CENTRAL CORRIDOR ADVISORY GROUP

MEETING #12

May 2, 2014 1:30 pm – 3:30 pm
Austin City Hall, Council Chambers

1) Welcome & Introductions
2) Public Involvement Update
3) Evaluation Results
4) Locally Preferred Alternative Recommendation
5) Next Steps
6) Citizen Communication
7) Next Meeting – May 16, 2014
1. **CCAG Charge**

The CCAG will:
- Ensure open and transparent public process
- Advise Mayor and project team in prioritizing and defining a preferred alignment for the next high-capacity transit investment for the Central Corridor
- Assist project team in a meaningful dialogue with the community

---

1. **Phase 2 Work Plan & Schedule**

**Decision-Making Process**

- **Phase 2: Select Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Central Corridor High-Capacity Transit Study Work Plan</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 9: Project Purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 10: Process – Methodology &amp; Criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 11: Identify &amp; Screen Preliminary Alternatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 12: Define Final Alternatives – Mode &amp; Alignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 13: Evaluate Final Alternatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 14: Select Draft Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Decision*
1. Phase 2 Objectives

- **Project Definition**
  - Service, mode, alignment, stops
- **Funding Plan**
  - Capital and O&M costs, funding sources
  - *Within* overall Project Connect Plan
- **Governance Structure**
- **Programs and Policies**
  - Housing/Transit/Jobs Action Team

2. Evaluation Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Qualitative**
- Meet Purpose?
  - Demographics
  - Destinations
  - Logical Termini
  - Technical Feasibility

**Quantitative**
- Best Meets Purpose?
  - Ridership
  - Detailed Costs
  - Stations
  - FTA Criteria
  - Maintenance Facility

**Quantitative**
- Competitiveness/Benefits?
  - Economic Impacts
  - Prelim FTA Rating
Public Involvement Update

Recent Public Involvement Activities

- 4/12 Step 5 Public Workshop at Midway Fieldhouse
- 4/16 Greater Austin Contractors & Engineers Association (ACEA) Symposium
- 4/16 Step 5 Workshop for Downtown Austin Alliance Mobility & Streetscapes Committee
- 4/17 Urban Land Institute Austin Marketplace
- 4/17 South Lamar Neighborhood Association
- 4/21 Congress for the New Urbanism - Central Texas Chapter
- 4/23 Step 5 Workshop for Network of Asian American Organizations
- 4/26 Austin Earth Day Festival
- 4/29 Austin Fashion Week
- 4/29 MoPac South Open House
Upcoming Activities

- 5/04 Cinco de Mayo Celebration
- 5/06 North Shoal Creek Neighborhood Assoc
- 5/07 Alliance for Public Transportation
- 5/07 Capital Metro Access Advisory
- 5/12 Capital Metro Board Planning/Operations
- 5/12 Waterfront Planning Advisory Board
- 5/13 UTC
- 5/13 Community Development Commission
- 5/13 Homewood Heights & McKinley Heights Neighborhood Association
- 5/14 Capital Metro Board Audit/Finance Committee
- 5/14 TX Society of Professional Engineers – Travis County Chapter
- 5/14 Capital Metro Customer Satisfaction Advisory Committee

Upcoming Activities cont

- 5/15 LBJ Neighborhood Assoc
- 5/17 University Hills Neighborhood Assoc
- 5/18 Questors Class
- 5/19 CANPAC
- 5/20 Bryker Woods Neighborhood Assoc
- 5/20 Northeast Austin Neighborhood Assoc
- 5/21 Environmental Board
- 5/21 Downtown Commission
- 5/22 NW Austin Civic Association
2 Upcoming Activities

- SpeakUpAustin discussions
- Webinars
- 6 to 8 Public Open Houses
- Stakeholder Briefings
- Social Media engagement
- Televised Town Hall
- Presence at various community events and festivals

3 Evaluation Results
Final Alternatives

Evaluation Matrix

Subject of CCAG “Dig”
Thursday, May 8

Tuesday, June 3
Three Key Decisions Remain

Lady Bird Lake alternatives
1. Bridge
2. Short tunnel
3. Long tunnel

Hancock alternatives
1. West tunnel
2. East tunnel

Two modes
1. Urban Rail
2. BRT

Target Service Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>Mixed Traffic</th>
<th>Transit Priority/Pre-emption</th>
<th>Dedicated Guideway</th>
<th>Separated Guideway</th>
<th>Fully Separated Guideway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mostly Dedicated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 minutes</td>
<td>10 – 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop Spacing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¼ mile</td>
<td>½ – 1 mile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 5 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 – 30 avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 mph</td>
<td>55 mph maximum (including stops)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60 mph</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mode Evaluation

