

HAMPTON ROADS
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION MEETING
APRIL 16, 2008

The Hampton Roads MPO Meeting was called to order at 10:55 a.m. at the Regional Boardroom, 723 Woodlake Drive, Chesapeake, Virginia, with the following in attendance:

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Paul D. Fraim, Chairman (NO) | Douglas L. Smith (PO)* |
| Bruce Goodson, Vice Chairman (JC) | Selena Cuffee-Glenn (SU) |
| James O. McReynolds, Treasurer (YK) | Louis R. Jones (VB) |
| Clifton E. Hayes, Jr. (CH) | Jackson C. Tuttle II (WM) |
| Randall L. Gilliland (HA) | Dennis Heuer (VDOT) |
| Stan D. Clark (IW)* | Michael Townes (HRT) |
| Joe S. Frank (NN) | Mark Rickards (WAT) |
| | Arthur L. Collins (HRPDC) |

OTHERS RECORDED ATTENDING:

William E. Harrell, Ella P. Ward (CH); Rowland L. Taylor (FR); Ross A. Kearney II, Jesse T. Wallace, Jr. (HA); W. Douglas Caskey (IW); Sanford B. Wanner (JC); Charles C. Allen, Randy W. Hildebrandt (NN); Barclay C. Winn (NO); Kenneth L. Chandler (PO); Michael W. Johnson (SH); Tyrone W. Franlin (SY); Harry E. Diezel, Robert M. Dyer, Barbara M. Henley, Meyera E. Oberndorf, James K. Spore (VB); Jeanne Zeidler (WM); Earl Sorey - Chesapeake; Keith Cannady, Elizabeth Kersey - Hampton; Beverly Walkup - Isle of Wight County; Jeff Raliski, Ron Williams - Norfolk; Paul Holt, Sherri Neil, Brian Swets - Portsmouth; Eric Nielsen, Joe Howell - Suffolk; Bob Matthias - Virginia Beach; John Gergely - Private Citizen; Jim Oliver - HRCCE; Karen McPherson - Kimley-Horn; Jim Ponticello, Chris Voigt, Eric Stringfield, Irene Shuman - VDOT; John Hadfield - SPSA; Ivan Rucker - FHWA; Joyce Heffington - HRSD; Michael Cline, Stewart Baker -VDEM; Ray Taylor, Vince Thomas - FHR; Pat Piras - HRT; Ron Hodges - HRT Traffix; David Hesson - Senior Services Southeastern Virginia; Donna Morris - HRP; Ellis W. James, Eileen Levandoski - Sierra Club Observer; Tom Holden - The Virginian-Pilot; Germaine Fleet - Biggs & Fleet; Staff: Jessica Banks, Sam Belfield, Shernita Bethea, John Carlock, Rick Case, Robert Case, James Clary, Nancy Collins, Dwight Farmer, Richard Flannery, Marla Frye, Greg Grootendorst, Frances Hughey, Rob Jacobs, Brett Kerns, Mike Kimbrel, Robert Lawrence, Mike Long, Keith Nichols, Joe Paulus, Kelli Peterson, Andy Pickard, Camelia Ravanbakht, Jennifer Tribo, Joe Turner, Chris Vaigneur and Eric Walberg.

CONSENT AGENDA

The Consent Agenda contained the following items:

Summary Minutes of March 19, 2008

FY 06-09 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment: Williamsburg (Final Approval)

FY 06-09 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment: Chesapeake

FY 06-09 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment: VDOT (20 Projects)

FY 06-09 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment: VDOT (4 Projects)

FY 06-09 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment: VDOT (1 Project)

FY 06-09 Transportation Improvement Program Revision: Request for Additional CMAQ Funding - Portsmouth

FY 06-09 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment: VDOT

FY 08 Unified Planning Work Program Amendment

Mayor Frank Moved to approve the Consent Agenda; seconded by Mr. McReynolds. The Motion Carried.

QUADRENNIAL CERTIFICATION REVIEW: STATUS REPORT

Mr. Collins stated that the review was performed in November 2007. The commendations, recommendations and corrective actions from Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) were received in February 2008. He added that some issues must be addressed by July 1st, while others can be accomplished after that date.

Mr. Collins stated that the MPO appreciated the acknowledgement of the commendations in the report. He then referred to the recommendations and corrective actions required prior to July 1, 2008.

