

Joint Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committees
Remote via Zoom
May 17, 2022 | 6-8 PM

Introductions/Announcements

None.

Vision Zero Update

Reading of the names of those who have died on Portland's streets since last month's meeting.

Interstate Bridge Replacement Program

IBR project staff and city staff will present an overview of the project, including recent work to define a modified [locally preferred alternative](#) (LPA) design. Discussion will then focus on active transportation elements of the project and how to make connections south of the slough, to Hayden Island and north into Vancouver

Presentation

- Caitlin Reff from PBOT introduced project. Not PBOT's project. Mentioned the read-ahead materials. This program highlights city values, climate change, equity, high quality alternative to driving, earthquake resiliency, and support of land use patterns.
- Encouraged by what the committee has advanced to this point, but important for the IBR team and PBOT team to hear from the committees and public. Staff will be working on specific conditions of approval with modified LPA in July.
- Greg Johnson from IBR described project. There is a Supplemental Phase for EIS in August. Will take 18 months to go through that. Then IBR must secure local funding, which will move it into pre-construction design phase.
- WA has allocated \$1B to pay for their part of construction. This is supported by a bi-state legislative committee.
- LRT would have been "tremendously disruptive to [Vancouver's] downtown development plans." Currently, there is 89,400,000 miles of gas powered cars that will reduce 36,000 metric tons/year due to a shift from cars to transit.
- Katie Mangle from Alta described three key points: how they're approaching active transportation, extent of improvements included, and what's included in the LPA. Assuming the bridge is being built, it's important to ensure active transportation environment is safe and comfortable. It should be intuitive, safe, not stressful, and should attract people to biking and walking.
- Looking rigorously at the network, focusing on safety at key nodes. Showed Marine Drive, Expo Road, did not show MLK when describing connections that will be improved.

Discussion

- Committee's response: construction impacts; noise, concern of recreating I-205 in regard to noise; better does not equal good when it is currently bad-abysmal, would like to see how better; connectivity, must make meaningful connection; can have something great in the project area, but if people cannot access, what is the benefit; maintenance, what are the plans for keeping the facilities usable

- GJ: Construction impacts include planning to keep the bridge in operation during construction and will “try to keep biking and walking facilities in operation until we’re ready to switch over to the new bridge.” Noise will be addressed by keeping biking and walking at a different level than car traffic.
 - “Better” could mean splashing paint out there, but goal is to create a modern, attractive facility that people will be comfortable using. Looking for an “excellent facility,” not one that is run of the mill. This project is one of the larger investments in biking/walking by DOT in a long time. Will work with biking/walking advocates and conduct workshops/charettes to get input. Will continue discussions with bike/walking community/focus groups.
- Rebecca Sanders: would like to hear this expressed as having a vision. Mitigating rather than creating something that we're drawn to. How can PAC/BAC help with this? Letter? Performance metrics?
 - GJ: Your input is key. Bridge will be replaced either now or via "the big one". Start thinking about this thing and what it can/should be. It can be something that people can look back on years after it's built and be proud of contributing to biking/walking safety/connectedness in the region in a significant way.
- Ally Holmqvist: How is team thinking about connections? Curlicue ramps to address grade and height. Confusing to get on bridge now. Curlicues don't really connect; connect to places w/o facilities. How will it connect to the broader network on either side of the bridge. Must think about it holistically
 - KM: would be great to dive into that when we have more time. Need good visual connections: wayfinding without signs. Want to understand grades/how it connects to the network. We're thinking about it and considering it. Not just universally accessible but universally understandable.
 - We know connections are key to getting people to using these other modes. If you have a path that abruptly ends or is confusing then people will not use it at the numbers they should We know there have to be connections appropriate to it (what we're building)
- Alon Raab: 370 cyclists a day v 165,000 cars. Is there a goal at which you're aiming. Not clear how many lanes we'll have on the bridge. Chance to read the bikeportalnd article by Joe Cortright re: auxilliary lane and 164'-wide.
 - KM: Aspirations are high. Should be good for AAA. No figure to quote. Must be good enough to have meaningful mode shift. That's why access to transit is so important. Shared use path is a separated facility. On-street should be low stress to meet city standards, especially on city streets.
 - GJ: width; intially spoke to Joe Cortright. He has some very smart (but uninformed) opinions, esp things at which he's taking wild guesses. Dedicated transit way. Dedicated shared use path. Minimum of 3-lanes in each direction. Studying one auxilliary lane in each direction to see if it addresses uprpose and need. Width of bridge has not been determined. Going to build it to right size.

