



## SAN FRANCISCO PENINSULA RAIL PROGRAM EXECUTIVE STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

### MINUTES

Friday, May 21, 2021

11:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

### WATCH LIVE:

<https://transbaycenter.webex.com/transbaycenter/onstage/g.php?MTID=eff22f760455741392b6ebbb52b5de75b>

PUBLIC COMMENT CALL-IN: 1-855-282-6330 — Access Code: 182 015 5132

Due to the COVID-19 health emergency, the Executive Steering Committee (ESC) will meet via teleconference. Members of the public are encouraged to participate remotely. Please see additional information on the next page for remote meeting access.

In compliance with the Governor's Executive Order N-25-20 (March 12, 2020) as superseded by Order N-29-20 (March 17, 2020), this meeting will be held *exclusively* via teleconference participation of a quorum of ESC members in locations not open to the public. The purpose of the orders is to provide the safest environment for all persons consistent with San Francisco Department of Public Health Orders of the Health Officer and current public health recommendations, while allowing the public to observe and address the ESC.

### EXECUTIVE STEERING COMMITTEE

San Francisco County Transportation Authority, Tilly Chang (Chair)  
Metropolitan Transportation Commission, Andrew Fremier (Vice Chair)  
California High Speed Rail Authority, Boris Lipkin  
City and County of San Francisco, Alex Sweet  
Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board/Caltrain, Michelle Bouchard  
Transbay Joint Powers Authority, Nila Gonzales

**REMOTE MEETING ACCESS**  
**WATCH LIVE:**

<https://transbaycenter.webex.com/transbaycenter/onstage/g.php?MTID=eff22f760455741392b6ebbb52b5de75b>

**PUBLIC COMMENT CALL-IN: 1-855-282-6330 — Access Code: 182 015 5132**

**Providing Public Comment**

Ensure you are in a quiet location – Speak Clearly – Turn off any TVs or radios around you

1. When prompted, “raise hand” to speak by pressing \*3 (star, 3) to be added to the queue.
2. Callers will hear silence when waiting for their turn to speak.
3. When prompted, callers will have the standard three minutes to provide comment.

**AGENDA**

1. Call to Order

Chair Chang called the meeting to order at 11:02 a.m.

2. Roll Call

Secretary Pollitt noted that alternates Simon Whitehorn, Doug Johnson and Lisa Klein were attending on behalf of Member Lipkin, Member Sweet, and Vice Chair Fremier respectfully.

Members Present: Michelle Bouchard, Nila Gonzales, Doug Johnson, Lisa Klein, Simon Whitehorn and Tilly Chang.

Members Absent: Alex Sweet, Boris Lipkin and Andrew Fremier.

3. Communications

Secretary Pollitt provided instructions on the Public Call-in/Comment process.

- Chair’s Report

Chair Chang stated that the project team continues its outreach efforts to State delegation members and staff regarding the Downtown Rail Extension (DTX) project as well as advocating with federal partners in the context of the federal infrastructure bill. She noted that it was exciting to see Governor Newsom’s California Comeback Plan and looks forward to sharing more in the coming months as proposals advance in the Legislature and in Congress.

4. Action Item:

Approval of Meeting Minutes: April 16, 2021

Public Comment:

Roland Lebrun stated that the Governor signed Senate Bill 7 and that it will have profound impact on expediting environmental clearance for projects like this one.

A motion to approve the Meeting Minutes was made by Member Johnson and seconded by Member Whitehorn. A unanimous voice vote approved the motion.

5. Informational Item:  
Funding Plan

Jesse Koehler, Rail Program Manager, San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA), presented the item. He stated that the presentation would cover the funding approach for the upcoming phases of project development and described the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) New Starts process, emphasizing that the project must achieve prescribed funding milestones as it moves through the federal funding process.

Approximately \$50 million will be needed over the next three fiscal years for project development as the project proceeds through the FTA New Starts process: \$30 million for the FTA Project Development phase and \$20 million for the FTA Engineering phase. Entry into Project Development is scheduled for Fall 2021. He also stated that Regional Measure 3 (RM-3) funds originally were slated to fund this work and that the team is working with the partner agencies to develop a near-term funding plan, and he noted that right-of-way acquisition and advance utilities work are not included in the \$50 million costs for project development. Mr. Koehler further stated that the TJPA is scheduled to submit the request for a Full Funding Grant Agreement to the FTA in August 2023, and must demonstrate a commitment of 30% non-New Starts dollars in February 2023 at the time of request to enter the FTA Engineering phase.

