

Riders' Advisory Council

June 3, 2009

I. Call to Order:

Ms. Zinkl called the June meeting of the Metro Riders' Advisory Council to order at 6:45 p.m. Mr. Pasek, the staff coordinator, called the roll.

The following members were present:

Diana Zinkl, Chairman, District of Columbia

David Alpert, District of Columbia

Frank DeBernardo, Prince George's County

Kenneth DeGraff, District of Columbia

Penny Everline, Arlington County

Chris Farrell, Montgomery County

Susan Holland, Prince George's County

Carl Seip, At-Large

Patrick Sheehan, At-Large/Accessibility Advisory Committee Chair*

Carol Carter Walker, District of Columbia

Lillian White, City of Alexandria

The following members were absent from this meeting and provided notification of their absence:

Kelsi Bracmort, District of Columbia

Sharon Conn, Prince George's County

Patricia Daniels, District of Columbia

Dharm Guruswamy, At-Large

Lora Routt, Montgomery County

Evelyn Tomaszewski, Fairfax County

II. Public Comment Period:

Ms. Zinkl asked if there were any members of the public who wished to make comments. There were no comments from members of the public.

III. Approval of Agenda:

Ms. Zinkl asked for a motion to approve the agenda. Mr. Alpert moved approval of the agenda as presented. Ms. Everline seconded this motion. Without objection, the agenda was approved as presented.

IV. Approval of May 6, 2009 Meeting Minutes:

Ms. Zinkl then asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the Council's May 6, 2009 meeting. Members suggested changes and additions to the minutes that were distributed prior to the meeting.

Mr. Sheehan arrived at 6:49 p.m.

Ms. Walker moved to approve the minutes as amended. This motion was seconded by Mr. Alpert.

In favor: Ms. Zinkl, Mr. Alpert, Mr. DeBernardo, Ms. Everline, Mr. Sheehan, Ms. Walker

Opposed: none

Abstentions: Mr. DeGraff, Mr. Farrell, Ms. Holland, Mr. Seip, Ms. White

The May 6, 2009 minutes were approved as amended. (6-0-5)

V. Reports:

Ms. Zinkl then called for reports from various committees and working groups. She asked that members keep their reports brief and try to limit questions so that the Council can stay on schedule.

A. *Report by Accessibility Advisory Council:*

Mr. Sheehan delivered the report from the Accessibility Advisory Council (AAC). He began by asking Ms. Holland to provide a report from the AAC's "Metro is Accessible" committee.

Ms. Holland provided the Council with an overview of the "Metro is Accessible" committee, which is part of the Accessibility Advisory Committee. She explained that the "Metro is Accessible" program was started several years ago with two employees in Metro's Office of Americans with Disabilities Act Programs (ADAP). She said that the mission of the "Metro is Accessible" program is to help individuals with disabilities use the fixed-route Metrorail and Metrobus systems. Ms. Holland noted that this program has recently expanded to five employees. These employees conduct outreach to various groups, including schools and medical facilities, and also conduct travel training, to help individuals with disabilities become more comfortable using the fixed-route system. Ms. Holland added that the program's work with schools lets parents to feel comfortable in allowing their kids become users Metro's fixed-route system after graduation. She told the Council that the recent increase in staff has allowed the "Metro is Accessible" program to double the number of people that it has reached out to over the past year through presentations, events and travel trainings.

Ms. Holland continued by telling members that one of the members of the committee had asked staff for a breakdown of senior citizen riders and riders with disabilities using the

fixed-route system versus those using MetroAccess and also asked for information on why riders might choose to use MetroAccess versus fixed-route rail and bus service. She said that the committee was interested in why riders would choose MetroAccess given that Metro has a significant travel-training program. She noted that the AAC also approved as a goal a 15% increase in the number of riders choosing to use Metrobus and Metrorail instead of MetroAccess service over the next three months, but that the “Metro is Accessible” committee needed to have further discussions on the feasibility of that goal. Ms. Holland noted that the AAC’s goal of having some MetroAccess users ride fixed-route service for some of their trips is consistent with the state goals of the Maryland Commission on Disabilities, of which she is also a member.

