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Proposed outcomes for this meeting
- State study committee charge and proposed goals
- Introduce members, presenters, staff, and other participants
- Receive Citizens League principles and process
- Hear from presenter on transit funding overview
- Discuss information received and confirm additional information needed
- Agree on next steps

Minutes

Chair Peter Bell called the meeting to order at 7:32 a.m.

Welcome
Chair Bell welcomed committee members and announced that at every meeting, he would aim to start and end on time. He also asked members to silence phones and refrain from using them during the meetings including tweeting. Calls should be taken outside the meeting room. Chair Bell explained how the scope of work was narrowed to focus on transit. One assumption the group will be starting from is that growing the transit system is important and positive – but how is an open question. He also asked members to assume that while the current system has problems, it is not necessarily unworkable and that it may be retained. The group should not try to change it for change sake.

He also explained that every meeting would end with the Citizen League practice of evaluating whether we stayed on task with the day’s proposed outcomes and objectives. Chair Bell highlighted three main objectives for the overall project:

1. Understand current transit capital and operating funding structures
   We have different knowledge levels in the room. We want to bring everyone to the same level of understanding. We will have presentations on current structures, as well as deep dives into systems that counties, Counties Transit Improvement Board (CTIB), Federal Transit Administration, cities, and Met Council use. This is very complex.

2. Renew and consider different funding scenarios.
   The committee will review and discuss the current transit funding, and perhaps work to consider two to three others. This may be the only work committee members do outside meetings. Members may be encouraged to get together and study particular scenarios.
3. Make recommendations. This will likely include pieces of various scenarios proposed. Chair Bell asked if there were any questions.

A committee member asked about the assumption that the buildout of transit system is good. He wanted to know where that assumption came from and what it meant. What is the definition of that goal?

Chair Bell said that there are a whole host of reasons we should not rely solely on single-occupancy vehicles. That said, he was unsure what exactly that looks like. He added that he would like the committee to focus less on modes and more on a system that ought to be funded. Is the current funding system optimal? Chair Bell added that future impacts of things like federal infrastructure spending, driverless cars, etc. will likely be discussed but at this time, he is not sure they'll be a major focus of the committee's work.

A different member raised a point concerning highways vs. transit. It was their opinion that both need to be considered for either to work optimally. The member wanted to make sure that the committee pays attention to how its recommendations would be integrated with roads too and not focus exclusively on transit.

Chair Bell responded that while the committee’s focus will be more on transit, it does not mean the group will ignore the intersection between transit and roads. The focus will be on funding and optimized decision making. As a starting place, the committee will focus on whatever dollars come in and ask whether they are being maximized. Is the current decision-making structure a good process? This will already be a huge task.

Staff member Sean Kershaw added that the Citizens League policy focus areas are in regional governance, aging, and workforce. This effort falls under regional governance. In his mind, there is no question that work on aging and transportation is related and important. Demographically, this is a very big deal. Transit for the workforce is also huge. His definition of transit comes from a Citizens League 1971 report: Transit is Riding.

A committee member asked about the connections between funding and governance structures. Chair Bell responded that the group will talk about governance structure in current funding levels, but will not make specific dollar amount recommendations. He explained that that would take a much deeper level of analysis regarding growth and demographics. The group will talk about current funding levels and how decisions are made now and ask whether they are the best ways we can make decisions.

A committee member added to the staff’s point raised earlier that they were also interested in the definition of transit. They have heard various definitions in the last few months and now they’re not clear what it is.

A committee member mentioned driverless cars and while they understand how hard it will be to anticipate technological advances, the member asked whether this should at least be acknowledged in the committee’s work as it talks about funding and as it moves forward towards recommendations with an eye toward creating a system that is more nimble and flexible to prepare for future technologies.

A committee member referred to the Chair’s comment about not getting into modes. She was unsure how to not talk about modes. It seemed to her that modes will overlap with governance issues. Chair Bell responded that while he would rather the committee not get into huge discussions over which modes he agreed that from a governance perspective, these things might need to be discussed.

A committee member commented that they hoped committee members would be able to a step back from their respective areas. Part of the reason for the current fractured system is that there are a lot of people—some in this room—involved in what gets built and how. It was his hope that the committee
members would take this opportunity to step back from their day-to-day negotiating and from what they do when they’re outside this room. The committee member hopes we can come together to talk about a better decision-making process. What kind of governance will give people confidence that the process of decision-making is good?

