

# Link21 Equity Advisory Council (Meeting 8)

January 16, 2024

## DRAFT Link21 Equity Advisory Council (EAC) Meeting #8

January 16, 2024

1:00 pm – 3:30 pm

A Zoom transcript of this meeting is included at the end of this document.

Presentation slides from this meeting can be found via BART Legistar.

### AGENDA

#### I. Call to Order (For Information)

A regular meeting of the Link21 Equity Advisory Council (EAC) was held Tuesday, January 16, 2024, convening at 1:00 pm via teleconference pursuant to the Link21 EAC Bylaws and consistent with Assembly Bill No. 361. This meeting was called to order by Tim Lohrentz (Equity Programs Administrator, BART Office of Civil Rights).

Tim Lohrentz gave instructions on the virtual meeting, accessing the presentation materials online, public comment, and members' remarks.

#### II. Roll Call (For Information)

Tim Lohrentz announced Hayden Miller as the newest member of the EAC and asked Hayden to introduce himself. EAC Member Hayden Miller introduced himself briefly, speaking to his background and interest in the public transportation sphere, as well as his lived experience as someone living in the Bay Area that does not drive. Hayden expressed enthusiasm for his new position on the EAC.

Sadie Graham (Link21 Program Director) announced to the EAC that Nicole Franklin, who has served as Link21's Outreach and Engagement Manager for years, had taken a job with the City of Alameda. Sadie expressed gratitude for her years on the program and affirmed that Nicole is looking forward to working on behalf of Link21 in the future.

#### EAC Present Members

Angela E. Herring	David Ying	Hayden Miller
Beth Kenny	Elizabeth Madrigal	Mica Amichai*
Clarence R. Fischer	Fiona Yim	Taylor Booker*
Cory Mickels	Gracyna Mohabir*	
David Sorrell	Harun David	

\*EAC members who entered the meeting at 2 pm onward have an asterisk next to their name.

#### EAC Absent Members

Ameerah Thomas	Linda Braak	Vanessa Ross Aquino
Landon Hill	Samia Zuber	

### Participating Link21 Staff & Consultants

Darin Ranelletti, Link21 Manager of Land Use Planning, BART	Katie DeLeuw, Link21 Tech Support	Stefania Diaz, Link21 Tech Support
Frank Ponciano, EAC Facilitator	Kyle Morales, Link21 Equity Manager	Tim Lohrentz, Equity Programs Administrator, BART Office of Civil Rights
Joseph Chroston-Bell, Link21 Stage Gate Lead	Lisa Marie Alley, Link21 Strategic Communications Manager	
Julian Hernandez, Link21 Tech Support	Sadie Graham, Link21 Program Director	

### Guest Participants

Wilhelmenia Wilson		
--------------------	--	--

### III. Public Comment (For Information)

Tim Lohrentz (Equity Programs Administrator, BART) asked for public comment for topics that are not on the meeting’s agenda. Tim reminded meeting attendees that public comment is limited to two minutes per person and outlined instructions for providing verbal comment via phone and Zoom.

Pamela Morris made public comment to let the Link21 team know that the links to access the meeting via Legistar were not working for her. Pamela also expressed gratitude for a recent change to BART service advisories to include a message of watching your step on wet stairways and platforms when trains are moving at slower speeds due to weather, as Pamela felt it showed a new level of consideration for the public that had not been displayed before.

### IV. Meeting Topics

#### A. Approval of November 28, 2023, Meeting Minutes (For Action)

Tim Lohrentz asked the EAC if there were any changes to be made to the November 28, 2023, meeting minutes. No edits were noted; Tim followed up by asking for a motion to approve the minutes. EAC Member Clarence R. Fischer initiated a motion to approve the meeting minutes, and EAC Member Harun David seconded the motion. The EAC members approved the motion by a show of hands.

#### B. Follow-up to Previous EAC Feedback (For Information)

Tim Lohrentz referred the EAC to the memo in the meeting packet that addresses EAC feedback. He highlighted the item in relation to paying for transit with Electronic Benefits

Transfer (EBT) cards, clarifying that general assistance EBT was the only form of EBT that worked for a tap to ride transit system, although it cannot be used to add value to a Clipper Card. He stated that CalWORKs EBT does not allow for transit payments, and that it may be an opportunity for EAC member advocacy as it is a state-by-state decision to allow individuals to use it to pay for transit.

**C. Advancing Towards Stage Gate 2 and A Project Recommendation (For Information) (60 minutes)**

Tim Lohrentz introduced Agenda Item C and turned over the presentation to Joseph Chroston-Bell (Link21 Stage Gate Manager).

Joseph provided a refresher on the Stage Gate process and the EAC's role within it. Joseph explained that Stage Gates are major milestones for the Link21 program, and that Link21 is approaching Stage Gate 2, where the program will make a recommendation between BART or Regional Rail as the technology in the crossing. Joseph emphasized that the Link21 program has been seeking the EAC's input throughout the year to understand the tradeoffs and benefits of each choice. Joseph outlined the Stage Gate 2 report and explained that the EAC will have a meeting dedicated to Stage Gate that reviews the statements captured in the report. He also explained that the public will have an opportunity to provide comments on the draft staff recommendation, and that Stage Gate 2 culminates in meetings with the BART and CCJPA boards where they will vote to approve the Link21 program to move forward.

Kyle Morales (Link21 Equity Manager) described the EAC Input Report, a comprehensive document that captures EAC input from throughout the year intended to make it possible for Stage Gate reviewers to see the full picture of what the EAC has commented on throughout its existence. Kyle explained that the report captures input related to three discrete things:

1. EAC input related to technical work driving Link21 that will help support the forthcoming staff recommendation for Stage Gate 2.
2. Input related to the service type or technology that will be recommended to the boards at Stage Gate 2.
3. Input informing the Link21 program on future scope items that should be moving forward as the program moves past Stage Gate 2.

Kyle emphasized that the EAC Input Report will be more exhaustive than the feedback memos attached to each EAC meeting packet, and that this report will be considered by Stage Gate reviewers alongside a number of other documents. Kyle then explained the EAC will review draft key themes in the report today, providing feedback both verbally and through a Mentimeter exercise. He also informed the EAC that they will have the opportunity to review the entire report starting March 15<sup>th</sup>. Kyle continued that any EAC members who want to review the full report will be requested to provide their comments by March 26<sup>th</sup>, as that timing will allow the Link21 Team to make updates before the report is shared with the BART and CCJPA Boards.

Kyle then walked through the draft key input themes: serving the Megaregion, potential for new stations and access, priority population benefits, displacement, service frequency, and service hours. He explained that the Link21 program was interested in hearing more feedback about what types of priority population benefits are important to the EAC, and differentiated between incremental benefits, relatively smaller benefits that would benefit a larger number of primarily existing riders, and significant benefits, relatively larger benefits that would go to a smaller number of people who may not currently have access to rail or are not regular users of rail. He also outlined three additional key themes that have been raised consistently by the EAC and will be important to keep in mind in upcoming phases of work: fares, safety, and accessibility. Kyle reminded the EAC that these key input themes are

meant to capture only the most frequently shared themes from the EAC, but that comments or concerns raised less frequently will also be included in the full report.

Frank Ponciano then asked the EAC to access the Mentimeter poll for this discussion through log-in information they received through email.

EAC Member Clarence R. Fischer requested that any items necessary to participate fully in EAC discussions be sent out at least one or two days in advance, as not everyone has the ability to access their email day of.

Frank Ponciano apologized for the oversight and explained that Mentimeter changes log-in information on a day-to-day basis for security purposes. He also promised to pay special attention to those with this accessibility concern and welcomed any EAC members to offer input verbally as well.

EAC Member David Sorrell stated that he felt the key input themes were a good overview of the overarching themes of the EAC thus far but was concerned about making sure the details were captured accurately to ensure that the voices of the EAC are translating to equitable and actionable policies. He said that the priorities are captured accurately, and that the next step is to make sure these priorities are translated correctly once the program moves into topics like station placement, transportation demand management, and individual infill stations.

Kyle Morales expressed that that comment was helpful, and many of the items David mentioned are going to be key priorities that the Link21 program will continue to bring to the EAC for discussion.

Frank Ponciano re-directed the EAC's attention to the Mentimeter exercise, and asked two follow up questions: what reflections do you have on the draft key input themes, and do you think that there is anything else the program needs to include given your experience in 2023?

EAC Member Harun David affirmed Clarence R. Fischer's concerns about Mentimeter instructions being sent out day-of while also acknowledging security issues and stressed that the Link21 team should find a middle ground.

Frank Ponciano thanked him for his comments and asked for verbal feedback on the Mentimeter question from EAC members who could not access the Mentimeter.

EAC Member Clarence R. Fischer stated that he voted for three.

EAC Member Fiona Yim stated that she had accessed the Mentimeter and was able to vote. She also stated that these themes were an accurate representation of EAC discussions but was concerned that the themes may be a bit too broad with too many competing priorities.

EAC Member Harun David stated that the themes were reflective of the discussions held by the EAC in 2023, especially in regards to priority populations, but reiterated that the challenge was now to turn those themes into something operational.

Frank Ponciano quickly recapped the Mentimeter results, which was at an average of 4 after 7 EAC members responded to the prompt on a scale of 1 to 5: the draft list of key input themes captures the most prominent priorities raised by EAC members in 2023.

EAC Member Hayden Miller agreed with Fiona Yim that there are a lot of good ideas among the key input themes, and asked if it would be helpful to prioritize. He stressed that in reality, it probably will not be possible to accomplish all the goals set forth by the EAC.

Kyle Morales affirmed the points that the EAC made about the key input themes being potentially too broad, but informed the EAC that the program is not yet at the stage of prioritizing these themes. He stated that the goal of these themes is to tie all the feedback the program has received into the forthcoming technology recommendation in March, and

additional conversations will occur after the Stage Gate decision regarding how the program puts these priorities into practice.

Frank Ponciano emphasized that this is not a prioritization exercise, but that these categories are going to feed into the decision coming up this year.

EAC Member David Sorrell expressed that while it is important to identify big picture goals that serve as a cornerstone for the work the EAC does moving forward, it is also important to manage expectations on what will be realistic moving forward.

Frank Ponciano asked for additional feedback from the EAC.

EAC Member Clarence R. Fischer brought up that it will be important to reach out to local transit operators ahead of any potential infill stations and get their commitment to providing service for priority populations to and from those stations. He brought up an example of the Beat the Backup week, where Capitol Corridor provided a temporary station in Hercules and then got a commitment from WestCAT, the local transit operator in the area, to provide access to that infill stop. He stressed that priority populations will not be served by new stations if they cannot walk the distance from their homes to the new stations.

Kyle Morales stated that the idea of ensuring robust connections with local transit has been raised by the EAC at multiple points throughout the year, and as such will be added to the list of key input themes. He then asked a follow up question of whether EAC members had thoughts on how they would prioritize between incremental benefits and substantial benefits.

EAC Member Beth Kenny expressed that while incremental benefits are great, priority populations are often the ones excluded from those incremental benefits. She stated substantial benefits can in fact benefit the whole population, even if they seem targeted. Beth provided the example of improvements built for the disabled population, as they also create important benefits for the larger population (e.g., curb cutouts benefit those with disabilities, but also benefit bikers and people with strollers). She stated that without having a defined list of what these benefits are, she would prioritize substantial benefits over incremental benefits.

EAC Member Hayden Miller shared that living in San Francisco, he generally sees incremental benefits, citing the new bus lane on Geary as an example. Hayden noted that travel times did not get faster from the bus lanes, because buses had to wait longer at each stop. He said that incremental benefits like time saved are often eaten away by other things, providing the potential example of the new fare gate project in West Oakland resulting in congestion when entering the station, which adds that time right back into one's commute. He stated that on the other hand, substantial benefits like entirely new bus lines in West Marin for example are transformational, as it is the difference between somebody being able to get to their job every morning, or him frequenting that area at all. He stated that he believes there is a lot of importance to substantial projects for smaller populations, as the impact is often large.

EAC Member David Sorrell named that transit needs to be above and beyond the baseline lifeline service that only serves as a last resort. He said that from his experience in two different transit regions, Chicago, and the Bay Area, he can see both sides of the argument for both incremental and substantial benefits. He also said that substantial benefits can sometimes neglect the smaller details of supporting neighborhoods, while incremental benefits have long term effects on these neighborhoods. He stated that while the program must ultimately find a balance between substantial and incremental benefits, what is particularly important is to get the word out to populations about these upcoming changes and be willing to evolve according to their needs in order to avoid making changes that are deemed as performative.

