



# NORTHERN VIRGINIA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

*The Authority for Transportation in Northern Virginia*

Thursday, March 13, 2014

7:00 pm

City of Fairfax, City Hall, Work Session Room, Fairfax, VA 22030

## MEETING MINUTES

### I. Call to Order

Chairman Nohe

- Chairman Nohe called the meeting to order at 7:08pm.

*(Delegate Rust arrived.)*

### II. Roll Call

Ms. Speer, Clerk

- Voting Members: Chairman Nohe; Board Member Hynes (arrived 7:12pm); Chairman York; Chairman Bulova; Mayor Parrish; Mayor Silverthorne; Council Member Rishell; Council Member Snyder (arrived 7:13pm); Senator Ebbin; Delegate Rust (arrived 7:10pm); Ms. Bushue.
- Non-Voting Members: Ms. Hamilton; Ms. Mitchell; Mayor Umstattd (arrived 7:14pm).
- Staff: John Mason (Interim Executive Director); Michael Longhi (CFO); Camela Speer (Clerk); Peggy Teal (Accountant); various jurisdictional staff.
- Guest: Ms. Fisher.
- Chairman Nohe explained that Ms. Fisher would be sitting in for Mr. Garczynski, but was not an official alternate.
- Chairman Nohe thanked the City of Fairfax Mayor and staff for their immediate response to the request for assistance with both providing office space and resources to the NVTA staff and hosting this evening's meeting. This was necessary due to a power outage at the NVTA offices.
- Chairman Nohe explained that it was necessary to move tonight's Authority meeting from the NVTA conference room to Fairfax City Hall, where the Authority has met before, due to power failure in the NVTA office building. FOIA and NVTA Bylaws procedures were followed by having two members request the meeting location change, and, upon his [the Chairman's] approval, required notifications were posted. He stated that it is advisable to have this action ratified.

*(Board Member Hynes arrived.)*

- Chairman York moved to ratify the process and decision to move today's meeting of the Authority from the previously advertised location to Fairfax

City Hall due to the emergency situation of a power failure in the normal location; seconded by Chairman Bulova. Motion carried unanimously.

### **III. Minutes of the February 20, 2014 Meeting**

- Chairman York moved to approve the minutes of February 20, 2014; seconded by Mayor Parrish. Motion carried with seven (7) yeas and two (2) abstentions [with Senator Ebbin and Delegate Rust abstaining as they were not at the February meeting].

### **Action Items**

#### **IV. Project Agreement Template**

Mr. Biesiadny

*(Council Member Snyder arrived.)*

- Mr. Biesiadny presented the Project Agreement Template that will be an agreement between the Authority and agencies that will be implementing projects using the 70% regional money that the Authority is retaining. He explained that a subcommittee of the Financial Working Group and the Council of Counsels has worked to put this agreement together. This agreement will allow regional projects that the Authority approved last year [FY2014 projects] to move forward. The intent is to have a standard project agreement that any of the recipient agencies would execute with the Authority. There will be a separate agreement for each project. The two main categories for these projects are:
  - ✓ Transportation projects that were selected by the Authority and are contained in the regional plan.
  - ✓ Mass transit projects that increase capacity.
- Mr. Biesiadny added that the agreement sets terms and conditions for 70% funding to be made available and is largely based on the legislation adopted in HB2313 as well as the other requirements that the Authority has. There is also practical language to ensure insurance provisions and record keeping requirements are taken care of.

*(Mayor Umstatted arrived.)*

- Mr. Biesiadny briefly highlighted:
  - ✓ Agreements will be based on project submission forms submitted by the jurisdictions last year. These project submission forms also went to the public and were available for the Authority's consideration when it acted in July 2013.
  - ✓ Similar to VDOT project agreement with money provided in phases.
  - ✓ Provision that under certain circumstances phases could be advanced. Also provides that an agency could advance a phase with their own money and be reimbursed with Authority money. The key being that the

Authority will be funding 24 projects, with cash flows being developed for each of those projects. If jurisdiction A wants to advance funding for a particular phase, NVTAA has to determine if there is money available to do that due to a number of projects being funded at the same time. Cash flow is an important consideration.

