

## MEETING MINUTES

### Merrimack Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MVMPO)

### Merrimack Valley Planning Commission (MVPC), Haverhill, MA

Wednesday, January 27, 2016 – 12:00 p.m.

#### **Attending:**

#### **Voting Members:**

Steve Woelfel, MassDOT, representing MassDOT Secretary Pollack  
Connie Raphael, Representing Highway Administrator Thomas Tinlin  
Dennis DiZoglio, MVPC Executive Director  
Joe Costanzo, representing MVRTA Advisory Board  
Mayor James Fiorentini, representing City of Haverhill  
Theresa Park, representing City of Lawrence Mayor Rivera  
Neil Harrington, Town of Salisbury Town Manager - MVMPO Subregion #1

#### **Others Present:**

|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Mary Kay Beninati, MVPC          | John Pettis, City of Haverhill         |
| Joe Cosgrove, MVPC               | Bill Scott, City of Amesbury           |
| Todd Fontanella, MVPC            | Bill Steelman, Essex National Heritage |
| Mayor Ken Gray, City of Amesbury | Commission                             |
| Jerry Klima, Town of Salisbury   | Jim Terlizzi, MVPC                     |
| Anthony Komornick, MVPC          | Nikki Tishler, MassDOT OTP             |
| Rafael Mares, CLF                | Geordie Vining, City of Newburyport    |
|                                  | Kevin Wright, FHWA                     |

#### **Agenda Item No. 1: Call to Order**

Mr. Woelfel called the meeting to order at 12:05 p.m. and asked all attendees to introduce themselves.

#### **Agenda Item No. 2: Adoption of Minutes of the July 29, 2015 MVMPO Meeting**

There was a motion to approve the July 29, 2015 MVMPO meeting minutes. *The motion was seconded and approved.*

### **Agenda Item No. 3 Opportunity for Public Comment**

Mr. Woelfel asked if there were any members of the public present who wished to speak to the MVMPO. Mr. Mares advised that he would comment on Agenda Item 4d later in the meeting. No other persons approached the MVMPO to provide comment.

### **Agenda Item No. 4 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

#### **a. Status of TIP Roadway and Bridge Projects**

Ms. Raphael updated the MVMPO on the status of the following FFYs 2016-2019 TIP projects:

FFY 2016:

- Amesbury, Powow Riverwalk Phase I: Project work scope has changed – revised 25% design plans needed. City has issued an RFP for design consultant, and is currently reviewing proposals. Mr. Scott advised that the City expects to award a contract for design services next week. The City's request to reprogram TIP funding for construction of this project in FFY 2017 will be addressed later in this meeting.
- Andover-Lawrence-North Andover, I-495 Resurfacing & Related Work: Project is in final design and scheduled to be advertised for construction bids on 2/27/16.
- Groveland, MA-97 Reconstruction: Construction bids were opened on 10/27/15. Contract was awarded to A.R. Belli. A Notice to Proceed was issued on 1/21/16, and a preconstruction conference is pending.
- Haverhill, MA-125 HSIP Intersection Reconstruction Project: The 25% public hearing was held in November 2015. Project is scheduled to be advertised for construction in July 2016.
- Lawrence, Bruce School Safe Routes to School: At pre-25% design. Project is scheduled to be advertised for construction bids on 9/30/2016.
- Methuen: MA-213 Resurfacing and Related Work: Project at 75% design and is scheduled to be advertised for construction on 2/6/16.

FFY 2017:

- Andover, Billerica, Bedford, & Tewksbury, Stormwater Improvements on I-93 at Various Locations: Includes improvements along I-93 in Andover. Project is at pre-25% design stage and is scheduled to be advertised in November 2016.
- Resurfacing of I-93 in Andover and Methuen: This \$11,011,021

project is at pre-25% design and is slated to be advertised in December 2016.

