

Port of Oakland
“Seaport Air Quality 2020 and Beyond Plan”
Task Force Meeting
Wednesday, September 26, 2018
10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.
Water Front Hotel – Spinnaker I Room
10 Washington St., Jack London Square, Oakland

Summary Meeting Notes

This summary is organized to initially highlight any key recommendations, agreements and action steps, followed by a summary of meeting activities and description of the meeting process. The agenda and list of attendees is attached to the back of these notes.

Meeting Objectives:

- Review and receive updates on public comments, potential responses and schedule of the Port of Oakland’s *Seaport Air Quality 2020 and Beyond Plan*.
- Participate in stakeholder engagement process.
- Share and participate in discussions regarding specific industry strategies and stakeholder interests as we all collaboratively move forward on a pathway to zero emissions.

Meeting Highlights and Action Items:

- The presentation and discussion of equity as a part of contemporary policy and planning showed a correlation between the air quality of the surrounding area and the impacts on the local community.
- There is a triple bottom line consideration associated with the implementing actions of the Plan. The actions and the costs should reflect equity, economy and environmental benefits.
- At the time of the meeting, stakeholders representing 14 different individuals and / or organizations had submitted letters or emails regarding the Draft Seaport Air Quality 2020 and Beyond Plan. The comments covered 6 key topic areas. These topic areas were reviewed at this meeting.
- The industry sector – specifically Port tenants and shipping operators -- while often in the room have been the “quiet voice” in the discussion of the 2020 and Beyond Plan. At this meeting, a special panel allowed for representatives of industry to share their opinions and perspectives regarding clean air technology and the developing zero emissions plans and policies.
- **Action Item:** Additional individuals and entities will be invited to the Task Force meeting, and others who are already invited from needed sectors will be strongly encouraged to be attend. These include Alameda County Transportation Commission (ACTC), City of Oakland Department of Transportation, PG&E, Caltrans and other groups and agencies.
- **Action Item:** Surlene working with Matthew Davis, Port’s Director of Governmental Affairs, and the Co-Chairs will prepare a letter to ACTC on behalf of the Task Force requesting information and continued updates on the GoPort program which includes the 7th Street Grade Separation project and the Freight Intelligent Transportation System (FITS) project. A similar letter will be sent to Caltrans.

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

I. Call to Order and Instructions

Agenda Review

- Surlene Grant (SG) went over logistics, meeting goals and the agenda.
- Co-chairs and alternates present were introduced:
 - Jack Broadbent and Greg Nudd, Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD)
 - Andy Garcia, GSC Logistics
 - Brian Beveridge and Ms. Margaret Gordon, West Oakland Environmental Indicators Project (WOEIP)

Surlene announced that both Chris Lytle and John Driscoll with the Port of Oakland could not be present because of schedule conflicts. However, Ms. Delphine Prevost was present as their representative. In addition, a number of other Port of Oakland staff members attended the meeting.

II. Meeting Purpose and Framework

- Brian Beveridge gave background about this specific Task Force meeting. He acknowledged Surlene’s work with the group.
- Brian highlighted questions of “why, how and what.”
 - *Why?*
 - The nearby community is heavily impacted by emissions from the Goods Movement and other industrial activities – this includes a trucking industry that does “not have a home”, and an expanding port.
 - Also, the global problem of climate change.
 - Not just one group or person’s problem, we’re all in it together.
 - *How?*
 - Not so much a technical question, more of a strategic one.
 - 85% emission reduction is a fine goal, but now the goal is zero -- or near-zero – emissions.
 - A significant move away from carbon-based energy.
 - Need to figure out the technology to get there.
 - Moving away from combustion-based energy is a long cycle of history to change – we need to do that in a pretty quick turnaround, but no one expects that to happen by 2050.
 - *What?*
 - The question is not just about “who will do it?” The question needs to be framed as “what can I do?” Whom can I talk to? Does everyone in my office – on my bowling team, all my interactions – understand what needs to happen? Is this in my organization’s strategic plan? What can my institution do in the coming year or in the next five years of planning and budgeting?

- Don't think of this as a demand from one sector to another, not as "an anti-anything", but as a "pro-humanity".
- He closed by thanking everyone for attending.

