# Regional Planning Advisory Council

Thursday, September 12, 2013

## **Minutes**

# **RPAC Members Attending:**

Sam Chaffin City of Benton
 Charles Cummings Freight & Trucking

Gary DalPorto (nonvoting) Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
 Julianne Dunn Clinton School of Public Service (UACS)

5. Tom Easterly Saline County

6. Coreen Frasier Bicycle Advocacy of Central Arkansas (BACA)

7. Dave Green City of Bryant
8. Sybil Hampton City of Little Rock
9. Bob Hardin City of North Little Rock

10. Scott Hunter Faulkner County

11. Todd Larson City of North Little Rock

12. Matthew Long Central Arkansas Transit Authority (CATA)

13. Tim Ragsdale Disabilities Community14. Dan Roda City of Little Rock

15. Kim Romano Arkansas State Highway & Transportation Dept. (AHTD)

16. Regina Taylor Youth Outreach17. Mary Louise Williams Pulaski County

# Metroplan Staff, Consultants, and Guests Attending:

1. Lynn Bell Graphics Specialist

2. David Blick HUD

3. Casey Covington4. Nelson GaleanoCARTS Planning DirectorTransportation Engineer

5. Daniel Holland Planner

6. Lindsay Puckett Gresham Smith & Partners (GS&P)

7. Richard Magee Deputy Director

8. Susan Markman
7. Jim McKenzie
10. Brian Mitchell
Transportation Planner
Executive Director
Research Planner

11. Kevin Tilbury GS&P

12. Judy Watts Outreach Coordinator

#### 1. Call to Order

RPAC Chairman Charles Cummings called the meeting to order at 12:00 noon.

#### 2. Minutes of Previous Meeting

The Council considered the Minutes of August 22<sup>nd</sup>. One correction was noted.

**MOTION** by Ms. Sybil Hampton, second by Ms. Scott Hunter "To accept the Minutes of July 30, 2013, as corrected to include Mr. Easterly as an attendee."

**PASSED** 

#### 3. Questions/comments on active items:

Before updating the Council on *Imagine Central Arkansas* items, Mr. Covington announced that a study is underway to assess the feasibility of establishing express bus service between Conway and Little Rock. Participants include the cities of Conway and North Little Rock, Pulaski County, Faulkner county, CATA and Metroplan. GS&P is the consultant firm. A public survey is available online, and all are encouraged to take the survey. Mr. Hunter expressed pleasure in the study, and said he would spread the information among his associates and friends in Faulkner County.

Mr. Tilbury then briefly reported on the following active items.

#### a. Are We There Yet? Results

Mr. Tilbury the information that has been obtained thus far from the online survey.

There was some discussion as to the value of the survey. Mr. Roda noted that the respondents are self-selected and more apt to be better informed on transportation and land use issues.

Mr. Hunter stated that tracking by county may not yield useful information. He pointed out that people who live in Conway may not share the same opinions or experiences as people who live out in the more rural areas of the county. Dr. Hampton said that she would like to see a profile of the respondents. Others agreed and suggested that a tracking element, such as requiring a zip code, be added. Mr. Tilbury agreed but reminded the group that many people are cautious about giving out personal information online.

Mr. McKenzie suggested that the value of this online survey is that the self-selected responses may be encouraging enough to justify paying for a statistically viable random sample of central Arkansans.

## b. Draft project list

The projects on the draft list had their genesis in the METRO 2030 and 2030.2 plans. In those planning efforts, projects were vetted against the adopted vision and goals and placed on either the constrained list—meaning that there is reasonable expectation to pay for the project within the plan period—or on the vision element of the plan. The significance of the list is that projects selected for funding and implementation in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) are selected from the long-range plan.

#### c. Draft project scoring results

Along with the other items, the RPAC has previously reviewed the draft project scoring.

Mr. DalPorto asked how the total project scores will be used. Mr. Tilbury explained that the score are only one factor to be considered in prioritizing projects.

Dr. Hampton suggested that another factor that should be considered is that of collaboration among jurisdictions, between the public and private sectors, and between public decision-makers and affected citizenry.

After additional discussion, Mr. Cummings stated that the RPAC would take up this issue at its next meeting. There was general agreement.

# 4. Trend vs. Vision Scenario (draft) results

Mr. Tilbury presented a detailed overview of growth scenarios, including the emerging trend (not the same as the existing pattern of development) and the Vision scenario. Staff reminded the RPAC that the PowerPoint will be posted on the RPAC website.

Mr. Covington presented travel demand model information on work that has been completed in-house. There was discussion regarding possible outcomes of the model scenarios. The Council requested additional information and guidance relating to parking and transportation modes.

#### 5. Ten Year and Long Term Project Lists

Consultants presented the overall approach that is being used in developing these lists. The financially constrained plan will come from projects included in the TIP, CAP and Bond programs as well as completing the rail grade separation projects. Remaining funds would be used to maintain the current CATA system and on maintenance of the existing roadway network. All new capacity must come from new revenue. Mr. Magee added that this is a directional change from previous plans.

**MOTION** by Mr. Roda, second by Mr. Hunter "To approve the tier approach as described." **PASSED** 

#### 6. Regional Forum

After receiving guidance at the previous meeting, adjustments were made to the concept of a regional forum. The tentative date of the forum is set for November 14<sup>th</sup>. A proposed agenda and facilitated discussion component were presented and discussed. The general feeling was the proposed time was better than previously proposed but would still inconvenience either the public or the business attendees. There were suggestions and questions

regarding group facilitation. Ms. Dunn offered her expertise in facilitating the group discussion.

# 7. Next Steps

The next RPAC meeting is set for 12:00 noon, Thursday, October 3<sup>rd</sup>. Lunch will be available at 11:30. Additional information will be sent out prior to the meeting.

# 8. Adjourn

With no further business brought forward, the Council adjourned at about 1:30 p.m.

