Call to Order
Chairman Hank Miller called the meeting to order at 3:00 PM.

Based on the MPO Board's adopted Remote Participation Policy, Executive Director Mike Kozlosky called the roll, and a quorum was present as follows:


Conflict of Interest Statement
Chairman Miller read the conflict-of-interest statement and asked if any Board member had a conflict of interest. Mr. Kozlosky said that staff distributed copies of the conflict-of-interest statement form to each member to be proactive, and that a Conflict-of-Interest Policy will be considered later in the agenda.
To avoid any appearance of a conflict of interest, Chairman Miller and Mr. Zimmer asked to be recused from discussion Item 9a. Ms. Bozeman made a motion to recuse Chairman Miller and Mr. Zimmer. Vice Chair Hays seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously by roll call vote, as follows:

**Ayes:** Mike Allen, Neil Anderson, Lynn Barbee, Brenda Bozeman, John Ellen, Wendy Fletcher-Hardee, Deb Hays, Hank Miller, Luke Waddell, Frank Williams, Eulis Willis and Landon Zimmer. **Nays:** None. **Absent:** Johnathan Barfield.

3) **Approval of Board Member Excused Absences**
Mr. Kozlosky said that Mr. Barfield has requested to be excused from today’s meeting. Mr. Ellen made a motion to excuse Mr. Barfield, seconded by Vice Chair Hays and the motion carried unanimously by roll call vote, as follows:

**Ayes:** Mike Allen, Neil Anderson, Lynn Barbee, Brenda Bozeman, John Ellen, Wendy Fletcher-Hardee, Deb Hays, Hank Miller, Luke Waddell, Frank Williams, Eulis Willis and Landon Zimmer. **Nays:** None. **Absent:** Johnathan Barfield.

4) **Approval of the Agenda**
Mr. Ellen made a motion to approve the agenda as presented, seconded by Mr. Anderson and the motion carried unanimously by roll call as follows:

**Ayes:** Mike Allen, Neil Anderson, Lynn Barbee, Brenda Bozeman, John Ellen, Wendy Fletcher-Hardee, Deb Hays, Hank Miller, Luke Waddell, Frank Williams, Eulis Willis and Landon Zimmer. **Nays:** None. **Excused:** Johnathan Barfield.

5) **Public Comment Period**
Mr. Kozlosky said that no public comments were received.

6) **Presentation**
   a. **Navassa Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan- Zachary Bugg, PE, Kittelson & Associates**
Zachary Bugg, Kittelson & Associates, gave a presentation on the Navassa Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. He said that the plan was a combined effort of the MPO, the Integrated Mobility Division (IMD) of the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) and the Town of Navassa. He noted that the project study area encompassed about 14 square miles, co-extensive with the town limits, and that the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan ran concurrent with the Navassa Street Collector Plan.

   Mr. Bugg gave a brief overview of the project timeline with public and stakeholder engagement throughout, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Conditions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternatives</strong></td>
<td><strong>Recommendations</strong></td>
<td><strong>Implementation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June Steering</td>
<td>July Public</td>
<td>Sept. Steering</td>
<td>March Steering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cmte. Mtg #1</td>
<td>Work Session</td>
<td>Cmte. Mtg #2</td>
<td>Cmte. Mtg #3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Bugg said that goals for the project included establishing a bike-ped network connecting existing and planned parks and trails such as the Gullah Geechee Cultural Trail and the Navassa Heritage Trail, and policy recommendations for private development to help pay for multimodal improvements, increase economic development, and support public health and safety.
Mr. Bugg said that all 10 project recommendations came from stakeholders and range from linear improvements of multi-modal facilities for major corridors like Cedar Hill Road to spot improvements aimed at providing connectivity and addressing transportation safety at key intersections. He reiterated that although the costs are substantial (as much as $30 million) and many of the projects may be 15 years out, an opportunity exists to offset them by private development.

Mr. Anderson asked about the cantilevered facility recommended for Sturgeon Creek Bridge. Mr. Bugg responded that no detailed structural assessment has been done, but examples can be seen in Savannah and Charleston.