	BAC /PAC Members	Public attendees
What people liked about the topic/presentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seismic resilience and consideration for transit and active modes are aspects to lean into • Light rail across the river (+2) • I support bridge that can accommodate 4-8 lanes today, but 10-12 lanes in the future. It's good planning to design a bridge that has future capacity for increased traffic. Just in case 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusions of rail transit (+4) • Designing a new bridge with current three lanes is not thinking about capacity for the next 100 years (+5) • Westside multi-use path connection would tie into Vancouver side of the river very well
What concerns people had	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re: purpose and need slide: any congestion "relief" will be temporary due to induced demand. Should not be a priority of this project (+2) • Centering climate and adding lane miles for cars are incongruent (+2) • Old bridges be changed/improved to 100% pedestrian/bicycle use • A shared use path next to a freeway bridge needs to be buffered by greenery to mitigate the noise and air pollution that will result from the auto traffic • So much concrete (+1) • We have a history of auxiliary lane creep on the highway. Why do we need an aux lane just the length of the bridge if traffic must merge back together on either side? It seems like there will be an ask not long later to extend that lane. • Expecting bicyclists to ride a 2.4% grade for over five minutes may be too much or discouraging to bicycle travel • The height/length of the span of the bridge looks prohibitive for cyclists • Current shared use path is on east side which could be in shadow of bridge during peak afternoon use. Recommend relocating path on west side of bridge to take advantage of sunlight • Please discuss how tolling can be made equitable rather than equal • Concern that ODOT and WSDOT have eroded so much trust in past projects that it's hard to believe any of their commitments to transit/active transportation • Connect this new bridge to the 40-mile loop eastward • WA underfunded the project by \$200M after accounting for inflation from 2016. Also, ODOT just asked for extra 33% for Abernethy Bridge project before breaking ground. This project will be at least \$6 billion • Multi-use pathways across the bridge must be wide enough to accommodate both bike and ped traffic. And must be gentle enough grade to be easily accessible. • "ADA-compliant" is the bottom rung. Pathways should be easily accessible, not simple "accessible" (+2) • It is important that shared use paths be as wide as possible as separate facilities and that all of these facilities be protected 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marine Drive is becoming and E-W I-5 offshoot. • Close all the streets you don't know what to do with. • Should be able to get to, easily and comfortably ride across the new bridge with a six-year old (+2)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep shared use path elevation as low as possible. Increased elevation will discourage pedestrian and bicycle use similar to current Glen Jackson Bridge, which has a significant grade increase 	
What questions people had	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How are the protections in place currently under review to accommodate northbound and southbound bike traffic with enough pedestrian traffic space to avoid collisions due to overcrowding? • What are the carrots and stick to encourage transit and bicycle use and discourage SOV travel? • How much of this will become a binding agreement that decision makers and government administrations will abide to? • How wide will bike and pedestrian lanes be? How protected will they be? • How will adding more car lanes help environmental issues and reduce traffic if past the bridge the road narrows down again to two lanes? • I appreciated the purpose and need points—totally get it. But, what is the story on the opportunity presented by this project for the places: Hayden Island, Vancouver, Expo Center, their people, past, presents and futures? Largest infrastructure project in Oregon history? To create a landmark destination? What about moving Pearson Airfield and a bridge design that links two cities across one of the largest American rivers? • At one time it was discussed having a double height with lower part going north and upper part going south. Is this idea totally abandoned because of cost concerns? • How many people on the IBR team had ridden a bicycle from Vancouver to Portland (or vice versa)? • How wide is the current bridge, compared to the proposed LPA • I have seen a common sense alternative II by AORTA. How can these suggestions be incorporated before we get to 30% design? • How high is the bridge linking Delta Park and Hayden Island? • Can the light rail line be placed between the car lanes and the ped/bike path to increase the safety of ped/bikes? • Won't the GHG reductions from adding active transportation / transit be more than offset by increased vehicle traffic? • How likely are people to walk or bike to Hayden Island? • How likely are people to walk or bike around once there? • Will these infrastructure changes extend to the rest of the island? • What is the timing for the 3 new stations? Will they be built concurrently as the bridge construction takes place or we talking about a decade later? • How will the design take into consideration environmental/weather impacts affecting the safety of riders? Will pedestrians and cyclists be separated? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What percent of current travel could be transitioned to other modes to reduce the needs of vehicle lanes? • What would the needed lanes be if that was done? • How will tolling be included to reduce vehicle use? • What is max height on the bridge deck? • Why does property alongside of freeways always considered for affordable housing when the statistic is that BIPOC and other groups are disproportionately adversely affected by the diesel particulates from freeway congestion? • What is an auxiliary lane vs a travel lane? • Bike/ped facilities along highways are terrifyingly loud, ugly and noxious. Under the road deck they're dark, loud, scary caves. Is it possible to make these pleasant to use? • How does it connect to Kenton/Slough Trail • How wide is this?

