



Potrero Yard Neighborhood Working Group Meeting 15 Minutes

Tuesday, July 7, 2020, 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.

Zoom Webinar, Webinar ID: 821 3576 8377

(Virtual)

Note – The meeting minutes capture the overall tone of the group’s discussion and is not meant to be an exact transcription.

Members Present:

Alexandra Harker
J.R Eppler
Magda Freitas
Alexander Hirji
Benjamin Bidwell
Kamilah Taylor

Members Not Present:

Roberto Hernandez
Erick Arguello
Claudia DeLarios Moran
Brian Renehan
Mary Sheeter
Scott Feeney
Thor Kaslofsky

SFMTA Staff:

Rafe Rabalais
Adrienne Heim
Licina Iberri
Pamela Owen Adams
Kerstin Magary

Other Attendees:

Mat Snyder (SF Planning)
Luiz Barata (SF Planning)
Rosie Dilger (consultant)
Abraham Vallin (consultant)
Jenny Zhou (consultant)
Ronald Mitchell (SFMTA, Muni
Operator and Joint Labor)
Allyson Di Conti Cole
Amy Elliot
Chris Jauregui
Christian Figueroa
Diane Fischer
Glen Hair
Hayden
Jesse Jobert
John Derr
Nathan Sibon
Ryan M
Silvia Stocco
Simin Naaseh
William Gorham
Miyamoto San Francisco
Roberto Jenkins



Purpose of the Meeting

To discuss project general updates, walk through the Planning Department's PPA letter, and provide next steps for RFP Subcommittees.

Item 1. Welcome

Rosie Dilger welcomed everyone to the meeting and reminded the Working Group of virtual etiquette. Adrienne Heim then transitioned to the Wellness Check-In.

Item 2. Wellness Check-In & Icebreaker

Adrienne Heim: What did everyone do for the holiday weekend? I'll start first. I visited five National Parks last Saturday and got back here yesterday evening. I went to Yosemite, Death Valley, Joshua Tree, Sequoia National Park and Kings Canyon.

Rosie Dilger: Over the weekend I went camping and pet an alpaca, which was pretty cool.

Rafe Rabalais: I did a very Mary Poppins activity. I flew a kite over the weekend. There was excellent kite flying weather right by the bay!

J.R Eppler: On Saturday my family and I went to Heron's Head and rode bicycles, and on Sunday we went to China Camp State Park to hike around.

Rosie moved forward along the agenda and transitioned Working Group members to the Working Group Member Announcements agenda item.

Item 3. Working Group Member Announcements

Rosie Dilger: Do you have any announcements or anything you'd like to share with us or perhaps any intel you have on community conversations that are happening about the project?

If you do have something to share, please feel free to just type in at any time.

Rosie transitioned to Adrienne to provide service updates and the agency's response to COVID 19

Item 4. COVID 19 Update

Adrienne Heim: There have been some updates that center around the budget and the transportation recovery plan. On June 30th, the SFMTA board approved the budget to move through and the next approval will go to the Board of Supervisors.



Within that budget the agency decided to pause on increasing Clipper Card Muni fare. It was originally proposed to increase by \$2.80 and that was set to take effect November 1. That's been halted for the upcoming budget. We use those fares for our operation expenses, so prior to COVID-19 that was projected to be around \$200M per year. However, we're retaining the discounted fare for youth, seniors, and people with disabilities. We're also looking into free Muni service for individuals experiencing homelessness. There will be more to come on that as part of the transportation recovery plan. Meter enforcement will return; that means our parking control officers will be out and you will see them starting on Monday, July 13th.

We are implementing temporary emergency transit lanes . That's for the 14 Mission, for Mission Street in the South of Market area; the 19 Polk for 7th and 8th streets in the South of Market area, and the 43Masonic and 44 O'Shaughnessy for Presidio, Masonic, Laguna Honda, Woodside, and Bosworth streets. You can find all of this information at [SFMTA.com/COVID-19](https://www.sfmta.com/COVID-19). These are temporary emergency transit lanes, but we will go through a public process to see if we should keep them if there is a positive effect from this.

Rosie Dilger: Thanks, Adrienne, we really appreciate hearing all of the updates. If any working group members or folks have questions please feel free to jump in. And if not, we'll move on to the next slide.

