

**Texas Tech University
Faculty Senate Meeting
Meeting #241
March 10, 2004**

The Faculty Senate met on Wednesday, March 10, 2004 in the Lankford Laboratory in the Electrical Engineering Annex with President Nancy Reed presiding. Senators present were: Kvashny, Johnson, Wilde, Buelinckx, Byerly, D'Amico, Dunham, Gray, Harter, Nathan, Roberts, Schaller, Troyansky, Watts, Dukes, Sherif, Duemer, Baker, Jackson, Masten, Sinzinger, Reifman, Russ, Shriver, Marshall, Quinn, Dolter, Garner, Gelber, Meek, Curry, Ellis, Hoo, Marbley, Spallholz and Marks. Senators excused were: Held, Soonpaa, Camp and Tacon. Senators unexcused were: Aranha, Alford, Kuriyama, Williams, Jones, Halsey, Johnson, and Hsiang.

I. Call to Order. President Reed called the meeting to order at 3:24 pm.

II. Recognition of Guests in Attendance. President Reed recognized Provost Marcy and Vice-Provost Hall, Michael Castellon from the University Daily, Sebastian Kitchen from the Avalanche Journal, former Senator Hartwell from the School of Music, Buddy Knox and Eric Crouch from TTU Traffic and Parking Services, and Colton Batchelor and Anne Hunninghake from the Student Senate.

III. Approval of Minutes. Senator Reifman noted that on page two, line four the word "allow" should be changed to "allows." Senator Marks said that his name had been consistently misspelled. President Reed asked for a motion to accept the minutes as emended. Senator Kvashny moved to accept. Senator Spallholz seconded. The Senate then voted to accept the minutes as emended.

IV. Invited Guests. President Reed introduced Buddy Knox, the Director of Traffic and Parking Services. Buddy Knox introduced his colleague, Eric Crouch. Knox said that he appreciated the invitation to speak because a lot of the problems in Traffic and Parking are a result of them not communicating well. He said if the Senators had any ideas of how they could do things better, he was willing to consider them. Knox described what was going to be happening in the short term with traffic and parking at Texas Tech. He said that this year, they have charged approximately \$250,000 less in citations than they had in the past. They have several initiatives that they have put into place to help people park better, rather than punish them for parking poorly. He said they want to teach the students how to park correctly. They have become not only educational but draconian as well. Knox said that his predecessor allowed each student to get as many tickets as he or she wanted to each semester. The record for one semester stands at 52 citations for a single student. The previous director did not require that students be towed for those tickets unless the student parked in a fire lane, blocked an entryway, or parked in a reserved space. Last year, on the first day of finals, the young man with the citations finally blocked an entryway, and they had to tow him. When he came in to get his car, they told him that the rules are that if you are towed; you have to pay all your tickets to get your car out. It cost him over \$1800 to get his car out of the tow lot. Knox said that they had not been doing the students any favors. So now the policy has been changed, so that when a student first gets six tickets in one semester, they are sent a nice letter that says, "excuse me, I cannot help but notice that you are getting a lot of tickets this semester." The letter asks them to come in and talk about it, and tells them that a class is going to be offered periodically on how to park at Texas Tech. If the student attends the class, they forgive two of the parking tickets. Most students do not take them up on the class, but a few have. The first time a student receives eight citations in one semester, Traffic and Parking puts a boot on the student's car. The boot cannot be removed by the student without damaging the car. In exchange for having the student come into Knox's office and tell him why they think that they can park anywhere they want to, he will remove the boot for free. Invariably, it is about a twenty minute dialogue, explaining why he or she did wrong and what he or she can do better in the future to not get tickets. Knox terms this an educational boot, because he does not charge for it. He explains to the student that when they receive their tenth citation they will be towed, and will be towed each time thereafter. By not charging the students for all the tickets that they earn, just in the last semester and a half, Traffic and Parking has saved those top offenders approximately \$23,000 in citations.

