1. Introduction

This public comment report outlines the opportunity provided for public comment and the input received related to the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2017-2025 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). Two public hearings were held on May 26, 2016, at which public comment was received on Amendment #7 to the FFY 2013-2016 STIP, as well as the draft FFY 17-25 STIP. However, this public hearing report only addresses comments related to the draft FFY 17-25 STIP. The public comment period for Amendment #7 ended with the close of the second public hearing, while the public comment period for the FFY 17-25 STIP ended on June 26, 2016. A previously published public comment report addressed the input related to Amendment #7 to the FFY 2013-2016 STIP.

Purpose of the Proposed Amendment

The State Planning Council is developing the STIP for FFY 2017-2025. The STIP is a nine-year program which includes Bridge Capital, Bridge Maintenance, Debt Service, Contingency-Inflation, Drainage Capital, Drainage Maintenance, Headquarters Operations, Maintenance Capital, Maintenance Operations, Pavement Capital, Pavement Maintenance, Planning – Program Development, Toll Operations, Traffic Safety Capital, Traffic Safety Maintenance, Transit Capital (RIPTA & RIDOT), Transit Operations (RIPTA & RIDOT), Other Transit Initiatives (RIPTA), Route 6/10, and Transportation Alternatives projects that are eligible to receive federal funding. The STIP must be updated at a minimum of every (4) years in accordance with federal requirements and the State Planning Council’s Rules of Procedure and the first four years of the STIP (FFY 2017-FFY 2020) must be fiscally constrained. This STIP update included a full solicitation of new projects from Rhode Island state agencies, municipalities, organizations, and individuals. These projects were reviewed by subcommittees of the State Planning Council’s Transportation Advisory Committee, Rhode Island Department of Transportation, and Rhode Island Public Transit Authority staff. Recommendations were incorporated into the full draft FFY 2017-2025 STIP document. A complete description of the STIP development process is outlined in the draft STIP document.

Public Hearings and Comment Period

The State Planning Council gave notice of its intent to hold a public hearing to afford interested parties the opportunity to provide public comment. Notice of the two public hearings and opportunity to comment on the draft FFY 2017 - 2025 STIP was provided through advertisement in the Providence Journal on April 25, 2016, posting on the Statewide Planning Program’s website in English and Spanish, a direct mailing to the over 800 planning and transportation contacts in the Statewide Planning Program’s database, and inclusion in the Statewide Planning Program’s May newsletter, which was sent to interested parties on May 2, 2016. In addition, the public notice was read in Spanish on the Spanish language radio station Podor 1110, 14 times leading up to the hearings. Both the English and Spanish hearing notices posted on the Division of Planning website are included as Attachment 1.

All persons were invited to present their views on the proposed amendments in person at the public hearings, through a representative, or by filing a written statement with the Secretary of the State Planning Council by the end of the public comment period on June 26, 2016. Written statements could be mailed or e-mailed to Jared Rhodes, Chief of the RI Statewide Planning Program, One Capitol Hill, Providence, RI 02908, or submitted at a hearing. All written statements are included in Attachment 2.
On May 26, 2016, the Statewide Planning Program, on behalf of the State Planning Council, held two public hearings, one at 2:00 p.m. and one at 6:30 p.m. in front of the Transportation Advisory Committee, to accept comments on the draft FFY 2017-2025 STIP. Both hearings were held at the Department of Administration, William E. Powers Building, Conference Room A, Providence, RI 02908.

The hearing locations were accessible to individuals with disabilities. Any individual with physical or sensory impairments requiring assistance for a reasonable accommodation in order to participate in the hearings, or any individual requiring the services of a spoken language interpreter, was instructed by the hearing notice as to how to request accommodation. A stenographer was present to create a transcript of both public hearings, which are included in Attachment 3.

Organization of the Report

This report contains three additional sections. Section 2 describes the proceedings of the 2:00 p.m. public hearing, Section 3 describes the proceedings of the 6:30 p.m. public hearing, and Section 4 includes a summary of the written and oral comments received at both hearings and during the public comment period relevant to the draft FFY 2017-2025 STIP and responses to the comments.

2. Proceedings of the 2:00 p.m. Public Hearing

The hearing was called to order at 2:10 p.m. by Jared Rhodes, Chief of the Rhode Island Statewide Planning Program, who was the presiding officer at the hearing. He then overviewed the purpose of the hearing which was to accept public comment on the Amendment #7 to the State Transportation Improvement Program for Federal Fiscal Years 2013 – 2016 and the Draft State Transportation Improvement Program for Federal Fiscal Years 2017 – 2025.

Mr. Rhodes directed all those who wished to make comments to sign in, and clarified that there is opportunity to provide additional comments at the second public hearing scheduled for 6:30 p.m. that evening, and to provide written comments on the proposed FFY 17-25 STIP through June 26, 2016.

Mr. Rhodes then introduced Linsey Callaghan, Supervising Planner with the Statewide Planning Program who overviewed and gave context for Amendment #7 to the FFY 13-16 STIP and the draft FFY 17-25 STIP. The presentation included a description of policy and funding changes on both the federal and state level directing the state towards a more asset management based system of transportation planning. Amy Pettine, Executive Director of Planning for the Rhode Island Public Transit Authority (RIPTA), reviewed RIPTA’s proposed amendments to the FFY 13-16 STIP. This presentation was followed by Meredith Brady, Acting Policy Director for the Rhode Island Department of Transportation (RIDOT), who explained RIDOT proposed amendments. Following the presentation on Amendment #7, a brief presentation was given by Ms. Callaghan, Ms. Pettine, and Ms. Brady regarding the draft FFY 17-25 STIP. Ms. Callaghan concluded the formal presentations by outlining the next steps in the FFY 13-16 STIP amendment and FFY 17-25 STIP adoption processes.

Mr. Rhodes noted that no responses to questions posed at the hearing would be given, however, anyone wishing to make comments was welcome to speak. In total, 20 members of the public provided comment, including Senator Dennis Algiere, Representatives Carlos Tobon and Carol Hagan McEntee, and the Mayors of Central Falls and Cumberland. All public comments are outlined and addressed in Section 4 of this report. All written comments received at the meeting are included in Attachment 2.
When all interested parties had been given and exercised the opportunity to comment, Mr. Rhodes thanked those in attendance for their interest. The public hearing closed at 4:20 p.m.

3. Proceedings of the 6:30 p.m. Public Hearing and Discussion on Amendment #7 to the FFY 13-16 STIP by the Transportation Advisory Committee

The hearing was called to order at 6:36 p.m. by Fran Shocket, Chairperson of the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC), who was the presiding officer at the hearing. She then overviewed the purpose of the hearing which was to accept public comment on the Amendment #7 to the State Transportation Improvement Program for Federal Fiscal Years 2013 – 2016 and the Draft State Transportation Improvement Program for Federal Fiscal Years 2017 – 2025.

Ms. Shocket directed all those who wished to make comments to sign in and clarified that there is opportunity to provide additional written comments on the proposed FFY 17-25 STIP through June 26, 2016.

Ms. Shocket then introduced Linsey Callaghan, Supervising Planner with the Statewide Planning Program who overviewed and gave context for both Amendment #7 to the FFY 13-16 STIP and the draft FFY 17-25 STIP. The presentation included a description of policy and funding changes on both the federal and state level directing the state towards a more asset management based system of transportation planning. Amy Pettine, Executive Director of Planning for the Rhode Island Public Transit Authority (RIPTA), reviewed RIPTA’s proposed amendments to the FFY 13-16 STIP. This presentation was followed by Meredith Brady, Acting Policy Director for the Rhode Island Department of Transportation (RIDOT), who explained RIDOT proposed amendments. Following the presentation on Amendment #7, a brief presentation was given by Ms. Callaghan, Ms. Pettine, and Ms. Brady regarding the draft FFY 17-25 STIP. Ms. Callaghan concluded the formal presentations by outlining the next steps in the FFY 13-16 STIP amendment and FFY 17-25 STIP adoption processes.

Ms. Shocket noted that no responses to questions posed at the hearing would be given, however, anyone wishing to make comments was welcome to speak. In total, 10 members of the public provided comment, including Municipal Councilors from the Towns of Warren and North Kingstown. All public comments are outlined and addressed in Section 4 of this report. All written comments received at the meeting are included in Attachment 2.

When all interested parties had been given and exercised the opportunity to comment, Ms. Shocket thanked those in attendance for their interest. The public hearing closed at 8:06 p.m.

4. Summary of and Response to Comments Received related to the draft FFY 2017-2025 STIP

Below, please find a table with a summary of all the comments, both written and oral, received as part of the public hearing and comment period related to the draft FFY 17-25 STIP. The table provides a summary of the comment, who made the comment, the project name, year in the STIP, TIP ID number, TIP program, municipality, reviewing entity, response, and change, if any, made to the STIP document.
### PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REQUESTED BY</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>FUND ID</th>
<th>MUNICIPALITY</th>
<th>REQUESTED FUND</th>
<th>TYPE OF COMMENT</th>
<th>REVIEWING ENTITY</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
<th>CHARGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barry Schiller</td>
<td>6/10 Project</td>
<td>2020-2024</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Not ready to give RIDOT $105 million when basic design is being debated and the City is putting out bids for alternate designs.</td>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>RIDOT will be completing NEPA and Conceptual Design for the Route 6/10 Project and will continue to examine alternatives for this corridor including assessing all modes of transit that could potentially be used (bus, light rail, light rail, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Bishop</td>
<td>6/10 Project</td>
<td>2020-2024</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Do not obligate $200 million for 6/10 Connector in FFY 2016.</td>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>RIDOT will allocate the 6/10 Connector in FY2016 will not be obligated to the project; they are state funds borrowed through the GARVEE financing tool and the intent of showing these funds as allocated to the 6/10 Connector in the FY2016 TIP amendment is to make clear (particularly to those who may be awarding grants) that the state has funded the project. In future years, as the project progresses, RIDOT will develop a cash flow for the use of the funds.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Deligante, Ecology Action for RI</td>
<td>6/10 Project</td>
<td>2020-2024</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Do not obligate $200 million for 6/10 Connector in FFY 2016.</td>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>Rhode Island will be completing NEPA, Conceptual Design and Preliminary Engineering for the Route 6/10 Project. During this time alternatives will be evaluated and additional data will be collected and analyzed including an examination of historical data.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Grabs</td>
<td>Aquidneck Island Bikeway - Melville Connector</td>
<td>2020-2024</td>
<td>5161</td>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>This project is ready to advance and should be moved up in the TIP.</td>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>TAC</td>
<td>There is not sufficient funds to undertake all projects in the earliest years of the Transportation Improvement Program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jorge Elorza, Mayor and Bonnie Nickerson, Planning Director</td>
<td>6/10 Project</td>
<td>2020-2023</td>
<td>1510</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>This project has been put on hold and the $3.2M in funding be allocated to one of the higher priority TIP projects identified by the City.</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>Rhode Island will not be able to obligate $800 million - need to sit down and try to determine what we should be looking at for 6-10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Algieri, State Senator, District 38</td>
<td>Bay Street Streetscape Improvements</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>5286</td>
<td>Westerly</td>
<td>Requests that the project be moved up in the TIP.</td>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>TAC</td>
<td>The project is moved from FY2022 to 2023 but no earlier to avoid moving projects already designated as high priority.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Kingdon, Town Manager Westerly</td>
<td>Bay Street Streetscape Improvements</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>5286</td>
<td>Westerly</td>
<td>Requests that the project be moved up in the TIP.</td>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>TAC</td>
<td>The project is moved from FY2022 to 2023 but no earlier to avoid moving projects already designated as high priority.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Simmons</td>
<td>Bay Street Streetscape Improvements</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>5286</td>
<td>Westerly</td>
<td>Requests that the project be moved up in the TIP.</td>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>TAC</td>
<td>The project is moved from FY2022 to 2023 but no earlier to avoid moving projects already designated as high priority.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Laddick, Town of Westerly, Town Engineer</td>
<td>Bay Street Streetscape Improvements</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>5286</td>
<td>Westerly</td>
<td>Requests that the project be moved up in the TIP.</td>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>TAC</td>
<td>The project is moved from FY2022 to 2023 but no earlier to avoid moving projects already designated as high priority.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Schiller</td>
<td>Bicycle Program</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Not enough spent on bicycle program.</td>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>Moving forward into future years, there will be an opportunity to review projects and progress on an annual basis, and projects not included in the FY2016 amendment or the FY2017-2025 STIP may be included in a future revision or future years. At this time, the FY2016 amendment and the FY 2017-2025 STIP are constrained fiscally and no additional funding is available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT NAME</td>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>TIP ID</td>
<td>MUNICIPALITY</td>
<td>REQUESTS</td>
<td>ACTIONS</td>
<td>TYPE OF COMMENT</td>
<td>REVIEWING ENTITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackstone River Bikeway - Segment 8A</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>5293</td>
<td>Woonsocket</td>
<td>Add STBG-SA funding of $1.21</td>
<td>Switching between available funding sources. Use of STBG set-aside funds (formerly TAP funds).</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackstone River Bikeway - Segment 8A</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>5293</td>
<td>Woonsocket</td>
<td>Decrease RICAP (HIP) funding from $1.61 to $0.40</td>
<td>Switching between available funding sources. Use of STBG set-aside funds (formerly TAP funds).</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackstone River Bikeway - Segment 8A</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>5293</td>
<td>Woonsocket</td>
<td>Add STBG-SA funding of $1.21</td>
<td>Switching between available funding sources. Use of STBG set-aside funds (formerly TAP funds).</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackstone River Bikeway - Segment 8A</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>5293</td>
<td>Woonsocket</td>
<td>Move $1.4 from 2019 to 2021</td>
<td>Switching between available funding sources. Use of STBG set-aside funds (formerly TAP funds).</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackstone River Bikeway - Segment 8A</td>
<td>2022-2025</td>
<td>9017</td>
<td>Pawtucket</td>
<td>Moved $1.6M from FFY 2024 to FFY2025</td>
<td>Revised project funding schedule</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackstone River Bikeway - Segment 8C</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>5320</td>
<td>Woonsocket</td>
<td>Add STBG-SA funding of $1.18</td>
<td>Switching between available funding sources. Use of STBG set-aside funds (formerly TAP funds).</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackstone River Bikeway - Segment 8C</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>5320</td>
<td>Woonsocket</td>
<td>Decrease RICAP (HIP) funding from $1.41 to $0.23</td>
<td>Switching between available funding sources. Use of STBG set-aside funds (formerly TAP funds).</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Coast Greenway Alliance</td>
<td>2017-2019</td>
<td>5293, 5318, 5320, 9001</td>
<td>Woonsocket, Narragansett</td>
<td>Requests that the project be moved up in the TIP</td>
<td>Supports projects</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Coast Greenway Alliance</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>8A-2</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Find ways to fund and prioritize gaps in the greenway network, particularly sections of the East Coast Greenway</td>
<td>Include in TIP</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>TAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Coast Greenway Alliance</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>5212</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Find ways to fund and prioritize gaps in the greenway network, particularly sections of the East Coast Greenway</td>
<td>Include in TIP</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>TAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Coast Greenway Alliance</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>9012 and 9013</td>
<td>Pawtucket</td>
<td>Requests that the project be moved up in the TIP</td>
<td>Find ways to fund and prioritize gaps in the greenway network, particularly sections of the East Coast Greenway</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>TAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Coast Greenway Alliance</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>5011</td>
<td>Pawtucket</td>
<td>Requests that the project be moved up in the TIP</td>
<td>Find ways to fund and prioritize gaps in the greenway network, particularly sections of the East Coast Greenway</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>TAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Coast Greenway Alliance</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>5201</td>
<td>Woonsocket</td>
<td>Requests that the project be moved up in the TIP</td>
<td>Find ways to fund and prioritize gaps in the greenway network, particularly sections of the East Coast Greenway</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>TAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Coast Greenway Alliance</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>5168</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Requests that the project be moved up in the TIP</td>
<td>Find ways to fund and prioritize gaps in the greenway network, particularly sections of the East Coast Greenway</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>TAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Coast Greenway Alliance</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>5319</td>
<td>Woonsocket</td>
<td>Requests that the project be moved up in the TIP</td>
<td>Find ways to fund and prioritize gaps in the greenway network, particularly sections of the East Coast Greenway</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>TAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Coast Greenway Alliance</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>5212</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Find ways to fund and prioritize gaps in the greenway network, particularly sections of the East Coast Greenway</td>
<td>Include in TIP</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>TAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnet Shores Fire District</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>5320</td>
<td>Woonsocket</td>
<td>Requests that the project be moved up in the TIP</td>
<td>Incorporating existing city streets, where bike-friendly design may be incorporated in the future. State systems have been viewed as a whole as part of the Ten Year Plan, instead of on a community by community basis, and every project can be funded in the first five years.</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>TAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narragansett</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>5293</td>
<td>Woonsocket</td>
<td>Add STBG-SA funding of $1.21</td>
<td>Switching between available funding sources. Use of STBG set-aside funds (formerly TAP funds).</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narragansett</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>5293</td>
<td>Woonsocket</td>
<td>Decrease RICAP (HIP) funding from $1.61 to $0.40</td>
<td>Switching between available funding sources. Use of STBG set-aside funds (formerly TAP funds).</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narragansett</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>5293</td>
<td>Woonsocket</td>
<td>Add STBG-SA funding of $1.21</td>
<td>Switching between available funding sources. Use of STBG set-aside funds (formerly TAP funds).</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narragansett</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>5293</td>
<td>Woonsocket</td>
<td>Move $1.4 from 2019 to 2021</td>
<td>Switching between available funding sources. Use of STBG set-aside funds (formerly TAP funds).</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narragansett</td>
<td>2022-2025</td>
<td>9017</td>
<td>Pawtucket</td>
<td>Moved $1.6M from FFY 2024 to FFY2025</td>
<td>Revised project funding schedule</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narragansett</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>5320</td>
<td>Woonsocket</td>
<td>Add STBG-SA funding of $1.18</td>
<td>Switching between available funding sources. Use of STBG set-aside funds (formerly TAP funds).</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narragansett</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>5320</td>
<td>Woonsocket</td>
<td>Decrease RICAP (HIP) funding from $1.41 to $0.23</td>
<td>Switching between available funding sources. Use of STBG set-aside funds (formerly TAP funds).</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT NAME</td>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>TIP ID</td>
<td>MUNICIPALITY</td>
<td>REQUESTED BY</td>
<td>TYPE OF COMMENT</td>
<td>REVIEWING/EDITING ENTITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narragansett</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>1401</td>
<td>S. Kingstown,</td>
<td>Reconsider Bonnet Shores Causeway -</td>
<td>Written (E-mail)</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Narragansett</td>
<td>want to resubmit a &quot;Plan B&quot; for the project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project will enhance safety of motorists and pedestrians in Bonnet. Improve the water quality in the Wesquage watershed and enhance substantially an important means of egress from Bonnet in the event of a natural disaster.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitted letter from Town Manager.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Submitted letter from Town Manager.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIDOT staff have reviewed this project, but it does not meet the asset management based criteria for TIP inclusion. The road is a Town road, and is not part of the National Highway System. In addition, there is concern that the revised estimate is low, given the scope and scale of the project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>930 bath houses and cabins - 2 -5 people a day to Bonnet Shores beach. Only access to beach club is causeway. Pond on either side, culverts between/under road. Water level is very high. Need to dredge West Bray pond - not included. Getting a permit from CRMC, can dredge once a year. Causeway floods and no one can get through. Fire chief - to go around the causeway, 5-7 minutes longer. Federal aid highway, evacuation route. Reconsider and look at new plan - submitted amended application. Bonnet Shores beach club planning on putting a sewer line down causeway, timing perfect.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconsider Bonnet Shores Causeway - want to resubmit a &quot;Plan B&quot; for the project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantially less. 57866. Services 600 of 950+ households in Bonnet Shores. 950 bath houses and cabins - 2 -5 people a day to Bonnet Shores beach. Only access to beach club is causeway. Pond on either side, culverts between/under road. Water level is very high. Need to dredge West Bray pond - not included. Getting a permit from CRMC, can dredge once a year. Causeway floods and no one can get through. Fire chief - to go around the causeway, 5-7 minutes longer. Federal aid highway, evacuation route. Reconsider and look at new plan - submitted amended application. Bonnet Shores beach club planning on putting a sewer line down causeway, timing perfect.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of Bonnet Shores representing 152 households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Narragansett</td>
<td>Reconsider Bonnet Shores Causeway - want to resubmit a &quot;Plan B&quot; for the project.</td>
<td>Oral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overpass Enhancement Project* for inclusion in the TIP, but it was not funded. The application requested striping, traffic lane reconfiguration, sidewalk widening and other streetscape enhancements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconsider Bonnet Shores Causeway - want to resubmit a &quot;Plan B&quot; for the project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests Rep. McElvee's comments. Amended application removes some obstacles they had concerning the lesser reconstruction of the causeway. Stable construction plan. Window of 15-20 years. Not a long-term amelioration of the hazards - vehicular danger, particularly in the summer. 20 feet wide, no shoulder, pedestrians crossing, traffic in both directions. Serious hazard. Without dredging, the overtaxed and overloaded Wesquage watershed will continue to flood. Only two roads in and out of BS, both subject to flooding with major rainfall.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narragansett</td>
<td>2018-2020</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Bridge Group 1</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Group 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>submitted the proposed project as part of the scope of Bridge Group 1, and may be more appropriately designated a TAP project or a traffic safety project. RIDOT partners closely with the City and will review needs related to this project as part of the annual TIP update process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include elements of the I-95 Downtown Overpass Enhancement Project (submitted by the City and not funded) within the scope of work for Bridge Group 1, and work with the City to generate initial ideas to make the overpasses safer and more attractive to pedestrians. In the Project Description, added &quot;bicycle and pedestrian accommodations&quot; as elements to be evaluated as part of the project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantially less. 938 Substantially less. 938 k. Services 600 of 950+ households in Bonnet Shores. 950 bath houses and cabins - 2 -5 people a day to Bonnet Shores beach. Only access to beach club is causeway. Pond on either side, culverts between/under road. Water level is very high. Need to dredge West Bray pond - not included. Getting a permit from CRMC, can dredge once a year. Causeway floods and no one can get through. Fire chief - to go around the causeway, 5-7 minutes longer. Federal aid highway, evacuation route. Reconsider and look at new plan - submitted amended application. Bonnet Shores beach club planning on putting a sewer line down causeway, timing perfect.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narragansett</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>1601</td>
<td>S. Kingstown, Narragansett</td>
<td>Add RHMA funding of $2.21</td>
<td>Switching between funding sources.</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Group 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>submitted the proposed project as part of the scope of Bridge Group 1, and may be more appropriately designated a TAP project or a traffic safety project. RIDOT partners closely with the City and will review needs related to this project as part of the annual TIP update process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add RHMA funding of $2.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>submitted the proposed project as part of the scope of Bridge Group 1, and may be more appropriately designated a TAP project or a traffic safety project. RIDOT partners closely with the City and will review needs related to this project as part of the annual TIP update process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REQUESTED BY</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>PROJECT YEAR</th>
<th>TIP ID</th>
<th>MUNICIPALITY</th>
<th>REQUEST COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jorge Elorza, Mayor and Bonnie Nickerson, Planning Director</td>
<td>Broad St Bridge at I-95</td>
<td>2017-2019</td>
<td>6453 Providence</td>
<td>Request that RIDOT include improvements to the bridge to make it safer and more attractive for pedestrians and bicyclists, and meet with the City as soon as possible to generate ideas for how the bridge replacement could enhance the City Walk project.</td>
<td>The City Walk project has been ranked as a high priority and been given funding in 2017-2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Pires, Pawtucket CF Development Corp</td>
<td>Broad Street Regeneration</td>
<td>2018-2021</td>
<td>9007 Pawtucket, CF, Cumberland</td>
<td>Support.</td>
<td>Support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor James A. Diossa, Central Falls; Mayor Bill Murray, Cumberland; Mayor Don Grebien, Pawtucket</td>
<td>Broad Street Regeneration Initiative</td>
<td>2018-2021</td>
<td>9007 Central Falls, Pawtucket, Cumberland</td>
<td>Support of the project and the funding plan as outlined.</td>
<td>Oral/Written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>Broad Street Regeneration Project</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>9007 Central Falls, Pawtucket, Cumberland</td>
<td>Add STBG-SA funding of $1.21 Switching between available funding sources. Use of STBG set-aside funds (formerly TAP funds).</td>
<td>Written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>Broad Street Regeneration Project</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>9007 Central Falls, Pawtucket, Cumberland</td>
<td>Decrease RIHMA funding from $2.30 to $1.09 Switching between available funding sources. Use of STBG set-aside funds (formerly TAP funds).</td>
<td>Written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>Capital Program Planning/Oversight</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>7801 Cathedral Square Enhancement Project</td>
<td>Add RIHMA funding of $0.40 Additional financing for planning purposes.</td>
<td>Written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jorge Elorza, Mayor and Bonnie Nickerson, Planning Director</td>
<td>Cathedral Square Enhancement Project</td>
<td>2017-2019</td>
<td>5181 Providence</td>
<td>Request that the timeline be moved up to 2020 to accommodate construction of this project. This project will include physical improvements to Cathedral Square.</td>
<td>Written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis Dana, Jewelry District Condominium District</td>
<td>CityWalk Providence Pedestrian and Bicycle Enhancement Project</td>
<td>2017-2019</td>
<td>5183 Providence</td>
<td>Thanks for recognizing the value of the idea. Will unite 8 neighborhoods with designated bike way and links to other attractions.</td>
<td>Oral/RISPP Support noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REQUESTED BY</td>
<td>PROJECT NAME</td>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>MUNICIPALITY</td>
<td>REQUEST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter McClure, Planning and Zoning Committee, Jewelry District Association</td>
<td>CityWalk Providence Pedestrian and Bicycle Enhancement Project</td>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>5183</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Supports the project, and thanks the state for its inclusion in the draft TIP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoebe Blake, Chair, Planning and Zoning Committee, Jewelry District Association</td>
<td>CityWalk Providence Pedestrian and Bicycle Enhancement Project</td>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>5183</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Supports the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Votava, Executive Director, DOT Watch</td>
<td>Commuter Rail to Kingston and Westerly</td>
<td>Not in draft TIP</td>
<td>5182</td>
<td>Include in TIP</td>
<td>Opting out of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy O. Dodge, Town Manager, New Shoreham</td>
<td>Conanmous Road - Pavement</td>
<td>Not in draft TIP</td>
<td>5100</td>
<td>New Shoreham</td>
<td>Fund project in early years of the TIP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jorge Eiras, Mayor and Bonnie Nickerson, Planning Director</td>
<td>Delanoe Street Bridge at Woonasquatucket River - Bridge ID 04021</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1412</td>
<td>Westerly</td>
<td>Switching between funding sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1413</td>
<td>Westerly</td>
<td>Remove STPG funding of $0.40. Add RCPP (HIP) funding of $0.60.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1413</td>
<td>Westerly</td>
<td>Switching between funding sources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We understand the city’s concerns and will meet and coordinate with them at the earliest stages of each project. An asset management based approach was used to develop the 10 year plan. The plan balances safety, budget, and the overall improvement of the entire state’s infrastructure. The asset management based approach allows us achieve a $950 million savings by incorporating preservation type projects early on in the plan. This allows us to prevent structures from becoming structurally deficient. The reconstruction of a structurally deficient bridge can be 4 to 6 times as expensive as a preservation project. To move these reconstruction projects up in the program upsets the balance of the program and reduces the savings and increase the time it will take us to put our infrastructure into a state of good repair. RIDOT will continue to monitor the structure to insure their public safety till the time the structure is rehabilitated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TIP</th>
<th>MUNICIPALITY</th>
<th>REQUEST</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Providence Enhanced Transit Corridor</td>
<td>2016-2020</td>
<td>5184</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Run a pilot bus route along the proposed corridor before committing $17 million to the project.</td>
<td>This project was ranked by the City as a low priority, however has been allocated $3M for 2017-2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Providence Enhanced Transit Corridor</td>
<td>2016-2020</td>
<td>5184</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Request project be put on hold and that further discussions take place between RIDOT, Providence and RIPTA to determine how the project can better advance the Downtown Enhanced Bus Corridor project and whether there is an opportunity to reduce the budget to allocate funding to one of the City's higher priority TAG projects.</td>
<td>This project was ranked as the lowest priority, however, has been allocated $3M for 2017-2018.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:**
- **Date:** 2017-2018
- **Location:** Dudley Street Connector (Eddy St. to Alkens Ave.)

**Description:**
- **Proposed Route:**
  - Route 6 and 49 on the proposed corridor.
- **Investments:**
  - 6 hybrid electric vehicles, 8 custom-designed shelters, seating, custom-designed signage including wayfinding, cycling infrastructure, ticket vending machines, real-time display panels, transit signal prioritization, and geometric roadway improvements.

**Additional Information:**
- **Project Benefits:**
  - Reduced traffic congestion.
  - Improved accessibility and mobility.

**Response:**
- **RIPTA:**
  - The project should be put on hold and further discussions should take place to determine how the project can better advance the Downtown Enhanced Bus Corridor project and whether there is an opportunity to reduce the budget.

**Editor:**
- Barry Schiller (DOT Watch)
- Jorge Elorza, Mayor and Bonnie Nickerson, Planning Director

**Action:**
- The project will continue to work with RIPTA and the City on how best to coordinate this project with the Downtown Providence Enhanced Transit Corridor Project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TIP ID</th>
<th>MUNICIPALITY</th>
<th>REQUEST</th>
<th>TYPE OF COMMENT</th>
<th>REVIEWS/EDITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Bay Bike Path Extension</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>5271</td>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>Wants the project moved up in the TIP.</td>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>TAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bay Bike Path Extension</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>5271</td>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>Would like to move the project up in the TIP. A feasibility study was completed in 1997 and construction of the first section was complete in 2009. The proposed path would schools and senior housing as well as possible connections to bike paths in Massachusetts.</td>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>TAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bay Bike Path Extension and Bridge</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>5271</td>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>Requests to move the project up in the TIP, specifically the bridge. He must travel on busy, unsafe Child Street to reach the East Bay Bike Path.</td>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>TAC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kate Michaud, Town Planner, Warren

James Lefere, Planning Board, Warren

Mayor John Stora, and planning Borin. [Insert Example]

RIDOT

TAC

There is not sufficient funds to undertake all projects in the earliest years of the Transportation Improvement Program.
**PROJECT NAME** | **YEAR** | **TIP ID** | **MUNICIPALITY** | **REQUEST** | **COMMENTS**
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Decrease 5307 funding from $4.2 to $0.70 | 2024 | 5128 | Providence | Double counted. Shows up in Drainage program in Draft TIP. | Written

**PROJECT NAME** | **YEAR** | **TIP ID** | **MUNICIPALITY** | **REQUEST** | **COMMENTS**
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Decrease RIHMA funding from $15.03 to $0.92 | 2018 | 5128 | N. Kingston | Double counted. Shows up in Drainage program in Draft TIP. | Written

**PROJECT NAME** | **YEAR** | **TIP ID** | **MUNICIPALITY** | **REQUEST** | **COMMENTS**
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Decrease funding from $1.4 to $0.70 | 2021 | 5128 | Providence | Double counted. Shows up in Drainage program in Draft TIP. | Written

**PROJECT NAME** | **YEAR** | **TIP ID** | **MUNICIPALITY** | **REQUEST** | **COMMENTS**
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Decrease funding from $1.4 to $0.70 | 2021 | 5128 | Providence | Double counted. Shows up in Drainage program in Draft TIP. | Written

**PROJECT NAME** | **YEAR** | **TIP ID** | **MUNICIPALITY** | **REQUEST** | **COMMENTS**
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Decrease RIHMA funding from $15.05 to $9.12 | 2024 | 5128 | Providence | Double counted. Shows up in Drainage program in Draft TIP. | Written

**PROJECT NAME** | **YEAR** | **TIP ID** | **MUNICIPALITY** | **REQUEST** | **COMMENTS**
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Decrease RIHMA funding from $15.05 to $9.12 | 2024 | 5128 | Providence | Double counted. Shows up in Drainage program in Draft TIP. | Written

**PROJECT NAME** | **YEAR** | **TIP ID** | **MUNICIPALITY** | **REQUEST** | **COMMENTS**
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Request that the $3.13M allocated in year 2018 and another $3.13M for year 2021-2023. The Exchange Street Bridge is slated for major rehabilitation work, superstructure and/or total bridge replacement in years 2023-2025. | Written | RIDOT | Written

**PROJECT NAME** | **YEAR** | **TIP ID** | **MUNICIPALITY** | **REQUEST** | **COMMENTS**
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Request that the major rehabilitation work for the Exchange Street Bridge be moved up to an earlier date to align with the Exchange Street improvements and the construction of the multi-modal hub near Providence Station. | Written | RIDOT | Written

**PROJECT NAME** | **YEAR** | **TIP ID** | **MUNICIPALITY** | **REQUEST** | **COMMENTS**
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Request that the bridge be included in earlier years of the STP due to current condition and importance in transporting heavy vehicle traffic, including buses, trucks and emergency response vehicles. | Written | RIDOT | Written

**PROJECT NAME** | **YEAR** | **TIP ID** | **MUNICIPALITY** | **REQUEST** | **COMMENTS**
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
We will perform the major rehabilitation work as outlined in our 10 year plan in order to maximize the benefits of using an asset management based approach. | Written | RIDOT | Written

**PROJECT NAME** | **YEAR** | **TIP ID** | **MUNICIPALITY** | **REQUEST** | **COMMENTS**
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Exchange Street Bridge at Woonasquatucket River - Bridge ID #07640 | 2025-2026 | 8405 | Providence | Double counted. Shows up in Drainage program in Draft TIP. | Written

**PROJECT NAME** | **YEAR** | **TIP ID** | **MUNICIPALITY** | **REQUEST** | **COMMENTS**
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
We understand the city’s concerns and will meet and coordinate with them at the earliest stages of each project. An asset management based approach was used to develop the 10 year plan. | Written | RIDOT | Written

**PROJECT NAME** | **YEAR** | **TIP ID** | **MUNICIPALITY** | **REQUEST** | **COMMENTS**
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Request that the $3.13M allocated in year 2018 and another $3.13M for year 2021-2023. The Exchange Street Bridge is slated for major rehabilitation work, superstructure and/or total bridge replacement in years 2023-2025. | Written | TAC | Written

**PROJECT NAME** | **YEAR** | **TIP ID** | **MUNICIPALITY** | **REQUEST** | **COMMENTS**
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Exchange Street Widening Project | 2018-2023 | 5128 | Providence | Double counted. Shows up in Drainage program in Draft TIP. | Written

**PROJECT NAME** | **YEAR** | **TIP ID** | **MUNICIPALITY** | **REQUEST** | **COMMENTS**
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Exchange Street Widening Project | 2018 | 5128 | Providence | Double counted. Shows up in Drainage program in Draft TIP. | Written

**PROJECT NAME** | **YEAR** | **TIP ID** | **MUNICIPALITY** | **REQUEST** | **COMMENTS**
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Exchange Street Widening Project | 2018 | 5128 | Providence | Double counted. Shows up in Drainage program in Draft TIP. | Written

**PROJECT NAME** | **YEAR** | **TIP ID** | **MUNICIPALITY** | **REQUEST** | **COMMENTS**
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
RIPTA | 2017 | 7001 | Providence | Double counted. Shows up in Drainage program in Draft TIP. | Written

**PROJECT NAME** | **YEAR** | **TIP ID** | **MUNICIPALITY** | **REQUEST** | **COMMENTS**
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
RIPTA | 2018 | 7001 | Providence | Double counted. Shows up in Drainage program in Draft TIP. | Written

**PROJECT NAME** | **YEAR** | **TIP ID** | **MUNICIPALITY** | **REQUEST** | **COMMENTS**
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
RIPTA | 2019 | 7001 | Providence | Double counted. Shows up in Drainage program in Draft TIP. | Written

**PROJECT NAME** | **YEAR** | **TIP ID** | **MUNICIPALITY** | **REQUEST** | **COMMENTS**
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
RIPTA | 2020 | 7001 | Providence | Double counted. Shows up in Drainage program in Draft TIP. | Written

**PROJECT NAME** | **YEAR** | **TIP ID** | **MUNICIPALITY** | **REQUEST** | **COMMENTS**
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
RIPTA | 2021 | 7001 | Providence | Double counted. Shows up in Drainage program in Draft TIP. | Written

**PROJECT NAME** | **YEAR** | **TIP ID** | **MUNICIPALITY** | **REQUEST** | **COMMENTS**
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
RIPTA | 2017 | 7002 | Providence | Double counted. Shows up in Drainage program in Draft TIP. | Written

**PROJECT NAME** | **YEAR** | **TIP ID** | **MUNICIPALITY** | **REQUEST** | **COMMENTS**
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
RIPTA | 2018 | 7002 | Providence | Double counted. Shows up in Drainage program in Draft TIP. | Written

**PROJECT NAME** | **YEAR** | **TIP ID** | **MUNICIPALITY** | **REQUEST** | **COMMENTS**
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
RIPTA | 2017 | 7002 | Providence | Double counted. Shows up in Drainage program in Draft TIP. | Written

**PROJECT NAME** | **YEAR** | **TIP ID** | **MUNICIPALITY** | **REQUEST** | **COMMENTS**
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
RIPTA | 2018 | 7002 | Providence | Double counted. Shows up in Drainage program in Draft TIP. | Written

**PROJECT NAME** | **YEAR** | **TIP ID** | **MUNICIPALITY** | **REQUEST** | **COMMENTS**
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
RIPTA | 2017 | 7002 | Providence | Double counted. Shows up in Drainage program in Draft TIP. | Written
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>MUNICIPALITY</th>
<th>REQUESTED BY</th>
<th>TYPE OF COMMENT</th>
<th>REVIEWING ENTITY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhancements to Downtown Interchange</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Senator Daniel DiPietro, D. 5A, Representative Katherine Kazarian, D. 63; Frank P. Gatto, Senior Director, Providence Downtown Improvement District</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>RIODOT InterchangeProjects are major links between the rapidly growing West Side of the City and downtown Providence. Making the overpasses safer and more attractive for pedestrians and bicyclists would greatly improve this area and add to the transformation of the West Side. This project is crucial to the future success of East Providence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herreshoff Marine Museum Enhancements</td>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>Katherine Kazarian, D. 63; Representative Daniel DaPonte, D. 63; Representative Cheryl Goodwin, D. 14; Representative Marnie Stabile, D. 59</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>RIDOT understands the concern and will work with the Museum to ensure that all reimbursements are appropriately accounted for as the project(s) move forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Road Bike Path</td>
<td>Jamestown</td>
<td>Town of Jamestown</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>TAC</td>
<td>While certainly worthwhile, due to limited funding, this project did not make the Transportation Advisory Committee’s priority list of Transportation Alternatives projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-95 Downtown Overpass Enhancement Project</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Frank P. Gatto, Senior Director, Providence Downtown Improvement District</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>This project is crucial to the future success of East Providence. It is crucial to the future success of East Providence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve I-95 Signage</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Frank P. Gatto, Senior Director, Providence Downtown Improvement District</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>This project is crucial to the future success of East Providence. It is crucial to the future success of East Providence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection Safety Improvements</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Frank P. Gatto, Senior Director, Providence Downtown Improvement District</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>This project is crucial to the future success of East Providence. It is crucial to the future success of East Providence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum/Herreshoff Marine Museum Enhancements</td>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>Katherine Kazarian, D. 63; Representative Daniel DaPonte, D. 63; Representative Cheryl Goodwin, D. 14; Representative Marnie Stabile, D. 59</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>RIDOT understands the concern and will work with the Museum to ensure that all reimbursements are appropriately accounted for as the project(s) move forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum/Herreshoff Marine Museum Enhancements</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Katherine Kazarian, D. 63; Representative Daniel DaPonte, D. 63; Representative Cheryl Goodwin, D. 14; Representative Marnie Stabile, D. 59</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>RIDOT understands the concern and will work with the Museum to ensure that all reimbursements are appropriately accounted for as the project(s) move forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIPTA Communications</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Frank P. Gatto, Senior Director, Providence Downtown Improvement District</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>This project is crucial to the future success of East Providence. It is crucial to the future success of East Providence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIPTA Communications</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Frank P. Gatto, Senior Director, Providence Downtown Improvement District</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>This project is crucial to the future success of East Providence. It is crucial to the future success of East Providence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIPTA Communications</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Frank P. Gatto, Senior Director, Providence Downtown Improvement District</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>This project is crucial to the future success of East Providence. It is crucial to the future success of East Providence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIPTA Communications</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Frank P. Gatto, Senior Director, Providence Downtown Improvement District</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>This project is crucial to the future success of East Providence. It is crucial to the future success of East Providence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIPTA Communications</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Frank P. Gatto, Senior Director, Providence Downtown Improvement District</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>This project is crucial to the future success of East Providence. It is crucial to the future success of East Providence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIPTA Communications</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Frank P. Gatto, Senior Director, Providence Downtown Improvement District</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>This project is crucial to the future success of East Providence. It is crucial to the future success of East Providence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIPTA Communications</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Frank P. Gatto, Senior Director, Providence Downtown Improvement District</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>This project is crucial to the future success of East Providence. It is crucial to the future success of East Providence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIPTA Communications</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Frank P. Gatto, Senior Director, Providence Downtown Improvement District</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>This project is crucial to the future success of East Providence. It is crucial to the future success of East Providence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIPTA Communications</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Frank P. Gatto, Senior Director, Providence Downtown Improvement District</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>This project is crucial to the future success of East Providence. It is crucial to the future success of East Providence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIPTA Communications</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Frank P. Gatto, Senior Director, Providence Downtown Improvement District</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>This project is crucial to the future success of East Providence. It is crucial to the future success of East Providence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIPTA Communications</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Frank P. Gatto, Senior Director, Providence Downtown Improvement District</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>This project is crucial to the future success of East Providence. It is crucial to the future success of East Providence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIPTA Communications</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Frank P. Gatto, Senior Director, Providence Downtown Improvement District</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>This project is crucial to the future success of East Providence. It is crucial to the future success of East Providence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REQUESTED BY</td>
<td>PROJECT NAME</td>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>MUNICIPALITY</td>
<td>REQUEST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor Bill Murray, Cumberland</td>
<td>Marshall Avenue</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>Not included in TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland PW Director</td>
<td>Marshall Avenue</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>Consider inclusion of project in TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIPP</td>
<td>Metropolitan Planning</td>
<td>2019-2025</td>
<td>TIP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Further refine funding source to FTA 5308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffy Corrie, Acting Town Manager, Town of New Shoreham</td>
<td>Narragansett Road Reconstruction</td>
<td>2020-2022</td>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>New Shoreham</td>
<td>Not included in TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy G. Dodge, Town Manager, New Shoreham</td>
<td>Marine Trail - Pavement Project</td>
<td>2020-2022</td>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>New Shoreham</td>
<td>Not included in TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIPP</td>
<td>Drainage System</td>
<td>2020-2022</td>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>Cranston</td>
<td>Not included in TIP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Town's submission targeted state roads in the greatest need of repair. In most instances, the shoulders of the roads are crumbling and present dangerous circumstances for walkers and the numerous bicycle and moped operators who share the narrow roads with vehicles. The road cannot have work postponed until after 2025 based on the current road integrity. The road has been eliminated from consideration with the comment that it is a "low volume roadway." The Town questions this characterization. To Ms. Dodge's knowledge, no volume study has been done on the road to support the determination of "low volume," nor can she find any clear definition of how volume is measured and over what time span. Considering that the useful life of a paved surface is approximately ten years, the volume of the road has experienced cumulative in the summer months of the last twenty-five years (when the road was microscreened) should clearly earmark the road for repair in the next two years and not another decade out. There is a substantial amount of traffic dollars that should update as a result of the island's absorption of tens of thousands of people in the summer, and that, combined with the safety concerns for visitors and residents, should merit another look at the submission.

We understand the city's concerns and will meet and coordinate with them at the earliest stages of each project. An asset management based approach was used to develop the 10 year plan. The plan balances safety, budget, and the overall improvement of the entire state's infrastructure. The asset management based approach allows us achieve a $950 million improvement of the entire state's infrastructure. The asset management based approach allows us achieve a $950 million savings by incorporating preservation type projects early on in the plan. This allows us to prevent structures from becoming structurally deficient. The reconstruction of a structurally deficient bridge can be 4 to 6 times as expensive as a preservation project. To move these reconstruction projects up in the program upset the balance of the program and reduces the savings and increases the time it will take us to put our infrastructure into a state of good repair. RIDOT will continue to monitor the structure to insure their public safety till the time the structure is rehabilitated.

While certainly worthwhile, due to limited funding, this project did not make the Transportation Advisory Committee's priority list of Transportation Alternatives projects.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>MUNICIPALITY</th>
<th>REQUESTED</th>
<th>ORIGINAL COMMENTS</th>
<th>TYPE OF COMMENT</th>
<th>REASON</th>
<th>REPLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pawtucket, Central Falls Train Stations</td>
<td>2016-2020</td>
<td>5011</td>
<td>Pawtucket, Central Falls</td>
<td>The funds listed in the TIP are not enough to build the station.</td>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>Staff acknowledges this comment. The FFY2017-FFY2025 Draft TIP includes project development for longer term projects such as in-fill stations. Planning and analysis for potential commuter rail expansion is included in the TIP's Planning Program as additional corridor, operations, and ridership analysis is required. RIDOT continues to focus on boosting relationship on existing commuter rail services south of Providence prior to advancing major capital investment along the Northeast Corridor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawtucket/Central Falls Train Station</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>5011</td>
<td>Pawtucket, Central Falls</td>
<td>The project is critical to advancing multi-modal transportation throughout the state. There are 1 million square feet of vacant mill space in the area.</td>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>RISPP</td>
<td>Support noted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawtucket/Central Falls Train Station</td>
<td>2017-2020</td>
<td>5011</td>
<td>Pawtucket, Central Falls</td>
<td>The project is important to the city and the region.</td>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>RISPP</td>
<td>Support noted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawtucket/Central Falls Train Station</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>5011</td>
<td>Pawtucket, Central Falls</td>
<td>Increase FTA funding from $2.70 to $3.30 and change source from FTA 5337 to FTA 5307.</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>The project is important to the city and the region.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawtucket/Central Falls Train Station</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>5011</td>
<td>Pawtucket, Central Falls</td>
<td>Decrease FTA funding from $2.70 to $1.62 and change source from FTA 5337 to FTA 5307.</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>The project is important to the city and the region.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawtucket/Central Falls Train Station</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>5011</td>
<td>Pawtucket, Central Falls</td>
<td>Add RIMAA funding of $0.82.</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>The project is important to the city and the region.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawtucket/Central Falls Train Station</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>5011</td>
<td>Pawtucket, Central Falls</td>
<td>Increase FTA funding from $2.70 to $3.10 and change source from FTA 5337 to FTA 5307.</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>The project is important to the city and the region.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawtucket/Central Falls Train Station</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>5011</td>
<td>Pawtucket, Central Falls</td>
<td>Add RIMAA funding of $0.82.</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>The project is important to the city and the region.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawtucket/Central Falls Train Station</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>5011</td>
<td>Pawtucket, Central Falls</td>
<td>Increase FTA funding from $2.70 to $3.40 and change source from FTA 5337 to FTA 5307.</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>The project is important to the city and the region.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawtucket/Central Falls Train Station</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>5011</td>
<td>Pawtucket, Central Falls</td>
<td>Remove CMAQ funding ($0.18).</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>The project is important to the city and the region.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawtucket/Central Falls Train Station</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>5011</td>
<td>Pawtucket, Central Falls</td>
<td>Decrease RCAP (HIP) funding from $2.02 to $0.85.</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>The project is important to the city and the region.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawtucket/Central Falls Train Station</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>5011</td>
<td>Pawtucket, Central Falls</td>
<td>Increase FTA funding from $2.70 to $3.10 and change source from FTA 5337 to FTA 5307.</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>The project is important to the city and the region.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawtucket/Central Falls Train Station</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>5011</td>
<td>Pawtucket, Central Falls</td>
<td>Decrease RCAP (HIP) funding from $2.70 to $0.85.</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>The project is important to the city and the region.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawtucket/Central Falls Train Station</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>5011</td>
<td>Pawtucket, Central Falls</td>
<td>Add funding of $4.18 of FTA 5307 funding to FTA 5307.</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>The project is important to the city and the region.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawtucket/Central Falls Train Station</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>5011</td>
<td>Pawtucket, Central Falls</td>
<td>Add funding of $4.18 of FTA 5307 funding to FTA 5307.</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>The project is important to the city and the region.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawtucket/Central Falls Train Station</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>5011</td>
<td>Pawtucket, Central Falls</td>
<td>Add funding of $4.18 of FTA 5307 funding to FTA 5307.</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>The project is important to the city and the region.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawtucket/Central Falls Train Station</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>5011</td>
<td>Pawtucket, Central Falls</td>
<td>Add funding of $4.18 of FTA 5307 funding to FTA 5307.</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>The project is important to the city and the region.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawtucket/Central Falls Train Station</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>5011</td>
<td>Pawtucket, Central Falls</td>
<td>Add funding of $4.18 of FTA 5307 funding to FTA 5307.</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>The project is important to the city and the region.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawtucket/Central Falls Train Station</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>5011</td>
<td>Pawtucket, Central Falls</td>
<td>Add funding of $4.18 of FTA 5307 funding to FTA 5307.</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>The project is important to the city and the region.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawtucket/Central Falls Train Station</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1264</td>
<td>Pawtucket, Central Falls</td>
<td>Decrease STBG funding from $14.49 to $12.54.</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>The project is important to the city and the region.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawtucket/Central Falls Train Station</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1264</td>
<td>Pawtucket, Central Falls</td>
<td>Decrease STBG funding from $14.49 to $12.54.</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>The project is important to the city and the region.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawtucket/Central Falls Train Station</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1264</td>
<td>Pawtucket, Central Falls</td>
<td>Increase RCAP (HIP) funding from $3.83 to $5.41.</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>The project is important to the city and the region.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawtucket/Central Falls Train Station</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1264</td>
<td>Pawtucket, Central Falls</td>
<td>Increasing STBG funding from $14.49 to $12.54.</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>The project is important to the city and the region.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawtucket/Central Falls Train Station</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1264</td>
<td>Pawtucket, Central Falls</td>
<td>Switching between funding sources.</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>The project is important to the city and the region.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawtucket/Central Falls Train Station</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1264</td>
<td>Pawtucket, Central Falls</td>
<td>Switching between funding sources.</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>The project is important to the city and the region.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawtucket/Central Falls Train Station</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1264</td>
<td>Pawtucket, Central Falls</td>
<td>Switching between funding sources.</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>The project is important to the city and the region.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawtucket/Central Falls Train Station</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1264</td>
<td>Pawtucket, Central Falls</td>
<td>Switching between funding sources.</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>The project is important to the city and the region.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawtucket/Central Falls Train Station</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1264</td>
<td>Pawtucket, Central Falls</td>
<td>Switching between funding sources.</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>The project is important to the city and the region.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawtucket/Central Falls Train Station</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1264</td>
<td>Pawtucket, Central Falls</td>
<td>Switching between funding sources.</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>The project is important to the city and the region.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawtucket/Central Falls Train Station</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1264</td>
<td>Pawtucket, Central Falls</td>
<td>Switching between funding sources.</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>The project is important to the city and the region.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Notes:***

- **RISPP** denotes support noted.  
- **Reported** indicates changes to funding.  
- **Oral** denotes verbal comments.  
- **Written** denotes written comments.  
- **E-mail** denotes e-mailed comments.  
- **Program Planning** denotes funding for projects in the Program Planning Program.  
- **Projects Currently Under Construction** denotes projects currently under construction.
This project did not neatly fit into a specific category for TIP

RIPOT

Projects Currently Under Construction

2012 1044 Providence

Increase STBG funding from $4.14 to $4.24

Revised project estimate. Switching between funding sources.