EQUITY DISCUSSION

III. Presentation of Equity in the context of the work with Air Quality and West Oakland

- Ms. Margaret Gordon introduced Darlene Flynn, Director of the Office of Race and Equity, City of Oakland

Darlene Flynn explained and shared a presentation of how the equity impacts policy discussions and decisions. Equity or the lack thereof, ultimately contributes to lower living standards for some communities. Specifically, she explained how in Oakland equity indicators are very poor for air quality and asthma. The presentation is available at

<https://www.portoakland.com/community/environmental-stewardship/maritime-air-quality-improvement-plan/>

- Darlene Flynn:
 - Came from Seattle, WA which has been working on equity for 10 years.
 - Lots of people working hard on change in Oakland for many years.
 - However, we have not erased the disparities that are rooted in the history of the country and the history of Oakland.
 - Much of the history is what we made up as our own stories, rationalizations; they are not grounded in reality.
 - Started with quantity (diversity), moved to quality (inclusion) (and we have more to do in that area), now need to work on justice (equity).
 - Working assumptions:
 - Race matters.
 - Disparities were intentionally created (e.g., red-lining of real estate) and are now maintained inadvertently by systemic policies and practices that create barriers to opportunity.
 - Need to close equity gaps through intentional focus on race.
 - If opportunities are equitable, then equitable results will follow.
 - Given right message, analysis and tools, people will work toward racial equity (and it doesn't have to be everybody).
 - This work to establish Equity requires a Systems approach
 - Not our fault that society got like this, but we now have an opportunity to write a new page.
- Asthma rates in Oakland –
 - The situation is not getting better –particularly for black people. If we remove barriers for black people, it helps remove barriers for all people; the improvements will make it better for everyone. She illustrated the point by explaining how curb cuts were

designed specifically for people with mobility challenges, but everyone in the room has used and benefitted from the curb cuts.

- She emphasized that a goal of the 2020 and Beyond plan should be healthy thriving communities. Achieving a zero emissions Seaport is just **one** strategy to help reach that goal.
- Equality versus equity –
 - The goal needs to be equity rather than just equality because some people need additional support. Using her illustration, she explained how equity is more than making sure everyone has equal set of “boxes” or tools.
 - Band-aid vs. preventing the wound.
- Designing action for equitable outcomes –
 - There are steps to take.
 - 1) Name the desired future condition, 2) do research, 3) work with impacted community, 4) design approaches with rigorous performance measures, repeat steps 2-5 as needed.

Questions and Answers to Darlene Flynn’s presentation followed.

- ✓ *How do you envision what you are talking about vis-à-vis what we are doing?*
 - I think you’re doing it! Make sure you understand the context and other drivers, even if you are only working on one piece, use data and work deeply with community, create partnerships. Think systemically. Focus on the result you want.
- ✓ *A lot of business plans don’t see the value of putting this logic into practice.*
 - Yes, that’s why it’s a struggle. But more and more organizations are getting there.
 - Organizations need to include the social benefit of equity in their cost. They need to include what the cost is to society for their product or service.
 - PolicyLink has done some good studies showing that thriving communities are good for business.
- ✓ *Brian – The last chart (in the PowerPoint presentation) may look different to many in this room. However, if the words could be the words and vocabulary used in the realm of capital acquisition and growth, then business and industry may see themselves in the discussion. Need to include equity language in the language of capital – inequity is a barrier to capital growth.*
- ✓ *Surlene summarized the presentation by restating an earlier statement of Darlene Flynn’s: “We don’t have to think alike, we just need to figure out how to do the correct thing.”*

CURRENT PLANNING - PORT AIR QUALITY AND OTHER PLANS

IV. Discussion: “Planning for Zero Emissions”

Overview of Task Force and Co-Chair meetings

Greg Nudd shared with the group a review of the last meeting and what happened that led to the consensus of working toward zero emissions (ZE)

- Under AB 617, CARB and the BAAQMD looked at communities that had sensitive populations. They looked specifically at communities that are exposed to high level of air pollution. If you look at a map of the West Oakland area and overlay it on Darlene’s redlining map, it’s essentially the same map. The maps show some of the most impacted communities and underserved areas.
- Last time we all met we made the commitment to go to zero emissions -that was important.
- Now, we need to figure out how to get there, and there are some things we should start doing now.
- We need specific commitments from the Port to put into our AB 617 plan.

