

MINUTES
TRANSPORTATION TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
3rd Floor Conference Room
June 6, 2023

Minutes of the Transportation Technical Committee meeting held June 6, 2023, in the 3rd Floor Conference Room, 212 SW 9th Street, Lawton, Oklahoma.

The agenda for the meeting was posted on the bulletin board in City Hall in compliance with the Oklahoma Open Meeting Act.

The meeting was called to order at 10:03 am by Charlotte Brown.

ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT: Charlotte Brown
 Cynthia Williams
 Jay Earp
 Ryan Landers
 Sarah McElroy
 Joseph Painter
 Mike Woodhams
 Tom Zigler
 Taron Epps

MEMBERS ABSENT: Debra Porter
 Barbara McNally

ALSO PRESENT: Madison Aust, Recording Secretary
 Jonathan Stone Senior Transportation Planner
 Shivani Rani, City of Lawton Engineering
 Laura Chaney, ODOT

2. Verify posting of meeting.

The meeting was posted on June 1, 2023, at 2:43 pm by Kobe Humble.

3. Introductions

4. Approval of minutes of the May 2, 2023, meeting.

Motion by Zigler, Second by Landers, to approve the minutes of the May 2, 2023 meeting as written. **Aye:** McElroy, Earp, Landers, Zigler, Brown, Williams, Epps, Painter, Woodhams **Nay:** None **Motion Passed**

Business

5. Consider recommending to the Transportation Policy Board approve a Request for Qualifications for development of the travel demand model, recommend authorizing staff to issue the RFQ, and recommend a method of reviewing responses.

Stone stated this is an item that we do every five years it is called the Transportation Plan and it does require a model for the plan. We did want to discuss the option of having the same consultant write the plan, we know of a few consultants that would be able to do this, and it will allow us to free up staff time to work on other projects as well. If the board wants to make that recommendation.

McElroy respond I would agree, we have talked this over with Jonathan. Just to get a Travel Demand contract they are not really going to have any experience with writing a plan, and that would be a huge undertaking for the LMPO staff to write as well. I would recommend changing that to a RFQ for a consultant to go the travel demand model as well as writing the MTP update.

Brown asked any comments or questions?

Epps asked is it common practice for the consultants to do both?

McElroy responded typically yes at the state we have to do this as well. We have our own Travel Demand Model. We also hire a consultant to write the plan. We don't even have the resources at the state level to write a plan.

Brown asked Jay did you have something?

Earp responded just the cost do we have the money. I agree with the thought, but consultants are very expensive, do we have the money to tackle both of these?

Stone stated the UPWP that is on the agenda today has the budgeted in the amount that the Travel Demand Model cost. Last time we did this for FY24 this if, especially if we have the right to plan, we will extend into FY25 for several months and that is where the remaining funds would come from.

Painter responded wait a minute. If you're signing a contract with consultant FY24, you have to have 100% of the funds when we sign the contract.

Stone stated yes.

Painter stated you can't sign it.

McElroy stated It would probably be like a nine-month contract, so it would be because the funds aren't guaranteed in 25 either at this time, so it would be like a nine-month more or less for the funding in 24, and then it would continue on into 25 and when 25 came up we would do like a renewal for the remaining funding.

Stone stated and the cash on hand is not the same as the reimbursement. The reimbursement is what's in the budget, the cash on hand we should have and that is.

Brown and Stone stated the MPO.

Brown stated not the City.

Painter stated okay, because I've been knee deep in budgeting and I don't know what you're talking about.

Brown responded we have we have a completely separate budget from the city for our stuff with the MPO.

Earp asked that do we have financial report? I know sometimes the lady comes and brings that. Do we have that today?

Brown responded yes; she will be here for the Policy Board.

Zigler asked how can we make a recommendation to the Policy Board if we don't know how much money there is?

Painter stated you can't. You got to have the money squared away before passing.

Stone stated this is to issue the RFQ not signing any agreements.

Brown responded yes; this is just the RFQ.

Painter stated it wouldn't be fair to waste consultants time if you don't have the money for like I mean they spend a lot of money on RFQ's, and to just nonchalantly do that without if you have the funds is not a good thing to do.

Zigler asked is the lady available to give us that information?