Rosie transitioned to RFQ & Schedule Updates

Item 5. RFQ & Schedule Updates

Rafe Rabalais: The one notable schedule update is the RFQ release. We were hoping to get the RFQ out in June. We're now in July, hoping to get it out this month. We have been in and out of a prolonged dialogue with Districts 9 and District 10. Now that we're actually talking about the RFQ and going into the solicitation process, it's become real - and we've seen heightened interest from both Supervisors' offices. We've been briefing them on the process and schedule. We have started a process of regular monthly updates with Districts 9 District 10. Within a week we think we will have a quick update from them. That's where we are. As you know, we have an RFQ that is fully drafted and we just want to make sure that it has an enthusiastic "thumbs up" from both of the district Supervisors.

Schedule-wise, there's no real change in the overall schedule and we are at the point where we have to bring development partners on board. As you can see in the agenda items below, we

will talk in more detail about what's known as the [Preliminary Project Assessment \(PPA\) letter](#). A PPA from the Planning department was issued in May.



The CEQA Scoping meeting will be in late August. That is a statutory requirement for projects that are going through the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) process. It's an opportunity for the public to weigh in on the project and to register their thoughts, observations, and concerns about potential environmental impacts associated with the project. This is mostly confirmed to take place at the end of August. The most important thing to note is that we are in the middle of our project timeline in between the RFP process, and design is what we're doing now and what subcommittees will be tasked with reviewing.

Rosie Dilger: This is the Project Timeline from the beginning to it being fully built. In the next slide we have a more expanded timeline that goes into detail about 2020.

Licinia Iberri: Sitelab helped us draw this 2020 Timeline, and we are currently in the draft stages of the RFP. After we move forward with the RFP, and the selection of the developer, the developer will propose a project and bring that forth to the community. It will be the developers' expression of what is feasible at the site. After that there will be another significant opportunity for the actual design features, and it will be folded in the final concept for the developed drawings. Right now we're trying to get to the second drawing.

This timeline is a narrative of what I just said, and you can see the previously defined elements. We know the square feet needed for transit, we have fit a number of housing units into a sort of "cereal box" if you will, we have a maximum height that was given to us by the Planning Department through their public process, we have guidance to be cognizant of shadows created over Franklin Square, we know from city policy what the sidewalk width should be, we know the project has to be LEED Gold because that's a city requirement for public buildings, and we know that we are not proposing on site parking for vehicles other than fleet vehicles.

This year we are in the next phase, where we are looking at what the active uses could be, how to incorporate neighborhood context, and what the overall architectural expression of the building is; is there an overarching color and material palette that we should include in the RFP to help provide some design guidance to the developer, and what are the general priorities around public benefit and community investment. Then we have 2021, which is the start of our relationship with our developer partner. Where the developer will really refine the details, give us final location, size, active uses, we'll start to understand how and if we can activate 17th St, we'll get a final unit count, lobby location, and all of the little details to get ready for that final building design.

Most notably, we did receive a project response letter from the Planning Department at the end of May. We have been working jointly as a part of this city working group on this project for



several years now, and typically a big project like this would submit a PPA application to the Planning Department. Because we had been in close contact for several years prior to it even being at that PPA phase. We continued our conversation and once we submitted the project

application, they responded with this letter/ To memorialize our first common understanding of the project's direction. It's like a PPA letter but not quite that. Luiz Barata and Mat Snyder are both here, to walk through the letter, answer any questions, and explain the entitlement process.

Rosie transitioned to the next agenda item and invited Mat Snyder and Luiz Barata to provide details on the PPA letter.

Item 6. San Francisco Planning Project Letter Review

Mat Snyder: I'm going to talk about the purpose of a PPA and what we do with it, and talk a little bit about land use, and again our sort of joint understanding of the project, and some things that we look forward to by working with the SFMTA and a development partner. We'll also talk a little bit about the entitlement process as we see it, as we focus on the design aspects and some of our design comments of the letter. So as Licinia had just said, a project application is generally the first step when a development project comes to the Planning Department, and Planning takes an initial look at the project description, and then provides some initial feedback and some critiques.

The developer will have to get the SFMTA through our review process. The PPA letter is intended for a couple of things. It is to enable the Planning Department and the developer to come to sort of a common understanding of what is before us. It gives an understanding of what needs to happen going forward, but it also kind of provides the public with the ability to have sort of an initial understanding of the project, so they know what to expect.

