Rhode Island Statewide Planning Program

STATE PLANNING COUNCIL

MINUTES

Thursday, September 20, 2007
William E. Powers Building
Conference Room A
One Capitol Hill, Providence, RI

I. ATTENDANCE

Members Present

Mr. Kevin Flynn, Chair	Representing Ms. Beverly Najarian, RI Department of Administration
Mr.Timothy Costa, Vice Chair	Governor's Policy Office
Mr. Jared L. Rhodes, II, Secretary	Statewide Planning Program
Mr. Robert Azar	Representing Mr. Thomas Deller, Department of Planning & Development, City of Providence
Mr. Daniel Beardsley	RI League of Cities and Towns
Ms. Jeanne Boyle	City of East Providence Planning Department
Ms. Sharon Conard Wells	West Elmwood Housing Development Corporation
Mr. L. Vincent Murray	Town of South Kingstown Planning Department
Mr. Peter Osborn	Federal Highway Administration (Advisory Member)
Ms. Anna Prager	Public Member
Mr. B. Michael Rauh	Environmental Advocate
Mr. Peder Schaefer	Representing Ms. Rosemary Booth Gallogly, Budget Office
Mr. William Sequino	Public Member
Ms. Noreen Shawcross	Representing Ms. Susan Baxter, Rhode Island Housing Resources Commission
Mr. Robert Shawver	Representing Mr. Jerome Williams, RI Department of Transportation
Mr. Henry Sherlock	Representing Mr. Steven Cardi, Public Member
Mr. John Trevor	Environmental Advocate

Members Absent

Ms. Janet White Raymond	Public Member

Guests

Ms. Lynn Abbott	RAVV Development LLC
Mr. Richard Bec	North Kingstown Asset Management Commission
Ms. Molly Clark	American Lung Assoc. of Rhode Island
Mr. Andy Cutler	Cutler & Co.
Mr. Anthony Deluca	North Kingstown
Mr. Michael Embury	Town of North Kingstown
Rep. Laurence Ehrhardt	R.I. House of Representatives
Ms. Heidi Green	Quonset Development Corporation
Ms. Harriet Holbrook	RI Public Transit Authority
Ms. Meridith Holdenbaum	House Policy Office
Mr. Saul Kaplan	R.I. Economic Development Corporation
Mr. Chris Long	Governor's Office
Mr. Tom Morgan	N.K. Coastal Preservation Association
Ms. Denise Parrillo	Cleanwater Action- Diesel Pollution Initiative
Mr. Bill Parsons	RI EDC
Mr. Jon Reiner	Town of North Kingstown
Mr. Ralph Rizzo	Federal Highway Administration
Mr. Richard Shapiro	North Kingstown Asset Management Commission
Mr. Brad Vauman	RAVV Development LLC
Mr. Ryan Vauman	RAVV Development LLC
Mr. John-Paul Verducci	House Finance
Mr. Tim Walsh	N.K. C.P.A.
Mr. Coleman Wholean	NKCPA

Staff--Statewide Planning Program

Mr. Robert Griffith	Chief, Strategic Planning
Mr. George Johnson	Assistant Chief, Statewide Planning
Ms. Blanche Higgins	Supervising Planner, Land Use
Mr. Bruce Vild	Supervising Planner, Economic Development
Ms. Katherine Trapani	Supervising Planner, Transportation
Mr. Kevin Nelson	Principal Planner, Land Use
Mr. William McKenna	Principal Accountant, Strategic Planning

II. AGENDA ITEMS

1. Call to Order

Mr. Flynn called the meeting to order at 9:04 A.M.

2. Approval of June 14th Minutes

Mr. Beardsley moved

To approve the Minutes of June 14, 2007, as presented.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Trevor, and carried unanimously.

3. Chief's Progress Report

Mr. Flynn indicated that the Chief's Progress Report would be deferred, given the other items on the agenda.

4. Project Conformance Review --PRF- 05-07-II, Quonset Gateway II

Mr. Flynn introduced this item, noting that the Staff Report had been provided prior to the meeting. He also noted that a number of Council members had gone on tours of the site and thanked the Quonset Development Corporation staff for arranging this. He outlined the process for considering this agenda item, and introduced Mr. Saul Kaplan, Chair of the Quonset Development Corporation (QDC), and Executive Director of the R.I. Economic Development Corporation (EDC) to introduce the proposal.

