

# SALTZMAN ROAD PAC MEETING



## SUMMARY

**Date/Time:** Wednesday, September 23, 2020 from 5:30-7:30 pm

**Location:** Zoom

## Attendees

### Project Advisory Committee (PAC):

**Bruce Barbarasch**, Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District

**Virginia Bruce**, CPO 1

**Mary Manseau**, CPO 7

**Asif Rahman**, Bethany Neighborhood Coalition

**Trace Richard**, Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue

**Mariana Valenzuela**, Centro Cultural

### Staff Attendees:

**Ben Lively, Marla Vik, and Melissa De Lyser** with Washington County

**Terry Song** with Murray Smith

**Brandy Steffen** with JLA Public Involvement

## Welcome and Introductions

Brandy Steffen, JLA Public Involvement, welcomed the group and reminded attendees that the meeting was being recorded. She reviewed the agenda.

There was a delay in the meeting start and present PAC members asked the following questions:

- **Virginia** – Can PAC members speak outside the meeting? The protocols sounded like we can't talk to each other or the County.
  - **Brandy** – Yes, you can speak with each other and with your constituents. We encourage you to do so. If you have clarifying questions or want to speak with Washington County. However, we agreed in our protocols to not to speak with the media or elected officials. The goal is to have conversations during these meetings since it's hard for Washington County to respond if we're not part of the conversation.
  - **Suresh** – We want to be able to talk openly as a community.
  - **Melissa** – We agreed to have Virginia post in Cedar Mills News,
  - **Brandy** – The protocols say PAC members should represent their constituents.

Brandy asked Washington County to introduce themselves. Ben Lively, Washington County, welcomed the group and began introductions for staff. Brandy introduced herself and reminded the group that she will keep the meeting running, ensure that everyone has a chance to speak, and keep the group true to their protocols. The Project Advisory Committee (PAC) member's introduced themselves and who they are representing.

Brandy then reviewed the agenda and reminded the public how to provide comments. Brandy asked if there were questions about the agenda:

- **Suresh** – Was Pam Treece invited?
  - **Ben** – She was invited and I don't think she's on. She's been recovering from an accident.

## Public Comments

Brandy opened the public comment period. Each person could speak for 2 minutes. Brandy also encouraged people to type comments in the Q&A box (those comments and staff's responses are listed at the end of this summary). There were about 20 people in the public side of the webinar.

- **Andrew Lamkin** emailed a comment before the meeting, which Brandy read to the group:  
As additional supporting information and to have a complete record I'd like to request documentation of the geological surveys performed on both the eastern and western alignments and the selection criteria plus alternate sources considered when selecting the survey performers.  
I also appreciated the look into the presentation and the assessment of the two alternatives. Although I appreciate the guidebook style cost options I'd like to request each line item and each option have a complete basis of estimate detailed in the backup materials for review by the public.
  - No geological investigation has been performed on either alignment. Cost estimates have been provided on the website.

Brandy reminded everyone of Ben's email and that questions can be sent in that way before or after the meeting.

*Public comments and materials distributed by PAC members are not endorsed by Washington County.*

## Housekeeping

Brandy reviewed the 8/23 meeting summary, including updates that help clarify some information. There were no edits but the group requested that public comments submitted through the first meeting have a response from the County. That will be updated for meeting #1 summary and answers will be included in summary #2 (this document).

A summary of PAC questions are listed below, along with responses or further conversation about that topic (sub-bullet):

- **Asif and Mary** – We want this to be open process, the answers to the public comments are important to see. Why have the chat open if you're not going to get a response?
  - **Brandy** – The group protocols don't require a response to all public comments/questions since we're trying to keep the focus on the PAC members and their discussions. We are asking that if you represent a group that you go back to your group and bring their comments to this group.
  - **Melissa** – We are looking for the PAC's feedback at a high level as interested parties, not the details of each geotechnical survey. There will be many public opportunities for comments, including several public events. What we're trying to do is get input from a select group of people, who have expressed interest in this project. So we've structured this process to facilitate

that conversation. The public can participate in this process but the goal is to hear from the PAC members.

- **Virginia** – Is this process only about one/two alignments?
  - **Melissa** – We are looking for feedback and you don't have to like either alignment. We're not expecting consensus, but we want you to keep an open mind and listen to the current data then come back with your opinions. We've heard that you want lots of details, but that is more typical for a technical advisory committee.
- **Asif** – Thanks for clearing up that PAC members can speak. But then why even bother talking about the cost at all. We shouldn't use the tax payer dollars to have you present that cost estimate.
  - **Melissa** – We'll need to get multiple bids/proposals for the construction of a project.

