

**MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING**

July 20, 2005
MAG Office, Saguaro Room
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Mayor Elaine Scruggs, Glendale, Chair Councilmember Peggy Bilsten, Phoenix, Vice Chair	Mayor Boyd Dunn, Chandler Rusty Gant, ADOT
# Kirk Adams, The Adams Agency	* Mayor Hugh Hallman, Tempe
F. Rockne Arnett, Citizens Transportation Oversight Committee	Mayor Keno Hawker, Mesa
Mayor Ron Badowski, Wickenburg	* Eneas Kane, DMB Associates
* Stephen Beard, SR Beard & Associates	Mayor Mary Manross, Scottsdale
Mayor Steven Berman, Gilbert	Jacob Moore, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
Dave Berry, Swift Transportation	* David Scholl, Westcor
Jed S. Billings, FNF Construction	# Councilmember Daniel Schweiker, Paradise Valley
Mayor James Cavanaugh, Goodyear	* Supervisor Max W. Wilson, Maricopa County
Vice Mayor Pat Dennis, Peoria	Mayor J. Woodfin Thomas, Litchfield Park
Mayor Ron Drake, Avondale	

* Not present

Participated by telephone conference call

+ Participated by videoconference call

1. Call to Order

The meeting of the Transportation Policy Committee (TPC) was called to order by Chair Elaine Scruggs at 4:17 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Chair Scruggs announced that Councilmember Daniel Schweiker and Mr. Kirk Adams were participating via telephone conference. Chair Scruggs stated that transit tickets for those who used transit to attend the meeting and parking garage ticket validation were available from MAG staff. Chair Scruggs noted that for agenda items #4B through #5C, a memorandum reflecting actions taken at the July 13, 2005 Management Committee meeting was at each member's place. She also noted that for agenda item #5B, Errata Sheet 06-6 and for agenda item #6, a revised summary transmittal reflecting discussion and a revised motion at July 13, 2005 Management Committee meeting, were at each member's place.

3. Call to the Audience

Chair Scruggs stated that an opportunity is provided to the public to address the Transportation Policy Committee on items that are not on the agenda that are within the jurisdiction of MAG, or non action agenda items that are on the agenda for discussion or information only. Citizens will be requested not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments. She noted that an opportunity is provided to comment on agenda items posted for action at the time the item is heard.

Chair Scruggs recognized public comment from William 'Blue' Crowley. Mr. Crowley informed the TPC that he has experienced some problems with the Committee, MAG, and the process as a whole, over the last two months. Mr. Crowley stated that when he came to review documents, he waited for staff for more than 20 minutes and then never showed up with the documents that Mr. Crowley requested. He then asked the Committee to turn to the Table of Contents in the Final Phase Input Opportunity Report, page 39, Transit Projects. Mr. Crowley stated that the transit projects are not there. Chair Scruggs asked Mr. Crowley if he was commenting on agenda item #5A. Mr. Crowley responded that he was using this opportunity as a call to the audience. Mr. Crowley stated that in the transit report, funds for bicycle facilities and bus pullouts are being increased by 1,000 percent. The same amount of bike lanes is being done, but \$4.5 million is being spent on bus pullouts. This is not the right way, stated Mr. Crowley. He noted there is a 469 percent increase in the amount of money going for bus stops and park-and-ride lots. Park-and-ride lots at 79th Avenue and Metro Center have all been covered. Mr. Crowley then asked Vice Chair Bilsten how many people have died of the heat in the last couple of days? Mr. Crowley stated that there isn't enough to spend on bus stops. Mr. Crowley held up a pollution advisory notice and asked the Committee if anyone realized that it was a high ozone day. Mr. Crowley noted that these alerts are happening this summer and with the frequency because the job wasn't done correctly. Mr. Crowley asked the Committee to compare what is being spent on light rail, and getting it all done within the first two years, and what is done for buses. Mr. Crowley stated the transit report states we spend money on buses. Chair Scruggs thanked Mr. Crowley for his comments.

