

# Regional Planning Advisory Council

Minutes of Wednesday, June 15, 2016

## RPAC Members Attending:

Name	Representing
1. Kay Kelley Arnold	City of Little Rock
2. Marcia Cook	City of Sherwood
3. Charles Cummings (Chair)	Freight/Goods Movement
4. Leesa Freasier	Arkansas Dept. of Health (ADH)
5. Becca Green	Rock Region Metro
6. Sybil Hampton	City of Little Rock
7. Paul Hastings	City of Little Rock
8. Antonio Johnson (Alt.)	Arkansas State Highway & Transportation Department (AHTD)
9. Todd Larson	City of North Little Rock
10. Eddie Long	City of Cabot
11. Bob Lyford	City of Little Rock
12. Buckley O'Mell (Alt.)	Little Rock Regional Chamber of Commerce (LRRCC)
13. Dan Roda	City of Little Rock
14. Paul Simms	AHTD
15. Patrick Stair	Sierra Club
16. Jack Stowe	City of Maumelle
17. Regina Taylor	Youth Outreach
18. Dan Weathersby	Pulaski County
19. Amy Whitehead	City of Conway

## Guests:

1. Ben Browning	AHTD
2. Chris East	Studio Main
3. Barry Haas	Resident
4. Corey Parks	City of Conway
5. Charley Penix	Resident, City of Little Rock

## Metroplan Staff:

1. Lynn Bell	Graphics Specialist
2. Casey Covington	CARTS Planning Director
3. Susan Dollar	Transportation Planner/Title VI Coordinator
4. Hans Haustein	GIS Planner
5. Jonathan Lupton	Research Planner
6. Richard Magee	Deputy Director
7. Jim McKenzie	Executive Director
8. Jeff Runder	

## 1. Call to Order and Announcements

Chairman Charles Cummings called the meeting to order at 11:30 AM. The Council met at 501 W. Markham Street, Little Rock.

Mr. Cummings reported that he addressed the Metroplan Board of Directors at its meeting of May 25<sup>th</sup>. He did so in order to clarify that the RPAC's recommendation to approve requested amendments to the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and the long-range transportation plan were solely for the purpose of tagging those funds, to keep them central Arkansas. The RPAC was reluctant to jeopardize other projects already on the TIP by allowing the inconsistency of the CARTS TIP and State TIP (STIP) to continue. Mr. Cummings emphasized to the Metroplan Board that the recommendation in no way reflects RPAC's agreement with or approval of the I-30 Crossing project in its current form. Mr. Cummings appreciated the opportunity to appear before the Board to voice the RPAC's concerns, and to assure the Board that the RPAC is continuing to perform its due diligence.

## **2. Minutes of Previous Meetings**

The Council considered the Minutes of April 20 and May 18.

**MOTION** by Mr. Stair, second by Mr. Stowe

"To approve the Minutes of April 20, 2016, and May 18, 2016, as prepared."

**PASSED**

## **3. Staff Updates**

Mr. Covington provided updates on several matters.

- (1) Regarding the I-30 project, Mr. Covington reported that the Board did approve the TIP and Plan amendments. The next step in the process will occur when the AHTD submits a formal letter requesting an exception to the CARTS six-lane policy, or for final approval of the project. Metroplan anticipates receiving that letter toward the end of the year. Considering the number of public comments the AHTD received, staff assumes that the Department will need to revise its schedule and update Metroplan accordingly.
- (2) In the meantime, the RPAC will use the next several meetings to focus on education, to address specific questions that have been raised, and to bring in speakers to present different perspectives regarding the I-30 Crossing. Two speakers have been scheduled for today's meeting: AHTD's Mr. Ben Browning, who is the project director for the I-30 project and has appeared before the Council several previous times, and Mr. Chris East, an architect with Cromwell and Associates. Mr. Tom Fennell was unavailable for this meeting, but is on the schedule for the July RPAC meeting.
- (3) Regarding the public comments, the State's comment period ended on Friday, May 10, with receipt of more than 1,400 comments. The AHTD is now working to respond to the comments; when available, the AHTD will be asked to come back to the RPAC with its report.

