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PLEASE LIST BELOW THE TOPICS THE CHAIR REASONABLY ANTICIPATES WILL BE DISCUSSED AT THE MEETING.

I. Call to Order:

II. Establishment of Quorum:

III. Approval of Agenda:

IV. Approval of Minutes:
   • January 23, 2020

V. Public Comments:

VI. Action / Discussion Items:
3C Programming Documents:
1. FFY 2020 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) – Authorize public review to amend Task 3.1 to include the Conceptual Review of the Milestone Rotary
2. Public Participation Plan – Authorize public review for amending the Amendment and Adjustment procedures per MassDOT.
4. FFY 2021-2025 Transportation Improvement Program – review of development schedule and draft project list
5. FFY 2021 Unified Planning Work Program – review of development schedule and draft list of tasks

B. Potential Study of Travel Trends to Cape Cod/Martha’s Vineyard via Nantucket Memorial Airport – review of NP&EDC coordinated study scope and participates

C. NRTA Regional Transit Plan – review of goals and scope of plan


E. 2020 Census Complete Count Committee – Appointment of replacement member

F. Annual Town Meeting – review of articles of planning concern.

G. Director of Planning – performance review (continued to March 16, 2020)

VII. Other Committee Reports

VIII. Other Business

IX. Adjournment
AGENDA ITEM IV.

MINUTES for January 23, 2020
I. Call to Order:

II. Establishment of Quorum:

   6:03 p.m.

III. Approval of Agenda:

   Agenda adopted by UNANIMOUS consent.

IV. Approval of Minutes:

   - November 18, 2019
   - December 9, 2019

The MOTION was made by Judith Wegner and seconded that the NP&EDC does hereby vote to approve the NP&EDC minutes for November 18, 2019 and December 9, 2019. The vote was UNANIMOUS.

V. Public Comments:

Billy CASSIDY Presents proposal to related to a recent Land Bank regarding the Larrabee property along Hummock Pond Road. He is interested in installation of bike paths along Hummock Pond to Somerset Lane. He met with Staff to discuss how to expedite. He proposes to underwrite the cost of the design phase of that section of bike path from Somerset Rd. to
Hummock Pond Rd. Should have a working schematic plan within a few months to invite comment. Attorneys Jessie and John Brescher have volunteered to help with legal aspect of easements that might be necessary. Observes that there is general support of abutters. Planning to set up 501(C) 3 to which neighbors could contribute to show a desire to support, not to subsidize, the work. Primarily here to promote kick-starting the effort. Thinks that Surveyor Art Gasbarro has majority of field work completed. Anticipates installing a 10’ paved surface with necessary buffer. This will be a living donation. Believes that Mike Burns will also be involved. Lowell asks if we have any old plans.

Burns partial surveys are done at intersection of Hummock Pond Road and Somerset and there is another project in the corridor for the DPW, water and sewer which includes a path and a bus stop for Raceway.

Cassidy we are planning on tying into that.

Lowell asks Andrew if we could get remaining funding in August. Should not be too expensive since it is a straight shot.

Gardner asks which side of the road he is going to build it on?

Cassidy on the south side. Already knows of several people who support this effort.

Vorce advises that we place this on a future agenda.

Lowell we will place on agenda when Art has a plan ready. Cassidy will be in touch with Staff.

VI. Action / Discussion Items:
A. Milestone Rotary – Authorize Director to sign agreement with Greenman-Pedersen, Inc to conduct evaluation of current conceptual improvements and right of way impacts.

Burns explains that we need to quantify or get a plan developed showing Right of Way impacts. This is a good visual aid for that process. Previous Design needs to be peer reviewed. Cost of GPI services is about $11,000. We do have funding with Unified Planning Work Program (“UPWP”) regional transportation funding source. Has been told that we have been given a soft yes on the approval. Recommends Board authorize Director of Planning to sign the agreement.

Vorce points out that we do have other land to exchange with NILB to mitigate for the loss of land here. Not extensive.

The Motion was made by Dave Iverson and seconded that the NP&EDC does hereby vote to authorize the Director of Planning to sign the agreement once the funding request is approved by MassDOT.

The vote was UNANIMOUS.

Burns informs Board that he has submitted a project initiation proposal to MassDOT for reconstruction of the Milestone Rotary, per the 2019 Town Meeting vote. The project initiation for the widening of Milestone Road to add shoulders is still being developed. Once MassDOT reviews the project information, the Planning staff and the Town will be notified of the next steps by DOT so that we can continue to advance this project.

B. Long-Range Transportation Plan – review status of implementing vision elements.

Burns this is more informational for tracking status of LRTP. Referring to Chart on Page 33 of packet and narrative in the report. Broken down into different vision elements. There has been recent interest in vehicle restriction vision. Goal is reduce number of motor vehicles on island and develop policy. There was a request for legal review. Nothing has been finalized. With
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respect to study efforts that are part of this vision, he has had discussion with representatives from ACK NOW regarding their interest in participating. There is a need to understand certain things. We are using historic documents for guidance that need to be updated. ACK NOW needs to elaborate on exactly how they want to participate. Balance of document shows work flow. This helps us track progress.

FEE remembers a legal opinion from outside the town showing that it was legal but had to go through legislature. We went up to the legislature and got through a few committees. Challenging to figure out how to do fairly. He asked Nantucket Data Platform (“NDP”) how they got their numbers. They use RMV and Assessor numbers and use mid-winter as their anchor. They are counting all vehicles. Totals over 32,000. They use trip level ferry data. They are taking a picture on every single boat. They do include trucks coming on/off boats. If another method is used, you end up with discrepancies.

LOWELL Steamship considers each direction as one trip. Doesn’t think they send information out for each direction.

BURNS Corrects that. They do send it out. He has about 20 years of to and from flows. There is a business summary for Steamship Board members and there is a separate traffic report which is very specific. It’s a monthly total. Matt’s point is that if there is a particular hour on a certain day – i.e. in the middle of August – things get skewed. His July number is bigger than the August number because he looks at the end of the month. NDP uses Assessor information, different source than RMV. This is out in the public and being used by the other sources.

WEGNER Wonders about desegregating the data. It would be helpful to see raw number total but something about the typology. Interested in methodology and wonders if common practice has shifted in last 20 years.

BURNS borrowing a technique that was developed by RKG. Doesn’t think NDP is using anything more complex than what he is using. We know exactly how many registered vehicles there are in the USA. There are two kinds of counts. Cars that are physically here and then how cars are used. None of the count technologies tell you exactly how many vehicles are on island at any given time which is why we rely on the Steamship for that information.

LOWELL thinks the RMV number is more accurate each year.

DISCUSSION about how to get more accurate information regarding number of vehicles. How does ride-sharing impact numbers?

FEE there is a huge shift in big data, how you collect and use it. A lot of visitors use their cars at a higher rate than they would at home. High rate of usage is something we need to understand that better.

C. Tom Nevers Multi-Use Path Feasibility Study – review of preliminary permitting requirements.

BURNS Draft permitting feasibility is in packet based on review by Weston & Sampson. There is a project map of the corridor from Milestone Rd. all the way to Tom Nevers to the fields specifically is being recommended to be advanced. These ancillary spurs that come off of it through Conservation Foundation property and down the private property section are subject to property acquisition issues and they trip a lot of MEPA processes. Going to recommend cutting off evaluation of any other spur alignments. Staff recommends that the Select Board (“SB”) modify their agreement to include ground survey for more detailed evaluation of the corridor like electrical poles etc. There should be an Amendment to contract in the next month or so.

NO ACTION NEEDED at present.
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B JOHNSON asks about the green spur that goes across conservation land. There is Housing Authority land out there where they were prohibited from building due to a moth. BURNS flagged for endangered species. VORCE we are recommending the east side because there are fewer crossings. Planning Board has secured various easements, including no disturb easements, over the years. It is the side with all the poles but still makes most sense. TRUDEL on opposite side there are some undersized parcels owned by the Commonwealth. They may be drainage parcels so would be hard to get easements in there. VORCE This is advancing so now is the time to speak up if you have any issues. It will be along the east side coming down and then when road bends around will be on the south side to avoid a road crossing. BURNS Going to do a field survey to see if we need to cross over at or after Old Tom Nevers Rd. LOWELL asks if this would be TIP? BURNS it’s in the CIP and would be locally funded. There could be a local support effort. TRUDEL asks about using the old railroad where you would have had historical easements. VORCE This would not be practical. The Roads and Right of Way committee has a project to try to reopen that for hiking. There has been concern about Emergency vehicles and putting it out in a completely inaccessible area.

D. Annual Town Meeting – review of articles\(^1\) of planning concern.

VORCE annually NP&EDC discusses articles that may be of planning concern. Our discussion and action is advisory to the Finance Committee (“FinCom”) or Planning Board (“PB”), the entities that provide the actual Motions to ATM. Page 65 of the packet breaks down our opinions. Not in a rush to get anything completed tonight. FinCom continues to review articles and we can update you on those about what we know. You can agree or discuss. The Warrant was just finalized last night. We have given you an update with actual numbers. SNELL Points out that PB has a meeting on 2/13 WEGNER asks if we want to make recommendations to PB, do they need to be done tonight. SNELL clarifies, yes if interested in PB articles. PB motions have to be drafted after 2/13 meeting. FinCom is not adopting their motions until Tuesday, 3/3, after next NPEDC meeting. LOWELL anything that is a FinCom motion, we can do at next meeting. VORCE these are Citizen’s articles. Goes through summary of NO ACTION articles. Not of planning concern and therefore does not need discussion here. FEE is interested in Park & Recreation article (Article 38). Does think that is a quality of life issue and NP&EDC should weigh in. GARDNER states they are back to doing regular meetings but they have no money or power. DPW controls everything. VORCE we can pull that one out and vote on balance.

Articles 31, 32, 33, 34, 37, 38, 68, 79, 83, 84, 85, 86, 88, 97 – Recommended NO ACTION and NOT OF PLANNING CONCERN

The MOTION was made by Bert Johnson and seconded that the NP&EDC does hereby vote to support the Staff recommendation that no action be taken relative to above-referenced Citizens

\(^1\) In the interest of clarity – these minutes will use the Article numbers rather than the formerly assigned letters to specify Articles.
Articles determined as not of planning concern, as shown on chart on page 65 of the Meeting Packet, excluding Article 38.
The VOTE was UNANIMOUS

THE REMAINDER CITIZENS ARTICLES REVIEWED HEREWITH ARE CONSIDERED TO BE OF PLANNING CONCERN UNLESS SPECIFICALLY DESIGNATED OTHERWISE.

Article 38 – To Re-establish the Parks and Recreation Department
GARDNER explains that main things is the playing fields at Delta, Tom Nevers, and Nobadeer Farm Rd. Little League takes care of their own fields.
TRUDEL notes that reestablishing Parks & Rec. from organizational and financial standpoint would require someone to organize maintenance.
GARDNER DPW cannot hire staff to cut grass. They have more administrators and not enough field staff.
FEE remembers that there was a hiring freeze during the last downturn and we consolidated, dissolving the Parks & Rec.
DISCUSSION about accountability.
VORCE this article is to establish a department with a separate dept. head appointed by Town Manager and also to make an appropriation. If Board thinks this is a planning concern, he doesn't think it should be supported.
CONSENSUS to recognize the intent and hope to see it restructured. Important aspect of resident experience which warrants further study.

VORCE asks if this has come up during the budget discussions at SB meetings.
FEE no due to volume of articles. He brought it up because this is a cross section of the island.
VORCE thinks that without the article, the vote on budget resources could be achieved with instructions to DPW to shift a staff person to Parks & Rec. There has been extensive restructuring at the DPW. A position could be created to focus solely on Parks & Rec.

The MOTION was made by Dave Iverson and seconded that the NP&EDC does hereby vote to take no action with respect to Article 38 other than to comment, through Staff, that as the regional planning agency, the NP&EDC supports the intent in principle but not as written.
The VOTE was UNANIMOUS

SNELL offers to prepare a draft comment for review at next meeting.
B JOHNSON would like Andrew to talk to Rob McNeil

Article 67 – Prohibiting roundabouts near school
VORCE explains why this is of planning concern and why we are recommending opposition.
BURNS confirms that FinCom will not adopt.

The MOTION was made John Trudel and seconded that the NP&EDC does hereby vote to gives a recommendation not to adopt Article 67.
The VOTE was UNANIMOUS
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**Articles 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113 – various real estate acquisition and conveyance articles**

VORCE explains that Staff recommends we support the Finance Committee recommendations relative to these Citizens Articles of planning concern.

The **MOTION** was made by Bert Johnson and seconded that the NP&EDC does hereby vote to give a **positive recommendation** to the above referenced real-estate articles of planning concern.  
The **Motion passed by a MAJORITY VOTE**, with 6 in favor and 2 (Fee & Phillips) abstentions.  
Fee and Phillips have not had chance to review all of them.

**Article 81 – Washington Street Parking Lot**

VORCE explains that this is legally defective per Town Counsel.

The **MOTION** was made John Trudel and seconded that the NP&EDC does hereby vote to give a **recommendation not to adopt Article 81**.  
The **VOTE** was **UNANIMOUS**

**Articles 75, 76, 114 – various bicycle articles**

VORCE explains that Article 75 is about bicycle ROW.  
FEE Article 114 – Bicycle Data Base – is not being supported by FinCom.  
CONSENSUS agrees that we support FinCom’s negative recommendation regarding Article 114.  
BURNS BPAC (Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee) supports all 3 of these articles. Article 75 is contentious at the state level. There are some unresolved issues with the ROW Stop signs. Need Town Counsel opinion because it may conflict with state law on right of way. The Police Dept. thinks there is a conflict. Liability and risk to municipality are at issue.  
FEE points out that Ian Golding (Sponsor) has counsel to weigh in on this.  
WEGNER points out that it couldn’t go into effect until AG approves.

The **MOTION** was made by Judith Wegner and seconded that the NP&EDC does hereby vote to give **positive recommendations for Articles 75 and 76**.  
The **VOTE** was **UNANIMOUS**

**Article 58 – CMI Height Restriction**

VORCE PB unanimously opposed this article. Directly in conflict with both the Master Plan and what has already been accomplished. HDC has full authority over the height of these buildings no matter what the zoning is.  
FEE asks if there was any discussion of going from 30’ to 40’ if a certain percentage would be for affordable use and how would we do that if so.  
VORCE There are design considerations (lot size, massing) or uses that could be beneficial in that area. No desire to restrict uses in this area.

The **MOTION** was made John Trudel and seconded that the NP&EDC does hereby vote to give a **recommendation not to adopt Article 58**.  
The **Motion passed by a MAJORITY VOTE**, with 7 in favor and 1 (Johnson) abstention.