A committee member added that this is just a means to an end. Transit is just a means to an end. The point is not simply just to move people around. It has to serve the goal of getting people from where they are to where they need to be.

A committee member commented regarding the question of different modes, the current charge of the committee, and looking at where the funding is coming from, he hoped the committee would review the current transit plan that has been in place for many years. He believed the plan includes a doubling of ridership. Chair Bell confirmed that looking at the current plan was important.

A committee member commented that they’d like some information about customers. Customer behavior is important to consider. It is easy to miss who we are serving. Chair Bell responded that he and staff would make sure there would be a presentation on who the customer is.

Introduction of Members
With no further questions, Chair Bell asked each committee member to introduce themselves and to provide their thoughts on or their concerns with the three goals he mentioned.

Vice-chair Lenczewski thanked the Citizens League for taking on the project. Since many of the people in the room know each other, Vice-chair Lenczewski said it is not hard to know what they may disagree on. Many people here are good at “going to war.” She stated that many people here have become good at it. That said, she felt that it is rare to have such a diverse group that consists so many high quality thinkers and decision-makers. She did not want to stop individuals from fighting for what they believe outside the room, but challenged the group not waste the opportunity here to get something done. She encouraged members to put the “weapons” away in this space to see how far the group could move forward together on transit. She mentioned she was honored to serve on the committee.

The member from Lakeville introduced herself as a county commissioner but clarified that she was here representing herself and not in her formal role. She thought the goals were fine. She noted the people in the room and that it reflected just the metropolitan area. At the very least, she thought there should be a presentation of the funding going to the bus systems serving St. Cloud, Rochester, Duluth, etc. – looking at how much comes from state/federal versus how much comes from local funding sources. People may be surprised at the difference. She noted that her bias is that she believes transit is a state responsibility and we are one state. She added that we [the metro area] send money out to Greater Minnesota for all kinds of things they need and she was never able to understand why the metro area could not make the same case that transit is a need in the metropolitan region. We need to understand how funding governance works elsewhere in the state. When Greater Minnesota looks for funding to support the Northern Lights train or the zip line, they are not looking for authority for a local sales tax to pay for it.

A member introduced himself as a Citizens League board member and the former regional administrator for the Met Council having retired.

A member spoke specifically to the goals stated by Chair Bell. His thinking was about the inputs: the humans interacting with the system. Thinking through the funding is important because he thought certain parts of the region are overburdened financially in relation to where transit investments are being made. He would like to see how the group could make sure there is a balance of who is getting served and where the money is coming from.

A member introduced himself as having served on a local city council, in the legislature, and most recently before his retirement, he worked in a law firm representing cities, counties, and the Counties
Transit Improvement Board (CTIB). He has been deeply involved in transportation issues and well as public finance.

In his introduction, a member mentioned that in order to understand current funding structures, we have to look at the history of how we got here. We ought to be looking at what our regional economic competitors are doing from Seattle to Dallas to Sacramento. Many are doing funding ballot measures in November, and it’s interesting to look at them and compare them to what we are doing. Of the ballot measures he’s reviewed, one of the more interesting ones is from Medicino County where they plan to use funding from a new tax on marijuana businesses.

A member introduced himself and let the group know that his bias is towards the east side of metro transit but he is looking forward to understanding the history of the system and how we got here.

A committee member introduced himself as from the Shakopee, Scott County area. He mentioned his city was one of the original opt-outs and helped to carry the original legislative to create the opt-outs because of disagreements on funding and service. He mentioned he was good with the goals Chair Bell mentioned. When he was in the legislature, he did not feel it was his role to play referee between the modes. Instead, he wanted to focus on how to maximize funding for mobility effectiveness. He wondered if this could be a useful definition of success.