- Haverhill, MA-97 between Silver Birch Lane and Research Drive: District 4 has completed review of 25% design plans and project is scheduled to be advertised for construction in December 2016.
- North Andover, Massachusetts Avenue /MA-125 Intersection Reconstruction Project: MassDOT District 4 has sent its comments on the 25% design plans to the design engineer. A 25% design public hearing is pending.
- Amesbury, Elm Street Reconstruction Project: District 4 has requested that the City resubmit its 25% design with any updates that are required, as the City's initial submission (2011) is aged.
- Amesbury/Salisbury, Powow Riverwalk/Ghost Trail Connector: Project 25% design plans are under review at MassDOT. Project is scheduled to be advertised for construction in 2018.
- Georgetown, Border to Boston Southern Segment: A 25% design public hearing is going to be scheduled.
- Haverhill, I-495 Bridge over the Merrimack River Superstructure Replacement: A 25% design public hearing was held in November 2015, and the project is schedule for construction advertising in early 2018.
- Salisbury, Border to Boston Trail segment: MassDOT held a 25% design public hearing on June 8, 2015. The Town and MassDOT are still working on the best design option for the trail's crossing of Elm Street (MA-110).

#### FFY 2019

- Georgetown-Newbury, Border to Boston Northern Segment: At 25% design stage and a date for the 25% design public hearing has yet to be set. The project is scheduled for construction advertising in November 2018.
- Amesbury/Haverhill/Merrimac, I-495 Sign Update: At 25% design stage and may be advertised in summer 2019.

Ms. Raphael provided MVMPO staff with a handout that included the above information.

Ms. Park noted that City of Lawrence staff had just met with Principal of the Bruce School to go over the design of the Safe Routes to School

project.

**b. Status of Transit Projects**

Mr. Costanzo briefed attendees on three FFY 2016 TIP projects. Delivery of the final five of ten replacement buses is expected to take place in May 2016. The first five buses are already in service. Five replacement vans have been delivered and the MVRTA is currently swapping out communications, GPS and fare equipment. Finally, the replacement of two support vehicles is moving ahead on schedule.

**c. Potential Statewide Project Amendments to FFYs 2016-2019 TIP**

Mr. Komornick directed attendees to the two-sided handout in their meeting packets detailing projects that the MVMPO staff proposes to add to the TIP or to amend details/cost data for in the existing statewide element:

- Add Project #608174 to replace decks on the MA-213 bridges over the Spicket River in Methuen and to conduct deck/superstructure work on the MA-213 Bridge over I-495 in Methuen in the FFY 2016 TIP element (\$2.4 million);
- Reduce the \$1.2 million estimated construction cost for Project #607476, resurfacing and related work on MA-213, by \$564,000 to match the project's revised stormwater work requirements;
- Reduce cost estimate for Project #607561: I-93 Resurfacing in Andover and Methuen from \$10,387,000 to \$9,987,520, and
- Revise the Advance Construction (AC) drawdown schedule for Project #605306, replacement of I-495 Bridge over the Merrimack River in Haverhill. The amount currently programmed in FFY 2018 (AC Year 1 of 3) would be reduced by \$4 million. For FFY 2019 (AC Year 2 of 3), the amount shown in the current TIP would be increased by \$2 million.

Mr. Woelfel requested that the MVMPO make a motion to adopt the staff's recommended changes. The motion was made by Mr. DiZoglio and seconded by Ms. Park. The motion was approved with no objections or abstentions.

**d. Potential FFYs 2016-2021 TIP Target Funding Project Amendments**

Mr. Komornick noted at the last MVMPO meeting in July 2015 that approximately \$1.9 million in target funds remained available for programming in the FFY 2016 element of the TIP. That \$1.9 million figure

was calculated assuming that the City of Amesbury's Powow Riverwalk Phase I project would be advertised this year. The MVMPO is now considering an amendment to move that project out of FFY 2016 into FFY 2017 to allow sufficient time for project design/permitting. If the MVMPO endorses this amendment, \$2.7 million will be available for programming in FFY 2016. Since the July 2015 MVMPO meeting, the staff has been working to develop a program of 'ready to go' infrastructure projects that minimize or avoid the need for acquiring rights-of-way.

Presently, the City of Lawrence is developing such a project. Ms. Park described this project's purpose, which is to improve or replace traffic signals, perform some sidewalk and crosswalk work, and install or revise pedestrian signals in various locations to improve traffic flow and pedestrian safety. Upgrades at a few locations where there have been fatalities are a top City priority. The overall project involves many signals that operate with an outmoded 'Dial' (electromechanical) controller system. Ms. Raphael noted that the City has submitted a Project Initiation Form to MassDOT and District 4 believes it to be a good project. The MassDOT Project Review Committee (PRC) will consider its approval at their next meeting on February 11. While the \$2.4 million estimated project cost is not inexpensive, the City and MassDOT have some flexibility to match the final work scope and design details to fit available funding.

