**ESCC meeting, 29 March 2018, 14:30 - 17:00, ESCC offices, Lewes**

**Present:**

*Conserve Alfriston -*

Graham Skelcey (Graham)

Bill Rendall (Bill)

Neil Parkinson (Neil)

Hannah Parkinson (Hannah)

Caroline Adcock (Caroline) [Not as a representative of APC]

*Alfriston Parish Council -*

Nick Beechey (Nick)

Keith Halliday (Keith)

*Safe -*

June Goodfield (June)

Tony Palmer (Tony) [Attending as June Goodfield’s driver]

Cllr Stephen Shing

*East Sussex Highways (ESH)* - James Vaks (James V) *East Sussex County Council (ESCC)* - Andrew Keer (Andrew K)

**Key purpose of meeting (as stated by Andrew K) -**

To present outcomes from the review of ESCC scheme; the commitment was made at the lead member’s meeting to proceed to the detailed design stage. At that meeting, the lead member also requested the ESCC team to keep stakeholders informed. This meeting is to do that, and to outline the next steps.

**James V introductory remarks**

SDNPA was not present due to availability issues - he will be making the same presentation to SDNPA in two weeks. But because of tight timetable, he wanted to have this meeting now, as it may feed into the report going to the lead member in advance of the lead member meeting in May.

James V stressed that the focus of the presentation is to bring the attendees up to date - not to focus on matters prior to the lead member’s meeting when the decision was taken to proceed to the detailed design stage.

He then set out the contents of the presentation.

* Key Project Milestones
* Traffic issues
* How to address the issues - the options considered
* A review of the 2016 ESCC scheme presented at the consultation
* The results of the traffic modelling
* The trial scheme
* Next steps

**Key project milestones**

* Meetings with key stakeholders being held in March.
* Lead member’s meeting in May - when the recommendation to the lead member will be to do a trial of the proposed traffic light scheme in September.

***IF*** the lead member decides to proceed with a trial, then after the trial the results of the trial will be reviewed. At that point, either ESCC will proceed with a permanent scheme or will explore other options.

James V was asked if he would send the presentation to the attendees. He said it would be part of the report sent to the lead member in advance of the meeting in May.

**Traffic issues**

James V noted that stakeholders and various parties from the village and APC had raised concerns about the 2016 ESCC ‘consultation’ process, making the point that it didn’t reflect the views of the village or of the APC, at least in part because it focussed only on a traffic signal design, but that he wanted to separate that out from the discussion. He then showed the charts produced by ESCC after the ESCC ‘consultation’ showing the responses to the ‘consultation’. There were 390 questionnaires received, 315 from the village. The charts showed:

* strong agreement that there is a traffic problem in the narrower section of the High Street
* strong agreement that there is congestion in the narrower section
* strong agreement/agreement that there is a problem with traffic mounting the footway in the narrower section
* strong agreement/agreement that there is a problem with traffic mounting the footway in the narrower section and striking buildings.

James V noted that, ignoring what was presented at the ESCC ‘consultation’ to resolve the issue, the questionnaire noted that there was strong opinion about traffic in the narrower section.

He noted that in the summer, ESCC conducted traffic surveys and video evidence, which he said backed up the feedback received from the ESSC ‘consultation’.

James V presented a graph (a pictorial representation of the data in the traffic monitoring report supplied to APC) that showed over the period 7am to 6pm how many times a vehicle mounted the pavement in the narrower section, and how many times a pedestrian and/or a Large Goods Vehicle was present in the area at the time. He stated that the occurrence of two cars passing in the narrower section, with one of them mounting the footway, happened frequently. Although in lots of cases no pedestrians were present, and so arguably this is a low risk to pedestrians, mounting the footway is a frequent occurrence.

Bill noted that the figures shown were absolute figures; he asked if ESCC had figures as a percentage. James V noted that they only had absolute figures, but that’s a fair point and **he would consider getting the percentage figures.**

Nick B asked if APC could have the report with these graphs in it, given that it was partly their justification for their next steps. James V noted that the report containing the data on which the graphs had been based had been supplied to APC (and that **he would supply a copy to Conserve Alfriston**). The graphs were simply pictorial representations of the data in that report. Andrew K noted that **he and James V would decide after the meeting whether or not to let the attendees have the graphs.**

The next slide showed the same thing at the weekend, although the number of pedestrians was higher and the number of commercial vehicles was lower.