Written RIDOT

RIDOT Table changed

This project did not neatly fit into a specific category for TIP

Increase STBG funding from $4.14 to $4.24

Revised project estimate. Switching between funding sources.

Written RIDOT

RIDOT Table changed

1264 Cranston

Increase funding from $1.50 to $1.80

Revised project estimate. Written RIDOT Table changed

RISTARS - Localized Bottleneck

Strong objection to the timeline set forth

Written RIDOT Table changed

Railroad At-Grade Crossing - Poplar Roadway Departure Mitigation - Projects Currently Under RISTARS - Localized Bottleneck

Written RIDOT Table changed

This project did not neatly fit into a specific category for TIP

9201 Newport

Increase funding from $10.8 to $12.1

Revised project funding schedule E-mail RIDOT Table changed

1470 Add STBG funding of $0.10 Revised project estimate. Written RIDOT Table changed

Each year, the Governor convenes a Transportation Coordinating Committee and is fully funded in the 10-year plan.

Projects Currently Under RISTARS - Localized Bottleneck

Requests that the project be

RIDOT

RIPOT

Projects Currently Under Construction

2018 1264 Providence

Reconstruction of dredging

Request that the project be

Written RIDOT

RIDOT Table changed

2018 1331 Cranston

Increase funding from $13.90 to $14.30

Revised project funding schedule

Written RIDOT

RIDOT Table changed

1325 East Providence

E-mail RIDOT Table changed

Projects Currently Under RISTARS - Localized Bottleneck

Written RIDOT Table changed

9201 Newport

Increase funding from $9.3 to $9.4. Revised project funding schedule E-mail RIDOT Table changed

2012 1325 East Providence

Add STBG funding of $0.10 Revised project estimate. Switching between funding sources. Written RIDOT Table changed

Written RIDOT Table changed

There is not sufficient funds to undertake all projects in the earliest years of the Transportation Improvement Program.

Written RIDOT Table changed

Written RIDOT Table changed

REQUESTED BY

Peter McClure, Planning and Zoning Committee, JeweKY District Association

D. 64

Deborah Grida-Crossing - Poplar and Elm Streets

2018 9010 Newport

Add $2.10 in Railway Program funding in 2018

Correct an error in total funding for project in FFY 2018 E-mail RIDOT

RIDOT Table changed

RIPOT

Projects Currently Under Construction

2019 9011 Newport

Reconstructing Pell Bridge Approaches

Decrease NHPF funding from $0.80 to $0.75

Written RIDOT

RIDOT Table changed

2020 9201 Newport

Reconstructing Pell Bridge Approaches

Decrease NHPF funding from $1.40 to $1.35

Written RIDOT

RIDOT Table changed

2021 9201 Newport

Reconstructing Pell Bridge Approaches

Decrease funding from $3.6 to $3.14.

Written RIDOT

RIDOT Table changed

2022 9201 Newport

Reconstructing Pell Bridge Approaches

Increase funding from $13.10 to $13.15

Written RIDOT

RIDOT Table changed

RIPOT

Projects Currently Under Construction

2022 1531 Cranston

RISTARS - Localized Bottleneck

Improvements to I-295 Northbound

Increase funding from $13.50 to $13.60

Written RIDOT

1531 Cranston

RIDOT

RISTARS - Localized Bottleneck

Improvements to I-295 Northbound

Increase funding from $13.50 to $13.60

Written RIDOT

RIDOT Table changed

RIPOT

Projects Currently Under Construction

2018 9010 Newport

Add STBG funding of $0.10 Revised project estimate. Written RIDOT

RIDOT Table changed

2018 1017 South Kingstown

 reimbursement for this project is currently subject to review.

RIDOT

2019 1301 South Kingstown

Reconstructing Pell Bridge

Within 4-pawnt playing project

RIDOT

2017 2006

Add NHPF funding of $0.80

Project is moving forward from the FFY 13-15 STIP. Please add this project as noted

Written RIDOT

RIDOT Table changed

2018 2007

Add NHPF funding of $1.30

Project is moving forward from the FFY 13-15 STIP. Please add this project as noted

Written RIDOT

RIDOT Table changed

Joseph Capriola, Chair of the Condominium District

14; Representative Kate Kaezian, D. 63; Representative Gregg Amore, D. 65; Senator William C. Conley Jr., D. 18; Representative Helo Melo, D. 64

Pam Sherrill, TAC Member

Projects Currently Under Construction

2020 - 2022 1531 Cranston

RISTARS - Localized Bottleneck

Improvements to I-295 Northbound

Please include a better description of this project.

Written RIDOT

RIDOT Table changed

RIPOT

Projects Currently Under Construction

2018 1470

Roadway Departure Mitigation - Projects Currently Under Construction

Add STBG funding of $0.10

Revised project estimate.

Written RIDOT

RIDOT Table changed

2017 1299

Approches

Approches

Approaches

Approaches

Approaches

approaches

Approaches

Approaches

Approaches

Approaches

approaches

Approaches

Approaches

Approaches

Approaches

Approaches

approaches

Approaches

Approaches

approaches

Approaches

Approaches

approaches

Approaches

Approaches

approaches

Approaches

Approaches

approaches

Approaches

Approaches

approaches

Approaches

Approaches

approaches

Approaches

Approaches

approaches

Approaches

Approaches

approaches

Approaches

Approaches

approaches

Approaches

Approaches

approaches

Approaches

Approaches

approaches

Approaches

Approaches

approaches

Approaches

Approaches

approaches

Approaches

Approaches

approaches

Approaches

Approaches

approaches

Approaches

Approaches

approaches

Approaches

Approaches

approaches

Approaches

Approaches

approaches

Approaches

Approaches

approaches

Approaches

Approaches

approaches

Approaches

Approaches

approaches

Approaches
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Richard Asceola, Assistant Town Planner, Portsmouth

- **Project Name**: Old End Rd/Route 1 (20 Ave to Warren Ave) Resurfacing and Sidewalks
- **Type of Comment**: Oral
- **Request**: Wants the project moved up in the TIP.
- **Comments**: This project was in the 2011 TIP. Since 2015, there has been considerable traffic growth in this area. It is heavily traveled but in dangerous condition. Since 2011, the school department expanded the minimum walking to school distance major concerns about public safety. Pavement conditions are poor first to the project.

East Providence Area Chamber of Commerce

- **Project Name**: Rt 114, Pawtucket Ave. (Taunton Ave. to Warren Ave.)
- **Type of Comment**: Written
- **Request**: Move construction year up from FFY 2023 to FFY 2018
- **Comments**: Pawtucket Ave is the vital link between Taunton Ave and Vets Parkway. Serves the business community as well as residents. Caused excessive vehicle damage over the years and is especially treacherous during the winter months and rainstorms. There are few places along Pawtucket Ave. that have handicapped accessibility.

Joseph LaSapio, Chair
Town Council, Warren

- **Project Name**: Rt 138, Market St/Kickemuit St/Metacom Ave
- **Type of Comment**: Oral
- **Request**: Remove STBG funding ($0.71)
- **Comments**: Would like to move the project up in the TIP. A busy street with 24,000 vehicles per day. Run-off cannot come off that street because it is higher than the rotary at the rotary yield sign. Town Council doesn't want anything to happen until the roads are fixed. Dangerous condition. E Main and W Main are a disaster, need to be fixed (resurfaced) before intersections are changed. Rotary not needed. Tumipike Ave resurfaced, not one pot hole before resurfacing, roads in the filled with tar. Spring St, at the end of Turnpike, terrible and never resurfaced. Other roads need to be resurfaced. Causing damage to cars, expensive.

Peter Roberts

- **Project Name**: Rt 138, East Main Rd & Park Ave
- **Type of Comment**: Oral
- **Request**: Earmark funding of $3.00
- **Comments**: Rotary is not the right solution for this intersection. Need to fix other roads in poor condition first. Watched the intersection, 12 people ran the night. No one stop at the rotary yield sign. Town Council doesn't want anything to happen until the roads are fixed. Dangerous condition. E Main and W Main are a disaster, need to be fixed (resurfaced) before intersections are changed. Rotary not needed. Tumipike Ave resurfaced, not one pot hole before resurfacing, roads in the filled with tar. Spring St, at the end of Turnpike, terrible and never resurfaced. Other roads need to be resurfaced. Causing damage to cars, expensive.

Peter Roberts

- **Project Name**: Rt 138, East Main Rd & Park Ave
- **Type of Comment**: Oral
- **Request**: No reason to change the intersection.
- **Comments**: No reason to change the intersection (heard they were changing it at a previous Town Council meeting). No accidents, no speeding, no problem with the intersection. Fix E Main Rd and W Main Rd and leave everything else alone. Want to dead-end Chase Rd because of run-off. Run-off cannot come off that street because it is higher than the intersection - 3’ higher. Chase Rd is important to people who are going to the post office. Never had a problem with the intersection - want to make it one road going in and one road going out.

Riddt

- **Project Name**: Rt 138, East Main Rd & Park Ave
- **Type of Comment**: Oral
- **Request**: Add $0.10 in funding in 2019 and $1.30 in funding in 2020
- **Comments**: Make it one road going in and one road going out.

Shawn J. Brown, Town Administrator

- **Project Name**: Rt 138A, Aquidneck Ave (East Main Rd to Green End Ave)
- **Type of Comment**: Oral
- **Request**: Add sidewalks and stormwater runoff control and treatment to the project.
- **Comments**: This project is the Town’s top priority. Project intended to improve pavement condition. Any increase in scope will significantly increase project cost. RIDDIT would be willing to consider Town cost participation.

Shawn J. Brown, Town Administrator

- **Project Name**: Rt 138A, Aquidneck Ave (Varley Rd. to Purdyory Rd.)
- **Type of Comment**: Oral
- **Request**: Add improvements identified in the 2007 Atlantic Beach District Master Plan, including roadway and sidewalk improvements, etc.
- **Comments**: Include roadway crosssection improvements, including sidewalk improvements and travel lane reallocation. Project intended to improve pavement condition. Any increase in scope will significantly increase project cost. RIDDIT would be willing to consider Town cost participation.

RIDDIT

- **Project Name**: Rt 134 (0.95 to 6 Miles South of Heroman Ave)
- **Type of Comment**: Written
- **Request**: Increase NHPP funding from $6.10 to $4.10
- **Comments**: Revised project estimate.

RIDDIT

- **Project Name**: Rt 2A (Rt. 1A to Husomnetts Ave)
- **Type of Comment**: Written
- **Request**: Decrease NHPP funding from $4.90 to $4.00
- **Comments**: Revised project estimate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>TYPE OF COMMENT</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>REASON</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rt. 138A, Aquashick Ave. (East Main Road to Green End Ave.)</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td>The project is crucial to the future success of East Providence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rt. 138A, Aquashick Ave. (East Main Road to Green End Ave.)</td>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td>The project should continue to improve maintenance condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Planner, Portsmouth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT NAME</td>
<td>TYPE OF COMMENT</td>
<td>REVIEWING ENTITY</td>
<td>REQUESTED BY</td>
<td>POSITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease NHPP funding from $1.50 to $1.30</td>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>Peter Roberts</td>
<td>Traffic Signals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease STBG funding from $3.40 to $2.80</td>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>Barry Schiller</td>
<td>Transportation Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add NHPP funding of $1.30 to $1.20</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>Bob Vinate, Executive Director</td>
<td>TIP Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add NHPP funding of $1.20 to $1.10</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>East Coast Greenway Alliance</td>
<td>TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove $0.00</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>Jorge Elorza, Mayor and Bonnie Nickerson, Planning Director</td>
<td>TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove $0.00</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>Jorge Elorza, Mayor and Bonnie Nickerson, Planning Director</td>
<td>TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove $0.00</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>Jorge Elorza, Mayor and Bonnie Nickerson, Planning Director</td>
<td>TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove $0.00</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>Jorge Elorza, Mayor and Bonnie Nickerson, Planning Director</td>
<td>TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove $0.00</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>East Coast Greenway Alliance</td>
<td>TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove $0.00</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>Jorge Elorza, Mayor and Bonnie Nickerson, Planning Director</td>
<td>TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove $0.00</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>TAC</td>
<td>Barry Schiller</td>
<td>Transportation Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove $0.00</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>TAC</td>
<td>Bob Vinate, Executive Director</td>
<td>TIP Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove $0.00</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>TAC</td>
<td>East Coast Greenway Alliance</td>
<td>TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove $0.00</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>Jorge Elorza, Mayor and Bonnie Nickerson, Planning Director</td>
<td>TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove $0.00</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>Jorge Elorza, Mayor and Bonnie Nickerson, Planning Director</td>
<td>TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove $0.00</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>Jorge Elorza, Mayor and Bonnie Nickerson, Planning Director</td>
<td>TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove $0.00</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>Jorge Elorza, Mayor and Bonnie Nickerson, Planning Director</td>
<td>TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove $0.00</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>East Coast Greenway Alliance</td>
<td>TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove $0.00</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>Jorge Elorza, Mayor and Bonnie Nickerson, Planning Director</td>
<td>TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REQUESTOR</td>
<td>TYPE OF COMMENT</td>
<td>REVISION/EDITING ENTITY</td>
<td>TYPE OF COMMENT</td>
<td>REVIEWING/EDITING ENTITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate Daniel Vale, D-14; Representative Katherine Kezarian, D-63; Representative Greg Amore, D-65; Senator William J. Conley Jr., D-18; Representative Helo Melo, D-44</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>We do not think it is possible to move on state of good repair in the current Ten Year Plan. Once strategic and targeted investments are made in existing structures to insure the viability of our transportation infrastructure into the future, additional projects with economic development significance must be considered.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jorge Elorza, Mayor and Bonnie Nickerson, Planning Director</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>We understand the city’s concerns and will meet and coordinate with them at the earliest stages of each project. An asset management based approach allows us achieve a $950 million savings by incorporating preservation type projects early on in the plan. This allows us to prevent structures from becoming structurally deficient. The reconstruction of a structurally deficient bridge can be 4 to 6 times as expensive as a preservation project. To move these reconstruction projects up in the program upssets the balance of the program and reduces the savings and increase the time it will take us to put our infrastructure into a state of good repair. RIDOT will continue to monitor the structure to insure our public safety till the time the structure is rehabilitated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence, the west side of the city along Promenade and Kinsley Streets.</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>We make this recommendation with the understanding that it is a “low volume roadway.” The Town questions this characterization. To Ms. Dodge’s knowledge, no volume study has been done on the road to support the determination of “low volume,” nor can she find any clear definition of how volume is measured and what time span. Considering that the useful life of a paved surface is approximately ten years, the volume of the road has experienced cumulatively in the summer months of the last twenty-five years (when the road was microscreened) should clearly earmark the road for repair in the next two years and not another decade out. There is a substantial amount of tourism dollars that travel upstate as a result of the island’s absorption of tens of thousands of people in the summer, and that, combined with the safety concerns for visitors and citizenry, should merit another look at the submission.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy G. Dodge, Town Manager, New Shoreham</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>TAC</td>
<td>This project is already slated to begin in the the earlier years of the Transportation Improvement Program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akiva J. Lehrer, Executive Director, Woonasquatucket River Watershed Council</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>TAC</td>
<td>There is not sufficient funds to undertake all projects in the earliest years of the Transportation Improvement Program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jorge Elorza, Mayor and Bonnie Nickerson, Planning Director</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>TAC</td>
<td>There is not sufficient funds to undertake all projects in the earliest years of the Transportation Improvement Program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT NAME</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>TYPE</td>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket Field to Allendale Avenue</td>
<td>Extension through Johnston, from Cricket Field to Allendale Avenue</td>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woonasquatucket River Greenway to the Woonasquatucket River Watershed Council</td>
<td>Request that funding that had previously been designated for this project not be reallocated, and that this project be included in the TIP.</td>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woonasquatucket River Greenway to the Woonasquatucket River Watershed Council</td>
<td>Request that funding that had previously been designated for this project not be reallocated, and that this project be included in the TIP.</td>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woonasquatucket River Greenway to the Woonasquatucket River Watershed Council</td>
<td>Request that funding that had previously been designated for this project not be reallocated, and that this project be included in the TIP.</td>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woonasquatucket River Greenway to the Woonasquatucket River Watershed Council</td>
<td>Request that funding that had previously been designated for this project not be reallocated, and that this project be included in the TIP.</td>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
<td>RIDOT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment**

There are a number of components of robust transportation infrastructure. Unfortunately, we do not have unlimited resources: by the end of the Ten Year Plan, funding for Transportation Alternatives projects (TAP) projects will have increased significantly. Bicycle and bicycle-related infrastructure is allocated 51% of the FFY2017-FFY2025 TAP program. As we move toward developing asset-based project selection, we will ensure that projects, once in the TIP, are delivered.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REQUESTED BY</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TIP ID</th>
<th>MUNICIPALITY</th>
<th>REQUEST</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RI Bike Coalition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td>Design all bridge and pavement projects as &quot;complete streets.&quot; If we want to build a transportation network in our state that makes people and jobs want to locate here, we cannot continue dismissing vulnerable road users as an aberration when we design our streets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI Bike Coalition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td>Include more bike projects, including the eight bike projects included in the previous TIP that were omitted from the draft, and the segment of the Blackstone River Bikeway through Central Falls that the RI Bike Coalition prioritized as &quot;high&quot; in their submission.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RIDOT

The Department will continue to look at accommodating complete streets principles as much as possible, commensurate with the scope of work for each project and given budgetary, temporal, and physical constraints.

RIDOT

The Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) and its subcommittees reviewed all current and new TAP projects and ranked more than 55 projects for inclusion in the TIP. The bike projects not included did not rank highly compared to other bike projects and were a lower priority, either for the communities or based on subcommittee discussion.
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May 26, 2016 Public Hearing Notice

- English
- Spanish
RHODE ISLAND STATE PLANNING COUNCIL
One Capitol Hill
Providence, RI 02908-5870

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS

State of Rhode Island
FFY 2017-2025 Draft State Transportation Improvement Program and
Amendment #7 to the
FFY 2013-2016 State Transportation Improvement Program

The Rhode Island State Planning Council will conduct two (2) public hearings. These hearings will be held to accept comments on the FFY 2017-2025 Draft State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and Amendment #7 to the FFY 2013-2016 STIP.

Opportunity for Public Comment - FFY 2017 – 2025 Draft STIP
The State Planning Council is developing the State Transportation Improvement Program for federal fiscal years 2017-2025. The STIP is a nine-year program which includes Bridge Capital, Bridge Maintenance, Debt Service, Contingency-Inflation, Drainage Capital, Drainage Maintenance, Headquarters Operations, Maintenance Capital, Maintenance Operations, Pavement Capital, Pavement Maintenance, Planning – Program Development, Toll Operations, Traffic Safety Capital, Traffic Safety Maintenance, Transit Capital (RIPTA & RIDOT), Transit Operations (RIPTA & RIDOT), Other Transit Initiatives (RIPTA), Route 6/10, and Transportation Alternatives projects that are eligible to receive federal funding. The TIP must be updated at a minimum of every (4) years in accordance with federal requirements and the State Planning Council’s Rules of Procedure and the first four years of the STIP (FFY 2017-FFY 2020) must be fiscally constrained. This STIP update included a full solicitation of new projects from Rhode Island state agencies, municipalities, organizations, and individuals. These projects were reviewed by subcommittees of the State Planning Council’s Transportation Advisory Committee, Rhode Island Department of Transportation, and Rhode Island Public Transit Authority staff. Recommendations were incorporated into the full draft FFY 2017-2025 STIP document. A complete description of the STIP development process is outlined in the draft STIP document. The public comment period for this document begins on April 25, 2016, includes the two (2) public hearings outlined below, and closes on June 26, 2016. All comments on the draft FFY 2017-2025 STIP must be received by June 26, 2016.

The draft FFY 2017-2025 STIP is available for review online at http://www.planning.ri.gov/statewideplanning/transportation/tip.php or at the R.I. Statewide Planning Program, One Capitol Hill, 3rd floor, Providence, RI between 8:30 a.m. and 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday.
Opportunity for Public Comment - Amendment #7 to the FFY 2013 – 2016 STIP

Amendment #7 is being proposed to the FFY 2013-2016 STIP for the State of Rhode Island, as adopted by the State Planning Council on July 12, 2012. The amendment has been requested by the Rhode Island Department of Transportation and the Rhode Island Public Transit Authority. This proposed TIP amendment realigns the FFY 2016 projects of the STIP with additional available state and federal funding sources and with RIDOT’s Ten Year Strategic Plan (FFY 2016 to FFY 2025). In addition, this amendment includes new transit and highway projects not included in the FFY 2013-2016 STIP. This amendment will affect all programs of the STIP. The public comment period for this amendment begins on April 25, 2016, includes the two (2) public hearings outlined below, and closes at the conclusion of the second public hearing on May 26, 2016. All comments on Amendment #7 to the FFY 2013-2016 STIP must be received by the close of the hearing on May 26, 2016.

The proposed amendment is available for review online at http://www.planning.ri.gov/statewideplanning/transportation/tip.php or at the R.I. Statewide Planning Program, One Capitol Hill, 3rd floor, Providence, RI between 8:30 a.m. and 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday.

Informational presentations and formal public hearings for both FFY 2017 – 2025 Draft STIP and Amendment #7 to the FFY 2013 – 2016 STIP will be held:

Thursday, May 26, 2016 at 2:00 p.m.
Department of Administration
William E. Powers Building
Conference Room A, 2nd Floor
One Capitol Hill, Providence, RI

Thursday, May 26, 2016 at 6:30 p.m.
Department of Administration
William E. Powers Building
Conference Room A, 2nd Floor
One Capitol Hill, Providence, RI

Each public hearing will include the same informational presentation. All persons may present their views on the draft FFY 2017-2025 STIP or Amendment #7 to the FFY 2013-2016 STIP documents in person, through a representative, or by filing a written statement with the Secretary of the State Planning Council. Written statements may be submitted at the hearings noted above or mailed to Jared L. Rhodes, Secretary (Acting), Rhode Island State Planning Council, One Capitol Hill, Providence, RI 02908.

This meeting place is accessible to individuals with disabilities. Any individual requiring a reasonable accommodation in order to participate in this meeting should contact Thomas Mannock, Ph.D at 401-222-6377 (voice) or #711 (R.I. Relay) 5 business days in advance of the meeting. Any individual requiring the services of an interpreter to participate in this meeting should contact Michael Moan at 222-1236 (voice) at least five (5) business days prior to the meeting. Any individual requiring the services of a spoken language interpreter to participate in this meeting should contact Michael Moan at (401) 222-1236 (voice) at least five (5) business days prior to the meeting. Public transit schedule information for the public hearings is available from RIPTA at (401)781-9400 or www.ripta.com.

(signed)

Jared L. Rhodes
Secretary (Acting), State Planning Council
CONSEJO DE PLANIFICACIÓN ESTATAL DE RHODE ISLAND
One Capitol Hill
Providence, RI 02908-5870

NOTIFICACIÓN DE AUDIENCIAS PÚBLICAS

Estado de Rhode Island.
FFY 2017-2025 Boceto del Programa de Mejora del Transporte Estatal
y
Enmienda #7 al
FFY 2013-2016 Programa de Mejora del Transporte Estatal

El Consejo de Planificación Estatal de Rhode Island realizará dos (2) audiencias públicas. Estas audiencias
 tendrán lugar con el fin de aceptar comentarios al FFY 2017-2025 Boceto del Programa de Mejora del
Transporte Estatal (STIP, por sus siglas en inglés) y a la Enmienda #7 al FFY 2013-2016 STIP.

Oportunidad para comentarios del público - FFY 2017 – 2025 Boceto del STIP
El Consejo de Planificación Estatal está en proceso de desarrollar el Programa de Mejora del Transporte Estatal
para los años fiscales 2017 a 2025. El STIP es un programa de nueve años que incluye capital para puentes,
mantenimiento de puentes, servicio de deudas, contingencia - inflación, capital para drenaje, mantenimiento del
sistema de drenaje, operaciones de la oficina central, capital para mantenimiento, operaciones de
mantenimiento, capital para el pavimento, mantenimiento del pavimento, planificación - desarrollo de
programas, operaciones de peaje, capital para la seguridad del tráfico, mantenimiento de la seguridad del
tráfico, capital para el tránsito (RIPTA y RIDOT), operaciones de tránsito (RIPTA y RIDOT), otras iniciativas de
tránsito (RIPTA), Ruta 6/10 y, proyectos de alternativas de transporte que cumplen con los requisitos necesarios
para recibir financiamiento federal. Cada cuatro (4) años, como mínimo, se debe actualizar el TIP, de acuerdo a
los requisitos federales y las Normas de Procedimiento del Consejo de Planificación Estatal, y los primeros cuatro
años del STIP (FFY 2017 - FFY 2020) deben ser fiscalmente restringidos. La actualización al STIP incluyó una
solicitud completa de proyectos nuevos a las agencias estatales, municipalidades, organizaciones e individuos de
Rhode Island. Subcomités del Comité Consultivo del Transporte del Consejo de Planificación Estatal, el
Departamento de Transporte de Rhode Island y personal de la Autoridad del Tránsito Público de Rhode Island,
revisaron estos proyectos. Se incorporaron recomendaciones al documento de boceto completo FFY 2017-2025
STIP. El boceto del STIP resume una descripción completa del proceso de desarrollo del STIP. El periodo de
comentarios del público sobre este documento comienza el 25 de abril de 2016, incluye las dos (2) audiencias
públicas especificadas a continuación, y concluye el 26 de junio de 2016. Se deben recibir todos los comentarios
cal boceto FFY 2017-2025 STIP antes del 26 de junio de 2016.

El boceto FFY 2017-2025 STIP está disponible para su revisión en línea en
http://www.planning.ri.gov/statewideplanning/transportation/tip.php o en el Programa de Planificación Estatal
de R.I., One Capitol Hill, 3er piso, Providence, RI, entre las 8:30 a.m. y las 4:00 p.m. de lunes a viernes.

Oportunidad para comentarios del público - Enmienda #7 al FFY 2013 – 2016 STIP
Se propone la Enmienda #7 al FFY 2013 – 2016 STIP para el Estado de Rhode Island, tal y como la adoptó el
Consejo de Planificación Estatal el 12 de julio de 2012. El Departamento de Transporte de Rhode Island y la
Autoridad del Transporte Público de Rhode Island solicitaron la enmienda. Esta enmienda propuesta al TIP realinea los proyectos FFY 2016 del STIP con fuentes de financiamiento estatales y federales adicionales disponibles y con el Plan Estratégico de Diez Años del RIDOT (FFY 2016 al FFY 2025). Adicionalmente, esta enmienda incluye nuevos proyectos de tránsito y autopistas que no estaban incluidas en el FFY 2013 - 2016 STIP. Esta enmienda afectará todos los programas del STIP. El período de comentarios del público sobre esta enmienda comienza el 25 de abril de 2016, incluye las dos (2) audiencias públicas especificadas a continuación, y concluye al culminar la segunda audiencia pública el 26 de mayo de 2016. Se deben recibir todos los comentarios sobre la Enmienda #7 al FFY 2013 - 2016 STIP al concluir la audiencia el 26 de mayo de 2016.

La enmienda propuesta está disponible para su revisión en línea en http://www.planning.ri.gov/statewideplanning/transportation/tip.php o en el Programa de Planificación Estatal de R.I., One Capitol Hill, 3rd floor, Providence, RI, entre las 8:30 a.m. y las 4:00 p.m. de lunes a viernes.

Las presentaciones informativas y las audiencias públicas formales tanto para el Boceto de STIP FFY 2017 - 2025 y la Enmienda #7 al FFY 2013 - 2016 STIP tendrán lugar el:

**Jueves, 26 de mayo de 2016 a las 2:00 p.m.**
Department of Administration
William E. Powers Building
Sala de Conferencias A, 2do piso
One Capitol Hill, Providence, RI

**Jueves, 26 de mayo de 2016 a las 6:30 p.m.**
Department of Administration
William E. Powers Building
Sala de Conferencias A, 2do piso
One Capitol Hill, Providence, RI

Cada audiencia pública incluirá la misma presentación informativa. Todas las personas pueden presentar sus opiniones sobre el boceto al FFY 2017-2025 STIP o la Enmienda #7 FFY 2013-2016 STIP en persona, mediante un representante o mediante documento escrito presentado al Secretario del Consejo de Planificación Estatal. Se podrán presentar declaraciones escritas durante las audiencias antes mencionadas o se pueden enviar por correo a Jared L. Rhodes, Secretary (Acting), Rhode Island State Planning Council, One Capitol Hill, Providence, RI 02908.

Individuos con discapacidades pueden acceder el lugar de las audiencias. Cualquier individuo que necesite adaptación de acceso razonable para poder participar en esta reunión, deberá contactar a Thomas Mannock, Ph.D al -222-6377 (voz) o #711 (Relevo de R.I.) cinco días hábiles antes de la reunión. Cualquier individuo que requiera los servicios de intérprete para participar en esta reunión, debe contactar a Michael Moore al 222-1236 (voz) al menos cinco (5) días hábiles antes de la reunión. Cualquier individuo que requiera los servicios de intérprete de un idioma hablado para participar en esta reunión, debe contactar a Michael Moore al (401) 222-1236 (voz) al menos cinco (5) días hábiles antes de la reunión. La información sobre el horario del transporte público para acudir a las audiencias públicas se puede obtener de RIPTA llamando al (401) 781-9400 o en www.ripta.com.

(Firmado)
Jared L. Rhodes
Secretario (Interino), Consejo de Planificación Estatal
Attachment #2

Written comments related to the draft FFY 2017-2025 STIP
May 23, 2016

Jared L. Rhodes, Secretary
RI State Planning Council
One Capitol Hill
Providence, RI 02908

RE: 2017 Transportation Improvement Program

Dear Mr. Rhodes:

I am writing to thank the State Planning Council’s TIP Review Subcommittee for acknowledging the need for roadway infrastructure improvement in Narragansett by placing nine (9) projects on its draft 2017 – 2025 STIP list. The roads, bridges and bike path projected in your list are all worthy projects and notably in need of attention.

We are, however, dismayed at the omission of our two Ocean Road enhancement projects, Mettatuxet Road reconstruction and the Bonnet Point Road causeway replacement from the list. The relatively low-cost enhancements projected for the Ocean Road segment near the Town Beach would have had enormous bang-for-the-buck benefits in this primary tourist area for hundreds of thousands of visitors Narragansett receives annually from out of state. We ask that you reconsider these two requests.

The causeway reconstruction project would have the effect of ensuring the safety of over 600 households to evacuate the Bonnet Shores neighborhood in the event of a natural disaster. On this submittal we acknowledge that the high cost estimate makes it difficult to justify a complete removal and reconstruction. In response we have drafted a lower cost alternative that we hope the State Planning Council will consider as a short/medium term improvement. That application is attached to this letter and we ask that you review and consider placing the new Bonnet Point Road Causeway project request on the 2017 TIP program.

On behalf of the Town of Narragansett, I thank you for your consideration of our transportation needs. Please contact Michael DeLuca, Community Development Director at 782-0602, or via email at mdeluca@narragansettri.gov, should you or your staff need additional information.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jerry Cearns
Acting Town Manager
New Project Application
Transportation Improvement Program

Contact Information
Agency/Organization: Town of Narragansett
Contact Person: Michael DeLuca
Title: Community Development Director
Mailling Address: 25 Fifth Avenue
City: Narragansett, RI
Phone: 401-782-0602
Email: mdeluca@narragansettri.gov

Type of Project
☐ Bridge  ☑ Pavement  ☐ Drainage  ☐ Planning  ☐ Traffic  ☐ Transit  ☑ Bicycle  ☑ Pedestrian  ☐ Transportation Enhancement  ☑ Other  Evacuation Route

Project Description
Project Title: Bonnet Point Road Causeway Rehabilitation - AMENDED APPLICATION
Location by Street Name: Bonnet Point Road
Project Limits - From: Allagash Trail  To: Dunes Road

Please include an 8.5" x 11" map of the site, indicating project limits.

Provide a brief description of the proposed project:

This section of road, a Federal Aid highway, is prone to periodic flooding and associated closures. Reclaiming and repaving of 1,850+/- feet of Bonnet Point Road between Allagash Trail and Dunes Road. Total reconstruction of an elevated structure has been eliminated for a limited repair and resurfacing project.

This revised project will include planning, design, permitting, and the physical repair of the causeway road surface including installation of permeable geotextile and polypropylene geogrid base reinforcement over the subgrade, reclaimed granular subbase material, and four (4) inches of hot asphalt applied in two 2-inch layers. It will not increase the elevation or width of the roadway.

The proposed funding will cover the estimated cost of design, permitting, and repair for the 0.35 mile section of Bonnet Point Road and associated dredging of the southeastern corner of Wesquage Pond that will serve to lower the water level and extend the life span of the new roadway surface.

The element of the project to fund dredging of the sand delta in the southeast corner of Wesquage Pond is necessary to ensure the viability of this project. Successful dredging will result in a lowering of the pond elevation by 2-3 feet. The Bonnet Shores Fire District currently has a permit to dredge a channel of 300 feet into the pond to achieve this result. The cost of this dredging project is in the $150,000 - $200,000 range and is incorporated within the cost estimate shown on page 3. The Town requests this cost be considered as a part of the TIP project.
Describe need for proposed project:

This project is needed due to the age and condition of the existing causeway which was built in the early 20th century. Documents available through the Bonnet Shores Fire District indicate the original causeway was constructed of several thousand yards of unconsolidated fill. The make-up of that fill is unknown. This causeway provides one of only 2 roadways for access and egress of the Bonnet Shores neighborhood. Severe rain events in the recent past have resulted in numerous incidences of Wesquage Pond over-topping the roadway with flood waters. Town DPW has closed the causeway in numerous winters when the pond water has flooded over and frozen on the roadway surface making it unsafe for vehicular travel. This condition limits access to and from a large portion of Bonnet Shores serving upwards of 600 households. A re-constructed road will provide for improved regular and emergency access for this densely-populated neighborhood.

The cost and effectiveness of adding fill to raise the causeway or build an elevated structure 4-6 feet higher has been determined to be cost prohibitive. This alternative proposal seeks funding to repair and repave the causeway to ensure its continued use for the next 10 - 20 years.

Describe anticipated municipal or state transportation network or economic development benefits:

Over 600 of the 900+ households in Bonnet Shores rely on this road as their primary route to and from Boston Neck Road. As such it also serves as a primary evacuation route in the event of a hurricane. Added to this is the reliance placed on the causeway by the Bonnet Shores Beach Club, (BSBC). The BSBC has 930 cabanas in addition to a restaurant and other facilities that attract 2,000 - 3,000 visitors on a typical summer day. This facility is in the process of pursuing local and state permits to install a sewer force main to replace its current on-site sewerage treatment system. This commitment of funds along with the site's appraised value in excess of $70 million for its tangible assets alone make the BSBC one of the major commercial entities in the Town.

Is the project consistent with the local Comprehensive Plan?  Yes  No
Is the project on the Federal Aid System?  Yes  No
Is the project on the National Highway System?  No
Evaluation Criteria

Please address the following topics as they relate to the project. Refer to “An Overview of TIP Guiding Principles” for more information. Submission must not exceed 2 pages, single-spaced, 12-point font.

1. Mobility Benefits
2. Cost Effectiveness
3. Economic Development
4. Environmental Impact
5. Supports Local and State Goals
6. Safety and Security
7. Equity

Project Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnet Shores Beach Club, Bonnet Shores Fire District</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated date of construction: 2018

ALL APPLICATIONS ARE DUE BY 3:00PM ON FRIDAY, JANUARY 8, 2016
NARRAGANSETT TIP PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS – EVALUATION CRITERIA
HIGH PRIORITY – BONNET POINT ROAD – CAUSEWAY REPAIR

- **Mobility Criteria**
  - **Travelers served** – Bonnet Point Road serves as a minor arterial roadway carrying traffic between the outer Bonnet Shores Peninsula and Route 1A. While no traffic counts are available through RIDOT, Town staff estimates between 1,600 – 3,200 vehicle trips per day are generated by properties located in this area. This figure more than doubles in the summer when the Bonnet Shores Beach Club (BSBC) is open to its 900+ cabana owners.
  - Planning staff estimates the ambient ADT to be 2,500 and the summer ADT to be 5,000.
  - **Modes** – This road carries a great deal of vehicular traffic. It also serves as a favorite bicycling and pedestrian route and should accommodate a wider multi-use curb lane.
  - **Transit mobility** - This area of Town supports a high percentage of elderly residents which create significant demand for special service buses (i.e., RIPTA/Flex).
  - **Walkability / Bikeability** – This roadway is currently less than 20 feet wide with no sidewalk or useable shoulder. A modest widening of the lane width would significantly improve conditions for bicycling. Addition of a sidewalk on at least one side of the road would enhance the pedestrian users safety and comfort significantly.
  - **Activity Centers** – With its 930 cabanas, in-ground pool and restaurant, the BSBC attracts thousands of people on a hot summer day. Without this improvement these beach goers and the 600+ households on the outer Bonnet peninsula would be relegated to a single access corridor on nearby Bonnet Shores Road.
  - **Connectivity** – This road segment is a key piece in the primary road loop road that serves Bonnet Shores 2,000+ residents.

- **Cost Effectiveness**
  - **Capital Cost** – Staff estimates 5,000 trips per day of summer traffic would directly benefit from this project. Using the figures noted above and estimating the lifespan of the causeway to be at least 15 years, the cost per person benefitted is very low; about $10/ user. This figure does not address tourists and their guests renting in Bonnet Shores in the summer. It would be lowered even more when this population is calculated into the result.
  - **Budget** – The project budget anticipates removal and replacement of the paved surface over a stabilized sub-base. This $590,000 budget is considered efficient when the safety benefits are factored into the equation.
  - **Infrastructure efficiency** - This roadway has served as a primary route to Bonnet Shores since the 1920’s. The road base has deteriorated over time and would be exceedingly expensive to expand and elevate to address current standards and sea level rise.
  - **Complements other projects** – Construction of the elevated roadway would allow for placement of a sewer pipe within the structure to serve the BSBC, which is currently engaged in design and permitting for said facility.
  - **Resiliency** –

- **Economic Development Impact**
  - **Employment Centers & Opportunities** – Rebuilding the causeway will ensure ease of access to the BSBC which seasonally employs 100+ individuals.
  - **Movement of Goods** – Reconstruction of this road will significantly enhance the movement of goods. Along with Bonnet Shores Road, this road is an essential component of the primary roadway network serving Bonnet Shores
- Tourism – This project will vastly improve tourist access to the BSBC and the Bonnet Shores neighborhood beach on Dunes Road along with the access trail to Bonnet Point which is a CRMC-designated right-of-way to the water.

- Urban Services Boundary – This road is located within the USB.

- Environmental Impact

- Air Quality & Energy Conservation – Improved conditions will enhance use of this roadway by pedestrians and bikers, which will translate into a small reduction in vehicle miles travelled.

- Water Quality – Dredging of the outlet channel in the SE corner of the pond will allow for more frequent flushing of the pond water therefore, reducing eutrophication and stagnation.

- Protect Natural Resources /Greenways – This road will protect Wesquage Pond by eliminating the intrusion caused by the current causeway and including updated stormwater management components.

- Support to Local and State Goals

- Priority – High (1 of 4)

- Comprehensive Plan – This project will respond to the goal of improving and maintaining a safe convenient traffic circulation system and the goal to correct road deficiencies and improve traffic safety. (See Comprehensive Plan at page 90).

- State Transportation Plan – This project addresses and implements the following goals and policies from Transportation 2035: B.2.d, B.3.a, D.1.b, D.1.d, D.2.a, D.2.d, D.2.f, ED.1.a, ED.2.h, ER.1.a, ER.2.f, ER.3.b, EN.1.b, En.2.d, EN.2.e, EN.2.f, EQ.1.a, EQ.2.b, H.1.b, H.2.b, LU.1.c, PE. 1.b, PE. 2.a, PE.2.c, PE.3.j, PL.2.g, S.1.b, S.1.c, S.2.c, S.3.q, S.4.h.

- Public Support – This project was heard on December 7, 2015 and was supported by the public and the Town Council.

- Safety, Security & Tech

- Enhances Safety – Project will replace a roadway that is past its useful life with a new stabilized road surface that will enhance safety for drivers, bikers and pedestrians.

- Public Safety & Emergency Response – This roadway serves as one of only two immediate and direct routes for emergency response vehicles into and out of the Bonnet Shores district. Fire, EMS, & Police response is often diverted around this flooded-closed causeway resulting in delayed on scene emergency services and extended EMS patient transports to the hospital.

- Improves Evacuation Route – In its current unreliable condition due to over-flooding, and/or ice coverage, there are many times when the road is closed to vehicular traffic. As a result, this roadway cannot be designated as a local evacuation route. Its replacement and associated channel dredging will improve public safety and dramatically enhance the evacuation routes for the Bonnet Shores residents and BSBC.

- Passenger safety – This will improve safety for vehicle passengers and walkers by replacing the narrow, deteriorated surface with a new facility designed to 21st century standards. Biking safety will vastly improve.

- Equity

- Elderly and Disabled - This replaced roadway will enhance access to the transportation network for persons aged 65 and older and those with disabilities by ensuring that a safe, secure and well-constructed roadway is in place to serve daily and emergency travel needs.
MEMORANDUM

Date: May 23, 2016
Job No.: 4511-2
To: Michael DeLuca
Narragansett Director of Community Development
Cc:

From: BETA Group, Inc.

Subject: Bonnet Causeway – Reconstruction/Reinforcement Conceptual Plan & Cost Estimate

Project Summary Statement
In the spring of 2016, the Town of Narragansett submitted an application to the Rhode Island Department of Transportation (RIDOT) for Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) funding for the replacement of the Bonnet Shores Causeway, which carries Bonnet Point Road across and between two sections of Wesquage Pond. The initial approach contemplated by the Town was to convert the existing fill-supported causeway and roadway with an elevated bridge causeway between Allagash Trail to the north and the entrance to the Bonnet Shores Beach Club to the south. The initial comprehensive cost estimate for this project (design, permitting and construction) was $15M; the funding request for that amount was rejected.

RIDOT, however, did indicate to the Town that it would be eligible to receive some level of TIP funding to be applied to a less comprehensive shorter-term project involving the roadway over the causeway. To that end, the Office of Community Development requested that the Department of Public Works, in conjunction with BETA, develop a conceptual plan and construction cost estimate for reconstructing and reinforcing the causeway section of Bonnet Shores Road.

Existing Conditions
The Bonnet Shores Causeway was constructed in the early 1920’s over dumped/placed fill material across Wesquage Pond. It runs for ~1,850 feet between the Bonnet Shores Beach Club (BSBC) driveway to the south and Allagash Trail to the north, and carries Bonnet Point Road, an existing ~21-foot wide bituminous concrete roadway that provides access to the Bonnet Shores Beach Club and the Point section of Bonnet Shores further to the east. Bonnet Point Road is one of only two designated emergency evaluation routes from the Bonnet Shores neighborhood, and is therefore a critical element of the Town’s road system.

The pavement structure of the roadway consists of approximately four (4) inches of bituminous concrete pavement over a variable-thickness sandy/gravelly granular base material; the subgrade consists of the original fill material used to construct the causeway. The causeway has two concrete culverts that connect the eastern and western sections of Wesquage Pond; they are intended to equalize the water elevations between both sections of the pond.

Wesquage Pond is a tidal pond, connected to Narragansett Bay by a natural breachway just east of the BSBC. There is an elevation control structure at the outlet from the breachway that is intended in part to maintain the levels of Wesquage Pond below the elevation of the causeway; however, in recent years the pond side of the breachway and the outlet control structure have been filled/buried by a significant volume of sediment, mostly from deposition of sand carried by tidal movement through the breachway. As a result, during even moderate storm events, water levels in the pond rise high enough to overtop and submerge the causeway, resulting in road closures and accelerated deterioration of the roadway structure.
Proposed Project
The goal of the prospective reconstruction/reinforcement project is to "harden" the roadway across the causeway to be less susceptible to structural damage when the pond water surface elevations rise to or close to the roadway subgrade/subbase. This will be achieved by reclaiming the existing roadway pavement structure and reconstructing the road with permeable geotextile and polypropylene geogrid base reinforcement over the subgrade, reclaimed granular subbase material, and four inches of hot-mix asphalt (two inches base and two inches surface). The reconstruction shall not increase the footprint (width) of the roadway or causeway, nor shall it increase the elevation of the roadway or causeway.

It is anticipated that a separate comprehensive breachway maintenance project shall also be undertaken to alleviate, or at least moderate, the frequency and severity of Wesquage Pond surcharging and causeway flooding. The combination of the breachway maintenance project and hardening the causeway roadway will enhance the durability and life cycle of the road, which is a critical element of the Town’s road system.

BSBC Participation
The BSBC is in the process of designing and permitting the installation of a seasonal sanitary sewer force main in the causeway from its property to the Town’s Allagash Trail sanitary sewer pump station; this project was going to include full-width resurfacing of Bonnet Point Road along the sewer service installation area. However, in light of the potential causeway reconstruction project, the BSBC has agreed in principle to assist the Town with its project by providing the funds that would have been allocated for the resurfacing to the Town for use in the reconstruction/reinforcement project.

Budgetary Cost Estimate
A budgetary cost estimate for the proposed reconstruction of the causeway was prepared, based on existing information gathered from various sources. The estimate is attached hereto; the total project cost (including soft costs and construction costs) is approximately $590,000.
## BONNET SHORES CAUSEWAY RECONSTRUCTION & REINFORCEMENT

**Conceptual Budgetary Cost Estimate Sheet**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>RIDOT Section</th>
<th>RIDOT Item Code</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Item Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>932.0200</td>
<td>Full-Depth Sawcut of Bituminous Pavement</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>204.0100</td>
<td>Trimming &amp; Fine Grading</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>9,800</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td>$44,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>206.0201</td>
<td>Baled Hay Erosion Check, Std. 9.1.0</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>3,380</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>$20,280.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>406.0100</td>
<td>Cold Recycled Base Course</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$8,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>202.0100</td>
<td>Unclassified / Earth Excavation</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$27,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Polypropylene Triaxial Geogrid Base Reinforcement</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>4,250</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>$25,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Non-Woven Permeable Geotextile Filter Fabric</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>4,250</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$12,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Placement &amp; Compaction of Reclaimed Base Course</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>401.2000</td>
<td>Class 12.5 HMA Base/Surface Course</td>
<td>TON</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>$130.00</td>
<td>$65,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>401.3000</td>
<td>Class 9.5 HMA Surface Course</td>
<td>TON</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>$130.00</td>
<td>$65,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>901.0101</td>
<td>Guardrail Steel Beam Single Face - Earth &amp; Asphalt</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$8,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>L01</td>
<td>L01.0104</td>
<td>Plantable Loam 4&quot; Deep</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$6,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>L02</td>
<td>L02.0102</td>
<td>Residential Seeding (Type 2)</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$2,440.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>T20</td>
<td>T20.2006</td>
<td>6&quot; Epoxy Resin Traffic Markings - White</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>3,650</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$10,950.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>T20</td>
<td>T20.2016</td>
<td>6&quot; Epoxy Resin Traffic Markings - Yellow</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>3,650</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$10,950.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Water Quality BMP</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Traffic Protection/Traffic Control</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Testing of Materials and Methods</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rounded Subtotal: $398,100.00

- Mobilization (10%): $39,810.00
- Subtotal w/Mobilization: $437,910.00
- Contingency (20%): $87,582.00
- Rounded Total Construction Cost: $525,492.00
- Soft Costs (Design & Permitting, 12%): $63,059.00
- Rounded Total Project Cost: $588,551.00
May 23, 2016

Jared L. Rhodes
Secretary (Acting)
Rhode Island State Planning Council
One Capitol Hill
Providence, RI 02908

Re: FFY 2017-2025 Draft State Transportation Improvement Program

Dear Mr. Rhodes:

The Woonasquatucket River Watershed Council (WRWC) is extremely disappointed and concerned that Johnston Extension of the Woonasquatucket Greenway/Northwest Trail from Cricket Field to Allendale Avenue was not included in the RI’s new 10-Year TIP. It seems like an opportunity for which the time has arrived.

