

**STATE PLANNING COUNCIL
TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

March 1, 2012 at 6:30 p.m.
Department of Administration
One Capitol Hill, Providence, RI

DRAFT MINUTES

ATTENDANCE

TAC members present

Ms. Fran Shocket, Chair	Public Member
Mr. Robert Murray, Vice Chair	Public Member
Ms. Melanie Jewett Army	City of Providence
Ms. Sue Barker	Greenways Alliance
Mr. Dan Baudouin	Providence Foundation
Mr. Mark Carruolo	City of Warwick
Mr. Michael Cassidy	Public Member
Mr. Russ Chateaufneuf	RI Department of Environmental Management
Ms. Ann Clarke representing Mr. Kevin Dillon	RI Airport Corporation
Ms. Elaine Colarusso	Town of East Greenwich
Dr. Judith Drew	Governor's Commission on Disabilities
Mr. Barry Schiller	RI Sierra Club
Ms. Pam Sherrill	RI Chapter, American Planning Association
Ms. Jane Sherman	Public Member
Mr. Robert Shawver	RI Department of Transportation
Ms. Dinalyn Spears	Narragansett Indian Tribe
Mr. Everett Stuart	RI Association of Railroad Passengers
Mr. Paul Romano	Public Member
Mr. Mark Therrien	RI Public Transit Authority
Mr. Michael Walker	RI Economic Development Corporation
Mr. Michael Wood	Town of Burrillville / RI League of Cities & Towns
Dr. Robert Vanderslice	RI Department of Health

TAC members absent

Mr. Alan Brodd	Town of Cumberland
Mr. George Monaghan	RI Consulting Engineers (RISE)
Mr. Henry Sherlock	Construction Industries of RI

Statewide Planning Staff Present

Mr. Kevin Flynn	Associate Director
Mr. Jared Rhodes	Chief
Ms. Karen Scott	Assistant Chief
Ms. Linsey Callaghan	Supervising Planner
Ms. Ronnie Sirota	Principal Planner

Others in attendance

Ms. Meredith Brady	RIDOT
Mr. David Capalbo	RIDOT
Mr. Peter Healey	RIDOT

Mr. Vin Palumbo	RIDOT
Mr. Tom Queenan	RIDOT
Mr. Bob Rocchio	RIDOT
Mr. Bob Smith	RIDOT
Ms. Amy Thibeault	RIDOT
Ms. Eugenia Marks	Audubon Society/ Coalition for Transportation Choices
Mr. Randall Rose	RIPTA Riders

AGENDA ITEMS

1. Call to Order

Ms. Shocket called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. Ms. Shocket thanked TAC members for their participation on the various subcommittees and staff for their work to prepare the draft Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) FY 2013 - 2016. She also welcomed two new members of the TAC, Dinalyn Spears and Pam Sherrill.

2. Approval of November 17, 2012 Meeting Minutes – *for action*

There was a small correction in the minutes due to the misspelling of Mr. George Redman's name. Upon motion of Mr. Murray to approve as amended, seconded by Mr. Cassidy, the November 17, 2012 meeting minutes were accepted unanimously.

3. Public Comment on Agenda Items

Mr. Randall Rose, a member of the RIPTA Riders requested the TAC's support for House Bill H7581 which includes funding for public transit. Mr. Rose stressed the importance of the bill, as public transit has not been funded very well in recent past, and RIPTA is faced with periodic budget shortfalls. Mr. Rose added that the gas tax, as source of revenue for transit, has been declining over the years. According to Mr. Rose, RIPTA projects a budget deficient of over \$10 million in the coming fiscal year. Mr. Rose urged all present to support the transportation bill.

Ms. Eugenia Marks, a member of the Technical Committee, thanked the TAC and the staff for all the work that went into preparing the TIP, which is easy to read and a well-organized document.

Ms. Shocket also thanked Mr. Flynn for the pizza that he brought to the TAC meeting.