Mr. Scott directed attendees to review the City of Amesbury's extensive Powow Riverwalk Phase I project documentation packet (distributed today). He provided an overview of the issues that have added several years to this project's development, and highlighted the progress that the City has made to date on the following project impediments:

- Lack of site control
- Permits not secured
- Discovery of Polychlorinated Bi-Phenyls (PCB) contamination on Project Site

The U.S. EPA helped the City by remediating the Project Site through its Rapid Response Program. In addition, MVPC provided technical and financial assistance through its Brownfields program. Site work funded by these parties (including construction of bulkhead components along the Back River) represented \$1.2 million in work that the City would otherwise have had to finance and undertake. With that work now almost complete,

the City is now moving ahead with a \$525,000 project to construct those components of the bulkhead that it is responsible for. In addition, the City already has \$200,000 on hand to construct the kayak launch component of Riverwalk Phase I. While the City had initially advised the MVMPO that Phase I remediation work would be finished in time to complete the Riverwalk design and advertise the project for construction in FFY 2016, the pace of the remediation work has delayed the overall Project.

Mayor Gray added that the PCB problem at the Heritage Park site led to a rethinking of the overall Riverwalk project phasing strategy. This led to the City's decision to prioritize connecting the existing Riverwalk to the emerging regional network in Salisbury while addressing the contamination issues in the downtown/Millyard area. Phase III will extend the eastern end of the existing Riverwalk through/around the Carriagetown Marketplace, connecting via Elm Street to the I-95 Trail Connector now in design. The City has solicited design services and expects to contract with a design consultant next week. During the design phase, the City will negotiate with a private landowner/developer on some off-site improvements at that end as well. In the meantime, the City has also completed its work on the Water Street parking expansion project. Mr. Komornick advised that \$671,000 is currently available in the FFY 2017 TIP element for programming Riverwalk Phase I.

Mr. Komornick advised that the MVMPO could vote today to release the amendment for public review and comment in advance of the MassDOT PRC's actions on the Lawrence project. Mr. Woelfel asked the MVMPO members if that was acceptable, or if they wanted to wait on this action until MassDOT's PRC had made a decision on the Lawrence project proposal. Mr. DiZoglio suggested that the MVMPO, by acting to release the amendment today for public review and comment, would prepare the MVMPO to accommodate both Amesbury and Lawrence's needs without hindering their individual project development tasks. In response, Mr. Woelfel recommended that an appropriate MVMPO motion would be to release the proposed amendment for public comment with the assurance that any other MVMPO communities that want to make their case before the MVMPO have the opportunity to do so.

Mr. DiZoglio made a motion to approve release of the amendment of the FFY 2016 TIP to move the Powow Riverwalk Phase I project from FFY 2016

to FFY 2017, and to add the Lawrence intersections/crosswalks/sidewalks project to FFY 2016. There were no comments or questions. The motion was seconded and approved with no objections or abstentions.

**Agenda Item No. 5: Schedule for Developing the MVMPO FFYs 2017-2021 TIP and FFY 2017 UPWP**

Mr. Komornick noted that the MVMPO staff begins developing these two documents at or about this time each year. We will get into more detail about the basic elements of the TIP at a subsequent MVMPO meeting. Staff is now finalizing a preliminary draft FFYs 2017-2021 TIP project list that will be distributed well in advance of the next MVMPO meeting. At that time, we'll have more info on the status of the projects that might be added.

Mr. Komornick then noted that this will be a five-year TIP rather than the four-year TIP that we've had for many years. The fifth year of the TIP in this cycle will be potentially different than the first four years. Mr. Woelfel and Ms. Tishler said there have been some internal discussions as to how the fifth year will be treated. Mr. Komornick then said that in addition to our March meeting, the MVMPO would be meeting in April, May and June in order to get our TIP endorsed by June 30th.

