



TOWN OF FAIRHAVEN, MASSACHUSETTS  
**PLANNING BOARD**  
Town Hall · 40 Center Street · Fairhaven, MA 02719

**MEETING MINUTES**

**Wednesday, September 4, 2024 at 6:00 pm**

**Held both at Town Hall & Remotely via Zoom**

**1. GENERAL BUSINESS:**

- a) **Chair's Welcome and Media Notification:** Madame Chair, Ms. Cathy Melanson, opened the meeting at 6:18 PM and advised who was present. The media notification was written on the agenda for the meeting and thus was not read aloud.

Ms. Melanson explained that the Board would conduct their general business first and then would recess the meeting until the scheduled Public Hearing start time of 6:30 PM.

- b) **Quorum/Attendance: Present:** Cathy Melanson, Patrick Carr, Sharon Simmons, Jessica Fidalgo, Kevin Grant, Ruy daSilva, Diane Tomassetti, and Rick Trapilo in Town Hall.

**Absent:** None

Recording Secretary Stephanie Fidalgo and Conservation Agent Bruce Webb were present in Town Hall.

c) **Minutes:**

1. **August 7, 2024, drafts to be reviewed:**

Ms. Tomassetti made a motion to accept the minutes of August 7, 2024, with typo corrections, and was seconded by Mr. Trapilo.

Ms. Tomassetti noted the typos on pages 3 and 4 to correct before the minutes were finalized and forwarded to the Town Clerk.

**The motion passed unanimously. (8-0)**

d) **Correspondence:**

There was no general correspondence for this meeting.

e) **Board Elections:**

1. **Buzzards Bay Water Quality Working Group Appointee**

The Select Board was working to form a Buzzards Bay Water Quality Working Group and requested that the Planning Board appoint a representative to the group. Ms. Melanson

recommended Mr. Trapilo serve as the representative, given his personal interest and advocacy on the issue.

**Ms. Melanson made a motion to appoint Rick Trapilo to the Buzzards Bay Water Quality Working Group and was seconded by Mr. Grant. The motion passed unanimously. (8-0)**

## **2. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

- a. **SP 24-02 36 Francis Street ADU:** Special Permit proposal for the total conversion of the existing garage at 36 Francis Street (Map 12, Lot 135) into an Accessory Dwelling Unit, submitted by Jessica Whiteley. ***Continued from June 25, 2024. Applicant requests to be withdrawn without prejudice.***

**Ms. Simmons made a motion to withdraw the application without prejudice and was seconded by Mr. Grant. The motion passed unanimously. (8-0)**

During the time spent waiting for the appointed start of the next Public Hearing, Ms. Melanson requested a moment of silence for the victims of the school shooting at Apalachee High School in Winder, GA that had occurred earlier that day.

Ms. Melanson inquired as to who was watching the meeting via Zoom, with Recording Secretary Fidalgo noting Fairhaven TV, the BPW, Ann Richard, and NTV in attendance.

The Board and public engaged in casual, unrelated conversation while waiting.

- b. **40R – Fairhaven Smart Growth Overlay District (FSGOD) Bylaw and Maps (Starting at 6:30 PM):** Presentation and review of the proposed amendment of the Fairhaven Zoning Bylaw to establish the Fairhaven Smart Growth Overlay District (FSGOD) and accompanying Zoning Maps entitled, “Fairhaven 40R Smart Growth Overlay 4-2 Smart Growth Zoning Map (Plaza Area SGOD)” and “Fairhaven 40R Smart Growth Overlay 4-2 Smart Growth Zoning Map (Waterfront SGOD),” prepared by Dodson & Flinker and dated 6/19/24. ***Continued from August 7, 2024.***

Ms. Melanson read the Public Hearing information and opened the Public Hearing.