Sadie Graham presented an overview of the Link21 planning process and reiterated that the upcoming decision is really a matter of technology chosen to be in the crossing. She started at the beginning of the Link21 project in 2019, which at the time was focused on defining the

problem statement: the 21-county Megaregion does not have a rail network that meets the needs of the Megaregion despite being the fifth largest economy in the United States and being made up of 12 million people. She also emphasized that priority populations are the ones who suffer the most from the lack of accessible rail options, as they bear the biggest housing and transportation costs relative to their incomes. She named that equity rose to the top as an important factor during initial engagement with the community. She reminded the EAC that the goals and objectives of the Link21 program were translated into a number of metrics that will inform the decision of which technology will be used in the crossing. Sadie provided an overview of the business case, explaining that within the business case, there is the strategic case, the preliminary business case (which is where the program is currently at), the economic case, and the deliverability case. She re-emphasized that the next step will be to bring back to the EAC emerging themes that can be seen within the metrics for a discussion on how they will inform the Stage Gate recommendation. Link21 will be doing public outreach beginning with the EAC and followed by some public workshops, meetings, and an online open house before advancing a recommendation to the boards.

Frank Ponciano then asked the EAC for any comments or questions related to this agenda item.

EAC Member Clarence R. Fischer named it as an equity issue that Union Pacific Railroad lines such as Capitol Corridor and Amtrak San Joaquins require riders to provide a government issued ID. He stated that Greyhound does not require ID but has also eliminated a lot of its buses and stations. He said that since it seems that rail will become the major carrier in the future for the Megaregion, rail needs to eliminate government ID requirements to remain a viable option for those without ID.

Sadie Graham affirmed Clarence's point as a good one and stated that ID requirements are a good example of a policy decision irrespective of technology choice that the program will have to consider when it is evaluating fares.

Frank Ponciano confirmed that current Amtrak policy requires riders to have an ID and asked for additional feedback from the EAC.

EAC Member David Sorrell added that it will be important to convince the 40+ transit operators in the Megaregion of the importance of regional rail as conceptual design, as well as important to keep in mind that not everyone will be traveling to the urban core. He emphasized that whether it be regional bus, BART, Regional Rail, or other forms of transit, it is important to convince people to try to use transit. He named that many financially insecure neighborhoods often do not have the means to cross the bridge regardless of mode of transportation, and that transit operators should keep service workers and those that live underneath the poverty level in mind. He also acknowledged that this region skews towards tech workers and the affluent, and that it should be a stretch goal to make transit work well for choice riders if VMT and carbon emission reduction is truly a long-standing goal.

Sadie Graham reminded the EAC that the program will be circulating and taking comment on the EAC input report.

### **Break (10 min)**

Facilitator Frank Ponciano announced a 10-minute break at 2:25 pm.

#### **D. Anti-Displacement Conversation on Race/Ethnicity and Transit-Oriented Development (For Information)**

Frank Ponciano introduced the next agenda item by reminding the EAC of the prioritization exercise at the October EAC meeting where EAC members identified race and ethnicity and transit-oriented development as the two topics to explore first in relation to anti-displacement

for the Link21 program. He also acknowledged the EAC's desire to learn more from community leaders. He then passed the presentation over to Darin Ranelletti to continue the conversation.

Darin Ranelletti (Link21 Land Use Planning Manager) re-introduced himself and defined transit-oriented development (TOD) as a development project that is located on or adjacent to public transit stations designed in a manner to support the public transit use. He also welcomed Wilhelmenia Wilson, Executive Director of Healthy Black Families (HBF), and asked her to speak to her work with HBF.

Wilhelmenia Wilson spoke to her work at HBF, explaining that HBF is dedicated to advancing social justice with a focus on Black people and their families in Berkeley as a community-based public health organization that works through the lens of social determinants of health. She provided an overview of the programs HBF delivers to the community, including early childhood education, kindergarten readiness, and healthy food programs.

Darin Ranelletti then asked Wilhelmenia Wilson to provide some historical context for Berkeley and explain how that shapes her work today.

Wilhelmenia Wilson asked to broaden the context past Berkeley, explaining that equity in the United States has a lot to do with property and property ownership. She explained that she is a descendant of five generations of enslaved people, and that to understand property negotiation in the United States, it is important to understand the original property transaction in the US regarded people. She stated that people transacted continued to be the most vulnerable and disenfranchised across decades, and that continued to be true in the 1940s and 1950s when the Federal Housing Administration codified property ownership with racial biases in their policy making. She quickly defined redlining and explained that south and west Berkeley were the historically redlined areas of Berkeley. She explained that the work HBF does deals with the historical disenfranchisement that resulted from these policies.

Wilhelmenia Wilson then explained that HBF has partnered with BART and the City of Berkeley in a project called Equity for Black Berkeley, and part of that work has had to do with transit-oriented development that is going to be built at the Ashby BART station. She also stated that part of the work is acknowledging the harm done to the Black community when the original transit station was erected. She stated that the BART development in Berkeley decimated the Black community of Berkeley, reducing the population of Black people in Berkeley from 40 percent to the current rate of 7.9 percent, and laying the groundwork for gentrification, disinvestment, and disenfranchisement.

Darin Ranelletti thanked Wilhelmenia for her answer and then asked her what the idea of repair might look like in this context, whether it be TOD or other transit policies.

Wilhelmenia Wilson applauded the City of Berkeley for their partnership with HBF as they have applied a case management tool, the family functioning scale, to estimate the amount of harm done to the community by systemic racism. Wilhelmenia stated that the City of Berkeley currently estimates \$300 billion of lost equity for Black folks to current day. She explained that as a result of this research, Equity for Black Berkeley has had discussions on housing for those in the workforce, those who need very low-income housing, and Berkeley's homeless population that don't only focus on affordable housing, but also the ability to afford. She explained that they are looking at ways to create housing models that allow people to own homes and create equity and generational wealth while still maintaining affordability. She also explained that an element of repair was related to negotiations for the air rights over the

BART station, which resulted in a community governed fund that will support things like down payment assistance, workforce development, and early childhood education programs.

Darin Ranelletti asked Wilhelmenia to elaborate on the work she's done around housing preferences.

Wilhelmenia Wilson explained that in 2016, the City of Berkeley put forth a housing survey and asked HBF to support outreach to the Black community. She explained that HBF quickly realized that the survey was not going to pull forward the right information, and as a result, they partnered with the City, the East Bay Community Law Center, and the San Francisco Foundation to rewrite the survey and title it a right to return/ right to stay survey. She also explained that in California, Prop 209 precludes cities from making race-based policies unless you can prove historic discrimination. She stated that because they were able to do that, they were able to create a preference policy that asked people whether they were displaced due to BART eminent domain, displaced due to predatory lending in the relevant time period, and whether they are at risk for homelessness, among other things. She finished her explanation by stating that people who qualify receive preferences for moving into affordable housing units as they become available.

Darin Ranelletti clarified that the repair is both physical and social, and Wilhelmenia agreed. Darin then asked Wilhelmenia to talk through what human centered reparative development means to her, as well as how it informs her work.

Wilhelmenia explained that she received training in human centered design through her previous position at Kaiser Permanente and brought those methods with her to HBF. She said that when this initiative started in January 2022, they would host events in public spaces and provide food, music, movement, and culturally resonant spaces for people to participate. She stated that at these events, they went through a human-centered design process where they asked a central question: what do we need to create a thriving Black Berkeley? She explained that they gathered over 1600 responses and distilled these comments into 9 categories, which they then took back to the community for a prioritization exercise. She pointed out that they had Black participants and allies use different colored dots, and that variations between the two groups allowed for HBF to have productive, data-driven conversations as to why solutions for the Black community need to be led by the Black community. She revealed that the top priority for the Black community was housing. She then shared a personal anecdote as to how her family was able to sell property before BART's eminent domain seizure and pass down assets between generation for the first time since her ancestors' enslavement in 1765 and acknowledged how many families in South Berkeley experienced very different outcomes due to not having the same opportunity. She stated that as she works with Black families in Berkeley, it is very present for her how transit agencies can deeply impact the outcomes of families.

Darin Ranelletti thanked Wilhelmenia for her powerful story and attempted to connect the conversation back to Link21. He asked Wilhelmenia how this understanding of systems in the past translate into ideas, concerns, or recommendations for Link21.

Wilhelmenia Wilson said it is important to draw on past wisdom, as this is not the first major transit infrastructure project in the region. She shared that Darin and her had the opportunity to sit in a panel at a convening sponsored by Build It Green in 2023 that brought up questions for her about measuring the right things within large systems to determine whether a not a project has been successful.



Darin asked Wilhelmenia for her thoughts on what kinds of metrics Link21 should look to gather to ensure that the right outcomes are met, and how to make these metrics equivalent to the metrics transit agencies have historically been driven by.

Wilhelmenia Wilson stated that the program would be doing itself a disservice to not learn from the failures of the past. She also stated that one person's failure is another person's success, so it is important to bring all voices into a conversation to level set what failure may look like. She emphasized that she was very happy to see the EAC engaged and said that she was planning on having community at the spring Link21 convenings, because unless all voices are in the room, the EAC really does not have the basis to make well-informed decisions.

Darin Ranelletti thanked her for comments on achieving desirable outcomes and said that the program could learn a lot from the dot voting exercise that revealed differences in values between Black folks and allies.

Wilhelmenia Wilson explained that Equity for Black Berkeley is now in the next phase of the project, the journey mapping phase, where they will be documenting people's lived experience with being displaced from housing. She stated that out of this phase will come metrics that matter from a human and qualitative standpoint that they hope to bring back to the institution to figure out how they can also be considered and evaluated.

Darin Ranelletti stated that it seems that these two efforts, Equity for Black Berkeley and Link21, can learn from each other and strengthen both efforts. Darin then passed the conversation back to Frank Ponciano for a facilitated discussion with the EAC.

Frank Ponciano thanked Darin and Wilhelmenia for the conversation and prompted the EAC to add any comments relevant to the discussion.

EAC Member Clarence R. Fischer agreed that different areas of Berkeley were positively and negatively impacted in the 1960s. He stated that the work of the EAC is now to learn from the past and consider how displacement will be handled by the Link21 program regardless of chosen technology. He emphasized that Wilhelmenia Wilson seems like a key person to continue to include in the Link21 program to ensure positive outcomes for all communities instead of converting them into negatively "impacted communities."

Wilhelmenia Wilson added that when she was holding conversations with people about the technical pieces of development, she invited them to bring the energy from their heart and move out of the technicalities. She urged people to ask themselves: if your family was being displaced, what would you need? How would you want to be moved? What would you require for your children? She said that if we move with human dignity and compassion, the outcome should reflect that.

EAC Member Taylor Booker commended Wilhelmenia for coming into the EAC space and sharing her expertise and showed appreciation for the way Wilhelmenia looped in the history of housing and its relation to transit. Taylor said that it is important for the Link21 program to understand that building healthy, thriving communities has to do with food, health, housing, transit, and other topic areas that tie into one. She commended the Link21 team for inviting her to this space and stated that she'd love to see Wilhelmenia become a part of the smaller anti-displacement working group conversations as well if possible. She also stated that community benefits is a topic she'd love to see the anti-displacement working group explore.

EAC Member Harun David thanked Wilhelmenia for the emotional and powerful conversation. He lamented that unfortunately, decision makers do not often have the lived experience or historical understanding of how history has created the problems society grapples with today.

He emphasized how important it is to give priority populations and other impacted communities a real voice in the planning process so that today's challenges can be addressed differently and result in different outcomes.

Wilhelmenia Wilson added that all people have good intentions but clarified that unless we listen to the voices of those who are impacted, we will not understand the impact of our intentions. She emphasized that intentions and impacts are not the same, and we have to hold space to understand both to make quality decisions for community benefit.

EAC Member David Sorrell thanked Wilhelmenia for talking through the historical background of BART's development in the 1950s and 1960s and for detailing how so many communities have been left out of the conversation and forced out. He stated that in technical planning and service planning spaces, it is a conversation that many still refuse to have. He emphasized that it is important to follow the lead of people like Wilhelmenia when doing outreach, as well as important for people in the planning space to do their due diligence in a way that will fix past harms.

Wilhelmenia Wilson closed the conversation by stating that at some point, almost everyone is a steward of community assets, whether it be government money or representation of communities, for example. She stated that is incumbent upon everyone to make decisions that will actualize the opportunities presented by wielding stewardship over those community assets responsibly, and with the goal of ensuring the largest benefit for as many community members as possible.

Frank Ponciano thanked Wilhelmenia and Darin once again for the conversation.

#### **E. Anti-Displacement Working Group Update (For Information)**

Frank Ponciano provided an overview on how the anti-displacement working group came to be and how EAC members were invited to participate. He announced that the working group will be meeting three times, on January 29, February 26, and April 15, with the goal of presenting recommendations to the larger EAC in May as to the goals and principles that will guide the EAC's anti-displacement work. He clarified that the working group will not be open to the public and no formal meeting minutes will be prepared, but that a high-level summary will be provided to the EAC through agenda packets to ensure transparency. He then asked for any questions or comments from the EAC.

EAC Member Clarence R. Fischer requested that all relevant meeting information be provided to EAC members the Friday before each meeting, as they will be held on Mondays.

EAC Member David Sorrell spoke in support of Clarence's comment, looking to ensure that EAC members are given ample time to prepare for the meetings.

