



## *Memorandum*

**Date:** March 26, 2017

**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

---

### **Statewide Update**

#### March Board Meeting

During the March 15, 2017 Authority Board meeting, the Board of Directors approved amending the contract with the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) to share project development costs for the integration of High-Speed Rail at Los Angeles Union Station.

The Board also received updates on the procurement of an early train operator and funding plans for the Central Valley and San Francisco to San Jose Peninsula Corridor Segment (funding plan update below). Information on all items discussed at the March Board of Directors meeting can be found online, [here](#).

The April Board meeting has been canceled. The next meeting will be on Wednesday, May 10, 2017.

#### Authority Board Appointments

On Thursday, March 16 the California State Senate appointed two new members to the Board of Directors. They include Ernest M. Camacho to the Authority's Board of Directors and the Honorable Jim Beall to an Ex Officio Board position. The press release can be found [here](#).

#### Update on Funding Plans

During the December 13, 2016 Board meeting, the Board of Directors approved the Central Valley Segment Funding Plan and the San Francisco to San Jose Peninsula Corridor Segment Funding Plan. In January, the two funding plans and corresponding Independent Consultant Reports were submitted to the [California Department of Finance](#) and the [Joint Legislative Budget Committee](#).

On March 3, 2017, the Director of Finance Michael Cohen made took actions related to the [Central Valley Funding Plan](#) and [San Francisco to San Jose Peninsula Corridor Segment Funding Plan](#). You can read these decisions in full by clicking the links above.

Director Cohen approved the Central Valley Funding Plan and at the request of the Authority and the Department of Finance, a spring bond sale by the State Treasurer's Office is planned for mid-April.

For the San Jose Peninsula Corridor Segment Funding Plan, Director Cohen deferred a decision due to the Federal Transit Administration's recent action to defer the execution of the Core Capacity grant agreement, which leaves a gap in the Project's (Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project) financing plan. Once the federal funding is secured, Director Cohen indicated he will act expeditiously.

#### 2017 Project Update Report

On March 1, 2017, the Authority submitted the 2017 Project Update Report to the Legislature which is required pursuant to Section 185033.5 of the Public Utilities Code. Since the last report in March 2015,

California has made tremendous progress in building the nation's first high-speed rail system—and nation's largest infrastructure project.

Building high-speed rail is creating thousands of new jobs and economic benefits, especially for small and disadvantaged businesses. California's achievements include:

- Hundreds of workers are building—right now—119 miles of new transportation infrastructure at nine active construction sites that will bring passenger rail service to connect the Central Valley to the Silicon Valley by 2025.
- Over 900 construction workers have good-paying jobs in the Central Valley, with many more coming across California.
- 334 small businesses are engaged in the project right now, of which 102 are certified disadvantaged businesses and thirty-nine are certified disabled veteran businesses.

Additionally, from July 2006 to June 2016, 94 percent of the \$2.3 billion that California has invested in this transformative project, has gone to companies and people in California. These investments have involved more than 600 companies and generated up to \$4.1 billion in economic activity, 52 percent occurred in disadvantaged communities. The report is available on the Authority's website [here](#).

#### February Construction Update

The [February Construction Update](#) shows the progress being made including the demolition and relocation of the old Greyhound bus station in downtown Fresno to make way for the new high-speed rail station. It also features a story about the largest girders ever constructed in California, which are being manufactured by a local Central Valley business for high-speed rail.

### **San Francisco to San Jose Project Section Update**

#### April Open House Meetings

In April, the Authority will be hosting three Community Open House meetings on the range of alternatives under consideration for the San Francisco to San Jose Project Section. The Open Houses are an opportunity for the public to learn about the range of alternatives, receive an update on the environmental clearance process, and to provide input on potential environmental impacts of the project.

The meetings will be held from 5:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. with a formal presentation starting at 6:00 p.m. Each meeting will be identical in format and content and will include opportunities to speak with Authority staff. The open houses will be held as follows:

- **San Francisco** – Wednesday, April 5, 2017 – Metropolitan Transportation Commission, 375 Beale Street, Yerba Buena Room, San Francisco, CA 94105
- **Mountain View** – Tuesday, April 11, 2017 – Success Center, 875 West Maude Avenue, Unit 5, Mountain View, CA 94043
- **San Mateo** – Thursday, April 13, 2017 – Silicon Valley Community Foundation, 1300 South El Camino Real, Suite 100, San Mateo, CA 94402

The Open House flyer can be found on the website [here](#).

