

SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA WATER EMERGENCY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

(March 12, 2020)

The Board of Directors of the San Francisco Bay Area Water Emergency Transportation Authority met in regular session at Pier 1, Port of San Francisco.

1. CALL TO ORDER – BOARD CHAIR

Chair James Wunderman called the meeting to order at 1:01 p.m. and welcomed guests.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE/ROLL CALL

Chair Wunderman, Director Anthony Intintoli and Director Jeffrey DelBono were in attendance.

3. REPORT OF BOARD CHAIR

Chair Wunderman explained that the open forum public comments workshop that had been planned to immediately follow the meeting had been canceled as a result of recent health orders banning large public gatherings in order to reduce the spread of COVID-19. Chair Wunderman said there was still opportunity for the public to address the Board to share comments and ideas on non-agendized items at the end of the regular Board meeting and that the public workshop would be rescheduled to a later date. He added that plans to hold WETA Board meetings in cities other than San Francisco to widen regional dialogue and participation would also be temporarily postponed and reiterated that this would remain an important objective once the COVID-19 disruptions had subsided.

Chair Wunderman said staff would be reviewing recent changes to the Brown Act public meeting requirements to identify options for holding upcoming WETA Board meetings in a way that would not require all Directors to be physically present consistent with the evolving public health orders. He emphasized that the Board's objectives were to ensure public participation while also protecting public health.

Chair Wunderman thanked Bobby Winston of Bay Crossings for throwing a really nice and well attended event to celebrate the twentieth anniversary of *Bay Crossings* and his appointment as the Chair of the WETA Board of Directors. He said the event took place on the waterfront on a beautiful evening and appreciated the attendance of the many event guests who were so committed and passionate about Bay Area water transit including Assemblymembers David Chiu and Rob Bonta and a host of other local leaders at the event who lauded WETA for its efforts and continuing plans to build a robust water transportation system for the Bay Area.

4. REPORTS OF DIRECTORS

Director Intintoli echoed the comments of the Chair about the *Bay Crossings* celebration event which he had also attended.

5. REPORTS OF STAFF

Executive Director Nina Rannells provided her written report to Directors and welcomed questions. She said WETA had implemented some new cleaning directives to Blue & Gold Fleet crews and cleaning teams in efforts to address the COVID-19 virus and assure vessels were as safe and clean as possible for riders. She explained that general cleaning had been increased on the vessels after

every reverse trip, with regular disinfection of all frequently touched surfaces and a full cleaning every 24 hours. In addition, she noted, all vessels were being fogged with disinfectant twice weekly. Ms. Rannells added that hand sanitizer was on board all vessels for passenger use and that all of these increased measures had been communicated to WETA riders in messaging.

Chair Wunderman thanked Ms. Rannells, staff and the Blue & Gold Fleet for the extra diligence to help keep the public safe while riding WETA vessels.

Ms. Rannells said there had been a 28% decline in ridership this week as expected with many Bay Area employers' recent directives that their employees telecommute instead of coming into the office to reduce potential virus exposure. She said declines had been most dramatic on the Harbor Bay and South San Francisco routes, both commute-only services. Ms. Rannells said the ridership decline had begun on Friday, March 6 and that prior to that, ridership had been up in general across the system.

Ms. Rannells said Directors could expect this decline to impact WETA's budget and added that to date, WETA had been operating under budget. She said the budget was presently under review in light of the increased cleaning expenses and fare box revenue decline, and that staff would return for Board direction if action to address any concerns was warranted.

Director DeBono said that if other agencies were asking the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and the State of California (State) for funds to help mitigate revenue losses, WETA should do the same. He said WETA had no reserves and that BART did have reserves but was requesting emergency funding to help mitigate its current ridership decline. He said this was an urgent situation and requesting that assistance was something staff should do urgently. Director DeBono added that Ms. Rannells had his full support to have WETA staff work from home instead of coming into the office. Chair Wunderman and Director Intintoli concurred.

Ms. Rannells said the new MV *Lyra* had made its way down from Washington and had arrived in San Francisco on March 20. She said the new vessel had been well cleaned.