Attorney Adam Costa of Mead, Talerman & Costa presented to the Board. At the last meeting, Mr. Costa had gone over the Town’s history with crafting a 40R bylaw and had discussed the law with both the Board and the public. In response to questions raised at the previous meeting, he would be presenting some additional information. By the end of this meeting, he wished to receive feedback from the Board on the Bylaw, following the form of the model bylaw. The Executive Office of Housing and Livable Communities (EOHLC) was reviewing the application and the bylaw, and he would need to inform them if there were any meaningful revisions. He did not recommend closing the public hearing as the Board may need more time to draft their report and recommendation to Town Meeting. The EOHLC could also request revisions, so the Board

81 could require one more meeting to finalize any revisions ahead of Town Meeting.

82  
83 Mr. Dillon Sussman of Dodson & Flinker joined the meeting via Zoom to answer additional  
84 questions.

85  
86 Attorney Costa presented a chart listing all the 40R districts in the State as of May 2024. *[See*  
87 *Attachment A.]* He covered the data covered by the chart, as well as what data he would have  
88 liked to see such as a comparison between the number of units allowed under base zoning as  
89 compared to 40R and notes on the amount of substantially developed land included in those  
90 districts. He noted that many districts were not fully built out and several had not seen any new  
91 units built since the municipality adopted the bylaw. Fairhaven's proposed 40R district was on  
92 the larger side, though there were several that were larger, and Fairhaven's included a far  
93 higher percentage of substantial developed land. He also made note of the project-specific 40R  
94 districts that covered a single development.

95  
96 The next two charts were related and focused on affordability standards under 40R, the first  
97 being centered on how affordability was defined and calculated *[See Attachment B].* 40R  
98 districts were required to have at least 20% of all housing units created to be affordable to  
99 households making 80% of the area's median income, as defined by the US Department of  
100 Housing and Urban Development (HUD). For the New Bedford Metro Area, which included  
101 Fairhaven, the median family income for 2024 was calculated at \$91,300 per year. The Low  
102 (80%) threshold for an individual was calculated at \$61,350 per year and a family of four was  
103 calculated at \$87,600 per year. Attorney Costa also outlined the limits set for 30% and 50% of  
104 the median income for the area.

105  
106 Following up on those points, Attorney Costa then showed the chart detailing the average  
107 earnings for different industries in the Providence-Warwick area as of 2022 *[See Attachment C].*  
108 The chart included the average annual earnings for different sectors and compared regional  
109 averages to the national average. He noted that six industries listed would qualify for affordable  
110 housing – Farm; Retail Trade; Real Estate and Rental and Leasing; Educational Services; Arts,  
111 Entertainment, and Recreation; and Accommodation and Food Services.

112  
113 At Ms. Simmons' request, Attorney Costa explained the Affirmative Fair Housing Marketing  
114 and Resident Selection Plan (AFHMP) guidelines. Units would need to be advertised in the local  
115 metro area and applicants would have to fill out forms and provide proof that they qualified for  
116 affordable housing. Fairhaven's proposed 40R bylaw also included a local preference pool  
117 provision to allow 70% of the affordable units to go to local residents. The local preference pool  
118 though would be subject to adjustments in order to prevent the discrimination of protected  
119 classes during the lottery process.

120  
121 Mr. Grant wished to know what happened when an individual or household that had previously  
122 been deemed eligible for affordable housing began to earn above the set income level. Attorney

Costa explained that there was a recertification process for renters and that for single-family houses, there would be restrictions placed into the deed rider that limited how much the house could be sold for and required the home to be their primary residence.

Mr. Trapilo requested information on the acreage included in the proposed 40R districts and the total number of units. Attorney Costa noted that there were approximately 88 acres included and the potential for 1713 units, though removing the substantially developed areas from consideration brought the number of potential units down to 1279.