Knox then talked about initiatives that will be happening in the near term. The Texas Tech Parkway will start at Indiana and 19th streets. It will eventually segue into Memphis Avenue and go over to the other side of UMC. The construction will affect parking lots C7, 8, and 9, resulting in a loss of 969 parking spaces. Traffic and Parking is constructing a new park and ride parking lot, called Satellite One Parking Lot, which will accommodate 1,500 cars when it is completed. Phase One, which includes 1,000 parking spaces, has been completed. Right now there is no road to it. Traffic and Parking will not close the other lots until a road is constructed to the new lot. Another project that will have an effect on parking is the Marsha Sharp Freeway. Right now, approximately 1,000 students a day park for free in the old Town and Country parking lot. When they begin construction and students are no longer allowed to park there, it will create a demand for 1,000 additional spaces. That means that Traffic and Parking is losing 1,000 spaces and gaining 1,500 and then getting another 1,000 customers. This means that there will be a deficit. This summer they are building an additional 250 parking spaces next to C10. That is all the parking that is being planned for the immediate future. For a more in-depth look at all of that, Senators should go to the Traffic and Parking web page (www.parking.ttu.edu). On the web site is a Five Year Plan that they have recently completed. It is an attempt to forecast what they want to achieve for campus parking over the next five years. Senators are invited to look at the plan and comment on it. If you go to the back first and read the assumptions, it will make a lot more sense. They are making some major assumptions, which they are going to build a new 500 bed dormitory and not one parking space. The Experimental Science building will be completed and the R2 parking lot will then become the roadway for all deliveries to the new dorm. This will reduce the amount of available parking to some extent. In the plan, it indicates that they conducted surveys to determine how many people work in each building and what their current needs are, which they then interpolated into the future. Based on this, they made some assumptions about what the parking deficit will be. The data suggests that they must build another vertical parking structure. If we want to maintain the density of buildings and the wide-open spaces and we want to keep our paradigm of 10 minutes to anywhere on campus that we enjoy right now, then we are going to have to go vertical. Traffic and Parking Services is not set up to build parking structures. They are here to enforce the parking laws and maintain the existing parking lots. Normally when you build a building someone brings money to the whole affair, but Knox said he has yet to find any big donors that want their name attached to a parking structure. To build another parking structure will require more money from everyone, just like parking fees increased when they built the first structure on Flint. If they build another one, fees will increase. Knox said that he recommended that they start building one immediately to accommodate the new dorm, and recommended parking fee increases of 30 percent the first year, 20 percent the second year, and 10 percent the third year. President Whitmore said no, that they had raised tuition all that they could this year and that they were not going to compound costs by raising parking. Although they have started planning and have had consultants look at the site and create blueprints, the new structure is at least a year off. They cannot start building until they begin bringing more revenues in. Knox has proposed to Max Hinojosa that he allow Knox to explore other sources of revenue that have never been exploited in the past. There are creative ways to bring in more revenue that do not involve giving parking tickets. If these revenue-generating ideas could be implemented, Knox could allow parking fee increases of 15, 10 and 5 percent, instead of 30, 20, and 10.

Knox said that Senators that park in reserve parking places probably already received a letter asking if they would like to trade in their reserve space for an area reserve space. Traffic and Parking makes this offer every year. There will be a 7.5 percent fee increase next year because they are losing revenue from lots 7, 8, and 9. He cannot charge a profit on satellite parking because it was built with federal dollars. If people are interested in trading their reserve spaces, they will be guaranteed an area reserve space in the same lot. If enough people are interested, then they can consolidate the reserve parking into a much smaller group, because area reserve is a much more efficient use of a parking lot than reserve. They would like all parking to be area reserve. Knox looked at peer institutions within a day and a half drive of Lubbock, such as Nebraska, Kansas, Colorado, and Arkansas, and found that Tech charges less than average. Knox then asked if there were any questions.

Senator Baker said that one of the problems that she has had with area reserve parking is that if you no longer have any spaces in your lot, your overflow is the commuter lot rather than a nearby adjacent faculty lot. Have you given any consideration to changing that policy? Knox said that they already allow some overflow. They have designated overflow lots—right now R1, R2, and R17 are considered area overflows

so that you do not have to go all the way over to the commuter lots. If new faculty or staff come in, all the lots are full except for R1, which is located immediately west of the chemistry building.

Senator Kvashny said that area reserve last year was \$75, and asked if now it will be over \$100. Knox said that the cost would increase 7.5 percent.

