May 29, 2020

Brian Kelly, Chief Executive Officer
California High-Speed Rail Authority
770 L Street, Suite 620
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Kelly,

We write to voice the City and County of San Francisco's strong support for the Draft 2020 Business Plan's strategy to extend the Central Valley Segment to the Silicon Valley terminating at San Francisco's Salesforce Transit Center. The Draft 2020 Business Plan affirms this recommendation from the 2018 Business Plan, acknowledging that this segment is the CAHSR's highest ridership and revenue option for its Valley-to-Valley service.

The goal of bringing high-speed train service to downtown San Francisco is of critical importance to our city and region, to serve our growing population and economy and linking to the Central Valley's growing economy and commuter base sustainably. The Draft 2020 Business Plan demonstrates the state's commitment to delivering this transformative system, building on its current investment in Peninsula corridor electrification with proposed initiation of electric, high-speed rail in the Central Valley. We agree this is the quickest and most efficient way to realize the mobility, environmental and economic benefits that this project will bring to our mega-region and California.

In the Bay Area, the US 101 and Interstate 280 corridor between San Francisco and San Jose was identified as one of the state's top priorities in 2017's Senate Bill 1. With the electrification of the existing corridor and future increases in rail transit capacity, including high-speed rail, the Bay Area will meet future travel demand and reduce greenhouse gases, consistent with the Governor's Executive Order N-19-19. Doing so will save the city, region, and state billions of dollars that would have to be spent on widening our freeways and building additional runways and gates at our airports to address future travel needs.

Given these benefits, we do not support deviations from the current strategy, including any redirection of the efforts and resources needed to see it to fruition. In fact, the San Francisco County Transportation Authority voted to unanimously oppose AB 1848 (Lackey) which would divert $4 billion in High-Speed Rail bond funds to the Metrolink commuter rail system.

The path proposed in the California High-Speed Rail Authority's Draft 2020 Business Plan represents the most effective way to realize the significant benefits that fast, clean, electrified high-speed rail service holds for Californians. Please find attached more detailed comments on the Business Plan from various San Francisco agency staff. We appreciate the opportunity to provide input to the 2020 Business Plan.

Sincerely,

Tilly Chang
Executive Director
San Francisco County Transportation Authority

Jeffrey Tumlin
Director of Transportation
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

Rich Hillis
Planning Director
San Francisco Planning Department

1. The Business Plan shifts the completion of Valley to Valley service one year later, from 2030 to 2031. This will have an effect on anticipated service to Salesforce Transit Center and associated projects, such as the Downtown Extension and the Pennsylvania Avenue Extension. San Francisco looks forward to closely coordinating on these related efforts.
2. The Business Plan mentions the proposed FASTER Bay Area measure. Please update the text to note the revised timeline for FASTER.
3. Similarly, please consider updating the text on DTX to note the APTA and SFCTA peer review efforts, anticipated MOU, and two-year timeline to the completion of design.
4. On page 56, the Business Plan proposes an interim service model under which the Authority would be an Infrastructure Owner who would lease the infrastructure to a third-party public agency who would, in turn, operate the service by entering into agreements with a train operating company to run the service and with private infrastructure owners. It is unclear why this interim service plan is needed and what the benefits are of having a public agency as the middleman between the Authority and the Operating Company. What can the Public agency do the Authority cannot?
5. On page 61, table 3.0 shows the ridership for the Northern California Peninsula Corridor. What is the northern limit of the corridor? Is it Salesforce Transit Center or 4th and King Streets?
6. Table 3.1 indicates that $22.4 billion in additional funding is required for the Northern California Peninsula Corridor segment, with $17. 1 being regional funding. What are the elements that make up that figure?
7. On page 66, the Plan states "The report notes that the median home price in Fresno County is $243,700, in comparison to more than $1 million in Santa Clara County. With an increase of more than37 percent in residential building permits from 2017 to 2018, the Central Valley can provide affordable home ownership for Californians." The statement does not acknowledge that providing High Speed Rail service will result in gentrification of the area resulting in increased home prices.
8. On page 81 it states that the San Francisco to San José segment includes a light maintenance facility in Brisbane, which seems to be at odds with the 100-acre site that the Authority is contemplating in the environmental review. It would be useful to state a range of the needed acreage.
9. On page 81, the section on the DTX makes no mention of the funding commitment by the CHSRA to the project.
10. Page 116 makes the case for an extension of the Cap-and-Trade program to 2050, which would provide significant funding to the CHSRA. We support the CHSRA in its efforts to achieve such an extension.
11. Interconnecting to the power grid will present significant challenges in both cost and execution. As stated on page 136, "Technical feasibility studies by PG&E now indicate that there are capacity variations along the corridor that need to be upgraded for high-speed rail operations. Work is underway with PG&E to define the scope and costs of these improvements to the network including new transmission line construction". The impact to the program's cost and schedule need to be quantified as early as possible, specially considering the state of PG&E.

12. On page 140, it states that "The 2018 Business Plan assumed a single line from San Francisco's 4th and King Station to Bakersfield. In 2020, this line is now enhanced by the addition of the Merced to Bakersfield Line." It is not made clear how adding Merced enhances the San Francisco to Bakersfield line. The breakeven analysis on page 150 states that "the 2020 Breakeven Analysis for Silicon Valley to Central Valley is slightly decreased over the previous 2018 Business Plan, reducing from 79 percent to 71 percent in the opening year. This is primarily caused by the increased operations and maintenance costs of the extension to Merced." This seems to indicate that the revenue is not there to fully support the Merced extension.