Mr. Kaplan indicated that he was there to speak in support of the staff recommendation to approve the proposal as being in substantial conformance with the State Guide Plan. He noted that the input from the Planning Council and staff and from the Town of North Kingstown's Advisory Council had improved the project greatly from the first version reviewed, and that QDC had taken this input and had done better. He noted several significant changes in the project relative to the original as including:

- A total of approximately 400,000 square feet of office space.
- 2,200 jobs – 1,200 of which are now higher wage office jobs.
- A significant redesign of the entrance area to improve the "look" and "feel" of this important gateway.
- An increase in density, with most buildings now being two stories or greater.

In terms of process, Mr. Kaplan noted that the intention is to continue to refine the project through a design review process and to work closely with Statewide Planning and with the Town on the details of the project. He noted that QDC had made organizational changes to facilitate this cooperation.

Mr. Kaplan introduced Mr. Tim Chamberlain of New Boston Development to give additional details about the revised proposal.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that it is New Boston's expectation that the Gateway Project will put Rhode Island and Quonset on the map nationally. New Boston's involvement stems from his conviction that New England is one large economic region that should be working together to compete with other large regions. He noted that the investment of $144 million is intended to produce, over a 5 to 7 year build out, 2,300 permanent jobs in corporate and retail sectors. The project will create a spark for Quonset's development and have an economic impact on all of Rhode Island. He noted that New Boston had listened and learned as it has gone through the process, and had responded with changes in the proposal. He narrated a computerized animation of a "drive-through" of the project showing projected views and building facades from Gate Road. He noted that another goal is sustainable development and

that they are working to obtain LEED certification for the project -- which now has 18 of the required 23 points. The project is typical of other investment projects that his firm is involved with in Connecticut, Massachusetts and Vermont, which focus on revitalization. It is responding to the State's investment in infrastructure at the site, and leveraging private investment. The goal is to line up a corporate tenant within two years, a goal he felt was attainable by leveraging the firms relationships with several financial institutions it deals with.

Mr. Sequino asked if QDC had reviewed the staff report and recommendations. Mr. King replied that they had been reviewed and most recommendations could be accommodated as the project moves forward.

Mr. Flynn asked Mr. Sequino to clarify what recommendations he was concerned with.

Mr. Sequino mentioned the design treatments for the big box retail components in particular as a recommendation that needs to be addressed.

Mr. King noted that the Sports Facility design is being reworked to include more masonary walls and a better corner entrance vestibule. He noted that New Boston's discussions with Kohl's and Lowe's relative to their façade treatments are continuing.

Mr. Murray stated that this area is a signature location, and that standard corporate designs for the large retail elements should not be accepted. He also noted that he approved of the addition of bicycle and pedestrian facilities in the revised design.

Mr. King noted that the bicycle path and amenities are being provided as a separate project of the Quonset Development Corporation. A path will extend along the northern boundary of the site, and bike racks and connections to the neighborhoods will be provided.

Ms. Boyle asked what the project phases would be.

Mr. Chamberlain outlined the phases as follows: Phase I would include two office buildings along Post Road, the Parcel 1 retail development, the hotel, the visitors' center, the Seabees Museum, the Lowes, and the sports complex. All of this could be built in 2008, except the hotel, which would follow in 2009. Phase II would include the three large office buildings in the corporate core of the complex; this phase would be completed by 2014.

Ms. Boyle asked if this meant that the bulk of the office space would not be built in the first phase. Mr. Chamberlain confirmed this was true. The office space in the first phase would be two 20,000 square foot, two story buildings. Mr. King added that the QDC would make a commitment that the goal of the project is to have the corporate office buildings developed, and would pledge that nothing else would be built on those sites without coming back to the Planning Council for a new project review.

Mr. Rauh asked why housing was not included in the project, from an economic standpoint. Mr. Chamberlain stated that housing is not included in the project, but there are a number of opportunities for housing to be developed in the immediate area on Post Road. There are two current proposals – not by his firm – pending near by, he noted, and the Gateway proposal could stimulate more.

Mr. Rauh also noted that the one-story retail box components were still a source of non-conformance, and asked if there were examples of two story large format retail being developed elsewhere in the country. Mr. Chamberlain replied that there have been some limited development of two story large retail, but it is not being contemplated here. The chains will only do this on urban sites where land values make the $20,000 per space construction costs feasible.

Mr. Rauh asked if there were some specific stipulations that should be included in the motion to assure that the project attains substantial conformance to the Guide Plan as it is finalized.

