered that there is currently no space to allow for acceleration. This person also said there must be a commercial or military reason to have two mammoth bridges. He asked why don't we have a series of causeway type bridges like in Florida. Other than a few garbage barges going back and forth, I have no idea why we need these large bridges. He said non-moveable bridges are required to have 125 feet of underclearance. Mr. Martin from the Army Corps responded that there are numerous commercial and military vessels that use the canal waters on a regular basis.

Someone from the public spoke about the proposed park-and-ride lot on Route 6 and 130. The Service Road to the Town of Sandwich is a very important east-west bicycling route. Make sure there it is possible to bike, walk, and take a left on the service road.

Mr. Paiewonsky stated that the outline on the presentation is around the whole parcel, but the park-and-ride won't be on the whole parcel. We won't need the whole parcel; it can be used for other connections between a park-and-ride lot and the bike trail.

Mr. Britland stated that the study team still needs to look at the parcel for grade issues, environmental impacts, and other beneficial connections. The study has not taken a deep dive into studying the issue, yet.

Another person asked why isn't JBCC a collaborator to look at a third bridge. Mr. Britland stated that JBCC is part of the study's working group and he meets with them every quarter.

Melissa Ferretti from Herring Pond Wampanoag Tribe Indian tribe said thank you for dismissing the Route 25 to Route 3 Connector alternative. She stated that there is an Indian burial hill at Scenic highway and work on the Belmont Rotary will need to be looked at carefully. Mr. Britland told Ms. Ferretti that she had been added to the working group list.

Stephen Buckley asked what is the difference between the project team versus the study team. Mr. Britland stated that it is the same thing. The same person asked if the people speaking tonight are the consultants and is this study what they think. Mr. Britland said that they are consultants. The ideas are MassDOT's and the working group.

Another person from the public said there are a couple of reasons not to build the third bridge with a roadway connection to Route 6 through JBCC. One reason is that the upper cape water supply needs to be protected, and changing this would incur an enormous resistance. The second reason is that it would bisect the training area Camp Edwards at the JBCC. Federal funding might be at risk for the National Guard and for Cape Edwards itself. This would effect the training for New England troops. This should be explained to people more. He said then there is the additional cost to maintain a third bridge.

Mark Forest seconded the idea that there should be more detail on why a third bridge idea has been dismissed. It would protect the military asset and training areas for the National Guard. He said these points should be summarized when talking about this. There was a serious analysis done for the 3rd bridge alternative.

Mr. Britland said it would go in the final report.

Another person asked about tunnels. Mr. Britland said for community and impact reasons, the study is not looking at tunnels. They cost more to build and maintain.

Attendees: Attendees are listed by name followed by their affiliation, if applicable.

- Melissa Ferretti, Herring Pond Wampanoag Tribe.
- Tom Baron.
- Sean McDonald, US Army Corps of Engineers.
- Sarah Brenna.
- Barbara Nagle.
- Stephen Mellin, Cape Cod AFS.
- Joe Grilli, HNTB Corporation.
- Amy Singelais.

MassDOT Cape Cod Canal Transportation Study.
Public Informational Meeting, December 1, 2016.

- Gene Morrow.
- Ed Hollingshead, Stantec.
- Patrick Tierney, Michael Baker International.
- Pam Alden.
- Phil Goddard, Bourne resident.
- Nick Schulz.
- Lisa Lefkovitz, Battelle.
- Stephen Buckley, OpenChatham.com.
- Pamela Haznar, MassDOT.
- Mark Forest, The Delahunt Group.
- Jim Reardon, The Middlesex Corporation.
- Andy Costa, Cape Cod Marine Services.
- Frank Mahady, FXM Associates.
- Fred DaCosta.
- Gary Dayton, Bourne resident.
- Catie Williams.
- Bill Burbank, Sandwich resident.
- Ethan Genter, Cape Cod Times.
- Lt. Brandon Esip, Bourne Police Department.
- Chris Farrell, Massachusetts Maritime Academy.
- Glenn Cannon, Cape Cod Commission.
- Stacy Duffany.
- Melanie DeRosa, resident.
- Chris Adams, Cape Cod Chamber.
- Sgt. John Kotfila, Mass State Police.
- H. Carter Hunt, Jr., Mass Development.
- Tom Leonard.
- Wayne Lamson, Steamship Authority.
- Ed DeWitt, Association to Preserve Cape Cod.
- Mike Burns, Nantucket Planning & Economic Development Commission.
- Len Pinaud, MassDEP.
- Marie Oliva, Cape Cod Canal Region Chamber of Commerce.
- Dave Vieira, MA State Representative.
- Kathleen Regan, Friends of the Bourne Rail Trail.
- M. McCabe, Bourne resident.
- Bob Dwyer, Pocasset Village Association.
- Kathy Dwyer, Pocasset Village Association.
- Leighton Peck, Weston & Sampson.
- Bradshaw Lupton, piRshared.
- Stephen Mealy, Town of Bourne.
- Douglas Hagerman.
- Michael Rausch, Bourne Enterprise.
- Walt Nagle, resident.
- Marcie Redmond, resident.

MassDOT Cape Cod Canal Transportation Study.
Public Informational Meeting, December 1, 2016.

- Steve Volucas.
- Jim Dervay, Walsh Group.
- Robert Young, North Falmouth.
- Bill Carpenter, resident.
- Valerie Caron, resident.
- Joseph Roy, resident.
- Andrew Costa, Cape Cod Marine.
- Rich Riker, Cape Cod Technology Council board member.
- Bill Kretowicz, Bourne resident.
- Kathy Kretowicz, Bourne resident.
- Craig Martin, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.
- Ethan Britland, MassDOT.
- Michael Paiewonsky, Stantec.
- Bill Reed, Stantec.
- Fred Moseley, Stantec.
- David Perloff, Stantec.
- Steve Cecil, Harriman.