So as you know, when we receive a project application, it is usually a more fully designed project, but since the Planning Department has been working with the SFMTA, this Working Group, and their consultants; we understood that this project was at a more conceptual stage. So instead of relying on a set of completed designs, if you will, we had worked with the SFMTA to develop a set of some objectives, which were sort of the initial set of principles by which the design would be developed and instead of having those designs. This was a way for us to kind of come to a common understanding of what this project is about and those objectives were divided into some basic objectives and some add on objectives.

We understood that the real purpose of this project is to improve the facility and improve SFMTA functions throughout the city. And so we certainly understand that, but we also want to engage



with the SFMTA about the possibility of using this public site to support other public needs, and of course the top of the list in San Francisco right now is affordable housing.

The basic objectives go through what our understanding is and what the needs are for the SFMTA and the actual facility. The additional objectives talk about that other element. Housing? What will make this something that's a little bit more dynamic than other bus yards? Something that's part of the neighborhood? So, you know, it goes into the ground floor uses; uses that can contribute to the neighborhood. And you know, other elements that we looked at in terms of the objectives, is of course sustainability and is another value that's very strong with the Planning department and in San Francisco. This letter sets out to very clearly state that we are supportive of these objectives. We also wanted the SFMTA to work with a consultant to come up with an initial conceptual/three-dimensional look of what this could potentially look like. We are generally supportive of the building envelope. The 150 foot limit was brought by the Planning department after we did some work. When we were testing out some possible development sites around the neighborhood. 150 feet seemed to be the tallest height that people were accepting.

We are also generally supportive of the building massing, and the approach to this is important to us. This building will be taller than a lot of the buildings around it. So we wanted the design to be as sensitive as possible to the massing above that bus parking podium. There are design interventions that could perhaps minimize some visual aspects of it from certain viewpoints. The other thing that is really important to Planning, and Luiz will go into this little bit more detail, but that's the podium itself - how the building meets the ground, and the potential uses on the ground; and how it meets the sidewalk and looks beside the buildings across the street. We don't want to see just a blank wall on all four sides, we want there to be active uses. We understand that maybe we're not going to see retail, but we want to entertain other ideas. We want to be flexible, while having this notion of wanting this active use at the sidewalk that contributes to the neighborhood.

We understand the site has to accommodate the bus facility. We are looking forward to maybe pushing you and the SFMTA a little bit about if there is a possibility of just making as many of those surrounding walls as active as possible. I think we agree that Mariposa really needs to serve as a functional aspect for the bus facility, and then Bryant Street perhaps, is the primary side where you do populate these activities. We also push a little bit to see what we can do for 17th Street, since it is across Franklin Square.

The current project description assumes that the current building on the site will be demolished. It is considered a historic resource and through this process which is environmental, and through the design process, we're going to have to do sort of an analysis to understand the trade-offs for our decision makers, when we demolish such a building and what it is doing for the bus facility and for this project.



In terms of the review process, which the PPA letters lay out. I should note there isn't one absolute way to get approved through the Planning Department's approval process. Right now the project is in Zone P. The height is limited, so we know we have to rezone it. The major tool that we're probably going to use to accommodate this project is to create sort of an overlay zone, what we call a Special Use District, that will address most of what this project needs to do. And this is what we do with a lot of our large-scale development projects, like Mission Rock and the Hope SF project. We create these Special Use Districts where we create these tailored controls for particular projects. Of course we'll have to also rezone, and will have to increase the height. Then, we'll also have to have some kind of process by which the project itself comes to the Planning Commission's approval.

We're going to want an ability for them to provide conditions of approval, which we always do with projects of this size. I can't say for sure what the underlying zoning will be; - what that entitlement could be; something like what we do in these certain neighborhoods with a large project authorization. There will be an approval before the Planning Commission. Because it's across the street from Franklin Square, there are limits and requirements that require special approvals for casting shadows on Park and Recreation parks. But we won't need to talk about that until the design guidelines. Luiz will go into some of those comments which were based on our urban design guidelines. Some of the urban design guidelines that he created with Citilab apply to this particular site.

So, I won't get into the environmental aspect that much; I understand that you'll be dealing with that at your meetings next month and there'll be a scoping meeting as well in the near future. Now, they have an environmental application and our environmental planning team is busy doing several environmental analyses. I'm going to turn it over to Luiz so he can go through some of the initial comments on design.