Mr. Flynn stated that the difficulty in this is that the Council's role in approval is not like that of a Planning Board in approving development projects at the local level. There conceptual approval, much as is being given -- if it is given by the Council – is followed by further review and approvals of more detailed design plans. He noted that many of the recommendations in the Staff Report, and in the Town of North Kingstown's correspondence are of that more specific nature, and address items that cannot readily be determined at this point in the project's life. The Council would have to accept the QDC's assurance that the Council and its staff will be involved, along with the Town's staff, as design proceeds. He pledged that he would report back to the Council and to the Governor, if needed, on the project as it evolves.

Mr. King noted that the QDC has a Design and Technical Review Committee that is involved in overseeing these aspects of project details, and that QDC has also offered the Town an opportunity to review and provide input on the technical plans. Mr. Chamberlain indicated that New Boston is also working with Town officials on life safety issues of the project. Mr. Kaplan noted that the leadership changes at QDC were made to more effectively work with the Town, and state agency staffs in order to complete the Park.

Mr. Costa noted that the Governor had asked Mr. Kaplan to ensure that Kevin Flynn and the State Planning Council's staff would be involved in shaping the project.

Mr. Rauh asked again relative to the building facades if there was a commitment to go beyond the standard formats and develop designs that are respectful of the town's character.

Mr. King replied that QDC is committed to getting a product that fits with the entire project.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that New Boston does not want ugly boxes, and that he was willing to wrestle with the chain store developers to get what we want, and to provide something unique and different. For example, this is why the developers are trying to have the development be the first of its kind to obtain LEED certification.

Ms. Conard Wells asked if there had been discussions relative to public transportation. She also asked if the trees on the Seabees site would be spared during development.

Mr. King indicated that QDC staff had recently met with RIPTA staff and had agreed to revise the transit plan for the Gateway area. RIPTA will be able to route its Post Road buses down Gate Road and around the roundabout. There will be three stops on each side, and possibly a bus pull-out near the planned Starbucks. Ms. Wells asked if the transit route will be expanded further into the park as the second phase is developed. Mr. King replied that this potential will be pursued at that time.

Mr. Chamberlain, repling relative to Ms. Wells' question on the Seabees Museum, indicated that the Seabees area is a personal priority of his, and that New Boston is working with landscape architect Bill Warner to insure it is properly treated in the overall plan. Ms. Wells asked if that meant that the mature trees would be conserved in the planning.

Mr. King replied that the treed area of the Seabees Museum would be conserved, and that a parking area shown on the current plans will be scaled back to avoid the treed area.

Mr. Schafer asked if the PILOT arrangement with the Town was settled. Mr. King replied that the QDC has an agreement in place with the Town that covers PILOT payments for all leases. The Gateway will be subject to that agreement, which provides for payments based on a formula. Mr. Schafer asked if the value of the buildings would be included. Mr. King replied that buildings on leased land are taxed directly by the Town.

Mr. Osborn commented that the bicycle and pedestrian plan appears to have been improved, but that he was still concerned that the crossing between the offices and shops and the hotel may not be conducive for safe pedestrian traffic. Mr. King replied that Gate Road was completed prior to the planning of the site, and does not have sufficient right of way for a center island. However, he stated that options such as a raised table crosswalk would be considered as design is finalized. Mr. Osborn asked if a pedestrian overpass or underpass would be considered. Mr. King stated that would be unlikely.

Ms. Prager stated she feared that the state is over-saturated with big box retail, and asked what the process would be should one of the large retail buildings planned for the site, or the sports center – another big box -- not be economically viable. Mr. Chamberlain replied by stating that the parking is what limits the type of development planned for the parcel. He stated that he had worked with Lowes to get agreement on a lesser number of spaces than typically demanded, and also noted that portions of the parking on the site would be permeable paving to lessen runoff. New Boston is also working with a leading landscape architecture firm in Boston to produce a landscaping plan for the entire site. Mr. King added that the market area for Quonset is also restricting the type of development that it can attract. Structured parking could not be considered given the rent structure the current market provides, but it might be a consideration for the future. He indicated that the type of structures planned for the large retail and sports complex are readily adaptable for other uses.

Ms. Prager asked if the Council would be involved in approving any change in use that might occur in the future. Mr. Flynn stated that if the Sports Complex were to fail and a new use proposed, that would require a new review by the Council. There is language in the staff report relative to this he noted.

Mr. King added that the lease terms for both New Boston and RAVV provide an 11 year lease term with an option for ownership after that. Once the sites become privately owned, changes in use would be subject to the Town's zoning regulations. Mr. Chamberlain stated that New Boston also has approval power over any changes in use during the lease arrangement and would not approve uses detrimental to the park.