**Agenda Item No. 6: Discussion and Potential Action on MVMPO Draft 2016 Public Participation Plan:**

Mr. Fontanella noted that at the last MVMPO meeting we shared an earlier draft with the members and we are looking for comment and suggestions. The new document represents wholesale revision to our existing PPP and is modeled on the MassDOT PPP approved by FHWA in 2014. He directed attendees to a brief memo in this meeting's handouts highlighting the chief changes: increased outreach efforts, documents that the PPP covers, outreach to persons with limited English proficiency, and detail on reformation of our MVTC and the Nondiscrimination Working Group. Members also have the link to the full draft PPP that Mr. Komornick sent out in advance of today's meeting. The MVMPO is being asked today to approve release of the draft PPP for public review and comment for 45 days – through mid-March, after which the MVMPO will be asked to take a formal action on the draft with any public questions or comments being addressed. There were no questions. The document was released for public review and comment with no abstentions or objections.

**Agenda Item No. 7: Update on MassDOT Draft FFYs 2017-2021  
Capital Improvement Program (CIP)**

Mr. Woelfel advised that the MassDOT staff have been interacting with the MassDOT Board of Directors and the MBTA Fiscal Management and Control Board on the CIP's structure and content. MassDOT's goal is to transform the CIP from a document based on an exhaustive list of projects into a programmatic document that states key priorities and contains projects that support those priorities. MassDOT staff is scheduled to continue its CIP discussions with the Fiscal Management and Control Board on February 1, and with the MassDOT CIP Committee at its next meeting on February 2. The draft CIP may be formally presented to both boards at a joint meeting on February 10.

Mr. Costanzo asked whether the CIP process would yield a list of priority projects that scored higher using the new criteria. Mr. Woelfel noted that there are about 5,000 transportation projects in the Commonwealth and that the Secretary wants everyone to know the status of their project. Some projects will have scores, but others have not been defined sufficiently. MassDOT is not sure how project scores will be presented but is considering options such as providing a website link.

Scores will matter, but the message is that it's not just about projects – it's about program priorities, e.g. State of Good Repair. Some of that guidance came from the Capital Conversations that were held around the state.

All of the Rail and Transit Division projects have been scored but the Highway Division, which has the largest number of projects, is still going through this process. Mr. Woelfel also reported that MassDOT had completed an analysis that compared the project scores generated using the new evaluation criteria with MPO scores. With a few exceptions, the PSAC scores overall were a bit higher but generally in line with those generated by the MPO's. MassDOT will send a slide to Mr. Komornick that shows these results.

Mr. DiZoglio said that the MVMPO staff would review its project scores to facilitate a comparison between the two methodologies. He then noted that from the time that the MPO first adopted its evaluation criteria, MassDOT highway has been at the table when projects are evaluated. While there is a tight timeframe now, it would be beneficial for MassDOT to have MPO staff



work with the District in applying their criteria as this process evolves. Mr. Woelfel said he believes this can happen.

Mr. Woelfel then said that Secretary Pollack mentioned at a Metro Mayors meeting a month ago that she'd like MassDOT to work with MARPA to create one intake form to be used in initiating transportation projects. MassDOT's Highway Division, the MPOs, MBTA and RTAs would use this one form. At MARPA's December meeting, a working group was created to develop such a form and that group will meet tomorrow for the first time. MassDOT is looking into some on-line capabilities that will be shown to the working group tomorrow. He hopes that the group can meet again in February to wrap up this effort and that MassDOT and the MPOs can begin using the new form.

Mr. Scott asked whether the new form would be anything like Grants.gov where you can apply for federal funding from multiple agencies. Mr. Woelfel responded that while such a concept is appealing, MassDOT won't pursue this approach at this time.

Mr. Vining commented that the Grants.gov system is a good concept but its execution needs much improvement. Mr. Woelfel noted that he has spoken to various folks within MassDOT on the development of the MAPS tool that will be presented tomorrow.

Mr. Vining then asked for clarification of the project driven vs. program driven approach for developing the CIP. How are the programs defined? Mr. Woelfel explained that the new CIP will contain three priorities: 1) State of Good Repair (SGR) which, from Secretary Pollack's perspective, goes beyond basic repairs and replacements and promotes better asset performance; 2) Fix it/Modernize, which is in line with the PSAC's recommendations, an example being an SGR or maintenance project that adds a bicycle lane or additional capacity, and 3) Providing Transportation Choices; these include bike/ped projects, and transit projects that expand service. Right now, OTP is working with each MassDOT division to finalize individual asset programs. Hypothetical examples can be as follows:

- MBTA developing a track program in 2018 thereby giving the Authority a set timeframe to prioritize/construct specific improvements, or
- The Highway Division developing a statewide guardrail program that will fund individual projects over time.