**Article 87 – Sewer District Map Change**

VORCE part of what Mr. Cassidy is doing, this is sponsored by the Land Bank.
The **MOTION** was made by Judith Wegner and seconded that the NP&EDC does hereby vote to give **positive recommendation for Article 87.**

The **VOTE** was **UNANIMOUS**

**Articles 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60, 61, 88 – various zoning articles**

The **MOTION** was made by Judith Wegner and seconded that the NP&EDC does hereby vote to refer all above-referenced zoning articles of planning concern to the Planning Board for recommendations.

The **Motion passed by a MAJORITY VOTE**, with 7 in favor and 1 (Fee) abstention.

**Article 66 – Paid Parking**

The **MOTION** was made Dave Iverson and seconded that the NP&EDC does hereby vote to give a **recommendation not to adopt Article 66.**

The **VOTE** was **UNANIMOUS**

**Article 65 – Short-term rental tax cap**

LOWELL thinks this is too complicated. Hard to know impacts.

VORCE Town Counsel thinks it’s legally defective.

WEGNER thinks it is planning concern because it affects land use, primarily in a financial way.

FEE there are other optional taxes which we have not yet pursued.

**CONSENSUS** This is of planning concern but should be referred to FinCom for further analysis.

The **MOTION** was made John Trudel and seconded that the NP&EDC does hereby vote that **Article 65 is of planning concern and further refers Article 65 to FinCom for further financial analysis.**

The **VOTE** was **UNANIMOUS**

**Article 62 – Historic Preservation**

VORCE This is submitted as an amendment to General By-laws. HDC under its authority has full decision-making power over razing of structure. We have a demolition delay bylaw in our Zoning bylaw. In order for Building Commissioner to enforce this, it cannot be in the General By-law.

The **MOTION** was made Bert Johnson and seconded that the NP&EDC does hereby vote to give a **recommendation not to adopt Article 62.**

The **Motion passed by a MAJORITY VOTE**, with 7 in favor and 1 (Fee) opposed.

FEE concerned that we need to tighten up our preservation. There are too many loopholes. Would like a comment submitted with motion that we agree with the spirit of this.

After discussion of desire for additional input, **Judith Wegner made a motion to reconsider the vote. Dave Iverson seconded the motion.**

The **Motion passed by a MAJORITY VOTE**, with 6 in favor and 2 (Trudel, Fee) opposed.

WEGNER proposes to continue to our February meeting and ask a representative from HDC to have someone attend our meeting to talk about this. We want to be clear on their views and craft an appropriate comment.

FEE suggests we ask Mary Bergman to attend

SNELL proposes to draft a comment for next meeting.

**CONSENSUS** We want to help Mary Bergman to recraft article and not have as General By-law.
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VORCE suggests that Staff talk to involved parties. Perhaps there is not a role for NP&EDC. Staff will come back with comments.

**Article 77 – Merchandise & Wares**

Dave Iverson sponsor of the article, recuses.

The **MOTION** was made Judith Wegner and seconded that the NP&EDC does hereby vote to give a **positive recommendation for Article 77**.
The **VOTE** was **UNANIMOUS**

**Article 80 – Unwanted Capital Projects**

The **MOTION** was made Bert Johnson and seconded that the NP&EDC does hereby vote to give a **recommendation not to adopt Article 80**.
The **VOTE** was **UNANIMOUS**

**Article 73 – Plastics Ban**

**CONSSENSUS** that this is not of planning concern, the Town has a single use bylaw and the sponsor may be happier with the Town's version of the proposal in Article 73.

The **MOTION** was made Maureen Phillips and seconded that the NP&EDC does hereby vote that **Article 73 is of not of planning concern** and further gives a **recommendation to take no action**.
The **VOTE** was **UNANIMOUS**

**Article 35 – Solid Waste**

PHILLIPS points out that this is important issue. She is on the that the Solid Waste Group. They have a range of options which are being actively considered by the DPW. She is opposed to the solid waste because it does have planning implications. WEGNER suggests we add comment that the Solid Waste Group is exploring a range of options so this is premature.

The **MOTION** was made Maureen Phillips and seconded that the NP&EDC does hereby vote that **Article 35 is of planning concern** and further gives a **recommendation not to adopt Article 35 based upon the review of the issue conducted by the Solid Waste Group**.
The **VOTE** was **UNANIMOUS**

**Article 36 – Beach Access**

The **MOTION** was made by John Trudel and seconded that the NP&EDC does hereby vote to **take no action with respect to Article 36** other than to comment, through Staff, that it is of planning concern and, as the regional planning agency, the NP&EDC supports the concept.
The **VOTE** was **UNANIMOUS**

**Article 69 – Traffic Rules and Restrictions in CDT**

VORCE this is about commercial vehicles in the core district. DISCUSSION about dynamics of downtown parking and delivery trucks.
The MOTION was made by Maureen Phillips and seconded that the NP&EDC does hereby vote that Article 69 is of planning concern and should be continued for further review and study.
The VOTE was UNANIMOUS

Article 78 – Outdoor Lighting Bylaw
VORCE too vague as submitted and not enforceable per Town Counsel. SNELL explains that lighting enforcement is based on complaints filed.
The MOTION was made by Judith Wegner and seconded that the NP&EDC does hereby vote that Article 78 is of planning concern and further recommended not to adopt until further comment received from Staff. Continued to next meeting.
The VOTE was UNANIMOUS

Article 74 – Beach obstruction prohibition
The MOTION was made by Judith Wegner and seconded that the NP&EDC does hereby vote that Article 74 is of planning concern and further gives a positive recommendation.
The VOTE was UNANIMOUS

VORCE acknowledges publicly the next two articles are sponsored by Chairman Lowell’s brother. CONSENSUS is as long as he has no bias or financial interest, he does not have to recuse.

Article 64 – Public Property Damage
VORCE this would have impacts on our operations. While we do not encourage this, this article is impractical. Public streets and ways are overseen by DPW, not the PLUS Dept.

The MOTION was made by Judith Wegner and seconded that the NP&EDC does hereby vote that Article 64 is of planning concern and further votes not to adopt in its present form. There is merit in exploring the options here to include other approaches and the concept needs to be referred for additional study for a more suitable mechanism.
The VOTE was UNANIMOUS

Article 63 – Affordable Housing
The MOTION was made by Bert Johnson and seconded that the NP&EDC does hereby vote that Article 63 is of planning concern and further votes not to adopt.
The VOTE was UNANIMOUS

E. Director of Planning – performance preview

VORCE explains that this is preview of the new system. At next meeting will have prepared a response to goals that were accomplished last year. Asks Commissioners to submit ideas for new goals. Staff will send out the links to follow new system. Amanda in HR will set up with access so can do from computer.
WEGNER asks if this format is better than previous form and if he does a self-evaluation VORCE thinks it’s better format. Town Manager will participate. Yes he does do a self-evaluation.
VII. Other Committee Reports

VIII. Other Business

IX. Adjournment
M/S/A to end MEETING at 9:15 p.m.
The vote was UNANIMOUS

Submitted by:
Eleanor W. Antonietti
This is a progress report of transportation-related activities as of February 18, 2020.

1. **FFY 2020 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)**

The NP&EDC will need to amend the UPWP to include the recently initiated task to evaluate the Milestone Rotary conceptual plan, as recommended by the Federal Highway Administration. As you may know, evaluation of the conceptual plan is necessary to better understand right of way impacts to the abutting Land Bank properties in preparation for the upcoming Town Meeting article to authorize an acquisition of these areas through an Article 97 process. To amend the UPWP, the NP&EDC will need to hold a 21-day public review from February 21st through March 16th. At the March 16th meeting, the NP&EDC will need to close the public review period and take action to approve the amendment.

Staff recommends that the NP&EDC authorize the advertising of a public review to amend Task 3.1 – Livable / Sustainable / Complete Streets Planning of the FFY 2020 Unified Planning Work Program to add language for land surveying and engineering design services for the conceptual review of the Milestone Rotary from February 21, 2020 to March 16, 2020.

2. **Public Participation Plan (PPP) Update**

MassDOT has provided more description guidance and thresholds for adjusting and amending the 3C program documents – Long-Range Transportation Plan, Transportation Improvement Program, Unified Planning Work Program, and Public Participation Plan. To add this language to the NP&EDC’s PPP, the document will require a 45-day public review beginning February 21st through April 23rd. The NP&EDC can take public comment at the March 16th and April 23rd meetings. At the April 23rd meeting, the NP&EDC will need to close the public review and take action to approve the amendment.

Staff recommends that the NP&EDC authorize the advertising of a public review to amend the Public Participation Plan to add updated descriptions to the adjustment and amendment requirements of 3C program documents from February 21, 2020 to April 23, 2020.

3. **2019 Title VI Report**

As the 3C program requires, staff has updated Title VI and Environmental Justice mapping and evaluated the use of transportation funding for studies and projects in the areas of the island found to have a relatively high portion of various protected populations – low income, minority, elderly, and disabled populations. No action is needed from the NP&EDC. Staff will submit the report to MassDOT, and the report should be used by decision makers to better understand existing and future impacts of transportation investments on protected populations.
4. **FFY 2021-2025 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) – DRAFT**

Staff has received the federal funding available for the next TIP cycle from MassDOT. Attached is a draft schedule of funding with a listing of federal aid eligible projects that could be included in the TIP. Staff has reviewed these projects with MassDOT and District 5 staff, and since the cost of these improvements exceed the regional target (annual budget for improvements) available to Nantucket, staff will continue coordinating with MassDOT to program of these projects based on availability of statewide funding. Currently there are no projects programmed in the regional TIP, but a Safe Routes to Schools project is programmed in the statewide TIP (STIP) for crosswalk/path improvement along Surfside Road between Vesper Lane and Anna Drive. The NP&EDC will need to prepare a draft TIP for public review by May 2020 and approve a final TIP in June 2020.

5. **UPWP Draft**

Staff has received the budget available to Nantucket for transportation planning activities in FFY 2021. In addition to the costs for staff salary and operating expenses, staff will recommend the use of professional services funding for expenses that align with the Select Board’s Strategic Goals, and could include modeling of island wide traffic conditions, mode split analysis, and/or study air traffic to Martha’s Vineyard and Cape Cod via the Nantucket Memorial Airport. The NP&EDC will need to prepare a draft UPWP for public review by May 2020 and approve a final UPWP in June 2020.

6. **Potential Study of Travel Trends to Cape Cod/Martha’s Vineyard via Nantucket Memorial Airport**

Staff has met with representatives of the Steamship Authority, Airport, and NRTA regarding a potential evaluation of passenger travel to the Cape and Martha’s Vineyard using the Airport and the regional service providers, such as JetBlue and United Airlines. A quantified evaluation of these trends will help justify additional service to the island and could be used to improve services for travel to the mainland, which aligns with the goals of the LRTP. Potential stakeholders in this evaluation include the Chamber of Commerce, NRTA, MassDOT, ferry providers, Airport, and Select Board. Funds for this evaluation could provide through the UPWP, Airport Commission, and other local sources.

7. **NRTA Regional Transit Plan**

The NRTA, through MassDOT’s consultant AECOM, is assisting with an update of the RTP. This document is used to evaluate service trends, asset conditions, and recommend potential capital and service improvements. Staff has included a draft description of goals for the RTP, which align with the goals of the LRTP. Future updates on this process can be provided by the NRTA.

8. **CY 2020 Safety Performance Measures**

As federally required, states and regions need to set safety performance measures to track trends on crash rates and fatalities. The NP&EDC has annually endorsed MassDOT’s performance measures to comply. Staff recommend the NP&EDC take action to endorse MassDOT’s CY 2020 Safety Performance Measures.
9. **Milestone Rotary Reconstruction**  
   **Source:** MassDOT  
   **Project Area:** Milestone at Orange Sparks Old South Rd  
   **Estimate:** TBD ($3.5 construction estimate)  
   **PM:** John Osorio – GPI

Staff is awaiting a long-form contract from Finance to initiate this project, which will also need to be signed by GPI, Director of Planning, and approved by the Select Board. The cost of this service would be through the UPWP’s Professional Services budget for Task 3.1 – Livable/Sustainable/Complete Streets Planning. Since the UPWP does not clearly state this project in the description, the FFY 2020 UPWP will need to be amended.

10. **Milestone Road – Implementation of Highway Safety Audit Recommendations (Federal Aid)**  
    **Source:** MassDOT  
    **Project Area:** Milestone Rotary to Sconset Rotary  
    **Estimate:** $3.3M  
    **PM:** Mike Zuzevich – MassDOT; John Osorio – GPI

Work on this project will resume in the spring. The $3.2M in safety and accessibility improvements is now scheduled to be completed by June 27, 2020. MassDOT will be providing the Town with a letter requesting work in June and to ask acceptance of a revised signage plan to reduce the number of non-safety related signage in the project area.

At the November 2019 meeting, the NP&EDC requested that staff prepare an evaluation within 6 months (by May 2020) of the consequences of taking over Milestone Rd as a locally controlled roadway instead of maintaining the status as a state highway. Staff has reviewed this with Traffic Safety to discuss the financial and enforcement obligations if the County would take over ownership. The Town Manager is also reviewing this matter.

11. **Milestone Road – Shoulders and Drainage Improvements**  
    **Source:** MassDOT  
    **Project Area:** Milestone Rotary to New South Rd  
    **Estimate:** TBD  
    **PM:** TBD

A Project Need Form is being developed though MassDOT’s MaPIT project development portal. This needs to be finalized to advance the project. Based on discussions with District 5 Project Development staff, the cost of this work is greater than the region’s annual funding target and will be dependent on approval of state-wide highway discretionary funding.

12. **Tom Nevers Multi Use Path Feasibility Study**  
    **Source:** Town  
    **Project Area:** Milestone Rd to playing fields  
    **Estimate:** TBD ($3.5 construction estimate)  
    **PM:** Michael Moonan – Weston/Sampson
The Select Board approved an agreement with Weston and Sampson (W/S) to initiate a Feasibility Study to identify permitting requirements that are not fully understood prior to initiating Preliminary Design. Based on a draft report from W/S, staff is recommending an amendment to the scope of work to proceed with surveying and other design tasks in the project area immediately adjacent to Tom Nevers Rd as there are much less permitting obligations (private property impacts and MEPA/NHESP permitting) than other supplemental alignments through Nantucket Conservation Foundation property and along Old Tom Nevers Rd to the beach. Staff will be working with W/S to refine the project schedule and scope and to provide project information on the Town’s webpage as information becomes available.

