

Regional Planning Advisory Council

Minutes of Wednesday, October 12, 2016

RPAC Members Attending:

Name	Representing
1. Sam Adams	Little Rock Air Force Base (LRAFB)
2. Kay Kelley Arnold	City of Little Rock
3. Marcia Cook	City of Sherwood
4. Charles Cummings (Chair)	Freight/Goods Movement
5. Coreen Frasier	Bicycle Advocacy of Central Arkansas (BACA)
6. Robin Freeman	Saline County
7. Sybil Hampton	City of Little Rock
8. Paul Hastings	City of Little Rock
9. Jeff Hathaway	Little Rock Regional Chamber of Commerce (LRRCC)
10. Amy Heflin (Nonvoting)	Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
11. Scott Hunter	Faulkner County
12. Todd Larson	City of North Little Rock
13. Ed Levy (Alt.)	BACA
14. Eddie Long	City of Cabot
15. Sara McClain	City of Benton
16. Bob Lyford	City of Little Rock
17. Buckley O'Mell (Alt.)	LRRCC
18. Dan Roda	City of Little Rock
19. Carolyn Shearman (Alt.)	Sierra Club
20. Paul Simms	AHTD
21. Patrick Stair	Sierra Club
22. Jack Stowe	City of Maumelle
23. Regina Taylor	Youth Outreach
24. Brad Walker	City of Little Rock

Guests:

1. Barry Haas	Resident (Little Rock)
2. Noel Oman	<i>Arkansas Democrat-Gazette</i>
3. Emmily Tiampati	AHTD
4. Tab Townsell	Mayor, City of Conway
5. Carol Young	League of Women Voters - Pulaski County

Metroplan Staff:

1. Lynn Bell	Graphics Specialist
2. Casey Covington	CARTS Planning Director
3. Susan Dollar	Transportation Planner/Title VI Coordinator
4. Daniel Holland	Planner
5. Jim McKenzie	Executive Director

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.

2. Minutes of Previous Meetings

The Council considered the Minutes of August 24, 2016.

MOTION by Dr. Hampton , second by Mr. Simms

"To accept the Minutes of August 24, 2016, as corrected on page 12 to include a response to Ms. Taylor's question."

PASSED

3. Jump Start

Mr. Holland, who coordinates Metroplan Jump Start program, presented information on the Jump Start program.

Jump Start was one of the deliverables of the *Imagine Central Arkansas* project. The goals of the Jump Start program are to provide proof of concept that environmentally sustainable developments can be profitable to build for the private sector, and economically sustainable for the public sector. The plans that arise from these initial neighborhoods will develop the region's experience and knowledge base for creating more livable communities and serve as a catalyst for further development in the region.

Products expected from the Jump Start communities include: (1) market studies; (2) implementation and action plans; (3) new visioning and zoning; (4) infrastructure funding. Ultimately, the Jump Start program hopes to help implement regional goals formed during the *Imagine Central Arkansas* development process.

Five project areas were selected in a competitive process of 20 applicants. Those five areas are: (1) Levy, North Little Rock; (2) 12th Street Corridor, Little Rock; (3) Old Town, Bryant; (4) Markham Street Corridor, Conway; and (5) Park Hill, North Little Rock. Following the devastation of a tornado in 2014, the communities of Mayflower and Vilonia were added to the Jump Start program.

All of the communities have progressed to the point where their achievements must be evaluated against their original proposals. Based on these evaluations, communities may be eligible to receive additional funding for transportation infrastructure.

The task of evaluating these projects would have been assigned to the Imagine Central Arkansas Partners (ICAP), since that is the group that was more involved with the Jump Start deliverable and was responsible for selecting the communities from among the 20 original proposals. However, the ICAP disbanded in 2014, and several of the individuals involved in the project are no longer in central Arkansas. Therefore, the job now falls to the RPAC. Several members of the RPAC also served on the ICAP, and the entire Council was responsible for oversight on *Imagine Central Arkansas* and its deliverables.

Several Council members expressed concern that they lacked the experience with Jump Start to make an informed evaluation. There was also concern that evaluating the projects, especially with regard to zoning documents, may require a level of technical expertise that Council members may not possess. There was also a general willingness to attempt the task, and an interest in this aspect of the overall *Imagine Central Arkansas*, because these projects actually implement the ideas expressed in the plan.

In response, Mr. Holland assured the group that staff will do most of the research and will present the material in an easily accessible format. Staff will provide additional information as soon as possible, and will be available as a resource.