Senator Marks asked, regarding the intersection at Flint and 18th northbound, if it would make sense for the right lane to be right turn only. Knox said that there are more problems with that intersection than just that. While that is a worthwhile suggestion, one of the ideas that was proposed recently was to close Flint and make it part of the interior of the campus, by putting an entry station at 18th and Flint. Right now, an inordinate number of students cross Flint at the BA building. There are no good bus pickups there, and the buses prevent drivers from seeing pedestrians crossing the street, making it a dangerous place. One solution is to put an entry station and stop traffic flowing north and south, and only allow permitted vehicles and buses. It is an expensive solution because it means installing another entry station, but it is less expensive than killing a student. Another idea was to block it off between 7:30 am and 5:30 pm by using removable barricades. This would make them reroute all the bus traffic and the service vehicles, which could not easily get back and forth, so there are some problems associated with this idea. This summer, the area on Flint between 18th and 15th streets is scheduled for repair and resurfacing, which is the needed because of bus traffic. The university master plan calls for Flint to be sealed off, but practically, they have never found a way to do that. When Flint is resurfaced, right turn only is one of the ideas that will be considered.

Provost Marcy asked what will happen when Indiana is closed. Knox said that Indiana as we know it will cease to exist and you will segue onto the Parkway. There will no longer be a way to cross Brownfield Highway.

Senator Johnson asked how people are going to get to the arena. Knox said that if you are coming from the north it will be off of Tech Parkway and a piece of Indiana will still be open to allow you to get to the arena. **Senator Johnson** said that you have an arena that houses 15,000 people, and we are doing all we can to shut off access to it by closing Indiana down, closing Flint down, and not allowing access from the north. You are going to have this big facility, and no way to get there except by walking half a mile.

Senator Baker said what compounds the problem is access for the disabled. There is actually very little ADA parking by the arena. Knox said, why did we do it? It was a decision made by the Facilities, Planning and Construction people. When they did the cost-benefit analysis they saw more benefit than cost. He trusted that they made an informed decision but he was not privy to it. **Senator Johnson** said that there are issues that have to be considered like disabled access and fire access and people have to be able to get in there. Knox said that he cannot explain this, and suggested that the Senate have the facilities people come and explain it. They are the ones that made the decision.

Senator Ellis said that after Indiana is closed the only way that you will be able to get to the medical center is to get on the Parkway. Also the museum and the International Cultural Center. Knox said the only way to access these institutions would be via 4th Street. The only way to get to the museum from the architecture building will be to go up to 19th Street and take the Parkway to 4th Street and turn right. Knox said that if he wants to get to campus from his office he will have to get on 4th Street and drive all the way to the other side of the hospital, get on the Parkway and drive to 19th Street. **Senator Ellis** asked if this was all decided and could not be reconsidered. Knox said that it was and that construction had begun on the Parkway.

Senator Meek asked if the Marsha Sharp Freeway will be subterranean. Knox said that it would be below grade. **Senator Meek** asked how far below grade. Knox said he did not know. **Senator Meek** said that as it takes many years to complete the construction and you are constantly evaluating these parking situations and, in particular, access to the hospital and the cultural center, there is always still the possibility that you could build a bridge and keep Indiana. Knox said that it is not in the blueprints but that nothing is impossible with enough money. The master plan called for closing off Indiana because they do not want that large a thoroughfare running in front of the arena complex with that many people crossing the street. **Senator Meek** said that Indiana is a major corridor for our campus. Knox said that now the Tech Parkway will have to take its place.

Senator Dolter said that he had a question related to the R11 lot next to the School of Music. Many of the activities in the School of Music happen between the hours of 7 and 10 at night. Is it a problem to open the lot to general use at 7 pm instead of 8 pm? Knox said that it is. Knox said that parking lot is a constant source of irritation for him because he cannot exploit its potential. He said that he cannot use it during the day because it is on the interior of the campus and he cannot allow students in there. So it sits fallow today. He cannot use it in the fall semester at all because the band has it tied up for the majority of the day. Students are creatures of habit, and if they get in the habit of not parking in that lot during the fall semester, they do not even consider it in the spring. Particularly when it is so hard to get to. This summer Knox has to resurface that lot and crown it and make it look like a football field. That comes out of Traffic and Parking money, and it has to be done because the lot is deteriorating. But he does not get anywhere near enough revenue from the lot to pay for it. Regarding the issue of the pay machines, they were only installed to ensure equity. People came at night to study and attend classes and to use that lot, and nighttime students did not pay for parking permits. The daytime faculty, staff and students were carrying those evening students on their backs, and as an equity issue we said you have to buy a permit or pay the machine. One of the initiatives that Knox has proposed as an additional source of revenue will solve the problem. If Knox can get the revenue he is asking for, he would be able to accommodate concerts at no extra charge and not charge people for events if he is allowed to do what he has proposed. The proposal entails a 50 cent surcharge on every ticket sold to any event on campus. That will enable Knox to not charge patrons for parking at concerts or events. It would also allow them to employ professional parking people at games and events instead of the people that they have now. The surcharge would allow them to do this and to build a new garage.