Mr. Carr discussed the buildout percentages of different 40R districts, including the fact 33% of all 40R districts had yet to build any new units since adopting the bylaw. He then asked if Fairhaven could expect to see 1279 units built out in the future and Attorney Costa did not think that would be likely to occur within the next 15 years. He then covered the differences between project-based 40R bylaws – specifically citing the Sharon Commons project he had worked on – and the wider, long-term, vision-based 40R bylaws designed for redevelopment and revitalization, such as the one proposed for Fairhaven.

There was a side conversation between Mr. Carr and Attorney Costa about the density levels and application processes under 40R and 40B, centered on the potential Sun Harbor project on Middle Street. The project requested 60 units under 40B, whereas only 43 units would be allowed under the base density defined in the 40R bylaw. Attorney Costa noted that Section 7 of the proposed 40R bylaw did allow waivers for increased density if specific offset measures were taken with the project.

Attorney Costa then went into detail on how affordable units and the lotteries for them would operate, including how the lottery agent would have to create proportional mixes of applicants based on protected classes to avoid any disparate impacts on members of those protected classes.

Ms. Melanson opened the floor to public comments on the previous discussions at this meeting.

Ms. Michelle Costen of 54 Spring Street had questions regarding the affordability of the units created within the 40R districts. Attorney Costa explained that the affordability income limits were based on the average income levels of the surrounding metropolitan area and that the developer would be able to set the rents of the market rate units in any projects within the districts. The 40R bylaw was designed to encourage an overall increase in the housing stock, with a percentage required to be affordable.

Mr. Randell Newman of 3 Mulberry Street inquired about the differences between for-rental and for-sale projects. Attorney Costa answered that the projects would either be entirely for rent or for sale and only the affordable units would be subject to specific regulations, including limits on resale price in for-sale projects. Market-rate units would be treated no differently than

any other market-rate units in any other part of the Town.

Ms. Linda Jackson of 60 Linden Avenue asked if any traffic studies had been conducted and requested information on the projected number of new residents as well as the possible benefits to the Town. Attorney Costa replied that no traffic studies had been conducted as there were no specific projects attached to the proposed 40R bylaw. There would be monetary benefits for the Town as the State did offer payments for both the adoption of a 40R bylaw as well as payments for units created within the districts, however, the bylaw would be more valuable as a planning tool to assist with revitalization and redevelopment in Fairhaven. It would also help Fairhaven meet the minimum requirements for affordable housing units in Town.

There was a side conversation regarding the application process for 40B projects, that 40R projects would not be required to perform traffic studies if they followed the design standards, and that developers would be responsible for funding any of the infrastructure improvements required by the 40R bylaw and design standards. Additionally, the BPW had confirmed that Fairhaven would have sufficient capacity to support new units. Chapter 40S could also be utilized to receive compensation from the State to cover the needs of educating additional children.

Ms. Pamela McDuffie of 44 Bridge Street inquired about the differences in project approval under Chapters 40R and 40B. Attorney Costa explained that 40R allowed for greater control over the types of projects allowed via the bylaw regulations and accompanying design standards, whereas projects created under Chapter 40B would have a wider range of allowances and waivers offered under the comprehensive permit and could seek an appeal from the State in case the project was denied by the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Ms. Ann Richard of 46 Hedge Street raised a concern about the overlap of members of the Planning Board and the Zoning Board of Appeals given that projects pursued under Chapter 40B would receive comprehensive permits from the Zoning Board. While Attorney Costa was willing to discuss comparisons about 40R and 40B, he requested that the discussion remain focused on the proposed 40R bylaw as a planning tool for Fairhaven as the process to craft it had begun before any 40B proposals were formally presented to the Town.

There was a brief argument when Ms. Michelle Costen requested to speak again which ended with her expressing her frustrations with the proceedings and leaving the meeting.

Ms. Despina Longinidis of 101 Washington Street expressed her concerns over the possible conflict of interest with sitting Planning Board members who owned property in the proposed 40R Waterfront District being a part of the public hearing discussion. She also raised concerns about whether the Town truly had the infrastructure needed to support the number of proposed new units. At the request of Ms. Melanson, BPW Superintendent Vinnie Furtado explained that the Town had both sewer and water capacity to support the new units and that

207 the BPW was working on upgrading the Town's water filtration system.