James V concluded that the problems were:

* insufficient carriageway width and poor visibility in the narrower section
* traffic speed / inappropriate driver behaviour
* parking enforcement (lack of)
* vehicles ignoring weight restrictions

Neil asked if the video evidence showed any vehicle/pedestrian impacts, any vehicle/building impacts, or any vehicle/vehicle impacts.

James V stated that the video evidence showed no vehicle/pedestrian impacts or vehicle/building impacts. There were no vehicle/vehicle impact, but there was an incident where it seemed two cars tried to pass each other, the drivers seemingly got out and had a dispute.

June noted that in the past she had a list of incidents (some with police reports) - are these not taken into consideration?

James V noted that the fact that we are here talking about possible schemes means that has been taken into account.

James V then moved on to how to address the issues - ie. why and where we are now.

**Options**

James V presented three options.

* + Widen or reconfigure the existing carriageway in the narrower section.
  + Reduce the volume and composition of traffic and/or improve driver behavior.
  + Manage the opposing traffic flows through the narrow section.

**Widen or reconfigure the existing carriageway in the narrower section**

No real option to do this (apart from pulling down houses, restricting/removing front gardens) so not viable.

**Reduce the volume and composition of traffic and/or improve driver behaviour**

James V viewed this section as a response to Conserve Alfriston’s proposals, i.e as he said, to make people more aware of their surroundings, shared space etc. And he noted that since the lead member’s meeting in September 2016, Conserve Alfriston had presented a petition; a response to this and the Conserve Alfriston proposal would be included as part of the report to the lead member’s meeting.

James V now went through several of the points in Conserve Alfriston’s proposal.

*Approaches to the village - enhancement of signage*

ESCC considered this worthwhile to explore – the enhancement of the HGV signage to improve HGV drivers awareness of the existing weight limit - and is doing so with Highways England. However, improved signage alone will not completely resolve the issues created by insufficient carriageway width. James V commented that he found it hard to understand how under current situation two large vehicles meeting managed to pass each other. Nick offered his view “that people sort it out – that’s the way the world works.”

*Enhancement of village entrances - eg village gateways*

ESCC considers these to have some merit in enhancing driver awareness. It has been done in other places, and ESCC offer a Community Match scheme which in some cases is able to help fund it. However, once again, this won’t resolve the issues created by insufficient carriageway width.

*Priority signing - i.e clear, static, signs giving one direction priority over the other*

These are only possible if there is inter-visibility between the opposing vehicles, and that there is sufficient space for vehicles to stop and wait. They would have been ideal, and it is a good way to control traffic, and they are tailored to blend in. However they are not viable – there is insufficient inter-visibility and insufficient carriageway width. (Presumably this statement refers to the narrower section of the High Street but Conserve Alfriston did not propose them there.) James noted that he felt that only a small minority of drivers are not respectful of road signs, but there are some who don’t give way.

*Vehicle Activated Signage (VAS) - signs that can flash up a message, such as Wait - Oncoming traffic!*

With the help of Conserve Alfriston, James V has been in discussion with a manufacturer. These can be hazard warning signs, signs that only apply to selected vehicles etc.VAS’s used in East Sussex only display speed, hazard or junction warning messages aimed at all drivers and vehicle types.. ESCC’s policy is to prioritise such signage at specific locations - where there has been an accident or crash history. They won’t use them to control speed, but will use them to assist drivers. They want to avoid proliferation - as they start to get ignored if too many.

Hannah noted that the signs Conserve Alfriston were suggesting were to instruct rather than inform.

The signs generally need to be standard signs (ie in the Highway code) because non-standard can lead to ambiguity, so they usually supplement existing static signs - for example speed limit warnings. He stated that “ a non-standard sign is not a problem, you go to DfT for approval; if it's a suitable solution there’s a process to go through”.

The signs need to be in a suitable location…they can only be justified if it can be demonstrated that alternative standard signs can’t be adopted.

Neil noted that Conserve Alfriston were looking to supplement the Give Way signs with a message to note that there was a vehicle approaching. James V noted that that was positive control of traffic. Neil said that no, the signs were providing information. James V said the sign had to be clear on what you want driver to do. So if you’re looking for positive traffic management, the solution is traffic signals. ESCC see traffic signals as an alternative means to do this (positively control traffic) and VAS will therefore not be approved.