The issue of separating the MPO's Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) document from the Commission's UPWP document has already been taken care of. A new "Master Agreement" between the MPO, state and transit operators is underway. The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) recommendation change is dependent upon assistance from the state. The citizen involvement portion of the recommendations will be taken care of as of July 1st with the institution of a citizen comment period at the beginning of each MPO meeting.

MPO members appointed a committee in February to work with staff regarding an advisory committee. Mr. Dwight Farmer from the PDC staff will be the committee liaison. The first meeting of that committee will be scheduled in early May.

Chairman Fraim listed the members of the committee: Mr. Smith, Mr. Gilliland, Mr. Hayes, Mr. Clark, Mr. McReynolds and Mr. Spore.

Mr. Gilliland asked if the work on the master agreement would go through the MPO committee.

Mr. Collins answered that would be one of their responsibilities. He added it would facilitate the discussion if it was done through a workshop since it involved legal discussions.

Chairman Fraim asked if any members of the MPO are interested in being involved in the discussions, they were welcome to be part of the committee.

Mr. Collins continued discussion regarding the corrective actions. He stated that the MPO will work with the state regarding the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). He continued to the issue of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) regarding the meetings. He suggested discussing the letter attached so the MPO members are comfortable with the letter that is sent to FHWA reflecting their views. The MPO has already committed to an advisory committee that will be FOIA compliant. He stated that the attorney for the MPO reviewed whether the Transportation Technical Committee (TTC) and the Chief Administrative Officers (CAO) committee are attached to the MPO in a way that would require them to adhere to FOIA. Mr. Peter Huber, the HRPDC attorney, drafted the letter and is present to answer any questions. Mr. Collins summarized that it is Mr. Huber's opinion that the CAOs and TTC do not fall under FOIA. These meetings will continue in the way they have in the past.

Mr. Smith stated that he sent an email to the MPO members with general and specific comments regarding the letter. He felt the MPO members should take a more active role in the response. He added that he believes a letter should be approved to meet the deadline, but as he stated in his email, he believed some revisions should be made prior to approval.

Discussion continued regarding specific language in the letter. He added that he believes the MPO should be as transparent as possible to avoid distrust from the public. He added that discussion needs to continue regarding the distinction between the MPO and the PDC, weighted voting and other issues.

Mr. Rucker stated that all the MPOs and MPO advisory committees in Virginia are open to the public with most of them offering a public comment period. The Hampton Roads MPO technical advisory committee is the only advisory committee in the state that is closed to the public. The position of the FHWA Virginia Division Administrator is that they will respect the position of the Assistant State Attorney General and VDOT special counsel. The division administrator's position is that an MPO and advisory committee are either a public body or regional public body and are subject to open meeting and notification requirements per state law and federal regulations.

Mr. Rucker stated it is his understanding that the conclusion of Mr. Huber's letter is based on the facts presented to him. He added that he assumed the facts were presented by Mr. Collins to the attorney. He stated that it was represented to him that the TTC was not created by a public body. However, when he reviewed the agreement between the MPO

and the Governor, it states that the MPO, a public body, established the technical advisory committee. He asked which one is fact.

Mr. Collins replied that the MPO did not establish the technical advisory committee. It was created by his request to the city managers and county administrators to appoint members of their staff to the committee.

Discussion continued regarding the listing of the CAOs as an advisory committee on the website and in the Long Range Transportation Plan. Mr. Rucker asked Mr. Collins whether the information presented to the attorney was that the technical committee was not created by a public body. He also asked if it was relayed to the attorney that the technical committee does not perform functions delegated to it by a public body and does not advise the public body.

Mr. Collins replied that was a fact.

Mr. Rucker stated the facts in the agreement between the MPO and the Governor state the MPO established a technical advisory committee to provide review and recommendations on items referred to it by the MPO. He asked which was true.

Mr. Collins replied that he told him the same thing last month.

Mr. Gilliland asked if the Transportation Technical Committee and the technical advisory committee referred to by Mr. Rucker are different entities. He then asked if they are different, is there a technical advisory committee or was it referred to in the document and never actually formed.

Mr. Collins answered that the characterization discussed last month in the Long Range Transportation Plan document was an error as indicated last month. An advisory committee is being established and authorized by the MPO and will be a public body. The current technical committee was set up by him and the city managers and county administrators which does not, in the opinion of the attorney, make it a public body.