Chairman Miller expressed appreciation to Mr. Bugg for his presentation. Mr. Kozlosky noted that the plan will be brought to the Board’s next meeting for consideration.

7) Consent Agenda
   a. Approval of Board Meeting Minutes from December 28, 2022, January 25, 2023, and February 9, 2023
   b. Opening of the 30-day Public Comment Period for 2020-2029 STIP/MPO Amendment #23-1
   c. Resolution approving 2020-2029 STIP/MPO Administrative Modification #23-1
   d. Resolution supporting the North Carolina State Ports Grant Authority’s Application for the USDOT FY 23 Port Infrastructure Development Grant Program to fund a new North Gate at the Port of Wilmington
   e. Resolution supporting Targets for Performance Measures Established By NCDOT

   Mr. Ellen made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as presented. Ms. Bozeman seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously by roll call vote as follows:


8) Regular Agenda
   a. Resolution adopting the 2023 Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization Legislative Agenda

   Mr. Kozlosky said that this item was presented at the Board’s last meeting for discussion, which now includes electric assisted bicycles. He noted that a memo included in today’s agenda packet outlines some information regarding electric assisted bicycles. Also included is language in support of the use of electric assisted bicycles and encouraging the General Assembly to implement legislation defining e-bike subclasses and local government control of permissible locations for their use to through local adopted ordinances and codes.

   Mr. Ellen expressed concerns regarding the public’s ability to distinguish between electric scooters and electric bicycles. Mr. Kozlosky responded that they are in separate legislation.

   Mr. Barbee expressed support for local control. Vice Chair Hays expressed a desire to get mopeds off the streets. Mr. Anderson pointed out that bikes can be faster than scooters.

   Associate Transportation Planner Carolyn Caggia gave an overview of sub-classes of electric assisted bicycles, which have been adopted in Virginia, Tennessee, and Georgia, but not North Carolina, as follows:

   - Class 1 – functional pedals and a motor to assist up to 20 mph
   - Class 2 – the motor can be used alone, without pedaling, up to 20 mph
   - Class 3 – motor assist with pedaling up to 28 mph
Ms. Caggia commented that these are industry standards, and that each e-bike should have a speedometer. She pointed out that enforcement may be difficult.

Vice Chair Hays made a motion to approve the MPO’s 2023 Legislative Agenda, seconded by Mr. Anderson, and the motion carried unanimously by roll call vote as follows:

**Ayes:** Mike Allen, Neil Anderson, Lynn Barbee, Brenda Bozeman, John Ellen, Wendy Fletcher-Hardee, Deb Hays, Hank Miller, Luke Waddell, Frank Williams, Eulis Willis and Landon Zimmer. **Nays:** None. **Excused:** Johnathan Barfield.

### b. Resolution adopting the Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Conflict of Interest Policy
Mr. Kozlosky said that at the last MPO Board meeting there was discussion regarding conflicts of interest. He noted that staff was encouraged to work with the MPO attorney to develop a draft policy, which has been included in the agenda packet for consideration.

Mr. Waddell expressed concerns regarding Item #5, which mandates that the member being recused is to leave the room while the matter is under consideration. Mr. Nichols clarified that there is no requirement that the member leave the room, but a suggestion based on the North Carolina State Ethics Commission’s Recusal Guidelines for Public Servants, on which much of the policy is based. He read the relevant section of the guidelines as follows:

> Because the Ethics Act restricts a public servant with a conflict of interest from taking “verbal or written action in furtherance of” an official action, it does not require that the public servant leave the room or a meeting where the matter is being discussed. However, the Ethics Commission recommends that public servants consider leaving the room in order to ensure that those present at the meeting are not influenced by the public servant’s presence or interest in the matter.

Ms. Hays concurred with Mr. Waddell. She noted that she would not be in favor of this item unless this point is stricken. Ms. Bozeman, Chairman Miller, and Mr. Anderson said that they might leave the table during recusal, but not the room.

Chairman Miller asked what would happen if both he and the Vice Chair were recused. Mr. Kozlosky responded that according to *Robert’s Rules*, a temporary chair would be elected.