4. Approval of Consent Agenda

Chair Scruggs recognized public comment from Mr. Crowley, who commented on conformity and whether the Committee and MAG are proactive in involving the public. Mr. Crowley stated that in one of the documents neither TPC nor RPTA had a quorum at a hearing. He feels that it's seen by the MAG boards as not important to be there, but that it is important to CTOC and the State Board. He then asked the Committee to turn to page 39 in the Final Phase Input Opportunity Report. Mr. Crowley commented that Paradise Valley doesn't have any transit projects. In the document, it shows those without automobiles and those without economic consequence. Mr. Crowley feels that the Gila River Indian Community needs a bus. He believes that for 20 years nothing is going to happen to Gila River Indian Community and Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community. Mr. Crowley made a note that Route 285 comes across and stops in the western half of the County and that 60 percent of the County is west of the Loop 303. Mr. Crowley feels the documents are hard to understand and the three minute limitation was a violation to conformity guidelines. He would like the Committee to listen to it all, not just ask for a part. Chair Scruggs thanked Mr. Crowley for his comments.

Chair Scruggs stated that any member of the Committee can request that an item be removed from the consent agenda and considered individually. Chair Scruggs stated that agenda items #4A, #4B, #4C, #4D, and #4E were on the consent agenda. Chair Scruggs asked members if there were any questions on the consent agenda items. No comments were noted.

With no further discussion on the consent agenda, Chair Scruggs called for a motion. Vice Chair Bilsten moved to approve consent agenda items #4A, #4B, #4C, #4D, and #4E. Mayor Badowski seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

4A. Approval of the June 22, 2005 Meeting Minutes

The Transportation Policy Committee, by consent, approved the June 22, 2005 meeting minutes.

4B. Draft FY 2007-2011 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Guidance Report

The Transportation Policy Committee, by consent, recommended acceptance of the Draft FY 2007-2011 MAG Transportation Improvement Program Guidance Report. MAG is starting the process to develop the FY 2007-2011 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), which is tentatively targeted for approval in July 2006. The first step in the TIP process is the distribution of the TIP Guidance Report (TGR), which was developed to act as a guide to decision makers to facilitate the programming of transportation projects in the region. The TGR contains the application forms for MAG federal funds and represents the formal request for projects for addition to the FY 2007-2011 MAG TIP. The Transportation Review Committee (TRC) and the Management Committee recommended acceptance of the TGR.

4C. Proposed Amendment to the FY 2004-2007 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Highway and Transit Projects

The Transportation Policy Committee, by consent, recommended approval of an Amendment and/or Administrative Adjustment to the FY 2004-2007 MAG Transportation Improvement Program to add one new Enhancement Funded Mesa project and several new transit projects, plus make several changes to existing transit projects as shown in the attached tables. Following approval of the FY 2004-2007 MAG TIP on November 25, 2003, a project has been identified that needs to be added to the TIP to allow it to proceed during the current fiscal year. A multi-use path project on the Consolidated Canal: 8th Street to Lindsay Road in Mesa was awarded Transportation Enhancement funds in a prior year, but was inadvertently declared as being underway in a previous TIP. The project is now ready to proceed, but needs to be re-added to the current TIP. It also is necessary to either amend the TIP or to carry out some Administrative Adjustments to incorporate several changes to existing transit projects. All of the proposed changes may be categorized as exempt projects or minor project revisions for which an air quality conformity analysis is not required. Consultation on the conformity assessment for the proposed changes is currently underway. The TRC and the Management Committee recommended approval of the project changes described above.

4D. Federal Fiscal Year 2005 MAG Federal Funds Final Closeout and Amendment/Adjustments to the FY 2004-2007 MAG Transportation Improvement Program

The Transportation Policy Committee, by consent, recommended approval of changes to the interim closeout and approval of the final closeout of Federal FY 2005, and recommended amending/adjusting the FY 2004-2007 MAG TIP to allow the projects to proceed. On June 29, 2005, the MAG Regional Council approved a list of 20 projects to utilize approximately \$20 million in projects for the funds expected to be available for the FFY 2005 Closeout, including the funds released by deferred projects. Three of the projects recommended include Valley Metro Rail studies and all three were listed as needing to be transferred from Federal Highway to Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funds. One

of these studies has already been included in the MAG Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) with existing funds and should therefore be deleted from the closeout process. The remaining two projects will not be transferred to FTA funds, but will be authorized through the MAG UPWP and the description of the funds need to be changed from STP-MAG-Flex to STP-MAG. In addition, the Regional Council also approved approximately \$6.4 million in contingency projects. These projects are for any additional, supplemental or redistributed obligation authority that may be received. Since that time, three other projects, totaling \$2.7 million, have requested to be deferred, which has effectively reduced the list of contingency projects to five, totaling \$3.7 million. At its June 30, 2005 meeting, the TRC recommended adding two ADOT projects to the list of contingency projects. The Management Committee recommended approval.

