

Potrero Yard Neighborhood Working Group Meeting 26 Minutes

Monday, February 7, 2021, 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.

Zoom Webinar, Webinar ID: 820 6895 9504 (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:

Thor Kaslofsky

Magda Freitas

Alexander Hirji

Roberto Hernandez

Scott Feeney

Jolene Yee

Claudia DeLarios Moran

J.R. Eppler

Alexandra Harker

Members Not Present:

Benjamin Bidwell

Kamilah Taylor

Ryan Parker

Mary Sheeter

Peter Belden

SFMTA Staff:

Bonnie Jean von Krogh

John Angelico

Kerstin Magary

Jonathan Rewers

Other Attendees:

Peter Lauterborn (consultant)

Violetta Muselli (consultant)

Abraham Vallin (consultant)

Purpose of the Meeting

To discuss general updates for 2022, the General Obligation Bond, the Pre-Development Agreement (PDA), projected construction for Muni Metro East (MME) and the upcoming calendar for the Working Group

Item 1. Welcome

Peter Lauterborn welcomed everyone to the February meeting. Reminding Working Group members and members of the public of zoom etiquette. (Slides 1–3)

Item 2. Member Check-in

Working Group members and the SFMTA checked in by discussing aspirations for 2022, and by Working Group members sharing general updates. (Slide 4)

Item 3. SFMTA Announcements

Kerstin Magary: (Slide 5) We had to say farewell to Licinia who took a wonderful opportunity at the San Francisco Unified School District. We miss her. All members from the SFMTA on the Potrero Yard Modernization project remain the same.

John Angelico: (Slides 6–7) As you know, the SFMTA is trying to return service back to full capacity. There are a few updates occurring in February, including full-service restoration for the J Church train. Which is now running underground again. All other metro lines have been restored to full coverage until 12 a.m. on Sundays. We are bringing back the 10 Townsend and the 21 Hayes bus line in March, alongside more lines which can be seen on our website. We appreciate your patience.

Thor Kaslofsky: I understand some shuttles will begin running to and from the Hunters Point shipyard, can you say more about that?

John Angelico: I can't speak to that, there might be another SFMTA member here that could.

Thor Kaslofsky: I can send an email about this if that's better.

Jonathan Rewers: I may be able to quickly answer that, as part of the Bayview Community Transportation Plan there was a recommendation to implement a shuttle. We've since gotten a grant to implement a pilot program. We can follow up with you on the details.

Thor Kaslofsky: Thanks Jonathan, any details would be excellent.

J.R Eppler: Quick question on the 10 Townsend, regarding stop consolidation. There are many stops very close to each other on a flat corridor of land around 15th and Alameda where not

many people get on. We could increase the frequency of buses if we removed that stop. Do you know anything about how that conversation has gone?

John Angelico: I don't but we're going to record your comment, file it, and get back to you. Thank you for the follow up.

Item 4: Updates on 1200 15th Street

Kerstin Magary: (Slide 8) We did a land swap and building swap with Animal Care and Control. 1200 15th Street has been city-owned since 1930. Animal Care and Control needed a different building that was bigger and renovated, so we the SFMTA gave our Overhead Lines building, built circa 1893, to Animal Care and Control in a swap approved by the Board of Supervisors. 1200 15th Street will be totally rehabbed from the bottom to the top, and the historic building façade will be kept. The building will be solar powered, the interior will be redone, and outside there will be an SFPUC sewer project. Both projects for the SFMTA and SFPUC will occur at the same time. Right now, we have about two dozen people in the building who will move out as we exit COVID as they return to their normal offices. Construction will be done by DPW. All these projects should be completed by 2026. Keep an eye on this if you're in the neighborhood.

Item 5. Potrero Yard Project Updates

Bonnie Kean von Krogh: (Slide 9) We had an exciting end to the year; in November we went to the Policy and Governance Committee about next steps for the procurement process, and then received proposals from remaining developers at the end of the year. This month we are set to go back to the SFMTA board and looking forward to the spring and summer of 2022 key next steps in the procurement process are the selection of a proposer, executing the Pre-Development agreement and then construction of our temporary Muni Metro East (MME) Bus Yard.

