

Board of Director's Meeting Summary

Meeting Date/Time: February 18, 2021, 6:30-9:00pm

Location: Remote via Zoom

Board Member Attendees: Raymond Hess, Jesse Miller, Kyra Sims, Roger Hewitt, Kathleen Mozak, Richard Chang, Mike Allemang, Ryan Hunter, Sue Gott, Eric Mahler (Chair)

AAATA Staff Attendees: Matt Carpenter (CEO), Bryan Smith, Forest Yang, John Metzinger, LaTasha Thompson

Guest Speaker: Steven Higashide (Author – Better Buses, Better Cities)

Guests: Michael Santicchia (UHY), Marlene Beach (UHY), and Gen Mojares (UHY)

Meeting Chair: Eric Mahler

Ms. Kyra Sims called the meeting to order at 6:34 pm.

Discussion Items	
1. OPENING ITEMS	
1.1	<p>Approve Agenda</p> <p>Mr. Rich Chang moved to approve the agenda, seconded by Mr. Jesse Miller.</p> <p>In support of the motion:</p> <p>Mr. Roger Hewitt: Yes</p> <p>Mr. Raymond Hess: Yes</p> <p>Ms. Kathleen Mozak: Yes</p> <p>Mr. Miller: Yes</p> <p>Mr. Mike Allemang: Yes</p> <p>Mr. Chang: Yes</p> <p>Ms. Sue Gott: Yes</p> <p>Mr. Ryan Hunter: Yes</p> <p>Ms. Kyra Sims: Yes</p> <p>Chairman Mahler: Not yet present for vote.</p> <p>The motion passed.</p>
1.2	<p>Public Comment</p> <p>Mr. Robert Pawlowski described the current state of traveling between Wayne and Washtenaw counties without owning a vehicle, as well as the difficulty some of the public may have paying for D2A2 and AirRide once they are back up and running. He asked AAATA if they would consider expanding their FlexRide within Washtenaw County not served currently and parts of Wayne County. He expressed needing a reliable, easier, and affordable connection between Wayne and Washtenaw counties.</p> <p>Jim Mogensen quoted a consulting adage: “You can have it good; you can have it fast; you can have it cheap; take 2.” He used this to describe his perception that before 2014, AAATA had a serious structural and Title VI problem. He also described an article he wrote called “Red-lining to Bus-lining”. He noted that a number of different things came together at the same time along with the millage campaign in 2014 to increase the amount of money available, the point of which was more buses, more places, more often. He described the challenge of this being AAATA’s first millage that it did by itself. Everything was costed out as to what it was actually going to cost.</p>

A bunch of service was proposed along with how much it was going to actually cost. The hybrid bus came into the discussion, and then the numbers stopped working quite as well, and it was very carefully costed out. He then described his perception of the new idea being the same sort of buses, most places, less often in some places. He expressed that this is likely to be controversial. He suggested that AAATA think carefully as they have a millage in 2022 that needs to be passed.

1.3 General Announcements
None.

2. CONSENT AGENDA

2.1 Minutes & Committee Meeting Report

Mr. Hewitt moved to approve the consent agenda, seconded by Ms. Mozak.

In support of the motion:

Mr. Allemang: Yes

Mr. Chang: Yes

Ms. Gott: Yes

Mr. Hess: Yes

Mr. Hewitt: Yes

Mr. Hunter: Yes

Mr. Miller: Yes

Ms. Mozak: Yes

Ms. Sims: Yes

Chairman Mahler: Yes

The motion passed unanimously.

3. BOARD EDUCATION

3.1 Speaker: Steven Higashide, Author (Better Buses, Better Cities)

Mr. Miller introduced Steven Higashide, who has a Masters in Urban Planning and is the Director of Research for Transit Center, a foundation that works to make cities across the US more environmentally sustainable and just by improving public transit. His book, Better Buses, Better Cities – How to Plan, Run, and Win the Fight for Effective Transit has been lauded as one of the 10 best urban planning books for 2019, and his writing has appeared in the New Republic, the Atlantic, and the Los Angeles Times, among others. Mr. Miller had the pleasure of hearing him speak at the Portland State University Transportation Research and Education Center Seminar Series and on the popular podcast 99% Invisible.