4E. Finding of Conformity for the Draft FY 2006-2010 MAG Transportation Improvement Program and Draft Regional Transportation Plan - 2005 Update

The Draft 2005 Conformity Analysis concludes that the draft Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and the Regional Transportation Plan - 2005 Update meet all applicable federal conformity requirements and are in conformance with applicable air quality plans. On June 16, 2005, a public hearing was conducted on the draft TIP, Regional Transportation Plan - 2005 Update, and Conformity Analysis. On June 23, 2005, the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee recommended approval of the Draft 2005 MAG Conformity Analysis for the Draft FY 2006-2010 MAG Transportation Improvement Program and Draft MAG Regional Transportation Plan - 2005 Update. Approval of the conformity finding by the Regional Council is required for MAG adoption of the TIP and Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The Management Committee recommended approval of the Finding of Conformity. This item was on the agenda for information.

5A. FY 2005 MAG Final Phase Public Input Opportunity

Chair Scruggs stated that public comment and combined action on agenda items #5A, #5B, and #5C would follow the presentations and Committee discussion.

Dennis Smith introduced Jason Stephens, who provided a presentation on the Final Phase Input Opportunity that was conducted in mid-May through June. The Final Phase, which is part of a four phase public involvement process, gives members of the public a final opportunity to provide comment on MAG transportation plans and programs. Mr. Stephens explained that MAG cosponsored several public input opportunities in May and June 2005 with the Arizona Department of Transportation, Valley Metro and Valley Metro Rail. In addition to attending MAG policy committee meetings, staff attended the Santan Freeway opening, and an open house/public hearing was held June 16, 2005 to provide information and receive comment on the Draft FY 2006-2010 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), the Regional Transportation Plan - 2005 Update and Draft 2005 MAG Conformity Analysis. Mr. Stephens stated that comments received during these input opportunities and staff responses to comments are included in the Final Phase Input Opportunity Report.

Mr. Stephens provided a summary of questions and comments, which included items such as, the light rail should go all the way to East Mesa, rubberizing freeways should be completed sooner, more bus shelters are needed as well as bus service and better Dial-A -Ride services. Mr. Stephens relayed that the public would like to decrease the number of high pollution days, increase roads in the Southwest Valley, including Pinal County, and see better street maintenance in Mesa.

Mayor Thomas asked Mr. Stephens if there is anything else that MAG could do to encourage public involvement. Mr. Stephens stated that MAG realizes it is difficult to get members of the public to attend meetings, therefore MAG hosts booths at special events with large numbers of participants. In addition to events held during the work week, weekends and nights are utilized to provide opportunities for the public input into the plans and programs. No further questions from the Committee were noted.

5B. Approval of the Draft FY 2006-2010 MAG Transportation Improvement Program

Dennis Smith introduced Paul Ward, who provided a presentation on the development of the FY 2006-2010 Draft MAG TIP. Mr. Ward explained that each year MAG updates the Five Year TIP, primarily by adding a fifth year. All federally-funded projects and regionally significant transportation projects (including city and privately-funded projects) must be included in the draft TIP for the purpose of meeting the air quality conformity analysis requirements. The Draft FY 2006-2010 TIP was approved by Regional Council in April 2005 to undergo this analysis, which is now complete. A public hearing on the draft TIP was conducted on June 16, 2005. The TRC and Management Committee recommended approval of the Draft TIP, contingent upon a finding of conformity.