13. Surfside Rd/Bartlett Rd Roundabout (Federal Aid)

Source: MassDOT
Project Area: Milestone Rd to playing fields
Estimate: $3,562,685
PM: Steve Rhoads / Trish Domigan – VHB

VHB continues to assist with the review of the Preliminary 25% design plans and will be meeting with MassDOT to resolve any conflicting comments prior to a Preliminary Design Public Hearing that would be scheduled later this winter. A staff submitted supplemental capital request for the 2020 Annual Town Meeting to fund final design and right of way acquisitions necessary for construction was NOT recommended at this time.

The Director of Planning continues to coordinate with the Historical Commission regarding this project. Although the Historical Commission suggests a mini-roundabout, it is not supported by staff or VHB. Other comments regarding minimizing signage aligns with comments submitted by staff and DPW to VHB.

Regarding coordination with the Schools, staff has submitted a contract amendment to include additional assistance from VHB to meet with the School Committee and Administration to better understand the Crossing Guard operations during arrival and departure. The amendment would also change the expiration date to December 2020 (currently December 2019). As soon as the Select Board approves that amendment, staff will work with School Administration on scheduling a workshop. If the amendment is not approved, staff recommends appropriating the balance of funding to other projects in the Town’s “Goal 2” corridor between downtown and 6 Fairgrounds Rd.

14. Pleasant Street / Williams Lane Sidewalk – Complete Streets – Design (Local)

Source: Town
Project Area: Five Corners to Sparks Roundabout
Estimate: TBD
PM: Jeff Maxtutis – BETA Group

Staff continues to work with BETA Group on this project. Field survey is on-going, and staff will provide BETA with sketch plans to inform design options that are consistent with the Mid-Island Area Plan. Public outreach is anticipated in the spring and summer to finalize a preferred alternative for final design and construction.
15. Sparks Avenue Sidewalk – Complete Streets – Design (Local/State)
Source: Town/MassDOT-Complete Streets
Project Area: Four Corners to Milestone Lane
Estimate: TBD
PM: Jeff Maxtutis – BETA Group

This project is on a similar track as the Pleasant St/Williams St sidewalk design. BETA Group is finalizing a field survey and public outreach is anticipated in the spring and summer to finalize design and be ready for construction following Sewer improvements along the corridor.

16. In-Town Bike Path – Orange Street Phases – Design (Local)
Source: Town (MassDOT? – PNF needed)
Project Area: Spruce St to Milestone Rotary
Estimate: TBD
PM: Steve Rhoads / Trish Domigan – VHB

The Select Board approved an agreement with VHB to initiate design work up to Preliminary Design. Staff will schedule a kick-off meeting with DPW and other town staff in the coming weeks to refine the project schedule and outreach strategy. Field survey is being schedule and should start soon.

17. Safe Routes to Schools Infrastructure Grant – Surfside Road between Vesper Lane and Anna Drive – Surfside Road Crosswalk Relocation and Path Widening (MassDOT Grant)
Source: MassDOT – SRTS
Project Area: Vesper Ln to Anna Dr
Estimate: $1M
PM: Jonathan Freeman – MassDOT

Staff continues to coordinate with MassDOT on conceptual design of this project. MassDOT is finalizing an agreement with an engineering firm to develop a preliminary 25% design. Staff anticipates additional information on this project soon with construction is currently anticipated to follow Sewer improvements along the corridor in spring 2021.

18. Four Corners Roundabout – Design (TBD)
Source: Town (MassDOT? – VHB to complete PNF)
Project Area: Prospect Atlantic Sparks Surfside Rd
Estimate: TBD
PM: Steve Rhoads / Trish Domigan – VHB

Staff has requested amending the design agreement to extend the expiration date to December 2020 (currently expired as of December 2019) and add scope to address design issues at the school’s pool parking lot. If the amendment is not approved, staff recommends appropriating the balance of funding to other projects in the Town’s “Goal 2” corridor between downtown and 6 Fairgrounds Rd.
19. Old South Rd/Fairgrounds Rd Roundabout – Design (Local)
Source: Town
Project Area: Old South at Fairgrounds Rd
Estimate: TBD
PM: Steve Rhoads / Trish Domigan – VHB

Staff has requested amending the design agreement to extend the expiration date to December 2020 (currently expired as of December 2019). If the amendment is not approved, staff recommends appropriating the balance of funding to other projects in the Town’s “Goal 2” corridor between downtown and 6 Fairgrounds Rd.

20. Wauwinet Road Multi-Use Path
Source: FHWA
Project Area: Polpis Rd to Pocomo Rd (PH1) / Gate House (PH2)
Estimate: $2,361,000.00 (construction est)
PM: Jacinda Russell – FHWA / Carl Melberg – Fish and Wildlife

The Town is awaiting a Memorandum of Agreement for the project management services that would be provided through Federal Highway Administration. The local matching funds for the Federal Land Access Program (FLAP) grant were approved at the April 2019 Town Meeting.

21. Mill Hill Path – Design/Construction (Local Aid)
Source: Town
Project Area: Prospect St to Old Farm Rd
Estimate: $215,000
PM: Don Bracken – Bracken Engineering

Staff and DPW has provided final comments on the plan and is awaiting the final deliverables from Bracken Engineering. Staff is waiting incorporation of the final comments and delivery of the bid documents for this project.

22. Amelia Dr/Waitt Dr (Fairgrounds Area Roadways)
Source: Town
Project Area: Amelia Dr, Waitt Dr, Ticcoma Dr, 2 Fairgrounds Road driveways
Estimate: $6.5M ($3.7M supplemental needed at 2021 ATM)
PM: TBD (BETA Group and Blackwell Associates assisted to date)

There is a supplemental capital funding request of $3.7M in the 2021 Town Meeting warrant (Article 13). This supplemental will fund the preferred alternative for Amelia Drive and the construction both Waitt Drive and the connections from Waitt Drive to Amelia Drive.

23. Lovers Ln / Okorwaw / Monohansett
Source: Town
Project Area: Lovers Ln, Okorwaw Ave, Monohansett Ave
Estimate: $6.5M ($3.27M supplemental needed at 2021 ATM)
PM: John Osorio – GPI
There is a supplemental capital funding request of $3.27M in the 2021 Town Meeting warrant (Article 12). This supplemental will fund the design and construction of roadway and multi-use path improvements along Lovers Lane from Boulevarde to Old South Road.

24. Newtown Road
Source: Town
Project Area: Lovers Ln, Okorwaw Ave, Monohansett Ave
Estimate: $6.5M ($3.27M supplemental needed at 2021 ATM)
PM: TBD

Funding for roadway, multi-use path, and traffic calming improvement is being requested at the 2021 Town Meeting (Article 11). This will fund design and construction of roadway and drainage improvement, a path on the north side of the roadway, and speed cushion/tables to ensure a 20MPH speed limit along the roadway.

25. Permanent Counting Station
Source: Town
Project Area: various locations
Estimate: $0.12M needed at 2021 ATM
PM: Joe Herr / David Greenberg – VHB

Funding to implement the counting station at Orange Street and Goose Pond Lane is being requested at the 2021 Town meeting (Article 10).

26. Millie’s/Massasoit Bridges
Source: Town
Project Area: bridge locations
Estimate: $500,000 (design only)
PM: TBD

DPW is advancing the conceptual design of these projects. Funding for construction will be requested at a future Town Meeting.

27. Multi-Use Path Maintenance

DPW is coordinating with BETA Group on the development of a report on condition and safety/signage. Recommendations from this report will be implemented from the Multi-Use Path Improvements account.

28. Downtown Sidewalks

DPW continues to coordinate stakeholder groups on the scope of work of sidewalk improvements identified in the Long-Range Transportation Plan and that align with the Town’s Strategic Transportation Goal #3.

29. Town Capital Improvement Plan
No update this month.
Staff continues to coordinate with Town Administration, Finance, and DPW to update the Town’s CIP to align with the prioritization identified in the LRTP. The current capital
recommendations include improvements to Newtown Rd, Waitt Dr/Amelia Dr, and Lovers Ln. There are also recommendations that align with LRTP goals, such as additional funding for permanent traffic counting stations and bicycle/pedestrian facility maintenance.

30. Transportation Demand Forecast Modeling

Staff had submitted a draft Request for Proposals to Town Administration and MassDOT develop a transportation demand forecast model using funding approved at the 2019 Town Meeting. A proposal for a different type of traffic congestion monitoring system has been submitted by Nantucket Data Platform. These proposals will need to be reviewed to identify which system the Town would prefer investing in to better understand traffic impacts.

31. Parking Demand Management Program

No change in status this month.

Staff continues to meet with Town Administration’s work group to implement this program. Staff has met with Police regarding enforcement technologies – license plate recognition scanners – that would be part of the program. Staff support and a committee to oversee the Parking Benefit District are part of on-going discussions among work group members with recommendations to be provided to the Select Board.

32. Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee

Staff continues to coordinate with BPAC to review a variety of projects and policy recommendations. BPAC has also developed recommendations for the dockless bike share program, Town Meeting warrant articles, and Town Bylaw amendments.
Summary of Airport and Ferry Statistics:

33. Nantucket Memorial Airport (passenger departures)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>6,729</td>
<td>7,047</td>
<td>7,627</td>
<td>9,674</td>
<td>12,381</td>
<td>18,924</td>
<td>31,484</td>
<td>32,852</td>
<td>19,333</td>
<td>11,696</td>
<td>9,026</td>
<td>8,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>6,183</td>
<td>5,893</td>
<td>9,674</td>
<td>13,479</td>
<td>19,847</td>
<td>32,009</td>
<td>35,512</td>
<td>20,330</td>
<td>12,665</td>
<td>7,717</td>
<td>7,534</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>4,728</td>
<td>4,506</td>
<td>6,358</td>
<td>8,453</td>
<td>14,230</td>
<td>19,841</td>
<td>31,250</td>
<td>33,252</td>
<td>18,822</td>
<td>11,246</td>
<td>6,007</td>
<td>2,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>4,233</td>
<td>4,536</td>
<td>6,026</td>
<td>7,607</td>
<td>11,039</td>
<td>18,411</td>
<td>32,009</td>
<td>35,503</td>
<td>19,247</td>
<td>11,561</td>
<td>6,690</td>
<td>7,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2,766</td>
<td>2,287</td>
<td>2,879</td>
<td>3,022</td>
<td>8,432</td>
<td>16,037</td>
<td>29,787</td>
<td>30,830</td>
<td>16,542</td>
<td>7,899</td>
<td>3,358</td>
<td>2,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2,501</td>
<td>2,480</td>
<td>3,260</td>
<td>3,196</td>
<td>6,785</td>
<td>14,724</td>
<td>28,582</td>
<td>29,375</td>
<td>14,017</td>
<td>7,986</td>
<td>3,764</td>
<td>3,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2,421</td>
<td>2,006</td>
<td>2,474</td>
<td>2,871</td>
<td>7,138</td>
<td>17,529</td>
<td>33,012</td>
<td>36,074</td>
<td>18,029</td>
<td>6,663</td>
<td>2,805</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5-Year Monthly Ave. 3,486 3,232 4,234 5,161 9,563 17,529 33,012 36,074 18,029 6,663 2,805

Chart 1. Total Enplanements (Departures)

Chart 2. Monthly Enplanement versus 5-Year Average

Chart 3. Annual Enplanements - to date comparison
34. Ferry Service - Steamship Authority

Chart 4. Total Ferry Monthly Passengers

Chart 5. Total Passengers for All Ferries

Chart 6. Total Ferry Passengers vs 3 Year Average
Chart 7. Total SSA Vehicles

Chart 8. Total Monthly Vehicles vs 5 Year Average

Chart 9. Total SSA Vehicles Year to Date
Chart 10. Total Registered Vehicles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Passenger Cars</th>
<th>Light Trucks</th>
<th>Heavy Trucks</th>
<th>Motorcycles</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>5,357</td>
<td>10,628</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>17,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>5,455</td>
<td>10,934</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>17,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>5,237</td>
<td>10,706</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>17,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>5,278</td>
<td>10,756</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>17,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>5,333</td>
<td>10,659</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>17,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>4,183</td>
<td>10,090</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>15,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>4,316</td>
<td>10,050</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>15,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>4,329</td>
<td>10,440</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>16,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>3,943</td>
<td>11,342</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>16,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3,969</td>
<td>11,471</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>16,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>12,084</td>
<td>11,471</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>18,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>12,629</td>
<td>11,471</td>
<td>1,149</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>19,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>11,223</td>
<td>11,471</td>
<td>5,823</td>
<td></td>
<td>17,506</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 11. Approximate Peak Season (July) Vehicles
NPEDC MEETING

2/20/2020

AGENDA ITEM VI.A(1)

3C Documents – Updated / Amended UPWP
3.0 TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ACTIVITIES

3.1 Livable / Sustainable / Complete Streets Planning

Objective:
1) Assist with the development of planning documents that recommend tangible transportation improvements that represent the goals of the Town’s Complete Streets Policy, Strategic Plan, and the LRTP. These goals include projects and programs that promote walking, bicycling, and public transit, support economic development through use of smart growth principles, and ensuring consideration to accommodate all users and modes for all ages and abilities.

Previous Work:
1) Coordination with the Traffic Safety Work Group to recommend improvements within the public way to improve the convenience, safety, accessibility, and reduce congestions for all users.
2) Old South Road Corridor Study, 2017
3) Complete Streets Policy, 2016
4) Nantucket Regional Transportation Plan, 2016
5) Planning work to implement NRTA park and ride at 2 Fairgrounds Road, FFY 2014 UPWP
6) Wilkes Square Redevelopment Study, 2010

Tasks (and schedule):
1) Initiate development of a multi-modal transportation model to track existing and future performance of the network based on recommendations of the Long Range Transportation Plan and other suggested traffic mitigation proposed as part of Planning Board and Zoning Board of Appeals development review (develop scope for a Request for Proposals in fall 2019).
2) Continue further study related to recommendations of the Old South Road Area Plan Study Area (as requested by the NP&EDC).
3) Continue with any study and review related to the Intermodal Transportation Center and other transportation elements of the Harbor Place development (as requested by the NP&EDC).
4) Assist with development and review of recommendations as Chair of the Traffic Safety Work Group.
5) Land surveying and engineering design services for the conceptual review of the Milestone Rotary at Milestone Road, Orange Street, Sparks Avenue, and Old South Road (by June 30, 2020).

Products:
1) Recommendations developed through participation with the Traffic Safety.
2) Strategy for improving congestion, safety, and accessibility along Old South Road.
3) Recommendations related to a downtown Transportation Center within the Harbor Place development.

Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Staff Weeks</th>
<th>Percent of Total Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% FHWA:</td>
<td>$42,575.80</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% MassDOT:</td>
<td>$10,643.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sub-Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Salaries:</td>
<td>$17,298.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead: (Overhead rate: 92.043% of Direct Salaries)</td>
<td>$15,921.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Costs:</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software, equipment, etc.:</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing, supplies, misc.:</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting Services:</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Expenditure for Task: $53,219.75
AGENDA ITEM VI.A(2)

3C Documents – Public Participation Plan
1.7.2 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

This is the short-range transportation programming document that includes a prioritized listing of improvement projects (both roadway and transit projects) identified in the RTP that would utilize federal funding for implementation. The TIP must be financially constrained and endorsed annually by the NP&EDC.

The draft TIP shall be developed in consultation with the Town of Nantucket, Nantucket Regional Transit Authority, MassHighway, and the Executive Office of Transportation. The draft shall be made available for public review at least thirty days prior to the NP&EDC endorsement. Copies shall be made available at the NP&EDC office, Board of Selectmen’s office, and the Nantucket Atheneum, as well as in an electronic format on the NP&EDC webpage. At least one public hearing shall be held before the endorsement to solicit public comments and questions.

1.7.3 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

The UPWP is a document that describes all of the transportation planning activities expected to be undertaken in the Nantucket region during the year. The UPWP is endorsed annually by the NP&EDC, and is one of the federal requirements for a certified transportation planning process that is a prerequisite for the receipt of federal funding for transportation improvements for roads or transit in the region.

The draft UPWP is prepared with input from the Town of Nantucket, the Executive Office of Transportation and the MassHighway. The draft shall be made available for public review at least thirty days prior to the NP&EDC endorsement. Copies shall be made available at the NP&EDC office, Board of Selectmen’s office, the Nantucket Atheneum, as well as in an electronic format on the NP&EDC webpage. At least one public hearing shall be held before the endorsement to solicit public comments and questions.

1.7.4 Amendments and Adjustments to the RTP, TIP, and UPWP

Following the endorsement of the RTP, TIP, or UPWP, there may arise an issue that will require that these documents be changed. Amendments are changes, such as the addition or deletion of a project, program, or task from the RTP, TIP, or UPWP, that are considered significant and require notification of a comment period and a public meeting prior to NP&EDC vote. Adjustments are changes, such as a new funding amounts or new descriptive narratives, which are considered minor and do not add or delete a project, program, or task from the RTP, TIP, or UPWP. Adjustments do require a public meeting prior to approval, but do not require notification of a public comment period.

1.7.5 Transportation Planning Studies

These studies are routinely undertaken by the NP&EDC to address the goals and objectives stated in the RTP, and to provide required information and potential...
Anyone that has subscribed to receive alerts/notices through the Town of Nantucket website will also receive NP&EDC notifications.

Planning staff will be available to meet and review drafts with any committee or agency upon request.

### 2.2.6 Summary of Public Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Public Meeting Requirements</th>
<th>Comment Period (Minimum)</th>
<th>Advertising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Participation Plan (PPP)</td>
<td>One meeting prior to public comment period and one additional meeting during public comment period</td>
<td>45 days</td>
<td>Public meeting notices. Notification to the identified stakeholders via mail or email. Public notification via website posting and social media. Availability of document for review at the Town Building, PLUS Office, and Atheneum during and after the public comment period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)</td>
<td>One meeting prior to public comment period and one additional meeting during public comment period</td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>Public meeting notices. Notification to the identified stakeholders via mail or email. Public notification via website posting and social media. Availability of document for review at the Town Building, PLUS Office, and Atheneum during and after the public comment period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)</td>
<td>One meeting prior to public comment period and one additional meeting during public comment period</td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>Public meeting notices. Notification to the identified stakeholders via mail or email. Public notification via website posting and social media. Availability of document for review at the Town Building, PLUS Office, and Atheneum during and after the public comment period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)</td>
<td>One meeting prior to public comment period and one additional meeting during public comment period</td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>Public meeting notices. Notification to the identified stakeholders via mail or email. Public notification via website posting and social media. Availability of document for review at the Town Building, PLUS Office, and Atheneum during and after the public comment period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendments to Documents</td>
<td>One meeting prior to review amendment and one additional meeting prior to approval</td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>Public meeting notices. Notification to the identified stakeholders via mail or email. Public notification via website posting and social media. Availability of document for review at the Town Building, PLUS Office, and Atheneum during and after the public comment period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments to Documents</td>
<td>One meeting prior to approval of adjustments</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Public meeting notices. Notification to the identified stakeholders via mail or email. Public notification via website posting and social media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Studies</td>
<td>One meeting at start of study and one additional meeting to present results and recommendations</td>
<td>None. Outreach efforts to identified stakeholders will be identified before start of study</td>
<td>Public meeting notices. Notification to the identified stakeholders via mail or email. Public notification via website posting and social media. Availability of document for review at the Town Building, PLUS Office, and Atheneum during and after the public comment period.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Public and Staff Written Comments during the Public Review Period

The written letters attached to this section were received by the Planning Office during the 45-day review period from the public and various agencies concerning the draft version of this PPP. Other written comments are from staff addressing the comments received in these letters.
MassDOT State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)
Project Revision Definitions and Procedures

The STIP is a “living” document and is likely to be modified during the course of the year. The definitions and procedures outlined in this section are followed when project based revisions to the STIP are necessary.

Definitions of STIP Revision Procedures

Amendment: A revision to the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) that requires public review and demonstration of financial constraint. The public process for a STIP amendment requires a publicly advertised 21-day public comment period and for MassDOT to address any public commentary prior to sending to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) for review and approval.

Adjustment: A revision to the STIP that is does not require a public process, but that is required to be included in a MassDOT STIP action with a demonstration of financial constraint for FHWA/FTA approval.

Administrative Modification: A revision to the STIP that is minor enough in nature to require neither a public process nor FHWA/FTA approval, but that does involve a notification to federal partners.
### Highway Project STIP Revision Definitions and Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Revision</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major Project Cost</td>
<td>Increase or decrease of $500,000 or greater for projects programmed under $5,000,000 and greater than 10% of the total cost for projects programmed over $5,000,000.</td>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td>The “increase” or “decrease” in cost is relative to the Total Federal Participating Cost (TFPC) of a project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Project Cost</td>
<td>Increase or decrease of $499,999 or less for projects programmed under $5,000,000 and less than 10% of the total cost for projects programmed over $5,000,000.</td>
<td>Adjustment</td>
<td>See above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Change in the description of the project as it is listed in the STIP.</td>
<td>Adjustment or Administrative Modification</td>
<td>Project description changes are treated as administrative modifications for minor changes (e.g. spelling errors, more detailed descriptions, adding mile-markers, etc.). In some cases, a major scope change will require the initiation of a new project through MassDOT’s Project Initiation Form (PIF), and review/approval by PRC. This would require deactivation and removal of the currently programmed project. In many cases, changes in this category will also include a minor cost change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Project Scope</td>
<td>A revision to the project scope large enough to necessitate an additional review by MassDOT’s Project Review Committee (PRC) – typically accompanied by major project cost change.</td>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td>Project additions are treated as amendments if the project was not part of any previously approved STIP that has been vetted through the public process. Exception: if a project is removed from an active TIP or the STIP due to it being previously advanced/advertised, or is moved to the statewide list from a regional TIP, the action would be considered an adjustment. Changes in funding sources for projects are permissible for advertisement purposes if the FHWA Division Office has been consulted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Project Scope</td>
<td>A minor revision to the project scope that does not significantly alter the original PRC-approved scope of work.</td>
<td>Adjustment</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Addition</td>
<td>The programming of a new project in any federal fiscal year of the active TIP.</td>
<td>Amendment or Adjustment</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Removal</td>
<td>The removal of a project in any federal fiscal year of the active TIP.</td>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Funding</td>
<td>A change in the project’s funding source, including federal and non-federal sources which fall within the project cost change revisions listed above.</td>
<td>Adjustment</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Additional</td>
<td>A change in any item listed in the “Additional Information” column of the STIP not covered in any other item listed here (e.g. earmark details, project proponent, etc.)</td>
<td>Administrative Modification</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Year of</td>
<td>Moving a currently programmed project earlier or later than an originally programmed year.</td>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td>Changes to a project delivery schedule (advancement or delay) requires an amendment for the change in programmed FFY.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Revision</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Project Cost Change</td>
<td>Increase or decrease of $500,000 or greater for projects under $5,000,000 and greater than 10% of the total cost for projects exceeding $5,000,000.</td>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td>The “increase” or “decrease” in cost is relative to the combined federal and non-federal aid participating cost of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Project Cost Change</td>
<td>Increase or decrease of $499,999 or less for projects under $5,000,000 and less than 10% of the total cost for projects exceeding $5,000,000.</td>
<td>Adjustment</td>
<td>See above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description Change</td>
<td>Change in the description of the project as it is listed in the STIP.</td>
<td>Adjustment or Administrative Modification</td>
<td>Project description changes are treated as administrative modifications for minor changes (e.g. spelling errors, more detailed descriptions, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Project Scope Change</td>
<td>A revision to the project scope deemed large enough to require public review and comment (e.g. changing the number of stations)</td>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td>In many cases, changes in this category will also include a major cost change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Project Scope Change</td>
<td>A minor revision to the project scope that does not significantly alter the original scope of work (e.g. changes to the bus model for vehicle replacement projects).</td>
<td>Adjustment</td>
<td>In many cases, changes in this category will also include a minor cost change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Addition</td>
<td>The programming of a new project in any federal fiscal year of the current TIP.</td>
<td>Amendment or Adjustment</td>
<td>Project additions are treated as amendments if the project was not part of any previously approved STIP that has been vetted through the public process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Removal</td>
<td>The removal of a project in any federal fiscal year of the current TIP.</td>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td>Exception: if a project is removed from a TIP or the STIP due to it being previously advanced/advertised, or is moved to the statewide list from a regional TIP, the action would be considered an adjustment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Funding Source</td>
<td>Change in the funding source, including federal and non-federal sources that fall within project cost change revisions listed in the first two rows.</td>
<td>Adjustment</td>
<td>Changes in funding sources for projects are permissible for obligation purposes with written notice from the FTA region office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Year of Programming</td>
<td>Moving a currently programmed project earlier or later than the originally programmed year.</td>
<td>Amendment or Adjustment</td>
<td>Note: Federal funds shall be programmed in the federal fiscal year in which the award will occur. Changes in year of programming are only treated as adjustments if they involve advancing federal funds to align with the year of the grant award.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exceptions

Although MassDOT typically holds a 21-day public comment period for amendments, in the event of extenuating circumstances beyond the agency’s control, the comment period may be shortened or waived in consultation with FHWA Division Office and/or the FTA Regional Office. Additionally, MassDOT may make exceptions to the procedures outlined above and treat amendments as adjustments and/or adjustments as administrative modifications, but these exceptions will also require coordination with and concurrence by MassDOT’s federal partners and the affected MPO.
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3C Documents – Title VI Report
Introduction

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 states that "no person in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, color or national origin, gender, handicap or sexual orientation to be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subject to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance". To comply with this basic civil rights mandate, each federal agency that provides financial assistance for any program is authorized and directed by the United States Department of Justice to apply provisions of Title VI to each program by issuing applicable rules, requirements, and regulations.

This report explains the Nantucket Planning and Economic Development Commission’s (NP&EDC) Title VI Program. The Title VI Program, managed by the Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT), assures that the program requirements are fully met and that NP&EDC is compliant with Federal guidelines and is responsive to the needs of Title VI beneficiaries.

Nantucket Planning and Economic Development Commission (NP&EDC)

As described in its bylaws (Exhibit A), the NP&EDC is composed of the five elected members of the Nantucket Planning Board, one representative of the County Commission (elected), one representative of the Conservation Commission (appointed by the Nantucket Select Board), one representative of the Housing Authority (elected), and three “at large” legal residents of the Town of Nantucket appointed by the other members of the NP&EDC.

Title VI Coordinator

The NP&EDC is committed to ensuring that no person is excluded from participation in, or denied benefits of its services on the basis of race, religion, color, age, ancestry, national origin, gender, handicap, or sexual orientation as protected by Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 49 CFR 21.9(b). Anyone who believes there is an act of discrimination in a program or activity may file a complaint with the NP&EDC Title VI Coordinator. The NP&EDC Title VI Coordinator is responsible for initiating and monitoring Title VI activities, preparing reports and other responsibilities as required by 23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 200 and 49 CFR 21. The Title VI Coordinator for the NP&EDC is:

Andrew Vorce, AICP
Director of Planning
2 Fairgrounds Road
Nantucket, MA 02554
508-325-7587
avorce@nantucket-ma.gov
Notice to Beneficiaries

As described in the NP&EDC’s Title VI Discrimination Complaint Procedure (Exhibit D), members of the public are provided with contact information of the MassDOT Title VI Specialist, Director of Planning, and Transit Administrator to request additional information of nondiscrimination obligations and to file a discrimination complaint. Complaints shall be submitted to either the NP&EDC, or the Nantucket Regional Transit Authority (NRTA), in writing and must include the contact information of the complainant, a detailed description of the complaint, other agencies where the complaint is also being filed, and a signature of the complainant and date submitted.

A Notice of Nondiscrimination Rights and Protections to Beneficiaries is provided on the Transportation Planning page of the Town of Nantucket website - [http://www.nantucket-ma.gov/DocumentCenter/View/6306](http://www.nantucket-ma.gov/DocumentCenter/View/6306) - and provided on the NRTA’s website - [http://nrtawave.com/policies/titleVI-english/toc.php](http://nrtawave.com/policies/titleVI-english/toc.php). The notice is provided by MassDOT and includes a narrative of nondiscrimination rights and protections, as well as contact information for additional information, complaint filing, and translation assistance.

NP&EDC Meeting Facilities

NP&EDC meetings are currently held in the Community Room of the Nantucket Public Safety Facility located at 4 Fairgrounds Road. The meeting space at the Public Safety Facility is relatively new and used by most Town boards and committees. This location is accessible for those with disabilities, it is equipped with wireless assistive listening devices, and is located outside the downtown area near the year-round neighborhoods in the mid-island portion of the island. Additionally, the Select Board has established a Strategic Planning goal to improve sidewalks along corridors between this facility and the downtown area and ferry terminals, which will accommodate active transportation modes and provide an accessible route between the ferry terminals and the meeting facility.