208  
209 The discussion then turned to the contents of the proposed 40R bylaw.

210  
211 Ms. Fidalgo inquired about the possibility of the Waterfront District being changed to a site-  
212 specific 40R district, given the concerns raised about density. Attorney Costa explained that the  
213 project-specific 40R bylaws he had previously worked on covered more than a single property  
214 and often had multifaceted components. However, having the 40R bylaw apply only to a single  
215 property along the Waterfront would constitute spot zoning. Additionally, the Waterfront was  
216 proposed as a whole district re-zoning both in its original incarnation and when it was  
217 reintroduced to the proposed 40R bylaw.

218  
219 Attorney Costa cautioned the Board that if they wished to either remove or separate the  
220 Waterfront District from the Plaza District, he would need to know as of this meeting given the  
221 timeline for review by the EOHLC as well as for having the Bylaw ready for the fall Town  
222 Meeting. He explained to the Board how the vote and articles would need to be formatted for  
223 Town Meeting and that he would need to speak with EOHLC if it was possible to split the article  
224 and still receive their approval.

225  
226 Ms. Fidalgo asked if there could be a definition for "Civic Use" in the bylaw, given that  
227 Dartmouth and Amesbury both included definitions of their recreation use. Mr. Sussman  
228 assured that he could add a definition to the Design Standards, which would be easier to amend  
229 and edit in the future. There was also a conversation regarding the setbacks and height levels  
230 allowed. Attorney Costa also covered how the 40R bylaw would allow for redevelopment and  
231 infill in substantially developed areas and how the bylaw included a waiver provision for the  
232 Plan Approval Authority. Mr. Sussman also explained that the Design Standards had guidelines  
233 for new developments to match the architectural character of the Districts and the Town as a  
234 whole. Mr. Sussman also provided information regarding the differences in units allowed under  
235 base zoning as compared to the 40R, and that the higher density was allowed in the Waterfront  
236 given the existing density.

237  
238 Mr. Carr inquired about the possibility of removing the Waterfront District from the proposed  
239 40R Districts and focusing solely on the Plaza District. Attorney Costa explained that the EOHLC  
240 was currently reviewing the proposed bylaw and accompanying application documents and  
241 requesting a major revision at this point would most likely result in the bylaw not being ready  
242 for approval at the fall Special Town Meeting. Additionally, the Select Board would also be the  
243 body to decide on the Waterfront Districts' inclusion.

244  
245 Mr. Trapilo supported the possibility of dividing the 40R Districts into separate Town Meeting  
246 Articles. He also stated his support for Mr. Furtado's work on improving the Town's  
247 infrastructure.

Mr. Grant outlined his thoughts regarding the redistricting of the Waterfront District as it was added back into the proposal due to the possible development on Middle Street. Now that Sun Harbor had made a proposal to the Select Board to pursue the project under Chapter 40B, it appeared to be a “friendly” 40B project and if so, there might not be a pressing reason to keep the Waterfront District in the proposed 40R bylaw and districts. Additionally, he did support the possibility of splitting the article. He also still had concerns regarding the heights allowed in the Plaza District.

Attorney Costa assured that he would speak to the Town Administrator and EOHLC regarding the possibility of splitting the two Districts.

Ms. Simmons requested more information regarding how the maximum height levels were set. Mr. Sussman confirmed that 45 feet was the set maximum height for the Waterfront, and the Plaza would be staggered from 55 feet to 65 feet to 75 feet, the lower heights being the closest to the street. He also brought up the popularity and development viability of “5-over-1” developments, with either retail or amenity spaces being placed on the ground floor with apartments on the floors above. Mr. Sussman also emphasized the importance of redevelopment of underused parking lots. Ms. Fidalgo also noted that the power lines that ran through the Plazas would restrict development further.