(Slide 10) In terms of the end of last year, we ended it with a bang. The three short-listed developer teams submitted proposals. The Potrero Mission Community Partners, the Potrero Neighborhood Collective, and the Potrero Yard Community Partners all composed of different developers. You can always go back to our [website](#) for details on the teams. As we head into Spring 2022 we are approaching the selection of a preferred proposer and the execution of a Pre-Development Agreement (PDA). From that selection process, there is a bunch of documentation next steps which is known as the PDA. We should be done with the selection process in the spring of 2022, with a developer team selected. This is a confidential process, and I can't share anything more.

(Slide 11) We are tentatively scheduled to go to the SFMTA board on the PDA for Potrero Yard. This means that we are requesting the board to approve our PDA to form and to authorize our director Jeffrey Tumlin to execute that agreement with a proposer team. That piece comes after the conclusion of a lengthy process last year. We had a series of lengthy one-on-ones with the three proposer teams to help us develop the terms of the PDA. That agreement is to help govern the next year-and-a-half of the project. During the PDA process the developer team will

come up with a number of plans, everything from a project management delivery plan and a POETS plan — a public outreach and engagement plan, working closely with the SFMTA — so we can identify where we have opportunities for more engagement, and where we will determine how we can further solicit feedback. The public benefits of the project will be a place where the community can weigh in further. Only after the PDA is signed can the development team start pursuing funding possibilities for things like affordable housing. The PDA will govern site due diligence, schematic design for both the housing and bus yard components. The PDA's term sheet will help determine the outline for what the Project Agreement looks like.

A key part of this process will include the past Entitlement Process. The project has already gone through the draft EIR (DEIR) process. This next step will take those draft recommendations and assessments to move onto the final EIR process which will all determine the final CEQA clearance for the project. Rezoning will also be part of this. This project will have its own ordinance for height and bulk. The final EIR will have to be within the envelope of the DEIR. It can be smaller, but not larger. Design-build and facility maintenance contractor procurement also happens during this time.

(Slide 12) In terms of looking ahead for construction, we are building a new temporary bus yard, Muni Metro East (MME), which will be used for expansion of our fleet but will also be used as we reconstruct various yards. Potrero Yard being the first one. Our bus operations would move to MME while Potrero Yard is under construction. Before moving operations there, we must complete building MME. That will kick off this summer and run through early 2024. Potrero Yard construction would begin in 2024–2027. Any questions so far?

Claudia DeLarios Moran: Regarding the PDA (Slide 11), can you tell me more about what details are baked into bullet point number 3, the Housing development approach, schedule, feasibility, and pursuit of funding? My understanding is we still have the floor of affordable housing at 50% and the envelope is minimum 50%. I'd like to make sure this is independent of funding.

Bonnie Jean von Krogh: Yes, that's right, in the RFP it specifies minimum 50% up to 100% affordable housing.

Claudia DeLarios Moran: How is the percentage finally determined? What is the commitment of the development teams to pursue more than 50% affordable housing?

Jonathan Rewers: I am the acting financial officer of the SFMTA, but my "real job" is also the Building Progress program manager. The answer is that we will be going back and forth with the development teams. The housing component of the Potrero Yard is independently financed by the developer. There are two elements at play: one is the percentage of total units that are affordable, and the other is the total number of units. It is up to each developer to propose their plan. For example, one proposer might propose the floor of 50% affordable units, with a high total number of units in their proposal. While another might propose 100% affordable units, with fewer units overall. The financing packages, and different approaches to construction will also be elements in making that affordable percentage decision.

Peter Lauterborn asked if Claudia had any follow up questions or comments.

Claudia DeLarios Moran: This is the essential question for me. As we move through this process, who is overseeing this part of it and what are the kinds of conversations we are having with developers and how are we making sure we get the best deal for the neighborhood in terms of maintaining this part of the city as an affordable place to live.

Scott Feeney: You mentioned that the proposed building could be smaller than the draft EIR envelope. Are we anticipating that it would be smaller, and are we still shooting for the same number of units, which was 575 units?.

Bonnie Jean von Krogh: No. I am not saying it will be smaller. Sorry I was trying to suggest that the proposer can't exceed the envelope. We don't know what's been proposed as that's confidential. We specified the desire for 575 units in the RFP.

Scott Feeney: I have another question (Slide 12), as SFMTA shifts operations to MME and rebuilding other bus yards, is there the potential that if the SFMTA tries to expand service and their fleet that existing bus yards and MME will become bottlenecks?