Graham commented that he felt that there’s a lack of flexibility with traffic signals and the scope of the ESCC brief is too limited. One thing he had got from Clearview (a designer / supplier) was that even though there is not inter-visibility between the proposed signal locations, there could be a clear line of wireless communication between VAS signs at each end via a ‘transmitter' box at the apex of the main bend (roughly outside the Coach House). The VAS signs needn’t be primary signage.

James V noted that it was still positive traffic control – conveying a message for the driver to stop. He cited examples in Dorset, where the signs flash on with an instruction to wait, and where there is room for vehicles to wait. They are targeting large vehicles. He noted that this isn’t the case in Alfriston, where the issue is two cars passing. He noted that the minimum width of the carriageway for two vehicles to pass is 5.5metres and stated that this is mandatory.

Nick noted that many roads were under 5.5m in width and stated that the mandatory minimum width relates only to temporary roadworks. James V seemed to confirm this.

Nick stated that at the existing give way signs there is sufficient room for two cars to pass. June noted that the whole meeting was ignoring the issue of pedestrians and that it is prohibited for cars to mount the footway.

Nick noted that although, as is known, he didn’t advocate the Conserve Alfriston proposals, but engaged in debate with James V about whether a reactive message, supplementing a standard Give Way sign, as proposed by Conserve Alfriston, would need authorisation. James V conceded that it might not. **Nick asked if James V and Andrew K would provide him with the regulations re. ‘special authorisation’.**

There was further discussion about what Conserve Alfriston had proposed - and whether the signs were attempting to positively stop traffic - which is what a traffic signal system does - or advise drivers/warn them not to proceed because of oncoming traffic. Conserve Alfriston noted the latter. James V raised the issue of ambiguity - how long would the sign be on…how long would drivers wait… Conserve Alfriston responded that the sign would flash on, and shortly afterwards the driver would be able to see the oncoming traffic - the stretch/period of blocked visibility before the car comes into view is very short.

It was pointed out that where the current give way signs are there is room to stop and for another vehicle to pass.

Caroline asked if it would work if the signs were positioned further away from the existing give way signs, where the carriageway was sufficiently wide. James V noted this would add to the ambiguity - it would take longer for the driver to see the ongoing traffic so they might be tempted not to wait.Also, James V was not convinced that it could cope with large vehicles passing a car.

Nick then suggested a simple width restriction through the village - a central island with a dropdown bollard. The majority of vehicles would be able to pass through unhindered. Larger lorries/emergency vehicles that needed to come through - eg for deliveries - could lower the bollard. He commented that such schemes had been used to great effect in Oxford and Cambridge. Andrew K noted that such examples were not the same sort of road; he said that as Alfriston was a primary route such width restrictions were not suitable for this type of road with this volume of traffic.

Nick asked Andrew K to confirm that he had said that Alfriston was a primary route. James V clarified - that it was not a primary route but rather a route connecting two primary routes, so the issue is about traffic volume as well as traffic type. He further noted that in his view such a suggestion was completely inappropriate given the scenario in Alfriston.

Nick noted that all cars could be accommodated - they wouldn’t be affected by width restrictions.

James V noted that it wasn’t just an issue with large vehicles passing each other - that two standard cars can’t pass each other in the narrower section.

Nick noted that while two ordinary cars can’t pass each other in the narrower section, then can in the give way part. James V agreed.

Neil noted that ESCC had correctly described the Conserve Alfriston proposals as seeking to reduce the volume to traffic and to change driver behaviour - this used mechanisms along the valley not just at the last minute at the narrower section. He also noted that the volume of traffic was predicted to reduce through the improvements at Exceat and to the A27 (citing Maria Caulfield, MP) and the reduction in coach parking in the Willows Car Park. He also noted that the Conserve Alfriston proposal was all about changing behaviour; that it was a holistic scheme…and that currently it seemed to have been ignored apart from better signage on the approaches.

James V commented that he approved of the concept, but that the issue was the physical width constraint in the narrower section; that that issue cannot be resolved by signage alone. And that width restrictions would not be something that the ESCC Road Safety team would support. Nick asked if ESCC Road Safety team had committed their opinion to writing and, if so, could he have a copy. James V said that it wasn’t committed to writing and that the conversation had taken place some time in February. All this would be in the pack for the lead member.