Frank Ponciano thanked Clarence and David and also assured them that the program team will look for other ways to ensure people have access to all relevant materials, such as through text message.

#### **G. Public Comment (For Information)**

Tim Lohrentz opened the public comment period for items on this meeting's agenda. Tim explained that public comments will be limited to two minutes per person.

No public comment.

**V. Next Meeting Date: March 19, 2024, at 6:00 pm (For Information)**

Tim Lohrentz announced that the next meeting will be on Tuesday, March 19 at 6 pm.

**VI. Adjournment (For Action)**

EAC Member Hayden Miller motioned to adjourn the meeting and EAC Member David Sorrell seconded the motion. The EAC unanimously motioned to adjourn at 3:26 PM.

## EAC Meeting Zoom Transcription Meeting #8 – January 16, 2023

This is a Zoom transcript of the meeting.

**Tim Lohrentz**

21 for the BART Office of Civil Rights and I want to extend a warm welcome to members of the public today, as well as to our Equity Advisory Council members on behalf of the Link 21 team. Next slide please. Before we do the roll call, hear public comments, and do a quick agenda review, I want to make sure we all are on the same page about how we will conduct the Zoom meeting today. First, please keep yourself on mute when not speaking. If you'd like to make a comment, please raise your hand, or come off mute. If on the phone, you can press star six to unmute, star nine to raise your hand, and star six again to remute yourself. If on screen, please keep in mind the mute button is on the bottom left of the screen. Next to that is the start video button. If you need to change your name, you can click on participants button and then click rename. Reactions icon on the bottom bar of your window allows you to raise your hand or provide responses such as thumbs up, applause, and other responses. This meeting is being recorded. Closed captioning or live transcript is available to all at the top of your screen. Please be sure to take advantage of this if it helps your participation. Chat is available for panelists in case you're having any technical difficulties and need assistance from our tech support. For comments related to the meeting, we ask that you unmute yourself to speak whenever possible instead of using chat. Next slide, please. We will begin this Equity Advisory Council meeting with a roll call of council members in attendance. When your name is called, please unmute yourself and let us know you are in attendance today by saying here. The names will be called in alphabetical order. Let's begin. Ameerah Thomas. Angela E. Herring.

**Angela E. Herring**

Here.

**Tim Lohrentz**

Beth Kenny.

**Beth Kenny**

Here.

**Tim Lohrentz**

Clarence R. Fischer.

**Clarence R. Fischer**

Here.

**Tim Lohrentz**

Cory Mickels.

**Cory Mickels**

Here.

**Tim Lohrentz**

David Sorrell. David Ying.

**David Ying**

Here.

**Tim Lohrentz**

Elizabeth Madrigal. She said she'd be a little bit late today. Fiona Yim.

**Fiona Yim**

Here.

**Tim Lohrentz**

Gracyna Mohabir. Harun David. Hayden Miller.

**Hayden Miller**

Here.

**Tim Lohrentz**

Landon Hill. Linda Braak. Mica Amichai.

**Tim Lohrentz**

Samia Zuber. Also said she'd be a little bit late today. Vanessa Ross Aquino.

**Tim Lohrentz**

Thanks for all your attendance and welcome to the Equity Advisory Council, of the Link 21 program. At this time, we'd like to offer a special welcome to our newest member, Hayden Miller. Hayden was originally selected to the EAC like all of you, but since he was 17 at the time, he could not serve per BART's rules. Now that he is 18, he is joining the EAC. Hayden, I'm hoping that you can take a couple of minutes to introduce yourself to the EAC and talk about why you are interested in being part of the EAC.

**Hayden Miller**

Hey, so I'm Hayden. I use he/him pronouns, and I'm a student at Lowell High School. I currently live in San Francisco in the outer Richmond, which is an area that you know isn't necessarily served as much by rail transit. From a young age, I relied on public transportation as I had a babysitter who was disabled, so she was unable to drive. So we took the bus everywhere. And that's kind of where my fascination for public transit started. And it led me to fighting for Muni service restoration during the pandemic and eventually to advisory bodies for the San Francisco Youth Commission, which advises the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, as well as the SFMTA's Youth Transportation Advisory Board. So I've served on both of those, and I've just always been fascinated by public transit. I've used it to travel all across the state to communities large like San Francisco or Los Angeles, or small towns like Lake Isabella in Kern County. So I really understand the value that public transit can provide to the public, to young people like me who don't drive. And I'm just interested in making it better for all of the young people. This project is a big project that will happen in the future, and many of the people in my generation will benefit from it. So just very excited to provide insight on this project.

**Tim Lohrentz**

Thanks, Hayden, and welcome to the EAC. Now we're going to have a short program announcement from our program director, Sadie Graham.

**Sadie Graham**

Hi, everyone. I wanted to just let you know that Nicole Franklin, who has been our Outreach and Engagement Manager for the last few years, has taken a different job and left the program and BART. And she's gone to the City of Alameda in the Economic Development Department. So I'm sure our paths will cross again in the future. But Nicole was one of the sort of founders and instrumental for lifting up and implementing the EAC. She was on the selection panel. She felt very strongly about equity. And we're fortunate to have had her work on the program for so long. And her last day was Friday. But she asked that I pass along her sadness for leaving the program and commitment to sticking with it in the long term and also working on behalf of us in the future. Just at the City of Alameda. So just a quick update.

**Tim Lohrentz**

Thanks, Sadie. Next slide, please. We will now move on to hearing public comments for topics not on today's agenda. Keep in mind public comment is limited to two minutes per person. If you are on the phone and would like to provide a verbal public comment, please dial six to unmute yourself.

**Frank Ponciano**

So we have Pamela Morris with their hands raised.

**Tim Lohrentz**

Okay, go ahead. Pamela.

**Pamela Morris**

Okay, I've got two comments. One is just to let you know that the links that show on several of the variations of the agenda, most of them do not seem to be working or are broken. So I don't know if that contributes to your attendance problem, but it certainly makes it difficult for the public. So I came in kind of tangentially, but your links are not working well today at least. The other thing I just wanted to mention is that for the BART service advisory emails, when those are posted, recently, there was a change that when the announcement is that BART is running trains at slower speeds due to weather, there's recently been an addition that actually says, please watch your step on wet stairways

and platforms, which shows a new level of consideration for the public that has not been displayed before. So that's certainly appreciated. Thank you very much.

**Tim Lohrentz**

Thanks, Pamela. And if I could ask, are those links you were referring to from the Legistar website?

**Tim Lohrentz**

Pamela, do you know?

**Pamela Morris**

I got, sorry. Yes, it was definitely from the Legistar, both within the text and on the cover sheet. But I think there was also another place where the link wasn't working also.

**Tim Lohrentz**

Okay, that's probably through the BART district secretary's office. We may have to contact them. So thank you for that notice about that. Are there any other public comments for those on Zoom?

**Frank Ponciano**

We're not seeing any hands raised.

**Tim Lohrentz**

All right, thanks again for those who provided public comment. Next slide, please. We will now approve the minutes from the last meeting and then review today's agenda. Next slide, please. Our first item on the agenda is the approval of the EAC meeting minutes from November twenty-eight.

**Tim Lohrentz**

Next slide, please.

**Tim Lohrentz**

Are there any changes to the minutes?

**Tim Lohrentz**

If no, does anyone make a motion to approve the meeting minutes?

**Clarence R. Fischer**

Clarence Fischer moves that we accept the minutes as presented and approve them.

**Tim Lohrentz**

Thanks, Clarence. Any second?

**Harun David**

I second it. Harun David.

**Tim Lohrentz**

Harun, thank you.

**Tim Lohrentz**

All those in favor, please raise your hand or say aye.

**Multiple Participants**

Aye.

**Tim Lohrentz**

Okay, it looks like that motion is approved. Thank you. Now we will move to. Next slide, please.

**Tim Lohrentz**

Next slide again. So today's agenda, we're looking. First of all, we'll do as we do every meeting, looking at follow up to previous EAC feedback. Then we'll have a longer presentation on advancing towards Stage Gate two and a project recommendation. We'll take a break after that presentation and then come back to an anti-displacement conversation related to race and ethnicity and transit-oriented development with a special guest. And then finally we'll talk about an update to the anti-displacement working group. Next slide, please. All right, so please refer to the memo that's in the packet with follow up to previous EAC feedback. The one item from that memo that I'd like to highlight is in relation to

paying for transit with EBT cards. We had a couple different questions related to this. We recognize this is confusing because there are several types of EBT cards. CalFresh EBT is only for food items. Cal WORKs EBT is for essentials like food, housing and utilities, but transit is not allowed. This is a state-by-state decision. It's not a mandate from the federal government. And this might be space for some advocacy on the part of EAC members. General assistance EBT is the most flexible and should allow for transit, although the Metropolitan Transportation Commission mentioned to us that currently it cannot be used to add value to a Clipper Card. However, it should work on a tap to ride system.

#### Tim Lohrentz

Next slide, please. We will now move to item c, advancing towards Stage Gate two and a project recommendation. And I'm going to turn this over to Joseph Chroston-Bell, the Link 21 Stage Gate manager. Joseph.

#### Joseph Chroston-Bell

Thanks, Tim, and hello again, council members, and also welcome to Hayden. As most of you remember, last year I presented on the Stage Gate process and specifically Stage Gate two and the role of the EAC. But I wanted to give you a refresh because Stage Gate is going to drive a lot of our work over the next few months and the EAC has got a very specific role in it. So we wanted to set the stage, give you a bit of an idea about what's coming down so you can engage with the right type of information and again understand kind of your role as we go forward. So if you could skip forward to the next slide, please, and the one after, I'd appreciate it. So first of all, starting with a Stage Gate two timeline and also a reminder of what Stage Gates are. So Stage Gates are major milestones in the development of Link 21. They are quite coordinated series of review meetings which end up in an action which goes to the Board for their review and approval. And Stage Gate two sits within the project identification fence. So we are currently developing Link 21 to get to a project which is ready for environmental review. Stage gate two sits in the middle of this project identification phase, and we are identifying a preliminary project which in practice means that we're deciding between BART or Regional Rail in the crossing. And why is this important? It's because this choice of BART or Regional Rail in the crossing has quite important implications for the type of service that Link 21 can provide to the Bay Area and the Megaregion, and we'd be doing a lot of development and evaluation of concepts. We've also sought your advisory through kind of the last year or year and a half of work on this conceptual development work to understand the tradeoffs and kind of benefits and outcomes of each choice. So if you could move on to the next slide, please. When we come to the Stage Gate review process, we present evidence, and we do this primarily in two forms. We do it in the form of a Stage Gate two report, and we do it through Stage Gate two presentations. Each of these two things are structured around four statements, and the statements are written in kind of qualifying terms. You have a statement for development evaluation, statement for engagement outreach, a statement for equity. These three looks at the quality of the work we've done. And if you read these statements, they're worded in a way which challenge us to provide evidence of quality. And the final statement, readiness, is looking forward. It's looking at our plan of work for what we do next. So how will we take all the work we've done and turn it into a project which is ready to deliver for environmental review? And as I said, two kind of key pathways of evidence. Stage Gate two report will have a chapter for each of these statements. So we'll lay out in each of these chapters essentially the approach we did to the work, and give you links within these to publicly available documents which present the work we've done over the last few years. These will be publicly available on the website as well. And within the Stage Gate presentation, there'll be sections, again, which are aligned to these statements, so it will be presented. The review process is that you can look at these statements, see that we've done a work of quality, and that we are ready to move forward. If you move on to the next slide, I'll give you again a refresh of the Stage Gate process and the role the EAC plays within it. So the Stage Gate review process consists of a number of review meetings, also ongoing reviews. So the EAC, you've provided ongoing advisory through all the time of your establishment, but you'll also have a very specific Stage Gate two meeting, your next EAC in later in the year, where we'll present essentially a summary of all the work done and how it kind of goes forwards. But they culminate, as I said earlier, in a board review and board action, we go to these two meetings. The first one is a board review meeting, which is currently pegged for April 25, for the BART board and potentially April 17 for the CCJPA board. This is where we present all the work done. We field questions and we inform them of our recommended staff action. The next is an action meeting and this is where we go to them again, usually to the next board meeting and we secure their action to move forward. And if there's any kind of major questions, we can answer them in kind of the period between the two as well. And tied to this process, we're doing an engagement and outreach round around the same period. As I said earlier, a lot of the evidence we'll be presenting to the board will be on the Link 21 website will be tied into this engagement process as well. So the public will have opportunity to see and engage with our draft staff recommendation at the time. So that was kind of a quick refresh. I think I'm due to hand over to other members of my team who will take you through potentially some of the early starting points to this process. Thank you, Tim.

#### Frank Ponciano

Thanks, Joseph. Appreciate it. Like Joseph said, that was a refresh on the Stage Gate process and it is important ahead of the next two speakers. We're going to have Kyle, who's going to come now and talk about the EAC input report, and then we'll hear from Sadie. Go ahead, Kyle.