Jonathan Rewers: The Potrero Yard Project is a part of the Modernization Program which was designed in parallel with the planned growth of the Muni fleets based on future expansions of service. The driving factor of the Potrero Yard schedule is for bus capacity to exist by the time it's required. Two elements are required for the new Potrero Yard. One is to have the capacity to store, maintain and charge the first full procurement of battery electric buses, and the other is to return the trolley coach fleet at MME back to Potrero Yard. The Potrero project and the following Modernization projects align with the projections to increase the Muni fleet.

Scott Feeney: What is the assumption approach, what would service be in 2027 as a percent of what it was in 2019?

Jonathan Rewers: We knew more about that before the pandemic than we do now. Generally, we assume a net 20% growth in overall Muni service. Closely following development projects across the city we will be tracking the eastern and southeast of the city as density increases. The infrastructure will not hold back the growth of service, what would hold back the growth of service would largely be if the agency can *pay* for that expanded service. This whole infrastructure program was meant to ensure infrastructure would not be a constraint.

Scott Feeney: So if the Potrero Yard is completed on time, there's going to be a lot of slack in the infrastructure capacity?

Jonathan Rewers: Every procurement that we've done since 2014 have been net expansions of the fleet. When we look at the next replacements, we might upsize vehicles, so the net number might be the same but the size of the vehicles would be larger. As an example, Potrero Yard allows for 60ft coaches. We will have the ability to do 60ft or 40ft battery electric buses depending on the need. With each new facility we are trying to build in redundancy to allow us to have any type of fleet. As an example, at our newest yard at Islais Creek, that facility can maintain a 40ft or a 60ft, which allows for flexibility in the future for us to expand service or add more vehicles.

Alexander Hirji: Is there any reason behind the prioritization of items for the PDA on slide 11?

Bonnie Jean von Krogh: The points could be bulleted, they are not listed in a chronological or prioritization order.

Alexander Hirji: Is there a risk of sinking during construction (Slide 12) with MME's settlement pattern? And the MME project being delayed?

Jonathan Rewers: On the four acres we have mitigated this issue, and there will have to be a lot of site remediation soil movement to continue addressing this issue. MME is designed so that we're going to store water and drainage on site to use for the on-site bus washer. Keeping it all self-contained. The one possible issue is the power requirement as we're adding storage for the trolley coaches. We're on the very edge for what the existing design allows for. As the existing site was meant for an expansion of the LRV trains on-site. We think we can make it work with the assistance of PG&E. That's the only minor risk we're concerned about. In the future as MME becomes a site for rail service, the issue you are talking about (site settlement) we might have to deal with.

Item 6. Transportation 2050–2022 Muni Reliability and Street Safety Bond

Jonathan Rewers: (Slide 13) This past summer the agency released Transportation 2050, which details how the agency can implement its vision and what financial resources would be required in the next 30 years. The first initiative out of Transportation 2050 is the proposed 2022 Muni Reliability and Street Safety Bond. It will go for a final vote to the Board of Supervisors tomorrow. Transportation 2050 is an update of two prior Transportation Task Forces.

(Slide 14) One asked for by Mayor Ed Lee in 2013, and another in 2018 to update the 2013 report. Both reports recommended that the SFMTA get two transportation General Obligation (GO) Bonds, of \$500M dollars each. The first was secured in November 2014 after the 2013 T2030 report after passing by 71% approval from San Francisco voters. The second was recommended and reaffirmed by the 2018 T2045 Report and will be voted on this June 2022.

(Slide 15) The focus of the bond up for vote is on three core areas based on extensive outreach. These areas are improvement of the transportation system and its core and key infrastructure, focusing on reliability instead of replacing the existing components of the system, and improving the safety of streets by promoting and advancing towards Vision Zero SF.

(Slide 16) When we looked and designed the program of the bond, there were three key elements. The first was project delivery. To advance delivery of projects, we will focus on projects that require cash flow and where that cash flow can be spent in 1-3 years, project concepts and initial planning are complete and technical resources are in place to deliver the project. As we don't want projects to be delayed as they have been in the past. Second, regarding General Obligation Bonds in the state of California, assets need to be good for 15 years or more. This means a focus on civil, heavy infrastructure. Lighter things, which have a shorter lifespan like streetlights and crosswalk painting are typically not allowed, but I will explain how we found a way to get some of these elements into this program. Lastly, with

regards to the bond program we looked at things that are hard to fund through state or federal sources or are not significantly funded through transportation sales tax which are critical.

Where are there gaps not funded by the San Francisco Transportation sales tax or the recent infrastructure bill. These are the improvements that San Francisco must self-fund.