Brown responded let me call her real quick. Hey, Susan, I'm in transportation technical committee and they've got a question about the budget for policy for MPO. Can you tell me what our unencumbered funds amount looks like right now. Ok. Thank you very much, bye. So, as of yesterday, we have \$70,041.00 we are still waiting on finance or not finance legal to finish the 5303 agreement with ODOT so we can draw that last of the CMAQ claims down from last year and that was another 38 almost \$40,000 for that. So that would put us over \$100,000, which I think we have budgeted 115.

Stone stated either 110 or 115 for this and either 110 or 15 for the next item, which is the land use plan.

Painter stated so you need 200 and something. Where did you come up with the original number on your budget? You talked to some consultants?

Stone responded the 115 is what it costs five years ago to do this.

Painter responded well, that's not there. No way is that even close to that.

Stone stated it's extending into FY25 because we know it goes over, because we know it goes into FY25. (cannot discern remainder of audio because Stone was interrupted)

Painter stated I mean, you're way off, costs have escalated so drastically in five years, you really to handle what the real budget is.

Brown stated if you guys want, we can table this until we do some more research.

Zigler responded I think that it would be an excellent idea. And I would make that motion.

Painter stated I second it.

Chaney stated one thing to keep in mind is for the MTP that's federally required as part of the MPO, and what they are supposed to do for their claims.

Painter asked are they behind schedule?

Chaney responded their plan will actually expire December of 2024.

Painter stated December of 2024.

Chaney responded so a little bit over a year and it does take some time. The travel plan model itself it probably takes six months to outline all your traffic zones and have the things you need there in order to move forward and do your analysis for the research. So, it's OK to table it today, but I just want you guys to keep that in mind that the budget is very important, and you know we're utilizing the funds to be able to carry out those federal planning priorities. And the MTP is one of those. So that means that we need to table a different plan to carry out the federal requirements that needs to happen.

Painter stated so planning has been neglected.

Brown responded yes.

Painter stated we're going to need some money. We got to figure out how we get you get some money, right? Because we got to do this Land Use Plan too.

Brown responded yes.

Painter asked when was the last update?

Brown and Stone responded 2008.

Painter stated wish we visited way sooner than that and that's a \$200,000 easy.

Zigler stated because in 2018, the total bill was about like \$330,000 for the consultant to do the joint land use study with Fort Sill.

Painter responded I can see half a million.

Landers stated right now what is the issue? You can't sign the contract until have the money.

TTC Minutes

June 6, 2023

Painter stated it's not fair to the consultant, to make them do a proposal, but you don't even have to have an inkling where you.

Landers responded I get that. What I was saying is that if we can work towards getting that money over like the next couple of months,

Stone stated the money for FY24 is now guaranteed correct. We have that money (cannot discern audio, Stone was interrupted by Painter)

Painter said yeah, that is what we are trying to figure out. It's a matter of a million dollars, and you've got \$100,000. You are way off. We've got to figure that problem out. How is this going to get funded and then come back and get this thing going.

McElroy stated to Jonathan's point, I mean, I think later on in the PL Agreement on this?

Stone responded yes along with all the documents and the UPWP that outlines the funding.

McElroy stated I think for PL for this year, we're looking at 350,000 and you have budgeted how much of that for?

Stone responded all of it. Oh, how much for this project these projects? Probably 110, second 15

McElroy asked so that would be in addition to this \$70,000.

Painter asked the state is going to give us \$350,000.

McElroy responded yes, that's your annual PL funds that you get.

Painter stated (cannot discern audio)

Brown asked are there grants, this is a random question, we can go after for as an MPO?

McElroy responded yes.

Painter stated so we basically have enough money to do the Land Use.

McElroy stated but that was not federally required.

Painter responded right.

McElroy stated the MTP is federally required.

Chaney stated if the MTP lapses, you can't carry out any projects that are under your TIP. Everything becomes void.

Painter responded well we don't want that to happen do we, Jay.

(Cannot discern audio, people are talking over each other)

Earp stated so we really need to concentrate on the MTP versus the Land Use Plan.

Painter responded exactly the land use is for us. The others are federally required. So, we do have enough money. Are we for sure going to get the 350,000?

Brown and Stone responded yes.

TTC Minutes

June 6, 2023

Painter asked 100% sure?

Brown and Stone responded yes.

Stone stated it's not in our bank account, but we it's a reimbursement, so yes.

(cannot discern audio people are talking over each other)

Landers stated like I said if the contract is not going to be signed until

Painter stated well that is not the point.

Landers responded no; I get that.

Painter stated I didn't get that, and I apologize. So, yeah, let's untable and do an RFQ then right.