Planning Documents and Notification Requirements

To receive federal funding for transportation planning and improvement projects, the NP&EDC must maintain an open, Comprehensive, Cooperative, and Continuing (3C) transportation planning process involving the local, regional, state, and federal levels of government in conformance with applicable federal and state requirements and guidelines. This requires the development and approval of a work program (UPWP), a capital program (TIP), a long-range plan (LRTP), and other planning studies with significant opportunities for public participation, as described in the NP&EDC’s Public Participation Plan (PPP). Figure 1 describes the purpose and relationship between these required planning documents followed by a more detailed description of each document.
Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) – The LRTP is required under the federal FASTACT law, and is a comprehensive report, updated every four years, that identifies existing conditions, as well as problems and deficiencies, of the Island's transportation infrastructure. It also articulates the vision, goals, and objectives for future projects and programs to improve the system and provides a 20-year fiscally constrained schedule for implementing the recommended improvements. It is developed in consultation with federal and state transportation agencies, and local agencies responsible for land use management, natural resources, environmental protection, conservation, and historic preservation, as well as with representatives of public transportation, freight transportation, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and elderly and disabled populations. The NP&EDC also provides special public workshops with these agencies, and for the public, to collect additional input from the public at various stages of the plan’s development. The draft and amendments to the plan are made available for a 21-day public review with an email notification to identified transportation stakeholders and email notification to subscribers to Town notifications. Copies are made available at the Planning and Land Use Services (PLUS) office, Town Administration’s office, and the
Nantucket Atheneum. A PDF version is posted on the NP&EDC webpage. At least one public hearing is held before the endorsement to solicit public comments and questions.

Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) – The TIP is the short-range transportation programming document that includes a prioritized listing of improvement projects (both roadway and transit projects) identified in the LRTP that would utilize federal funding for implementation. The TIP must be financially constrained and endorsed annually by the NP&EDC. The draft document is developed in consultation with the Town of Nantucket, Nantucket Regional Transit Authority, MassDOT, and the Federal Highway Administration. The draft and amendments to the plan are made available for a 21-day public review period with an email notification to identified transportation stakeholders and email notification to subscribers to Town notifications. Copies are made available at the PLUS office, Town Administration’s office, and the Nantucket Atheneum. A digital PDF is also posted on the NP&EDC webpage. At least one public hearing is held before the endorsement to solicit public comments and questions.

Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) – The UPWP describes all the transportation planning activities expected to be undertaken in the Nantucket region during the year. The UPWP is endorsed annually by the NP&EDC and is one of the federal requirements for a certified transportation planning process and is a prerequisite for the receipt of federal funding for transportation improvements for roads or transit in the region. The draft is prepared with input from the Town of Nantucket, MassDOT, and the Federal Highway Administration. The draft and amendments to the program are made available for a 21-day public review period with an email notification to identified transportation stakeholders and email notification to subscribers to Town notifications. Copies are made available at the PLUS office, Town Administration’s office, and the Nantucket Atheneum. A digital PDF version is also posted on the NP&EDC webpage. At least one public hearing is held before the endorsement to solicit public comments and questions.

Transportation Planning Studies – These studies are routinely undertaken by the NP&EDC to satisfy the goals and objectives stated in the LRTP. These studies will identify additional needs that should be included in the LRTP and can be used to refine the scope of projects or evaluate the feasibility of projects already included in the LRTP. Projects identified or evaluated in a study may potentially be included in the TIP or the local Capital Improvement Program (CIP). Funding for these studies can originate from the UPWP, but can be provided through other sources, such as the Town of Nantucket. A draft study is developed with input from all identified stakeholders and public meetings and forums. Copies are also made available at the PLUS office, Town Administration’s office, the Nantucket Atheneum, as well as in an electronic format on the NP&EDC webpage. At least one public meeting is held at the beginning of the study, and one public meeting is held to present results and recommendations to address public comments and questions.
Community Profile and Equity Analysis

As part of the annual work program, and the latest update of the NP&EDC’s Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) development, planning staff developed updated maps of Title VI and Environmental Justice (EJ) populations using the latest data available from the American Community Survey (ACS) for 2014-2018. As shown in the maps below, the areas with higher concentrations of lower income, minority, limited English proficiency, and/or disabled populations are primarily outside the downtown core area and proximity to the Airport, Miacomet Pond neighborhoods, and in proximity of the public schools. These areas are also within or overlapping the Town Overlay District where density and future growth are to be focused. These are also where transportation services and facilities, such as public transportation and multi-use paths, already exist or have future investments identified.

Figure 2 - Percentage of Population Minority (ACS 2014-18)
Figure 3 - Percentage of Limited English Speaking Households (ACS 2014-18)

Figure 4 - Households less than $60,000 median income (ACS 2014-18)
Figure 5 - Percentage of Total Population with Disability (ACS 2014-18)

Figure 6 - Percentage of Households with People 65 and Over (ACS 2014-18)
As described in the NP&EDC’s FFY 2019 3C Annual Report, and as shown in the maps above, planning activities consisted of a variety of tasks such as traffic studies and intersection evaluations primarily in the mid-island area (Amelia Drive Traffic Study), Parking Management recommendations for downtown, and implementation of a variety of recommended capital projects between the ferry terminals and the Airport property. The NP&EDC does have a goal in the current LRTP (section 4.4.1) to focus infrastructure investments within the Town Overlay District, with bike and pedestrian improvements focused on roads into the downtown area, around the schools and hospital, and around the commercial mid-island area (section 4.5.1.1). The UPWP and TIP projects in FY 2019 are in conformity with these goals.

The major transportation studies completed this year, which utilized UPWP funding, was the Amelia Drive Traffic Study. This included an evaluation of alternatives that accommodated bicycle and pedestrian traffic, on-street parking, vehicle circulation, and preserved the existing street trees. This Complete Street approach to developing a recommended alternative is advancing and will accommodate all modes of travel within and adjacent to areas (as shown in the maps above) with high concentrations of low income, minority, LEP, disabled, and elderly populations.

Also, year-round transit service was launched for in the fall of 2018, which provided year-round transit service to these same areas. The operations of this service were reviewed as part of a UPWP task to identify opportunities to increase ridership. Staff also updated the accessibility attributes of all NRTA bus stops. Additional capital investments for transit users in and around these areas have also been incorporated into plans for a Raceway Drive multi-use path and other sidewalk projects between the Airport and the ferry terminals.

Staff time funded through the UPWP continued to be used for on-going review and assisting with the implementation of locally funded improvements to sidewalk accessibility between the two ferry terminals and other downtown roadways. Staff also assisted as needed with safety and accessibility improvements along Milestone Road, which is also in proximity to the island’s Title VI populations.

**Language Implementation Plan**

Based on the 2014-2018 American Community Survey (ACS) data, the Nantucket region has a relatively small population of Limited English Speakers (LEP). The data show that 1.8% of households are “limited English speaking households”. As shown in Figure 3, the concentration of households is around the Airport area and Old South Road corridor, and in the Bartlett Road and Miacomet neighborhoods. Planning activities and capital investments to address the needs of all users and abilities, as well as expanded transit services, have been focused in these neighborhoods.

The recommended “safe harbor” threshold for providing translation services is 5% or 1,000 people in the community that speak English less than very well. Although no
expenditures or resources were necessary to translate, interpret, or provide other accommodations to participate in planning activities, staff does attempt to reach out to populations by posting flyers in churches, markets, and other areas with high concentration of minority, LEP, low income, disabled, or elderly populations. The NP&EDC will attempt to translate any document using free online services, or by contacting other public agencies, such as Town Administration, local Police, and Nantucket Community Hospital, for assistance with oral translation. The NP&EDC will also rely on the bi-lingual network setup by the Town of Nantucket’s Public Outreach Coordinator and the Nantucket Regional Transit Authority (NRTA). The NP&EDC did not receive any request for translation of any documents in 2019 and did not expend any funds for language or disability related accommodations.

As part of the NP&EDC’s public outreach, planning staff notifies a variety of stakeholders representing outside agencies and population groups, such as the Interfaith Council, Commission on Human Services, NRTA Advisory Board, and Housing Authority. Such notification is part of the development of all program documents and studies. Each of these agencies and committees are consulted with to solicit issues and concerns, even on an anecdotal level, for all population groups. Planning staff will continue this effort to ensure input on transportation needs for Title VI and EJ populations who may not participate in open public meetings.

**NP&EDC Funding Allocation**

The NP&EDC is a recipient of local, state, and federal funding to administrate and implement planning recommendations. The NP&EDC receives an annual funding appropriation for direct and indirect expenses as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3C Planning Grant</td>
<td>FHWA/MassDOT</td>
<td>Funds salaries and expenses of the transportation planning program for the NP&amp;EDC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Local Technical Assistance (DLTA)</td>
<td>Commonwealth of Massachusetts</td>
<td>Funding appropriated by the Commonwealth to help municipalities with sustainable development and achieve regional planning and development goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article 8 Annual Town Meeting</td>
<td>Town of Nantucket</td>
<td>Annual appropriation from the Town of Nantucket for salaries and expenses of the NP&amp;EDC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 3C Planning Grant funding is expended as outlined in the annual UPWP, which is developed using the goals of the MassDOT and NP&EDC and is subject to a 21-day public review prior to approval. DLTA funds are expended by the Director of Planning within the requirements of the Commonwealth, and to achieve the goals of the program and NP&EDC. The funding provided by the Town of Nantucket is approved as part of a budget submitted annually by the NP&EDC.
Active or Completed Discrimination Lawsuits and/or Complaints

To our knowledge there are no active discrimination investigations, lawsuits, or complaints against the NP&EDC.

Title VI Activities and NP&EDC Contracts from the Past Year

In the past calendar year, the staff of the NP&EDC participated in consultation with MassDOT prior to preparing this report. Staff compiled Census and American Community Survey data to identify and map the demographic profile of the regional population, including income and language profiles. This included mapping of transportation investments in the past year with Title VI and EJ populations.

In addition to the collection of data and mapping, staff consulted a variety of stakeholder groups with connections with Title VI and EJ population during the development of all planning documents and studies, including the Interfaith Council, Commission on Disability, Council on Aging, Council for Human Services, Nantucket Housing Authority, and Nantucket Housing Office.

The NP&EDC did not execute any contracts in calendar year 2017 using federal funding. Further, there were no contracts executed with Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBEs). The NP&EDC does not discourage DBEs from responding to procurement notifications.

_________________________ __________________________
Andrew V. Vorce, AICP Date
Director of Planning
NP&EDC Title VI Coordinator