The timeframe for evaluating Jump Start projects is within the next month. Ideally, the Council would be ready to make a recommendation at its November 9 meeting and the Metroplan Board will take action at its meeting on November 16. Negotiations with the selected communities are expected to go into the spring of 2017; projects should be underway by early 2018.

4. I-30 Project in Context

Overview of *Imagine Central Arkansas*

Ms. Dollar: As the federally designated metropolitan planning organization (MPO) for central Arkansas, Metroplan is charged with the responsibility for preparing a long-range metropolitan transportation plan. This plan - *Imagine Central Arkansas* - is not a "Metroplan document." It is the region's plan, which when adopted by the Metroplan Board of Directors, is followed by member governments, Rock Region METRO Transit Authority, and the Arkansas State Highway and Transportation Department. There was some confusion about the hierarchy of the long-range plan as it applied to our partners, but the issue was clarified during the federal certification review this past July. Plan development is a collaborative process, with Metroplan staff and the RPAC working in partnership with Rock Region METRO, AHTD, cities and counties.

Mr. Cummings asked Ms. Dollar please explain the differences between the regional metropolitan plans, such as *Imagine Central Arkansas*, and the Statewide plan that the AHTD is required to do.

Ms. Dollar: The Statewide plan is a policy document and therefore financial constraint is not a requirement of the State plan.

Ms. Heflin and **Mr. Simms** agreed and added that the State plan does not include specific projects.

Ms. Dollar: Recognizing the importance of the MPO's task, in 1992, the Metroplan Board established the Regional Planning Advisory Council (nee Transportation Advisory Council, or TAC) as a citizen-based body to oversee plan development and public engagement. The RPAC represents participating governments and

stakeholder groups, and is a recommending body to the Metroplan Board. The Board retains final authority for actions.

We didn't start from scratch! Imagine Central Arkansas rests on a firm foundation established in the 1990s with the adoption of METRO 2020, and with each five-year update after that. Each plan iteration was accompanied by expanded public outreach to include people from all over the region, as well as those populations that have historically been under-served. The level of public engagement enabled us to reaffirm the vision that has been expressed in the previous plans.

The over-arching vision of *Imagine Central Arkansas* is as follows:

Imagine Central Arkansas is a community-driven guide to creating a sustainable, healthy and prosperous region that celebrates diversity, community cooperation, educational excellence, economic vibrancy and quality choices in housing and transportation. Imagine . . .

The transportation vision statement was created in the early 1990s, during the METRO 2020 plan development. In each subsequent plan the statement has been re-examined and re-considered - and in the end, has been left alone, because the RPAC, Board and feedback from the public concluded that the vision stands the test of time.

The transportation vision statement is as follows:

The Metropolitan Transportation Plan will contribute to a more livable and efficient environment in central Arkansas. This plan should significantly change how we allow our transportation systems and our communities to develop, by defining an intermodal transportation system that:

- Maximizes the mobility of people and goods;
- Minimizes transportation related fuel consumption and air pollution; and
- Establishes a strong link between transportation infrastructure and land use.

The *Imagine Central Arkansas* document, including the technical supporting document, is some 300 pages. Summing up, the three key points of the regional vision are:

1. Continue to promote a pattern of compact, mixed-use growth that varies in scale and function (because we recognize the diversity within the region);

2. Foster conditions that make safe, affordable, energy-efficient, geographically available and accessible neighborhoods; and,
3. Create the conditions described above by shifting our approach to mobility to emphasize a balanced network of multi-modal options.

The significance of the plan, its vision and goals, is that as projects are developed and brought forward, they can be tested against the plan: *Does this project advance the vision and goals set forth in the plan?*

The I-30 Project - PEL Process

Mr. Covington: The Planning and Environmental Linkages, or PEL, represents a collaborative and integrated approach to transportation decision-making that: (1) considers environmental, community, and economic goals early in the transportation planning process, and (2) uses the information, analysis and products developed during planning to inform the environmental review process (NEPA). The responsible party is the AHTD and its consultants.