Mr. Waddell made a motion to approve the MPO Board’s Conflict of Interest Policy striking the requirement for the recused to leave the room. Vice Chair Hays seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously by roll call vote, as follows:

**Ayes:** Mike Allen, Neil Anderson, Lynn Barbee, Brenda Bozeman, John Ellen, Wendy Fletcher-Hardee, Deb Hays, Hank Miller, Luke Waddell, Frank Williams, Eulis Willis and Landon Zimmer. **Nays:** None. **Excused:** Johnathan Barfield.

### 9) Discussion
#### a. Military Cutoff Road/Eastwood Road interchange
Vice Chair Hays presided in place of Chairman Miller. Mr. Kozlosky said that in October, the Board requested staff bring back options for delaying the Military Cutoff Road and Eastwood Road interchange project. He noted that staff has identified that this project has the potential to be swapped with the College Road and Oleander Drive intersection improvement project, since both are funded at the Statewide Tier. He pointed out that the Military Cutoff Road and Eastwood Road interchange is one of the Board’s top-five funded priorities and is funded at $66.4 million, whereas the College Road and Oleander Drive intersection
improvement is funded at $37.7 million. If the swap was to occur, $28.7 million would be used to rebalance in the Statewide Tier of the State Transportation Improvements Program (STIP).

Mr. Kozlosky said that there was some discussion at the Board’s November meeting and the Board delayed any decision because NCDOT was updating the traffic forecast. He noted that at the last meeting, a summary of the forecast was provided, although no discussion about the potential swap occurred due to concerns about potential conflicts of interest. During the last meeting, the Board requested that staff provide the conceptual aesthetic enhancements that the Wilmington City Council approved, which staff distributed and identified that City Council had allocated $560,000 for these enhancements. He added that any project swaps must be submitted with documentation to the STIP unit at NCDOT by March 17, 2023.

In response to an inquiry by Vice Chair Hays, Mr. Kozlosky said that the Board would need to decide today on a swap and that any remaining balance of funds would not remain local.

In response to an inquiry by Mr. Anderson, Mr. Kozlosky said that several intersection improvements funded for interchanges were identified by City Council for aesthetic enhancements, starting with Kerr and MLK, and that the other planned intersections have a consistent brick treatment. Since the Military Cutoff Road/Eastwood Road interchange is near the beach, the City Council decided it should appear different. Staff worked with the City’s Governance Committee (Councilmember Anderson, Mayor Pro Tem Haynes, and Councilmember O’Grady), who identified the aesthetic treatment, which is similar to Hungry Neck Boulevard and US-17 in Mount Pleasant, South Carolina. He added that the design for the interchange project has Eastwood Road passing over Military Cutoff Road, with traffic signals at Allen’s Lane and Drysdale Drive, and eliminating the one at the intersection.

Mr. Anderson said that this interchange has a coastal, sandstone vibe, whereas the others have a more historic Wilmington look. Mr. Kozlosky said that the lighting is like 3rd Street with prominent four globe lighting at the entrances to each approach and in the middle, and acorn lighting at the other locations. He added that the railing is two-bar railing.

In response to an inquiry by Mr. Waddell, Mr. Kozlosky said that he worked with Kevin Bowen at the Division office about three years ago and the cost of the aesthetic enhancements is subject to increase. Mr. Kimes said that NCDOT would continue to provide revised estimates.

Mr. Kimes said that the first traffic forecast was done in 2015, and, without the bridge being built, the first year of unsatisfactory Level of Service (LOS) is 2032. He noted that with the Drysdale Drive Extension, it’s anticipated that drivers will go past the extension and make a left at Military Cutoff Road to avoid waiting twice for a signal. If the interchange is not built, it will be necessary to remove the left turn at the intersection in 2029.

Mr. Kimes said that with the interchange, the LOS at Drysdale Drive at Military Cutoff Road improves from LOS F to LOS C; at Drysdale Drive and Eastwood Road, from LOS F to LOS A or LOS B; and at Commonwealth and Military Cutoff, from LOS F to LOS A. He pointed out that the interchange makes significant improvements based on the traffic forecast.