- How specifically will this project make bicycling and walking easier and simpler throughout the corridor (connecting to networks off-bridge)?
- How steep will the bridge be for people riding. The existing bridge is already a bit steep.
- What is the commitment to creating a beautiful, comfortable, safe space for people walking and bicycling and not just checking the box for a shared use path?
- What steps is PBOT taking to minimize potential cut-through WA commuter traffic through North Portland? (+2)
- How will we ensure that neighborhoods surrounding the on- and off-ramps “benefit” from this project?
- How much do the proposed auxiliary lanes cost? Why are we spending money to encourage WA residents to shop without sales tax on Hayden Island?
- The interchanges take up so much valuable lane in this area. What are the alternatives to those giant ramps?
- Will there be seamless access for people on bikes and walking to access transit if that may be on a separate bridge?
- What is the grade of those stations and the bridge that people using it will have to climb?
- How will this multi-use path ensure safe noise levels for users walking and rolling considering it is next to traffic lanes?
- The current routes to access the bridge for people walking and bicycling are incomplete, circuitous, confusing and unpleasant. The images cut off on some facilities at the bridge but roads like Vancouver Way don't have facilities currently- how is the project ensuring that bike/ped improvements tie into an existing network so that people can get to those ramps?
- How likely are people to bike or walk to Hayden Island? Or walk or bike around the island once there? What purpose does built infrastructure serve if there is no change in the destination infrastructure?
- Are there plans to add a new multi-use off-street path west of I5 between the slough trail and the new IBR facilities?
- Are there any examples of highway projects of this scale that include pleasant/comfortable walking/biking infrastructure? Where the community has supported the project after the fact?
- Outside of LRT, how will this bridge ensure consistent and dependable Bus Transit if there is no dedicated bus lane?
- How do auxiliary lanes prevent induced traffic demand? (+3)
- Will congestion pricing be used and begin as soon as the bridge opens?

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What are options for reducing the frequency of bridge lifts? Raising the height would also increase the grade for ped/bike accesses• Have you considered a reversible lane for rush hour traffic? | |
|--|--|--|

Zoom Chat

From Jacinta Higgins BAC to Hosts and panelists:

Re: cycling/walking on another level, does this mean below? Curious what the safety concerns would be with that. Love the other level, just curious what emergency services, and personal safety look like for this.

From Ryan Ross (he/him) BAC to Everyone:

I am just kind of stuck thinking what would be the point of amazing bike/ped infrastructure when Hayden Island already stinks to navigate or bike around? Why would I bike over great public works stuff, just to die in a parking lot?

8:55:22 From David Stein (he/him), BAC Chairperson to Everyone:

A problem we may have is that the official project area is expanded on both sides of the river to accommodate freeway improvements but they would effectively preclude addressing the same type of issues for bike/ped connectivity in the same area because Main St on the Vancouver side does not appear to be included. Expanding the project area as needed for bike/ped connectivity may need to be something we send to council.

