RHODE ISLAND STATEWIDE PLANNING PROGRAM
TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Thursday, July 28, 2016
RIDOA, Conference Room A
One Capitol Hill, Providence, RI

DRAFT 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 Northeast
Mr. Dan Baudouin	Providence Foundation
Ms. Meredith Brady	RI Department of Transportation
Mr. Michael Cassidy	Public Member
Mr. John Flaherty	Grow Smart RI
Ms. Bari Freeman	Bike Newport
Mr. Ronald Gagnon	RI Department of Environmental Management
Ms. Martina Haggerty	City of Providence
Ms. Eliza Lawson	RI Department of Health
Mr. Chris Maxwell	RI Truckers Association
Mr. George Monaghan	RI Consulting Engineers (RICE)
Ms. Lillian Picchione (Greg Nordin)	RI Public Transit Authority
Mr. Daniel Porter	RI Airport Corporation
Mr. Michael Walker	RI Commerce Corporation

2. Members Absent

Mr. Alan Brodd	City of Woonsocket
Mr. Richard Crenca	City of Warwick
Dr. Judith Drew	Governor's Commission on Disabilities
Mr. Jonathan Harris	Sierra Club
Mr. Timothy Scanlon	Construction Industries of Rhode Island
Ms. Pamela Sherrill	RI Chapter, American Planning Association
Ms. Dinalyn Spears	Narragansett Indian Tribe
Mr. Michael Wood	Town of Burrillville/RI League of Cities and Towns

3. Staff Present

Ms. Catherine Pitassi	RI Statewide Planning Program
Mr. Benjamin Jacobs	RI Statewide Planning Program
Ms. Karen Scott	RI Statewide Planning Program
Mr. Chris Witt	RI Statewide Planning Program

4. Guests Present

Ms. Pam Yonkin	Mr. Grant Dulgarian

II. Agenda Items

1. Call to Order

   At 6:35 p.m. Chair Shocket called the meeting to order.

2. Approval of May 26, 2016 Meeting Minutes – *for action*

   Chair Shocket asked for a motion to approve the meeting minutes of May 26, 2016. Mr. Walker made the first motion. The motion was seconded by Ms. Brady. There was no further discussion. The following members voted aye, Shocket, Albert, Baudouin, Brady, Cassidy, Flaherty, Freeman, Gagnon, Haggerty, Lawson, Maxwell, Monaghan, Nordin, (designee for Pettine), Porter, Stuart and Walker. There were no nay votes, abstentions or recusals.

3. Public Comment on Agenda Items – *for informational purposes*

   There was none.

4. State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) FFY 2017 – 2025 – *for action*

   Chair Shocket asked Ms. Scott to give an update on the Draft TIP. She reported on what transpired during the two public hearings held on the draft STIP on May 26, 2016 and the public comment period which was open until June 26, 2016. SPP staff have compiled a draft public hearing report, which is included in this package. RISPP, RIDOT and RIPTA all addressed the comments applicable to their areas of expertise and their recommended changes have been incorporated in the draft STIP document as indicated in the public hearing report summary table. RIDOT has asked that the selection and scheduling of the TAP projects be deferred to the TAC. Ms. Scott indicated that at this meeting, the TAC is being asked to consider and address the public hearing comments related to the TAP projects. To complete this exercise, the TAC is being asked to do the following:

   1. Review the public comment period input related to TAP projects not currently included in the draft FFY 17-25 STIP. These comments are highlighted in purple in the public hearing report summary table. TAC members will be asked if there are any projects from that list that they would like to reconsider for inclusion in the draft FFY 17-25 STIP.
   2. Review the public comment period input related to the TAP projects that are currently in the draft FFY 17-25 STIP. These comments are highlighted in blue in the public hearing report summary table. TAC members will be asked if there are any projects from that list that they would like to reconsider the priority of to advance the implementation schedule in the STIP.
   3. Lastly, discuss the projects that were selected under both of the above exercises and assign them a rank of high, medium or low and embed them into the TAC's original TAP priority list which is attached and separated into high, medium and low priority projects. If the total funding proposed for TAP projects is the same as originally recommended ($123 million over the 9 years), the updated TAP priority list will be sent over to RIDOT for rescheduling. If the total funding proposed for TAP exceeds the originally recommended amount ($123 million over the 9 years), the updated TAP priority list will be sent as a recommendation to the State Planning Council for final approval, then to RIDOT for rescheduling.