Ms. Rannells said the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion ribbon-cutting celebration planned for March 20 had been canceled, and staff was considering rescheduling the event for a later date or identifying options to celebrate the project without requiring a large, in-person public gathering.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Bay Crossings Publisher Joel Williams asked if the project would still open.

Ms. Rannells said it was largely already open and in public use, and that when the final pieces of the project were completed that the fencing on the property would be completely removed.

She said staff had held all five of the open house events to gather public feedback on WETA's draft Fare Program that Directors had authorized for release at the February Board meeting. She noted that a public hearing on the Fare Program had also been planned to take place at the next Board of Directors meeting in April. Ms. Rannells explained that the public comments received had been overwhelmingly in opposition of the planned elimination of the Vallejo Monthly Pass. She said Directors could expect to see an alternative recommendation at the April Board meeting to resolve those concerns that would include an extension of the use of the pass for the first three years of the Fare Program.

Director DelBono asked why, given all of the parking and traffic congestion challenges for riders at the Alameda Main Street Terminal, riders who have bicycles were not allowed to disembark first, before those riders without bicycles. Planning & Development Manager Kevin Connolly explained that bike loading and unloading is a slower process than just people loading and unloading so allowing those riders with bicycles to leave vessels first would increase disembarkation times. He said the City of Alameda had done a great job designating bike lanes around the terminal to help segregate riders from drivers and noted that this has improved access and safety for all. Mr. Connolly added that the decision to allow those passengers without bicycles to disembark first was driven by a desire to adhere to WETA's service schedules.

In response to a question from Director Intintoli, Public Information & Marketing Manager Thomas Hall said that the information website for the new planned Seaplane Lagoon service and related Alameda service changes, branded *Seaplane Shift*, was expected to launch the following week. Mr. Hall explained that the date to have ambassadors aboard vessels and at terminals to educate the riders and promote the changes in person had been pushed back to late April or early May and said that plan would be adjusted to support any mandates or lifting of mandates related to the COVID-19 situation in the Bay Area. Mr. Hall also noted that on February 29 he had hosted a table at the grand opening celebration of the Cross Alameda Trail grand opening where he answered many questions and had been able to speak to attendees about *Seaplane Shift*. He said people had been very receptive to and excited about the planned changes and new service.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Pat Murphy from Blue & Gold Fleet said California Governor Gavin Newsom had signed some legislation earlier that day to provide relief from Brown Act requirements for public meetings.

Chair Wunderman thanked Mr. Murphy for the information and said the Board's legal counsel would be looking at those changes and advising Directors on the way forward while limits on public gatherings were in effect.

6. CONSENT CALENDAR

Director Intintoli made a motion to approve the consent calendar:

- a. Board Meeting Minutes – February 13, 2020
- b. Authorize Submission of an Allocation Request to the California Department of Transportation for FY 2019/20 Low Carbon Transit Operations Program Grant Funds

Director DelBono seconded the motion and the consent calendar carried unanimously.

Yeas: DelBono, Intintoli, Wunderman. Nays: None. Absent: Josefowitz.

7. AUTHORIZE ACTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH REPLACING THE MV SOLANO

Operations & Maintenance Manager Keith Stahnke presented this item to authorize actions associated with replacing the MV *Solano*. He said in September 2019 the Board approved rejecting all proposals for the MV *Solano* Service Life Extension Project and authorized staff to instead sell the vessel and develop an approach to replace it with available grant funds. Mr. Stahnke explained that since that time staff had developed a plan and worked to receive the necessary approvals meeting with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) to sell the MV *Solano* and apply the sale proceeds to the replacement vessel purchase. Mr. Stahnke said staff used a competitive process to select a marine brokerage firm to list the MV *Solano* for sale and that contract was awarded to Pinnacle

Marine Services (Pinnacle). He said Pinnacle's marketing efforts to date have included direct contact with more than forty ferry operators in the United States.

Mr. Stahnke said procurement process considerations had included leveraging existing vessel procurement contracts and utilizing a new procurement process. As a first step, he said, staff had entered into direct negotiations with Dakota Creek Industries to add a fourth Pyxis class vessel and determined that this approach was not feasible because it would exceed WETA's available grant funds.