*Change of surface treatment*

ESCC noted there was merit in doing this, and that it could be part of any package. But again, it does not provide a resolution to the insufficient carriageway width in the narrower section.

*20mph speed restriction*

ESCC is taking this forward, as shown in the 2016 ESCC ‘consultation’ plans.

Bill asked if there could be an extension of the restriction through West Street and up North Road past the school. Andrew K noted that this was not part of the scheme, but Lewes is looking into having an area-wide 20mph limit, so it could be done. 20mph would be introduced as part of the trial, and feedback would be obtained to determine if people liked the speed limit, hated the lights, could extend the speed limit more.

Nick asked if ESCC would consider extending the 20mph trial without the traffic light trial, to give more evaluation? James V noted that this was a fair point - the main drive was to try and replicate the proposed traffic light scheme with the 20mph limit; if the lights can’t operate with the 20mph, then the option is flawed. But there would be no reason not to trial the 20mph without the signals - they don’t have to go hand in hand.

James V concluded that the option to reduce the volume and composition of traffic and/or improve driver behaviour would not solve the issue of insufficient carriageway width in the narrower section.

**Manage the opposing traffic flows through the narrower section**

**One-way system**

This would mean southbound vehicles using the High Street, with northbound vehicles going up Star Lane, along the Furlongs and down North Street past the school, and through the car park. Apart from the issue of more traffic (including large vehicles) going past the school, WDC would not support the changes to the car park to make this possible, so this option is not viable.

**Traffic Management Control**

**Priority signs** (in the narrower section)

Only possible if inter-visibility from the waiting point along the carriageway is sufficient, which in Alfriston’s case it is not.

Bill asked if the use of mirrors was considered? Nick noted that mirrors can be approved, DfT street furniture. James V noted that they could be used in the correct circumstances - they are a form of equipment to allow visibility around corners but he would not recommend them for roads of this nature, based on his professional judgment, and the Road Safety team agreed. Mirrors are ok for private access, but they mist up, can be awkward to get used to, can distort, can’t be seen at night.

**Traffic signals (as presented in 2016)**

James V stated that ESCC have a clear mandate to progress with a traffic light scheme as presented in 2016.

He noted that the scheme presented in 2016 suggested 3 sets of lights at the Weavers Lane junction, and traffic control at Market Square.

The lead member instructed him to proceed to detailed design stage. As part of this, the first thing he did was to scrutinise in detail the scheme presented to see if it could work. He noted that ESCC has to be comfortable that the scheme works, so he has to question its design and appropriateness, and test it out. So he has been reviewing and questioning the design – they will continue that process with this trial, including seeing impacts further up from the narrower section.

The point of this scrutiny is that ESCC don’t want to spend lots of money on something that is not easy to construct, and doesn’t work because of the whole dynamic Alfriston brings further along the village.

Market Square

James V considered:

* visual impact from supporting signage that would be needed
* social impact
* risk of congestion
* safety concerns
* impact on commercial operations
* impact on bus operators

James V acknowledged that the ESCC ‘consultation’ was misleading in that it didn’t show the true extent of signage needed, particularly around Market Square.

He noted that he had considered the alternative placements of the signals at the North end of the village. He concluded that delivery access combined with parking in the square would prevent northbound traffic going the west side of Market Square. He showed a video of Morris dancing in the square, showing vehicles passing safely by on the other side. Signals would mean such events would need road closures. He acknowledged the important social nature of the square to the village and that they didn’t want that to be lost.

He then looked at the suggested lights south of Star Lane and outside the Manor House. A signal outside the Manor House he has also deemed not suitable.

June was concerned that during the discussion no one had mentioned the rights of pedestrians, the disabled, mothers with toddlers or pushing  buggies.  She said that all  pedestrians  are entitled to have safe passage through their streets on pavements without having to worry about encroaching vehicles.

**The Trial Scheme**

The proposed scheme is now for traffic lights at Weavers Lane and Star Lane/Tudor House. The trial scheme will be as close as possible to the actual proposed scheme. However there will be differences. There will be a single primary traffic light (at Star Lane?) but in a permanent scheme there will need to be primary and secondary signal heads for safety, likely to be on swan neck poles. There is a lack of clarity where - outside The Star and the Tudor House or outside The George and Steamer Trading. (As James V noted at the close of the meeting, this is a material change to the scheme shown at the 2016 consultation).