Brandy stopped the discussion. We approved protocol to keep moving forward in our discussions. Several people raised their hands.

- **Mariana** – Wanted to clarify the process. You provided two options so our job is to choose one or neither. So we'll meet until we come to a decision then you'll take this recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners and they'll say yes we'll build or not. Then builders will apply.
  - **Ben** – Clarified that if the County Commissioners approve an alignment, then we'll progress with Murraysmith to continue design from 5-10% (now) to 100% (which would extend into next year). There would be public outreach/events in the future.
- **Mariana** – If I'm trying to decide on the alignment, why is it not important to learn about the previous community work? That gives me more knowledge to make an informed decision and that's important for me. It's not all about cost. In Washington County we're trying to do something good for the community. I'd like the information from Asif and Suresh.
  - **Ben** – Asif can distribute the information from before to the PAC members. Tonight, we'll go through the technical details/presentation, which is endorsed by the County. We will also address questions that people have raised.
- **Mary** - Can we have the evaluation criteria in the meeting notes? If we're not providing answers in meeting, then please include that message in the zoom. If we're representing the public, then it might be nice to see public questions and answers. Can the PAC members see the public comments that Ben receives.
  - **Ben** – We'll go back and take a look the public questions and add those to the meeting summary. We've shared all of the emailed public comments with the PAC, if the person gives permission to share.
  - **Mary** – I submitted questions that I've only received partial response to.
  - **Ben** – We'll respond.
- **Suresh** – The main thing to add from what Mariana said. This process was not clear to us, so we're making assumptions. Is this process for PAC new? We need to be educated on the PAC process. Two things came up today that was unknown: 1) PAC is proxy for the public and 2) take recommendation to the Board and that is where a decision is made. We are getting worked up about the cost fluctuations. If we're being asked to make a decision, the criteria is not clear. Safety is not a criteria but it is the biggest concern for the public/neighborhood.

Saltzman Road PAC Meeting Summary

- **Ben** – Just wanted to clarify that there are many aspects of each criteria that address/embed safety. Costs are part of the criteria.
- **Suresh** – I thought that Melissa said cost doesn't matter.
- **Melissa** – I'm sorry if I misspoke earlier. I was talking about the line by line breakdown of costs.
- **Asif** – if a line shows right of way cost from floodplain higher than a multimillion-dollar house then we will question the validity of the cost. The western alignment is shown as double right of way cost than the eastern and that is wrong by \$4M.
- **Brandy** – I hear you're concerned about having the right level of information to have trust in the information and the right level of information to help you and the other PAC members to make informed decision. Heard Mary to include evaluation criteria and answers to public questions in the meeting summary.

Brandy then briefly reviewed the interview results from the stakeholders the PAC identified during meeting #1. Suresh has been added to the PAC to represent the Bauer Highlands. These stakeholders will be alerted to all future meetings and have been invited to provide public comments before or during the meetings.

- **Beaverton School District Transportation** – Concerned about elevation, freezing, safety related to blind curve and traffic visibility, construction impacts that would require a reroute of buses.
- **Tualatin Riverkeepers** – Existing preferred with stream crossing improvements for fish passage, since it has lower impacts based on current information to trees, wetlands, and non-damaged areas. Their main focus is to minimize environmental impacts to the maximum extent possible.
  - **Asif** – Western alignment we aren't touching the water. Is more touching better than no touching, I don't understand that view? I don't trust the interviews since they were conducted by you.
  - **Brandy** – Happy to answer your questions and I've invited them to attend the meetings and provide comments. They will be kept on the email list to get updates on the project as new information is available. They are most concerned with increasing impermeable surface (pavement) and damaging areas that haven't already been disturbed.
- **Portland Audubon Society** – Interested in keeping the undisturbed areas as untouched as possible, similar to the concerns raised by the Tualatin Riverkeepers.
- **Tualatin Valley Water District** - There is a 24-inch transmission main in the eastern alignment. It is difficult to adjust those large diameter pipes, so if the eastern alignment is selected that leads to impacts to the pipe, so they prefer the western alignment.