Mr. Higashide presented on shaping the transportation future in Ann Arbor, followed by a Q&A with the Board.

Mr. Miller asked what a transit agency that is not necessarily strictly a municipal department can do to influence planning decisions. He described that issues like dedicated bus lanes are generally the responsibility of the planning department, of which AAATA is not a part.

Mr. Higashide shared that one region that is instructive on this is Seattle where just like in Ann Arbor and most places, the transit agency does not have any control over the streets and vice versa. Over the course of a number of years, Seattle created a lot of formal collaboration structures, which can start in informal ways, where just a few city staff and a few transit agency staff have a regular call every month to talk about coordination issues. At King County Metro, the agency that runs buses in the Seattle area, he described that they have a traffic engineering unit inside the transit agency that goes around to all of the municipalities in their service area providing technical assistance, especially to the smaller municipalities that do not have the capacity to

have an engineer who specializes on transit. King County Metro does not control any of the streets in the area, but they have traffic experts who can make the case to municipal staff around why they might want to change the signal timing or put in a cue jump and will help municipal staff make that case higher up the chain.

Conversely on Seattle's side, their transportation department eventually created an internal transit unit that is responsible for transit priority and is in regular coordination with the agency. He described that one could go from really informal types of collaboration to something that ends up being really formal.

Chairman Mahler asked what the two or three biggest drivers were for transit agencies who convinced their community partners and the ridership in general that this is worth their time – what were the biggest driving factors to get the public behind movements and increase their funding and utilization.

Mr. Higashide shared from a process perspective, there can be a lot of advantages toward more wide-spread incremental improvements. In some ways, they can end up laying the groundwork for some of the bigger investments. He did not want to imply that bus rapid transit or a high-capacity investment should never be done. It is more that agencies might have been stuck on trying to get political support for a major project while riders and the public are not seeing any real improvements. He expressed that what the shift to incremental improvements does is one can start to be able to demonstrate to people in a much shorter timeframe that their trips are getting better. For example, if one was working with a transit advocacy group, it is a huge lift to ask them or a neighborhood group to advocate for a project that is not going to be done for five or six years. Many of the folks living in that neighborhood might not even be around by the time it is open. Meanwhile, if an agency takes a tactical approach, a pop-up bus lane, maybe they are really only asking people to organize for a month or two. Then the pop-up bus lane can be built upon with BRT down the line. He noted that in a lot of ways it leads to more favorable political dynamics.

Mr. Hewitt asked what the Board's function is when staff take a tactical approach. Mr. Higashide described that a big part of the Board's role is to be a bridge between those tactical improvements and the promise of doing bigger, greater things in the future – to be ambassador to community groups that are going to be really important to organizing the public support for that plan. He noted that in the Indianapolis example, one of the things that was fortuitous for IndiGo is that the Government Relations Vice President of the Chamber of Commerce was also an IndiGo Board member. When the agency would go around doing public meetings on what they could put out on the street if the tax was passed, they did it in a neutral way, talking about what the options were with or without the increased tax. Then, their Board member could get up as a Board member speaking personally and talk persuasively about why this was so important to make Indianapolis a competitive place. Mr. Higashide described that there are types of explanation and arguments that Board members can make that staff might feel constrained in doing, especially when talking about long-range plans and bigger investments.

Mr. Allemang expressed that spending more effectively on a number of small projects all over rather than concentrating on one or two mega projects has a lot of attractiveness. He noted that Indianapolis, Boston, and Seattle are all pretty big cities compared with the area to which AAATA provides service. He pointed out that there are some areas where the density of population is very small and spread out, and there is a feeling that it is important to be able to have those individuals have service, but there are limited resources. AAATA debates frequently how to balance being able to provide service to the very low-density areas with more frequency in the higher-density areas.

