

(Page 2-2)

Chapter 2: Project Development

and public works professionals, citizens, or consultants. Real partnerships require ongoing relationships of trust and collaboration.

The project development process is one of a set of tools needed to achieve context-sensitive design. The process is structured to encourage public outreach throughout planning, design, environmental review, and construction so that those affected by transportation projects are in general agreement regarding the project's need, the selected approach to meet this need, and the refinements to the project that result as the process evolves. Section 2.9 of this chapter overviews public outreach approaches and tools to assist in establishing an effective project development process.

This project development process is complemented by the inclusion of the project's context as a basic design control. Flexibility for determining specific design elements that satisfy the project need, and are responsive to the context of the project, is inherent in the subsequent chapters of this Guidebook.

Applicable Projects



Project proponents are required to follow the process described in this chapter whenever MassHighway is involved in the decision-making process. The project development procedures are, therefore, applicable to any of the following situations:

- When MassHighway is the proponent; or
- When MassHighway is responsible for project funding (state or federal-aid projects); or
- When MassHighway controls the infrastructure (projects on state highways).

In addition to MassHighway, many other agencies and organizations may be involved in a project. These procedures are written to be a useful resource for projects that are locally sponsored, funded, and reviewed, as well as for those which fall under the jurisdiction of other Massachusetts authorities. Projects with local jurisdiction and local funding sources are not required to go through this review process unless the project is located on the National Highway or Federal-Aid Systems. Proponents designing projects on local roads, however, may benefit from the project development steps outlined in this chapter and the design guidance found in subsequent chapters.

* 12/15/14: Stephen Buckley will forward (cc:) the MPO with an email containing web-links in his planned response to MASSDOT. January 2006



Deval L. Patrick, Governor
Frank DePaola, Acting Secretary & CEO

2 of 5
massDOT
Massachusetts Department of Transportation

December 9, 2014

Mr. Stephen Buckley
15T Balfour Lane
Chatham, MA 02633

Dear Mr. Buckley:

Thank you for your e-mail inquiry concerning the level of public participation performed by the Town of Chatham (Town) and its consultant for the improvement of Route 28 between George Ryder Road and Barn Hill Road and compliance with guidelines established in the Project Development and Design Guide (Guide). The Guide establishes suggested actions for public outreach during the project identification and initiation process. [These actions vary depending on the project type.

→ see Guide P. 2-2: "required" ← !!

During the initial stages of project development, the proposal was presented at several public informational meetings and Board of Selectmen meetings where alternatives were presented and public comment solicited. After the project was approved by the Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) for Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) eligibility and further development, the Town continued with a robust public outreach process. This included developing a public involvement plan, a project specific website, and the establishment of specific office hours for the public to discuss the project and provide comments to the project designers. Additional public outreach was also provided at a public informational meeting and Board of Selectmen meetings.

In the opinion of MassDOT, the process followed by the Town and its consultant were consistent with the guidelines established in the Project Development and Design Guide. Considering the scope and nature of the project, the level of public participation undertaken by the Town has exceeded that which is normally undertaken for other similar projects during the preliminary design process.

Sincerely,

Frank DePaola, P.E.
Acting Secretary & CEO

cc: David Mohler, Executive Director, OTP
Patricia Leavenworth, P.E., Chief Engineer
Mary-Joe Perry, District 5 Highway Director

Ten Park Plaza, Suite 4160, Boston, MA 02116
Tel: 857-368-4636, TTY: 857-368-0655

Frank DePaola, 10:55 PM 11/20/2014, Public Participation; MassDOT oversight for compliance on

To: Frank DePaola <frank.depaola@state.ma.us>
From: Stephen Buckley <sbuckley@igc.org>
Subject: Public Participation; MassDOT oversight for compliance on
Cc: Clinton Bench <clinton.bench@state.ma.us>, Mark Guenard <mark.guenard@state.ma.us>, Michael Furlong <michael.furlong@state.ma.us>, Thomas Currier <thomas.currier2@state.ma.us>, Pamela Haznar <pamela.haznar@state.ma.us>, Mary-Joe Perry <mary-joe.perry@dot.state.ma.us>, Jill Goldsmith <jgoldsmith@chatham-ma.gov>, Gloria Freeman <freeannie@comcast.net>, Tim Wood <twood@capecodchronicle.com>
Bcc: govinders@earthlink.net, openchatham@googlegroups.com
Attached:

To: Frank DePaola <frank.depaola@state.ma.us>
From: Stephen Buckley <sbuckley@igc.org>
Subject: Public Participation; MassDOT oversight for compliance on
Cc: Clinton Bench <clinton.bench@state.ma.us>, Mark Guenard <mark.guenard@state.ma.us>, Michael Furlong <michael.furlong@state.ma.us>, Thomas Currier <thomas.currier2@state.ma.us>, Pamela Haznar <pamela.haznar@state.ma.us>, Mary-Joe Perry <mary-joe.perry@dot.state.ma.us>, Jill Goldsmith <jgoldsmith@chatham-ma.gov>, Gloria Freeman <freeannie@comcast.net>, Tim Wood <twood@capecodchronicle.com>
Bcc: govinders@earthlink.net, openchatham@googlegroups.com
Attached:

To: Frank DePaola <frank.depaola@state.ma.us>
From: Stephen Buckley <sbuckley@igc.org>
Subject: Public Participation; MassDOT oversight for compliance on
Cc: Clinton Bench <clinton.bench@state.ma.us>, Mark Guenard <mark.guenard@state.ma.us>, Michael Furlong <michael.furlong@state.ma.us>, Thomas Currier <thomas.currier2@state.ma.us>, Pamela Haznar <pamela.haznar@state.ma.us>, Mary-Joe Perry <mary-joe.perry@dot.state.ma.us>, Jill Goldsmith <jgoldsmith@chatham-ma.gov>, Gloria Freeman <freeannie@comcast.net>, Tim Wood <twood@capecodchronicle.com>
Bcc: govinders@earthlink.net, openchatham@googlegroups.com
Attached:

Mr. Francis DePaola
MassDOT Highway Division Administrator
10 Park Plaza, Room 4160
Boston MA 02116-3973
also via: frank.depaola@state.ma.us

November 20, 2014

Subj: Public Participation; MassDOT oversight for compliance on

Dear Mr. Paola,

Frank DePaola, 10:55 PM 11/20/2014, Public Participation; MassDOT oversight for compliance on

I am writing to request an official opinion from MassDOT as to whether a project proponent has complied with the specific requirements for Public Participation, as specified in MassDOT "Project Development and Design Guide" (2006), with regard to the project proposed for Route 28 in West Chatham (Project # 606596).

I have already raised this issue a number of times this year at meetings of the Cape Cod MPO (Metropolitan Planning Organization) where Pamela Haznar, MassHighway District 5, has participated as your representative. However, the only response that I have received has been dismissive and only verbal (i.e., unofficial). I believe that the following information is enough to justify further investigation by MassDOT.

During the Spring 2013 Town Meeting in Chatham, its citizens were so frustrated with the public planning process for the Route 28 project in West Chatham that they voted for the Town to withdraw (p. 30) from the process altogether. But, because the Board of Selectmen were not bound by that vote, they continued with the process, promising that the new (i.e, fourth) consultant would finally present the public with a "slew of options" to review.

Six months later, however, at the Board of Selectmen's meeting of 11/12/13, under an agenda item referred to merely as an "Update", the consultant made a power-point presentation of its roadway study, followed by the Selectmen deciding (at the video's 02:46:00 mark) to go forward with the consultant's recommended design alternative ... all without any opportunity to the public to review documents (because there weren't any) before a decision was made. (!)

While that action, of course, is in stark contrast to the very public promises made at the previous Town Meeting, it also contradicts your MassDOT Guide (on page 2-23) requirements for the "Project Presentation Meeting" where the proponent (Town government) is required to hold a meeting for the public "to overview the alternatives" and "to solicit input" after providing "handout materials" describing the alternatives, including a "visual depiction" of each design alternative.

I've looked at your website and can not find an office responsible for state-wide oversight on this topic, so that is why I am contacting you. I would be glad to share additional background and details with whomever you designate.

By copy of this letter to the Chatham Board of Selectmen (via the Town Manager), I am also requesting that this matter of (non)compliance be added as an Agenda Item for discussion at a future Board meeting. I expect that they may already be preparing to discuss this matter, as I publicly raised the issue in the Cape Cod Chronicle (11/6/14) as a "Letter to the Editor" (see below).

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at the number below.

sincerely,

Stephen Buckley
15T Balfour Lane
Chatham, MA 02633
(508) 348-9090
<http://www.twitter.com/OpenChatham.com>

P.S. As a retired federal engineer experienced in Public Engagement, I am also interested in helping MassDOT to improve its efforts to involve the affected public in a timely and meaningful way (e.g., the "Third Bridge" proposal for Cape Cod Canal). As a Cape Cod native, it is fascinating to see the local variety of approaches for Public Engagement, which is valuable for comparison with my peers at the national level.

collaboration engineer @OpenGovMetrics
<http://www.OpenGovMetrics.com>

=====

Cape Cod Chronicle, Chatham Edition 11/06/2014, Page 23
Public Hasn't Seen All Options

Editor:

In his recent letter ("**Changes Sought in Project,**" Oct. 30), David Burns reported on some of the public comments about the West Chatham Route 28 turning lane that were made to Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) at the Cape Cod Commission on Oct. 20. I understand how the MPO would prefer that we *not continue our years of back and forth* at their meetings over the issue of the turning lane. What is different now, however, is that the MPO (and MassDOT) has been made aware, since last spring, that the citizens of Chatham have not been properly informed by their town government, in accordance with MassDOT requirements, about a third design option presented by the town government's traffic consultant last **November**.

During that presentation, the consultant spoke to the board of selectmen about a third option, in addition to the status quo (existing layout) and a two-lane design (no turning lane). He called it "Left-turn with Turning Pockets," **which is a raised median with occasional openings to shift** over and allow a left turn without holding up traffic. It also improves crosswalk safety by providing an island **between** two lanes of traffic. However, the consultant's presentation did not show any "visual depiction" that would inform the public what this third option would look like. That is specifically required by MassDOT's "Project Development and Design Guide."

I pointed out this failure to the board of selectmen (and the consultant) in an email during the public comment period last December, but have never gotten a response.

To see a drawing of a "Left-turn with Turning Pockets", i.e., the third option that you should have been shown a year ago, go to www.bit.ly/1bvHm9H . You can also find it, along with the MassDOT Guide (see page 2-23), at OpenChatham.com (scroll down to links for December 2013). I am also waiting to hear from MassDOT about their review of this project for non-compliance with their requirements for public planning.

Stephen Buckley
Chatham