Mr. Gilliland asked if the technical advisory committee referred to in the agreement between the MPO and the Governor was never formed.

Mr. Collins replied that was a fair statement.

Mr. Gilliland continued that at the end of Mr. Huber's letter it states that this was information provided by staff. He asked if any research was done regarding the 1996 agreement between the MPO and the Governor.

Mr. Collins replied that the attorney is aware of the facts of the situation since it rides on the idea of who appointed the technical committee. Since it was not appointed by the MPO, it is not a public body.

Mr. Gilliland stated he believes the MPO needs to be in alignment with the spirit of the law as well as the letter of the law. He added that the letter to the FHWA needs to say that the MPO intends to honor the spirit and the letter of the law when it comes to public

participation. He added that he would hope the letter would reflect that and that would satisfy the FHWA at least long enough for the study group to meet and come back with some specific recommendations for the MPO to consider.

Mr. Goodson added it was understandable why there was a misunderstanding regarding the CAO committee.

Mayor Frank noted that having public input at the appropriate time is important; however, a technical committee is composed of mid-tier staff, not policy makers. To expose them to a public hearing process would be unfair to them since their considerations relate to technical issues, not policy decisions.

He added that he would propose to have the FHWA regional director address a letter to the MPO chairman outlining the exact concerns and the factual basis for them which would allow the HRPDC attorneys to review them and provide advice to the members. Since attorneys can only provide opinions based on the facts presented to them, this would provide a more formal and clear process to work through the issues. He added it is also important to know what information was provided to the Assistant Attorney General.

Mr. Heuer noted that he believes it is important to look at what the organization's functions are. As part of the agenda, the MPO is asked to ratify the minutes of the Transportation Technical Committee. If they are not providing any benefit or advice to the MPO, it should not be necessary to consider their minutes. The purpose of the FHWA review of the MPO process is for improvement, to make the process better, more effective, transparent and more responsive to the needs of the area and the citizens.

Chairman Fraim commented that the MPO certainly wants to comply with the spirit of the law and stated that when the MPO creates the advisory committee, it will certainly be bound by all the FOIA requirements.

Mr. Heuer reminded the members that a very important piece that must be considered is the risk of federal dollars going to projects and the MPO.

Mr. Collins asked if the meeting is open to the public when the Commonwealth Transportation Board commissioners meet with their staff prior to a meeting. If the MPO must live by that sort of rule, then others should too.

Mr. Heuer asked if other MPOs have their PDC convene to ratify the actions of the MPO.

Mr. Rucker replied that the PDC and MPO are separate organizations.

Chairman Fraim explained that the letter stated that the PDC does not need to, it is just routine and is something that has been done for several decades.

Mr. Townes asked how the MPO members can come up with a letter to adopt within the time constraint since there is obviously significant discomfort around the table regarding approval of the letter as it reads. He added that since federal money is at risk, he would be irresponsible in ratifying the letter and is not willing to be a party of the process that puts a significant part of the region's federal transit money at risk.

Mr. Collins asked Mr. Rucker if he would be agreeable to allow the committee to meet, then get the advice of the MPO and have a July 1st deadline rather than May 1st.

Mr. Rucker agreed to look into it but could not provide an immediate response since it is the position of the FHWA Virginia Division Administrator that FHWA will respect the decision of the Assistant State Attorney General and VDOT counsel on this issue. He recommended that the MPO attorney meet with the Assistant Attorney General to come to a consensus as to what the technical advisory committee actually is.

Mr. Rucker then asked how the MPO functions without bylaws. Typically all the information would be laid out in bylaws which would be clear, transparent and comprehensive. Bylaws are important.

Mr. Heuer stated he would be willing to go with Mr. Rucker to meet with Mr. Fonseca-Martinez to ask for an extension.

Mr. Collins added if the extension was approved, the MPO committee could help redraft the letter and reconsider it in May.

Mr. Rucker then agreed to push the deadline to July 1st since he will probably be the one responding to the letter anyway.

Chairman Fraim summarized that the reply will be postponed and sent before July 1st which will give the committee time to review all the information. In the meantime, the MPO attorney will meet with the Assistant State Attorney General to determine the facts regarding the technical committee. Special meetings of the MPO will be called if necessary to insure compliance in order to have a letter that addresses all the issues.

