

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

May 29, 2014

Maricopa Association of Governments Office
302 North First Avenue, Suite 200, Saguaro Room
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Phoenix: Rick Naimark, Vice Chair and
Acting Chair
ADOT: Kwi-Sung Kang for Floyd
Roehrich
Avondale: Kristen Sexton for David
Fitzhugh
Buckeye: Scott Lowe
*Cave Creek: Ian Cordwell
Chandler: Patrice Kraus for Dan Cook
El Mirage: Jorge Gastelum
Fountain Hills: Randy Harrel
Gila Bend: Ernie Rubi
*Gila River: Tim Oliver
Gilbert: Leah Hubbard
Glendale: Debbie Albert
Goodyear: Cato Esquivel

Litchfield Park: Julius Diogenes for Woody
Scoutten
Maricopa (City): Paul Jepson
Maricopa County: Clem Ligocki for John
Hauskins
#Mesa: Jeff Martin for Scott Butler
*Paradise Valley: Jim Shano
Peoria: Dan Nissen for Andrew Granger
Queen Creek: Mohamed Youssef
Scottsdale: Eve Ng for Paul Basha
Surprise: Martin Lucero for Dick McKinley
Tempe: Shelly Seyler
Valley Metro: John Farry
*Wickenburg: Vince Lorefice
Youngtown: Grant Anderson

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING

*Street Committee: Dana Owsiany, City of
Phoenix
ITS Committee: Catherine Hollow, City of
Tempe
*FHWA: Ed Stillings
* Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

* Bicycle/Pedestrian Committee: Denise
Lacey, Maricopa County
*Transportation Safety Committee: Renate
Ehm, City of Mesa

+ - Attended by Videoconference
- Attended by Audioconference

OTHERS PRESENT

Eric Anderson, MAG
John Bullen, MAG
Monique de los Rios Urban, MAG
Bob Hazlett, MAG
Sarath Joshua, MAG
Teri Kennedy, MAG
Alex Oreschak, MAG
Brian Rubin, MAG
Steve Tate, MAG

Eileen Yazzie, MAG
Trent Kelso, ADOT
Giao Pham, City of Apache Junction
Charlene Neish, City of Tempe
Tim Wolfe, Dibble
Brian Sager, Kimley Horn
Art Brooks, Strand Associates, Inc.
Steve Jimenez, SCI

1. Call to Order

Acting Chairwoman Patrice Kraus from the City of Chandler called the meeting to order at 10:04 a.m. Acting Chairwoman Kraus noted that the quorum requirement for the May 29, 2014 TRC meeting was 13 committee members.

2. Approval of Draft April 24, 2014 Minutes

Mr. John Farry from Valley Metro motioned to approve the minutes. Mr. Grant Anderson from the Town of Youngtown seconded, and the motion passed by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

3. Call to the Audience

There were no public comments from the audience.

4. Transportation Director's Report

Acting Chairwoman Kraus invited Mr. Eric Anderson, MAG Transportation Director, to provide the Transportation Director's Report.

Mr. Anderson noted that revenues for the sales tax in April increased 5.2% over last year, and had increased 7.5% year-to-date. Mr. Anderson stated that, if these growth percentages hold, final sales tax revenues will be at or above FY 2014 projections. Similarly, HURF revenues increased 2.8% year-to-date. The HURF revenues are now near 2004 levels. Most of the growth in HURF revenues resulted from increases in Vehicle License Tax (VLT).

Mr. Anderson informed the committee that MAG was closely following the potential reauthorization of MAP 21, which expires in 2014. The Highway Trust Fund (HTF) is in danger of becoming insolvent by early August 2014, unless Congress provides additional funding. Mr. Anderson noted that the latest proposal to fund transportation from the U.S. House of Representatives is to cut Saturday mail service. MAG will continue to monitor the process.