Mr. Higashide described that it is a perpetual question, and he would not feel comfortable giving a prescriptive recommendation as someone coming from outside the community. He did share his thinking that it is a pretty hefty decision to have to take away someone's service. When he looks at transit agencies that are redesigning their networks, it often begins with the intent of being a cost-neutral exercise, but what usually ends up happening is there is a little bit of an increase because the agencies often decide they want to move toward more frequent ridership-oriented service, but they have to plus it up a little bit so that they are not abandoning some of the coverage areas. He described trying to find a balance.

Mr. Hess asked Mr. Higashide if he sees any trends through his research on shifting work patterns and how that might affect transit. Mr. Higashide shared that what is being seen is an acceleration of trends that were already happening, to some extent. There has been movement toward telework for the last decade plus. He also expressed that employers' decisions around re-opening will include what the transit network is going to look like. This is one of the few reasons why it is important to take a posture of putting service out and showing folks that frequent service is going to be there as opposed to hanging back and trying to wait and see how much ridership rebounds before increasing service. He noted that it gets back to the question of what routes are more resilient and that commuting is still depending on the system. He posed the question of what the routes are where there is a lot of demand for other types of trips, which would mean they are more resilient. He suggested talking to employers regularly to get as informed an estimate as to what is going to happen as one can and trying to be prepared for different scenarios.

Mr. Yang asked what Mr. Higashide's advice would be for the staff members to balance all of the stakeholder public engagement with all of the technical work. Mr. Higashide described that this is a Board question in a few different ways. First, particularly in small systems, Board members can play a really important roll in making and maintaining the community connections, not in the way that one would do a formal public engagement process, but in terms of bringing stakeholders along, Board members can play a really important roll. Also, he thinks that more and more agencies are recognizing that more resources need to put into public engagement. It cannot be treated as something asked of service planners and project managers to do on their nights and weekends; teams can be built that have focus and expertise in community engagement. He described that in some places there is an increased realization that for certain types of projects, one might want to hire community-based organizations to do some of the outreach. He pointed out that in Minneapolis there is a project around improving bus stops that was fairly well federally funded that allowed them to hire a dozen community organizations to do survey and outreach work. Because they worked with groups that really knew their communities, they got survey results that were actually representative of the ridership in terms of income, ethnicity, riders with disabilities, a lot of the things that are not always gotten out of public engagement. He encouraged resourcing the work.

Chairman Mahler thanked Mr. Higashide for his time and excellent presentation.

4. POLICY MONITORING & DEVELOPMENT

4.1 Committee Meeting Discussion
None.

4.2 FY2020 Audit Report (Decision)
Ms. Sims shared that the Audit Task Force met last week – herself, Ms. Gott, Ms. Mozak, Ms. Thompson, and the team from UHY. She highlighted that Ms. Thompson and her team prepared the financial statements that UHY used in the audit, which is

usually a task that the audit team would assist with, but Ms. Thompson and her team did that independently, which was very helpful to the UHY team. She described that last year during the audit process the post of the retirement benefits program was discussed, and the record for that is good. That liability has been decreased by about 50%. Other than that, there were no significant findings, and it was a clean audit.

Ms. Sims introduced the UHY auditors (Mr. Michael Santicchia, Ms. Marlene Beach, and Ms. Gen Mojares) who presented the [FY2020 Audit Report](#) followed by a Q&A with the Board.

Ms. LaTasha Thompson thanked UHY for their expertise and how the process went.

Ms. Gott congratulated and thanked all of the staff for such good financial and fiscal stewardship.

Mr. Miller and Chairman Mahler described the benefits of having this kind of confidence in staff and financial security, being able to back up claims and requests with credibility.

Ms. Gott motioned to accept the FY2020 Audit Report as submitted, seconded by Ms. Mozak.

In support of the motion:

Mr. Allemang: Yes

Mr. Chang: Yes

Ms. Gott: Yes

Mr. Hess: Yes

Mr. Hewitt: Yes

Mr. Hunter: Yes

Mr. Miller: Yes

Ms. Mozak: Yes

Ms. Sims: Yes

Chairman Mahler: Yes

The motion passed unanimously.