As part of discharging this responsibility, the AHTD engaged in extensive consultation with project partners, holding four public meetings and numerous other stakeholder meetings. The Purpose and Need statement was developed in coordination with these project partners. Through this process the following "needs", or problems, were identified:

- Traffic congestion
- Roadway safety
- Structural and functional roadway deficiencies
- Navigational safety
- Structural and functional bridge deficiencies

From these identified issues and objectives (the "purposes") a "universe of alternatives" was developed and through a series of qualitative and quantitative screening tests (Levels 1 -3), various alternatives were eliminated from consideration. Note, however, that alternatives were not considered in concert with other alternatives. For example, transit options were considered alone, and not in combination with improved arterials, on/exit ramps or other actions.

The decisions made during the PEL process include: (1) determining the Purpose and Need; (2) eliminating many alternatives through a series of screening processes; and moving the remaining alternatives into the NEPA phase. Those alternatives include the "6 + 4 CD Lanes" (or 10-lanes) and at the request of Metroplan, an eight-lane alternative.

Mr. Hunter: I've lived in central Arkansas all my life. I see nothing about educating the public on how to drive. You can build 22 lanes of road, but if people do not possess the knowledge of how to properly navigate an interstate there will still be problems with free flow of traffic.

Mr. Covington: I can say for sure that the universe of alternatives did not include an education element.

Ms. Dollar: Your statement also goes indirectly to the public's concept of congestion. Congestion is often a matter of perception and varies widely from place to place. People who moved to central Arkansas from places such as Atlanta don't perceive congestion. People who move to Little Rock from rural areas perceive a lot of congestion.

Mr. Hunter: That's right. I've traveled in areas where it took hours to get from one side of the city to the other. Now that's congestion.

Mr. Covington: One more thing before we move on. I didn't get into a lot of detail on the alternatives, but that information is available and I will be happy to talk with any of you after the meeting today.

NEPA Process

Mr. Covington: As we move into the NEPA process, I want to mention that Metroplan conducted a preliminary analysis of the impacts the I-30 project would have on the freeway system and the long-range transportation plan. This preliminary analysis: (1) assessed traffic impacts of the I-30 Crossing; (2) Identified projects necessary for I-30 improvements to function properly, and the logical project resulting from its construction (associated widening and the financially constrained plan); (3) identified a freeway network necessary to reach the AHTD's stated LOS goal. This is important because the plan amendment must be financially constrained. We will be looking at this again and refining, updating it.

The National Environmental Policy Act of 1970 (NEPA) requires federal agencies to consider potential environmental consequences to project or policy proposals. NEPA is a federal responsibility. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) is the responsible party and will make findings, but the AHTD is preparing the document. The evaluation is project-specific, but requires the consideration of direct, indirect and cumulative impacts.

As it applies to transportation, the intent of NEPA is to allow transportation officials to make decisions that balance engineering and transportation needs with social, economic and natural environmental factors. The FHWA adopted the policy of managing the NEPA phase as an umbrella under which all applicable environmental

laws, executive orders and regulations are considered and addressed prior to making a final project decision.

There are three levels of NEPA analysis: (1) Categorical Exclusion (CATEX); (2) Environmental Assessment (EA); or Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

CATEX is given to a category of actions which do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment, and therefore for which neither an Environmental Assessment nor an Environmental Impact Statement is necessary. Examples of CATEX projects include most pedestrian and bicycle projects, minor arterial roadway widening, and signal projects.

An EA is prepared when the significance of impacts is uncertain and more detailed information is needed to make a determination. If the EA determines that there are no significant impacts associated with the project, then a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) is issued. The Broadway Bridge is an example of a project that received FONSI.

An EIS is conducted when a project is expected or is determined to significantly affect the quality of the human environment. The EIS is a "full disclosure", very detailed document that considers project development, reasonable alternatives and potential impacts. There are three stages of an EIS: (1) issuance of a Notice of Intent (NOI); (2) preparation of the draft EIS document; and (3) issuance of a Record of Decision (ROD). The ROD could also include mitigation strategies.

Ms. Heflin: Yes, mitigation should be included in the ROD.

Mr. Covington: Another question that has come up is about Section 106. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act is to mitigate negative impacts to historic properties. This project has triggered a 106 evaluation because of concern in the EA that historic areas in Little Rock and North Little Rock may be impacted. That process is ongoing.

So, while we are still in the NEPA phase there are no current decisions to be made, but we will be making decisions near the end of the NEPA phase. As best we know, the draft EA will be issued in April 2017. If a determination of significant impact is made, then it will automatically go to the more intensive, detailed EIS. So that is the first decision.