Mr. Sheehan noted that each MetroAccess trip costs \$42, so shifting MetroAccess riders to Metrobus and Metrorail for some of their trips substantially reduces costs. He added that Metro is showing a 30% decrease in the number of MetroAccess customers’ trips on MetroAccess, with many of those trips being shifted to Metrobus and Metrorail. He said that “Metro is Accessible” has substantially increased its outreach to veterans groups, schools and facilities that serve senior citizens.

Mr. Sheehan said that the AAC also had a demonstration of the new seatbelt/wheelchair restraint system being proposed for Metrobuses. He said that this system is expected to cost around \$7.5 million. He said that he thinks that the system that was demonstrated is a good system but that more input from Metrobus staff is needed before making a decision.

He also announced that Metro’s recent priority seating campaign has been successful and that both the AAC and Christian Kent, Metro’s Assistant General Manager for Access Services are very pleased with the results. He noted that his wife had been profiled in a *Washington Post* article about the outreach campaign. He also noted that some members of the AAC were featured on the posters installed on Metrorail as part of the outreach campaign and have received positive reactions from riders when they’re spotted riding Metrorail. Mr. Sheehan said that he thinks the campaign is making a difference and that it would be a good idea to review its effectiveness as a follow-up measure.

Ms. Zinkl said that she thought that providing travel training for persons with disabilities on how to use the fixed-route system is a great idea, especially because of cost of providing MetroAccess service. She added that she thought it might also be useful for Metro to conduct similar training for persons without disabilities. She explained that because of the relatively transient nature of D.C.’s population, many people move here with limited experience using transit, and are often unfamiliar or uncomfortable with riding transit.

Ms. White said that she was pleasantly surprised to hear an announcement on the rail system recently about priority seats. She said that she thinks that these announcements

need to be made consistently. Ms. Zinkl suggested that Metro may also want to run these announcements on buses.

B. Report by Customer Delivery Standards Working Group:

Ms. Everline said that the Council's working group that is reviewing Metro's proposed Customer Delivery Standards will be meeting again on Monday, June 8th at 6:00 p.m. She said that this meeting would be to review the draft Customer Delivery Standards document and to develop a "checklist" of items to bring forward to discuss with Metro staff.

VI. Council Standards and Policies:

Ms. Zinkl then moved the discussion to a review the Council's standards and practices. She said that in light of time constraints she hoped to at least have a discussion on some of the more straightforward issues, such as:

- The confidentiality of Council emails and other communications;
- Notation of attendance in meeting minutes.

A. Notation of meeting attendance in minutes:

Ms. Zinkl said that currently members are marked as either "absent" or "present" from meetings and said that there had been discussions about adding a "noticed absent" category, which would list members who had given notice that they were unable to attend a Council meeting. She noted that, in most cases, members will contact her or the staff coordinator when they know they won't be able to attend a Council meeting. She said that the options are to either list this "noticed absent" category in the public record or have staff keep a private record of attendance.

Ms. Walker said that she would like the minutes to differentiate between "noticed" absences and those that aren't and suggested that this be noted during roll call and become part of the public record of the meeting. She said that she also had concerns about listing members' arrival and departure times in the minutes but said she has not proposed changing that practice.

Mr. Farrell noted that there were no members representing Montgomery County at last month's Council meeting and said that, in his opinion, members should either come to meetings or resign their posts.

Ms. Zinkl said that she shared Mr. Farrell's concerns about members missing meetings, though she understood that there would always be some occasions where missing a Council meeting would be unavoidable. She said that, as chair, she is concerned about concerns about the number of vacancies on the Council, since those vacancies leave jurisdictions underrepresented when the Council discusses issues. Ms. Everline

suggested that this was more of a recruitment and retention issue rather than an attendance issue.

Mr. Seip said that if the purpose of taking attendance at meetings was to show the Board and members of the public which members attended meetings, he didn't see what the difference would be between "noticed" and other absences. He said that members are either in attendance and contributing to a meeting, or they're not.

Ms. Zinkl said that showing that members have provided notice of their absences would at least show that members have valid reasons for missing the meetings. She said that she gets concerned when members miss meetings because she wants the Council to achieve consensus on issues, and if members are absent from meetings, they aren't able to provide their jurisdictions' perspectives on the issue being discussed. She said that while she can't control whether or not members can make meetings, this information could help Board members when they fill vacancies on the Council.