EXHIBIT A: NP&EDC Bylaws
EXHIBIT B: Annual Title VI Certification and Assurance
EXHIBIT C: Rights to Beneficiaries
EXHIBIT D: Title VI Discrimination Complaint Procedure
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3C Documents – FFY 2021-2025 - TIP
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2021 Current Obligation authority (federal aid only)</th>
<th>2021 Proposed Obligation authority (91%)*</th>
<th>2022 Current Obligation authority (federal aid only)</th>
<th>2022 Proposed Obligation authority (91%)*</th>
<th>2023 Current Obligation authority (federal aid only)</th>
<th>2023 Proposed Obligation authority (91%)*</th>
<th>2024 Current Obligation authority (federal aid only)</th>
<th>2024 Proposed Obligation authority (91%)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base obligation authority</td>
<td>$641,988,270.00</td>
<td>$621,541,829.00</td>
<td>$658,744,163.00</td>
<td>$634,503,827.00</td>
<td>$676,662,004.60</td>
<td>$647,736,142.00</td>
<td>$689,684,332.90</td>
<td>$661,244,412.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned redistribution request</td>
<td>$50,000,000.00</td>
<td>$50,000,000.00</td>
<td>$50,000,000.00</td>
<td>$50,000,000.00</td>
<td>$50,000,000.00</td>
<td>$50,000,000.00</td>
<td>$50,000,000.00</td>
<td>$50,000,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total estimated funding available</td>
<td>$691,988,270.00</td>
<td>$671,541,829.00</td>
<td>$708,744,163.00</td>
<td>$684,503,827.00</td>
<td>$726,662,004.60</td>
<td>$697,736,142.00</td>
<td>$739,684,332.90</td>
<td>$711,244,412.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABP GANS Repayment</td>
<td>($85,190,000.00)</td>
<td>($82,375,000.00)</td>
<td>($89,590,000.00)</td>
<td>($86,470,000.00)</td>
<td>($93,985,000.00)</td>
<td>($89,510,000.00)</td>
<td>($98,715,000.00)</td>
<td>($93,985,000.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total non-earmarked funding available</td>
<td>$606,798,270.00</td>
<td>$589,166,829.00</td>
<td>$619,154,163.00</td>
<td>$598,033,827.00</td>
<td>$632,677,004.60</td>
<td>$608,226,142.00</td>
<td>$640,969,332.90</td>
<td>$617,259,412.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding for Regional Priorities**</td>
<td>$194,665,923.26</td>
<td>$194,665,923.26</td>
<td>$198,629,796.33</td>
<td>$198,629,796.33</td>
<td>$202,968,036.19</td>
<td>$202,968,036.19</td>
<td>$205,628,283.96</td>
<td>$205,628,283.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Division Programs***</td>
<td>$412,132,346.74</td>
<td>$394,500,905.74</td>
<td>$420,524,366.80</td>
<td>$399,404,030.67</td>
<td>$429,708,986.41</td>
<td>$405,258,105.81</td>
<td>$435,341,048.94</td>
<td>$411,631,128.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Base Obligation Authority based on 2.1% growth rate from actual FFY 2020 apportionment and average of Fast Act Obligation Authority (91%) through FFY 2020
**MPO TIP targets will be held harmless from the change in proposed Obligation Authority
***MassDOT Highway Division programs are being revised based on new ABP GANS schedule and proposed Obligation Authority
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MassDOT ProjectID</th>
<th>MPO</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Total Federal Participating Cost (TFPC)</th>
<th>Total Programmed Funds</th>
<th>MPO Proposed FFY</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>610533</td>
<td>Nantucket</td>
<td>Safe Routes to Nantucket Public Schools - Surfside Road Crosswalk Relocation</td>
<td>Safe Routes to School Infrastructure</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Project will be included in the Statewide TIP (STIP), not regional TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>608664</td>
<td>Nantucket</td>
<td>NANTUCKET-INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS AT SURFSIDE ROAD AND BARTLETT ROAD</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,363,326</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>Project is on hold per guidance from Select Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Nantucket</td>
<td>Construction of Bike Lanes along Orange Street from Spruce Street to Milestone Rotary</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Project needs to be included in the MassDOT project database by filing a Project Need Form (to be completed by VHB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Nantucket</td>
<td>Milestone Rotary Reconstruction</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,900,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>Project has been approved by MassDOT, but a Project Initiation Form needs to be submitted to advance the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Nantucket</td>
<td>Milestone Road Reconstruction - Roadway Shoulders and Hazard Mitigation Improvements between Rotary and Bunker Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,150,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>Project needs to be included in the MassDOT project database by filing a Project Need Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Nantucket</td>
<td>Four Corners Intersection Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>2050</td>
<td>Project needs to be included in the MassDOT project database by filing a Project Need Form (to be completed by VHB)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3C Documents – FFY 2021 - UPWP
## 2021 Unified Planning Work Program Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY 21 (PL)</th>
<th>FFY 20 (PL)</th>
<th>Δ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>apportionment</td>
<td>$9,899,184</td>
<td>$9,746,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obligation authority</td>
<td>91.0%</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>federal PL funds only</td>
<td>$9,008,258</td>
<td>$9,076,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matching funds added</td>
<td>$11,260,322</td>
<td>$11,345,453</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FFY 20 (Actual)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY 20 (Actual)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9,695,577.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The recommended PL Allocation Formula was developed by the Massachusetts Association of Regional Planning Agencies and recommended by MassDOT to FHWA, is based upon the following three factors: 40% of available funds divided equally among the ten MPOs, 30% is allocated based on each MPO’s relative share of Massachusetts population, and 30% is allocated based on each MPO’s relative share of urbanized population. These factors result in the percentages shown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPOs PL funded</th>
<th>40% of total funds/ten MPOs</th>
<th>30% of funding for relative size of population</th>
<th>30% of funding for relative size of urbanized population</th>
<th>$5303 Full Amount w/Match (FFY 20)</th>
<th>$5303 Full Amount w/Match FFY 21 (2.1%)</th>
<th>Total FFY 20 funding by MPO</th>
<th>Total FFY 21 funding by MPO</th>
<th>Δ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire</td>
<td>$4,504,129</td>
<td>$3,378,097</td>
<td>$2,126,107</td>
<td>$5303 Full Amount w/Match FFY 20</td>
<td>$5303 Full Amount w/Match FFY 21</td>
<td>Total FFY 20 funding by MPO</td>
<td>Total FFY 21 funding by MPO</td>
<td>Δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>$450,413</td>
<td>$307,305</td>
<td>$215,888</td>
<td>$226,726</td>
<td>$226,726</td>
<td>Total FFY 20 funding by MPO</td>
<td>Total FFY 21 funding by MPO</td>
<td>Δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Mass</td>
<td>$450,413</td>
<td>$291,583</td>
<td>$198,826</td>
<td>$112,845</td>
<td>$112,845</td>
<td>Total FFY 20 funding by MPO</td>
<td>Total FFY 21 funding by MPO</td>
<td>Δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrimack Valley</td>
<td>$450,413</td>
<td>$337,475</td>
<td>$236,475</td>
<td>$123,859</td>
<td>$123,859</td>
<td>Total FFY 20 funding by MPO</td>
<td>Total FFY 21 funding by MPO</td>
<td>Δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montachusett</td>
<td>$450,413</td>
<td>$236,475</td>
<td>$129,859</td>
<td>$78,201</td>
<td>$78,201</td>
<td>Total FFY 20 funding by MPO</td>
<td>Total FFY 21 funding by MPO</td>
<td>Δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Middlesex</td>
<td>$450,413</td>
<td>$236,475</td>
<td>$129,859</td>
<td>$78,201</td>
<td>$78,201</td>
<td>Total FFY 20 funding by MPO</td>
<td>Total FFY 21 funding by MPO</td>
<td>Δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Colony</td>
<td>$450,413</td>
<td>$324,085</td>
<td>$215,888</td>
<td>$113,076</td>
<td>$113,076</td>
<td>Total FFY 20 funding by MPO</td>
<td>Total FFY 21 funding by MPO</td>
<td>Δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer Valley</td>
<td>$450,413</td>
<td>$291,583</td>
<td>$198,826</td>
<td>$112,845</td>
<td>$112,845</td>
<td>Total FFY 20 funding by MPO</td>
<td>Total FFY 21 funding by MPO</td>
<td>Δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern Mass</td>
<td>$450,413</td>
<td>$337,475</td>
<td>$236,475</td>
<td>$123,859</td>
<td>$123,859</td>
<td>Total FFY 20 funding by MPO</td>
<td>Total FFY 21 funding by MPO</td>
<td>Δ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPOs PL funded</th>
<th>FFY 20 total funding by RPA</th>
<th>FFY 21 total funding by RPA</th>
<th>Δ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>$452,099</td>
<td>$565,124</td>
<td>$113,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha’s Vineyard</td>
<td>$299,268</td>
<td>$324,085</td>
<td>$24,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nantucket</td>
<td>$220,540</td>
<td>$273,591</td>
<td>$53,051</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CTPS 5303 includes MassDOT 5303

The SPR funding provided to the RPAs not officially recognized as MPOs is adjusted year-to-year based on the change in funding experienced by the MPOs for their PL funds.
AGENDA ITEM VI.C

NRTA Regional Transit Plan
NRTA Comprehensive Regional Transit Plan Update Goals

This memo presents the draft goals developed for the NRTA RTP update based on the discussions held at the NRTA Kick-off meeting for the Comprehensive Regional Transit Plan (CRTP) update held on 1/21/2020, previous RTP and vision and goals outlined in the Long Range Transportation Plan 2020 for Nantucket.

Vision Statement

Nantucket Regional Transit Authority has established a standard of excellence that is only equaled to its commitment to provide safe, efficient, affordable and widely accessible transportation service to meet the needs of the year-round community and the diverse summer population it serves.

Goals

1. Provide Safe and Convenient Service

   Provide a safe and convenient alternative to driving for residents and visitors that is sensitive to the character of the Island and offers an array of interconnected modes to the public that provides/offers access to jobs and services

   Objectives
   A. Increase transit frequency, span of service and reach in a way that is sensitive to the character of the Island
   B. Improve accessibility to bus stops
   C. Maintain the vehicle fleet in a state of good repair
   D. Pursue system upgrades, including procuring new vehicles that are designed to safely navigate island roadways
   E. Expand the number of shelters
   F. Work with the community to approve transit friendly development and infrastructure improvements that accommodate bus service in the initial design

2. Minimize Auto Use on the Island

   Minimize the use of automobiles on Nantucket and provide an attractive, accessible alternative transportation option that meets mobility needs while contributing to increased access to opportunities and a healthy environment for residents and visitors

   Objectives
   A. Promote interconnectivity with other transportation modes, including boat, air, and bicycles
   B. Investigate alternative service models that are affordable and flexible for the elderly and disabled
   C. Identify peripheral parking areas for a park and ride potential
   D. Explore the potential for a downtown circulator route
# NRTA Work Plan

*Internal Use Living Document*

## Table of Contents

Overview .................................................................................................................................................. 1  
Project Description ................................................................................................................................. 1  
Team .......................................................................................................................................................... 1  
  Overall Team Organization ..................................................................................................................... 2  
  RTA-Specific Team ................................................................................................................................. 3  
  Responsibilities ....................................................................................................................................... 4  
  Communication Protocol ....................................................................................................................... 4  
Approach .................................................................................................................................................. 5  
Deliverables .............................................................................................................................................. 6  
Reviews .................................................................................................................................................... 14  
Plan Development .................................................................................................................................... 14  
  Data Request and Tracking .................................................................................................................... 14  
    *Data Sources* .................................................................................................................................. 14  
Templates ................................................................................................................................................ 14  
    *Report Templates* ............................................................................................................................. 14  
    *Data Templates* ................................................................................................................................. 15  
    *Map Templates* ............................................................................................................................... 15  
    *Survey Templates/Questions* .......................................................................................................... 15  
Schedule ................................................................................................................................................ 15  
Technical Tasks ...................................................................................................................................... 16  
Stakeholder Engagement .......................................................................................................................... 0
List of Tables
Table 1: Overall Team Contact Information .................................................................................. 3
Table 2: Group 2 RTA Assignments ............................................................................................... 3
Table 3: Primary Responsibilities .................................................................................................. 4

List of Figures
Figure 1: Overall Project Organization .......................................................................................... 2
Figure 3: Overall Project Schedule ................................................................................................ 16
Figure 4: NRTA Schedule ................................................................................................................ 17
Overview
This NRTA Work Plan is a living document; it will be updated over the course of the Comprehensive Regional Transit Plan Update process as needed. This Work Plan should be used as a guide for the NRTA and AECOM teams to coordinate and understand the scope of the project, communication protocol, and roles and responsibilities.

Project Description
The MassDOT Rail and Transit Division has retained the services of AECOM and CityPoint Partners to support each of the 15 Regional Transit Authorities (RTAs) across the Commonwealth in developing Comprehensive Regional Transit Plan Updates (CRTPU). The CRTPU is intended to be a five-year transit plan from 2020-2025 and is an update and expansion of the Regional Transit Plans last developed in 2015.

The CRTPUs are being developed in the context of several statewide and regional initiatives. The CRTPUs are both a result of and a contributor to the ongoing discussions on regional transportation. Recent and ongoing initiatives include the following:

- Governor’s Commission on the Future of Transportation
- A Vision for the Future of Massachusetts’ Regional Transit Authorities (RTA Task Force)
- Transportation Climate Initiative

NRTA also signed a two-year Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with MassDOT in August of 2019. The MOU includes agreement to complete the CRTPU process. The MOU also contains performance metrics and targets, agreement to maintain an up-to-date asset inventory, agreement to submit a fare policy by December 2020, agreement to submit a balanced budget annually, and reporting timelines.

Project Goals
Overarching goals for the CRTPUs include the following:

- Generate performance measures to define what a successful route looks like using the metrics and targets in the MOU as a baseline
- Identify key customer groups and institutions to serve
- Lay out how to handle routes that are not meeting performance benchmarks
- Enhance transparency in agency decision making
- Create or refine a vision for the next five years for the agency

The AECOM Team will work with NRTA to update the NRTA-specific goals and objectives for this CRTPU process as well as for the organization over the next five years.

Goals/Areas of Focus for NRTA include:

- Prioritize investments in bus stop improvements, in particular accessibility
- Review previous recommendations in 2015 RTP to determine what is still applicable
- Examine the feasibility of a free downtown shuttle using the Ferry Connector Model
- Guidance on a fare policy
- Evaluate winter service to better match service hours to demand


• Information on using ridesharing to supplement paratransit

Team
On the consulting side, the team is under contract to MassDOT using an approved scope of work. However, the CRTPU is meant to reflect the priorities of NRTA, so there is flexibility in the content, structure, engagement, areas of focus, and goals and objectives of the process and plan. The overall team is described in the next section and the RTA-specific team is described in the following section.

Overall Team Organization
The overall organization of the AECOM Team is shown in Figure 1.

*Figure 1: Overall Project Organization*
Contact information for the primary contract Project Managers at MassDOT and AECOM is listed in Table 1.

Table 1: Overall Team Contact Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Schiavone</td>
<td>MassDOT</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td><a href="mailto:thomas.schiavone@state.ma.us">thomas.schiavone@state.ma.us</a></td>
<td>857-368-8967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Cahoon</td>
<td>AECOM</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jill.cahoon@aecom.com">jill.cahoon@aecom.com</a></td>
<td>603-289-3531</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RTA-Specific Team

As described in the previous section, the RTAs have been divided into three groups of five RTAs and assigned a Team Lead, a Transit Planner, a Stakeholder Engagement Lead, and a GIS Specialist. NRTA is part of Group 2. The Team Lead is Krystal Oldread. The other RTAs with CRTPUs being led by the Group 2 Team Lead are shown in Figure 2: Commonwealth Map of Team Assignments.

Table 2. Because there are 15 RTAs and an aggressive timeline to complete all the CRTPUs simultaneously, the RTAs were divided into three groups based on size, modes, and previous professional relationships in order to have an equitable distribution of work.
Figure 2: Commonwealth Map of Team Assignments

Table 2: Group 2 RTA Assignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 2 Team Lead: Oldread</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Pioneer Valley Transit Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Nantucket Regional Transit Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Franklin Regional Transit Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Greater Attleboro-Taunton Regional Transit Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Merrimack Valley Regional Transit Authority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responsibilities

The overarching responsibilities of NRTA, AECOM, and CPP are described in Table 3.

Table 3: Primary Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NRTA</th>
<th>AECOM</th>
<th>CPP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide guidance to AECOM and CPP on RTA goals, priorities, stakeholders, engagement methods, areas of focus and recommendations</td>
<td>Coordinate with MassDOT and manage project</td>
<td>Manage stakeholder engagement strategies and logistics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Provide route-level and other more specific data to AECOM and CPP

Coordinate with NRTA, ensure NRTA priorities and areas of focus are reflected in CRTPU

Ensure major stakeholders are engaged in the process using methods and messages approved by NRTA

Validate existing conditions information produced by AECOM and CPP

Produce existing conditions documentation, maps, charts, and tables

Develop Stakeholder Engagement Plan in coordination with AECOM and NRTA

Guide development of recommendations and

Conduct technical analyses, research, and reviews to inform and develop recommendations

Share stakeholder input with technical team to be included in the development of recommendations

Assist with public outreach

Assist with public outreach

Conduct stakeholder focus groups and public meetings; draft surveys and summarize results from outreach events

Review draft document chapters as they are developed and full draft CRTPU

Draft CRTPU document

Communication Protocol

The overarching Project Management involves coordination between MassDOT and the AECOM Team. AECOM will provide weekly, biweekly, or monthly status reports to MassDOT depending on the activity level at certain points in the process. The AECOM Team will setup a bi-weekly check in call with MassDOT and also post meeting schedules and progress reports to the shared Teams site.

On a day-to-day basis during the development of the CRTPU:

- The primary point of contact for AECOM is: Krystal Oldread
- The primary point of contact for NRTA is: Paul Leary

The NRTA Team and AECOM Team will discuss status of the CRTPU on check-in conference calls as needed. Other in-person meetings will occur at strategic points in the process and for stakeholder engagement activities. The schedule of calls and in-person meetings is outlined in a subsequent section.

Table 4: NRTA CRTPU Team Contact Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Krystal Oldread</td>
<td>AECOM</td>
<td>Team Leader</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Krystal.oldread@aecom.com">Krystal.oldread@aecom.com</a></td>
<td>413-203-5055; C 413-575-0393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Leary</td>
<td>NRTA</td>
<td>NRTA Admin</td>
<td><a href="mailto:NRTA@Nantucket-ma.gov">NRTA@Nantucket-ma.gov</a></td>
<td>508-325-9571</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Approach
The CRTPU scope of work with MassDOT includes two tasks: Project Management and RTA CRTPU Development. The tasks and subtasks are summarized below and the approach is described in the following section:

- **Task 1: Project Management**
  - 1A: Project Work Plan
  - 1B: Stakeholder Engagement Plan
- **Task 2: RTA Service Description, Data Collection and Analysis, and Recommendations**
  - 2A: Needs and Goals
  - 2B: Data Collection
  - 2C: Comprehensive Assessment of Existing Service and Ridership Including Performance Evaluation
  - 2D: Market Evaluation
  - 2E: Commonwealth Environmental Policies
  - 2F: Fare Rates and Collection Method Evaluation
  - 2G: Performance and Service Measure Setting
  - 2H: Alternatives Development and Evaluation
  - 2I: Development of Recommendations
  - 2J: Draft and Final Plan

Task Description
The proposed approach to Tasks 1 and 2 is described in this section. RTA-specific modifications, areas of focus, priorities, etc. are also included.