Mr. Anderson noted that Certified Agencies need to close out inactive projects as soon as possible, and need to submit for reimbursement promptly. Mr. Anderson explained that some new US-DOT measures could delay reimbursements, and that US-DOT may go to a proportional reimbursement instead of full reimbursement, which could present cash-flow problems for agencies. Mr. Anderson informed the committee that MAG was starting the development of the new Regional Transportation Plan, and that MAG provided a presentation to the MAG Transportation Policy Committee on May 21, 2014. The next steps would be to convene work groups to discuss goals, objectives, and performance measurement. Mr. Anderson explained that MAP-21 requires a more robust performance-based planning process and requires setting targets for performance measures. There are no financial penalties for not meeting such targets at this point, but financial penalties could be a part of future transportation bills.

Mr. Anderson also noted that the Central Phoenix Framework Study process was wrapping up, and that a presentation on May 29, 2014 would be given to discuss final deliverables.

Mr. Farry noted that the second audit from Proposition 400 would occur in 2015, and that the auditors would likely look closely at performance measures and targets. Mr. Anderson noted that the first performance audit found that MAG needed to set targets on performance measures, which had not been done in the region previously.

5. Consent Agenda

Addressing the next item of business, Acting Chairwoman Kraus directed the Committee's attention to the consent agenda items 5A – Arterial Life Cycle Program Status Report December 2013 – April 2014 and 5B – Project Changes – Amendment and Administrative Modification to the FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program, and to the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan. Acting Chairwoman Kraus asked the Committee if there were any questions or comments. Seeing none, Acting Chairwoman Kraus requested a motion. Mr. Grant Anderson motioned to approve the consent agenda. Mr. Julius Diogenes from the City of Litchfield Park seconded, and the motion passed by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

5A. Arterial Life Cycle Program Status Report December 2013 – April 2014

The MAG Transportation Review Committee, by consent, approved the Arterial Life Cycle Program Status Report December 2013 – April 2014.

5B. Project Changes – Amendment and Administrative Modification to the FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program, and to the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan

The MAG Transportation Review Committee, by consent, approved the Project Changes – Amendment and Administrative Modification to the FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program, and to the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan.

6. MAG Federally Funded, Locally Sponsored Project Development Status Report

Acting Chairman Rick Naimark invited Ms. Teri Kennedy from MAG to present on the MAG Federally Funded, Locally Sponsored Project Development Status Report.

Ms. Kennedy noted that the Federal Fund Project Status Reports have been very successful in reporting on suballocated FHWA funds, including Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ), Safety, and Transportation Alternatives (TA) projects. The Status Reports do not cover Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) freeway program, Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP), or Transit Life Cycle Program (TLCP) projects. The Status Reports allow MAG staff and managers to monitor the status of federally funded projects, and allow member agencies to request funding for closeout if funds are available. The Status Reports also include reporting on Commitment Letters, project cost changes, and an opportunity to find out about any agency staff changes on project leads.

Ms. Kennedy provided a summary of project statuses. For FY 2015, 48 projects were on time, with three projects requesting deferrals. For FY 2016, 39 projects were on time, with no projects requesting deferrals. Ms. Kennedy explained that the trend from 2009 has been a sharp increase in deferrals through 2011, and then a decrease in deferrals since that time. Ms. Kennedy noted

that it was a good goal for program to have more on-time projects and fewer deferrals. Ms. Kennedy also explained that carry forward funding has been reduced in recent years due in large part to the Project Status Reports. Carry forward funds have fallen from over \$30 million a year to nearly non-existent levels.

Acting Chairman Naimark thanked Ms. Kennedy and all the member agencies for helping to achieve the goals of reducing deferrals and carry forward.

Acting Chairman Naimark asked for a motion. Ms. Patrice Kraus moved to recommend approval with the inclusion of advancement of the projects outlined in the presentation. Mr. Clem Ligocki from Maricopa County seconded the motion, and the motion passed by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

7. Draft Fiscal Year 2015 Arterial Life Cycle Program

Acting Chairman Naimark invited Mr. John Bullen from MAG to present on the Draft Fiscal Year 2015 Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP).

Mr. Bullen noted that the ALCP is the financial management tool for the arterial section of the RTP, and is updated annually. Mr. Bullen noted that state statute requires that costs cannot exceed available revenues in the program. Additionally, federal statute requires that the program must show fiscal constraint in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) . Mr. Bullen provided an overview of the development process for the ALCP. The first step is to update project work schedules and costs. The second step is to update revenue forecasts, and the third step is to adjust reimbursements as needed.