Luiz Barata: Thanks Mat, I'm part of the design review Planning team. For this project, we used the urban design guidelines as a basis for design review, which is applicable whenever you have a project that is mixed use and has a large number of units. In this case, because it is not expanded, it is likely to develop more focused design guidelines. The document is basically three main components which are: site design, architecture, and public realm. So, we have highlighted in this letter to further define these main guidelines that are growing and will look into when we review the project. We want to ensure that the project will respond to the character of the neighborhood and the context of the surrounding buildings in terms of scale. We also looked at pedestrian use and active walls. Meaning, that we want to make sure that the uses are integrated and respond to the guidelines in a way that you don't end up with blank walls. We have identified some of the areas that we were thinking are more important. For instance, 17th Street facing the park is one of those areas where we would like to focus on active uses and make sure that there is an active front there.



Just scrolling down a little bit on the PPA letter. We also look at how tall the building will be and how to integrate the common space. The building massing has to respond to how to provide solar access to Franklin Square park. We are very concerned about a building that is of this scale because the area comprises two urban city blocks. So we're looking at how the buildings are going to be modulated and have articulation in a way that, again, responds to the context of the neighborhood. So we want this building's appearance to blend into the neighborhood and not be a strange object in that neighborhood. So we also made comments of that, in terms of homeowners harmonizing with the different designs through neighboring scale materials. It's important to make sure that you know that the proposed building will complement and enhance the character of the neighborhood.

In response to all those public visible facades, we have comments based on renderings, and are hoping the developer considers public art, as it mirrors the Mission and is a big component of the neighborhood. We want to let you know that some of the art could be incorporated into the design. I think signage is very important to have a clear indication of the main entrances and exits. The active use guidelines could include that the service areas are activated on some of the corners and all along Bryant and 17th Street. For most part, and as for sustainable practices, the city has a mandate to house all electric buses and that will be achieved.

Then you have to consider the public realm, and residents versus pedestrian circulation, and sidewalk space. It has to enhance the pedestrian experience as much as possible. That's the design review in short summary.

Rosie Dilger: It looks like Magda has raised her hand. Magda if you'd like to jump in and ask a question.

Magda Freitas: I think we met at one of these events here. So I see that the Planning Department wants to change one of the entrances to the building. As I understand, the entrance will be moved from Hampshire to Mariposa. Although Hampshire has a bicycle lane. So I want to understand why the bus entrance is being moved to Hampshire.

Luiz Barata: As the design evolves we will be taking additional comments. We are very restricted in terms of what we can do as there are only a few areas where we have room for the entrance. We saw Hampshire as one way that we could potentially minimize some of those conflicts. However, we will continue to review.

Magda Freitas: Yes, maybe it should be reconsidered. There is a kids' school on Hampshire so I hope it can be moved back to Mariposa.



Rafe Rabalais: If I could interject just to make sure I'm understanding your question Magda; the entrance comment from the Planning Department is not about the bus entrance changing. The main entrance for SFMTA employees and for the busses would still remain on Mariposa. The idea is that there would be a pedestrian entrance for the residential development on Hampshire Street because Mariposa Street is not ideal for a lot of pedestrians and a lot of buses to be coming in and out of. The thought is it would be safer for everybody if those pedestrians could access the upper levels for residential development through a separate entrance.

Luiz Barata: Yes, the key here is to ensure that the pedestrians and buses are having the minimum amount of conflict.

Magda Freitas: Okay. Thank you.

Licinia Iberri: Any other questions? I think folks can just kind of come back to these Powerpoint slides if you'd like to review the main points of the letter. This slide has all the different approvals that they have in the letter. There will be other approvals and it is sensitive because we are also a public agency, so as a public project there will also be a specific design review hearing. We will also go before the Arts Commission and the PUC because we are conducting a water supply assessment. And we will also go before the Historic Preservation Commission. I mean the project will be everywhere. So if you feel like doing a parade of all the public hearings in San Francisco we can take you on one.

One thing I wanted to flag is that Luiz is drawing from the Planning Department's design guidelines. This project is drafting its own Potrero Yard guidelines with project-specific ethics and guidelines that will be reviewed by the Planning Department. We mentioned this last month in the hopes that we would be able to distribute them for this meeting. We were not able to get to a good enough draft to share. Hopefully we'll be able to get it in good enough shape to send out to you all and also in partnership with the Planning Department. We do envision the Planning Department will ensure the design guidelines before they are added to the RFP.