That said, you'll see the overall funding here (slide 17). The largest chunk of money would go to the agency's bus yard and infrastructure projects (\$286M) as we can't use the two previously mentioned funding mechanisms. The amounts remaining (\$114M) would go towards street and transit infrastructure, in accordance with the 2014 GO Bond. (Slide 18) This would include streetlight & crossing infrastructure, corridor projects, and traffic calming projects intended to slow down people driving. More specifically, the \$286M is meant to support the electrification of our facilities for future fleets, additional upgrades to existing facilities, replacing maintenance bays, and supporting the expansion of the fleet through small projects like MME.

Technical issues caused the screen sharing to be paused. Questions were taken from the Working Group while the technical issue was being resolved.

Claudia DeLarios Moran: In reference to the PDA, what bullet does parking mitigation/community impact fall into? As a neighbor who already experiences difficulty finding parking in the neighborhood I wonder what are the plans to mitigate parking demand for the 575 units?

Jonathan Rewers: The only planned parking for vehicles outside of buses, are for non-revenue maintenance vehicles. We have started a TDM plan for the site, and we're awaiting the recommendations from that. It's likely that once we have the lead developer, one of the elements we'll have to determine is the urban design and we'll look at the surrounding blocks and attempt to develop a parking plan like the Woods Yard site and go the to the MTAB to legislate those changes

Roberto Hernandez: I want to address this bond issue. What has SFMTA done to get funding from the \$2.3 trillion bill that was passed by the House for infrastructure?

Jonathan Rewers: That's a great question, as that funding is already integrated into the bond programs overall, our region will receive a couple billion dollars. Much of that funding will be in the form of nationally competitive grants that the SFMTA has competed for in the past and will compete for again this round. These include the RAISE grant \$40-50 million a year, the Bus & Bus Facilities Grant which we've applied for in the past for about \$4-5 million. The Low or No Emission (Low-No) Grant Program which has increased in that bill by 1500% to support agencies across the US to convert to electric buses. We expect the formula funds within the region to go up maybe by 10-15 million dollars. Those dollars go to rail and overhead projects. We did heavy advocacy to get that Federal bill done. This bond is meant to leverage and enhance these sources. We're looking to pursue the Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA) for this project specifically. Although if we choose to federalize this project, we could delay the completion by one to two years because of the federal NEPA

process, etc. Which doesn't mean it's off the table, but it might be more expensive to delay it in pursuit of these federal grants.

Roberto Hernandez: I have seen a lot of delays. I don't have very much faith that a project of this magnitude will be completed in time.

Jonathan Rewers: I want this group to remember that in three years we have a draft EIR done, we got special legislation approved to do a public-private partnership, went through the full RFQ and got three amazing development teams and now we are in RFP. The speed of getting that done and while respectfully working with the community is pretty unusual for an MTA project. I am hoping that this track record of innovation and outstanding outreach continues to meet the schedule for this project.

Roberto Hernandez: For me the delay would be the construction. But we don't have to continue on this subject. The state of California has the biggest surplus in the history of California. The governor said that he would fund transportation, specifically green transportation. Is there an amount that will be given by the state to this project?

Jonathan Rewers: This project and all facilities projects have written a joint letter with all agencies across the region, and we participated in the last budget process with the state, and the current ask is that 75% of the state surplus dollars go to the state Transit Assistance Program which is a pass-through-by formula to all the local transit agencies. So we, the SFMTA, could spend it on operations & service or capital. The remainder of the 25% would go to the Transit Inner City Rail program. We're working on follow up legislation, and a trailer bill which would make the criteria for that program a little broader. Which could allow funding for the Kirkland Yard Project to allow for added capacity as the electric fleet grows. We are directly working with the state to get our facilities funded to meet the needs of San Francisco.

Peter Lauterborn: Thank you for that. Jonathan, could you continue with the presentation.

Jonathan Rewers: (Slide 19) This is the second of the transit funding categories. This includes Muni Forward projects such as dedicated lanes, boarding improvements, Transit Signal & Priority Upgrades, and Travel Time Reduction.

One of the key elements of modernizing our Muni Metro Network is replacement of the train control system. Which is estimated to be over \$500M. This is an example of a project where we can submit for federal and state funding. (Slide 20) On March 3 we will be submitting for a state grant, for \$140M that will fund major improvements on the Muni Metro. This \$10M from the city shows the local commitment to the project which can be leveraged.

