

Regional Planning Advisory Council

Minutes of Wednesday, March 15, 2017

RPAC Members Attending:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Representing</u>
1. Becky Adams	Arkansas Department of Health (ADH)
2. Kay Kelley Arnold	City of Little Rock
3. Richard Brown	Pulaski County
4. Marcia Cook	City of Sherwood
5. Charles Cummings (Chair)	Freight/Goods Movement
6. Coreen Frasier	Bicycle Advocacy of Central Arkansas (BACA)
7. Robin Freeman	Saline County
8. Becca Green	Rock Region Metro
9. Jeff Griffin (Alt.)	City of Bryant
10. Sybil Hampton	City of Little Rock
11. Susan Inman	Pulaski County
12. Todd Larson	City of North Little Rock
13. Bob Lyford	City of Little Rock
14. Sara McClain	City of Benton
15. Carolyn Shearman (Alt.)	Sierra Club
16. Paul Simms	Arkansas State Highway & Transportation Department (AHTD)
17. Patrick Stair	Sierra Club
18. Jack Stowe	City of Maumelle
19. Brad Walker	City of Little Rock
20. Amy Whitehead	City of Conway

Guests:

1. Ben Browning	AHTD
2. Barry Haas	Resident (Little Rock)
3. Noel Oman	<i>Arkansas Democrat-Gazette</i>

Metroplan Staff:

1. Lynn Bell	Graphics Specialist
2. Casey Covington	Deputy Director
3. Daniel Holland	Planner
4. Jonathan Lupton	Research Planner
5. Jim McKenzie	Metroplan emeritus
6. Tab Townsell	Executive Director

1. Call to Order and Announcements

Chairman Charles Cummings called the meeting to order at 11:35 AM. The Council met at 501 W. Markham Street, Little Rock.

2. Minutes of Previous Meetings

The Council considered the Minutes of February 15, 2017

MOTION by Dr. Hampton, second by Ms. Cook

"To accept the Minutes of February 15, 2017, as corrected to address several typographical errors."

PASSED

The approved, corrected Minutes will be posted to the RPAC webpage.

3. RPAC Introductions

A regular agenda item is to ask two members to take about five minutes to introduce themselves to their colleagues on the Council.

Ms. Amy Whitehead represents the City of Conway. She is the Director of UCA's Center for Community and Economic Development and runs the Community Development Institute, which is a weeklong seminar that trains leaders in community and economic development. Ms. Whitehead lives in Conway with her husband and two young sons.

Ms. Susan Inman represents Pulaski County. She is a native of Little Rock and a graduate of University of Central Arkansas. Ms. Inman is active in politics, has worked for the election commission and for Sharon Priest, and later became the Pulaski County Election Commissioner. She formed a statewide non-profit organization to help train election volunteers. Ms. Inman has two grown sons and three grandsons.

4. *Imagine Central Arkansas* Plan Amendment Language

Mr. Covington led the Council through some of the considerations that should go into the proposed amendment. The PowerPoint Used in Mr. Covington's presentation will be saved as a pdf and posted to RPAC webpage.

Before beginning the presentation, **Mr. Townsell** read from the Freeway Vision of *Imagine Central Arkansas'* Metropolitan Transportation Plan, as follows:

The investment strategy developed in 1995 was to complete the area's circumferential freeway system, i.e. East Belt (440) and Northbelt Freeways and to widen all freeways in the metro area to six through lanes to more safely accommodate rapidly increasing truck freight and commuter demands. At that point, freeway investments would focus on correcting choke points at interchanges, maintaining pavement quality and bridge structures on an aging system, and improving traffic flow by more actively managing the system through the use of advanced technology.

Additional lane capacity needs should be revisited after investments are made in robust regional arterial and transit systems necessary to provide a balanced metropolitan system and allow the freeway network to focus on its primary mission.

Mr. Walker commented that the passage read by Mr. Townsell is very critical to the overall analysis, and that he is disappointed that Metroplan staff has not taken this vision into sufficient account in its analysis. **Mr. Townsell** responded that if the region can keep true to this [policy] then it will be true to 20 years of long range planning.