- ✓ Provision that, if a project goes over budget, jurisdictions or agencies could come back and seek additional funding from the Authority, but that is completely at the Authority's discretion. Request would have to go through the regular process that all other projects went through to be analyzed in the process, so no guarantee that additional funding will be available.
- ✓ The funding arrangements associated with Resolution 14-08, adopted by the Authority and which deals with larger projects by extraterritorial organizations, have been incorporated in this agreement. Recipient must insure that any match associated with the project has been identified and procured. Must certify that it will use the project for the intended purpose for life of the project. If not, there are provisions for reimbursing the Authority.
- ✓ It is clear that the Authority will not operate or maintain any of these projects once completed. That will have to be done either by the agency that is building the project or in the case of a roadway, ultimately VDOT would accept it for maintenance. Agreement says that if it is anticipated that VDOT will accept the roadway for maintenance, it has to be built to VDOT's standards.
- ✓ Authority will provide money on reimbursement basis within 20 days if all paperwork is submitted. Will allow jurisdictions to submit contractor bills and be reimbursed in time to pay the bill. In most cases the jurisdiction will pay the contractor, then submit for reimbursement. For some of the jurisdictions it was important to have the ability to be reimbursed in order to pay the contractor.
- ✓ Any unused money at the end of a project must be returned to Authority. Or, if an allocation for a project has money left after the project is completed, that money will be freed up to be reallocated to other projects.
- ✓ Provisions dealing with the potential misuse of funds, consequences of misuse of funds and the role of the Authority in dealing with misuse of funds.

*(Ms. Fisher arrived.)*

- Chairman York stated that he attended the last Financial Working Group meeting, had a chance to listen to staff discuss the project agreement and agrees with it.
- Chairman York moved to approve, in substantial form, the Standard Project Agreement between the Authority and recipients of 70% funding that the Authority is allocating to regional projects; seconded by Chairman Bulova.

- Board Member Hynes asked if governing bodies have to approve the project agreements or if they can be signed on an administrative level. Mr. Biesiadny replied that the intent is that there be an official action by the policy making body of the recipient agency. If recipient is a jurisdiction, its board or council. If recipient is an agency, its board would have to approve it. Chairman Nohe added that a consent agenda can be used. Mr. Biesiadny responded that is correct. He stated a governing body could also designate that their chief administrative officer be authorized to sign the agreement.
- Delegate Rust asked if this is applicable to the 70% and the 30% money. Mr. Biesiadny responded that this is for the 70% money, that the agreement between the Authority and the jurisdictions for the 30 % money was approved in December.
- Delegate Rust referenced page 12, asking about money being subject to appropriation. He stated that the taxes imposed flow to General Assembly, then flow to NVTVA, therefore they [the taxes] are not subject to appropriation. Mr. Biesiadny replied that in the budget the General Assembly approved, it actually does appropriate revenues, just as with the Northern Virginia gas tax.
- Ms. Bushue asked who has lead in a multi-jurisdictional project. Mr. Biesiadny answered that the implementing partners would decide who has lead. Whoever takes the lead would sign the agreement.
- Chairman Nohe asked if a jurisdiction is proposing a project, but intent is for VDOT, for example, to build the project, would VDOT or the jurisdiction sign the agreement. Mr. Biesiadny responded that this issue is still being worked on. If VDOT is clearly requesting and doing project, it would sign. If jurisdiction is requesting money and VDOT is going to be the contractor, there may need to be an agreement between the jurisdiction and VDOT.
- Chairman Nohe requested that staff draft a statement to be sent to Delegate Albo about Resolution 14-08 being incorporated into the Project Agreement. Delegate Rust stated that Delegate Albo had withdrawn his bill and that he is satisfied. Chairman Nohe replied that he wants to show Delegate Albo that NVTVA built this into the agreement. Mr. Biesiadny responded that it would be done.
- Motion carried unanimously.