Mr. Stahnke said in February, the Board authorized release of a Request for Proposals to replace the retiring MV *Bay Breeze* with a 320-passenger, multiple use vessel with the flexibility to serve all of WETA's existing routes, including the Vallejo route. He said the capacity and speed for this replacement vessel were the same as those for the MV *Solano* replacement vessel providing a direct match for replacement with fleet commonality operating benefits. Mr. Stahnke said staff recommended combining these two vessel replacements into a single procurement to provide a cost-effective approach to two replacements.

Responding to a question from the Board Mr. Stahnke said staff had rejected the idea of putting the MV *Solano* up for auction because of the high probability it could be sold well under its value to support its replacement of the listed \$7.5 million price. Mr. Stahnke added that there had already been some international interest in the vessel as a result of the broker's listing. It was noted that California had the most stringent emissions restrictions in the country and that any current operational use of the MV *Solano* in California would violate California Air Resource Board (CARB) rules but that the vessel could be operated in the rest of the United States in compliance with federal Environmental Protection Agency rules as well as internationally.

PUBLIC COMMENT

An anonymous speaker asked when the CARB emissions rules had gone into effect.

Mr. Stahnke said the rules had gone into effect around 2009 or 2010 and the MV *Solano* had been built in 2006 adding that WETA's newer vessels were even cleaner than the current rules required. Ms. Rannells noted that CARB was presently working on new rules and accepting public comments through the end of March. Chair Wunderman said it didn't make sense for the State to be replacing rules that had already been met and acknowledged that a 25-year vessel lifetime expectancy was a long time in consideration of emissions concerns. Director Intintoli noted that it was difficult to have to make this decision given these myriad concerns.

Director DelBono made a motion to approve the item.

Director Intintoli seconded the motion and the item passed unanimously.

Yeas: DelBono, Intintoli, Wunderman. Nays: None. Absent: Josefowitz.

8. APPROVE ENTERING INTO A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WITH THE CITY AND PORT OF REDWOOD CITY FOR THE FEASIBILITY AND BUSINESS PLAN PHASES OF THE REDWOOD CITY FERRY TERMINAL PROJECT

Planning & Development Manager Kevin Connolly presented this item to approve entering into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the City and Port of Redwood City for the feasibility and business plan phases of the Redwood City Ferry Terminal Project. He explained that the proposed MOU would define roles and responsibilities for partner agencies, the process to investigate feasibility and a business plan development. Mr. Connolly noted that the feasibility investigation and business

plan were required by the San Mateo Transportation Authority (SMTA), a funder of the project. He said the MOU had already been approved by the Redwood City Port Commission (Port) on February 26 and by the City Council of Redwood City on March 9.

Mr. Connolly said the feasibility study was already underway and expected to be completed this summer with the launch of the business plan work to immediately follow. He introduced Port of Redwood City Executive Director Kristine Zortman provide further comments on the recommendation to the Board.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Zortman noted that she was representing both the City and the Port of Redwood City. She said the Board's approval of the MOU was tremendous and explained that as the only deep water port serving Silicon Valley that there was a huge need for alternative transportation modes and that the Port believed that in a partnership with WETA, the Port believed it could fill that need for the region. Ms. Zortman said that the Federal Emergency Management Administration had designated the Port as an emergency staging area in 2017 to serve the region in the event of a catastrophic event and said having WETA ferry service at the Port would strengthen that designation and also demonstrate to peninsula and Silicon Valley communities the importance of waterborne first responders' abilities to access disastrous and catastrophic event centers by assuring that the region had a port ready to support emergency response. She thanked the Board and WETA staff for moving this first step forward and said she looked forward to a long partnership with WETA.

Chair Wunderman noted that the Bay Area Council had been working for a long time to try to figure out how to relieve the terrible traffic congestion in the region and was one of his objectives in joining the WETA Board. He said several challenges were expected to be identified in the feasibility process and that this project had historically been underestimated by numerous agencies in the Bay Area. Chair Wunderman said the project was very important to him and he was pleased to see it moving forward in this positive direction. He added that he expected the project would mirror the ridership success of WETA's new Richmond service. Chair Wunderman added that the project would provide a foothold in the South Bay that would allow WETA to improve and grow its interconnected service. He emphasized his belief that Redwood City ferry service should begin as soon as possible.