Ms. White said that it should be part of the recruitment process to remind potential members of their obligations as a Council members prior to their appointment and that this information should be provided to new members. Ms. Zinkl said that information about needing to be available for meetings was made clear to her when she applied to be on the Council. She said that she's not sure what can be done in terms of recruitment and retention when the only thing being asked of members is to attend the regular monthly meetings.

Ms. Walker moved that the Council form a "Governance Committee" to address this and other administrative and procedural issues. She said that this group could then bring back recommendations to the Council.

Ms. Zinkl asked members for a decision on how they wanted to address the issue of recording members' attendance.

Mr. DeGraff moved that the minutes list members' absences and "absences with notice" separately. This motion was seconded by Ms. White.

In favor: Ms. Zinkl, Mr. Alpert, Mr. DeBernardo, Mr. DeGraff, Ms. Everline, Mr. Farrell, Ms. Holland, Mr. Seip, Mr. Sheehan, Ms. Walker

Opposed: none

Abstentions: Ms. White

This motion was approved. (10-0-1)

Mr. DeGraff said that he would also like the working group proposed by Ms. Walker to include discussion on how the Council can enhance its relationship with the Board of Directors.

Ms. Zinkl asked whether members preferred to have one working group that addressed both the Council's by-laws as well as other procedural issues or whether they would prefer to separate those two discussions into two separate working groups. Ms. Walker said that she would prefer to have one group address both issues, to allow the group to decide which issues should be addressed by proposed changes to the by-laws and which could be addressed through other means.

Mr. Pasek noted that any changes to the Council's by-laws would require approval from Metro's Board of Directors.

Ms. Zinkl said that she understood the need to discuss both procedural and by-laws issues since there are many Council procedures that aren't enumerated in the by-laws. She said that many aspects of how the Council operates haven't been fully explained to members and this group would help by setting procedures and orienting members to them.

Ms. Walker restated her motion. She moved that the Council form a Governance Committee that would deal with procedures and by-laws. This motion was seconded by Mr. Seip. *Without objection, this motion was approved.*

Ms. Zinkl noted that the Council had set aside dates for subcommittee or working group meetings – the second Monday and third Tuesday of each month.

Mr. Alpert asked whether the working group that was just formed would also be addressing the issue of meeting administration and flow. He said that had hope that this topic would be covered at this meeting. Ms. Zinkl responded by outlining her responsibilities as chair and some of factors that influence her method of running Council meetings.

Mr. Alpert moved that the Council place a discussion of meeting administration at the beginning of the agenda for the next Council meeting. This motion was deferred until later in the meeting.

VII. New Business:

Ms. Zinkl then introduced the evening's speakers.

A. *Panel Discussion of Pedestrian and Customer Information:*

Bicycle and Pedestrian Access Study:

Tom Harrington from Metro's Office of Long Range Planning told the Council that he would be presenting on Metro's planned Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities study. He noted that Kristin Haldeman, who is managing the study, was called out of town on family business and was unable to attend the Council's meeting.

Mr. Harrington gave a brief background on the study and told the Council that it is planned to address growing bicycle access to Metro stations and to identify both future bicycle facility needs along with missing bicycle and pedestrian links within ½-mile of rail stations. He explained that Metro is expecting significant ridership increases on both bus and rail over the next 25 years and Metro is trying to determine how to best meet this demand.

Mr. Harrington noted that the, while it is a small percentage of total Metro riders, the number of riders accessing Metrorail by bicycle in the A.M. peak period increased 60% from 2002 – 2007. He said that this was a significant increase and highlighted the need for Metro to look at the projected need for bicycle access to the system.

Mr. Harrington also gave members an overview of the Metrorail stations with the highest number of bike riders throughout the system and details on Metro's recent upgrades to bicycle racks and facilities at Metro stations. He said that Metro would be looking at "best practices" for bicycle facilities as part of this study.

Mr. Harrington also gave an overview of the pedestrian access portion of the study. He explained that the study would provide broad-level recommendations for improving pedestrian access to stations which could then lead to more detailed, station-specific pedestrian access studies.

He said that the project would develop its recommendations over the next 6-9 months and would host a public workshop over the summer to get input and feedback on the study.

B. Bus Stop Customer Information Study:

Scottie Borders from Metro's Office of Customer Service gave the Council an overview of Metro's Bus Stop Customer Information Study. A draft of this study has been completed.

