

## Potrero Yard Neighborhood Working Group Meeting #55 Minutes

March 10, 2026, 5:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.

### Virtual Meeting via Microsoft Teams

Note – The meeting minutes capture the overall tone of the group’s discussion and is not meant to be an exact transcription.

#### Members Present:

Amy Beinart  
James Bryant  
Magda Freitas  
Roberto Hernandez  
Christian Howes  
Erick Arguello  
Alejandro Abogado\*

#### SFMTA Staff:

John Angelico  
Bonnie Jean von Krogh  
Chris Lazaro  
Wade Wietgreffe  
Tim Kempf

#### PNC Staff:

Chris Jauregui  
Jennifer Trotter  
Myrna Ortiz  
Seth Furman  
Yancey Clayton  
Miguel Galarza  
Sharla Sullivan  
Mara Rosales

#### Members Not Present:

Christian Vega  
Claudia DeLarios Morán  
Edward Hatter  
Jolene Yee  
Karolina (youth member)  
Manuel Santamaria  
Martha Ryan  
Mary Travis-Allen  
Raven McCroey  
Scott Feeney

Members of the public attended, including:

- Online:
  - Juliana Sommer
  - Dermot Naughten
  - Vanesa Hernández-Ricardo
  - Ramil Tagoylo
  - Victor Ramirez
  - Martin
  - Hamm Khoudary
  - Nick Colina
  - Ramon Ramirez
  - James Mabrey
  - D.C. Williams Development Company
- In-Person attendees included: Tim Olson, Demitrius William, and Timothy Rayford

**Purpose of the meeting:** The purpose of the meeting was to discuss project updates.

#### Item 1. Welcome

John Angelico: (Slides 1–2) Welcomed the Working Group and presented the meeting agenda.

## **Item 2. Member Announcements**

John Angelico: (Slide 3) Introduced Member and SFMTA Announcements.

John Angelico: (Slide 4) Invited Working Group members to provide announcements of upcoming events, activities, programs, etc.

- Q: Did the City Hall meetings happen and how did they go? (James Bryant)
  - A: Yes, the project agreement was presented to the SFMTA Board. We will provide additional details in the next agenda item.

## **Item 3: SFMTA Announcements**

John Angelico: (Slide 5) SFMTA has held its first Budget Open Housing meeting and will host two more meetings on March 11 and March 12 (details on the slide). More information about the SFMTA budget can be found at [SFMTA.com/Budget](https://www.sfmta.com/Budget).

## **Item 4. SFMTA Board of Directors Meeting Update**

John Angelico: (Slide 6) Introduced SFMTA Board meeting updates and speaker Chris Lazaro.

Chris Lazaro: (Slide 7) Last Tuesday the SFMTA Board of Directors approved both the bus yard Project Agreement and the housing agreement (Lease Development and Disposition Agreement – LDDA). The LDDA is essentially an option to ground lease in the future. The actual ground lease will come when the housing developers have acquired all funding/financing and are ready to start construction.

The LDDA is fully approved by the SFMTA Board and does not require additional approvals. The Project Agreement (Bus Yard Agreement) requires approval from the Board of Supervisors in the coming weeks.

Multiple community members came to the meeting to speak and make public comments. Each director also made comments and questions.

Director Cajina made an amendment to the legislation that was unanimously accepted:

*WHEREAS, The FEIR studied in an expanded and modernized transit facility that would include residential uses above and adjacent to the transit facility as well as a Project Variant proposing to construct residential units next to the transit facility along Bryant Street and a paratransit facility above the transit facility. Ordinance No. 58-24, effective April 22, 2024, for allowed for 465 residential units above and next to the infrastructure for infrastructure facility or a paratransit facility above the Infrastructure Facility and a housing project with up to 103 residential units next to the Infrastructure Facility;*

The SFMTA recognizes the disappointment about the recent changes to the project design. We share that disappointment and the Director of Transportation (Julie) also made this acknowledgement at the SFMTA Board meeting. Difficult decisions were made, yet we recognize that we can do better.

Wade Wietgreffe: (Slide 8) During the SFMTA Board Meeting on March 3, several public comments made included a question about the impact of changes to housing at Potrero Yard to the City's Housing Element and Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) requirements. While I'm not here to address the legitimate concern about expectations and considerations about the podium removal, I will speak factually about the impact of this change on the Housing Element.