- **Mr. Cummings:** I think that is where we are now. In light of the Board's decision to go forward with this, all of us at this table have had a tremendous amount of time and effort invested in our plan. The AHTD's responsibility is the freeway system; our responsibilities are much broader in scope and encompass not only the freeway system but also system-wide impacts on and off freeways throughout our region. We have produced an outstanding plan, *Imagine Central Arkansas*, and it's our job to go through that plan. We will be more productive if we work within our role as advisors, rather than to get angry or hurt because the Board chose not to act as we advised. When we need to be about the business at hand, which is to protect our communities and our arterial system.

Casey is going to present information to us, and will need our input. What he's bringing today is just thoughts and outlines; we need your input and guidance so that at our April meeting staff can come back with some firm language for the amendment that will be considered. Casey?

- **Mr. Covington:** Thank you, Charles. I have only a few slides to show today, because I want the Council members to have plenty of time to discuss the amendment itself and general concepts for amendment language. Our intent is to take what you say today, and get the Board's input next week, then come back with more specific options next month.

The project as currently listed in the Financially Constrained Plan (approved as "Amendment 1") specifies "Operational Improvements and Reconstruction" at a cost of \$646.7 Million. The following language is included as a footnote to the project:

Specific type of work will be determined through the NEPA process. Following the selection of a single alternative from NEPA and at the request of AHTD, the Metroplan Board will consider a LRMTTP and TIP amendment to reflect the final project. Approval of the amendment by the Metroplan Board will be required. Total cost includes all phases to allow the project to be delivered by the Design-Build-Finance method. 2019-2023 funding reflects payback of \$100 Million borrowed with interest (\$115 Million payback).

The AHTD requests that "operational Improvements" be replaced with "major widening" and to remove the footnote. The estimated cost would remain the same as currently listed. Staff will advise that a portion of the footnote be retained in any amendment that is approved. This amendment would allow all design alternatives to be considered without coming back for additional approvals.

There are two questions for the RPAC to answer. The first is, what is the wording of the plan amendment, and more specifically, what if any other projects are

referenced in the amendment, as part of systems approach? This is the question we'd like you to focus on today and again in April. The second question the Council will need to consider is, should the amendment be approved? This question will be taken up in future meetings.

A key take-away from the February meeting is that the 30 Crossing project is directly linked to I-30, I-630, and I-40. Traffic operations are appreciably impacted on the I-30 project area because of I-30 west of the corridor, and I-630 and I-40. Traffic congestion on these segments is impacting I-30, or vice-versa.

Since our last meeting, staff received additional information from the AHTD (yesterday) and the data have reinforced staff findings. We haven't seen anything that would alter our conclusions. The AHTD has advised us that it will provide a letter regarding these facilities. The letter will likely explain that studies will be conducted on those corridors or corridor segments to determine what improvements will be necessary. We at Metroplan are saying that what we do with 30 Crossing will shape the options that are available for those facilities.

Mr. Covington led the Council through a series of slides showing where congestion is projected to occur along the various corridors and with each option. Following his presentation, the Chairman opened the floor to comments and questions.

- **Mr. Stair:** Please give us some examples of what is meant by "selected improvements."
- **Mr. Covington:** I'd hoped to be able to bring those to you this month, but the State has not provided that information. Possible examples might include interchange improvements, such as extending ramps at I-440. Regarding I-430, there is some concern about traffic coming in from Benton, where only one lane exits to I-430, creating a significant bottleneck in the morning hours. Widening at University to get traffic out of the corridor - that could also be an option. Another possibility might be adding a managed (toll) lane on some of the other facilities. Those are all broad options that might be available. I am anxious to read the State's study recommendations.
- **Mr. Stair:** So, the options could include a wide variety of improvements from the South Terminal to 65th Street - for example, no widening but perhaps interchange improvements?
- **Mr. Covington:** Yes. However, the modeling shows that adding a lane would be necessary on I-30 to 65th Street.
- **Mr. Townsell:** Projects must have funds identified before they can be on the plan. We have to be able to say how we intend to pay for projects.
- **Mr. Cummings:** In terms of this amendment, which comes first? How is that coordinated?