Director Intintoli made a motion to approve the item.

Director DelBono seconded the motion and the item passed unanimously.

Yeas: DelBono, Intintoli, Wunderman. Nays: None. Absent: Josefowitz.

9. SPONSOR AND SUPPORT CALIFORNIA ASSEMBLY BILL 2995 CLARYIFYING WETA'S AUTHORITY RELATED TO FERRY TRANSPORTATION SERVICES IN THE BAY AREA

Chair Wunderman presented this Item to sponsor and support California Assembly Bill 2995 (AB 2995) clarifying WETA's authority related to ferry transportation services in the Bay Area. He explained that AB2995 was introduced by California Assemblymember David Chiu, a consistently strong advocate of water transit in the Bay Area. Chair Wunderman said the bill would keep the pressure on WETA to continue its work and provide the support to do so. He said that over time, he had suggested to Assemblymember Chiu that he might consider sponsoring legislation to ensure that WETA's authority was fully clarified to position the agency to develop the kind of robust water transportation system long envisioned for the Bay Area.

Chair Wunderman said at the time WETA was created with the legislation of California Senate Bill 976, there were no private sector water transit services other than tourist services but now numerous

private water transit service operators are interested in providing water transit services on San Francisco Bay. Chair Wunderman added that this was a positive development which he encouraged. He explained that these operators currently must apply to the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) for its authorization of their private service schedules and routes in order to provide these services. Chair Wunderman said during this application and authorization process, that as a common carrier, WETA participates in these conversations to identify what effects the proposed services would have on WETA's public transit services. He explained that because of the way this process presently worked, WETA was often at the end of the process rather than the beginning, and as a result of sharing its valid feedback and concerns, WETA had ended up with a reputation of not supporting private service operations.

Chair Wunderman said the precise language of the AB 2995 was expected to be released in the next few days and that a letter of opposition had been received from PROPSF. He emphasized that this was the beginning of this legislative process, not the end, and said the process would involve a lot of conversation and thought, and that there may be an impression that WETA's objective was to block private service delivery, however, this was not the case. Chair Wunderman added that because of the limitations on its assets, the only way WETA was going to be able to successfully deliver the kind of robust water transportation system the Bay Area region needed was through partnership with the private sector. He added that in a region like the Bay Area, a strong governmental system of oversight was required to ensure successful operations and honor the interests of passengers, public safety, emergency response preparedness and workforce protections.

Chair Wunderman emphasized that AB 2995 would not in any way replace what the CPUC already did but would allow for a concurrent review by WETA and ideally encourage private operators to engage WETA at the front end, providing opportunity for desired partnerships before the CPUC application process.

Ms. Rannells reiterated that the language of AB 2995 wasn't yet available and said it would likely evolve over time and with robust input. She also confirmed that the opposition letter from PROPSF was available to the public on the meeting materials table.

PUBLIC COMMENT

San Francisco attorney Tom McBride representing Tideline Marine Group (Tideline) said that Tideline operated a Berkeley commuter service under a PUC vessel common carrier certificate. He said Tideline had been asked to provide comments to the Board on AB 2995 but said the challenge was not knowing the language in AB 2995. He said that from what the Chair had just expressed in his comments on the item, it sounded like it was something Tideline would be able to work with but that the staff memo detailing the item was a little bit different. Mr. McBride noted that the staff memo stated WETA would not interfere with the PUC's final decision-making process, but his interpretation was that WETA would require anyone wanting to apply for authority or amended authority to not apply without WETA Board approval. He emphasized that the language was critically important. Mr. McBride said there was a body of law surrounding vessel common carrier legislation by the PUC that has developed over decades and a concurrent body of law for ground passenger transportation that has developed that clarifies charter service, sightseeing service and true common carrier service. He said you have to figure out how those would apply to vessel service under AB 2995 before you can understand how companies like Tideline who are currently operating and considering what they might want to do in the future would be impacted by this legislation. Mr. McBride said how the WETA Board and the PUC would work together also required clarification. He reiterated that he was not able to provide any real comments on AB 2995 on behalf of Tideline until at least March 18 when the precise AB 2995 language was expected to be available for review.