The Housing Element is a City plan for the next 8-year period. In San Francisco, according to the findings in the most recent Housing Element, the number of housing units that the city needs to demonstrate the capacity for is 82,000 units. The Planning Department drafted the Housing Element and at that time added a buffer, increasing the stated need by 15% up to 94,000 units. This was done because there was an early understanding that projects would change from time to time, and no one project individually would put the City at risk of not being compliant with the Housing Element/RHNA. There are serious consequences for having a non-compliant Housing Element.

- Q: RHNA has a goal for how many of those units are affordable? I understand that the City is responsible for creating 47,000 affordable housing units. Potrero Yard's 465 units had been cited in the Housing Element as part of the distant pipeline, and now that 365 have been lost, could the Housing Element now be out of compliance? (Amy Beinart)
  - A: That is correct that there are different brackets within the 82,000 housing units based on household income levels. The Housing Element includes a housing inventory that assumed 194 low-income units from Potrero Yard. With the project being at approximately 100 units, the difference between what is in the Housing Element is approximately 94 units. (Wade Wietgreffe)
- Roberto: It is beyond disappointing; it is frustrating. Especially for those of us who have been on this committee for 8 years. I have been asking for a plan for how the city will build the 82,000 units or even the 47,000 affordable housing units.

During the height of evictions in the Mission, 10,000 people got evicted from the Mission because of tech. At that time Mayor Ed Lee and others in the community agreed to spend two years with the Planning Department to create the Mission Area Plan (MAP 2020) to plan for 2,400 housing units in the Mission. The city failed to build these units and revised the Plan to meet this goal by 2030 instead. These 465 units were part of the MAP housing goal. You are impacting not only at the state level, but you are also impacting what the Planning Department planned for the people in the neighborhood.

- Q: Erick, I, and a few others met with the Director of Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD), Dan Adams. It was shocking to hear from him that MOHCD is just an advisor to SFMTA on this project. This raised a lot of flags for us. Who is responsible for doing the finance and building these units? (Roberto Hernandez)
  - A: MOHCD is an advisor to the housing project at Potrero Yard. They are also an investor since they have made a verbal commitment of \$35 million towards affordable housing at Bryant Street. (Seth Furman)
- Q: They [MOHCD] are an investor but not responsible for development of the project? (Roberto Hernandez)
  - A: For this project, the Ground Lease is with SFMTA not MOHCD. Since it is SFMTA land, it is an SFMTA project to manage. (Seth Furman)

- Q: In the last two weeks, we have uncovered a lot of information that we were never told. Since 2024, who takes responsibility for not securing financing? If we were told that there were challenges in securing the financing earlier, we could have helped. I don't see us working together, I feel abused and used. (Roberto Hernandez)
  - A: On the housing side, we have been transparent that Bryant Street Housing was going to go up first. And we have shared that there were challenges for funding podium housing since that is further into the future. (Seth Furman)
  - Roberto: It's one thing is to have a challenge, and another is getting it done.
  
- Bonnie Jean: SFMTA does take full responsibility for the funding situation. Things have changed where we were in 2018 and where we are now. As our Director of Transportation acknowledged, we could do better, about bringing sooner to the Working Group. We definitely talked about challenges, but not about the specific need for you to activate networks to gather support. During the confidential negotiation process, we should have taken a step back and better communicated the challenges. And we have other slides to cover this further.
  
- Wade Wietgreffe: I agree with Bonnie Jean, and in hindsight, we should have done a better job at communicating restrictions of how SFMTA funds can be used.
  
- Q: I attended the MTAB meeting and only four Working Group members were able to make it. It is important for SFMTA to report back on the sentiment of the community and the Board of Directors, what is SFMTA going to do about it? It's a huge mistake. (Roberto Hernandez)
  - A: As we look back, we tried to push to make this project possible. As we look back on where we are now, we should have done better at communicating with a variety of options. We presented the Paratransit option with 100 units of housing, and we also looked at other variants in the CEQA process.