For the first time in history, all the communities in the northwest part of the state are showing staunch support for extending the Woonasquatucket Greenway/Northwest Trail to connect the historic mill towns along this former rail corridor. Currently, there are very few safe places to bike and walk in this quarter of RI.

In addition, the state of RI has invested significant funds already on design and construction for this section of bike path. The WRWC and RIDOT completed major improvements to Cricket Field in Johnston in 2015 using earmark funds for the Northwest Trail, specifically to create a destination for the future bike path. In addition, RIDOT completed and updated a preliminary design study for the next section of path using hundreds of thousands of dollars in earmark and state funding. We have in hand a proposal from an on-call design and engineering firm to move the project forward to the next step immediately.

There is also local support from Johnston for this project and earmark funds ready for use. Over 700 residents from neighborhood in Johnston where the bike path will be constructed signed a petition or wrote letters supporting the expansion of the bike path into Smithfield.

It seems unusual, and certainly sparks our dismay, that the TAC prioritized other paths in the 10 year TIP that lack both existing funds and preliminary designs.

Waiting 10 years to continue work that is already underway would be the same as wasting funds already spent on feasibility and design. We encourage you to rethink your decision and add this segment to the 10 year TIP to embrace the momentum that we currently see with the present town administrations.

Sincerely,

Alicia J. Lehrer
Executive Director
June 1, 2016

Jared L. Rhodes
Secretary (acting)
Rhode Island State Planning Council
One Capitol Hill
Providence, RI 02908

Dear Mr. Rhodes,

The Woonasquatucket River Watershed Council (WRWC) respectfully submits the following comments on the STIP for Federal 2017-2025.

Our Providence TIP submission titled: Northwest Bike Trail/ Woonasquatucket River Greenway: Providence Woonasquatucket Greenway Corridor Enhancements is currently ranked as a high priority by the Transportation Advisory Committee. This project will include the development of a higher quality extension of the Fred Lippitt Woonasquatucket River Greenway bike path that provides a safer connection along Promenade and Kinsley Avenue between downtown Providence, the westside of the City and Olneyville Square. Through the STIP, RIDOT has allocated $4.1 M for years 2017-2020 and another $1.88M for years 2021-2025.

We are requesting that the $1.88M shown for years 2021-2025 be moved up to 2020 to accommodate full construction of this project in a more reasonable timeframe.

We thank you for your consideration of our request. Please don’t hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Alicia J. Lehrer
Executive Director

Alicia J. Lehrer
Executive Director
Prarag Argawal, Associate Director  
Rhode Island State Planning Council  
One Capital Hill  
Providence, Rhode Island 02908

Dear Mr. Argawal,

May 23, 2016

Our organization takes this opportunity to compliment all involved in the arduous task to prepare the 580 page Transportation Improvement Plan. Certainly, a compliment to the municipalities and citizens who have had to decipher this document. Several concerns, which we describe as omissions, include the following.

If read correctly, there is no reference for commuter rail being extended in South County to Kingstown and Westerly. If our state participates in the national effort to reduce the dependency on petroleum, which involves the automobile, we must continue to extend our commuter rail. The attached letter which we have sent to our South County legislators as well as the South County Tourism Council Director, Myrna George, who also sent a letter to the Governor soliciting their leadership to achieve this goal. Meanwhile, Connecticut is working to extend their Shore Line Train to Rhode Island, and a third rail is presently being installed at the Kingston Station to assist in maintaining Acela efficiency. LETS NOT BE THE STATE THAT DROPS THE BALL TO ACHIEVE A NETWORK OF COMMUTER RAIL FROM NEW YORK TO BOSTON.

We understand the national concern for restoration of infrastructure. Economic development is also a powerful voice being heard in our state’s planning objectives. Unfortunately building bike paths, a major contributor to our tourism industry being ignored in this TIP document. Meanwhile Connecticut is soon to award a bike path contract which will bring the East Coast Greenway to our state line. Lets complete the Trestle Trail, our link to Connecticut. I have included an article which recently appeared in the Providence Journal regarding the national economic success of building bike and pedestrian paths.

Supposedly the defense of this omission of bike paths is lack of funding. Meanwhile, the $17/m Federal Tiger grant for the light rail project in Providence is now being reconfigured for a bus route. It is difficult to grasp how all of this money would be spent to construct only a “bus route”. It would appear that major consultant contracts would be awarded to expedite this expenditure of dollars which seems to contradict the recent Providence Journal article about RIDOT’s excessive consultant spending? Prioritizing infrastructure is understandable. Waste of money is no excuse for lack of dollars to build bike paths.

Please help Governor Raimondo work toward achieving her goals to expand a unique quality of life in our wonderful state. This is what attracts business to achieve job growth and also encourages our young people to stay in our state and become leaders in making Rhode Island a major player in the north-east.

Sincerely,

Bob Votava, Executive Director

CC: Jack Reed, Senator  
Sheldon Whitehouse, Senator  
David Cicilline, Congressman  
James Langevin, Congressman  
Gina Raimondo, Governor  
Peter Alviti, RIDOT Director  
Janet Coit, RIDEM Director  
Ed Achorn, Providence Journal
May 9, 2016

Dear South County State Senators, Representatives, and Town Managers,

Now that RIDOT has prepared their ten year transportation plan (approximately 480 pages), we have noticed that South County towns have not requested expanding commuter rail in this part of the state. However, there is a request for a Pawtucket train station.

In terms of priority, over the past decades, there has been movement to bring commuter rail south. First, the new airport station in Warwick, then the new Wickford station, and supposedly Kingstown and Westerly are next. Certainly are organization as well as Myrna George at the South County Tourism Council have contacted the Governor to bring the train south. However, with the re-birth of Pawtucket, they have campaigned for a stop in their city, unfortunately they don't have a building or funding for the project. This means many years before service could be in place.

Both Kingstown and Westerly have a station and are ready to accept service. Meanwhile, Connecticut is thinking about bringing the Shore Line Train up to the Rhode Island line. This would complete a network of commuter rail from Boston to New York City. In Kingstown, a third track is being constructed to allow the Acela to move more efficiently. Meanwhile there is important investment taking place in Westerly which is generating a loud drumbeat. Help bring commuter rail south to Kingstown and Westerly. Please contact the Governor and voice your concern, and have this put on the ten year plan.

Thank you.

Bob Votava,
Executive Director

CC: Jack Reed, Senator
   Sheldon Whitehouse, Senator
   James Langevin, Congressman
   David Cicilline, Congressman
   Ed Achorn, Providence Journal
Bike paths pay off for Rhode Island

Economic development is a top priority for most towns and cities. Though communities might like to attract a large company, they have discovered that bike and pedestrian paths are important economic generators for tourist dollars. In addition, these paths pay dividends by promoting exercise, good health, beautification and appreciation of the landscape.

One example is the former Flagg Rail Line, which once connected Miami to Key West, Fla. It was built to take people to the Key West ferry to Cuba. Hurricane damage ended the rail use and it was converted to an auto route. After new traffic bridges were built, some sections of the rail bridge sat abandoned until about a decade ago, when local officials recognized their potential for a bike path that would stimulate economic development. It is now in construction and will be the last south-bound leg of the East Coast Greenway, which starts in Calais, Maine, and connects major seaborne cities, including Providence.

Closer to home is Poughkeepsie, N.Y., where a two-track abandoned rail bridge over the Hudson River now serves pedestrians and cyclists. The bridge is called “Walk Across the Hudson,” and it has boomed tourism. Philadelphia used a federal grant to build a $17 million bike bridge over the Schuylkill River as part of the Schuylkill Banks River Trail. London is considering a multimillion-dollar floating walkway in the Thames.

Everybody, it seems, has heard of the High Line in New York City, an abandoned elevated freight rail viaduct that stood abandoned for many decades. Former Mayor Rudy Giuliani wanted to tear it down. Thanks to the wisdom of citizens, it was saved and turned into a park, with Mayor Michael Bloomberg’s support. It mimics an elevated train line in Paris that was converted into a park several decades ago, called the Promenade Plantée, which goes from the new opera house out to the Park Vincennes. It is a major tourist draw to a beautiful Parisian neighborhood.

Given the success of the High Line, a fourth section is now being completed that will take people to the Convention Center on 34th Street. This project has become the second-highest tourist draw in the city. In addition, New York has just completed the $61.8 million reconstruction of the elevated High Bridge, which once supported an aqueduct between Manhattan and the Bronx. This architectural gem sat abandoned for over four decades before local officials recognized that it could serve as a major economic generator as a pedestrian bike path connecting communities.

Here in Rhode Island, the William O’Neill South County Bike Path, which connects the Kingston Amtrak station to Waterfall and soon the beaches in Narragansett, is a major economic development success story. In 1995, the project was suggested by state Sen. William O’Neill on the abandoned Narragansett Pier railroad easement, and the state Department of Transportation used federal funds to build it. It is the town’s most heavily used park and a major tourist draw.

Thanks to the leadership of former Gov. Lincoln Chafee and former DOT Director Michael Lewis, the old masonry Washington Bridge on Route 195 between Providence and East Providence has been restored and converted into a pedestrian bike path called the George Rodman Linear Park. It was recently dedicated by Gov. Gina Raimondo and Janet Cott, director of the Department of Environmental Management, and named for a longtime environmental activist.

Construction on the Providence Bike Pedestrian Bridge is scheduled to begin soon. That will be another success story for Rhode Island.

As state legislators fine-tune the recently unveiled 10-year transportation plan, they should prioritize bike path and pedestrian projects. Transportation dollars can generate economic development. Since Governor Raimondo is a cyclist, I hope she will take note of this economic generator that can improve the quality of life here in Rhode Island by building on our state’s incredible assets.

— Bob Votava (bobvotava@msn.com) is a retired architect who worked in the New York mayor’s Office of Development. He is chairman of the Friends of the William C. O’Neill South County Bike Path.
May 24, 2016

Mr. Jared L. Rhodes  
Secretary (Acting)  
Rhode Island State Planning Council  
One Capitol Hill  
Providence, RI 02908

Dear Mr. Rhodes:

Re: Public Comment on ID 5089 SOUTH COUNTY BIKE PATH EXTENSION

This letter is in response to State of Rhode Island Transportation Improvement Program FY 2017-2025 Public Review Draft - April 25, 2016 as posted on the http://www.planning.ri.gov/ for public review and comment.

On behalf of the Friends of the William C. O’Neill South County Bike Path, we are commenting on:

   ID 5089 SOUTH COUNTY BIKE PATH EXTENSION

on page 316 under Transportation Alternatives Program.

On January 7, 2016, we submitted a New Project Application for the FY2017-2025 Transportation Improvement Plan titled Completion of the South County Bike via Canonchet Farm, Narragansett, R.I. A similar application, though described with less detail, was included in the Town of Narragansett TIP submission as a High Priority. These two submissions followed a R.I. Department of Transportation presentation before the Narragansett Town Council on December 7, 2015 of:

   FEASIBILITY STUDY  
   SOUTH COUNTY BIKE PATH - PHASE 4  
   CANONCHET FARM EXTENSION  
   NARRAGANSETT/SOUTH KINGSTOWN BICYCLE FACILITY  
   RHODE ISLAND CONTRACT NO. 89111

The study provided a thorough review of seven possible routes (both off-road and on-road) to complete the bike path. (A similar study was done in 2000.)

In its regular meeting immediately following the presentation the Narragansett Town Council voted to maintain its earlier recommendation that the bike path be completed using an off-road route through Canonchet Farm.

We are pleased to see that the work on the path completion is in the Highway Maintenance Account in the first four years of the plan.

However, the description of the project as “evaluation of on-road and off-road alternatives for the final segment of the William C. O’Neill (South County Bike Path) to Narragansett Town Beach” is not acceptable. The alternatives already been evaluated. Twice. The description creates an opening for another round of study and delay.
The $1.62 million allocated for FY2017 and FY2018 should be used for design and permitting of the off-road route through Canonchet Farm. The project should be described accordingly to remove any ambiguity:

Design and construction of the final segment of the William C. O’Neill (South County Bike Path) to Narragansett Town Beach using an off-road route through Canonchet Farm.

Such a description would communicate readiness and commitment and be helpful in securing funding from other public and private sources.

We also recommend that the title of the project be changed to “South County Bike Path Completion,” as the project is not to extend an already completed bike path, but to finish development of this valuable state transportation and recreation asset.

We realize that the title and project description may be holdovers from previous TIPs carried forward for convenience, but they should not stand.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

David and Rosemary Smith
24 Castle Road
Narragansett, RI 02882
401 783-5344
dsmithmark@cox.net

Copies:
Bob Votava, Friends of the William C. O’Neill South County Bike Path

R.I. Legislators
Sen. Mark Gee, R.I. Senate District 35
Rep. Carol Hagan McEntee, R.I. House District 33
Sen. James Sheehan, R.I. Senate District 36
Sen. Susan Sosnowski, R.I. Senate District 37
Rep. Teresa Tanzi, R.I. House District 33

Town of Narragansett
Town Council
Jeffry Ceasrine, Acting Town Manager
Michael DeLuca, Director of Community Development
May 26, 2016
To: Members of the Rhode Island Transportation Advisory Committee

From: Alex Krogh-Grabbe
Executive Director, Rhode Island Bicycle Coalition

Dear members of the TAC:

The RI Bicycle Coalition has been paying close attention as the 2017-2025 Transportation Improvement Plan has been in development, and we would like to provide comment as you consider the approval of the draft plan today.

The Bike Coalition was supportive of the RhodeWorks proposal because the resulting increase in funding for the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) was significant. However, this increase has still only resulted in four bike projects that are scheduled to be constructed in the next ten years: Blackstone River Bikeway Segments 8A, 8C, and 8B-1 (all in Woonsocket), and the two bridges (not even the paving) of the final section of the Trestle Trail in Coventry.

Furthermore, this plan's funding of bike and pedestrian infrastructure is even more out of step with usage than the national average. Nationally, 11.4% of all trips are taken by bike or by foot, 14.9% of all roadway fatalities are pedestrians & bicyclists, but only 2.1% of transportation funding goes to projects designed for these users. In our four-year TIP, only 1.9% of funding goes to TAP. We must increase that number if we want to reverse the financially and environmentally unsustainable dependence on motor vehicle transportation.

One reason the Bike Coalition nonetheless found it palatable to support RhodeWorks was that we expected that all of the bridge & paving projects consuming the bulk of the funding would be constructed with complete streets in mind. If you’re not familiar with the term, “complete streets” means streets that are built to be safe and comfortable for all road users, with the inclusion of sidewalks, bike lanes, and real transit accommodation in addition to basic motor vehicle striping. However, it is concerning to us that the phrase “complete streets” only appears twice in the draft TIP. If we want to build a transportation network in our state that makes people and jobs want to locate here, we cannot continue dismissing vulnerable road users as an aberration when we design our streets.

While the most obvious shovel-ready bike projects around the state, as well as several vital bike improvements in the City of Providence and on Aquidneck Island are present in the draft plan, beyond that we are disappointed with how statewide bike priorities were included or not included. Eight bike projects included in the previous TIP were completely omitted from this draft plan, and a critical segment of the Blackstone River Bikeway through Central Falls prioritized as “high” in our submission is also absent.
A few final notes about process:

- I know the Bike Coalition is not alone in frustration about the timetable forced on municipal and other submitters by the late release of RIDOT's recommendations last fall. That imbalance was too much like the historical practice of back-room decisions and token public meetings that RIDOT is known for. If the new RIDOT administration truly seeks to change those perceptions of the agency, that timetable must be more collaborative in the future.

- In this transition year to a ten-year TIP, there were a few confusions that are worth mentioning here. First, in subcommittees, a “low” prioritization was interpreted more like “do not recommend” than like an overflow “medium” prioritization. Had that interpretation been clearer before submissions were due, we would have submitted many more projects with “low” priority and upgraded all our “lows” to “mediums”.

- In general, the subcommittee decision-making process could be made much more objective. In meetings I attended, prioritization was often made merely by members’ statement of their personal priority, which usually met with no comment or at least unfamiliarity from other members. Perhaps greater education about the universe of potential projects before the decision-making meetings would help.

In sum, if we wish to increase the proportion of Rhode Islanders who get around by bike, we must stop treating this mode choice as an “alternative” and instead consider it an equally valid transportation decision. As Rhode Island is particularly vulnerable to climate change, it is our responsibility to change the conversation to encourage more sustainable transportation decisions such as bicycling. In the Transportation 2035 plan, we articulated a multimodal vision for the state. This TIP does not put us adequately on track for that vision, and we encourage future updates of the TIP to include a more fair funding allocation.

Thank you,

Alex Krogh-Grabbe
Executive Director, Rhode Island Bicycle Coalition.
Amendment #7 to the FFY 2013-2016 STIP

Jared L. Rhodes
Secretary (Acting)
Rhode Island State Planning Council
One Capitol Hill
Providence, RI 02908

Dear Mr. Rhodes:

I am writing to show my support for the extension of the Woonasquatucket River Greenway through the Town of Johnston. Mayor Polisena asked that the Woonasquatucket River Watershed Council meet with a small group of residents at the end of Lyman Avenue and the Tyler Avenue area who were opposed to having the bike path go behind their homes on land that is owned by National Grid or go on road in front of their homes on Lyman Avenue due to various issues.

The WRWC reached a compromise with the residents where we will focus on completing the bike path off road from Cricket Field to Allendale Avenue and will continue on road in North Providence connecting Lyman Avenue with a bridge over the Woonasquatucket River. This compromise will provide access to the residents in North Providence and to commuters from RI College to downtown Providence.

Over 700 Johnston residents have written letters or signed a petition indicating that they are excited and support the continuation of the bike path into Smithfield. The Northwestern part of the state is lacking safe routes to bike, jog and walk. For the first time in history, there is support from all of the in the Northwestern towns to design the expansion of the Northwest Bike Path through the towns of Johnston, Smithfield, North Smithfield and Burrillville.

Earmark funding of 1.5 million dollars has been allocated to this effort to design this next phase. We are strongly requesting that the funding that is designated for this purpose, not be reallocated to another RIDOT project and that we move forward with the project as the money was intended.

Thank you for the consideration.

Very truly yours,

Robert V. Russo
President – Johnston Town Council
May 26, 2016

VIA HAND DELIVERY

Rhode Island State Planning Council
One Capitol Hill
Providence, RI 02908-5870

To the Rhode Island State Planning Council:

It is with great frustration and disappointment that we hereby submit for the hearing record this letter strongly objecting to the FFY 2017-2025 Draft State Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), which is scheduled for public hearing today, Thursday, May 26, 2016.

The timeline set forth in the TIP for addressing projects we consider crucial to the future success of East Providence—such as Waterfront Drive, the I-195 Interchange, and the Extension of the Ten Mile River Greenway—is simply unsatisfactory to us and to the residents of East Providence whom we’re honored to represent.

Even worse, the repaving of Pawtucket Avenue—a state managed roadway about which we’ve previously written to urge a priority status (see enclosure)—is not scheduled to occur for many years to come. Given this dreadful determination, we must ask with all sincerity: Does the Draft TIP even attempt to address the immediate and ongoing safety/vehicular concerns we’ve continued to raise to RIDOT and others, both in public and in private? It would seem that the answer is a resounding, “NO.”

Kindly ensure this letter and enclosures are included as part of the formal hearing record today, Thursday, May 26th, the scheduled timing of which is disappointing to all of us, as well as to our constituents—the vast majority of whom work for a living, and in any case should not be compelled to take time out of their busy schedules in order to voice their objection to such a blatantly flawed plan.

As taxpayers, we all deserve better than this.

Sincerely,

Sen. Daniel Da Ponte
D. 14 (E. Providence)

Rep. Katherine S. Kazarian
D. 63 (E. Providence)

Rep. Gregg Amore
D. 65 (E. Providence)

Sen. William J. Conley, Jr.
D. 18 (E. Providence, Pawtucket)

Rep. Helio Melo
D. 64 (E. Providence)

Encl. November 2, 2015 letter to DOT Director Alviti
December 18, 2015 response letter from DOT Director Alviti
November 2, 2015

Peter Alviti, Jr. P.E.
Director, RI Department of Transportation
Two Capitol Hill
Providence, RI 02903

Dear Director Alviti,

As you are aware, the districts we represent cover substantial portions of East Providence. In recent months, each of us has been inundated with complaints regarding the deplorable condition of Pawtucket Avenue—a state managed roadway and the primary thoroughfare which residents must traverse to get from Point A- to Point B in the City. In short, Pawtucket Ave. might otherwise be referred to as “Townie Highway.”

In order to be responsive to our constituents’ safety and vehicular concerns, we are writing to jointly and respectfully request that the Department provide us with a detailed update on RIDOT’s plans for repairing and resurfacing Pawtucket Avenue in East Providence.

As state legislators, we certainly appreciate the overwhelming demand for improvement of our state’s roadways. However, we must insist that a priority status for Pawtucket Ave. is truly warranted, due to the level of deterioration that both we and many, many city residents see and “feel” on a daily basis.

Thank you in advance for your timely consideration of this request. Please know that we will make ourselves available to further discuss this matter if you should have any concerns.

Sincerely Yours,

[Signatures]

Senator Daniel Da Ponte
Representative Gregg Amore
Representative Katherine Kazarian

D. 14 - East Providence  D. 65 - East Providence  D. 63 - East Providence
December 18, 2015

Senator Daniel DaPonte
District 14 - East Providence
State House
Providence, Rhode Island 02903

Subject: Pavement Condition of Pawtucket Avenue (Route 103, Route 114 and Route 1A)
From Willett Avenue (Route 103) to City of Pawtucket
Schedule for Upcoming Repairs to Pawtucket Avenue

Honorable Senator DaPonte,

Thank you for the November 2, 2015 letter bringing attention to the pavement condition of Pawtucket Avenue in the City of East Providence. As you know, Pawtucket Avenue begins as Route 103 at the intersection with Willett Avenue and extends north to the border with the City of Pawtucket becoming portions of Route 114 and Route 1A along the way.

Using an asset management approach and with current funding levels, the Department has developed a 10 Year Paving Pipeline that utilizes an objective method (pavement condition, surface type and traffic volumes) to plan and schedule future resurfacing projects. Based on anticipated funding, the following table shows various sections of Pawtucket Avenue that are included in Roadworks program for resurfacing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Begin</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Year to be Paved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newport Ave (Rt 1A)</td>
<td>Beverage Hill Ave</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Ave (US-6)</td>
<td>Taunton Ave (US-44)</td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullocks Point Ave</td>
<td>Wampaug Tr (Rt 114)</td>
<td>2024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed 10 Year Plan can be accessed on our website. Comments on the proposed 10 Year Paving Pipeline may be submitted through the Division of Planning (www.planning.ri.gov), as this is the process for approval of all Federal funds. The condition of all State roads will be evaluated every year and the 10 Year Paving Pipeline will be updated as well. Should you have any questions or require additional information please contact me.

Sincerely,

Peter V. Alviti, Jr., P.E.
Director
Rhode Island Department of Transportation
May 25, 2016

TO: Rhode Island Transportation Advisory Council  
   Rhode Island Division of Statewide Planning

FROM: Broad Street Business Community  
       Pawtucket, Central Falls and Cumberland

We, the undersigned, support the $11.45 million requested in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Broad Street Regeneration Program 2.0 to re-pave, re-drain and re-design to a higher standard this important corridor.

This community and regional based regeneration effort impacts the community, social and economic development of the cities of Pawtucket and Central Falls and the town of Cumberland.

Broad Street, the three-mile road from Main Street in Pawtucket to Mendon Road in Cumberland, has important small business and culturally ethnic implications that will have a positive benefit on the municipalities and the region, now America’s 402nd National Historical Park, recognized for being the birthplace of America’s Industrial Revolution.

The first Broad Street Regeneration Project began in 2009. It saw a successful effort in banding together the small businesses, cultural organizations and the creation of new small businesses through this unique collaboration.

Now, with plans by Pawtucket and Central Falls underway for a proposed commuter rail hub, along with using the Broad Street corridor as a major access point to social, cultural and visitor destinations, and intermodal connections to the Blackstone River Bikeway in Cumberland, and in the Blackstone River Valley itself, this project is vital for the long-range business sustainability of regional development.

We respectfully urge approval of this funding, as it is a vital, long-term investment in the future of our communities and its residents.

Sincerely,

John Gregory, President  
Northern Rhode Island Chamber of Commerce

Robert D. Billington-Ed., President  
Blackstone Valley Tourism Council
Linda Weisinger, Executive Director
Pawtucket/Central Falls Citizens Development Group

Jan Brodie, Executive Director
Pawtucket Foundation

Tim Draper, Vice President, Marketing
Navigant Credit Union Central Falls

Louis Yip, President, Tai-O Corporation
Broad Street Business Owner Pawtucket

Angelina Melo, Proprietor
Colonial Bakery
185 Broad Street, Cumberland

Sandra Cano, Owner
Lleras Grille, LLC
1252 Broad Street, Central Falls

Russell Long, Owner
Subway Central Falls
310 Broad Street
Broad Street Regeneration Initiative 2.0

Jose Garcia, Owner
Garcia Insurance
539 Broad Street
Central Falls, RI 02863

Cristian Tabares, Owner
La Casona Restaurant
768 Broad Street
Central Falls, RI 02863

Maria Denizard, Owner
Le Femme Salon
180 Broad Street
Cumberland, RI 02864
THE CASE FOR OPTION #2

ROUTE 138 PROJECT AREA COMMITTEE
Dorald Beasley - Member: Author
Vincent Murray - Committee Chairperson: Reviewer
An Analysis of Options #1, #2 and #3

Below is the RIDOT response of 2/14/2014 to a 138 PAC request on 2/10/2014 for additional information on the three options presented to committee on 12/10/2013.

BETA investigated options for installing an opposing left hand turn lane for the left turns into South Road and Old North Road. Each of the options (including the current configuration in the draft 90% plans) requires some land taking. As discussed at the last PAC meeting, Options #1 & #2 were dismissed due to insufficient room to develop taper and stacking lengths necessary to meet design standards and to reflect a natural driving path. Since there is not enough room for vehicles to adequately position themselves in the turn lane, movement in the through travel lane will be impacted. Attached for your information is a more in-depth discussion on the evaluation.

We support Beta's recommendation to implement Option #3 because it seems to best accommodate the needs expressed by the committee members in past meetings. Since we do not consider Options #1 & #2 to be suitable, it doesn't seem necessary to further analyze the land taking areas associated with them. I recognize your concern for how such changes would affect the taking area for the individual properties you listed. The good news is... of the three options investigated, Option #3 requires the least amount of additional land taking area compared to the others.

Although we concur with the explanation as to why dedicated opposing left hand turn lanes cannot be included in the final design we disagree with the conclusion that Option #3 is the only viable choice. After reviewing all three options in more depth we would rank them in the following order in regards to the benefit each brings to the village – 2/1/3. Encapsulated assessments would describe them as follows: the addition of a bypass lane at the intersection of 138 and South Rd. for northbound vehicles on South Rd. in #3 is the only change to the current 90% design; #1 can best be described as trying to stuff 10 lbs. of design in a 5 lb. bag; leaving #2 as the choice with the greatest potential for adding value to this project. The following slides explain our position.

Note: The details shown on each slide are explained in the notes pages.
A. Route 138/108 Intersection and Sidewalk to Robert’s Court

1. Option #2 puts into direct alignment the Eastbound and Westbound travel lanes of 138 at the intersection with 108 eliminating the “joggles” which Options #1 and #3 have and which been a feature of every design going back to the beginning of this project. It also creates a more defined dedicated right turn only lane for E-bound traffic heading south on 138.

2. The amount of land taking, shown now to be 2734 sq. ft., could be reduced by approximately 1000 sq. ft. to around 1750 sq. ft. if the sidewalk servicing Robert’s Court ended at the crosswalk spanning 138 as shown here. In fact this was the BETA design in May, 2008 on Signing & Striping Plan No. 28. It would require an “all-red” phase with countdown timer of the signalization to allow a handicapped person(s) to cross but would place pedestrians on the north side of 138 which is apt to be their preferred option with access to the Kingston Free Library, the U.S. Post Office, URI, two churches, and the Emporium. We also think activation of this “all-red” phase will be a rare occasion.
B. Land Taking
Now is the time to invite the owners of the three lots most affected by Option #2 - AP 23-3 Lot 41, AP 24-4 Lots 1 and 2, and the owner of the business on AP 23-3 Lot 40 into the S.K. Planning Office to explain where we’re at and what we’re trying to do here. If they concur then another box has been checked off, but if they have objections it would certainly be to everyone’s advantage to find what they are and see if they can be resolved now, instead of months from now, or in court, which would push the construction start date out even further than it already is.
C. Turning Movements at Old North and South Roads

1. Even without defined turning bays, the 10 ft. wide median (whether striped, cobbled or stamped concrete) which this realignment creates on both entrance points of the Old North/South Rd. intersection definitively separates the E and W travel lanes of 138, and in and of itself provides a “crossover space” for queued vehicles waiting to turn onto Old North or South Rd. It should include left turn arrows for both E and W bound vehicles.

2. Traffic volumes in the village center increase exponentially when URI is in session with vehicles travelling to and from campus. Likewise, the instances when westbound and eastbound vehicles on 138 turn onto Old North Rd. simultaneously also increase. Because of this it may be better to show the turning movement of the eastbound vehicle using the left lane, leaving the right lane for westbound vehicles. This is also the case today for vehicles on South Rd. which “shoot across” 138 onto Old North Rd.
D. Parking - The Village Well - Existing Brick Sidewalk - Cyclists
1. The realignment of the eastbound travel lane(s) in Option #2 also creates 2 to 3 new parking spaces for the village on the south side of 138 in front of Tavern Hall.
2. Although Option #2 necessitates cutting back the well island approximately 4 ft. to accommodate the lane realignment, the revered village well structure will remain where it is today.
3. There is no need for a new sidewalk on the south side of 138 from the Kingston Hill Store parking lot to the crosswalk at the village well. The meandering existing brick sidewalk is sufficient.
4. If there isn’t enough room at the two bump-outs for cyclists to ride alongside traffic then signs such as the one shown above will need to be posted.
E. Conclusion

The additional 1000 sq. ft. of land needed for Option #2 provides many advantages over the other two choices. The symmetry of Option #2 will make this section of the reconstruction ascetically more pleasing and functional at the same time, traits which are certain to be appreciated when the project is finally completed.
Concept Modifications North Road / South Road (Option No. 3)
Localized Widening of East Bound Travel Lane
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We support Beta’s recommendation to implement Option #3 because it seems to best accommodate the needs expressed by the committee members in past meetings. Since we do not consider Options #1 & #2 to be suitable, it doesn’t seem necessary to further analyze the land taking areas associated with them. I recognize your concern for how such changes would affect the taking area for the individual properties you listed. The good news is...of the three options investigated, Option #3 requires the least amount of additional land taking area compared to the others.

Although we concur with the explanation as to why dedicated opposing left hand turn lanes cannot be included in the final design we disagree with the conclusion that Option #3 is the only viable choice. After reviewing all three options in more depth we would rank them in the following order in regards to the benefit each brings to the village – 2/1/3. Encapsulated assessments would describe them as follows: the addition of a bypass lane at the intersection of 138 and South Rd. for northbound vehicles on South Rd. in #3 is the only change to the current 90% design; #1 can best be described as trying to stuff 10 lbs. of design in a 5 lb. bag; leaving #2 as the choice with the greatest potential for adding value to this project. The following slides explain our position.

Note: The details shown on each slide are explained in the notes pages.
Route 138/108 Intersection and Sidewalk to Robert’s Court

Ending sidewalk here reduces required taking by 1000 sq.ft.

Required Land Taking Approx. 2,734 s.f.
Currently Proposed - 721 s.f.

Signing & Striping Plan No. 28
May, 2008
Land Taking
Turning Movements at Old North and South Roads

County Rd.
Barrington, RI

Route 2,
North Kingstown, RI
Parking - The Village Well - Existing Brick Sidewalk - Cyclists

- Leave sufficient room for cyclists
- Additional parking spaces
- New sidewalk not required

Downtown Providence
Conclusion

The additional 1000 sq. ft. of land needed for Option #2 provides many advantages over the other two choices. The symmetry of Option #2 will make this section of the reconstruction ascetically more pleasing and functional at the same time, traits which are certain to be appreciated when the project is finally completed.
June 13, 2016

Mr. Parag Agrawal
Secretary of Rhode Island State Planning Commission
One Capitol Hill
Providence RI 02908

Dear Mr. Agrawal,

On behalf of the Providence Downtown Improvement District, representing all the property owners in downtown Providence, I want to voice our strong support for a section of the program of work being established through the Rhode Island State Transportation Program (STIP).

The City of Providence submitted a new project entitled “I-95 Downtown Overpass Enhancement Project” for inclusion in the STIP. This was not allocated any funding through the STIP, however, RIDOT has indicated that the issues listed in the City of Providence’s new project application, including restriping, traffic lane reconfiguration, sidewalk widening and other streetscape enhancements, will be evaluated as part of their work to extend the useful service life of the I-95 overpass structures for which they have allocated $11.54M from years 2018-2020 (BRIDGE GERoup 01). This project will include Washington, Broadway, Broad and Westminster bridges over I-95. On behalf of the Providence Downtown Improvement District, I request that the STIP include elements of the City’s “I-95 Downtown Overpass Enhancement project” within the scope of work for Bridge Group 1 and urge RIDOT to begin to work with the City as soon as possible to generate initial ideas to make the overpasses safer and more attractive for pedestrians and bicyclists.

These overpasses are major links between the rapidly growing West Side of the City and downtown Providence. To make the overpasses all the more safe and attractive for people to use, will enhance economic vitality in the Capital City.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours truly,

Frank P. LaTorre
Senior Director
Providence Downtown Improvement District
May 24, 2016

Mr. Parag Agrawal
Secretary of the Rhode Island State Planning Council
One Capitol Hill
Providence, RI 02908

Dear Mr. Agrawal,

Thank you for your partnership in advancing so many important projects throughout the City of Providence to be constructed over the next several years, and for the opportunity to help shape the program of work through the Rhode Island State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). After careful review of the STIP for federal fiscal years 2017-2025, I submit the following comments on behalf of the City of Providence for your consideration.

The STIP includes a project titled “Dudley Street Connector”, which involves the construction of a new roadway, with sidewalks and handicapped compliant ramps, between Allens Avenue and Eddy Street. In our rankings of projects that were submitted to Statewide Planning, the City ranked this project as low priority. Despite this low ranking, RIDOT has allocated $3M to this project for years 2017-2018. On behalf of the City of Providence, I request that this project be put on hold and that further discussions take place between RIDOT, the City of Providence, and RIPTA to determine how this project can better advance the Downtown Enhanced Bus Corridor project and if there is an opportunity to reduce the three-million dollar project budget in order to allocate funding to one of the higher priority Transportation Alternatives projects that have been identified by the City, but which have not received adequate or timely funding from through the STIP.

The STIP includes a project titled “Allens Avenue Arterial Traffic Signal Improvements”, which involves signal improvements to the Allens Avenue corridor. In our rankings of projects that were submitted to Statewide Planning, the City ranked this project as a low priority. Despite this low ranking, RIDOT has allocated $1.75M to this project for years 2019-2020 plus an additional $1.45M for the year 2021. On behalf of the City of Providence, I request that this project be put on hold and that the $3.2M in funding for this project be allocated to one of the higher priority Transportation Alternatives projects that have been identified by the City, but which have not received adequate or timely funding from RIDOT through the STIP.

The City submitted a new project entitled “City Walk” for inclusion in the STIP. This project, which was ranked as a high priority by the STIP review committees and the Transportation Advisory Committee as a whole, will include pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, streetscape improvements and signage to connect eight Providence neighborhoods from Roger Williams Park on the southwest through Downtown to India Point Park on the east. The STIP allocates $1.88M from years 2017-2018 to begin design and construction of this project and another $16.58M from years 2017-2019 for “major rehabilitation work, superstructure, and/or total bridge
replacement" of the Elmwood Avenue and Broad Street Bridges over I-95 near Roger Williams Park (TIP ID 6453). On behalf of the City of Providence, I request that RIDOT, as part of their STIP scope for the Elmwood and Broad bridges over I-95, include improvements to make the bridges safer and more attractive for pedestrians and bicyclists and meet with the City of Providence as soon as possible to generate initial ideas for how the bridge replacements projects could enhance the City Walk project. Both bridges are essential connections for the City Walk project.

The City of Providence submitted a new project entitled, "I-95 Downtown Overpass Enhancement Project," for inclusion in the STIP. This was not allocated any funding through the STIP, however RIDOT has indicated that the issues listed in the City of Providence's new project application, including restriping, traffic lane reconfiguration, sidewalk widening and other streetscape enhancements, will be evaluated as part of their work to extend the useful service life of the I-95 overpass structures for which they have allocated $11.54M from years 2018-2020 (BRIDGE GROUP 01). This project will include the Washington, Broadway, Broad, and Westminster bridges over I-95. On behalf of the City of Providence, I request that the STIP include elements of our "I-95 Downtown Overpass Enhancement Project" within the scope of work for Bridge Group 1 and urge RIDOT to begin to work with us as soon as possible to generate initial ideas to make the overpasses safer and more attractive for pedestrians and bicyclists.

The City of Providence submitted a new project entitled "Exchange Street Sidewalk Widening Project" for inclusion in the STIP. This project will include pedestrian enhancements following a Complete Streets approach to Exchange Street, between Kennedy Plaza and Providence Station. Through the STIP, RIDOT has allocated $400,000 to this project for the year 2018, and another $3.13M to this project for years 2021-2023. The Exchange Street Bridge over the Woonasquatucket River is also slated for major rehabilitation work, superstructure, and/or total bridge replacement (TIP ID 6455) as part of Bridge Group 40 in years 2023-2025. On behalf of the City of Providence, I request that the major rehabilitation work for the Exchange Street Bridge be moved up to an earlier date in order to ensure the safety of those who use this important bridge within Downtown and better align with the Exchange Street improvements and the construction of the multi-modal transit hub near Providence Station. I also request that the $3.13M allocated for years 2021-2023, be moved up to an earlier date. This project was ranked as a priority project by the Transportation Advisory Committee and is essential to improve connectivity between Kennedy Plaza and Providence Station.

The City of Providence submitted a new project entitled "Woonasquatucket Greenway Corridor Enhancements" for inclusion in the STIP. This project, which was ranked as a high priority by the Transportation Advisory Committee, will include the development of a higher quality extension of the Woonasquatucket River Greenway bike path to connect Downtown to Olneyville Square and the west side of the city along Promenade and Kinsley streets. Through the STIP, RIDOT has allocated $4.1M for years 2017-2020 and other $1.88M for years 2021-2025. On behalf of the City of Providence, I request that the $1.88M shown for years 2021-2025 be moved up to 2020 to accommodate full construction of this project in a more reasonable timeframe.

The City of Providence submitted a new project entitled "Providence Bicycle Infrastructure Enhancements" for inclusion in the STIP. This project will include design and construction of approximately 20 miles of on road bicycle lanes, bicycle boxes, bicycle signal loops, bicycle racks and other related bicycle infrastructure. Through the STIP, RIDOT has allocated $1.8M to this project for years 2023-2025. On behalf of the City of Providence, I request that the $1.8M allocated to this project be moved up to earlier years to accommodate full construction of this project in a more reasonable timeframe.

The City of Providence submitted a new project entitled "Washington Secondary Bike Path Extension" for inclusion in the STIP. This project will include the study, design and construction of an approximately 1-mile off-
road multi-use trail to connect Olneyville Square to the terminus of the Washington Secondary Trail in Cranston. Through the STIP, RIDOT has allocated $1.71M to this project for years 2022-2025. **On behalf of the City of Providence, I request that the timeline for this project be moved up. This is a critical connection that is currently missing from the regional bike trail network. Appropriate study and planning to determine the best path for the bike path extension must be completed prior to full design of the 6-10 Connector so that we can ensure that the 6-10 project can accommodate the preferred alignment of the bike path.**

The City of Providence submitted a new project entitled “Cathedral Square Enhancement Project” for inclusion in the STIP. This project will include physical improvements to Cathedral Square, a 1.8 acre city owned plaza on the western edge of downtown Providence, and adjoining walkways leading to the plaza from surrounding streets. Through the STIP, RIDOT has allocated $480,000 to this project for years 2021-2025. **On behalf of the City of Providence, I request that the $480,000 shown for years 2021-2025 be moved up to 2020 to accommodate timely construction of this project.**

Through the STIP, RIDOT has included $4.2M in funding for the Smith Street project which involves resurfacing to the roadway, and replacing sidewalks and handicapped ramps on Smith Street between Lyndhurst Avenue and I-95. The funding is allocated for years 2018-2019. **On behalf of the City of Providence, I request that RIDOT work with the City to improve bicycle infrastructure along Smith Street as part of this project.**

**On behalf of the City of Providence, I also request that the bridges listed below, ranked in priority order, be included in earlier years of the STIP than they are currently listed due to their current condition and importance in transporting heavy vehicle traffic, including buses, trucks and emergency response vehicles. Many of these bridges are currently posted with load restrictions as indicated below.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Ranking</th>
<th>Bridge ID</th>
<th>Facility Carried</th>
<th>Feature Intersected</th>
<th>Planned STIP Construction Start</th>
<th>Currently Posted Load Restriction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>51301</td>
<td>Manton Avenue</td>
<td>Woonasquatucket River</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>079601</td>
<td>Hawkins Street</td>
<td>West River</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>08740</td>
<td>Exchange Street</td>
<td>Woonasquatucket River</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>092901</td>
<td>Orms Street</td>
<td>Railroad</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>070401</td>
<td>Park St.</td>
<td>Woonasquatucket River</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>088301</td>
<td>West River St.</td>
<td>West River</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>089001</td>
<td>Veazie St.</td>
<td>West River</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>04021</td>
<td>Delaine St.</td>
<td>Woonasquatucket River</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The Manton Avenue Bridge over the Woonasquatucket River is currently posted for load restriction and has a concrete barrier placed in the road gutter to prevent vehicle traffic loads close to the edge of the structure. The City of Providence is concerned that more restrictive load restrictions will be required between now and the STIP construction date of 2024. As part of a main RIPTA bus route, truck route and emergency response route, it is imperative that this bridge project be moved up to earlier years in the STIP.

- The Hawkins Street Bridge over the West River is currently posted for load restriction and has a concrete barrier placed in the road gutter to prevent vehicle traffic loads close to the edge of the structure. The City of Providence is concerned that more restrictive load restrictions will be required between now and the STIP construction date of 2024. As a truck route, emergency response route, and school bus route...
to the RI School for the Deaf and other schools, it is imperative that this bridge project be moved up to earlier years in the STIP.

- The Exchange Street Bridge over Woonasquatucket River is currently posted for load restriction. The City of Providence is concerned that more restrictive load restrictions will be required between now and the STIP construction date of 2024. As a major RIPTA bus route and key element of the planned intermodal transit hub, it is important that this project be moved up to earlier years in the STIP.

- The Orms Street Bridge over the railroad right-of-way is currently posted for load restriction. The City of Providence is concerned that more restrictive load restrictions will be required between now and the STIP construction date of 2024. Orms Street is an important arterial roadway and emergency response route that carries a significant amount of heavy vehicle traffic from Interstate 95. Further weight restrictions will redirect truck traffic onto adjacent streets and intersections creating congestion issues and access problems for large trucks.

- The Park Street Bridge over the Woonasquatucket River is not currently posted for load restriction, however steel road plates have been placed over areas of failed bridge joints, and according to bridge engineers, the bridge joint deterioration will likely spread over the next several years requiring additional steel plating and potential load restrictions. Park Street serves as a major access point to Providence Place Mall especially during special events in Downtown when the Mall is used for parking. Vehicular restrictions on the bridge would shift significant amounts of traffic to Francis Street which already is congested during special events. The Rhode Island Department of Transportation has indicated that as part of the Route 95 North Viaduct project minor improvements to the bridge joint will be performed to allow for construction of that project’s bridge structure. If the Park Street Bridge project can be moved up to earlier years more permanent lasting repairs can be performed instead of the minor repairs currently proposed under the Route 95 North Viaduct project.

- The West River Street Bridge over the West River is currently posted for load restriction. The City of Providence is concerned that more restrictive load restrictions will be required between now and the STIP construction date of 2019. West River Street is an important truck route that is also used by the Central Post Office. It is imperative that this bridge project be moved up to earlier years in the STIP. Any further load restriction may shift truck traffic onto adjacent roads such as Branch Avenue, Charles Street, Corliss Street, and Silver Spring Street, which are already congested roadways.

Thank you for your facilitation of the State Transportation Improvement Program process and for your consideration of these requests. We appreciate your partnership to advance these important projects throughout the Capital City. Please contact Bonnie Nickerson, Director of Planning and Development, at 401-680-8400 if you have any questions regarding the City of Providence’s comments as provided in this letter.

Sincerely,

Jorge O. Elorza
Mayor
June 15, 2016

RI Planning Council
Jared L. Rhodes
Acting Secretary
One Capitol Hill
Providence, RI 02908

Subject: Main St Resurfacing and Sidewalk Rehabilitation

Dear Mr. Rhodes:

This letter serves to advise that the Town of East Greenwich would like to have the RIDOT provide the adequate capital improvements to the sidewalks and road paving to Main Street in East Greenwich. Presently, Main Street is on the Transportation Improvement Program for 2017 at a project cost of $550,000. The town does not feel that the funds noted for the project will be adequate to provide all the improvements needed. The appropriate amount would be approximately $1,500,000.

Additionally, the project would encompass the town to perform all the work (including engineering) and RIDOT would reimburse the town. The reimbursement will only be $450,000. As such, the town would like to have RIDOT undertake the full project including engineering.

Main Street has not received any substantial maintenance in many years. As such, the roadway is in need of resurfacing and the sidewalks are also in need of rehabilitation in many areas. Additionally, the handicap sidewalk ramps need to be brought-up to ADA standards.

Main Street provides extensive local and state economic benefits. With an increase of pedestrian use, it is becoming a safety concern (see attached photos). Further deterioration of both the roadway and sidewalks will become very unsafe and a deterrent for commercial viability.

If you have any questions relative to this matter feel free to contact me at 886-8621.

Sincerely,

Joseph C. Duarte, P.E.
Director of Public Works

Enclosures

Cc: Thomas E. Coyle, III, Town Manager
# TOWN OF WARREN

**TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM: 2017-2025 / STATUS OF TOWN’S PRIORITY LIST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WARREN’S PRIORITY</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME DRAFT TIP</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Water Street Sidewalks &amp; Streetscape</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Included in 2016 – Thank you!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Main Street Curbs and Sidewalks</td>
<td>2023 &amp; 2024</td>
<td>TIP description: Main St (Warren Bridge to Child) Resurfacing / Limited Sidewalk Replacement / Limited Handicapped Ramp Installation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2019 &amp; 2020</td>
<td>TIP description: Bristol (Washington St to Dyer Ave) includes Warren portion – Town line to Dyer – replace sidewalks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Market Street Curbs and Sidewalks</td>
<td>2023 &amp; 2024</td>
<td>TIP description: Route 136, Market St, Kickemuit St, Metacom (Bristol Town Line to Mass. State Line) – Resurfacing / Limited Sidewalk Replacement / Limited Sidewalk Extension &amp; Handicapped Ramp Installation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Belcher’s Cove Bridge at Market St</td>
<td>2017-2025</td>
<td>Included in Bridge Group #15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Intersection Safety Improvements for Main St. at Market / Miller</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>TIP description: Curbing / Signal Improvements / Geometric Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Intersection Improvements to Metacom</td>
<td>Split 2016 &amp; 2017</td>
<td>TIP description: Signal Upgrades &amp; Left Turn Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Resurfacing Vernon Street</td>
<td>2024 &amp; 2025</td>
<td>TIP description: Vernon St from Rt. 114 to Rt. 136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>South Warren Bridge at South Main St</td>
<td>2017-2025</td>
<td>Included in Bridge Group #15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kickemuit River Bridge at Child St</td>
<td>2017-2025</td>
<td>Included in Bridge Group #15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Resurfacing Rt. 114, Warren Bridge to Child Street</td>
<td>See item #2 2023 &amp; 2024</td>
<td>Incorporated with Sidewalks and Curbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Resurfacing Rt. 136</td>
<td>See Item #3 2023 &amp; 2024</td>
<td>Incorporated with Sidewalks and Curbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Resurfacing Birch Swamp Road &amp; Schoolhouse Road (Market to Long Ln)</td>
<td>2024 &amp; 2025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Abbreviations:**
- **TIP:** Transportation Improvement Program.
TIPID 1300 - MAIN STREET CURBS AND SIDEWALKS
RT 114 / WARREN TOWN LINE TO DYER STREET
(COMBINED WITH BRISTOL)
FUNDED IN FY 2019-2020

- Located within SPG area for aging households
- Located within an area with a high concentration of disabled residents
- Many areas are not passable for those with disabilities
- Vital connection to the center of Town / services
- Sidewalk condition forces pedestrians into the street
- Sidewalks were programmed for completion with repaving that was completed several years ago
- Project has been in planning stages for a decade.

May, 2016 photos
WARREN CONTACTS

Jan H. Reitsma
Interim Town Manager
jreitsma@townofwarren-ri.gov
401.245.7554

Kate Michaud
Town Planner
kmichaud@townofwarren-ri.gov
401.245.2469
- Located within Census Tract 305 / majority low and moderate income households
- Located within SPG area for Carless Households and Environmental Justice
- Within the SPG area containing a high percentage of disabled residents
- Non-ADA compliant crossings (curbs) and sidewalks
- Area of extreme importance for economic development
- Walkability and quality of experience is the key to the area’s economic recovery
- High traffic area, well used RIPTA route, many pedestrians
- Area contains the Corliss Institute, churches and the American Tourister Mill redevelopment.
- Critical infrastructure need.