Chair Wunderman agreed that it was difficult to share feedback on legislation without first seeing the language that will be in it. He reiterated that this was the beginning of a process that would include multiple hearings and ample opportunities for the public to share their thoughts and feedback on the final language of the bill throughout its evolution. Chair Wunderman emphasized that it was never WETA's intention to regulate charter or tourist services and thanked Tideline and Mr. McBride for their comments. Mr. McBride said he would continue to participate in this process on Tideline's behalf.

Director DelBono said he was supportive of the bill as presented today and looked forward to seeing the final language to assure the legislation meets the interest of all stakeholders and most importantly the WETA Board's interests.

Director Intintoli said he had read the letter from PROPSF, concurred with everything the Chair had shared about the recommendation and made a motion to approve the item.

Director DelBono seconded the motion and the item passed unanimously.

Yeas: DelBono, Intintoli, Wunderman. Nays: None. Absent: Josefowitz.

10. STATUS REPORT ON WETA HOVERCRAFT FEASIBILITY STUDY

Mr. Connolly introduced this status report on the WETA Hovercraft Feasibility Study (Study). He said WETA's consultants had been working for the last few months on updating new technology in WETA's 2011 Hovercraft Feasibility Study. Mr. Connolly explained that the two committees working on the study - a Technical Regulatory Committee staffed by members of the public and regulatory agencies such as the United States Coast Guard (USCG) and the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission, and an Advocacy Committee of private, non-profit and public sector representatives - had held their first set of meetings and he noted that at least three additional sets of meetings were planned to support the Study work. Mr. Connolly said the Study was in its very early stage and then introduced Krystle McBride and Mark Sisson from AECOM, WETA's prime consultant on the Study, who shared a short PowerPoint presentation providing context, history and existing conditions to date, along with a video clip demonstrating the operation of a hovercraft vehicle.

Ms. McBride said AECOM has been working to complete the first phase of the Study which has consisted of investigating hovercraft as a technology, looking at all associated costs and operating parameters and identifying where hovercraft could be feasible. She said Phase 2 of the Study will be analyzing much more route specific details including costs and environmental considerations.

Ms. McBride said thus far the Study has looked at hovercraft design for consideration as a class of craft to be considered for use on San Francisco Bay. She said findings have indicated that off-the-shelf and custom-built hovercrafts are more expensive than traditional ferry vessels to operate and that because of this, the Study has eliminated consideration of any routes that could be served with traditional catamaran ferry vessels.

Ms. McBride said further findings provided by a key member of the Study's committees, the USCG, were that four crew members would be required for each 150-passenger hovercraft, well below WETA's current standards on their traditional vessels. In response to a question from the Chair, Ms. McBride explained that the requirement was higher due to Coast Guard regulations for high-speed craft. She said the threshold for the requirement was 150 passengers and that it may be possible to have a reduced number of crew for craft carrying 149 passengers but that the requirement was not black and white and was entirely in the jurisdiction of the Coast Guard to make the determination based on specific craft exercise review.

Ms. McBride said certification to operate hovercraft required 100 training hours and had to occur on the actual hovercraft that would be in operation. She said ideally training would be done by retired United States or Canadian veterans who would need to first be trained on the specific hovercraft that WETA was planning to put into eventual service. In response to an anonymous question from a meeting guest, she explained that the training requirements for captains were related to specific types of vessel class operations experience and that the licensing for hovercraft was a separate, additional process than the licensing process for traditional ferry operations.

Director DelBono requested that additional specific information related to the training of hovercraft captains and crews be provided to the Board at a future date.

Ms. McBride said the shallow water landing pads was one of the big advantages of using hovercraft but cautioned that engineering challenges would be finding a solution to spray and infrastructure required to create floating pads for deeper water landing.

Ms. McBride said ideal route characteristics for hovercraft included shallow water, no service already with traditional ferry vessels, high ridership demand, minimal speed restrictions, short travel distances and near employment centers. She said the current top speed of off-the-shelf hovercraft was 45 knots and service in the South Bay could be ideal because of the many areas speed restrictions in the area eclipsed by the primary benefit of access. She added that most of the channel speed restrictions were dictated by the local Sheriffs' Offices and the Coast Guard and driven by safety concerns.