Mr. Ward explained that all projects originally come from the 2004-2007 TIP and RTP. MAG federally-funded projects are normally handed in or requested and approved by MAG Regional Council by December. ADOT and transit projects are submitted in December and agency projects by the end of January. Mr. Ward went on to explain that a Draft TIP for a conformity analysis is prepared in the April/March time frame and the conformity analysis is usually completed in May/June. Regional Council approval of the TIP will be sought next week and federal approval of Air Quality Conformity Analysis in July/August. Mr. Ward stated that approval by the Governor's designee is expected to occur in August/September and the incorporation into the STIP in September/October.

Mr. Ward explained that changes to projects in the Draft TIP during the development process are sent to member agencies by means of Errata Sheets, which are approved at various points in the process. Mr. Ward referred to the Errata Sheets that were at each member's place. He informed the Committee that changes to the TIP occur on a regular basis. The main changes to the TIP are to the funding types or addition, deferral or scope changes, including closeout actions. Mr. Ward confirmed that no regionally significant changes are allowed after the Draft TIP is approved for air quality conformity analysis, which occurred in April. Any changes or any new regionally significant projects that are submitted after that point in time will have to be put forward as a TIP Amendment. Mr. Ward confirmed that there are no TIP Amendments at this time.

Mr. Ward stated that the projects listed in the FY 2006-2010 Draft MAG TIP include more than 520 street projects; 270 transit projects; 160 freeway projects; and 100 bicycle and pedestrian projects. The total FY 2006-2010 Draft MAG TIP spread over five years is \$5.8 billion. Mr. Ward informed the Committee that the largest portion comes from regional highway funds. The remainder comes from local highway, federal transit and federal highway funds. Mr. Ward explained that almost half of the funding is going to streets, including local arterials. The remainder will go to freeways and transit and for studies and contingencies.

Mr. Ward stated that the MAG federal funds that are currently programmed are almost \$420 million. Mr. Ward expects this amount to rise once federal reauthorization is completed. The largest portion of funds, slightly less than 40 percent, will still go to freeways. As there were no questions for Mr. Ward, the Committee moved to the next agenda item.

5C. Approval of the Draft MAG Regional Transportation Plan - 2005 Update

Dennis Smith introduced Roger Herzog, who provided an update on the 2005 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Mr. Herzog explained that the 2005 Update covers the change in the construction phase for certain projects in the RTP. He stated that the changes involve advanced construction of arterial projects that will be funded by the agencies that are implementing these projects and that those agencies will later be reimbursed according to the original schedule in the RTP. These changes will be applied to the plan that was approved in November 2003 and amended in June 2004. Mr. Herzog went on to explain that MAG has gone through a consultation process as required by ARS 28-6308. This is a process that will need to be followed through calendar year 2005 to review any changes to the plan. Mr. Herzog also stated that MAG held a public hearing on the changes on June 16, 2005. The changes all meet air quality conformity requirements. The TRC and Management Committee recommended approval of the Draft RTP Update, contingent upon a finding of conformity.

Vice Chair Bilsten moved to recommend acceptance of 5A, the FY 2005 MAG Final Phase Public Input Opportunity; to recommend approval of 5B, the Draft FY 2006-2010 MAG Transportation Improvement Program contingent upon a finding of conformity of the TIP with the applicable state and federal air quality conformity implementation plans; and to recommend approval of 5C, the Draft MAG Regional Transportation Plan - 2005 Update contingent upon a finding of conformity of the RTP with the applicable state and federal air quality implementation plans. Vice Chair Bilsten also thanked staff for all their hard work in the public meetings that they have held. Mayor Hawker seconded the motion and Chair Scruggs opened the floor for discussion.

Mr. Dave Berry wanted to be sure that he was on record as objecting to the expenditures of CMAQ funds. Mr. Berry, who serves on the Air Quality Technical Committee, stated that the air quality issues are well documented and that there is a need for very high returns in terms of reducing emissions at low cost. Yet CMAQ funds are being used for bicycle education programs. Mr. Berry stated that a perfect example of where there are unmet needs is with the PM-10 Efficient Street Sweepers.

Mr. Smith reminded the Committee that in the Closeout process there is extreme competition for a limited amount of money. Environmental staff went to the Transportation Review Committee and made a plea for street sweepers. Mr. Smith confirmed there was a list of street sweepers approved by Regional Council and each street sweeper on the list was funded.