Mr. Bullen explained that project workbooks were distributed to all agencies in February 2014. The lead agencies provided updated project costs and schedules. Then, MAG analyzed the updated cost schedules and projects and adjusted reimbursements accordingly. If a project was deferred, the associated reimbursement was deferred as well. Project change requests were reviewed and approved at the MAG Street Committee. Mr. Bullen noted that multiple project change requests were heard at the MAG Street Committee this year.

Mr. Bullen informed the committee that Regional Area Road Fund (RARF) revenue forecasts have increased by approximately \$2.5 million from FY 2012 to FY 2013, but that federal revenue forecasts fell from FY 2012 to FY 2013, and again from FY 2013 to FY 2014. The decreased forecast represents about five percent of the federal program. Mr. Bullen noted that from FY 2015 to FY 2020, there is a surplus projected for the ALCP, but that projections indicate a deficit in the ALCP after FY 2020.

Mr. Bullen explained that under the new ALCP programming principles, advancement of reimbursements programmed in the first several years can be advanced to align properly with the work schedule. With the ALCP funding in balance through FY 2020, the ALCP meets federal constraints in the TIP window, though there is a long term deficit that must be addressed. The FY 2015 ALCP continues the temporary elimination of bonding and inflation. MAG believes that the program does not need to be rebalanced yet, with surpluses projected through FY 2020, until more clarity is provided at the federal level regarding revenues.

Mr. Bullen noted that after near-term advancements to match work schedules, the fund balance is maintained from FY 2017 to FY 2020, which will help off-set any losses if a new federal transportation bill reduces revenues. Mr. Bullen also explained that there were a few minor changes from the workbooks that provided to the committee, but that those changes do not have major impacts on what was being presented.

Mr. Ligocki noted that MAG was doing a very good job with the program, which was a culmination of a good process through the workbooks.

Acting Chairman Naimark asked for a motion. Mr. Ligocki moved to recommend approval. Ms. Leah Hubbard from the Town of Gilbert seconded the motion, and the motion passed by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

8. Interstate 10/Interstate 17 Corridor Master Plan

Acting Chairman Naimark invited Mr. Bob Hazlett from MAG to present on the Interstate 10/Interstate 17 Corridor Master Plan.

Mr. Hazlett introduced Mr. Trent Kelso, ADOT Urban Projects Manager, who would be available to provide answers on any technical questions. Mr. Hazlett noted that this presentation was previously provided to the MAG Management Committee, Transportation Planning Committee, and Regional Council. Mr. Hazlett noted that the study included a 35 mile corridor from the SR-101L/I-17 North Stack Interchange to the Pecos Stack Interchange at SR-202L/I-10. Mr. Hazlett explained that roughly 43% of all traffic in the region occurs on either I-10 or I-17, and that there was \$1.47 billion programmed in the RTP to improve the corridor. Mr. Hazlett noted that previous corridor and EIS studies for I-10 and I-17 were cancelled, and that a new process was started to study the corridor anew, multi-modally and fitting the character of the region.

In October 2012, a large group met to identify a path forward for the corridor. The first step was to identify near-term improvements to solve bottlenecks, while simultaneously developing a corridor master plan. The corridor master plan would look at narrow rights of way, and needed a long term vision for what the region wants to have happen in the corridor. Previous studies have identified bottlenecks and strategies for near term relief. Mr. Hazlett noted that near term improvements must meet environmental requirements and a near-term construction time-frame. Mr. Hazlett explained that a number of micro-simulation models were run to identify improvement strategies, and that the Microsim model was available for member agency use to address operation-level planning.

Mr. Hazlett explained the near-term strategies. One improvement involves adding an additional outbound lane from the I-10/SR-51/SR-202L Mini Stack Interchange to US-60. There has not been a determination made whether the lane will be general purpose or high-occupancy vehicle (HOV). Mr. Hazlett noted that the improvements did not involve narrowing lanes below 11 feet, that minimal shoulder width would need to be taken to accomplish the widening, and that there was heavy HOV demand in the corridor. Mr. Hazlett noted that the Broadway Curve carries 300,000 vehicles per day, with significant weaving issues. Most of the needed right of way is already available for the improvements.

