

Wednesday, December 10, 2008

MINUTES

Westside/Central Service Sector
Governance Council

Regular Meeting

325 South La Cienega Boulevard
Beverly Hills, California 90211

Called to Order at 5:00 P.M.

Council Members Present:

Glenn Rosten, Chair
Art Ida, Vice Chair
Catherine Bator
Peter Capone-Newton
Terri Slimmer
Joe Stitcher
Jerard Wright

Officers:

Mark Maloney, General Manager
William Walker, Council Secretary

1. RECEIVED Public Comment for items not on the Agenda.

Ken Ruben, Southern California Transit Advocates (SoCaTA) – Said he and Dana Gabbard attended the Wilshire Bus Rapid Transit public hearing in November. He said that SoCaTA supported that concept. He thanked the Westside Central Service Sector Governance Council for putting up with him over the past year. He said that his friend Jerry Brown opposes the TAP Card program because they are stupid and add unnecessary complication to already complicated lives. Mr. Brown also does not support the gating of the Metro Rail system and says the proposed changes to Line 33 and 333 are stupid. Mr. Ruben also said that the TAP Card is not programmed for regional transfers, but it should be.

Joan Taylor – Asked General Manager Mark Maloney to discipline an operator driving a Line 780 bus southbound on Fairfax Avenue at Beverly Boulevard at 4:32pm, December 10, 2008, for refusing to lower the wheelchair access ramp for her to board the bus. She also said that she would like the Council to review the changes made by the Metro Board to the Metro Immediate Needs Program.

2. CARRIED OVER approval of Minutes from the November 12, 2008 regular meeting.

3. RECEIVED report from council members on their line rides.

Representative Slimmer – Said Line 704 eastbound buses are not dropping passengers in front of the Vermont/Santa Monica Red Line Station; bus 9280, dropped passengers farside on December 9, at 12:22pm. On Tuesday, December 9, the 3:35pm bus also dropped passengers on the farside.

Representative Bator – Said she rode Lines 2, 4/704, 20/720, 105, and 217, but only encountered a Metro “How Are We Doing?” car card once. She also noticed that there are no car cards at all, often on Lines 4 and 704. Mr. Maloney said that he will investigate whether the Sector is short on “How Are We Doing?” cards. As for blank spaces, the spaces are sold to advertisers. Spaces left open for Metro campaigns are used for public information campaigns. The same holds true for how time on TransitTV is allocated.

Representative Bator suggested printing the telephone number in a larger font and possibly eliminating pictures from the car card. Mrs. Jody Feerst Litvak (Communications Manager, Operations) agreed to research how much

funding is available for printing additional car cards. She also said she would give an update on the Sector Marketing campaigns at the January meeting.

Representative Bator said the referral number on the “How Are We Doing?” telephone line forwards callers to human resources rather than customer service. Executive Secretary Suzanne Handler agreed to rectify this situation.

Representative Bator said she wants to know what the policy is regarding merging Rapid and Local stop locations. Mr. Maloney said the Stops and Zones department is reviewing requests from the Council to merge rapid and local stops on a case-by-case basis and that information presented at the Governance Council meetings is now being applied to the stop locations suggested by Council Representatives to be merged.

Representative Rosten suggested referring “How Are We Doing?” callers to a live person for all calls rather than highlighting complaint calls that might need a live person. He also complimented the public pay-per-use toilet adjacent to Vermont/Santa Monica Station. Mr. Maloney said the toilets were a service of the City of Los Angeles and that many of the same types of toilets had been removed from locations in San Francisco for attracting unlawful behavior.

Representative Rosten suggested maximizing the use of Metro display cases adjacent to major trip generators for as much transit information as possible rather than “Go Metro!” campaigns. He mentioned using buses for “Go Metro!” campaigns made more sense since they are always moving and visible to potential new riders.

4. RECEIVED General Manager Report, Mark Maloney, General Manager

Key Performance Indicators – October 2008

- Mean Miles between Mechanical Failures have improved to 3,269 miles.
- On-time performance increased by one percentage point over September.
- Accidents are at 4.12 per 100,000 hub miles, slightly above the 4.0 target.
- Complaints per 100,000 boardings continued to increase in October.
- Workers Compensation claims are down to 10.5, much better than the agency average and the Sector target.