Ms. Prager asked if the mature trees at the back of the parcel, where the Lowes parking is planned could be preserved via site planning. Mature trees, she noted, cannot be replicated via site landscaping. Mr. King agreed, and stated that the QDC would re-examine the possibility for saving these trees.

Mr. Flynn recognized members of the audience for comments on the proposal.

Mr. Dick Shapiro, of the Town of North Kingstown Asset Management Commission, urged the Council not to squander tax dollars to subsidize the Gateway project. He noted that the $500 million had not been well spent, and that the voters would not have approved the recent $48 million bond if they had know that it would be used for this project. He asked why the best industrial land in the state was being used for retail, and noted that there had been no public meetings, and that neither the QDC Board nor the Town Council had approved the proposal. He noted that the revised plan still contains the big boxes, and questioned whether anything else would be built. He noted that the traffic concerns had not been addressed, and that the focus should be on connecting the Industrial Park to I-95 south at RI-403. Quonset Davisville has not accomplished its goals, in his opinion, this project is being advanced just to shown that QDC is "doing something" with the site. He urged the Council to vote against the proposal.

Mr. Dale Nelson, a Quonset-Davisville property owner, stated that he is involved with a number of small businesses in the Industrial Park, and that the Gateway Center is needed and will be beneficial to the tenants of the Park by providing services such as the hotel and restaurants.

Ms. Carla Driscoll, Executive Director of the North Kingstown Chamber of Commerce, submitted a written statement, and noted that the Board of the Chamber has surveyed its members and reviewed the revised plan and feels that it supports the project.

Mr. Scott Wolf, Executive Director of Grow Smart Rhode Island, submitted written correspondence, and stated that Grow Smart had opposed the first proposal. The new plan is substantially improved, but can be further improved via the recommendations put forward in the Staff Report. He offered five specific areas where the plans could be further improved upon:

1. Require the office buildings on Post Road to be built in the first phase (Mr. King clarified that this was planned.)
2. Decrease the retail component footprint by requiring two story construction for the Kohls as has been done elsewhere.
3. Require New Boston to demonstrate that no parcel exceeds the Park's Development Standards relative to lot impervious surface coverage.
4. Require New Boston to follow the Town of North Kingstown's development standard calling for a minimum canopy coverage of 30%.
5.

Mr. Michael Embury, Town Manager of North Kingstown, stated that the Town Council has not taken a formal vote on the revised proposal, but has been kept informed relative to the changes proposed. He noted that the Town had submitted two letters indicating a number of specific concerns on the revised plan, and would like them considered if the project moves forward. He noted that the proposal has the potential to positively support the Town's Post Road Corridor Plan and could spur development on Post Road. The Town has big boxes in other locations, and has found that they have not impacted other local retailers as much as feared. They can be compatible if carefully designed. Wickford Village's merchants have expressed concerns, but the retail planned for the Gateway targets a different market segment than the shops in Wickford. He stated that the communications between QDC and the Town have been improved and that he was encouraged by the offer to include the Town's comments in the review process.

Representative Laurence Ehrhardt, of District 32, North Kingstown, stated he had gotten involved in politics via involvement in the Quonset Davisville park over the years. He commended all involved with making this project a reality. He stated that the majority of the 10,000 voters he represents are satisfied and want the project to go forward. He acknowledged that it is still not perfect, and that the Town has not taken an official stand, but on behalf of his constituents and on behalf of the General Assembly, he urged that the Council allow the project to move forward.

Mr. King, responding to the concerns raised by Grow Smart over impervious surfaces, stated that, overall, the project is more than 47% open space. This is twice the required amount of open space, although individual parcels may have less than the standard requires. The plans include a vegetated berm and a wide buffer area along the northern fringe.

Ms. Prager asked again about the potential for having a two story Kohls. She asked where the examples cited by Grow Smart were located. Mr. Wolf stated he did not have that information readily available. Mr. Flynn and Mr. Chamberlain both noted that they understood that two story Kohls had been built only in more urban settings. Mr. Flynn noted that there are some nearby examples of suburban big boxes that have incorporated "green design" principles. A BJs in Middletown and a Kohls distribution center in Connecticut have solar roof arrays.

Ms. Prager stated that the Kohls in the Gateway Center should be the first suburban Kohls to have a two story design.