Brandy asked the PAC members if they had any questions about that information:

- **Mary** – what information was shared with Audubon and Tualatin Riverkeepers? Their view should be taken with a grain of salt since that information isn't available. School District raises a good point about road closures and that's a good point. Kinder Morgan pipeline and the western alignment may affect them and is anyone keeping that on the radar?
  - **Terry** – We can talk about that in the presentation. Appreciate the comments and many of these items in the presentation. Hope you leave this meeting feeling well informed.
  - **Brandy** – I shared the information presented at PAC meeting #1 plus the map from Bruce shared from THPRD.

## Saltzman Road PAC Meeting Summary

Brandy reminded the group to hold questions until the end to hear from all PAC members in attendance. She shared the values that have been raised from PAC members and stakeholders throughout this process (meetings, emails, interviews) is safety for drivers, children, livability, minimizing environmental impacts, cost effectiveness, and ensuring that the project moves forward.

- **Suresh** – On the value front, there has to be a weighted evaluation of the criteria and safety is number one.

## Evaluation Criteria

Ben Lively added that there will be opportunities to value engineer and refine these alignments to look at different aspects that we're not getting into during this presentation. There are four PAC meetings scheduled, so we're trying to move things through in a timely fashion – so thank you for going through this process together. He reminded the group that when they Board of County Commissioners selects an alignment the County will hold public events to collect input from everyone. The current level of design is very high level (5-10% out of 100%) so there is a lot of engineering that needs to be completed still.

Terry Song, Murraysmith, civil engineering company hired by the County. Terry walked through the two alignments and reminded the group that both alignments meet the County's design speed of 35 MPH and they are being compared with the same cross section of two travel lanes, a middle turn lane, plus 6' bike lane plus a 2' buffer, then sidewalks. However, during future refinements the alignment design would go through review by the Bicycle and Pedestrian Review Board. This widest cross section was used to develop the most conservative design and can be narrowed in the future. Terry also told the group that both alignments examined ways to reduce roadway slope through the use of retaining walls to reduce the impacts to nearby homes. Neither alignment includes impacts to the sub-divisions, but there are impacts to several homes.

Terry then reviewed the evaluation criteria that was sent to the technical team after the second PAC meeting. The evaluation criteria were:

- Environmental Permitting
- Stormwater Management
- Structures
- Traffic
- Utilities
- Right-of-Way
- Trees
- Traffic Control
- Estimated Total Project Cost
- Safety [added based on committee comments]

Terry went through the questions raised by PAC members and provided answers to the group. Brandy called on the PAC members one at a time:

- **Suresh** - Is safety included as a criteria?

- **Terry** - We're meeting the County standards with both alignments, so safety is equivalent between the two alignments. Both have street lighting, sidewalk, bike lanes and generally be much safer than what is out there right now.
- **Suresh** - icy conditions where slopes make a big difference; this is a safety issue. Is there something in the alignments that will help with that?
  - **Terry** – We tried to reduce steepest part of the slope where we could, so 9.5% for the eastern alignment and 10% for the western; so it's about the same. This is comparable to what is out there currently since we can't change the hill slope too much.
- **Suresh** - It's a sticker shock from what the funding is today, we fought hard to get \$6.5M. Every time we see the options the cost goes up. What is the reason for the cost going up? Eliminating the middle lane will that reduce the cost?
  - **Terry** – Cost for basic construction are fairly similar to what you had in your study and W&H study, but we're including a 40% contingency for inflation of unit costs over the last 5 years (since we're in such early stage of design).
- **Suresh** - Why did the cost go up from the first draft of the presentation?
  - **Terry** – We did some additional review of the bridge and that is why the cost changed. Taking out the left turn would be about the same between alignments. It would be about \$2-3M reduction if we could eliminate it entirely, the relative cost will be about the same.
- **Suresh** – Eastern alignment, what are the impacts to Bauer Highland?
  - **Terry** – No impacts to sub-divisions but there are impacts to other homes.
- **Trace** – If the east alignment is picked could there be an option of not doing a hard closure but keep one lane/section open? Or is it a total shut down?
  - **Terry** – We'll have to look at that closely. Where we go off the existing alignment it would make it hard to keep the road open.
  - **Virginia** – What is the detour if existing Saltzman is closed?
- **Trace** - Concerned about response times up to north Bethany/Laidlaw area. As of right now it's 6-7 min but if a hard closure of Saltzman, then looking to double those response times to detour to Keizer or McDaniel's.
  - **Virginia** – An estimated length of time?
  - **Terry** – We haven't looked at that yet, but probably one construction season.
- **Mariana** – no questions
- **Bruce** – If the western alignment is selected what will happen to the exiting Saltzman Road?
  - **Terry** - considering that but need to provide access to existing homes, maybe cul-de-sac at Laidlaw to provide emergency vehicle access, possibly provide bike/ped path.
- **Bruce** - If eastern alignment is chosen, can you show profile? It looks like at the bottom the road dips, why not a more gradual angle?
  - **Terry** – We were trying to minimize a change in grade to allow the current driveway to access Laidlaw. It could have a flatter curve but would require more retaining walls.
- **Virginia** - What is the role of Murraysmith but why were you talking about going out for bids?
  - **Ben** - Murraysmith was the designer and environmental, bidding is for construction to build the project. That would be a competitive bid process. Murraysmith is one of many firms on a 5 year