Board Report

- Metro announced that Measure R passed and that sales tax revenue would be a welcome addition to operating revenue that will help the agency.
- The Metro Board also implemented a hiring freeze.

5. DISCUSSED Council Agenda and Meeting Format

Council Representatives were requested to submit ideas to Mr. Maloney on the Council Agenda and Meeting Format and he agreed to compile the list and distribute it to all Council Members.

6. RECEIVED Update on Wilshire Bus Rapid Transit, Rex Gephart, Director Countywide Planning and Development, and Jody Feerst Litvak, Community Relations Manager, Operations

Objective for the Wilshire Boulevard Bus Rapid Transit (Wilshire BRT) Project:

Reduce bus transit travel times along a 12.5 mile segment of Wilshire Boulevard, a key east-west corridor connecting Santa Monica, Westwood, Beverly Hills, Mid-Wilshire and Downtown Los Angeles, by improving the street infrastructure and implementing weekday, peak period, curbside bus lanes.

Facts:

- Wilshire Boulevard is the highest bus ridership corridor in the United States with a combined ridership of 93,000 passengers.
- Average bus speeds have declined each year over the past 20 years throughout Los Angeles County – the impetus for the Metro Rapid program.
- Traffic congestion within transit corridors is a primary factor of longer average travel time for buses and traffic in general.

Wilshire BRT Project Overview

- The study area extends along Wilshire Boulevard from Valencia (just west of the 110 Freeway) to Centinela (the Santa Monica City Line). It does not include the portions of Wilshire in the Cities of Beverly Hills and Santa Monica.
- The project received the highest ranking for funding by the Very Small Starts grant program administered by the Federal Transit Administration.
- The Initial Study/Environmental Assessment began in September 2008.
- The project, as proposed, would consist of weekday, peak period, curbside bus lanes for two hours in the morning and three hours in the afternoon, in both directions of Wilshire Boulevard with right turn permissions at all times and open to all vehicles during off peak.

- Wilshire Boulevard curbside lanes within the project area will be repaved at certain locations.
- A portion of Wilshire Boulevard, between Federal Avenue and Interstate 405, will be widened and reconfigured to accommodate an additional east bound lane to ease freeway access and to extend a left turn pocket for traffic turning left from eastbound Wilshire Boulevard onto northbound Sepulveda Boulevard.
- Traffic signals will be timed along the corridor to move more vehicles per hour and improve bus signal priority for Metro Rapid buses in the Wilshire Boulevard Corridor.
- Parking impacts overall will be minimized.

Funding Partners

Federal Transit Administration (FTA) (74 percent share)

City of Los Angeles (10 percent share)

Metro (16 percent share)

Total Funds: \$31.5 million

Definition of BRT

Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) is a federal program developed in 1999. The FTA requested proposals from cities and transit operators that would help define what BRT would become throughout the United States. Metro submitted a proposal for a BRT project that included most elements of bus rapid transit except for exclusive bus lanes and off-vehicle fare payment, in order to implement a network on a short timeline. For that reason, FTA initially designated Metro's BRT project as second tier rather than first tier project. With the success of the Metro Rapid Program, however, FTA has since reclassified the Metro Rapid Program as a first tier project.

Elements of BRT

Existing Metro Rapid service appears in bold type face below

- **High capacity buses**
- **Branded buses and stations**
- **Bus signal priority**
- **Frequent service**
- **Headway-based schedules**
- **Simple route alignment**
- **Less frequent stops**
- **Integration with local bus service**
- **Level boarding and alighting**
- Exclusive bus only lanes (currently proposed)
- Off-vehicle fare payment (not considered in this or previous proposals)

Environmental Analysis Process

The Wilshire BRT project is currently undergoing an initial study/ environmental assessment to assess the feasibility of operating bus rapid transit in exclusive bus lanes in both the City and County of Los Angeles portions of Wilshire Boulevard. Next steps include evaluating how the project might impact traffic, parking, air quality, noise, historic resources, parklands, and cultural resources within the project area. Environmental justice concerns are also considered.

Segment-by-Segment Project Description

The project, beginning at the east end of the corridor:

Valencia to Western (2.5 miles)

- Existing curb lanes converted to peak period bus lanes

Western to Fairfax (2.8 miles)

- Repaving and reconstructing curb lanes
- Existing curb lanes converted to peak period bus lanes
- Eliminate 11 parking spaces

Fairfax to Beverly Hills city limit (0.6 miles)

- Existing curb lanes converted to peak period bus lanes

Beverly Hills (2.9 miles)

Not included in the project at this time.