8:56:59 From Rebecca Sanders (s/h), PAC Co-Chair to Hosts and panelists:

Ryan, I get your point, but why wouldn't we take every opportunity to improve conditions? Once the bridge is built, we won't get this chance again for decades. This project doesn't relieve us from making Hayden safer.

18:57:13 From Rebecca Sanders (s/h), PAC Co-Chair to Hosts and panelists:

@David, good point about expanding project area.

18:59:35 From Jacinta Higgins BAC to Hosts and panelists:

Love this discussion in the chat, I'd just add that it seems like a great opportunity to either expand the area or push for an actually safe, equitable (as much as possible) connection & passage. That with so much money and focus on the Interstate Bridge, and creating an intentional bike/ped space, is there room/can we push to improve the actual experience instead of a bandaid on a broken bone. Not to dismiss creating the best possible bike/ped on the bridge- that should absolutely happen. But with the focus, we should also put it into context for the full experience and gaps to make it all better.

Update on the [Earthquake Ready Burnside Bridge Program](#)

Multnomah County submitted a Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) in late April, starting a 45-day comment period. Project and city staff will discuss changes to the previously submitted Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). Meeting focus will be on width to be allocated to the active transportation environment on the bridge and connections to the west side and Eastbank Esplanade on the east side.

Presentation

- Sharon Daleo from PBOT introduced project. The project is scheduled for Council approval in July with the goal of creating a connection between the bridge and Eastbank Esplanade. PBOT

has contracted with consultant to study ramp options. Consultant will develop 2 ramp concepts to both north and south side of bridge.

- High level concept slides to share: HAP concept. Highly liquifiable soils along the Eastbank near the bridge, which elicits concern. However, HAP concept is really great for the points where it provides access to the water. Team may look at different ramp designs, but they are emphasizing water access. User experience is driving different concepts. Soil conditions will have big influence on ramp design, which allows designs to be different on each side of the bridge.
- Megan Neill and Steve Drahota from Multnomah County continued. This presentation is following up from the previous presentation given to the BACPAC in December 2021 when they were wrapping up a large public outreach campaign. Since then, the group approved the proposed cost-saving measures for the conventional structure for the west approach over waterfall park and reduced the number of lanes on the bridge from 5 to 4.
- The goal for tonight's meeting included reviewing the proposed cross-section, providing a high-level overview of impacts to active transportation users, and sharing plan for moving forward with identified mitigations.
- This cross section is becoming more viable. There is a wider bike-ped space than current bridge conditions. They are calling it a "balanced cross section" because there are 2 lanes westbound and 2 lanes eastbound, one of which is dedicated bus only. Bike and pedestrian space allocation will be decided during the final design phase.
- Construction will cause a longer duration bridge closure. It is an estimated 3-to-5-year range depending on the contractor. Additionally, portions of the waterfront park will be closed to gain access from the parkway into the river. Construction will work in alternating 18-month intervals of closing, opening, closing, etc.
- The team is processing all forms of communication for the public to participate and leave comments.

Discussion

- AH: Disappointed. When it came back last time it was at 20'. Now it is 14-17'. Still about 50' in roadway for lanes, medians, and sides. Concerned about options for ramp. Some of the ramp options could be difficult to turn due to tight turns. Have you thought about that? Does that play into considerations?
 - o Sharon Daleo: Regarding the bridge itself; we're still working with the county about how to allocate feet to active transportation vs motor vehicles. Regardless of where that lands, it will not necessarily be the same on the ramp. Ensuring ramps will be wide enough for different modes and speed differential and widening at turns to make sure people can make the turns.
- Milly Guitron: The westbound cross section does not show a dedicated bus lane, but there is on the eastbound lanes. Why is there no westbound bus lane?
 - o SD: Looked at westbound rose lane at the time, but that is not where the delay occurs for transit. Traffic analysis shows that right now it wouldn't really provide a benefit. But we like the balanced option as it presents opportunity for a future rose lane.
- Joseph Perez: Will the connections from Stark to 7th to the Water to Morrison bridge be made prior to the bridge shutting down?
 - o Megan Neill: When might these improvements occur? EQRB is finalizing network of routes they're modeling to id investments to bring safety up and user comfort up.

Haven't yet finalized the route list. Will create allotment of funds to dedicate to upgrades.

