SAN FRANCISCO PENINSULA RAIL PROGRAM
EXECUTIVE STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

MINUTES

Friday, May 19, 2023

TJPA Office
425 Mission Street, Suite 250
San Francisco, CA

9:30 a.m. to 10:30 a.m.

EXECUTIVE STEERING COMMITTEE

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

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

This meeting will be held in person at the location listed above. Members of the public may attend the meeting to observe and provide public comment at the physical location listed above or may watch live online using the link below:

https://transbaycenter.webex.com/transbaycenter/j.php?MTID=m465649b9cd44ec3dc3a63ed6758ef6ea

PUBLIC COMMENT CALL-IN: 1-855-282-6330
Access Code: 2553 221 2782# — Password: 3899#

When the item is called, dial *3 to be added to the speaker line. When prompted, callers will have two minutes to provide comment unless otherwise noted by the Chair. Please speak clearly, ensure you are in a quiet location, and turn off any TVs or computers around you.

AGENDA

1. Call to Order

   Vice Chair Chang called the meeting to order at 9:33 a.m.

2. Roll Call

   Members Present: Dahlia Chazan, Lisa Klein, Boris Lipkin, Alex Sweet, Adam Van de Water, Tilly Chang

   Members Absent: Michelle Bouchard, Andrew Fremier

3. Communications

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

   - Chair's Report

   Vice Chair Chang delivered the report.

   Public Comment:

   Roland Lebrun suggested the Chair's report be posted as a link in the meeting agenda on the TJPA's website and thanked staff for the closed captioning.

4. Action Item:
   Approval of Meeting Minutes: April 21, 2023

   A motion to approve the minutes was made by Member Sweet and seconded by Member Lipkin. A unanimous voice vote approved the motion.

   Public Comment:
   There was no member of the public wishing to comment.

5. Informational Item:
   Governance Study Blueprint Update for The Portal

   Stephen Wolf, Metropolitan Transportation Commission Assistant Director, and Jesse Koehler, San Francisco County Transportation Authority Rail Director, jointly presented the item.

   Member Sweet inquired about risk and responsibility associated with the Configuration, Change and Risk Management Body (CCRMB) and whether the process would be "one agency, one vote." Mr. Koehler explained the one agency, one vote approach is the most

straightforward; however, certain decisions may have more bearing on one or two agencies, and a decision at the CCRMB would not override an agency's ultimate ownership of the decision at a policy level. For example, Caltrain would always have certain decision rights established through the Master Cooperative Agreement as it pertains to Caltrain's operations or infrastructure. Additionally, Member Sweet inquired about the relationship between the Integrated Management Team (IMT) and the Project Director. Mr. Koehler stated that the IMT is primarily a management body (not a decision body) that will support the Project Director, Caltrain and the City to ensure good alignment and coordination at a management level. The objective is for the IMT to help problem-solve and marshal resources.

Further, Member Sweet emphasized the importance of quality control and risk management and expressed concerns about the impact of these on the overall schedule. Mr. Koehler stated the Integrated Program Management Team (IPMT) is studying this topic and expects to discuss it at future meetings.

Member Lipkin stated he understood from previous ESC meetings that the Executive Working Group's role will be advisory in nature, but in the updated graphic the group appears to have a more formal role. He questioned what the objectives were by delegating issues to the CCRMB. Referring to slide 7 of the presentation, he expressed his belief that the structure surrounding the TJPA Executive Director—Caltrain Board, TJPA Board, The Portal Board Committee—was too prescriptive and suggested empowering the Executive Director to decide which issues go to the policy bodies before going directly to the TJPA Board. He further commented that the roles of the TJPA Executive Director, Project Director, and Integrated Project Delivery Team need to be clarified in writing to make sure there are no gaps or overlaps. He asked how the design approval process will be managed, given the three categories of infrastructure: Caltrain-only infrastructure, Caltrain-California High-Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) shared infrastructure, and CHSRA-only infrastructure. Alfonso Rodriguez, Project Director, explained that currently the design team engages weekly with the Caltrain design team while CHSRA staff are present. The design team ensures that the design complies with the applicable CHSRA design criteria. Going forward, Mr. Rodriguez envisions the same level of design coordination will continue. Member Lipkin proposed that further offline conversations regarding the design process with the three agencies would be useful.