(4) MPO certification Review will take place on July 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup>. Metroplan, is the federally designated metropolitan planning organization (MPO) for central Arkansas, and is therefore subject to periodic review by federal representatives of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA). Metroplan partners in the MPO process with Rock Region Metro and the Arkansas State Highway & Transportation Department (AHTD). The purpose of the review is to assure that the three entities - Metroplan, Rock Region Metro and AHTD - are carrying out the regional planning process in accordance with federal regulations and the standard of "3C" planning: *Comprehensive, Cooperative and Continuing*. As part of this review, a public meeting will be held from 6:00 until 7:00 PM, on Tuesday, July 19<sup>th</sup>, here in the Jeffry Hawkins Conference Room, 501 West Markham Street, Little Rock. All are welcome and encouraged to attend. On Wednesday, July 20<sup>th</sup>, the review team will attend the RPAC meeting and will be happy to meet privately with individuals who wish to make comments. (Staff will not be present for these private meetings.)

Mr. Covington introduced the first speaker. Benjamin Browning is the Project Director of the 30 Crossing project, the Highway Department's first Design-Build venture. Browning began his career with the Department in 2003 and worked as a Field Engineer in the Hot Springs and Bentonville Resident Engineer offices before moving to the Construction Administration office in Little Rock in 2008. In October of 2014 Browning promoted to Assistant Division Head of the Program Management Division. Prior to moving into his current position, he held the title of Division Head of Program Management. Browning has a bachelor's degree in Engineering with an emphasis in Civil Engineering from Arkansas State University and is a Registered Professional Engineer. Ben currently resides in Little Rock with his wife and two young daughters with whom he tries to spend as much time as possible.

#### **4. Presentation by AHTD (Ben Browning)**

Mr. Browning presented a detailed discussion on the design-build process. [The complete PowerPoint is posted to the Metroplan RPAC website.]

Design-build is a project delivery method that consists of a single contract between the project owner (i.e. AHTD) and the design-build contractor, which covers both the final design and construction of the project. Although not previously used in Arkansas, design-build is considered a good method to employ for projects in which: (1) the scope is large and complex (such as the I-30 corridor); (2) environmental activities are typically either underway or complete; (3) innovations in delivery are desired; and, (4) the project delivery schedule is a critical issue.

Procurement of the contractor is a two-step process: (1) Request for Qualifications (RFQ); and, (2) Request for Proposals (RFP).

The RFQ outlines the minimum qualifications required of a design-build firm in order to be invited to submit a proposal and be considered for the job. A detailed description of how the firm meets or exceeds the minimum qualifications is required, and includes among other things: (1) qualifications of the firm, including experience on similar projects; (2) identification and qualifications of key personnel who would be committed to the project (for example, relevant experience on similar projects); and, (3) project management methodology. The RFQ contains only high level project information and therefore can be released before the project scope has been finalized. The RFQ is advertised to the public and any interested party may respond. Furthermore, release of the RFQ does not commit the Department to the project.

Once received, responses to the RFQ are evaluated and scored. Those firms judged to be the best based on the RFQ response are then invited to submit a formal proposal. At that point the project will be outlined in detail and include the general and technical provisions that define the terms by which the design-builder would design and construct the project. Included in the RFP would be a "Not to Exceed" budget to which the design-builder must commit. The RFP also informs the proposers of all documents and agreements to which they are bound in designing and constructing the project. Proposals submitted in response to the RFP would entail a description of how the design-builder proposes to construct the project. Release of the RFP still does not commit the Department to the project. Mr. Browning noted that preparing a proposal is an expensive undertaking by the firms and that only a very few are expected to make the short-list from the RFQ phase.

Control of the final design is managed in the following manner:

- (1) All design must be based off of the Baseline Project Scope and Schematics, as developed and presented in the NEPA process.
- (2) Any deviation from the Baseline Project Scope and/or Schematics must be approved through the Alternate Technical Concept (ATC) process.
- (3) Approval of a deviation through the ATC process will include notification of all authorities impacted by the proposed change.
- (4) Any deviation from the Environmental Document will require that the design-builder go through a NEPA process to incorporate the proposed change.
- (5) Construction will not begin until the Department has determined that the final design is in accordance with the proposal, design-build agreement, and all other pertinent agreements, regulations, and specifications.

Mr. Browning concluded his presentation by emphasizing that the design-build process is very well defined, with many built-in controls to assure proper implementation of the design selected for the project. The proposal is not a "low

bid" process; therefore, the successful proposing firm will be very concern with maintaining a reputation.

The Chairman asked for questions and comments. Following is a summary of the discussion that followed. Although it is not a verbatim transcript, it does closely follow the discussion.