May, 2016 photos
MAIN STREET - WARREN BRIDGE TO CHILD STREET

WARREN CONTACTS

Jan H. Reitsma
Interim Town Manager
jreitsma@townofwarren-ri.gov
401.245.7554

Kate Michaud
Town Planner
kmichaud@townofwarren-ri.gov
401.245.2469
• First submitted by the Town as a project in 1993.
• Feasibility study completed in 1997.
• First segment construction completed in July, 2009.
• Completion will connect KMS and Hugh Cole School to the most densely populated areas of Town.
• Will connect eastern Warren to the East Bay Bike Path / Providence to Provincetown Bikeway.
• Will divert bicycle traffic off of Child St / Route 103, which is not suitable for bike traffic.
• Study recently completed by RWU — now is the time to act and move forward.
- Identified by Statewide Planning in 2003 as an area in need of improvements.
- Metacom Ave Corridor Plan completed in 2012.
- Difficult to comment on a TIP project with such a large scope.
- The Town has received multiple complaints regarding safety and the lack of ADA compliance.
- Opportunity exists to work collaboratively with the Town to expedite and facilitate improvements.

Metacom Avenue Corridor Plan
Warren, Rhode Island
2012
WARREN CONTACTS

Jan H. Reitsma
Interim Town Manager
jreitsma@townofwarren-ri.gov
401.245.7554

Kate Michaud
Town Planner
kmichaud@townofwarren-ri.gov
401.245.2469
May 26, 2016

Honorable Members of the Transportation Advisory Committee
RI Division of Planning
One Capitol Hill, 3rd Floor
Providence, RI 02908

Dear Honorable Members:

It is with great enthusiasm on behalf of Central Falls, Cumberland, and Pawtucket, that we, the Mayors of those respective communities offer our full support of the proposed funding of the Broad Street Regeneration Initiative introduced in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) funding plan advised by this Committee.

In the proposed funding plan, our three communities stand to benefit from an $11.54 million investment in much-needed improvements and maintenance on Broad Street, a critical main street that links all three of our downtown districts. This crucial funding will not only addresses current infrastructure deficiencies, but also elevate a major thoroughfare, which in turn, will have major economic development benefits. The Broad Street Regeneration Initiative represents an unprecedented collaboration between three communities designed to leverage to power of partnership to increase efficiency, maximize investment, and expand project impact.

We believe that through this strategic investment, our vision of a world-class, complete street will become a reality, which will benefit the entire Blackstone River Valley. Our communities have already demonstrated commitment to elevating Broad Street through investments in façade improvement programs in Central Falls, an urban forestry program shared between Central Falls and Cumberland, and recent road surface maintenance in Pawtucket. Funding the Broad Street Regeneration Initiative will also alleviate significant infrastructure deficiencies effecting storm water drainage, bridges, and road surfaces.

We respectfully reiterate our support for the proposed funding plan of an initiative that will have a wide-ranging positive impact upon an entire region. Please feel free to contact us if you have any further questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

James A. Diossa
Mayor, City of Central Falls

Bill Murray
Mayor, Town of Cumberland

Don Grebien
Mayor
June 1, 2016

Jared L. Rhodes  
Secretary of State Planning Council  
Rhode Island State Planning Council  
One Capitol Hill  
Providence, R.I. 02908

Re: Town of New Shoreham TIPS submittals FY2017-2025

Dear Mr. Rhodes:

The Town of New Shoreham is forwarding this letter as commentary on the proposed New Shoreham Status Report for the submissions we had for the FY2017-2025 Transportation Improvement Program.

Our request for sidewalks on West Side Road #5096 is scheduled for funding in FY 2018. This request has been part of our submissions in the past and has been identified as a critical safety issue every summer for the past ten years. While we are glad it is part of the program going forward, we are dismayed that it will not be addressed for at least two more summer seasons. There is no sidewalk along this stretch of state road and pedestrian traffic keeps increasing each summer. We ask that this item be reviewed in the hopes that it can be funded before next summer, because the absence of sidewalks here is a critical safety concern.

Our other submissions all involved paving state roads throughout the island and we specifically targeted those that are in the greatest need of repair. In most instances, the shoulders of the roads mentioned are crumbling and present dangerous circumstances for walkers and the numerous bicycle and moped operators who share our narrow roads with vehicles.

Project #5101 can be removed from the list because that road will be repaved this fall under the National Grid/Deepwater project project. But #5100 Cooneymus Road, #5104 Mohegan Trail, #5099 Ocean Ave., #5013 Spring Street, and #5102 West Side Road are all roads that cannot have work postponed until after 2025 based upon the current road integrity. They are eliminated from consideration with the comment that they are all “low volume roadways” and we question this characterization and its basis.
To our knowledge, no volume study has been done on these roads to support the determination of “low volume”, nor can I find any clear definition of how volume is measured and over what time span. Considering that the useful life of a paved surface is approximately ten years, the volume these roads have cumulatively experienced in the summer months over the last twenty five years (when they were only microscreened) should clearly earmark them for repair in the next two years or so and not another decade out. As part of our submission and our presentation during the initial hearings, we provided pictures of the roadways in question and will willingly provide more pictures and video of the crumbling shoulders and sinking parts of these state roads if that will help put this work front and center.

While usage here may pale in comparison to mainland roadways, I would be curious to know if mainland roads have gone without any upgrade at all as is the case on island. There is a substantial amount of tourism dollars that travel upstate as a result of the island’s absorption of tens of thousands of people in the summer time; and that, combined with the safety concerns for our visitors, as well as of our own citizenry, should merit another look at the submissions made in our application and addressed at the first round of hearings.

Please let me know if you need any further information at this time.

Sincerely,

Nancy O. Dodge
Town Manager

NOD/sig

cc: Town Council
    Michael Shea, Highway Superintendent
    James J. Geremia, P.E.
May 9, 2016

Karen Scott, Assistant Chief  
Rhode Island Statewide Planning Program  
One Capitol Hill, 3rd Floor  
Providence, Rhode Island 02908

Dear Ms. Scott:

The Jewelry District Association writes with enthusiastic support for the draft Transportation Improvement Program and its funding of CiTY WALK in fiscal years 2017 and 2018.

Recognizing that connectivity is critical to Providence’s appeal and development potential, Mayor Elorza and many City Departments, along with Neighborhood Associations and organizations such as Grow Smart RI, the Children’s Museum, RI Foundation, Southside Community Land Trust and the RI Bicycle Coalition have endorsed CiTY WALK, which will serve several diverse neighborhoods.

We thank you for recognizing CiTY WALK’s value to the City and the State.

Respectfully,

Phoebe Blake, Chair  
Planning & Zoning Committee  
Jewelry District Association

cc: Bonnie Nickerson, Director of Planning + Development

116 Chestnut Street  
Suite H  
Providence, RI 02903  

Setting a Sparkling Example for Providence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SafeTrek: High Priority Projects 3677-3177</td>
<td>906.00</td>
<td>906.00</td>
<td>906.00</td>
<td>906.00</td>
<td>906.00</td>
<td>906.00</td>
<td>906.00</td>
<td>906.00</td>
<td>906.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total FTA Funding</td>
<td>3,419</td>
<td>3,419</td>
<td>3,419</td>
<td>3,419</td>
<td>3,419</td>
<td>3,419</td>
<td>3,419</td>
<td>3,419</td>
<td>3,419</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
May 20, 2016

Rhode Island State Planning Council
ATTN: Jared L. Rhodes, Secretary (Acting)
One Capitol Hill
Providence, RI 02908

Re: Middletown FFY 2017-2025 TIP submission

Dear Mr. Rhodes,

Enclosed I am providing a resolution of the Middletown Town Council dated May 16, 2016 requesting that two of Middletown’s highest priority road improvement projects be afforded additional consideration for inclusion in the FFY 2017-2025 TIP. The following projects have been submitted by the town for consideration during past TIP rounds, and they continue to be two of the town’s highest priority requests:

- **Aquidneck Ave. (Rt. 138A) reconstruction from Green End Ave. to East Main Rd. (Rte. 138) (including drainage and sidewalks).** While this segment of state highway is included in the draft TIP pavement capital program for funding in FY 2019 for resurfacing, the pressing needs for sidewalks and storm water runoff control and treatment are not addressed. This project continues to be the Town’s top priority.

- **Atlantic Beach District - Aquidneck Ave./Purgatory Road – Improvements in the beach area as identified in the 2007 Atlantic Beach District Master Plan, including roadway and sidewalk improvements.** As with upper Aquidneck Ave, this segment is included in the draft TIP for resurfacing only. And while safety improvements to three intersections in the area are included in the TIP traffic safety capital program for FY2017-18, the town’s request for roadway crosssection improvements, including sidewalk improvements and travel lane reconfiguration, are not included.

Attached I am again providing documentation previously submitted in support of these projects which demonstrates how the projects address each of the seven TIP guiding principles. I hereby respectfully request that the State Planning Council consider including the projects in the FFY 2017-2025 TIP. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and please feel free to contact me with any questions or additional information needs.

Sincerely,

Shawn J. Brown, CPA, CFE
Town Administrator
WHEREAS: The State Planning Council, the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the State of Rhode Island, is responsible for development of the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for FFY 2017-2025; and,

WHEREAS: The Middletown Town Council held a public hearing on December 7, 2015 regarding the Town’s proposed project submissions for the TIP, and subsequently authorized submission of the town’s project priorities, submitted to the Statewide Planning Program on January 4, 2016; and,

WHEREAS: The State Planning Council has now released the draft FFY 2017-2025TIP for public review and comment; and,

WHEREAS: Two of the Town’s highest priority projects due to their public safety and economic development benefits are not included in the draft TIP; now,

THEREFORE, BE IT

RESOLVED: That the Middletown Town Council hereby opposes the adoption of the FFY 2017-2025 TIP as currently drafted, and requests that the following projects be added to the TIP:

1. Aquidneck Ave. (Rt. 138A) reconstruction from Green End Ave. to East Main Rd. (Rte. 138) (including drainage and sidewalks).
2. Atlantic Beach District - Aquidneck Ave./Purgatory Road -- Improvements identified in the 2007 Atlantic Beach District Master Plan, including roadway and sidewalk improvements.

MAY 16 2016
READ AND PASSED IN COUNCIL

[Signature]
New Project Application
Transportation Improvement Program

Contact Information
Agency/Organization: Town of Middletown
Contact Person: Ronald M. Wolanski
Title: Planning Director
Mailing Address: 350 East Main Road
City: Middletown
Phone: 401-849-4027
Email: rwolanski@middletownri.com

Type of Project: select all that apply
- Bridge
- Traffic
- Transportation Enhancement
- Pavement
- Drainage
- Bicycle
- Pedestrian

Project Title: Aquidneck Ave. (Rt. 138A) Reconstruction
Location by Street Name: Aquidneck Avenue
Project Limits - From: Green End Avenue To: East Main Road

Please include an 8.5” x 11” map of the site, indicating project limits.

Provide a brief description of the proposed project:
This project proposes reconstruction of Aquidneck Avenue from East Main Road to Green End Avenue (approximately one mile), including the implementation of appropriate stormwater drainage control and treatment, sidewalks, and shoulder and/or bike lane on both sides of the road.
Describe need for proposed project:

Aquidneck Avenue in the subject area is a densely developed business corridor, that also serves abutting residential neighborhoods and the Gaudet Middle School. Over the past several years concerns have been expressed locally about the need for improvements, particularly to address pedestrian safety. Currently there are no sidewalks in this area. The level of activity resulting from the school and local businesses appears to warrant the installation of sidewalks. Due to the nature of the stormwater system, including the use of ditches along the roadway, and the lack of curbing, installation of sidewalks and bike lanes is not possible without reconstruction of the roadway. Implementation of appropriate stormwater drainage control would also provide for the installation of BMP's to address the Town's and RIDOT's responsibilities relative to the Bailey Brook and North Easton's Pond TMDLs.

The proposal would increase mobility for physically handicapped residents of Middletown as well as residents without access to automobiles. The facilities are particularly important in this respect as Aquidneck Avenue is not serviced by RIPTA.

Describe anticipated municipal or state transportation network or economic development benefits:

Creating comprehensive bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure along Aquidneck Avenue encourages wider adoption of more environmentally friendly multi-modal and/or active transportation by providing increased safety for motorists, pedestrians, and cyclists. In addition to directly supporting the goals outlined in the 2014 Middletown Comprehensive Plan, these proposed facilities would tie directly into existing infrastructure on East Main Road, creating a more broadly useful multi-modal transportation network in Middletown.

Is the project consistent with the local Comprehensive Plan? ☑ Yes ☐ No

Is the project on the Federal Aid System? ☑ Yes ☐ No

Is the project on the National Highway System? ☑ Yes ☐ No
**Evaluation Criteria**

Please address the following topics as they relate to the project. Refer to “An Overview of TIP Guiding Principles” for more information. Submission **must not exceed** 2 pages, single-spaced, 12-point font.

1. Mobility Benefits
2. Cost Effectiveness
3. Economic Development
4. Environmental Impact
5. Supports Local and State Goals
6. Safety and Security
7. Equity

---

**Project Estimates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.8 million</td>
<td>$1.8 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Cost: $1.8 million

Amount Requested through TIP Process: $1.8 million

Is there funding from other sources committed to this project?  □ Yes  ☑ No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Highway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated date of construction **Summer 2017**

---

**Applicant Certification**

I attest that the information provided on this application is in true and accurate.

Applicant’s Signature: [Signature]  Date: 1/4/16

Chief Executive Officer’s Signature: [Signature]  Date: 1/4/16

---

**ALL APPLICATIONS ARE DUE BY 3:00PM ON FRIDAY, JANUARY 8, 2016**
Town of Middletown
New Project Request
Aquidneck Avenue Reconstruction

Mobility benefits
According to the Aquidneck Island Transportation Study, the section of Aquidneck Avenue connecting Green End Ave. and East Main Rd. serves approximately 12,000 vehicles daily. Currently, pedestrians and cyclists are required to share this space with motorists, discouraging all but the most dedicated and experienced users. The construction of sidewalks and bicycle lanes along Aquidneck Avenue allows for greater mobility among those unable, unwilling, or simply not interested in using automotive transportation but understandably uncomfortable with the current street configuration.

Cost Effectiveness
Restructuring Aquidneck Avenue with regards to stormwater management and pedestrian/cyclist safety would allow the Town of Middletown to solve two problems in a single project, effectively eliminating the need to reconstruct the road a second time. This alone makes the project worth pursuing with regards to cost effectiveness. With the presence of Gaudet Middle School on Aquidneck Avenue, the project creates a safe route to school. Increasing the safety of Middletown school children cannot be valued, but nonetheless provides a valuable incentive for completing this project.

Economic Development
Home to ~40 retail and restaurant businesses, nearly all of them locally owned, this area would benefit greatly from increased foot and bicycle traffic. These road users are often slower moving and less rushed than drivers and are more likely to visit local shops they stumble upon. Offices located on the same stretch of Aquidneck Ave. provide a number of potential patrons for the restaurants during the lunch hour and construction of pedestrian facilities has the potential to greatly reduce mid-day vehicular activity in a congested area.

Located immediately outside of the focus area and already home to sidewalks, the Aquidneck Corporate Park employs approximately 2,500 additional potential customers lacking only this link to frequent the Aquidneck Avenue. Looking further, Aquidneck Ave. is the primary connection to the Atlantic Beach District of Middletown, home to hundreds of hotel rooms and full of summer tourists who, due to a lack of current connectivity, may be totally unaware of the plethora of local businesses within a thirty minute walk (10 minute bicycle ride) of the beach.

Environmental Impact
The removal of automobiles from the road, such as results from the increased availability of active transportation facilities, has an immediate impact on the generation of CO2 emissions. It also reduces the level of contaminated runoff from roadways due to automobile leakage and the creation of litter from motorists.

The reconfiguration of stormwater management facilities along Aquidneck Avenue will improve current runoff issues. Currently, untreated surface runoff flows into ditches and stormwater drains, ultimately flowing into Bailey Brook and Easton’s Pond, both of which are subject to TMDLs, Bailey Brook for
bacteria and Easton’s Pond, a drinking water reservoir, for phosphorus. Reconfiguration of drainage would allow for the regeneration of these degraded water resources.

Supports Local and State Goals
Identified as a high-priority project, this proposal directly supports objectives outlined in the 2014 comprehensive plan which was fully accepted by the State in November 2015. Specifically, the Town of Middletown’s Transportation Vision Statement, “Town of Middletown will strive to provide a safe, efficient, and sustainable multi-modal transportation system that reduces reliance on the automobile and meets the diverse mobility needs of residents, workers, and visitors while maintaining the scenic quality of our community.” Community-identified goals of: Promote livable and sustainable communities through coordinated transportation/land use strategies and Provide a safe, convenient, and pleasant network of walkways are also addressed by this proposal.

On a state policy level, this project is consistent with Transportation 2035. Specifically, the project addresses implementation of the following goals: B: Increased bicycle facilities, ED: Economic development, EN: Environmental, H: Highway, PE: Pedestrian, and S: Safety.

Safety and Security
By providing infrastructure for pedestrians and cyclists, these groups become far safer than if they were required to share the road with cars as is currently the case. Motorist safety is also increased by reducing the likelihood of accidents, either from striking pedestrians/cyclists or striking traffic/obstacles in an attempt to avoid doing so.

The section of Aquidneck Ave. in question also serves as a primary means of accessing Gaudet Middle School. Construction of pedestrian and bicycle facilities in this area creates a safe route to the school. In addition to its primary function as an educational institution, Gaudet is an approved emergency shelter with Aquidneck Ave. serving as an important evacuation route.

Equity
Reconfiguring Aquidneck Avenue will open a range of mobility options for those without access to an automobile. These groups are currently unable to safely travel down Aquidneck Ave. The proposal increases mobility equity. Unfortunately, no RIPTA service currently operates along Aquidneck Avenue, further restricting the mobility of economically stressed populations in this part of Middletown.
New Project Application
Transportation Improvement Program

Contact Information
Agency/Organization: Town of Middletown  
Contact Person: Ronald M. Wolanski  
Title: Planning Director  
Mailing Address: 350 East Main Road  
City: Middletown  
Zip Code: 02842  
Phone: 401-847-4027  
Email: rwolanski@middletownri.com

Type of Project  
select all that apply
- Bridge
- Pavement  
- Drainage
- Planning
- Traffic
- Transit
- Bicycle  
- Pedestrian
- Transportation Enhancement
- Other

Project Description
Project Title: Atlantic Beach District Streetscape and Cross-section Improvements  
Location by Street Name: Aquidneck Avenue (Route 138A)  
Project Limits - From: Valley Road  
To: Purgatory Road

Please include an 8.5” x 11” map of the site, indicating project limits.

Provide a brief description of the proposed project:

The existing layout of Aquidneck Avenue, currently comprised of two 12 foot travel lanes, two 2-10 foot
buffers, and two 0-5 foot sidewalks, is decidedly auto-centric and does not allow for comfortable use by
pedestrians. Additionally, the sidewalk and parking areas are the same material and elevation in many
places, leading to cars parking on the sidewalk. Many utility poles are located within the sidewalk,
creating obstacles at least and in many places making the sidewalk unusable.

The proposal calls for reconfiguring the roadway to maintain the two travel lanes, create an 8 foot parking
lane on the eastern side of Aquidneck Avenue, expand the eastern sidewalk to a contiguous, differentiated
6 foot sidewalk, and expand the western sidewalk to a contiguous, differentiated 10 foot sidewalk with
street furniture and plantings. The western sidewalk would allow for a pedestrian scale transportation
system connecting the hotels in the area with local shops and the beaches. The new sidewalks will be
ADA compliant, unlike the current sidewalks. By removing the “shoulder” on both sides of Aquidneck
Avenue, this proposal will not involve the acquisition of any additional right of way and will maintain the
current width of the roadway.
Describe need for proposed project:

The current configuration of Aquidneck Avenue in the Atlantic Beach District is unwelcoming to pedestrians and unusable by the handicapped. It serves as an unattractive and uninviting gateway to the district and may dissuade potential visitors staying at the numerous hotels in the area from venturing out without a car.

Describe anticipated municipal or state transportation network or economic development benefits:

The ability of pedestrians, including disabled and low income populations, to access the Atlantic Beach District will be greatly improved. The experience of tourists visiting the beaches in the area and staying in adjacent hotels will also be improved. Creating pedestrian infrastructure to accommodate these groups will reduce congestion during the busy summer months.

Is the project consistent with the local Comprehensive Plan?  ✔ Yes  ☐ No

Is the project on the Federal Aid System?  ✔ Yes  ☐ No

Is the project on the National Highway System?  ✔ Yes  ☐ No
Evaluation Criteria

Please address the following topics as they relate to the project. Refer to “An Overview of TIP Guiding Principles” for more information. Submission must not exceed 2 pages, single-spaced, 12-point font.

1. Mobility Benefits
2. Cost Effectiveness
3. Economic Development
4. Environmental Impact
5. Supports Local and State Goals
6. Safety and Security
7. Equity

Project Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$300K</td>
<td>$1 million</td>
<td>$1.3 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Cost $1.3 million

Amount Requested through TIP Process $1.3 million

Is there funding from other sources committed to this project?  □ Yes  □ No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intersection improvements in the Atlantic Beach District have already been funded with construction slated to start this year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated date of construction 2017 forward

Applicant Certification

I attest that the information provided on this application is in true and accurate.

[Signature]

Applicant’s Signature Date 1/4/16

Chief Executive Officer’s Signature Date 1/4/14

ALL APPLICATIONS ARE DUE BY 3:00PM ON FRIDAY, JANUARY 8, 2016
Town of Middletown
New Project Request
Atlantic Beach District Roadway Improvements

Mobility benefits
According to data collected for the Aquidneck Island Transportation Study, daily traffic volume is roughly 12,000 on Aquidneck Avenue between Green End Lane and East Main Road. Similar volumes are projected for the section of Aquidneck Avenue in the Atlantic Beach District. While the area can become congested during the summer months, this project is primarily aimed at improving safety and pedestrian access.

Roadway improvements and sidewalk optimizations will allow for this residentially and commercially dense area to become a pedestrian-oriented neighborhood, a status it is perfectly suited for but presently unable to obtain given safety concerns. Additionally, increasing pedestrian friendliness will allow greater access to the water and a proposed park immediately adjacent to the neighborhood.

Cost Effectiveness
The safety and utility of the Atlantic Beach District intersections will be greatly improved by this project. These changes will be especially evident to visitors to the area, ideally resulting in increased tourism numbers and increased capture of tourism dollars by the increased walkability of the district. When taken in conjunction with other submitted proposals, including the extension of pedestrian infrastructure on Aquidneck Avenue and Purgatory Road, as well as proposals for increased park space in the Atlantic Beach District, this proposal is capable of turning the Atlantic Beach District into the vibrant tourist destination it has the potential to be.

Economic Development
Tourism is the primary economic driver for the Atlantic Beach District given its proximity to the beach and Downtown Newport. Increased walkability would certainly increase the attractiveness of this economically strong area, as well as reduce traffic and open parking facilities to visitors not staying in one of the many neighborhood hotels. Furthermore, the presence of the Aquidneck Corporate Park immediately north of the project area provides ~2,500 employees who may be willing to travel the approximately half mile to visit the Atlantic Beach District restaurants for lunch, further increasing investment in the local economy as no chain establishments currently exist in the district.

Environmental Impact
Providing facilities that allow for non-vehicular transportation options decreases the vehicles miles traveled and the corresponding emission of CO2 and other air pollutants. Fewer chemicals are distributed on the road surface, reducing polluted surface water and limiting the potential of these pollutants to contaminate groundwater, particularly important given the proximity of Easton Pond, the largest drinking water reservoir on Aquidneck Island.

Supports Local and State Goals
Identified as a high-priority project, this proposal directly supports objectives outlined in the 2014 comprehensive plan which was fully accepted by the State in November 2015. Specifically, the Town of
Middletown’s Transportation Vision Statement, “Town of Middletown will strive to provide a safe, efficient, and sustainable multi-modal transportation system that reduces reliance on the automobile and meets the diverse mobility needs of residents, workers, and visitors while maintaining the scenic quality of our community.” Community-identified goals of: Promote livable and sustainable communities through coordinated transportation/land use strategies and Provide a safe, convenient, and pleasant network of walkways are also addressed by this proposal. In addition to the comprehensive plan, improvements in this area were shown broad support during the creation of the Atlantic Beach District Master Plan.

On a state policy level, this project is consistent with Transportation 2035. Specifically, the project addresses implementation of the following goals: D: Design, ED: Economic development, EN: Environmental, H: Highway, PE: Pedestrian, and S: Safety.

**Safety and Security**
This proposal corrects a significant safety problem with the reconfiguration of four intersections: Aquidneck Ave./Valley Rd., Aquidneck Ave./Newport Ave., Aquidneck Ave./Briarwood/Crescent, and Aquidneck Ave./Purgatory Rd. Currently, the intersections are unsafe for pedestrians and motorists, both of which would see increased safety with the corrections via improved sight lines, intersections, and traffic calming measures. As an area of high residential density and high tourism activity, there are a large number of families with children in the area. Improving pedestrian safety is of the utmost concern with regards to the safety of minors.

Additionally, Aquidneck Ave. serves as an evacuation route and a primary emergency shelter, Gaudet Middle School, is located along it.

**Equity**
Any project aiming to improve pedestrian utility inherently supports greater transportation equity by permitting individuals without access to or preference for automobiles to take full advantage of their community. As a project targeting both a high density residential area and a tourism heavy area, this proposal also provides for a high degree of social equity between locals and visitors to the area.
May 27, 2016

Mr. Jared L. Rhodes
Secretary, RI State Planning Council
One Capitol Hill
Providence, RI 02908

Re: Herreshoff Marine Museum Rehabilitation Project

Mr. Rhodes:

I appreciate the opportunity to have addressed the Council on Thursday, May 26th. This letter will serve as a follow up to that presentation, and it includes the relevant attachments as referenced in my comments.

Built in 1855, the General Ambrose Burnside Building at 22-26 Burnside Street has a rich and colorful history. Between 1858 and 1870, the building served as the headquarters for the Burnside Rifle Company (later the Bristol Firearms Company), manufacturers of the Burnside Carbine which saw widespread use during the Civil War. In the late 1800s, the building was expanded and became the Machine Shop for the Herreshoff Manufacturing Company. It is currently the largest building on the Herreshoff Marine Museum campus which straddles SR 114 halfway between Providence and Newport, and the building is the focus of a planned expansion of the museum’s exhibit space to accommodate HMM’s growing collection including the newly completed 1/6th-scale model of the 1903 America’s Cup defender RELIANCE, arguably the greatest yacht built in Rhode Island.

Key Points

1. Based on the project agreement between the HMM and RIDOT dated June 6th, 2013 (attached), this project was funded by transportation enhancement funding from the USDOT administered by the FHWA. The total funding is $1.5 million of which $1.2 million is federally-funded and $300K state-funded. While the federal funding is subject to obligatory authority limitations, we are not aware of a sum of $815K that is available for re-prioritization by RIDOT.

2. The project is in progress and over $386K of the $1.5 million has been spent to-date. Phase 1, the stabilization of the building’s cupola and replacement of several areas of the roof to keep the water out, is largely prep work for Phase 2 which involves the restoration of the building’s envelope. Phase 1 is now complete and Phase 2 is at the 10% stage. HMM has invested over $100K in this project to-date and hundreds of hours of staff time. This project is geared to restore a seriously deteriorating asset which is a major component of the museum’s expansion plans, and if we aren’t
able to undertake Phase 2 in 2016/17, the building will continue to deteriorate further which will increase the cost of saving it in later years.

3. In the draft TIP, a reason given for de-prioritizing our project was a "lack of support from the town of Bristol". Evidence of a lack of support was that our project was not on the town’s list of priority projects. Further investigation has revealed that, for whatever reason, our project was omitted from the list of projects sent to the town for prioritization, so that fact that it did not show up on their list is not an indicator of a lack of support – rather it’s an indicator of an omission on the part of Statewide Planning. We met with Bristol Town Administrator Anthony Texiera, and he reaffirmed that the town fully supports our project – support that was provided in a letter from Mr. Texiera as part of our submission (attached).

4. HMM applied for and was awarded a $150K grant from RHIP for the restoration of additional windows in the Burnside Building and to augment the RIDOT project. This grant requires a match, and the project must be started within one year. We are now in danger of losing the matching funds and therefore also the $150K grant, all of which would have gone to Rhode Island-based contractors.

5. This project is a key driver for our Strategic Plan and a significant component of a larger campus master plan both of which are geared to make the HMM campus a major destination. We have recently kicked off a capital campaign to raise funds for this project. HMM has directly spent over $20K getting Phase 2 to the 10% stage, and we have been meeting with prospective funders under the assumption that we can execute this project in 2016/17.

To reiterate the two requests I put to the Council:

1. Review the agreement between RIDOT and HMM (attached) to confirm the amount of state funding available for “re-prioritization” as we believe it is $300K, not $815K.

2. Reconsider the timing of that funding, and shift from 2025 to 2016/17 with 50% available in each of those two years.

Again, I appreciate the fact that our project is in the 2017-2025 Draft TIP, and I also appreciate the opportunity to address the Council on this matter. On behalf of the museum staff and my board of directors, I remain hopeful that the Council will reconsider the timing of the funding.

Kind regards,

Bill Lynn
President & Executive Director
HERRESHOF MARINE MUSEUM
REHABILITATION PROJECT AGREEMENT

By and Between

RHODE ISLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

And the

HERRESHOF MARINE MUSEUM

AGREEMENT made and entered into by and between the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations acting through its Department of Transportation (hereinafter the State) and the Herreshoff Marine Museum (hereinafter the Museum), (collectively the “Parties”), a 501(C) (3) domestic non-profit corporation doing business at One Burnside Street, Bristol, Rhode Island.

WHEREAS, the Parties entered into an Enhancement Project Agreement dated June 7, 2007; and

WHEREAS, the Enhancement Project Agreement dated June 7, 2007 encompassed an agreement to build the America’s Cup Hall of Fame building; and

WHEREAS, due to the costs of maintenance of this new building the Museum no longer wishes to proceed with the Enhancement Project Agreement dated June 7, 2007; and

WHEREAS, the Museum wishes to reallocate the remaining project funds from the Enhancement Project Agreement dated June 7, 2007 to the Herreshoff Marine Museum Rehabilitation Project (hereinafter the Project) specifically the rehabilitation of General Ambrose Burnside building at 22-26 Burnside Street and, if funding permits, other adjacent historic buildings on the Herreshoff Marine Museum campus; and

WHEREAS, the Parties hereby agree that the Enhancement Project Agreement of June 7, 2007 is terminated in its entirety and is replaced with and is subject to the terms and conditions of the Herreshoff Marine Museum Rehabilitation Project Agreement; and

WHEREAS, the State is the recipient of transportation enhancement funding from the United States Department of Transportation, administered through the Federal Highway Administration (hereinafter FHWA) under catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number 20.205; Highway Planning and Construction; and

WHEREAS, the State has approved enhancements and maritime heritage site improvements to include restoration under Federal Aid Project Numbers STP-TEA2(042), STP-TEA3(060), and SAFE-TEA-LU Earmarks HP-4854 and HP-1318; and

WHEREAS, the Museum agrees to be responsible for the design and construction of the Project; and
WHEREAS, the Museum will pay for the full cost of the design and the State will reimburse the Museum for construction of the project up to the amount of One Million Five Hundred Thousand and 00/100 ($1,500,000) dollars; and

WHEREAS, the Project will be implemented under the provisions established in the Federal-Aid Policy Guide of the FHWA, and comply with the Code of Federal Regulations, Title 23, highway and State requirements and procedures; and

WHEREAS, the State and Museum recognize that Project funds may be reduced based upon obligatory authority limitations. The State will work with the Transportation Enhancement Advisory Committee and/or Transportation Advisory Committee to set priorities based on limitations on available funding; and

WHEREAS, of the One Million Five Hundred Thousand Dollars ($1,500,000), eighty percent (80%) or up to One Million Two Hundred Thousand Dollars ($1,200,000) is federally funded and twenty percent (20%) or up to Three Hundred Thousand Dollars ($300,000) is State funded.

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of the foregoing premises and the mutual obligations contained herein, the State and the Museum hereby agree as follows:


2. The authorized start date of the Herreshoff Marine Museum Rehabilitation Project for reimbursement purposes shall be the State’s Notice to Proceed to construction.

3. One Million Five Hundred Thousand Dollars $1,500,000 in remaining State and Federal funds will be used solely for construction of the Herreshoff Marine Museum Rehabilitation.

4. Of the One Million Five Hundred Thousand Dollars ($1,500,000), eighty percent (80%) or up to One Million Two Hundred Thousand Dollars ($1,200,000) is federally funded and twenty percent (20%) or up to Three Hundred Thousand Dollars ($300,000) is State funded.

5. The Museum will be responsible for the full cost of design of the Burnside building rehabilitation subject to the review and concurrence of the State and the Rhode Island Historic Preservation and Heritage Commission under its responsibilities as outlined in Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, amended.

6. The Museum will select a consultant to design the Project and develop the bid documents in accordance with federal requirements.

7. The design of the Project will conform to all State design standards, specifications and policies.

A. The Museum will submit the design plans to the State for review and approval at the preliminary stage of design and submit the plans, specifications, and estimates (hereinafter PS&E) at the 90% stage of design and at the FS&E stage of design. Such submissions shall
include not be limited to all engineering, landscaping, and permitting requirements, as applicable to the Project.

B. Review by the State is for the limited purpose of confirming that final design documents will be acceptable to the State and is not intended to relieve the Museum of full responsibility with respect to errors and omissions.

8. The Museum will be responsible for construction of the Project in accordance with the plans and specifications approved by the State.

9. All costs for the work on the Project, including construction, materials testing, building and site related certificates of compliance and construction inspection that exceed the $1,500,000 of State and Federal funding will be the responsibility of the Museum.

10. The Museum will develop a preliminary restoration program with cost estimates for each step, sequenced so as to ensure that the building will be in a habitable condition should the funds be exhausted before all the restoration steps are complete. The work sequence is prioritized as follows: Roof, cupola, gutters and downspouts, base masonry repairs, windows, doors, east wall reconstruction, front facade, siding, painting, wiring, sprinklers, fire alarm and interior restoration.

11. The Museum will select a Project Manager to administer the Project. Such administration shall include but not limited to the maintenance of a Project account, as well as processing invoices, change orders and contract addenda. The Museum shall maintain all financial records.

12. Pursuant to the provisions of 49 CFR, the State reserves the right to apply additional consideration to ensure that Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBE) as defined therein have the maximum opportunity to compete for and perform contracts and subcontracts under this Agreement. The Museum and its contractors shall not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin or sex in the award and performance of work under this Agreement.

13. Prior to construction of the Project, during the post-qualification process, the Museum’s contractor shall submit a Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Plan for review and approval by the State. The Plan shall demonstrate the manner in which the City’s contractor will achieve participation rates established by the State. The State shall not authorize the construction by the Museum to proceed until such Plan has been approved by the:

Vanessa Crum, Administrator  
Office of Business & Community Resources  
Two Capitol Hill  
Providence, RI 02903

14. The State will be responsible for reimbursement to the Museum of all costs associated with construction of the Project; up to and not exceeding One Million Five Hundred Thousand Dollars ($1,500,000). Costs in excess of said reimbursement are the responsibility of the Museum. Supporting documentation of payment will be required for all reimbursements.
15. Upon execution of this Agreement, if the Museum is subject to the single audit requirements established in the Office of Management and Budget Circular A-133, the Museum will be required to submit a copy of the single audit report for each year in which work was performed.

16. If the Museum is not subject to the audit requirements of OMB Circular No. A-133, the Museum shall perform a final audit of the contract(s) in accordance with OMB Circular No. A-133. The State will not make final payment to the Museum until the State has received a completed copy of the audit.

17. The Museum will work with the State to obtain an Environmental Determination of no significant impact for the project in accordance with FHWA regulation at 23 CFR Part 771.117. Construction of the Project may proceed only after receipt of said Environmental Determination.

18. The Museum will construct the Project using the design approved by the State.

   A. In awarding the construction contract to the lowest qualified bidder, the Museum will use competitive bidding for the Project in conformance with 23 CFR Part 635 and will comply with all provisions of Title 37, Chapter 2 of the Rhode Island General Laws.

   B. The Museum shall be responsible for ensuring that materials incorporated into the Project are in conformance with State Standards and Specifications.

       1. The State and the Museum will develop a Materials Testing Schedule based upon the Department’s Master Materials Testing Schedule before commencing construction.

       2. Steel, aggregate, soils, Portland cement concrete, and bituminous concrete utilized in construction of the Project shall be obtained from State approved sources and sampled and tested by personnel certified by either the Northeast Transportation Training and Certification Program, the National Institute for Certification of Engineering Technologies or American Concrete Institute, whichever may be applicable for the materials being sampled and tested.

       3. Steel used in permanent placements shall comply with Buy America Requirements.

       4. The Museum shall obtain certificates of compliance and mill certifications in accordance with the approved Materials Testing Schedule.

       5. The Museum must certify that all materials used as part of the Project comply with the design specifications established for the Project.

       6. Contractor test results shall not be used for materials acceptance.

       7. All samples shall be random samples and all sampling and all testing shall meet the requirements of 23 CFR Part 637, Construction Inspection and Approval.

       8. Manufacturer certificates of compliance must accompany each shipment of product and must be received and accepted by the Project Manager prior to incorporating the product into the work. Under no circumstances will the State reimburse costs for items where a Certificate of Compliance is required and has not been received.
C. The Museum must certify that prevailing wage (Davis Bacon) rates have been paid during construction of the Project. Certifications of prevailing wage rates must be provided with each invoice, subject to review and acceptance by the State in accordance with State procedures.

D. For any work required within the State highway right-of-way, in accordance with 23 CFR Part 635.105, the State shall assign an engineer to ensure that the Project receives adequate supervision and inspection to insure that the Project is completed in accordance with approved plans and specifications.

19. The following are the General Program Requirements for the submission of reimbursement requests by the Museum:

A. The Museum shall invoice the State for work completed by the contractor on the Project and the cost of materials supplied by the contractor to the Project in accordance with State requirements and procedures.

B. The Museum shall submit reimbursement requests with a cover letter signed by the Project Manager containing the following language and provisions:

"I hereby certify that the materials and work for which payment is being requested meets the requirements of the contract documents and approved change orders in all respects, except as noted below. This certification is made in full cognizance of the Federal False Statement provision under United States Code, title 18, Section 1020, and I am duly authorized to certify on behalf of the Museum."

20. The following are the General Program Requirements for the finalization and closeout of the Project.

A. Finalization and acceptance of the Project shall be performed by the State. The following items are required to finalize and close the Project:

- Final inspection report
- Corrective action plan(s) and Punch List resolutions
- Letter of Project acceptance certifying that the Project has been completed in accordance with the contract documents
- MBE/DBE certification
- Prevailing Wage Certification (Davis Bacon)
- Anti-collusion Certification
- Materials Testing Certification
- Certification by the Project Manager that all certificates of compliance and mill certifications are on file
- Copy of Single Audit Report(s) issued in years in which work was performed or a copy of the program specific audit if applicable
- Equal Employment Opportunity Statement
21. The Project shall be subject to inspections by the State in accordance with State-funded procedures. All findings must be satisfactorily addressed before final reimbursement by the State.

22. Upon completion of the Project, the Museum will be responsible to maintain all aspects of the Project in accordance with the plans and specifications developed for the Project at its own cost and expense.

23. All costs billed under this Agreement are subject to audit. The Museum agrees to maintain all records pertaining to the costs incurred in performance of the Project and this Agreement for a period of three (3) years from the date of final payment and all other pending matters are closed.

24. The State reserves the right to terminate this Agreement if state or federal funds are rescinded or not authorized.

25. This Agreement may not be altered or amended except by written agreement signed by all the parties.

26. The State has provided the Museum the federal award information for this Project and the Museum agrees to comply with all applicable requirements under OMB Circular A-133 as designated on the Sub-Recipient Fact Sheet, which is attached hereto as Appendix A and incorporated herein by reference.

27. The Museum will take all necessary steps to receive authority by its Board of Trustees and execute this Agreement for ratification; submission of proof of such authority to the State prior to issuance of a Notice to Proceed to construction.

(Intentionally Blank)
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, The Rhode Island Department of Transportation and the Herreshoff Marine Museum have caused this Agreement to be executed by duly authorized officials on the ___ day of ____________, 2013.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL:

[Signature]
CHIEF ENGINEER
DATE: 6/1/13

[Signature]
CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER
DATE: 5-30-13

HERRESHOFF MARINE MUSEUM

APPROVED AS TO FORM

[Signature]
EXECUTIVE COUNSEL
DATE: 5/23/13

[Signature]
APPROVED:

DIRECTOR
DATE: 6-6-13

[Signature]
APPROVED:

PRESIDENT
DATE: 6/23/13

EXAMINED AND APPROVED:

[Signature]
DIVISION ADMINISTRATOR
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
DATE: 7-16-13
January 8, 2016

Ms. Karen Scott
Assistant Chief
RI Statewide Planning Program
1 Capitol Hill
Providence, RI 02908

RE: Herreshoff Marine Museum Rehabilitation Project

Ms. Scott:

This letter is to inform you and the other members of the Project Evaluation Subcommittee that the Town of Bristol is aware of, and supports the restoration of the Burnside Building at 22-26 Burnside Street in Bristol.

I can also attest that the project conforms to the Town of Bristol Comprehensive Plan as it is directly intended to protect the historic and cultural resources that link Bristol’s present with Bristol’s past.

As the Herreshoff Marine Museum is located in one of Bristol’s historic districts, any exterior renovation project must secure a permit from the Bristol Historic District Commission.

Kind regards,

[Signature]
Antonio A. Teixeira
Town Administrator
RIDOT Public Hearing

Background

Built in 1855, the General Ambrose Burnside Building at 22-26 Burnside Street has a rich and colorful history. Between 1858 and 1870, the building served as the headquarters for the Burnside Rifle Company (later the Bristol Firearms Company), manufacturers of the Burnside Carbine which saw widespread use during the Civil War. In the late 1800s, the building was expanded and became the Machine Shop for the Herreshoff Manufacturing Company. It is currently the largest building on the Herreshoff Marine Museum campus which straddles SR 114 halfway between Providence and Newport, and the building is the focus of a planned expansion of the museum’s exhibit space to accommodate HMM’s growing collection including the newly completed 1/6th-scale model of the 1903 America’s Cup defender RELIANCE, arguably the greatest yacht built in Rhode Island.

Key Points

1. Based on the project agreement between the HMM and RIDOT dated June 6th, 2013, this project was funded by transportation enhancement funding from the USDOT administered by the FHWA. The total funding is $1.5 million of which $1.2 million is federally-funded and $300K state-funded. While the federal funding is subject to obligational authority limitations, we are not aware of a sum of $815K that is available for re-prioritization by RIDOT.

2. The project is in progress and over $386K of the $1.5 million has been spent to-date. Phase 1, the stabilization of the building’s cupola and replacement of several areas of the roof to keep the water out, is largely prep work for Phase 2 which involves the restoration of the building’s envelope. Phase 1 is now complete and Phase 2 is at the 10% stage. HMM has invested over $100K in this project to-date and hundreds of hours of staff time. This project is geared to restore an important but seriously deteriorating asset, and if we aren’t able to undertake Phase 2 in 2016/17, the building will continue to deteriorate further which will increase the cost of saving it in later years.

3. In the draft TIP, a reason given for de-prioritizing our project was a “lack of support from the town of Bristol”. Evidence of a lack of support was that our project was not on the town’s list of priority projects. Further investigation has revealed that, for whatever reason, our project was omitted from the list of projects sent to the town for prioritization, so that fact that it did not show up on their list is not an indicator of a lack of support – rather it’s an indicator of an omission on the part of Statewide Planning. We met with Bristol Town Administrator Anthony Texiera, and he reaffirmed that the town fully supports
our project — support that was provided in a letter from Mr. Texiera as part of our submission.

4. HMM applied for and was awarded a $150K grant from RIHP for the restoration of additional windows in the Burnside Building and to augment the RIDOT project. This grant requires a match, and the project must be started within one year. **We are now in danger of losing the matching funds and therefore also the $150K grant.**

5. **This project is a significant component of a larger campus master plan for which we have begun a capital campaign.** HMM has directly spent over $20K getting Phase 2 to the 10% stage, and we have been meeting with prospective funders under the assumption that we can execute this project in 2016/17.

**Conclusion**

HMM therefore makes two requests:

1. Review the agreement between RIDOT and HMM to confirm the amount of state funding available for “re-prioritization” as we believe it is $300K, not $815K.

2. Reconsider the timing of that funding, and shift from 2025 to 2016/17 with 50% available in each of those two years.
June 17, 2016

Rhode Island Statewide Planning
One Capitol Hill, 3rd Floor
Providence, RI 02908

RE: FFY 2017-2025 State Transportation Improvement Program

The East Providence Area Chamber of Commerce respectfully requests that the project for Pawtucket Avenue from Taunton Avenue to Veterans Memorial Parkway be advanced from its current FY2022 construction year to 2018.

Each of these roads are major thoroughfares for the City of East Providence, and Pawtucket Avenue is the vital link between Taunton Avenue and “Vets Parkway.” This road serves the business community as well as our residents on a daily basis. It has also caused untold numbers of flat tires and damage to our vehicles over the years. (I speak from personal experience.) Pawtucket Avenue is especially treacherous and nerve-wracking, in the winter months and during rainstorms, when the pot holes and tire trenches are filled and covered with water or snow. For those without access to a vehicle, there are few places along Pawtucket Avenue to use the sidewalks with handicap accessibility. They are in serious disrepair as well. These roads and walkways have become a negative topic of discussion regarding conducting business in the City and being dangerous.

We would also like to request that the I-195 Taunton Avenue/Warren Avenue Interchange project be retained in the Study & Development Project Category for the reasons that the City of East Providence has noted in previous testimony.

The East Providence Area Chamber has been actively involved in promoting this section of the City, also known as Watchemoket Square. For the last five years, we have coordinated the Annual Watchemoket Square Day event to bring awareness among the public to this area. The major economic development projects along the waterfront would benefit greatly from improved access that would be created by the Interchange.

Thank you for your consideration and attention to these projects. They are of great interest and benefit to our business community and residents.

Sincerely,

Laura A. McNamara, executive director
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June 23, 2016
Re: Bonnet Point Road Causeway Rehabilitation-Amended Application

Dear Mr. Rhodes,

We, the residents of the Bonnet Shores Fire District, strongly support the Town of Narragansett's amendment to the TIP application. The granting of this proposal would allow for reconstruction of the currently failing causeway, enhance the safety of motorists and pedestrians in Bonnet, improve the water quality in the Wesquage watershed and enhance substantially an all-important means of egress from Bonnet in the event of a natural disaster. Bonnet Point Rd. is one of only two roads that lead in and out of Bonnet Shores. The causeway section is easily flooded with heavy rains and often impassable in the winter months. This greatly impedes emergency vehicles from reaching homes on that side of Bonnet in a timely and urgent manner.

We would like to thank Mike DeLuca and his planning staff from the Town of Narragansett for recognizing this important issue and their great efforts to help our community. We also thank Carol Hagan McEntee, our State Representative, who has been very supportive of this project.

Thank you and the board very much for your consideration of this proposal.