Attorney Costa also covered the balancing act between creating viable design standards and the ability of the Plan Approval Authority to grant waivers, which he usually saw as requests for minor adjustments. Mr. Sussman also discussed the importance of crafting a bylaw that could both meet the needs and visions of the Town and that had a solid possibility of being approved by both the State and Town Meeting. Attorney Costa also noted that limiting the proposed height could also lower the proposed density levels to below the EOHLC’s minimum requirements.

Ms. Melanson once again opened the floor to the public.

Mr. Randell Newman of requested to speak again and asked about height allowances. Attorney Costa covered the nuances of the height allowances and how they intertwined with the required density levels. Ms. Melanson expressed her support for the heights as presented.

Mr. daSilva inquired if developers created “5-over-1” style buildings, if the ground floor had to have a business requirement, and Attorney Costa answered that there was no mixed-use requirement, but it would be allowed and encouraged for any new development.

Ms. Tomassetti expressed her support for keeping the Waterfront District in the 40R Bylaw to maintain more control over new development and redevelopment in the area. She also voiced her support for the heights as presented.

The Board and the consultants gathered the opinions of the Board Members regarding the presented heights and the Waterfront District.

The Board all supported exploring the possibility of splitting the proposed bylaw into two Articles – one to approve the Plaza District, and one to approve the Waterfront District. The majority of the Board was also comfortable with the heights as presented.

Ms. Melanson then noted the Public Hearing would not be closed. Ms. Melanson and Attorney Costa discussed the time and date of the next session of the Public Hearing, eventually settling on October 8, 2024, at 6 PM.

**Mr. Carr made a motion to continue the Public Hearing on the 40R District to a date certain of October 8, 2024, at 6 PM and was seconded by Mr. Trapilo. The motion passed unanimously. (8-0)**

**3. OTHER BUSINESS:**

- a. **Any other business that may properly come before the Board, not reasonably anticipated when posting 48 hours prior to this meeting.**

There was no other business for this meeting.

**4. NEXT MEETING: Tuesday, September 10, 2024**

Ms. Melanson adjourned the meeting at 9:24 PM.

Respectfully submitted,  
Stephanie A. Fidalgo,  
Recording Secretary,  
Planning Board