If we had to do it again, we should have communicated these other options better. The housing was proposed, but there were multiple factors that could shift. The outline for SFTMA financially was very different at that point. We need to look at all the options, and we'll take lessons learned from this project, and this is certainly a lesson learned about how we approach these with the community. (Bonnie Jean von Krogh)
  
- Roberto Hernandez: This site was originally going to have 575 units and then it was all scaled down, and we got to where we are at. When the final plan was approved in 2024, the number of housing units dropped based on what was feasible. I clearly remember asking "do we have the financing, are we good?" And everyone kept saying yes, we are good. CitiBank just announced a \$60 billion funding initiative for housing, and I feel that I can't even call the person leading this initiative even though I know him because we are being rushed to move this forward now.
  
- Q: When were we supposed to start construction originally? In 2024? In 2024 the economy was different and we couldn't even pause for a minute to potentially come up with money. We are not asking SFMTA to pay for this, and SFMTA is only saying "no, we can't wait a few months"? (Roberto Hernandez)

- A: Yes, the project has faced some delays, and we have slides that will talk about the challenge for delaying further. (Bonnie Jean von Krogh)
- Q: If we are talking about the possibility that the atmosphere may change in some years to come, are we still considering the platform that would have to be built for the housing? Who has the say on this? (James Bryant)
  - A: There are three related things happening. As we said last fall, the cost of the podium was roughly about \$70 million. If we were to theoretically press pause and take the time to re-design to add the podium, we would be at a much higher price for the bus yard due to the delay.

Also if we pause to redesign and then not able to build the bus yard because the cost became unaffordable to the SFMTA, we would also lose the ability to also build Bryant Street Housing. There is not a point where we would be able to move forward with the bus yard and then add the podium at a later point. (Chris Lazaro)

#### **Item 4. SFMTA Budget**

Bonnie Jean von Krogh: (Slide 9) Introduced SFMTA Budget Environment section.

Bonnie Jean von Krogh: (Slide 10) Taking a step back to look at the SFMTA budget and 5-year deficit forecast. We have a gap between expected revenue and expenses, as pandemic relief funding is running out. We are working on a budget plan to address this budget gap.

Bonnie Jean von Krogh: (Slide 11-12) If approved, San Francisco would receive \$155 million per year from the Regional Revenue Measure and an additional \$150 million per year from the Local Revenue Measure.

We are also looking for efficiencies within the agency. We are looking everywhere for funding and cost savings, even considering if there are capital dollars that can be flexible and used for operations.

Bonnie Jean von Krogh: (Slide 13) If these measures are successful at the ballot, then the SFMTA can maintain Muni service. These measures are really there to address maintaining Muni service. However, if we are not successful, the agency is facing steep cuts to Muni service:

## MUNI SERVICE OPTIONS FOR CUTTING COSTS WITHOUT NECESSARY FUNDING

### These cuts would have citywide impacts:

Slower downtown recovery, increased traffic congestion, less access and fewer opportunities for people who rely on Muni, major systemwide crowding.



This is what the agency is facing today when we look at deficit scenarios. We were not facing these types of cut scenarios at any point of this project. We are looking at all our projects through this lens.

### Item 5. Project Cost Considerations

Bonnie Jean von Krogh: (Slide 14) Introduce Chris Lazaro to speak about the Potrero Yard project cost considerations.

Chris Lazaro: (Slide 15) Potrero is not the only capital project that we had to look at and make cuts on. These are cuts we don't want to make, but creating a safe Potrero Yard is the highest priority for SFMTA Facility program. We looked across the portfolio to see what other projects needed to change in order to make this project possible. For example, we scale back on Islaias Creek and even though Kirkland Division is fairly old and needs work, it has been delayed.

Chris Lazaro: (Slide 16) We talked about \$560 million as the initial estimate of the project cost, but at the time that the estimate was provided, it had not been tested out in the market. When Webcor was selected, their cost estimate for design and construction based on real information from real bidders came in about 30% higher than expected. We knew we could not afford this higher price.

The first thing SFMTA did was challenge Webcor on the numbers. Then since this was not enough, the team looked at the Value Engineering efforts to reduce the price during the Summer 2025.

This is when the SFMTA realized that in order to reduce project costs, the cuts needed to be larger and began to consider removal of podium, reducing the basement size, and other

measures. And even with these cuts, the price was higher than SFMTA could afford and why we continued to negotiate the final price until last month.

Chris Lazaro: (Slide 17) If we were to go back to add in the podium and all the necessary elements, the effect would be to also increase the price of the base bus yard due to cost escalation over time.