Mayor Fiorentini asked whether the draft CIP would identify funds for sidewalk programs in addition to those provided under M.G.L. Chapter 90. Mr. Woelfel noted that MassDOT is using an updated version of its Planning for Performance Tool that Cambridge Systematics developed for the WeMoveMassachusetts statewide plan about 1½ years ago. It has been updated and contains many but not all asset groups that are now being evaluated. It includes performance metrics and performance curves for items such as pavement, bridges, RTA vehicles, and transit facilities. The metrics and curves help MassDOT identify recommended time points for maintenance and major overhauls. They also indicate when a specific asset has reached the point of diminishing returns, and should be replaced or reconstructed. This and other tools will be used to help make decisions on how funds for programs such as Chapter 90 should be allocated.

Mr. Woelfel then described the state's new \$12.5 million Complete Streets Program that is to be funded from Gaming Commission revenues. Discussions are ongoing within MassDOT regarding future funding levels for this program. Mr. DiZoglio advised that MVPC staff is updating communities on the various aspects of the program including developing a Complete Streets policy, then prioritizing which sidewalks could be upgraded, and finally obtaining funds to implement the infrastructure upgrades.

Mayor Fiorentini asked if it's mandatory that the communities complete the training to qualify for the grant program and, if so, would it be possible to have a Complete Streets presentation for the region's communities? Mr. DiZoglio advised that such a training session is already scheduled in Lawrence on Monday, February 1. He added that we've had representatives from a few communities that have Complete Streets policies speak on this matter. Mr. Woelfel added that MassDOT, through the Bay State Roads Program, would be conducting additional Complete Streets trainings for municipal planners. Also, MassDOT is working with its Office of Diversity and Civil Rights (ODCR) to train municipal officials about sidewalk issues. So, if the City of Haverhill wants to host one of these events, it should let MassDOT know.

Mayor Fiorentini provided his perspective on the Complete Streets program and the task of developing a comprehensive program of sidewalk and other related improvements that could be constructed within the constraint of a limited budget. He cited the example of the City of Lawrence, which tried to

spread its investment in roadways across as many streets as possible by curb-to-curb micro-surfacing and still couldn't address the majority of its street needs.

The Mayor cited his concern that for every street improved under the Complete Streets Program, many others would remain unimproved leaving many constituents dissatisfied. In the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)–eligible areas of Haverhill alone, the City estimates that it needs \$22 million for sidewalk repairs or reconstruction. This amount is roughly equivalent to the City's entire annual Chapter 90 allotment over twenty years. If the City prioritized those improvements, no other infrastructure priorities would get accomplished.

Mr. DiZoglio noted that the MVPC had worked with Haverhill and expected to assist other communities in preparing sidewalk assessments.

Mr. Mares asked whether sidewalks are required to be built as part of Chapter 90 resurfacing projects. He was informed that the construction of sidewalks is not required as part of a Chapter 90 resurfacing project but is for a federally funded roadway project.

Mr. Vining commented that the \$12.5 million is for the handful of communities who have met the program's requirements – the Mayor's comment shows that the needs far outstrip available funding. Will the program grow? Mr. Woelfel said that the framework under which the new MassDOT Capital Improvement Program (CIP) is being developed will help answer this question as it considers the funding needs for all MassDOT divisions.

Mr. DiZoglio said that the good news about this program is that it is funded with Gaming Commission funding thereby setting a precedent that perhaps there can be a 'dedicated' source of revenue going forward.

Mr. Woelfel added that this funding source was selected in part because Secretary Pollack felt strongly that the Complete Streets Program should be designed and funded to maximize opportunities for communities to participate. MassDOT staff reviewed the Complete Streets legislation that was part of the MGL Chapter 90 Program, and found that it was restrictive to the point where only a handful of communities would be able to compete for the funding. Since the program is not funded through a state bond, there is more flexibility and additional funding to meet anticipated demand.