In response to an inquiry by Mr. Waddell, Mr. Kimes said that the College Road and Oleander Drive intersection is at LOS F. He noted that the preferred alternative needs to be reviewed.

Vice Chair Hays expressed concerns that College Road and Oleander Drive remains unimproved. She pointed out that the Wrightsville Beach Bridge is a bottleneck, and that an improvement might not be noticeable until the bottleneck is addressed.
Discussion continued about the College Road and Oleander Drive intersection improvements. Mr. Anderson pointed out that it’s less costly because it’s only a partial improvement.

Ms. Bozeman expressed concerns about the need to improve NC-133. Mr. Kimes responded that the project has environmental impacts, and is not in the 10-year STIP.

Mr. Anderson commented that Mayor Saffo is opposed to giving up $20 million and putting the project off when it’s at LOS F.

Vice Chair Hays reiterated her concerns about putting off College Road and Oleander Drive. Mr. Waddell commented that there is no worse intersection.

Mr. Barbee said that those who drive to Carolina Beach do not go through this intersection but take Myrtle Grove and Greenville Loop Road or the golf course, which pushes traffic into residential neighborhoods.

Mr. Anderson commented that the previous Division Engineer gave a great presentation on North-South traffic and all the lefts. He expressed concerns about delaying Statewide projects such as the Independence Boulevard Extension, which has not come back once it was denied by the city.

Vice Chair Hays asked about improvements for College Road other than at Parkway Drive. Mr. Kimes explained that it’s complicated by right-of-way and utilities.

Ms. Fletcher-Hardee agreed with Mr. Anderson about not relinquishing any money. She pointed out that the continuity of the project is important. She expressed concerns about the congestion in Hampstead and hopes for the completion of the Hampstead Bypass.

In response to an inquiry by Vice Chair Hays, Mr. Kimes responded that Military Cutoff Road would only be widened for additional turn lanes. He added that the footprint of Eastwood Road will become narrower. Mr. Kozlosky noted that the lefts will be removed.

Vice Chair Hays expressed concerns about the hard right onto Commonwealth Drive. Mr. Kimes responded that it will be improved. He added that most of the buildings will remain intact although there will be some impacts to parking.

Vice Chair Hays noted that no action would be required in the absence of a project swap.

Mr. Barbee expressed concerns about a potential loss of funding, and the weaker impact of the College Road and Oleander Drive intersection improvement project.

It was the consensus of the Board to stay with the plan as is. Vice Chair Hays asked for a focus on the College Road and Oleander Drive intersection.

b. **2020-2029 STIP/MPO Transportation Improvement Program Administrative Modifications #23-2**

Chairman Miller resumed presiding over the meeting.

Mr. Kozlosky said this item is for information purposes only and will be brought back for consideration at the Board’s next meeting.

c. **2020 Urbanized Area (UA) Census Data- Organizational Boundaries, Structure, and Governance**

Mr. Kozlosky reminded Board members that the U.S. Census published the Wilmington Urbanized Area (UA) population in December and additional information in January. He noted that the MPO Board began a discussion at its last meeting, which will continue.
MPO Deputy Director Abby Lorenzo gave a brief presentation on the federal code for the Metropolitan Planning Area, outlined some potential pros and cons related to potential expansion and provided a few scenarios. Due to technical difficulties, remote participants were unable to view the presentation.

Ms. Lorenzo said that staff continues to have discussions since the release of the Urban Area boundaries. She noted that State Statute stipulates that the MPO must re-evaluate every ten (10) years when the Urban Areas are released by the Census Bureau. She read the relevant stipulations within the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) that guide MPOs through the process of identifying potential impacts to the planning area boundary of the MPO as follows:

**CFR § 450.312 Metropolitan Planning Area boundaries**

(a) The boundaries of a metropolitan planning area (MPA) shall be determined by agreement between the MPO and the Governor.

1. At a minimum, the MPA boundaries shall encompass the entire existing urbanized area (as defined by the Bureau of the Census) plus the contiguous area expected to become urbanized within a 20-year forecast period for the metropolitan transportation plan (MTP).

