

Hyannis Access Study

**Task Force Meeting
Friday, May 12, 2006
1:00 PM**

**Barnstable Town Hall
Barnstable, Massachusetts**

Attendance

Task Force Members and Public who signed in:

George Allaire	Yarmouth DPW	Rick Angelini	Hyannis COC
Nicholas Ary	Zion Union Church	Demetrius Atsalis	State Representative
Robert Berry	Resident	Manila Bryan	Zion Union Church
Robert Burgmann	Barn. Town Engineer	Anthony Campbell	Zion Union Church
Ann Canedy	Barnstable Town Council	Mark Carmichael	MassHighway Dist. 5
Cynthia Cole	Main Street BID	Andrew Court	Independence Park Inc.
Chris Court	Independence Park Inc.	Judy Crocker	Comm for Will Crocker
J Crowell	CC Cooperative Bank	Patricia Cruz	Zion Union Church
Jennifer Doyle	MassRIDES	Robert Edwards	Resident
Mark Ells	Barnstable DPW	Peter Fisher	Centerville Civic Assoc.
Maggie Geist	Assoc. to Preserve CC	Allen Goddard	Hyannis Civic Assoc.
Shirley Gomes	State Representative	Rev. Bernard Harris	Zion Union Church
Kelly Jones	Zion Union Church	Maria Jones	Shepley Wood Products
Michael Jones	Cape Cod Healthcare	Ed Lambert	Cape Cod Aggregates
Paul Lebel	Resident	Lev Malakhoff	Cape Cod Commission
Robert Miceli	MassBike	Quincy Mosby	Barn. Municipal Airport
Thomas Mullen	Barnstable Land Trust	Bob Mumford	Cape Cod Commission
David Munsell	Barn. Planning Board	Paul Niedzwiecki	Barn. Asst. Town Mgr
Wendy Northcross	Cape Cod COC	Robert L. O'Brien	Steamship Authority
Robert O'Leary	State Senate	Anne Perrault	Resident
Michel Perrault	Resident	Edward Pesce	Pesce Engr & Assoc
Joe Potzka	CC Regnl Transit Authority	Lynne Poyant	Town of Barnstable
Sue Rohrbach	Senator O'Leary	Earl Rue	Zion Union Church
Stephen Seymour	Town of Barnstable	Karen Simmons	Zion Union Church
Michele Simmons	Zion Union Church	Michael Sives	Cape Destinations
Brian Sullivan	WQRC News	Mark Thompson	Independence Park Inc.
Harold Tobey	Barnstable Town Council	Ruth Weil	Barn. Growth Mgmt Dir
Larry Wheatley	Barn. Airport Commission		

Executive Office of Transportation staff:

Tom Cahir	Deputy Secretary for Transportation Programs
Bob Frey	Manager of Statewide Planning, Office of Transportation Planning
Adriel Edwards	Office of Transportation Planning, Study Project Manager
Douglas Carnahan	Planning
Rachel Bain	Planning

Meeting Summary

Welcome and Administrative Items

Tom Cahir, Deputy Secretary of Transportation Programs, opened the meeting and welcomed all Task Force members and the large number of public attendees. He said he was pleased to look around the room and see many people who have contributed greatly over the years to making this area better. He said that this study seeks to continue those collaborative group efforts. He then spoke about the many changes that are taking place in the area, including a number of transportation projects. He said that although some people may be discouraged that the Executive Office of Transportation (EOT) is conducting another study, the complexities and long-term impacts require a careful and comprehensive new look at the area. He touched briefly on the restructuring of the transportation agencies, and expressed confidence in the Planning office. He said that EOT now directly oversees the Office of Transportation Planning, and as a result, the Planning office is more multi-modal than in years past.