Ms. Scott indicated to assist in this process key documents have been included in your package. Please find the TAC's original TAP priority list (minus projects and funds that were included in the Amendment #7 to the FFY 13-16 STIP and including projects that were added in by RIDOT) divided into high, medium and low priority projects, and the TAP Subcommittee reports where all TAP projects were originally discussed and ranked. While the focus of the meeting will be the TAP projects, any TAC member is also welcome to weigh in and make recommendations regarding any project in the draft FFY 17-25 STIP. Ms. Scott asked if there were any questions before getting started with the exercise.

Ms. Freeman asked a question in regard to the Semi Annual Safety Review that has been referred to in the TIP. Ms. Scott reported that DOT did respond and read their answer, which was included in the public hearing report.

Ms. Scott distributed a color coded public hearing table to review. Ms. Scott explained that 6 TAP projects that were not in the draft STIP received public comments (Blackstone River Bikeway: Segment 3B, I-95 Downtown Overpass Enhancement Project, Ice Road Bike Path, Ocean Road: Phases 1 & 2, Sidewalk and Curbing Replacement: Walcott Avenue, and Woonasquatucket River Greenway Extension through Johnston). She explained they have gone through a review process where sub-committees did not rank them as high priority and were not considered for inclusion. It is because of this, they did not make it to the TAC's original priority list. After reviewing the comments, the first question for the TAC is are there any projects you would like to reconsider for inclusion based on new information provided.

Mr. Flaherty asked if something has to come out in order to make room. Ms. Scott replied that there are a couple different ways the TAC can consider this. First option you can put one in and take one out. The second option is you can recommend one goes in and recommend the amount and the TAP goes higher. However, this recommendation would then be submitted to the State Planning Council, who has the final authority to alter the amounts in each category.

Mr. Baudouin questioned the number of bike projects funded in the outer years of the TIP. He mentioned a bond issue coming up in the amount of $10 million for bike projects and the likelihood of it passing. He wanted to know how it fits into the discussion of the TIP. He would like to have a more global view of the bike picture before he votes on anything.

Ms. Brady responded that the TIP will have to be approved, as the TAC approves it, before the voters vote in November. At this point, we are unable to include the $10 million as part of the TIP. As we go forward, when we do the revision next year, we can included the $10 million for more bike projects or switch to other projects.

Ms. Scott stated that because there is some uncertainty now with regard to the bond items and money being available to spend we should not hold the process up. She reminded the committee of the deadline and mentioned that the TIP needs to be submitted for adoption by the State Planning Council by September.

Ms. Brady announced her job title has changed at DOT. DOT is establishing a more robust division of planning. She stated they will have a separate bike planning section that will enable DOT to have a better idea of what they need concerning bike paths within the next six months to a year.

Mr. Walker asked for a refresher on the TAC sub-committees. He noted they had to come up with lists that then got prioritized. He asked if there was a list that had more on it and assumed that some of these requests did not get into the pool of 56 that were ranked. Ms. Scott responded that none of the projects in question were brand new, and they were all considered at the sub-committee level.

Mr. Cassidy stated that he wanted to clarify what transpired during the public hearings. Due to some individuals complaining that certain projects didn't make the cut, the projects that went through the full process, that were not prioritized, were now coming back to the TAC for reconsideration. Ms. Scott answered yes they were. Mr. Cassidy felt that the TAC should not spend time on these projects. The only projects the TAC should reconsider are the projects that have drastic changes to them and not the ones for which someone is unhappy about prioritization.

The committee continued to discuss at length the list of projects for consideration and reprioritization. Ms. Haggarty noted the I-95 Downtown Overpass Enhancement Project that was submitted as a new project, did not make it through the sub-committees. She indicated that RIDOT was willing to incorporate this in Bridge Group 1. She also reported the City recently received notice from RIDOT, through the public hearing report, that the project would not be considered in the scope of Bridge Group 1. Ms. Haggarty also reported that RIDOT suggested the City pursue this as a separate TAP project. The City was upset this happened and wanted to note this.

Ms. Brady responded RIDOT is in the middle of an extensive reorganization at this time. As they move into having a separate bridge, pavement, and bike planning section, they are going to look into incorporating this type of issue into projects as they go out. Ms. Brady guaranteed RIDOT will look at this issue; however, could not guarantee 100% this will be included in the Bridge Group 1 project. RIDOT will work with the City to come up with a reasonable solution. Ms. Brady stated she will report any updates at the next meeting.

Ms. Haggerty made a motion that the TAC recommend that RIDOT consider including the I-95 Downtown Overpass Enhancement Project within the scope of Bridge Group 1. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cassidy. The following members voted in favor: Shocket, Stuart, Albert, Baudouin, Brady, Cassidy, Flaherty, Freeman, Gagnon, Haggerty, Lawson, Maxwell, Monaghan, Nordin, Porter and Walker. There were no nay votes, abstentions or recusals.