A member introduced herself as a member of the Transportation Accessibility Advisory committee. While not here to officially represent the Transportation Accessibility Advisory Committee, the member informed the group that she does sit on that committee. She explained that she has been a long time user of transit since she has cerebral palsy, epilepsy, arthritis, and tremors. She was employed full-time for 27 years before she had to stop work due to her disabilities. Because of her disabilities, she became certified for Metro Mobility, which is how she arrived at the meeting this morning. She recalled her time working for West Publishing (now Thomson Reuters) who, at the time, were planning to move to their new Eagan location. Getting to this new location was problematic for her but her employer at that time was not transit savvy. While she understands that disability is only one aspect of transit, she wanted the group to know that because of available transit including Metro Mobility, she is able to volunteer and contribute what she knows to the organizations that need her.

The county commissioner for Hennepin County introduced himself as the current chair of CTIB (Counties Transit Improvement Board) and tax committee in House when he served in the legislature. His bias is building out a transit system so that it supports economic growth and equity in region. He added that there has been a history of good decision-making in transit investment but that in recent days, we have been faltering a bit. As far as governance, he would like to see a structure that can get things done.

The council member of Minneapolis introduced herself. She has been the city’s lead on a number of regional governance issues and experience with some of the city’s transit projects. One perspective she interested in is how a city perspective is reflected in governance. Cities are significant in making transit work. The other piece is how we are thinking through who are current and future users are and how the system is matching up to their needs.

A member introduced himself as the metro district engineer with MnDOT. He explained that the metro district coincides with the Met Council’s seven-district area, but they also have Chisago County. He imagines he will be the “road” guy on the committee but wants the committee to know that transit is a huge focus area at MnDOT. With every project MnDOT takes on, the process includes looking for transit advantages. He mentioned the variety of experiences on transit management including the first bus-on-shoulder projects. He also mentioned the various advisory committees that he serves on.

A member introduced himself as the director of health equity advocacy at BlueCross BlueShield of Minnesota. He explained that this department was created as a result of the landmark tobacco settlement. He added that health disparities remain a huge equity issue and the physical built
environment is a large determining factor on health. He also serves on the board of Transit for Livable Communities.

The county commissioner for Ramsey County introduced himself as a member of CTIB. Looking around the room, he noted that there are members he has advocated alongside and times when they've been on opposite of the issues. He is looking forward to see where the group will go between now and the end of the year.

A member introduced himself as a member from the group called Community Solutions. The group’s primary focus is on local elections. He grew up in Crystal and has opinions on the Blue Line extension (Bottineau) near his childhood home. He sees transit as something we have to have but he disclosed his bias that he did not think transit needs to be everywhere. He thought why transit is expanding is an important question. It should be there for those who need it not be imposed on those who do not want it. He noted that he might change his mind.

The member from the Minnesota Chamber of Commerce introduced himself. The Minnesota Chamber represents about 2000 companies – 60 percent in the Twin Cities and 40 percent in Greater MN. Most of the members have fewer than 100 employees. The Chamber looks at issues from a statewide perspective. In the last ten years, a lot of focus has been on transportation. Even if one has a bias towards roads, you have to have an interest in transit. It has become a roadblock for a transportation system statewide. He hopes to make progress towards a statewide transportation policy that is credible.

The mayor of Woodbury introduced herself. Since the mayor of Eden Prairie could not attend the meeting today, she made a plug for both cities since they were recently recognized at top places to live in the nation by Money magazine. Bias-wise, she cannot understand why people distinguish between transit and transportation. She identifies as conservative but believes transit is one of government’s core functions. She mentioned a variety of transportation committees she serves on. She not only represents the east side of Saint Paul voice, but a general voice for transit would like the committee to get towards a governance model that is effective and a funding system that is sustainable.

The member from the Minneapolis Bicycle Coalition introduced himself. He mentioned that the coalition will have a new name soon to reflect an additional focus on pedestrian issues. His perspective is that people walk and bike to transit and that needs to be seen as important since everyone walks to get transit. How bicycles and walking fits into transit is important. It's not just about mobility, but about access. It is also not just how fast and how far but where one can actually get to. He and his wife who lives at the intersection of the two busiest bus routes in the region. They do not own a car by choice and he hopes to bring this perspective and this voice to the committee.

A member introduced herself as a member of the Transportation Advisory Board. She mentioned a transportation conference she attended that revealed to her how unprepared some communities might be. She later researched the Met Council and was later appointed to advisory board and has been learning ever since. As a racial equity advocate, it is important to know how people use these systems and how it affects their lives.