**V. Confirmation/Revision of Project List for Evaluation**      Mr. Srikanth, VDOT

- Ms. Hamilton introduced the VDOT Project Selection Model Results.
- Mr. Srikanth briefed the VDOT Project Selection Model Results presentation.
- Ms. Bushue congratulated and thanked VDOT for the excellent descriptive map and legend in the handouts provided.
- Chairman Bulova commented on a project proposed by the CTB that would widen the Fairfax County Parkway. She stated that this project is not on the County comprehensive plan, adding that some parts of parkway are on the

comprehensive plan for widening. Some areas have already been widened. Some areas have already built additional interchange improvements that will free up congestion. This particular area is a new area that just opened. It is not on the comprehensive plan to be widened and for most of the area, there is not the right of way in order to do that. There are two interchange improvements that are on the comprehensive plan to be done. The County believes that these two interchanges will address the congestion that the CTB project attempts to address. Chairman Bulova asked that this project not be advanced as part of a Fairfax County project for those reasons. She clarified that this project is project CTB 4. Ms. Fisher responded that the thought process behind putting this project on the list was that the interchange improvements on both I-95 and the Fairfax County Parkway will cause a bottleneck on that small portion. She stated that if Chairman Bulova really believes this is unnecessary because of the other projects, she requested that Chairman Bulova provide some documentation prior to the CTB meeting next week, so that it can be discussed and presented at the meeting. Chairman Bulova responded affirmatively.

- Mayor Parrish moved to recommend to the Commonwealth Transportation Board the approval of the list of proposed projects for evaluation as shown in Item V, with the note that Fairfax County has expressed concern about Project No CTB-4 as it is not in the County's Comprehensive Plan and is inconsistent with its planned improvements in the same area. Fairfax County believes that interchange improvements already planned for this segment of the Fairfax County Parkway would address congestion and negate a need to widen the Parkway in this particular area; seconded by Chairman York.

*(Senator Ebbin departed.)*

- Board Member Hynes questioned whether the Authority has to move the CTB projects back to the CTB, or is the Authority just moving Authority projects. Chairman Nohe responded that the Authority is recommending to the CTB that the CTB approve a list. The CTB does not have to listen to the Authority recommendation. He observed that some of the study results were surprising. Some projects that are viewed as vital by a jurisdiction in reducing congestion, scored very low in the study. He pointed out that this is a process that was developed to figure out which projects would go through full evaluation, designed with the expectation that 70 projects would be submitted to the first round study. He reminded the members that this is just an evaluation and this creates a great experiment to test the robustness of the process being embarked on. The Authority does not have to fund any of these projects. It is possible that projects with really high scores will be too expensive to fund.
- Board Member Hynes asked again if the Authority has to recommend to the CTB their own projects, or is it recommending the Authority list. Mr. Srikanth responded that the reason for including the CTB list on the compiled list presented to the Authority was to give the Authority the opportunity to

review and comment on all the projects nominated. Authority concerns are now captured in the motion that the CTB will be informed of and we will be bound by what comes out of that process.

- Chairman York stated that this would matter more if we were recommending more projects than could be evaluated. Potentially we could be recommending that CTB projects not go forward to make room for Authority projects.
- Chairman York asked about project NVTA#223 in Purcellville. He observed there were low ratings in categories for congestion relief and asked what surrounding area was considered in the study. He added that it is now not an intersection and is proposed to be an interchange. It is intended to provide congestion relief for other interchanges and other roads in the area. Wants to be sure that entire surrounding area is considered in final evaluation. Mr. Srikanth responded that the project selection scores and attributes are VDOT's assessment as to whether the project has the potential to reduce congestion. The actual results will become available once we get the full results. Chairman York added that he wants to be sure VDOT is not just looking at congestion relief on one road, but on all the roads in the area. Mr. Roden responded that VDOT will look at a larger region in the final study.
- Board Member Hynes suggested the Authority needs to think about what the purpose of its vote is at this stage. CTB has the opportunity to submit projects to VDOT, regardless of the Authority's vote. In regard to the funding, the decision comes back to the Authority. She added it is appropriate for the members of the Authority to opine about the projects the CTB has submitted and respond that there are concerns from jurisdictions. Board Member Hynes wondered whether the Authority should vote to advance the CTB proposed projects; stated that is not the Authority's call as the Authority does not control what VDOT is doing. Voting yes at this point may indicate something the Authority does not mean to indicate at this point. Chairman Nohe suggested that since the Authority has proposed less projects than can be evaluated, there is no harm in advancing all projects. In the future if too many projects are proposed, then there may be a different answer. He added it would be nice to think that if this scenario unfolded NVTA could work with the CTB to recommend the projects that scored the highest regardless of which entity proposed the project. This is what NVTA agreed to do, as this is in comport with the law. In this circumstance, with acknowledgement of parochial issue, Chairman Nohe recommended that the Authority vote to recommend all the projects because the Authority should evaluate all the projects it can. He added the answer might be different if there was a longer list of projects. Chairman Nohe disclosed that the Prince William project nominated by the CTB will directly impact customers getting to his store.
- Delegate Rust stated that the vote tonight is that these projects are worthy of consideration and there will be more consideration when evaluation results come back with detailed rankings. Tonight's vote is just to move the projects forward from preliminary study to final study. Chairman Nohe added there are other projects on the evaluation list that have non-fatal flaws, for example