Ms. Rannells said speed costs money in operating costs and rises exponentially. Chair Wunderman asked about potential speed allowances on routes where there is deep water at one or both ends and shallow water throughout the middle. Ms. McBride said the Study would be looking at that scenario with a Dumbarton Bridge route - South Bay to San Francisco - with the objective of connecting a hovercraft route to a well utilized service terminal already in existence with WETA's traditional ferry service.

Ms. McBride said the Study has been focused on more North/South routes versus East/West routes. She said her team was in the process of narrowing down ninety possible routes to about five for further consideration and analysis including the east side of the Dumbarton Bridge to get employees to Facebook and Cooley Landing in East Palo Alto.

Ms. McBride said the final Phase 1 task will be to confirm and begin modelling for the top five routes for hovercraft consideration. She said some of the key operating concerns for hovercraft use by WETA include passenger safety and comfort, maneuverability, operating costs for fuel, training, captains and crews and required infrastructure and maintenance. She reminded the Board that hovercraft vehicles were aircraft, not vessels and would require completely different infrastructure and maintenance than what was currently is use for WETA's traditional ferry vessels. She said hovercraft maintenance was similar to airplanes and require professionals trained in and familiar with aircraft. She said Directors could think of hovercraft as an addition to WETA ferry service, not as an overlap of its ferry service. She said the passenger experience riding a hovercraft was also very much like their experience would be on an airplane trip, including occasional turbulence.

In response to an anonymous question from a meeting guest, Ms. McBride said a noise analysis will be included for all considered routes in the Study. Mr. Stahnke asked whether wind affects the speed of hovercrafts and Ms. McBride said it absolutely did and this was something that could be managed with speed reduction. Mr. Stahnke noted that this could present difficulties in adhering to schedules.

Ms. McBride said that a draft of the updated 2011 Study was expected to be delivered to WETA staff in the coming days and that the overall study was expected to be completed before the end of 2020.

Director Intintoli left the meeting at 2:24 p.m.

Ms. McBride said that currently there have been no hovercrafts built in the United States since 2017. She explained that one of the challenges of the Study's research process is that the only public transportation hovercraft service offered in the world at this time is service to the Isle of Wight in England, which primarily uses a small hovercraft built in 2016.

11. PUBLIC COMMENTS FOR NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Genentech Transportation Program Manager Heather Salem said she understood everyone was dealing with an issue on the global scale, but she wanted to address a local concern. She said that as a leader in the Oyster Point neighborhood, Genentech was planning now for how they were going to get their employees to work during this summer's Caltrans Highway 101 Alemany Project that some have coined "carmageddon" and asked what additional services WETA would be providing to help mitigate the effects of the shutdown of the highway lanes. Ms. Salem said now was a good opportunity to look at offering a boat bridge between San Francisco and South San Francisco or even Redwood City and to partner with public and private bus service to shuttle employees and suggested that the Bay Area Council Employer Coalition might be a good place to start this work. She said she looked forward to seeing this concern on a future WETA Board agenda to learn what WETA was doing to address the matter.

Mr. Connolly said WETA was working with Caltrans to offer service between South San Francisco and downtown San Francisco to help address the traffic and access challenges expected to result from the project. Chair Wunderman said it would be useful to bring all partners concerned about the project to the table to discuss solutions which would likely include bus service to get people to the ferry terminal which doesn't have ample parking for the number of people who would likely need to access the South San Francisco terminal. Mr. Connolly said that Caltrans has been very forward looking on this project including carving out additional parking spaces and increasing BART and bus services. Chair Wunderman said a meeting with all affected parties to get everyone on the same page would be helpful and offer the opportunity to review all of these pieces not just to address this specific project but in the bigger transportation picture, including WETA's recent South San Francisco ridership concerns.

Mr. Hall said he has been working with Genentech and will be reviewing the results and findings of a recently completed survey of South San Francisco riders and about their ferry use and needs with Genentech and other South San Francisco area employers as part of WETA's efforts to address South San Francisco ridership concerns. He emphasized that a meeting with all parties would be very beneficial.

Director DeBono asked that this matter be agendized for a future WETA Board meeting for further, more in-depth discussion.

With all business concluded, Chair Wunderman adjourned the meeting at 2:37 p.m.

- Board Secretary

END