4.3 Monitoring: Financial Condition & Activities (2.5)

Mr. Metzinger walked the Board through the monitoring report of Policy 2.5, which indicated compliance in most areas. He highlighted two areas.

On page 16 of the report, Policy 2.5: This particular policy requires the CEO to have a policy on establishing financial reserves, to be able to continue to provide financial support for operations in an emergency. Over the previous years, this was an area where non-compliance was experienced, not able to hit the reserve target established by the CEO, until September 2019. This particular policy interpretation says that compliance will be achieved when the target is hit for 12 consecutive months in a row. That target has been achieved now for the first time.

Mr. Metzinger pointed out instances of non-compliance on pages 12 and 13 of the report, in policy 2.5.5.1. This policy prohibits cost overruns on capital projects. What is presented in the evidence is a list of the adopted capital budget and expenditures within each line during fiscal year 2020. In this case, there are two examples where more was spent than was authorized. Mr. Metzinger described how this gets a little bit into some granular detail that unveils some particularly challenging areas in terms of how the capital budget is talked about, versus a capital program. As a result of this, Ms. Thompson and Mr. Metzinger are discussing steps of how to improve internal

processes to monitor capital project expenditures, as well as bring that detail to the Board in monitoring reports down the line.

Mr. Metzinger focused the Board on the following table:

Timing Variances in the Furnishings Replacement Capital Program				
	Capital Program Authorization	FTA Grant Award	Expenditures	Balance of Available Grant Funding
FY2019	150,000	150,000	(68,719)	81,281
FY2020	75,000	75,000	(82,023)	74,258

The table details the cost overrun in the are of furnishings. What is really happening with that particular budget line is a timing variance rather than a true overrun. AAATA has expended less than the Board has authorized over the course of several years for furnishings. So, what is happening is that this is a carry over. Last year, the Board authorized funds that were not spent that carried into 2020 and then expended, on top of the authorized expenditure for FY2020. Mr. Metzinger would characterize this as more of a timing variance than a true override. In the future, staff will provide more clear detail to the Board about prior year expenditures and how carryover funds are applying to a particular capital budget line.

Mr. Metzinger shared that there was another issue dealing with a communication system project where there was an actual overage in the cost of the project that was missed in AAATA's internal processes.

Mr. Hewitt described if AAATA gets into large capital projects that are going to run over a number of years, inevitably this problem is going to come up on a much larger scale. He agreed it is important to come up with a method that shows that AAATA is actually within budget on capital projects even if they are over budget in a particular year.

Mr. Allemang expressed that the overrun on the communication system project to him is a classification issue. The \$36K apparent overrun there is really capital versus expense. To replace this communication equipment, it took a total of X dollars of capital and X dollars of expense, but the way AAATA budgets is only for capital dollars. In this particular project, more fell into the capital and less into the expense, and therefore it looks like an overrun, but if you look at the capital and the expense together, it was not. He expressed that to him the most important thing is the total dollars spent, not necessarily how they were classified. He shared not seeing a problem in either of the overruns, other than the way the capital budgets have been done, which staff are adjusting. He also expressed that the CEO could have interpreted these overruns still in compliance and complimented staff on the report.

Mr. Allemang moved to approve the CEO as in compliance except for items noted (B), seconded by Ms. Sims.

In support of the motion:

Mr. Allemang: Yes

Mr. Chang: Yes

Ms. Gott: Yes

Mr. Hess: Yes

Mr. Hewitt: Yes

Mr. Hunter: Yes

Mr. Miller: Yes

Ms. Mozak: Yes
Ms. Sims: Yes
Chairman Mahler: Yes

The motion passed unanimously.

4.4 Monitoring Report (4.0-4.4)

Chairman Mahler reported that the Board graded themselves pretty well in terms of adhering to their own policies.

Mr. Allemang noted that under 4.4.4 that there were five “always” answers and 1 “never” answer, but if one reviews the comments at the very end of the report having to do with the reasonable person standard, that is probably why the one person voted “never”. He expressed that maybe someone did not recall the reasonable person standard discussions that have been had or was not on the Board when those discussions took place.