Next item on the floor for discussion concerns the ranking of seventeen projects that were included in the draft TIP for funding, but were brought up through public comments with concerns about scheduling. Ms. Scott summarized the ranking process and asked committee members to review the list of projects and recommend any changes in their current ranking.

Mr. Cassidy clarified the TAC did not do the scheduling; RIDOT did. He felt the discussion should only address projects that may have had something significant or new that occurred that warrants consideration to move a project forward.

Ms. Brady responded on DOT's funding of various projects, such as how the movement of funding into bridge projects changed scheduling.

Mr. Baudouin asked if any other lower priority projects were scheduled in the earlier years ahead of high priority projects. Ms. Scott responded yes and gave two examples – one where RIDOT bundled several smaller projects together to get economies of scale (Safe Routes to School Projects) and one

where the TAP aspects of the project were coordinated with a larger pavement project to accommodate design and pavement scheduling (Broad Street Regeneration).

Ms. Freeman noted the TAC should keep in mind there have been estimates of $125 million required to meet the transportation and recreational cycling needs of the state. She explained there are statewide advocates working to put this funding together and on initiatives to bring more funds in. She pointed out that Aquidneck Island Bikeway: Melville Connector fell to the bottom and is ranked #21 and wanted to know if this information qualifies as new information for a potential reprioritization.

Ms. Haggarty voiced her concerns about the Exchange Street Sidewalk Widening Project. The project is ranked high; however, the majority of it is not funded until 2021-25. There are at least seven projects ranked medium to low that are funded before it. The Exchange Street Sidewalk Widening project one of four or five city and state projects that are happening along the same stretch of road that connects Kennedy Plaza and the Providence Train Station. RIDOT is also planning to replace the Exchange Street Bridge, and RIPTA is relocating the hub in this vicinity. Her concern is to avoid digging up the road again 4 years later, and she asked if this project should be funded earlier in the TIP. Mr. Scott noted the Exchange Street Bridge is scheduled to be replaced in 2023-25. She asked if the Exchange Street Widening project could be done when the bridge is replaced, so that the projects are completed together. Mr. Nordin responded that relocation of RIPTA's hub should be completed in the next 3-4 years. He noted that RIPTA can detour traffic from Canal Street to North Main Street. Ms. Brady explained DOT has an internal group working looking to better coordinate pavement and bridge planning projects to avoid this from happening again. She is not sure if DOT will have a finalized recommendation prior to adoption of the current TIP, but will be revising the TIP next year with this being at the top of the list.

Mr. Walker and Mr. Cassidy discussed the different requirements for the use of federal funds versus state funds. Using state funds changes some of the standards. Mr. Walker asked Ms. Brady how many years of the TIP were fiscally constrained. Ms. Brady reported that the federal government requires four constrained years, FFY 17-20. Funding is in place, but specific sources are not identified in the later years of the TIP.

A motion was made by Ms. Haggarty that the Exchange Street Sidewalk Widening Project be funded in the earlier years and that RIDOT align this project with the Exchange Street Bridge and RIPTA Hub projects. Mr. Baudouin seconded the motion. Discussion was as follows:

Mr. Flaherty suggested that the motion identify the specific projects the TAC recommended be bumped. Ms. Haggarty identified projects listed as low priority, including are Blackstone 8A, Main Street Improvements, Trestle Trail, West Side Road Sidewalks, etc. Mr. Walker voiced his concern that it may be too early to make this motion because projects are still in the design phase and are not ready. Ms. Freeman suggested the TAC should hold off on its approval until the committee receives a revised schedule from RIDOT. Mr. Cassidy noted a motion is still on the table to recommend that RIDOT revisit the rescheduling of this project and determine if it can be moved up.

Ms. Scott reported that she needed to take whatever is recommended by the TAC back to RIDOT for updated scheduling, turn the schedule changes into the final draft TIP, and bring the final draft TIP back to the TAC at the August meeting for action.

Ms. Haggarty reported she would like to simplify her original motion to have RIDOT and RITPA revisit the timing of the Exchange Street Sidewalk Widening Project. Mr. Baudouin seconded the motion as noted above. The following members voted in favor Shocket, Stuart, Albert, Baudouin, Brady, Flaherty, Freeman, Gagnon, Haggerty, Lawson, Maxell, Monaghan, Nordin, Porter and Walker. The following member voted nay – Cassidy. There were no abstentions or recusals.