Inbound traffic from I-10 exiting to SR-143 northbound would be separated from thru traffic south of the US-60 interchange and a separate exit from US-60 to SR-143 and Broadway would be provided. Outbound traffic entering I-10 from SR-143 or Broadway Road would utilize a new collector/distributor (C/D) road, allowing traffic to either enter US-60 directly or enter I-10 south of US-60. Ms. Kraus asked if the near-term improvements would include a flyover at SR-143. Mr. Hazlett noted that a flyover at SR-143 would need to be addressed in the corridor master plan, but is not included in the near-term improvements due to the fact that the final locations for structures and bridge piers would not be known until that effort was completed.. Acting Chair Naimark asked whether any near-term investments would end up wasted when the long-term recommendations implemented. Mr. Hazlett noted that there would be minimal waste, as the near-term improvements focus on needs in the next 5-10 years, while long-term improvements could be decades away. Additionally, Mr. Hazlett explained that the near-term improvements were being treated as givens in the corridor master plan, so long-term recommendations would consider the near-term improvements. Mr. Farry asked how these near-term improvements impact Level of Service (LOS). Mr. Hazlett noted that the improvements to LOS have been analyzed visually, but not yet quantified. Mr. Hazlett estimated that the improvements would probably generally increase LOS to a level C or better, but on a lane by lane basis, not corridor-wide.

Mr. Hazlett explained that the improvements on the I-10 from Baseline Road to the Pecos Stack Interchange at SR-202L would include the addition of an extra lane in both the inbound and outbound direction, along with raising noise walls. The lane additions would dovetail with the full six lane cross-section being built south from the Pecos Stack to Queen Creek Road. Improvements on the I-17 from 16th St to 19th Ave would be minimal, with the addition of auxiliary lanes for the entry/exit ramps, which will improve capacity and safety. The interchanges of Pinnacle Peak Road and Happy Valley on I-17 are also being considered for reconstruction, as they are both at the end of their service life. Mr. Hazlett also noted that bicycle and pedestrian crossings were being considered at both Guadalupe Road and Alameda Drive over I-10.

The final improvement outlined by Mr. Hazlett were enhancements to Traffic Operations and ITS. These improvements included Incident Management, Ramp Metering Coordination, Arterial Infrastructure, Supporting Corridor Operations, Traffic Video Sharing, and Maintenance Support. One example was adding DPS personnel in the room at the ADOT operations center.

The construction time-frame for the near-term improvements is anticipated to be two to three years, though operations and ITS improvements can be implemented more quickly. Construction items would be added to the TIP in Fall 2014, with operations improvements added starting in June 2014. For most elements, construction would occur by FY 2017. Mr. Hazlett noted that the Corridor Master Plan was underway, and that MAG would update the committee every three to four months. Additionally, the website for the project will be spine.gov.

Ms. Kraus asked how long the near-term improvements would improve traffic for. Mr. Hazlett responded that MAG was analyzing the improvements in the 2025 and 2040 horizon years to see how long the improvements will last. Ms. Kraus asked whether construction in these areas would occur only in the life of the existing RTP, or if there would be additional beyond the life of the current RTP. Mr. Hazlett noted that there would be additional improvements beyond the current RTP, such as the loop ramp at SR-143, and solutions could come right after the C/D roads come

in. Ms. Debbie Albert from the City of Glendale asked if managed lanes were discussed as a near-term improvement option. Mr. Hazlett responded that managed lanes are more of a long-term solution. Ms. Albert clarified that she meant advanced traffic management generally. Mr. Hazlett replied that the near-term improvements would help work toward an advanced traffic management system, but most improvements would be in the long-term. Mr. Farry asked what the target date for completing the corridor master plan was. Mr. Hazlett replied that the target date was December 31, 2016. Mr. Farry asked whether some construction projects would be underway before the corridor master plan was completed. Mr. Hazlett replied that this was correct. Mr. Ligocki asked what impacts the Broadway Curve improvements would have on US-60 inbound traffic. Mr. Hazlett replied that MAG did not look closely outside of the study area, but that near the I-10, the near-term improvements do improve inbound US-60 traffic.