Beverly Hills city limit to Comstock (0.5 mile)

- Existing curb lanes converted to peak period bus lanes

Comstock to Glendon (1.2 miles)

- Remove jutouts from curb lane and realign curb lane
- Add peak period bus lanes

Glendon to Sepulveda (0.4 miles)

- Existing curb lanes converted to peak period bus lanes

Sepulveda to Federal (0.8 miles)

- Remove 5 feet of sidewalk on the southern side (eastbound direction).
- Restripe eastbound and westbound lanes.
- Extend eastbound turn pocket 600 feet for traffic turning from Wilshire onto Sepulveda.

- Add peak period bus lane in eastbound direction only.

Federal to Barrington (0.1 miles)

- Widen both sides of Wilshire Boulevard by removing 5 feet of sidewalk
- Add bus lane

Barrington to Centinela (0.8 miles)

- Reinstate curbside peak period bus only lanes

Traffic studies are being performed on intersections within and surrounding the Wilshire Boulevard corridor to ensure that the new lanes do not negatively impact other intersections.

Project Goals

- Improve bus passenger travel times by 25 percent
 - * existing Metro Rapid service on Wilshire Boulevard has already improved passenger travel times by 29 percent, although bus speeds are declining.*
- Bus Service Reliability – allows buses to consistently move with improved speeds through congested areas
- Improve traffic flow along Wilshire Boulevard – improve traffic signal timing along Wilshire Boulevard to maximize travel time savings
- Repave curb lanes along damaged portions of Wilshire Boulevard
- Encourage shift from automobile use to transit – ridership increased by 30,000 passengers with initial Metro Rapid implementation on Wilshire Boulevard because service was significantly faster. Improving speed and reliability further could potentially shift single occupancy drivers to transit by 10 percent according to the City of Los Angeles
- Improve air quality
- Minimize impacts to existing parking

Outreach

- Four community meetings were held between November 12 and 19. About 141 people participated and 60 members of the public commented on the proposal.
- Two-thirds supported Wilshire BRT as proposed.
- One-third opposed Wilshire BRT as proposed.
- Written public comment will be accepted through December 12, 2008.

Timeline

- The next cycle of public meetings begins in March 2009.
- Technical studies on noise, architecture, archaeology, traffic congestion and parking are now in progress.
- A draft initial study/environmental analysis will be available for public

review in March 2009.

- The Metro Board will consider approving the Study in June; FTA approval would be sought in July.
- If approved, construction would begin in October 2009. Agencies collaborating on construction include the City of Los Angeles Bureau of Street Services, Bureau of Engineering, Department of Transportation and the County of Los Angeles.

RECEIVED Public Comment regarding Update on Wilshire BRT:

Sandy Brown – Said that the presentation from Mr. Gephart and Ms. Litvak failed to mention a multitude of problems with the Wilshire BRT project, including the fact that people in the Westwood neighborhood do not want the project. She said that three homeowner associations representing one-third of Westwood households object. She added that the project increases bus speeds at the expense of traffic speeds, especially within the Comstock-to-Glendon segment and along north-south corridors crossing Wilshire Boulevard. She added that the only BRT stop within the Westwood neighborhood other than Westwood Boulevard is at Beverly Glen Boulevard. The Beverly Glen Boulevard stop does not have connecting crosstown service forcing residents to walk great distances to their homes or transfer to connecting service at Westwood Boulevard. She said the project does not solve any problems for the Westwood area and suggested that Metro perform another environmental impact review of the project as currently proposed. She submitted a copy of her comments for the meeting file. Mr. Rosten asked that the comments be included as part of the meeting minutes.

Ken Ruben – Said that Southern California Transit Advocates supports Wilshire BRT as proposed, but suggested that more local service be added on Line 20 along Wilshire Boulevard. He added that the NextBus display at La Brea indicates when Rapid Express 920 arrives even though it does not stop there, confusing waiting passengers. Supports improving service and exclusive bus lanes.