Mr. Borders reviewed the findings of the study and noted it found that customers want consistent, reliable information at their bus stop s. He explained that Metro currently has over 12,000 bus stops – 7000 of these, mostly in the District of Columbia, have information cases, and that there are approximately 3000 bus shelters throughout the region. He explained that many bus stops are served by multiple bus lines, which sometimes makes conveying schedule and route information difficult. He noted that the most common complaint Metro receives about the information it posts at its bus stops is about the font size of the schedules displayed.

Mr. Borders then provided an overview of the key information elements that should be posted at bus stops and described some of the recommendations of the study in terms of bus stop flag design. He explained that the study recommended providing stop-specific schedule information and that information about the destinations of the buses serving each stop be included on the bus stop flag as well as with the schedule information. He showed members of the Council an illustration of the proposed new schedule information display along with the proposed new bus stop signs.

In response to a question from Ms. Everline, Mr. Borders said that the consultant's recommendations were consistent with the Americans with Disabilities Act's requirements. Mr. Sheehan suggested that Metro's Office of ADA programs be asked to review any recommendations.

Bike Access and Commuting Options:

Eric Gilliland, Executive Director of the Washington Area Bicyclists' Association (WABA) introduced himself and provided a brief history of the organization. He said that he wanted to talk about the relationship between cycling and transit and some of the issues that WABA has recently been working on.

Mr. Gilliland said that he thinks that transit and cycling can complement each other and that cycling can help expand transit capacity by shifting shorter trips away from transit. He said that if people used bikes for shorter trips, this would free up capacity on Metro for riders making longer trips. He said that he hoped that Metro would embrace this vision and tadded hat improving bicycle access to Metro would help achieve this.

Mr. Gilliland also made note of a recent project to construct a bicycle trail at the Shady Grove Metro which he said was very encouraging as to how it was carried out. He explained that Metro gave the land to Montgomery County at no charge for the construction of the trail because Metro completed a study which found that the value added to the Metro system from the completion of the trail exceeded the value of the land required for the trail. He said that this was the first time Metro had done something like this, but that he hoped that this could be replicated at other Metro stations with trails near them.

Mr. Gilliland said that another way to improve access to the Metro system is to more fully integrate Metro with the District of Columbia's bike-sharing system, specifically by collocating bike stations with transit centers to make switching between modes (transit and bicycle) more convenient.

He also noted that WABA is encouraged by the jump in riders accessing Metro by bicycle, but remains concerned about the security of bikes parked at Metro stations. He said that thieves know that bikes parked at Metro stations are good targets for theft because they will be unattended for long stretches of time. He said that he is encouraged that Metro is looking at addressing this issue, such as by improving bike lockers or moving bicycle parking to more visible locations inside of rail stations where it can be monitored by video or by Metro staff. He said that WABA hoped that as Metro installed more bicycle lockers around the region that they are placed in visible locations.

Mr. Gilliland thanked the Council for inviting him to its meeting and provided WABA's website address (www.waba.org) if members wanted any additional information.

Ms. Zinkl thanked all of the presenters for coming to the meeting and opened the floor for questions and discussion.

Ms. Zinkl asked each of the panelists how they incorporate jurisdictional input.

Mr. Harrington responded that he felt that the bicycle and pedestrian facility study would involve both significant input from the jurisdictions as well as help Metro develop relationships that it could take forward to the implementation of the study's recommendations. He added that Metro would be getting input from the Transportation Planning Board's Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee along with Metro's Jurisdictional Coordinating Committee and other stakeholders. He said that he thinks that it will be interesting to find the commonalities and differences across the region in terms of the challenges and solutions in providing bicycle and pedestrian access to transit.

He said that the bicycle and pedestrian access study will not only focus on improvements that Metro can make, but will also focus on improvements that the local jurisdictions will need to make.

Mr. Gilliland said that the exact nature of WABA's work with the various Washington-area jurisdictions depends on the specifics of each jurisdiction. He said that WABA works with cycling advocates in all of the jurisdictions around the region. He added that he thought of Metro as something that knits the region together and said that he thinks that there will be common access issues across the region. He said that he thinks Metro can be an advocate with local departments of transportation for the projects and strategies ultimately recommended by the access study.

Mr. Borders said that as part of the bus stop customer information study, Metro worked very closely with the regional bus stop task force, which is composed of the staff responsible for bus stops in the various jurisdictions that Metro serves. He said that jurisdictional staff members are interested in the study because they share many of Metro's frustrations about providing information at bus stops.