Sincerely,

Dale G. and Nancy P. Cordy, 240 Bonnet Point Rd.
David H. and Carol M. Stenmark, Lake Rd.
Terry and Carole Duffy, Richard Smith Rd.
Mary E. McGinn, 63 Fairway Dr.
Janice and Robert Mcllanaghian, 178 Treasure Rd.
Lloyd P. and Jean Albert, Camden Rd.
Eliot and Kathy Gersten, Camden Rd.
Jessica, Rebecca and Mike Blinn, Treasure Rd.
Rick and Vicki Gersten, Camden Rd.
Liz and Nagi Osta, Bonnet Point Rd.
Kevin L. Masse, 233 Bonnet Shores Rd.
Brad and Denise Sellon, 236 Bonnet Point Rd.
Paul and Margaret Haas, 245 Bonnet Point Rd.
James and Nancy Riccitelli, 7 Cross Rd.
Joe and Rosemary Pariseault, 5 Dunes Rd.
Elayne and Bernie Casey, 37 Lake Rd.
Joseph H. and Judith A. McGinn, 60 Fairway Dr.
Lawrence & Linda Marcello, 5 Namcook Rd.
Terence and Alison Fracassa, 30 Withington Rd.
Michael J. Vendetti, 29 Muratore Lane
Richard and Mary Mercier, 169 Col. John Gardner Rd.
Hugh and Mary Dunlap, 38 Richard Smith Rd.
Nicholas P. Mocciolo & Alyssa D. Benedict, 10 Tom Walsh Lane
Anthony and Ann Marie Vitale, 19 Webster Ave.
Shelley Parness, 205 Col. John Gardner Rd.
Dr. Spiros and Niovi Constantinides
Mark & Karen Connor, 3 Oswego Trail
Robert Crossley, Allagash Trail
Maureen McMahon, 60 Treasure Rd.
 Lynne & Douglas Stotz, 33 Anchorage Rd.
 Robert Wolodziejian, 234 Bonnet Shores Rd.
 Mark & Leisha Simon, 14 Fairway Drive
 Mark and Denise McNamara, Col. John Gardner Rd.
 Sheila & Richard Mulcahy, King Phillip Rd.
 Carol & Kevin Ryan, 3 Roxbury Ave.
 Stephen Nugent, 158 Treasure Rd.
Bonnet Point Rd  Causeway Rehabilitation

Peter & Paula Brunelli, 85 Treasure Rd.
Alisa L. Ruggiero,
Kathleen & David Murphy, 9 Old Town Trail
Diane & Jeff Kendall, 16 Fairport Rd.
Richard J. Murphy, 268 Bonnet Point Rd.
Andy Kushner, 97 Allagash Trail
Marie & Winifred Kelley, Bonnet Point Rd.
Judith & Richard Hoyer, 7 Onondaga Rd.
Matt & Joanne Listro, 9 Salem Trail
Susan Alukonis, 15 Huron Ave.
Carolyn Churnside, 24 Dunes Rd.
Giuseppe & Lynn Giordano, 1001 Boston Neck Rd.
Sarah O'Hare, 52 Leonard Bodwell Rd.
Nancy McFeeley, 161 Camden Rd.
Mary Hogan, 239 Bonnet Point Rd.
Steve Rotenberg/Roseanne DiCenzo, 131 Col. John Gardner Rd.
Susan & David Resnick, 162 Camden Rd.
Robert H. Ryan, 232 Bonnet Point Rd.
James L. Sheridan, Esq., 3 Cavalier Rd.
Theresa M. Murphy, 56 Camden Rd.
Richard W. & Arlene Stauffer, 70 Camden Rd.
Judi D. Braman & Sidney S. Braman, MD, 8 Dunes Rd.
Raymond F. Collins, 210 Col. John Gardner Rd.
William J. Cassidy, 132 Camden Rd.
Donna Sinel & Diane Martin 12 Algonquin Trail
Steve & Joy Ryder, 35 Lilly Lane
Buz & Cynthia Gardiner, 120 Allagash Trail
Sharon Ford, 123 Camden Rd.
David DiPrete, 24 Fairway Dr.
Thomas Walsh, 138 Treasure Rd.
Richard Sylvestre, 18 Mohawk Trail
Patricia Davis & Mary Mason, 54 Gardenia Lane
Joan Croce, 92 Lake Rd.
Madeleine and Bob Stepanian, 47 Ottawa Trail
Maria Golden, 7 Anchorage Rd.
George Short, 64 King Phillip Rd.
Joe Steigauf, 34 Muratore Lane
Carol Cotter, 204 Bonnet Shores Rd.
Victor & Rebecca Primavera, Col. John Gardner Rd.
Carol O'Donnell & Salvatore Mio, 278 Col. John Gardner Rd.
Alfred G. Vuono
Brenda & John Moriarty, 165 Treasure Rd.
Edward P. Ready, 54 Bayberry Rd.
Henry Marciano, 19 Treasure Rd.
Lionel G. Archambault, 186 Treasure Rd.
Phil & Pat Kuehne, 235 Col. John Gardner Rd.
Patricia O'Brien, 176 Col. John Gardner Rd.
Jeff Case, 40 King Phillip Rd.
Anthony, Marie, Adam Lupino, 25 Lake Rd.
Frank & Eileen Baker, Burbank Ave.
Thomas Natale, MD, 27 Fairway Dr.
Geraldine DelSesto, 14 Presque Isle Trail
Joe Badaracco, 176 Col. John Gardner Rd.
Sharon Dougherty & Joseph Iannucci, 57 Onondega Rd.
PJ DePetillo, 36 Joy Lane
Lynne Pi-Sunyer, 34 Muratore Lane
Hal Torman, 8 Merriweather Ave.
Jim & Betty Ann O'Shaughnessy, Camden Rd.
Elizabeth M. Dalton, 105 Treasure Rd.
Wally & Julie Collins, 42 Bayberry Rd.
Jane & Paul Williams, 8 Penobscot Trail
Bonnet Point Rd Causeway Rehabilitation

Charles & Paulette Brousseau, 1 Cross Rd.
Margaret C. Ford, 132 Treasure Rd.
Adrien & Kristen Deberghes
Paula Child's & Mark Rose, 55 Lake Rd.
Raymond T. Bush, 20 Stratford Rd.
Elaine & Albert J. Perrotta, 91 Camden Rd.
Robert & Mary Patterson, 43 Lake Rd.
Thomas Cody, 28 Stratford Ave.
Donna & Jim Benedict, 30 Bonnet Point Rd.
Andrea Falcione, 25 Maywood Rd.
Edward & Paula Fratelli, 26 Aroostook Trail
Kathryn Shanley, 55 Treasure Rd.
Mr. & Mrs. Dana E. Carter, 173 Treasure Rd.
Leona Keeley, Bonnet Point Rd.
Steve Randall & Kathleen McDonald, 47 Burbank Ave.
John & Meghan Vitale, 47 Withington Rd.
Scott, Karen (DOA)

To: Rhodes, Jared (DOA)
Subject: RE: In favor of raising the cause way , adding our names

-----Original Message-----
From: Bonnie Fiske [mailto:bonniefiske@cox.net]
Sent: Sunday, June 26, 2016 10:49 AM
To: Rhodes, Jared (DOA) <Jared.Rhodes@doa.ri.gov>
Subject: In favor of raising the cause way , adding our names

Charles H. Fiske and Barbaralee Fiske
9 Maywood Rd. Narra. R.I. 02882
Sent from my iPhone
CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION and/or work product. This e-mail and any attachments contain confidential and/or legally privileged information from the office of the State of Rhode Island, Department of Administration, Division of Planning, Statewide Planning Program. It is intended solely for the use of the named addressee(s). If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the contents of this e-mailed information is strictly prohibited and unauthorized. If you receive this e-mail in error, please immediately notify the sender by e-mail or telephone and permanently delete all copies of this e-mail and any attachments.

From: wysock@comcast.net [mailto:wysock@comcast.net]
Sent: Sunday, June 26, 2016 11:33 AM
To: Rhodes, Jared (DOA) <Jared.Rhodes@doa.ri.gov>
Subject: signature request

Please feel free to use my name shown below to include on any correspondence in pursuit of support for the causeway road in Bonnet.

Best,
Len

Len Wysocki Ph.D.LLC
licensed Psychologist
49 Finley Hill Rd.
Marlborough, Ct. 06447
(860) 798-4913
http://www.newhaven.edu/Faculty-Staff-Profiles/Leonard-Wysocki/
June 23, 2016

Re: Bonnet Point Road Causeway Rehabilitation-Amended Application

Dear Mr. Rhodes,

We, the residents of the Bonnet Shores Fire District, strongly support the Town of Narragansett's amendment to the TIP application.

The granting of this proposal would allow for reconstruction of the currently failing causeway, enhance the safety of motorists and pedestrians in Bonnet, improve the water quality in the Wesquage watershed and enhance substantially an all-important means of egress from Bonnet in the event of a natural disaster.

Bonnet Point Rd. is one of only two roads that lead in and out of Bonnet Shores. The causeway section is easily flooded with heavy rains and often impassable in the winter months. This greatly impedes emergency vehicles from reaching homes on that side of Bonnet in a timely and urgent manner.
FW: Causeway

Jared Rhodes
Chief, Rhode Island Statewide Planning Program One Capitol Hill Providence, RI 02908
(401) 222 5731

CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION and/or work product. This e-mail and any attachments contain confidential and/or legally privileged information from the office of the State of Rhode Island, Department of Administration, Division of Planning, Statewide Planning Program. It is intended solely for the use of the named addressee(s). If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the contents of this e-mailed information is strictly prohibited and unauthorized. If you receive this e-mail in error, please immediately notify the sender by e-mail or telephone and permanently delete all copies of this e-mail and any attachments.

-----Original Message-----
From: Margie [mailto:margiemanning@verizon.net]
Sent: Saturday, June 25, 2016 9:06 AM
To: Rhodes, Jared (DOA) <Jared.Rhodes@doa.ri.gov>
Subject: Causeway

Please add my name ... Marjorie Manning.... 57 Colonel John Gardner Road to the list of people in favor of Causeway reconstruction ... Thank You ...
Sent from my iPhone
Scott, Karen (DOA)

From: Rhodes, Jared (DOA)
Sent: Monday, June 27, 2016 9:04 AM
To: Witt, Chris (DOA); Siefert, Chelsea (DOA); Scott, Karen (DOA)
Subject: FW: Bonnet Point Road Causeway Rehabilitation Proposal

Jared Rhodes
Chief, Rhode Island Statewide Planning Program One Capitol Hill Providence, RI 02908
(401) 222 5731

CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION and/or work product. This e-mail and any attachments contain confidential and/or legally privileged information from the office of the State of Rhode Island, Department of Administration, Division of Planning, Statewide Planning Program. It is intended solely for the use of the named addressee(s). If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the contents of this e-mailed information is strictly prohibited and unauthorized. If you receive this e-mail in error, please immediately notify the sender by e-mail or telephone and permanently delete all copies of this e-mail and any attachments.

-----Original Message-----
From: Nancy Cordy [mailto:npcordova@verizon.net]
Sent: Monday, June 27, 2016 8:25 AM
To: Rhodes, Jared (DOA) <Jared.Rhodes@doa.ri.gov>
Subject: Re: Bonnet Point Road Causeway Rehabilitation Proposal

Good morning Jared,
I received a few more names since last night. Thanks again for your assistance. When will the application be reviewed and when will we be able to learn if it was approved?
Have a great day,
Nancy

Bonnet Shores residents in favor of TIP application (cont'd.):
Nina Petrarca, 255 Bonnet Point Rd.
John & Maria Andrews, 78 Leonard Bodwell Rd.
Frances Girardi, 10 Camden Rd.
Karen Beauchesne, Lake Rd.
Barbara Feeley, 151 Treasure Rd.
Ted & Kathy DiStefano, 94 Col. John Gardner Rd.
Patricia & Charles Cole, 20 Bayberry Rd.
Michael & Marcia Mills, 39 Joy Lane

Sent from my iPad

> On Jun 27, 2016, at 8:05 AM, Rhodes, Jared (DOA) <Jared.Rhodes@doa.ri.gov> wrote:
> 
> > Dear Nancy,
> >
Thank you so much for coordinating this submittal. Your efforts are greatly appreciated.

Jared Rhodes
Chief, Rhode Island Statewide Planning Program One Capitol Hill
Providence, RI 02908
(401) 222 5731

CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION and/or work product. This e-mail and any attachments contain confidential and/or legally privileged information from the office of the State of Rhode Island, Department of Administration, Division of Planning, Statewide Planning Program. It is intended solely for the use of the named addressee(s). If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the contents of this e-mailed information is strictly prohibited and unauthorized. If you receive this e-mail in error, please immediately notify the sender by e-mail or telephone and permanently delete all copies of this e-mail and any attachments.

-----Original Message-----
From: Nancy Cordy [mailto:npcordy@verizon.net]
Sent: Sunday, June 26, 2016 9:47 PM
To: Rhodes, Jared (DOA) <Jared.Rhodes@doa.ri.gov>
Cc: Nancy Home <npcordy@verizon.net>
Subject: Bonnet Point Road Causeway Rehabilitation Proposal

Hi Jared,
Attached please find a letter of support for the Bonnet Point Rd. Causeway proposal.
I reached out to the residents of Bonnet Shores and received an overwhelming response of support from 190 residents (from 123 residences) who are very supportive and hopeful that this project comes to fruition. I also gave them your email address in case they wanted to say something in addition to what is in this letter.
Again, thank you and the board very much for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Nancy Cordy
Scott, Karen (DOA)

From: Rhodes, Jared (DOA)
Sent: Monday, June 27, 2016 9:05 AM
To: Siefert, Chelsea (DOA); Scott, Karen (DOA); Witt, Chris (DOA)
Subject: FW: Bonnet Point Road, Narragansett, RI

Jared Rhodes
Chief, Rhode Island Statewide Planning Program
One Capitol Hill
Providence, RI 02908
(401) 222 5731

CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION and/or work product. This e-mail and any attachments contain confidential and/or legally privileged information from the office of the State of Rhode Island, Department of Administration, Division of Planning, Statewide Planning Program. It is intended solely for the use of the named addressee(s). If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the contents of this e-mailed information is strictly prohibited and unauthorized. If you receive this e-mail in error, please immediately notify the sender by e-mail or telephone and permanently delete all copies of this e-mail and any attachments.

From: Richard Mercier [mailto:richard.d.mercier@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2016 3:06 PM
To: Rhodes, Jared (DOA) <Jared.Rhodes@doa.ri.gov>
Subject: Bonnet Point Road, Narragansett, RI

Please work to include the Bonnet Point Road repair / replacement in the TIP funding program or find other funding to complete an upgrade.

The road is the primary ingress / egress point for the Bonnet Shores Community as well as the Bonnet Shores Beach Club. In the summer, it serves a steady stream of cars both to the community and to the Beach Club. Flooding of this road has been a continuing problem for the residents of Bonnet, and Rhode Island residents who come to the beach club, which can imperil both walkers and riders alike. One often sees cars slide into the marshland or ponds because of flooding and the road’s low elevation.

In the winter, it becomes even more treacherous when the community is home to many URI students, who often because of their youth are less cautious than they are likely to be later in life. As a result, please work to keep these young people safe.

For the health and safety of the Narragansett and Rhode Island residents and URI students, please work with our community leaders to find a way to fund a major upgrade to this dangerous road, either through TIP or other funding mechanism.

Thank you

Richard D Mercier
169 Col. John Gardner Road
Narragansett, RI 02882
June 23, 2016

Mr. Jared L. Rhodes
Secretary
Rhode Island Statewide Planning Council
One Capitol Hill
Providence, RI 02908

Dear Mr. Rhodes:

On behalf of the Council for the Bonnet Shores Fire District, Narragansett, RI, I would like to extend our support for the revised plan for the Causeway, (Bonnet Point Road), for consideration. Mike Deluca, Narragansett Town Planner submitted this revised plan and the Bonnet Shores Fire District Council is very much in favor of the revised plan.

This revised plan would allow for reconstruction of the causeway, enhance the safety of motorists and pedestrians in Bonnet, improve the water in quality in the Wesquage watershed and enhance substantially an all-important means of egress from Bonnet in the event of a natural disaster.

For years, the residents of Bonnet have been concerned about the condition of the causeway and it’s ability to support use year round.

Thank you for your consideration and know that the Bonnet District is in favor of it moving forward.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at 978-852-9550.

Sincerely,

Leonard J. Mercier
Chairman, Bonnet Shores Fire District

Paul Farley
Vice Chairman, Bonnet Shores Fire District

LJM:mb
June 24, 2016

To: Members of the Transportation Advisory Council

Re: East Coast Greenway Alliance Comments on 2017-2025 Transportation Improvement Plan

Dear members of the TAC:

The following comments are in response to the draft 2017-2025 Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) which was published on April 25, 2016.

The East Coast Greenway Alliance (ECGA) is the non-profit 501 (c)(3) spearheading the development of the East Coast Greenway (ECG), a developing 2,900 mile traffic-separated bicycling and walking network connecting communities from the Canadian border to Key West, Florida. Today, the entire network is 30% off-road; the remaining 70% is on carefully selected roadways. The ECG route in Rhode Island has a total of 48 miles, approximately 30 of those miles are completed ECG (63%).

The ECGA is pleased to see several segments of the ECG listed on the TIP including: the Woonsocket sections of the Blackstone River Bikeway segments: 8A, 8C and 8B-1, and the two bridges on the Trestle Trail in Coventry. We are also aware that our neighbors in Connecticut and Massachusetts have made strong commitments to build out their portion of the ECG and are quickly closing in on the state line.

We commend the State for passing RhodeWorks, which will result in more funding for the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP). And as members of the Paths to Progress Coalition, we are hopeful that the Green Economy Bond will pass and provide further resources for the bike-ped network. However, we understand that closing critical gaps in the ECG network will require additional resources. We encourage Statewide Planning to look beyond traditional means to fund and prioritize gaps in the greenway network. One need not look much further than our neighbors in Connecticut and Massachusetts for inspiration.

In 2015, Governor Dannel Malloy of neighboring Connecticut, released a five-year transportation ramp-up plan which includes $101 million for planning, constructing and maintaining the state’s trail network - of which the ECG is given priority because it identified as a trail of national significance. The ECG in Connecticut is nearly 40% complete (77 miles) and the State is projected to construct an additional 40 miles by 2020. According to the RI TIP — and if all goes as planned- the Ocean State will add a measurer 2.5 miles to the ECG system by 2020. Meanwhile, in Massachusetts the Department of Transportation is setting aside $157 million to fund shared use paths
listed on the MA TIP and an additional $60 million over the next five years for construction and planning for those projects listed on the updated State Bicycle Plan and State Pedestrian Plan.

Over the next few years, the gaps in the RI network will become more pronounced at the state lines. In Connecticut the six-mile Moosup River State Park Trail - connecting Moosup Village to the RI line - is projected to be complete by 2017/2018. The 3.7-mile Blackstone River Greenway - connecting Uxbridge, Millville and Blackstone, Massachusetts to the Rhode Island line – will open to the public in late summer/early fall of 2016.

We strongly encourage Statewide Planning to reconsider the TIP priorities for Rhode Island’s multi-use path network and to pay special attention to those segments which are part of the ECG and not included on the TIP or are scheduled far into the future. These segments include the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>City/Town</th>
<th>Length (mi)</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trestle Trail</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>Coventry</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackstone River</td>
<td>Bikeway Segment 1A</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>Med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Bikeway</td>
<td>River Road (Pitman St to Irving St)</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>Med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackstone River</td>
<td>Bikeway Segment 8C</td>
<td>Woonsocket</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Bikeway</td>
<td>Segment 8A</td>
<td>Woonsocket</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackstone River</td>
<td>Bikeway Segment 8B-1</td>
<td>Woonsocket</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Bikeway</td>
<td>Segment 8B-2</td>
<td>Woonsocket</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackstone River</td>
<td>Bikeway Segment 3A (south of 95)</td>
<td>Pawtucket</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Bikeway</td>
<td>Segment 3B (north of 95)</td>
<td>Pawtucket/Central Falls/Cumberland</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence to Cranston Bike Path</td>
<td></td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
June 24, 2016

Rhode Island is the heart of the ECG route in Southern New England. Commitment to completing the ECG network in Rhode Island will result in closing critical gaps in the network and connecting communities through active transportation and offer recreation opportunities which create healthier citizens and sustainable local economies. We’d hate for Rhode Islanders to seek locations outside the State to enjoy these opportunities, or for tourists to turn around at the state line because the resources necessary to complete this valuable network were not prioritized during the TIP planning process.

Thank you for your consideration. Please do not hesitate to contact me at with any questions.

Sincerely,

Molly Henry
New England Greenway Coordinator
East Coast Greenway Alliance
76 Dorrance Street, Suite 301
Providence, RI 02909
molly@greenway.org
610.348.4931 (cell)
June 23, 2016

Mr. Jared L. Rhodes, Secretary (Acting)
Rhode Island State Planning Council
One Capitol Hill, Providence, RI 02908

Re: TIP 2017-2025 Recommended Projects

Dear Mr. Rhodes:

The Town of Jamestown is appreciative of the projects proposed to be listed in the TIP. These projects represent maintenance and replacement of critical linkage bridges, sidewalks to get children off the busy roads and safely to school, and paving of the other half of our downtown main street; all vital to Jamestown’s quality of life.

There are two projects that were listed in the 2013-2016 that were not recommended to carry through to the 17-25 TIP. The Town of Jamestown wishes at this time to formally advocate for the following projects reentry into the 17-25 TIP:

- Ice Road Bike Path – TIPID 5062
- Sidewalk and Curbing Replacement on Walcott Avenue from Hamilton Avenue to Fort Wetherill State Park

The Ice Road Bike Path was borne out of the Jamestown Bike Path Design Committee Final Report in April 2010. The committee, led by Robert Sutton involved seven residents including the Town Planner Lisa Bryer as well as the Town Administrator and Lambri Zerva, PE, from RIDOT. The Town has committed $120,000 towards this project, over the last five years, and has completed the project design, including the Reservoir spillway bridge and has also permitted the only wetland crossing for the path through RIDEM. The Town is fully committed to completion of this project as evidenced by the most recent allocation of $40,000 in the FY16-17 capital budget for the construction phase which has an total estimated cost of $225,000.
In October 2011, a meeting was held with then RIDOT Director Lewis regarding the critically important bike path linkage in Jamestown and Director Lewis noted in his letter (attached) that “RIDOT supports the funding of this projects in the Transportation Improvement Program at the appropriate time, subject to successful project development and permitting by the Town...” The Ice Road Bike Path was first listed in the 13-16 TIP. The Town has successfully developed and permitted this project and would respectfully request that this project remain in the 17-25 TIP as it is ready for construction.

The Sidewalk and Curbing Replacement on Walcott Avenue from Hamilton Avenue to Fort Wetherill State Park was initially listed on the 13-16 TIP for construction in 2016 at a total cost of $500,000. This project will make the main walking route from Jamestown’s Village to Fort Wetherill State Park. Much of the sidewalk and curbing is in “failing” condition and would not support handicap usage. The need for this project is even more relevant 3 years later and the Town of Jamestown respectfully requests that this project remain in the 17-25 TIP.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Andrew E. Nota, Town Administrator
Town of Jamestown

C: Jamestown Town Council
   Robert Sutton, Chair, Jamestown Bike Path Design Committee
   Lisa Bryer, Town Planner
   Michael Gray, Public Works Director

Attachment: October 24, 2011 letter from RIDOT Director Lewis supporting the Ice Road Bike Path
Mr. Bruce Keiser  
Town Administrator  
Town of Jamestown  
P.O. Box 377  
Jamestown, Rhode Island 02835-1199

RE: Proposed Jamestown Bike Path

Dear Mr. Keiser:

In reference to your September 28th letter regarding our recent meeting to discuss the proposed Jamestown Bike Path, we concur that the meeting was very productive and provided the opportunity to gain a better understanding of the purpose and importance of this bicycle link to the Town. RIDOT supports the funding of this project in the Transportation Improvement Program at the appropriate time, subject to successful project development and permitting by the Town and the availability of funding. We look forward to working with the Town in the future on this exciting project.

Sincerely,

Michael P. Lewis,  
Director
From: Ellen Waxman, Town Councillor, North Kingstown

From: Five Main <fivemain@verizon.net>
Subject: 
Date: May 26, 2016 5:47:43 PM EDT

As a member of the North Kingstown Town Council, I'm here to bring attention to Wickford Junction, one of Rhode Island's most significant transportation assets. Wickford Junction opened four years ago, and there is still no service on weekends.

on page 32 of this TIP draft

Summer Service
The state is anticipating the further development of limited season bus/rail/ferry services connecting major tourist attractions, recreational facilities and summer events along Narragansett Bay. Specific service locations include but are not limited to Wickford Junction and (list other locations). It is anticipated that initial start-up service would be limited at select locations but could be expanded based on demand and usage.

on page 309 funding tables

ID 7109 SUMMER SERVICE DESCRIPTION
This line item involves the start-up operations and further development of limited seasonal bus/rail/ferry services connecting major tourist attractions and recreational facilities along Narragansett Bay. Specific service locations include but are not limited to Wickford Junction and (list other locations). It is anticipated that the initial service in FY16 will be limited to weekends during the summer season at select locations, and depending upon usage and demand, could be expanded with additional locations and operations in subsequent years.

on page 308 funding tables

ID 7108 T-LINK BUS SERVICE
Proposed RIPTA bus service connecting RI's three commuter rail stations, Wickford Junction and (list other locations) that would supplement MBTA service gaps, in addition to possible linkages to connect other regions of the state to commuter rail, including but not limited to major tourist attractions, recreational facilities and summer events along Narragansett Bay, with an emphasis on weekend bus service to test the commuter rail market.

Summer is the time of year when people want to get out of the city and come to the seashore to relax and cool off. While visiting they will eat, shop and contribute to our economy. Let's act now and make it easy for people to visit Beautiful Southern Rhode Island!

Improve access to southern Rhode Island
Improve access to Boston
Improve access to TF Green Airport
Improve access to South County Beaches
Improve access to art and culture
Add options for shopping
Add options for dining out
Reduce traffic congestion
Reduce parking congestion
Reduce pollution
Preserve the environment
Improve health
Improve safety
Attract students
Attract seniors
Attract cyclists
Attract businesses
Generate jobs
Increase property values

The 2014 Rhode Island State Rail Plan that was published in December of 2013

6.1.1 SOUTH COUNTY COMMUTER RAIL PHASE I

The commuter rail station at Wickford Junction opened with MBTA commuter rail service in April 2012.

One of the goals of the overall transportation system in the State is to create an intermodal system with seamless transitions between modes with aligned schedules to reduce congestion and emissions along the State’s highways.

Add system capacity without expanding the road network, and attract economic development.

The current service to the InterLink and Wickford Junction does not operate on weekends and provides less frequent weekday service than MBTA service to Providence or within Massachusetts. Limited rail service between the two stations and Providence is provided on the weekdays, with two inbound trips and three outbound trips provided to and from Providence. Additional service is under consideration to fill the service gaps; however, any added service needs to be examined for coordination with Amtrak and freight operations, as capacity on the NEC is an issue.
Her Excellency the Governor of Rhode Island  
Gina Raimondo  
State House, Room 224, 82 Smith Street  
Providence, Rhode Island 02903  

Dear Governor Raimondo,  

South County Tourism Council writes to encourage the expansion of a strong commuter rail service to Kingston and Westerly be included in the planning process as Rhode Island works to develop a ten year transportation plan. We assume that this is in the draft presently being reviewed since the third track design is moving forward which we are told includes a section in Kingston.

Passenger rail service on the eastern seaboard is the main economic generator for Amtrak. One reason for success is ensuring the frequency of trains. Hopefully, the MBTA being reviewed in Boston will bring opportunity of increased frequency to Rhode Island. Rail passenger service historically, has not been a profitable operation. Many would say, neither are roads which service the trucking industry at no charge even though trucks are the main generator of wear and tear on the roads. Neither South County visitors nor residents can enjoy an evening in Providence or Boston using rail service because trains are not running either frequently or late enough.

Wickford station was a major victory in reducing our dependency on our overburdened highways and byways throughout our state but more importantly, particularly, in South County.

The happy consequence of restoration at Kingston Station has provided 180,000 people use of the historic train station. The southern end of our state continues to grow and greet visitors. I implore you to prepare for the next twenty years of growth both to residents and visitors – view it as an imperative - we simply must provide alternative modes of transportation to our southern region. One former RI DOT Director opined: “There will be no more taking of land for new roads in South County.”

Passenger rail use is increasing worldwide with the installation of new infrastructure. Let us seize the opportunity to unite our state from our northern border to southern border. Let us be forward thinking and take bold action in planning now. After all, it is up to us to write with vision and veracity our ten year transportation plan.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Myrna George  
President & CEO

CC: DOT Director Alviti, Jr.  
Senator Jack Reed  
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse  
Congressman James Langevin  
Congressman David Cicilline
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(HEARING COMMENCED AT 2:10 P.M.)

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Good afternoon, everyone. I'd like to call this hearing to order. If you could please mark the time as 2:10, I would appreciate it. Hello everyone. My name is Jared Rhodes. I'm the chief of the Rhode Island Statewide Planning Program, and I will be the presiding officer for today's hearing.

This hearing has been authorized by the Rhode Island State Planning Council, and we're here today to accept your comments and your input on two distinct actions that are proposed relative to the state's Transportation Improvement Program. Those actions include a proposed amendment to the FY2013 to 2016 Transportation Improvement Program and also the proposed 2017 to 2025 Draft Transportation Improvement Program.

Before we get started, I have a couple of quick housekeeping matters I just want to go over with you. First and foremost, I would like you all to note where the fire exits are. There's one in the back of the room there. There's also one on the other side, and you can see one here and behind me. In addition, if you happen to need the restrooms, you will find those outside of the main
entranceway and to the right.

If you are here today to offer comment and public input, please note that we do need you to register and sign in accordingly at the Welcome Desk. So, if you haven't done that, please do so, so we can make sure we get your name called and get you the opportunity to speak. Last, but not least, I want to make sure that you all realize that there are additional opportunities to offer comment on these two important actions.

We will be having another hearing tonight in this very same room starting at 6:30. And with particular reference to the proposed '17 to '25 TIP, we have -- the public comment period is going to be open until June 26th, and you'll have the opportunity to submit written comments specifically on that item up until that date.

The action on the other item, the 2013 to 2016 TIP, that will be considered this evening by the Transportation Advisory Committee at their meeting with final -- with potentially final action being considered by the State Planning Council in their June meeting. So with that said, what we're going to do today is, we're going to have about -- we're going to have kind of two
sections of our hearing.

First, you're going to have the benefit of hearing a presentation from Ms. Linsey Callaghan, supervising planner in our Transportation Unit, as well as from Amy Pettine from the Rhode Island Transit Authority, and Meredith Brady from the Rhode Island Department of Transportation. They're going to take the time to walk through some of the basics of these two actions. We're going to go over the development process and give you a summary of what is contained. Once we are complete with that, we will move into the formal comment period, and we will start with the customary recognition of the elected officials. From there, we will flow into all of the other comments.

So, before I turn it over to everyone, are you guys able to hear me well and hear us well at this point, even in the back of the room?

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: It's a little quiet back here, but I can hear you.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Okay. So, we'll all try and speak up a little bit. So, with that said, let me turn it over to Linsey. And Linsey is going to kick off our formal presentations for
you, and this should take about fifteen or twenty
minutes.

MS. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Jared. As
Jared stated, the purpose of this hearing is to
receive public input on two separate, but related
documents. Amendment 7 to the State
Transportation Improvement Program for federal
fiscal years 2013 to 2016, and the Draft State
Transportation Improvement Program for federal
fiscal year 2017 to 2025. Before I go into those
documents, I'd like to provide you with some
background context behind those documents
themselves.

The STIP, as a document, is a list of
transportation projects the State of Rhode Island
intends to implement using U.S. Department of
Transportation funds. For transportation projects
to utilize federal funds, it must be included in
the STIP. To provide some contact on the STIP
document before us tonight, in 2012 when the
Federal Transportation Authorization Bill, Map-21,
was enacted, it represented a major policy shift
at the federal level. Map-21 focused on improving
the conditions of the nation transportation
system, particularly the National Highway System,
otherwise known as the NHS, which is comprised of the highest order of functionally classified roads, including, in Rhode Island, Interstate 95, 195, 295, Route 4, Route 2, et cetera.

While Map-21 did not specifically specify a federally established goal for pavement conditions on the NHS roads, it did specify a goal of having no more than 10 percent of the state's NHS bridge deck area in poor condition.

Currently, 22 percent of Rhode Island bridges are deemed structurally deficient, which ranks Rhode Island last in the nation in overall bridge condition. In addition, states are now required to show how these federal investments in their infrastructure improve the transportation system overall performance and conditions.

Map-21 focused on how each investment will result in improving the system as a whole. These policy changes initiated with Map-21 are carried forward into fixing America's surface transportation, otherwise known as the Fast Act, which was adopted in 2015. The state has been preparing for this policy shift for several years since Map-21 was passed. RIDOT formed an Asset Management Council and engaged a consultant to
start the migration of transportation infrastructure planning to an asset management-based approach, increasing the emphasis on preservation and maintenance to keep infrastructure in good condition and avoiding more expensive long-term costs.

This process accumulated with a development of RIDOT's 10-year strategic plan, which was released in October 2015; however, the biggest issue facing the state and meeting the federal requirements was identifying appropriate funding. A few years back, the state took some key steps to provide stateable transportation infrastructure finding and brought in available resources, including the redirection of the gas tax to focus on transportation needs, replacement of biennial bonds, bond borrowing with an increase in vehicle registration, driver license fees, along with Rhode Island Capital Plan or RICAP funds to provide the state match for the annual federal transportation program.

They also reinforced the existing general obligation bonds to soften the anticipated sharp peak in debt service payments. And they also created the creation of the Rhode Island Highway
Maintenance Account and a shift of future funding from transportated (sic) related sources that this vehicle registration, title fees and gas tax indexing and other accounts to establish a state-funded pool for critical transportation infrastructure projects.

The shift in available resources to meet the state's critical infrastructure needs culminated in the passage of Rhode Works in February of this year. Rhode Works is a funding plan which calls for the repair of the state's deteriorating bridges and the proposal funds project in two ways. It borrows $300 million against future federal highway funding while refinancing old obligations to yield an additional 120 million, and it also imposes a new tool on large commercial trucks, which is expected to bring in 45 million a year when fully operational.

This increase in available resources, along with the creation of an asset management-based plan for improving the state's critical infrastructure, has aligned the state with the policy direction set forth at the federal level in Map-21 and continue to the FAST Act. The two documents that are presented today represent
the project implementation of the policy shifts outlined above. The remaining presentation will first focus on Amendment 7 to the 2013 to 2016 STIP.

As previously mentioned, RIDOT released a 10-year plus strategic plan and covers years 2016 to 2025. Amendment 7 realigns the FY -- the federal fiscal year 2016 project of the STIP with additional available state and federal funding sources with RIDOT's 10-year strategic plan. In addition, this amendment includes new transit and highway projects not included in the 2013 to 2016 STIP. I will now turn the presentation over to Amy Pettine, Executive Director of the Rhode Island -- I mean the Executive Director of Planning for the Rhode Island Public Transit Authority to detail RIPTA's amendment request.

MS. PETTINE: So we have, as has been mentioned, federal funds must be in the TIP before they can be accessed. So we've got two projects that we're requesting in this TIP amendment. The first, I'm sure most of you have heard of it. It's the circulator project which was originally the Providence Street Car, a project we had worked on for many years in Providence. The city had --
just to give you the short story -- we had worked
for years with them.

    We started with a study called the Core
Connector. It even goes back before that.
Parametric (inaudible) in Providence Transit
Enhancement Study, when we were looking at ways to
connect key destinations in the downtown area.
The city went after a TIGER grant in 2014. That
was originally $100 million project. They asked
the federal government for the TIGER program for
26 million, they were awarded half that amount.
We were unable in the -- since the '14 TIGER Award
to come up with the funds to do a full-blown rail
investment, so we circled the wagons and came up
with what, I think, is, even a stronger project,
which is already enhanced by the corridor. So
running along a similar alignment, connecting the
Providence Train Station to the north through
Kennedy Plaza. A couple of key locations in the
Jewelry District and then terminating in the Rhode
Island Hospital area at a new hub.

    So, this became a $17 million project.
So, we were looking for an amendment in the TIP to
put those federal funds in there with the state
match -- put the project in the TIP, identifying
those federal TIGER funds that are discretionary funds being matched with state and local resources. So that's the first project. That's the bigger project.

The second project is actually a small amount of money. It's monies that were generated by the miles that are accrued in our East Side Bus Tunnel. These "miles," for lack of a better word, were mistakenly appointed by FTA to one program of money and, since, they have moved Fixed Guideway. So we were notified by FTA this year. There was roughly $50,000 that needed to be obligated. We have a State of Repair Project going on right now in the bus tunnel. We have seven other discretionary grants that's already in the TIP to make repairs to the bus tunnel.

So we're just going ahead and adding this money again, formula funds, generated by miles through the bus tunnel to a larger bus tunnel renovation project. So those are RIPTA's two projects in broad strokes. Thank you.

MS. CALLAGHAN: I will now turn the presentation over to Meredith Brady, Acting Policy Director for the Rhode Island Department of Transportation to detail RIDOT's specific request.
MS. BRADY: Thank you very much, and thank you all for being here. I just want to take a quick minute. I know that it's taking time out of everyone's afternoon, and we really appreciate the fact that you're taking time out of your day to give us input and feedback. Not everything that we have put into this plan is perfect, and I will be the first to admit it. In fact, we have submitted -- RIDOT has submitted some minor changes even to the '16 TIP Amendment based on shifts and funding sources, things we may have missed initially.

There are no new projects added, but we have some technical corrections that we needed to make even to the '16 TIP Amendment, and when you're dealing with a database and project that are this numerous, I know the cities and towns had a lot of projects to rank and a lot of projects that they wanted to put forward. So, obviously, there's always going to be something that gets missed, and part of the reason for these public hearings is to make sure that we have all the information that we need to make the best decision possible. So, thank you again for your time.

The federal fiscal year '16 TIP Amendment
that RIDOT has proposed is a big amendment. RIPTA's amendment is a little amendment. RIDOT's amendment basically replaces the entire '16 program that was in the previously enacted TIP, and there are several reasons for this. When the State Planning Council passed and Federal Highway approved the '13 through '16 TIP, at that time we had just gotten a new federal transportation authorization act, which is not the same federal transportation authorization act we have today. So we've been through two iterations of the authorization.

We had not gone through many of the changes that Linsey outlined, as far as what the state has done for transportation funding, and we also now have a new administration and a shift that has been taking place for a while but has really been pushed forward over the last year in how we take a look at our assets and preservation of assets, state of good repair for our system. So that's the "why" behind the amendment.

The "what" of the amendment -- and we have replaced what you used to be, which was just the capital expenditures that the state made with full accounting for both operational and capital
expenditures, state funds and federal funds, and any other funding sources. So it looks like it's a much bigger program. In reality, it's very similar to what you would have seen in the past if we had seen all of the funding sources, with a couple of notable exceptions.

One of those is the $35 million transit hub bond that was passed after the '13 to '16 TIP was enacted and had not been accounted for previously, is considered state funds, but we wanted to account for it here. Another is $300 million in GARVEE funding from a new GARVEE Bond, which we'll be working over the summer to issue, hopefully, in the early fall. And then $120 million in federal funds has been freed up as a result of refinancing, refunding the existing GARVEE Bonds.

And, just by way of background, for those who may not have the transportation background themselves, the GARVEE is a grant anticipation revenue vehicle. It's based on federal funds. So we're not pledging state funds in this case. We're pledging our future federal funds to be able to do more projects now so that we can save money later. So one of the principles behind Rhode
Works is that by making these expenditures now on bridges in particular, we're saving $950 million in getting to the same point with 10 percent -- or 90 percent bridge sufficiency, 10 percent deficiency by 2025.

In any case, those are the major changes that we're seeking. We've also added -- as some may be aware, we have money that has been set aside from the GARVEE Bonds. 100 million has gone towards bridges. 200 million is set aside specifically for the 6/10 project. And, in addition, we've got $3 million from funds -- unallocated bond funds set aside for the ramps on 295. Those are the major changes outlined in the '16 Amendment, and we're looking forward to hearing what everyone has to say.

MS. CALLAGHAN: The next portion of the presentation will focus on the draft 2017 to 2025 state Transportation Improvement Program. Federal regulations require the State Planning Council, acting as the single statewide metropolitan planning organization in Rhode Island adopt a new STIP at a minimum of every four years. The STIP must present a four-year program by year and may present additional projects proposed for funding
in future years.

This draft STIP includes the required four federal fiscally constrained years. However, it extends the planning horizon to 2025. This longer time frame better aligns with the state's shift to a more asset management approach to transportation planning and offers municipalities and the general public a better idea of when projects are moving through development into implementation.

The draft STIP also aligns with the years 2017 to 2025 of RIDOT's ten-year strategic plan. The development of this STIP began in November of 2015 when the notice of projects of solicitation was released. The deadline for submissions for the STIP was January 8, 2016. Statewide Planning received over 300 new applications containing over $880 million in requests, and they were received from municipalities, other state agencies, and non-profit organizations.

After all the projects were submitted, Statewide Planning conducted four regional meetings and invited applicants to present their project applications to staff and members of the TAC. The projects were then reviewed and ranked. As previously mentioned, a key focus of this STIP
is to better integrate an asset management
approach into the overall transportation planning
process. To that end, projects in the categories
of bridge, pavement, traffic and drainage, and
Regionally Significant projects were referred to
RIDOT to be evaluated primarily using data-driven
management systems, optimizing the impact of the
total investment in Rhode Island's transportation
network, especially projects located on the NHS.

All other projects, including transit,
bicycle, pedestrian, safe routes to school and
other transportation enhancement projects, were
evaluated by a series of subcommittees comprised
of staff of Statewide Planning, RIDOT, Rhode
Island Department of Environmental Management,
RIPTA, and members of the transportation advisory
committee. Although the projects were not scored
using a numerical scoring process, the
subcommittee used the TIP guiding principles in
their decision-making. This defined set of
principles take into consideration such things as
mobility, cost-effectiveness, environmental
impact, economic development, safety and security
and support for state and local goals and equity.

All of the highest ranking projects were
sent to RIDOT and RIPTA for refined project cost
estimates and scheduling over the time period of
the STIP. Specific funding resources were
assigned to each project, and this process
resulted in the draft STIP tables before you
today. The Statewide Planning Program then
combined the data from RIPTA and RIDOT with text
and analysis to create the full draft STIP that is
under consideration. I will now turn the
presentation back over to Amy Pettine for the
RIPTA portion of this draft.

MS. PETTINE: Thank you. So the draft TIP
represents RIPTA's priorities moving forward.
I'll talk about it in broad strokes. It includes
ongoing operational support for our agencies,
certainly with the focus on state of the repair.
It looks at incremental improvements to help with
operating more safely and efficiently. We have an
eye on strictly going to the 10-year TIP longer
term investments, specifically in upgrading our
passenger facilities, and then it also outlines
our priorities within the CMAQ program, the
portion of funds that we are proposing to use to
identify some of our other -- some specific
initiatives.
So, if you look at the TIP -- just another note on the FAST Act. I know there's been a lot of talk about the increase in federal transportation funding for the FAST Act. Huge impacts for RIDOT, very minimal impact for RIPTA. So not a huge boost in funding really, you know, looking at somewhat similar funding levels that we've seen in the past. The majority of our funds are coming from the 5307 program. So you'll see that pot of money outlined in the TIP, but there are some smaller pots of money that are tied to particular outcome, like focusing on rural transportation or on specific populations of people. So you'll see that as we look to identify some of our initiatives.

The bulk of our monies are going to Fleet Replacement, both on the fixed route and paratransit side. You'll see the monies in the outer years sort of shift a little bit on the fixtures. That's because we don't have a smoothly replacement program. We don't replace the same amount of vehicles every year. It's a little bit of a curve of up and down. Sometimes we're actually looking at smooth and outer years, but that's why you'll see the numbers jump up and
down.

We have a whole line or program of work around IT investments. This relates to back office IT upgrades that we're making in the next several years to vehicle technology upgrades. We have a huge fare box system upgrade, for example, coming up in the next couple of years. And, as I mentioned, operational support. Nearly one-fifth of RIPTA's annual operating budget -- so, you know, a good portion of our operating budget -- is getting reimbursed through federal programs. So that's money, preventative maintenance, that we can use to pay mechanics, maintain the fleet that we bought with our federal funds, to be paying for planning staff, to help plan the work both in the year term and the short-term.

And then I mentioned passenger upgrades. That was one project that we had put in during the TIP solicitation process looking beyond our four-year fiscal constraint long-term. How can we set a course to do improvements to bus stops and major facilities around the state. We've got some key projects going on in Providence, but we also have our eye on upgrades in Pawtucket, the City of Warwick, East Providence, and we're in the middle
of developing bus stop design guidelines right now and are getting proactive about making passenger amenities that are nearly 4,000 bus stops around the state.

Identifying the use of CMAQ map funds, we've broken out our work into a few different areas, again, going back to supporting our operations. We're putting a significant amount of that money into our "R" line route. So, similar to the commuter rail, that's an ongoing route that we are using federal dollars to support those services, highest frequency, highest ridership line in the state. We have some money set aside for passenger initiatives that includes marketing both bus but also rail, doing joint initiatives with RIDOT to promote those services and help create a more inter-modal system.

Capital investments, such as transit signal priority. We have began work on an expansion study to look at how to increase transit signal priority around the state, and then the Commuter Resource RI program; which is, again, in addition to being your transit operator, we also manage the state's alternative transportation resources program where we connect people to
carpooling or van pooling, and basically anything
to reduce single occupancy vehicle, the wear and
tear on our roads and bridges. So, that's RIPTA's
program overview.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Thank you, Meredith. Do
you want to bring us to the other half?

MS. BRADY: Absolutely. And, again, I
will to be brief here because I know people are
anxious to get started. The '17 through '25 TIP
represents a real change in the shift and focus,
and in terms of going through the process with the
Transportation Advisory Committee and Statewide
Planning, there's actually been a couple of years
that we've worked on doing an educational program
for the Transportation Advisory Committee, because
we're making a real shift that's not going to
necessarily be palatable to everyone.

And that is looking at the state as a
whole system, as opposed to looking at "What can
we give to individual communities?" Rather, "What
can we do at the state level to get us to a
certain goals?" some of which are prescribed at
the federal level, some of which are state level
goals. Some of which may be prescribed in the
example of the drainage program by the Consent
Decree in the court action. But in the case of most of the projects, we're looking at a data-driven program, and instead of going back and looking at what projects do we have on the books -- when we formulated this particular program, we went back and said, "We have a finite amount of money. Where are we going to make the investments in order to get the best value for our dollar in reaching the goals that we need to meet?"

So that was the philosophy that was behind developing this 10-year plan. One of the other things to keep in mind is, moving forward, we'll be looking to do frequent updates, annual updates, to this 10-year plan, so that every year you're adding a year further out. You're looking at the program of projects and re-evaluating, "Has something changed? Is there something we missed?" as I talked a little bit about before. But some of the major themes for '17 through '25 are investment in bridges.

We have additional -- over the regular amount that we would have invested in bridges, we have an additional 220 million in our 10-year. Much of that is up front. Some of it is in the
'16 Amendment, but much is in '17, '18 and '19 in order to, in the future, invest less in bridges and be able to invest more in other types of transportation options, in roads, in transit -- any transportation alternatives. But I'm going to keep this, as I said, very brief. One of the things to keep in mind, I know Amy mentioned the FAST Act and increases there.

For RIDOT, the increase averages to less than 3 percent a year over the five-year life of the authorization, and that is something that we're very pleased with because in the past -- between 2009 and 2015 pretty much had level funding the entire time, so finally getting an increase on an annual basis instead of positive development. But looking at this program, the biggest changes, again, come from the data-driven approach. So we're looking at the state as a whole.

So, the worst road in one community may not be comparable to the worst road in another community or have the traffic flow. Another thing to keep in mind as we do this is we're looking at a different management approach to the projects as well. So, in the past, we may have only gotten a
smaller percentage of project out. We're looking at what is actually achievable in any given year.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Thanks to each of you. That was very helpful in setting the context. What we will do now is, we will start formally accepting comment. I would like you all to note that we're going to call people in the order in which you registered and you signed up today. First, however, we will -- as is customary, we will call the elected officials forward first. I've been asked to ask you that when you approach the podium, if you could please identify yourself and spell out your name and speak clearly. That would be very helpful for all of the people we have here trying to capture your input.

Also, I'm going to ask that you initially limit your comments to five minutes. Once we make it through the first round, I will touch base with everyone to see if anyone wants to make any additional comments, but we're going to try to use this process to keep us on track. So, with that said, I would first like to call Senator Dennis Algiere from Westerly. Good afternoon, sir.

SENATOR ALGIERE: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee. Thank
you. I'm here today with the town manager of Westerly, Derrik Kennedy; the Town Council President, James Silvestri; Town Council Chris Duhamel; Grant Simmons for the Watch Hill Fire District; Sharon O'Hearn (phonetic), Executive Director of the Washington Conservancy; and Paul LaBlanc, Town Engineer.

Again, my name is Dennis Algiere (A-l-g-i-e-r-e), the State Senator, District 38. I'm here today, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, to specifically discuss the Bay Street Westerly project, which is on the TIP scheduled for 2022 construction. This particular project was listed as a priority with the Town of Westerly as a number one on its TIP recommendation. And, today, I'm respectfully requesting that this committee forward to the Statewide Planning reprioritization of this project.

The project scope is about a quarter mile length of roadway in Watch Hill, which is a seaside village in our community. It's high commercial. It generates a lot of revenue, not only through hotel tax but also food and beverage, and also through the stores that are located in the project limits. Heavy pedestrian traffic,
bicycle traffic and vehicular traffic on the roadways, especially during the summer months. And, again, I cannot overemphasize the fact that this is an economic engine to our community and to our state.

Over the past few years, the Town of Westerly, the fire district and the conservancy, along with private donors, have invested a considerable amount of money in this roadway by burying all the utilities and upgrading the drainage. And they've also purchased decorative lighting. This particular district also is a location where a number of historic locations are present. However, the roadway, sidewalks and curbing are in disrepair, especially after the construction. It was the understanding that we would work hand in hand with the state in putting in a new roadway, sidewalk and curbing.

I'm asking that the committee look favorable on reprioritizing this project. It's very important to our community. It generates a lot of money for our state and our local government. And I just thank you for your time, and I've made it as brief as possible, but thank you very much.
CHAIRMAN RHODES: Thank you, Senator.

Next, I'd like to call Mayor James Diossa from the City of Central Falls. Welcome, Mayor.

MAYOR DIOSSA: Thank you, Chairman and members of the committee, for hearing our comments I bring up. The chief of staff of Pawtucket and also the mayor of Cumberland -- there's two points I would like to discuss on this TIP program. The first being the Central Falls -- or the Pawtucket and Central Falls Commuter Rail Station. The second, which is a major project for three communities, that being Cumberland, Central Falls and Pawtucket. It's the Broad Street Regeneration Initiative.

I think you've heard a lot since the last time we were present about the train station and how an investment in this region will fully help develop both communities who we know need the support. I'm sure that you've also been informed that the TIGER grant has been submitted and we hope to hear back by the end of the summer. The fact that this project is in an urban core with about almost $100,000 residents available, and that's not even counting communities that have signed on, such as Cumberland and Lincoln and
North Providence.

So, again, I want to thank this committee for considering this project on the TIP program, and I assure you that this project is going to do very well, not only in Central Falls and Pawtucket, but the whole northern side of Rhode Island. The second project and the proposed funding plan is the Broad Street Regeneration Initiative. We know that this is a major commercial thruway for three communities, and the investment are sidewalks, roads. As far as the three communities also chipping in to make it look more decorative and more inviting, it's important for us because we know that we have great storefronts, great food, and we have a Blackstone River Valley National Park now that will invite a lot of people into this region.

Having this investment on this Broad Street I'm sure will make it a pleasant visit for not only people in the community but for the state as a whole. So I want to turn it over to Pawtucket and Cumberland who also want to talk about Broad Street as well.

MR. ZELAZO: Thank you. My name is Dylan, like Bob Dylan, and Zelazo (Z-e-l-a-z-o). I'm
Mayor Grebien's chief of staff. He sends his apologies. He had a family commitment, but we're here today to talk, really, about two projects. The first one I want to touch on, the Mayor of Central Falls, Mayor Diossa did a much better job than I will, but the Pawtucket and Central Falls Commuter Rail Station is a critical project, not just to our communities but to the state as a whole, in advancing multi-modal transportation throughout the state, specifically locally.

There's over a million square feet of vacant mill space just next door to the site, instantly becomes prime transit-oriented development space. There's underutilized properties also in the surrounding area. We have a destination brewery going in one block away from the site. Train access will be huge for that business as well. It's right on the outskirts of our downtown.