RFP process where consultants propose to get into a pool to work on projects. The County uses this process often and we've used Murraysmith successfully on several projects. They are a design firm. **Brandy** – Clarified that there are two process, now is the design phase where Murraysmith. Then construction when it's not Murraysmith. **Marla** – Clarified that it's not 3 bid process, it's just an open process. On other projects we've received over 14 proposals.

- **Virginia** – Why that third alternative has been completely removed? Why is the County adamantly against looking at the engineered/prefabricated bridge that the neighborhood looked at.
  - **Terry** – Said that the bridge crosses a 100-year floodplain. It's once in 100 year frequency, FEMA map so we have to maintain a bridge opening to maintain that floodplain or you could affect all nearby homes. Have to prove a 0 rise or mitigate it somehow. That is what determines the bridge length and you can chose any bridge material. However, the prefabricated bridge length has a maximum width of 40' for a 160' span, but that is not wide enough for County cross section. Then as you reach the capacity the cost goes up. Quoted yesterday about \$310/sqft for a prefabricated bridge.
  - **Asif** – I care to disagree, the design there is a 500' design. Yesterday got quotes for another bridge. Had very specific quotes from this company. This is not based on fact.
  - **Terry** – We talked to the same company and they reported the information for a mutli-section bridge. Not trying to sway the conversation.
- **Virginia** – Is right of way cheaper if there are willing sellers?
  - **Ben** – No, there is an independent appraisal and the offer is based on that appraisal. So not necessarily cheaper but there is a negotiation process where things can be worked out individually.
- **Virginia** - Since we don't know the County's criteria that it's hard to determine the long-term future of transportation is being considered. If we're spending a lot of money then we should plan for the future. The eastern alignment is less appropriate, western has a big chance that if Multnomah county develops then it's ready to connect.
  - **Asif** – The 30-year plan shows a connection to 130<sup>th</sup>. If you do the eastern alignment you have to consider the cost of future connection. Include that as a criteria. Concerned about the future connections with other roadways.

Brandy checked in with the PAC to stay on a few minutes longer.

- **Mary** – I do support the long-term consequences being considered and it should be part of the criteria evaluation. If we look at eastern alignment then the part between to 130th needs to be beefed up as part of the project cost.
- **Mary** – Want to see wildlife passage would like to see how that would work. On western alignment it looks like good passage but only water for the west.
  - **Terry** – Span bridge is bigger and would provide passage, but the culvert would be 16' which is much wider than the existing creek and would allow animals. We'll confirm how that was selected.
- **Mary** – Asked staff about LIDAR for the earthquake and landslide risks in the area. If we build a bridge is that going to be more secure than culvert?

## Saltzman Road PAC Meeting Summary

- **Terry** – both structures will be designed to earthquake haven't done subsurface drilling but that will be considered later. Did review the DOGAMI hazards and neither crosses any known fault lines. There are some slide hazards which would be addressed with retaining walls.
- **Mary** – Existing alignment with the driveway access talked about changing is steep. We need to be sure that those homeowners are getting their needs addressed.
  - **Terry** - Tried to keep driveways same elevation.
- **Mary** – Alternative comparison summary - there was talk about utilities that with the western alignment that would need to be relocated if it's in existing alignment why would you need to move it for the western alignment?
  - **Terry** – That is a great point, we need to follow up on that.
- **Asif** - Press on the connection at end of Saltzman to 130<sup>th</sup>. That part of the alignment need to be included as a cost row item. The western alignment gives opportunity to divide the bike/ped traffic from the car traffic. We shouldn't talk about the same cross section, that is flawed for cost estimated. No one needs that wide of cross section. Children's perspective, a neighborhood street is much safer than these street options. Safety of kids is most important. This is a place we live and livability is most important. Grateful that so many of the issues we've been struggling with have been clarified today.