Vehicle Capacity and Operations

170 Passengers

Urban Rail

1 CROSSING

85 Passengers +

85 Passengers

BRT

2 CROSSINGS

170 Passengers

Urban Rail

1 CROSSING

85 Passengers +

85 Passengers

BRT

2 CROSSINGS

Impacts on Transit Reliability & Traffic Operations
Preliminary Ridership Estimates Based on Target Service Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Urban Rail</th>
<th>BRT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assumed vehicle capacity</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak frequency</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated daily ridership*</td>
<td>16,000 – 20,000</td>
<td>15,000 – 19,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Preliminary estimates. Subject to change.

LRT Ridership Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Downtown/CBD</th>
<th>Medical Center</th>
<th>Entertainment</th>
<th>Sports Arena</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Shopping District</th>
<th>Convention Center</th>
<th>Airport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ridership per mile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Hampton Roads (Tide) 7.4 mi
- Charlotte Blue Line 9.3 mi
- Austin Central Corridor 9.5 mi
- Phoenix Metro 20 mi
- Seattle Sound Transit Central Link 14.6 mi
- Minneapolis Blue Line 12.6 mi
- Houston Red Line 7.5 mi
### LRT Ridership Reality Check

Actual weekday light rail ridership above projections in opening year.

- Charlotte: +53%
- Denver: +29%
- Dallas: +20%
- St. Louis: +58%
- Phoenix: +80%
- Salt Lake: +35%

*From Charlotte Area Transit System (CATS)*

### Target Service Profile – Peak Demand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Urban Rail</th>
<th>BRT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assumed vehicle capacity</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak frequency</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated daily demand</td>
<td>16,000 – 20,000</td>
<td>15,000 – 19,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated weekday peak-hour demand</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Demand Between Any Two Stations</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Service and Demand

Urban Rail
- Peak demand MET by single vehicle

BRT
- Peak demand NOT MET by single vehicle

Urban Rail & BRT
Same 10-min Service

Modified Service-Capacity Comparison

Urban Rail & BRT
10-min UR & 4-min BRT
- Urban Rail – 6 one-car trains can meet demand
- BRT – 15 buses at 4-minute headways required to meet demand
  - Change in service profile
  - BRT on 4-minute headways will increase demand
  - Results in more BRT Vehicles and higher O&M + replacement costs
System Capacity

- Minimum headway for reliable service is 3-minutes
- No capacity for system expansion with BRT
- Urban Rail is the appropriate mode to meet system needs

Life Cycle Vehicle Costs (Service + Spares)

- Urban Rail Life Cycle: 25 years
- BRT Life Cycle: 12 years

Initial Vehicle Capital Cost:
- 9 UR vehicles x $4.4 M per vehicle = $39.6 M
- 20 BRT vehicles x $900 K per vehicle = $18 M
- 20 BRT vehicles x $1.0 M per vehicle = $20 M
- Total BRT Capital Cost = $38 M
### Mode Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Urban Rail</th>
<th>BRT – 4 minute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ridership</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Vehicle Cost</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual O&amp;M + Lifecycle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Emissions</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Impacts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW Impacts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Expansion Capacity</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>– –</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mode Decision: Urban Rail

- **Initial Capital Cost**
- **O&M + Life Cycle Cost**
- **Emissions**
- **System Capacity**
- **Travel Time**
- **Traffic Impacts**
- **Economic Development**
- **ROW Impacts**
Mode Discussion

Alignment Evaluation: Hancock
Hancock Alternatives

- Grade separation with Red Line
- Property and neighborhood impacts
- I-35 improvements

East Tunnel Alternative
- Portal on 41st
- Below-grade station at Red Line
- Potential tunnel extension under I-35 towards Mueller

West Tunnel Alternative
- At-grade station and portal on Red River
- Red Line transfer at Highland or new station on Airport

Hancock Alternatives: West Tunnel

Benefits
- Shorter travel time due to length and geometry
- At-grade station at 41st and Red River is less costly, more visible
- Consistent with Airport Blvd. Plan

Issues
- No Red Line transfer at Hancock
- Potential new Red Line station at Airport/53 ½—too close to Highland Station?

