STATE PLANNING COUNCIL
TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
April 23, 2015 at 6:30 p.m.
Department of Administration
APPROVED MINUTES

I. ATTENDANCE

1. **Members Present**

Ms. Fran Shocket, Chair	Public Member
Mr. Everett Stuart, Vice Chair	RI Association of Railroad Passengers
Mr. Lloyd Albert	AAA Southern New England
Mr. Corey Bobba	Federal Highway Administration, Advisory Member
Mr. Richard Crenca	City of Warwick
Mr. David Everett	City of Providence
Ms. Bari Freeman	Bike Newport
Mr. John Flaherty	Grow Smart RI
Mr. Ronald Gagnon	RI Department of Environmental Management
Mr. Jonathan Harris	Sierra Club
Ms. Joelle Kanter	Representing Mr. Dan Baudouin, Providence Foundation
Mr. Chris Maxwell	RI Truckers Association
Mr. George Monaghan	RI Consulting Engineers (RICE)
Ms. Lillian Picchione	RI Public Transit Authority
Mr. Daniel Porter	RI Airport Corporation
Mr. Bob Shawver	Representing Ms. Meredith Brady, RI Department of Transportation
Mr. Michael Wood	Town of Burrillville /RI League of Cities and Towns

2. **Members Absent**

Mrs. Dinalyn Spears	Narragansett Indian Tribe
Mr. Michael Cassidy	Public Member
Mr. Alan Brodd	City of Woonsocket
Dr. Judith Drew	Governor's Commission on Disabilities
Mr. David Everett	City of Providence
Mr. Michael Wood	Town of Burrillville / RI League of Cities and Towns
Ms. Eliza Lawson	RI Department of Health
Ms. Amy Pettine	Rhode Island Public Transit Authority
Mr. Timothy Scanlon	Construction Industries of Rhode Island
Ms. Pam Sherrill	RI Chapter, APA
Mr. Michael Walker	RI Commerce Corporation

3. **Statewide Planning Staff Present**

Ms. Linsey Callaghan	Supervising Planner
Ms. Karen Scott	Assistant Chief
Ms. Kimberly Crabill	Executive Assistant

4. **Guests Present**
No guests present.

II. Agenda Items

1. Call to Order

Ms. Fran Shocket called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m.

2. Approval of January 22, 2015 Minutes – *for action*

Ms. Fran Shocket asked for a motion to approve the minutes, which was made by a Mr. John Flaherty, seconded by Mr. George Monaghan, and approved unanimously with no further discussion.

3. Public Comment on Agenda Items

Ms. Fran Shocket asked if there were any comments on the agenda items. No comments made as no public members were present.

4. Unified Work Program for Transportation Planning, Proposed FY 2016 Work Tasks – Summary Presentation

- **RISPP Staff Presentation – *for discussion***

Ms. Karen Scott outlined the annual MPO Unified Planning Work Program process. She then explained the format of the document and overviewed the new projects. See attached document for more details.

Ms. Karen Scott explained that this is on the agenda for discussion only and will come back again next month for a formal recommendation to the state planning council. At the next meeting the document will also include financial resources.

Chairman Shocket opened the discussion to TAC members.

Mr. Flaherty asked if the document will need action at the next meeting. Ms. Scott replied that the work program must be adopted prior to the start of the fiscal year, so yes it will be in need of TAC action in May.

Mr. Wood asked where the topics in the Work Program come from and how do they become included? Ms. Scott responded that it is a combination of federal and state law.

Mr. Wood asked about the State Guide Plan's long range transportation plan and if the State Guide Plan is complete? Ms. Scott responded that we are constantly adopting different elements of the State Guide Plan, there are about 25 different elements of the state guide plan, and long range plan is one of them.

Mr. Flaherty asked if this gives staff marching orders for this next year cycle program of work? Ms. Scott responded, yes, it does and explained that we do quarterly reporting to monitor the progress

throughout the year. The quarterly reports show what happened in that quarter and what caused the delay if there was one.

Ms. Picchione commented that hopefully the quarterly reports will be published on the statewide planning website each quarter. Ms. Scott responded, the work program is online and the quarterly reports should be in the future.

Mr. Albert stated that the work program shows $6.4 million in federal funds and asked what the state match is, is it a one-for-one? Ms. Scott responded that it is generally 20 % state match. When we give you the detailed spreadsheets you would be able to see exactly how the funds are matched.

Mr. Albert asked if the funds are not all used, do they roll over into the next year? Ms. Scott responded that yes, they do roll over. We project out what our needs are, then collaborate with RIDOT and RIPTA to see where we can put the funds, and invest our money responsibly.

Mr. Porter asked about Project 13.2 Challenge Grants and if the six listed challenge grants are a continuation of previous grants that were awarded, and are there any new ones, is there any more money for municipal grants in terms of adopting new ones? Ms. Scott responded that there are not any additional funds available in this fiscal year. It is looked at year to year.