Updates on other plans that are relevant to the Seaport Plan

AB671

Ms. Margaret Gordon provided an update on the AB 617 planning process and the Community Steering Committee. Standing meetings – first Wed of the month at West Oakland Senior Center

- Timeline goes to March 2019
- Plan proposes to specifics on how to reduce emissions as well as go to zero emissions
- West Oakland first community to be chosen by the State of California to do a Community Action Plan
- Call office with questions

Truck Management Plan

Patricia McGowan, City of Oakland planner, provided an update and presentation on the joint City of Oakland- Port of Oakland West Oakland Truck Management Plan (TMP).

The TMP presentation can be found here:

<https://www.portofoakland.com/community/environmental-stewardship/maritime-air-quality-improvement-plan/>

- Addresses truck circulation and truck parking in West Oakland
- The TMP looks at better signs/enforcement, parking restrictions, enforcement, truck movement and safety
- Want truck operations to be less disruptive and for the drivers to know where they can and cannot go
- Draft recommendations presented in July 2018 at a public community meeting
 - The Draft TMP Plan will be presented in 6 weeks, and there will be a public review in winter 2018/2019. (The end of Public Review for TMP is January 4, 2019.)

V. Questions / Comments

- ✓ *Regarding communications, what have you learned about how truckers learn/communicate?*
 - The drivers have communication with licensed motor carriers.
 - Good communication system among themselves.
 - Looking at a clear portal on Port's and City's websites, better maps of trucking routes.
- ✓ *Bill Aboudi – different levels of communication among primary motor carriers (PMCs)– some are good at communication, some do not seem to care. As a truck supporting business, we do our best, but hope the Port will listen to the trucking community. Not just about racism, about power and class.*
- ✓ *Where are resources to implement the TMP coming from?*
 - City and Port will put in money, and they will ask for some grant money; Caltrans will help with signs
 - Significantly more funding is ultimately needed than what is available now.
- ✓ *Margaret Gordon - Which office in the City will be responsible for the implementation of the plan?*
 - Yet to be determined – probably either City Administrator's Office or the Planning Department.
- ✓ *Is the new City Department of Transportation (OakDOT)focusing on this?*
 - Yes, but they still trying to find their role. Will work with OakDOT on parking.
- ✓ *Andy Garcia - Anytime a driver gets a citation it goes against the record of the licensed motor carrier and affects the rankings – so they have an incentive to comply with laws and community guidelines.*
- ✓ *Jack Broadbent – as you look for resources, consider the Air District as well.*

During this part of the morning, Surlene asked participants to introduce themselves. Because of the absence of Co-Chairs Chris Lytle, Executive Director, and John Driscoll, Maritime Director, she asked the Port of Oakland staff to identify themselves first so that everyone could see that the Port was clearly represented. Following the Port staff introductions, everyone else introduced themselves. Approximately 58 people were present. Notably absent and desired for future meetings are representatives from Caltrans, PG&E, Alameda County Transportation Commission (ACTC), and City of Oakland Department of Transportation. (PG&E has attended prior meetings.)

SEAPORT AIR QUALITY 2020 AND BEYOND PLAN

VI. Seaport Air Quality 2020 and Beyond Plan: Comments and Responses to Draft Plan

Richard Sinkoff, Director of Environmental Programs and Planning, provided an update and overview of the “2020 and Beyond Plan”.

The presentation can be found at

<https://www.portofoakland.com/community/environmental-stewardship/maritime-air-quality-improvement-plan/>