Okay, great. I'll move on to the next slide but please jump in if you have any questions.

Rosie moved on to the next agenda item to discuss RFP Subcommittees

Item 7. RFP Subcommittees

Licinia Iberri: So as we kind of talked about last month, we have divided the work that is needed for the next phase for the three subcommittees; first for the Urban Design and Ground Floor Activation Subcommittee. These were split differently and some folks in the Working Group had some comments about how to group them and so previously the Ground Floor and



Urban Design were separate - now they're together. The focus of that group is to go in depth and get a really good understanding of the PPA letter that we just reviewed to really make sure that you understand the different points of design in this stage and study what was shown in this presentation, and look through a series of case studies. You're welcome to provide additional case studies if you'd like and then we will be sending out a preferred ground floor use survey activity for you to complete a high-level overview once your subcommittee slide deck is presented.

You'll see that there's a lot more detail in there. This is just a high level overview and then the Housing Subcommittee will look at the kinds of things we talked about for a little bit last month in more detail. They'll also be looking at case studies of housing developments in the vicinity, both in kinds of housing developments and of similar size. Those will be for more urban things closer to downtown and then housing developments with high-level affordability housing developments, this time with similar ground floor scenarios, relationships with open space, and we're going to do the best we can to focus on the housing element. So we're not looking at just any kind of joint use. Let's get above that so this will also look at the target population preference to continue that discussion of how to word and really include language around preferences and principles around affordable housing.

The Public Benefit and Engagement Subcommittee will be looking at case studies and will be looking into reviewing equity principles for the project to produce a document. I'll be providing a document that will become an attachment to the RFP that is a public benefit and principles documents that the subcommittee will look at for the Balboa Reservoir. A document that was an attachment to that area is a precedent. Our case is very different from the BalboaReservoir, but the kind of approach to writing it is analogous. We could borrow some things from it. We will be doing things differently here and we will have the standalone present design guidelines for this site, so the focus will be slightly different. But if you're in this subcommittee, you will receive that as well as the slide deck for your review. There are activities built into each of the subcommittee slide decks and we will be asking you all to set aside some time to meet with your subcommittees to go through the information and provide feedback and comments. Unless any of you have strong objections, one of us from the SFMTA will sit in on that meeting to take notes and listen, and provide references and structure as needed.

As you can see on this slide, each subcommittee intersects and I've tried to to describe how here. For example, between the Housing and Urban Design Group, or really there is a relationship between uses. It's important to show differentiation between the larger industrial use and housing, and if there's a major difference in expression or material palette. Then as another example for those who are in the Public Benefits group



and you are also interested in the Ground Floor Urban Design group, the intersection there is potential for community investment at the ground floor. As you can see, they then all meet in the

middle and share case studies as they highlight different topic areas for each subcommittee and then all subcommittees will all have an opportunity to review the design guidelines with specific focus on the areas that your subcommittees have.

Rafe Rabalais: All right, and so here is the unveiling of who is going to be on what subcommittee- and this is based on everybody's sign-ups for the most part. We took a couple of liberties in making sure we had fully populated committees. This comment at the bottom is very important in that if you'd like to serve on more than one, let us know and people can serve on multiple, but we'd ask that reassignments be at a minimum and that you commit to what's shown here so we have a diversity of voices on each of these topic areas.

I would like to thank you for your patience. This is the topic that we've been talking about for several months now, and the RFQ was obviously very technical. We appreciate the participation, and the input that we received but you know at this point we're starting to get into the substance of projects, so that was kind of a good trial run and we'll be doing some things kind of similar to what we did for the RFQ. Within the next couple of days you should receive the first slide deck with background information prompting questions. We will be setting up availability polls for people to sign up for conversations about your topics. We're happy to kind of participate or observe to the extent that you want us there. Then the next step will be us talking about some of the CEQA meeting and RFP criteria at our next meeting.

Rosie Dilger: We will reach out to all of the Working Group members and your subcommittees with the materials, resources, and to schedule a Doodle poll to figure out what timing works for you between this meeting and the next. Let us know how we can best support you whether that's logistically or by setting up a Zoom call or whatever we can do to support.

With that, Rosie opened the meeting to members of the public.

