

Link21 Equity Advisory Council (Meeting 10)

May 21, 2024

DRAFT Link21 Equity Advisory Council (EAC) Meeting #10

May 21, 2024

1:00 pm – 4:00 pm

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

AGENDA

I. Call to Order (For Information)

On Tuesday, May 21, 2024, the Link21 Equity Advisory Council (EAC) held its regular meeting at 1:00 pm via teleconference, following the Link21 EAC Bylaws and Assembly Bill No. 361. Tim Lohrentz, the Equity Programs Administrator at the BART Office of Civil Rights, called the meeting to order.

Tim Lohrentz gave instructions on the virtual meeting logistics, including how to access presentation materials online and the procedures for public comments. He also shared opening remarks from council members.

II. Roll Call (For Information)

EAC Present Members

Angela E. Hearing	Fiona Yim
Beth Kenny	Gracyna Mohabir
Clarence R. Fischer	Hayden Miller
Cory Mickels	Linda Braak
David Sorrell	Taylor Booker
David Ying	Vanessa Ross Aquino

EAC Absent Members

Ameerah Thomas	Landon Hill
Elizabeth Madrigal	Mica Amichai
Harun David	Samia Zuber

Participating Link21 Staff & Consultants

Brian Soland, Link21 Manager of Rail Planning, BART	Frank Ponciano, EAC Facilitator	Tim Lohrentz, Equity Programs Administrator, BART Office of Civil Rights
---	---------------------------------	--

Camille Tsao, Link21 Program Lead, Capitol Corridor	Iris Osorio-Villatoro, Link21 Tech Support	
Darin Ranelletti, Link21 Manager of Land Use Planning, BART	Sadie Graham, Link21 Program Director	

III. Public Comment (For Information)

Tim Lohrentz (Equity Programs Administrator, BART) opened the floor for public comment on topics not included in 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.

Mark Joffe, a member of the public, stated that after his comments at a recent bond oversight committee meeting, a Link21 staff member predicted BART ridership would bounce back to pre-pandemic levels by 2040, aligning with the expected completion of Link21. He asked for documentation to back up this claim.

IV. Meeting Topics

A. Approval of March 19, 2024, Meeting Minutes (For Action) (5 minutes)

Tim Lohrentz requested a motion to approve the minutes. EAC Member Clarence R. Fischer made the motion, which EAC Member Linda Braak seconded. The EAC members then approved the meeting minutes by verbally saying aye.

B. Follow-up to Previous EAC Feedback (For Information) (15 minutes)

Tim Lohrentz provided an overview of the EAC Feedback Memo that addressed previous feedback from the EAC. He clarified some logistical points, noting that chat would be enabled for EAC members during the meeting. Tim emphasized that chat should enhance, not replace, active participation, and that its effectiveness will be reviewed after the meeting.

Tim announced that there would be an additional public comment period before the break, allowing the public to give input on items discussed up to that point. Furthermore, for any EAC actions, there will be a public comment period before EAC members discuss the item, similar to BART board meetings. Tim then reminded everyone to provide feedback on the EAC input report via the survey sent out last week.

C. Link21 Program Update (For Information) (40 minutes)

Sadie Graham (Link21 Program Director) gave a presentation that provided insight into the program's historical background, funding sources, and recent milestones.

Camille Tsao (Link21 Program Lead, Capitol Corridor) then presented on community engagement efforts and key themes heard from public feedback.

Brian Soland (Link21 Manager of Land Use Planning, BART) discussed proposed services and track gauge considerations, emphasizing the importance of improving travel time, connectivity, and ridership experience.

Tim Lohrentz then showcased equity considerations by highlighting modeling results showcasing benefits to priority populations and the program's commitment to exceeding federal equity requirements.

Brian Soland returned to discuss additional comparisons between standard gauge and BART gauge crossings, focusing on factors such as interoperability, redundancy, and amplification of benefits for other planned projects. He also touched upon considerations for cost estimates and funding strategies, with insights into how the Link21 Program is leveraging federal funding opportunities based on chosen technology.

Sadie Graham concluded the presentation by discussing future steps, emphasizing ongoing stakeholder coordination, refinement of project details, and continued public engagement as integral to the program's success.

EAC facilitator Frank Ponciano opened up the discussion by asking EAC members to participate either by utilizing the chat or raising their hand.

EAC Member Clarence R. Fischer expressed concerns about frequency implications if standard gauge technology is adopted. He highlighted the need for discussions on achieving optimal frequencies, referencing the Capital Corridor's current 40-minute headways. Clarence questioned whether single-track corridors could accommodate enhanced frequencies through double tracks or long sidings.

Brian Soland acknowledged his concerns and spoke on opportunities for frequency enhancements within the Regional Rail network. Brian explained that while not all opportunities for frequency enhancement were addressed, the focus was on understanding where improvements could be made. He detailed frequency projections for intercity and urban metro services, highlighting the potential for increased frequencies in the future as projects progress.

EAC Member Gracyna Mohabir raised a question regarding the FRA funding mentioned in the presentation's funding opportunities section. She inquired about the availability of the approximately \$100 billion funding and its alignment with the timeline for Link21 project decisions and applications. Gracyna sought clarification on the timeframe and process for accessing these funds.

Sadie highlighted the big increase in funding for inner-city passenger rail projects following a recent bipartisan infrastructure law. She stated that this law allocates \$100 billion over the span of four years, encompassing various improvements, including safety enhancements, extensions, and state-of-good-repair initiatives. She also named that a key aspect of this funding is the creation of the Corridor Identification Program, aimed at facilitating future funds for rail projects like Link21. Sadie then outlined the process of aligning with Capitol Corridor efforts within the FRA Corridor Identification Program. She stated that the initial step involves developing a service development plan for the entire corridor, including Link21, so that funding can be sought for this planning effort. Sadie noted that the progress of Link21's work is slightly ahead of other planning efforts within the corridor.

EAC Member Fiona Yim firstly sought clarification on how the operations and service frequency might be affected if multiple rail agencies use the transbay terminal and tunnel transmission crossing. She then commented regarding the terminology used to describe benefits to priority populations, suggesting alternative phrases like "restorative benefits" to better reflect the aim of addressing past underservice.

Sadie emphasized that service planning aims to focus on optimizing service for customers regardless of the operator.

EAC Member David Sorrell emphasized the ongoing need for communication and discussion, especially regarding the integration of multiple networks for a single line. David stressed the importance of creating a network with minimal transfers and frequent service to effectively serve a wide range of people. David acknowledged the various steps required before the project becomes ready and discussed factors such as standard gauge adoption, BART's process, and public sentiment regarding taxes and congestion.

D. Public Comment (For Information)

Tim Lohrentz then opened the floor for public comments on the last agenda item and any previous items. He reminded attendees to state their name and the agenda item they were commenting on, with a two-minute time limit per person.

BART Director Liz Ames raised concerns regarding the Link21 project's sharing of rail lines with freight services, noting that freight takes precedence over passenger rail. Liz noted that she advocated for the replacement of Carquinez Bridge, which experiences heavy freight traffic due to its location to multiple ports along the Carquinez Strait. Liz highlighted the significant increase in freight train traffic expected in the coming years, particularly in Alameda County, presenting environmental and equity challenges. Liz emphasized the need for comprehensive freight planning to address these issues effectively.

Member of the public Roland Lebrun provided feedback regarding slide 20 of the presentation, focusing on the concept of a standard gauge Regional Rail crossing. Roland expressed concerns about the proposed route, suggesting that it may not align with plans for High-Speed Rail connecting San Francisco and Sacramento. Roland suggested an alternative route starting south of Emeryville, using existing connections to the Capitol Corridor. Roland emphasized the advantages of this route, including opportunities for tunneling and accessing Yerba Buena Island. Roland urged consideration of long-term planning for the route northeast towards Martinez and Sacramento.

Sarah Rowley, a resident of the San Antonio neighborhood in Oakland, advocated for an infill BART station in their community. She shared her personal experience of enduring a lengthy and costly commute to Fremont, highlighting the significant time and financial burdens associated with it. Sarah emphasized the need for improved connectivity in the neighborhood. She expressed concerns about the focus on Regional Rail expansion, noting the limitations posed by freight lines and the slower pace of Regional Rail.

Break (10 min)

Facilitator Frank Ponciano announced a 10-minute break at 2:26 pm. Frank reconvened the meeting at 2:32 pm.

E. Anti-Displacement Update: Working Group Draft Principles & Anti-Displacement Toolkit (For Information) (40 minutes)

EAC Facilitator Frank Ponciano addressed the final agenda item, highlighting the Community Stabilization and Anti-Displacement Principles co-created with the Anti-Displacement Working Group. He thanked working group members for their work and contributions in developing these principles, and reminded the EAC that this group met three times to examine displacement research and draft these guiding principles. He explained that these principles, made up of value statements and specific actions for Link21, are intended to guide future efforts in community stabilization and anti-displacement.

Darin Ranelletti outlined the process for finalizing the anti-displacement principles. Darin mentioned that following today's presentation, EAC members would have the opportunity to review and provide feedback on the draft principles. He then stated that the principles would be brought forth to the EAC for a vote of adoption at the July 2024 meeting.

The format of the principles was explained, consisting of an introduction describing their intended use, followed by eight principles, each containing a statement of values and corresponding actions for implementation by Link21. Volunteers from the working group would take turns reading each principle to the full EAC.

Frank asked for volunteers from the working group to read each principle aloud to the entire EAC.