- In the plan development process now are the following appendices:
 - Workforce development component
 - Assessing cost of implementation
 - Resource analysis – staff and consultant support the Port needs to implement the Plan
 - Public Engagement Plan – Today is the 4th Task Force meeting. The Task Force meetings are just one component of the overall public engagement. There will be additional points of interaction and additional Task Force meetings in the near future.
 - The Draft 2020 and Beyond Plan will be revised based on comments received.
- Implementation phases
 - Near-term (2018-2023)
 - Intermediate (2023-2030)
 - Longer term (2030-2050)
- Managing comments in this phase. Comments are categorized and will be evaluated in context of the Draft Plan. The comments will be posted online. There will be more opportunities for engagement.
- Richard reviewed the comment categories and the general tone of the comments received.
 - Near-zero or zero emissions
 - Support for goal, understanding that it is ambitious.
 - Targets and goals
 - Want to see more specificity.
 - Potential response: enhance Near-Term Action Plan (NTAP) with programmed (time-bound) actions.
 - Community health risk/AB617
 - Include community health risk in evaluation criteria.
 - Align Plan with AB 617.
 - Include 2009 BAAMD Truck Survey contribution to community health risk.
 - Potential response – focus on ZE cargo-handling equipment and short haul trucks to benefit the community and reduce community health risk. Also, more of the technology is closer to being more commercially available.
 - Commercial availability of technology
 - Some say ZE tech not commercially available, others say that ZE innovations are more advanced than portrayed.
 - Potential response: availability and financial feasibility are directly related; as technology matures costs come down– Port is doing some grant-funded projects to NZE and ZE tech.
 - Financial feasibility and funding
 - Some said plan is cost-prohibitive.
 - Potential response – cost and resource studies underway, also pursuing grant funding.

- Stakeholder engagement
 - What role will stakeholders play in process?
 - Potential response – continued involvement through Task Force, technical advisory committee to screen Implementing Actions.
 - Document Review
 - Request for review of response to comments, etc.
 - Potential response – will provide Revised Draft for review, and will provide written response to comments.
- Richard also presented a detailed slide of projects underway [DETAILED IN SLIDE]
 - Richard shared there will be a Seaport Electrical Infrastructure study starting soon
 - Next Steps [DETAILED IN SLIDE]

Questions and Comments

- ✓ *Will the Port expand the 2017 inventory to include polluters that start at the Port but end at another location?*
 - I’m not sure if we are going to expand the domain of the 2017 inventory, but we are planning to do updates of the inventory.
 - ✓ *Regarding the FITS (Freight Intelligent Transportation System) project – more information is needed. We have not heard about it.*
 - Talking to trucking groups.
 - On the ACTC website, but there needs to be in better communication with truckers.
 - ✓ *Ms. Margaret Gordon - What is the FITS communication loop here? What are the impacts on West Oakland? We need to understand the project’s value and the mitigation of the construction of the project.*
 - ✓ *Brian Beveridge – He mentioned this project to City of Oakland’s new DOT Director and was informed that the Director did not have any information either. For a project like this, “with \$250 million of concrete dropped into the middle of the City,” we all need to be informed and be at the table.*
- ✚ **Action Item: Surlene suggested writing a letter to ACTC on behalf of the Task Force requesting information on the GoPort program – which includes the 7th Street Grade Separation project and the Freight Intelligent Transportation System (FITS) project. The FITS project applies intelligent transportation systems along West Grand Avenue, Maritime Street, 7th Street, and Middle Harbor Road to manage Port truck traffic. Ms. Margaret Gordon recommended doing the same with a letter to Caltrans. There was general consensus in the room for such correspondence.**

LUNCH

- VII. Round Table Discussions:** *Agenda Items VII and VIII were combined*
- VIII.**

In order to manage time, and respond to participants’ interest of staying with one group discussion, following lunch there was only one segment of round table discussions and

dialogue. The purpose of the table top discussions was to encourage a more detailed discussion of each comment topic area. Participants were asked to self-select the table topic of interest to them.

The topics reflected components of the Draft 2020 and Beyond Plan. There were 6 tables in the room at which the conversations explore 4 different topic areas. The tables were managed by a subject matter leader from the Port. While there were initial guiding questions, the conversations were free-flowing.

The following summarizes the information shared during the report-out. The total summary of notes from all table conversations has been retained by the Port and will be considered in the preparation of the final draft of the 2020 and Beyond Report.

Summation and Reports

- Targets and Goals
 - How to use newer and cheaper measurement and sensor technology.
 - Looking at ways to increase training and awareness to eliminate roadblocks.
 - Important to have communication with equipment owners, vessel operators, terminal operators as part of goal-setting.
 - Helpful to establish interim equipment turnover targets?
 - Need to be aware of what a strong or weak target represents to original equipment manufacturers.
- Commercial Availability of Technology
 - People interested in Zero and Near Zero Freight Facilities (ZANZEFF) grant - really important to have reporting and measurement as part of the grant.
 - Quick charging versus increased demand fees.
- Financial Feasibility and Funding
 - Re: pilot grants – can we establish dates certain for these grants so that terminal operators can better plan their equipment purchases in order to amortize ~~fund~~ funding costs? And if relying on public grants, will the money be there in time, and will the money be there at all in a competitive environment?
- Stakeholder Engagement: Review of Implementing Actions
 - Needed to expand the tent a little more
 - Mayor, City Administrator’s office, City DOT, CalTrans, bulk terminal operators, and Prologis, given that they are doing development
 - Clear understanding of metrics and goals – what is the model we are using as our baseline?
 - Interest in making sure larger community knows what we are doing
 - Using existing forums
 - What is each industry’s plan when it comes to this work?