a Loudoun County project that is not in TransAction 2040. The Authority decided to advance it, recognizing that at this point it cannot be built even if it scores very high. However, it could be built at some point, or VDOT could be petitioned to build it. Already have a precedent that projects that are not fatal, if they meet Tier 1, can be advanced by NVTA.

- Mayor Umstatted asked if the final project ratings will be based on congestion reduction and noted there are five separate categories related to congestion reduction. Mr. Srikanth replied that the congestion reduction related performance numbers that will be used to develop the final rating will be slightly different from those listed in the preliminary screening, as presented to the Authority last month.
- Mayor Umstatted asked if VDOT anticipates that projects that did not get high scores in one of the categories in the first round, might not get high scores in the final rating system. Mr. Srikanth responded that VDOT is eager to learn how these processes work from first round study to final round study. If VDOT has applied assessment correctly, this could happen, but it will give VDOT the opportunity to learn and fine tune the process as well. Mr. Srikanth added that as with some of these operational improvements, in the first round VDOT was looking at one area, in the detailed analysis will evaluate all surrounding areas. There could be correlation between the stages of the study and VDOT wants to find out to what degree there is correlation.
- Mayor Umstatted asked whether the final congestion reduction criterion will carry a higher weight than the emergency mobility criterion. She questioned why the emergency mobility criterion is included in the study as this is a Federal interest. She stated that some projects that do extremely well in emergency mobility do not rate as well in congestion reduction. Mayor Umstatted asked if the importance of emergency mobility is being reduced relative to congestion reduction. Mr. Srikanth responded that in the overall rating emergency mobility does have one of the lowest ratings, not necessarily because VDOT does not think it is important, but because the technical tools available and the data from the model are rather limited.
- Chairman Nohe stated that the jurisdictions did a self-evaluation of how they thought projects would fair in the preliminary round. He asked that as we enter into the next stage of the process, if a jurisdiction is troubled by what VDOT sees a score being and what the jurisdiction sees as score being, does VDOT want to hear from the jurisdiction. Mr. Srikanth responded that due to the scheduling of the CTB meeting, VDOT did not have time to meet with the PIWG to work through the study results yet. VDOT has offered to meet with PIWG and TAC to review process of how study was done and determine if any improvements can be made in applying ratings in the next round.
- Motion carried unanimously.
- Chairman Nohe noted that the next round of preliminary data will be provided to the Authority and PIWG by June, which will then be turned into final data

in December. He stated that the Authority can begin using preliminary results in the development of the Six-Year Plan. He recognized that results could change in December and then the Six-Year Plan might need to be reevaluated. Mr. Srikanth responded that the preliminary data will be good enough for a draft Six-Year Program. Chairman Nohe added that if the Authority would have to wait until January to put out a Six-Year Plan, there would not be time for public comment; draft would have to be final plan.

### Information/Discussion Items

~~VI. Revised RSTP/CMAQ Program FY14 – FY19~~ Ms. Backmon, Chair, JACC

**VII. JACC Approval of Reallocation of RSTP/CMAQ Funds for the City of Fairfax** Ms. Backmon, Chair, JACC

- No verbal report.

**VIII. Status of Memoranda of Agreement** Mr. Mason, CEO

- No verbal report.

**IX. HB 2313 Funding Status** Mr. Longhi, CFO

- No verbal report.