Member Van de Water stated he appreciates the structure of the reporting relationships and the visuals in the presentation showing the single path of decision-making but found the narrative confusing. He noted that all the partnering agencies have a similar reporting line: from staff level to executive level, to board level. He emphasized the blueprint is the opportunity to provide a framework for joint decision-making that could be a model in the region; his concern is introducing more than one clear path, which would result in inefficiency, confusion, additional risk, and unnecessary cost. He stated that the structure should align responsibility and representation with delivery authority. He expressed concern with getting the right interests to make the right decision. For example, as TJPA Executive Director, he should not make a decision that affects Caltrain's long-term infrastructure; simultaneously, he has a contractual relationship on behalf of the TJPA Board to deliver the project. He noted at the peak of tunnel construction, daily expenditures will be some $2-3

million; therefore, a weeklong delay will be substantial. He concluded that the team needs to find ways to efficiently make the appropriate decisions and provide timely and appropriate delegated authority to the project delivery team with appropriate inputs from the IMT and others. Lastly, he stated that he wants the FTA to know that there is a single path to decisions, with collective input points at different levels.

Member Klein seconded Member Van de Water's comments regarding timely decision-making. She noted that while the proposed approach is modeled after Caltrain's electrification program, the DTX project is far more complex. She stated that each formal meeting will precipitate a series of informal preparatory meetings, which will involve additional staff time and effort. Regarding text on incorporating the CCRMB risk review with the FTA's risk review (slide 13), Member Klein suggested seeking the FTA's concurrence with this approach. She stated that the governance blueprint being presented to the ESC is close and advocated for approval in June. She reiterated the three key issues: timely decision-making, structured and disciplined process, and partnering agency involvement. She stated that she is hesitant to leave anything unstructured.

Vice Chair Chang stated that she, too, favors the one-path approach. She stated moving to the Executive Working Group model under the executive directors is a big step. Decision-making should be pushed down to the lowest possible level. She stated that this is the City's signature project and that it is orders-of-magnitude more complex than Central Subway or Caltrain electrification. While this blueprint represents a commitment of time and effort, it may be the best way to avoid the worst consequences (time, money, claims) of not having a well-structured process.

Member Van de Water asked what the next steps are. Mr. Koehler stated the TJPA Board's stamp of approval would give the team a structure in which to work. Member Van de Water stated that it sounded like the IPMT held a robust discussion and when they and the ESC are ready, the team will take the governance blueprint to the TJPA Board.

Public Comment:

Mr. Lebrun complimented the team on the governance blueprint. He advised the study team to take advantage of the lessons learned as well as input from ESC members and members of the public. He expressed concern about the "burn rate" of $6 million per day. He stated this results in a burn rate of $2 billion a year, not $0.5 billion. Mr. Lebrun suggested revisiting the cost estimate.

6. Informational Item:
   Presentation of The Portal Procurement Approach

   Item 6 was not presented as scheduled due to time constraints.

7. Public Comment
   Members of the public may provide comments on matters within the ESC's purview that are not on the agenda.

Mr. Lebrun suggested reviewing Europe's Technical Standards for Interoperability as high-speed rail and regular trains share tracks and he further suggested looking at the video of the St. Pancras Station opening which would be good inspiration for DTX's inauguration.

8. Discussion Item
   ESC Agenda items for upcoming meetings

   Member Van de Water suggested agenda Item #6, Presentation of The Portal Procurement Approach, be rescheduled for the beginning of the next ESC meeting. Member Lipkin suggested that the next meeting be extended.

9. Adjourn
   Vice Chair Chang adjourned the meeting at 10:37 a.m.