There is a desire to do as little digging as possible for the trial so the temporary lights will be larger at their bottoms - Caroline A raised the potential that they would block footways. James V noted that the lights would be difficult to fit in due to the narrow footway and road carriageway. The trial scheme will need to go through an independent safety audit.

Nick asked if ESCC would be making it clear to residents that the number of signals, and the look etc would not be representative of what would be in place under a permanent scheme. James V completely agreed. James V noted he was well aware that even a trial scheme was a big project for the village, and it would be vital to collect feedback from the trial and acknowledge that the trial has omissions. The trial will not look ‘nice’.

Andrew K noted that they wanted the trial to be as close as possible to the actual situation but there were constraints as above.

James V noted that the main point of trial is to scenario test how it operates. It won't replicate look. If the trial shows there is not gridlock, that it could work, then there would be further details to show what the real scheme would mean.

Nick noted that a parishioner at APC had raised the issue of whether emission testing had been planned as part of the trial. James V noted that it was not planned - a high level review of possible emissions and noise had been done. Air quality was onerous to assess - need baseline data, normally over a period of years. Nick urged ESCC to undertake whatever emission testing was possible, so as to gauge whatever impact there may be. **Nick asked them to respond in relation to this as soon as possible, and not leave it until the lead member meeting, given that the question had been raised at APC.**

James V agreed to take that away and provide a response. Andrew K noted that the environmental team could assist. Also, he acknowledged that where congestion was in the narrow section, it may just move up into the High Street, so difficult to assess impact on air quality, but he acknowledged that this wasn’t his area of expertise.

**Traffic modelling**

The modelling was taken from volumes of traffic counted July and August 2017 and models the periods: weekday pm peak (16-18) and weekend peak (12 -14).

James V noted that if they were to put in a signal scheme, which would have significant impact, they needed clearer information on how it would work, hence the modelling. The count of cars at High and Over was used to inform when peak time might be so when best to monitor. The objective was to determine:

* if parking could be retained at the approach to Star Lane
* the extent of traffic queues

**Outcomes:-**

* full time parking restrictions needed at the approaches to the signals at Star Lane - i.e all along the current single yellow line.
* the signals had minimal impact on the average vehicle journey time - Nick noted that southbound times would increase be c. 30 seconds/50%.
* average maximum queue length was 140m at Market Square end and100m at Weavers end. Maximums of 200m+ at Market Square and 100m at Weavers end.

These are not insignificant queues over the peak period. The trial will test whether queue length will look like that. Bill noted that 140m from the Star took the queue to halfway down North Street

Neil pointed out that James V had made the point that he had modified the ESCC scheme to protect the market square, but even a queue length of around 70m from the Star would block the east side of the Square and again send northbound traffic past the shops, again creating a virtual roundabout.

The permanent signals will be ‘intelligent’. The modelling didn’t use bias - ie give preferential treatment to one direction or the other. The trial lights will. Nick asked what would happen if there was equal demand at each end, and if the bias is too much in one direction, you simply get a mass of traffic coming the other way. James V noted that they could play around in the trials, varying the bias. He noted that they might be creating a perfect storm and gridlock, hence the trials. Andrew K noted that signals could make the route through the village undesirable.

Nick asked if parking enforcement was integral to the scheme and so would bollards be put out during the trial? And would the trial be run some of the time without bollards to replicate what is likely to happen without enforcement.

James V confirmed that parking enforcement was intrinsic to the scheme. If the trial shows the traffic lights scheme could work, and there are not significant queues, then the next step would be how to resolve parking enforcement. The modelling showed that with cars parked outside the Star a traffic light scheme gridlocked within 30 seconds.

Neil asked about Star Lane. James V noted that the intention was to keep Star Lane two-way, though one-way may be necessary. As part of the trial, left turns into Star Lane from the High Street would need to be banned, and right turns out of Star Lane. Relevant signage would need to be placed outside Steamer Trading and in Star Lane.

Discussion then took place about how parking enforcement would impact on the village. Neil asked about the issue of loading and unloading in the HS queue zone since vehicles needed to stop there for access. James V said this would need to be looked at; parking enforcement is not in the gift of ESCC. If the trial showed that it was necessary, ESCC might seek to ban all loading/unloading in the High Street 24/7.