Item 8. Public Comment

Abraham Vallin: I'll start calling people off one by one. First, there were two Q&A questions, the first one was by an anonymous attendee, which is: Is the RFQ for developers only? Or will it ask for a fully assembled team of developers, contractors, architects, and engineers?



Licinia Iberri: To protect the Integrity of our procurement process we can't tell you the qualifications of who we'll be selecting. If you're not already on our project mailing list you can do that at our website. As Rosie said earlier in the meeting, you can also contact any of us or the Department of Public Works with questions about the project and we can reply with anything that's already available as part of the public record. We cannot disclose any of the competitive items right now.

Rafe Rabalais: There's a lot of information on the project web page, but as you know we're not in a position to describe the specific qualifications.

Jesse Jobert: How excited is the team to start design?

Rafe Rabalais: Very!

Licinia Iberri: It's been a long time coming. When we were getting drafts of the RFQ, I was thinking to myself, I can't believe we actually have this big document about the project on time.

Abraham Vallin: I will mention that everybody who's joined through their computer and is a member of the public has a function to raise your hand. So if you do have a question or comment. Feel free to do so.

Roberto Jenkins: I don't want to be redundant but I did want to reiterate my point from last month regarding the maximum height of 150y feet.I look at the conceptual rendering for the Mariposa and Hampshire Street view and it's fading out the height. I feel like the public already is not getting a full sense of what150 ft.means and that if you're doing 150 ft. t you should bite the bullet and do 220 ft., which will make your high-rise residential much more efficient. You can be much more efficient in density. That is all I had that thank you.

Rosie Dilger: Thank you - we appreciate your comment and it will be noted in the minutes.

Nathan Sibon: I'm interested in noise and all things acoustics and have been interested in this project for a while. I think it's a really interesting combination. You've got a generally noisy use there that will combine with the peace and tranquility of people's homes and I'm interested to see how the project is going to handle very different uses.

Licinia Iberri: You want to respond to that or is that a comment Nathan?



Nathan Sibon: Just to comment to see if this has been a part of the initial kind of project planning. I noticed there is a separation of the bus entrance from the residential entrance, which I think is a good idea. I wonder if there's any thought behind where that entrance is going to go in terms of how it's going to affect the residential uses that are going to be above and looking down on the bus entrance.

Licinia Iberri: In the project parameters and narrative there is significant mention of working to minimize conflicts between both entrance users, like dimensions and other kinds of conflicts like noise and vibration. We are proposing that as a design consideration for the developer team to deal with. That seems the most appropriate, and the other thing to note is that we do have residents already, including one of our Working Group members. Magda lives directly across the street from our yard because most of our yards are in highly urbanized areas already, we have neighbors as close as 20 ft. away. So this is not new for us really, the idea of having people stacked on top of us versus directly across the street or in some cases directly adjacent to our yards. It is something that the SFMTA kind of deals with already now as part of our daily operations, there are already issues that our staff works with the community to minimize - you can hear beeping, the snapping of both of the trolleybuses against the overhead lines, etc. So we were well aware of some of the noises that vehicles make. Some folks actually kind of like it. It's definitely highlighted in our narrative as something for the project team to carefully consider.

Nathan Sibon: Do you see this project as an advantage from that perspective, being able to kind add some shielding and other elements that are going to come in addition to the residential and the rest of the building that's going to go on this site? That you will be able to mitigate some of those issues?

Licinia Iberri: We do see a benefit to our own vehicle longevity and just general maintenance for having them be in an enclosed space, with walls and doors, which will also do a lot to lessen the impact for our neighbors. A lot of the unsavory and unsightly things that happen, like oil changes and wash areas, will now be in enclosed areas.

Nathan Sibon: Great. Thank you, I'm very excited about this project.

Jesse Jobert: I may have missed it. But will the Planning letter be posted to the project website?

Adrienne Heim: You can go to [SFMTA.com/PotreroYard](https://www.sfmta.com/PotreroYard) and in the reports and documents section on the right hand column, it is attached there.



Licina Iberri: It is also on the Planning Department's PPA letter page. For those of you who are visiting our website regularly, we are just about to look into redesigning some of it to make sure that as more documents come pouring in you're able to navigate. For those of you with design brains and have ideas for ways we could improve our project page, please email us with suggestions.

Further public comment was not provided. Rosie thanked all for participating and concluded the meeting.