Mr. Flynn next called upon Mr. Rhodes to present the Staff Findings. Mr. Rhodes summarized the Staff Report, calling attention of members to the Findings and Recommendations, beginning on page 8. He noted that these findings are recommended for adoption by the Council as its own. The staff analysis contrasts the original proposal with the revised proposal currently pending. However, the statistical analyses exclude the RAVV element of the current proposal, since it was not in the original.

Overall, he noted that the Report finds that the project has changed and improved significantly. Key findings in the Staff Report are that:

- The proposal can now be considered an efficient utilization of fully-serviced urban land.
- The proposal can now be considered relatively compact.
- The proposal now properly includes features encouraging pedestrian and transit usage.
- The proposal no longer presents concerns that its uses will be detrimental to other uses in the Business Park by creating excessive traffic.
- The big box element continues to be a less efficient aspect of the proposal, and continues to be inconsistent with the State Guide Plan.
- Overall, considering all aspects of the revised proposal, staff finds that the proposal can be found to *substantially* conform to the applicable provisions of the State Guide Plan.

Mr. Flynn asked if the Council had any further questions. There were none.

Mr. Costa stated that the Governor expresses his appreciation for the involvement of Statewide Planning in reshaping the proposal.

He moved:

TO APPROVE THE STAFF REPORT FINDING THE PROPOSAL TO BE IN SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE WITH THE STATE GUIDE PLAN.

This motion was seconded by Mr. Trevor.

Mr. Sequino proposed an amendment to the motion, as follows:

TO TRANSMIT THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STAFF AND THE TOWN OF NORTH KINGSTOWN TO QDC AND RECOMMEND THAT IT WORK CLOSELY WITH STATE PLANNING STAFF AND WITH TOWN STAFF TO EFFECT THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STAFF REPORT AND THE TOWN.

The amendment was accepted as friendly by the motion's sponsors.

Ms. Boyle also proposed that the motion be changed to make clear that approval of the proposal be "subject to" adherence to the staff report's recommendations.

Mr. Flynn stated that many of the recommendations were specific, and it could not be known at this stage if all would be feasible. He cautioned against conditioning approval of the project on the recommendations. Ms.Boyle stated she felt that the recommendations were worded carefully to avoid such a situation. Mr. Rhodes stated that the recommendations were characterized as suggestions since many did not explicitly tie back to a Guide Plan conformance issue. They are more of a character of issues that should be examined during detailed project design in order to obtain the best possible project. For example, the median on Gate Road may or may not be achievable, but there may be another suitable solution to the issue raised.

Mr. Costa reiterated that the Governor wants Statewide Planning involved in the process as the project moves forward, but he questioned if the Council had the authority to stipulate conditions as part of the conformance review process.

Ms. Prager suggested that staff be directed in a separate motion to work with QDC to pursue as many of the staff reports recommendations as possible.

Mr. Schafer stated that the Council's authority has a 45 day limit. Once it makes its determination on conformity, its powers are limited, and he did not feel that the improvement measures should be imposed as conditions.

Mr. Beardsley stated that the role of the Council is to find conformance or non-conformance, but not to police implementation of its recommendations.

Mr. Sherlock called the question.

The motion, as amended, carried unanimously, with no abstentions.

Ms. Prager moved:

TO CHARGE MR. FLYNN AS THE COUNCIL'S REPRESENTATIVE TO PURSUE, TO THE EXTENT PRACTICABLE, IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STAFF'S RECOMMENDATIONS AS THE PROJECT MOVES FORWARD.

Mr. Rauh seconded this motion. There was no discussion, and the motion carried unanimously with no abstentions.

Mr. Flynn accepted this charge and stated that he would report progress to the Council on a monthly basis, as necessary.

5. Amendment #6 to FY 2006-2007 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Mr. Flynn introduced this item by calling members attention to a statement provided by Mr. Anthony Deluca of North Kingstown, who is present today in opposition to the Jamestown bridge fishing pier proposal. He noted, however, that the public hearing on this agenda item had been previously held by the TAC, and that further public comment this morning would not be entertained.