The Pawtucket Red Sox also have been looking for additional ways to access their stadium. This allows people from multiple ends of the spectrum to access Pawtucket, and then it's a short jaunt from downtown to McCoy Stadium. So, a really critical project. I won't bore you with
the rest of the details. I do also want to thank everyone here for your leadership on this initiative and all of the projects. I know the roads and the bridges are a little bit more boring than train stations and the like, but it's all very important, and we appreciate it.

The other piece that we're here to talk about today is the Broad Street project. This links three communities that are standing here today in solidarity: Cumberland, Central Falls and Pawtucket. This is a key business corridor. There's also a lot of residential density along the corridor. That connectivity, that access, is a key corridor in our downtown from those communities. It's really a critical project to link the communities together and just create another ease of access for our residents as well as our visitors. So, we thank you very much for your consideration.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Thank you, Mr. Director. Next, we have Mayor Murray.

MAYOR MURRAY: Good afternoon and thank you for the afternoon. Do you want me to spell Mayor Diossa name? He forgot?

THE REPORTER: No, thank you.
MAYOR MURRAY. I just want to -- my name is Bill Murray (M-u-r-r-a-y). As I said, I'm -- actually, I don't know whether it's due anymore. I'm the mayor for now a year-and-a-half, for Cumberland. So, I'm pretty new to the situation. One of the most interesting and exciting things that's happening that I've seen is this combination of Pawtucket, Central Falls and Cumberland bringing together this revitalization of the Broad Street area. From the records, they tried it once before a few years back. It got shelved, and it was a shame because for all three communities, this means so much to our economy for this thing to go forward.

So we totally endorse it as the three mayors endorsing this because it will do wonders for the three communities that are involved. However, on the Cumberland side, I want to bring to the attention of the committee that where everything is good, and there's money going to come in, we've been fighting for a drainage correction on Broad Street. To me, if you're going to put money towards this thing, fix the roadways, and don't take care of the drainage, you're wasting a lot of money.
And I don't want to sit here and say that -- I want to sit here and say that it wasn't done correctly. So I'd like to bring that to your attention. We've put it in. Every time we do, we talked to the DOT director. We have a safety problem with the school there. They want to come in and fix the roadway, yet they don't want to do it until the drainage is fixed. So I'd like to just bring that to your attention, and if we could all get everything together, I think it will become an excellent program to get done. So, I thank you for considering.

If I could take the opportunity, we have one more project that I'm very concerned about, and it was eliminated, and I am going to call on my public works director and engineer, Bob Anderson, and it's Marshall Avenue. We've been threatened with a suit on that roadway. We've talked to the DOT about it. We've sent them pictures about the problems. It seems to be falling on deaf ears, and I hope that we can do something to, again, bring that to the attention that it has to be worked on. So, if you don't mind, I'd like to have my public works director fill you in on it, if that's okay.
CHAIRMAN RHODES: Yes, Mayor.

MR. ANDERSON: Good afternoon, everyone.

Again, my name is Bob Anderson. I'm the public works director in the Town of Cumberland. During the TIP process and the submission that was prepared for January 8th, of all the projects that we list and prioritize in the new projects, there was only one that was a new project entirely. It's called the Marshall Avenue Drainage Improvement. We developed that as a result of subsurface drainage conditions that have been plaguing that road for many, many years.

There may be some uninvestigated subsurface conditions taking place, but one of the ones that we think is contributory to it is -- I'm not sure, but it has about 1,000 feet of older corrugated metal pipe that serves that roadway from Garden Street down to Mendon Road. As a result of a recent utility work, namely water main excavations, we were able to take a look at the deterioration of that pipe and the leaking of the water that was leaking out of it. So, that's obviously contributory to that condition.

And as a result of that, I created this sheet. It definitely -- it's definitely in need
of rehabilitation. Again, that's about 1,000 linear feet of the older corrugated metal pipe drainage piping. For those of you not familiar with Cumberland, this is a road -- a principal primary. It's a state road, by the way, obviously, connecting Mendon Road, Route 122 and High Street, 114. At the very -- the drainage of this road ends at Mendon Road. That is actually tied into the state drainage system that serves Mendon Road and the old Mendon Road that's part of that intersection there.

There are structures that are there that we believe are -- maybe not necessarily in need of replacement but investigation and maintenance because there is surcharging (sic) that takes place at those structures during very, very heavy storm events, leading to inundation and some flooding of private property at that corner. That was an ancillary comment I added as part of the need for this project. But, again, the principal need was the replacement of that drainage along that roadway. So, thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. The next individual I would like to call is Representative Carol Hagan-McEntee from Narragansett. Representative?
REPRESENTATIVE HAGAN-McENTEE: Mr. Chairman, I believe Representative Tobon wants to speak on the issue that you just had before you. So, I don't mind --

CHAIRMAN RHODES: If you're fine with that. He was up next, but by all means.

REPRESENTATIVE HAGAN-McENTEE: I just want to reserve my spot next, though.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Not a problem.

REPRESENTATIVE TOBON: Thank you so much. See, chivalry does exist. So, my name is Carlos Tobon. I'm a state representative, District 58, in Pawtucket. My last name is Tobon (T-o-b-o-n). I'm here to -- I'll be one more to talk about the importance of the real project in Pawtucket. As you guys know, or many of you know, it's been talked about for 20 years. For the last 14 years, they've put an emphasis on it, and just hundreds of thousands of dollars have been spent on that, and talking about feasibility studies of what it could do for that area. But I'm here to talk about what it could do for the state level.

Pawtucket is the gateway to Rhode Island, coming from the north. As you guys see -- and you guys were instrumental in working with us and
making the beautiful bridge that we have today -- 
and we also want to put up a great stop that could 
maybe be a station one day. As Mayor Diossa and 
Dylan Zelazo explained, there’s two million square 
feet of vacant mill space in that area that at one 
point was a pillar to the industrial revolution. 
And, today, we could re-purpose it for commercial 
business space, but more importantly, our governor 
is being very aggressive, going around the 
country, trying to get business into Rhode Island, 
and going after a company like G.E. and PayPal. 

We might not get their CEO or their top 
administrative jobs, but if we get this spillage, 
we need to house them somewhere. Pawtucket might 
be the prime spot. We also -- if this train 
occurs, then there's also the opportunity where 
Worcester is going to put a private line right 
into Pawtucket, and it would make it a hub. 
Again, additional people coming in, into our city. 
Slater Mill recently became a national park. We 
have four craft brewers, and just like money 
attracts money, breweries might attract more 
breweries. We'll continue to expand on that area. 

Central Falls has an amazing cuisine that 
people are going to want to go and have a bite,
and we are making -- you know, our state has invested a lot of money -- the Department of Health with exploring built environments and all that. We're well on our way to be able to address that as well in that general area. So, the return on investment for our state would be huge. It's nominal what we're asking for, and this is something that you invest now, but it's going to bring dividends in for generation.

We luckily kept the Paw Sox in place, and we could only think the sky is the limit as we continue to invest in that area. And, lastly, it's an area that's been heavily depend on our city -- I mean, on our state and our federal government, but it's populated by individuals who have a lot of pride and who wish to contribute at some point. So, if we lift the tide -- if you guys help us lift the tide, like I said, it's going to be a great return on investment. Thank you so much.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Thank you for taking the time to join us Representative Tobon.

REPRESENTATIVE TOBON: Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE HAGAN-McENTEE: Hi, I'm Representative Carol Hagan-McEntee from District
33. That's Narragansett and South Kingstown. I'd like to also bring up with me my town planner from Narragansett, Mike DeLuca and Terry Duffy from the Bonnet Shores Fire District and the Chairman of the Land Trust. So what you have already seen from us before is an application for a $15 million causeway rehabilitation project in Bonnet Shores that was going to be a bridge. Now we understand that that was financially prohibitive, and we didn't make the TIP list on the Bonnet Point Road Project.

So what we're coming forward with today is a Plan B. It's not a permanent fix, which is what we were looking at in the prior application, but we have a new application -- an amended application, I should say, for the Bonnet Point Road Causeway Rehabilitation. Now, this is substantially less. The amount would be $788,700, which is a far cry from the 15 million of the first project. This would include -- I don't know how familiar anybody is with the Bonnet Shores Causeway. It's a seriously dilapidated road. It is waterlogged. It services approximately 600 of the 900 plus households in Bonnet Shores.

It also -- in addition to that, there's
930 bathhouses and cabanas at Bonnet Shores Beach Club, which brings in two to 3,000 people a day to Bonnet Shores beach. Now, the only access to that beach club is that road. The roads in Bonnet Shores are not made to have people going around through the neighborhood. We seriously need some help with this. If you're familiar with the road, there's a pond on either side, and there's culverts that run between them, and there's an opening to the beach that sometimes runs through and sometimes does not, but the water level is very high.

In reality, to do this project, all the resurfacing we're talking about and all the drainage issues that we're talking about, we really need to dredge the Wesquage Pond. And that, in addition to this, would cost somewhere in the area of 200,000. So that is included in the project. I have been instrumental in helping Bonnet Shores fire district get a permit that comes from -- with CRMC that starts from the road and goes into the pond 300 feet. Once a year, they're allowed to dredge that, and then they have a maintenance dredging program that's ongoing constantly.
As the high tide comes in -- and these
guys can tell you way more than I can; they know
the technical aspects. As the tide comes in, it
washes in the sand, and the culverts get stuffed
up, and then the water level rises, and then the
causeway floods, and nobody can get through. We
have -- the fire chief is on board. He has
explained to myself and to the town council in
Narragansett that to go around and bypass the
causeway is anywhere from five to seven minutes
longer to get to somebody at the other end of
Bonnet Shores.

This is also a -- this is a section of
road which is a federal aid highway. So this is
an evacuation route. We just can't leave it like
this anymore. It closes off every winter. It
freezes over. It's in my district. Everybody
wants it fixed, and I am pleading with you to
reconsider and look at our new plan. And, with
that, I'd like to have Mike DeLuca come forward,
and he can give you all the details.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE HAGAN-McENTEE: Thank you.

And thank you members of the board and Mr.
Chairman for having me today.
MR. DeLUCA: My name is Michael DeLuca (D-e-L-u-c-a). I'm the planning director in Narragansett. I don't know that I can add much more. Our Representative McEntee covered most of it. I am here representing the town manager, Jeffrey Ceasrine and the town council and the taxpayers of the Town of Narragansett. I have a letter from Manager Ceasrine and a copy of -- actually, three copies of the amended application that representative McEntee has mentioned. I'm wondering if I could bring them forward and hand them off to you.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Yes, sir.

MR. DeLUCA: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Thank you, Mike.

MR. DeLUCA: That application -- in the letter, I should state that Mr. Ceasrine wants to thank the committee, the state TIP committee for allowing several of our applications -- our requests to be placed on the TIP this year. I want to say that in years past, we have felt that the southern half of the state maybe didn't get as much attention as it could have. We thought that this year's selection was much more beneficial, and we thank you for that.
With that said, though, the manager did want to make note that there were a couple of omissions that we were somewhat dismayed about, and we wanted to just make a short play to ask you to reconsider. The first one was, in fact, the Bonnet Point Road Causeway, and for all the reasons Representative McEntee mentioned, which I will not reiterate we feel as though that the reduced scope of the project is defendable, and it will also provided us a 10 to 20-year window for providing adequate and safe travel through to the Bonnet Shores Beach Club to the outer part of Bonnet Point as an alternative to the elevated more ambitious crossing that we had suggested before.

The larger project would have had greater environmental benefits as well as pedestrian bicyclists amenities and would have accounted for sea level rise, which this particular project cannot do. The other projects that I wanted to make a brief note of was -- we had two beautification projects submitted, Ocean Road Phase I and Phase II. They are relatively low-cost projects.

In Narragansett, as you know, we are
somewhat of an active tourist town for about
twelve weeks a year or more, and the area that
would have been improved with that project would
have been the walkways, the sidewalks, and the
amenities along the sidewalks on Ocean Road in the
vicinity of the seawall, the historic towers and
the Narragansett Town Beach. We would ask that
you give some consideration to looking back at
those beautification projects to potentially
reinsert them into the TIP.

Again, they're fairly low cost. We think
it's high bang for the buck. We see hundreds of
thousands of tourist visitors a year, and to have
improved sidewalks, improved lighting, site
amenities, such as benches and handicap accessible
curb ramps at intersections, would be very
helpful. So, I thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Thank you, Mr. DeLuca.

MR. DUFFY: Good afternoon, everyone. I'm
Terry Duffy. I'm the chairman and trustee of the
Bonnet Shores Land Trust. We are the direct
abutter to the Bonnet Shore Road, and we are the
principal owner of public land within the
community of Bonnet Shores. My purpose here today
is to reinforce the comments of Representative
McEntee and Mr. DeLuca. We've worked long and hard on this project, the first iteration, and, again today, with one that removes some obstacles that we had had (past tense) in the community concerning the reconstruction on a lesser level of this causeway.

The town has gone through great lengths to develop a more stable construction plan, one which, again, gives us a window of 15 to 20 years. That does not, in the long-term, in any way ameliorate the hazards that the residents of Bonnet Shores face twelve months of the year. Those are vehicular danger, particularly in the summer months when the causeway is an absolute free-for-all. It's 20 feet wide. There is no shoulder and pedestrians crossing it, and traffic going in both directions can take your breath away. It represents a serious hazard, which has been acknowledged by all the public safety officers of the Town of Narragansett.

Critical to any consideration of this program is the portion of it that suggests and incorporates dredging into this project. Without it, the overtaxed and overloaded Wesquage Watershed will continue to flood. That's a given.
We sometime are isolated. There are only two roads that go in and out of Bonnet Shores, both of which are subject to flooding with any sort of major rainfall. I urge your consideration of the construction of the causeway. It will give us a window. I'll finish with a question, and it might set a tone for the future: Will there be a TIP class that we may introduce next year, Mr. Chairman? Is that an ongoing --

CHAIRMAN RHODES: I'll follow up with you after the remainder of the hearing and try and get you an answer to that question.

MR. DUFFY: Excellent. Thank you so much.

REPRESENTATIVE HAGAN-McENTEE: Could I just say one other thing?

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Of course,

Representative.

REPRESENTATIVE HAGAN-McENTEE: Thank you. Also involved in this is the Bonnet Shores Beach Club is in the process of planning to put a sewer line down this causeway. So the timing is perfect. Their working with the Bonnet Shores fire district to come up with an agreement. If all -- I'm very optimistic that this will happen. I know that -- you know, DEM and all the agencies
would like to see this barrier beach be connected
to a sewer as opposed to having holding tanks
which is what they have there now, and they pump
every single day. So this is a project that needs
real consideration, and I certainly appreciate
your time.

The other thing I'd like to mention is I
know you did put the Narragansett bike path, the
end of the bike path, on the TIP, and I appreciate
that. And anything you could do for that, because
everybody wants that, too. So, thank you very
much for your time, and good day.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Thank you,
Representative. Okay, the next speaker I would
like to call is Mr. Derrik Kennedy, Town Manager
for Westerly, Rhode Island. Welcome, Mr. Kennedy.

MR. KENNEDY: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner,
and the panel. I'm here to talk about the Bay
Street project in Westerly or the Watch Hill
section of Westerly, the road sidewalk and curbing
project. I'd just like to reiterate that this was
the first priority on our application this year,
and this project was already approved on a prior
TIP application, the last TIP. The project is
already underway based on prior approval of funds
from the state and was actually set for completion this year based on the last TIP.

This area is a major commercial area for the town, especially during the summer months, but is a major thoroughfare for the section of that town, and further deterioration could be restrictive and detrimental. It's vital to complete this project to reduce the impact on the businesses in that area and the economic growth that's currently happening. And more, especially, this project piggybacks on a town and conservancy backed project that is also underway that our state senator talked about earlier.

Holding back on this project has an effect on related projects as well, further disrupting this important commercial area. Understanding, based on prior comments, especially in your presentations earlier, that this state is looking to be economical in this new TIP. Finishing this project, which is already been underway based on a prior TIP, is a quick win for the state and would be a quick win for the TIP as a whole. So I just ask that you please consider moving this project up so that we can finish this project in time, in the time projected by the state and from the town
to its residents and its businesses. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Thank you for taking the time to come and share with us today. Next, I would like to call Mr. Richard Kirby, City Manager for the City of East Providence.

MR. KIRBY: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for having me here today. My name is Richard Kirby. I'm the city manager for the City of East Providence. Today, I have with me Stephen Coutu, who is our public works director, as well as Mr. James Moran, who is our economic developer coordinator. We're here to speak to you about the Route 114 Pawtucket Avenue sidewalk improvement project that was part of the TIP that was applied for in the year 2011.

I would ask that while I make my remarks to you, that I submit to you some photographs that I think are very important, and I'd ask that they be made part of the record. I think we made enough copies for you to have. As you may be aware, Route 114, Pawtucket Avenue, in the City of East Providence, which is our state's fifth largest community is a heavily traveled road, an artery, over 20,000 cars per day.
It is absolutely a dangerous, dangerous condition that exists there. In fact, I would have had my chief of police here today to support this request for you to reconsider; however, he was a little busy getting ready for Vice President Biden, who's visiting East Providence tomorrow. But this project has been on the TIP in 2011 and has now been relegated to your year 2022 fiscal year. And, quite frankly, the conditions of these sidewalks that exist on Pawtucket Avenue are -- they present a daily hazard.

Since 2011, the school department expanded the minimum distance for students to walk to the local schools off of Pawtucket, and there are major concerns as to public safety for those issues. Also, Pawtucket Avenue serves as an access point to an area that we in the City of East Providence take great pride in called the "Waterfront District," which the legislature created some over 10 or 12 years ago. Presently, we anticipate 1,000 residential units will be built out within the next two to three years, along with an 80,000 square foot medical facility employing over 250 people.

This is -- it's imperative that the board
take into consideration that this has been around since the year 2011. These sidewalks are in a very difficult condition right now. We understand that you're in a difficult position in your decision. We'd ask you to reconsider and take a look at that project. We believe that the cost benefit analysis, I think back in 2011, was about -- the cost is around $2.1 million. Obviously, it would be greater now, but as each year goes by, these sidewalks are just deteriorating. There's no ADA accessibility and disability access.

Also, the second issue that I would like to bring to your attention is the I-195 Taunton Avenue Warren Interchange Study Project that is before you and was removed. The project itself is also part of an earmark that was federal government for $4 million in improvements. We would ask that you consider putting that study back in. It's imperative that this access point and the removal of a bridge, the Potter Street Bridge.

We're trying to work with a private public partnership to help out. We met with the DOT on that, but we think that this study obviously is important because the Waterfront District is in
the area of East Providence that will expand in
growth and economic development beyond anything
that the city has ever seen, and, in fact, it's
multiple times larger than the I-195 project or
the land downtown. We're here to answer any of
your questions, and we just ask that the
photographs be made part of the record. We
respect your decision. We'll look forward to
hearing from you.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Thank you, sir. We'll
be sure to get the photographs into the hands of
the Transportation Advisory Committee and the
State Planning Council.

MR. KIRBY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Thank you for your time.

Next, I'd like to call Lisa Nolan. Welcome.

MS. NOLAN: Thank you, Chairman Rhodes and
Committee Members. I'm Lisa Nolan (N-o-l-a-n),
the Executive Director of the Southeast Lighthouse
Foundation. I just have some very brief prepared
remarks. My speaking today on behalf of the Block
Island Southeast Lighthouse Foundation in support
of the obligation of funding for the National
Historic Landmark Southeast Lighthouse Museum
Rehabilitation Project in fiscal year 2016 as
provided for by Amendment 7 to the 2013–'16 State Transportation Improvement Program.

As requested by the Rhode Island Department of Transportation, the realignment of priorities and funding in this amendment will ensure that shovel-ready projects like the Southeast Lighthouse Rehabilitation will proceed in a timely and cost-effective manner. And we thank the Transportation Advisory Subcommittee members for a project's inclusion into Amendment 7 and strongly urge the Transportation Advisory Committee to recommend its adoption to the Rhode Island Statewide Planning Council at its meeting in June. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Thank you. Next, I'd like to call Mr. Ron Wolanski on behalf of the Town of Middletown. Good afternoon.

MR. WOLANSKI: Thank you. Good afternoon. Ron Wolanski (W-o-l-a-n-s-k-i), Town Planner for the Town of Middletown. So I'm here on behalf of the town administrator, Shawn Brown, as well as the town council. There's a letter submitted, which I believe you have, so I'll be very brief and just reiterate some of the points in that letter. The town would first like to express its
appreciation to the TAC and the planning council for the inclusion of some of the high priority projects submitted by the town in the draft TIP, including some important intersection improvements, as well as the sidewalk project. So we appreciate that.

There are two projects, however, that are also high priorities that the town is disappointed that did not get included in the draft TIP. The town council has passed a resolution requesting that these two projects be given additional consideration, and I believe you have a copy of that resolution as well.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Yes.

MR. WOLANSKI: Both projects are on Aquidneck Avenue, which is Route 138A in Middletown. If you're familiar, it's a very heavily traveled route, one of the important entryways into Newport, traveling through Middletown. There are two segments involved on that roadway. The first segment, and really the town's top priority project, is the northern end of Aquidneck Avenue, which is connecting from East Main Road to Green End Avenue. This project has been submitted for at least the last two TIP
rounds as a high priority project.

I understand that it is included in the
draft TIP as a resurfacing project. It was in the
current -- the 2016 TIP for study and development
but now has been shifted into pavement management.
Unfortunately, that is not going to solve the
problem of that roadway. As I said, the roadway
is very heavily traveled. There are no sidewalks.
It's an important business district in town.
There are fifty or more small businesses along
Aquidneck Avenue, residential communities, and
also, and perhaps most importantly in terms of
safety is the Gaudet Middle School is also
accessed on that stretch of Aquidneck Avenue.

Without sidewalks, it's a dangerous
situation. We have children and others walking
along the sides of the road to get to various
locations. So, a second point related to that
segment of roadway is stormwater drainage.
Currently, there is very limited formal drainage
control on that segment of roadway. It's
basically ditches along either side of the roadway
for that one-mile stretch. That roadway is within
the watershed of the Bailey's Brooke, which is
part of the Newport Water supply watershed.
So this project, should it be added to the TIP, would allow for improved drainage control and treatment. So that's sort of the second component of the project in addition to safety -- pedestrian safety, traffic safety, bicycle safety. It's also a water quality issue where that water, that drainage, is getting into the Bailey's Brook without any treatment currently. So that's really the town's top priority project.

The second segment of Aquidneck Avenue is down by the beach. It's what we call our Atlantic Beach District area, and that area is, thankfully, one of the areas that's included in the proposed TIP. It's one of the town's high priority areas for intersection improvements, and, again, we're thankful that those intersections are included. However, similar to the other segment of Aquidneck Avenue, sidewalks are -- while they do exist, they are not in good condition. It's an important tourist area. Again, if you're familiar with the area, it's the location of the Atlantic Beach Club, or the former Atlantic Beach Club. There are several tourist-type businesses in that area; hotels, restaurants and retail shops.

So, again, that project is identified in
the out years for resurfacing; however, we respectfully request that that project be included in the draft TIP as a reconstruction project to allow for those improvements to the sidewalks and also drainage improvements. So, again, thank you, on behalf of the Town of Middletown. Thank you for your time, and we appreciate your reconsideration.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Thank you, Mr. Wolanski.

Next, I'd like to call Mr. Tom Grieb. Good afternoon, sir.

MR. GRIEB: Good afternoon. My name is Tom Grieb (G-r-i-e-b). Thank you for giving me the time. I'm humbled to talk after all the illustrious elected officials. In October of 2015, VHB Engineering completed a design study review for a bike path through Portsmouth. It's a needed bike path because there is no safe way to get from the north end of the island down to Newport. The town council subsequently approved that route. It is in the 2017 to '25 TIP for 2024 construction. However, there are funds in the present 2013 to '16 TIP for funding reserved for bike path projects coming from study and design.

There was $2,500,000 in '15 and another $5
million this year. As far as I can find out, that money has never been used. As far as I can find out, this bike path is the only one coming from design -- a design study that is ready for construction having been approved by the town council of that particular municipality. I don't know how to get this funded quicker than 2024, and I'm sort of asking the right way to do it, whether it should be in the amendment that you're looking at right now in using the monies that's there, or a separate method of doing it, but I certainly would like to be able to use that path sometime in my lifetime.

So that's what I'm asking. The money does seem to be there, from all the documents that are available, and I'd like to find out how to get that funded in the money that is there rather than have that money evaporate and not be used. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Thank you, sir. If you'd like to leave your phone number with the staff at the welcome table, and we'll try and follow up and answer some of those questions for you. Thank you very much.

MR. GRIEB: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN RHODES: Next, I'd like to call Mr. Andrew Pierson. Welcome.

MR. PIERSON: Good afternoon. Thanks for having me. My name is Andrew Pierson (P-i-e-r-s-o-n). I'm the assistant director of real estate development at Pawtucket/Central Falls Development with the local CDC Community Development Corporation Housing Developer in Pawtucket and Central Falls, also representing the business community of Pawtucket, Central Falls and Cumberland, the Blackstone Valley Tourism Council, and several local businesses along Broad Street.

Echoing the three mayors' comments earlier, we're here to support the Broad Street Regeneration Plan. I think it's ID 9007, 1307 and 1317. The business community has prepared a letter of support. With your permission, I'd like to distribute, if that's okay.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: By all means.

MR. PIERSON: I'm just going to briefly read a couple of comments at the end. "We, the undersigned, support the $11.45 million request in the Transportation Improvement Program for the Broad Street Regeneration Program to re-pave, re-drain and re-design to a higher standard..."
important corridor.

This community and regional based regeneration effort impacts the community, social and economic development of the cities of Pawtucket and Central Falls and the town of Cumberland. Broad Street, the three-mile road from Main Street in Pawtucket to Mendon Road in Cumberland has important small businesses and culturally ethnic implications that will have a positive benefit on the municipalities and the region, now America's 402nd National Historical Park, recognized for being the birthplace of America's Industrial Revolution.

The first Broad Street Regeneration Plan (sic) began in 2009. It saw a successful effort in banding together small businesses, cultural organizations and the creation of new businesses through this unique collaboration.

Now, the plans by Pawtucket and Central Falls underway for a proposed commuter rail/hub, along with using the Broad Street corridor as a major access point to social, cultural and visitor destinations, and inter-modal connections to the Blackstone River Bikeway in Cumberland; and in the Blackstone River Valley itself, this project is
vital for the long-range business sustainability of regional development.

We respectfully urge approval of this funding, as it is a vital, long-term investment in the future of our communities and its residents. It's signed by the Northern Rhode Island Chamber of Commerce and the Blackstone Valley Tourism Council, Pawtucket/Central Falls Development, the Pawtucket Foundation, Navigant Credit Union, Tai-O Corporation, Colonial Bakery, Lleras Grille, Subway Central Falls, Garcia Insurance, La Casona Restaurant and Le Femme Salon.

As you can see, there's a strong support in Pawtucket, Central Falls and Cumberland for this important corridor, and this serves as one of our main streets, one of our key business routes. These three cities, as the mayor has mentioned, has started this regeneration after back in 2009. It's got a lot of strong, strong support at the local/resident and community level. We think that, with some smart investments in the infrastructure, this street can really better serve its businesses, its residents and its visitors.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Thank you, sir.
MR. PIERSON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Next, I'd like to call Mr. Joseph Duarte.

MR. DUARTE: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee. My name is Joseph Duarte (D-u-a-r-t-e). I'm the public works director with the Town of East Greenwich, and today I'm here with regard to the Main Street project. Main Street is very much one of our economic engines of our community, and we feel -- right now, Main Street is on a 2017 TIP program. We feel that Main Street is, once again, like I said, an economic engine of our community.

It has great local benefits, the economy as well as the state. It is either nearing its life or has exceeded its life; the sidewalks are in substantial deterioration, as well as the street. It will need re-paving. It will need handicap improvements, ramp improvements, as well as sidewalk rehabilitation. This project was earmarked for $550,000 on the program, and there was going to be undertaken by the Town of East Greenwich staff the assistance from the Rhode Island DOT, and they were going to reimburse the community $450,000 for this project.
We feel that $450,000 is nowhere near what is going to be required to do what I mentioned: Sidewalk rehabilitation as well as the handicap ramps and the paving. We feel that the handicap ramps as well as the paving is closer to 800 to $1 million, and the rest of the repairs that need to be done on the sidewalks would be in excess of one and a half million dollars. Main Street is very important to the community. It's mixed-use with residential, commercial and a wide array of commercial from retail.

So, in the recent years, we've had an increase of many restaurants. It's become a destination for many people in the state to visit our restaurants. It's very popular. We do quite a few activities, like Main Street Stroll on Main Street, that people have an opportunity to visit the restaurants. The merchants have an opportunity to have samples for the residents and so forth. So, with an increase of the pedestrian use, we feel that safety is a great concern to the town, and if these measures aren't -- improvements aren't made, we feel that down the road it will become a deterrent for our economic viability. So, we're respectfully requesting that greater
funding be provided to the project.

Also, as we have -- as my staff has gotten into the project and looked at, you know, the engineering or requirement, we feel that it's far beyond just the handicap ramps alone. They will consume all our time, and we will not be able to do that solely with the staff level that we have and the time we need to devote to this project.

So, we would either have to seek out outside resources from consultants, or better yet, we would ask that this project be handed over to the RIDOT and receive a high priority so that it can be done in the very near future.

We believe it fits very much in the near goals that the council has, such as paving, safety concerns and economic benefits, and we feel that this would fit very much in that category, and it could be done in a very near future with reasonable engineering. It could be a shovel-ready project in the very, very near future. So, we respectfully request once again, if you could add an increased of funding towards this project, and it could receive high prior so that the RIDOT could undertake this project in the very near future. Thank you very much.
CHAIRMAN RHODES: Thank you, sir. Next, I'd like to call Alicia Leher (phonetic). Again, that name is Alicia Leher. Okay. Seeing no one, I'll call this one again before we wrap up. Next, I'd like to call Mr. Michael Asciola, and, hopefully, I pronounced that properly.

MR. ASCIOLA: Not really.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: My apologies, sir. Help me out.

MR. ASCIOLA: Michael Asciola with the Town of Portsmouth, assistant planner. I'm here today on behalf of the Town of Portsmouth and the town council to comment on two items in particular of concern. The first is, we'd like to align the two construction projects in the same area, the resurfacing of East Main Road, which is from Turnpike Ave. to Boyd's Lane, scheduled for '17 and '18, and the ADA compliance sidewalk project for that same area, which was on the previous TIP as a high priority but is scheduled for 2021 completion.

We feel that it would be more efficient if they were combined at the same time period, limit disruption, and impact on -- potentially negative impact on the previous resurfacing when the new
sidewalks were constructed. The second area is, we'd like to see the East Main/West Main Road Resurfacing Projects prioritized at a higher construction date. It's a unique situation. It goes to roadways in the major thoroughfare and vital to the economic development for the community and Aquidneck Island as a whole. They're heavily traveled and also support the tourism industry. That's all I have.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Thank you very much. Okay, next, we have Patricia Raff (phonetic).

MR. SCHILLER: She just left, sorry.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Do you know if she's coming back, Barry?

MR. SCHILLER: Possibly this evening.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Fair enough. Next, I'll call Alex Crow-Greib (phonetic). It looks like Alex has left as well. Maybe we'll see him tonight. That brings us to you, Mr. Schiller.

MR. SCHILLER: Because I'm concerned about being interrupted, I'll wait 'til everybody speaks, and then could I speak without worrying about interruption?

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Would you like to take the first five minutes, and then we can go from
there?

MR. SCHILLER: I'd rather not be worried about interruption.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: All right. In that case, we will next call Mr. Peter McClure.

MR. McCLURE: Peter McClure (M-c-C-l-u-r-e). I am with the planning and zoning committee of the Jewelry District Association here in Providence, and particularly interested in the City Walk Project, which is your 5183, and we want to thank you for having it at a high priority and encourage that it not be let out of sight because we do want to press for it. Separately, I want to join in behalf, not on behalf, in behalf of Dan Baudouin, Executive Director of the Providence Foundation and a close friend, Barnaby Evans of the WaterFire, encouraging you to consider or actually reconsider the dredging of the Providence River up through the WaterFire area and into the downtown where it ends in the circle.

This project, while it was dismissed because it doesn't appear to have a public safety issue, it does have such an importance to the city and to the state and the hundreds of thousands of
people it attracts both from here and abroad, as well as those of us who are residents of Providence. I think we all know the attraction and phenomena of the WaterFire, but now we are to a point where the new pedestrian bridge crossing the Providence River in the downtown area or the I-195 parcels area, we're looking at mud. You look over at the bridge, and you look at mud.

In fact, we joke we could set up a card table in the river at low tides and have a meal. So, for this reason, we are encouraging you to consider -- actually, it's to reconsider the importance of dredging of the river. I do not know your intricacies of funding and budgets where it would fit in, but darn it, we do need the river dredged again. It's a fact of life. So for both, for City Walk, which we thank you for very much and encourage you to reconsider the dredging of the river up through the city. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Thank you, sir. Next, I'd like to call Mr. Lewis Dana.

MR. DANA: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman. My name is Lewis Dana (L-e-w-i-s) (D-a-n-a). I represent a condominium association in the Jewelry District, and, in fact, my colleague, Mr. McClure
is another resident, and he has said many of the
things I was going to say about the WaterFire, but
I really want to say sincere thanks for
recognizing the value of the City Walk idea
because it really -- if you talk about the bike
paths, East Bay Bike Path is a wonderful thing.
If you've ever tried to ride a bicycle from Fox
Point to Roger Williams Park, it's pretty exciting
because there's no safe way to do it, and,
similar, walking is entertaining, to say the
least.

But, more important, far more important,
is the City Walk is going to unite eight
neighborhoods across the city with designated
bikeway with links to other attractions on the
way, and the funding will allow us to do the
signage and possible park benches or mini parks
and things like this. So, it's really wonderful,
and thank you very much. On the subject of
WaterFire, they're going to have to put wheels on
the boats any day now. So, reconsideration of
dredging the river would really be a great thing.
Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Thank you, sir. Okay,
next, I'd like to call Dorald Besley.
MR. BESLEY: I apologize for my appearance, but I'm from South County, so maybe that explains it.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: I wish I had my tee-shirt on as well.

MR. BESLEY: I live in South Kingstown, and since 2001, I've been a member of the Route 138 Reconstruction Committee. In January, Mr. Alvedi (phonetic) came down to South Kingstown when they printed the regional comments about the regional aspects of the roadworks funding to explain it to the town residents and our town council. One of the statements he made was that he thought that the Route 138 project was over designed.

I took that to mean that it was -- that the DOT lost control of it, there was too many details and whatever. So, I'm here to take umbrage with that comment. I think that is absolutely incorrect. This project runs through the heart of two of South Kingstown's eleven or twelve villages that make up the town. So, West Kingstown and Kingston. And when it goes through Kingston, it's actually the national historic district of Kingstown.
So our committee over the 15 years we've been working on this project now have done our due diligence. I can absolutely say that because I'm the last of the Mohicans from the original groups. Four of our members are unfortunately no longer with us, but it's taken so long. We've done our due diligence to make sure that this project -- and what we were asking the DOT to do was the correct stuff, where the roundabouts were going to be sited, some of the details, the traffic volumes -- the traffic volume from the road traffic studies that we were shown early in the project are about 25,000 cars a day right in the center of the village where all those roads, like South Road, North Road, 108, 138 where they all intersect with the university that, in fact, is actually about a quarter of the daily traffic that's been the most heavily portions of the 6/10 connector, which I've noticed is getting somewhere around the $400 million mark for improvements.

In 2005, Senator Chafee was able to get a $15 million earmark for that project. The last time we inquired about it I think was when Mr. Smith, Bob Smith, was still our coordinator before he became the chief of engineering. We asked for
an accounting of where we were with the money, and
I think, if I remember correctly, he said we had
about -- about 11.15 million was left in the
budget.

Now, when I look at the amounts of money
that are now projected to be that are going to be
spent for the 138 project, it's now divided into
two parts, Route 2 to Fair Grounds Road, and then
we've got the railroad bridge, and that's there in
the middle that you guys, I think, are starting to
work on next year; and then, after that, from the
other side of the railroad bridge to 108 and
Kingston. Now, there are $7 million shown in the
latest version of the Rhode Works thing for the
first portion, which just goes from Route 2 to
Fair Grounds Road. There's actually just a
straight flat road, very little drainage issues.
There's one bridge to go across.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Excuse me, I'm going to
give you one more minute, and then you will have
an opportunity to finish up afterwards. I'm
trying to respect everyone's time.

MR. PIERSON: Fine. And for the other
portion from Railroad Avenue to 108, we have $9.5
million. $9.5 million, I don't think is going to
be enough, but I'll come back and pick it up from there.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Thank you for that, sir. It should not be long. I only have a few other speakers. Next, is Mr. William Lynn. Welcome, Mr. Lynn.

MR. LYNN: Thank you. It's William Lynn (L-y-n-n). I'm the executive director of the Herreshoff Marine Museum, and we have -- I'm here to talk about the Herreshoff Marine Museum Rehabilitation Project. This project is focused on the General Ambrose Burnside Building at 22-26 Burnside Street in Bristol. It's a building with a fairly rich history between 1858 and 1870. It served as the headquarters for the Burnside Rifle Company, which later became the Bristol Firearms Company. They were the manufacturers of the Burnside Carbine which saw widespread use during the Civil War.

In the late 1800s the building was expanded, and it became the machine shop for the Herreshoff Manufacturing Company, which is arguably the cradle of Rhode Island's vibrant marine technology industry. It's currently the largest building on the Herreshoff Marine Museum
Campus which straddles straight Route 114 halfway between Providence and Newport, and the building is the focus of a planned explanation of the museum's exhibit space to accommodate our growing collection including our newly completed one-sixth scale model of the 1903 America's Cup defender Reliance, which was arguably the greatest boat built in Rhode Island.

Our project was included in the TIP; however, funding was pushed out to 2025, and there are just five key points that I'd like to make. One is that, based on the project agreement between the museum and RIDOT dated June 6, 2013, this project was funded by transportation enhancement funding from the U.S. Department of Transportation administered by the FHWA. The total funding is 1.5 million of which 1.2 million is federally funded, and 300,000 state funded. While the federal funding is obviously subject to obligational authority limitations, the sum of money that was pushed out to 2025 was 815,000, which, obviously, is the lion's share of the budget, and we're unclear as to exactly how it was 815,000 that was re-prioritized versus 300.

Second secretary point I'd like to make is
that the project is in progress. Over 386,000 of
the 1.5 million has been spent to date. Phase I,
which is the stabilization of the building's
cupola, and the replacement of several areas of
the roof to keep the water out was really largely
prep work for Phase II. Phase II involves the
restoration of the building's envelope. Phase I
is complete as of November 2015, and Phase II is
at the 10 percent stage right now.

The museum has invested over $100,000 of
our own money in this project to date and hundreds
of hours of staff time. This project is geared to
restore an important but seriously deteriorating
asset. If we aren't able to undertake Phase II
sometime in 2016 and '17, the building is going to
continue to deteriorate further and will increase
the cost of saving it in the future years. The
third point is in the draft TIP. A reason given
for deprivitizing our project was "limited
support from the city," evidenced by the fact that
our project was not on the town's list of priority
projects.

Further investigation on our part has
revealed that, for whatever reason, our project
was omitted from the list of projects sent to the
town for prioritization. So the fact that it
didn't show up on their list is not an indicator
of a lack of support; rather, it's an indicator of
omission on somebody's part. We met with Bristol
town administrator, Tony Texeira, and he
reaffirmed that the town fully supports our
project, support that was provided in a letter
from Mr. Texeira as part of our submission back in
January.

Four, each of them applied for and was
awarded a 150,000 grant from the Rhode Island
Historic Preservation for the restoration of
additional windows in this building and to augment
the RIDOT funding. This grant requires a match,
and the project must be started within one year.
We're now in danger of losing the matching funds,
and, therefore, also, this $150,000 grant, which
is a major grant for an organization of our size.
This project is a significant -- finally, this
project is a significant component of a large
campus master plan, for which we have begun a
capital campaign. The museum has directly spent
over $20,000 preparing to get at Phase II to the
10 percent stage, and we've been meeting with
prospective funders under the assumption that we
could execute this project in 2016 and '17.

Therefore, while I thank you for including the project in the draft TIP, two points. One is, I'd like to review the agreement between RIDOT and HMM to confirm the amount of state funding available for re-prioritization, as we believe it's 300, not 815. And, two, to reconsider the timing of that funding and shift from 2025 to 2016-2017 with 50 percent available in each of those two years. Thanks very much.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Thank you, sir. Next, I'd like to call Mr. Paul LaBlanc.

MR. LaBLANC: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, committee members. A lot of your faces look familiar. For the record, my name is Paul LaBlanc (L-e-B-l-a-n-c). I'm the Town of Westerly, Town Engineer. I started shortly after Super Storm Sandy. So it's been a busy three and a half years. Back in January of 2013, I was in front of the Transportation Advisory Commission for a TIP amendment for the Bay Street Streetscape Project. You've heard a prior request from Senator Algiere and Mr. Derrik Kennedy, the Westerly Town Manager. We're looking for a request to re-prioritize, really, the schedule,
and I will go into where we are with the project itself.

The Bay Street Streetscape Project looks like it’s on the -- as a qualifying project for somewhere around 2022. I was one of the department personnel representing the town that came in for an amendment to the 2009 to 2012 TIP project to include the Bay Street Streetscape Project as an amended project back then in January of 2013. I think that was approved April of 2013, and a subsequent amendment was made, I think, mid-April or May in 2014 for additional project funding, which is up to around $1.3 million.

The town itself, as well as the Watch Hill Conservancy, to date, through their local improvements to the Bay Street area as well as Larkin Road, drainage, water main utilities, the undergrounding project for the Watch Hill Conservancy, we’ve expended in excess of $10 million to date in that area. We have another contract coming up for historic street lighting to replace the overhead lighting that’s going to come down probably this fall. That work was taken out of the design scope and the construction scope for the prior TIP qualifying project and will be
constructed this fall.

So the town is moving forward for that.

That's an additional -- with assistance from the Watch Hill Conservancy and a partnering group in the area, that's an additional 300 to 350,000.

So, right now, all of the drainage has been completed. That was completed about the time that I started with the town sometime in the fall of 2012. Those drainage improvements were made to the best good faith efforts to the new 2010 storm water manual requirements. Water main replacement work has been completed. We're down to the last 10 or 12 or 13 poles left in the area for the undergrounding work to be completed, which will be started this fall.

This project is listed as the number one priority for the town. Right now, we're looking at -- for the total wide project, including the requested funding, we're about 90 percent complete. Right now, the design plan for the project, just shy of the PS&E submission. That's why we're looking for a possible change in schedule. That's our request. We're probably three or four months out from getting those complete and revise a CRMC permit. So the project
has been continuing to go. Our contact person through DOT was Mr. Thomas Queenan. He's been great to work with so far, and, hopefully, he'll consider our request.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Thank you, sir. I'm guessing, you're Mr. Grant Simmons?

MR. SIMMONS: Yeah. I just would like to say thank you very, very much for hearing our request, and, hopefully, we can move this forward. It's very significant to the community of Watch Hill and to the Town of Westerly because it is such an economic engine that we have down there on Bay Street. So, thank you again, for considering it, and, hopefully, we can again move this forward. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Thank you for taking the time to be here today. Mr. Schiller, would you care to let the other folks finish up?

MR. SCHILLER: Sure.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Barry, I'm just going to remind you that, right now, that I'm going to limit you to five minutes. If you want to wait, you're welcome to. It's your call. I'll get started. Maybe I'll get through.

MR. SCHILLER: So, my name is Barry
1 Schiller (S-c-h-i-l-l-e-r), and I just want to be
clear to everyone that I'm speaking for myself,
although I'm affiliated with a number of transit
advocacy groups. I do have a broader view, which
is why I was thinking of more than five minutes
because, as some of you know, I was on the
Transportation Advisory Committee for many years.
So I've been involved in discussions on all these
issues. So I want to start by saying what I like
about what you're doing or what RIDOT and RIPTA
have done.

First of all, it's really a game-changer
about our basic bridge and, to some extent,
pavement infrastructure, which we were struggling
with for so long, and Statewide Planning felt that
we were on the verge of sinking, as they put it,
and I commend RIDOT for taking a lot of political
heat to put roadworks forward and deal with
especially the bridges and having the big heavy
commercial trucks that do a lot of the damage and
also do a lot of the requirements for bridges to
maintain to be able to handle heavy weights. I
agree with the tolls. I agree with their 10-year
look. I think that's a step forward to look ahead
ten years.
I like a few small innovative things about how the RIPTA supplemented the commuter rail, some seed money for summer services, the City Walk thing that really makes a difference in the city, I hope. Commuter rail marketing, which is badly needed. Those are all good things. So, what are my concerns? I wouldn't need five minutes; right?

CHAIRMAN RHODES: You would hope so.

MR. SCHILLER: The biggest concern is the 6/10, which we're not ready, in my opinion, in Amendment Number 7 to give RIDOT $195 million at this point when the basic design is still being debated, and the City of Providence is still putting out bids or requests for different visions for what that might look like, and that's so much money that if we could do it cheaper -- and RIDOT said that the people who are talking about a boulevard that could be done a lot cheaper, if it could be done, and that's an "if." If it could be done on a boulevard basis, which would help reconnect the neighbors. It would help reduce the cost, which would make funds available for some of the things I've been hearing about in Westerly, in East Greenwich and Cumberland, Pawtucket, Central Falls, East Providence.
I know that all too well about the fiscal restraint. So, we need -- if we're going to try and add things, we need to cut things. And the 6/10 to really only be funded in 2016 as to what RIDOT needs to keep the oversight to process their Fast Lane (sic) application and so on. It shouldn't be 195 million this year. We shouldn't give them a blank check basically to go ahead before we do this. And also related to saving money, if we could have a boulevard on the 6/10, and it wasn't that long ago we didn't have an expressway between Olneyville and I-95.

I have a map from the 1970s, which basically Route 10 ended in the area around Olneyville, and then you were on Kinsley or Harris Avenue to go the rest of the way, and you know what, the world didn't end. And if we could do that again and do it better than we used to have it, then we wouldn't need to spend an extra 50 or 60 million on widening I-95 northbound when they redo the northbound viaduct. They want to widen it substantially, and that's in the tens of millions extra.

So this is all very interconnected, and it gives us an opportunity to save big money to help
the cities and towns and transportation
alternatives. I want to hold up your own picture
of what Providence has been sacrificing by having
this huge I-95/Route 6 interchange right now, and
they want to make it wider. This is only a small
picture. Somewhere in the documents, you have a
whole page of that interchange, and if you widen
it slightly to cover the Dean Street ramps, it's a
huge amount of land that Providence has sacrificed
for that interchange, and when you add that to the
6/10 interchange in Olneyville --

When you think back to Providence of the
pictures of the 40s and 50s when it was a thriving
city, it didn't have any of that. The whole
business of drive everywhere, drive fast through
the city, has hurt Providence so much. This is an
opportunity to be a game-changer to start to
reverse the damage that the auto age has done to
our core city, and not just Providence, but other
core cities. So, I'll hold off to the end at this
point because with the money saved, I have a lot
of thoughts about what we might do.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Mr. Schiller, please
know that I appreciate your yielding, particularly
given all your service to the TAC. We'll get back
1 to you.

   MR. SCHILLER: Thank you.

   CHAIRMAN RHODES: Okay. Mr. DeLuca and
2 Mr. Duffy, I notice you're still with us. Would you like an opportunity to say anything else?
3
   MR. DUFFY: Mr. Chairman, we're chipping
4 away for discussion with you about the next plans.
5
   CHAIRMAN RHODES: I will follow up with
6 you after the meeting, then. Thank you very much.
7
   Mr. Besley?
8
   MR. BESLEY: I'll make this second part
9 brief.
10
   CHAIRMAN RHODES: Welcome back, Mr.
11 Besley.
12
   MR. BESLEY: Thank you. So, in 2011, when
13 Robert Smith was our coordinator from the DOT, he
14 came to one of our meetings that year, and he said
15 that the DOT director -- they were looking for
16 shovel-ready projects, and 138 was deemed a
17 shovel-ready project even though -- even up to
18 that time and as of today -- the archeological
19 study, which we were told was going to have to
20 take place where Ministerial Road intersects 138
21 for possible Narragansett/Indian Village.
22
   We were given a start date. The project
was -- you said the first shovel would go in the
ground in late 2012, early 2013, but as what
happened was, subsequent meetings took place, and
every time we went to the next meeting, it was
pushed down the road, and now it's pushed down to
2021. And I know the Town Planner, Mr. Murray,
has spoken -- he spoke in January, and they've
written a letter, and there are going to be some
interim things done to kind of work on the really
bad parts of it. But, really, what I'm most
concerned is is the funding, because if $7 million
is now put in there for paving for the first mile
and a quarter with basically nothing other than a
little bit of drainage work, but then from the
railroad bridge into Kingston, you're going
through the two villages, the historic district.

We have sidewalks we wanted. We have
major drainage issues coming down Kingston Hill.
All the really heavy duty engineering and
important things that we want in a project are
from there up to 108. Now you only have $9 1/2
million. So it looks to me like all it's going to
be is a pavement. You know, we're going to go in
there; we're going to pave the highway and the
rest of the things, everything that we've tried to
get into this project to make it a better place for the residents of Kingston for the university and everybody that travels to and from the university on a daily basis. For the people that use that highway to go across Southern Rhode Island, it's like -- that's not going to happen.

