



Memorandum

Date: March 7, 2016

To: CalMod Local Policy Maker Group (LPMG)

From: Ben Tripousis, Northern California Director, California High-Speed Rail Authority

Re: LPMG E-Update from High-Speed Rail

Draft 2016 Business Plan

On February 18, the California High-Speed Rail Authority (Authority) released its Draft 2016 Business Plan, a foundational document for implementing the California High-Speed Rail program. This Draft 2016 Business Plan summarizes the progress made over the last two years, updates information and forecasts that were presented in the 2014 Business Plan, and identifies major anticipated milestones for the coming years.

Highlights:

- Reduced capital cost from \$67.6 billion to \$64.2 billion.
- With more than 100 miles of active construction in the Central Valley, the Authority has transitioned from a focus on planning to a focus on construction and program-delivery.
- Expands on three major steps forward: substantial progress in environmental clearance, funding from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF), and updated cost estimates.
- Now that we have a long-term funding stream in place we lay out a concrete plan for delivering a Phase 1 system that will ultimately connect the San Francisco Bay Area to the Los Angeles Basin via the Central Valley with high-speed passenger rail service.
- With our current projected funding we can and will deliver a high-speed rail line connecting the Silicon Valley to the Central Valley and offer passenger service within the next ten years.
- Lays out an approach to sequencing the delivery of this system to maximize current federal and state dollars and use them to deliver the earliest operating high-speed rail line that is compliant with Proposition 1A within available funding.

An overview of the Draft 2016 Business Plan will be presented at the March LPMG meeting.

Public Comment:

The Authority is seeking public comment as part of a 60-day public comment period that will close on April 18, 2016. There are five methods for submitting comments on this draft plan, which can be found on our website:

https://www.hsr.ca.gov/About/Business_Plans/Draft_2016_Business_Plan_Comments.html

The Draft 2016 Business Plan can be found online at:

www.hsr.ca.gov/About/Business_Plans/Draft_2016_Business_Plan.html

San Francisco – San Jose Project Section

The Authority continues to work in partnership with Caltrain as well as other transportation partners, local and regional stakeholders, and communities to move forward on the next steps toward blended service along the peninsula. Specific to the San Francisco to San Jose corridor, the next few months will have an increasing level of outreach to engage stakeholders, businesses and the public.

Additional information can be found on our website:

http://hsr.ca.gov/Programs/Statewide_Rail_Modernization/Project_Sections/sanfran_sanjose.htm

1



Local Policy Maker Group (LPMG) Summary Meeting Notes for January 28, 2016

Summary Notes

Caltrain Offices, San Carlos, CA

Members Present:

City/County	Representative or Alternate	Present	
		Yes	No
Atherton	C. Wiest	X	
Belmont	E. Reed	X	
Brisbane	C. Lentz		X
Burlingame	E. Beach	X	
Menlo Park	R.Cline		X
Millbrae	W. Lee		X
Mountain View	L. Siegel	X	
Palo Alto	P. Burt	X	
Redwood City	J. Borgens	X	
San Bruno	K. Ibarra		X
San Carlos	R. Collins	X	
San Francisco	G. Gillett	X	
San Mateo	J. Goethals		X
Santa Clara	J. Matthews	X	
South San Francisco	M. Addiego	X	
Sunnyvale	J. Davis		X

Acting Chair: Dan Richard (Chair, California High-Speed Rail Authority Board of Directors), in absence of R. Peralez (JPB Representative)

Vacant Seat(s): San Francisco BOS, San Jose, San Mateo Co. BOS, Santa Clara Co. BOS

California High-Speed Rail Authority (Authority) Team Present: B. Tripousis, L. Alley, M. McLoughlin, S. Rothenberg, G. Preston, R. Graham, A. MacPherson, L. Hames, L. Nungesser, M. Galli, W. Gimpel

1. Introductions

a. Authority

Tripousis, Northern California Regional Director, introduced Authority staff. Chair Richard welcomed everyone and thanked LPMG members for participating. Chair Richard acknowledged working relationship with Caltrain to advance blended service.

b. Caltrain

Marian Lee, outgoing Director of the CalMod program, gave a statement on behalf of Caltrain General Manager Jim Hartnett and made farewell remarks to the LPMG.

2. State Overview

- a. Alley, Chief of Communications, provided a statewide overview of the high-speed rail program. She outlined project Phase 1 and 2 and potential economic, environmental, and community benefits of the statewide system. She provided an update on construction currently underway in the Central Valley and program highlights and benefits statewide.

LPMG Member Questions:

- L. Siegel asked if a station between Gilroy and Fresno is being considered. Richard answered that Proposition 1A prohibits any stations between Gilroy and Merced.
- L. Siegel asked about the process for resolving whether or not there will be a mid-Peninsula station. Tripousis said that he would be addressing that issue in his portion of the presentation.

3. Environmental Process & Project Schedule

McLoughlin, Deputy Director of Environmental Services, provided an update on the Authority's selection of HNTB as the environmental and engineering regional consultant. HNTB will be responsible for environmentally clearing the San Francisco to San Jose and San Jose to Merced project sections.