Mr. Koehler reported that a working group with representation from the six partnering agencies has convened to support development of the Funding Plan. He presented three possible funding scenarios for the near-term funding that would include contributions from Mello-Roos Special Tax bond proceeds, SFCTA Proposition K funds, other partnering agencies, and federal grant programs. With regard to the Special Tax bond proceeds, Mr. Koehler noted that at the May TJPA Board of Directors meeting, Director Mandelman (the San Francisco Board of Supervisors' Representative to the TJPA Board) expressed the need for a demonstrated commitment from the project partners as part of advancing the bond issuance backed by Special Tax revenues.

Member Whitehorn emphasized the need to evaluate each scenario expeditiously, given that securing funding is not a quick process and the partnering agencies' internal processes need to be recognized. Member Bouchard said that she appreciated the options, noting that many agencies are undergoing budget processes and challenges. She emphasized that she appreciated the funding milestones at various stages and said Caltrain will need to understand what their contribution should be, as she will need direction from the Caltrain Board. Member Klein said that she thinks the three options provide a nice range and that all agencies face constraints and pressures, so the ESC will require more information to determine which option is most feasible. Member Klein concurred with Member Bouchard that looking at the bigger funding need (\$50 million) is helpful. Mary Pryor, financial consultant to TJPA, explained that the process of issuing bonds would be managed by the City's Office of Public Finance in coordination with the TJPA and SFCTA. Ms. Pryor added that the City's Capital Planning Committee would review the details of the planned bond issuance.

Chair Chang referenced Director Mandelman's desire to see wider funding commitment and stated that the partnering agencies need to show a regional funding commitment for the near-term work. Member Johnson stated that the State recently issued its budget and asked how the State could support one or both FTA phases. Chair Chang suggested reaching out to the State, CHSRA, and CalSTA (California State Transportation Agency). Chair Chang stated that there are several line items in the California Comeback Plan that the team may be able to focus on in discussions with state representatives, noting that the regional delegation to the State will be interested as well. Member Klein asked when the ESC can expect a recommendation, and whether comments from the TJPA Board meeting suggest an additional scenario, which would be a combination of bonds and the full \$50 million. Mr. Koehler stated that the third scenario he presented addresses this broader commitment to the entire project while also committing the first \$30 million. Regarding timing, Mr. Koehler stated he expects to return to the ESC later this summer on the near-term plan and full Funding Plan. Ms. Pryor stated that the Capital Planning Committee meeting would be in July. Member Gonzales noted that the team would want to present the recommended option and gain consensus from the TJPA Board before proceeding. Chair Chang noted that given time constraints, the team should target the July Capital Planning Committee and be prepared to report on progress to either the ESC or TJPA Board in July. Chair Chang also noted that the City's bonding legislation process is expected to conclude this Fall and stated that the Funding Task team would keep the ESC regularly informed as the process proceeds. Member Whitehorn stated that working groups should use that timeframe to evaluate each of the scenarios within their respective agency's process. Chair Chang reiterated the need for engagement with CalSTA, the statewide delegation, and others.

**Public Comment:**

Roland Lebrun stated that he will have the Board of Supervisors, Metropolitan Transportation Commission, Caltrain, and CHSRA defund the project until it gets back on track and said that he would elaborate during the next item on the agenda.

**6. Informational Item:**

Presentation by Caltrain and California High Speed Rail Authority on Operations Analysis

Stephen Polechronis, Interim Project Director, introduced the item, stating this is a significant milestone in support of the Phasing Study, which was undertaken to help the Integrated Program Management Team (IPMT) make recommendations to the ESC and TJPA Board to bring down capital costs. The IPMT has reached consensus on the infrastructure and is looking to the ESC for guidance on open questions.

Sebastian Petty, Caltrain Deputy Chief of Planning and Paul Hebditch, CHSRA Lead for Operations Planning, presented the item. Mr. Petty explained that the analysis looked at the proposed infrastructure relative to phasing concepts and the levels of service being planned on the DTX by the operators. The levels of service are in key policy documents, which include Caltrain's 2020 Business Plan and long-range 2040 Service Vision and CHSRA's 2020 Business Plan. The goal for integrated service is eight Caltrain and four high-speed trains per direction per hour, which could be phased in over time. He noted that the alignment

is within a constrained urban environment, stating that the operators took a holistic approach to the study, looking at different levels of service over time. Mr. Petty reported that key findings indicate that three tracks are required between the Fourth and Townsend Street Station and the Salesforce Transit Center to support the 12 trains per direction per hour, noting that this result is consistent with previous analyses. He presented alternative layouts for the Fourth and Townsend Street Station. He said that dynamic simulations were run hundreds of times to test minor delays to the system, and that the system showed good resiliency. To understand how the system would perform during more significant events, the operators performed static analysis and were pleased to find viable contingency options, even with significant pieces of infrastructure offline, the system could function in a contingency manner. Mr. Petty discussed a “run-through” analysis, which would look at the Salesforce Transit Center as a run-through station rather than a terminal station, stating that this option is being considered relative to the Link21 program’s plan for an East Bay rail crossing. He said that the IPMT and members of the Link21 team have discussed how to approach the run-through analysis, noting that the Link21 project is at the conceptual level. The IPMT decided to defer further discussion on a run-through analysis pending direction from the ESC on whether to proceed with some level of run-through analysis and how the analysis should address the relationship to Link21.