2. The MPA boundaries may be further expanded to encompass the entire metropolitan statistical area or combined statistical area, as defined by the Office of Management and Budget...

(c) An MPA boundary may encompass more than one urbanized area. [Within the current WMPO planning area boundary is a portion of the Hampstead Urbanized Area under the population threshold of 50,000.]

(d) MPA boundaries may be established to coincide with the geography of regional economic development and growth forecasting areas...

(i) The MPO (in cooperation with the State and public transportation operator(s)) shall review the MPA boundaries after each Census to determine if existing MPA boundaries meet the minimum statutory requirements for new and updated urbanized area(s) and shall adjust them as necessary. As appropriate, additional adjustments should be made to reflect the most comprehensive boundary to foster an effective planning process that ensures connectivity between modes, improves access to modal systems, and promotes efficient overall transportation investment strategies.

Ms. Lorenzo provided the staff-identified pros and cons of MPA expansion, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPA Expansion Pros</th>
<th>MPA Expansion Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Provides federal transportation planning process to a rapidly growing region where some locations are identified as Urban Areas (UA) by U.S. Census definition.</td>
<td>• Expansion could increase demand on existing staff and budgetary resources, and potentially increase the cost for the organization to provide transportation planning services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enables greater regional coordination and collaboration, while potentially strengthening regional influence.</td>
<td>• Would increase the competitiveness of projects selected for submittal to NCDOT Prioritization (by the WMPO) and for WMPO Direct Attributable funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Creates additional relationships with communities in northern Pender County and/or southern Brunswick County.</td>
<td>• May dilute the voting membership of the existing MPO members (depending on how the governance structure is or is not amended).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expands opportunities for transportation planning in northern Pender County to include US 17 and NC Highway 50.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MPA Expansion Pros
- Expands opportunities for transportation planning in southern Brunswick County to include the NC Highway 133, NC Highway 211, and NC Highway 87 corridors.
- NCDOT could provide additional funding for planning and project implementation (to be based on revised funding distribution formula).

### MPA Expansion Cons
- May create a situation where it is harder to maintain a quorum with added membership.

In response to an inquiry by Mr. Anderson, Ms. Lorenzo said that jurisdictions immediately outside the MPO Planning Area Boundary are part of the Cape Fear Rural Planning Organization (RPO). She noted that RPOs are created by the state, work closely with NCDOT Planning Division, and are neither federally required nor mandated. She noted that RPOs have a policy board, an advisory committee of elected officials from the jurisdictions that are part of the organization. For instance, the Cape Fear RPO neither receives federal funding to be distributed to members for projects nor do they receive funds for federal planning activities.

Ms. Lorenzo noted that staff has identified potential scenarios for consideration, as follows:

1) Expand the planning area boundary to the north to the remaining portion of Hampstead to include Surf City and Topsail Beach
2) Expand the planning area boundary to the west to Columbus County and to the south in Brunswick County to Southport, Oak Island, Saint James, and Boiling Springs Lake.
3) A combination or hybrid of the first two scenarios.
4) No change.

Mr. Kozlosky reminded the Board members that staff’s intent is to begin the conversation today although any amendment to the Planning Area boundary would need to be made no later than November 18, 2025, when next long-range plan is adopted. He noted that reasons to begin consideration now include:

- The impending kick-off of the next long range plan update to include any new jurisdictions,
- Potential changes to the state’s formula for disbursing its planning funds, and,
- Once the urbanized Area and Planning Area boundaries are settled, the state will update the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), which all of the member jurisdictions must sign.

Mr. Kozlosky encouraged the Board members to consider the Planning Area boundary sooner than later to prevent having to sign the MOU twice if there is a desire to expand. He noted that if there is support for a change, staff recommends beginning conversations with the local jurisdictions because any expansion will need to be mutually agreed upon.

A question/answer and discussion period followed. Mr. Anderson expressed concerns about dilution with changes to the formula. Mr. Kozlosky responded that discussions are early yet. He noted that the formula was changed in the early or mid-2000s and agreed to again with the 2010 Census. Since when Southern Pines and Pinehurst will become an MPO, they will need to be added to the formula.