Chair Bell noted the varied and impressive committee and expressed his excitement to move forward. He mentioned that the rest of the time this morning would be spent on the first objective: understanding current funding structures. In future weeks, the group will be doing deeper dives into various topics. He introduced Matt Buress from House Research, who is knowledgeable on transit funding. Chair Bell let the group know that Mr. Buress is open to take questions throughout presentation.
Mr. Burress explained that he was asked to prepare a general “101” high-level overview of transit funding. Because of this, it may not be as comprehensive.

Mr. Burress began his presentation by going over PowerPoint slides that covered the governance structure and history of the Met Council. On slide 5, he provided background information on the motor vehicle sales tax (MVST). In setting up an understanding of public finances, Mr. Burress underscored the importance of the motor vehicle sales tax. The 6.5% sales tax is on new and used motor vehicles and is imposed instead of the state’s sales tax. It is statewide. Over time, but on again and off again, it has been partially allocated for transportation with the rest going into the state’s general fund.

**Question:** Do local sales taxes tax for things like the stadium go in to the 6.5% motor vehicle sales tax as well or is it separate? Mr. Burress responded that it is separate. He added that other local taxes like the legacy tax is over and above the 6.5% motor vehicle sales tax. It creates a separate revenue stream.

**Question:** If there was a rate change for the general sales tax, would it affect the motor vehicle sales tax? Mr. Burress responded that it would not. A change in the motor vehicle sales tax rate would require a law change.

**Question:** How much does the motor vehicle sales tax generate? On slide page 15, Mr. Buress showed the estimated amount generated in FY 2015: $697.1 million. The slide also showed the allocation formula:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highways (HUTD)</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twin Cities metropolitan area transit</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Minnesota transit</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He shared few a more details on MVST. There was an on again, off again allocation to transportation, but a constitutional amendment led to a 100% dedication of revenues to transportation. It also created a ceiling for highways and a floor for transit. The actual split is determined by the state.

**Question:** Can you disaggregate what the highway percentage to show metro and Greater Minnesota split? The member added that he thought some of these decisions are at an agency level while some are done through the state. He thought it important to get a full picture. Mr. Burress did not recall seeing that break out but he thought it could be assembled in a straight forward way. Mr. Burress advised not to put cart before the horse as it relates to the full picture comment. If we are only looking at one funding stream as we are now, there are considerations that need to be made. It would be different if we were looking at something more comprehensive such as the state general fund.

**Question:** Is that decision on split made by MnDOT? Mr. Buress responded that the highway is a constitutionally established fund. There is an allocation fund formula between state and local units of governments.

A member commented that Mr. Buress is correct. You cannot take from one source and make an analysis based on that. But in order to provide an answer to the highway split, if one were to take all of the money, and look statewide as to how we are spending it, the portion going to the metro area is somewhere within the range of 35-40%, trending towards 35%.

A member commented that she would personally love to see a study of what the breakdown of metro vs Greater Minnesota, as well as how it is getting broken down locally so that we can use a racial equity lens in our work.
Vice-chair Lenczewski informed the group that she made a request to House Research for a presentation that would take a deeper look as to where things are coming from and where they are going. Some of us in the metro area feel like we get rolled, and that Greater Minnesota is getting a great deal. All of the ways we tax to fund transportation including the gas tax, the MVST, are all regressive taxes. So a more detailed analysis of that breakdown is planned for this committee.

Question: On the transit end which agency receives the funding and determines the allocation? Mr. Burress responded that Greater Minnesota transit side through to MnDOT and allocated out as grants. Metro funding goes through Met council.

Question: Can Met Council money be spent on capital, operating, and bonding? And by bonding, they mean building a bus garage for example, and paying back on those bonds for the bus garage. A member responded that they believed this was possible but that historically, it has not been done. He added that of that 36% that goes to the Met Council, the Met Council has a side agreement with the opt-out servicing communities, and allocate a percentage of the 36%.

