



Title VI Review – Service Change

Choose Up: Fall 2016

Description of Service Change: **Route 32 East Providence/Wampanoag:** Routes 32 and 34 are proposed to be merged into one route, route 34, resulting in the elimination of route 32. The new route 34 would maintain coverage to the same areas as route 32.

Major Minor

Location includes:

- Minority Population
- Low Income Population

Major Service Changes Only:

Adverse Effect? Yes No This qualifies as an adverse effect due to elimination of the route.

Comparison Population: Ridership Census Population

Disparate Impact on Minorities? Yes No

Disproportionate Burden on Low Income Individuals? Yes No

Description of Alternatives Considered: Also under consideration for public review and comment, is a second alternative that maintains the route 32 designation. This alternative changes the route to terminate at Wampanoag Plaza, instead of continuing to downtown Providence, where passengers may transfer to one of three other East Providence routes. Neither alternative would have adverse effects on minority or low-income populations.

Substantial Legitimate Justification: Service in East Providence is proposed to be restructured in an effort to increase ridership on some underperforming routes (namely routes 32 and 34), to create a high frequency trunk to Providence via the east side and tunnel, and to provide new access to jobs and shopping in Seekonk, MA.

Mitigation Measures:

Attachments: maps tables datasets additional narrative



Title VI Review – Service Change

Choose Up: Fall 2016

Description of Service Change:

Route 33 Riverside – Frequency reduction of 25%; rerouting to be part of the service trunk connecting the east side of Providence to East Providence.

Major Minor

Location includes:

- Minority Population
- Low Income Population

Major Service Changes Only:

Adverse Effect? Yes No

Comparison Population: Ridership Census Population

Disparate Impact on Minorities? Yes No

Disproportionate Burden on Low Income Individuals? Yes No

Description of Alternatives Considered:

Substantial Legitimate Justification:

Mitigation Measures:

Attachments: maps tables datasets additional narrative



Title VI Review – Service Change

Choose Up: Fall 2016

Description of Service Change: **Route 34 East Providence** - Routes 32 and 34 are proposed to be merged into one route, route 34. The new route 34 will cover the same areas as route 32, and be extended to provide new access to jobs and shopping in Seekonk, MA.

Major Minor

Location includes:

Minority Population

Low Income Population

Major Service Changes Only:

Adverse Effect? Yes No

Comparison Population: Ridership Census Population

Disparate Impact on Minorities? Yes No

Disproportionate Burden on Low Income Individuals? Yes No

Description of Alternatives Considered:

Substantial Legitimate Justification:

Mitigation Measures:

Attachments: maps tables datasets additional narrative



Title VI Review – Service Change

Choose Up: Fall 2016

Description of Service Change:

Route 40 Butler/Elmgrove – Route is proposed to be merged with route 92 Federal Hill/East Side. The merger would result in an increase of service frequency from 60 minutes to 40 minutes.

Major Minor

Location includes:

Minority Population
 Low Income Population

Major Service Changes Only:

Adverse Effect? Yes No This qualifies as an adverse effect due to elimination of the route.

Comparison Population: Ridership Census Population N.A.

Disparate Impact on Minorities? Yes No N.A.

Disproportionate Burden on Low Income Individuals? Yes No N.A.

Description of Alternatives Considered:

N.A.

Substantial Legitimate Justification:

Route 92 is proposed to be rerouted to serve a new nursing school on Eddy St and merging these two routes will provide a direct connection to Butler Hospital and other East Side shopping and job opportunities.

Mitigation Measures:

While the route number is being eliminated, service is actually being increased and new connections are being created. As described above, frequency will increase from 60 to 40 minutes.

Attachments: maps tables datasets additional narrative



Title VI Review – Service Change

Choose Up: Fall 2016

Description of Service Change:

Route 50 Douglas Ave – This route is proposed to merge with route 52, operating along its current alignment to Shaw’s on Douglas Ave, operating every 20 minutes as it currently does, and every other trip continues to Bryant University.

Major Minor

Location includes:

Minority Population

Low Income Population

Major Service Changes Only:

Adverse Effect? Yes No

Comparison Population: Ridership Census Population

Disparate Impact on Minorities? Yes No

Disproportionate Burden on Low Income Individuals? Yes No

Description of Alternatives Considered:

Substantial Legitimate Justification:

Mitigation Measures:

Attachments: maps tables datasets additional narrative



Title VI Review – Service Change

Choose Up: Fall 2016

Description of Service Change:

Route 52 Branch Ave – This route is proposed to merge with route 50. Service to Bryant University would be on route 50; service on Branch Ave would be on a revised route 58 alignment; and service on Charles St would continue to be route 51, along with the revised route 58.

Major Minor

Location includes:

Minority Population
 Low Income Population

Major Service Changes Only:

Adverse Effect? Yes No This qualifies as an adverse effect due to elimination of the route.

Comparison Population: Ridership Census Population

Disparate Impact on Minorities? Yes No

Disproportionate Burden on Low Income Individuals? Yes No N.A.

Description of Alternatives Considered:

Several alternatives were considered as part of this route change proposal but were found not to be feasible due to issues such as road geometry, weight restrictions on bridges, and significantly higher service costs.

Substantial Legitimate Justification:

Extending route 50 every other trip to serve Bryant University, and removing route 52 from this service area, results in a more consistent frequency and therefore more easily predictable service. However, by doing this, route 52 would only then exist to serve a 1.15-mile portion of Branch Avenue.

Mitigation Measures:

As part of this service change, RIPTA proposes to reroute bus route 58 to serve the majority of bus stops Branch Ave in order to maintain service to this corridor. The route will operate from Mineral Spring Ave to Woodward Rd to Branch Ave and continue to downtown Providence via Charles St.

Attachments: Full SAFE analysis report with maps, tables, and additional narrative.



Title VI Review – Service Change

Choose Up: Fall 2016

Description of Service Change:

Route 66 URI/Galilee – Increase in service hours of about 25% to accommodate anticipated increase in ridership due to the opening of a new nursing school in Providence.

Major Minor

Location includes:

Minority Population
 Low Income Population

Major Service Changes Only:

Adverse Effect? Yes No

Comparison Population: Ridership Census Population

Disparate Impact on Minorities? Yes No

Disproportionate Burden on Low Income Individuals? Yes No

Description of Alternatives Considered:

Substantial Legitimate Justification:

Mitigation Measures:

Attachments: maps tables datasets additional narrative



Title VI Review – Service Change

Choose Up: Fall 2016

Description of Service Change:

Route 92 Federal Hill/East Side – The 92 is proposed to be rerouted and merged with route 40. Eastbound from Kennedy Plaza via Memorial Blvd to Eddy Street, turns east to Point Street and Wickenden Street, then via Wayland Ave to Wayland Square and continue north via the current route 40 alignment. This option solves some longstanding scheduling problems with route 40 while maintaining service to the same markets. The 20 minute frequency currently on route 92 is maintained, and service to Butler Hospital would increase from 60 to 40 minutes.

Major Minor

Location includes:

Minority Population

Low Income Population

Major Service Changes Only:

Adverse Effect? Yes No

Comparison Population: Ridership Census Population

Disparate Impact on Minorities? Yes No

Disproportionate Burden on Low Income Individuals? Yes No

Description of Alternatives Considered:

Substantial Legitimate Justification:

Mitigation Measures:

Attachments: maps tables datasets additional narrative