- **Mr. Covington:** We request the State Highway Commission to commit to funding. If that commitment is not made, it would still be recognized as a "need" but wouldn't be included in the Financially Constrained Plan until funds were identified.
- **Mr. Cummings:** And so, the wording of the amendment will be important in identifying those projects we think are vital to the system?
- **Mr. Covington:** That is correct.
- **Dr. Hampton:** It seems from news reports that the AHTD is having trouble with the State Legislature, in getting funding for projects it wants to do around the State. What are the implications of that for this project and especially the associated projects to address bottlenecks?
- **Mr. Covington:** The current plan includes funds for maintenance and operations but not to specific projects. Potentially, some of those funds could be used to help pay for associated projects. Widening of I-30 to Benton is not in the plan, and money has not been identified to do that project. Widening to 65th Street: my understanding from talking to Ben Browning is that there is already a microsimulation project for which funds have been identified, and funds could potentially be added to it.
- **Mr. Lyford:** Before we would put language like that in the amendment, would we have to know with certainty the amount of money that would be required and committed to for each project?
- **Mr. Covington:** That is correct. We will ask AHTD to provide estimates, which we would include as part of the language.
- **Ms. Frasier:** To me, our concentration should be on those areas - I-530 and I-440 - that we are not considering in this meeting. We should address traffic going around the city and not put more traffic on I-30, right through the downtown areas. I don't understand why that hasn't been thought out. Both I-530 and I-430 offer ways around the city; you don't have to drive through the city just to go keep going through it. The people who want to go around are truckers and travelers; people who want to come to the city will use I-30. The corridor doesn't need to be widened, in my opinion.
- **Mr. Covington:** I'm not saying that we should forget I-430, I-530 and I-440 from this process. Current analysis shows that all facilities have capacity to handle traffic. They should be included from a regional strategy perspective.

I'd like to talk about I-630 for a couple of minutes, and get your comments on that. We have two options. (1) We could choose to widen I-630, which would also require some major improvements in that corridor. (2) Or, in order to minimize the impact of 30 Crossing, we could opt for the strategy of not widening I-630. That would require design considerations that would minimize those impacts. The AHTD has not assumed the widening of 630, so in some ways it has already taken that

approach; however, affirmatively stating that would highlight the strategy and might give incentive to different design considerations.

- **Mr. Larson:** Widening makes no sense unless the off-ramps are improved - that is where the chokepoints are.
- **Mr. Covington:** Yes. All of the alternatives under consideration include widening off-ramps to two lanes. Also, consistent with the plan, which calls for interchange improvements, that is an assumed improvement. We see issues in the morning hours, as well, and the modeling shows that congestion will increase in the first year after the completion of "six-plus-four" alternative on 30 Crossing.
- **Ms. McClain:** How will businesses and health care providers be protected and will the economy along the corridor be affected?
- **Mr. Covington:** It would, and that is a consideration. The State will do a study of I-630 to determine improvements that would address the hospitals and other places. Again, the range of options will be limited according to what we do on I-30.
- **Dr. Hampton:** It's really startling to me because this is not a systems approach. There are implications in what has already been decided for I-30. Will the region be stuck with unintended consequences because of limited funds? This is really a flawed process.
- **Mr. Covington:** This is an MPO responsibility. We raise the issues and bring them to the Council and to the Board. You are correct that the decisions made will affect all of the system.
- **Dr. Hampton:** The RPAC is an advisory body and only advises the MPO Board. We have a voice but no vote.
- **Mr. Lyford:** We are discussing an amendment that is necessitated by the I-30 project, but I don't think that the I-30 project has been sufficiently detailed. Plus, the agreements that may be made between the State and the cities of Little Rock and North Little Rock are additional unknown elements. Before we vote on an amendment, we need to know the whole picture - the cost, the design, the specific proposal and how it will affect the whole system.
- **Mr. Covington:** I hope to bring that to you next month. That is why I am glad we are having this conversation today. I will not have all of the answers you are seeking, although I understand your perspective on that. Keep in mind that we do have the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) process, which is the final point of approval before the project (or any project) can move forward to construction.
- **Mr. Cummings:** Bob [Lyford] is making a good point, and I agree. Our concern is the timing of the amendment. We don't want to get the cart before the horse.
- **Mr. Stair:** The Sierra Club is particularly concerned about casting a vote - yea or nay - without the Environmental Assessment and FONSI. It's nice to have these

discussions, but without those additional studies, the EA and the FONSI, the Sierra Club isn't ready to vote.

- **Mr. Covington:** The last point I wanted to mention today is I-40. I noted at the last meeting that there are issues around the Levy Bridge. Options are to extend the current project to the Levy interchange, over the viaduct, and eventually beyond.