Mr. Vining expressed his support for the program and noted that Newburyport's Department of Public Services staff just attended their first Complete Streets Program training session. The City would like to implement a Complete Streets policy but there are still many steps that need to be taken plus the \$12.5 million statewide funding amount is small. Mr. Woelfel noted that the hoops created in the Complete Streets legislation are a disincentive for communities and MassDOT sought to overcome this in the program by being true to the spirit of the legislation while encouraging participation. Mr. Mares added that while the initial program is small and there had been hopes for more funding, it's important that the program get started, and the details of the program can be worked out. It's really important to make it easy for municipalities to participate.

Mr. Scott asked if it would be possible for municipalities to get bonus points in MassWorks applications or additional Chapter 90 funds if the municipality was a Complete Streets Program participant. Mr. Woelfel said that several Complete Streets communities are going through the Community Compact program and MassDOT works with the Governor's Office to make it aware of this. Mr. Scott thought that it would make a big difference to the communities if this was the case. He said that the MassWorks program already asks municipalities in their application if they are a Commonwealth-recognized Complete Streets community or not.

### **Agenda Item No. 8: Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act**

#### **a. Discussion of Impacts on MVMPO TIP**

Mr. Komornick reported that we've been operating under continuing resolutions for several years since MAP-21 expired. The FAST Act, passed by Congress in December 2015, basically continues the MAP-21 programs that have evolved through several federal surface transportation authorizations over the years. He noted that the Obama Administration wanted to greatly expand highway and transit funding levels, but this did not happen. Passage of the Act came more quickly than anticipated and there currently is a lack of specific information on its details.

Mr. Komornick directed attendees to a two-page handout summarizing financial information on the Act. The handout provided approximate funding breakdowns for federal highway and transit programs. Mr. Woelfel added that MassDOT was combing through the Act at present to

understand all of its details and the exact impacts it will have on transportation funding during its effective period.

The FAST Act provides a modest funding increase of \$305 billion for highway and transit over five years including:

- \$233 billion for highways, a 15% increase over the life of the Act;
- \$49 billion for transit, an 18% increase over the life of the Act. and
- \$10 billion for federal passenger rail.

Mr. Komornick reported that most of these increases occur in FFY 2016, and we could potentially see incremental funding in each FFY through FFY 2020. Mr. Komornick asked if MassDOT could offer some insight into the effect that the additional federal authorization would have on the MVMPO's regional target. Mr. Woelfel said that it was a bit too early in the CIP process to know that and MassDOT is using the latest information to identify funding sources and calculate future funding availability. A major consideration yet to be worked out is the Commonwealth's ability to finance the required additional state match.

Mr. Komornick summed up discussion on this item, noting that the MVMPO is faced with an unusual situation right now. The amount of uncommitted FFY 2016 Target funding is increasing while the MVMPO staff and member communities struggle to develop projects that fit the amount(s) of funds available, meet federal and state project eligibility requirements, and can be programmed in what time is left for FFY 2016. Now, passage of the FAST Act could potentially provide even more FFY 2016 target funding, further increasing the need to identify ready-to-go projects.

### **Agenda Item No. 9: Other**

Mr. Fontanella briefed attendees on the MBTA's proposed Commuter Rail system improvements, which are scheduled to take effect in May 2016. The MBTA is seeking to: 1) reduce delays from interlining (operating a train set on one line and then on another during a given day), 2) provide adequate time for train set maintenance; 3) reduce layover periods at terminal stations, 4) reduce trip running times, and 5) where feasible, provide additional service to smooth out existing schedules, reduce headways, and reduce passenger congestion when it occurs. The MBTA is currently holding public meetings at various locations throughout its service area to offer the public an opportunity to review and comment on the proposed changes.

A review of the MBTA's proposed improvements indicates that users of both the Haverhill and Newburyport Lines would benefit through:

- Weekday span of service (hours of operation) would be maintained or slightly increased;
- Some trip running times would be reduced, particularly during time-sensitive peak periods. As a result, some trains would arrive in Boston a few minutes earlier than under the current schedule, and
- Trip headways would in many cases be less irregular, particularly in off-peak periods.

On the Haverhill Line, the MBTA would offer one additional PM Peak express train between Boston and Haverhill via the Lowell Line. On the Newburyport Line, the MBTA would offer two new AM and one PM express trains between Boston and Newburyport.

**Agenda Item No. 10: Adjourn**

There was a motion to adjourn at 1:05 p.m. *The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.*