Mr. Anderson expressed concerns regarding the expense of projects in coastal areas with many bridges.

Mr. Williams said that Brunswick County is currently represented by three planning organizations: the RPO, the WMPO and the Myrtle Beach MPO. He expressed concerns with southern Brunswick County working with SCDOT instead of NCDOT, although working with the Grand Strand MPO is favored. He added that if
Brunswick County were served by one planning organization, the governance structure would be challenging to accommodate its 19 towns.

Discussion continued. Mr. Kozlosky said that the Jacksonville MPO expanded its boundaries a few years ago to the Onslow County line, excluding Surf City, and will be conducting boundary expansion conversations again.

In response to an inquiry by Mr. Anderson, Mr. Kozlosky said that the WMPO might consider expanding its boundary to Surf City and Topsail, which are part of the federally designated UA of Hampstead and would logically be part of the WMPO’s Planning Area boundary. He noted that the RPO has one staff member. Whereas the WMPO has 12 staff members, provides planning services for 494 square miles, and receives and is responsible for the expenditure of federal transportation dollars, which benefit member jurisdictions. He explained that the MPO is tasked with conducting transportation planning in a continuing, comprehensive, and cooperative manner, which expansion would achieve.

Mr. Kozlosky commented that it would be beneficial to have conversations to see if interest exists. If so, the MPO could work out the details. He noted that there are different approaches to voting membership, such as weighted voting on an on-call system as included in the MOU of the Capital Area MPO in Raleigh. He added that for the Jacksonville MPO, the city has two votes, NCDOT has one vote and the two county commissioners each have a vote. However, the county commissioners also represent jurisdictions with no voting responsibility. He said that the MPO is tasked with reviewing its planning area boundary, governance, and structure, with the boundary being the first consideration.

In response to an inquiry by Ms. Bozeman, Mr. Kozlosky said that Southport approached the WMPO a few years ago. However, the Board was not in favor of expanding at that time.

Mr. Kozlosky requested to gauge the interest of other jurisdictions. It was the consensus of the Board to continue discussion to the next meeting. Mr. Williams expressed support for exploring the options.

10) Updates

a. Wilmington Urban Area MPO
b. Cape Fear Public Transportation Authority
c. NCDOT Division
d. NCDOT Transportation Planning Division

Mr. Kimes reminded Board members that the interchange at Martin Luther King Jr. (MLK) Parkway and College Road (U-5792), and the College Road improvements from Gordon Road to Market Street (U-5881), which were going to be built together, fell out of the State Transportation Improvements Program (STIP) and became unfunded. He noted that due to some shifts in the Division Tier, Independence Boulevard slipped a few years, which freed up some Division Tier funds that will go toward U-5792 and NCDOT will build College Road from Gordon Road up to Market Street with three interchanges at Kings Drive, Ringo Drive, and MLK Parkway and College Road. He added that the project will be under right-of-way acquisition in 2024 and construction in 2026. He commented that this is big news, which Mr. Kozlosky distributed, and a map of the improvements is available. He pointed out that it will allow Wilmington to get its gateway and free flowing traffic on MLK Parkway.

Chairman Miller requested an interchange project update from NCDOT at a future meeting.
11) **Announcements**

a. **NC State Ethics Forms Due- April 17, 2023**

   Mr. Kozlosky added that the Compensation Committee will meet on March 1st, and that the Ports Tour is on March 8th.

   Chairman Miller acknowledged that Mr. Waddell’s son was born on February 14th. He added that NC State beat UNC yesterday, although NC State fell out of the top 20.

12) **Next meeting – March 29, 2023**

   Attorney Nichols advised that it would be okay to adjourn without a roll call vote.

   Mr. Zimmer made motion to adjourn the meeting. Vice Chair Hays seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

   The meeting adjourned at 4:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Kozlosky  
Executive Director  
Wilmington Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization

**THE ABOVE MINUTES ARE NOT A VERBATIM RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS.**  
**THE ENTIRE PROCEEDINGS ARE RECORDED DIGITALLY AS PART OF THIS RECORD.**