It is now Metroplan staff's responsibility to draft a proposed amendment to bring to the Council on April 19th, and then to the Board on April 26th. If the Board is comfortable with that, it will put the amendment out for public comment. If you have comments, suggestions or concerns before then, I encourage you to bring them to us. I want to make sure everybody understands the process, although I certainly respect that some of you are hesitant to take a position at this point.

- **Mr. Stair:** Some of the 30 Crossing designs could have impacts on the entire system. Going back to systems analysis, aren't there projects farther down the line, for example, south of McCain that would improve congestion throughout the corridor?
- **Mr. Covington:** In conducting the analysis, staff is assuming what is already there, so if there is already a chokepoint or potential, we leave it. Regarding facilities other than I-630, I-40 and I-30, which are more directly linked to the 30 Crossing project, improvements and types of improvements are more of a policy issue.
- **Mr. Cummings:** Where are we regarding seeing a completed Section 106 (historic preservation) report, and NEPA process, and other modeling from the AHTD?
- **Mr. Browning:** We are nearly finished with the modeling. The Federal Highway Administration asked us to extend the time period to see when congestion resolves itself outside the peak hour. The write-up takes time. Regarding the environmental portion, we anticipate having a draft EA - meaning, for internal review and including Metroplan staff - early summer but we are still looking at the fall for a public hearing, when the public will get a chance to read the environmental document. Following that, the FHWA will make a determination. As a reminder, that determination may be a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI), or it may be a finding that, based on the data, there are significant impacts, in which case a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will be necessary. An EIS would extend the process by at least 12 months. The good news is that we are already doing EIS-level analysis. We anticipate a determination by FHWA late this year or early next year.
- **Mr. Cummings:** What about the historic preservation review?
- **Mr. Browning:** Yes, Section 106 is continuing. We have one, possibly two more meetings. We will be working on a programmatic agreement with the State Historic Preservation office. I see that wrapping up in three or four months, and the results will be brought in as part of the Environmental Assessment.
- **Mr. Covington:** There are two approaches to the amendment. One is to have very specific language regarding the alternative preferred by the Board. Both the FHWA and AHTD raised the concern that such an amendment would eliminate or give the

impression of eliminating alternatives that were still under consideration. The second approach is to approve a more generally-worded amendment, but include a non-binding Board Resolution that expresses preferred designs.

- **Mr. Cummings:** Why do we need to act now, before fall, when the data will be available? Why should we write a generic amendment when we could write a better, more detailed amendment when we have all of the information?
- **Mr. Browning:** Typically, a plan amendment happens during the planning phase. We have passed the planning phase and the environmental phase is about to wrap up, so by ordinary standards we are late in getting an amendment. We understand and agree that this is a different case, and therefore has taken longer to work through. But we've been working on this for a long time now, and if we waited until the end of the year to begin the plan amendment process, we would be delaying by six to eight months. FHWA cannot make a decision until the amendment to the plan and TIP are in place. The process is not set up to move like that. We are actually behind the traditional process at this point. I understand that Casey and Jim probably disagree a little bit with us, but from the Department's standpoint, that's where we are. Also, understand that because this is design-build, it's not just waiting on a letting date: we have an eighteen-month procurement process to go through, as well. The procurement cannot move forward until we have the plan amendment and TIP. It's not that we want you to move forward without information; our position is that you already have the information you need, more than you would ordinarily get before making an amendment to the long-range plan. Let the process move forward as intended by federal regulations. Let the environmental process proceed as it is intended. The plan amendment does not pick the design alternative.
- **Mr. Covington:** Ben summed up the AHTD's position very well. In terms of consistency with other projects, you wouldn't have this level of detail. However, with 30 Crossing, it will come down to a political decision as to when and how the amendment takes place.
- **Ms. Whitehead:** To clarify, we need to decide if theoretically we support widening within the next month-and-a-half. If the amendment is passed, although we may have some say in the final design, we are basically approving the freeway expansion to move forward.
- **Mr. Covington:** Yes, that is correct.
- **Ms. Whitehead:** So you are suggesting that the amendment needs to include language to include a system-wide analysis.
- **Mr. Covington:** Yes, that is correct. You will have an opportunity - not only as part of the RPAC but as a private citizen - to comment on the final decision when the NEPA document is released. At this point, based upon the timeline that has been established and absent a board decision to change that timeline, we will bring an amendment to the Council and Board next month. If you have thoughts about these facilities, it is important to get them on the record now, so that they can be considered during the remaining NEPA process.