- JP: 7th over 84 opens and there are traffic signals on Stark/Sandy could precipitate other activity. Would be a great opportunity to create connections to Morrison. Wayfinding is not very good.

	BAC /PAC Members	Public attendees
What people liked about the topic/presentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A sculptural-but- functional ramp would be really cool. Functional: wide and gentle enough to accommodate all users • Like the spiral ramps with viewpoints – this is a great opportunity for some public art, like mosaic pavement • The creative options involved • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multco working with PBOT to coordinate temporary enhanced bike and pedestrian facilities around Burnside to help mitigate traffic impacts during construction
What concerns people had	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • grades and path width are important for different bike types and mobility devices • I noticed the eastbound bus lane was a great addition when it went in for pre-COVID rush hours. I'd love to see westbound too and to have a clear strategy for how that will stay transit-only. • switchback ramps are notoriously tricky to manage safely during busy times. the dangers posed during rush hours would likely discourage cyclists from utilizing • These ramps seem very challenging to safely navigate for cyclists, particularly with so many e-bikes on the road. one of the biggest issues with all the bridges is how challenging it is to transition between paths. The current ramps on bridges are very challenging for mobility devices that aren't bicycles. They are very ableist and rarely take into consideration manual wheelchairs • During construction, I would love to see temporary (or permanent) bus lanes & attention to bike/ped connections getting through more congested areas on/near adjacent bridges. • Considering a future streetcar westbound would need to share the road with cars, it seems like a win-win to have a dedicated bus / transit lane westbound as well. • Egad! Where did all our bike/ped space go? We went from 20' to maybe 14! But the travel lanes may be well over 11' at 44 to 50 feet (+2) • These ramps seem very challenging to safely navigate for cyclists, particularly with so many e-bikes on the road. one of the biggest issues with all the bridges is how challenging it is to transition between paths. The current ramps on bridges are 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please call on MultCo to follow the direction of the 2015 Climate Action Plan, which specifically calls for identifying “opportunities for expanding pedestrian, bicycle and other multimodal transportation options on Willamette River bridges”. (p. 82, Action 4CC) https://www.multco.us/sustainability/2015-climate-action-plan • I like the circular ideas in theory. I ride a longer cargo bike with both my kids in it and there are several crossings where I struggle to make the turns. The width of these ramps would be important as well as any switch back turns for these types of bikes.

	<p>very challenging for mobility devices that aren't bicycles. They are very ableist and rarely take into consideration manual wheelchairs</p>	
<p>What questions people had</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there plans for an elevator to connect the bridge paths and lower paths for people that need it? • How will this right-of-way ensure consistency and dependability for Buses traveling westbound? (Routes 12, 20 and 19 namely) • How much is portions of the Waterfront Park (closed for construction)? Significant portions? How intermittently will EBE be closed? Will the detour provide a similarly protected facility? • What is the anticipated vehicle speed limit on the bridge and the approaches? • Will there still be the elevator on the east side? • What would the width be on these different ramps? Turns especially like those in the basket get tricky to make when they are tight especially in 14' • Why is there not a westbound and eastbound transit lane? • What would the width be on these different ramps? Turns especially like those in the basket get tricky to make when they are tight especially in 14' • Are reduced widths at the east and west approaches still planned? • How will construction affect Naito Pkwy - car lanes, bike lanes, sidewalks? • Are the physical barriers between vehicle and bike/ped traffic able to be modified, or will they be part of the bridge structure (e.g., if we are able to somehow meet our climate/mode share goals, is it possible to remove traffic lanes in the future?)? • Beyond traffic calming will detours have temporary protection when not on greenways? • can there be a more creative, unique design to the east span? the two options look so basic, boring, and more of the same designs. maybe look to something innovative and enjoyable to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will the eastbank approach from the esplanade be effected by widening I5 at rose quarter?

the eye and to users and not just another copy of an already existing portland bridge?

- Intuitively, it's hard to see why there would a rose lane in one direction but not the other - can we see the data at some point?
- The Esplanade is a frequent locus for bike/ped conflict. Is there intentional planning to mitigate this, particularly on the approaches to the bridge?