Earp stated it seems like the budget is light for that though for that the \$115,000.

Painter responded Yeah, that's not right at all.

Stone stated the amount is in there.

Painter stated can we untable and revise the budget to \$300,000?

Stone responded the revision of the will be the next UPWP item, which is three items from now, I think. That item is the budget. So, if this body would like to cancel the Land Use Plan and increase the budget for the MTP then that is something that that we will do in in the year.

Painter stated I mean it's not even a choice, do you know how many projects we have we're getting federal fundings for our highway and interchange. We don't want to get crossways with anybody.

Landers stated hey, Jonathan, you have Debbie's e-mail on here just that line.

Stone responded what I changed that in in like 14 places. OK, which one is it?

Landers stated page seven.

Stone responded page seven. Ok, it was everywhere in this document.

Earp stated also in the resolution the city's acting city attorneys name what is his first name?

Brown responded Timothy Wilson is the acting City Attorney right now.

Painter stated we are agreeing there will not be a Land Use right now.

(cannot discern audio people are talking over each other)

Brown stated so, we need a substitute motion to not table, to add the writing of the plan to the RFQ, and issue.

Zigler stated yes.

Landers stated I'll second that.

Brown stated any discussion or debate. Mady, Call the roll.

Motion by Zigler, Second by Landers, to add the writing of the plan to the RFQ. **Aye:** Landers, Earp, Zigler, Brown, Williams, Woodhams, Epps, Painter, McElroy **Nay:** None **Motion Passed**

6. Recommend to the Policy Board a consultant for the 2050 Land Use Plan and recommend the Policy Board to authorize the Director to negotiate with the firm.

Brown stated we meet with the two applicants that responded to the RFQ, Garver and Wallace Architects. Wallace was very, very new and had not ever, they were like pieces from outside and it was just not a good presentation. So, our recommendation was Garver for that, but based on the discussion on the previous item.

Painter asked we only had two responses from that call.

Brown responded yes, and that was it.

Painter asked did we do an invitation only? I don't remember. Was it open to the public?

Brown responded yes; it was posted.

Stone stated it was posted and we sent it out to.

Brown stated we sent it out to five or six that we knew of for sure that were that had asked us to send it to them.

Painter responded We like Garver, but we have some issues with Garver. Remember Fire station #2, it's falling down.

Brown stated I know, but this is a different group.

Painter stated and we have another deal with the software thing. That's going to be a big you know what, before it resolves.

Brown responded I know; this is a different group. These are actually Land Use Planners that I had met never met before.

Painter stated planners. Planning degrees?

Brown responded yes, and that had worked on the public side and are now consultants for the private side. We felt comfortable with them with moving forward, but from the direction on the last one, it looks like we are going to table this indefinitely until we get some funding.

Painter asked do we have any.

Stone stated once we know the budget of the MTP consultants, we should be able to bring back an amendment.

Painter asked do you have any other sources of funding that you are pursuing.

TTC Minutes

June 6, 2023

Brown responded not right now. We'll have to start doing some research and see what grants and stuff around there that could.

Painter stated do you remember anything propel talked about. I don't think there was anything happening on this.

Brown responded there's not. We don't have anything.

Landers asked I'm curious how long is the project supposed to be?

Brown responded about 18 months.

McElroy stated if we don't do it now, do you guys have something that states that, I don't want you to have to put back out another RFQ. Do you have something in, I'm sure it's something legal has that says that this is only good for 90 days or.

Painter stated once you select a professional service, once you've selected Garver, we're there for ours till we don't want.

Landers stated yeah, there was an RFP, the amount would be good for like 90 days or something.

Brown stated it was just professional services, so we didn't argue on it.

Stone stated this motion needs to be to select Garver but to table negotiations until (cannot discern remainder of audio, speaker was interrupted)

Painter stated but we could actually start talking again with Garver.

Brown stated and we can get some amounts and then that way we could start.

Painter responded you guys can start working with them and thinking about what you want done, what it looks like, and what's it's going to cost.

Brown stated okay.

Painter stated we can't actually go to Council, with the contract with them until we.

Landers stated yes, that was my thing you'd be taking the contract back to the board before.

Brown responded yes. Our recommendation is to bring it back to the board.

Landers stated I mean I would be fine with negotiating those things now that way it keeps the interest going and they know that we want to go through with everything.

Brown responded okay.

Painter stated you clearly have a green light to negotiate.