The second decision is that of "locally preferred alternative". This is what comes out of NEPA and goes into the Design- Build phase. We thought that when the draft EA was done, it would include the locally preferred alternative. We've now been told that it may not be until the FONSI or EIS that a locally preferred alternative will be known.

Ben Browning (AHTD) could not be here for this meeting, but he has indicated that he is available to answer any questions anyone might have.

Ms. Heflin: About the preferred alternative: we (FHWA) won't identify a preferred alternative until one is clear. There may be a preferred alternative in the draft EA, I don't know, but there won't be unless a decision is clear. If we feel like we need one more round of public involvement before we can determine a preferred alternative, then there won't be a preferred alternative in the draft EA. However, even though there may be a preferred alternative, that does not mean it is the *selected* alternative.

Mr. Hunter: Who are decision makers for the ROD? Is it a committee, an individual? Or does the ROD go to separate sections within the FHWA and then to a final decision point?

Ms. Heflin: The ROD is ultimately signed by the Division Administrator in Little Rock. Having said that, we don't do this in a vacuum, especially if there is an EIS. There will be a formal Notice of Intent, and we will be working with cooperating agencies. There are many, many parties that will be involved in this before we make that decision. If it is elevated to an EIS, it will have to go through "legal sufficiency", our attorneys, and all will have to agree before we proceed.

Mr. Hunter: Do you expect litigation?

Mr. Covington: I think that actions are being taken with the anticipation of possible litigation. Actions are being carefully documented and reviewed so that they could be defensible, should litigation occur.

Ms. Heflin: True, we trying to "dot all the i's and cross all the tees" but not just to protect ourselves in case there is litigation. This is a huge decision and we want to make this decision with all the information we can get, and we want to do the right thing.

Mr. Hunter: What bothers me about this whole I-30 project is that this area has been built up to the extent that expansion will disrupt everything in that part of the city. The same thing is happening along the corridor going to Benton. And the more we expand, the more vehicles will fill the expansion. I hope that by 2087, we will have figured out a better way to do things.

Mr. Covington: Any other questions? By the way, we have been told that at this point there has not been a decision made regarding whether to go to an EIS.

Ms. Heflin: That's correct.

Ms. Arnold: Please explain what is meant by "human environment."

Ms. Heflin: The FHWA distinguishes between the natural environment and the built environment. For example, natural impacts could be wetlands or endangered species. Farmland could be human or also natural, depending on the issues. Examples of human impacts could be noise, air quality, impacts to parks. The NEPA process is not limited to one or the other.

Ms. Arnold: You've answered my question. Thank you.

Design-Build-Finance Delivery

Mr. Covington: We've gone through the project in context with Imagine Central Arkansas; gone through the PEL phase and NEPA phase. Now let's talk about the Design-Build phase.

Mr. Cummings: Casey, before we move into that section, let's back up and discuss the Section 106 aspect of the evaluation. Where are we in that process?

Mr. Covington: Yes, of course. A Section 106 evaluation was determined to be needed as part of the EA, and parties were identified and invited to participate as part of the consultation process. That consultation process is underway. Metroplan is one of the consulting parties. Neighborhood associations likely to be impacted are also parties. Those areas include MacArthur Park in Little Rock, and Argenta and Park Hill in North Little Rock. We met initially about a month ago. Another meeting is coming up. The group is currently concentrating on identifying areas and structures potentially impacted by the project.

Mr. McKenzie: Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 requires federal agencies to evaluate the effects of all federally funded or permitted projects on historic properties. The objective is to avoid, minimize or mitigate - in that order - and negative impacts to historic properties. A consultant has been retained by FHWA that specializes in this. One of the factors in bringing this to national attention was the consideration of the split diamond interchange, which would route traffic through the MacArthur Park historic district, but all historic properties that are potentially impacted are being looked at.

Section 106 is a procedural law that requires a good faith effort to consult with others regarding effects on historic properties. It's the consultation process that is important - no specific outcome is dictated. Adverse effects must be mitigated and resolved through a legally binding agreement. This 106 process must be completed prior to approval of expenditure of any federal funds.

Ms. Arnold: How long do you think it will take to get that analysis?

Mr. McKenzie: They are looking at impacts on all four designs.

Ms. Arnold: And is that still in process or has there been a conclusion?

Mr. McKenzie: Still working on it. We hope to see an initial report by the end of this year.

Mr. Cummings: Thank you for going over that information for us. Casey is now going to tell us about the Design- Build process.