Mr. Grant Anderson noted that the presentation was very timely, but asked why the presentation was heard at the MAG Management Committee, Transportation Policy Committee, and Regional Council first, when presentations are usually heard at the Transportation Review Committee (TRC) first. Mr. Hazlett noted that time restrictions demanded that the presentation be given out of order, as information was not ready in time for the April TRC meeting. Mr. Hazlett noted that MAG always attempts to go to the TRC before the other committees. Mr. Eric Anderson noted that funding for DPS and Traffic Operations would be brought to the other committees in June 2014, and not to the TRC, as the June TRC meeting was canceled. Mr. Anderson noted that recent wrong-way crashes in the region make these improvements even more timely.

Mr. Jepson asked whether the segment of I-10 from the Pecos Stack to Queen Creek Road could be addressed more quickly, or whether there were any updates on that project. Mr. Kelso replied that part of the solution for that corridor was a district minor project from Wildhorse Pass to Riggs Road, which would include auxiliary lanes and additional pavement preservation. Acting Chairman Naimark noted that the future South Mountain freeway would have an impact on that traffic. Mr. Grant Anderson asked if the South Mountain freeway would eliminate the need for extra lanes on the I-10, or whether it sets back the timeline in which extra lanes are needed. Mr. Hazlett replied that MAG modeling assumes that the South Mountain freeway is built, so the future modeling done with the corridor master plan would take that into account.

Ms. Eve Ng from the City of Scottsdale asked if previous Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) work on the I-10 and I-17 corridors could be utilized with the corridor master plan, or if the corridor master plan would be starting from scratch. Mr. Hazlett replied that previous corridor studies and EIS work provided relevant information that is being used in the planning process. Acting Chairman Naimark thanked Mr. Hazlett, MAG staff, and ADOT staff for their work, noted that he was looking forward to seeing the near-term improvements implemented, and stated that he appreciated the coordination with the Central Phoenix Transportation Framework study.

9. MAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Pathway/Railroad Crossing Recommendations Report

Acting Chairman Naimark invited Mr. Alex Oreschak from MAG and Mr. Brian Sager from Kimley-Horn to present on the MAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Pathway/Railroad Crossing Recommendations Report.

Mr. Oreschak provided project background, explaining that the project was originally awarded as a MAG Design Assistance grant to the City of Chandler to study one crossing, on the Western Canal at the city's border with the Town of Gilbert. After awarding the grant, MAG recognized that there were a number of off-street path / railroad crossings in the region, and that addressing them as one larger project would be preferable to a piecemeal approach. Mr. Oreschak noted that the project team was comprised of representatives from City of Chandler, Town of Gilbert, City of Tempe, Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), Salt River Project (SRP), Roosevelt Water Conservation District, Arizona Operation Lifesaver, the Federal Railroad Administration, and the Arizona Corporation Commission (ACC). Mr. Oreschak introduced Mr. Sager to present on the project.

Mr. Sager introduced the project management team: Mr. Oreschak and Mr. Marc Pearsall from MAG, and Mr. Sager from Kimley-Horn. Mr. Sager discussed that the need for the project stemmed from an increase in interactions between bicycle and pedestrian users and railroad users. Seven locations were identified in the southeast valley where off-street paths intersect with railroad crossings, generally along the SRP canals, which are increasingly being identified and utilized as bicycle and pedestrian corridors. Increasing regional use of the paths is creating more potential conflicts between users.

Mr. Sager noted that the Railroad Crossing Study is transferrable to other railroad crossings beyond the seven identified in the study. Mr. Sager noted that UPRR currently considers intersections of multi-use pathways with rail lines as private property unless otherwise noted, and that those who cross the railroad at these locations are currently breaking the law and trespassing. However, with people continuing to cross at these locations in greater numbers, there is a question of how the agencies and the railroad company can provide for public safety. Mr. Sager noted that train and pedestrian/bicyclist collisions can result in severe injuries, with 64% of such collisions resulting in death.