4. Draft Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) FY 2013 – 2016, Recommendation to authorize a public hearing – *for vote*

Ms. Shocket, Chair, introduced Ms. Scott who went into an overview of the TIP process undertaken since November as documented in the TAC Agenda supplement. Ms. Shocket noted that the TIP packet was extremely well organized. Ms. Scott replied that it was a group effort and that TAC members and staff have worked very hard. Ms. Scott continued by explaining that the TAC subcommittees met and reviewed all of the TIP projects, including both the old projects from the previous TIP and the new project applications. The new project applications were individually scored by the subcommittee members according to the Criteria for Evaluation of Project Proposals. Staff then averaged subcommittee member's scores into a composite score for each application within the TIP programs. The project application scores were then ranked by program, which helped to facilitate the

subcommittee's discussion and recommendations for project selection. Ms. Scott added that RIDOT staff provided valuable information and expertise at the subcommittee meetings and throughout the process as a whole.

Ms. Scott continued to describe the project selection process by noting that the details of the subcommittee meetings is captured in the Subcommittee Reports prepared for the Bike/Pedestrian, Pavement Management, Highway / Study & Development, Enhancement, and Transit subcommittees. Ms. Scott acknowledged that staff has received several edits on the reports from TAC members, RITPA, and RIDOT staff resulting in added clarification on many items, however, none of the project recommendations were changed.

Ms. Scott next explained that today's meeting was an opportunity for TAC members to ask questions and discuss any of the subcommittee reports and recommendations for TIP projects. Ms. Scott then went through the each of the following Subcommittee Reports:

- Highway Subcommittee
 - There were no questions or comments.
- Enhancement Subcommittee
 - Mr. Stuart asked about the status of the regular RIDOT Enhancement Advisory Committee. Mr. Tom Queenan of RIDOT replied that committee still exists. Mr. Shawver added that this recent TIP review process was also an opportunity to refresh the list of projects that already went through the Enhancement Advisory Committee.
 - Ms. Sherrill asked about cost of the India Point powerline project. Ms. Army, of the City of Providence explained that funding listed in the TIP is \$300,000 for both the Providence and East Providence portions of the project, which is estimated to have a total cost of \$17 to \$22 million.
 - Mr. Schiller stated that he was concerned that the Woonsocket Depot does not accommodate RIPTA and its passengers. Mr. Queenan agreed that RIPTA passengers are not accommodated. Mr. Therrien of RIPTA stated that RIPTA does wish to be part of the RIDOT owned depot. Mr. Shawver added that this issue can be addressed as the project moves forward.
- Study and Development Subcommittee
 - Mr. Cassidy asked about project #18, Main Street Conversion, which indicates as located in Pawtucket / Smithfield. Ms. Scott responded that was a typo and that it should just indicate Pawtucket.
- Bicycle / Pedestrian Subcommittee
 - Mr. Schiller asked about Northwest Bike Trail / Woonasquatucket River Bikeway. Ms. Callaghan replied that it is in the FY 2009 – 2012 TIP. Mr. Bob Smith of RIDOT explained that RIDOT has a signed agreement with the Woonasquatucket Watershed Council enabling them to complete some work on the bike path. Mr. Smith added that since the funding for this project will be expended by the end of 2012, it does not have to be listed in the new TIP.
- Pavement Management
 - As a member of the Pavement Management subcommittee, Mr. Murray commended the staff on their efforts and stated that this was the best TIP he has participated in throughout his many years of service on the TAC.
- Transit Subcommittee

- Mr. Schiller stated that one of proposals from Middletown included enhanced bus service on Aquidneck Island. Mr. Schiller felt that with RIPTA's limited budget, even with additional capital there still would not be enough for operating costs to expand service in areas like Aquidneck Island. He referred to Mr. Rose's earlier comments regarding trying to obtain more funding for RIPTA.
- Mr. Wood asked how the CTC's proposed transit bill will impact the ability to pursue capital projects. Mr. Therrien answered that it would not have an impact since the funds are for operating expenses and will come from vehicle registration fees. Mr. Schiller stated that \$10 million in service cuts would be devastating to RIPTA.