#### Kyle Morales

Thank you, Frank. And thanks, Joseph, for that refresh on the Stage Gate process. Hello everyone, to the EAC members. My name is Kyle Morales and I work for HNTB, which is one of the firms supporting BART and the Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority on Link 21. In my role as Equity Manager, I work closely with Tim and others to be providing some more behind the scenes support for the great team that helps out running these EAC meetings. And as a part of my role, I also work closely with other parts of the Link 21 team outside of these meetings to make sure that we're considering equity, including the valuable input that you all bring to the table throughout the work that's happening on Link 21. Next slide, please. Today we'll be talking about one of those efforts to really make sure that what you all are bringing to the table is getting reflected in Link 21 work. And that's the EAC input report. A little background on this. As you all know, since June of 2023, we've been compiling a follow up to EAC feedback memo and having that as a part of meeting materials. There's also an agenda item that Tim leads, as he did today, to go over some of the key portions from those memos. And we do view those follow up to EAC feedback memos as important ways for us to continually show that we are listening to you all and endeavoring to incorporate your input throughout Link 21 work. But we also recognize that those memos aren't exhaustive. They're usually only covering content from the previous meeting and the most recent office hours sessions. So as we prepare for Stage Gate two, we recognize that it would be beneficial to create a more comprehensive document that captures EAC input from throughout the year. And that way the people involved in these various Stage Gate reviews, including the BART and the CCJPA boards, the Capitol Corridor board, are able to see the full picture of input that the EAC has brought to the table. So that's what the EAC input report does, is it's a document that is capturing the input that you've given from throughout the past year, and it's focusing on input related to three discrete things. One is the input you've given related to the technical work that has driven Link 21 and will help to support the forthcoming staff recommendation for Stage Gate two. An example there would be you all gave input on different environmental constraints and opportunities, and that was a technical exercise that supported the work going on. Another type of input that will be included in the EAC input report is input that is related to the service type or the technology that will be recommended to the boards at Stage Gate two. Examples there would be input you've given that relates to what sorts of service characteristics you think are important to see in Link 21, or what sorts of locations you think should be served. And the third type of input that will be included in the EAC input report is input that is informing us about what the really important scope items should be moving forward as we get past Stage Gate two. Really important examples there are all of the input you've given around displacement, around issues like fares that will drive what is getting considered, and what sorts of topics we really need to focus on as we get past Stage Gate two. So this EAC input report will bring all of those together, and it will show not just the input you've given, but also how that input was considered by the Link 21 team and used in the work. So this will be much more substantial than those bimonthly follow up to EAC feedback memos. It still won't be completely exhaustive of every comment from EAC members. For example, input related to something like the logistics of EAC meetings won't be included in that report. Next slide, please. So the EAC input report will be made available to everyone that's taking part in these Stage Gate reviews over the coming months. And those people will also be able to, if they want to get more information, access the publicly posted full meeting summaries and other meeting materials related to the EAC. The idea is that this report is one piece of evidence that will help Stage Gate reviewers understand some of the equity implications of the draft Stage Gate two recommendation. It will be considered alongside a number of other documents. So one specifically highlighted here is the overall engagement and outreach summary report. That will be another piece of evidence that is helping to give those Stage Gate reviewers an idea of the full picture of what we're hearing from the public, both from the EAC and from other bodies. Next slide, please. We think that a really key step is having the EAC actually be able to review this EAC input report. It is built off of input that you've given over the past year, but we think that it's really important to give you all the chance to review and make sure that you think that it's accurately reflecting what the EAC has brought forward in these meetings, office hours, surveys and other communications. So before we do bring it to bodies like the BART and Capitol Corridor boards, we want to give you all the opportunity to review, and we're going to approach that review in two steps. The first part today is that we are going to go over the draft list of key EAC input themes, and by key themes I mean feedback that has arose commonly throughout the year. These are the sorts of comments that have appeared to be priorities to the EAC as a whole due to the number of EAC members that have brought them up or how frequently they've been expressed. And I'll go over those draft key input themes in the next couple of slides. After that, we'll open up for a mentimeter exercise and some space for discussion. Then there'll be a second step to review, and that's in March. We will be publicly posting the materials related to Stage Gate two on the Link 21 website. We'll concurrently also send that information directly out to EAC members and along with those materials will be the full EAC input report. We'll provide you with instructions on how to review and provide comment on that report if you'd like to. It's at your discretion if you do want to go through the full document,



but if you do choose to review, we'll ask for comments back from you by March 26. And the reason for that tight turnaround is that if we do get all comments in by that date, it will then allow us to make any necessary adjustments in advance of those materials needing to get finalized so they can get sent to the BART and the Capitol Corridor boards. And we think that will be really important for them to have an EAC reviewed version of that report by the time that they're approaching their Stage Gate reviews. One thing that I'll mention a couple more times today, and I'll mention it again in March, is that the EAC input report is summarizing insights shared by all EAC members. So there is some of that feedback that was expressed more universally across the group, and that's the type of feedback that's going to be the focus of today's review. Really looking for the themes that have been expressed across the EAC. If you do choose to review, come March, you'll likely find that there's some things in there that might not align with your point of view or you don't feel like you've said, and that may be because a different EAC member expressed that. So that full report is going to include things said by EAC members throughout the year, and not necessarily it won't be saying that those things were consensus opinions held by the EAC. We will have language in the report to make that clear as well. So I'll mention that again as we get to March because I think it will be more pertinent at that point in the process, but wanted to begin raising that now. Next slide, please. Here is the first of our two slides with some of the draft key input themes of what we've heard from you over the past year. The order of these bullets is not intended to convey any level of importance between these different input themes. I'll start off by mentioning that we feel we heard strong interest from the EAC in providing better rail service to a variety of places, both within the Bay Area and throughout the mega region. As we talk about the Bay Area, that there was a lot of interest in connecting underserved portions in Oakland and San Francisco, but also in other places in the East Bay, throughout San Francisco and the peninsula, and then, as previously mentioned, in other places through the Megaregion too. Another piece of input that we heard commonly from the EAC was interest in creating access to rail in places that currently don't have that. In particular, some EAC members raised that there are long stretches of rail alignments today where there's not a station, and that implementing stations in these places could help create benefits for the communities that are currently impacted by rail but don't actually have the current benefit of having closer access to a station. Another view we commonly heard expressed was that for Link 21 to be equitable, priority populations must receive their due share of the benefits. And this is the theme that we're interested to hear a bit more about today when we open it up for discussion, because a follow up that some EAC members also expressed was that it matters where and how priority populations benefit. One way of thinking about those benefits to priority populations is to consider two different types. One is that there's incremental benefits. An incremental benefit, an example of that could be someone who currently takes rail is able to take a few more trips a month, or someone who relies on rail for their daily commute is able to take a couple of minutes off of that commute time. So in other words, an incremental benefit is something that on an individual level might be a relatively smaller benefit, but it would benefit the large number of people that already ride today. So the cumulative amount of benefits would be high. Another type of benefit we can conceptualize is a significant benefit. And by a significant benefit, an example would be the ability of someone who isn't able to take the train today to use the train as a daily mode of travel for them, or someone that is able to cut 20 minutes off of their commute time. So these are significant benefit is something that would be a relatively larger benefit on an individual level, but it would go to a relatively smaller group of people who are people that are not able to ride a lot today or don't really have access to the system today. So for those folks, it could be considered a more transformative benefit of going from not having access or having inadequate access to having quality access to rail. When we do open up for a discussion a bit with Frank later, we'll be interested to hear if you have any thoughts about the importance of those types of benefits to communities that have been marginalized, like priority populations. Continuing with the list on this slide, displacement has also been a critical topic that the EAC has raised, and that's been clear from all the discussion from the new working group that's being developed there. We know there's a lot of work to do on anti displacement, and that's a very nuanced topic. But a big point of emphasis that we've heard is that it's a top priority and that there needs to be concentrated and early work to begin addressing it. We have also heard from multiple EAC members about the importance of the frequency of rail service. Folks have identified that the lack of frequent service is a key obstacle to rail being a more equitable transit solution. And closing out this slide. Service hours were also mentioned as a priority through 2023, with members advocating for better service across more hours of the day, and also the idea of service around the clock coming up as an important desire, particularly for folks who need to work at late night or early morning hours. Next slide, please. This is our second slide of key input themes. These are three topics that came up throughout the year and I think were very clear as priorities to the EAC, fares, safety and accessibility. And these are all important points that, as I said, have come up throughout the year. They're factors that need to be considered within Link 21 work. For example, as we move forward and start to get into things like station design, the idea of how do you design a station that feels safe for people or station that includes all the necessary accessibility features are going to be really critical considerations. These three topics are also key things that need to be coordinated with BART and CCJPA as a whole at the agency level, and then also with other government partners to make sure that there's holistic solutions occurring in these spaces. So between this slide and the last, that is the draft list of key input themes that we have based off of what we've heard from the EAC so far. Remember that this list is only intended to capture the input that arose frequently across the whole EAC membership. So if there's something

that was shared less frequently or shared maybe only by one or two people, it may not have been captured on this list, but it's something that you will see when the full report is available for review in March. With that, I'll turn over to Frank so we can open up for some activity and discussion around this.

**Frank Ponciano**

Thanks Kyle, I appreciate it. So before we go on to this reflection, I do want to note EAC members, you received a reminder email at about twelve this afternoon. Subject line today, January EAC meeting Zoom information and materials, within that email you should have a link to the mentimeter question that we're asking here at the top, which is on a scale of one to signify strong disagreement to five, strong agreement, do you feel that the draft list of key input themes that Kyle just went through captures the most prominent priorities raised by EAC members in 2023? So that is the question that's going to be on our screen pretty soon. But I do want to open up some space for any clarifying questions that people may have, either for what Joseph brought up earlier, the refresher on Stage Gates, or what Kyle was just talking about in terms of the key input themes from the EAC. So we have two folks. I saw Elizabeth first and then Clarence we'll go to you. Go ahead, Elizabeth.

**Elizabeth Madrigal**

Thanks. Not a clarifying question from my end, but just want to note that I arrived a bit on the late side.

**Frank Ponciano**

Thanks for that. I appreciate it. We have noted your arrival and other folks as well that came after the roll call.

**Elizabeth Madrigal**

Thanks.

**Frank Ponciano**

Clarence.

**Clarence R. Fischer**

I'm a little discouraged that. Okay, you said an email was sent out at twelve noon. I have not been able to really look at my email since this morning. These last-minute items, how maybe I'm the only one who doesn't have priority to always look at emails. Can't these things be done a day or two in advance, please, in the future, because I can't vote right now. Thank you.

**Frank Ponciano**

Thanks for that, Clarence. Unfortunately, Mentimeter does change the information for security reasons, a couple of hours at a time. So we do have to send a day off, but we'll make sure to pay special attention to you and make sure to send you the link via other channels as well. And if we need to be in conversation with you directly before the meeting, we can do that. Sorry about that. And we can totally get your input verbally as well. Thanks, Clarence, Dave.

**David Sorrell**

Okay, got it. Thank you all and happy new year, by the way. So I think at least with where we're going now, I think it's a good overview of some of the overarching themes in which that we can be able to provide feedback. I think I'm more concerned about the devil in the details, mostly because we do want to make sure that while acknowledging that the overall themes are covering all of our bases, which I think it does a good job with at least providing both the technical and the logistical support, I think it's really coming down to the nitty gritty and the details of it all. So that what we're doing as part of an equity advisory council is to guide and be able to make sure that our voices are being heard, but that translates to an equitable policy and an action that's attached to it. So I would argue that I think that the priorities are there. It's just that once we start delving into topics of station placement, transportation demand management, location of where the vehicles are going to go, or at least in terms of destinations, individual infill stations, in which that's definitely going to be a concern, that I would want to make that an issue, I think it's just going to come down to what's going to translate in the end. So thank you very much for providing the overview in which we had been working on for the better the last year.

**Frank Ponciano**

Thanks, Dave. Kyle, do you have any, I know it wasn't exactly a question, more of just thoughts, but any response to that?

**Kyle Morales**

I think that's very helpful. And certainly, Dave, a lot of those things you mentioned are going to be key priorities that we'll see continue to come to this group as we think about some of the more detailed ones like station placements and other facets of the work like that. There's going to be a lot more of that past Stage Gate two, and we're going to

really be able to get into that sort of level of detail. So I think all of that's helpful for really flagging what those priorities are as we move forward.

**Frank Ponciano**

Thanks all. I'm not seeing any other hands up. We can move on to the mentimeter question before having this discussion on the follow up questions. Again, we'll bring up the draft key input themes so you all can see them as you think about any reflections. But think about these other questions. These last two questions here, what reflections do you have on the draft key input themes, and do you think that there is anything else that we're needing to include on this list given your experience in 2023, something that may not be reflected in the list as it is right now? So think about those two questions as we switch over to the mentimeter. We could switch over the screen to see if we have gotten any response from EAC members. Thanks for letting us know. Clarence. You might have had some issues accessing it, wondering if anybody else is needing any help.