Bob Frey, the Office of Transportation Planning's manager of the Statewide Planning Group, explained that planning studies often save a project significant time and money. He said that a transportation project need public support to be successful, and planning studies achieve this by engaging the public and working through challenging issues early in the process. This may avoid more expensive delays during the implementation phases. He assured attendees that the previous studies would be used as background information, but at the same time, this study would take a fresh look. He then led introductions of the Task Force members. Senator Robert O'Leary said he was pleased at the turnout for the meeting and expressed enthusiasm for the study. He echoed comments made by Tom Cahir and Bob Frey reflecting the importance of a comprehensive look at the area. Representative Demetrius Atsalis stated that his primary interest in this study is to see Exit 6 ½ implemented. He expressed frustration and disappointment that the state is initiating another study, especially since it will take 12 months. He also expressed a concern repeated later by some members of the public audience that the Task Force seemed to contain too many stakeholders who would be "anti - 6 ½".

Role of the Task Force

Bob Frey said the Task Force would serve the dual roles of an advisory group to EOT and a sounding board for the public. He said that the term "Task Force" is used because members would have "tasks" over the course of the study. This would mainly involve reading and commenting on the study documents as they are produced, and involving other members of the public in the process, which encourages everyone to work toward common goals. He stressed that no votes would be taken because that tends to polarize the group, and voting sometimes has the effect of drowning out minority voices. Bob stated that he hoped people wouldn't view the issues solely as "pro-Exit 6 ½" or "anti-Exit 6 ½," and that this study should not turn into a referendum on the potential interchange. Bob stated that all Task Force meetings are open to the public. In addition, three public informational meetings will be held at key milestones. There are also plans to have a study website, where meeting notices, summaries and a variety of study materials would be available for all. The main roles of EOT in the process are to listen to everyone, oversee and facilitate the work of the consultant, and work closely with the Task Force and public to develop well-supported recommendations. There will be substantial opportunity for Task Force and public involvement throughout the study.

Study Process

Bob then reviewed the document “Standard Process for Transportation Studies” which was distributed via e-mail prior to the meeting and also provided as a handout at the meeting. He explained that the first step establishes common goals and objectives within an agreed-upon study area and defines how solutions will be evaluated. Another important part of step one is the public participation plan, which outlines how the public will be involved throughout the study. He then reviewed step two - existing conditions, issues and evaluation - saying that the purpose is to lay the groundwork for the development of alternatives. Regarding alternatives development (step three) he described the importance of the “no-build” option, saying that all the other alternatives are compared to it, and it is referenced in the environmental stage of every project. In step four, qualitative and quantitative, subjective and non-subjective judgments would all play a part in the evaluation of alternatives. The evaluation of alternatives would not be reduced to a simple ranking. Here again he stressed the importance of public participation, saying that all voices, not just those of the Task Force, would be heard. Regarding step five, he highlighted some of the non-highway elements, such as transportation demand management, that would likely be part of a package of recommendations. Bob stated that three public meetings are usually part of the process, with the first meeting occurring after the existing conditions are solidified. The first public meeting introduces the public to the study and gives them an update on the progress so far. The second public meeting occurs after some alternatives development has been done, and some draft solutions are ready for discussion. The purpose of this meeting is to solicit input regarding the draft solutions. The third public meeting presents the results and offers the public another opportunity to comment before the report is finalized.

Adriel Edwards, the Study’s project manager, reviewed the scope of work, which was distributed prior to the meeting via email and was also provided as a handout at the meeting. She expressed enthusiasm for the study especially since she grew up in Yarmouth and is very familiar with the area and its transportation challenges. Adriel described the scope of work as a greatly expanded version of the standard study process that Bob reviewed previously. It has sufficient detail so that the Task Force, EOT and the study team all understand the expectations, but at the same time there is considerable flexibility as the study progresses. She then underscored several significant aspects. She pointed out that the Cape Cod regional traffic model would be updated and additional geographic detail would be added to test the proposed alternatives. She also asked attendees to note that a variety of non-highway options would be explicitly included as part of the alternatives development. She asked if everyone had had a chance to review the scope of work and had any questions, comments or additions. Bob Mumford commented that the ongoing and upcoming work on Route 132 and at the airport should be included in the scope of work. As there were no other questions or comments, Adriel asked that all attendees return comments to her by Friday, May 19th. She said her intention was to finalize the scope of work the following week so that they could begin to work with the consultant.