Mr. Berry was pleased to hear that, but commented that street sweepers are just one example and there were many others. He stated that air quality is a critical area where the region is just on the cusp with compliance and that he doesn't feel MAG is being aggressive or discriminating enough on how CMAQ money is spent. Mr. Berry believes that although bike and safety issues are important, there should be a much heavier emphasis on air quality with CMAQ monies.

Mr. Smith commented that in the Regional Transportation Plan, money was slotted for bike and pedestrian projects, maintenance, air quality, and many other categories. Therefore funding is in its own slot and those projects will compete in those slots. Chair Scruggs asked Mr. Smith if there were other projects competing for the same funds that did not get funded or did everything get funded? Mr. Smith replied that there were \$50 million worth of projects and \$20 million to spend. Many projects were left on the table, but all the street sweepers were funded.

Mr. Berry explained that the Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee does a scoring based on the air quality benefit and if that scoring method was used, many of these projects wouldn't have made the cut and there would be better air quality projects in their place. Mr. Berry stated that he wanted to put it on the table that he has been fighting for air quality along the way.

Chair Scruggs conducted a vote in which the majority voted in favor of the approval of 5A, the FY 2005 MAG Final Phase Public Input Opportunity; of approval of 5B, the Draft FY 2006-2010 MAG Transportation Improvement Program contingent upon a finding of conformity of the TIP with the applicable state and federal air quality conformity implementation plans; and approval of 5C, the Draft MAG Regional Transportation Plan - 2005 Update contingent upon a finding of conformity of the RTP with the applicable state and federal air quality implementation plans. The motion passed, with Mr. Berry voting no.

6. Williams Gateway Freeway Preferred Alignment

Mr. Smith explained that in the MAG Regional Transportation Plan, Williams Gateway was listed as a new corridor, and similar to what was done with the Loop 303, MAG went through an effort to come up with a preferred alignment. Mr. Smith explained that two cities, Queen Creek and Mesa, desperately wanted the same freeway. Therefore MAG needed to go through a consultant effort, very objectively, and look at where the best place for the preferred alignment would be. He went on to explain that the summary transmittal in the agenda package includes comments from both Queen Creek and Mesa.

Mr. Smith then introduced Mr. John McNamara, consultant, with DMJM+HARRIS. Mr. McNamara provided the Committee with a presentation on the MAG Williams Gateway Freeway Alignment and Environmental Overview, which was initiated in November 2004. The objectives of the alignment study and environmental overview were threefold. The first was to conduct a rigorous planning effort to evaluate a variety of preliminary alignments and come forward with a recommendation. The second objective was to conduct an environmental overview to identify any critical environmental factors that would affect the location of the corridor. The final objective was to conduct a preliminary engineering study to identify preferred right-of-way and the characteristics of that right-of-way, including the traffic interchange locations and information related to the preliminary cost of the facility. Mr. McNamara explained that during this process, extensive public outreach efforts were conducted. Interviews were held with cities, towns, counties, the Williams Gateway Airport Authority and major business and property owners. Along with the 18 stakeholder interviews in December through February, a public open-house and community workshop at ASU East was held in March for which there was an extensive turnout.

Mr. McNamara explained that the study used a three-tiered process. He stated that Tier 1 was broad. It was to define system corridor alternatives with Santan/Loop 202 at one end, serving Williams Gateway Airport, and extending east to the Pinal County Line. He explained that there were three different potential alignments for the system corridors: Hawes #1 Corridor, Hawes #2 Corridor, and lastly a corridor off the Santan Freeway in Gilbert near Greenfield Road. All three corridors extended past the Williams Gateway Airport to the Pinal County line. The evaluation criteria for Tier 1 included consistency with the MAG Regional Transportation Plan, local general plans, Williams Gateway Airport impacts, and major land use or economic impacts. Mr. McNamara confirmed that the Hawes #2 Corridor ranked highest.

Mr. McNamara went on to explain that Tier 2 defined seven different alternatives roughly a half mile apart within the Hawes #2 Corridor. The evaluation criteria for Tier 2 included economic development,

consistency with general plans, transportation service, environmental compatibility, cost minimization and Pinal County considerations.