Ms. Scott stated that the Bridge Safety, Traffic Safety and Interstate projects did not utilize a subcommittee and were evaluated by RIDOT staff. Projects within these categories were evaluated according to specific engineering and safety criteria that do not offer flexibility in determining funding selection. The appendix of the TIP will include a section describing how these projects were chosen.

Ms. Scott stated that the established Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) Committee reviewed the CMAQ eligible projects including funding for RIDOT's Transportation Management Center (TMC), South County Commuter Rail, and RIPTA. The remaining resources were transferred to projects in the Bicycle / Pedestrian program.

Ms. Scott explained that Mr. Shawver and his staff at RIDOT placed all of the recommended projects into a four year, fiscally constrained TIP. Ms. Scott described a new feature to the TIP includes a detailed tracking report, *Preliminary Project Recommendations – FY 2013 – 2016 TIP*, for all of the projects, including both old and new, funded and those not funded. Projects are organized by municipality and can be located as to their status on funding, progress, etc. Ms. Scott added that staff feels that this report will be very useful to municipalities, as it will provide an easy reference to identify whether the projects they requested were recommended for funding and what additional projects RIDOT has proposed within their community under the TIP. Mr. Cassidy commented that he was very impressed with this TIP and the tracking report was especially useful. Ms. Sherrill added that the tracking report is helpful for a municipal planner to be aware of state projects located within the town.

Ms. Scott stated that the actual TIP text and associated tables can be found under Attachment 3 of the TAC meeting packet. Ms. Scott explained that the text of this TIP very closely follows the content and format of the previous TIP. She went on to describe that Statewide Planning, along with our colleagues at RIDOT and RIPTA worked with FHWA and FTA respectively to come up with reasonable financial assumptions in this climate of transportation funding uncertainty. She noted that staff also worked very closely with the TAC to divide the funding up into the TIP program categories. This distribution really seems to mirror the municipal needs.

Ms. Scott stated that she wanted to highlight a few parts of the text that really seems to tell the story of what types of projects the TIP is funding. She explained that most of the TIP is focused on system preservation, meaning preserving and maintaining our existing infrastructure. System expansion accounts for just 3.4 percent of the entire TIP and is found only in bike/pedestrian and transit projects. Ms. Scott acknowledged that although the system expansion percentage is small, it is significant given the very constrained resources that all system expansion is allocated to alternative modes of transportation.

Mr. Shawver then gave the funding estimates for the TIP. Mr. Shawver explained that in October he expected Rhode Island would have \$200 million in total highway funds for FY 2013. Mr. Shawver however now believes Rhode Island will be allocated an additional \$14 million in federal funds for a total of \$214 million. Mr. Shawver stated that in the draft TIP, there is little change as to what was regarded as a baseline program funding. He continued by noting that funding for Highway program projects decreased, while the Bike /Pedestrian program increased by \$1.5 million due to funding being transferred from the CMAQ program. The Traffic Safety program received an additional \$500,000 for local municipal projects and the Bridge program increased by \$3 million. The Highway program's American with Disabilities Act (ADA) projects will have an additional \$2 million in funding. Mr. Shawver added that the TIP will still be fiscally constrained. Mr. Shawver also stated that the TIP tables have been improved and now contain more information on project funding sources and project descriptions. For example, the Traffic Safety projects now include a listing of all of the intersections programed for improvement. Mr. Shawver noted that RIDOT intends to update the status of the projects on a monthly basis.

Mr. Walker asked if FHWA has reviewed the draft TIP. Ms. Scott replied yes, that Barbara Breslin from FHWA has been involved throughout the development of the draft TIP and has provided feedback along the way. Mr. Wood asked if there were any prior or current projects that if not completed could impact the projects listed in the FY 2013 – 2016 TIP. Mr. Shawver stated that the assumption is that the 2012 projects will be completed this year and we will not have to carry over into the FY 2013 – 2016 TIP however there the possibility that some may have to be carried forward. Mr. Shawver added that Rhode Island will apply for TIGER discretionary funding to help with the cost of the Providence Viaduct. If Rhode Island receives TIGER funding, work can start on the Providence Viaduct in 2013 instead of 2014, as currently programed.