Darin then provided an overview of the anti-displacement toolkit, explaining its connection to the principles. He stated that the toolkit serves as a technical resource, offering recommendations for understanding neighborhood dynamics, identifying displacement pressures, and implementing anti-displacement strategies.

Darin invited feedback and discussion from the EAC members to further refine the toolkit before finalization.

EAC Member Angela E. Hearing inquired if EAC members can give suggestions on the different draft principles that were presented. She then suggested that "immigrants" be named as a stakeholder on Draft Principle Three.

Frank clarified that feedback on the principles is welcomed, and there is time for further review and suggestions before any adoption decision is made.

EAC Member Clarence R. Fischer suggested implementing preemptive rent control measures around station areas, where rent increases are significantly higher (45%) compared to the wider community (25%). This approach would involve coordinating with city or county agencies to establish rent control policies in advance to ensure stability and prevent disproportionate rent hikes as new stations are developed.

Darin emphasized the importance of timing in implementing anti-displacement measures, particularly naming that rent control should be implemented ahead of building projects. He noted the need to collaborate with local jurisdictions early in the process to ensure these policies are established before the program becomes operational.

EAC Member David Sorrell emphasized the need for collaboration with cities and jurisdictions where stations will be located, such as Oakland and Alameda County. David highlighted the potential of leveraging existing plans like ACE rail's extension to Union City and the state rail plan to support neighborhood protection and market stabilization.

F. 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.

Roland, a member of the public, brought up the importance of considering specific alignment options for the transit project. Roland emphasized the need to study a route from the East Bay to Alameda, citing personal experience with a difficult commute between South San Jose and Alameda. Roland stated that a connection from Alameda to the existing BART line and transbay tube should be explored, as it could offer a feasible solution. On the San Francisco side, Roland pointed out that the Caltrain station on Fourth Street is poorly located and suggests moving it to Seventh Street for better integration with UCSF, Caltrain, and Muni. Roland cautioned against using First Street for the new route due to existing infrastructure on nearby streets.

V. Next Meeting Date: July 16, 2024, at 6:00 pm (For Information)

Tim Lohrentz announced that the next meeting will be on Tuesday, July 16, 2024, at 6:00 pm.

VI. Adjournment (For Action)

EAC Member Vanessa Ross Aquino motioned to adjourn the meeting. EAC Member Clarence R. Fischer seconded the motion. The EAC unanimously motioned to adjourn at 3:07 pm.

EAC Meeting Zoom Transcription Meeting #10 – May 21, 2024

This is a Zoom transcript of the meeting.

Tim Lohrentz

It's Tuesday, May 21st, at 01:05 p.m., and I am now calling the Equity Advisory Council meeting to order. I'm Tim Lohrentz, the equity programs administrator of Link 21 for the for BART's Office of Civil Rights, and I want to extend a warm welcome to our members of the public today, as well as to our equity advisory council members on behalf of the Link 21 team here today. Next slide, please. Before we do a quick agenda review and hear public comments, I want to make sure we're all on the same page about how we will conduct the Zoom meeting today. First, please keep yourself on mute when you're 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 and nine to raise your hand. Keep in mind the mute button is on the bottom left of the screen of the zoom screen. Next to that is a start video button. If you need to change your name, you can click on participants and then click rename. The reactions icon in 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 transcription 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 are having any technical difficulties and need assistance from our tech support team. For comments related to the meeting, we ask that you unmute yourself to speak whenever possible. 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 by saying here or I. The names will be called in alphabetical order. Let's begin with Ameerah Thomas. Angela E. Hearing.

Angela E. Hearing

Here.

Tim Lohrentz

Beth Kenny

Beth Kenny

Here.

Tim Lohrentz

Clarence R. Fischer?

Clarence R. Fischer

Here

Tim Lohrentz

Great. Cory Mickels. Were you saying here, Cory? David Sorrell? David Ying?

David Ying

Here.

Tim Lohrentz

Elizabeth Madrigal? Fiona Yim?

Fiona Yim

Here.

Tim Lohrentz

Gracyna Mohabir?

Gracyna Mohabir

Here.

Tim Lohrentz

Harun David. Hayden Miller, Landon Hill, Linda Braak?

Linda Braak

Here.

Tim Lohrentz

Mica Amichai, Samia Zuber, Taylor Booker, Vanessa Ross Aquino.

Vanessa Ross Aquino

Present.

Tim Lohrentz

Thanks all for your attendance, and welcome to the Equity Advisory council, for the link 21 program. Next slide, please. We will now move on to hearing public comments on topics not on today's agenda. Keep in mind public comment.

Frank Ponciano

Forgive me for cutting in. Just want to note. Hayden noted that they're present in the chat but could not speak for the first couple minutes of the meeting.

Tim Lohrentz

Okay, great thank you. So 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. Now. If there are no comments for those who dialed in, we will now see if anyone participating.

Frank Ponciano

Yeah, sorry, I see one raised hand in the public.

Tim Lohrentz

On the phone?

Frank Ponciano

No, on the public. Not on the phone.

Tim Lohrentz

We will now see if anyone participating via Zoom would like to provide a public comment. You can do so by raising your hand, and it sounds like there's one hand raised at least. Yes? Mark Joffe?

Mark Joffe

Yes. Hi, can you hear me?

Tim Lohrentz

Yes, we can.

Mark Joffe

I'll keep it very brief. Thank you for the opportunity. In response to some public comments that I gave at the bond oversight committee a few weeks ago, a member of Link 21 staff said that she expected the ridership on BART to recover to pre pandemic levels by 2040, when link 21 would theoretically be finished. I'm wondering if that in fact is true, and if so, whether you could provide the public with documentation supporting that claim. Thank you.

Tim Lohrentz

Thank you for that public comment. Are there any other public comments?

Frank Ponciano

Not seeing any of this moment.

Tim Lohrentz

All right, thanks for those who provided public comment. And next slide, please. And next slide. Our first item on the agenda is the approval of the EAC meeting minutes from March 19. First of all, are there any changes to the meeting minutes by either staff or EAC members?

Tim Lohrentz

Seeing none. Does anyone motion to approve the meeting minutes for March 19?

Clarence R. Fischer

Clarence Fischer so moves.

Tim Lohrentz

Hey, Clarence R. Fischer moved. Is there a second 2nd? That was Linda Braak. Linda Braak. Okay, all those in favor, raise your hand or say aye so that we can get an accurate count.

Multiple Speakers

Aye.

Tim Lohrentz

That motion is carried. Thank you for that. And now moving to the items on today's agenda, agenda item b. We have a follow up to previous EAC feedback. Then we'll talk, have an extended program update with an analysis of where we're at. And then we'll have public comment for items a, b, and c. We'll talk about that in a minute. And then we'll have a break after item d. After that public comment. And then after the break, we'll have an anti-displacement update talking about the working group draft principles and the anti-displacement toolkit. And then following that, we'll have public comment on item e, and then we will adjourn after that. Next slide, please.

Tim Lohrentz

Please note the memo that you received detailing follow up to previous EAC feedback. I would like to highlight a couple meeting logistics points. An EAC member asked whether chat could be turned on amongst EAC members and the EAC team during these EAC meetings. We are unable to turn on and turn off chat during the meeting. For this meeting, we will have chat turned on for EAC members. Some of you have already discovered this. We see chat as a way to supplement EAC discussions, but should not be seen as an alternative to active participation. For example, if a discussion is coming to an end and you have more to say, chat is a good way to express that members of the public are able to see the chat but not able to use chat themselves. We will evaluate the effectiveness of the use of chat. Following this meeting. Another EAC member asked if we could allow for more public comment on the EAC meetings so that members of the public have more opportunities to provide input. We are adding one additional public comment period right before the break so that members of the public can comment on items heard prior to the break. In addition, when EAC members are taking an action, aside from approval of meeting minutes or adjournment, we will add public comment on that action item prior to discussion by EAC members, which would be similar to what you might see in the BART board meetings or other public board meetings. I would also like to remind you to provide feedback to the EAC input report which was sent to all of you at the beginning of last week. We are receiving feedback this week through the survey form that was sent out with that report. Your suggested edits or input on the report are very valuable to us. Thank you. I'm now going to turn it over to Sadie Graham, link 21 program director, as we talk about our program updates. Sadie?

Sadie Graham

All right, here I am. Can you hear me?

Tim Lohrentz

Yes.