4.5 LAC Task Force Report (Verbal)

Ms. Mozak reported that the LAC task force met with Governance Coach Rose Mercier at the start of February, and CEO Carpenter was also in attendance with the Task Force. Points of discussion included suggestions and concerns from both the Service Committee and the Governance Committee, as well as CEO Carpenter. From that meeting, Ms. Mercier made changes to the policy language that was presented at the last Governance Committee meeting, and where those policies should be placed. There were some concerns about that. The document has been shared with the Task Force and will be up for discussion at the next Governance Committee meeting at the end of February. Ms. Mercier may be at the Governance Committee meeting where hopefully there will be a resolution from the Governance Committee, and then it will be presented to the full Board for discussion and hopefully adoption.

4.6 Board Retreat Feedback (Verbal)

Chairman Mahler thanked the Board members for their participation at the Board Retreat. He noted that it was a lot to digest and good dialogue.

Mr. Allemang expressed that it was a very good beginning, but that the most difficult part of it is still ahead. The next Retreat meeting will be very important, and Mr. Allemang suspects that it will be worthwhile to have some other sessions on the same topic, but it was a very good beginning. Chairman Mahler agreed and expressed looking forward to part II of the Retreat on March 3rd.

5. STRATEGY & OPERATIONAL UPDATES: CEO

5.1 Federal Funding Update (Verbal)

Mr. Metzinger reported that AATA was notified last month by the FTA that AAATA was apportioned additional federal emergency aid through the Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act (CRRSAA). The net funding is coming to TheRide in addition to the CARES Act emergency aid that was authorized last Spring.

Last year, plans for the use of funding were to spend the funding slowly, with respect to the fact that there was concern about long-term financial sustainability and risks to TheRide’s regular funding sources, including passenger fares and state operating assistance. AAATA did begin spending the CARES Act funds last year, spending \$1.4M last year. Since then, AAATA has spent another nearly \$1.5M in the first quarter of 2021. While this funding does not expire, staff are recognizing that

utilization can now move more quickly because there is greater confidence given that the federal aid is available to TheRide.

Mr. Metzinger shared that staff intend to bring a proposal for a budget amendment to the Board next month. Along with that amendment, staff will be providing clear details on a spending plan to ensure that these funds are fully realized in the coming times. The approach is going to be transparent and unambiguous so that the Board and public are very clear about how these funds will be obligated.

Mr. Metzinger highlighted that the continued focus will be upon the long-term financial strength of TheRide, but meanwhile, AAATA will be able to advance progress on some key capital projects. Staff will be providing some details on that next month.

Chairman Mahler asked if staff will be presenting and expecting a decision on that amendment both next month. Mr. Metzinger expressed that there is time. Staff certainly want to introduce this proposal and are willing to take the time that the Board needs to work through the information that is presented. If it looks like the Board is ready to go next month with a budget amendment and approval, then that would be great, but Mr. Metzinger has been thinking that this is something that will be done over the next couple of months. A preview of this will be brought to all of the Committee meetings next month before coming to the full Board in March.

5.2 CEO Report

CEO Carpenter asked Mr. Brian Smith to report on an incident that occurred this last week in one of the municipalities that was out of the ordinary but a good example of the sorts of things that AAATA does that do not always get noticed by the general public.

Mr. Smith report that this past Monday in the afternoon, AAATA got a call through the Red Cross that Clark East Tower (a large apartment complex on the northeast side of Ypsilanti and Ypsilanti Township) had a fire and the residents were all standing outside in the cold. AAATA was asked to bring some buses to evacuate them. The number AAATA got initially was 180 people, so staff gathered up what extra buses and drivers they had and ended up sending over 5 buses to start. They ended up taking 6 trips of people to the Hampton Inn in Belleville where they were able to get emergency shelter. It was an afternoon occurrence that wrapped up around 10pm at night. AAATA is on standby to bring them back to Clark East Tower when they need it. Anyone that had a ride for ARide, AAATA is going to be honoring it from Hampton Inn, so that those that have to take any medical trips are not missing out on any of those.