Another major risk is that in the event that the podium would be added, and housing above the bus yard would be deemed infeasible, then the SFMTA would have to pay for the cost of the podium. The SFMTA cannot afford to take on the cost of the podium and its financing costs.

Chris Lazaro: (Slide 18) Delaying the project to restore that scope, this would delay the project and also the 100 units of housing on Bryant Street.

- Q: What is the source of the \$33 million annual payment that the SFMTA and City will be on the hook for the next 30 years to repay \$990 million loan on this project? (Amy Beinart)
  - A: The Availability Payment would be paid from the agency's own available funds. We would not have to pull money from transit services or other sources because we normally receive funds for capital improvements. (Chris Lazaro)
- Q: The annual capital funds that would be used from the annual MTA budget to fund the \$990 million loan (\$612 million with interest), would that be bond money or from the annual budget? Who decides what funds will be used for capital vs operating? (Amy Beinart)
  - A: It would come from multiple sources of funding such as toll revenue, transportation sales tax revenue, etc. Some of these funding sources are limited to only be used for capital improvement. (Chris Lazaro)
  - A: A truly affordable price would be \$600 million. Capital Improvement Program funds cannot be transferred to operations, and the SFMTA is prioritizing the payment for this project above any new capital improvement projects. (Tim Kempf)
- Q: To add \$70 million in financing, would that have been \$3 million more per year? (Amy Beinart)
  - A: It is not just about spending \$70 million. The MTA cannot be the financier for that \$70 million. The decision space MTA was in last year was how do we make this project affordable and what do we need to do to make it affordable.

If we were to make that change today in 2026, the \$70 million estimated cost from 2025, would increase. It would mean going back to market, and back to bidders, and this cost would put the project right back into an unaffordable cost.

There is no reality where we could add the podium back; we would lose the bus yard and the 100 units of housing. (Tim Kempf)

- A: According to the Budget Legislative Analyst, the savings to SFMTA in current dollars is about \$161 million, by removing the podium. (Chris Lazaro)
- A: We are saying as an agency, Potrero Yard is our top priority. One of two top priority projects, the other being the Train Control Upgrade Project. We are updating our facility budget to make this \$612 million deal work right now. We

have a deal with PNC right now, and if we cannot move forward with this deal, the \$612 million price goes away. It is locked in right now, but it does not stay locked in. (Bonnie Jean von Krogh)

Chris Lazaro: (Slide 19) The conditions that we were operating under at Potrero Yard were challenging, and they are conditions that operators and staff should not be operating in indefinitely. That is why Potrero Yard is part of the earthquake safety bond, because this is part of our portfolio that needs to immediately address the existing conditions. (Chris Lazaro)

#### **Item 4. Housing Updates**

Chris Lazaro: (Slide 20) Introduce the Housing Updates section.

Chris Lazaro: (Slide 21) We shared this slide in February and want to reiterate our continued commitment to affordable housing. Even with the redesign, the ability to preserve the opportunity to build approximately 100 units of housing on Bryant Street remains.

Chris Lazaro: (Slide 22) One of the two approvals that the SFMTA Board made last week was to authorize the Director of Transportation to enter into a Lease Development & Disposition Agreement (LDDA) for Bryant Street Housing. The LDDA is a bridging document that will be used from now until the developers get their funding for construction. This sets the terms for what SFMTA will expect from the developers until they are able to start construction.

Seth Furman: (Slide 22) From MY-T, I want to emphasize how important the LDDA is for securing funding for housing at Potrero Yard. We need to show the State that we have site control when we apply for funding and tax credits. The LDDA gives us a way to prove to the state that SFMTA is working with us to hold this site for housing. It's important for our development runway.

Seth Furman: (Slide 23) As we prepare to move forward with Bryant Street Housing, we want to clearly communicate key considerations that we are faced with, including type of units, limits of the Entitlements like height, and how we look at costs. We also do not want to impact the success of the bus yard next door to us.

Seth Furman: (Slide 24) With the changes to the bus yard, we need to figure out with our architects, Arcadis and YA Studios, what revisions to the drawings are needed. Once we have the drawings, we plan to go to the state to apply for Affordable Housing & Sustainable Communities (AHSC) funding in a year from now. Then we would apply for tax credits if we are awarded funding in our first round of AHSC. If we secure tax credits, we would be able to start construction by 2029 at the earliest possible.