Sadie Graham

I don't know who I'm asking. Okay, next slide. So we're getting ready to share with you some of the findings that we have on the concepts, and this is also going to be very similar to the public outreach that Tim's going to lay out for you. That's, or maybe Brian. That's coming up soon. And so we just wanted to start by reminding you where the link 21 program really has come from and originated. So the idea of a second Trans Bay rail crossing goes really back, even probably before 2007, but to the Regional Rail plan. It's been studied a number of times by MTC, and it's been a part of the state rail plan and plan Bay area. And more recently, the corridor that includes link 21 was accepted into the FRA Corridor Identification Program, which is a program that will provide future funds for inner city passenger rail from the Federal Railroad association. And so there's work that we are doing with the state to better position link 21 for those future funds. So just a long list of the plans and then also the money that has followed it. The measure RR funds have been used to pay for the study thus far. There's, in addition, regional measure three funds, a reminder that we were awarded state TIRCP funds last year. And then as part of the Corridor Identification Program, we're moving along. So just wanted to set everything sort of within that context as a reminder. So next slide please. And then also just the early work and study for that, for a new trans bay rail crossing really helped us identify the three key challenges that have become our program problem statement. So it's really that insufficient mega Regional Rail access that doesn't really meet the community's needs or make rail competitive or with driving to achieve our state greenhouse gas reduction goals. Really inequitable service that doesn't meet the needs of the region's priority populations, which is access to jobs, housing and other

destinations. And meeting the Trans bay crowding issues on BART. While we know that it's not today's reality, it does remain a challenge that we need to strive for finding a solution for. And as we look forward to planning for the future, like the caller said before, you know, we are, we are sure that, well, we're sure that the transbay congestion is something that will be a problem again in the future that we're trying to solve. And it may not be what we're doing right now, but we're looking to 2050 and beyond. And so rail provides, you know, we don't, we're not, we're not providing sufficient access to frequent or reliable time competitive service to really meet the passengers needs, which is why the program is focused at improving BART and Regional Rail service connections. Next slide. So this is just a reminder where we have been. We were in the program definition phase when we approved the business case and the problem statement and the goals and objectives. We're now in the project identification phase where we've been working on these different concepts so that we can really share with you the trade offs and the similarities between the two technologies, so that we can move forward with the milestone of a technology decision which then has the implications to service network operations, the type of service we can provide, the travel experience for our existing and future passengers. After we identify that technology decision, we really, we have more work to do in order to really define that project, to move forward into environmental review, where we would be and that would necessitate, you know, talking with the community or local partners to really identify locations of proposed stations and extents of the project and such. So with that reminder, I'm just going to turn it over to Tim.

Tim Lohrentz

Since inception, the program has made a commitment to elevating equity. We have identified priority populations and communities that have historically been marginalized, and we have worked to bring them into the planning process to help inform how we can advance the program to make sure these communities are benefiting from the program. Equity is embedded in all our work streams. With equity at the core of link 21, we are committed to planning and developing projects differently and in partnerships with the communities we serve, such as through collaboration and partnerships with community based organizations. Next slide please. All of you are very familiar with this, but we wanted you to see what we tell other audiences about the Equity advisory council. We're starting to receive calls from other agencies about how to set up an equity advisory council. What you see for topics are some of the key highlights for themes of feedback and discussion that we engaged in over the last year. This will look familiar to you, avoiding displacement, developing improvements that benefit priority populations, and making sure that the future service is affordable with a unified, fair structure. I will now turn this back over to Camille Tsao.

Camille Tsao

Hi everyone. Nice to see you all. I'm going to be talking a little bit about the outreach that we've done and what we've heard, and then talk a little bit about the service that link 21 is proposing. So this image on the screen is just a quick snapshot of the successful engagement that the program has had during the phase one work. Since March of 2022, we've proactively reached out to direct connections over 11,000 community members and partners in 322 activities. We've built awareness of the link 21 program through a number of media, including social media, the program website and community canvassing. A couple of key tactics that were introduced in 2023 was the inclusion of an online open house event. So that's a virtual micro site through our website that allows people to attend a meeting 24/7 anytime, anywhere and allow them to share their feedback. So basically it doesn't matter where you're located, you could access that anytime. And we're planning to do that again in the next month. So through all of these efforts, including surveys and opinion research conducted last year, we've heard a number of resounding themes, which is on the next slide.

Camille Tsao

What we've heard since 2021 is that regardless of where you live, work or play in the mega region, people do want faster, more direct, convenient connections to destinations across northern California. And part of this key theme is creating a direct connection between Sacramento and the East Bay and the San Francisco Peninsula. Improved transfers between BART and Regional Rail and increased frequency, which provides better travel reliability, is something we've heard, as well as a need for better non peak service options. So in other words, not just high frequency service during commute hours, but good service throughout the day, night and weekends. And another important thing that we've heard is that transforming the rider experience, building ridership requires the creation of improved bicycle, pedestrian and transit connections to rail stations, as well as improving safety, security and accessibility on the train and in around stations.

Camille Tsao

Next, this as part of continuing to gather public sentiment on Link 21, we hired a firm called FM three Research. They conducted an online survey to targeted registered voters across the mega region, and the goal of the research was to collect information on commute patterns and transportation needs in the 21 county mega region. There is support for Link 21, the top two reasons being to reduce vehicular traffic and make commutes easier and

to improve transportation with expanded mass transit options. There's also great support for connecting the peninsula to Oakland and other parts of the East Bay, and much support for creating a more connected network that integrates the existing systems, meaning BART and Regional Rail. Next, I'll talk more about the service that is being proposed as part of Link 21. So there's two types of service. They already exist today, and link 21 is meant to accommodate both of those when we're thinking about how to improve the passenger experience. So since we're considering two different track gauges for the new crossing, each represents a unique opportunity to provide two different types of service. So just to make sure you all know this, but BART runs on broad gauge, what we call broad gauge. It's a unique track gauge that in the Bay area only BART operates on. And then we have other tracks that you see that, you know, freight, freight trains, capital corridor trains, Caltrain, Amtrak are running on, and we call that standard gauge. And that is found throughout the country. Most times you see track, you're looking at standard gauge. But BART runs on a separate closed system. So those are the two types of tracks that we're looking at in the new crossing. Now, when we talk about types of service, we have urban metro service, which is represented by the green lines and dots that you see and that you'll see on the other maps. Urban metro service is basically fast, frequent, reliable service that most people associate with BART, and that Caltrain will also be providing once it is electrified later this year. Typically the stations are a bit closer together than what you see in an intercity or express service. So inner city express service, represented by the purple lines and dots, tends to run less frequently. Half an hour every half hour would be very frequent for that type of service. It's usually, you know, hourly or could be more. And this distance between the stations that they're stopping at tends to be greater too, because these are catering generally to medium and longer trips. So both a standard gauge crossing or a BART gauge crossing could make improvements to these, to these two types of services. They're just a little bit different. And so I'll be going over that in the next couple slides. So in this one. So this covers the standard gauge or Regional Rail crossing and link 21. We've developed this concept, or multiple concepts, I should say we've developed concepts to give us an idea about how a standard gauge crossing or a BART gauge crossing would make travel, train travel different. So in this particular one you'll see that in purple we have all the intercity express services. So Capitol corridor is purple Caltrain on the peninsula. We're showing in green because it is going to be an urban metro service once it's electrified. But they would be essentially connected with a new standard gauge crossing because they both run on standard gauge. So a standard gauge crossing gives you a two for one opportunity where you can have two different service types using the same crossing. I think if we click, you'll see, please click, you'll see the pink. Yes. So the pink shows you where trains on the standard gauge network could come in and use the new crossing across the bay. We have some arrows because they could go beyond that too, but it'll really all depend on the service plan that is, that is developed. But the thing to remember is that you could have a Caltrain type urban metro service using the new crossing if it's standard gauge. Or you could have intercity trains that run on the purple using the new crossing as well if it's standard gauge. The next map shows a concept if the new crossing is BART gauge. So again, BART gauge is only used by the conventional BART trains that we know. BART also runs E BART and Oakland Airport connector. Those are not running on BART broad gauge, but most BART trains run on BART broad gauge. And so this map shows the new crossing is the Green Dash line between Oakland and the Mission Bay Area in San Francisco. In this example, folks traveling on intercity service, the purple lines, they don't have a direct link to San Francisco. So if you're on one of the trains in the purple coming from like Sacramento or Stockton, you would still need to transfer to get across the water to San Francisco in the peninsula if you're crossing in that area. So it's still required transfer to the green line across the bay. But there is an opportunity for a better, a new and better transfer between BART and intercity. We've been looking at different options in this one. You know, this one could be at Oakland Jack London Square today. You know, people either transfer the Richmond BART station or some people take intercity trains and then transfer to a bus in Emeryville to get across to San Francisco. Since in this concept the additional BART alignment avoids existing bottlenecks in Oakland, it basically would allow for more frequency on the East Bay BART line. So if you'll please click, you'll see this pink line represents where trains on the BART network, the existing BART network, could then feed into the crossing. Please. Please click. Yeah, there you go. So you'll see the pink on this map was a little different from the pink on the previous map. It's because only conventional BART trains would be able to use the new crossing and therefore they would feed into the existing network on the East Bay but would not go on the purple lines. I know that was a lot of information, so we can answer questions and clarification later if you need it. Now. On the next. Basically, this is a summary of how having a BART gauge crossing or a standard gauge crossing is similar or different. We've done a lot of work which we've been sharing with the public and stakeholders and will continue to do so. So let's see.

Camille Tsao

So some of the similarities as shown here. Sorry. You'll see. We'll talk about it a little more, but the equitable outcomes are very similar. The improved access to stations and jobs is similar and we're able to expand transbay capacity in the Oakland to San Francisco corridor and redundancy so that if the current crossing goes down, we have a backup in case we need to still move people across the bay on rail. Some of the differences, the major

differences is the mega regional connectivity. As you saw from those previous maps, if someone's coming from the Sacramento or Stockton areas, they still need to transfer to get across the bay. They don't have the same travel time savings and convenience as they would if we had a standard gauge crossing. Also, the difference, a major difference is interoperability. So with the standard gauge crossing, multiple different train operators, as long as they operate on standard gauge, could use the new crossing, whereas with a BART crossing only BART would be operating through that new crossing. And then thirdly, another difference that we've seen is that there are other rail investments in the mega region, many of which are for standard gauge rail. There are a few for BART, but many of them are standard gauge. And so we'd be amplifying, adding to the benefits of this greater network with a standard gauge crossing, not as much so with a new BART crossing. And then there are other evolving considerations which will be considered when we have more project details and definition, like ridership and cost and funding opportunities. It's still a little early in the project to be able to consider those things with great accuracy, but we know that they're important and we're going to continue to look at them. So now I'm going to pass it to Brian to talk a little bit more about those differences.