Jerry Brown – Said that condominium owners along Wilshire Boulevard in Westwood and Holmby Hills did not receive notices regarding public meetings for the Wilshire BRT project. He asked why the curb jutouts along the Comstock-to-Glendon portion were considered for removal when in a past environmental review of the Wilshire BRT project the jutouts were not proposed to be removed because traffic flows at the highest speeds in this portion. He suggested the proposal to remove the jutouts would justify

payment for the full Wilshire BRT project. He queried why the extension of the left turn lane pocket at Sepulveda Boulevard could not be implemented in the first phase of the project considering it is the simplest component of the Wilshire BRT project that would not need an environmental review process nor federal funds. He concluded that \$5.6 million to remove jutouts would be a waste of money.

RECEIVED QUESTIONS regarding Update on Wilshire BRT:

Representative Rosten asked what role the 2002 Wilshire BRT environmental review process would have on the current project and whether it would be considered. Mr. Gephart said the project in 2002 was very different than the one proposed. The 2002 project proposed park/ride lots; traffic conditions were different then; and the project did not anticipate receiving federal funds meaning the federal environmental review process was not required. The 2002 project also added buses, new stop locations and a center bus lane concept with 24-hour service. None of these components are part of the new project. Representative Rosten requested a copy of the 2002 Wilshire BRT environmental impact report to be distributed to Council Representatives.

Representative Rosten asked for clarification on where new lanes would be added to Wilshire Boulevard. Mr. Gephart and Ms. Litvak confirmed that the segments where a lane would be added are (1) the portion between Comstock and Glendon where “jutouts” would be removed, (2) between Federal and Sepulveda where five feet of sidewalk will be removed, and (3) between Federal and Bonsall where the median of Wilshire Boulevard will be shifted north. The eastbound left turn pocket at Sepulveda will also be extended 600 feet to the west, alleviating traffic congestion that prevents through traffic from moving where Wilshire Boulevard intersects Sepulveda Boulevard, just below Interstate 405.

Representative Rosten asked about noticing requirements for the project. Mr. Gephart said a consultant was hired to distribute notices within the project area. Ms. Litvak agreed to research how notices were distributed and report back to the Council at the January meeting.

Representative Rosten asked how buses will pass in the bus lanes without impacting other lanes of traffic. Mr. Gephart said this was a concern with the demonstration bus lane implemented on Wilshire Boulevard between Centinela and Federal. He said both Metro Local and Rapid services operated faster in that lane as did other traffic. He said once peak period bus lanes are reintroduced on Wilshire Boulevard, rapid buses will be encouraged to use the curb lane, a practice that is not necessarily the case currently.

Representative Rosten asked if bicycles would be permitted to use the lanes. Mr. Gephart responded affirmatively that bicycles would use the lane per City of Los Angeles policy that mandates bicycles to be permitted in bus only lanes.

Representative Slimmer said that adding the possibility of a full environmental impact review process to the timeline presented by Mr. Gephart and Ms. Litvak might help calm the perception that the project has been approved without a due process for the public to voice their concerns relating to the project. She added that removing portions of the sidewalk, although consistent with the predominant widths of the sidewalk along the corridor, are not consistent with Metro's transportation design management group and might impact sidewalk users – pedestrians, bicyclists, and storefronts – especially if jutouts at pedestrian generators (i.e. crosswalks) are removed.

Representative Wright suggested moving all bus lane stops for rapid and local service farside, which would permit buses to merge in and out of the exclusive lane with ease. Mr. Gephart said that Representative Wright's suggestion is already Metro policy and that the agency continues to retrofit the existing system to comply with that standard.

Representative Wright asked why right turn movements are not restricted in the proposal considering right turns will slow down operation of the exclusive bus-only lane. Mr. Gephart said that allowing right turns before pedestrians crossing might alleviate the delays caused by vehicles in the bus-only lane turning right.

Representative Stitcher asked if Metro has quantified the operational dollars saved by implementing the bus-only lane without the need for adding additional service and also reducing travel time by 25 percent. He added that placing a dollar amount on the operational savings could demonstrate a capital project with direct operating savings attached. He also suggested itemizing how that revenue could be reallocated. Mr. Gephart agreed that quantifying the savings would be a great idea. He added that the Wilshire Boulevard corridor operates the highest number of buses in a corridor (120 buses) and has the highest ridership (93,000 riders) in the United States. Since implemented, Metro Rapid service on Wilshire Boulevard has operating speeds that are 29 percent faster than local service. With exclusive bus-only lanes, Rapid service running time could improve an additional 25 percent.