To start construction in 2029, we would have to use the bus yard general contractor for the housing construction. This is an option created to make sure that the bus yard is not impacted by housing construction.

- Q: If MY-T doesn't use Webcor, then when can housing construction start? (James Bryant)
  - A: After 2030, after the bus yard reaches substantial completion. (Seth Furman)

Seth Furman: (Slide 24) We have shared this type of schedule before and this is a typical timeframe for building affordable housing.

- Q: When would the bus yard be completed? (James Bryant)
  - A: The yard would open in mid- to late- 2030. (Chris Lazaro)

## **Item 5. Legislative Update**

Chris Lazaro: (Slide 25) Introduce the Legislative Updates section.

Chris Lazaro: (Slide 26) The schedule is moving forward in the next few weeks. There was a slight change from the last schedule provided; we had to push back the dates by one week. The Board of Supervisors (BOS) Budget and Finance Committee is next week on March 18. And then the full BOS meeting will be on March 24.

We would reach Commercial Close with all the signatures on the agreement by April 3 and then Financial Close by mid-April.

John Angelico: (Slide 26) At the Budget & Finance Committee meeting, the public may make public comment on the agenda item.

## **Item 6. Community Engagement Update**

Bonnie Jean von Krogh: (Slide 27) Introduce the Community Engagement Updates section.

Bonnie Jean von Krogh: (Slide 28) The Project Agreement does include requirements to continue to do community engagement throughout the construction process including requiring PNC to create materials in English and Spanish, continue facilitating the Working Group, and provide project tours when safe and feasible.

We just want to make sure that the commitment to engage the public continues through the project.

Bonnie Jean von Krogh: (Slide 29) The next Working Group meeting is scheduled for April 14, 2026. At that time, we will share how the BOS meetings went, and we anticipate providing updates from Webcor team.

## **Item 7. Public Comment**

- Q: I am the owner of Ancor Iron Construction, Founder of BuildIt, and SF Latino & Black Contractors Association. The reduction in housing would significantly reduce the amount of work available for Local Business Enterprises (LBEs). Is there a way to have LBE requirements for the bus yard? Since we are using a bond to fund this project, and SF residents are paying for this, SF LBEs and workforce should get work from this. Is there a mechanism to make it so there are LBE goals on the bus yard? (Nick Colina)
  - A: The bus yard is partially funded from the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) and the DOT has a requirement that there cannot be any local business preferences, priorities, or requirements. Because of this restriction, we are unable to include an LBE goal on the bus yard project. However, all LBEs are also SBEs. (Jennifer Trotter)
  - A: To your point Nick, the requirement of the SBE participation is for the bus yard only and includes set asides that Webcor agreed. (Miguel Galarza)
  - A: Once the housing developer receives full funding, they will develop an economic inclusion plan for the housing based on the requirements of their funding source(s). (Jennifer Trotter)
  - A: For the bus yard, the SBE goal is 25% for Design and 20% for Construction. (Chris Jauregui)

- Demetrius Williams: It is alarming that there is a SBE goal versus a requirement. The general contractors have their regular subs that they work with, and there is no opportunity for LBEs to work with the larger contractors when there are goals only. LBEs are San Franciscans and we stay here when the large contractor leaves. We are here in force to ask that the project includes requirements.
  - A: Unfortunately, because of the funding restriction, we are unable to include an LBE requirement nor an SBE requirement. We have to follow the federal regulations on the bus yard project. (Jennifer Trotter)
- Hamm Khoudary: I'm frustrated that the SFMTA is taking up all the lanes for buses. I would pay a FasTrak to use certain lanes within the city - an idea for Muni.

Coming from a general contract world, Webcor is never going to suggest a pre-cast solution for this building. Precast would be much faster, but the Webcor would not make money that way.

- Sharla Sullivan: From Webcor Buildings, to chime in about local business. The DBE program is anticipated to be re-evaluated this Spring. Webcor outlined the participation goals for subs and this is stated in the SBE Plan submitted to SFMTA. We will make sure to continue engaging in local communities.

We recently had a meeting to connect SBEs who are also LBEs with prime contractors. If you need support and are looking to bid on the project, please reach out to our SBE Liaisons. We are here to support you. I will put contact information in the chat.