Tim Lohrentz

Actually, I'm going to talk about the equity. Yeah, I'm going to talk about what Camille mentioned that there's similarities in the equity outcomes, so I want to talk a little bit more about this. So this first graph shows a comparison between the two technologies and how they would both promote equity and livability by providing a large share of benefits to priority populations. As a reminder, people and priority populations areas make up 32.4% of the mega region's population. We have been seeking to have a project that disproportionately benefits priority populations. Shown here are the results of our modeling work that show the percentage of benefits to priority populations when looking at the enhanced access to opportunity jobs and enhanced access to community resources. These are shown in the first two columns of each group. For standard gauge, This results in 58% of benefits for opportunity jobs going to priority populations and 63% of the access to community resources. For BART, this is 57% and 50%, respectively. The awesome thing here is that both technologies provide benefits above and beyond the justice 40 federal requirement. Justice 40 says that the equity population for us, defined as priority populations, should receive a 40% share of benefits. That both technologies achieve that for these and other benefits is not surprising given the level of importance our project has placed on equity and serving priority populations. One difference between the two options is that broad gauge benefits are largely within the existing service area of BART versus standard gauge benefits, which expand access of urban metro service as well as inner city service to new priority population areas. Another thing that is important to note, looking at the third column of each grouping, is that the majority of new trips for both concepts are taken by low income households, those earning less than \$60,000 per year. Next slide, please. These comparisons relate to comparisons of access to stations and access to jobs. These are indicators of our goals to support economic opportunity and livability. Both technologies improve access of populations within half a mile of stations with new metro service. Standard gauge improves station access for more people, but a lower percentage are priority populations. Both technologies increase the number of jobs within an hour commute. This looks at all jobs, not just opportunity jobs, which were on the previous slide for the general population. Throughout the region, the average person has access to about 45,000 more jobs than without link 21. And when we isolate the evaluation for priority population areas, the average person has access to about 80,000 more jobs within a 1 hour commute with either crossing option. Okay, at this time I'm going to pass it off to Brian Soland.

Brian Soland

Thanks, Tim. Brian Soland here. I'm the manager of rail planning for Link 21. I'm going to walk you through a few of the other differences and considerations for our evaluation. So this metric that we have on the screen here considers how a crossing project can transform the passenger experience is one that Camille was referring to earlier. And here we found that standard gauge can do this by allowing for multiple services to use a single crossing between Oakland and San Francisco and increasing the opportunity for more direct, no transfer necessary connections across the mega region. And this is shown in the example trip here on the screen between Sacramento and San Francisco. For BART, Less transformative, a broad gauge crossing does enhance connectivity by bolstering the existing BART network and the opportunity for better frequency. And both technologies increase the number of new direct connections available within the rail network and also increase the number of destinations that are connected with just one transfer. Next slide. This metric here compares travel time savings. This is a big deal, getting people on trains. It's a really important factor for how people choose to get around. And a standard gauge crossing improves travel time significantly for those longer journey trips to Sacramento and from the mega region, also from the East Bay to the peninsula. These are examples of where we would see a lot of travel time savings. From Sacramento to San Francisco, the savings is more than 20 minutes. From Emeryville to Redwood City, you see a significant ridership Save, sorry, travel time savings, 45 minutes. A BART crossing reduces wait times for most East Bay BART stations. So if you're getting on, if you're taking a trip

from an East Bay BART station, your waiting time is going to be less because there are more frequent trains as well. There's the opportunity to improve travel time to Mission Bay. If you're getting on a BART station, there will be the opportunity for stations in the Mission Bay Area in San Francisco, so you have more direct access there. And from Fremont to Mission Bay, this travel time savings would be about 20 minutes. If we look at and on the next slide, this comparison considers interoperability and how benefits can improve local and or mega Regional Rail travel. So this is just another layer of how we're thinking about things. Both technologies do provide redundancy for riders. If the existing crossing is down for some reason, there would be another rail crossing that they could use for center gauge. It does allow for really true interoperability where multiple services could use the crossing, and it would have a great impact on connectivity connecting Caltrain, the San Joaquin's Capitol corridor high speed rail could all potentially use the crossing. And it also provides reliability on portions of the standard gauge network that are in desperate need of improved reliability. For a broad gauge crossing. It would focus on more localized improvements, again by improving the frequency of the BART service, but there wouldn't be that interoperability opportunity that we see with standard gauge.

Brian Soland

This comparison shows how a crossing can amplify the benefits of other planned projects throughout the mega region and how those projects could also benefit Link 21. Right one example is how a standard gauge crossing could increase the benefits of the portal project, which is also called the Downtown Crossing Project, connecting the Caltrain Fourth and King station to the Salesforce Transit Center. So if there were a new standard gauge crossing that connected to Salesforce Transit Center, it would make that station a through running stations and trains accessing that station would now have access to both sides of the bay and allow for more, a better utilization of that station. This would increase the passenger volume through that portal project by 60% to 70%. So it'd be amplifying the benefits of that project that someone else is advancing. Generally throughout the network, there are more standard gauge projects across the region compared to ones that would connect to BART. So that's a difference that we see here. Next slide, I'll walk you through a few of the considerations, things that we haven't highlighted necessarily as differentiators. So our analysis looked at the ridership potential and we see potential for significant gains of new riders with Link 21. Big picture here is not a big differentiator at this stage. Part of the reason is that it's very dependent on where are the stations, how frequent is the service, exactly where are the alignments of that service and what are the travel time savings. And those are things that we have lots of different concepts for, but we haven't narrowed down to one set. So there's a range. One example from our analysis, it showed that the number of stations that would be in San Francisco was a, a big driver in the variability of our ridership. We added just one station for the standard gauge, and it boosted ridership by 25%, I'm sorry, by 25,000 new riders, which is actually 30% beyond 2050. That's sort of the line, the dotted line there, the dashed line there. There could be other improvements that we saw on the previous map. Some of them haven't been identified within our analysis yet, and if those were to come online, those would further increase ridership. So those are definitely worth considering as we move forward. Like ridership, cost is another frequently asked question. And it's also highly variable at this very early stage, so it's worth contextualizing a bit. They're based on one to 2% Conceptual design with big ranges, and designs will continue to evolve and change as future phases of work occur. The cost of the crossing, the crossing infrastructure itself is broadly comparable between standard gauge and broad gauge. And for the connecting infrastructure, standard gauge tends to be higher. So once you get beyond just the crossing, there are more improvements that would be needed for the standard gauge network. And this is just because historically, investment on that network has been less. And you can kind of see that by all of the projects that are happening throughout the region on the standard cage network as well to support it. So now investment is happening in that network, and in future phases of work, there will be more of a focus on honing in on the costs and getting it to a greater level of detail as design detail becomes more clear.

Brian Soland

And now, choosing a broad gauge for new infrastructure, the crossing means that it's providing urban metro service, this type of service that Camille was referring to earlier. And this aligns with a certain type of funding, the Federal Transit Administration funding. And so it's open to those sorts of funds. With standard gauge, it's a little bit different because it would allow inner city trains as well as urban metro service to use the crossing, and so it would also be open to Federal Railroad Administration funding. So FRA funding. So there'd be two types of funding available. It's worth noting that the Capitol Corridor is included within, including Link 21 crossing is included within the state's corridor ID program, corridor identification development program, which is being administered by the FRA. And so since it's part of that program, it's open to funds available through that program. So that's a consideration, something that we're going to continue to focus in on and work as the project advances. And with that, I'll turn it over to Sadie.

Sadie Graham

Thanks, everyone. So, yes, we're working on refining this presentation to share it with some online open house or webinar events that are scheduled for early June. And then, I'm sorry, the online open house is something that would be up in June and is available 24/7 for people that can't attend a meeting. We did want to say that in the past, we've heard from the EAC that they're interested in having a better understanding of when we are going to be having these public events. And so if you plan to attend any of those events, please let us know, and we would be happy to introduce you at the beginning of the meeting and let people know that you're there to listen to what they have to say. So feel free to let us know in a follow up email. Next slide, please. And then, so, you know, after we get to this train technology, we've talked a lot about what else we need to do, but there is a fair amount of project definition and refinement that we need to do. Brian was talking about the funding strategy in terms of how to leverage the investment of local funds for state, continue to leverage local funds for state and federal grants. I think with moving forward, there's going to need to be continued key stakeholder coordination and probably better coordination, including sort of bringing some of the operators into the decision-making sort of roles within the group. And then, of course, we'll continue with our ongoing commitment to public engagement and prioritizing equity. So I think that was a lot, and I think that will end our presentation. And so now it's time for us to answer your questions.

Frank Ponciano

Great. So just, Iris, gonna ask you to go back to the last slide. Just leave it in there as people may be thinking about questions to ask. Obviously, as Tim mentioned, the chat is open for you to use as a supplement, to add comments, to react to other people's questions, to ask your own questions. But we also do want to, obviously, incorporate it into a verbal conversation. As Sadie said, that was a lot of information. I know we talked about equity aspects. We also talked about public outreach and public opinion. And then there was the broader program and technology updates and analysis conversation. We can have conversations and answer questions about any of those three broader categories of the presentation. As you all remember, you can raise your hand to go ahead and start the conversation. Anyone have any questions? Okay, I see. I saw a brief hand raise from Clarence. Clarence, go ahead.