**X. Flow of NVT A Funds** Mr. Longhi, CFO

- Mr. Longhi briefed the Flow of NVT A Funds and pointed out that the first chart is tied to the narrative and shows the incoming revenue streams for the Authority. The chart shows the tax receipt revenue and the bond proceeds. The numbering in the chart matches the narrative to walk the reader through the actual flow of funds. The second chart has the same principal and shows the dollars originally predicted for the Authority and the funds actually received through the end of February.
- Chairman Nohe asked if the Authority has either allocated to projects or allocated for reserves a certain amount of dollars from the FY2014 funds. Mr. Longhi responded that this has effectively been done.
- Chairman Nohe asked how much is left on the bottom line for FY2014: Are there any FY2014 dollars that will be programmed in the future. Mr. Longhi replied not without changing the timing of filling the working capital reserve. He added the principal issue is that the Authority is filling the reserve for the first time so it will take a lot more money in FY2014 as it is 50% of the 70% revenue or \$102 million.
- Chairman Nohe stated this is very relevant because FY2014 dollars under HB2313 are not constrained by HB599, so they are an excellent candidate for reserve money.



- Mr. Longhi added that we [staff and the Authority’s Financial Advisor] are looking at different funding options for the reserve, so that if there is a need to fund more FY2014 projects the sequencing of funding the reserve can be reviewed.
- Mr. MacIsaac confirmed that Chairman Nohe’s statement was correct. Chairman Nohe clarified that the FY2014 revenue is less constrained than the FY2015 revenue. Therefore, it is the best money to put into a reserve because the Authority knows when that money is used it is money not constrained at its source. Chairman Nohe explained that he was specifically bringing this up because of a budget amendment currently in the House [of Delegates] that would require that those FY2014 funds that NVTA has not yet allocated would retroactively be subject to the HB599 process. If this budget amendment does survive, it would force the Authority to evaluate policies on how reserves can be used because they are as of yet unallocated FY2014 revenues. Mr. Longhi responded that this will need to be reviewed.
- Delegate Rust added that we will have a better picture of items like this on March 24.
- Ms. Bushue thanked Mr. Longhi for providing this report.

**XI. NVTA Operating Budget Report**

Mr. Longhi, CFO

- No verbal report.

**XII. Legislative Report**

Ms. Dominguez, Vice-Chair, JACC

- Mr. Biesiadny briefed the General Assembly Report. The General Assembly adjourned without a budget, so will be back in session on March 24. He added that during regular session all the bills that would have impacted NVTA were either defeated or left in committee. The remaining item that would impact the Authority is the previously referred to budget amendment. He stated that what becomes of it will be clearer on March 24.
- Mr. Biesiadny noted that the changes to the Legislative Program were highlighted in the report. He addressed HB2 that will affect the CTB’s ability to allocate transportation dollars in the future. He explained:
  - ✓ The final bill that was passed by the General Assembly was significantly different than the bill that was introduced.
  - ✓ HB2 requires the CTB to develop a prioritization process for the funds that it allocates in the Six-Year Program.
  - ✓ Need to consider roadway, transit, rail, technology improvements as well as transportation demand management.
  - ✓ Needs to be done in cooperation with the MPOs and NVTA.
  - ✓ Need to solicit input from local governments, transit authorities and other stakeholders.
  - ✓ Have two years to implement, will begin using these new criteria to allocate money beginning on July 1, 2016.

- ✓ Some criteria to be considered include congestion relief, economic development, accessibility, safety and environmental quality.
  - ✓ Criteria can be rated differently for different construction districts within the Commonwealth.
  - ✓ For Northern Virginia and Hampton Roads, the highest rate needs to be assigned to congestion mitigation.
  - ✓ Exempts from the process any projects that have reached a completed environmental review or have their National Environmental Policy Act Process completed, even if provided funding after July 1, 2016.
  - ✓ Excludes from the process CMAQ funding, RSTP funding, Urban and Secondary Road funding, however, includes caveat that CTB may develop a prioritization process for these funds in the future.
  - ✓ Excludes HB2313 funds.
  - ✓ States that no project can be undertaken primarily for economic development purposes.
  - ✓ Summarized that HB2 as passed was significantly different than the bill as it was introduced and will result in a significant change to future allocations of transportation funding.
- Council Member Snyder asked for an explanation about how this bill significantly changes future transportation funding. Mr. Biesiadny replied that currently the CTB does not have a specific prioritization process for allocating money. In the Virginia Code there is a formula that says 40% of the money will go to primaries, 30% to secondaries, 30% urban. It also says that \$500 million comes off the top and can be allocated at the discretion of the CTB. HB2 establishes for the first time legislative priorities for how the CTB allocates money and gives the CTB two years to develop specifics as to how that process will be done.
  - Council Member Snyder inquired as to what opportunities the Authority will have to comment on how the CTB will implement this. Mr. Biesiadny responded that the legislation is clear that the CTB needs to consult with the local MPOs, NVTA and the local governments. He added he is sure there will be a process, but process is probably not defined yet. Council Member Snyder suggested that perhaps NVTA should be thinking about NVTA's role in the process now. Mr. Biesiadny suggested that until NVTA knows what information the CTB is looking for, it could be a little challenging to do that.
  - Chairman Nohe stated that April 24 is the next CTB meeting. He asked that staff or the JACC communicate that as such processes are developed, the Authority would like to be engaged and to ensure opportunity to comment.
  - Mayor Umstatt asked if the last bullet under the bill is redundant with the provision that the highest weight has to be given to congestion mitigation. Mr. Biesiadny responded that the last bullet was inserted due to recent court cases related to condemnation associated with economic development. It was the intent of the General Assembly to make it clear that these funds cannot be used for the primary purpose of economic development although economic development is one of the criteria that could be considered and might be weighted in a certain fashion in some districts.