- **Ms. Whitehead:** Metroplan's amendment will allow for widening if the project passes the NEPA process?
- **Mr. Covington:** I don't know that Metroplan has any recommendation at this point, but I anticipate that the language in the amendment will be consistent with all of the alternatives that are currently on the table. So, yes, if the amendment passes, it would allow any of the alternatives to move forward. These facilities have an impact or that decision - or rather, the decision will have impacts on the facilities - so do you want to address those considerations in this amendment?
- **Dr. Adams:** To clarify, since the plan amendment should have occurred early in the planning phase, does that mean that these other activities should not be happening now? What stops if we don't vote on it now, versus in a few more months. It seems that we are moving ahead with this project anyway, so I don't understand why there would necessarily be a six-to-eight-month delay.
- **Mr. Browning:** You are right, in that the Environmental Assessment continues to go forward. The problem is that until the EA is approved it's not final, and there are several things that must happen before the EA is approved. None of the procurement process can happen until the EA is approved. So what would happen is that all of the work being now - the research and reports - would be finished but the project would not be able to go further. The plan amendment must be in place before the EA can get the necessary signatures to proceed.
- **Mr. Covington:** That is a key point for us. Our deadline for this is tied to the NEPA process. The plan amendment and TIP amendment must occur before the FHWA can make a decision.
- **Ms. McClain:** Do we need to take a vote today, or should we just offer you our recommendations as to what should happen? Speaking as someone who lives in Benton and travels to Little Rock. If economic development is a goal, we need to have the plan amendment so that we can at least consider widening that roadway segment.
- **Mr. Covington:** It can be considered already, but if you think we should explicitly state that we want to look at other recommendations that come out of the corridor study, such as I-430, then yes, we can do that.
- **Ms. Green:** Is this the first design-build project that includes a bridge and major widening?
- **Mr. Covington:** No, but it is the first design-build project in the State of Arkansas.
- **Ms. Green:** Then my follow-up to that is, are there examples of other timelines that MPOs in those states have reckoned with for design-build? We keep coming back to the common theme of questioning why we are looking at this timeline, and why do

we have to vote now. Do we have any information as to how other States have handled this kind of design-build project?

- **Mr. Covington:** I don't know of any examples just off the top of my head, but we will certainly look at other States. I think the process for getting such a project to construction is very similar for every State, because it is largely responding to federal procedures.
- **Ms. Freeman:** Are you asking us to include the details we want in the TIP amendment, as well as the plan amendment?
- **Mr. Covington:** Not in the TIP amendment, just the plan amendment. We want to know what details, specific to this project, you consider necessary to include in the amendment language. We are not voting on anything today; I just want to hear everyone's opinions.
- **Ms. Freeman:** So I would concur with Sara McClain, that the issue of impacts is of concern to Saline County residents, and needs to be addressed in some way in the amendment language.
- **Mr. Walker:** Do the traffic projections out to 2041, reflect assumptions of linear increases? Was consideration given to possible decreases in car travel? What are the assumptions that were used?
- **Mr. Covington:** We provided some assistance to the State on the modeling. The figures are not reflective of linear increases. There were several assumptions in play. If you are interested in more details, I suggest we set aside a time for us to meet. I will be glad to go over the modeling with you. Much of the material is technical and will require some explaining. But to your question, it is not simple linear projection.
- **Mr. Walker:** Did you make any fundamental assessments as to owners' utilization of vehicles?
- **Mr. Covington:** No, not directly.
- **Mr. Walker:** I think it is critical to look at impacts at regular intervals. For example, congestion numbers at zero year, five year, ten year intervals. I would guess that you are more comfortable with your numbers in the zero-five-ten year intervals, than you are with the later years.
- **Mr. Covington:** Thank you for that. That is a help to us and I will summarize that information. You are correct, that we feel very confident about our projections in those early years, and less so in the later years.
- **Dr. Adams:** In order to optimize the outcome that we are hoping for, there are other elements or projects that we need to do to alleviate bottlenecks; therefore, we need to consider the financial impacts of all those other mitigating projects. Can we consider other transportation elements from the Vision Plan? For example, can we look at a combination of dedicated lanes, various transit, and arterials? Are we

displacing funding that could be used for those kinds of improvements to our regional system?