## Public Comments

Brandy took more public comments, each 2 minutes:

- **Jessica Barbosa** – I am the owner of Blueberry hollow on Saltzman/Laidlaw. Listening to this your talking about wetlands and trees, I have a personal commitment to this. It takes out our well and pumphouse for the plants. It affects our farm and we chose this location because of the community and wanting to be part of the community and people to come pick blueberries. That adds something to the community. I know its about saving the wetlands, but there is something about being a part of our community. It may take out our chicken coop. Then we need to figure out Saltzman and 130<sup>th</sup> then that could take out the blueberry bushes and our barn. It's already hard enough to have people pick. It's something to keep in mind when you're doing this. It's tearing out historic Bethany forever and it adds something to the community. I don't have a question. Thanks for the time. I know you're talking about the future on Saltzman.
  - **Terry** – confirm the location
  - **Asif** – we lost a nursery and farms, we don't want to lose this last one.
- **Suresh Enamuri** – I'm a Bauer Highlands homeowner. Terry explained all the inputs into how he chose grading. I would recommend that is part of the presentation. It's hard to remember just when you're listening. I recommend that you add those impact assessments during the presentation. Can you also include the dimensions of the options, what is the current width of the road and how are you expanding. Where are you expanding? Show with future option width. Those details would be helpful. One is \$10M and one is \$20M. Is there going to be an impact to the timeline. IF one option is 5 years and the next is 15 years, how can the PAC consider the timeline as part of their recommendation?
- **Mariana** – So glad that Jessica came to speak to us. She should part of the committee and don't know why she isn't. If she will be impacted directly, if she won't be included that is wrong. We talk so much of



Saltzman Road PAC Meeting Summary

DEI and we're not aware of the impacts/consequences to this property and business. I hope she speaks up and that Washington County does the right thing to stop a business from suffering. Everyone matters.

- **Jessica** – I appreciate that. I'm not much of a public speaker and I appreciate that the community wants us here as well. Thank you for that. Asked for Ben's email.
- **Suresh** – want to reiterate the future expansion, besides Blueberry Hollow, I hope that you'll add that as a criteria?
  - **Ben** – I'll speak with future planning and see how we can address that.
- **Virginia** asked if the PAC member's emails could be shared with the public and if public comments emailed to the County could be shared with PAC members.
  - **Brandy** – I can send an email to ask you if you would like to share your emails with other PAC members.
  - **Mary** – I feel fine sharing my email with the public. Listening to Jessica it's something I've been thinking about, another evaluation criteria is the number of individuals affected by the alignment.
  - **Melissa** – Please send an email confirming that we can share your email.

The following comments and questions were submitted through the Q&A chat window:

- **Bhushan** - Does the expansion impact house lot boundaries at corner of Bayonne and Saltzman on west side (Bauer Highlands)? Sorry it is on east side
  - **[Response after meeting:** There are a few homes that would be impacted by the project; however, none within the Bauer Highlands subdivision.]
- **Jason Lee** - Eastern vs. Western alignment discussion may be misleading. Saltzman road exists already. According to Western alignment supporter, Saltzman (as it is) presents risk, and it is not going anywhere (even if Western is chosen). Isn't the discussion supposed to be: Eastern vs. Western+Eastern improvement?
  - **[Response after meeting:** You are correct that the existing Saltzman alignment won't be removed. However, it will not function as it does today but may "dead-end" to allow access to homes that have driveways on Saltzman. The exact design of the existing Saltzman is unknown at this time but would be refined if the Western alignment is selected by the Board of County Commissioners.]
- **Suresh Enamuri** - Could you help me know whether the public attendee can raise a question at any time during the meeting or wait for the allocated time for the public questions only. I apologize if I missed if you had already explained this earlier.
  - **[Response after meeting:** Public comments can only be raised during the public comment period at the beginning and end of meeting. Responses to questions won't be answered in real time, but will be answered in the written summary.]
- **Ram Grandhe** - Just want to make sure that BNC does not exist... please look into the state records accordingly...[http://egov.sos.state.or.us/br/pkg\\_web\\_name\\_srch\\_inq.show\\_det?p\\_be\\_rsn=1793307&p\\_srce=BR\\_INQ&p\\_print=FALSE](http://egov.sos.state.or.us/br/pkg_web_name_srch_inq.show_det?p_be_rsn=1793307&p_srce=BR_INQ&p_print=FALSE) Could you please maintain the QA will be in the end, without disturbing the presentation please... Thank you!