**Task 1: Project Management**
The overall approach to work plan development/project management and stakeholder engagement will be the same for all RTAs. However, the details and specific schedule will vary by RTA within the overall project construct. Task 1 includes a Work Plan (this document) and a Stakeholder Engagement Plan to guide the development of the CRTPU.

**Stakeholder Engagement Plan**
Throughout the process, starting with the kick-off meeting, our team will actively solicit each RTA’s commitment to invest in a collaborative process that will identify stakeholders and build coalitions based on consensus. Engaging primary stakeholders in a meaningful process will require a series of internal meetings to survey the RTA members, leverage their local
knowledge and existing stakeholder lists, and establish internal working groups with a focus on developing a larger public outreach process. Follow-up internal meetings will be held to identify a broad range of external stakeholder groups within each RTA. During this stage, surveys will be developed to garner broad-based and comprehensive public feedback.

The stakeholder engagement lead will be City Point Partners (CPP), a DBE firm with extensive public engagement experience around the Commonwealth. The team will develop a broad outreach strategy that each RTA can customize into an engagement plan to fit their region's needs. AECOM and CPP understand that no two RTAs are alike.

We will develop and present outreach options to each RTA and work with the organizations to determine which methods are best suited for each region. These options are outlined in the outreach strategy below. In order to establish the right level of uniformity and consistency, we will develop survey questions that are relevant for each RTA, but will analyze customer feedback on a local, regional, and statewide basis. The survey will be designed in conjunction with the RTA and will ask questions about use of transit, travel patterns and needs. Based on a successful approach recently employed in multiple projects, we will develop an online survey using Survey Monkey which will simultaneously reach out to existing riders and the general public.

The online survey will allow for two different tracks of questions depending on whether or not the respondent is a current rider. The online survey can be accessed via links in electronic format or by QR codes (a bar code that can be scanned by a smartphone to take a user directly to the survey website) on flyers. Paper copies of the surveys will also be available at transit stations and at community locations for people without access to the internet or smartphones.

Outreach Strategy

Drawing on the expertise and support of the public outreach team, we will leverage tactics used in similar campaigns that effectively engaged the public at-large. In collaboration with the individual RTAs, regional education and awareness campaigns seeking customer feedback will be launched in respective areas. We recommend a mixture of meetings and stakeholder workshops in addition to the survey mentioned above and will present this to each RTA to develop a tailored outreach plan. The team recommends meetings that are interactive, providing displays for people to examine and comment on via sticky note or conversations with a study team member and other participants, in addition to providing information. Often, good conversations with neighbors spring up around these displays.

A brief overview of the study and findings to date precede the open house style meeting giving opportunity to comment on displays — and it is not necessary to attend the entire meeting to make helpful comments. The stakeholder workshops are more intimate meetings with invited stakeholder groups to discuss needs. The existing RTA databases of stakeholder groups will be used as a base to build a list of stakeholders. Example local and regional stakeholders that might be invited include:

- Neighborhood and transportation advocacy groups
- Human and health services representatives
- Major employers
- Municipal Leaders within each RTA member community
- Senior Centers/Councils on Aging
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- Chambers of Commerce
- Institutions such as hospitals, health centers, schools, and universities

To get the word out and increase participation in the public meeting and survey, advertising tactics could include:

- Social media campaign
- Website information
- Press releases
- Email campaigns to large local employers and institutions
- Deployment of poster advertisements in all buses serving RTA areas
- Contacting the regional news media
- Utilizing the stakeholder networks
- Outreach to transportation advocacy groups such as Transportation for Massachusetts or the RTA Advocates Coalition run by Massachusetts Public Health Association
- Briefings for legislative delegations and municipal
- MassDOT communications

Measured Results

The outreach strategy will draw on the lessons from numerous similar public outreach efforts undertaken by the AECOM Team. We understand the highly variable constituencies in each region of the Commonwealth, from the higher educational student population of the Five Colleges to the huge seasonal ridership fluctuations of the Cape and Islands. We are well-versed in providing all collateral materials necessary for impactful outreach campaigns including posters, notices, flyers, PowerPoint presentations, and handout materials of all forms.

We develop all content and graphic materials to Section 508 and Title VI specifications for a variety of MassDOT websites.

Task 2: RTA CRTPU

Task 2 includes the methods for analysis to be used to develop alternatives and recommendations to guide each RTA over the next five years.

Task 2A: Needs and Goals

The AECOM Team will work with the RTAs to identify and articulate a set of needs and goals specific to each RTA. These needs and goals will be developed with the input of each RTA, their Steering/Study Advisory Committee, and MassDOT. As stated in the RFP, the goals need to align with the Commission on the Future of Transportation in the Commonwealth, be vested in local participation, be driven by data, lay the groundwork for providing service that is both effective and financially efficient, and reflect what each RTA wants the Regional Transit Plan to accomplish. The project kick-off meeting with each RTA can serve as a tool to engage the RTAs in developing their respective goals as well as a collective goals and objectives statement. To facilitate the kick-off meeting dialogue on goals, AECOM will prepare a draft set of goals and needs as a first step. These will be based on our review of each RTA’s existing system mission and vision statement, current Regional Transit Plan, the Commission on the Future of Transportation in the Commonwealth report and A Vision for the Future of Massachusetts’ Regional Transit Authorities (RTA Task Force).
**Task 2B: Data Collection**

AECOM will meet with each provider to hold a project kickoff and data collection meeting. At the meeting, the team will present the data requests/needs and begin to understand the RTAs’ needs and limitations as it pertains to data. While a template can be provided to each RTA to enter their data, the team anticipates that the majority of RTAs will submit their data based on what they receive from their operators and use for state and federal reporting. AECOM will work with the RTA to gather the data and enter it into the format developed for analysis in later tasks. AECOM’s data collection plan does not include our team conducting onboard surveys or ridership counts. Where data does not adequately exist at the needed level of analysis, AECOM will work with the RTA to develop a method for collecting appropriate data. For each dataset collected, AECOM and the provider will document from where the data is derived, date, assumptions and collection methodologies. At a minimum, the following data will be collected for each year from FY 14–FY 19:

- Service span, frequency, days and service, vehicle requirements and interlines by route
- Ridership by route and service, day type and, if readily available, by time of day and stop
- Revenue hours and miles by route and service and day type
- On-time performance information by route and service
- Operating cost by route and service
- Farebox revenue by route and service and any partnerships or funding sources that are route specific
- System-wide breakdown of federal and state funding, marketing and other revenue, and partnerships
- The number of preventable accidents, road calls, missed trips, valid passenger complaints, fatalities, injuries and safety events by mode
- Vehicle, facility and equipment inventory, age and condition as it pertains to the Transit Asset Management (TAM) Plan
- For ADA paratransit only: denied trips, average phone hold time, percent cancellations, percent no-shows

GIS data will be collected from a variety of sources including the U.S. Census Bureau, Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics dataset (LEHD), Commonwealth GIS data warehouse, Regional Planning Agencies, and the RTAs. AECOM will convert any GTFS datasets into a clean set of GIS routes to show primary routings and limited service variations. AECOM will work with each provider to map areas or zones of coverage for demand response, deviated fixed route and ADA paratransit services.

**Task 2C: Comprehensive Assessment of Existing Service and Ridership Including Performance Evaluation**

AECOM will evaluate ridership and performance measures at the system and route/service level to understand how existing services are performing. Table 5 presents which metrics are recommended to be evaluated at the system level and which at the route level. The assessment will include all modes operated by each RTA. The team will create system and route/service profiles to show performance. A standard template will be developed with the minimum information required to understand the route/service (general service area description, service span, frequency, days operated, service type) and evaluate performance, as agreed upon with
MassDOT. AECOM will work with each RTA to adjust the template as long as the minimum information is included.

Table 5: Example of Metrics by System, Mode, or Route Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>System Wide</th>
<th>Route Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unlinked passenger trips</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle revenue hours</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle revenue miles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-time performance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers/mile</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers/hour</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost/mile</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost/hour</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost/passenger</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidy per passenger</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farebox Recovery</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles between road calls</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventable accidents by 100,000 miles</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Trips operated by mode</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid complaints per 100,000 passengers</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injuries</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety events</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA/Demand Response denied trips</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average phone hold time ADA</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA/Demand Response percent cancellations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA/Demand Response percent no-shows</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of revenue vehicles by type that exceed the ULB</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of non-revenue vehicles by type that exceed the ULB</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of facilities by group that score less than 3 on the TERM scale</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To understand how each RTA is performing, a peer analysis with up to five peers will be conducted. The peer analysis will utilize data from the NTD and examine metrics such as productivity, financial efficiency, safety, and reliability. AECOM will work with each RTA to select peers nationwide that provide a comparable level of service with similar demographics and size. Alternatively, the peer analysis could also look at innovative approaches, best practices, etc. based on the areas of focus identified by the RTA.

Upon completing a preliminary evaluation, the team will meet with each provider to understand the nuances in performance, clarify any questions/issues/concerns, and gain an understanding of why certain routes operate as they do given the performance. This will help in providing transparency in decision making moving forward.

In addition to service metrics, AECOM will look at the percent of the population and jobs that are within 3/4 mile of a transit bus stop or route (route only if flag stop) and determine the transit ridership per capita. If stop-level ridership is readily available, it will be mapped by route for
boardings and alightings using an average weekday. Ridership will also be examined by time of
day by route if available. Similarly, origins and destinations for demand response service will be
mapped and analyzed at a fine grain but presented only at the community/system level to
protect customer privacy.

**Task 2D: Market Evaluation**

We will perform a demographic analysis of each RTA service area to identify and quantify
transportation needs based on current population, socioeconomic data, and key indicators such
as major employers, key destinations, land use, travel patterns, connecting transportation
providers, and other points of interest. A key product of this market analysis will be a transit
need score for the region, overlaying and highlighting factors that typically relate to demand
(existing or potential) for public transportation. Information on future land use or planned zoning
changes, planned and programmed developments, population and employment projections, or
new destinations will be used to identify potential new markets if data is available. Information
gleaned from stakeholder engagement will also be incorporated into the market analysis as it
relates to current and future needs and demand for service.

**Task 2E: Commonwealth Environmental Policies**

Each CRTPU will include a section detailing how recommendations promulgated by the
Commission on the Future of Transportation in the Commonwealth impact the current and
future operations of the RTAs. The Commission was tasked with exploring the anticipated
changes in technology, climate, land use, and the economy to determine what the impact would
be on the transportation system through 2040. Volume I of the plan presents five categories with
18 recommendations. The team will review each recommendation and how the RTAs can
advance each or will be impacted by them.

**Task 2F: Fare Rates and Collection Method Evaluation**

The AECOM team will conduct a fare structure analysis and technology review for each system.
AECOM will examine the fare structure and data on how riders pay fares. The evaluation will
also examine fare technology, challenges, policies, historical fare changes and any proposed
changes. Data about how riders pay fares, transfers, recent fare changes and revenues from
passes/ticket books will be reviewed to establish a fare structure benchmark for each system,
which exhibits the level of pass use, percentage of cash and impact of transfers on fare revenue
per boarding. Per the MOUs signed by each RTA with MassDOT, they are required to adopt a
fare policy “that includes regular and recurring fare reviews and consideration of periodic
modest fare adjustments.” As part of the task the team will work with each RTA to develop a
policy if one has not already been adopted. Some RTAs have already set a policy — in these
cases the team will review the existing policy and make recommendations to strengthen it, as
applicable.

**Task 2G: Performance and Service Measure Setting**

Performance targets and benchmarks will be based on existing service levels, peers, national
best practices, national averages, and demand. Measures will be tailored to each system. After
conducting Task 2C, benchmarks will be developed that are in line with national best practices
and provide the RTAs with ambitious yet achievable goals that are tailored to the service area.
AECOM will meet with each RTA to go over the recommended benchmarks and work with them
to formulate or evaluate benchmarks. AECOM will confirm with MassDOT that these
benchmarks are acceptable.
Guidelines and a decision tree will be provided with recommended steps on what to do if a route is meeting some but not all of the metrics. This will help with creating transparency in service change decisions. Potential benchmarks will be broken out by mode and include:

- Passenger/hour, mile or trip
- Stop activity by route
- Cost/passenger
- Cost per hour or mile
- Subsidy per passenger
- Farebox recovery
- On-time performance
- Percent denied trips
- Accidents/miles
- Complaints/passenger
- Road calls/mileage
- Safety events/passenger
- Injuries/passenger
- Fatalities/passenger
- Percentage of revenue vehicles by type that exceed the Useful Life Benchmark (ULB)
- Percentage of non-revenue vehicles by type that exceed the ULB
- Percentage of facilities by group that score less than 3 on the TERM scale
- ADA/demand response denied trips
- Average phone hold time for ADA service
- ADA/demand response percent cancellations
- ADA/demand response percent no-show

To assist the RTAs and MassDOT in tracking the measures in the future, on an as-needed basis, AECOM will develop dashboards for RTAs and MassDOT. The dashboards will be developed in Microsoft Excel so that they can be easily maintained and modified without additional software. AECOM will build on its success with dashboards developed for past clients, tailoring them to the specific needs and measures of the RTAs and MassDOT. Dashboards will be structured to minimize data entry by allowing RTAs to simply copy and paste data from existing Blackcat reports. Once data is copied and pasted into the dashboard, the RTA or MassDOT would only need to select the date range and report type — the dashboard automates the rest. Performance reports can be generated for monthly or annual time periods and compared to targets set by the RTA or MassDOT. Recognizing that the dashboard will likely be used by multiple audiences, data is presented in three easy-to-read graphical formats: tables, line charts, and gauges. Color-coded icons indicate if a metric has increased or decreased from the previous period at a glance. It is noted that many RTAs already have performance dashboards, so this task will only be deployed on an as-needed basis.
Task 2H: Alternatives Development and Evaluation
The first step in developing alternatives for recommendations will be to meet with each RTA to discuss route performance and the findings from the outreach. The preferred method is a half-day to one-day workshop with the RTA to go through all of the findings and present broad alternatives. AECOM will come to the table with a broad list of recommended changes based on how routes and services are performing, the policy reviews, the capital reviews, the market analysis, needs and goals, and outreach. This is an opportunity for the RTA to identify any constraints such as funding, staffing, technology, space, or vehicles. Once the broad list of changes is agreed upon, AECOM will expand them and add relevant details. AECOM will then meet with MassDOT to review the alternatives for each RTA and confirm that they meet the goals and objectives of both the RTA and MassDOT. All alternatives will be categorized by timeframe with sufficient detail to calculate operational and capital costs.