*Approved, September 24, 2024*



# 40R DISTRICTS/ACTIVITY

05/24/24

<https://www.mass.gov/service-details/chapter-40r>

Approved Districts (received DHCD final/conditional approval)					Municipalities: 49		Districts: 61		
Community	District Name	Eligible Location*			District Size** (acres)	Year Adopted / Amended	Gross Future Zoned Units***	Units Built / Under **** Construction	Remaining Zoned-Unit Capacity
		Transit	ACD	HSL					
Adams	SGOD		X		43	2020	693	0	693
Amesbury	Gateway Village			X	52	2007	249	240	9
Amesbury	East End SGOD (pending)		X		32	2024	288	0	288
Belmont	Oakley Neighborhood			X	1.51	2008	18	17	1
Beverly	SGOD (Sohier Rd)		X		5.1	2017	101	77	24
Boston	Olmsted Green (amended 2023)			X	52.5	2008	710	427	283
Bndgewater	Waterford Village			X	128	2008	594	0	594
Brockton	Downtown (amended 2018)	X			127	2007	3,812	354	3,458
Brockton	Thatcher St HOD			X	15.7	2017	175	0	175
Chelsea	Central Ave SGOD	X			2.83	2019	330	330	0
Chelsea	Gemsh Ave	X			2.82	2006	125	120	5
Chicopee	Chicopee Center SGOD		X		25.62	2010	1,092	41	1,051
Danvers	Maple Street TND SGOD		X		16.8	2017	211	169	42
Dartmouth	Lincoln Park			X	40.65	2006	319	84	235
Easthampton	SGOD (amended 5/4/22)		X		180.97	2010	876	73	803
Easton	Queset Commons			X	60.66	2008	280	110	170
Fitchburg	West SGOD (initial)			X	33.2	2010	676	272	404
Fitchburg	Downtown SGOD		X		8.8	2019	570	112	458
Grafton	Fisherville Mill			X	13.74	2007	240	0	240
Grafton	N. Grafton TVOD	X			8.8	2020	317	0	317
Great Barrington	North SGOD		X		36.74	2017	304	0	304
Great Barrington	South SGOD			X	39.17	2017	190	49	141
Haverhill	Downtown (amended 5/2/17)	X			58	2007	701	404	297
Holyoke	Smart Growth Overlay District		X		152	2008	296	59	237
Kingston	1021 Kingston's Place	X			109	2007	730	0	730
Lakeville	LS-NR SGOD (amended 7/11/18)	X			33	2006	353	315	38
Lawrence	Arlington Mills			X	34.1	2008	1,031	239	792
Lawrence	Downtown SGD		X		205	2019	2,263	80	2,183
Lee	SGOD (Eagle Mill)		X		9.88	2018	119	56	63
Lowell	SGOD (amended 5/14/17)	X			2.5	2008	250	122	128
Ludlow	Smart Growth Overlay District		X		186.8	2014	350	170	180
Lunenburg	Tri-Town			X	8.97	2006	204	201	3
Lynnfield	Meadow Walk			X	80.25	2007	180	180	0
Marblehead	Pleasant Street		X		0.33	2010	17	0	17
Marblehead	Vinnin Square		X		1.56	2010	47	0	47
Methuen	Methuen Center SGOD		X		54.4	2018	350	33	317
Middleborough	MSGOD	X			40	2022	632	26	606
Montague	SGOD		X		4.18	2022	83	0	83
Natick	SGOD	X			5	2008	138	138	0
Newburyport	SGOD	X			49.4	2015	540	160	380
North Adams	SGOD		X		57.6	2021	1,280	0	1,280
N. Attleborough	KBSGOD		X		13.68	2023	311	0	311
N. Reading	Berry Center / Edgewood Apts.			X	46	2006	434	406	28
Northampton	Urban Res. SD (amended 9/1/22)		X		9.66	2017	184	91	93
Northampton	Village Hill SD (amended 12/8/17)			X	30.56	2008	429	227	202
Norwood	Guild Street / Regal Press	X			0.57	2014	44	40	4
Norwood	St. George Ave		X		0.78	2006	15	15	0
Pittsfield	Smart Growth Overlay District		X		10.72	2008	296	112	184
Plymouth	Cordage Park	X			56.8	2007	675	302	373
Reading	Downtown (amended 5/5/22)	X			41.46	2008	316	205	111
Reading	Gateway			X	10	2010	202	200	2
Rochester	Cranberry Highway SGOD			X	8.8	2019	208	0	208
Rockland	DRROD		X		33.8	2017	187	0	187
Sharon	Sharon Commons			X	11.55	2009	167	192	0
South Hadley	Newton Street SGD		X		22.31	2018	354	0	354
South Hadley	S. Hadley Falls SGOD		X		48.27	2015	383	0	383
Sudbury	Melone SGOD			X	5.95	2019	101	101	0
Swampscott	Vinnin Square		X		2.27	2015	68	0	68
Wellesley	Wellesley Park SGOD		X		26.55	2019	600	350	250
Westfield	Southwick Road			X	22.2	2008	244	0	244
Woburn	Woburn Mall SGOD		X		23	2019	350	350	0
Totals:		14	27	20	2,445		27,302	7,249	20,053

SEE NEXT PAGE FOR NOTES ON ACRONYMS, ETC AS WELL AS DISTRICTS/AMENDMENTS THAT HAVE NOT RECEIVED FINAL/CONDITIONAL APPROVAL BUT HAVE RECEIVED A PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY OR ARE CURRENTLY UNDER REVIEW