Clarence R. Fischer

Okay. A couple of things. As we look at the technology, if we end up going with standard gauge, one of the things that I'm a little concerned about is with the frequencies, because in order to make this work, I think, you know, some areas we're going to have to talk about 30 or 40 minutes headways, just like capital corridor. Before, you know, the virus hit, during commute hours, they were offering 40 minutes headways is as we expand to different corridors, unlike the Sacramento to Emeryville Oakland, where tracks are two across to allow for trains in each direction. In some corridors, if there's only a single track currently, if there's enough land, are we talking about, you know, double tracks in those corridors, too, or at least long enough sidings so that those corridors could also benefit from the enhanced 20 frequencies of perhaps anywhere from a half hour to an hour, so that Regional Rail, if it ends up with standard gauge, that, again, the frequency would be drawing people in to writing. Thank you.

Frank Ponciano

Thanks, Clarence. Is there any reaction, I think, from staff on that?

Brian Soland

Sure, I can. Camille can answer. I'll start. Thanks, Clarence. That's an astute comment. And there are opportunities for frequency improvements throughout a Regional Rail network. And I think that's like, that's something that the region is, and the mega region, and I would say, like the state are striving for and looking to advance. We didn't include every single opportunity for improved frequency. We focused in on the crossing and the understanding where other improvements would be made within our baseline to come to a, an understanding of what that frequency could be. So for intercity, it's about every hour, and for the urban metro service, it's up to 16 trains in the crossing. And so that's between five and ten minute headways on the East Bay side and more frequent on the. Because it splits, well, some to the north and some to the south. And certainly as those other projects get advanced beyond that area, there would be opportunity for more inner city and better inner city frequency, but those would be beyond the horizon year that we looked at.

Frank Ponciano

Thanks, Brian. Okay, we have two more members of the EAC with their hands up. Just want to note. I noticed there were some members of the public with their hands up as well. We will have public comment coming up, but at this point, we are just taking comments and questions from members of the EAC. Going to keep going with Gracyna?

Gracyna Mohabir

Yeah. Thank you. I was just curious about the FRA funding that was kind of discussed in the funding opportunities section of the presentation. I think it said something inside about it being like \$100 billion, like, the pot of funds for that. And I was just curious if there was, like, a certain time horizon when, like, these funds were available and, like, you know how that lines up with, like, the Link 21 timeline for, like, deciding the project, applying. Yeah, just stuff like that. If anyone could speak to that. Thank you.

Frank Ponciano

Thanks Gracyna . I'm going to pass it over to Sadie.

Sadie Graham

Yeah, great. Good question. So I think the punchline there is, with the recent bipartisan infrastructure law, there's a lot more money that has been identified in the FRA world for these types of inner city passenger rail projects. So that billion, that, excuse me, \$100 billion is for the four years that began when the bill was passed. And it includes. Not just. So this is a good question because I think it means that we can revise the slide to make it more clear. Clear. But it includes all kinds of funds for improvements to inner city passenger rail. So safety improvements, new extensions, state of good repair improvements. But the one thing that it does, the one thing that it also does do that is really important for Link 21 is it created this Corridor Identification Program, which is a new program which is essentially meant to be a pipeline for future funds for inner city passenger rail projects. And the Corridor Identification Program, it provides funds for program development, which is sort of the phase we're in right now, and environmental review. A lot of other funds are only really ready when you're ready to go into construction and such. And so that's why it's important for Link 21 to be a part of the corridor identification, so that we can then fall in line for funds for future development. And I think, as for the future, I'm not quite sure what it holds in terms of future sort of similar investment in infrastructure for the country. Hopefully, that answers your question a little bit.

Frank Ponciano

Yeah. And I see Gracyna sent in an answer on chats and says, thanks for clarifying, Sadie. This is interesting. Please let it know, Gracyna, if there are any additional questions on this. And I do see that we have two more folks from the EAC with their hands up. But I want to highlight a question from Vanessa that is related. So, Sadie, I'll come back to you with this one. Says, how many months or years out to receive funds?

Sadie Graham

Oh, well. So for Link 21, we need to be. So we are part of the Capitol Corridor, which is one of the six states that's been identified within the FRA Corridor Identification Program. So the first step is for us to develop, like, a service development plan for that overall corridor. And so that's the work that we're scoping out right now. And then we'll ask this. Then we'll apply for those funds. So that'll sort of fund overall planning for that whole corridor of which Link 21 is a part of, and of which, I would say the work that we've done, we're sort of a little bit ahead of maybe the entire corridor. So that would sort of be an umbrella plan for that overall corridor. And then from there, it would be the ability. There would be the ability to apply for future funds. So when we say time out or, like, when the. I mean, we still have to apply for these funds. So we're just really noting that it's a new. It's a new bucket of federal funds. Hopefully that answers. Oh, I love the chat. I can see instant validation. Okay. You get instant validation feedback. Yeah. And I will find the Corridor Identification link.

Frank Ponciano

Thanks, Sadie. And, yes, Dave, I'm going to come to you right after we hear from Fiona. So, Fiona, go ahead.

Fiona Yim

Hi. I have two questions. One is just clarification. I'm sure it's already been covered, but if there are, like, other rail agencies using this transbay terminal as the same, like, if they're to agencies sharing this tunnel transmission crossing, like, how will that relationship work, and will it impact the frequency of service? And my second question was about. It's more of a comment, and it's kind of nitpicky. When we were talking about benefits to priority populations, I noticed that we use the phrase disproportionate benefits, and I'm wondering if it would be more accurate and impactful to use a phrase like restorative benefits or like, another phrase that, like, recognizes that these are populations that have been underserved in the past. Yeah, that's it. Thanks.

Frank Ponciano

Thanks, Fiona. So I'm gonna start with you, Sadie. You can pass it on to anybody else, and I know that Tim might have something to say about that last part, but. Go ahead, Sadie.

Sadie Graham

Yeah. And so I think I'll answer the second part of the question first, which is the way we've been planning is for service to be agnostic. So it doesn't really depend on who's operating the service. We're trying to, you know, plan for something that, you know, meets the optimal, you know, service plan that we can have for the customer, even if there's different operators. But, yes, there's a number of different ways in which something like this could happen. It's fairly common in Europe for a railroad to be run a railroad or infrastructure to be owned and operated by one agency, but then for other operators to run through it. So it's actually fairly common. You know, think about it as up is the host agency for the railroad that Capitol Corridor runs on. So definitely is like logistics, and they're, you know, it would require sort of a lot more of interoperability and, you know, intercommunications between those railroads. But that would be part of the plan. So hopefully that answers the question. But it's a really good question.

Frank Ponciano

Great. And is there anything more to be said on the other item? Tim, on I know that there was a conversation on terminology used for priority population equity, piece of things.

Tim Lohrentz

Just, those are welcome comments and something we may revise our talking points about that. So thank you for those suggestions.

Frank Ponciano

All right, going to go on to David Sorrell.

David Sorrell

So, yeah, thank you very much, and thank you all for providing this guidance. And I think the challenge that we're going to end up facing, I feel no matter what technology is going to be used, is obviously, I think the path to, at least the path to getting more funding might have to come from the feds, even though there's a lot of uncertainty. Well, maybe a lot, maybe a few uncertainties going on in Washington at the moment. And so I think in terms of strategizing, I think it's still obviously an ongoing process to communicate and discuss, especially if you're joining multiple networks for a single line. And I think from an equity and safety strategy, creating a network where you have minimal transfers but also frequent service. And this is a theme that we've talked about both in the working group, but also as the collective whole, is going to be helpful in at least getting us, setting the framework for a service operating plan that's going to be quite effective in trying to capture as many people as possible. And obviously, once we get closer to whether or not it's a decision that's been made or whether or not the project shovel ready, those are multiple steps further down the timeline. But I think it's helpful, at least in this context, to continue having that discussion, acknowledging that the standard gauge might be a path, acknowledging that BART has to go through other steps, and just looking at the, I guess for lack of a better word, some level of anti tax sentiment from the public as it stands right now. At what point does the narrative now switch from the current or the pre Covid status quo? Is that going to change the mindset of reducing congestion and improving access to different places? And, of course, shoring up a lot of the externalities of living further away and causing sprawl and congestion that goes along with it.

Frank Ponciano

Thanks, Dave. Sadie, I see you.

Sadie Graham

I think we're going to file that as a comment rather than a question. Right? Fair enough.

Frank Ponciano

Yeah.

Sadie Graham

Very well put.

Frank Ponciano

Okay. Any last comments or questions, I want to note. Clarence, I saw you raise your hand briefly, then it came down, and. Just want to give you a moment, see if there's anything you're wanting to ask. Not at the moment.

Clarence R. Fischer

I think it was answered. Thank you.

Frank Ponciano

Great. Thanks, Clarence. Before we go on to the next item on the agenda, I just want to give us one more moment for people to make any last comments, ask any last questions, a lot of information. Of course, we're always available for your outreach, and so we'll make sure to keep that conversation going.

Sadie Graham

And we'll take public comment after the. Right before the break. Is that right, Frank? Because I see that that is correct. Okay.

Frank Ponciano

Which is a great transition, because I'll pass it back to Tim for public comment.