Mr. Berry asked if the evaluation gave any consideration to alignments if property owners might be willing to donate their property. Mr. McNamara responded that there was some discussion, but it never entered into the evaluation criteria. Mr. McNamara reminded the Committee that the results of this study are not the “end all.” ADOT is scheduled to initiate a design concept report next year. At that point ADOT goes through a federal environmental process that also has to consider alternatives in addition to the recommendation.

Mr. Berry suggested that the Committee try to spend taxpayers’ dollars as efficiently as possible and should emphasize an alignment that takes the cost component into consideration.

Mr. McNamara explained that as a result of the Tier 2 process, the alternatives were narrowed down to the following three: Frye Road alignment; Willis Road alignment; and Ryan Road alignment. He also mentioned that there was a side investigation performed where they looked at super street or parkway options. There were three potential locations; Ellsworth/Ryan Parkway; Crismon/Ryan Parkway; Signal Butte/Ryan Parkway. It was noted that further work on this concept would require a separate study and there is no regional funding for a parkway facility.

Mr. McNamara stated that at this point the study moved into Tier 3 and the evaluation criteria became more detailed, with nine criteria and 31 performance measures. As a result of the application of these criteria and performance measures, the Tier 3 process led to the recommendation of one of the three remaining alternatives. Mr. McNamara stated that it was the consultant’s recommendation to move ahead with Alternative Three - Frye Road.

Mr. Rusty Gant commented that he would be abstaining during the vote due to an ADOT study on the Williams Gateway Corridor which has not been completed and that he cannot take a position at this time.

Mayor Hawker raised the issue of possible land donations and the cost of alternatives Three, Five and Seven. He understood that potential land donations would not offset the higher cost of Alternative Seven. Mr. McNamara confirmed that this was their conclusion.

Mr. Berry said that he would like to contact land owners to see if they are willing to donate land. He commented that the road will bring value to the surrounding area. Mr. Berry asked if MAG was doing taxpayers a service. Mayor Hawker mentioned that he brought a property owner representative to the meeting tonight. He also stated that a freeway will enhance the property value and they will work that angle to keep the cost down.

Mayor Thomas believes MAG follows the “yellow book,” where land is considered in its current state. He stated that if there is speculation on where the preferred alignment is going, it will drive prices up. Mayor Thomas asked if zoning had been established with Alternative Three.

Mayor Hawker responded that it is part of the master plan view. He commented that the freeway will be used by Mesa as a buffer between heavy industrial to the south and residential to the north. Mayor Thomas asked how Pinal County fit into the picture. Mayor Thomas did not want to see the same congestion occur as it has in Gold Canyon.

Mr. McNamara responded that to his knowledge Pinal County has not taken an official position on the preferred alternative. The State Land Department has indicated its preference is Alternative Three, which also happens to be the alternative with the lowest estimated cost. Alternative Three is also compatible with ADOT’s Pinal County Corridor Definition Study. He stated that for the ADOT Pinal County Study, any of the alternatives in the final mix (Three, Five and Seven), were located in a way to make sense with the corridors ADOT is studying in Pinal County. Mr. McNamara went on to explain that there is a large area in Pinal County that is being examined by ADOT, as to whether the Williams Gateway Corridor continues straight eastward and makes a connection to US 60 southeast of Gold Canyon Ranch, or if it even dips down into Pinal County before it connects eastward.

Mr. Eric Anderson stated the outer sections of US 60 going through Gold Canyon Ranch weren’t envisioned as a fully-controlled access facility and as development has occurred, access control has become a bigger issue. Mr. Anderson went on to say that for the Williams Gateway facility and other new facilities that are being planned in Maricopa County and even Pinal County, the corridors will be designed and planned as fully access controlled facilities from the beginning. Mr. Anderson feels that this scenario puts us ahead of the game.

Mayor Cavanaugh moved to select Alternative 3 - Frye Road as the preferred alignment for the Williams Gateway Freeway in Maricopa County and recommend to ADOT that Alternative 7 - Ryan Road be considered in the design concept/environmental evaluation conducted by ADOT. Mayor Dunn seconded, and the motion passed, with Mr. Gant abstaining.

Chair Scruggs announced that no meeting will be held in August. There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:08 p.m.

Secretary

Chair