(Slide 21) On the streetside, we should replace our traffic signals every 30 years, and we are currently on a 60-year replacement cycle. We do not have the technology to be able to control all our traffic signals from our traffic management center. This \$42M allotment is to help us catch up and allow us to put in the technology to expand pedestrian countdowns, add audible signals and other improvements (CPS, APS, Curb to Curb) at complete intersections.

(Slide 22) The second \$42M is for major corridors, this is where we're going to do major improvements along numerous streets like Potrero Street which is now complete with signal improvements, bike lanes and curb improvements. These dollars will help us leverage several grants from the state from the Active Transportation Program and a future Vision Zero program that has not been defined by the USDOT but we are working on, showing San Francisco's local commitment to these projects will help us bring in those significant state and federal dollars.

(Slide 23) Lastly is \$30M for the Speed Management Program. There is a significant component that includes improvements to the High Injury Network intersections we want to complete by the 2024 deadline. In alignment with Vision Zero SF. These would largely be quick build improvements and speed reduction improvements. Although the average age of the improvements on these bonds needs to be 15 years, because we have our facilities as assets with a useful life of 75 to 100 years, this means we can add a component of improvements that are less than 15 years – like smaller, lighter projects like these. This \$30M should be enough to complete improvements along the High Injury Network in the quick-build style.

Bonnie Jean von Krogh: (Slide 24) Overall, the gist of this next slide is that the \$400M Muni Reliability and Street Safety Bond is within the city's overall bond program. You may have seen earthquake and safety bonds, parks bonds — this is a transportation bond. You see the average cost on this slide and should understand that the city has a current debt management policy for their overall bond program. The Muni Reliability bond is a part of that, and the policy is to keep the property tax rate for City general obligation bonds at or below the 2006 rate. That means that new bonds only get issued when old bonds are retired.

Then finally (Slide 25), you can see in this overall list that this bond is just one piece of the overall funding puzzle that SFMTA is working with. The Board of Supervisors is debating putting this bond on the ballot tomorrow. As Jonathan said, federal grants and state grants are also a key part of our program, as well as looking at what we can do in the future that addresses the SFMTA's overall needs. These are all things that the Transportation 2050 team is considering.

In Chat – Jolene Yee: Regarding residential parking permits (RPP), my understanding is that the residential parking program is expanding in our neighborhood to include many of the streets.

Bonnie Jean von Krogh: I don't know but I can certainly find out.

Jolene Yee: My understanding is that right now there is a plan going around to expand it and it looks like it includes streets around this project. What I've heard from people in other large buildings is that they are not actually granted street parking permits, like the W permit. It might be something to share with residents if there is a concern about parking availability.

Bonnie Jean von Krogh: I will investigate it and loop back.

J.R Eppler: I think having RPP folks come in to talk about the plan as part of this project is going to be important. My question is about traffic particularly along the High Injury Network, as my understanding is that the current definition of the high injury network is tied to out-of-date information. What are the plans to update it?. I only ask because roadways and traffic use

patterns in our neck of the woods have changed dramatically over the last six or so years. It seems to follow that conflicts between cars and pedestrians have also changed.

Jonathan Rewers: That's a great question. We work with the Department of Public Health using traffic related injury and fatality data. Then the network is updated depending on the frequency of incidents by intersection or corridor. You are right that it's not perfect as it's always based on older data. It takes a long period of time either for the Police Department and/or the CHP to report this data. You're not wrong that the nature of streets and their use can change over that time. It's always been an issue the MTA has been dealing with.

It doesn't mean that if we get a request that we still won't do separate requests and traffic analysis through the regular Traffic Calming program. You are not wrong that the nature of streets change. We update the network every two or so years based on the data we have. The methodology of the network is in the Vision Zero SF Action Strategy released a couple of months ago.

J.R Eppler: The regular Traffic Calming process is frustrating for neighborhoods experiencing large amounts of growth as the improvements are not nearly comprehensive enough for traffic mitigation.

Alex Harker: I know at one point Daniel Sheeter (former SFMTA employee) gave a presentation on bicycling along 17th street. I wonder if that was baked into this process.

Jonathan Rewers: Yes, that is a pre-existing condition that was assumed in the RFP. This will develop more once we get into the design and the nature of the streets around the project with the lead developer.