Discussion was held regarding a committee to prepare the bylaws for the MPO. Mr. Gilliland suggested the bylaws be drafted through the MPO committee. Chairman Fraim agreed and stated that a few more members would be needed to serve on the committee.

Mr. Rucker stated FHWA was allowing the MPO until May 2009 to address the issue of bylaws. The corrective actions that are identified are time sensitive.

(Mr. Winn departed.)

Mr. Townes volunteered to participate in the MPO committee meetings.

Chairman Fraim reminded everyone that the MPO has no staff and that the HRPDC staff will be relied on for help with the MPO committee meetings.

Mr. Goodson Moved to postpone approval of the reply letter to FHWA until the June MPO meeting; seconded by Mr. McReynolds. The Motion Carried.

AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY ANALYSIS - DRAFT FY2009-2012 TIP PROJECT LIST

Chairman Fraim introduced Chris Voigt with VDOT to present the report.

(Mr. Clark departed.)

Mr. Voigt stated his presentation includes the results of the analysis and update in the schedule to get the conformity finding and recommendation for approval. He displayed the criteria specified in the federal conformity rules that were addressed in the analysis. A slide showing the emission tests for NO_x (nitrogen oxide) and VOC (volatile organic compounds) was displayed. The emissions forecasts are less than the limits for both NO_x and VOC for all years.

He added that the analysis was completed early so the federal conformity finding will be finished in July. He concluded by asking the MPO members to approve the draft conformity analysis and finding for public review and comment. If there are adverse comments from the two-week public review period, they will be brought before the Transportation Technical Committee in May. Otherwise, final approval will be brought before the MPO in May.

Vice Chairman Goodson Moved to approve the draft conformity analysis and finding for public review and comment; seconded by Mr. Jones. The Motion Carried.

OYSTER POINT TRANSPORTATION STUDY FINAL DRAFT REPORT

Chairman Fraim introduced Mr. Dwight Farmer, Deputy Executive Director, Transportation, to present this report.

Mr. Farmer stated that the city of Newport News requested the PDC staff to conduct a traffic management study for Oyster Point City Center which is a high growth area.

The study components include everything from the basic land use data congestion mitigation strategies to the traditional traffic analysis and projects into the future to the year 2030, the horizon year in the Long Range Plan.

Mr. Farmer reviewed a summary of changes in population, the number of households as well as employment from the year 2000 to 2030. He stated the growth in Newport News is going quite well at about 30 percent for the three attributes. When looking at the study area, the growth rate is significant, 150 percent for population and households and nearly 80 percent for employment which presents a traffic challenge.

Congestion mitigation strategies covered transit capital improvements, public transit operational improvements and bicycle and pedestrian facilities. He displayed a map depicting the proposed Peninsula Rapid Transit project. The study also included recommendations for bike and pedestrian facilities. Traffic initiatives, such as telecommuting, flextime, vanpools, etc., have also been included in the study.

Mr. Farmer then reviewed a chart outlining intersections that are at or near capacity during the morning and afternoon hours. The PDC staff has worked with Newport News staff to optimize current traffic signal plans to help improve the traffic situation at a very low cost.

He reviewed future alternatives that staff recommended. These include a "no build" consideration, the extension of Middle Ground Boulevard from Jefferson Avenue to

Warwick Boulevard or the extension of Middle Ground Boulevard from Jefferson Avenue to Warwick Boulevard and an I-64 partial interchange.

Mr. Farmer displayed a chart showing 2030 intersection analysis results for the morning peak hour and afternoon peak hour. Four columns are displayed showing the delays for the existing optimized intersections as well as the results for the three alternatives.

It is obvious when reviewing the data that Alternative A is not recommended which results in the highest intersection delays. Alternative C is not recommended because from a traffic engineering perspective, the extra money spent is not worth the benefits. Alternative B is recommended because it provides the most benefit.

Mr. Farmer added that staff also looked at some low-cost enhancements that can achieve some significant improvements in the level of service. Those enhancements include turn bay extensions, addition of turn lanes, channelization and reoptimized signal timings. He displayed some graphs outlining in more detail the benefits that can be achieved from Alternative B in 2030 to the affected intersections.

Mr. Farmer concluded by asking the MPO to approve the report for formal distribution.