Mr. Smith expressed that this is something that AAATA does not get called on to do a whole lot, but when they do get called on, it is something that AAATA is in a unique position to help. He also shared that it something he is really proud of that AAATA does and a reason why AAATA exists, to help the community. He extended his gratitude to the operators, supervisors, and Mr. Brian Marshall (Manager of Operations) who was on scene to make sure AAATA was as coordinated as possible in a crisis situation.

CEO Carpenter noted that this is something that may happen every other year that AAATA is called upon like this. He pointed out that it is not a formal service level or Ends statement per se, but it is part of keeping the community safe and AAATA is uniquely able to do it.

Chairman Mahler thanked Mr. Smith and the operators. He noted that the fact that there was a plan to mobilize in a situation like that very quickly speaks to the planning and forethought given to an operation like that by the team.

Mr. Allemang expressed his appreciation of this and hopes that there is some way that this information can get out to the community so they can see the kinds of things AAATA does above and beyond what the normal business is.

CEO Carpenter noted that AAATA did reach out to Supervisor Brenda Stumbo while the operation was still in process to let her know that AAATA was doing something unusual in the Township, and she seemed quite appreciative of the response.

Mr. Hunter expressed that he was very much impressed by the responsiveness, organization, and all the work that went into it. He pointed out that this should serve as an example to exactly the kind of peripheral things that AAATA can do when called upon. He commended the efforts of everyone.

CEO Carpenter shared that he was happy to be able to work with the Ann Arbor City staff and Planning Commission. He appreciated being involved in the discussions of the transit-oriented zoning for a couple months prior to the recent meeting as well. He pointed out a [newspaper article](#) covering the discussion. He highlight the WATS Policy Committee meeting and ongoing discussions with the RTA, along with a letter that he wrote to the RTA and WATS Policy Committee, which is in the [Board meeting packet](#) on page 67. CEO Carpenter expressed being pleasantly surprised that his letter seemed to be very well received by many of the recipients. He noted that Jennifer Simmons from the City of Ypsilanti summed it up well in terms of really liking the idea of rail but not at any cost. Counselor Briggs from the City of Ann Arbor also voiced that it is a nice idea, but frequency is more important. CEO Carpenter described that the community is grappling with some of the same elements that he heard the Board discussing at the Board Retreat in terms of wrestling with priorities, with the reality of tradeoffs. He commended the RTA staff for being very clear in their presentation to some of the elements that he had raised questions about and their validity. He described that it was a good day for transparency and illuminating for many people in the room. No decisions were made; there will be a follow-up discussion next month.

CEO Carpenter expressed that it was nice to see a body like the WATS Policy Committee grappling with some of the same things that the AAATA Board is in terms of liking everything, but what can be afforded, what is needed, what gets the job done, and what is the actual priority. He reported that Doug Fuller from the Road Commission called his letter a model. Discussions with the RTA are going to continue as this is a very early step in their public engagement process that is going to lead out the rest of this year and get started actually in a couple of months for them to update their regional transit plan in preparation for a millage referendum in November of 2022. It is still not clear that they will seek a millage in November of 2022, but their staff are attempting to get their plan updated, ready, and in position if the RTA does choose to go in that direction. He reported that they still do not have a CEO and he is not sure if they have a timeline to change that.

Mr. Miller asked if there was anything notable discussed by the RTA in terms of other inner urban transportation, like buses connecting to other transit agencies. CEO Carpenter pointed back to Mr. Higashide's presentation and book, describing a reaction to a tendency to focus on mega projects, particularly rail projects to the detriment of more modest, but cheaper bus options. In this particular context, he expressed that may be a very apt parallel; interest in commuter rail may have crowded out discussions about other options. Counselor Briggs did make an explicit parallel to the Detroit to Ann Arbor service, acknowledging that there can be a lot more frequency of trips through bus services than it looks like will be able to be gotten through rail. CEO Carpenter expressed his thought that the Policy Committee has recognized,

perhaps for the first time, the very large vestment that would be implied by the commuter rail and is starting to think about the alternatives. The next meeting in March may be intended for rural residents and representatives of rural townships and municipalities throughout the county to have time to speak about what they would want in their communities.