**Dr. Hampton:** Thank you so much for your presentation. The potential of the design-build process is excellent. The previous presentation was unsettling, but this presentation has helped us to see that design-build is streamlined and more professional. In addition to pre-qualifying the contractor through the RFQ step, do you also pre-qualify any sub-contractors who may be employed by the successful bidder?

**Mr. Browning:** We are requiring that the proposers include a list of any sub-contractors that would be used. We don't require a detailed qualification of each sub, but we will be able to research those firms and base our score partly on the reputation and qualifications of those sub-contracting firms. Most of the time, sub-contractors will be Arkansas-based; firms typically do not bring in sub-contractors from out of state. Whereas the major contracting firm will likely be out-of-state, because this project is too big for most Arkansas contractors, the sub-contractors will be mostly in-state and we will be very familiar with them.

**Dr. Hampton:** Are you going to have a blind evaluation? Once you've pre-qualified the consultants, will the proposals be evaluated anonymously?

**Mr. Browning:** Yes, it will. Evaluation will involve several different teams. The team at the bottom of this process will be looking at the qualifications and they will have to know the names of responders, because they will be checking on references and drilling down into the RFQ response. But once they have been, that will be sealed, and names will be redacted from that information. When its sent to the selection team, they will take the score and apply a letter grade to it. They will not know who that particular applied to.

**Mr. Larson:** I love the design-build process. I think that this may be the way much of our infrastructure will be built in the future. There is one step in the process that concerns me, and that is: what if no company says that it can build the project for the set budget amount?

**Mr. Browning:** That is always a risk. The Department is working right now on determining a reasonable cost estimate. If, however, costs are coming way over what is anticipated, we may have to put in "estimate options". And so we will have a baseline project - components that must be built, and if you can't build it for this amount, then don't even try. But we want more than the baseline, and so whoever can give us the baseline project plus "Option A", "Option B", "Option C", and so on,

which will be prioritized, will be awarded the project. We have talked with numerous people who are interested in proposing, and not one of them thus far has indicated that the cost estimates are unrealistic.

**Mr. Stair:** Couple of questions. One, during the development of the RFP, are there going to be any external people or groups - external to the AHTD - that can look at the RFP, particularly the restrictions and promises? Or will it all be conducted internally within the Department?

**Mr. Browning:** As far as the writing of the RFP, it is written by AHTD. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) is also involved in reviewing it. We'll definitely let our project partners review the document. However, as the RFP is nearing completion, we will release a draft of the RFP to the public. It's called an "industry review" and although it's intended for the industry to identify any issues that need clarification before finalizing the RFP, it will be publically released and so anyone who wishes to go through the 1000+ pages is welcome to do so.

**Mr. Stair:** My second question is, during the project itself, you have an ATC process in place for vetting changes to the design. Is that process also only internal to the Department, or will external players be brought in? Could impacted communities or Metroplan be brought in on that?

**Mr. Browning:** Yes, we will definitely have to do that. In many situations that impact an expectation, or where promises were made, we will bring in representatives. For example, let's say we've made some commitments regarding what the retaining walls will look like, and the contractor counters with another option. That is something that impacts a promise and an expectation, so we would then need to bring in the people who were part of the original decision-making group (visioning committee) for the retaining walls. However, if the design on a temporary median wall is proposed by the contractor, the majority of the public would never even notice and it would not have an impact on any community, that's something that would be handled internally, because it would be a technical matter anyway. It would be a case-by-case.

**Mr. Lyford:** As a follow-up to that question, would the interested party involved in that ATC dialogue have a veto, or will it be a Department decision?

**Mr. Browning:** It would be a team decision. In situations like these, you always shoot for a unified decision. We are still refining how that ATC process will work, but that is direction we are heading.

**Dr. Hampton:** After you've pre-qualified firms and you get ready to accept proposals, will that be a public what you set forth in terms of scope, desired design characteristics, performance specifications, will we as a public get to see that?

**Mr. Browning:** The draft will be publically available. When the actual RFP goes out and is released to the industry, that iterative process will not be released to the public because of its proprietary nature.

**Dr. Hampton:** What I am asking about being available is what goes out to the pre-qualified proposing firms.

**Mr. Browning:** Yes, that will be available to the public.

**Mr. McKenzie:** Ben, this is going to be a design-build-finance proposal and the whole "finance" part is a little fuzzy. could you please go into how that part will work?