Senator Watts asked if the proposal would include adding a 50 cent surcharge to season ticket holders such as for basketball. Season ticket holders pay extra for special parking. Knox said that while that was true, he does not get any revenue from it. All of that goes to the athletic department. **Senator Watts** suggested getting the money from the athletic department rather than charging season ticket holders twice. Knox said he has asked permission to get money back from the Red Raider Club. On a different issue, **Senator Watts** said that if a faculty member has to leave campus and return at night, the professor has to give up his or her parking space and there is no place to park upon returning. Is there not some way to be able to park close to your facility without having to walk half a mile. Knox said that if she could think of a way to make that happen without upsetting all the evening people, he would appreciate any suggestions. Particularly in the evening, people are concerned about safety. The faculty do not want to walk long distances, but neither do the students. Knox said that if there are a significant number of faculty teaching in the evening in a particular lot, Traffic and Parking would consider adding a couple of “reserved until 11” spaces. Senator Watts said that there would be competition for these spaces too. Knox said that he just does not have enough spaces for everyone. President Reed said that there was time for one more question.

Senator Garner said that her biggest concern is parking in the evening in the R11 lot. A lot of her students are required to get there prior to 8 pm in order to prepare for a concert that they are putting on, and they have parking passes for the commuter lots or the dorm lots but they cannot park in the R11 area. Then their concerts get out around 10 or 10:30 pm and they have to walk back to their dorms when it is not the safest time of day. Knox said that any vehicle with a permit can park in R11 after 5:30 pm for free. After 5:30 pm any vehicle with a current Tech permit can park anywhere on campus except fire lanes and “reserved until 11” spaces. **Senator Garner** said but for those students who do not? Knox said then they must use the machines. Knox thanked everyone and said that if anyone would like to contact him about traffic and parking issues they could email him at buddy.knox@ttu.edu. He invited Senators to drop by Traffic and Parking Services, and said that he enjoyed hearing some of their potential solutions to some of the issues that they have.

V. Old Business. President Reed called upon **Senator Kvashny** for a Nomination Committee Report. **Senator Kvashny** said that the Committee has nominated the following candidates for office. The candidates for President are: Gene Wilde and David Troyansky; for Vice-President, Liz Watts and Andrew Jackson; and for Secretary, Richard Meek. **President Reed** said that the elections will be held at the next meeting. Write-in candidates will be permitted, but at the moment the slate is closed.

President Reed turned to other committee reports. She said that Senators should have received one report with the agenda mailing. She called upon Senator Nathan for a report from Study Committee B. **Senator Nathan** said that the Committee was asked to look into the issue of having a faculty ombudsperson on campus. They looked at a number of institutions that had ombudspersons for faculty and staff and students. After looking at various models and for the two reasons that they had identified in the report that was sent with the agenda mailing, they decided to recommend against hiring an ombudsperson at this time. The two reasons why they decided to recommend against having an ombudsperson at this time are that they found no evidence that faculty desired it. The need was suggested by the Provost Office rather than being initiated by the faculty. It may be that the reason for this is that the needs that would be served by a faculty ombudsperson are already being served in other ways. The second reason why they recommended against an ombudsperson is that on other campuses that do have ombudspersons, the usage by faculty seems quite low. The situations in which faculty ombudspersons are better utilized are ones in which the ombudsperson represents not only faculty but staff and students as well. Given the cost of hiring an ombudsperson, it seemed prudent to recommend against hiring one at this time. There are also good reasons for hiring an ombudsperson, and they spent a long time discussing what to do if the Senate goes against the Committee recommendation and decides to recommend hiring an ombudsperson. The Committee would like to move that the university not create such an office unless and until a faculty survey indicates a need or desire for such a position.