In Chat - Bonnie Jean von Krogh: Here is the latest Vision Zero Action Strategy:
https://www.sfmta.com/sites/default/files/reports-and-documents/2021/11/vzsf_as_111021_spreads-final.pdf

Item 7. PYNWG Meeting Calendar & Logistics

Bonnie Jean von Krogh: (Slide 26) It's our first meeting of 2022, so let's map out our meetings for the rest of the year. We've mapped out what meetings would potentially look like. Would this group like to stay with that? We did get feedback from someone who can't meet Monday or Tuesdays. I wanted to ensure the current trend of meetings is working for most people. As I mentioned, the procurement process is ongoing through Spring. It may be that the group would like to move to every other month. We won't have really large updates on the project itself until the developer team has been selected. I also wanted to get a sense if people would prefer to go back to in-person once it is safe to do so, or try a hybrid format?

Jolene Yee: I prefer virtual, it makes it easy with family and schedules. When would the procurement process be over?

Bonnie Jean von Krogh: It's going on through the Spring. It may be done by the May meeting.

Roberto Hernandez: Is anyone from our Working Group going to be a part of the procurement process?

Bonnie Jean von Krogh: The Working Group had a lot of input into the RFP itself. We integrated questions from the Working Group into the RFP, and this group had heavy input on certain elements of it, like the housing element. I believe it was discussed that the Working Group would not have a representative on the panel. So now that we are in the procurement process the Working Group does not have representation in this piece of it since it is a confidential process.

Alex Harker: In addition to working on the RFP, I know that we developed questions to ask the developers during the selection process. Did we hear back?

Bonnie Jean von Krogh: Yes, so those questions went into the RFP and they must respond to those questions as part of their submission. Once the selection process has concluded, then you will be able to see their responses.

Alex Harker: But only after one of them has been selected?

Bonnie Jean von Krogh: Yes, the process is confidential until its conclusion and then it will be public information.

Scott Feeney: If it's safe in terms of COVID, I would prefer to meet in-person. Having been a part of these meetings both virtual and in-person I found that when we were in-person we talk more openly, people are more focused, and we move faster. No time spent on tech glitches. So by moving faster and being more focused we could give people more of their time back.

Magda Freitas: This is about the questions that I submitted during the draft EIR process, where can these be found?

Kerstin Magary: The draft EIR questions are all published by the Planning Department, and so they should all be available online ([website](#)). The Final EIR will be done after the selection of a proposed developer. It's all online under 2500 Mariposa Street.

Bonnie Jean von Krogh: Magda I can pass on a contact, so you don't have to search for it.

Claudia Delarios Moran: Once we secure a developer, do we get a say in the composition of the workforce hired for the construction of the bus yard? Is there a possibility of hiring people/companies from the neighborhood, or companies owned by minority individuals?

Kerstin Magary: There will have to be a workforce development plan proposed by the lead developer and the SFMTA and Public Works will review that. There are requirements within the RFP detailing how that should be done.

Claudia Delarios Moran: Are those standard City policies or is that something the Working Group has a say in?

Kerstin Magary: We can send you that section of the RFP.

Item 8. Next Steps

Bonnie Jean von Krogh: Regarding topics for future meetings, one of the things we touched on today was upcoming construction for MME and 1399 Marin which is where the heavy duty maintenance would happen when Potrero is under construction. As we approach that, we can further detail what that will look like in future meetings. If we do go to the SFMTA Board on the PDA, we can report back on takeaways. If there are other topics that you would like us to address in future meetings, like the Residential Parking Program, please let us know.

Jolene Yee: Can we come to a consensus on future meetings, and frequency of meetings? Do people feel like we should meet every month?

Bonnie Jean von Krogh: (back to slide 26) We would love some guidance from you on that. The sense from conversations before was that when input was needed you wanted to engage regularly but when there weren't items to discuss we would pause. Does the idea of meeting depending on the need resonate?

Alex Harker: It seems that between now and when the developer is selected that monthly meetings are not needed.

Scott Feeney: I am generally in agreement. Unless there is something specific that you all really need our input on.

Jolene Yee: I agree. To the degree that we should meet if something arises that we are able to discuss during the procurement process, that isn't confidential, then I'd be happy to weigh in on that.

Peter Lauterborn: I am hearing we have a plurality saying that meeting less often, still virtual, with the option of increasing frequency as things pick up again. Does anyone object? So yes, we have a working consensus for now to pause meetings until developments arise.

Bonnie Jean von Krogh: Thank you for your comments in chat. Yes, during this time we would continue to send updates to the group via email.

Item 8. Public Comment

Peter Lauterborn asked for public comments. There were no call-in audience members. With no additional public comments, Peter concluded the meeting.