Ms. Zinkl said that she wanted to second Mr. Gilliland's point about Metro's unique position as a region-wide unifying force. She said that Metro can help people come together on various issues relating to transit access.

Ms. White said that she has heard concerns from bicyclists about elevator access in Metro stations, and that the presentation on the bicycle and pedestrian facilities study didn't mention elevators. She explained that bicycle riders are required to use elevators to access train platforms, and when elevators are out of service, riders are sometimes unable to use the rail station. She also noted that she attended the bicycle and pedestrian workshop that had been mentioned and also that the City of Alexandria has a bicycle and pedestrian coordinator on staff.

Ms. White also noted that the signs that provide information for bicyclists in the Metro station are often deteriorated or otherwise hard to read. Mr. Gilliland said that WABA had surveyed Metrorail stations and found many signs that were out-of-date and referenced outdated Bike-on-Rail rules. He said that station access is difficult now and will only become more difficult as Metrorail gets more crowded. He added that Metro may need to look at allowing cyclists to use stairs at some locations rather than restricting them solely to elevators.

Mr. Farrell noted that the maps in many bus shelters highlighting the specific routes serving that shelter are tremendously useful and could serve to acquaint riders with the bus system who otherwise would not use it. He suggested that Metro make those maps available, and noted that riders may even be willing to pay for them as they provide such good information.

Mr. Farrell asked Mr. Gilliland about the progress on the trail that runs between Silver Spring and Union Station. Mr. Gilliland said that this trail, the Metropolitan Branch Trail, has been in development for a long time. He said that the next segment from the New York Avenue Metro station north to Franklin Street is under construction and the District is working with the National Park Service for access to the Fort Totten area since this is Park Service land. He explained that the section of trail around the Silver Spring Transit Center will be constructed as part of the Transit Center but that Montgomery County has not yet done any design work for the segment from Silver Spring to Takoma Park. He told the Council that he ultimately hopes to see a trail connection from Bethesda along the Georgetown Branch Trail to Silver Spring and then connecting to Union Station. He said that the trail is complicated because of all of the various partners involved in its design and construction but that progress is being made.

Ms. Walker asked for clarification on what an “accessible I.D.” was as it related to bus stop information. Mr. Borders said that the I.D. is a small sign with Braille mounted on the bus stop pole that helps blind riders identify their bus stop. Ms. Walker also said that describing a bus route as “counterclockwise” as shown on the example signage in Mr. Borders’ presentation was confusing to her.

Ms. Zinkl asked if the accessible NextBus signs would be available only at bus stops located at Metrorail stations or at all of Metro’s 12,000 bus stops. Mr. Borders said that these would only be available at bus stops at rail stations. Jim Hamre from Metro’s Bus Projects and Corridor Planning Program clarified that the audible NextBus signs would only be at locations where there are LED NextBus signs. He noted that there would only be 24 of these audible signs when the system is relaunched in July. In response to a question from Ms. Zinkl about neighborhood stops, Mr. Hamre said that customers would need to call Metro’s Customer Information number to get NextBus predictions.

Mr. Sheehan asked whether the accessible I.D. would have raised letters in addition to Braille. Mr. Hamre responded that the accessible I.D. would ADA-compliant.

Mr. Hamre offered some clarification about the accessible I.D. He said that this is one of the items that Metro is investigating as part of its study of bus stop standards is how to help blind or low-vision customers identify bus stops. He said that these accessible I.D. signs on bus stop poles would help these customers differentiate the bus stop pole from other traffic signs.

Mr. Sheehan suggested that Metro staff discuss the issue with the Office of ADA Programs.

Mr. DeBernardo asked whether the study will look at changing Metro's restrictions for bringing bikes onto the rail system during certain hours to allow for greater bike access.

Mr. Harrington said that as Metro gains more riders, station crowding will only increase, making it more difficult for riders to bring their bikes through stations and He said that the purpose of the study is to look at access and

Mr. Gilliland said that WABA supports greater bike access, but that he doesn't think that this study is the appropriate place to do. He noted that there may be other opportunities for Metro to expand bicycle access on the rail system, such as allowing riders to take their bikes on "reverse-commute" trips, though he said that it may be difficult to enforce such regulations given the configuration of the Metro system.