Mr. Therrien reported on RIPTA's related items in the TIP. Mr. Therrien stated that FTA anticipates Rhode Island will maintain level federal funding from the previous year. Therefore RIPTA will be using a flat estimate, assuming that they will receive the same amount of funding. Mr. Therrien also explained that RIPTA will likely have requests for TIP amendments if they are successful in securing various federal grant awards for projects. For example, RIPTA and RIDOT will try to obtain livability funds for needed work at the Providence Train Station.

Since there were no further questions, Ms. Scott returned to describing the draft TIP. She explained there are some highlighted sections of the TIP text that are in the process of being revised. Ms. Scott stated that the highlighted parts of the text are areas where additional information is needed to complete the section. The three most notable sections are the environmental justice analysis, air quality analysis, and Appendix G which include Bridge, Traffic Safety, and Interstate project selection criteria.

Ms. Scott stated that Statewide Planning staff is currently finalizing the environmental justice analysis. According to Ms. Scott, because this TIP is focused on system preservation rather than system expansion, staff feels very confident that the final conclusions of the environmental justice analysis will show that minority and low income populations will be provided with increased benefits, as opposed to increased burdens, as a result of implementing the transportation projects listed in the TIP.

Ms. Scott also explained that Statewide Planning, RIDOT, and RIDEM staff have been working together with VHB on the air quality analysis for the FY 2013 – 2016 TIP. According to Ms. Scott the preliminary results indicate that the air quality emissions for the existing, design, and interim years will be below the Rhode Island State Implementation Plan (SIP) emission budgets. Work will continue on this process to

develop a final report for inclusion in the TIP. Ms. Scott also explained that an important detail to note is that EPA has extended the deadline to transition from the MOBILE to MOVES for air quality modeling from March of this year to March of 2013. Therefore, the analysis will be based on the MOBILE model.

Ms. Scott went on to describe Appendix G, which will offer an outline of the specific criteria utilized to select new TIP projects that did not utilize the subcommittee approach and were ranked and scored by RIDOT staff, including Bridge, Traffic Safety, and Interstate. Ms. Scott stated that staff is in the process of completing this document and will email it out to the TAC next week.

Ms. Scott stated that the TIP tables closely follow the content and format used in the prior TIP. Ms. Scott continued by stating that the FY 2013 – 2016 tables have however been expanded and the format improved to provide additional transparency to the general public. The TIP tables now include a funding category label to clearly indicate the federal funding program source. The key to the funding category abbreviations can be found on the last page of the TIP tables on page 14. Ms. Scott continued by stating that the TIP tables also contain several appendices. Appendix A of the table is an entirely new section, developed by Mr. Shawver, which provides a breakdown of federal and state funds proposed for each project. It also includes a brief project description to clarify the scope. Ms. Scott commended both RIPTA and RIDOT for their efforts in adding this information to the tables.

Ms. Scott continued to describe that Appendix B lists the Enhancement projects. She stated that Appendix C lists all of the ADA sidewalk projects which will be prioritized by the Governor's Commission on Disabilities and implemented according to their prioritization. Ms. Scott added that there is not sufficient funding in the TIP to support construction of all of the projects, however staff felt that it was important to list all of the projects should alternative funds become available.

Next, Ms. Scott stated that Appendix D includes the Study and Development projects. There will be two Study and Development lists for projects, one for Highway projects and a separate for Bicycle/Pedestrian projects. Ms. Scott alerted the TAC to the three projects listed in the Bike/Pedestrian Study and Development program that are labeled as high priority. She stated that the reason for the special designation was on account of subcommittee's desire to include these projects in the TIP for construction. However after further discussion, RIDOT felt that more study and development was necessary before committing to construction or arriving at a reliable cost estimate for construction. The high priority ranking was a way of recognizing the importance the subcommittee gave these projects.