**Mr. Browning:** The legislature just recently gave us [AHTD] permission to do what's called a design-build-finance process. Because these proposing contractors are such large companies, they are willing to come in and build the project realizing they may not get paid immediately all of the money that is budgeted for the job. They may have to wait a little bit.

Early-on in this process, the public told us that the interchanges on I-40, where there are merge problems, need to be addressed. That was not originally part of the scope and extra funds were required to incorporate that element. That is where the *finance* aspect came in. You've seen the budget: \$100 million in "finance" has been set aside; that's \$20 million per year for five years, starting in 2019. The first three years are in the current draft STIP, and the last two years will be committed to the project in a future STIP at \$20 million per year. That number will not change; it is not tied to inflation. It's today's dollars, and there is no interest associated with it. We tell the design-builder, "We have another \$100 million on top of the cash that we have available right now for the project. You need to go out and find a way to use it, understanding that you will not have access to the money right away."

As we've developed our "construction S-curve", showing projected payout on the project, we've realized that our payout of the money that we have on hand is going to extend far past 2019. So, in reality, the delayed payment to the contractor will probably be more like only \$40 million. The contractor will not get the money until the work is completed.

**Mr. Cummings:** What will be the impact on existing or future projects within the TIP during those five years the \$20 million will come off the top for the design-builder?

**Mr. Browning:** It's in the STIP and will be reflected in the TIP, and so would be obligated like any other project. As far as impacting other projects, we have put in additional funds to central Arkansas to account for that finance portion.

## 5. Presentation by Studio Main (Chris East)

Mr. Covington introduced the second speaker: Chris East is an architect with Cromwell Architects Engineers in Little Rock, AR. Chris has been the lead architect on some of Cromwell's notable recent buildings including Capital Hotel's One Eleven renovation, UALR's Engineering and Information Technology (EIT) and the AHTD's Public Transit Building. Chris has served as the American Institute of Architects Arkansas Board since 2012, where he was a founding member of studioMAIN, a 501C3 nonprofit organization with a mission of advocating and visioning for good community design. Chris is married to his wife of eight years, Kate, and they have a rambunctious two-year-old, Colin. They both work, and all live in downtown Little Rock.

Mr. East has worked with the AHTD to develop design ideas to activate the green space that may be available as a result of eliminating existing downtown ramps as part of the I-30 Crossing design. The work is all done on a volunteer basis, from the design community. The presentation focuses on what can be done with the proposed six-lane CD, split-diamond design concept put forth by the AHTD.

Mr. East describing himself and others at StudioMAIN as "practical optimists", who believe that if they can get people to change their minds about the way they travel, they can change the community. Four guiding objectives of the organization: (1) to educate the public by helping them to visualize the kind of community they want; (2) to advocate for better design; (3) to involve the public; and, (4) to challenge convention. Mr. East noted that the I-30 project accomplishes all four objectives "to a tee".

In 2014, StudioMAIN was appointed to participate on the SAG committee, and as designs began to emerge from the AHTD, they developed some concerns associated with the proposed I-30 Crossing project. Those concerns included: (1) a lack of long-term planning for the affected communities; (2) lack of east-west connectivity and division of the communities; (3) area land that was not used to its "highest & best" advantage (for example, defaulting to lots of surface parking instead of parks and "people" places); and, (4) no planning for multi-modal transportation that allows for pedestrian, bike, public transit, as well as personal vehicles.

Those concerns were the catalyst that engaged StudioMAIN with the AHTD. StudioMAIN endorses the six-lane CD, split diamond design concept and has developed some ideas for mitigating the concerns raised, by increasing east-west connectivity and laying out a long-term plan for enhancing the land uses around the new road facility. Mr. East showed many slide images depicting innovative ways to use space under and immediately around big roadway facilities. Several of these images included imaginative approaches taken by countries other than the United States. Consistent elements in the images included human-scale lighting, pedestrian access, landscaping with plant material and parks, and a definable street edge.

DesignMAIN recommends that 4th and 6th Streets be converted to three lanes and that Capitol Avenue be converted to four lanes. Other recommendations include creating "signposts" to signal a sense of entrance or gateway to places that are conducive to people, streets that accommodate bikes and pedestrians, and creating many pocket parks to accommodate family-friendly events. A deck park was also suggested, which would be constructed over the interstate and permit pedestrians and bicyclists to traverse the interstate. Mr. East commented that a deck park is not in the AHTD budget and would require "everybody at the table" to find the funding for the project.