Tim Lohrentz

Thanks, Frank. We will now hear public comments for this last item, as well as any other items previous to that on today's agenda. 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 verbal public comment, please dial star six to unmute yourself. And if no one comments by phone, then if you are on Zoom and would like to provide a public comment, you can do so by raising your hand. Please do so now.

Frank Ponciano

Tim, we have a few, we have three folks that are wanting to make public comments, starting with Liz Ames.

Tim Lohrentz

Okay, go ahead, Director Ames.

Liz Ames

Oh, thank you. Hi, I'm Liz Ames. I'm your BART director, and I really appreciate this update. This is regarding the last item that was just discussed. And I guess my concern all along with this project is, you know, Link 21 is sharing rail lines with UP for freight. So freight takes precedence over passenger rail. We pay for access to use passenger rail on the freight lines. And I really advocated to replace the Carquinez Bridge, which is between Benicia and Martinez, which Capitol Corridor is studying, which I appreciate because that bridge is really the biggest bottleneck for Capitol Corridor and providing frequent service to the Bay area. Unfortunately, that bridge also contains a multitude of freight trains. And we have five ports through that Carquinez Strait from Oakland. It's Oakland port. There's Richmond, there's Benicia, there's Antioch, there's Stockton and Sacramento ports. And that line between Oakland and Sacramento is the busiest line in northern California because of, in part, freight trains. And Alameda county just announced that the freight train traffic will double in the next 15 years just in Alameda county alone. So I guess that's the port of Oakland. So this is a big equity issue. We have a lot of pollution around the Oakland port because of trucks being, you know, focusing on the delivery of containers. And you can't really justify this service unless you address freight. So I'd like to know more about freight planning. Thank you.

Tim Lohrentz

Thank you, Director Ames. Very good points. Can move to the next public comment.

Frank Ponciano

Yes, we have Sarah Rowley.

Frank Ponciano

Sarah Rowley, you are muted, we cannot hear anyone.

Tim Lohrentz

Okay. While we figure this out, then we can move on to Roland.

Roland Lebrun

Thank you. So I have a quick comment, which is about slide 20, according to the PDF, but they're not numbered, which has the concept standard gauge Regional Rail crossing. I want to respectfully bring to your attention that the plan is to use that crossing for high speed rail and hopefully connect San Francisco and Sacramento in an hour or less. So if you start by making a U turn as you exit the Salesforce transit center and then somehow wing your way through Alameda, and how on earth you're ever going to be connected to the capital corridor somewhere in Oakland? I have no idea. You're off to a bad start. So my advice to you, if you look at this map, you look at the grand picture of where everything is, is initially you have to make a straight shot at Emeryville, specifically just south of it, where the old, I forgot what it was, the connections to Capital Corridor already there, all the ramps

and everything under the I-80 freeways. I don't understand why we're not looking at that. Another advantage you've got is that you go to Yerba Buena island. That gives you tremendous opportunities of breaking the crossing into separate sets of tunnels that you can drill at the same time. And when you get to Emeryville. Yes, initially, as the previous speaker said, you're going to share tracks with Union Pacific, but you got to start planning for the long term plan, which is after you go to Emeryville, you're going to be making a straight shot northeast, you know, towards Martinez, and then eventually get to Sacramento. And I would really wish that that would be considered at some point. Thank you.

Tim Lohrentz

Yes, thanks for that comment, Roland.

Sarah Rowley

Hello? Sorry.

Frank Ponciano

Yes, Tim, we have Sarah Rowley. Looks like we could hear them.

Sarah Rowley

Yeah, go ahead about that. Hi, my name is Sarah Rowley. I'm a resident of the San Antonio neighborhood in Oakland. I'm part of a group that's advocating for an infill BART station down the street from us. Here's why I want this station. When I commuted to Fremont, I had a lucrative contract on there. When I left my house at 730, I would not be able to step on a train until 813. I spent \$3,000 in car maintenance in my commute and an hour and a half one way in bumper to bumper traffic. I'm seeing a lot of lean here towards Regional Rail showing up and I would just like to advocate for an infill BART station. We need it in our neighborhood. This includes schools and includes Highland Hospital. It includes La Clinica de la Raza. When I see all these plants that are extending out this Regional Rail, I would like to lift up what was said before, which is that there's freight lines on these tracks and Regional Rail is slow. You know, we need to shore up inner city connectivity as well. All right, I think that's all I have to say.

Tim Lohrentz

Thank you, Sarah Rowley, those very good comments as well. Thank you for your participation. And thanks for all who provided a public comments. And at this time, is there any other public comments?

Frank Ponciano

None at this point. Okay. At this time we will take a ten minute break and come back at around 2:26. Thank you.

Frank Ponciano

All right. Just want to note we have two minutes left in this break. Two more minutes, then we'll come back. Thanks, everybody. See you soon.

Frank Ponciano

Okay, everybody, that is 2:26. Ten minute break thus ends. I'm going to get people a few seconds to come back and then we'll get started with the next item. I ask if you can flip over to the next slide, please.

Frank Ponciano

Okay, great. Next slide, please. So this is our last agenda item and an important conversation and update for you all. The topics that we're going to be discussing is, number one, the community stabilization anti displacement principles for Link 21, which were developed by the EAC anti displacement Working group. Bit more information coming up about that, but we're going to introduce those principles to you, hopefully have some feedback that we can start implementing into those principles as we move forward with the process. And the second item is we are going to be updating you on the anti displacement toolkit, and where we are with that, we can go on to the next slide. One thing that I want to note is that these two items, before I move on, we're going to just present through them and then we'll take comments and discussion after the fact right at the end. So just keep that in mind. Again, the chat is available to you as well while things are ongoing. So I want to start at the bottom of this slide. The first thing I'd be remiss to not do is thank the members of the anti displacement working group. So I'm going to go ahead and name each of them. I really appreciate, we all really appreciate your time, your commitment, and the passion that you all have for this topic. We have Clarence Fischer, David Sorrell, Gracyna Mohabir, Samia Zuber, Taylor Booker, and Vanessa Ross Aquino were great participants in the conversation. Lots of great insights and teamwork that led to what you are all going to hear about today. The anti displacement working group was formed in December of last year, 2023. It has the six members that I just named and has met three times, once in January, February and April of 2024. The main task that the working group had was to review and discuss

displacement research and data, and to discuss examples of other anti displacement principles for similar programs and efforts as Link 21. And the main task that they had was to collaborate with staff in order to develop those draft principles that we will be talking about today. So, with that, we go on to the next slide, and I am going to pass this over to Darin, who's going to walk us through the process, and what next? And then we'll start walking through those. Well, no, let's not do that. Let's go back and let me just talk a little bit about the principles themselves, just so we understand the different components of it. The principles are going to be comprised of two items. The first one is a value statement, and then another item at the bottom of the screen is going to be the corresponding Link 21 action. Just so you understand, there's gonna be a lot of words that you're gonna see on your screen. Sorry that it's so word heavy, but just wanting to give you that orientation so that when you see it, you know exactly what you're looking for. The top is gonna be the values, and the bottom is gonna be potential corresponding actions. We are going to use those principles ultimately to guide future Link 21 community stabilization and anti displacement planning efforts. So, this is an important conversation. As you all know, it's been a long time coming and a pretty big effort. And this is going to be incorporated into Link 21 's planning work in conjunction with other program goals, objectives and principles. It'll be pretty central to the anti displacement and community stabilization efforts going forward. So it's an important conversation and one that does not end today. So with that, I apologize, Darin, I'll pass it back to you.

Darin Ranelletti

Great.

Darin Ranelletti

Thanks, Frank, and good afternoon, everyone. Darin, Ranelletti , the manager of land use planning at BART for Link 21. And I also second Frank's appreciation for the working group members and their time and commitment. It was an outstanding effort and really pleased with what we were able to come up with and looking forward to introducing that to the rest of the EAC today and getting your initial feedback. So this slide shows the steps for finalizing those principles that you're about to see. But before we see them, we want to give you a sense of where we're going after this. The working group in April finalized the draft that we're about to present. We're showing that to you for the first time at this meeting, introducing that to you, getting your initial reaction, initial questions. But you will have an opportunity after today's meeting to consider and review them further. We'll send out the principles to the EAC after the meeting, and you'll have an opportunity to review and provide feedback to the team. We'll make any necessary revisions based on input from the EAC with the intent that we come back to the full EAC in July with an action to approve the principles. And then we have the final approved anti displacement principles, next slide. So once we have them, what do we do with them? So this slide shows the different elements of anti displacement planning and how the principles fit in. So the principles really act as foundational guidance for the Link 21 program as we do our anti displacement planning work. We also have the anti displacement toolkit, which you'll hear an update today, and that contains specific technical strategies around collecting data and identifying anti displacement policies and programs that implement the foundational guidance and direction that comes out of the principles. And then we have local community engagement. So we take the principles, the toolkit, and we sit down with local communities, intensive local community engagement to understand what are the local conditions, sharing with them the data that we've collected, seeing if it resonates with them, what's missing, what needs to be added, and finalizing the anti displacement strategies that would go into the program. And that's the final outcome, is that we would have locally tailored anti displacement strategies for new station areas that are implemented as part of Link 21. Next slide. So this is the format of the principles. And Frank touched on this earlier. They contain two pieces. There's an introduction that describes the overall intended use of the principles. And then there are eight principles that were developed collaboratively between the Link 21 team and the working group. And then each of those eight principles contains two parts. There's the initial statement of values, which documents what's important. Then there is a corresponding action for Link 21 to implement in order to incorporate those values into its planning work. So we're introducing the draft principles today and seeking initial reactions and questions. And like I said, we'll send it out after the meeting and there'll be further opportunity to review. It's a lot of text. What we're going to do is read through them together as a group. What we have found doing this work with the working group is that words matter and the working group did spend time adjusting individual words. So that's why we're going to read through them as a group. And the way we're going to do that is I'm going to start by reading the introduction and then I'm going to read the first principle. And then Frank will read the second principle. And then we're going to ask for volunteers from the working group to take turns reading each principle to the full EAC. And then at the end of this item, we'll be able to hear your initial reactions and questions. And if we need to pull up the slides and go back to certain ones, we can certainly do that. Next slide.