Ms. Scott continued to describe that Appendix E illustrates the Traffic Safety program for implementation including funding sources and timeframes. Appendix F lists the unprogrammed priority projects that are recommended for implementation should additional funds become available in the future. Ms. Scott noted that it is a targeted list of projects.

To conclude the overview of the TIP, Ms. Scott noted that she hopes the TAC agrees that this TIP provides more information than any previous and should act as an excellent resource for any member of the public in clearly understanding how transportation funds are proposed for spending in the state. Mr. Shawver added that the various TIP timetables can change if a particular project is derailed and another has to be advanced in the time table. Mr. Shawver also stated that he anticipates updating the tables on a monthly basis. Ms. Scott stated that as you can see, we have plenty of RIDOT, RIPTA, and Statewide Planning staff available to answer any question the TAC might have on the process just outlined, on any specific projects included in the TIP tables, or any analysis included in the TIP text.

Mr. Baudouin commented that staff did a great job on the TIP. Mr. Baudouin also wanted to clarify that if a project is already committed for FY 2012 construction it does not have to be included in the FY 2013 - 2016 TIP. Mr. Shawver explained that a particular project may be in the current TIP but not in the TIP FY 2013 – 2016 for that reason. Mr. Schiller asked about the status of the Washington Bike/Pedestrian Bridge. Mr. Shawver answered that it will be advertised for construction on March 9. Mr. Schiller expressed his appreciation to staff and the cooperation between RIDOT, RIPTA, and Statewide Planning Program on this project. He stated that not all of the Sierra Club chapters have this high level of cooperation in their jurisdictions.

Ms. Clarke stated that she hoped that there will be flexibility with the Post Road and Main Avenue projects in Warwick because the new T.F. Green Airport improvement projects will seek to maximize funding / construction opportunities in the area. She suggests that RIDOT projects located within the airport area be coordinated with the airport's construction schedule. Mr. Shawver replied that a defined project such as the airports could be listed in the TIP as "funded by others." Ms. Scott concurred that the airport projects could be included in the TIP. Ms. Clarke explained the Airport Corporation was waiting for notice of definite funding. Mr. Rhodes added that members of the public are interested in seeing the Airport Corporation projects included in the TIP.

Ms. Sherrill referred to page 24 of the *Preliminary Project Recommendations FY 2013 – 2016 TIP*, stating that she was unaware of the Town of Johnston dropping some of the projects, as indicated in the report. Ms. Scott stated that any project that was not ranked by a municipality was considered dropped. Ms. Sherrill replied that certain projects that were considered "Interstate" did not come to the town for consideration. Ms. Scott stated she will check on these particular projects. Ms. Army stated that on page 46 of the *Preliminary Project Recommendations FY 2013 – 2016 TIP*, the Elmwood Avenue ADA project should be should be Elmwood Avenue 1R. Mr. Shawver asked TAC members to review all the information included in the TIP for accuracy since there was a lot of information included in a short time. Any errors can be passed on to Ms. Scott. Ms. Sherrill then asked about the Central Avenue Bridge drainage project in Johnston. Mr. Shawver stated he would look into that item as well.

Mr. Schiller asked if the geographic distribution of the projects were analyzed by staff. Ms. Scott answered that most of the top projects of the cities and towns made it into the TIP, therefore the answer is in the positive. Ms. Callaghan added that all of the projects were mapped for the environmental justice analysis and thereby revealing the geographic distribution of the projects.