Mr. Hewitt described that in the past he has been an instigator of interest in rail in the area, but the numbers that have been presented clearly make it not a wise decision to continue to try to push commuter rail. He described as CEO Carpenter mentioned getting twice the frequency with buses at a tiny fraction of the operating cost and virtually no capital cost.

Chairman Mahler asked what the timing is for possibly including ARide in the mobile ticketing option. Mr. Metzinger responded that the Community Relations staff is currently working on a timeline that he will bring back to the Board. Chairman Mahler expressed that it seems so successful that the quicker AAATA can expand it, the better.

Mr. Allemang asked what proportion of the total ticketing is done via mobile ticketing. Mr. Metzinger expressed that it is likely something like 1% of the total ridership. He described that this is still very new, having been launched in September, and what he thinks is encouraging is that there is a great growth trend happening. With more promotion and more users signing up, he would expect continuing to see growth trends like this to where it becomes a more significant portion of ridership.

6. EMERGENT BUSINESS

None.

7. CLOSING ITEMS

7.1 Board Retreat – Part II – March 3rd. This is an [open meeting](#) that the public are welcome to attend.

7.2 Topics for Next Meeting:
Investments (Policy 2.6)
Communication & Support (Policy 2.10)
Q1 Service Report
Q1 Finance Report

7.2 Public Comment

Mr. Jim Mogensen described that a subset of the population is moving to telework while another subset does not have that, and there may be some substantial issues coming in relation to how that sorts out in a community. He also expressed seeing some real risks coming forward where the new capital project is now out for public comment and he suspects to hear more about electric buses. Lastly, in regard to the new changes to be debated next month, he expressed concern with the 2022 millage.

Ms. Michelle Barney described missing out on a chance to receive a vaccine last week because she was given the appointment the week before, but she could not call until three days before to request an ARide to go to the vaccine clinic, and they were filled and could not take her. She asked if something can be done for those that have a vaccine appointment to be able to call earlier to reserve an ARide.

7.3 Closed Session Briefing (as per OMA)

Ms. Sims motioned to go into closed session pursuant to section 8(d) of the Open Meetings Act to discuss the purchase or lease of real property. This was seconded by Mr. Hunter.

Chairman Mahler conducted a roll call vote for this.

In support of the closed session:

Mr. Allemang: Yes

Mr. Chang: Yes

Ms. Gott: Yes

Mr. Hess: Yes

Mr. Hewitt: Yes

Mr. Hunter: Yes

Mr. Miller: Yes

Ms. Mozak: Yes

Ms. Sims: Yes

Chairman Mahler: Yes

The Board went into the closed session at 8:23 pm.

Mr. Hewitt motioned to go out of closed session, seconded by Ms. Gott. Chairman Mahler took a roll call vote.

In support of going out of closed session:

Mr. Allemang: Yes

Mr. Chang: Yes

Ms. Gott: Yes

Mr. Hess: Yes

Mr. Hewitt: Yes

Mr. Hunter: Yes

Mr. Miller: Yes

Ms. Mozak: Yes

Ms. Sims: Yes

Chairman Mahler: Yes

At 8:57pm, the Board voted unanimously to come out of the closed session.

[7.4 Board Assessment of Meeting \(Electronic\)](#)

7.5 Adjournment

Mr. Chang moved to adjourn, seconded by Ms. Mozak.

In support of the motion:

Mr. Allemang: Yes

Mr. Chang: Yes

Ms. Gott: Yes

Mr. Hess: Yes

Mr. Hewitt: Yes

Mr. Hunter: Yes

Mr. Miller: Yes

Ms. Mozak: Yes

Ms. Sims: Yes

Chairman Mahler: Yes

The motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Mahler adjourned the meeting at 9:00pm.

Respectfully submitted by: Keith Everett Book

Approved March 18, 2021