Member Bouchard thanked Sebastian Petty for the presentation and thorough analysis and how it tackled important questions, specifically, the tension between the DTX project, which is moving toward a concrete definition for near-term funding, and the Link21 concept. Member Bouchard cautioned against changing assumptions for the standalone DTX project and asked how a run-through analysis would be pursued. Mr. Petty replied that (1) the analysis can assume that the DTX is built-out as designed and that at future Link21 would connect to an existing tunnel, or (2) the analysis can analyze iterations of the DTX alignment under the assumption that the Link21 project will happen and will connect to the DTX. Mr. Petty noted that with the scenarios being different, the inputs to the analysis are critical. Mr. Polechronis stated that the second scenario Mr. Petty described, where the definition of DTX would change, would have significant schedule implications relative to the federal funding process and the start of the design refresh in late Summer/early Fall and our August 2023 target for the Full Funding Grant Agreement request to the FTA. Regarding scoping a run-through analysis, Chair Chang stated that her first question would ask what such a high-level analysis shows, assuming the DTX as designed and environmentally cleared, i.e., what is the practical capacity of the station given the two-way service. Chair Chang explained that she sees this as a planning exercise as a way to understand infrastructure constraints and fatal flaws. Member Bouchard concurred with Chair Chang’s remarks, noting that there is value at looking at this to ensure questions can be answered that will eventually come up at the TJPA Board. She also noted that the ESC needs to be able to respond to questions about future connected regional service. Member Bouchard asked about the term “defer,” which she heard used in different ways during the presentation and asked for clarification. Mr. Petty stated that he had referred to deferring the run-through analysis pending direction from the ESC. Mr. Polechronis stated that one of the phasing concepts is to defer the third track of the DTX tunnel; the upcoming Phasing Study report will explain. In terms of the run-through analysis, the assumptions that would need to be made about alignment, service levels, and other parameters. Mr. Polechronis added that several members of the IPMT would have concerns with this analysis informing decisions related to major changes to the DTX design, given the

uncertainty of the underlying assumptions. Member Gonzales thanked the group for their work and noted that the Link21 team is involved and has shared their opinions relative to risk.

#### Public Comment:

Roland Lebrun stated that the root cause of the problem is an inconsistency with Prop 1A, which specifies a single station between San Francisco and San Jose. He also stated that high-speed trains should not stop at Fourth and Townsend, and he noted that replacing the high-speed platforms with passing tracks, which can be phased in later, would eliminate these problems. He referenced slide 8 of the presentation and stated that with three tracks, there will be no way for passengers to get off the train without shutting down the entire tunnel.

Jim Patrick expressed his support for Chair Chang's comments that we should look at how the DTX will connect to an East Bay link.

Adrian Brandt stated that a principle Deutsche Bahn uses in Germany—that any train can call at any track or platform—is not being used for the DTX, which would offer a degree of flexibility in constrained environments and allow for cross platform transfers. He expressed disappointment regarding the design, stating that it is limiting this option. He noted that Caltrain's new electric multiple unit trainsets will be able to accommodate multiple platform heights and that the planning should take advantage of this.

#### 7. Public Comment

Members of the public may provide comment on matters within the ESC's purview that are not on the agenda.

Roland Lebrun listed several conditions to a new allocation of Prop 1A bonds needed to complete the Merced–Bakersfield high-speed rail line, which included the restoration of meeting minutes and EIR materials, and stated that high-speed trains should be designed to be compatible with Caltrain, Capitol Corridor, and MetroLink.

#### 8. ESC Agenda items for upcoming meetings.

None.

#### 9. Adjourn

Chair Chang adjourned the meeting at 12:03 p.m.

#### ACCESSIBLE MEETING POLICY

The Ethics Commission of the City and County of San Francisco has asked us to remind individuals that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance (Campaign and Gov't Conduct Code, Article II, Chapter 1, § 2.100, et seq.) to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the Ethics Commission at 25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 220, San Francisco, CA 94102, telephone (415) 252-3100, fax (415) 252-3124 and website: [www.sfethics.org](http://www.sfethics.org).