Ms. Scott explained that the next step for the TAC would be to recommend that the State Planning Council authorize a public hearing for the draft TIP on April 26, 2012, the day of the regular April TAC meeting. The public hearing would be at 2:00 p.m. and again at 6:30 p.m. The TAC will have the opportunity to review and discuss the draft TIP again if necessary at the public hearing. Ms. Scott stated that the incomplete TIP text items discussed prior will be emailed to the TAC next week. Ms. Scott also stated that there will be extensive outreach in advance of the public hearing including notice of the draft TIP posting on the Division of Planning's website; notification letters will be sent to Statewide Planning's municipal notification list which includes municipal chief executives, director of public works, municipal clerks, and chief planners. A copy of each municipality's *Preliminary Project Recommendations FY 2013 – 2016 TIP* page will also be sent to the local officials summarizing the status of the projects within their boundaries. A notice of the public hearing and draft TIP posting will be sent to Statewide Planning's full mailing list, as well as an ad appearing in the Providence Journal. There will also be a printed copy of the TIP in the Statewide Planning Program office.

Dr. Drew asked if there would be a phone number listed for the public to call in the event there are accessibility issues. Ms. Scott replied that the public hearing notice has the number listed. Mr. Walker asked if it makes sense to rethink how a TIP amendment is made because of RIPTA's impending amendments. Mr. Shawver said the process is outlined in an agreement between Statewide Planning, RIDOT, and RIPTA. Mr. Shawver said they will look into the agreement.

Mr. Walker moved that the Transportation Advisory Committee recommend to the State Planning Council that a Public Hearing be held on the draft Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) FY 2013 - 2016 on April 26, 2012. Mr. Murray seconded the motion. The TAC voted unanimously in favor of the motion to recommend the State Planning Council hold a public hearing on the Draft Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) FY 2013 - 2016.

Mr. Walker then moved to have a review of the TIP amendment process prior to the public hearing to accommodate the opportunities of discretionary spending as Mr. Therrien described. Mr. Baudouin seconded the motion.

Mr. Schiller stated that since discretionary grants are given by RIDOT public oversight should not be sidestepped. Mr. Shawver answered that the amendment procedures could go back to the TAC without public notice. Mr. Murray stated that he is leery of giving a blanket approval right now and perhaps it would be best if this issue is revisited later since the TAC or the public would probably need to have an opportunity to comment. Mr. Schiller added that if the grants came in after the TIP was adopted, there would need to be transparency. Mr. Cassidy stated the TIP document included in the meeting packet includes the Memorandum of Understanding, which outlines the TIP amendment procedures. Mr. Rhodes suggested TAC members look at that document and determine if there are any concerns; if there are, they can go through the scenarios with Mr. Therrien.

Mr. Walker then withdrew his motion for the amendment.

5. Staff Report – *for discussion*

Ms. Callaghan gave the staff report:

- Ms. Callaghan reported that most of the staff work has been focused on preparing the draft TIP.
- However the consultant working on the State Rail Plan has just submitted the first set of deliverables and will be reviewed by staff in the next couple of weeks.
- Ms. Callaghan noted the promotion of Mr. Vincent Flood from the Transportation Unit to Supervising Planner in the Planning Information Center, responsible for the program's GIS and redesign of the Division of Planning's website.

6. Additional Public Comment

Ms. Shocket asked if there was any additional public comment. There were none.

Mr. Rhodes stated that this would be Ms. Scott's last TAC meeting for awhile since she will be out on maternity leave. He thanked her for all the work she did on the TIP.

Ms. Clarke announced that this will be her last TAC meeting since she will be leaving the RI Airport Corporation at the end of March and will be moving to Pittsburgh.