Representative Rosten asked if congestion will decrease due to a shift from

single occupant drivers to bus rapid transit. Mr. Gephart said that the environmental assessment in progress is evaluating 74 intersections and data from that will help Metro determine where car trips impacted by the bus-only lanes will go. Some drivers will switch to riding buses and some might drive alternative routes, such as Sunset or Olympic Boulevards. The environmental assessment will observe whether those 74 intersections will be impacted with more traffic congestion.

Representative Capone Newton asked that the amount of sidewalk removed, and its impact on pedestrian movement be quantified and presented at a future meeting. He also asked whether an actual physical approach or mechanism to operating three different tiers of service as well as the possibility of further bus bunching in an exclusive lane operation has been considered under this proposal. Mr. Maloney responded that Council Representatives will be the final arbiters once the exclusive bus-only lanes are in operation, deciding relevant service changes, frequency of services, assignment of lines to stops, and if necessary, removal of service. Representative Capone Newton said that design elements could be considered for the bus-only lanes – such as striped areas allowing buses to pass at intersections, bus-only signals, bus-signal priority mechanisms – that could facilitate operating the different tiers of service more efficiently that would not be incorporated if not planned for initially. Mr. Gephart concurred.

Representative Capone Newton asked if there would be special enforcement of the bus-only lane. Mr. Maloney said that there are existing Los Angeles Sheriff's Department and Los Angeles Police Department resources that provide special enforcement along Wilshire Boulevard during peak periods. Special attention is given to parking, right turns, and pedestrian crossing. This will continue once the bus-only lanes are implemented. Representative Bator asked if cars could really be prevented from using the lane considering most drivers would insist that they were only using the lane to go one block. Mr. Gephart said that enforcement would be similar to the enforcement of a bicycle lane where an officer would pull over a vehicle if it was observed using the lane for more than one block.

Representative Rosten asked why parking was not included in the project. Mr. Gephart said the cost of including parking in the project would have increased the cost per mile, thereby precluding the project for consideration by the FTA Very Small Starts program.

7. RECEIVED General Public Survey Results on Los Angeles County Transportation, Jeff Boberg, Transportation Planning Manager IV

Metro conducts two major surveys taken each year:

The Metro Customer Satisfaction Survey is taken on all Metro-operated fixed-route service, takes the pulse of the agency and finds out what we are doing right and wrong.

The Metro General Public Survey is a computer-aided telephone interview taken in the evening. A random sample of Los Angeles County residents with a landline telephone receives a fifteen minute call in either English or Spanish. Questions asked are regarding Metro and a caller's awareness and familiarity with the agency's services.

Facts About 2006 Survey

- 888 respondents were surveyed.
- The General Public survey is conducted every 2 years; 2008 survey postponed until spring 2009. 2009 survey will be revamped, have more market segmentation, a more diverse pool of respondents, and will query why residents choose to or not to ride.
- When respondents think of public transportation in Los Angeles County, almost half (48%) mentioned some form of "Metro" versus other municipal operators and services. "Metro" ranked higher in name recognition than "MTA" for the first time.
- Even 14 percent of respondents said RTD, a Metro predecessor agency with name recognition years after dissolution.
- 75 percent of respondents are aware of a bus line serving their neighborhood, illustrating the success of increased marketing efforts in recent years.
- Metro continues to be perceived by respondents to have a better image than in past years.
- People surveyed who have seen Metro ads are more likely to take Metro than respondents who have not.
- More respondents say Metro provides higher quality service now than in 2002.
- More respondents perceive Metro to consider the needs of residents when making decisions than in 2000.
- Public opinion of Metro has improved since 2000.
- 68 percent of respondents said Metro is fiscally responsible compared to 42 percent of respondents in 2000.
- In the past 6 months ...
 - One-third of respondents said they rode a bus
 - 22 percent of respondents used rail
 - 14 percent of respondents used Metrolink

- 27 percent of respondents that used Metrolink also used a bus
- More than half of respondents said they will use Metro – although this is a “stated preference,” it proves that people feel good enough about Metro to try it.
- 85 percent of respondents feel Metro fares are reasonable
- 96 percent support selling advertising space inside Metro stations as well as inside and upon Metro vehicles
- More than half of respondents use Internet daily
- 35 percent of people surveyed use high occupancy vehicle lanes
- 15 percent of respondents are aware that Metro subsidizes

Mr. Boberg noted how information from surveys is vital to improving Metro overall and said that resources may be allocated in future years to increase the frequency of both the General Public and Customer Satisfaction surveys.