A member commented that the history of the first chunk of MVST funding to the Met Council was to buy out the property tax levies for transit operations. It was supposed to be a 1 for 1 switch. Everyone thought MVST and property tax levies would run at the same pace, but immediately did the opposite. By the fifth year, we were

Mr. Burress covered additional background topics including the regional transit capital (RTC) levy authority. The transit district is where the Met Council has authority to levy taxes. The transit district does not cover the entire Met Council area. It is a subset of the area that the Met Council has regional governance over. The structure of this is that there's a property tax levy which is used as debt service which covers bonds that the Met Council issues which are primarily for the capital maintenance side of the Met Council transit operations. This includes maintaining light rail, replacing buses, etc. The issuance of the bonds are based on legislative authorizations. Essentially, the amounts are legislatively determined. The rate has been mostly flat over the last few years is my recollection.

Question: That is also used for the opt-outs maintenance as well? Mr. Burress responded yes.

Chair Bell could not remember whether those regional transit bonds are used for the ongoing maintenance of the systems that the CTIB and the Met Council funds. His recollection is that CTIB pays for its portion of the maintenance dollars and the Met Council pays for its portion of the maintenance dollars – usually 50/50. He questioned where the Met Council’s portion comes from. He would like some more information on this.

A member said sometimes things get put into operating budget although it might be a major rehabilitation project. There sometimes is a line there that is debatable.

A member commented that there is a legislative definition of the communities that are subject to the levy. You are either in or you're out. However, some communities are not subject to the debt service but are using the park and rides in a community that is. Another question is what the Met Council is levying or bonding for. Some people would argue that it doesn't make a difference because the interest rate is so low. In his judgment they are bonding for a lot of things. At times, they may be bonding for things that ought to be on the operating side. In a recession they start bonding for things more loosely.

Chair Bell agreed that this issue isn’t a game changer, but as the committee thinks about recommendations regarding how funds flow, it would be something to think about.

A member added that it’s important to understand why some of these decisions are made. Because some decisions are out of their control for funding, people get creative with the tools they do have access to in order to get the outcomes they need. This doesn’t mean it’s the best decision-making structure.
Question: What does the legislation actually say regarding bonding? How specific is it? A member responded that the language is vague. Another member added that the other thing that’s unique is that it’s cumulative. Every year they come in to get a hunk of authority but they might have a lot of money in the bank because it builds up if they don’t use. It is an authorized levy for capital and cannot be used for operating. It was the product of the 2001 tax reform when they took operating off of the property tax. It was taken off because Greater Minnesota got a lot of local government aid. The tax chair at the time said the metro area has to get something. This is why they took operating off the property tax and made it so that the state would fund it as a part of the deal. If one were to look at how much our share of the deal has grown in dollars versus how much the local government aid has gone up in Greater Minnesota, you’d be surprised.

A member agreed. Many of us in the metro have forgotten that deal. Outstate thinks we are getting a free ride but the deal has eroded.

For metro versus the local government aid that went to Greater Minnesota and the amount of operating funds that are being generated in the metropolitan area to supplement the system, a member said she would be surprised if it wasn’t more local than state at this point going into that pot.

Mr. Burress continued to present slide 7. He explained that the way the language is structured is setting a cap as to how much the Council can bond for capital expenditures. These have to be expenditures that are reflected in the Council’s capital improvement program. The Council has sought authorizations annually but perhaps has not issued the debt right away but has the commitment from a multi-year capital program. So, from a Council perspective, the dollars are expected and will be spoken for once long-term contracts come due.

To connect the dots, a member explained that the state gives them the authority to bond. They levy the tax to pay the debt service but they keep some bonding authority in their pocket since they don’t always levy to the maximum that they can to do the capital pieces that they have in the plan.

Mr. Burress began to talk about the Counties Transit Improvement Board on slide 8. Created as part of a broader transportation plan in 2008, it was probably one of the biggest changes in transportation funding that has occurred in recent times. What it did was authorize counties to join under a joint powers agreement. They could already do this, but what made this special was the sales tax. This was set up as a seven-countywide optional arrangement. Five counties originally entered in. The legislation set up a number of requirements and expectations and as it moved through the legislative process, both roads and transit were originally envisioned. What eventually was enacted included just transit with park and rides. Because transitways was not defined, this has been one area of disagreement.

Question: The park and rides that CTIB is authorized to fund, do they have to be connected to a transit line? In other words, the Met Council has all kinds of park and rides, could they build park and rides that are for regular bus routes? Mr. Burress responded that the legislation doesn’t say much more than just park and rides. He would argue that this is at the discretion of CTIB.