Darin Ranelletti

So this is the introduction and this is technically part of the principles. So this is something that when the EAC does take an action to approve the principles, this is included in it. The introduction states, the Link 21 Equity

Advisory Council recommends that the Link 21 program incorporate these community stabilization and anti displacement principles into the program as commitments to guide Link 21 planning and delivery activities. The principles will assist the Link 21 program in meeting one of the program's stated objectives to advance equity and protect against community instability and displacement, and will be considered in conjunction with other program goals, objectives, and principles. Next slide. So this is the first principle and this gives you a format. I'm going to explain it before I read it. So there's a title at the top, and then there's the statement of values, which is explaining what is important to the EAC and to Link 21 so that it is documented for the program and then the recommended action. And this is what the EAC is recommending to Link 21. Ultimately, when these principles are approved, it is intended that Link 21 will make the commitment to do this action. Okay, so draft principle number one is addressed past harms history is important, especially harm caused to priority populations by past transportation projects. Although Link 21 on its own cannot address all harm caused by past transportation projects, Link 21 is an opportunity to acknowledge history and address past harms by advancing equitable outcomes. Link 21 should learn from the past, identify harms created by past transportation projects, and strive not to repeat the prior harms of past transportation projects. Link 21 should identify and pursue opportunities to address past harms by advancing equitable outcomes. Next slide. Now I'll turn over to Frank.

Frank Ponciano

Thanks, Darin. And as Darin said, starting with the next principle, we'll ask members of the working group to read them as well. So get ready for that. Draft principle two, strengthen communities. The statement of values is communities, including communities where Link 21 infrastructure is located should be better off with Link 21 compared to without Link 21. In addition to improved transportation access, communities where Link 21 infrastructure is located should be stronger and more stable. The recommended action associated with these values is Link 21 should identify and pursue opportunities to strengthen and stabilize community communities, including communities where Link 21 infrastructure is located beyond improved transportation access. Next slide, please. Any members of the working group want to volunteer to read this principle?

Frank Ponciano

Go ahead, Gracyna.

Gracyna Mohabir

All right, so draft principle three is avoid displacement, and the statement of values is physical displacement, both direct and indirect, can cause substantial, long lasting harm at the individual and community level and can disproportionately impact priority populations and groups that face additional systemic barriers, including, but not limited to, people of color, low income households, seniors, people with disabilities, women, the LGBTQ community, transitional age youth, people with limited English proficiency, and formerly incarcerated individuals. And the recommended action, Link 21 should strive to avoid direct and indirect displacement and disruptions to community cohesion, especially in priority populations and groups that face additional systemic barriers, including, but not limited to, people of color, low income household, seniors, people with disabilities, women, the LGBTQ community, transitional age youth, people with limited English proficiency, and formerly incarcerated individuals.

Frank Ponciano

Thanks for sharing. Next slide. Anyone else? Vanessa?

Vanessa Ross Aquino

Sure. Draft principle four, develop local strategies. Statement of values, every community is unique with its own unique circumstances. Local community members are the experts of their community, and anti displacement outcomes at the local level are important. The recommended action, local anti displacement strategies should be developed and prioritized in areas where there is the greatest risk of displacement associated with Link 21. They should be informed by data and based on local conditions in consultation with local communities, including local government, community based organizations, and community members. Local anti displacement strategies should identify SMARTIE goals to the extent desirable and feasible. Smarty goals are specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, time bound, inclusive, and equitable.

Frank Ponciano

Thanks, Vanessa. I saw Dave. You had your hand up and calling you.

David Sorrell

Yeah, I'll just slide in for principle five, design strategies to be effective. The statement says that anti displacement strategies are only effective if they are implemented and enforced. In some cases, Link 21 may not be responsible for implementation and enforcement of certain elements of local anti displacement strategies. Other entities may

be responsible. It is important for these anti displacement strategies to be implemented and enforced. Therefore, the recommended action is that local anti displacement strategies should be designed to be implemented and enforced effectively. If Link 21 is not responsible for implementation and enforcement of the certain elements of local anti displacement strategies, Link 21 should closely work with those entities in the development of local anti displacement strategies and to seek ways to support their implementation and enforcement.

Frank Ponciano

Thanks, Dave. All right, we have draft principle six. Totally fine if not available. But just so you all know, we have Clarence and Taylor left.

Clarence R. Fischer

Okay. This is Clarence. I can only read so far and then my screen is blanked out. Let me start, though. Draft principle number six. Preserve existing culture. Statement of values. Existing community members who remain in neighborhoods can experience cultural displacement and feelings of exclusion and non belonging as neighborhoods change. The recommended action, Link 21 should identify and pursue opportunities to preserve and enhance cultural assets and strengthen social connections to promote a sense of belonging as neighborhoods change, so that existing residents feel welcomed. And that's all I see.

Vanessa Ross Aquino

I can help him if he needs to.

Frank Ponciano

Yeah, go on.

Vanessa Ross Aquino

Okay. Included and connected to the community. Link 21 should consider cultural preservation opportunities at stations and in the surrounding station area in consultation with local communities, including local government, community based organizations and community members.

Frank Ponciano

Thanks, Clarence and Vanessa. Appreciate that.

Clarence R. Fischer

Frank, real quick, afterwards, I should talk to you about why I don't see those ending lines.

Frank Ponciano

Yeah, let's talk about that.

Clarence R. Fischer

Okay, thank you.

Frank Ponciano

Okay, last. No, this is not last. Principle seven, again, it's okay if not available. Oh, Hayden. Go ahead, Hayden.

Hayden Miller

Sure. So, principle seven, support those displaced. Statement of values. If direct displacement is unavoidable, displaced residents and businesses should be better off with link 21 compared to without link 21. And the recommended action is that during local station and infrastructure planning, link 21 should engage early with residents and businesses that may be directly disrupted, disrupted or impacted by link 21 and provide timely support and services during the planning and implementation phases to address those impacts.

Frank Ponciano

Thanks, Hayden. Let's move on to the next slide, please. Anyone else? Want to open up to the EAC? This is the last principle. Anyone want to read through it? Dave, go ahead. Yeah.

David Sorrell

So, draft principle eight is evolve strategies as needed. So the statement says the displacement pressures can change over time. It is important to understand and respond to changing pressures. And the recommended action is that local anti displacement strategies should evolve as needed in response to changing conditions. Link 21, in consultation with local communities, including local government community based organizations and community

members should assess and monitor displacement pressures before, during and after construction and to take parallel steps to address the changing pressures.

Frank Ponciano

Thanks, Dave. So with that, we go on to the next slide. I'm going to pass it back to Darin to sort of reiterate on what the process is going to be and then going into the anti toolkit conversation before we take questions and comments from the EAC. Go ahead, Darin.

Darin Ranelletti

Thanks, Frank. And thanks for everyone for the group effort in reading those principles. You already saw this slide, so it's just a reminder that these are the steps. So we will be taking your feedback, initial feedback from today. You also have enough other opportunity outside of the meeting to provide feedback, and then we'll be making revisions to bring back to the full EAC in July. So that's going forward. On the principles before we go on to the toolkit, I wanted to introduce the toolkit by saying that we briefly discussed the toolkit previously with the EAC last year. It's been a while since we've given you an update, so we wanted you to receive an update, and we thought it would be a good time to do that because the toolkit and the principles really work together. The principles are foundational values, so when we are developing the toolkit with specific strategies, we'll know what to prioritize and what's important because of those value statements. So by showing you the toolkit today and how that's structured, you'll get a sense of how the principles are important. Now, the toolkit hasn't been finalized, but we previously showed you an approach. Now we have some further detail to show you, and we're welcoming feedback so that we can incorporate that into the toolkit before it's finalized the next slide.