# FY 2024 INCOME LIMITS DOCUMENTATION SYSTEM

[HUD.gov HUD User Home](#) [Data Sets](#) [Fair Market Rents](#) [Section 8 Income Limits](#) [MTSP Income Limits](#) [HUD LIHTC Database](#)

## FY 2024 Income Limits Summary

FY 2024 Income Limit Area	Median Family Income <a href="#">Click for More Detail</a>	FY 2024 Income Limit Category	Persons in Family							
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
New Bedford, MA HUD Metro FMR Area	\$91,300	Very Low (50%) Income Limits (\$) <a href="#">Click for More Detail</a>	38,350	43,800	49,300	54,750	59,150	63,550	67,900	72,300
		Extremely Low Income Limits (\$)* <a href="#">Click for More Detail</a>	23,000	26,300	29,600	32,850	36,580	41,960	47,340	52,720
		Low (80%) Income Limits (\$) <a href="#">Click for More Detail</a>	61,350	70,100	78,850	87,600	94,650	101,650	108,650	115,650

NOTE: Fairhaven town is part of the **New Bedford, MA HUD Metro FMR Area**, so all information presented here applies to all of the New Bedford, MA HUD Metro FMR Area. HUD generally uses the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) area definitions in the calculation of income limit program parameters. However, to ensure that program parameters do not vary significantly due to area definition changes, HUD has used custom geographic definitions for the New Bedford, MA HUD Metro FMR Area.

The **New Bedford, MA HUD Metro FMR Area** contains the following areas: Acushnet town, MA; Dartmouth town, MA; Fairhaven town, MA; Freetown town, MA; and New Bedford city, MA.

\* The FY 2014 Consolidated Appropriations Act changed the definition of extremely low-income to be the greater of 30/50ths (60 percent) of the Section 8 very low-income limit or the poverty guideline as established by the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), provided that this amount is not greater than the Section 8 50% very low-income limit. Consequently, the extremely low income limits may equal the very low (50%) income limits.

**Average Earnings Per Job Structure by Major NAICS Industry  
Providence-Warwick MSA, 2022 and 2001-2022**

Major Industry	2022 Structure			2001-2022 Averages		
	Average Earnings Per Job	Percent of Overall Average	National Counterpart	Percent of Overall Average	National Counterpart	
Farm	13,754	20.07	44,556	23.35	54,79	
Retail Trade	45,265	57.32	44,166	67.00	107,55	
Finance and Insurance	75,697	110.47	63,102	122.66	95,90	
Real Estate and Rental and Leasing	34,620	50.34	32,907	44.42	95,63	
Educational Services	53,046	77.42	52,145	78.65	105,81	
Health Care and Social Assistance	69,154	100.63	71,524	99.35	96,77	
Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation	30,529	44.56	45,662	45.88	79,91	
Accommodation and Food Services	35,281	52.95	26,354	44.41	54,40	
Federal Civilian Military	124,397	195.14	126,217	196.69	102,55	
Other "Suppressed Industries"	84,628	123.32	94,105	116.20	95,08	
	81,924	119.36	94,246	113.82	98,34	
<b>All Industries Average</b>	<b>68,520</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>71,586</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>96.13</b>	

\* The "Other/Suppressed industries" category portrayed in this table represents a combined total of those industries for which data were unavailable due to confidentiality restrictions. Those industries that are combined include: Forestry, Fishing, and Related Activities; Mining, Utilities; Construction; Manufacturing; Wholesale Trade; Transportation and Warehousing; Information; Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services; Management of Companies and Enterprises; Administrative and Waste Services; Other Services (except Public Administration); State Government; Local Government.

Note: Percent growth figures may not add due to rounding by a factor of ± 0.1%.

Source: Calculations by the Massachusetts Regional Economic Analysis Project (MA-REAP) with data provided by the U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis

November 2023

REAP\_FL02A100NA