Task 2I: Development of Recommendations
Recommendations will be developed based on the outcome of the RTA workshops and meeting with MassDOT. All recommendations for service will include proposed service spans, parameters, headways, and any capital investments needed, and will be accompanied by maps if routing changes are recommended.

In addition to service changes, AECOM will work with the RTA to outline recommendations for fare policy, strategies to better align with the Commonwealth’s environmental policies, and future collaboration with local partners. It will be the responsibility of the RTA to develop schedules to implement any service changes.

The team will review the RTA’s Title VI policy and for each recommendation indicate the likelihood that its implementation will trigger a full Title VI analysis (e.g. a major service change or other trigger) as applicable. Once the recommendations have been fully developed, the team will again meet with the RTA to walk them through the recommendations and revise/adjust based on feedback. An important part of the recommendations will be a section explaining the background and assumptions to emphasize the goals of improving service for the customers, establishing sound financial management, and improving operating efficiency.
**Task 2J: Draft and Final Plan**

Using the information developed in the previous tasks, the full draft of the comprehensive regional transit plan update will be developed. The final plan will include a one-page executive summary with plan highlights to be used as a handout at meetings or otherwise by the RTA. The information on service improvements and strategies will be developed in sufficient detail to be able to estimate and make assumptions to complete year-by-year operational and capital budgets. The plan will be submitted to the RTA and MassDOT for simultaneous review before being posted for public comment at the discretion of the RTA.

**Deliverables**

Interim and final deliverables include the following:

- Work Plan (this document)
- Stakeholder Engagement Plan
- Interim Memos (Plan Chapters)
  - Market Analysis
  - Existing Conditions
  - Fares and Funding
  - Alternatives
  - Recommendations
- Draft Final Plan
- Final Plan

Deliverables will be shared with NRTA electronically via [NRTA - Microsoft Teams.](mailto:NRTA-Microsoft-Teams)

**Reviews**

The AECOM Team will ask MassDOT and the NRTA to review and validate documents and data at the beginning of the project, and then at critical milestones throughout the plan development.

**Plan Development**

Because 15 CRTPUs are being developed simultaneously, the AECOM Team has developed a standard data request list and different types of templates. The lists and templates will be modified to reflect each RTA.

**Data Request and Tracking**

Data is being collected from MassDOT and NRTA. A tracking spreadsheet by data type and vintage has been developed and shared with NRTA. The tracking spreadsheet also includes the sources of data to be used in development of the plan. If NRTA has alternative or additional data sources, please inform the Group Leader.

**Data Sources**

The following is a brief summary of known data sources:

- Black Cat
- National Transit Database (NTD)
- NRTA Transit Asset Management (TAM) Plan
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- Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with MassDOT
- Annual Reports/Audits
- NRTA Website
- Nantucket Planning Commission

Templates

AECOM has developed templates that we will be using to enter data collected from NRTA and other data sources. All of the templates are flexible based on NRTA goals and areas of focus.

Report Templates

The Table of Contents for the Comprehensive Regional Transit Plan Update includes the following elements with more detailed subsections as needed:

1. Executive Summary
2. Why a Comprehensive Regional Transit Plan?
3. Agency Overview
4. Current Transit Services
5. Performance Monitoring
6. Market Evaluation
7. Fare Rates and Structure
8. Unmet Needs
9. Recommendations

Additional elements will be added or more or less emphasis on a particular element will be made depending on NRTA areas of focus. Particular areas of emphasis for NRTA include:

- Prioritize investments in bus stop improvements, in particular accessibility
- Review previous recommendations in 2015 RTP to determine what is still applicable
- Examine the feasibility of a free downtown shuttle using the Ferry Connector Model
- Guidance on a fare policy
- Evaluate winter service to better match service hours to demand
- Information on using ridesharing to supplement paratransit

Data Templates

The data from MassDOT and NRTA will be entered into Excel-based spreadsheets to produce tables and charts for analysis. Topic areas include:

- Asset Management
- Capacity
- Customer Service
- On-Time Performance
- Peer Analysis
- Safety and Security
- Service
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Map Templates
Map templates have also been created for each RTA. Demographic and socioeconomic data is stored in a Commonwealth-wide geodatabase to be shared with MassDOT at the conclusion of the study. Routing information from GTFS has also been converted to GIS format and alternate mode datasets (e.g. ADA paratransit service area, demand response service, etc.) are also being produced. All of the service planning GIS files will also be shared with NRTA and MassDOT at the conclusion of the study, including any GIS files used to represent recommendations developed as part of the planning process.

Survey Templates/Questions
The primary medium for surveys will be online surveys via SurveyMonkey. Flyers and posters advertising the surveys will be developed with the online survey link/scannable QR code to encourage survey respondents to use the online survey option. Survey links and website buttons will also be created for RTAs, member communities, stakeholders, and regional bodies to post on websites and via social media. As needed, paper versions of the surveys will also be designed.

Survey templates and questions by audience have been developed and saved in a shared location for team members to utilize and customize.

Schedule
The study was kicked off with MassDOT on December 12, 2019. The overall schedule for the development of the Comprehensive Regional Transit Plan Updates includes completion of full, accessible final plan documents by the end of September 2020. MassDOT would like to see draft final plans by the end of July 2020. The overall project schedule is shown in Figure 4. However, each RTA may have different schedules depending on RTA availability, areas of focus, and stakeholder engagement activities. The more specific schedule for NRTA is described in the following subsections on Technical Tasks and Stakeholder Engagement.
Figure 4: Overall Project Schedule

Technical Tasks
The technical tasks do not necessarily need to progress in numeric order. Some tasks feed each other, but most can be concurrent, rearranged, or condensed/expanded as needed. The schedule specific to NRTA is included below.
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### Figure 5: NRTA Schedule

#### NRTA Project Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 1A Work Plan and Project Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 1B Stakeholder Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2A Needs and Goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2B Data Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2C Comprehensive assessment of existing service and ridership including performance evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2D Market evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2E Commonwealth Environmental Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2F Fare rates and collection method evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2G Performance and service measure setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2H Alternatives development and evaluation (for recommendations)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2I Development of Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2J Draft and final plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Deliverables

- PMP - Project Management Plan
- SEP - Stakeholder Engagement Plan
- MA - Market Analysis Memo
- EX - Existing Conditions Memo
- DAR - Fare and Funding Analysis Report
- PM - Performance Measures Memo and Dashboard
- AM - Alternatives Memo
- RM - Recommendations Memo
- DFP - Draft Final Plan
- FR - Final Document

#### Meetings/Presentations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meetings/Presentations</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deliverables</td>
<td>PMP, SEP</td>
<td>MA, EX</td>
<td>DAR</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Meetings Overview

1. Kick-off Meetings
2. Existing performance discussion
3. Discuss performance measures
4. Recommendation Workshops
5. Present Final Recommendations
Meetings with NRTA to discuss the plan development include the following:

- Kick-off meeting (1/21/20)
- Existing performance/market (Late March)
- Discuss performance Measures (Late April)
- Recommendation workshop (Late May/Early June)
- Present final plan (Late summer/early Fall)

Deliverables for review by NRTA and MassDOT include the following:

- Work Plan (this document); early February 2020
- Stakeholder Engagement Plan; early February 2020
- Market Analysis (Plan Chapter 6); mid March 2020
- Existing Conditions (Plan Chapters 3, 4 and part of 5); March 2020
- Fares and Funding (Plan Chapter 7); early 2020
- Performance measures (Plan chapter 5 remaining); end of April 2020
- Alternatives (Plan Chapter 8); May 2020
- Recommendations (Plan Chapters 9); June 2020
- Draft Final Plan (Plan Chapters 2-9); end of July 2020
- Final Plan (Plan Chapters 1-9 and Appendices); end of September 2020

In order to keep within the schedule, the NRTA review timeline will be approximately two weeks.

**Stakeholder Engagement**

Stakeholder engagement extends throughout the life of the study and plan development. A separate Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) is also being prepared and will be incorporated herein by reference.
E. Expand service to areas not currently served

3. Ensure Transportation Services are Affordable
   The NRTA will continue to operate a service in a cost effective manner in order to deliver affordable transportation services to the community and meet future needs

   Objectives
   A. Seek supplemental funding to increase frequency, hours of operation, and reach of service
   B. Encourage a downtown parking management system with a proportion of revenues collected dedicated to transit
   C. Develop partnerships to help offset the cost of new services
   D. Operate a cost effective and efficient system

4. Meet the Needs of the Diverse Summer and Year Round Populations
   Ensure access to public transit that meets the demands of the year-round community and meets the needs of the increased and diverse summer populations

   Objectives
   A. Evaluate winter service to better match service hours to demand
   B. Increase transit frequency and service options to make bus use an attractive transportation alternative
   C. Conduct outreach to year-round, seasonal and tourist populations in order to identify service gaps and unmet needs.
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AGENDA ITEM VI.D

CY 2020 Safety Performance Measures
**MassDOT CY20 Safety Performance Measure Targets (PM1)**

**Total Fatalities:** Over the last seven years, the number of fatalities in Massachusetts has been relatively stable, fluctuating less than 1 percent with the exception of 2016, when the 5 year average reached 364. That said, the most recent data shows that the five-year average for fatalities in 2018, 358, is the second lowest it has been since the 2008 – 2012 five-year average. The calendar year (CY) 2020 target of 347 was set to reflect an anticipated decrease in fatalities due to data enhancements, safety projects, and strategies and legislative proposals that were part of the 2018 Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP), such as the primary seat belt and hands-free driving laws. It should be noted that MassDOT’s overarching goal is towards zero deaths, which will be pursued through the continued implementation of SHSP strategies.

**Fatality Rate:** Partly due to a 0.3% annual increase in VMT and an overarching downward trend in the fatality rate, it is anticipated that the fatality rate from 2013–2017 of 0.59 fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled will drop to 0.56 fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled between 2016–2020. *(Note: Statewide VMTs used to calculate the Projected CY20 Target Fatality Rate were adjusted after state adoption of the 0.56 per 100 million VMT target.)*
MassDOT CY20 Safety Performance Measure Targets (PM1)

**Total Incapacitating Injuries:** Although this measure is particularly prone to contextual factors, it is anticipated that there will be an overall decrease in the number of incapacitating injuries due to a continual downward trend line as well as the implementation of countermeasures that are being developed as part of the 2018 Strategic Highway Safety Plan.

**Incapacitating Injuries Rate:** Similar to the fatality rate, it is anticipated that the increase in VMT and a downward trend line will result in a drop in the rate of incapacitating injuries from 4.84 per 100 million VMT between 2013–2017 to 4.30 between 2016–2020. *(Note: Statewide VMTs used to calculate the Projected CY20 Target Incapacitating Injury Rate were adjusted after state adoption of the 4.30 per 100 million VMT target.)*
MassDOT CY20 Safety Performance Measure Targets (PM1)

Total Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities and Incapacitating Injuries: The most recent data for non-motorized fatalities and incapacitating injuries indicates that the previously increasing trend decreased in 2017. The CY 2020 target of 505 has been set to reflect continued projected reductions in non-motorized fatalities and injuries due to a number of implementation strategies contained within the Statewide Bike Plan, Statewide Pedestrian Plan, and Strategic Highway Safety Plan.
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AGENDA ITEM VI.F

2020 ATM – Articles of Planning Concern
DRAFT COMMENTS AS DISCUSSED AT THE 01/23/20 NP&EDC MEETING

Article 36 (Legal Opinion for Beach Access)

NP&EDC COMMENT: Public access to the shores and waters surrounding Nantucket have long been supported by the NP&EDC and voters, therefore if there are additional opportunities for public access they should be explored.

FINANCE COMMITTEE: Not to adopt.

Article 38 (Re-establish Parks and Recreation Department)

NP&EDC COMMENT: The adequacy of public parks and recreational facilities is a planning concern, however, we do not take a position on whether or not the Parks and Recreation Department should be re-established. We agree with the proponent that some type of action that leads to more resources being dedicated to our parks and recreational areas is needed. Keeping play structures, benches, multi-use paths, and/or other amenities in a safe and attractive condition should be a priority. These amenities are important to the physical health of our seasonal and year-round community.

FINANCE COMMITTEE: Not to adopt.

Article 62 (Preservation of Historically Significant Buildings)

NP&EDC COMMENT: Historic preservation is a planning concern, however we recommend that this article not be adopted. The proposal is at variance with HDC regulations and other administrative procedures. It contains a variety of concepts, some of which are already addressed in (1) the HDC enabling legislation, (2) Chapter 124 of the Town Code (Signs; Satellite Dishes; Rooflines), and (3) Chapter 139 of the Town Code (Zoning). In addition, the article as written would require a Home Rule Petition to implement. Significantly more consideration about what the proponent is attempting to accomplish as well as the most appropriate way to achieve it should occur prior to any action on either this or a future article.

FINANCE COMMITTEE: Hearing still open.

Article 63 (Affordable Housing Requirements)

NP&EDC COMMENT: The availability of affordable housing is a planning concern, however, the approach suggested in this article is illegal and impractical.

FINANCE COMMITTEE: Not to adopt.

Article 64 (Public Property Damage)

NP&EDC COMMENT: Damage to public property is of planning concern, however additional consideration is needed to determine the best approach to protect public property. The Building Commissioner has very limited authority related to requirements that must be met prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy, and, there are many instances where damage to public property is unrelated to construction activity.

FINANCE COMMITTEE: Take no action. Comment is consistent with NP&EDC and they note that the to-be-hired Construction Supervisor at the DPW may be of assistance with tracking and enforcing compliance with existing or new regulations addressing this matter.

Article 78 (Outdoor Lighting)

NP&EDC COMMENT: Outdoor lighting is a planning concern, however, we recommend that this article not be adopted. A Lighting Enforcement Officer, appointed by the Town Manager and supervised through PLUS, is authorized to conduct inspections as necessary to enforce the outdoor lighting bylaw. Further, issues related to pay and scheduling are subject to collective bargaining agreements that are not within the purview of Town Meeting.

FINANCE COMMITTEE: Not to adopt.