GUIDING PRINCIPLE – INFORMATION SHARING

IX. Industry Panel: Dialogue and Discussion

Moderator: Andy Garcia, Co-Chair, and Chairman and Exec VP, GSC Logistics

- The purpose of the panel is to hear thoughts from different industry representatives regarding the move toward ZE.
- What we are seeking is participation, not just attendance – this is a joint effort.
- Andy Garcia (AG) introduced panelists:
 - Bryan Brandes (BB), *Director*, West Coast Operations, CMA CGM
 - Kevin Bulger (KB), *Chief Operating Officer*, Apex Maritime Co., Inc.
 - Thomas Jelenic (TJ), *Vice President*, Pacific Merchant Shipping Association
 - Chris Shimoda (CS), *Vice President*, California Trucking Association

How do you view the overall pathway to ZE?

- BB: Targets are good, but they have to be achievable
 - need to allow for near-zero if there are no zero options.
- KB: Need to take into account how we are to compete with our competition (and competition includes all of the West Coast and even the East Coast) - don't want to push it so far that we go over edge
 - Need to make sure equipment is there for our drivers. For example, it is not just enough to have clean trucks – need to make sure they are affordable for drivers.
- AG: Drayage industry relies on independent contractor model – primarily conducted by one man, one truck, one company.
- TJ: ZE is not possible now, because the technology is not there. But it will be there. In Long Beach equipment owners are already bypassing opportunities to put in cleaner equipment. Folks are hanging on to older equipment because they are worried that the State will add new requirements and they won't be able to get the value from the investment in new equipment now. Need to look at what's available today. Equipment already incredibly clean. We cast aside what we have today and instead focus on pot of gold at end of the rainbow that we call zero emissions.
- AG: With the drayage industry, the work force is 98% first-generation immigrants - supports equity efforts.
- CS: Agree with what's been said already. ZE target of Port consistent with overall message we're getting.
 - But not a single commercially available technology now.
 - If the doctor wants to you lose 100 pounds, you don't worry about the 100 pounds, you worry about the first pound.
- AG: Price flexibility is not infinite– if you offer a customer a price that's too high, they'll look for another alternative. For example, customers will look for another port.

Funding: Identify key financial issues facing your company?

- BB: Already aiming toward 80% compliance. And implementing other things – scrubbers, Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG).
- KB: Customer for the most part is still price-driven, probably not looking at the asthma rates
 - But prices have been going up – and if customers have nowhere else to go, they will pay for it.
- TJ: Funding issue a big challenge – we don’t know what the costs are because the technology doesn’t exist
 - And automation comes at a cost to the community.
- CS: Agrees with Tom – tough to say what ultimate business model will look like. Need a commercialized product that will eventually be able to compete without government subsidy in the long term.
- AG: Executives of other ports (Charleston, Savannah, Virginia, Miami, etc.) are not interested in a clean truck program. That is the type of competitive environment we in California are facing. It’s not a level playing field.

Technology Pathway—

The Draft 2020 and Beyond plan provides flexibility for other technological options (e.g., hydrogen-fuel cell powered equipment) to provide power for zero-emissions operations. From your perspective as an equipment owner or operator or industry representative, how do you see the issue of technological choice?

- BB: Sees hydrogen-fueled technology as near zero, not ZE – likes choice
 - Reminder- electric trucks expensive not only to purchase, but to maintain.
 - Critical that we have options.
- KB: Need to look at not only the asset but infrastructure – e.g., in L.A , he has a warehouse and a yard – so he would have to upgrade his warehouse to have plugs for the trucks.
- AG: Infrastructure issue is extremely critical.
- TJ: Concerned that there aren’t really options now. So, there will be delayed investment because people don’t know what to do or expect. By not focusing on next step until a quantum leap, we have eliminated options
- CS: Will see a lot of different actions being taken.