McLoughlin outlined the process and schedule for achieving environmental clearance for blended high-speed rail service along the Caltrain corridor. He presented the timeline to acquire the Record of Decision (ROD) for these project sections by 2017.

4. Project Description

Tripousis outlined elements for blended service on an electrified Caltrain corridor and the station locations being studied along the Peninsula. The San Francisco to San Jose project section is defined by legislative action and a nine-party MOU. Safety improvements being considered include perimeter fencing, four-quadrant gates at at-grade crossings, grade separations, and track adjustments. Tripousis identified elements of blended service currently under consideration, including passing tracks, curve straightening, a train storage and maintenance facility, as well as station improvements..

LPMG Member Questions:

- E. Beach asked if the Authority could identify the potential locations for passing tracks. Tripousis answered that the Authority will go into greater detail on passing tracks at future LPMG meetings. The Authority has had ongoing conversations with cities that could be affected. Beach also noted that she was pleased to hear the Authority is pursuing grade separations as part of its plans for safety improvements.
- P. Burt asked what the Authority's funding plan is for grade separations and how much of the cost the Authority will be responsible for. Tripousis said that funding for grade

separations, where grade separations will be located is ongoing and predicated on the environmental process.

- P. Burt asked if past or future Business Plans include specific funding for grade separations. Richard indicated that the Draft 2016 Business Plan would be coming out in the near future.
- L. Siegel asked what the timetable is for selecting a mid-Peninsula station. Tripousis said conversation with communities is ongoing. Discussions will take place concurrent with planning and the environmental review process.
- C. Wiest suggested the Authority better detail its plans for quad gates and grade separations, as well as related costs in its Business Plan. Richard explained those details will be determined as a result of the environmental review process. McLoughlin explained that only a certain percentage of design is determined before the contract for the actual work is awarded.

5. Communications & Outreach

Alley presented the Authority's Communications and Outreach plans for a collaborative approach giving equal importance to community input, project objectives, and environmental needs. Community engagement is a top priority for the Authority throughout the planning and environmental process and will help shape the ultimate outcome of the project. The Authority's plan for outreach and community engagement includes different types of groups and partnerships.

LPMG Member Questions:

- E. Beach asked what the Authority's vision is for Community Working Groups (CWG). CWGs will be comprised of representatives from various public interest groups including business, environmental justice, community action groups, etc. The Authority will solicit recommendations from LPMG members for potential CWG participants.
- P. Burt said the LPMG had some preliminary discussions regarding Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS). The Authority is committed to working with communities to address concerns. Richard agreed to look into what would be involved in the CSS process and would continue to have dialogue with Mayor Burt and the LPMG.
- J. Borgens asked Tripousis to clarify the ending point of the second project (the second project being San Jose to Merced). The SF-SJ project section will extend past just south of the Diridon Station.
- E. Beach asked if CSS could be revisited at the next Authority-hosted meeting. Tripousis and Richard agreed to include it on the agenda. Alley also noted that community engagement efforts will move forward concurrent with CSS discussions.

Public Comments/Questions

Consistent with Authority policy at Board of Directors meetings, public comment was heard, but not answered in an effort to provide as much time as possible to the public.

- A public speaker asked about the status of any agreement with Union Pacific for the Bay Area. (*The Authority has a statewide agreement with Union Pacific that covers all regions.*)
- A Burlingame resident suggested automated traffic reinforcement at at-grade crossings.

- A member of the public commented that grade separation was not needed at 25th Street in San Mateo.
- A public speaker commented that a traffic study should be done in cooperation with peninsula cities. *(Traffic studies are a part of the environmental process and in cooperation with local municipal staff.)*
- A member of the public asked about the alternatives analysis and purpose and need.
- A public comment was made regarding how CSS is awesome for high-speed rail, the Caltrain community and building consensus and keeping an open process. *(The context-sensitive solutions process (CSS) is an approach applied within the environmental review process. The Authority expects to incorporate many elements of this approach into the outreach efforts.)*
- A comment was made regarding the Peninsula Freight Rail Users Group and an interest in ensuring that freight movement should be part of the process. *(The Authority staff is working directly with this group.)*
- Comments were made regarding the engagement of business people within the community as well as making stations thriving locations.
- A public comment was made about multi-modal/value capture at Diridon, the best practice for design, a mid-Peninsula stop, can a NOI/NOP be done without context sensitive solutions, and having a mix of people involved in the environmental process. *(The environmental process will involve extensive outreach for a public conversation. The Authority expects to incorporate many elements of context-sensitive solutions process (CSS) into the approach to outreach efforts.)*
- A public comment was made about multi-modal/value capture at Diridon, the best practice for design, a mid-Peninsula stop, can a NOI/NOP be done without context sensitive solutions, and having a mix of people involved in the environmental process. *(The environmental process will involve extensive public outreach to involve a public conversation, context sensitive solutions is not a required part of the process to release an NOI/NOP).*

Final Remarks from LPMG

- G. Gillett requested that the LPMG, Authority, and Caltrain work together and possibly with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) to identify a common policy framework regarding grade separations. Let's work together and with MTC to find funding to support that effort.
- C. Weist requested the Authority respond publicly to any of the public comment/questions.
- L. Siegel requested more information about if there will be a mid-Peninsula station and what the process will be for selecting a location.