**Fiona Yim**

I would also like some help accessing the mentimeter.

**Frank Ponciano**

Okay, would you say, what is the issue on your end, Fiona? Are you not able to find the link?

**Fiona Yim**

Also can't find the link, yeah.

**Harun David**

Yeah, I think what Clarence said is relevant because we just have so much going on and if something is sent out last minute almost, we might miss it. So if we are given advanced notice, look at it. But I also understood what you did say about the safety and security issues. So we just need to balance both that so that when we can come to the meetings we're prepared and also ensure that on your end there's that security issue address. I think that was a valid point and I think we just need to find a middle ground for that.

**Frank Ponciano**

Yep, totally understood. At this point in time, we have five responses from EAC members, but obviously interested in hearing from the folks that have not been able to access the mentimeter to hear how they would answer this question. Again, the question is the statement is the draft list of key input themes captures the most prominent priorities raised by EAC members in 2023. And please let us know in the spectrum of disagreeing at one to strongly agreeing at five, where do you find yourself? So I want to hear from Clarence, I want to hear from Fiona, Harun as well. Anybody else that wasn't able to answer the question through mentimeter online. Go ahead, Clarence.

**Clarence R. Fischer**

I voted three.

**Frank Ponciano**

Okay. Is there any other thoughts to that that you want to add at this point? Okay, when we bring up the key input themes, we can discuss those results in a bit more detail. Fiona, have you been able to access the online tool or would you like to tell us where you're at right now?

**Fiona Yim**

Yes, I found it. That's my fault. Yeah, I voted for it. I think it's like a pretty accurate representation of what we've discussed. I'm afraid that it might be a little too broad. I feel like we're trying to capture a lot of things and

**Fiona Yim**

maybe too many competing priorities, but I would love to hear what other people have to say as well.

**Frank Ponciano**

Thanks for that point, Fiona. Hayden, I see you have your hand up. Let me hear from Harun just really quick. I know, Harun, you might be on your cell phone, so if you're able to, you could let us know. Do you agree or disagree with the idea that these key input themes that Kyle brought up reflect your experience and that of the EAC in 2023?

**Frank Ponciano**

Harun might not be able to answer that question right now. Feel free to raise your hand or unmute. Go ahead, Harun.

**Harun David**

No, I was not able to answer that. So sorry.

**Frank Ponciano**

No, we would just like your thoughts here verbally, if you have any, in terms of whether you think what Kyle presented represents the discussion at the EAC in 2023.

**Harun David**

Yeah, I think it did capture a lot of that. What we had discussed in 2023, the priority population, and I think it did. But again, the challenge is how do we turn that into something that's operational, that's reflective. But yeah, I think it captured most of what we had discussed in 2023.

**Frank Ponciano**

Great, thanks, Harun. I just want to do a quick recap. It looks like we have gotten seven answers on the mentimeter. Obviously we heard from Clarence and Harun and I think we would only be missing one more EAC member as we have ten here today. Most of those answers, five of them are at the four. Number four, which is generally agreeing but not quite strongly agreeing. Hayden, go ahead.

**Hayden Miller**

I just wanted to agree, I think it was with Fiona. I think I mentioned this when I was getting onboarded and I was kind of shown some of these priorities, but I just think there's a lot of them and a lot of them are all good ideas, but it's just like when giving feedback, I don't know how helpful it is to prioritize. When we say we want the train to come 24 hours a day, we want the train to come often, we want the train to go everywhere, we want stops to be a lot of infill stops. It's just like, well, all those things are great. And I support a lot of those. And it sounds like, I wasn't at the previous meetings, of course, but it sounds like a lot of people on here support all of those. But it's just like from all of this feedback, how do you actually take this information and prioritize? Because the reality is, you know as much as we'd like to, you can't do it all.

**Frank Ponciano**

Thanks, Hayden. Appreciate that. So just seconding that comment from Fiona about sort of how this may be sort of too general and broad in terms of setting priorities. Kyle, any thoughts on that?

**Kyle Morales**

Yeah, I think that those are really great and valid points and I understand how this can seem broad and a bit like, yes, of course, people like some of these different outcomes that are perceived as beneficial. I think for now, it's kind of this idea of we aren't quite at that level of prioritizing between all of these ideas. It's more about being able to tie what we're hearing as these key input themes to that forthcoming recommendation that will be in March. And that recommendation in March is that big decision point around the service type or the technology of BART or Regional Rail as the new crossing service. So being able to look at all of these together is helpful in that it lets us consider both of those technologies and think how well can each of these technologies provide those sorts of what's been identified as in these key input themes? And then as we do move forward with that technology selected and start really developing a more concrete project there that will let us get into some much more tangible conversations around some of the trade offs or tensions between some of the priorities that have been identified. For example, something like exploring what are the benefits or the potential negative impacts of an infill station in a certain place, or how does running service at a certain frequency for x number of hours a day impact the ability of the system to have some other sort of service characteristic that people are interested in. So all of that will definitely be coming in time. But for now, being able to validate what these key, more broad desires and preferences are for the system is helpful as we consider BART and Regional Rail for the Stage Gate two decision.

**Frank Ponciano**

Thanks for that clarification, Kyle. So just to sum up, we're not looking at any sort of prioritization exercise here. This is just something we're doing to identify what categories are going to sort of feed and are going to be data points for that decision coming up here this year. Dave.

**David Sorrell**

Thanks again, Frank. So I think the other thing I do want to be able to stress, at least in the realm of public policy and transportation policy, is making sure that we have expectations, not necessarily pie in the sky, I want my pink pony type of expectations, but some reasonable expectations management when it comes to, I guess, the efforts that we're going to be doing moving forward, only because realizing the efforts and the challenges that I have on my campus, we do have an expectations management issue that I'm trying to kind of work around. But when you're dealing with public policy and you're dealing with a lot of folks that have commuting issues, whether it be financial access or other,

we do have to set some level of expectations. But we also have to be somewhat realistic, if not definitely not cynical, but definitely realistic about how we go from point a to point b and point c and moving forward. And I think that using those key phrases and those key topics can help kind of guide that. But it doesn't preclude us from offering what we can do and what we should do as a cornerstone.

**Frank Ponciano**

Definitely. Thanks, Dave. Appreciate that. So just have the questions back up here on your screen. And folks are already starting that conversation, but I do want to restate them. What reflections do any of you have on these key input themes, and do you think that there is anything else that is missing? Again, understanding that this is not a prioritization exercise. Rather, it's just trying to capture what the conversation was to be used as data points for the recommendation that will ultimately be made coming up. So if we could go back a couple of slides to the first slide of the key input themes just to refresh people's memories. These are the bulk of the key input themes, so we'll leave them here and would love to hear from folks here in the room. Any thoughts on any of these specifically? Anybody want to elaborate on something that you don't see reflected here that you think is important to include?

**Frank Ponciano**

Go ahead, Clarence.

**Clarence R. Fischer**

Okay. One thing that should somehow be worded is that the whole. Well, at least one of the key things of the EAC is how do we serve underserved priority populations and in doing so guides what we as Link 21 might end up doing, such as an infill station. And let me give you an example where approximately 30 years ago, BART and back then Southern Pacific ran a beat the backup week where they had a couple of trains serving outlying areas connecting at Richmond BART and West Oakland BART. I myself at that time used the Hercules stop. Again, it's not there today. It was just a very temporary stop for this demonstration. And WestCAT, the local transit operator in the area, made a commitment so that people in the WestCAT area could have access to that temporary infill station stop. What is missing, I think in this serving the priority population benefits is something stating in such a manner that wherever potential infill stations are done and whether they are served by every train, whether they're served by every other train, depending upon how schedules would mesh, is that we also need to reach out ahead of time to the various local transit operators to get their commitment to say, you make the infill stations on the rail system, we shall provide the service for the priority populations to get to and from those rail stations. Because if you don't have the commitment from the local transit operators, how will these priority populations really be served unless they walk all that distance from where they are, to where the infill stations are? Thank you.

**Frank Ponciano**

Thanks, guys. Appreciate that. Thoughts? Kyle, just before I move on, and we do have to move on to Sadie's presentation, is there any last thoughts? Any last points you'd like to make? Anything that you think is worth clarifying or any questions that you don't think we've asked that we should?

**Kyle Morales**

Yeah, a couple of things before we move on. First, thanks, Clarence, for that comment. I think that idea of making sure that there are robust connections with local transit is an important thing to have, and that is something that's been raised by the EAC at multiple points over the past year. So we'll get that added on to the key input themes here. The other thing that I'll reiterate, that if we don't have time here, I think we can ask it in essentially a follow up or if folks have thoughts and they want to send those over, that would be helpful, is that idea that we talked about within the priority population benefits here of those incremental benefits, benefits that on an individual level might be smaller but go to a large pool of people who are using transit currently versus the more substantial benefits, which are those larger individual benefits, but are going to a smaller group of people who might be able to access rail for the first time through a program like Link 21. We're very interested if the EAC does have thoughts on that. So I think be on the lookout in a post meeting survey for some more on that. And if you do have any ideas in the meantime that you're inspired to send over, we'd be very interested to see that.

**Sadie Graham**

Frank. I think we have time for some feedback on that now. If anyone has thoughts, it's really important.

**Frank Ponciano**

Great. Yeah. So in that case, the question again, can you restate it succinctly, Kyle, just for the EAC members?

**Kyle Morales**

Sure. So that this idea of two types of benefits, incremental benefits, which are benefits that on the individual level will be a little bit smaller. That could be the idea of something like your travel time might get a minute faster, but it would go to a large number of people, many of whom are currently riders of the system. And then there would be benefits that are more significant on an individual level that would go to people, a relatively smaller group of people who probably don't have access, either they're unserved or underserved today. So that might look something like someone having 20 minutes shaved off of their transit travel time. We're interested to hear from you all as you think about benefits to priority populations, if you have reflections on how important those incremental benefits are and how important those more substantial benefits are.

**Frank Ponciano**

All right, thanks, Kyle. So the question is incremental versus substantial. Beth, go ahead.

**Beth Kenny**

I think that oftentimes with incremental benefits, they're great, but the priority populations can get pushed out of that increment, for example, being displaced out of the area that's served. And the direct benefits, I forget what the second name of the benefits that you used. Those benefits, I find, although they may be going directly for priority populations, and I know just to use people with disabilities as an example, even though they're not a priority population, things that we do for people with disabilities in our society do tend to benefit everybody. Like curb cutouts don't just benefit people with disabilities, they benefit people with bikes, people pushing strollers. And so I think that those direct benefits, especially when it comes to priority population, are extremely important. And I generally would, not having a defined list of what those benefits would look like, I would push more, would be inclined to go more towards those. Thank you.

**Frank Ponciano**

Thanks, Beth. And just as a reminder, it's incremental versus substantial for any folks that are considering your thoughts on this. Hayden, go ahead.

**Hayden Miller**

Yeah, I don't just, I think I've always kind of been a big supporter of the substantial benefits and know, I don't know, I live in a city, San Francisco. Like, we generally see more of the incremental stuff out know they put down like a bus lane on Geary recently. And overall, the bus travel time has stayed actually about the same because now the bus runs early and we sit at each stop, so the bus can not be early and stay on time. So at the end, those incremental benefits, they kind of get eaten away or. I don't know. I just think also of the congestion for the people trying to get in the fare gates at West Oakland when they were doing the new fare gate project. I'm like, any benefit of it just gets eaten away by any minor inconvenience like waiting or those lines for the fare gates. Any of the benefit is so easily eaten away on these incremental projects. But for me, the things that I think of that have made me, or, I don't know, just riding around those random buses out in west Marin or stuff, that's the stuff that changes people's lives. It is very transformational. And it's the difference of somebody being able to get to their job every morning or not is like the service that's maybe more fringe. But if it wasn't there, those people, for me, if there's no service somewhere, it means I don't go there. It doesn't mean I drive or, oh, I spend \$100 on an Uber. It means I don't get to go there. So I think there's a lot of importance on those projects that may seem like they impact a smaller population, but that impact really is big.

**Frank Ponciano**

Thanks for that, Hayden. Very thoughtful. I just want to give folks an opportunity before we move on. Any other thoughts on which kind of benefits? Dave, go ahead.

**David Sorrell**

Yeah, thanks, Frank. And I think the challenge is obviously going to be for us, you know, representing transit and transit representing us. Transit needs to be served as above and beyond the baseline lifeline service that would only serve as a means to last resort. That shouldn't be the philosophy when we're doing station design and where we're doing planning. I'm coming from both meddling in two transit regions, the first ten years in Chicago and the last seven here, seven or eight in the Bay Area. And I'm seeing both sides of the argument for both incremental and just wholesale. And I feel that sometimes the wholesale tends to forget the smaller details of supporting neighborhoods versus long term incremental effects. That tends to push out these objectives that we set forth. What we're trying to do, and I think that a balance needs to happen, is that if we decide to do one option over the other, meaning whether or not we're doing things substantially or we're doing things incrementally, we need to actually not leave out these populations and individuals in getting the word out, but also in terms of service. And I think that it's going to be important as we tend to evolve, continue to evolve, is that communicating these objectives and communicating these

changes is going to be very important to making sure that we get the necessary feedback so that what we're doing is not deemed as performative.