Cost Savings: would you be interested in purchasing ZE equipment? Over what time period do you need to see a return on investment (ROI)?

- BB: If tech not available for a ZE truck, will be awhile before a ZE vessel is out there. Need to look at whole package for ZE, including maintenance and labor.
- KB: ROI time period – needs to be immediate.
- TJ: ROI often ignores carrying costs of capital.
- CS: Difficult to know cost recovery time period, but usually a 12 to 24-month payback.
- AG: Recently lost a customer to the Port of Seattle because the customer was informed of what was only a potential clean truck program to be initiated. Customer became concerned and moved the business.

X. Questions and Answers

No time remained for questions of the panelists from the participants. Surlene asked panelists to remain a few moments after the meeting to respond to any questions one-on-one.

However, as part of the Co-Chairs' closing remarks, Brian Beveridge asked a couple of questions that captured the interest of many, so many people stayed an additional few moments to hear the responses (see below).

XI. Closing Remarks

Next Steps

- ✚ Letter to ACTC from this Task Force asking for more info and robust engagement on 7th Street Grade Separation Project and FITS project
- ✚ Ms. Margaret Gordon – wants the request to extend beyond just having an information meeting. She would like to know more about the structure or plan for robust engagement.
- ✚ Bill Aboudi – requested that the response from the letter be shared back with this group.
- ✚ Next meeting: a review of the plan
- ✚ Sometime in the spring, infrastructure update
- ✚ Workforce study will be presented for review

Co-chairs:

Brian Beveridge: thanked everyone

- need PG&E to be a consistent member of group and participant in these discussions; also, someone from ACTC should be here.
- Appreciated the industry representatives being brave to get up there.
- **Question for industry – in your minds, what role does regulation play in nudging the ball forward to new technologies?**
 - TJ: Regulation hugely important statewide and even better, national. Costs shouldn't be borne by a single industry (or a single port). There is a need for a level playing field.
 - CS: Every single technology that has ever been developed has gone through regulation process – we aren't doing it that way now, but we should.
 - AG: I would wish that clean energy action program, etc. was a national program.
- **Question -- We just put a lot of money into Oakland Trade and Logistics Center, which includes a new rail assembly yard and is supposed to make the Port more competitive- how does rail pricing fit into competitive pricing for this port? Is rail the "big fix?"**
 - It's complicated –a lot of times the contract is with the shipper, so even if container is moving by rail (in Prince Rupert, Seattle, Oakland, L.A. etc., the railroad didn't sign that contract to move it
 - We were told that Northern CA suffers from higher rail rates than SoCal-so should we invest in rail?

- The time it takes to send a container from Oakland to Chicago on a train is not that different than from L.A. and Long Beach. However, what makes LA and Long Beach more desirable is that they have “on-dock rail” where container is taken off the ship and placed directly on the train. This makes LA and Long Beach more competitive.
- Appreciates the commitment in this room. We know it’s not going to be simple. We will all work on this together

Ms. Margaret Gordon: When are we going to work closely and in sync on these issues?

- Specifically, when we talk about health and equity, we are not even close to work together.

Andy Garcia: We [industry panel] didn’t come here to cry the blues. Trying to present the issues that we face every day. Many of the people who make decisions for these companies are far away from here and from these meetings. But the industry has changed its attitude. The degree of responsibility has risen. More willing to participate, to engage. You are the best.

Michael Murphy (on behalf of the BAAQMD Co-Chairs): We really appreciate the representatives from industry getting up there. Appreciate the Port’s taking and analyzing the comments. Appreciate that another round of review is planned.

Delphine Prevost (on behalf of the Port of Oakland Co-Chairs): Good movement is a very complex system. The Port itself is a part of the system. I am glad that our tenants and customers were able to be here today and speak in their own voices. Having said that, we too are doing our part in the supply chain, but it isn’t going to be easy. Regarding rail, and Brian’s question, it is possible to be more competitive, but it takes time. At the end of the day, we’re trying to grow revenues, because if we don’t have the funds, we won’t be able to support the initiatives we want to see. And we need our tenants to be on board. But we’re working on it. Thanks for your time, your effort, and your positivity.

Meeting adjourned at 2:13 p.m.