Brown responded okay; I just need a motion.

Painter stated so moved.

Landers responded second.

Motion by Painter, Second by Landers, to authorize the Director to negotiate with Garver on developing the budget for the Land Use Master Plan. **Aye:** Landers, McElroy, Painter, Epps, Williams, Zigler, Woodhams, Brown **Nay:** None **Abstained:** Earp questionable about funding **Motion Passed**

7. Consider recommending the Policy Board authorize the Chairman to sign the No Cost Time Extension request for Congestion Mitigation-Air Quality Projects.

Stone stated this is specifically for the CMAQ grant Air Quality grant and for the main project this is referring to is the traffic flow study. It's expected to be completed in August and it is using FY23 funds. We need this extension to be able to use these funds into August.

Brown asked any questions or discussion?

Painter asked yeah, what is it again?

Brown responded it's the CMAQ grant that we have. That's what we're using to pay for the traffic flow study on board. We have the funds, and we have it all encumbered, but in order to continue using the FY23 funds in FY24, we have to do an extension.

McElroy stated the contract expires June 30th.

Painter asked what was the air quality part?

Stone responded its air quality funds that we're using.

McElroy stated yes, it's the name of the funding pot, Congestion Mitigation.

Stone stated the MPO receives three grants and one of those the Air Quality Grant.

Painter responded okay, so moved.

Zigler stated second.

Motion by Painter, Second by Zigler, to recommend that the Policy Board authorize Chairman to sign the No Cost Time Extension request for Congestion Mitigation-Air Quality Projects. **Aye:** Epps, Painter, Williams, McElroy, Landers, Woodhams, Brown, Zigler **Nay:** None **Motion Passed**

8. Consider recommending to the Transportation Policy Board approval of a resolution adopting the Fiscal Year 2024 Unified Planning Work Program for the Lawton Metropolitan Transportation Planning Process.

Stone stated this is our annual budget for the LMPO outlining the spending of the three grants we receive and the budget for those grants.

Painter stated so let's discuss that.

Brown responded so we now need to.. (speaker was interrupted)

TTC Minutes

June 6, 2023

Painter stated lay that out for us.

Stone stated yes, that is what I'm doing.

Painter stated lay it that out for the three grants and whatnot.

Stone asked do you want this by grant or by project.

Painter responded why don't we go over the three grants.

Stone stated okay. Our Planning grant which is our PL grant.

(cannot discern audio)

McElroy responded yes, that the \$350,000.

Painter asked and you've got it for sure?

Brown and Stone responded yes.

McElroy stated yes, well once you approve that the funds will be yours.

Painter responded alright.

Brown stated you approve the consent agenda the money is ours.

Painter responded okay.

McElroy stated (cannot discern audio)

Painter stated right, I understand.

Stone stated our Air Quality Grant or CMAQ Grant is \$150,000.

Painter asked and you can spend it on what?

Stone responded we can spend that on pretty much anything that helps improve air quality. We do an Air Quality Awareness campaign with a small portion of it, and we do the traffic flow study. Last year for FY23 and FY24, we've budgeted for another traffic flow study on another section, and we've also included a money for the improvements of what this travel flow recommends.

Painter asked for some construction.

Stone responded yes.

Painter stated that's nice.

Stone stated the CMAQ grant can be used for physical projects.

Painter responded Public Work is paying for signals.

Brown stated we talked to.

Stone stated the signals was in the old project.

Brown stated we talked to Larry Wolcott.

Painter responded that's the money you need to be spend upgrading all those.

Brown stated we talked to Larry Wolcott about the upgrades to the signals that the other consultant presented to council and asked do you want to wait until we have our full study back or they said no, they were going to go ahead and move forward with that because those were going to be cheaper and then we would use our stuff for any of the bigger projects.

Stone stated that information has been passed on to the consultant.

Painter stated I will talk to Larry about that. Maybe you should too. It's not good a deal to pay a consultant to do a study on a section of road and then talk to a guy and we just talked to at TEC and go with his recommendation, and don't even hear from the consultant that you've been paying a lot of money to do consulting. I mean, that's crazy. That's not good for us as a staff to do things with. Even though they're probably going to say exactly what what's his face I can't think of his name right now, and recommend, but we really need to see that study before we do anything.

Stone stated we've also passed _____, that we received from TEC. Two?

Brown responded yes.

(Cannot discern audio)

Painter asked do you agree or disagree?