Darin Ranelletti

So the toolkit is a technical resource. So it has recommendations for understanding neighborhoods and neighborhood pressures that might be present. So it identifies local data that should be collected, and then it also identifies anti displacement strategies. Based on the research and our experience and from what we've heard from the EAC and the community are important strategies to consider to address those anti to address those displacement pressures. So the toolkit is used by link 21 and local communities, that's local government jurisdictions, cbos, and community members during local station infrastructure planning. So we would take the principles, we would take the toolkit, we would collect that data, we would sit down with local communities, share that data, collect more data from them, see if we're understanding the community correctly, and then looking for their thoughts on strategies that would be most effective to address potential displacement pressures. The toolkit is divided into two parts. The first part is a neighborhood change assessment. So what it does is it identifies data points related to land use policies and community indicators that should be collected that indicate what type of displacement pressures may be present in the neighborhood that Link 21 could contribute to or accelerate when the infrastructure and the service enhancement is delivered, such that we would need to do some anti displacement strategy work to address those, those changes. The second part is identifying the actual anti displacement strategies that would be in these local station areas. So we have the neighborhood pressures and the neighborhood change data, and then we would match those up with specific anti displacement policy and program tools. And then that outcome with community input is the local anti displacement plan. Next slide. This goes into a little bit more detail on that first part, the neighborhood change assessment. So we'd be collecting data on things like density in the station area, development potential, and what types of existing anti displacement policies might already be in place. And then the local community indicator data that we would be collecting to understand trends in the in the neighborhood would be demographic trends such as income, racial mix, housing tenure, renters, and ownership development trends, understanding what development has happened or will happen, and then also understanding cost trends are, for example, apartment rents flat, declining increasing. So we can understand what types of pressures might be existing in the neighborhood before link 21 comes in. Next slide. The second part of the toolkit, like I said, has strategies for anti displacement. Now, I'm not going to read through all these strategies, but I wanted to give you a sense of the types of categories that'll be covered in the toolkit. We've built a pretty extensive menu of tools based upon the research, based upon input from you all what we've heard from the community. You might recall we also convened a focus group of folks from the nonprofit, local government, philanthropy, and policy worlds to provide additional input. So we have strategies around residential protection and protecting tenants and homeowners. We have strategies around preserving and producing affordable housing. Next slide.

Darin Ranelletti

We also have strategies that are geared towards homeowners and non residential strategies. So business support, retail and office support. Recognizing that the toolkit addresses more than just housing displacement, but also small business and non residential displacement, which are important contributors to community stability, health, and vitality, we're also looking at cultural preservation. So you'll recall one of the principles talked about

cultural preservation. As neighborhoods change, it's important for folks to feel connected to and feel a part of and welcomed in neighborhoods. And so we're also going to be including cultural preservation tools. And then we also heard, particularly from the EAC, interest in tools that might go beyond traditional housing or small business preservation tools, recognizing that displacement is connected to other elements of people's health and well being, such as their access to economic opportunities, their financial literacy, and their access to healthcare. So this is going to be a pretty comprehensive toolkit that will prioritize which tools should be implemented first, which are most effective, but then also other tools that can help continue to strengthen community. Next slide. So this is an example of what the toolkit would look like in action. So this is just hypothetical, but if we start with the neighborhood change assessment, we collect data, in this case on residential rent and how it's changed over the last ten years. We would collect it for the station area. Around the station. We'd also collect it for the city to compare to the city. So in this hypothetical example, we see that rent has increased 45% over the last ten years. It's increased 25% in the city. So both of those are large increases, but it's increasing substantially faster in the station area, and therefore that's a priority to address. So we would look at the tools that are in our anti displacement menu that match up to addressing accelerated rent increase. So some of the examples are things like just cause eviction protections, rent control and stabilization, tenant support services and affordable housing development on link 21 owned sites. Next slide. So that was a lot of information that we threw at you really quickly, but we would love to hear your thoughts. And to facilitate that conversation, I'm going to turn it back over to Frank. Thank you.

Frank Ponciano

Thanks, Darin. And as a reminder, the conversation had two major components, the first one being those draft anti displacement community stabilization principles, and then secondly talking about the anticipate toolkit. So want to take a moment then to check in with members of the EAC. Also specifically want to invite and welcome any comments from members of the anti-displacement working group. Angela, I see you raised your hand, go ahead.

Angela E. Herring

Yes, I had a quick question. Can we give suggestions on the different drafts that we just saw? I think for draft number three, I want to suggest using the word immigrants. I don't see that listed as an important stakeholder.

Frank Ponciano

Thanks for that, Angela. Yes, we invite any and all feedback on the principles and there, and correct me if I'm wrong here, but you know, the decision is not being made today as to whether this is adopted. So you will have time to also reach out in between meetings after this one, reacting to the principles. That true there?

Darin Ranelletti

Yeah, absolutely. So we welcome initial feedback questions. That's great suggestion, Angela. I think that makes a lot of sense. I think what we're going to be doing is just collecting notes, and there might be two recommendations or 50 recommendations. We'll compile all those and then send it back out to the group so that you can see what changes have been made.

Frank Ponciano

Great. Angela, I'll come right back to you. I'm assuming it's related.

Frank Ponciano

Okay. Or maybe accidental. Thanks for the question, comment and suggestion there, Clarence. Go ahead.

Clarence R. Fischer

Okay. In that section where we talk about where, let's say, with the whole community, rents have gone up 25%, but around station areas, rent's gone up 45%. That wording is done in such a way where the, be it, the city, the county, whatever, that we would have contact with the appropriate agencies to have some sort of rent control in place, perhaps ahead of time before stations are built, so that there is some sort of ramrodded in stability so that rents cannot go up beyond what the general rent control or community increases.

Frank Ponciano

Thanks, Clarence. There aren't any reactions to that. Thank you, Clarence. That's a great comment. I think that really speaks to the importance of timing, and you're absolutely right that as we're working with communities to identify alignments and stations and developing these anti displacement plans, that we will be needing to work with local jurisdictions ahead of the building the project to implement those policies so that they are in place prior to and ahead of the program coming online. So thank you. That's a good comment.

Frank Ponciano

Great. It is 03:00 however, we do have some time. This is the, I believe, yes, it is the last agenda item in terms of discussion. So want to give any time that is necessary for folks to jump in and ask any questions, make any comments, as you've seen, on the toolkit or the principles, anything come to mind or any questions about process from here on out? Dave, go ahead.

David Sorrell

Yeah, I think the toolkit is a good start. I think it's kind of laying down actionable items that would be able to force the way that we think and force the way that we adhere to policy. And I think that would require additional assistance or help with the respective cities and the jurisdictions that the stations are going to lie in. So, for example, the city of Oakland, Alameda county, depending on the stop locations, but also just looking at possible opportunities, like, for example, acknowledging ACE rail going to Union City at some point and utilizing that transit village on a, you know, utilizing and identifying those solutions in the state rail plan, it could be able to kind of gateway itself into kind of making that transformative change into protecting the neighborhoods and those that live in those neighborhoods from higher rents, or at least in terms of, you know, stabilizing the market in a way that would be favorable for home ownership or even for renters in general and those that are below the poverty line. So just overall, thank you very much for providing this contextual feedback in terms of anti displacement.

Frank Ponciano

Thanks, Dave. They're going to check on you for any reactions and or last thoughts before we move on.

Darin Ranelletti

No, that was great. Thank you, Dave. I think it really speaks to the importance of tying these things in together. Mega regional vision, community stability. So, yeah, opportunities to strengthen communities throughout the mega region are important. So I appreciate the comment. Thank you.

Frank Ponciano

Great. Acknowledging some folks are hopping off for other responsibilities. We will take all of your feedback. And of course, again, just to address a comment I saw from Ameerah, there will be opportunity for feedback via email and other spaces as well. So keep that in mind and keep thinking about those principles. Going to pass it back to Tim for one last round of public comments.

Tim Lohrentz

Thanks, Frank. We will now hear public comment for item e on our agenda, which is what the topic that we have just been participating in. Please keep in mind public comment is limited to two minutes per person. If you are on the phone and would like to provide verbal public comment, please dial star six at this time to unmute yourself. And if there are no comments by phone, we'll now see if anyone participating via Zoom would like to provide a public comment. You can do so by raising your hand.

Frank Ponciano

Tim, we have Roland.

Roland Lebrun

Okay. Well, actually I would like to comment on slide 21. Is that okay or is it too late?

Tim Lohrentz

Go ahead.

Roland Lebrun

Okay, so this is about alignment, and I would like you to think about something that you may or may not have considered. So at the start, from the East Bay, you go to Alameda. And I absolutely support you 100% because 30 years ago I spent seven years commuting by car between South San Jose and Alameda. It was brutal, quite frankly. I had to do it after 09:00 in the morning and then I couldn't get back home until 07:00 in the evening. My belief is that you should go ahead and study that because this is going to be the most difficult part of the crossing and it needs to be there whether the crossing eventually goes to Alameda or not, because you then have the possibility of going from Alameda, connecting to the existing bot line and taking the existing translate tube. It's not going to take that much longer. But, you know, the housing will export in once you get over to the other side, you have city, correct, to head towards Mission Bay and UCSF. But if you look at that Caltrain station on Fourth street, quite frankly, is in the wrong place. It should be in 7th street at that time. You can integrate UCSF, about Caltrain and Muni all in a single station. And then as you head further west to San Francisco, you don't really want to take first street. Okay? You have already got Caltrain's going to be on Second street. You've got the central subway on

Fourth street. You don't really want BART on Third street. What you want at that point in time is probably to have more like the BART 16th street station. Thank you.

Tim Lohrentz

Thanks for that comment. We'll take that into account. Any other public comment?

Frank Ponciano

None at this point.

Tim Lohrentz

All right, thank you for public comment again. And at this time, I'll remind you of our next meeting date, which is Tuesday, July 16. And this will be an evening meeting. We'll start at 06:00 and hope to see all of you there. And this time we'll take is our time of adjournment. This is an action item, so we will take a motion from someone, one of the EAC members, to adjourn.

Vanessa Ross Aquino

I will.

Tim Lohrentz

Think Vanessa moved first. Is there a second? Thank you, Clarence. All in favor, say aye or raise your hand.

Multiple Speakers

Aye.

Tim Lohrentz

All right. And at 03:07 p.m. when this meeting is adjourned, thank you all for your participation. Have a good day.