- Mayor Umstatt asked if it is possible that using economic development as any justification could put the project in conflict with the Constitutional Amendment from last year or the year before. Mr. Biesiadny responded he was not sure, that it may require legal review.
- Delegate Rust clarified that the General Assembly was concerned that there was no priority system to ranking of how the money was spent. HB2 started out as almost a mirror of what NVTA has done in Northern Virginia. The bill changed dramatically as it went through. One reason that economic development got added and congestion, other than in Northern Virginia and Hampton Road, is not the priority is because once you get out of this area, congestion is not the big problem. The big problem is economic development and the transportation infrastructure to permit the economic development. Other than Northern Virginia and Hampton Roads, there will be more flexibility in how money is spent. This, for the first time, puts a process in the Virginia Code that the CTB must follow. He suggested the General Assembly may do something similar on maintenance in the future. He added that this bill was the highest priority of the Speaker, passed almost unanimously in both houses and there was a lot of work done on it to get it to what it was at the very end. Delegate Rust stated that it was a good bill.

### **XIII. Executive Director’s Report**

Mr. Mason, CEO

- No verbal report.

### **Reports from Working Groups**

#### **XIV. Financial Working Group**

Chair Euille

- No verbal report.

#### **XV. Project Implementation Working Group**

Chair Nohe

- No verbal report.

#### **XVI. Chairman’s Comments**

- Chairman York explained that this year the US Department of Transportation TIGER Grant opportunity includes up to \$35 million for transportation planning.
- Chairman York moved that the Authority direct the Interim Executive Director, in coordination with appropriate staff, to investigate the potential for using the FY2014 TIGER solicitation to fund the update of TransAction 2040 and, if feasible, to pursue and submit an application by the program’s submission deadline. He further moved that if needed the Interim Executive

Director, in coordination with staff, be allowed to seek consultant services for assistance in preparing an application with a limit of \$20,000; seconded by Chairman Bulova.

- Chairman York suggested that in future years the Authority incorporate this in the schedule sooner as the application closing date is April 28.
- Board Member Hynes suggested that in the future the Authority should discuss how to use this money.
- Chairman Nohe inquired as to whether any member jurisdictions or partner agencies were applying for this grant in this round. Chairman York responded that Loudoun may be, but not for a planning grant. Chairman Nohe suggested the region should not compete against itself.
- Motion carried with eleven (11) yeas and one (1) abstention [Chairman Nohe].
- Chairman Nohe appointed Mayor Parrish, Chairman Bulova, Board Member Hynes and Council Member Rishell to the Finance Committee.
- Mayor Parrish moved that the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority convene a closed meeting, as authorized by Virginia Code section 2.2-3711.A.1, for a personnel matter relating to the selection of an Executive Director for the Authority; seconded by Board Member Hynes. Motion carried unanimously.
- The Authority entered into closed session at 8:35pm.

### **Closed Session**

- The Authority returned to open session at 9:30pm.
- Mayor Parrish moved that the members of the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority certify: (1) that only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements under Chapter 37, Title 2.2 of the Code of Virginia; and (2) only such public business matters as were identified in the motion by which the closed meeting was convened were heard, discussed or considered by the Committee; seconded by Chairman York. Motion carried unanimously.

### **Adjournment**

## **XVII. Adjournment**

- Meeting adjourned at 9:35 pm.