Zoom chat

19:20:54 From Joseph Perez to Hosts and panelists:

Will connections on Stark from 7th Ave to Water Ave to Morrison Bridge be made for bicycling before Burnside closures begin?

19:20:55 From Miguelangel (BAC member) to Everyone:

Thanks for presentation.

19:24:56 From Sarah Pullman, she/her, PBOT to Everyone:

Broadcasting this comment for the public: Will connections on Stark from 7th Ave to Water Ave to Morrison Bridge be made for bicycling before Burnside closures begin?

19:27:59 From Andrew Holtz to Everyone:

The Multnomah County Climate Action Plan (2015) says the county should take advantage of opportunities to add bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure on the bridges. But this design contemplates bike/ped space that could be only about one foot wider than the existing conditions. That sounds like an abdication of the climate plan.

19:28:18 From Milly Guitron (She/Her) (PAC) to Everyone:

^

9:37:34 From Andrew Holtz to Everyone:

Please call on MultCo to follow the direction of the 2015 Climate Action Plan, which specifically calls for identifying “opportunities for expanding pedestrian, bicycle and other multimodal transportation options on Willamette River bridges”. (p. 82, Action 4CC)

Committee Business

BAC consideration of a letter in support of the SW Capitol Highway Rose Lane Project. BAC and PAC discussion for next steps regarding membership on PBOT’s Bureau Budget Advisory Committee.

- David Stein sought a motion to provide comments to SDEIS. Joseph makes a motion to submit a letter similar to what’s been done in the past: write a concurrent letter to meet the needs of the committees as expressed by David.
- The chairs will write a draft letter in response to the SDEIS that best represents the will of the committee as best they understand it. Deborah Small has concerns her opinions will not be voiced/represented. Call a quick meeting end of May/beginning of June to address this issue. Prior to expiration of public comment period.
- The IBR letter would be a letter to Council that recommended conditions of approval.
 - o BACPAC members who offered to help with letter: Ryan Ross, Milly Guitron, William Hsu, Michelle DuBarry, Joseph Perez, Victor Duong, Rebecca Sanders, Tiel Jackson, Miguelangel Aleman
- BAC members agreed 19-0 to write the Rose Lane letter with a strengthened bullet point.

BBAC was not discussed.

Modal Committee Evaluation

Kristin Hull with PBOT will briefly discuss and answer questions about a bureau effort to improve the modal advisory committee system.

Presentation

- Denver Igarta and Francesca Jones will show up next month to discuss further. Kristin is here today to introduce the evaluation.
- Attended many meetings. Has consistently heard about frustration about how they're engaging, worth of exercise (what a bummer of a statement). Ask some hard questions about how the committees are intersecting with the city overall. Identifying what's going well. Has the "shape of some concerns" but need to do some "deep listening". Also reaching out to other cities to see how they interact with their committees.

Discussion

- AH: I'm wondering if you are looking at how structures are operating broadly? For governance? What is the scope?
 - o Kristin Hull: We will use the problem statement we are creating together to determine how broad of a scope. It is more of a city council decision than a staff choice. Staff will just be providing options and reasoning.
- JP: What type of weekly reporting is done by department staff to city Council to the city manager about what projects they are working on, how far along they are, what they have complete? BAC needs that information. I'm subscribed to every Portland email thread but is the BAC privy to any staff communications to Council Mayor?
 - o KH: We need to start talking about this: the role of the committee, what information you need to do your jobs, how we can have better communication.
- Katherine Sheie: Will we have the same power as the design commission, a structure that has some teeth? Will you then look at the process to modify the city charter?
 - o KH: It must come from city council. The process will help identify needs and goals.

Jamboard | Likes

- I'm just a continuous process improvement fan

Jamboard | Concerns

- It seems premature to define the problem statement before stakeholder input

Public Comment

- Andrew Holtz, Chair of MULTCO CAC: Have been urging county to maintain 20'. Would be happy to provide letters etc. Board of Commissioners is saying they'd love to have full width but are saying that it's a luxury we cannot currently afford.
- Eric Wilhelm: Look to the question of who gets to have final say about who makes final decision about design, connections, etc. when thinking about committee reformation. Think instead about designing for the mode share we want to have. Don't just count number of cars today and provide for them.

Adjourn