Mayor Frank Moved to approve the report for formal distribution; seconded by Mr. Gilliland. The Motion Carried.

DRAFT PUBLIC TRANSIT - HUMAN SERVICES TRANSPORTATION COORDINATED PLAN

The Chairman introduced Ms. Patrisha Piras of HRT to present this report.

(Mayor Oberndorf departed.)

Ms. Piras stated this has been a year and a half effort by Williamsburg Area Transport (WAT), HRPDC and Hampton Roads Transit (HRT) to derive projects from a locally developed coordinated public transit-human services transportation plan as outlined in SAFETEA-LU. The Section 5310 program has been in existence for some time and is capital money for nonprofit organizations for seniors and people with disabilities. The Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) program used to be earmarked but is now a formula program, and the New Freedom Program is for services to people with disabilities that are both new and beyond the Americans with Disabilities Act.

HRT is the designated recipient for the Virginia Beach urbanized area which includes all of the HRT service area, the nonurbanized areas of the region and Williamsburg. The state, through Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT), is the designated recipient for the nonurbanized areas such as Isle of Wight and for the 5310 money which is a statewide formula.

The Coordinated Plan must include an assessment of existing services, providers and users; assessment of current gaps and needs; and strategies and/or activities to address gaps and achieve efficiencies.

(Mr. Smith departed.)

Ms. Piras displayed a summary of money that has been made available under the JARC and New Freedom Programs to the urbanized area. The total is just under \$1 million a year.

There has been an extensive stakeholder outreach and public involvement process. A mailing list was compiled with over 150 organizations; an online survey with a response from 39 agencies; three rounds of regional meetings in a year's time conducted in Hampton, Norfolk and Williamsburg; newspaper ads asking for public comment and a dedicated phone line, email address and website.

Ms. Piras displayed a list of key strategies and types of projects identified for the Hampton Roads area. Any application for a project requesting funds under JARC, New Freedom or 5310 must be able to point to one of the strategies or types of projects listed in order to receive funding through the SAFETEA-LU structure. Capital projects are being emphasized for the first couple of years since it is unknown what will happen with JARC and New Freedom with reauthorization after September 2009.

The plan is scheduled for endorsement and approval through the end of April. It has been endorsed by WAT, recommended for endorsement by the TTC, and the HRT Commission will be asked for approval on April 24th. The first year of funding must be obligated by September 30th. Applications will be due by May 13th for the first round and a second round of applications and selections will likely occur by November.

She concluded by offering to answer questions and asking for the MPO's endorsement of the Coordinated Plan.

Mr. Rickards Moved to endorse the Hampton Roads Area Coordinated Plan; seconded by Mr. Townes. The Motion Carried.

HURRICANE EVACUATION STUDY

Chairman Fraim introduced Mr. Michael Cline with Virginia Department of Emergency Management.

Mr. Cline introduced Mr. Stewart Baker to present the recent hurricane evacuation study information.

Mr. Baker stated that he would present an interim update for the 11 Hampton Roads jurisdictions listed. The study process was purposely broken into various phases so the updated data could be distributed to the jurisdictions for utilization and acquisition into their plans for the upcoming hurricane season.

Maps of the surge inundation areas of the current study were compared with the previous 1992 study. The new data allows for an increase in sea level of approximately one foot from the information previously used. Also, the surge inundation limits utilize a high tide feature rather than the mean tide feature previously used. With the extensive amount of impact areas, significant numbers of people are impacted by this.

Mr. Baker reviewed a graph depicting the number of people subject to evacuation or relocation based on the storm surge category. He also reviewed a map of the area with three key areas marked. He stated that the Bowers Hill area is a significant bottleneck area for a major evacuation in the Hampton Roads region. The map also earmarks the area of Hampton Roads that would utilize the reverse lane evacuation on I-64 if that alternative is implemented by the Governor. He further reviewed that in a Category 1 hurricane, it is estimated that 90,000-110,000 people would be leaving the region. The number increases to 260,000-290,000 people in a Category 2 storm. The numbers increase to close to 900,000 for a catastrophic event. The remaining Hampton Roads population will stay in region and seek refuge in available facilities.