**Frank Ponciano**

Thanks. Okay, do we have one more person with thoughts on incremental versus substantive benefits or questions?

**Frank Ponciano**

Okay, thanks, Kyle. Appreciate the conversation and the context. I am now going to pass it on to Sadie Graham, program director.

**Sadie Graham**

Thanks. Thanks, Frank. And I just want to say that was a really helpful conversation. Next step or next slide, please. And so, just following back on how we're making this decision in the overall setting, you've heard a number of times now about our Stage Gate approach, which is essentially a structured decision making process. And we're approaching that second milestone this spring. At the next meeting, we're going to be sharing with you a technology recommendation for the crossing, which is really exciting. And that's a big step. And we want you to know how we're framing all of this information. We have an enormous amount of information, but I do want to reiterate at this time, we are making a decision based of what the crossing technology will be. There's a ton of work that has to be done within the next phase and then even within environmental review, as we talk about station siding locations, locations of construction and alignment. And I think looking back at that list, to me, there stands out to be a number of things that are really physical in nature. And I think I know, at least for myself, I'm chomping up a bit to get there and design stations. That's the fun stuff in my world. And then there's also these sort of policy decisions. Hold on a second, Tim. My thing says it's going to turn off. It's not charging. Sorry, mechanical malfunction. And then there's a number of things that I think are policy decisions that we've heard loud and clear are really important to you. Things like safety and anti-displacement. And so I think one of the things that we're grappling with here is some are really big, huge policy decisions which have super implications in the long run, and we need to be thinking about them now. And then others are really specific on the ground. And so, just a reminder, the technology decision is an important one, but there's still a lot of work to be done as we continue to advance, and we will have the opportunity to come back to that. So this is an overview of the process that I'm going to walk through in the next couple of slides. So we can just go to the next slide. So, at the beginning of the project, which was really in 2019, we set forth our problem statement. And really, the things that we were grappling with at that time was that we have this 21 county Megaregion. It's the fifth largest economy in the United States, there's 12 million, and it's expected to continue to grow. But the rail network doesn't meet the needs of the Megaregion. It's often infrequent and unreliable service, and it has challenges for people to access jobs and other destinations, and it's really inadequate transit options to sort of compete with driving.

**Frank Ponciano**

All right, so I think we had Sadie's computer.

**Sadie Graham**

I'm just Tim, look, I'm over here. Okay, consider me as Tim. So sorry, everybody. So even though we have this really prosperous region, that equity isn't shared amongst everyone else, and so specifically, priority populations are the ones that suffer, I think, from the biggest housing and transportation cost per imbalance for themselves. And then we were struggling with this trans Bay capacity. At that time, BART was full, congested freeways were full, and there was really not many alternative routes for rail to get people out of their cars. Next slide. So that's our problem statement, and that influenced our goals and objectives. And you've heard about our goals and objectives a number of times now. And we spent a lot of time at the beginning, we worked with the community. This was where we had the opportunity to co create with a number of people to really revise these objectives. And at that point is where equity really did rise to the top as a really important factor. And we revised these goals and objectives. These goals and objectives really are the underlying within the business case framework and really influence the strategic case, which I'll talk about in a second. Go ahead. Sorry, I lost my notes, but I'll get there. So, next slide, please. So really, again, the question we're trying to answer here is, what is the technology within the crossing? And so those goals and objectives have translated to a number of metrics, really, that we've shown you, and we've looked at these two different technologies a number of ways, and ultimately those goals and objectives are going to influence how we evaluate and then present a recommendation for which technology will be in the crossing. Next step or next slide, please. And so this is just a reminder. In the business case, there's these four different cases. There's the strategic case, which is really how the project meets the goals and objectives. And this is where we are right now, the preliminary business case at this level in the project. These are the things that are most important as we continue. Once we make this decision and move forward, then we are considering the economic case, the financial case, the deliverability case presently. But we're really making sure that this choice is underlined by achieving these strategic values. Right. And so as we move forward and advance the project, the economic financial deliverability case, they

will become sort of more filled out with more information. We'll be looking at it at a higher level of detail. Next slide, please. And so sorry, on that last slide, you saw the metrics that we have that are underlying. It's okay. We have a ton of them down there. And as we're know, there are some metrics that really aren't key differentiators between the different technologies. Right. But there are some that are very different. And so what we're trying to do and what we're going to bring back to you are sort of these emerging themes, and that's sort of what Kyle was getting to a little bit before with the transformational versus incremental change. So we have a lot of metrics and what we're doing right now is sifting through them. And really the next step will be to bring to you the emerging themes that we see within those metrics and then how we feel like they are going to support the recommendation that we're going to bring to the Stage Gate. So next slide, please. I think that's where we are. This is just an overview. We have a fair amount of work to do with our stakeholders moving up to those dates that we spoke about earlier of when we eventually go to the BART and Capitol Corridor board of directors with a recommendation. We want to talk with our stakeholders, our Stage Gate partners, so that we can make sure that within the Stage Gate recommendation, we are confident that the recommendation that we're making is supported and also is aligned from what we've heard. Next step. Next slide. As part of that next step, we are going to do some public outreach where we'll be sort of bringing this recommendation out to the public. And so here are those dates. It'll be starting here with you and the Equity Advisory Council, but then the following week, we'll be doing some public work and meetings, and then we'll be advancing the recommendation to our boards. And we'll have an online open house. We'll give you more information when that launch happens. Sorry about the technical difficulties. Now I'm done and I'll pass it back to Frank, I think since I'm on Tim's computer.

**Frank Ponciano**

Yes. We could go to the previous slide, please. That's what we call rolling with the punches. Good job, Sadie. We do have a good amount of time. A little bit over ten minutes. Well, ten minutes now before our break, our scheduled break, we're happy to take any questions and to get a conversation going on this particular topic, and it's a big one. So hoping to have a substantive conversation here. Anyone have any questions about the process that Sadie explained? What's to come, the nature of the decision, thoughts on the decision that is forthcoming? You go ahead and raise your hand and would love to hear from some folks we have not heard from so far. Though, if we've heard from you, don't let that stop you. We'd love to hear from you too.

**Frank Ponciano**

Clarence.

**Clarence R. Fischer**

Okay. One thing I'm concerned about is no matter if you're thinking BART or Capitol Corridor, please correct me if I'm wrong, but I'm under the impression that these Union Pacific railroad lines, such as Capitol Corridor and the San Joaquin. One of the problems with equity, I feel. I think in order to ride those trains, you have to have a government issued ID. Greyhound, who used to be a major transport of people who never asked for any kind of government ID. You could go anywhere in the United States, no questions asked. Greyhound is failing. They have eliminated a lot of their stations. They have eliminated a lot of their buses. So in this Megaregion, what I am seeing, in order for people to get around, rail is going to have to become the carrier in the future. But we need to eliminate any kind of government ID requirement to get people around. I mean, I don't know where everyone stands, and it shouldn't really get in the way about illegal immigrants or stuff like that. But you have, like farm workers who work in Salinas, for example. Greyhound won't go to Salinas soon, rail will. But if you can't get those workers to the farms, because train systems like that UP run, might require government IDs where BART doesn't, where's the equity? How are we going to move people where they are needed. This is something that really needs to be talked about and considered.

**Frank Ponciano**

Thanks, Clarence.

**Sadie Graham**

That's a good point. I guess that I wasn't sure that I didn't know that you had to have an ID, but irrespective, I think to your point to what I was trying to say before, that's definitely a policy decision that's related to fares that I think is slightly irrespective of technology. But it's one of those things that I also have the understanding that fares is a huge issue here and that we will continue to raise that, especially through this EAC, that it's a policy related issue about the cost but also the access. And that's both sort of physical and I guess what you're pointing out, sort of governmental in some way. So good point.

**Frank Ponciano**

Great. Thanks both. And just confirming it does look like it's Amtrak policy, but something worth discussing for sure. Any other question? Again, big decision points at this early stage in Link 21, which technology is the crossing going to have running through it? And so we still have a good five minutes to have a discussion. Would love to hear from other



EAC members. Any thoughts? Just like Clarence brought up, super helpful. I mean, that's very important that we discuss and that it's factored in. Any other thoughts like that or questions that people may have about this looming decision?

**Sadie Graham**

If there's no one, I guess I'll just say that.

**Frank Ponciano**

We do have a couple. Sadie, we have Dave. Dave Sorrell. Go ahead.

**David Sorrell**

I'll just slide right in and thank you, Sadie, as always. I think what this would empower us, but also just empowering the respective boards of at least, let's see, it's 21 counties, there's at least 40 transit agencies. If you're including everything within the Megaregion, I think it's high time that we try to empower them because if we're expanding rail, which is the objective here, we have to try and convince or at least empower the transit board members. Some of them are elected, some of them are not amongst 40 plus operators, plus the different cities, into convincing them, but also demonstrating to them the importance of regional rail as a conceptual design, but also as an actual act of practice in realizing that not everyone is going to the core. I think I've talked about this at the last meeting, too. Not everyone's going to the urban core, but we do want to empower riders to give that opportunity a shot, whether it be through regional bus, whether it be through regional rail, BART, or other forms of transit. That will be a many to one option also. What it comes down to as well is that many of the financially insecure neighborhoods oftentimes don't have the means to cross the bridge, whether it be through tolls or through BART. And the mechanisms that are in place should be supported permanently in order for those to make that competitive advantage to getting to work or getting to school or getting to recreational activities that won't necessarily require budgeting excessively for travel and just being kind of aware of many of our service workers and many of our folks that are underneath the poverty level. And granted, this region skews tremendously. It skews tremendously towards tech workers and the affluent. We have to be cognizant that the decisions that we make not only help out those that need it the most, our lifeline workers. But also, just as a bonus maybe stretch goal is to make sure that these decisions also impact positively these affluent folks. Because those are choice riders, those are people that choose to drive because it's more attractive than taking the train. But if you make the economic course, if you make the economic case for public transit, but also in terms of accessibility, getting to amending to one option, to the train being your first and last mile, that could actually make some considerable dents, especially if we're looking at VMT reduction and carbon emission reduction as a long standing goal. So I do appreciate us looking at this, and I think that that's how we can be able to apply some of these technical aspects to the greater good.

**Frank Ponciano**

Thanks, Dave. Appreciate that. We have one more minute. I don't know, Sadie, if you have any closing thoughts and or any quick questions, sort of yes or no questions from the EAC at this point.

**Sadie Graham**

I was just going to say, you know. Kyle talked a little bit before about the report that I think we're going to circulate and then take comment on. And so it's another opportunity for people to share their thoughts when we reach out. So please do. And Dave, I'm totally going to steal the y'all at the end of your pronouns. I don't think I've seen that before, but I'm going to steal it. Hope you don't mind.

**David Sorrell**

I've been using that as a thing for the last seven or seven and a half, eight years, so feel free to steal it, please.

**Sadie Graham**

Okay, thank you. I had someone tell me I sounded like I was from Alabama this morning on the train.

**Frank Ponciano**

Okay. So with that, again, just to highlight what Sadie noted, we want to hear from you, reach out via other means and or if you want to have any quick conversations on our end after the meeting the next upcoming weeks. Happy to have one on one, so please don't be afraid to reach out and ask questions and let us know your thoughts. With that. And that was a lot. We're going to take a ten minute break. We're going to come back at 2:35 and have a discussion on anti displacement. See you all soon. As always, I'll be here with the two minute warning. Football theme is back and we'll talk then.

**Frank Ponciano**

Hey, everybody, just giving you a quick heads up. We've got a little less than two minutes left before we get going with the second leg of the meeting. See you soon.

**Frank Ponciano**

Okay, everybody, just going to give folks a couple more seconds to get back to get set up before we get going. And it would be awesome if we can bring up, thank you so much to the agenda item slide. I believe that is the next slide. That would be agenda item d.

**Frank Ponciano**

Let me let this Capitol Corridor train pass in just a second.

**Frank Ponciano**

All right, we love Capitol Corridor on here. So at the October meeting, that is the, I believe, well, the EAC meeting, to be specific, it was identified that the EAC wanted to start the anti displacement discussion, prioritizing conversations on race, ethnicity and transit oriented development, TOD, as is commonly known. They noted that these were topics that they wanted to explore in more detail as it's related to the anti displacement. This was the prioritization exercise. You will all remember. The EAC also expressed interest in engaging more and learning from local community members. And so in response, the way we wanted to get 2024 started as it relates to anti displacement is to have a conversation, a one on one conversation with a local community leader who is engaged on anti displacement work and of course, does work in relation to race and also TOD. So we hope that this conversation is going to be informative to the EAC's consideration of anti-displacement broadly and ultimately what its recommendations, rolling recommendations would be for the Link 21 program. We go on to the next slide. So it is my honor to present to you two folks. One of them will be familiar to you. That is Darin Ranelletti, who is the Link 21 land use planning manager at BART. And Darin will be joined today by our special guest, Wilhelmenia Wilson, who is working with Healthy Black Families, matter of fact, leading Healthy Black Families. And so I'll let Darin introduce himself and Wilhelmenia speak for Healthy Black Families as well. Go ahead, Darin.