Ms. Scott then reported that RIDOT noted two projects were shovel ready, and it recommended that their construction scheduling be advanced. The first project is the Bay Street Streetscape Improvements. This was originally scheduled for 2022, and after review RIDOT recommended moving to 2017 based on the information presented at the public hearing. The second project is the Herreshoff Marine Museum, which was originally scheduled for 2025, and RIDOT recommended this project be moved forward to 2017 after hearing the information presented at the public hearing. Ms. Scott gave detailed information about each project and the economic investment involved. Advancing these two projects would push other projects back. TAC members continued to discuss at length issues around moving projects, funding, priorities, and scheduling.

A motion was made by Mr. Cassidy to move the Bay Street Streetscape Improvements and the Herreshoff Marine Museum Projects forward as recommended by RIDOT. Motion was seconded by Mr. Gagnon. Discussion was as follows:

Mr. Baudouin said that he could not vote on the motion unless he knew what the affect is on the overall program and requested more information before voting on these projects. He suggested waiting. Ms. Freeman has confidence in RIDOT and will go along with its recommendation. Ms. Brady reported that if the TAC decided to bump the two projects forward she would have to report back to the TAC which projects will then be delayed.

The following members voted in favor of the motion Cassidy, Monaghan, Porter, Albert, Gagnon, Walker, Shocket, Stuart, Brady. The following members voted nay – Flaherty, Nordin, Haggerty, Baudouin, Lawson. The following member abstained – Freeman. Motion passes.

5. <u>State Freight and Goods Movement Plan</u> – *for discussion*

Due to the time, this agenda item was tabled until next month's meeting.

6. <u>Additional Public Comment</u> – *for informational purposes*

There were none.

7. <u>Announcements</u>– *for discussion*

Mr. Cassidy announced that the Pawtucket Central Falls received a $13.1 million grant for the commuter rail station. Chair Shocket announced this will be Ms. Scott's last TAC meeting and would like to thank her for a job well done. Mr. Boudouin made a motion to pass a resolution thanking Ms. Scott for her great work while at Statewide Planning. Motion seconded by Mr. Cassidy. Motion passed unanimously. At the August meeting it was suggested that the TAC address the freight plan item first.

8. Adjourn

Chair Shocket asked for a motion to adjourn. Mr. Walker made the first motion. The motion was seconded by Ms. Brady. There was no further discussion. The following members voted aye, Shocket, Albert, Baudouin, Brady, Cassidy, Flaherty, Freeman, Gagnon, Haggerty, Lawson, Maxwell, Monaghan, Nordin (designee for Pettine), Porter, Stuart and Walker. There were no nay votes, abstentions or recusals.

Meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Prepared by: Catherine Pitassi, Executive Assistant

Respectfully Submitted,

Chris Witt

Public Comments: Requests to Add Projects

PROJECT	COST
Blackstone River Bikeway: Segment 3B	$6.7M
I-95 Downtown Overpass Enhancement Project	$2.6M
Ice Road Bike Path	$0.225M
Ocean Road: Phases 1 & 2	$0.65M
Sidewalk and Curbing Replacement: Walcott Avenue	$0.5M
Woonasquatucket River Greenway Extension Through Johnston	$2.2M

Public Comments: Requests to Reprioritize Projects

PROJECT REPRIORITIZATION REQUESTS	Priority
Aquidneck Island Bikeway: Melville Connector	Low
Bay Street Streetscape Improvements	Medium
Blackstone River Bikeway: Segment 3A	Medium
Blackstone River Bikeway: Segment 8A	Medium
Blackstone River Bikeway: Segment 8B-1	Medium
Blackstone River Bikeway: Segment 8B-2	Medium
Blackstone River Bikeway: Segment 8C	High
Cathedral Square Enhancement Project	Medium

PROJECT REPRIORITIZATION REQUESTS	Priority
East Bay Bike Path Extension	Medium
East Bay Bike Path: Warren Bridge	Low
Exchange Street Sidewalk Widening	High
Herreshoff Marine Museum	Low
Providence Bicycle Infrastructure Enhancements	Low
Ten Mile River Greenway: Segments 1 - 4	Low
Trestle Trail West Section Paving	Low
West Side Road Sidewalks	Medium
Woonasquatucket Greenway Corridor Enhancements	High