Brown stated we've passed on TEC's information to EST so that they're aware of what TEC.
(cannot discern reminder of audio Brown was interrupted)

Painter stated yeah, we could really get in the pinch if by some weird deal they came back with a better, more technical solution and we're already running with the guy who we didn't really even pay anything to.

Brown stated we kind of thought we would wait.

Painter stated I mean, we like him, we use him a lot, but you know what I mean.

Brown stated you are Larry's voice this month, so.

Painter stated you are Larry.

Stone stated and our third grant is the 5303 grant with the Transit Planning. That one runs federal fiscal year, so we do not have the funding amount for that at this time. The UPWP, we will bring an amendment back once we have those numbers.

Painter asked how much are you thinking?

Stone responded roughly \$50,000, is that right Mike?

Woodhams stated I think 75.

Stone responded all right.

Woodhams stated that is because we have multiple years.

Stone stated that's for FY23 though. Is FY24 going to be 75 as well?

Woodhams responded it should remain pretty much the way it has been. I know there's been a lot of discussion as to the expansion of with Enid coming into the Urban Area Transit Plan, that there was going to be a reduction, there shouldn't be. The pie should increase to accommodate them as well as maintain the same funding that everybody else has what they need. And so those should continue with the levels of funding that we've had previously.

Stone stated okay, previously was 25,000 a year.

Woodhams responded yes, so it should. We're converting from just a static 25,000 to going back to the using the population model and allocating those funds based on that.

Stone stated so fluctuate. Okay. As soon as we have that, then we will bring that to the board in the budget. Transit Planning

Woodhams responded everything that's outlined in the agreement.

Brown stated Joe just wants us to find money.

Painter stated I'm all about money. We just busted what, \$26 million or \$260 million for the projects.

Stone stated but we have a large amount of staff time budgeted for finding grants.

(cannot discern audio, people are talking over each other)

Painter stated you are doing a good job keeping on top of those grants.

McElroy stated Jonathan, will you talk about did any copy of the UPWP go out for Tech and Policy members and then have you notified anybody of the changes that ODOT requested? Because I don't. It doesn't look like.

Stone responded that changes are in this document.

McElroy stated yes, but nobody's seen them before thirty minutes ago.

Stone responded they were not finished until 6:00 pm last night.

McElroy stated and herein is the problem. So that's my question, has anybody really had a chance? Did anybody receive a copy of the UPWP prior to today or?

Landers stated yes, this was sent out.

Stone stated yes, LATS is one of our offices that we have it on file at the view for the public and it's on our MPO's website.

McElroy asked did Tom. ASCOG is one of them, correct?

Zigler responded Yeah, I mean I didn't see these numbers until now.

Stone stated yes, this is the revision, so it is slightly different here.

McElroy stated and they have changed, yes.

Painter asked can you give us a brief? I'm an engineer, I don't read very well.

McElroy stated honestly that is kind of the point is.

Stone stated the reason it is brought today with you know is that if we don't at least discuss this item, we can't discuss it at a special meeting later on if the boards feel like if policy and tech both feel like that there has not been enough notice and they don't have time to time to review it, they can table it, but if we did not bring it to this meeting, they would not been able to table it and we have to wait till July 11th. Then we would not be able to do anything with the MPO until July 11th. It had to be on the agenda for today no matter what.

Chaney stated to go off what Sarah was talking about, I'm just curious how you notified the public, and how they were aware of the comment period? I didn't see anything on the LMPO website besides just the draft copy of the plan.

Stone responded our current public participation plan that is, that is what our requirements are, is to post it on our website.

Chaney stated it says that the meeting date will be announced on the LMPO website to let them know that there's a public comment period, and to have those in and I there was nothing on there about this meeting today on the LMPO website.

Stone responded okay.

Chaney stated just so you know, if the public's not really aware, we need to make them aware, and I would suggest that this be tabled and brought back in a special meeting.

Painter stated so moved.

Zigler stated second.

Brown stated okay.

Painter asked can we do a special meeting before the 11th?

Stone responded we can do a special meeting before the.

Brown stated yes, we should be able to. We've got an extra week. From the way things fell.

Stone stated we have a 15-day notice period, as long as we could do it the 4th week of June.

McElroy asked will you send this out to everyone electronically?

Stone responded yes; we can do that.

Brown stated okay, so motion and a second to table to the special meeting date to be determined once we get the notice out, we'll let everybody know about the time frame about the date for the meeting. Any discussion or debate?