A combination of factors lead to high levels of danger at the unimproved crossings. Pedestrians do not pay full attention when walking on the paths. In some locations, UPRR only runs one or two trains per day with low noise levels. In others, UPRR runs more and faster moving trains. Poor crossing angles also present dangers for bicyclists.

Mr. Sager noted that there is no national crossing design standard, though various guidelines exist to provide some recommendations. The MAG Railroad Crossings Recommendation Report recommends implementing grade-separated crossings where feasible. Otherwise, agencies should work closely with the railroad company to implement safe at-grade crossings. Mr. Sager noted that UPRR requires the closing of two active crossings to open one new active crossing. These crossings can be anywhere in the state, and can include public or private crossings.

The MAG study included development of a process checklist and flowchart for use by agencies when considering addressing a crossing. Crossings should be addressed on a case-by-case basis and should be closely coordinated with the railroad company. The flow chart gives general guidance on types of treatments needed depending on the specific circumstances of the crossing, including considerations of train speed, sight distances, bicycle and pedestrian activity, and number of trains.

Mr. Sager provided an overview of passive warning crossing treatments, such as tactile warning strips, crossbucks, signage, fencing, and gates. Mr. Sager also provided an overview of active crossing treatments, including flashers, audible devices, and automated gates.

Mr. Sager provided the committee an overview of the study's test case: the crossing on the Western Canal at the border between Chandler and Gilbert, which is part of the regional Sun Circle Trail. Mr. Sager noted that this section of track was a rail spur with low speeds and low frequency of train traffic. The pathway had previously been built right up to the rail line on each side of the tracks, but there was no legal, developed crossing for users. The pathway generally followed the path of an SRP canal. Recommendations at this site included advanced warning signage, pavement markings and striping, channelization, flashing lights, audible devices, and clearing vegetation to increase sight distances.

Mr. Sager then explained the crossings checklist. The checklist was written as a step-by-step guide for municipal planners to use in getting crossing improvements implemented. Step one involves gathering basic information on the existing conditions at the crossing. Step two is to identify whether an existing public or private crossing agreement exists at the location. Step three is to determine the improvements that should be implemented. Step four is to develop a preliminary cost estimate, and determine whether the crossing should be pursued. If the crossing should be pursued, step five is to identify partners, such as the railroad company, utility companies, flood control districts, adjacent municipalities, ADOT, the ACC, and any commercial or private entities. Step six is to open official dialogue with the railroad company and other partners. Step seven is to develop agreements and construct the project.

Ms. Kraus thanked MAG for conducting the study, and noted that Chandler had been working to improve that railroad crossing for years, and that the trail system is a strong amenity to the community, both for recreation and transportation. Ms. Kraus noted that these gaps are problematic, and that people are using the crossings anyway, so we have a responsibility for making the crossings as safe as possible. Mr. Grant Anderson asked about legality of the crossings, and whether adding a sidewalk to a road crossing that has existed for decades would be an illegal bicycle and pedestrian crossing in the railroad's eyes, or whether it would be legal because of the road. Mr. Sager noted that the ACC has jurisdiction over roadway crossings, and that the sidewalks alongside roads would likely be incorporated into the existing road crossings. Ms. Hubbard thanked MAG and Kimley-Horn for working with the Town of Gilbert to take feedback and help to address serious safety issues at some of these crossings. Mr. Naimark asked MAG staff to send the study link directly to the committee. Mr. Oreschak noted that he would email the study directly to the committee.

Acting Chairman Naimark asked for a motion. Mr. Grant Anderson moved to recommend acceptance of the report. Ms. Kraus seconded the motion, and the motion passed by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

10. Request for Future Agenda Items

Acting Chairman Naimark requested topics or issues of interest that the Transportation Review Committee would like to have considered for discussion at a future meeting.

11. Member Agency Update

Acting Chairman Naimark offered opportunities for member agencies to present updates to their community.

12. Next Meeting Date

The next regular Transportation Review Committee meeting is scheduled for Thursday, July 31, 2014 at 10:00 a.m. in the MAG Office, Saguaro Room. The June 26, 2014 meeting has been canceled.

There being no further business, Acting Chairman Naimark adjourned the meeting at 11:23 a.m.