Nick asked multiple times about bin lorry collection as it made its way along the High Street. No resolution was reached.

Discussion also took place around what happened with, for example, a bin lorry between the lights - how people would know which traffic flow had priority - James V noted that the Amey proposal (2016 scheme) had signal heads midway through the system to reinforce traffic priority. Nick said Amey’s own safety auditors had highlighted that as a danger as it might add more confusion.

Nick stated it is a big issue if you cannot load or unload outside your house or business, where there is no access at the side or rear. What happens if someone is moving house? Nick also noted that there was at least one property with a garage leading on to the High Street. And that whilst numerous villagers outside of the High Street might not see this as a problem in a consultation, it would be for those directly affected. And also, equestrians use the High Street. How would all this be taken into account in a consultation? James V responded that a lot of issues needed consideration and assessment, and they have to take an evidence-based approach and informed decision.

In summary, James V noted that the trial scheme was subject to lead member approval. If approved, there would be temporary traffic signals at Weavers Lane and Star Lane junctions, to replicate as much as possible the proposed scenario. A four-week trial in September 2018 is proposed. James V further stated that if after the trial he got a tick in the box, then they would move onto the next stage. Nick asked what would happen if he got a cross in the box. After a pause, James V responded ‘I can’t decide that or say.’

James V noted he was not trying to defend a traffic light scheme; the trial would either rule it out or prove evidence that it could work.

Cllr Shing challenged why the trial was for September, rather than August - the busiest month. Andrew K noted that ESCC had chosen September because of the negative economic impact on such a busy tourist village of having it in the busiest month. (As noted before, the trial scheme will not look nice).

Also, there is a matter of timing. The lead member meeting is at the end of May, after that James V needs to follow a legal process to get approval for the trial, and the ESCC communication and engagement team will need to get in touch with villagers to inform them about the scheme etc.

Cllr Shing still noted that it would be better to do it at a time when it is at its busiest.

The trial would include 20mph, revoked parking along the High Street (using cones) and buildouts around the Star Lane junction.

James V noted that the trial would be assessed as follows:

* queue lengths monitored
* video surveys to monitor traffic behaviour
* traffic speed surveys to be conducted
* opportunity for community feedback.

**Timetable**

March 2018 - update meetings with stakeholders

May 2018 - Lead member meeting

Subject to lead member agreement to the trial:-

June - September 2018 progress the design of the trial scheme

September 2018 - Trial Scheme

Post Trial -

Holding period to review the trial scheme.

James V acknowledged that the new ECC proposal is a “material change” from the scheme on which the village was consulted.

Caroline asked if ESCC would walk away if the trial failed. Andrew K noted that there had been a long history of involvement and he wouldn’t want to commit to an answer now.

Neil pointed out that Conserve Alfriston needed to relay information from the meeting to its c365 petitioners so that they have the opportunity to give feedback prior to the Lead Member meeting. ESCC declined to provide the presentation they had given for wider circulation as would not work as a standalone item. Neil noted that conveying information from our notes was likely to be more confusing, but the presentation was not provided. Andrew K stated that the report to the lead member will be available seven days before the meeting.

Neil asked how villagers could give their views to the lead member about the trial scheme, before the lead member’s meeting. He also asked if someone from ESCC would come to make this presentation to the wider village before the lead member meeting. No answer was given.

June thanked James for his detailed work.

Neil also thanked him, noting that he appeared to have been put in a difficult position by ESCC, and had to work within the mandate he was given.

However, Neil was very critical of ESCC. He noted that almost a year ago, ESCC had been provided with detailed survey information that showed overwhelming opposition to the ESCC traffic lights proposals from villagers and businesses. And the various survey results was not, for example, a close 52%/48% - there was overwhelming opposition to the ESSC scheme and support for the Conserve Alfriston scheme of the order of 90%/10%. Yet ESCC has not meaningfully responded to the letter or this survey data and he regarded this as profoundly undemocratic.

Nick noted that at a previous meeting with James V and Andrew K he had asked whether they would conduct a trial before committing to any permanent scheme. Nick noted that they had said no because the computer modelling was so good there was no need to have a trial. Nick then asked why now, when the modelling shows the scheme doesn’t work, they are proceeding to a trial?

James V and Andrew K responded that they were going through the stages.

The meeting then ended.

**APPENDICES**

 