Mr. Covington: Glad to answer those questions. I'll be happy to go over the Section 106 in more detail after the meeting.

Design-Build is a project delivery system involving a single contract between the project owner and a design-build contractor covering both the final design and construction of a project. The AHTD, with FHWA oversight, is the responsible party for this project. The Design-Build delivery is a good method to use for projects in which the scope is large and complex, environmental activities are either underway or complete, innovations are sought, and timeliness of delivery is a critical issue.

Here is an analogy: Think of the project as a sandbox. The contractor-builder is told to play in the sandbox, but don't go out of the sandbox. If he does want to go out of the sandbox, he must go back to the Department to explain why and to get approval. This project will have some specific design elements that came out of the public process and that will have to be included in the "sandbox."

Dr. Hampton: Is there someone in the AHTD who has experience with this process? The process calls for someone who can be very proactive.

Mr. Covington: This is the first design-build project in this State. Ben Browning is the project manager. I don't think he has experience, but he has received training.

Mr. Simms: Ben has immersed himself in this process. He has visited states, especially Missouri, and talked with people who have managed design-build projects, and has educated himself in a number of ways.

Ms. Heflin: Our Little Rock FHWA has a person on staff who is from Missouri and has extensive experience in design-build. He is a resource for the AHTD.

Mr. Covington: Decisions that are made during the Design-Build Process include: final design and technical specs (e.g. beam depths, pavement design). Modifications to the design are allowed during Design-Build but must go through a review and approval process. Control of the final design includes the following:

- All design must be based off the baseline project scope and schematics, which are developed in the NEPA phase.

- Deviations from the scope must be approved through the Alternate Technical concept (ATC) process.
- Final approval of an ATC will include all authorities impacted by the proposed change.
- Any deviation from the environmental document will require that the design-builder go through the NEPA process to incorporate the change.
- Construction will not begin until the AHTD has determined that the final design is in accordance with the proposal, design-build agreement, and all other pertinent agreements, regulations, and specifications.

Dr. Hampton: My concern is that with the emphasis on time- and cost-savings, there could be less effort put into quality issues and the overall quality of the project could suffer. I am hoping there is a balance between savings and quality.

Having just seen the Broadway Bridge go down and knowing that in Europe there are bridges that last for thousands of years, I am concerned that we don't put enough emphasis on constructing high-quality, long-lasting infrastructure.

Mr. Hunter: That's right. It seems like freeways and runways - where we entrust our lives every day - always go to the lowest bidder.

Ms. Heflin: But this isn't lowest bidder.

Mr. Levy: We (Cromwell Architecture/Engineers) do a lot of design-build projects, and have for the last 30 or so years. If quality is a concern, you need to make certain that the RFP documents are thorough and they establish the level of quality that you want. You also need to be very mindful of the fact that everything you want in the end product is spelled out in the RFP, because the contractors are notorious for leaving things out that are not specifically in the RFP. The RFP document for design-build needs to be enormous in order to include everything. And then you have to watch them (contractors) like a hawk during construction. You have to remember that the contractor is driving the boat, not the designers, on a design-build. That presents a whole new range of problems. Those problems can be managed, but you have to approach it quite differently.

Ms. Frasier: Am I understanding it correctly, that the Highway Department decide to do the Design-Build? Who made the decision to go with a design-build concept?

Mr. Simms: It was decided almost from the beginning, because of the complexity and cost of this project. The Department thought it could get a better product by taking this approach.

Remaining Decisions for Metroplan

Mr. Covington: Before we adjourn for the day, I want to talk about where we are headed with this project.

If you refer to the chart that was included in your meeting packet, you see where we are in the NEPA process, and at the bottom are two circles. Metroplan responsibilities in two items. One is the plan amendment, and the other is the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) amendment.

The plan amendment is the biggest issue remaining for Metroplan. That is RPAC's responsibility. Responsibility for the TIP amendment rests with the Technical Coordinating Committee.

AHTD asked us for either an exception to the six-lane policy or to eliminate it, which we have been through. AHTD has also asked for a plan amendment to look at an amendment that is more inclusive of various design elements.

As staff, we are going to meet with AHTD staff and work on that amendment. We are specifically concerned with the impacts on our financial constraint, because as the MPO we are federally required to maintain a financially constrained plan. It is our core function to match available resources with investments in infrastructure. During the months of November and December, and depending on how soon we can reach an agreement, we anticipate that amendment proposal coming to the RPAC in early 2017. That will be for your discussion and comment and then to go out for public comment; then back to the RPAC for a recommendation, and then to the Board for action.