Mr. Baker then compared minimum clearance times from the 1992 study to the current study with and without lane reversal. The figures represent the clearance times from the initial start of evacuation to the last vehicle leaving from the Hampton Roads Bridge Tunnel to the Richmond I-295 interchange. He added that the clearance times are estimated without the impact of any traffic incidents. A parallel study is ongoing and VMASC is developing a model and simulation that will allow estimates for the impact of traffic incidents.

When looking at the clearance times, the local emergency management community felt that a significant number of people would choose not to evacuate which creates more issues that must be addressed within the region. He then reviewed a chart depicting the projected out of region public shelter needs for those who do evacuate. In the previous 1992 study, the need for inland sheltering was not considered significant until the storm reached a Category 3 level.

(Mr. Dyer departed.)

Fifty-six facilities have been identified as available shelters that are outside the storm surge zone and can be utilized in all events. The state is diligently working with localities to consider other facilities for shelters or refuges of last resort. An additional 95 facilities are still being considered as options to reduce the number of people who would need to leave the area. Mr. Baker added that he asked localities a couple months ago for identified refuges of last resort. The localities are working diligently with VDEM in identifying additional facilities to help house the Hampton Roads community.

He explained that a shelter is a facility with full services such as cots, blankets, food services, medical services, sanitary services and security. A refuge of last resort is a facility offering only sanitary facilities and security. Local shelters and refuges of last resort can increase in the region through more cooperative memorandums of understanding between the localities.

Mr. Baker concluded and offered to return to provide further updates as they become available. He offered to answer questions.

(Mr. Caskey and Ms. Henley departed.)

Discussion continued. It was explained that the reverse lanes will be utilized by Southside residents and the traditional I-64 west lanes will be utilized by the Peninsula residents.

Mayor Frank asked Mr. Baker if he had a sense of the number of days prior to the actual event that the Governor might announce a mandatory evacuation.

(Mr. Chandler departed.)

Mr. Baker answered that a state exercise plan is scheduled for May 2nd with a number of jurisdictions involved to help define the outward timeline prior to the start of the 2008 hurricane season. Many factors are involved when trying to specifically answer that question.

Mayor Frank voiced his concerns about falling trees and signs on the interstate during strong winds and suggested that those issues be discussed. He added that it is important to focus on finding state and federal funding to assist localities in building hardened shelters to house those who cannot evacuate or stay in their homes.

(Mr. Franklin departed.)

Mr. Baker stated that VDEM is working with VDOT, Virginia State Police and the National Guard to completely revamp the hurricane evacuation traffic control plan. This year's plan will not just be a Hampton Roads plan; it will be a statewide plan.

Mayor Frank asked if financial considerations have been made for people who cannot get into a governmentally controlled shelter due to lack of space.

Mr. Baker replied that each locality is trying to identify the population with no transportation so possible assistance can be provided. He added if a state provided shelter is full, then the state would have an obligation to try to find safe shelter for people during the peak of the storm.

Chairman Fraim asked whose responsibility it is for positioning tow trucks on I-64 to address the issue of accident clearing.

Mr. Baker answered that issue is being addressed under contract by VDOT for tow trucks, water and sanitary facilities that will be placed at designated locations along I-64 as well as services on Route 58 at the weigh station.

Another question was asked regarding ambulance service for emergencies that might arise. Mr. Baker stated that the traffic control gates on the ramps will be manned to allow access for emergency vehicles. In addition, the state has been working closely with other communities to provide task forces during a major evacuation to respond primarily to events on the interstate.

Mayor Kearney commented that he and Mr. Wallace attended the National Inner City Conference in New Orleans where they spoke with the mayor and his staff regarding disaster preparedness. The bottom line is a person must be able to take care of himself for at least ten days.

FOR YOUR INFORMATION

The Chairman asked for questions or comments regarding the informational items. None were noted.

Vice Chairman Goodson commented that he had asked staff for a quick presentation regarding the process to follow if members wish to revisit the 2030 Long Range Plan to review the projects that were passed approximately ten years ago.

Chairman Fraim stated that the response is in Old/New Business. He then asked if a formal presentation is desired at the next meeting.

Mr. Gilliland replied that he would like a presentation at the next meeting so members will know the process to follow.

Chairman Fraim assured the members it would be in the agenda for the next meeting.

OLD/NEW BUSINESS

Chairman Fraim asked if there was any old or new business for the MPO.

No further old or new business was brought before the MPO.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to come before the Hampton Roads MPO, the meeting adjourned at 12:40 p.m.