7. Other Business – *for discussion*

Mr. Baudouin spoke about transit funding. He stated that last year, the TAC sent a position statement to the General Assembly in support of transportation funding. Mr. Baudouin suggested that perhaps staff could analyze the issues and develop a position for the TAC, possibly similar to the statement the TAC issued last year. Mr. Murray stated that the Governor's budget contains a section for dedicated transportation funding, however this bill before the General Assembly would add specific funding for transit thereby altering Governor's Chafee's position. Therefore, Mr. Murray believes that this is more of a political issue and that it would not be proper for the TAC to comment. He continued that it is a difficult position. Mr. Shawver stated that the proposed transportation bill is tricky and that RIDOT could not support such a statement issued by the TAC. Dr. Drew stated that she felt there should be more advocacy to ensure the funding is adequate to meet the needs of transit particularly RIPTA. Mr. Murray added that the problem is that RIPTA is competing for the same funding as highway transportation. He believes public transit should be funded as a department of the state and that RIPTA should not have to raise its own funds. Dr. Drew commented that this is an economic development issue since there are people who cannot get to work because there is not adequate public transportation even though there are employers who have jobs for them. Mr. Murray added that if RIDOT operated on a "pay as you go" basis, they would not have their current debt burden. Mr. Shawver stated that RIDOT has a \$12 million projected deficit next year and that the Governor has proposed accelerating the vehicle registration fee increases as a means to address the deficit earlier. Mr. Murray explained that most states except for Rhode Island and Alaska have dedicated funding sources for transportation, rather than funding coming out of the state's general budget. Without a dedicated transportation funding source, the whole state suffers, as Rhode Island has to borrow as a means of coming up with the required state match in order to receive its full federal transportation funding allotment.

Mr. Schiller stated that the Rhode Island Constitution cannot be changed at this point or additional bills introduced since the deadline for new bills has passed. According to Mr. Schiller, the current transportation bill is the only one that proposes to address the \$10 million deficit and to help RIPTA at this time. Mr. Schiller encouraged people to attend hearings for the bill. Mr. Schiller added that RIPTA's budget deficit needs to be addressed at this session or there will be devastating cuts in service. Mr. Schiller stated that the Coalition for Transportation Choice (CTC) has also endorsed a bill to upgrade the complete streets law to make streets safer for pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, and motorists. He continued by mentioning that there is additional legislation to promote highway safety for vulnerable road users such as first responders, disabled people in wheelchairs, pedestrians, bicyclists, etc. Mr. Schiller added that the legislation also proposes enhanced penalties for defendants found responsible for death resulting crashes involving vulnerable road users. Mr. Schiller asked that TAC members to review the proposed legislation and to contact him if anyone needs any additional information.

Mr. Randall Rose, the member of the public who spoke earlier about the transportation funding bill stated to the TAC that he does not want anyone to think that the legislation just reallocates transportation funding. Mr. Rose continued by stating that the bill proposes to expand revenue for public transit and highway maintenance between July 2012 and July 2015.

Mr. Baudouin also asked if the TAC, as a body, would like to comment on MBTA's announcement that it will cut several trains from Rhode Island. Mr. Shawver commented that he hopes we can prevent MBTA commuter rail service cuts in Rhode Island. According to Mr. Shawver, MBTA proposes to eliminate weekend service from Providence even though the ridership is very high. Mr. Cassidy moved that the TAC recommend that the TAC communicate that they do not want the MBTA to make cuts in service especially the new service to T.F. Green Airport. Mr. Dan Baudouin seconded the motion. Mr. Wood

stated this item regarding MBTA was not on the TAC's Agenda and therefore should not offer a formal comment. Mr. Murray stated that the TAC is a subgroup to the State Planning Council. Ms. Clarke asked if the TAC could state that it wants to ensure that a level of MBTA service is provided since clearly the state has made a commitment to provide service to the new stations in Warwick and Wickford. Mr. Stuart suggested that the issue be referred to the State Planning Council and that they offer a recommendation. Mr. Murray suggested the motion be withdrawn. He believes it is probably better for each TAC member to send a letter in the name of the group they represent and not the TAC. Mr. Murray recommended that anyone interested obtain information from the staff as to how the organizations should write a letter. Mr. Cassidy withdrew his motion and recommended the staff give information about this to inquiring TAC members.

8. Adjournment

By motion of Mr. Murray, seconded by Mr. Baudouin and passed unanimously, the TAC adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Ms. Shocket stated there would be no March meeting unless there was an emergency.

Submitted By: Ronnie Sirota, Principal Planner to Linsey Callaghan, TAC Secretary

Respectfully submitted,

Linsey Callaghan, TAC Secretary