Mr. Flynn asked Ms. Trapani to introduce the Amendment. Ms. Trapani summarized the process and travel of the major amendment. It was proposed on July 19th and reviewed by the TAC at the July meeting. Due to the large number of projects in the TIP that cannot be funded at present, the TAC also voted to defer solicitation of TIP proposals, planned for this Fall, for a year. This was communicated to all Chief Elected Officials, Planners, and Public Works Officials via correspondence signed by MPO Director Flynn and DOT Director Williams. Additional changes to the amendment were made based upon the TAC's and staff review. It was docketed for a public hearing on August 7th, and a hearing was conducted by the TAC on September 6th. An Air Quality analysis was conducted, which concluded that the amendment would not affect the TIP's conformance to the State Air Quality Implementation Plan. This finding is under review by DEM, and a consultation meeting was held yesterday. Public comment on the Air Quality finding closed yesterday. While DEM is still reviewing the details of the air quality analysis, their concurrance is expected. She described the amendment as a major amendment. It is required to add Fiscal year 2008 to the TIP and to maintain fiscal constraint reflecting actual funding available. The amendment's major components were summarized as:

- Changes to allow the Safe Routes to School Projects to be added to the TIP by the staff as an administrative adjustment within the budget authority of the existing line item.
- Addition of several projects to the CMAQ Program to use $1.0 million available in FY 2008. These were recommended by the Air Quality- Transportation Subcommittee, and relate to diesel retrofit for school buses.
- Changes to the Transit Program as proposed by RIPTA. These increase funding for paratransit and preventative maintenance, and change capital funding to operational support. There is a decrease in the number of buses proposed, due to the increasing cost of buses. She noted that Ms. Holbrook of RIPTA was present if there were any questions.

- Changes proposed by RIDOT to add several projects, including the Warwick Intermodal Station, and several emergency bridge repairs, and to reschedule many projects to reflect increased costs and reduced funding levels. She asked Mr. Shawver to provide more details on the proposed changes.

Mr. Shawver stated that the State needs to have an effective TIP for fiscal 2008, which begins on October 1st. He distributed charts showing the reductions in so-called "flexible" funding that the state had counted on in drafting the TIP. The Congress in enacting SAFETEALU increased overall funding, but earmarked a share to specific projects, some of which are not ready to proceed. This reduced the amount of flexible funding for other projects below what the State expected when planning the TIP. He noted that this amendment proposal does not change any priorities or the overall structure of the TIP. In addition to funding lower than anticipated, the amendment adds in the Warwick Station, which was long planned, and now is moving ahead, and requires funding to be shown. Other factors are cost increases in design and utility costs for the major projects – the FRIP and Interstate 195 relocation – these are not covered by the GARVEE bonds and have to be absorbed. Other than those changes, the amendment adjusts the schedules and funding of other projects to reflect the reality of the funding that was received or is now expected. Relative to the Jamestown Bridge pier, he noted that this project is shown in fiscal 2009, which is beyond the effective year of the TIP. DOT must include it since it is required by State law, but, there is insufficient funds in the earmark. He concluded by noting that looking beyond the current amendment, new Director Williams is now reviewing each project in the TIP and visiting sites, and will likely propose another amendment to Fiscal 08, and a new TIP for Fiscal 09-12, that reflects his priorities of safety and infrastructure preservation.

Ms. Trapani continued by describing the public review process. Nineteen comments were presented at the public hearing, and 32 written comments were received, some of which came in by email. Four comments came in after the deadline, but are included as well. The public input is presented in the Public Hearing Report and the attached Written Comments in the packages provided to members. Many comments were received generally supporting bicycling, pedestrian and transit, which are well represented in the TIP. A number of comments related to a proposed cut in funding for the Sidewalk Program, and funding was restored to the original level from FY 2008 onward by the TAC. Several comments related to individual projects in the Enhancements program in Providence and Woonsocket. These schedule changes were worked out to the satisfaction of commentors and endorsed by the TAC. Several other comments relative to project rescheduling – by East Greenwich, South Kingstown, and QDC could not be accommodated. There was considerable testimony from neighbors opposing the proposed fishing pier at the site of the old Jamestown Bridge in North Kingstown. Staff supports inclusion of this project as required by State law, and a desirable facility for the public.

There were no questions for Ms. Trapani.

Mr. Beardsley moved:

TO ACCEPT AMENDMENT #6 TO THE TIP.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Schafer.

Mr. Schafer asked if the Amendment affects the schedule for the Apponaug project. Mr. Shawver replied that it does not.

Mr. Rauh sought clarification that the vote does not provide direct approval for the Washington County Planning Council's requested planning funding. Staff confirmed that this vote does not directly effect that request.

On vote, the motion carried unanimously with no abstentions.

6. Other Business

Mr. Flynn noted that in deference to the hour, the Chief's Report would be deferred to the next meeting. There was no other business noted.

7. Adjourn

There being no other business before the Council, the meeting adjourned at 11:20 AM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jared L. Rhodes, II
Secretary