In response to a question from Mr. Seip, Mr. Borders said that the bus stop prototype shown in his presentation was a suggestion from the consultant and was not a final recommendation. Mr. Seip asked that if, at some point, Metro has a mock-up of its new bus stop, that the Council be provided the opportunity to look at it. He also asked if NextBus information would be integrated into the new bus stop flag. Mr. Borders responded that the NextBus stop number would be included on the new bus stop flag.

Mr. Seip also asked about Metro's timeline for deploying new bus stop flags throughout the system. Mr. Borders said that there isn't a set timeline for their installation. Mr. Seip also suggested that Metro incorporate information for "Metrobus Express" service at stops that are served by express routes.

Mr. DeGraff asked if Mr. Borders anticipated information cases being available at all of Metro's bus stops. Mr. Borders said that, over time, Metro hopes to have an info case or some type of information panel at all of its stops.

Mr. DeGraff also noted that he has experienced difficulty getting through Metro's faregates when he brings his bike onto the system and asked if addressing this issue was within the scope of the study. Mr. Harrington said that changes to the faregates would be outside the scope of the study. Mr. Gilliland said that he wasn't aware of any issues that bicyclists have faced in using Metro faregates.

Mr. Alpert said that he didn't see destination information included as part of the "Key Information Elements at Bus Stops." Mr. Borders said that the consultant suggested that

destination information be shown on bus stop flags in addition to route numbers. Mr. Alpert suggested providing information about intermediate destinations along with the final destinations of each bus and gave the example of buses destined for Southern Avenue that also pass through downtown and Capitol Hill. Ms. Zinkl said that including intermediate reference points also makes sense for bus stops served by multiple lines.

Mr. Hamre noted that there are ADA requirements for type size on bus stop flags which limit the amount of information that can be displayed. He noted that the Ride On sign shown in the presentation is not ADA-compliant. He said that Metro is looking at the bus stop as a system and would general reference information on the bus stop flag and then include additional information in the information case mounted on the pole, like a route map, schedule information, contact information and information on how to ride the bus. He said that bus shelters would also have the bus stop shelter maps.

Ms. Zinkl said that it would be helpful to see a prototype of the proposed bus stop information system that includes all of the bus stop information elements – the flag, the information case, and any other information elements that would be included, prior to Metro making any recommendations to the Board. She said that it would be helpful to be able to see all of the information proposed to be made available at bus stops as a system in terms of Council members providing feedback.

~~Mr. Alpert said that wanted to emphasize he thinks that it's important that information about the major destinations along a route be made very obvious to riders.~~

Mr. Alpert said that he believes it would be very beneficial to bus riders to include some information about the intermediate destinations. If they cannot fit on the flags, he suggested Metro ensure that the information is obviously visible on some other signage.

Ms. Zinkl thanked the presenters for coming to the meeting and for participating in the discussion. She also specifically thanked Mr. Gilliland for being the Council's first non-Metro presenter.

Ms. White left the meeting at 8:30 p.m.

Mr. DeGraff moved postpone adjournment until 9:00 p.m. or later to discuss Council procedural issues which were earlier referred to the governance working group. Ms. Zinkl said that extending the meeting would be contingent on members being willing to stay. She suggested adjourning the meeting and having an offline discussion on this topic. Mr. DeGraff's motion was withdrawn.

Mr. Alpert then moved to have a discussion on this topic at the beginning of the next Council meeting. Ms. Zinkl said that the Council had already formed a working group to address some of the procedural issues that had been brought up.

Mr. Alpert restated his motion. He moved that the Council have an informal discussion immediately after the present meeting and also to reserve 20 minutes at or near the beginning of the next Council meeting to discuss the issue of meeting flow. Ms. Walker seconded this motion.

Ms. Holland left the meeting at 8:33 p.m.

Ms. Everline asked that members be respectful of each other in these discussions and that members remain appropriate, especially if guests are present at the meeting.

In favor: Mr. Alpert, Mr. DeBernardo, Mr. DeGraff, Ms. Everline, Mr. Farrell, Mr. Seip, Ms. Walker

Opposed: Mr. Sheehan

Abstentions: Ms. Zinkl

This motion was approved. (7-1-1)

VIII. Adjournment:

Without objection, Ms. Zinkl adjourned the meeting at 8:35 p.m.