RECEIVED QUESTIONS regarding General Public Survey Results on Los Angeles County Transportation

Representative Rosten asked if surveys are taken to gauge public opinion of proposed projects or corridor studies. Mr. Boberg responded that his team conducted surveys along the Wilshire Boulevard corridor that provided the data that supported the conclusion that rapid buses are 29 percent faster than local buses on Wilshire Boulevard. In addition, the surveying unit takes enough samples in order to parse data by Metro Service Sector. Representative Rosten said that 900 respondents seems small. Mr. Boberg said only 384 surveys are needed for a 10 percent margin of error.

Representative Rosten asked whether bus riders were more inclined to take the survey than non-bus riders. Mr. Boberg responded that respondents are not aware that the survey is about Metro until questions about Metro are revealed in the latter portion of the survey. Questions about the respondent’s perception of other countywide service providers are also asked.

Representative Wright said the survey should ask whether a respondent has taken transit in the last three months rather than six months because ridership patterns tend to be more seasonal and a response to that question might be more useful.

Representative Rosten asked if Sector Council Representatives could suggest questions for future use. Mr. Boberg responded affirmatively and said that Representative Capone Newton has indeed added questions to a past survey.

Representative Capone Newton asked if survey responses could be traced by

geography. Mr. Boberg said surveys are categorized by zip code, which corresponds to each Service Sector.

Representative Capone Newton asked whether questions regarding cellular phones have been asked. Mr. Boberg said questions regarding cellular phones will be asked in both the General Public and Customer Satisfaction surveys in 2009. Representative Capone Newton suggested asking customer satisfaction survey respondents if they use text messaging and suggested asking general public survey respondents if they have a smart cellular phone, if they access the internet with that phone, and whether a respondent has logged onto metro.net from their cellular phone.

Representative Slimmer opined that not many bus riders spend extra money on internet telephony and text messaging.

8. CARRIED OVER update on TAP Program, Jane Matsumoto, Deputy Executive Officer Project Manager UFS
9. APPROVED February 11, 2009 as the public hearing date and RECEIVED preliminary recommendations on Service Changes for June 2009, Rogelio Gandara, Service Development Manager

Preliminary Recommendations on Potential Service Changes for June 2009:

- Line 14 Downtown Los Angeles – Beverly Hills via Beverly Bl – Reallocate resources from unproductive Line 714 trips
- Line 30/31 Pico/Rimpau Terminal – East Los Angeles College via Pico Bl/E 1st St – Terminate Line 30 at Rowan and Dozier. Reduce frequency between Alameda and Atlantic.
- Line 220 West Hollywood – Culver City via Robertson Bl – Recommend discontinuation due to low productivity.
- Line 704 Santa Monica Rapid – Review service levels and possibly establish short turn service at Santa Monica and Sepulveda.
- Line 714 Beverly Bl Rapid – Reallocate unproductive trips to Line 14.
- Line 730 – Pico Bl Rapid – Eliminate service north of Broadway and Temple Street and terminate at Little Tokyo/Arts District Station (via 1st St/Temple

St) to provide direct access from Gold Line going west.

- Line 920 – Reallocate unproductive trips west of Westwood Boulevard and establish a short line terminal at Wilshire and Westwood Boulevards.

Next Steps

1/4/2009 – Publish June 2009 Service Changes public hearing notice.

1/14/2009 – Return to Council with more detailed analysis

2/11/2009 – Public hearing

3/11/2009 – Return with staff recommendation


4/23/2009 – Recommendations considered by Metro Board of Directors

RECEIVED Public Comment regarding preliminary recommendations on Service Changes for June 2009

Ken Ruben – Said he supports discontinuance of Line 220 (Robertson Boulevard) if Culver CityBus indeed assumes service on that line. He supports any additional local service added to Line 14 (Beverly Boulevard). He also believes that buses deadheading should run as revenue service rather than passing up passengers.

10. Chair's Remarks - NONE

ADJOURNED at 7:05 P.M.

Prepared by: 
William L. Walker
Council Secretary