Approximate cost: $180M
### Hancock Alternatives: East Tunnel

**Benefits**
- Preferred potential Red Line transfer station at Hancock – favors bus transfers
- Future connectivity to Mueller

**Issues**
- Below-grade station cost
- Requires acquisition/displacement of property and businesses along I-35 frontage
- Appearance of duplication of service

*Open Cut Station on DART*

Approximate cost: $220M

### Hancock Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>West Tunnel</th>
<th>East Tunnel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ridership</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Time</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Cost</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual O&amp;M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Impacts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW Impacts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Expansion</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Opportunities for value engineering
Alignment Decision: Hancock East

- Capital Cost
- ROW Impacts
- Connectivity
- System
- Ridership
- Economic
- Development
- Hancock West
- Hancock East

Hancock Discussion
Alignment Evaluation: Lady Bird Lake

Lady Bird Lake thru Downtown

Profile

Bridge
Short Tunnel
Long Tunnel
Station
### Bridge Alternative

**Benefits**
- Opportunity for signature structure/city icon
- Could be multimodal with bicycle, pedestrian, bus access
- Lower capital cost -> allows greater overall project length

**Issues**
- Conflict with boathouse
- Reduced auto capacity, left turns, parking on Trinity
- Utilities
- 6th Street during street closures

**Approximate cost:** $175M

---

### Short Tunnel Alternative

**Benefits**
- Avoids conflict with boathouse
- Avoids crossing Cesar Chavez

**Issues**
- Convention Center operations (north portal)
- Reduced auto capacity, left turns, parking on Trinity
- Utilities
- 6th Street during street closures
- FTA cost effectiveness

**Approximate cost:** $215M
3. **Long Tunnel Alternative**

**Benefits**
- Greater reliability
- Can accommodate slightly higher speeds and higher frequencies
- Maintains auto capacity, left turns, parking on Trinity
- Avoids issues with 6th Street during street closures, boathouse

**Issues**
- Cost, including underground stations
- Less visible service downtown/reduced placemaking
- Portal and vents
- FTA cost-effectiveness

Approximate cost: $470M

---

3. **Lady Bird Lake Alternatives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bridge</th>
<th>Short Tunnel</th>
<th>Long Tunnel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ridership</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Cost</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual O&amp;M</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Impacts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW Impacts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Expansion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placemaking</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Competitiveness</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Implementation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alignment Decision: Bridge

COMPETITIVENESS
- Risk
- Economic Development
- Capital Cost
- O&M Costs
- Placemaking
- FTA

Reliability
- System
- Traffic Impacts
- ROW Impacts

Tunnel(s) Bridge

Lady Bird Lake Crossing Discussion
Locally Preferred Alternative Recommendation

Recommended LPA
**LPA Details**

- **Mode:** Urban Rail
- **Alignment:**
  - East Riverside
  - Bridge over Lady Bird Lake
  - Trinity in Downtown
  - San Jacinto through UT
  - Red River to Hancock Center
  - East Tunnel at Hancock
  - Airport Blvd to ACC Highland at Middle Fiskville
- **16 Stations**
- **Vehicle operations center**

**East Riverside**

- Grove Blvd. to South Central Waterfront: 3 miles
- Potential Vehicle Operations Center Opportunities
- At grade

*From East Riverside Corridor Master Plan*
Vehicle Operations Center

- LPA fleet: 9 cars
- 6 to 8 acres for LPA
- Functions:
  - Control Center
  - Maintenance bays
  - Vehicle wash/painting/body shop
  - Maintenance-of-way equipment storage
  - Administrative offices

Lady Bird Lake

South Central Waterfront Station to Convention Center: 3/4 mile

Conventional Center

Bridge

Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Bridge across Willamette River
Trinity Street