- **[Response after meeting:** Thank you for this information; the Bethany Neighborhood Coalition is no longer active but Asif is representing that historical perspective and his own interests. We will clarify this at future meetings.]
- **Andrew Lamkin** - would there be any property impacts in ANY of the houses in the area? If so what is the anticipated cost to acquire?
  - **[Response after meeting:** There is a legal process for right of way acquisition. The property appraisals are conducted by a third-party firm. The right of way acquisition process is conducted by the County. Right of way will need to be acquired for either alignment, including home impacts/purchase depending on the alignment. Rough cost estimates for purchase are included in the overall cost.]
- **Andrew Lamkin** - What other bridge structure options were considered?
  - **[Response after meeting:** For early analysis at this design stage typical bridge construction methods were considered including steel, prefabricated, and pre-cast concrete. Cost estimate reflects pre-cast concrete, as these are generally the most cost competitive types.]
- **Andrew Lamkin** - What were the criteria used to evaluate and select?
  - **[Response after meeting:** This was shown in the presentation.]
- **Andrew Lamkin** - You mentioned traffic patterns would change in both - can you quantify the impacts?
  - **[Response after meeting:** The technical team looked at traffic counts to examine the impact of the traveling public on Saltzman Road. However, we assume that local traffic would continue to access their neighborhood routes as they do today. The impacts to areas north of Laidlaw were not modeled since no through traffic will be accessing these northern subdivisions, since there are no connection points.]
- **Andrew Lamkin** - What cost reductions measures were considered and how would they apply to both alignments?
  - **[Response after meeting:** This will be addressed in meeting #3.]
- **Suresh Enamuri** - I would recommend to add the Terry's inputs on impact assessment on both alignments to the presentation itself. It helps to refer back when anyone need to refresh the memory with all these details. It is difficult to remember all these inputs and adding to the presentation help to avoid repeating the same question.
  - **[Response after meeting:** Thanks for that idea. All of that information can be found in the Evaluation Memo circulated during meeting #3.]
- **Andrew Lamkin** - We heard about the results of the estimation process but we're still not sure how the conclusions were arrived at. Is it possible to receive the basis of the estimates (what was considered, what historical examples were used, how did the result come from those inputs)?
  - **[Response after meeting:** This information will be provided in the Alternatives Evaluation Memo.]
- **Ram Grandhe** - Brandy, could you please let other members to wait until there term comes to talk, instead disturbing each and every step?
  - **[Response after meeting:** Thanks. We will mute everyone during the next meeting.]
- **Suresh Enamuri** - Could you provide dimensions for both Eastern and Western alignment options to understand the ROW acquisition impact on the private properties of the residents. Terry had mentioned

Commented [BS1]: Terry – please confirm

## Saltzman Road PAC Meeting Summary

there is no impact to Bauer Highlands homes. So providing these road dimensions also help to understand how the expansion of the road is accomplished without impacting any of the Bauer Highlands homes.

- **[Response after meeting:** Yes, the cross-sections were provided in the PowerPoint presentation for meeting #2 (on the profile sheet).]
- **Jason Lee** - Laidlaw is not walkable from Stoller to Arbor Height. What separates kids from cars is a single white line. What makes you think that Western alignment (Straight line) will be safe for kids to walk?
  - **[Response after meeting:** Both of the alignments will include a bike lane and sidewalks to meet County standards.]
- **Ram Grandhe** - Brandy/Ben, could you please mute others please? otherwise never ends this meeting time please??
  - **[Response after meeting:** Yes, we will mute everyone during the next meeting.]
- **Mahesh Udata** - why I am unable to see myself into the attendees list
  - **Virginia Bruce** - I see you there
  - **[Response after meeting:** You may not see yourself as part of the PAC, since you're a public attendee.]
- **Jason Lee** - Can you please ask guys to stop interrupting?
  - **Virginia Bruce** - Haha
  - **[Response after meeting:** Yes, we will mute everyone during the next meeting.]

## Next Steps

Brandy thanked the group for attending and reminded them of the next meeting on Wednesday, October 14 from 5:30-7:30 pm. Ben thanked the group and for all the public comments, especially Blueberry Hollow. Please email him directly if you have any questions. To Mary's question, we'll look at the Q&A.