**Darin Ranelletti**

Great.

**Darin Ranelletti**

Thanks so much, Frank. And good afternoon, everyone. As Frank said, I'm Darin Ranelletti. I'm the Link 21 land use planning manager. It's good to be back at the EAC. Really looking forward to this conversation. Before we jump into it, I just wanted to start with defining what transit oriented development, or TOD, is so that we're all on the same page. So when we say TOD or transit oriented development, what we mean is development projects that are located on or adjacent to public transit stations that are designed in a manner to support the public transit use. They tend to be compact, they tend to be higher density, and they tend to have a mixture of different types of land uses in order to support the transit use as well as walking and bicycling. So I'm thrilled today to welcome Wilhelmenia Wilson, who's the executive director of Healthy Black Families, to the Link 21 Equity Advisory Council meeting. So, Wilhelmenia, welcome.

**Wilhelmenia Wilson**

Good afternoon. Thank you for having me.

**Darin Ranelletti**

So I was hoping we could start with you describing a little bit about your work with Healthy Black Families.

**Wilhelmenia Wilson**

So I come to Healthy Black Families from 15 years in healthcare. I retired from Kaiser Permanente in 2021 and started the Healthy Black Families October of that year. I am their executive director, so I get the privilege of leading a committed group of women who are doing social justice and social advocacy work around Black people in Berkeley. We really, as an agency, are focused on advancing social equity and justice with a focus on Black folks and their families in Berkeley. And to do that, we really look at providing peoples with the knowledge, skills, and strategies that help make social systems and policies more equitable for Black folks and communities. Our vision is to organize individuals, families, and the organizations that serve them into communities that are empowered with the skills to advance social equity and justice. So we do that through people. We focus on people. We deliver programs to the community, including early childhood education, kindergarten readiness, healthy food programs. We're a community based public health organization that really focuses through a lens of the social determinants of health. So it's very intersectional. So it's been quite a learning curve for me as I've come on, but I've enjoyed every minute of it.

**Darin Ranelletti**

Great. So you and I have talked before about when we're talking about race and TOD and displacement, that it's really important for us to have a historical understanding of the context to inform what's happening today. So I was hoping you could talk a little bit about the historical context for Berkeley and how that's shaping your work today.

**Wilhelmenia Wilson**

I can begin in Berkeley, but I'd like to broaden the context a bit, Darin, if I may, as I start because equity in the United States really has a lot to do with property and property ownership, and that really creates space, and who has access to space. And so in my personal history, I am the descendant of a plantation in North Carolina called Somerset Place Plantation, where five generations of my ancestors spent time as enslaved people. In that, I think it's really, as we look at the horizon of inequity in our nation, to begin understanding that when we began negotiating property in this nation, we weren't talking about single family homes and duplexes and transit oriented developments. We were really transacting in property that were people. And so those people have continued to be the most vulnerable and disenfranchised across decades. In the 40s and the 50s, as the Federal Housing Administration began to codify property ownership and with the new deal and things like that, they brought that kind of racial bias into their policy making. And so I'm sure we've all heard of redlining. And so communities, not based on their ability to sustain themselves or any financial metrics, but really on a racial basis, were redlined as not adequate for investing in. And so today we sit in an area of historic south and West Berkeley that was the red lined area of Berkeley. And there are these urban communities across our nation that fell in that slot based on these legislative policies.

**Wilhelmenia Wilson**

So the work that we're doing today in Berkeley really has to do with looking at the historical disenfranchisement. So let me back up a little bit. We are partners in a project called Equity for Black Berkeley. It's a partnership between the city of Berkeley, Bay Area Rapid Transit and Healthy Black Families. And part of it has to do with the transit oriented development that's going to be erected at the Ashby BART station. And another piece of it is really acknowledging the harm done to the Black community as the initial transit was erected. They didn't. And I think this is true, as I read and have researched, of much urban development, the places that were chosen to lay these interstate tracks, they didn't go to the prosperous areas or they went to the urban areas where low-income people lived. And so the BART development that happened in Berkeley decimated the historical economic center of the Black community of Berkeley. And as a result, we've gone from at a high of 40% of Black people in the city of Berkeley down to the current rate of 7.9%. And that really lays the whole landscape for gentrification, disinvestment, disenfranchisement. And so it's kind of like this snowball that rolls unless interrupted. And so in addition to the transit oriented development, there's a thread of equity in this initiative around repairing harm to the community.

**Darin Ranelletti**

Thank you for laying that out. I'm wondering if you could talk a little bit about that idea of repair. What does that look like in this kind of context, whether it's TOD or other types of policies?

**Wilhelmenia Wilson**

So I really applaud the city of Berkeley for their partnership in this with us, because they hold the annals of the history of this. And so they went back and had their staff do research. We also used a tool, it's a case management tool that's used in many community service professions called the family functioning scale. It rates family capability across eight points and eight different statuses, from at risk to thriving. And so we use that in a way to estimate harm done to the community by systemic racism. And the estimate that the city came up with was just in the city of Berkeley was \$300 billion of lost equity for Black folks over the duration from the late current day. And so

**Wilhelmenia Wilson**

one of the things that we're looking at is really the amount of affordability, because it's a kind of stacked equation, giving people affordable housing at a large enough rate. And we're talking about scaffolded affordable housing, from workforce housing all the way down to very low income housing, even housing for people, you know, Berkeley's homeless population, I think, is one of the highest in the nation, and a lot of that is driven by mental health issues. We, in the early 80s, Reagan shut down our mental health facilities that housed all of these and serviced those in our community that needed this kind of support. And so now we see them on our streets, and there's not really an infrastructure to support them. So

**Wilhelmenia Wilson**

in addition to affordable housing, we're also looking at the ability to afford. So how do we create housing models like limited equity, community collaboratives and things like that, that allow people to own homes and create equity in them, that allows them to create some generational wealth, but still will maintain a level of affordability. And as you can imagine, that's quite an interesting balance to strike. In addition to that, there's also element of repair that we are in discussions with the city about. And in the BART negotiations at Ashby BART, there was a piece of equity that

came from air rights over the BART station that they've been in negotiation with BART about. And that equity is going to go into a fund that will be community governed and will support things like down payment assistance for home ownership, workforce development for youth and young adults, early childhood education programs for children who come from the disenfranchised community.

**Darin Ranelletti**

And I'm familiar somewhat, and I was hoping maybe you could elaborate a little bit on some of the work you're doing around housing preferences. Could you explain what that means and the work you're doing for that?

**Wilhelmenia Wilson**

Yes. In fact, the website was just launched and it's wonderful. We're going to be moving into a building at the corner of Ashby and Adeline in June. It's called the Maldor Sherik Building. It's an 100% affordable housing development, and we're going to anchor the commercial space on the bottom floor.

**Wilhelmenia Wilson**

I believe it was about 2016 when the city began doing a housing survey and they asked Healthy Black Families to support outreach to the Black community. As we looked at the housing survey, we realized that the questions in the survey weren't going to pull forward the type of information that we needed to know. And so we rewrote the survey and we called it a right to return right to stay survey, and we partnered with the city of Berkeley to do that. Out of that came information that we worked in conjunction with the East Bay Community Law Center and the San Francisco Foundation. They had a grant called the Challenge Grant. So they gave us a fellow from policy link named Anna Cash, and we began developing preference policy. Now, part of the catch 22 of equity is you have this backlash against race based policies. And at the state of California level, we have Prop 209 that precludes us from making any race based policy. The caveat is, if you can prove historic discrimination, you can develop policies in response to that. And so that's what this preference policy is. See if I can just pull it up. There's a five point system that we've developed in the preference policy that includes things like, were you displaced due to BART eminent domain seizure? Were you displaced due to predatory lending from 2007 to some defined date? There are also preferences. Are you at risk of homelessness? And so there's five points. And people can apply for certification for the preferences. They'll receive a certificate if they qualify. And then as affordable housing comes online, they receive preferences for moving into those units. So that's one of the ways that we have been able to work toward equity with the barriers that have been placed upon us by other legislation.

**Darin Ranelletti**

Okay, so it's repair physically and socially. Right? So you're looking at ways that this past infrastructure harm can be addressed through some development. But this development is not just your typical development.

**Wilhelmenia Wilson**

Right.

**Darin Ranelletti**

It's a new kind of development. It sounds like it's an equitable, reparative development. I've heard you use the term human centered development, wondering if you could talk a little bit about what does this human centered reparative development mean to you, and how does that inform your work?

**Wilhelmenia Wilson**

Yeah, surely that's been a really exciting process. We began the Equity for Black Berkeley initiative. I received my training in human centered design at Kaiser, and I worked for the performance improvement Institute there. And I brought those methods with me to Healthy Black Families. So in January of 2022, as this initiative started, we hosted events called people's assemblies in public spaces with all of the nuances. We provide food, we provide music, we provide movement, we gather people in very culturally resonant spaces to participate. And we went through a human centered design process around one central question, and it was, what do we need to create a thriving Black Berkeley? And so people responded to that in kind of focus group settings. We had poster boards and sticky notes, and we collected over 1600 responses from community members. And then we began synthesizing those, and we pulled those into. At the first pass, we had 21 categories. And then we continued to refine that down, and we got to nine categories. And then we took those categories back to the community, and we said, this is what you said, and this is the feedback we have now. We'd like you to prioritize those for us. And we had them do that by a process called dot voting. And in that process, we really wanted to see if there was a variation between what Black community members said, those who identified as Black and those who identified as allies. And so we used different colored dots for the dot voting. And it was very revealing, the variation. And that created a whole nother level of conversation and really helped our allies see why we, as a Black community, have to be centered in the solutioning around this if we're

going to reach the goals and the outcomes that we desire, because our values are different. And it was a way for us to express that in a data driven way that made the conversation much more objective. So now we have those nine categories. We have the top four prioritized, and we have also prioritized the input within those categories. So, for instance, our primary category is housing, which is, for me, why this displacement conversation is paramount.

**Wilhelmenia Wilson**

And I'll tell a little backstory, because I think this is really important. I don't like to center myself, but I think the story is very key. My father was a young attorney in Berkeley. Prior to BART going up, he and my mom owned a house on Hearst Avenue, just one block from the North Berkeley BART station. And he worked for Governor Pat Brown, Jerry Brown's father, he was the director of fair employment practices commission. And so he got the memo about BART, and he and my mom sold that property, not knowing whether it was very close to the BART station. So eminent domain seizure was a risk, and they sold that property, having gotten the memo, and they moved our family to El Cerrito. And so that's where I grew up. That's where I went to high school. I'm the youngest of five. Many of the families in South Berkeley didn't get the memo, and they had very different outcomes. So as a byproduct, my parents were able, they had both transitioned to the new other realm now. And really, for the first time since being enslaved in 1765, my family has had assets to pass down to another generation. Right. Those who were displaced in Berkeley did not get that opportunity. So as I work with families in Berkeley, it's very present for me how a move by a transit agent like this can deeply impact the outcomes of families. Myself being one who was lucky enough to get the memo.

**Wilhelmenia Wilson**

I kind of lost track. Darin, where are we?

**Darin Ranelletti**

Thank you for sharing that. That was powerful. I think if you're okay with this, connect this to Link 21.

**Wilhelmenia Wilson**

Absolutely.

**Darin Ranelletti**

And this is a mega infrastructure program. Early phases, and we're trying to do things differently. We must do things differently. I'm curious, in your mind, how does this understanding of systems in the past and what we're trying to achieve in outcomes, how does that translate into ideas or thoughts, concerns, or recommendations you might have for Link 21?

**Wilhelmenia Wilson**

Well, I think we have wisdom to draw upon from the past. This is not the first major transit infrastructure that's gone in. It was BART, and it affected our region. So if we look at the lessons from that, there's a lot that we can learn as we seek to move more wisely in this next iteration of transit oriented development. Right.

**Darin Ranelletti**

You and I were together at the build it green convening in November of last year, and we had the opportunity to sit in a panel that talked about community engagement. And they were talking about these large systems and the measures. And in my mind, I was like, are we measuring the right thing? What are the measures that we define to determine whether or not we've been successful? And as we sat in that group talking about that, and we identified that family is the cornerstone of community, we began to talk about, well, what do we need to ensure resilience for families to make sure that we have strong communities? And so my question continues to say, what kind of metrics would we look to gather to ensure that that outcome is met as we do this into the future? And how do we make those metrics equivalent to the metrics we've historically been driven by? Like what kind of profit the developer walks away from this project with, or whatever other metrics that we call forward.