- Demetrius Williams: At that meeting, the plumbing estimator could not tell us their scope and bidding opportunities. We value our time and want to build a bond with the prime contractor on the project but if the estimator is not prepared, what incentive is that? We have been on this project since the beginning and will continue to be here.
  - We are made sure the set asides are made appropriately and are unbundled as appropriate to encourage participation. (Miguel Galarza)
- James Mabrey: Construction Clean Up and Bayview Hyperlocal Collective. I was concerned about Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) goals but PNC has broken that down. The Webcor has been great, they do have the best interest of Micro LBEs. Most of us have been around for a while. We have been aligning ourselves for 20 years. We want to come home to provide for our families and kids. We are SF residents, we grew up in these areas. We have the best interest of the entire SF community at heart. To allow others to come in and profit from our communities. There just needs to be some oversight from the SFMTA and the Liaisons to make sure the requirements are met throughout the project.

The other concern that I have is being overlooked as commercial cleaning. At the end of the contract, there will be a project manager that will be deciding what number to plug in. Has SFMTA thought about subbing out some of the work to local contractors and not spend it on overtime?

- Jennifer Trotter: We do want you to know that SFMTA Contract Compliance Office (CCO) has been involved with the SBE Plan. CCO has made sure that this project has robust SBE goals and set asides for specific scopes of work. They are also making sure Webcor is planning for future procurements and considering SBE attainment for each scope of work. Also, both PNC and Webcor both have SBE Liaisons to make sure we have the third-party checks and balances.
- James Mabrey: What about my concern of SFMTA subcontracting out other services at their facilities. We would like to have an introduction with those decision-makers.
  - A: The SFMTA did take on maintaining the building, as we do with internal staff – janitorial staff etc., so we took on the responsibility of maintaining the facility as we do our other facilities with internal staff. This was a change in the project plan. (Bonnie Jean von Krogh)
- Demetrius Williams: We would like to be included on the mailing list for these meetings.
  - Jennifer Trotter: The details for the next meeting and the notes from this meeting will be posted on the SFMTA website.
- Roberto: We will have a historical moment at the post office in the Bay View this weekend to celebrate the first ever low rider stamp. The event is on Saturday March 14 from 11am-3pm and we will have low-riders there.

### Online Chat

- Amy Beinart: It is worth noting that of the total number of units in the RHNA goals, 57 percent - that is, approx. 47000 -- are supposed to be affordable. Also worth noting is that the Housing Element cited the 435 AFFORDABLE units that were expected, so now there is a hole of 335 units. Isn't that do be considered in the question of whether the HE is in compliance?
- Amy Beinart: I think what wasn't shared with the WG was that the sharp increase in the construction cost of the transportation facility would lead to the choice to sacrifice the podium that would allow housing to be built. Rather than to pull back and look at the entire project, SFMTA approached it as a Value Engineering exercise, where individual pieces of the project were shaved off. And the WG wasn't informed at all that this was going to happen.
- D.C. Williams Development Company: Support local community-based developers. There are no pathways for our inclusion. D. C Development Company
- Amy Beinart: What is the source of the \$33MM annual payment that SFMTA/The City will be on the hook for the next 30 years to repay \$990 million loan/interest on this project?
- James Mabrey: No Problem,
- James Mabrey: SFMTA Just go ahead and Purchase the Build for the ( Low Price ) of \$612Million from Webcor, if not purchased Soon, due to the Integrity of the Bus Yards Infrastructure and, the approaching Due to Renew the Potrero Yard and, also Including the Climate of the US Today, the price will sour in the near future, purchase Now Guys. Then Raise the Requirement Goals for Inclusion of the Micro LBE Community, currently SFMTA has a 1% requirement goal but maybe that's wrong? SFMTA should purchase this project

and move the project forward asap. Plus The City Needs the Housing per its Commitments, save Money and Purchase Now. IJS....

- Vanessa Hernandez-Ricardo Marrun Construction: Very helpful information. Thank you everyone. I apologize but I have to go now.
- James Mabrey: Hint Hint
- Sharla Sullivan: Design-builder SBE liaison contact information:  
Contigo & IRLM: [hello@contigo-partners.com](mailto:hello@contigo-partners.com)  
Webcor Outreach project contact: Sharla Sullivan, [s.sullivan@webcor.com](mailto:s.sullivan@webcor.com) and 5105179637
- Sharla Sullivan: Sounds fun!
- Martin @ Caps Electric: thank you for the invite!

Meeting ended at 7:46 p.m.