Referring to the mailing, **Senator Gelber** said that looking at the list of reasons for and against creating the position; you could make a better argument for creating one than against it. **Senator Nathan** said that the lack of utilization seemed to justify recommending against it. One of the things that the Committee discussed was surveying the faculty to see if there was sufficient interest and hence the motion that they introduced.

Senator Troyansky asked if the Committee had detected any pattern among the schools that have an ombudsperson and the schools that do not. **Senator Nathan** said that those schools that have an ombudsperson strictly for faculty do so as a result of a specific conflict or some issue that was not handled properly by the grievance procedure. There was a specific event that triggered the senate at these institutions to request an ombudsperson. Among the institutions that have general offices, places like Berkeley and the University of Iowa, the vast preponderance of activity at these institutions involved staff-related rather than faculty-related issues. It appears that over the last three years, only four cases have risen to the level of grievance on this campus, and the grievances that did come up were so severe that an ombudsperson would have been unlikely to be able to help.

Parliamentarian Elbow said that as someone who has had some dealings with the grievance procedure, he believes that maybe the reason that you have so few people grieving is because the procedure is not very good, and that is not necessarily a very good indication of how many people might resort to an ombudsperson if that person were available.

President Reed said that the Senate would now vote simply to adopt the report or not. The Senate voted in favor of the report. President Reed said that the report was adopted and becomes the will of the Senate.

President Reed asked for a report from Senator Dolter. He said that Senate Study Committee A would like to report on the issue of academic administrator evaluations, which involves OP 30.15. The Committee has met to discuss this issue with input from Vice-Provost Brink. Senator Dolter handed out three sheets—OP 30.15 in its current form, OP 30.15 with revised wording, and an Administrator Evaluation Form that is currently a part of the OP. The Committee was not able to find anything wrong with the form but wanted to bring it to the Senate's attention. The Committee has been requested by the Provost Office to provide more faculty input into administrator evaluations. The Committee has sought to make sure that this input is required every year that an evaluation is conducted, and that the information gleaned from this evaluation is both quantitative and qualitative in nature. **Senator Dolter** said he would like to bring to the Senate's attention the handout featuring OP 30.15 with the revised wording, specifically No.3, Section c, Paragraph 2. The Committee cannot agree on the wording and would like to open it up for discussion by the Senate. The instructions from the Provost were to consider the whole document, not just section d. **Senator Dolter** said he was very pleased with the work of the committee and that the Provost is looking for more faculty

input. He said that he thought the main problem was one of wording; specifically 3c, Paragraph 2, line 3. The wording that the committee had come up with was “all tenured/tenure-track faculty...” rather than “and a representative sampling of tenured/tenure-track faculty...” The Vice-Provost suggested that it might be a little difficult for the Provost to gather input from all faculty. It is a question of logistics; it is a question of how to do it. It would be a little bit simpler to have each individual unit pick its representatives to do the evaluation instead of polling the entire faculty. But the committee is open to discussion on this. They do not expect to come up with a finished document today, but they do need to get some kind of a document to the Provost Office before April 30.

Senator Nathan said that in the wording it does not say that the representative sampling will be based on the recommendations of the unit. It is important to indicate that. **Senator Dolter** asked if the committee members agreed with that. **Senator Marks** said that he did not agree with the idea of a representative sampling. **Senator Nathan** said that by leaving it unstated it is not at all clear who selects the sample. **Senator Marks** said that his concern is not with how representatives are chosen but with representative sampling. Maybe it would be better to poll the faculty, even if it takes longer. **Senator Nathan** asked why then does the wording say “a representative sampling?” **Senator Dolter** said the change was suggested by Vice-Provost Brink, who is concerned about how difficult it would be to poll the whole faculty.

Senator Jackson asked if the Vice-Provost had said why he thought it was so important when all of us get so much junk mail each day, what is the big deal about polling us. What was the reason why he considered it difficult? **Senator Dolter** said that he had received an email from the Vice-Provost that said, in his words, that “it would be difficult if you included the entire faculty.”

Senator Dukes said that if you have a representative, and that is all, you are wasting your time. If it is difficult, it might be worth doing. You will get comments that you might not get; if you get one person to represent the faculty, he is not going to represent the faculty. You either need to do it broadly, or not do it at all. Which is what we have been doing.

Senator Nathan said that in the College of Arts and Sciences it would be difficult, it would be about 600 comments, but that he would be inclined to poll everyone.