So, I would just -- I'm hoping that that's not the case. And I guess my last thing that I want to be interested in is if in -- 2014 was the last time I got an e-mail from Mr. Smith before he left the DOT, when he was now the head of engineering, he said the earmarked money was still around. I don't know how much of it was still around in 2014. But if it is, where is it, you know? It's not showing up in the roadworks thing as, you know, possible funding for this project. So I guess that was my question. And the last thing is -- the last time -- our committee actually hasn't met since December of 2013, for some reason. Maybe it's because I show up at the meetings. But at that meeting, we were showing some -- three options for the last part of the project that we had questions on. We've never met again, so we've never had any opportunity to discuss that with the DOT and BETA Engineering,
but I'd like to leave this with you guys. These were my comments from there that I sent to the DOT but never really got an answer on it.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Thank you very much, sir.

MR. BESLEY: All right. Thank you very much. I appreciate it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: Mr. Schiller? Take your time, Barry.

MR. SULLIVAN: It is 4 or 500 pages between the two documents. So, as I was saying, I believe there's a game-changer about our infrastructure but it's not this plan, a game-changer in terms of our societal interest in reducing vehicle miles traveled and encouraging people to walk and bike more and deal with climate change emissions. It's not a game-changer that way. It's still a lot of the investment for -- to drive everywhere transportation system.

Besides the 6/10 issue, it seems to me that the way we used to do the TIP, we tried to guess what amounts were needed each year for the part of the project that we're in. So the 195 -- I mean the 195 million for the 6/10, I can't believe, really, RIDOT plans to spend that in
fiscal year 2016, which only has a few months. I just don't understand that budgeting, why it's such a large amount for this fiscal year.

There's a couple of other things like that that is in the form of a question. It doesn't mean it's wrong; I just don't understand it. Besides the 6/10, I want for the record to oppose the $3 million, supposedly, in highway safety for the ramps on 295. That, you all know, is subverting our land use goals. In the Johnston Sunrise, which I recommend you take a look at, this pushback in Johnston, the people that live on Greenville Avenue don't want a commercial strip mall the way it is on 44 or other roads with interchanges. The -- it cannibalizes -- it's not like it's new economic development. It cannibalizes what citizens already have in Cranston, Providence, East Providence. So it's not even economic development.

I don't think I could tell Citizens Bank what to do, but we can ask what we do with our public money. And putting in at least $3 million of public money for subverting our land use goals so that our anti-land use, anti-environmental bank could build a campus where they can have 3,000
employees with 3,000 parking spots for each of them, I think is something that we should not go along with. If we are taking land use planning seriously, here's the time to draw the line, and you'll have plenty of support in Johnston people alongside it.

I was involved in the CRF Club (phonetic) when we did the new interchange for the Resource Recovery, and there was a full environmental impact statement, which among other things, to avoid sprawl. If you know that interchange with the Resource Recovery, it doesn't connect to the neighborhoods. So you could only get off the highway there to go to the Resource Recovery facility. So, an environmental impact statement should be required for this ramp. And one of the things that you should be exploring is, you can only go to citizens, so it doesn't have as much sprawl impact as I fear that it will. So that's an important issue, which has gotten attention in the environment community as well as in Johnston.

Another thing on the highway side is the -- somewhere, there's 38 million for the toll infrastructure. Now, I support the idea of tolls, but I hope that the powers that be will make sure...
that that's not spent unless we know that it's legal to do this. I've always heard on the TAC that you can't put new tolls on interstate highways, and, apparently, RIDOT now has found a loophole where you can. That may be true, or maybe it's not. I know the trucking industry is going to challenge it.

We obviously don't want to spend 38 million and then find it's illegal. So I hope that there's some provision in the sequencing to make sure that that doesn't happen. Now, on the transit side, I already made a few comments about some things that I liked. I think -- oh, one more thing about the ramps. It's listed under Highway Safety. To me, that's very deceptive. I suppose it's arguable that if you don't build a ramp for citizens, and people have to get there from Route 44 or one of the other interchanges, there would be some danger on the back roads, but that's disingenuous. It shouldn't be in highway safety. That not where it is. Having additional on and off ramps on I-295 is actually highway unsafety because you have more merging and exiting traffic. That really should be changed.

The same way on the transit side. The
Hopkinton travel plaza is listed under "Transit," which, when you look at the total transit numbers, it's misleading because, I mean, there's only three buses a day each way on weekdays, not weekends or holidays. And there's already a Park & Ride, I understand. It might be a better Park & Ride, but it's not really a transit proposal to have a rest area primarily for motorists, and that should be correctly labeled.

It's 12 million. So it inflates the transit part. What percentage of that use will be for the people who actually do take a RIPTA bus, that's the percentage that should be for transit. That would be a more accurate way to do that. The -- I also have a question about RIPTA's 17 million Enhanced Transit. Amy Pettine said it was better than the streetcar. I guess it's cheaper, but I don't understand, and I don't think the public understands what it's for. I'm going to read what it says the 17 million is going for in the RIPTA proposed amendment:

Bus stops along the corridor, six of them, will include a high level of amenities, including branding, bus shelters -- some of them already had that -- seating real-time arrival information,
increased signage, ticket vending machines, Wi-Fi and integrated bike-share amenities. Of course, Providence doesn't have a bike-share program now and not for the foreseeable future. So I just read what 17 million is supposed to buy, and that's not plausible.

I assume that there's something else going on. The public has a right to know: Where is that 17 million being spent? It doesn't even promise green light priority on the corridor. It doesn't promise that it would enhance the corridor all the way to the State House, which, as you know, there's an army of people who come up here to work, to attend rallies, to lobby, to tourists who go here to see our beautiful state capitol building, all the stuff that happens in the DOA. We don't even have a shelter, and here's one more stop in the six. There is an opportunity to improve things here, but I don't see how this could be 17 million, and if that's all they're going to do, then it should be rejected as a TIP amendment because that doesn't justify 17 million.

Everybody I ask about this, they're saying -- they're thinking this is just an excuse to spend the federal TIGER money but it's 4 million
of state money. So, even if it was only federal money, it's still a lot of money. So it's got to be accounted for. It might be a good thing, but it needs to be explained. Also, on the RIPTA thing, the bus hub money, the way it's accounted for -- again, like the 195, the 35 million is attributed to -- it's listed under RIDOT, and then under RIPTA only for the Providence bus hub, and that's not the way the bond issue was stated, which is eligible for bus hubs around the state, and we have an issue in Pawtucket where it might be a little bit useful.

It seems to me that, since they're not going to spend 35 million this year, that we should do the budgeting for the bus hubs the way we do the budgeting for the computer rail stop which is, you know -- in the 2016 amendment, there's a little bit for the next step of the environmental review going on now, and then in the following years, it tells you how we're going to spend money on the commuter rail stop in Pawtucket. I think we should do the same for the bus hubs. What do you need this year to oversee the process of putting it out to bid, and that's all there should be because maybe we'll want some
of it not for Providence. Maybe we will have it all in Providence, but we don't know yet.

It doesn't seem to me the way it's handled in the existing amendment that that's the right way. So, I hope that you'll look at that. On the commuter rail, of course I agree with -- always have agreed with what you heard from Pawtucket, Central Falls, Cumberland, and even a little bit North Providence on having better access to that commuter rail system. The problem I have here is that the amount of money for the commuter rail isn't enough to build it. It's like 18 million over the ten years. They're really depending on a grant -- TIGER Grant or some other kind of federal grant.

I just want to comment that I'm a little nervous about that one; over ten years and 5.6 billion, there isn't enough money to be sure that we could build that station, which I think should be built. There is also nothing in the rail area. The state rail plan talks about infill stations, as a goal, there's nothing there. I believe, especially with climate change, that we should be studying electrification of the commuter rail.

The MBTA said it's not in their five-year plan,
but as soon as they look past that, electrification is definitely on their docket, and we're looking at a 10-year plan here, then we ought, you know, be part of the conversation with them about moving ahead.

There's a lot money going into subsidizing electric vehicles, electric cars. We ought to be thinking about electrification. The MBTA has to electrify if they ever build a south coast rail, if they ever build North Station/South Station connection. So we have an interest in -- especially the second of those two things -- to connect us to the North Shore and Northern New England. It would have to be electrified. Let's get the conversation started as soon as possible.

Amy Pettine mentioned that RIPTA was interested in the Green Light Extension, and I hope that you are -- RIDOT has talked about 3 or 400 million for a bus rapid transit for a handful of buses out Route 6/10. Green Light Extension for much, much less ought to help speed up all the buses in all the key roots, not just a tiny handful. On the pedestrian side, I only have one comment. Being from North Providence, our North Providence Environment Commission frustrated by
North Providence's failure to clear sidewalks after snow both on public land and on private land, we asked them -- and they did -- put in a request for capital equipment that DPW would operate for removing snow from sidewalks, which is not even done on public property/town property in North Providence.

Those of you who know Evans Field, there's an example. It's not done at that or at Stephen Olney Park on the sidewalks there, and they say they don't have the equipment, and it seems to me that we spend all this money on traffic safety, which is a huge program over ten years, but it should be for safety for pedestrians also, and, for that matter, for bus passengers that have to access bus stops using sidewalks. So I know it's not a normal thing. So my question is: Why can't that be funded in the accounts transit -- in the traffic safety capital program to get such equipment, because it definitely is a safety issue.

We got by this winter, fortunately, with little snow, but people take their life in your hands if you have to wait for a bus. I happen to be on a curve on Smith Street where I wait for a
bus, and there's not good visibility; the
sidewalks are not cleared, and it's hard to see me
when a motorist is coming around the curve. RIDOT
does a great job of clearing the streets, which
means the cars go real fast at these bus stops.
It's not just North Providence, so I hope to hear
an answer why that wasn't deemed either eligible
or important in such a vast project.

And the last part is on the bike program,
which I know Alex was going to speak on; maybe he
will tonight. The basic point on the bike road is
that it's advancing so slowly. If you look -- I
was involved in preparing the 2013-'16 TIP, and
there's so many projects that were listed for
construction that were not done. Section 8 of the
Blackstone, the Warren extension, the Western part
of Coventry, and it's projecting out ahead even
though there's so much more money now with
increased federal stuff and the GARVEE Bonds and
the Highway Maintenance Account and the truck
tolls. That ought to accelerate the bike program,
especially when you think about the Blackstone
Valley, and it's a national park.

And when you're marketing to national park
people, having it all connected with a bicycle,
that's a marketing tool. But our bike path doesn't go to the Museum of Work and Culture in Downtown Woonsocket. It doesn't go to Slater Mill in Pawtucket. Those are sites in the national park, but it's not yet connected by the bikes. It seems to me that it's an economic opportunity as well as a quality of life thing to market the national park and the tourism industry by really moving ahead on that Blackstone bikeway all the way as soon as possible.

And there's other bike things that didn't even make the TIP, which I want to call attention to, and I hope that if money is freed up to expand the transportation alternatives, which is such a small percentage of the program, that I want to call attention to the fact that something we thought was a high priority in study and development are connected to the University of Rhode Island with all its thousands of students, staff and faculty from Wakefield, that didn't even make the TIP, the new TIP draft, even though it was a high priority in study and development in the old TIP.

Also, finally, the northwest towns of Burrillville, which put in some of its own money
for a small bike path, but also North Smithfield and, finally, Smithfield. I believe you'll hear from the Woonasquatucket Watershed Association tonight that now interest in Johnston are interested in the northwest bike trail that is, unfortunately, not even in the TIP at all. So I hope that as you reconfigure things, especially if you could save money from these huge mega highway proposals on 6/10 and I-95 North, they could do a little bit to help the transportation alternatives, which I believe is so underfunded.

Again, we have a societal interest in having people walk more and drive less, and by "walk more," that includes carpool, use transit, bicycle. That would save us money that we ship out of state for gasoline. It would help fight climate change. It would help our economy. It would help our health. So I hope that you can find ways of improving the funding at higher levels, the transportation alternatives. So that's my overview about this vast thing, and thank you for your patience. I know everybody wants to leave, but you don't have to be back 'til about 6, so you still have an hour and a half. Thank you, Jared, for inviting me to do this.
CHAIRMAN RHODES: Barry, if you could just
stick around so I could speak with you afterwards.

MR. SULLIVAN: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN RHODES: At this point, I'd like
to ask if there's anyone else who would like to make any comments at our hearing today. Seeing none, I'll formally close this hearing at 4:20.

Thanks to all of you for your time and,
particularly, for the rest of the DOT and RIPTA staff members who are in the audience today.

Thanks for being here.

(HEARING CONCLUDED AT 4:20 P.M.)
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(1) $1 - analysis
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bikes</td>
<td>99:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bike-share</td>
<td>93:2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bikeway</td>
<td>60:24;69:15;99:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>5:21;32:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>billion</td>
<td>95:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>birthplace</td>
<td>60:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bit</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackstone</td>
<td>29:15;59:11;60:24,25;61:7;98:16;22;99:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blank</td>
<td>83:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>block</td>
<td>30:16;52:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>board</td>
<td>41:7;24;50:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boat</td>
<td>74:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boats</td>
<td>69:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>29:25;33:16;34:3;71:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bond</td>
<td>7:17;14;8:12;15:13;94:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bonds</td>
<td>7:17;23;14:17;15:9;98:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnet</td>
<td>39:4,7;10,16,21,24;40:1,3,4,20,41:12;43:6,12,13;44:21,22,24;45:12;46:2,19,22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>books</td>
<td>23:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boost</td>
<td>19:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bore</td>
<td>30:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boring</td>
<td>31:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>borrowing</td>
<td>7:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>borrows</td>
<td>8:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>both</td>
<td>13:25;19:17;20:15;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brought</td>
<td>7:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>53:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buck</td>
<td>44:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>budget</td>
<td>20:9;10:72;4:74:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>budgeting</td>
<td>89:2;94:15,16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>budget(s)</td>
<td>68:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>build</td>
<td>89:25;91:16;95:12;19:96;9:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>73:12,13;20,25;74:2;75:15;76:13;93:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>building's</td>
<td>99:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>built</td>
<td>38:3;50:22;74:8;95:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bulk</td>
<td>19:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnside</td>
<td>73:12,13,15,18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burrillville</td>
<td>99:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burying</td>
<td>27:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buses</td>
<td>92:4;96:20,22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>business</td>
<td>10:30,18;31:11;37:8;38:5;59;10:9,16;41:1,16;84:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>businesses</td>
<td>48:9,49:1,55:10;56:23,59:12;60:8,16;17:61,23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>busy</td>
<td>50:5,77:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buy</td>
<td>93:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bypass</td>
<td>41:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cabanas</td>
<td>40:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carried</td>
<td>6:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cars</td>
<td>49:25;71:13;96:7;98:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>case</td>
<td>14:22,15:6,23:1;67:5,87:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casona</td>
<td>53:16;56:11;57:10;59:1;62;2,65:2,4,5;66:17;67:5;68:21;69:25;77:12;80:23;99:12,16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>categories</td>
<td>17:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>category</td>
<td>64:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>causeway</td>
<td>39:7,17;22;41:6;10:43;6:45;6,14;46:5,21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDC</td>
<td>59:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cearse (3)</td>
<td>42:6,8,17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>center</td>
<td>71:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>28:3,9,10,12,29:5;30;5,6,31:10;32:8;37:24;59,9,10;66:0,5,19:61,11,14,82:24;95:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>37:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>certain</td>
<td>22:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>certainly</td>
<td>18:16;47:5;58:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cetera</td>
<td>6:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chafee</td>
<td>71:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>challenge</td>
<td>91:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber</td>
<td>61:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>change</td>
<td>22:10,79:22,88:17;95:23,100:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>changed</td>
<td>23:18,91:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>changes</td>
<td>6:19,12,10,13,14;15:6,14,24:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cheaper</td>
<td>82:16,18,92:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>check</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Min-U-Script®

Allied Court Reporters, Inc. (401)946-5500
115 Phenix Avenue, Cranston, RI 02920 www.alliedcourtreporters.com

(3) bikes - check
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day (9)</td>
<td>18:8;21:17;31:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept (1)</td>
<td>37:15;45:21;75:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deck (1)</td>
<td>6:9;12:16;48:6;62:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficient (1)</td>
<td>15:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definable (1)</td>
<td>43:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detrimental (1)</td>
<td>48:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detrimental (1)</td>
<td>17:23;24:16;30:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed (1)</td>
<td>34:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop (1)</td>
<td>4:10;7:8;16:9;12;17:23;24:16;30:14;52:2;55:4;59:6;7:8;60:4;61:2;86:66;89:16;19:9;18:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devote (1)</td>
<td>64:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference (1)</td>
<td>82:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different (3)</td>
<td>21:6;24:24;82:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult (2)</td>
<td>31:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilemma (1)</td>
<td>38:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct (1)</td>
<td>38:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directly (1)</td>
<td>38:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabilities (1)</td>
<td>51:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disappointed (1)</td>
<td>54:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary (2)</td>
<td>11:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss (3)</td>
<td>72:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion (1)</td>
<td>71:3;7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion (1)</td>
<td>59:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribute (1)</td>
<td>71:3;7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditch (1)</td>
<td>55:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division (1)</td>
<td>91:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct (1)</td>
<td>51:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disrepair (1)</td>
<td>54:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disruption (1)</td>
<td>48:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinct (1)</td>
<td>2:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditch (1)</td>
<td>59:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents (7)</td>
<td>5:6;11;12:8;25;58:15;84:6;88:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dollar (1)</td>
<td>23:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dollars (3)</td>
<td>21:11;36:19;63:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors (1)</td>
<td>27:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door (1)</td>
<td>30:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doral (1)</td>
<td>69:25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>obligated (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obligation (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obligatory (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obligations (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obstacles (1)</td>
<td>45:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obviously (8)</td>
<td>12:19;34:23:35:6;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean (2)</td>
<td>43;22:44:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October (2)</td>
<td>7:9;57:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offer (7)</td>
<td>4:25:41:16:42:12;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offers (2)</td>
<td>3:2:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>office (1)</td>
<td>16:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>officer (1)</td>
<td>20:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>officers (1)</td>
<td>2:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>officials (3)</td>
<td>4:14:25:10:57:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Hearn (1)</td>
<td>26:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>old (3)</td>
<td>8:15;35:10:99:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>older (2)</td>
<td>34:16:35:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olney (1)</td>
<td>97:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olneyville (3)</td>
<td>83:12;15:84:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>omission (1)</td>
<td>76:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>omissions (1)</td>
<td>43:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>omitted (1)</td>
<td>75:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once (6)</td>
<td>4:11;25:17:32:11;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one (49)</td>
<td>2:21;22:23:11:9;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>optimistic (1)</td>
<td>46:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>optimizing (1)</td>
<td>17:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>options (2)</td>
<td>24:4;87:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>order (5)</td>
<td>2:3;6:2:23:8:24:2;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization (2)</td>
<td>15:22;56:8:26:12:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizations (2)</td>
<td>16:19:60:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>original (1)</td>
<td>71:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>originally (2)</td>
<td>9:23:10:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others (1)</td>
<td>55:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>otherwise (2)</td>
<td>6:1:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ought (4)</td>
<td>96:4;7:21:98:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only (20)</td>
<td>24:25:26:23:29:5;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operating (3)</td>
<td>18:18:20:9:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operational (4)</td>
<td>8:18:13:25:18:15;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operations (1)</td>
<td>21:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operator (1)</td>
<td>21:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opinion (1)</td>
<td>82:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opportunities (1)</td>
<td>3:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opportunity (13)</td>
<td>3:7:16:33:13;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overall (3)</td>
<td>6:12:16:17:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overemphasize (1)</td>
<td>27:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overhead (1)</td>
<td>78:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overloaded (1)</td>
<td>45:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overuse (1)</td>
<td>94:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oversight (1)</td>
<td>83:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overtaxed (1)</td>
<td>45:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overview (2)</td>
<td>22:4:100:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one (3)</td>
<td>75:11;84:2:99:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>owner (1)</td>
<td>44:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>page (1)</td>
<td>84:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pages (1)</td>
<td>88:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palatable (1)</td>
<td>22:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>panel (1)</td>
<td>47:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parametric (1)</td>
<td>10:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paratransit (1)</td>
<td>19:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parcels (1)</td>
<td>68:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park (12)</td>
<td>29:16:37:20:60:12;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parking (1)</td>
<td>90:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parks (1)</td>
<td>69:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part (19)</td>
<td>12:21:35:10:19;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>particularly (5)</td>
<td>5:25:45:13:67:9;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partnering (1)</td>
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CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Good evening, I'm calling this hearing to order at 6:36. My name is Fran Shocket, and I am the chair of the Transportation Advisory Committee and will preside at this hearing, which has been authorized by the --

COUNCIL MEMBER: You're going to have to speak a little louder. My apologies.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Okay, I'll shout. My name is Fran Shocket, and I am chair of the Transportation Advisory Committee and will preside at this hearing, which has been authorized by the State Planning Council for the purpose of accepting public comment on Amendment Number 7 to the State Transportation Improvement Program for federal and fiscal year 2015, 2016, and the Draft State Transportation Improvement Program for federal fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

In getting us started today, I would like to begin with a few housecleaning items. First and foremost, please note the location of the fire exits. In addition, and should you need the restrooms, know that you can find them directly outside and to the right of the main entrance.
Next, should you be here to offer testimony, please know that you must sign in and register accordingly at the welcome desk, which is back there. Otherwise, we will be unaware of your desire and may not call your name.

Last, but not least, I also want to make sure everyone is aware that all comments, including written, related to Amendment Number 7 must be received at the close of this public hearing tonight; however, written comments on the proposed draft fiscal year '17-'25 STIP will be accepted through June 26th as explained in the official notice, which is posted on statewide planning's home page.

Now, with those items out of the way, and prior to accepting public comment, I am first going to turn the floor over to Linsey Callaghan, supervising planner with the Statewide Planning Program, then Amy Pettine, Executive Director of Planning for RIPTA, and, finally, Meredith Brady, Acting Policy Director for RIDOT, who will provide brief informational presentations overviewing the proposed actions. Following that, I will ask you to hold any questions that you may have so that we may begin the formal comment period. Linsey?
MS. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Madam Chair.

As Madam Chair explained, the purpose of this hearing is to receive public comments on two separate related documents: Amendment Number 7 to the State Transportation Improvement Program for federal fiscal years 2013 to 2016 and the Draft State Transportation Improvement Program for federal fiscal years 2017 to 2025.

The STIP, as a document, is a list of transportation projects the State of Rhode Island intends to implement using U.S. Department of Transportation funds. For transportation projects to utilize these federal funds, it must be included in the STIP. To provide some added context on the STIP, in 2012 when the Federal Transportation Authorization Bill, Map-21, was passed, it focused on improving the condition of the nation's transportation system.

States are now required to show how these federal investments and their infrastructure improve the transportation system's overall performance and conditions. The state has been preparing for this shift for several years. RIDOT started with the migration of transportation infrastructure planning, an asset management place
system of planning to avoid more expensive
long-term costs. However, the biggest issue
facing the state in meeting the federal
requirements was identifying appropriate funding.

The state has taken some key steps to
provide sustainable transportation infrastructure
funding and broadening available resources,
including the redirection of the gas tax on
transportation needs, the replacement of bond
borrowing with the increase of vehicle
registration and driver's license fees, along with
RICAP funds, and also the creation of the Rhode
Island Highway Maintenance Account. The shift in
resources to meet the state's critical
infrastructure needs culminated in the passage of
roadwork in February of this year, which imposes a
new toll on large commercial trucks, which is
expected to bring in approximately $45 million a
year when fully operational.

These two documents that are being
presented today represent the project
implementation of the policy shifts I just
outlined. The remaining of the presentation will
first focus on Amendment Number 7 to the 2013 to
2016 STIP, which realigns the federal fiscal year
2016 projects with additional available state and federal funding sources and with RIDOT's 10-year strategic plan. In addition, this amendment includes new transit and highway funds. I will now turn the presentation over to Amy Pettine to detail RIPTA's specific amendment request.

MS. PETTINE: So, tonight, we're requesting an amendment to the current STIP for two projects, one larger one and one smaller one. So the first is: We're requesting to include the Downtown Providence enhanced transit corridor in the current STIP. This project is one that's been going on for many years. RIPTA and the City of Providence began several years ago to look to put in a high capacity transit corridor in the Downtown Providence area connecting heat destinations throughout a spine anchored in the north by the Providence Train Station going to Downtown Kennedy Plaza to the hospital area.

The city was successfully awarded a TIGER discretionary grant in 2014. We worked collaboratively to pursue a potential streetcar. That was a much larger project, 100 million plus project. Unable to pull the local funds together, however, through further effort, we were able to
successfully get permission from U.S. DOT and the FTA to move forward with this enhanced bus corridor.

So a lot of the features are very similar to the original goals of the project. We're looking at high quality bus stops, real-time information, really nice large shelters, repairing pavement, coordinating with the city's potential future bike sharing bike program and looking at roadway and geometric improvements, transit signal priority, getting some priority for the bus on this 1.4 mile corridor. We're also purchasing six additional vehicles, hybrid diesel electric vehicles, that will be part of our overall fleet. And the approach that we're taking is, we're taking six existing bus routes, and we're basically extending them along the spine to create more one-seat rides for our entire statewide transit network and more connections to the train station for people living not only in the downtown but in the metro and state as well.

So we're really excited about this project. It's a $17 million total project. Again, the 13 million is a discretionary competitive grant that has already been awarded,
so we're looking to include it in the STIP with
the local match coming from state sources. The
second project in the TIP that we're proposing is
we need to grant, or we'd like to grant, a small
amount of money generated from some mileage
associated with buses running through the eastside
bus tunnel. This is a one-time apportionment of
$54,000. It's federal formula funds through the
state to repair high intensity bus programs.

These were monies that we were notified by
FTA this year that had been apportioned to us, but
we hadn't been notified prior, so we need to get
them obligated before they lapse. Coincidentally,
RIPTA actually has a larger discretionary grant to
do repairs. That project is already in the TIP,
so we're basically going to just add this small
amount of money to a larger million plus project
for renovations to the bus tunnel.

MS. CALLAGHAN: Now we'll turn the
presentation over to Meredith Brady of RIDOT.

MS. BRADY: Thank you very much, Linsey.
Thank you, Chairwoman, and thanks to everybody
who's taken the time out of their schedules to be
here tonight. I know it's particularly difficult
coming up on the holiday weekend, and I'd also
like to thank the RIDOT staff over here that's in the audience listening. We're not going to be answering any specific questions, but they will listen to everything that's posed here and take that into consideration.

Our amendment to the federal fiscal year 2016 TIP is a big amendment compared to RIPTA's smaller amendments, and the reason for that is a process that we started last year with the change in administration and new leadership within Rhode Island DOT. We had already been paving the way for a move towards an asset management-based system of determining projects, but that was accelerated. We also moved from a four-year look at projects to a 10-year plan. So, if you look at the proposed draft TIP, which is federal fiscal year '17 to federal fiscal year 25, that's actually only nine years.

Federal fiscal year '16 is the first year of the 10-year plan, so we needed to have this amendment to align what had been proposed in the 10-year plan with what was included in the TIP itself. It also is big for another reason, and I have explained this to the TAC members previously. It looks at all funds as opposed to just federal
funds. So, in past iterations of this TIP, you will have seen federal funding and then the state match, but not operating funds. That may have gone towards other purposes.

Another change or another request is approximately $300 million in new GARVEE funds. GARVEEs are grant anticipation revenue bonds. These are bonds drawn down on future federal funds. We already have done this once, and we actually are in the process of refunding the current bond in order to have money in the first three years of the 10-year plan, about 120 million to put towards bridges, specifically, to bring it into a state of good repair, and another 100 million of that funding will come from, at least initially, from the new GARVEE funding, which we're planning to work towards issuing in the fall.

That 300 million is shown in the TIP. It wouldn't have been there before. So, it obviously is a big change. And, as I said, about 100 million goes towards bridges, and about 200 million is being set aside for the 6/10 connector project. That is not to say that all of it or much of it will get actually used in federal
fiscal year '16, but we wanted to make sure that it's allocated for that purpose, particularly in conjunction with grant applications that we've made recently.

Another project that you'll note in the federal fiscal year '16 amendment is the $3 million for the ramp on 295 for the Citizens Project, the Greenville Avenue Grant, and that project is limited to $3 million in unexpended bond funds, which is a source that can be tapped just for capital projects, and the legislature has directed us to tap that source specifically for capital projects.

Otherwise, the projects in general that are in our amendment are aligned, as I said, with the 10-year plan, which may be different than what had been in the -- in fact, quite different than what had been in the prior federal fiscal year '16 of the current adopted TIP. But, as Linsey mentioned, there have been two federal authorizations in place. Since then, we've had a slight increase in funds and, again, a whole new method of looking at things from an asset management perspective, which changed the way the projects were selected.
MS. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Meredith. This TAC is being requested to make a recommendation to the State Planning Council on Amendment Number 7 tonight. I'd like to provide a brief summary of the comments received, either in writing or at the 2 p.m. hearing that was held today, related to the amendment. I also prepared a summary -- I'll provide a general overview of the comments, but also as each TAC member sees, it's a summary of the comments received. It's titled "FFY 2016 Summary of Comments Received."

But, generally speaking, the comments were related to administrative reprogramming of titles in the TIP, the Traffic Safety and Bridge Maintenance and also federal funding sources, just ineligibility or changes in amounts. As the comments relate to specific projects, you can see an outline of each comment that was provided for the projects, but, generally speaking, the comments consisted of general support for inclusion in either the TIP amendment or in the FY2017 to 2025 TIP. However, some people would like to see their projects advance earlier than provided in the draft TIP or incorrect, or the funding increased. So, if the TAC has any further
questions, we can talk about them when they
discuss the amendment. And there's also copies
provided on the back table there.

The next portion of the presentation will
focus on the 2017 to 2025 TIP, which includes the
required four federally fiscally constrained
years, however extends the planning horizon to
2025. This longer time frame better aligns with
the state shift to an asset management-based
approach to planning and offers municipalities in
the public a better idea of when the projects
would be moving forward from development into
implementation and also aligns with RIDOT's
10-year strategic plan.

The STIP development process began in
November of 2015 with the notice of project
solicitation. We've received over 300 new
applications containing over $880 million in
requests, which were received from municipalities,
state agencies and non-profit organizations. The
projects were then reviewed and ranked. Projects
in the categories of bridge, pavement, traffic,
drainage and Regionally Significant projects were
referred to RIDOT to be evaluated primarily
against data-driven management systems to optimize
their impact of the total investment in Rhode
Island's transportation network.

All of the projects, including transit,
bicycle, pedestrian, safe routes to school and
other transportation enhancement projects were
evaluated by a series of subcommittees comprised
of staff, statewide planning, RIDOT, Rhode Island
Department of Environmental Management, RIPTA and
members of the Transportation Advisory Committee.
All of the highest ranking projects were sent to
RIDOT and RIPTA for further project cost
refinements and estimates and scheduling over the
time period of this TIP. The resulting process --
the process resulted in the draft TIP tables and
its associated texts under consideration tonight.
I will now turn the presentation back over to Amy
Pettine at RIPTA to describe RIPTA's portion of
the 2017 to 2025 TIP.

MS. PETTINE: Thanks, Linsey. So RIPTA's
program -- projects in the TIP reflects our
priorities, and I will just talk to them in broad
strokes, ongoing operational support with the
focus on state of the repair, incremental
improvements to help us operate more safely and
efficiently, and there's also some larger scale
past investments, particularly in the outer years, passenger facilities, and our ongoing fleet maintenance and replacement program.

So, if you look at the TIP, you can see the funding programs that come through FTA, a portion that we program out. 5307 is the big one, but there are some smaller ones, like 5310 and 5311, and I just mentioned that to say that some of them are tied to specific outcomes. They might be focused on rural transportation, for example, or they might be focused on working with particular populations with access challenges, but we are definitely, similar to RIDOT, focused on the state of the repair. You'll see our largest program line is our fixed route fleet replacement program. There's also a program line for our paratransit fleet replacement program.

There's also an IT program of work. I'll just point that out because that is an area that we're looking to advance to keep our facilities open in the back end, as well as on the vehicles, to modernize our system. For example, we have a large fare box investment coming in the next couple of years. We are also proposing to continue using a portion of the CMAQ funds that
the state receives to support some of our operational operations such as our "R" line, which is our Rapid Bus Service.

We pay for a good majority of the operations out of the CMAQ program. That's our highest ridership service that actually will connect nicely to help with any of the proposed commuter rail stations in Pawtucket in the future. We also use this program to support transit promotions; facility investments -- transit signal priority is an area that we're looking to advance in the future. And it also supports our commuter resource RI program, which is a program that does a lot of outreach on promoting transportation alternatives, not just bus but carpooling, van pooling, et cetera, biking, in the state.

So, again, I'll just end with ongoing operational support is certainly the biggest priority for us. You know, 20 percent of our annual operating budget at RIPTA, we're roughly $100 million annual budget. Roughly, 20 percent of the op-budget is coming from federal funds. That's funds to pay our maintenance workers to maintain our vehicles, our preventative maintenance program. It's paying staff. It's
paying for the operations of the different routes. So it's a huge part of our work. I'll turn it over to Meredith.

MS. BRADY: Thank you, again. There are a lot of things that I could say about the '17 to '25 proposed TIP. So, I'm not going to keep at it all night, but I'm just going to pick a few choice items. If people have further questions, I'll be happy to follow-up, but the federal fiscal '17 to '25 TIP, again, show a lot more than you're used to seeing in terms of what you need to see for transparency purposes. You'll be seeing the operating funds and where they're going. There are a lot more line items than you might be used to seeing in prior versions of the TIP.

There's also going to be an opportunity -- and this is something that I wanted to make very clear. We're not doing this process for '17 to '25 as, pardon the pun, end of the road or end of the line, so to speak, for these projects. We're going to be re-examining these projects as we move forward, hopefully on an annual basis. And one of the very important things is with so many different projects here, we can't have gotten everything right. We admit that we may not know
everything there is to know about a project or about a road. We have limited ability to really delve down into some of these projects that are municipally sponsored.

So we're hoping to get more information on some projects as we move forward as well so that we can appropriately schedule. We've heard earlier today about some projects that have sidewalk and pavement components that might not have been scheduled at the best times in order to make those connections. So that's something that, with thousands of projects, it's great to have somebody draw that to our attention.

Some of the components of our '17 to '25 TIP that I just wanted to touch on are -- again, we're looking at the state as a whole system, and this is something that the Federal Highway Administration has been moving us towards slowly over the last four years or so as we move from one short two-year authorization into a new authorization that's now finally five years.

The push has been towards a performance management basis and an asset management basis. The transportation asset has -- management plans are required. Bridge expenditures are based on
bridge asset management plans. There are a lot of different pieces that the federal government requires. Among that, those requirements, the 10 percent were less structural deficiency for bridges, and that's one of the main components of our Rhode Works proposal, which was passed by the legislature in February. It's a push to, by 2025, be down to 10 percent from the 22 percent, which again, right now, is the height in the nation.

So, looking at the system holistically, it's not going to make everybody happy, unfortunately, but it is going to make a difference in short-term investing where it might be a little more painful to make those investments. You're replacing your roof instead of going on vacation. It's not the most pleasant choice, but it's a choice that makes a difference because if you fix or replace your roof now, you will avoid more expenditures in the future.

Our roadworks plan was to avoid about $950 million in future expenditures, which if we had continued spending the way we have in the past, we would have been looking at a much higher bill for getting to the structural sufficiency and getting to a state of good repair with our infrastructure.
So, with that in mind, we'll be looking forward to hearing everybody's comments and hearing perspectives and also getting information here tonight at the public hearing.

MS. CALLAGHAN: In conclusion, I would just like to overview the next steps of the process. The public comment period for Amendment 7 to the 2013 to 2017 STIP ends at the close of this evening's public hearing. All comments received related to Amendment Number 7 will be addressed and incorporated into a public hearing report. At the conclusion of this evening's hearing, the TAC will be asked to make a recommendation on the amendment to the State Planning Council.

At their next meeting on June 9th, the State Planning Council will be presented with this public hearing report and the tax recommendation and will be asked to make a final decision on the amendment. The public comment period for the TIP -- for the draft TIP for federal fiscal year 2017 to 2025 ends, however, on June 26th. All comments received at today's hearing and throughout the public comment period will be addressed and incorporated into a public hearing report.
The TAC will meet to discuss the public comment report and the draft TIP at their meeting on July 25th and at their August 25th meeting, in which the TAC will be asked to make a recommendation to the State Planning Council. The State Planning Council will be asked to make final action on the draft 2017 to 2025 TIP at their September 8th meeting.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Thank you. Thank you, Linsey, Amy and Meredith, for those excellent presentations. As noted earlier, we will not be taking questions, but will now begin accepting comments on both of these proposed actions. Those wishing to comment will be called in the order in which they registered and after the customary recognition of elected officials. If you speak, please identify yourself and if you represent any particular organization, and address all comments to me as the presiding officer.

To ensure that all who wish to speak may have an opportunity to do so, each speaker will be limited to the initial presentation of five minutes. After all who wish to speak have had an initial opportunity, those wishing to make supplemental statements will be recognized after
all who have registered have spoken, and others
wishing to comment will be recognized. Written
statements will be given equal consideration.
They may be read into the record or simply
submitted to our staff at the welcome.

Are there any elected officials who wish
to present a statement?

MS. DEPASQUALE: May I?
CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Yes.
MR. DEPASQUALE: Good evening, Madam Chair, Members of the Committee. My name is
Joseph DePasquale. I am the town council
president for Warren. I want to start by thanking
you for giving us this opportunity to provide our
comments, and look forward to your hopeful 2017
versus the '25, which is the tail end. We regard
-- with regard to both, I want to start by
expressing our appreciation that the committee has
been responsive to the concerns we've raised in
the earlier round and has recognized several of
the town's priorities.

We are particularly pleased that funding
will be restored in the current year for our
Waterstreet Streetscape project. Instead of
having to interrupt this project, we can now
continue with the Streetscape project itself. But also with the coordination of several other construction projects on Water Street. These projects are of great importance to us for several reasons, including public safety, handicap accessibility, beautification, needed infrastructure improvements, potential to reduce negative impacts from prolonged construction, and to produce significant economic benefits for our local businesses, the town as well as the state.

We also appreciate that the proposed TIP for 2017-'25 includes many projects that are of high priority for the town, including improvements to Routes 114 and 136, which will also extend into our neighboring town, Bristol, as well as the East Bay bike path extension. Like the Water Street project, these all have significant public safety community revitalization and economic development aspects. Unfortunately, the proposed TIP essentially means for the Town of Warren that many of these projects, notwithstanding how significant and needed they are, are once again being postponed. And, in some instances, actually interrupted and suspended for several more years.

In the case of Route 114 and 136, these
projects themselves have already been delayed for
10 to 15 years. They involve serious public
safety issues, not only but also between
intersections -- not at only intersections but in
between as well. Because of the roadway
conditions and also because crumbling -- and in
some instances, missing sidewalks -- it's become,
in some stretches, impassible. We have had the
great project on the bridge between Barrington and
Warren, and the downtown area has been done, but
we have a few small sections that have not been
completed, and it's very discouraging.

In the case of the bike path extension, it
would bring an ongoing project to a halt,
jeopardizing investments both the town and the
state has already made in the planning and
preliminary design. This project is important in
part because of its safe routes to school aspects,
but also to enhance the benefits the East Bay bike
path brings in terms of visitors and public
health. In each case, the disruption and delay
are contrary to promises repeatedly made in the
past, but also contrary to the concept of cost
efficiency.

In the case of Route 136, Metacom Avenue,
it seems to ignore, if not waste, the effort and expense involved in developing the 2012 corridor development plan, which was a joint effort by the town and DOT. In the case of the bike path, it proposes a new expensive feasibility study instead of building on the not-yet-so-old plan preliminary design that was completed a few years ago. The money would be better spent on more detailed engineering and design that is still needed to implement that plan.

The additional delay also interferes with planning by the town which is relying on earlier promises for its own infrastructure improvements, including pavement, curbing and sidewalk projects, and for improving the town's business districts. Much of this work needs to be coordinated with the state and planning, design and construction phases, which brings me to my last general comment and plea. Please communicate and coordinate with us. We need more and better communication, and what you have been doing is good, but we need to help you understand and -- we respect the state's priorities, which focus on state roads and bridges, and we ask that you work with us, with our priorities, and work with us to align both the
priorities and the projects as much as possible.

These infrastructure projects are key to our economic growth, including continued growth of our manufacturing sector. With me is Kate Michaud, our town planner, who will provide supplemental information. She has also compiled a packet of information and comments for each project, which we are submitting as part of our formal testimony. Thank you again for the opportunity, and I appreciate the coordinated effort that we will have, I'm sure. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Thank you very much.

The next person to address the TAC is Ellen Waxman. Thank you.

MS. WAXMAN: Hello, I'm councilor Ellen Waxman from the Town of North Kingstown. I do not have a formal statement such as this gentleman did, but I'm here to go to bat for North Kingstown, specifically the Wickford Junction train station. I was so excited when the train station was finally opened in 2012. It's such a fantastic transportation asset, and I really feel like it's underutilized. I can't imagine there's anyone in this room that would disagree with me.

The question is how can we leverage the Wickford
Junction train station to work for us and to help revitalize our economy and help improve access to Rhode Island and Southern Rhode Island, and specifically, I might add, to the beaches in Southern Rhode Island.

I have really thought that even though it's a commuter rail, I think we really need to look at Wickford Junction as a transportation asset that should be used for non-business-related commutes such as weekends to visit the beach in South County. And, also, to allow -- that would be during the summertime -- but what about weekend service during the rest of the year when we all want to get out of Rhode Island and catch a show at -- you know, the symphony in Boston or go shopping in Back Bay? I know I don't like to get all the expense of parking tickets on Newbury Street when I go shopping.

When I used to live in Boston, it was -- you know, you just have to add $50 on to your day for parking or parking tickets. So now that I'm living out here, I do miss shopping in Boston, but I would like to hop the train and go shopping and catch a show and meet friends for dinner. So the attitude that the commuter rail is just for
commuting to and from work, I feel that that's really shortsighted, and I hear it over and over again. You know, "The ridership is down," and, "Only a small percentage of what the commuter numbers are will be reflected on weekends," and I don't really buy that. I think our weekend ridership could even exceed our weekday commuter ridership.

I really want to just elevate this issue when the STIP document came out, I admit, I didn't sit down and read the whole thing cover to cover, but I did do a search for Wickford and North Kingstown, and I'm quite familiar with the content in that area. Specifically, on page 32 of the STIP draft, I was really excited -- well, I'm sorry; I'll start with 309 -- I was really -- it's a funding table. And I was really excited to see ID 7109 when it said "Summer Service Description," and for a moment my heart leapt and I said, "Oh, this is it."

And I see that there's language in there that it says: "This line item involves a startup operations and further development of limited seasonal bus rail ferry services connecting major tourist attractions and recreational facilities
along Narragansett Bay. It's anticipated that the initial service in FY'16 will be limited to weekends during the summer season at select locations." I am thinking surely this has to mean Wickford Junction. "And depending upon usage and demand could be expanded with additional locations and operations in subsequent years."

And I was just really happy to see that, and language similar to that shows up on page 32 and also 308. But after conversations with staff from RIDOT -- who I have to say have been very, very nice in openly communicating, and whenever I call or e-mail to kind of gently check-in to see how weekend train service is coming along for Wickford, they're always very nice and very informative to keep me informed on the status of things. But I have to say I was really disappointed to find out that ID709 (sic), Summer Service Description, is not at all talking about weekend service to Wickford, but it talks about seasonal bus rail ferry services connecting major tourist attractions.

And, specifically, I understand that it is going to be a ferry connecting Providence to Newport, and, unfortunately, weekend service to
Wickford Junction is now postponed again.
Wickford Junction opened four years ago. I feel that it's an underutilized asset. I would like to request you all to please consider initiating weekend train service, this right here in FY'16, and I have specific language changes for these areas that I would like to submit to the chair.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Yes.
MS. WAXMAN: Thank you very much for your time.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: The next person to speak is Kate Michaud.

MS. MICHAUD: My name is Kate Michaud (M-i-c-h-a-u-d). I'm the town planner for the Town of Warren. Thank you, Madam Chair, and members of the TAC. First off, I would like to thank everyone for including the projects in Warren in the TIP list. Every project in the list is critical to the Town of Warren, and we are thankful that we've been included in the process.

The second, I'm a little unusual because I am a planner who is present tonight in support of less planning and more doing.

In the Town of Warren, we have three major areas of concern with the current '17 through '25
TIP. The first item that I'd like to address are safe and accessible streets and sidewalks. The specific projects that I'd like to speak about deal with Main Street which is Route 114. The first project is TIP ID Number 5269. Just for a little background, Route 114 in Warren is an urban principle arterial roadway with 16 to 19,000 average daily trips.

Project 5269 is the northern section of Main Street, which is the Warren Bridge to Park Street, and it's programmed for year 2023 and 2024. I'd like to note that this area is within the environmental justice SPG tract. It is also within the Carless Household SPG Tract. It is an area with a high volume of pedestrian traffic, including churches, the large American Tourister Redevelopment Project; the Corliss Institute, which provides services for those with disabilities, specifically those with hearing impairments; a high residential density; and multiple RIPTA bus stops.

The sidewalks within this area are impassible in places, and crosswalks and intersections do not have handicap accessible ramps. So I would recommend and request that this
project is moved up in priority on the '17 through '25 TIP. The second project on Route 114 is ID Number 1300. This is the southern section of Main Street, which would be Dyer Street to the Bristol town line. This is included in your TIP report as part of a Bristol pavement management program for the year 2020 and Dyer Street to the Bristol Town line. This is included in your TIP report as part of a Bristol Pavement Management Program for the year 2020.

This portion of roadway has been in design and planning for more than a decade. The roadway was re-paved several years ago, and the sidewalks were not completed with the promise that DOT would return and complete the sidewalks. And, now, this is not scheduled to be completed until 2020. Again, this is an area with impassible and missing sidewalks. There's a high traffic volume, and it's unsafe for people to walk within the roadway. The majority of segments of this area of sidewalks are not accessible for the disabled, and it is an area with a high percentage of elderly persons and people with disabilities. There are multiple trip hazards, and, again, it's an area that's highly used by RIPTA bus users.
The third project that I'd like to discuss is the bike path extension, which is TIP ID Number 5271. This project was first submitted to DOT by the Town of Warren in 1983. The feasibility study for the project was completed in 1997, and the first segment was constructed in -- finished construction in July of 2009. This project will connect the Kickemuit Middle School and Hugh Cole School to the most densely populated areas of town, and further the goals of safe routes to school.

It would connect Eastern Warren to the East Bay bike path, and it would also create potential connections to bike paths in Massachusetts as part of the overall plan for the Providence to Provincetown Bike Path. It would divert bicycle traffic off of Child Street and Route 103, which is not suitable for bicycle traffic. Just last month, a study was completed by students at Roger Williams University, and they assessed feasibility of certain aspects of the plan, and now is the time to act and to move forward on implementation. So, again, we would ask that this project is moved from the program year 2022 two to a more current year.
The last thing that I'd like to speak about is ID Number 1409, which is Metacom Avenue, Market Street. The program year is 2023 and 2024. Again, this is an urban principle arterial roadway with approximately 24,000 average daily trips. This area was identified by statewide planning in 2003 as an area in need of improvement. A corridor plan was completed in 2012 through the statewide planning challenge grant program. In the plan, a high number of points of conflict were identified and a number of remediation actions were recommended. One of the vital parts of this project is to create handicap accessibility and to fill in the areas with no sidewalks that exist today.

So, in conclusion, I would like to say that we're here to be partners with you. The Town of Warren looks forward to working with DOT and to working with all state agencies in an effort to get these projects done as quickly and expeditiously as possible, and we are here to help and to share any information that we may have so that we cannot duplicate effort and we can move forward with getting these projects constructed. I have packet for the TAC members. Thank you.
MR. RHODES: Thank you very much, Kate.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Peter Roberts?

MR. ROBERTS: My name is Peter Roberts. I live at 80 Ormerod Avenue in the Town of Portsmouth. I was at the town hall meeting last — I mean, Monday night, and they mentioned this was going on. It's my first time here. But at the town hall meeting one time, we had representatives come in and explain things. They did talk about the intersection that I come out of on Park Avenue onto East Main Road, they're going to change the intersection, and there was absolutely no reason to change it.

As you come up to it, there's a right-hand turn that takes you down the hill. You don't have to go through the light. When you come out of there, the only people that stop at that light are the people going south down East Main Road. If you want to go north, there's an exit that goes out; you do not use the light. And they were going to change it all. There is no problem with that intersection. They said that there was a lot of speeding there and tickets and accidents.

After I got down and sat down, the police chief in Portsmouth got up and said, "No, there are no
accidents. There is no speeding, and there is no
problem with this intersection," but they want to
change it.

So what I ask is: Why don't we fix East
Main Road and West Main Road and leave everything
else alone? There was another problem here. When
you go on Chase Lane, which goes to the post
office and stuff, they want to dead-end it right
there so you can't use it. When you come up this
hill, you can turn down that road and go right to
the post office. There's a medical facility
there. There's a few law offices, and it makes it
a lot easier to go to the post office, but they
want to stop it. What they said is because the
runoff that comes off that street goes down the
hill.

I got up, and I pointed it out to them.
The runoff cannot come off that street. It is
higher than the intersection. And I went over
there with laser lights and measured it. From the
side of Chase lane, it is 3 inches higher, so
water cannot go off the edge. So the people who
said they did this study did not do the study,
because they were wrong. That water won't run
down the hill, and that is very important to
people who want to go to the post office.

Otherwise, you've got to go out, wait for the light or anything else; you go down and turn in another road to go to the post office.

This is inconvenient. I'm 68 years old, and I have never had a problem at this intersection, never once. There's no reason to change it, and they want to make it so it's one road going in and one road coming out, and we have these extra entrances that save a lot of time. It doesn't need to be done. Another thing, they're going to put a rotary in where the turnpike comes into East Main Road, which I pointed out at that meeting. I sat there in the lawn chair and filmed it -- and filmed in a one-hour period, twelve people ran that red light because when the light is changing, they hurried up through it, okay. And if you are going to run through a red light -- at rotaries, there's own a caution sign or a yield sign. Nobody is going to stop. That is very dangerous.