We don't know exactly when the TIP amendment will be requested, because a TIP amendment requires detailed knowledge of the project as it will be constructed. We look at the TIP in relation to the plan and as long as everything matches, the TIP amendment should go through for approval.

Mr. McKenzie: The big deal is the plan amendment, particularly the financial constraint part of the amendment. There is money in the plan now for the initial project, but not money for additional widenings that are necessary to make that project work. That whole process of discerning what it will take over the next 20 year period - the plan period - to do those additional widenings, is critical to this process, in order to meet the federal requirements. The TIP amendment is the instrument that implements the plan.

I think we have a little dance to do regarding identifying the locally preferred alternative. In particular, the mayor of Little Rock favors one alternative and disfavors another. We want the TIP amendment to reflect local support.

Again, the plan amendment is the big rock.

Mr. Cummings: How deep into the plan are we going?

Mr. McKenzie: That's the big unknown. Our preliminary systems impact analysis showed additional freeway widenings to eight or 10 lanes, at a cost of \$3 to \$4 billion. Nobody has that money. Also, if you do that kind of massive freeway widening, then all your land use assumptions change, all your environmental and sustainability assumptions change. It could be pretty fundamental.

Mr. Cummings: So we are looking at the possibility of a major re-write when we update our plan.

Mr. McKenzie: It depends on what assumptions will have to be re-evaluated. There will be different opinions about that.

Mr. Covington: Right now, we don't know what that plan amendment will look like. There are a lot of questions still to be answered. Council input will be crucial to this process. We want you to be engaged in every part of it.

Mr. Stair: When the cap was removed part of the idea was that the project was given the opportunity to go up to ten lanes, but it didn't specify that it would go to ten lanes. Am I correct that there is no further advisement from this Council as to the design details? For instance, where additional lanes would be added? Is that off the tables for RPAC?

Mr. Covington: I don't think we know enough about the anticipated plan amendment at this point to say one way or the other. It could be an amendment for a very specific project, or one that is more general. We don't know at this point.

Mr. McKenzie: Patrick, I think as a general rule, your statement is correct. The waiver could be for any number of lanes, although the alternatives being considered are for eight or ten lanes. The significant factor is the associated freeway widenings, and also the widening on the local street grid. Local environmental impacts and cost impacts will be significant.

Ms. Frasier: How do we convince our constituents that our vote on the RPAC makes a difference one way or the other? Our last vote was overwhelmingly in favor of denying the waiver, but the Board acted to grant the waiver. I have had people say to me, "They will do whatever they want."

Mr. McKenzie: This is the struggle that any advisory body has. As staff, we make our best professional recommendations to elected officials, and they do what they do. As citizens, we hold the elected officials accountable for their actions. In any federal

project of this scope, there is not a single decision. Everybody has ultimately - the MPO, the AHTD, Federal Highway Administration, the courts if it gets to that point - has at some point in the process be nodding their heads up and down at the same time, or else the project can't move forward.

All I can do is thank you for your service, know that I and staff value your input, and even when they disagree, I believe the elected officials also value your service.

Mr. Cummings: Let me speak to this. Those of us who have been involved in this since back in the ISTEA days, can look back at our history and acknowledge that we have made a difference. We have had an impact on how central Arkansas is developing. Do we always get what we want? No. We have lost a few fights, but have and continue to have a lasting impact on our region. I don't want anybody to get discouraged.

Mr. Larson: To be even more specific, this whole six-lane policy, the idea of holding freeways to six lanes and concentrating density in the urban core, came out of this Council. It went to the Board, and has gone back to the Board at every plan update. Each time, the Board has endorsed the policy. This time, it granted a waiver but didn't abolish the entire policy. We have a good track record.

5. Other Business

Ms. Dollar asked for input from the Council regarding social event next month. The RPAC has this on previous occasions. It is a good way to get to know your colleagues on the Council, and to decompress from the past few challenging months. Ms. Dollar indicated that if there is not much response from the Council, she will assume that there is no interest.

No other business was brought forward.

6. Next Meeting

The next meeting will be at 11:30 AM, on Wednesday, November 9th. Confirmation and meeting material will be sent at least one week prior to the date.

7. Adjourn

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

MOTION by Mr. Hunter, second by Mr. Hastings

"To adjourn."

Council adjourned at 1:19 PM