Mr. Everett Stuart asked about Project 8.1 Freight and Goods Movement Plan and if there is an update on the status of that project? Ms. Callaghan responded by summarizing that the focus thus far has been on stakeholder outreach, data collection, and analysis. In the next two months HDR will complete the first part of the structure and freight transportation infrastructure assessment. There will be a public meeting in June.

Mr. Stuart asked in terms of the amount of freight flowing in Rhode Island, is the inventory more on number of movements in miles or is it based on weights? Ms. Callaghan responded that it is based on commodity and value.

Ms. Freeman asked if there is a project that specifically addresses multi-model in the work program? Ms. Scott responded that multi-model falls into a couple of different places.

Ms. Freeman clarified her question by stating she is thinking vehicular, but multiple efforts in support of transit/vehicle or bike/transit or active transportation or other methods of reducing traffic congestion by combining different transportation models, including HUBS where people would transfer. Ms. Scott responded by reviewing the areas in which we are investing with RIDOT and RIPTA in regards to multi-model.

Ms. Freeman further questioned that she was still not hearing the multi-model mode where they improve efficiency. Ms. Freeman stated that she sees it as a separate conversation. Where are the opportunities to bring these different pieces together? In terms of support of transit, support of active transportation and reduction of traffic congestion by moving people, users of the transportation among different modes, for example, we see it in transportation hubs. Should it be a separate project? Ms. Callaghan responded by explaining the congestion management task force. Ms. Scott also responded by explaining the East Bay Corridor study which is a multi-model study. The future plan is to do this study in different areas throughout the state.

Mr. Shawver commented about the HUBs in Providence that RIDOT has undertaken to work with RIPTA, the trans-system, and parking facilities. There is a TIGER grant and there will more information to come on that.

Mr. Flaherty asked if the HUB work is in the Unified Work Program? Ms. Scott responded that it is included as a task within the program where we would partner with someone and this is not included as a specific project.

Mr. Flaherty asked if the tasks really relate to the projects that Statewide Planning takes the lead on? Ms. Scott responded yes and no and explained the way the unified work program funds work specifically for the MPO, RIDOT, and RIPTA funds, etc.

Mr. Bobba asked that as part of the East Bay Corridor study (to address Bari's point) maybe there is an opportunity to look at a couple of locations and evaluate trip chains; so as part of this regional study, what are some select low choice trip chaining in the region? Mr. Bobba suggested that we do it a couple of times in the region and see what pops out for other regions or activities.

Mr. Shawver stated that the other project included in the work program is transit fair integration which also gets at increasing multi-modalism. Ms. Scott responded that it is a continuing project partnership with RIPTA to look at fair policy. This project looks at maximizing fair revenue, maintaining ridership, advancing the goal of cashless payment, and developing a future product that could potentially be used on different modes.

Ms. Picchione in keeping in line with Ms. Freeman's multi-mode concerns, questioned how do you take every project and take a multi-model approach? That would be the ideal in that it works its way through all projects. Do we do that? Or is there room to push that out? Ms. Freeman responded that, yes, it is what she was suggesting. Ms. Picchione stated that some of the multi-model work takes place as an engineering component and that we don't see that in the document. Mr. Shawver pointed out Project 6.4 Transit Highway Design Guide for its multi-modal goals. Ms. Scott responded and pointed the committee to the long range transportation plan which includes many multi-modal goals and objectives.

Ms. Freeman asked to make a couple more points. One with multi-model I see the definition as less a variety of modes than the relationship among the modes, especially following one for many riders or people transporting. The other is to compare it with something like complete streets, paying attention to all users when planning. Multi-model might be some kind of a separate discussion that defines and encourages multi-model perspective on planning, and then becomes something that can be taken out and used wherever planning takes place. Ms. Scott responded that they will take it into consideration.

Mr. Flaherty asked about a project he saw on previous unified work plans, developing a transit pass system for state employees, is it part of this year's plan? Ms. Scott responded that it is there as a plan and it is at an administrative level to make a decision.

Chairman Shocket asked if there are any other comments, having none, we moved on to the next item on the agenda.

5. Staff Report – *for information*

Ms. Linsey Callaghan made the following report:

TIP Amendment #5, was approved by the State Planning Council, followed by review and signature by the Governor's Office. The Amendment is now awaiting FHWA and FTA approval.

There is now a draft of the Public Participation Plan and the Public Participation Plan Advisor Committee will review and provide input on the draft in the next few weeks.

Ms. Callaghan asked for comments.

6. Additional Public Comment

None

7. Announcements – *for discussion*

Chairman Shocket asked if there were any announcements to share.

Ms. Picchione gave a quick update on RIPTA's American bus benchmarking group. The fair study outreach is going on now. Two surveys are out.

Ms. Freeman announced the celebration of the bike lane on the Sakonnet Bridge – all welcome to cross

8. Adjournment

Hearing no other business, Ms. Shocket asked for a motion to adjourn. Mr. John Flaherty made the motion which was seconded by Mr. George Monaghan and approved unanimously at 7:31 p.m. with no further discussion.