Senator Harter said that the polling could easily be done using Scantrons on the web and it would not matter how many responded. Not all 600 are going to respond. **Senator Dolter** said that this did come up in committee and that the methodology is still to be determined. There are problems with security when you use Scantrons or email. **Senator Dolter** said that the original wording was “all tenured/tenure track faculty” and that they could go back to that original wording. **Senator Marks** said that he supposed that it was up to the Senate.

President Reed said that since Senator Dolter has presented this as simply a work in progress, is there any recommendation or resolution that any Senator would like to make that Senator Dolter can then take back to the committee, or simply let them continue to work on this with the input that they have received?

Senator Troyansky asked if it made sense to poll everyone over some period but not necessarily annually. There might be something that could be done annually and something that could be done every three years.

Senator Meek said that he was looking at the document and it looks like the evaluation that students fill out for faculty. They all do it on Scantrons and it is not that different.

Senator Watts asked if there were any mechanism for notifying faculty of the results of the evaluations. Maybe it is being done now, but she is just not aware of it. Would that be a concern of the faculty, to know that evaluations are done and complete?

Senator Gelber said that the committee had discussed that in relation to section e, the idea being that such information is really private and confidential. **Senator Watts** said that she understood about confidentiality, but that it was more about knowing that the evaluations had actually been conducted. **Senator Gelber** said that there could be a report of some kind that it was completed. **Senator Wilde** said

that this was an argument for polling the entire faculty, so that you would then know that you had been polled.

President Reed asked if there were any further comments, suggestions, or resolutions for Senator Dolter's committee.

Senator Jackson moved that the committee revise the document as they thought it should be worded rather than as the Vice-Provost thought it should be worded. **Senator Nathan** seconded the motion. **President Reed** asked if there were any discussion.

Senator Dunham asked if the motion could be repeated because she could not hear what **Senator Jackson** said. **Senator Jackson** restated the motion. **Senator Dolter** read the wording as it would be if the motion passed: "...the provost will solicit input from associate deans, chairpersons, and all tenured/tenure-track faculty from the relevant college or unit." **President Reed** asked if there were any discussion of the motion on the floor. She then asked if someone would like to call the question. **Senator Troyansky** said yes. **President Reed** called for a vote. The resolution was passed with one abstention.

President Reed said that it will now go forward to Senator Dolter's committee and they will amend the document. The amended document will be submitted to President Reed who will then forward it on to the Provost Office.

President Reed said that the matter was concluded and that she wanted to read to the Senate a note which she had received from the Office of the Chancellor. Although it was addressed to President Reed, she was turning it over to Senate documents for posterity. The letter was from Chancellor Smith thanking the members of the Senate for their memo expressing the support of the Faculty Senate. **President Reed** said that President Whitmore had not responded.

VI. New Business. **Senator Wilde** said that in recent weeks several colleagues had expressed interest in seeing revisions made to OP 32.34, Faculty Awards. It is due for revision or renewal this year so that it is kind of a short time frame. The specific concern was that a number of the awards, the Presidential, the Distinguished Teaching Award, things like this; the nominations come out of the Dean's Office and then go to the appropriate screening committees. He knows of several individuals who have been nominated for various awards and that the awards are getting bottled up some place in the department or college. He wondered if it might be possible to amend the OP and give the Faculty Senate the ability to pass forward nominations for some of these awards. This would create an alternate method by which people could be recognized for contributions. He said that he had contacted Jim Brink and talked briefly about this with him. As a faculty member, **Senator Wilde** said that it is his right to make some kind of recommendation and pass it on up, but he suggested it would have more force if it was something that was passed along to and ratified by the Faculty Senate. He would like to see if there is interest on the part of the Senate. If there is interest and support it could be passed along to a committee to do or he could spend some time crafting possible wording for the next meeting.

President Reed said that she thought that it should be passed along to the Faculty Status and Welfare Committee. She asked if anyone would care to make a motion to that effect. **Senator Reifman** moved to pass the matter along to the committee. **Senator Kvashny** seconded the motion. **President Reed** called for a vote. The motion passed.

President Reed asked if there was any other new business to bring before the Senate.

VII. Announcements. President Reed asked if there were any announcements.

VIII. Adjournment. Hearing none, and having none herself, she adjourned the meeting at 4:37 pm.