In his conclusion, Mr. East reiterated the reasons StudioMAIN endorses the AHTD six lane design concept: it does improve connectivity and the street grid within Little Rock's downtown, accommodates multi-modal transportation, connects cultural institutions, and can increase traffic safety.

The Chairman thanked Mr. East for his presentation and asked for questions and comments from the Council. Following is a summary of the ensuing discussion.

**Mr. Stair:** Has a similar set of scenarios been prepared for North Little Rock? What hope is there for that side of the river? The ideas you've presented all look pretty for Little Rock, but for those of who live on the North Little Rock side of the river all we are left with is still a giant barricade of concrete and a Texas turnaround for visual enhancement.

**Mr. East:** We chose to focus on what we thought to be our greatest concern. We are concerned about North Little Rock, although we don't live there and are right in the middle of what is happening here in Little Rock. We haven't had the opportunity to hear from North Little Rock.

**Mr. Stair:** Is there any opportunity in this as it progresses, to bring this type of intense design focus to the problems in North Little Rock?

**Mr. East:** I certainly hope so. StudioMAIN will be glad to work the City of North Little Rock.

**Mr. Stair:** Do you think the AHTD would work with StudioMAIN on the north side, just as it has with Little Rock? And who would initiate such work? Would it be the City?

**Mr. Larson:** Part of the problem in there is already so much easement taken up with the interstate. I'm not sure what was planned in the 50s and 60s when all that land was gobbled up. The land in Little Rock is occupied by on and off ramps, which if removed, would free up space. That is not the case in North Little Rock. We have huge, wide easements and then private property.

**Mr. Stair:** That is true, and the North Little Rock side may not have the same designs or look the same way, but a fresh look at innovative approaches couldn't hurt.

**Mr. Covington:** I think there will be opportunities, albeit different opportunities due to the land uses, to improve the design in North Little Rock. I suggest you talk to the City leaders and encourage them to talk and see what they

**Ms. Whitehead:** As part of your presentation you talked about redeveloping land that had previously been concrete. Is the removal of the concrete part of the design-build?

**Mr. Browning:** Yes.

**Ms. Whitehead:** That is a definite yes?

**Mr. Browning:** As it is now, the concrete would be removed and the ground sodded or seeded.

**Ms. Freasier:** As you considered the different options for traffic control, such as signalization, did you look at roundabouts or traffic circles to keep a continuous flow?

**Mr. East:** No, we did not. We took the stance that a connected city street grid is more conducive to pedestrian travel than a roundabout.

**Mr. Stair:** Do you have any health professionals on your team? The reason I ask this is that while your example of the Netherlands showed those nice four lane roads with facilities built under, there is a big difference between being under four lanes and under ten lanes. Have you considered the health effect of traffic emissions - particulate matter, noxious gases - on say, children's parks next to a major roadway facility.

**Mr. East:** No, and I agree with your point. Locating a children's park next to a major facility would not be my first choice, but given the realities on the ground this is a better design for our city. Is it the best environmental design? No, but it's what we have to work with.

**Mr. Stair:** You would be assisting in the expansion on this facility and bring young children into closer contact with this expanded roadway traffic. You don't see that as a fundamental disconnect?

**Mr. East:** I see it as a weighing of the options.

**Mr. Cummings:** Ben, what is the Highway Department's willingness to change the design of the under-bridge area as far as capping it off, and accommodating

integrating lighting and the other ideas that Chris has shown us? What is the Highway Department's position on this?

**Mr. Browning:** We are very open to what is being proposed at StudioMAIN. A lot of us live in Little Rock and want to see our city succeed, so we are excited by StudioMAIN's ideas. If the split-diamond is selected, then as part of the project all of that will be brought down to ground level, all that is not being used for transportation purposes. What's going to be important is that we work closely with the City of Little Rock to come together with an agreement on what needs to happen to facilitate that master plan, to facilitate that vision in going forward. It has to be in writing, because we have to give our design-builder something solid to go on. Chris has mentioned funding several times. It's a sensitive issue with the Department because we have to be careful about not setting a precedent. For example, Northwest Arkansas loves to put "betterments" on our highways - not just signal lights, but very nice and fancy signal lights. It is our policy to fund the standard facility, and anything over that - any betterment - is funded by the city or county. Putting in landscaping would be considered a betterment and would require city or private funding.