- **Mr. Browning:** This project doesn't necessarily cause anything else to happen. There are issues elsewhere in the system, and improving the I-30 corridor will mean that we need to make sure future improvements on other facilities will coordinate with the work that is already done on I-30. For example, if we spent \$500 Million on I-30, and then improved another corridor, it would be terrible to discover that those improvements do not mesh with the I-30 corridor. We understand that there are choke points, and those will have to be addressed in the future. We are not causing the need for improvements on other facilities; we are anticipating the future needs. Also, in our Planning and Environmental Linkages study - the PEL - we did look at managed lanes, we did look at transit. Could those solve the problem? It's possible they could help to alleviate it, but there would be huge investments needed by the Department, and others; policy changes would be necessary. And it still wouldn't solve the infrastructure problem. We did take a very in-depth look at all of that. As a matter of fact, as a result of all that examination, we understand that transit must be robust, and that the corridor must accept some level of congestion. This project, even by itself, without any additional improvements to I-630 or other roadway segment, will improve traffic conditions. As the Highway Department, we would love for a more robust transit system to come into play, because that would relieve pressure from our highways. The problem is, whose responsibility is that? We need to make sure funds are available for transit, while solving today's problems.
- **Ms. Green:** The answer to Becky's question is yes. When you put most of the funding in to one mode of transportation, it takes away opportunities for other modes of transportation, including transit. Period.
- **Mr. Covington:** Before moving to the next agenda item, I'd like to summarize by thanking you all for your comments. I think I have the information I was looking for and hope to come back next month with options that incorporate your concerns.

Ben mentioned - correctly - that some of the issues in the ancillary highways are already occurring; However, you may have been to Phantom of the Opera. Phantom has a mask. I-30 is our mask; it is masking issues with other corridors. Once the mask is removed, those issues become magnified.

Again, I appreciate your thoughtful input. What I heard is that if it is an issue at opening or shortly after opening, then we need to incorporate that into the amendment. Based on that, I think that both I-630 and I-30 have issues that should be addressed, and possibly other facilities. We will deal with that. I also heard from Saline County representatives that there are issues on I-30 going toward Saline County that need to be addressed. We will return with amendment options for your consideration at the next meeting.

5. Public Engagement Strategy

Staff distributed a one-page handout that outlined a proposal for public outreach during the I-30 Crossing amendment comment period. **Mr. Townsell** described the proposal in more detail.

Elements that are required, either by federal regulation or Metroplan's own policy, include:

- (1) establish a 30-day comment period;
- (2) place legal notices in the State newspaper (*Arkansas Democrat-Gazette*), plus one paper in each of the CARTS area counties, and in a Spanish language paper;
- (3) post information on the Metroplan website, in both English and Spanish; and
- (4) use Twitter and Facebook to further the outreach.

Because of the controversial nature and high level of public interest in the project, additional efforts are recommended:

- (5) reach out to broadcast media;
- (6) encourage our partners (e.g. Rock Region METRO, AHTD, RPAC members, Metroplan member governments) to post on their own websites, send E-blasts and tweets to their constituents, and use other social media to reach their audiences;
- (7) E-blast to people who have previously commented on some facet of the I-30 project;
- (8) hold a public meeting (details to be determined); and
- (9) prepare a personal letter informing people of the process and encouraging responses. This letter could also take the form of an op-ed, and be included with information sent to stakeholder groups.

Mr. Townsell explained that although details are lacking at present, he envisions a public meeting that would involve the presence the Board members, possibly held after regular business hours.

Ms. Green stated that she liked the idea of a meeting to which Board member would be present, but suggested that the meeting should begin earlier to accommodate transit riders, because the bus system does not run late. **Mr. Stair** suggested that a public meeting could be held on a Saturday, as well.

Ms. Green also asked if Metroplan would consider developing an e-newsletter. **Mr. Covington** replied that an e-newsletter is a good idea, and will be considered. **Ms. Inman** suggested investing in a billboard on I-30 to announce the meeting.

MOTION by Mr. Stair, second by Ms. Green

"To recommend that the Metroplan Board approve the public engagement strategy."

PASSED

6. Other Business

No other business was brought forward.

7. Next Meeting

The next meeting will be at 11:30 AM, on Wednesday, April 19th. Confirmation and meeting material will be sent at least one week prior to the date.

9. Adjourn

With no further business brought forward, the Chairman called for a Motion to adjourn.

MOTION by Mr. Lyford, second by Ms. Freeman
"To adjourn."

PASSED: Meeting adjourned at 1:03 PM

DRAFT