A member commented that it is important as we are starting to identify funding, and especially when a new funding piece comes into play. It is not always new and more dollars. The 15% operating funding used to be on property taxes and it used to be 17% of the capital share was on county property taxes. It went down to 10%. He wants to make sure everyone here at the table understands that when money comes into play at certain points, it is not always growth. It might just be a different way of paying for it. For example, how there isn’t a definition for transitways, there are differences in definition of priorities - where CTIB spends versus where Met Council spends. He also recalled that legislation stated funding could not supplant current dollars other than what they changed on the property tax. CTIB was created with the goal to get results not have more studies, which was what was happening.
Another member added that when CTIB legislation passed, non-CTIB counties received authorization to impose a local option half cent sales tax for roads. This provides for inequities since some counties have the tax base while others do not. It doesn’t always get us the best policies.

A member said it was difficult selling even the quarter cent to businesses. Transit generally received support but businesses at the time did not support LRT.

A member commented that the legislation does allow counties, by resolution, to pass a half cent sales tax for a specific set of projects with a begin and end date—except for the transit component. That might have been an amendment that came in later years.

Mr. Burress added that when CTIB was first enacted it was narrow and needed referendum. This language has since been removed. He further explained that once a CTIB member leaves, it will have the authorization of a non-CTIB county and can impose a half cent sales tax.

Chair Bell asked whether a county—once they leave CTIB and can impose the half cent sales tax—could enter a joint powers agreement with CTIB to fund to any agreed-upon project. Mr. Burress responded that he could not think of a legal reason this could not happen but was not sure.

A member thought in this hypothetical situation, they didn’t know why a county couldn’t enter into an agreement with the Met Council that operates transit. Members agreed they would like to find out for sure, but Vice-chair Lenczewski reminded the group that one can’t levy more than allowed but one should be able to make agreements with whomever they want. She also commented that CTIB created out of a legislative deal. It should not be viewed as the right way.

**Question:** Are non-CTIB counties who can impose the half cent sales tax, are they limited to only roads? The response from the group was that they could do either roads or transit.

Mr. Burress went through the slides on the opt-out transit providers. He added that there is a formula minimum the Met Council provides to suburban providers, but traditionally, the Met Council has provided more than that minimum in allocations.

**Question:** Where do RTC dollars show up? Mr. Burress responded RTC dollars show up on the capital side over and above but he would have to check.

A member commented that members should be aware that the service for disability community is run through Met Council. The opt-out cities do not run these services. However, there may be some service in opt-out cities referred to as dial-a-ride services. A member added that some opt-out cities contract with the Met Council.

Until just last October, Scott and Carver Counties, the two non-CTIB counties, had an agreement to provide dial-a-ride services through a few providers, mostly staffed by Scott County employees. They did this in a cost effective way. It was unclear whether funding was pulled due to the federal government or Met Council, but it is now under Metro Mobility.

A member added that it is the Met Council who makes that decisions about what the service areas are and was can be competitively procured.

A different member added that Metro Mobility has divided the service are among three contractors who provide this service. Their mandate is to provide a parallel service to what is available by regular mass transit. The federal stand is half-mile on either side of regular bus route.
Mr. Burress continued discussion on general fund versus MVST and state funding streams. History of property tax changes and where and how to count CTIB dollars. Met Council’s capital improvement plan is a 6-year plan where funding sources are identified but not yet secured.

A member commented that one thing that does not show up in the analysis is MnDOT’s work such as widening shoulders for the purpose of transit advantages.

Mr. Burress wrapped up his presentation by commenting that there are many entities one can look at with transportation, from federal, state, metro, counties, cities. And there are many ways of looking at the decision-making process, transparency being a common concern, as well as seeing the variety of funding sources.

Chair Bell thanked Mr. Burress for his presentation.

Staff explained the Citizens League evaluation process. She explained that staff would like to know how well the meetings are going. It is on a 1-5 scale, 5 being we met or exceeded objectives, 1 being it was not productive at all. The members evaluated the meeting as follows: 4, 3.5, 4, 5.5, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, and 4 for an average 4.1.

Chair Bell adjourned the meeting at 10:41 a.m.