Bob Frey informed attendees that TranSystems would be the consultant for this project and the Task Force would meet them at the next meeting. They would attend every meeting after this one. Bob invited Douglas Carnahan to list some of TranSystems’ projects. Doug explained that TranSystems is a highly respected, talented, nationwide firm that focuses exclusively on transportation projects. Their expertise includes highway and structural planning and engineering, transit planning, and analysis of economic and environmental impacts of transportation facilities. The company has done many studies in Massachusetts over the years. He highlighted the Route 2/Crosby’s Corner project because it has similar elements to the Hyannis Access Study, including strong public involvement, and complicated

and competing land use issues. Wendy Northcross asked if that project was complete. The study is complete, but it has not been fully implemented yet.

Mark Thompson, Independence Park, asked if the public would be informed of every meeting and how they would participate during the Task Force meetings. Bob replied that the public would be informed of every Task Force meeting and would be welcome to attend any and all of the Task Force meetings. However, agenda items would be covered first with Task Force members. If time permits at the end of each Task Force meeting, members of the public would be invited to make comments or ask questions. He stressed that there will be ample opportunity for public input throughout the study, again referencing the three public informational meetings and the planned study website. Mr. Thompson expressed concern that the Task Force was weighted against a new exit 6 ½ interchange. He asked how the Task Force was formed. Bob replied that it was a collaborative effort between Senator O'Leary's office, the Town of Barnstable, the Cape Cod Commission, and our Planning office. Every effort was made – with the information available at the time – to create a Task Force representing diverse interests.

Robert Berry, a resident of Barnstable, expressed interest in reviewing the parameters of the regional traffic model that would be used to test the recommended study alternatives.

Representative Shirley Gomes from Harwich requested that a voice from the lower Cape be added to the Task Force. She felt the impacts from this project would affect the entire Cape and thought the Task Force should reflect this. Bob Frey noted that the study would take a regional approach, as outlined in the scope of work. Barnstable resident Manila Bryan expressed concern that the Task Force did not contain a layperson or sufficient resident representation. Adriel responded that Planning made an effort to include residents' voices and that two people representing local civic associations were on the Task Force to serve that purpose. Cynthia Cole echoed Representative Atsalis' earlier comments that 12 months is too long. She wanted the study process shortened. Bob Frey responded that by engaging a consultant that was already hired for an ongoing transportation study, at least six months had been saved. He also reiterated the importance of taking the time to do a good job and building consensus for recommendations. Harold Tobey introduced himself as the Barnstable Town Council's appointed liaison to the Exit 6 ½ project. He felt he should serve on the Task Force because of his significant involvement previously. Tom Mullen addressed comments indicating that some people may be against a new interchange. He said that he was not "for" or "against" Exit 6 ½, but wanted to see a project that was good for the town and the Cape. Having a right process would lead to good decisions that would serve the community for many decades. Ed Lambert of Cape Cod Aggregates advised Planning that there are many existing sources of data useful to the study such as those available from the Cape Cod Commission.

Addressing comments that there was not enough advanced notice for this meeting, Ann Canedy offered to provide information to any residents regarding upcoming meetings, until the website makes this information more readily available to a wider audience.

Bob Frey responded to the audience saying that Planning understands there are still concerns about the Task Force membership. Therefore, he stated that Planning would review the membership and try to make some adjustments. Bob also addressed concerns about the length of time that the study will take, saying that Planning is undertaking this process – doing what it is charged to do – as directed by the Secretary of Transportation. Planning will make every effort to complete the study in a timely

manner. Rick Angelini asked if May 12, 2007 could be cited in the scope of work as a deadline for the final report. Bob and Tom Cahir advised against this, saying that it is important to not rush through when consensus is needed for a successful project. Adriel concluded the meeting by describing the work that would take place until the next meeting. The scope of work will be finalized; task one documents will be drafted, as will the summer's data collection plan. The next meeting date was set *tentatively* for Tuesday, June 20th in the morning with the exact time and location to be determined.