Another thing, as you go up this hill, Quaker Hill it's called, there's an assisted living place at the bottom of the hill. They just put a crosswalk in there, but what they need is a
light for handicap people to be able to go across
in their wheelchairs or walkers. And I said the
same thing. About halfway up the hill, there's
another assisted living place. They have no way
to cross that road, and they need a light. At the
top of the hill, right at town hall, there's
another assisted living house in the Old Anthony
School that people have trouble getting across
there to get across the street and everything. I
asked about a light there.

When I went out in the hall to talk to the
person who presented this at the thing, he said it
would be a waste of time to put it there because
nobody would notice the red light. So,
personally, I said to him, "Are you a moron?
Because, yes, they will." And the problem that
it's not there is because nobody has ever put it
there. These people get off the bus on the far
side of the road when they're coming back, and
they can't get across the road. They start out on
the road, and people don't stop. They need a
light there. These things need to be done, and
our town council did address this at the meeting
on Monday about -- they have asked that nothing be
done until all the roads are fixed.
Now, I have a pickup truck. My wife has a van. One of my daughter has a Ford Taurus, the other one has a Mercury Sable. Everyone of these vehicles, two times now, have had struts put in, tie-rod ends and ball joints and everything else because when you're driving down these roads, you are going down in these holes. Yes, they fill the holes. Within three months, that stuff is coming back out of the holes. By the time the season ends, you have holes this deep, and what happens a lot too when you're going down the road, people will swerve out because they know there's a hole, and they cut people off. This is very dangerous. East Main Road and West Main Road are a disaster, and they need to be fixed before anybody goes in and puts rotaries in and changes intersections because there's no sense to that.

And I did bring up at the meeting, and I'm not hiding this, that the only reason they're doing this is because somebody wants to sign that and say, "I designed that." It's not needed. Let's fix the roads. Now, we know the way the roads are; it's not your fault. It's because our government spent the money on other things and wouldn't spend on it what they should have. But
we really need to concentrate on getting the
safety part of this done and especially anywhere
where they need a crosswalk. Is that five
minutes?

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: All right. Thank you very
much. I can come back up in a little while;
right?

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Yes, at the end of
the comment period for the individuals, you can
come back.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: James Leffers.

MR. LEFFERS: James Leffers
(L-e-f-f-e-r-s). I'm here in my capacity as a
volunteer member for the Town of Warren Planning
Board. I specifically want to talk about one
element that Mr. DePasquale and Ms. Michaud
mentioned, which is the building of the bridge
across the Kickemuit River for the Warren bike
path. So, historically, there's a three-quarter
mile section of bike path that's east to west. It
begins at a local road called Long Lane, which is
rural, and it ends at the Kickemuit River in town.

Our town geographically is basically
divided by the Kickemuit River and waterways north of that and wetlands north of that. So there's one main east/west road that traffic goes on to link East Warren with West Warren, and that's Child Street, a state road. So, I'm an avid bicyclist, and I want to bicycle from my home into -- connecting up to the East Bay bike path, I have to travel down Child Street. The road marker on Child Street, the white line marker that would be on your right side when you're travelling either direction, has about 6 inches to the curb either way.

So it's a high-risk way to travel, but it's the only way to travel. So it's been a plan of the town to build a bridge across the Kickemuit River, specifically the bike path pedestrian combined use path that would then link up the Warren bike path to the East Bay bike path, and the critical element of that is the building of the bridge. Not only does it enhance the bicyclists that want to have a safe route from east to west and west to east, but it also, as has been mentioned, provides a safe route to school. It also -- there's a senior center and a housing development for the elderly on the western side of
the Kickemuit River.

It would terrifically enhance the ability of those folks to have a safe off-road pedestrian way of traveling; or if they're bikers, as well, to use that. From that point, it would be eastbound. There's another element that then has to link that particular location to the East Bay bike path, but the critical element, as has been mentioned, is this building of this bridge. So my request would be -- that has a TIP target date of 2022, and if there's any ability to move that up to an earlier implementation and build-out date, that would be wonderful for our town. Thank you very much.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Thank you. Peter Brassard.

MR. BRASSARD: Thank you, Madam Chair. My name is Peter Brassard. I'm a member of the Rhode Island Association of Railroad Passengers. I want to commend the TAC for including and prioritizing the Pawtucket/Central Falls train station. Given that the lead time for train station development is often 10 to 15 years, I ask the TAC to include an allocation for a preliminary study for other infill train stations as station locations. Also,
due to the time involved with developing and implementing train stations, I suggest that the TAC include multiple train station proposals concurrently.

   Beyond the cost of the train station during the design of construction period, once they're built, an infill station has minimal added cost to the state, since trains are already passing by on scheduled timetable where they can stop at these new stations. Possible station locations could be Cranston, Olneyville and East Greenwich, although there would be others which are within walkable urban or town center locations. These three stations would help develop local and also state economies and, you know, really help to develop the system, which is still kind of in its infancy as far as computer rail and train service.

   Please consider adding these or another grouping of urban infill train stations with the TIP. I appreciate you hearing me and thank you.

   CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Bonnie Nickerson?

   MS. NICKERSON: My name is Bonnie Nickerson. I'm the planning director for the City of Providence. We've submitted a formal letter
from Mayor Elorza, and I just wanted to highlight
a few of the comments that we'd like to offer on
behalf of the City of Providence. First is the
Dudley Street connector. This is a project that
the City of Providence is requesting be put on
hold and further discussion take place between
RIDOT, the City of Providence, and RIPTA to
determine how this project can better advance the
downtown enhanced bus corridor that we heard a bit
about from RIPTA tonight, and to see if there's an
opportunity to reduce the $3 million budget in
order to allocate funding to one of the other
higher priority projects that the city has
requested.

The second project I want to mention is
the Allens Avenue arterial traffic signal
improvements. This was a low priority for the
City of Providence, but it has been allocated in
years 2019 to 2020. So the city is requesting
that we put this project on hold and that $3.2
million of funding for the project be allocated
for a higher priority project that's been
identified by the city. The next project I want
to highlight is a new project that we submitted
called City Walk. City Walk is a really
interesting project that includes streetscape
enhancements throughout the city linking India
Point Park to Roger Williams Park.

It did receive funding in the STIP for
$1.8 million for the years 2017 to 2018, which is
fantastic. I want to highlight that there's an
Elmwood Avenue and Broad Street Bridge Replacement
Project that includes those two bridges near Roger
Williams Park. So our request is that the
allocation for that bridge replacement project
include improvements to make those bridges more
safe and attractive for pedestrians and bicyclists
to enhance the City Walk project that has a
separate allocation in the TIP.

The next project was a project we
submitted called the Downtown Overpass Enhancement
Project that was not allocated funding through the
TIP. However, RIDOT has indicated that many of
the elements that we included in that project will
be covered in a different bridge project that they
have identified $11.5 million of funding in the
years 2018 to 2020.

So our request tonight is that the
elements of that overpass project that we
submitted be included in that scope of work again
for that bridgework that is going to be funded.
And we'd like to start those conversations with
RIDOT as soon as possible to start to generate
ideas of how to make those overpasses over 95,
again, safer and more attractive for both
pedestrians and bicyclists. So those are the
overpasses that cover 95 through the downtown.

The Exchange Street Sidewalk Widening
Project is a very important project for the city.
It's been allocated $3.13 million in the years
2021 to 2023, and we're requesting that this be
moved up to an earlier date. This project is
really critically important because it connects
the planned Providence inter-modal hub at
Providence Station with Kennedy Plaza. That is
the key pedestrian quarter linking the two. So
those improvements really need to be aligned with
the timing for the implementation of the
Providence inter-modal hub which RIDOT is planning
to advance much earlier than the date of these
improvements.

Next, I'd like to highlight the
Woonasquatucket Greenway Quarter Enhancement.
There has been funding allocated to this project,
but we'd like to move it up earlier than the
scheduled 2021 to 2025. There's lots of other critically important projects to the City of Providence, but I'm running out of time. So I promised my colleagues at DPW that I would specifically highlight eight bridges that are in critical condition and that we believe are going to see further load restrictions prior to the planned reconstruction date. So I just wanted to quickly go over which bridges those are.

The Manton over the Woonasquatucket. The Hawkins Street Bridge over the West River. Exchange Street Bridge over the Woonasquatucket. Orms Street Bridge over the Railroad. Park Street over the Woonasquatucket. West River Street Bridge over the West River. The Veazie Street Bridge over the West River and Delaney Street Bridge over the Woonasquatucket River.

Thanks very much for your cooperation, and we really appreciate the opportunity to provide these comments. Thank you for your partnership to improve the City of Providence. We appreciate it.

Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Thank you. Justin Boyan.

MR. BOYAN: My name is Justin Boyan.
(B-o-y-a-n). I'm just going to speak briefly in support of bike infrastructure. What brought me here was just skimming the lengthy TIP and observing that anything related to Providence bicycle infrastructure is sort of deferred until 2023. And as the parent of two daughters who bike to school in Providence, that concerns me because their route is not super safe. I also bike from the East Side to downtown and back. Well, if you've tried to bike around here, you've probably noticed it's not super safe for us.

So I'd like to encourage earlier funding for bike infrastructure that isn't strictly recreational, but is more an actual transportation alternative for people who are getting home to work or from -- you know, to do shopping or to get to school. I just want to briefly rhapsodize about the seven months I spent in the Netherlands in 2011, which if any of you have been there -- well, if you haven't, you should go and just see what a difference it makes in a culture when the society is set up so that biking is actually safe. It's a whole different way of thinking when, you know, people are doing their grocery shopping by bike, and everybody is taking their kids to school.
by bike.

It's, you know, a way of designing transportation where there's a separate place for the bikes to go that's protected from the cars. It's more like a an extension of the sidewalk than an extension of the road, and it's not only in Amsterdam; it's throughout the smaller towns in the Netherlands and now across Northern Europe. So, I feel like they're 20 or 30 years ahead of us, but if we sort of put our mind to trying to replicate, really, the higher standard of living that they have in those places -- because they're able to get from place to place, you know, without using gas and without polluting and without traffic -- that it will make Rhode Island a much better place to live. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Thank you. Brian Bishop.

MR. BISHOP: Thanks. I'm going to speak mostly to the amendments, since they seem to be moving at relatively great neck speed. In these public hearings, obviously, if you're going to make a recommendation tonight, I really almost -- you know, a last gasp, while I never really expect to have much effect on the outcome, at least, I
think, I should speak to them at this point. In particular, I'm concerned about — while it's been -- I appreciate the explanation that there's been a change in asset management philosophy and approach that requires some of these amendments, I can't possibly see the probity in placing $200 million for the 6/10 connect project, which the design is not complete. And DOT has said the design really needs to come back to Rhode Island.

It's rushing forward for other, I think, absurd reasons to get federal grants and so forth, so that we have the cart completely before the horse with this project. And I understand the frustration. There was someone here who said we've a project on the books for 10 or 15 years tonight, and, of course, I know that people in DOT know that that project has been on the books for thirty years, some-odd. I mean, I don't celebrate that, and I don't think that it sat there because there are a bunch of people here, you know, protesting the nature of what the 6/10 connector was. It has given us an at opportunity to re-examine that, and I don't celebrate the time it took.

If that had been rebuilt 20 years ago, we
wouldn't be talking about it. We are. I didn't try to obstruct that 20 years ago. I have absolutely nothing against cars, but I do think good ideas have been brought forward, and I am concerned two-fold. One is, there's talk about actually issuing the bonds this fall for a couple of hundred million dollars on a project, and we don't even have a project yet. I mean, last I knew, that would be effectively a re-look at how we go about bonding in Rhode Island. And I thought that revenue and DOA would -- maybe you've already had comments on that. I haven't been to every meeting, so I can't say. It's very concerning.

I mean that funding may belong in out years. It may even belong with some more directed money, you know, in those out years that are fiscally constrained, i.e. the nearer portion of the TIP you're hearing, but I cannot see putting them in there. And having them in those others, personally, I can't see how this has anything to do with a grant application on the project. And, additionally, it wasn't mentioned. It's a much smaller amount. Only 30 some-odd million is also in this TIP amendment for the toll gantries coming
from the GARVEE bonds again. And, you know, I
concede that the legislatures, you know, did pass
some legislation.

Last I knew, it was DOT's opinion that the
most -- and this is a clairvoyant moment -- the
most practical thing to do would be to put up the
gantry that we already own and let some litigation
happen in order to see if this is the route down
which we want to go. And I actually think these
two comments are very closely linked because
although the GARVEE bonds are not toll money, and
money is fungible, the cost of the proposed ideas
for renovating the 6/10 or rebuilding the 6/10
were really driving the idea that the extra in a
different approach to funding, including the
tolling, was necessary.

So, I think where the 6/10 connector, a
full rebuild was used as a reason to approach
funding that way, and where we're not even sure at
this point of the constitutionality of that
funding, it's inappropriate for those items to be
GARVEE bonded at this point, especially in the
2016 amendment. Now, if somebody -- if some great
fiscal wizards have said, you know, interest rates
are going up, I think it's relatively marginal.
It means we'd be paying for the money while we're not using it, and forgive my cynicism for thinking that having that amount of money sitting around when it's not ready to be spent is not a really good idea.

And this actually relates, with all due respect to folks who think that Wickford could be, you know, the second coming of transportation or something, you know, I cannot look at the Wickford train station as an asset. I look at it as an embarrassment. It's evidence of what happens when we spend on infrastructure instead of it service. And the -- I was not here to try and lie in front of those bulldozers, so, you know, I'm as much to blame as anyone else that we own an expensive train station to which relatively few trains and relatively few customers go.

I bring this up because, at least semantically, that appears to be on page 87 of the TIP amendments what we're doing with the so-called Travel Center, which is being put forward as a transit hub. Huh, who knew? Now, I am not a big transit advocate, but, you know, I have to say that -- you know, I feel that when projects are improperly premised or when they somehow are said
to be -- am I time out?

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Yes.

THE WITNESS: Oh, okay. That's fine.

I'll be back.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Grant Dulgarian.

MR. DULGARIAN: Grant Dulgarian (D-u-l-g-a-r-i-a-n). A few things: One, the 6/10 connector. $800 million for a 6/10 connector is amazing to me. And before we even think about spending any of that money, we need to really sit down and try to determine what makes sense. I'm a data-driven individual. I'd like to see some data. I remember, as a kid growing up, there was no connection, and there was no massive traffic jam that there exists now on 6/10 as you're approaching 95, whether it's north, south. If you want to get off the Convention Center exit, it's amazing. And it's amazing throughout the day. It's not, like, isolated morning or afternoon. No, it's continuously slow. I don't know if we have data from before we built this, but it would be -- I perhaps might be instructive to look and see what's going on -- what went on then as opposed to what's go on now.

I say that because a few years ago, we
replaced the Union Avenue Bridge that overpasses Route 10. And it didn't seem like it was that big a deal in terms of traffic volume before they replaced it. And, so, they replaced it by actually shutting it down for the better part of two years, and it had on/off ramps going both north and south, and replaced the bridge. The bridge is now back, and the traffic that uses that is amazing. I'm saying, "Wow, where did all this traffic come from, and where were they before?"

So I figure you have the data on that, and I would be very interested in knowing what the data was before the bridge replacement and what the data was during replacement and the surrounding on and off ramps and what the data is now. That might inform us as to what we ought to be looking at and thinking about when it comes to the 6/10 connector. I say that because it's right next door. So, that's number one. Number two, when we were talking about spending $100 million for a 1.6 mile rail line, I could not believe anybody thought that was a bright idea.

Anyone who thought that was a bright idea to me, you know, I couldn't trust anymore. I remember reading in the Boston Globe or the Wall
Street Journal some -- for a distance of a lot more miles and a lot less cost were doing a rail line, and I am saying, "Why is this costing so much for such a short amount of distance?" Well, that's gone away because not enough folks bought into that, thankfully. We wonder why Rhode Island is in economic doldrums is because we spend money on stuff we shouldn't be spending on.

When we were talking about 195, and we could have added a lane in each direction in the same location for a fraction of the amount of relocating it in a new location, but which did we pick? We picked the relocation and it cost even more than they said it was going to cost at the public hearings when they were first discussing it. But the answer was, "Oh, it's going to uncap land for the development. "That's good." People are going to be waiting in line to develop this land it's so valuable, so important, and so it's worth all this extra amount of money. Well, what happened? We did it. We spent it, and nobody waited in line. Now we're giving tax incentives for people to go there. Very distressing.

So we're now down to 17 million for an enhanced bus, whatever we're talking about, and
according to what I heard tonight we're talking about running six different bus lines in and out of this extending whatever. My thought is this, two thoughts: One, the Route 6, which is the Roger Williams Park or Avenue, Rhode Island Hospital and the Route 49, which is the Camp Street. Marry those two together; have it run the route that we're talking about; do a lot of promotion, and see what kind of ridership we get before we invest any money in doing all these in the ground investments because we need some data. We need to know what's going on before we spend millions and millions of dollars. I'll be back.

Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Thank you. Are there any registered speakers who would like to make supplemental comments?

MR. RHODES: Mr. Roberts, I think you were first, if there's anything else you'd like to say?

MR. ROBERTS: Peter Roberts, again. 80 Omerod Avenue, Portsmouth, Rhode Island. I want to begin where I ended off talking about my vehicles. On my van, the rims cost $500 apiece. Two had to be replaced both on the right-hand side of the car because of the bumps. I believe the
state only gives you $350. My van cost $2,600 to
have everything repaired, and I did not get the
rims that were on it before. I went to a junkyard
and got old ones. The Sable was around $1,700 and
the Taurus was around $1,500. That's what it cost
to keep these cars going, and this is the second
time two of the cars had to be done in eight years
because of the roads.

Another thing, Turnpike Avenue, which goes
to the Mt. Hope Bridge, was resurfaced. I went
down that road and filmed the whole road when they
said they were going to do that. There was not
one pothole on that road, not one. There were
cracks in the road that they had filled with the
tar. They resurfaced that road. Right at the end
of that road is Sprague Street that goes across to
East Main Road, and it's like a washboard going
across there. I mean, terrible. It's a state
road. They never did a thing to it, and it's not
that long. But they resurfaced a road that had
nothing wrong with it, and East Main and West Main
Road have more potholes than you can imagine, and
they fixed a road that had nothing wrong it.

If you go down by Boyd's Lane and head
south on East Main Road 'til you get to Turnpike,
they changed the lanes on that road. You can still see the old lines in it. They never resurfaced that road. When you get to the end of Bristol Ferry Road and turn right onto West Main Road, they changes the lines in that. As you drive down that, you can still see some of the old lines, and you can see the little squares in the road where the reflectors used to be. They never recovered that, but, yet, they did Turnpike Avenue.

Then I found out there's a few people involved with government that live on that road, and believe me, I believe that kind of thing happens in Rhode Island. And as far as bridges go, they're putting tolls on trucks. If you go to bridges during the rush hours in the morning and the evening, the amount of cars that's on those bridges, the trucks don't even come close to them, don't come close. That weight is far more than any trucks on the bridge. The weight of the trucks are not hurting those bridges.

If you look at everything, especially what they show you on TV, or go to the old Sakonnet River Bridge, it's all because of the rust and the age. It had nothing to do with the weight.
They're going after tolls, they want tolls, because the state keeps spending money on the wrong things, and it even goes with the lottery. They don't spend it on schools, they spend it on other things. We need to get everything straightened out here and get it done right because when they first built the Mt. Hope Bridge -- excuse me, the Pell Bridge, Newport Bridge, every year they went along underneath of that and sandblasted it and painted it. There was never going to be any trouble when they did it this way. Then, all of a sudden, they quit doing that, and the rust builds up under the paint. You don't see it.

Every now and then, you'll see a section fall that's three feet long or something because the rust has let it go. That's the problem with them, they haven't kept the maintenance up. And, on the news, you'll see the pictures of the different overpasses and stuff. The stuff that's falling off is the old concrete because it's so old. It's on the handrails and everything else. It's not because of the weight; it's because it is not being taken care of. So we don't need the tolls. We need to just start taking care of
things. And I honestly believe, you toll the
trucks, the next that's coming is the cars,
because I was involved in "no tolls" on the
Sakonnet River Bridge.

    That was one of the biggest jokes in the
world, too, all right. And you go on the Tiverton
side, and you were down under the bridge. Every
sidewalk is brand new. Every street was redone.
You go on the Portsmouth side, none of them were
done. The overpass you go over that Anthony Road
road goes under, you can watch the rain coming
through it in the wet weather, which means ever
since they did this, and they never repaired that,
that means in the wintertime that moisture gets in
there, and it's cracking more and more. But, yet,
they did everything on the other side of the
river. They didn't do anything on the Portsmouth
side.

    Here they are coming in and wanting to put
rotaries and change intersections instead of
fixing the roads. Let's get the roads fixed
before you think about anything else because it's
tearing our automobiles up and causing lots of
problems. I'm a disabled veteran. I cannot
afford having four cars that I've got to pay for
to fix and have my kids in school. I need the
roads fixed so we can rely on our vehicles and not
worry about accidents. My wife is driving on East
Main Road right near Stub Toe Lane, and the
tie-rod come off on the car. That scared her to
death. Now, she did hang onto the steering wheel
and was able to stop, but if you ever think about
-- okay, but you lose your steering, think about
that, and there's only one reason it happened,
because of the potholes.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Thank you. Any other
registered speakers who wish to make supplemental
comments? Brian Bishop.

MR. BISHOP: Okay. That always reminds me
of blazing saddles. So we left off at the welcome
center which is now a transit hub, and I don't
know that that designation has really changed
much, what anybody thinks it will cost, but I just
want to point out at a time when we're moving the
commuter bus parking over to Wickford, you know,
just to -- so there's a few people there at the
train station taking the buses -- that we have a
commuter parking lot in Westerly, it's already
paid for, you know, and what I don't see and --
well, I say Westerly; that's really Ashaway.
In meeting with the people in Ashaway who kind of wonder how anybody got the idea that they all thought this was a good idea, apparently, somebody sent a letter along with the TIGER grant that it was, but they're not really clear on how that happened, and they're a little confused because, of course, they thought the transit hub meant they were going to get a lot more transit. So they thought that was an upside to this. I mean, where's the service that goes with that? I mean, is there something that -- and I am not begging for that, but I'm saying, "Look, does that mean you're going to run buses up out of Westerly to the thing, or does it really mean you're just going to take the relatively paltry, you know, modestly effective commuter rail parking service that we already have, and the parking lot is already paid for, and stick it in a highway plaza and call it a transit hub?"

When the priorities at Westerly, you know, which again, I think, are fadingly far off, but I would say transit-wise are how to improve on the results on commuter rail and for themselves to be reached in that way. And, so, I think it -- you know, what possible interest there could have been
semantically in putting this under transit capital spending, I can't imagine when we're talking -- look, it's a welcome center. The people who are welcoming are not the commuters coming home. Maybe we're being nice to them; maybe we're glad they're there; but, you know, it's supposed to be a welcome center to enter the state.

I mean, I don't do that as a transit project. I don't think people are going to drive from New York City to park there to get on a bus to go to Providence. And, another thing that I have a problem within this designation aside from the fact that I think there's really not -- there's not the support for the scale of endeavor there. It appears, in a sense, to pay for it and to make the thing operate, that the state wants to, you know, wants to kind of compete with truck stops and gas stations and food in South County to make this into something. I don't think anybody thinks it's a bad idea to have a modest welcoming center. It's certainly not necessary.

Everybody is running around with their iPhones these days. It's not necessary to have it to, like, pass out little tourist pamphlets, but it could still be a piece of the gateway to the
state. But, as you can see, it competes with private businesses ranging from right where I live at Exit 5, right on down to the state line, and of course, it will be a tax-free facility. So I think the idea of kind of making -- this idea has gotten grander than it ought to.

And then to top matters off, I think it's not a semantic that the line item for the state's share comes out of the Bridge and Highway Maintenance Fund. How is building a welcome center part of bridge and highway maintenance? I mean, this is why we're having the argument about how to fund our roads because any time that something comes along that somebody wants to do, they take the money from fixing the roads, and they put it towards, you know, some splashy project.

So, finally, I have some serious actual and semantical problems with the way a number of these projects have been presented. And, finally, what I would like to say is, you know, I'm not at all here in many senses as a loud critic. I'm not here as a critic of highways or cars. I love highways and cars, and as much as I think the 6/10 could be different, I'm not here saying, "Oh,
let's rip 95 out of Providence because it doesn't
do South Providence a lot of good," because I
think that part of transportation is
psychological; not only whether there's
congestion, but when people stand back, and they
take a look at the state, can we get places?

The main -- one of the main
disappointments I have is how we've got stuff to
fix. If we're going to use tolls, I'd like to see
them used for projects that have been tabled and
never done. Since that is open, since the longer
TIP is open, I'll submit that stuff in writing. I
thank you for your time.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Thank you. Are there
any other registered speakers who wish to make
additional comments?

MR. DULGARIAN: It would be nice -- seeing
this is balloonist document -- a lot of stuff is
in there, a lot of moving parts, that maybe once
every two or three years, we revisit it. I'm not
saying we're not going to revisit it for enough
five or ten years. The time frame is a little too
far out. Number two, you know, we did GARVEE
bonds for five big projects a decade ago, a decade
and a half ago. And then under Chafee, it was
decided that we were going to do pay as you go,
and the way we were going to accomplish that was
by raising the license fees, raising the
registration fees, raising the inspection fees.

I just got a renewal for the registration.
It went from 61.50 to 91.50. But then we were
told last year that wasn't enough, we're going to
have to borrow money again. And so we're
borrowing more GARVEE. I'm saying to myself, "How
much GARVEE can we borrow over what period of
time?" Is the sky the limit? Is there a ceiling?
I'm troubled by all this borrowing. And the
argument is, "Well, we've got to do so much right
away because if we wait, stuff will be in worse
shape, and it will cost more."

So my question is that the stuff that is
going to be deteriorating even more than it is now
and cost us more than it will be now, maybe that's
the stuff you ought to do first. And the stuff
that's already deteriorated that we have to spend
the full amount on, you ought to save that for
later because it's not going to get any more
expensive, and maybe we don't have to borrow as
much money and spend as much on interest. The
back -- so that was number three.
Number four, back when -- in the '70s, I remember that Federal Highway was doing some stuff down in Texas, looking at maintenance-free landscaping; what would work? What didn't work? Different climates, different soils. It made sense, and I haven't heard anything about that since, and yet we're still doing a lot of maintenance. It's been a third of a century; you'd think that we had this thing under control by now, and we could be doing this and save ourselves some money on the operating side.

Finally, traffic signalization. I can't believe that New York City can signalize their traffic lights, and we can't in Rhode Island. I have grown up in this state, and we haven't gotten any better at it in all the decades that I've lived in this state. Part of the problem is that we have two parallel transportation maintenance operations. We have the individual cities and towns, and we have the state. There isn't a lot of rhyme or reason because every so often the state legislation will pass a bill that says, "Oh we're going to add this to the state maintenance. This street to the state maintenance list," and so it grows like tumbleweed.
In any event, when it comes to traffic signalization, it's a little unclear who's in charge. Is it a state maintained road? Is the state in charge? If it's not a state maintained road, that means the state is not in charge? If there's an intersection, will the state maintain or the municipality maintain the road? Who's in charge? I don't know, but it would seem like something we ought to find out and figure out because that leads to traffic accidents, I'm sure, because people are so frustrated. They get a green light, but the next light in front of them is about to turn red. So it's very troubling. We ought to pay attention to that.

As part of that sort of 5A (sic), the Providence Water Supply Board has decided it's going to spend a huge amount of money to relocate their headquarters unnecessarily. At the same time, they're ripping up roads all over the place because they've got to do the Lead Replacement Program. Presumably, when they're done with that, they're responsible for making the road -- fixing the road back up again. The one jumps out at me is Reservoir Avenue in Cranston, which is a mess, and it's been a mess for a couple of years.
Providing Water was doing a lot of work on it last year. I don't see them around this year; maybe they're done. But Reservoir Avenue is still a mess.

I'd like to think that they're going to do that; they're going to make it whole again. But who's in charge of the traffic signals on Reservoir Avenue in Cranston, as an example. It's a state-maintained road, but Providence Water has been doing all this work, and the signals are not coordinated. That's a subset. That's an example of if Providence Water is going to be replacing a lot of lead pipes all over the place, there ought to be a coordination between Providence Water and DOT so that we can get this all done as efficiently and economically as possible. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Thank you. Is there anyone who is not registered that wishes to speak? (NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: I'd like to close the public hearing at 8:06.

We are now going to go to the agenda as set. I don't think I need to call anybody to order. The first item on the agenda is an action
item for the approval of the April 21st, 2016
minutes. Do I have a motion to approve them?

MR. FLAHERTY: So moved.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Second?

MR. MONAGHAN: Second.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Is there any
discussion?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: All in favor?

(UNANIMOUS VOTE)

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Opposed?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: The second item on
the agenda is a public comment on the agenda
items, and, obviously, that does not include
Amendment Number 7, which we've already had. So,
is there anyone that wishes to speak about any
other issues on the agenda?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Well, we might get
out of here. The next item on the agenda is an
actual action item. That is approval of the STIP
2013-2016 Amendment Number 7, which we've been
discussing. I would like a motion, a second and
then discussion.
MR. WALKER: So moved.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Second?

MS. BRADY: Second.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Discussion? TAC?

MR. WALKER: Chair?

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Yes.

MR. WALKER: First, I'd like to reiterate what has been said in some of the other meetings in thanking the staff for the detail that we've got in front of us. In my years that I've been here, I don't think that I can say that the level of detail, the different ways that the material has been split and the updates on what's going on community by community to actually see that projects are moving along, or they're not, or they've been cancelled. I have to say I think this is the first time we've had this, which ends up being double-sided enough to weigh things down, but I think it's worth it.

I think that I'll give a lot of credit to Meredith and the work that she's done for going back and historically looking at where some of the gaps are to come up with how the funding came about being presented here in the '13 to '16 TIP Amendment, as well as Amy for the transit
component. But I've not seen where we've ever
gone back and then come back to this body and
said, "We didn't spend this money," or "We found
this," or "It was unallocated, and we're going to
put it on the table today."

So that's refreshing that we're actually
going back and accounting for what their projects
have been and what has been done with it or not
done with it. So I'd like to commend the staff
and the administration for doing that, as well as
the Statewide Planning Program. And, last, but
not least, I can't think Chelsea enough for her
work in putting these tables together and being
able to cut the data so that we could actually
have it to use.

So, I also want to thank the staff for
this summary because having it in our hands today
instead of just getting a little bit of a
narrative with being actually able to read what
people said, again, I think is one of the first
times we've had it in front of us from the
afternoon session when we've met here at night,
and it's nice to see what people are actually
talking about for projects instead of
generalities.
And then tonight to have almost two hours -- or an hour and a half of more public discourse, pro and con, I think is refreshing that people are still coming out, and they're still interested. So, I move the question because the detail that's behind it, and notwithstanding the comments that we've heard, I put forth a compelling case of why we should -- for the programming, the fiscal '16 dollars, we should advance this tonight. And the 6/10, to me, scares me a little bit. I drive on it every day, and I see the wood blocking.

I see that this project is about reconstructing bridges. And as we've had in the earlier meeting, I believe, and I would like to be corrected if I'm wrong, that the bigger project is still undefined. Jonathan, I remember, asked about "Where do we do that?" and "How do we talk about that?" That's not been discussed yet, so that's still to come. I look forward to those discussions, but if we can get those bridges started that a lot of us drive over both ways every day, to me, that's progress.

So, with that, thank you for the time, but also thank you to the staff for what we have before us tonight.
CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Is there any other further discussion from members of the TAC?

MS. BRADY: I just wanted to note, so in front of you, you also have -- it's actually three pages. I've got a request to ask you all a favor. You've got a black and white, kind of like this with the lines. There should be two pages, not three. Your third page has to do with years going forward, not the '16 Amendment. So, if you would take your last page off and just don't confuse yourself and eliminate it, and follow along. I'm going to walk you through this amendment -- not amendment, but these changes. These are technical changes that you've made. Some of them actually answer some of the questions that were raised by people earlier today. So I would like to just walk you through it really quickly.

We have found in going through our FTA Fixed Guideway Funding that we had accidentally not included about half a million dollars, which is when you're looking at the Fixed Guideway Funding, that's significant. So we have now included that funding. That's on your first page. We also have included an earmark for the Trestle Trail Project, and this is all written and appears
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in the record.

On your second page, you see a pretty substantial list of projects with revised project estimates. When we first put this program of projects together, we were putting these estimates together without necessarily project managers assigned and with our system very new, and we have since revised a number of the project estimates. In addition, we have a project on Route 102, Victory Highway, which was pointed out actually by a member of the TAC. The project is, in fact, complete.

The funding for that project has been removed, which has helped us out significantly in order to be able to increase the estimates of some of the other projects. And, for the most part, that generally takes care of the -- we also switched between available funding sources for a couple of projects. But, as I said, we're not adding any projects. These are all what I'll call technical corrections to what we originally submitted. And if there are any questions on those or anything else before us, I'm happy to help if I can.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: So we have a motion
on the floor for a second, and we've had
discussion. Is there any further discussion?

MR. FLAHERTY: Madam Chair, thank you. I
want to begin with a point of order. Looking at
agenda item number 4, I thought that there was
going to be TAC discussions before we went
directly to a motion on item 5, but I'm fine with
that. I'm happy to have that discussion now. It
probably won't come as a surprise to the members
of the TAC because we discussed at the April 21st
meeting a concern that I raised about the use of
public funds included in Amendment 7 for new
highway ramps for Route 295.

Grow Smart has taken a formal position on
that. In fact, I brought copies, and I'll just
share with folks. You can pass it down. That
outlines our concern more specifically. We don't
believe that the use of these funds are consistent
with our state guide plan. So, I was prepared to
offer an alternate motion, but we have a motion on
the table. So I'll just say that I'll be voting
"no" for this motion and would be happy to offer
an alternate motion if a sufficient number of
people agree with that. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Any further
discussion? Dan, did you have something you
wanted to -- I thought he raised his hand. I
thought you had your hand raised for discussion.

MR. BAUDOIN: I did. I'm sorry, I don't
know where we are. Did John make a motion?

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: We're dealing with a
motion, and we're going to be voting on that, and
then he may have a supplemental motion.

MR. BAUDOIN: I'm okay.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Everett?

MR. STUART: Everett Stuart. I just want
to comment that I agree with John Flaherty on the
Route 295 ramps aspect and the sprawl of that
would induce into the whole area. I don't have a
problem with the state providing financial
assistance to keeping Citizens in the state, but
at that location, it's not transit friendly.

Urban freeways, part of the reasons they move
slowly and they're clogged is because of the exits
and on-ramps are so close together. The two
existing ones at Route 44 and Route 6 are only
about three miles apart. And, now, to accommodate
one entity, we're going to put in one in the
middle of that.

So between the land use patterns and the
sprawl that would induce, you know, all sorts of
surrounding properties, not just as what Citizens
is dealing with, I agree with John. I'm going to
vote with John against this motion but based on
that one reason.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Any other comments?
Yes.

MS. FREEMAN: I want to share that I'm
also planning on voting with John on this
regarding the ramps. I have concerns about the
location of a major employer like this outside of
the urban center and the national friends by
employers and employees who want to be in urban
centers. I've just witnessed this with General
Electric. I moved to Boston based on urban
infrastructure, and to spend money supporting a
relocation to an isolated campus like this doesn't
make sense, and for the state to support it
financially like this doesn't make sense. So I'm
looking forward to hearing John's alternate
motion.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Yes?

MR. HARRIS: I will vote with Bari and
Everett and John on this for the reasons stated.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Michael?
MR. WALKER: It shouldn't come as a surprise that I have a different viewpoint about this. Citizens, as a corporate citizen in Rhode Island, have made a decision to retain 3,200 Rhode Island jobs in Rhode Island, and those folks, as reported in the Providence Journal back when the announcement was made, is reaching the end of a lease agreement that they currently have in Cranston, and they are looking to bring their folks from Cranston, as well as a couple of our suburban locations, to one consolidated place.

When this was announced, I anticipated that there would be some discourse about it and actually pulled out land use 2025, the executive summary, and took a look at the map that's included in land use 2025 that depicts the urban services boundary and found that this location is actually within the urban services boundary. As land use 2025 calls for, that's where we should be focusing our development along our interstate highway system and within that boundary, which this does.

I also find right now that that land is zoned, and there could be other developments taking place there. This is not protected land
that is prevented or protected from future development. In fact, it could become house lots tomorrow if Citizens were not going in there, and we could have housing developments all through that area as well. So there was a landowner who sold. There was a company that made a location decision for their business, and it's 3,200 other Rhode Islanders that are keeping their jobs in Rhode Island, and, for that reason, I support this project. That's why I moved the question the way it was.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Any other comments?

MS. HAGGERTY: Given the controversial nature of the 295 component of Amendment 7, I'd like the TAC to consider potentially separating that out and moving forward the rest of Amendment 7 without 295 and tabling that for further discussion after that vote, if possible.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: I think we need the approval of the original motion person to be able to separate it out.

MR. WALKER: I'd rather not. I'd rather have the motion stand as it is.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Oh, I thought you wanted to separate it out.
MR. WALKER: No, not at all.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Is there any further comment from any members of the TAC? Yes.

MR. BAUDOIN: Thank you. No one was more disappointed than me and others that they didn't locate in Downtown Providence, but I think they made a decision, and I understand the support to try to keep them in Rhode Island. I think it comes down -- not considering the land use elements, but when it comes down to the money, I think this project is a $6 million project. I could be wrong, and Citizens was paying for half. Is that generally right?

MR. WALKER: Yes.

MR. BAUDOIN: My suggestion is that there's nowhere in the transportation field that gives property owners a windfall than to build a new interchange. In other states, you have transportation improvement districts, and in this case, there are other development sites around that will probably be developed because it's a new interchange. Why have a windfall go to the owners of those properties and create a transportation improvement district and at least try to recover back the money that the state is going to put
forward to build the interchange so that maybe it becomes a zero cost to the government, a zero cost to this program, which at least overcomes some of the objections, I think. That would be my idea. Let's see if we can investigate creating a transportation district like they've done in probably about ten other states. Maybe we need state legislation, but I don't think RIDOT would oppose the concept of trying to recapture some of the value that is created when they build all new interchanges. But, you know, I can't vote against this. I think the whole thing is, you know, not great for Providence, not great for downtown, but, hey, it is what it is. They've made their decision, and if there's a way that we can do it without coming up with any money, let's figure it out that way.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Is there any further discussion? Yes?

MS. SHERRILL: Pam Sherrill. I'd like to support Dan's idea about a transportation improvement district. It's an area -- as a former town planner in Johnston, I can say that it's a former area -- or it's an area with several large developable parcels that are subject of lawsuits
right now that will be very -- be highly
developable once the sewer and water is extended
to those sites, and certainly with access -- ramp
access extended to the sites. So I would like to
support your idea. I know that that's not
something within our amendment to speak about, but
it is an idea worth further investigation.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Yes?

MR. MONAGHAN: It would seem to me that
this is tantamount to a public private
partnership, and we're going to be seeing more of
this as time goes by -- design build, different
project deployment practices -- and I don't see an
issue with the state and Citizens participating in
a funding program where everybody wins. It's good
for the state; it's good for the people who are
working for Citizens; and we need to keep these
companies in the state. What we have to do is
cooperate with them and work with them, and I
think that we should go forward with this matter.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Any other discussion?

Yes?

MS. FREEMAN: Can I ask Dan or someone
else to explain the process briefly of
establishing a transportation for the district?
CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: I'd like to save that discussion for another time. We have a motion on the floor now, and I would like the discussion to pertain particularly to that motion. Do we have any further discussion on this motion? All in favor?

(UNANIMOUS VOTE)

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Opposed?

MR. RHODES: Fran, can we do a roll call?

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Yeah, I think we have to do a roll call. Walker?

MR. WALKER: Yes.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Stuart?

MR. STUART: No.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Harris?

MR. HARRIS: No.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Brady?

MS. BRADY: Yes.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Piccione?

MS. PICCIONE: Yes.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Baudouin?

MR. BAUDOuin: Yes.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Flaherty?

MR. FLAHERTY: No.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Freeman?
MS. FREEMAN: No.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Gagnon?

MR. GAGNON: Yes.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Haggerty?

MS. HAGGERTY: Yes.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Monaghan?

MS. MONAGHAN: Yes.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Porter?

MR. PORTER: Yes.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Scanlon?

MR. SCANLON: Yes.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Sherrill?

MS. SHERRILL: Yes.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Shocket, yes.

Motion carries, 12-2.

MR. RHODES: 11 to 4.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: That's not even close. Well, it passed, let's put it that way.

MR. BAUDOUIN: At some point, can I make a motion about my suggestion about the transportation improvement district? Does that come later?

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: You can do it now.

MR. BAUDOUIN: Well, I'd just like to make a motion that RIDOT, and I guess the Department of
Administration and the Statewide Planning take a
look at the transportation improvement district as it pertains to the interchange project that we just voted on as a way of recouping the other $3 million that the state is allocating towards that project.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Dan, I apologize. I missed the action part in the middle. Could you please repeat that for just so I capture it accurately?

MR. BAUDOIN: The motion is just to have RIDOT and Department of Administration look into the idea of establishing a transportation improvement district in the area of the -- what is it, the 295 interchange that we just voted funding for with the idea of trying to recoup the $3 million that the state is expected to pay for that interchange.

MR. RHODES: Thank you. I appreciate that.

MR. FLAHERTY: Second.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Discussion? Yes, Mike?

MR. WALKER: Perhaps in our next agenda item, the work plan, that may be a good place
under the work that the TAC does, that the staff
does on behalf of the TAC to undertake this TAC
after the motion carries, that we have the staff
consider it as part of the work scope in the work
plans.

MR. RHODES: Dan, if you would be willing
to amend your motion to make that a request to
have that included in the UPWP for FY'17, the
staff would be happy to accept that.

MR. BAUDOIN: Is that related to this
specific project, though not as a general idea?
I'd like it related to a specific project.

MR. RHODES: Yes, sir.

MR. BAUDOIN: Yes, sure.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Any further
discussion?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: All in favor?

(UNANIMOUS VOTE)

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Opposed?

(NO RESPONSE).

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: I'd like to introduce
Parag Agrawal, and he will be discussing agenda
item number 6, Unified Transportation Planning and
Work Program.
MS. FREEMAN: May I ask a question? It was just a point of order. Was there a moment when we had an opportunity to ask questions that related to the original TIP? I see it as tax discussion under item 4, but I don't feel like I -- similar to -- what John mentioned earlier.

MR. RHODES: So we got to the discussion point. It was actually taken up under item number 5. At that point the Mr. Walker made a motion to approve. That motion was seconded, and then the discussion was held.

MS. FREEMAN: And when was the TAC discussion on the TIP?

MR. RHODES: The discussion was on the amendment.

MS. FREEMAN: On the amendment. Is there a point where we were having a discussion on the TIP?

MR. RHODES: No, because the TIP for '17 to '25 is not scheduled for action. The TAC, of course, can entertain that discussion should you like.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: But that agenda item was specifically for the amendment.

MS. FREEMAN: Okay.
MR. RHODES: And I apologize; the agenda was a little bit fuzzy there. So we're on the work program.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Michael Walker?

MR. WALKER: At the next meeting, when the public hearing is closed, will we have the opportunity to talk about the '17 to '25 TIP then, or prior to taking any action on it?

MS. CALLAGHAN: Yes. And we'll provide you with the public comment report, which will summarize all of the public comments received at this public hearing and the earlier one and all written comments received. So that's really the opportunity the TAC will have to discuss the draft TIP.

MS. FREEMAN: Okay, I'm sorry. I was under the impression it was today.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Ms. Piccione?

MS. PICCIONE: Lilly Piccione. What happens if we do not approve -- we have a discussion and have arguments or discussions and are unable to approve the TIP at the next session?

MS. CALLAGHAN: Well, you're scheduled to review the draft, the public comment report into the July meeting, and to make a recommendation to
the State Planning Council in August. So you'll
have lots of opportunity.

MR. RHODES: Two more meetings prior to
staff requesting action on the FY'17 to '25 TIP.

MS. CALLAGHAN: Again, the public comment
period closes on June 26th. I think that's after
the next meeting date. The next meeting date is
the 23rd, June 23rd. So the public comment period
closes after your meeting date.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Okay. Go ahead.

MR. BAUDOUIN: Thank you. Just a
procedural question. All the comments that have
been received, that will be received, is it -- are
they going to be answered by staff, or do we just
receive the comments without an answer? And then
will there be any suggested changes that RIDOT or
the Department of Administration and Statewide
Planning make on the next draft, or is it
basically -- or there won't be any changes?

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Jared is going to
take that.

MR. RHODES: Dan, as is our standard
practice, what we will do is we will be working
between now and the end of the comment period to
first and foremost put together a summary table
that summarizes all the comments that were received on the proposed FY'17 to '25 TIP, both those we received verbally at our hearings today as well as those that we received in writing. Once we have what we feel is an accurate capture and summary of those comments, we will be coordinating with staff at DOT and RIPTA to produce draft responses to those comments. Based on how those conversations go and what those responses are, there may, in fact, be proposed revisions to the TIP as a result of all the comments that we have received.

So, by the time we've reached the end of this process, and we're asking for a final recommendation, you will have that summary table that summarizes the comments, has the DOT, RIPTA, Statewide Planning response, as well as any suggested edits that are proposed. In addition to that, you will have a complete stenographic record of the hearings, as well as hard copies of all the written comments that are received, and our intention is to also make available to TAC members the actual audio recording from these meetings should you be interested in them.

MR. BAUDOIN: All right. You've got it
cover.

MS. FREEMAN: There were also questions that were asked by the TAC at the last meeting recorded in the minutes that we're going to get an answer from RIDOT, which I don't believe we've received yet.

MR. RHODES: RIDOT is well aware of those comments and is working on preparing the response to those as well.

MS. FREEMAN: Questions, not comments?

MR. RHODES: Questions, comments.

MS. FREEMAN: Semi-annual safety review, the definition and the process.

MR. RHODES: As documented in the minutes, correct.

MS. FREEMAN: Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Parag?

MR. AGRAWAL: Good evening everyone. I'm Parag Agrawal, and I'm the new director of the Division of Planning. This is my third week over here. I know a lot of good work is going on over here, so I'm very happy to be part of all this. I came here from Bridgeport, Connecticut, where I served as the city's planning director for more than three years. Before that, I was working for
Montgomery County in Maryland for more than eight years, and I started working for the City's Historic Preservation Office in Columbus, Ohio where I worked for more than six years.

I have a background in architecture. I am an architect, and I did my planning from Ohio State. Taking this number 6 on the agenda of the Unified Transportation Planning Work Program, it is my understanding that you all have reviewed this work program. And, since then, we have added three more items to this based on the suggestions of the State Plan Council and the Governor's office. Those three items are: Number 1 is the transit hub. We will be more involved in the transit hub. Second is the housing plan. That division will be working more closely with the Rhode Island Housing on the Housing Plan, and the third is the Cranston Street Rehabilitation Project.

So our division will be taking a more active role and rehabbing that rehabilitation on Cranston Street. So these are the three major improvements. These are three major revisions in our work program, but all other items remain as they are. We have also -- Jared and I, we have
also made a comprehensive summary of this item, because there was around 81 pages, and for other things, State Planning suggested, "Okay, there should be a better way of reviewing this document so not everyone can go through the 81 pages." So what we have done is we have put together a table that basically charts all the projects from our division, and we can hand over that table to you.

MR. RHODES: So, if I may?

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Yes.

MR. RHODES: Jared Rhodes speaking again. Staff would appreciate if the Transportation Advisory Committee would be willing to recommend to the State Planning Council that they adopt this work program, and Dan I have not forgotten about your recent motion. I will make that add.

MR. AGRAWAL: So there are four new items, including Dan's.

MR. BAUDOIN: I so move.

MR. RHODES: Thank you, sir.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Is there a second?

MS. BRADY: Second.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Any further discussion of this item?

(NO RESPONSE)
CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: All in favor?

(UNANIMOUS VOTE)

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Opposed?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Is there any additional public comment?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Are there any announcements?

(NO RESPONSE).

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Motion to adjourn so we can all go home.

MS. SHERRILL: Announcement.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Announcement.

MS. SHERRILL: I left a flier for some upcoming meetings for the Bus Stop Design Guide Project. This is from RIDOT and RIPTA, and this is a design guideline for RIPTA/RIDOT and municipalities used to integrate bus stops into a complete street and approach. So I hope to see people at these meetings. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Any other announcements?

MS. FREEMAN: Just a quick one. We have a new bike map in town. It's the Newport County
Bike Map. It was made possible with the RIDOT, AAA. They all participated in funding it. There are 15,000 copies of them now in Newport. I have a few copies here if anybody would like to pick one up, and just let me know if you have a location where you think they should be distributed.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Great. Thank you.

Any other additional discussions? Motion to adjourn?

MR. WALKER: So moved.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Second.

MR. BAUDOuin: Second.

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Okay. All in favor?

(UNANIMOUS VOTE)

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: Opposed?

(NO RESPONSE)

CHAIRWOMAN SHOCKET: No one.
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<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2:17</td>
<td>28:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2:19</td>
<td>32:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-'25</td>
<td>23:12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>45:5</td>
<td>44 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>44:19</td>
<td>49 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>32:7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>46:11</td>
<td>5 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>33:25</td>
<td>5269 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>31:11</td>
<td>5271 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>31:12</td>
<td>5307 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>2:19</td>
<td>5310 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>2:1</td>
<td>5311 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>3:12</td>
<td>5A (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st</td>
<td>71:1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>19:8</td>
<td>6 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23rd</td>
<td>91:8</td>
<td>6/10 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>34:5</td>
<td>6:36 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>9:17</td>
<td>6:50 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th</td>
<td>21:3</td>
<td>68 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26th</td>
<td>3:12</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>11:7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>36:21</td>
<td>7 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>80:4</td>
<td>8:06 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>49:9</td>
<td>80 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>10:19</td>
<td>81:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>808</td>
<td>29:10</td>
<td>87 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8th (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9th (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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