**Mr. Cummings:** But demolition and removal is part of the standard, budgeted amount?

**Mr. Browning:** Yes, sir.

**Ms. Freasier:** And am I to understand that the six-lane split diamond is one of the designs you are looking at?

**Mr. Browning:** It is the six-lane-CD and split-diamond. That's six through lanes and two collector-distributor lanes.

**Mr. Lyford:** Under the 10-lane option, from the bridge to 4<sup>th</sup> Street, where the park area ends, how many through-lanes would be constructed on the bridge to 4<sup>th</sup> Street?

**Mr. Browning:** As soon as the collector-distributor separates, there are three lanes in each direction, then a barrier, plus two collector-distributor lanes, and then an extended ramp from Broadway to Little Rock. Across the River Bridge it is a total of twelve lanes. I brought the design schematics if anyone would like to view them after the meeting.

**Ms. Freasier:** Chris, what has been the City's response to the idea of developing the area as usable green space?

**Mr. East:** Mayor Stodola likes the idea. He is excited about the idea of activating the green space.

**Mr. McKenzie:** Just a clarification on who is going to own the green space and the uses it can be put to: Right now the state is talking about retaining that right-of-way under State ownership and leasing it to the city for park space. If they didn't do that, they would have to go back to the original owner of the property and give that individual first option to purchase, and then sell it for fair market value. The City could then condemn the property and take it over for park space. As long as it is State right-of-way, Arkansas State law (not true in every State) says that nobody can earn money on that right-of-way. So, you can't have retail stores under the space. If you had a beer festival down there, no beer vendor that sold beer could be on the State right-of-way portion; they would have to be moved off of the right-of-way. Now, that law could be amended, this could be an exception to the law; generally, the State doesn't like to set precedent, because as Ben said they are a statewide agency. So you need to keep that in mind when the wonderful images that Chris showed us about how that could be programmed, also conflict with current State law.

**Ms. Green:** Regarding the street edge elements you discussed earlier, that helps to calm traffic, how does that affect the traffic modeling? Also, how does that affect the arterial roads coming into the city?

**Mr. East:** That is being studied by Garver and the AHTD, and multiple different agencies, such as the Nelson Nygaard group.

**Dr. Hampton:** I have read about design-build and am impressed with the method as a collaborative, integrated process. Cost is not a primary factor. The concept emphasizes a teamwork approach, which must be clearly communicated to the pre-qualified design-build firms that will be proposing to do this project. The desired outcome is to reduce inefficiencies and to deliver high-quality products.

**Mr. Stair:** Regarding the split diamond interchange design, that will channel much more traffic down 4<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> Streets. A school is on 4<sup>th</sup> Street, and 6<sup>th</sup> Street is heavily residential, and those streets are not currently feeder streets. Are you (AHTD and/or StudioMAIN) looking at that?

**Mr. East:** Yes, we are. It will bring more traffic, but it will not become a parking lot, cars will still move. We do not think the amount of traffic will be detrimental.

**Mr. Magee:** Ben, isn't there a meeting in North Little Rock this week or next week?

**Mr. Browning:** No. We spoke to a small group at Shorter College. We will present to King Solomon Church on June 30.

With that, the Council moved to the next order of business.

## 6. Other Business and Next Meeting

Three items were brought forward:

- (1) Mr. Cummings encouraged Council members to continue to voice their questions and requests for information, whether data or guest presenters, that would increase their knowledge base and assist in making the difficult decisions that lay before the group.
- (2) Mr. Magee announced that in 2014, members of the Imagine Central Arkansas Partners (ICAP) selected five unique Jump Start communities in a day-long competitive process. Those communities have now gone through the process of creating and adopting a plan for implementing each Jump Start project (except for Little Rock, which is nearly there) and it is time to evaluate those plans and bring them to the Metroplan Board of Directors. Metroplan staff will be asking those of you who participated in the selection process to review and evaluate each project. You will be asked to judge the projects to see if they achieved the objectives as originally proposed. Mr. Magee said that former ICAP members can expect to receive additional information in the coming weeks.
- (3) The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, July 20<sup>th</sup>. Confirmation and additional information will be sent a week prior to the date.

No other business was brought forward.

## 7. Adjourn

With no further business brought forward, the Chairman asked for motion to adjourn.

**MOTION** by Ms. Freasier, second by Ms. Cook  
"To adjourn."

**Council adjourned at 1:27 PM.**