Convention Center to Medical School: 1 mile

At grade

MetroRail

I-35

University of Texas

Medical School to St. David’s: 1.5 miles

At grade
St. David’s to Hancock: 1 mile

Hancock to Airport Blvd: 1.2 miles
Airport Blvd to ACC Highland

MetroRail

Potential Vehicle Operations Center Opportunities

Recommended LPA

• 9.5-mile Urban Rail
• Anticipated Daily Ridership
  – 16,000 – 20,000
• Travel Time
  – Grove to Convention Center (4.1 miles) – 11 min
  – ACC Highland to Convention Center (5.4 miles) – 17 min
• Vehicle Operations Center opportunities
  – Pleasant Valley to Grove
  – Airport Blvd Area
• Total Capital Cost: $1.38 B (2020)
• Annual O&M Costs: TBD
## Capital Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Category</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$726 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles</td>
<td>$43 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>$38 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services</td>
<td>$239 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total contingencies</td>
<td>$330 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1.38 B</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Cost Comparison – Other LRT Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System/Line</th>
<th>Length (miles)</th>
<th>Total Cost (2020 Dollars @ 3%/year esc.)</th>
<th>Relative Cost per Mile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Houston SE Corridor</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>$823 M (2012)</td>
<td>$1.1 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston N Corridor</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>$756 M (2013)</td>
<td>$958 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland-Milwaukie</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>$1.49 B (2013)</td>
<td>$258.6 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSP Central Corridor</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>$957 M (2013)</td>
<td>$1.2 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin Urban Rail</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>$1.13 B (2014)</td>
<td>$1.38 B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relative Station Activity (Preliminary)

- Pleasant Valley represents nearly 18% of all station activity
- Highland is a strong commuter station, but under-represented
- Strong balance between north and south
  - AM peak is stronger in the NB direction (1.3 NB:1 SB)
  - Even distribution of passengers in downtown and at UT
- Off-peak ridership (25% of daily)
  - Indicates strong all-day demand
- Hancock Center has strong ridership due to Red Line connectivity and park-and-ride

Population & Employment Served within ½ Mile

- Population 46,151
  - 5,527 pop./square mile
- Employment 96,944
  - 11,610 emp./square mile
Potential Economic Development Impacts

- Developed by UT Center for Sustainable Development
- Uses Envision Tomorrow+ (Sustainable Places Project Analytic Tool)
- 3D Development Visualizations

Image showing potential change in land use

Potential Economic Development Impacts

- Orange = "emerging projects" already planned to be developed
- Other colors = high potential to be developed
### Project Influence on Economic Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Economic Impact of LPA</th>
<th>Low Estimate</th>
<th>High Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>14,400</td>
<td>17,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Employment</td>
<td>14,700</td>
<td>26,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030 Annual Property Tax Revenue*</td>
<td>$31,600,000</td>
<td>$44,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030 Annual Sales Tax Revenue*</td>
<td>$5,900,000</td>
<td>$10,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 2030 Annual Tax Revenue*</td>
<td>$37,500,000</td>
<td>$55,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Building Value</td>
<td>$6,300,000,000</td>
<td>$9,100,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROI on recommended LPA</td>
<td>5:1</td>
<td>7:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*City of Austin only*

### FTA New and Small Starts Evaluation

**Individual Criteria Ratings**
- Mobility Improvements (16.66%)
- Environmental Benefits (16.66%)
- Congestion Relief (16.66%)
- Economic Development (16.66%)
- Cost-Effectiveness (16.66%)
- Land Use (16.66%)
- Current Condition (25%)
- Commitment of Funds (25%)
- Reliability/Capacity (50%)

**Summary Ratings**

- Project Justification (50% of overall rating)
- Local Financial Commitment (50% of overall rating)

**Overall Rating**

- Overall Project Rating
Recommended LPA Discussion

Next Steps
May 16th CCAG Topics

- Phasing Options
- Project Recommendation
- Funding Approach
- Governance Approach
- System Connectivity

CCAG “Digs”

- Thursday, May 8th
- Tuesday, June 3rd
Road to the LPA
Central Corridor Study Topics

• CCAG #12, May 2\textsuperscript{nd}  
  – Project team recommendation for LPA (end-to-end)  
  – Rough order-of-magnitude (ROM) cost estimates  
  – Ridership estimates  
• CCAG #13, May 16\textsuperscript{th}  
  – Phasing options  
  – Project recommendation  
  – Funding and governance  
  – System connectivity  
• CCAG #14, June 13\textsuperscript{th}  
  – \textit{Action} on recommended LPA and 1\textsuperscript{st} Phase

Council Schedule

• March 27\textsuperscript{th}  
  – Briefing  
• May 22\textsuperscript{nd}  
  – Briefing  
• June 19\textsuperscript{th}  
  – Special Session  
• June 26\textsuperscript{th}  
  – Action TBD  
• Aug 7\textsuperscript{th}  
  – Action TBD

Citizen Communication
Next Meeting
May 16th

THANK YOU

More Information:

Project Connect & Central Corridor HCT Study
projectconnect.com