Rank	ID	Name	Type	TIP Cost
H	5253	Recreational Trails Program	Rec. Trails	$5.21
H	1307	Rt 114 St (Mendon Rd, Cumberland to Exchange St, Pawtucket)	Ped/ADA	$7.54
H	5294	SRTS Infrastructure Improvements for Citizens & Pothier Elementary Schools	SRTS	$0.35
H	5183	Citywalk Providence Pedestrian and Bicycle Enhancement Project	Ped/ADA	$1.88
H	5320	Blackstone River Bikeway - Segment 8C	Bike	$1.41
H	5155	Slater Mill Phase II	OTA	$0.50
H	5178	NBT/WRG: Providence Woonasquatucket Greenway Enhancements	Bike	$5.98
H	5001	SRTS Infrastructure Improvements for Barrington Middle School	SRTS	$0.38
H	5120	Post Road - Curbing & Sidewalks	Ped/ADA	$2.00
H	5089	South County Bike Path Completion	Bike	$8.30
H	5110	Shared Use Trail Path along Newport Secondary Rail Corridor	Bike	$7.20
H	5105	Thames and Spring Street Streetscape Improvements	Ped/ADA	$8.50
H	5040	SRTS Infrastructure Improvements for Myron Francis Elementary School	SRTS	$0.15
H	1460	Exchange Street Sidewalk Widening Project	Ped/ADA	$3.53
H	5080	East Main Road Shared Use Path (Hedly St. to Enterprise Dr.)	Bike	$3.00
H	5088	SRTS Infrastructure Improvements for Narragansett Pier Middle School	SRTS	$0.72
H	5060	Jamestown Bridge Bike/Pedestrian Access	Bike	$0.80
H	5166	Sprague Street Sidewalks	Ped/ADA	$0.50
M	5096	West Side Road - Sidewalks	Ped/ADA	$1.22
M	5109	SRTS - Bedlow Avenue/Hillside Avenue Sidewalks	SRTS	$0.23
M	5286	Bay Street Streetscape Improvements	OTA	$1.40
M	5021	SRTS Infrastructure Improvements for Western Hills Middle School	SRTS	$0.44
M	9001	Trestle Trail - West Section, 2 Bridges	Bike	$1.56
M	5072	Purgatory Road Sidewalk Installation	Ped/ADA	$0.64
M	5285	SRTS Infrastructure Improvements for State Street Elementary School	SRTS	$0.78
M	5309	Main Street Improvements	Ped/ADA	$0.37
M	5202	Providence Waterplace & Riverwalk Repairs & Walkway Improvements	Ped/ADA	$4.05
M	5293	Blackstone River Bikeway - Segment 8A	Bike	$4.04
M	5164	East Main Road Sidewalks	Ped/ADA	$2.00
M	5318	Blackstone River Bikeway - Segment 8B-1	Bike	$2.48
M	5132	Blackstone River Bikeway - Segment 3A	Bike	$8.60
M	5108	Marlboro Street/West Marlboro Streetscape Improvements	Ped/ADA	$1.90
M	5182	Cathedral Square Enhancement Project	Ped/ADA	$0.48
M	5319	Blackstone River Bikeway - Segment 8B-2	Bike	$2.64
M	5162	Mount Hope Bay Bicycle Improvements	Bike	$0.16
M	5271	East Bay Bike Path Extension (Warren Bike Path)	Bike	$2.00
L	9002	Trestle Trail - West Section, Paving	Bike	$5.50
L	5199	Providence Bicycle Infrastructure	Bike	$1.80
L	5215	Washington Secondary Bike Path Extension	Bike	$1.71
L	5157	Ten Mile River Greenway	Bike	$0.50
L	5161	Aquidneck Island Bikeway - Melville Connector	Bike	$2.16
L	5005	East Bay Bike Path Bridge Replacement (Barrington River & Warren Bridges)	Bike	$10.40
L	5045	Ten Mile River Greenway, Segment 1-4	Bike	$2.50
L	5007	Herreshoff Marine Museum	OTA	$0.82
L	5171	Stone Bridge Rehabilitation Study	OTA	$0.08
L	5200	Downtown Providence Pedestrian Wayfinding Project	Ped/ADA	$0.05
L	5002	SRTS - Primrose Elementary School	SRTS	$0.43
L	5039	SRTS - Kent Heights Elementary School	SRTS	$0.29
L	5224	SRTS - Gallagher Middle and McCabe Elementary Schools	SRTS	$0.24
L	5028	Cranston Street Transportation Enhancements	OTA	$0.12
L	5267	SRTS - Cole Elementary and Kickemuit Middle Schools	SRTS	$1.37
L	9011	ADA Plan Project Implementation	Ped/ADA	$1.70
L	5307	Woonsocket River Landing	OTA	$0.39
				$123.00