Motion by Painter, **Second** by Zigler, to table to a special meeting, date to be determined. **Aye:** Williams, Zigler, Woodhams, McElroy, Painter, Epps, Brown, Earp, Landers
Nay: None **Motion Passed**

CONSENT

9. Consider recommending to the Transportation Policy Board approval of the Annual Agreement between the Oklahoma Department of Transportation and the Lawton Metropolitan Planning Organization for transportation planning.
10. Consider recommending to the Transportation Policy Board approval of the annual Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Agreement between the Oklahoma Department of Transportation and the Lawton Metropolitan Planning Organization for air quality planning.
11. Consider recommending to the Transportation Policy Board approval of the Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Lawton and the Lawton Metropolitan Planning Organization for metropolitan transportation planning for Fiscal Year 2024.
12. Consider recommending to the Transportation Policy Board approval of the Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Lawton and the Lawton Metropolitan Planning Organization for transit planning for Fiscal Year 2024.
13. Consider recommending to the Transportation Policy Board approval of the Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Lawton and the Lawton Metropolitan Planning Organization for Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality programs and projects during Fiscal Year 2024.
14. Consider recommending to the Transportation Policy Board approval of the annual Joint Certification Statement for the Lawton Metropolitan Transportation Planning Process.
15. Consider recommending to the Transportation Policy Board approval of the Federal Transit Administration Certifications and Assurances for Federal Fiscal Year 2024.

Brown stated nine through fifteen are consent agenda, these are annual documents. So, here's where we're voting on getting the money, Joe. Part of on the annual documents that we have annual agreement between ODOT and LMPO for Transportation Planning, Air Quality Planning for the CMAQ grant, the PL MOU between the City of Lawton and MPO for transit planning. There is one for each grant, and then our certs (short for certifications) and assurances for fiscal year 24. And the joint certification statement at the Lawton Metropolitan Planning Transportation Planning Process. They're all considered consent unless someone wants to pull an item for separate discussion.

Stone asked now these are in support of the previous items, so do these also need to be tabled?

McElroy stated I know PL doesn't.

Stone responded okay.

McElroy asked Laura, do you know about the others?

Chaney responded the funding agreements noted it should not have an impact.

Brown stated that's what I was thinking because they should all be normal and then we're just changing. we're just changing funding UPWP.

Stone responded we can approve this, all right.

Brown asked does anyone want to pull anything on the consent agenda to discuss. Do we have a motion?

Painter stated so moved.

Zigler stated second.

Brown asked any discussion or debate.

Motion by Painter, Second by Zigler, to approve the consent agenda as written. **Aye:** Woodhams, Earp, Brown, Painter, Landers, McElroy, Epps, Williams, Zigler **Nay: None** **Motion Passed**

16. Reports or Comments.

Brown stated I don't think I have anything. Sarah?

McElroy stated I don't think I have anything from the planning side either I feel like we pretty much discussed all of that earlier. You guys have any questions for me?

Painter asked you got any more money.

McElroy responded not at this moment we will look.

Brown asked Tom, do you have anything?

Zigler responded I don't have anything today.

Brown asked Cynthia.

Williams responded no.

Brown asked Joseph.

Painter responded I think I've said enough.

Brown asked Mike. Taron?

Zigler stated congratulations on your position.

Epps responded thank you.

Painter asked is this brand new.

Epps responded yes; it is.

Painter stated alright.

Brown asked Jay.

Earp responded we have a couple of reports on area highway projects. We are overlaying Highway 62 from the Lawton City limit line out to Cache 115, I believe they're about finished the eastbound lanes, and will be starting the westbound lanes. We are doing some bridge work in Wolf Creek on what I call the S curve of Rogers Lane. It's kind of on the westside of Rogers Lane West of 82nd. Should be finishing up there, it's a little bit of a traffic problem.

Painter asked what was it, a scour issue?

Earp responded deck. (cannot not discern audio) And that concludes my report.

Brown stated okay. Laura, do you have anything to add?

Chaney responded I do not.

Brown asked Shivani, do you have anything to add?

Rani responded no.

17. Adjournment

Motion by Painter, Second by McElroy, to adjourn the meeting. **Aye:** Brown, Zigler, Williams, Epps, Painter, McElroy, Landers, Earp, Woodhams **Nay:** None **Motion Passed**

With no further business the meeting was adjourned at 10:42am.