**Wilhelmenia Wilson**

So I think that's the opportunity. I think we really do ourselves a disservice to look at this like a one off initiative, to not look at the historical context of it, to not learn from the failures of the past. And I don't know. One person's failure is another person's success. So getting all the voices in the room to calibrate and level set what that failure might have been, I think is also very important. And I'm very happy to see that this group is engaged. I plan to have community at the spring convenings, because their voices, they are the subject matter experts of their lived experience. And unless those voices are in the room, this body really doesn't have a basis to make a well informed decision.

**Darin Ranelletti**

Thank you. I like what you were talking around, achieving desirable outcomes and how important it is for us to do that with appropriate measurements and metrics. And that exercise you did with the dot voting and seeing the differences in perspectives between Black folks and allies, we could really learn from that. I think that's really interesting around setting the right goals in the right way and then measuring progress and holding ourselves accountable to meeting those goals. So I think that's super relevant and good timing for this.

#### **Wilhelmenia Wilson**

The next phase of that, Darin, is that's kind of where we are right now. We're moving into what we're calling a journey mapping phase. Where we'll take people and housing is going to be our first focus because it's our priority area, and we're going to document their lived experience with being displaced from housing and what are the things that are key? And out of that comes the metrics that matter from a human and qualitative standpoint that we hope to bring back to the institution and say, can we also consider these as we develop a paradigm to evaluate what success looks like? So that's the next phase, and I'm really looking forward to that, because out of that comes all of our recommendations.

#### **Darin Ranelletti**

Okay, well, this is perfect timing because this is something that we can do together, because we can learn from each other and really strengthen both of our efforts here. So I just really want to thank you for sharing these thoughts. It's been a real delight meeting you and learning from you. And I'm thankful that we were able to hear your perspective today, but we have a few more minutes, so if you're okay, Wilhelmenia, I'd like to turn it back over to Frank for him to facilitate some conversation and see if we could bring in the EAC and broaden the conversation a little bit.

#### **Frank Ponciano**

All right. Hi, Darin. Hi, Wilhelmenia. Great conversation. I was happy to sit back and just listen. I'm sure EAC members felt the same, but we want to bring you all into the conversation. We have eleven minutes for any questions, anything that stood out about what was noted in this discussion or anything you'd like to add yourself, just related to the discussion, whether it's about Berkeley or something sort of in parallel going on in your local community, please feel free to raise your hand and we'll go ahead and call on you in the order. Would you raise your hand. Clarence?

#### **Clarence R. Fischer**

Okay. I think she brings up a very good historical point where back in the 60s, when BART was first formed, and I was around that, how different areas in Berkeley got impacted positively and unfortunately negatively of how the BART system went through, how it was designed, construction, and so forth. I think what we as the EAC now need to consider whether it's going to be regional rail, which is pretty much already defined, where the tracks are, but where stations may come up with transit oriented development, of course, or whether that second crossing is going to be built in a BART fashion, where there's going to be new construction. And then, of course, displacement can very well be viewed as negative in communities that people may and probably will get displaced for BART, aerial structures, or subways, whatever, to have that second crossing. Think with her background of as this project progresses, she would be a key person, I would think, to make sure that impacts from the past either do not happen or if they do happen on a negative side, that even better positive outcomes happen to anyone, be they Black, white, Asian, whatever, Latinos, so that these communities will thrive instead of being what we call impacted communities today. Let's learn from the past so that as projects continue into the future, the best outcome can be achieved. Thank you.

#### **Wilhelmenia Wilson**

I would also say that as I was talking about the financials and all of the technical pieces of this with people, I invited them to bring their energy below the neck into their heart space and out of the technicalities. And just think, if your family was being displaced, what would you need, right? How would you want to be moved? What would you require for your children? If we move in that way, that's just human dignity and compassion. Then the outcome should reflect that.

#### **Frank Ponciano**

Thanks for that, Wilhelmenia and Clarence. Taylor.

#### **Taylor Booker**

Hi. Thanks, Frank. Ms. Wilhelmenia, I just wanted to first commend you for coming into this space and sharing your expertise. And I really want to say that I appreciate the fact that you looped in the relevance of the history of housing and how it relates to transit. I think as the Link 21 team in general, it's really important to understand what it takes to build healthy, thriving communities and food, health, housing, transit all tie into one. And so your expertise is just very instrumental in this process for the team that's doing all this amazing work. So I just commend everyone for this

conversation. And I also wanted to mention that your thought around the cop holders and community benefits is also something that I would love to bring up in our anti displacement conversations now that I'm on that team later. And also welcome the Link 21 team to invite her to those smaller discussions if possible. But I just wanted to state my piece and just show my appreciation for the conversation today.

**Frank Ponciano**

Thanks.

**Wilhelmenia Wilson**

Thank you, Taylor.

**Frank Ponciano**

Thanks, Taylor. That's a good touch there. We will, we have things we can follow up with. We have Harun, then we have Dave Sorrell. Go ahead, Harun.

**Harun David**

Yeah. Appreciate hearing Wilhelmenia's contribution to this topic. It's very emotional, it's very passionate. And she speaks volume for a lot of the impacted communities and the priority population that we continue to talk about. And unfortunately, when we do all this planning and even after the final stage and implementation, the voices like that of Wilhelmenia or the priority population has never been considered. The people making decisions, they don't have the living experiences, they do not have the historical understanding of what their forefathers probably did that has created the problems who we see to continue to have today. And we continue to build on those past hurtful policies that are with us today. And we that we want to solve the issues that's going on right now. When we don't give the people who have been impacted a voice, I think we need to step back and give the people a real voice so that we can be more reflective of the realities. So. I think it's very important that, as Clarence said, going forward we address the challenges we have now. And if it's going to be impacted, then we address and compensate this ails that had been done and that's going to be done so that we do not again continue the same path. Thank you again so much. That was very emotional and that was very powerful. appreciate you and we need your voices going forward.

**Wilhelmenia Wilson**

I just want to say that I like to think people have good intentions and we all have intentions to make these things successful. But unless we hear the voices of those who are, we don't get the impact. There's no way to understand the impact. An intention and impact are not the same. Somehow we have to hold space to understand both in order to make quality decisions for community benefit.

**Frank Ponciano**

Thanks, Wilhelmenia. Let's hear the last comment here from Dave Sorrell. Go ahead, Dave.

**David Sorrell**

Hi there, and thank you very much for explaining kind of the historical background of the impacts, especially with BART being developed in the 50s and 60s and how a lot of our communities have been left out of that equation or have been forced out. And it's an ongoing conversation that a lot of us are having, but many people refuse to have much less acknowledge. And I think that for us, even in the technical planning space, in the service planning space that I am, it's still kind of gatekept, both in terms of community outreach, but also in terms of being very intentional with our approaches to fix the harms that are being made. And with that being said, I think that what you've done and what you've demonstrated are telling us. I'm kind of explaining this as a Black man, just being able to identify, but also understand, just realizing that the struggle continues and realizing that there are folks that will continue to support and follow your lead, but also in terms of outreach, in terms of giving us what we need so that we can be able to do our due diligence in a way that will fix a lot of these harms. So I really do appreciate where you're coming from, and I thank you for spending the time and space with us.

**Wilhelmenia Wilson**

You're welcome. I will close by saying many of us, and I think at some point all of us are stewards of community assets, whether they're government monies, whether they're representation of communities. And it's incumbent upon us all to make decisions that will actualize the opportunities presented by wielding stewardship over those community assets. So how might we solution in a way that ensures to the largest benefit for as many of our community members as possible? That's our goal. Thanks for having me. I appreciate the time.

**Frank Ponciano**

Thanks Wilhelmenia and Darin for creating this space and the powerful words. And like we heard, I think, from other EAC members, we hope to have you along for the ride and to borrow some of your wisdom and your experience as

the EAC looks to think about this anti displacement work that is so important. Thank you. And with that, we could bring the presentation back up for the second and last anti displacement item, and that is an update on the anti-displacement working group. Just going to start with a quick retrospective to refresh your memories at the November EAC meeting, and this was in response to feedback that we received from council members. The Link 21 team proposed forming either a subcommittee or a working group to focus on anti-displacement, and we discussed the differences and the similarities between the two formats for this discussion. And we also discussed EAC members preferences. And so, based on the conversation at that meeting, the Link 21 team decided to create an anti-displacement working group. And so again, the differences and the similarity were discussed at length, but we can of course welcome any questions or if folks want to have a conversation beyond this meeting on the background behind the decision. We're happy to have that discussion. We go on to the next slide. So little bit about the working group, the purpose of it is to advise the EAC and the Link 21 program staff on anti-displacement matters. So based on the feedback that we receive from EAC members, the idea behind the working group, the task would be to develop a draft set of anti displacement goals and also anti displacement principles that the broader EAC can review. So in December, the Link 21 team emailed EAC members. We emailed you seeking volunteers, council members who would be interested in being part of the working group. And so we have these names here on this slide as folks that reached out that responded with interest in participating. So you also see the projected dates. As you can see, the first meeting would be this month, on January 29. Then we have a meeting on February 26, and then we wrap it up on April 15. One of the features of a working group was that it would be limited in scope and the number of meetings because, as I said, the task is sort of a foundational task to make sure that the EAC is on the same page about how to address anti displacement. So the intent is to wrap up the working group work in April and present the recommendations from that working group to the larger EAC in May. So a couple of things to note before we hear any questions or reactions is that the working group meetings are not going to be open to the public, the meetings are not going to be recorded, and there will be no formal meeting minutes prepared. But to make sure that we remain transparent, we are making sure that there is a high level summary note document containing discussion topics, proposed next steps from the working group meetings that can be distributed to the full EAC and the public and included in the agenda packet for the following EAC meeting. And in that meeting, the public can comment on what that document says about the discussions with the working group. And of course, the EAC also able to make any comments, ask any questions. So that is sort of the quick download on the progress we've made with this anti displacement working group. And it would be great time to open up the floor, and you know, hear if there are any questions, thoughts that folks may have. Before I do that, just want to check in with Darin. Darin, anything that you would add to that or are you thinking you wanting to hear from the EAC?

**Darin Ranelletti**

Oh, that sounds great, Frank. I'm curious if the EAC has any questions or comments, and I'm here if needed to help.

**Frank Ponciano**

Great. Thanks, Darin. So as always, you can go ahead and raise your hand and we can hear from you. Again, the conversation would be on the anti-displacement working group, first meeting happening in a couple of weeks, January 29. Any questions? Comments?

**Clarence R. Fischer**

Yeah, again, just to try and make sure if we can get our links of the meeting, IDs and all that, since this is going to be a Monday meeting, if it's possible by Friday before the weekend that that information can be emailed to us, those members who are on this committee, working group, I mean. Thank you.

**Frank Ponciano**

Thanks, Clarence. Yeah, we'll be sure to be in communication before, make sure that folks are set up for success. Dave?

**David Sorrell**

Yeah, thank you, Frank. I'd like to second what Clarence had mentioned only because that is important, at least in terms of reviewing the documents or at least reviewing any topics in the agenda, just in case things get a little bit squirrely on my end. I know some of us are more connected or more capable of answering emails or at least reading emails in real time, but I do want to make sure that we're giving space to those that may not be as flexible as, say, I would be. So thank you.

**Frank Ponciano**

Great. Thanks, y'all. And we'll also think about, I know in the past we've also sent a text, for example, with a mentimeter link. We're happy to do that as well and make sure that we cover those bases in the future. We have one



more minute in this section, so I do want to give folks the opportunity for any last questions or comments on the working group work that is upcoming for the EAC.

**Frank Ponciano**

Okay, hearing none. We are going to move on to the next agenda item, that is public comment. I'll pass it on to Tim.

**Tim Lohrentz**

Thanks, Frank. We will now hear public comment for items that are on today's agenda. If commenting, please state your name and which agenda item you are commenting on. Keep in mind public comment is limited to two minutes per person. If you're on the phone and would like to provide a verbal public comment, please dial star six to unmute yourself at this time.

**Tim Lohrentz**

If you are on Zoom, please raise your hand and we can unmute you.

**Frank Ponciano**

All right. Tim, just a quick update. I'm not seeing any raised hands on my end.

**Tim Lohrentz**

Okay. Thanks, Frank. If not, we will move to the next slide.

**Tim Lohrentz**

And this is our next meeting time, which is Tuesday, March 19. It will be an evening meeting at 06:00 p.m. We'll go until more or less 8:45. So we'll hope to see everyone there. And then our last item is an agenda item, an action item, rather. And so we need an EAC member to move that the EAC meeting be adjourned.

**Hayden Miller**

Motion to adjourn.

**Tim Lohrentz** 2:21:33

Okay, thank you. And a second. Seconded by Dave Sorrell. Okay, thank you. And either a show of hands or saying aye, can you please be in favor of adjourning?

**Multiple Speakers**

Aye.

**Tim Lohrentz**

Thank you all. The motion passes, and at 3:26, we are adjourned. Thank you all for this meeting. Bye bye.