#### Upcoming CSCG and LPMG Meetings

The next LPMG meeting scheduled for **Wednesday, April 27, 2017** from 6:00 – 8:00 pm at SamTrans in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Auditorium (1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070).



## Local Policy Makers Group (LPMG) Summary Meeting Notes for February 23, 2017

### Summary Notes

1250 San Carlos Ave., San Carlos, CA 94070 (Caltrain Offices, 2nd-floor Auditorium)

Members Present:

City/County	Representative or Alternative	Present	
		Yes	No
Atherton	C. Wiest	X	
Belmont	E. Reed	X	
Burlingame	R. Ortiz	X	
Menlo Park	R. Cline	X	
Millbrae	R. Holober	X	
Mountain View	L. Siegel	X	
Palo Alto	G. Tanaka	X	
Redwood City	J. Borgens	X	
San Bruno	K. Ibarra		X
San Carlos	R. Collins	X	
San Francisco	G. Gillett	X	
San Jose	D. Davis		X
San Mateo	J. Goethals		X
Santa Clara	P. Mahan		X
South San Francisco	K. Matsumoto		X
Sunnyvale	N. Smith	X	

**Chair:** J. Gee (Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board)

**Vacant Seat(s):** City of Brisbane, City and County of San Francisco Board of Supervisors (BOS), San Mateo County BOS, Santa Clara County BOS

**California High-Speed Rail Authority (Authority) Staff:** J. Morales, B. Rooney, B. Tripousis, R. Graham, M. Galli, W. Gimpel, B. Fukuji, M. Marvin, K. Rugani

### 1. Introductions and Agenda Review

Chair Jeff Gee welcomed LPMG members. Ben Tripousis, California High-Speed Rail Authority Northern California Regional Director, conducted roll call of LPMG members in attendance. Tripousis then reviewed the agenda and introduced Jeff Morales, California High-Speed Rail Authority Chief Executive Officer.

## 2. High-Speed Rail Program Update

### Statewide Update

Morales reviewed the key highlights of the 2016 Business Plan, which include:

- Reducing capital costs from \$67.6 Billion (2014) to \$64.2 Billion.
- Initial service between San Jose-North of Bakersfield by 2025. Funds of \$20.7 Billion have been allocated for the initial service.
- Operational extensions to San Francisco, Merced & Bakersfield by 2025. Federal funds of \$2.9 Billion are being sought for the operational extensions.
- Operation of Phase 1 (San Francisco-LA/Anaheim) by 2029.

Morales discussed recent construction developments. Approximately 119 miles of the project is under construction in the Central Valley from Madera to the Bakersfield area.

Morales summarized the history of blended service along the Peninsula. Benefits of the blended system include reduced costs; increased ridership capacity and service; environmental benefits; and improved safety. The Authority has pledged \$713 Million for Peninsula Corridor Electrification Program (PCEP) and \$105 for Positive Train Control (PTC).

### *LPMG Member Comments, Questions & Answers*

- Q: How many local jobs have been created through current construction efforts in the Central Valley?  
A: Nearly 1,000 construction jobs have been created, 80% of which have gone to Central Valley residents.

### San Francisco to San Jose Project Section Update

Tripousis provided an overview of the San Francisco to San Jose Project Section and its milestone schedule. Station footprint planning, technical analysis, and outreach are currently underway. In summer 2017, the Authority will identify a Preferred Alternative (PA). The draft environmental document is planned for release and public comment in fall 2017. The Authority intends to release the final environmental document and reach a Record of Decision in 2018.

### Range of Alternatives under Consideration

Will Gimpel, San Francisco to San Jose Project Section Manager, shared that the Authority is carrying two alternatives through the environmental process, both of which would run within the blended, electrified Caltrain corridor along the Peninsula. The two alternatives and the components of each are designated Alternative A and Alternative B. The components of each alternative are not mutually exclusive and the ultimate project could incorporate elements from both alternatives. Alternative A consists of a light maintenance facility (LMF) in Brisbane to the east of the alignment; no additional passing tracks; and an aerial approach to Diridon Station via a short viaduct. Alternative B consists of a LMF in Brisbane to the west of the alignment; additional passing tracks; and an aerial approach to Diridon Station via a long viaduct. In general, Alternative A will have lesser impacts than Alternative B.

### Light Maintenance Facility Alternatives

Gimpel provided an overview of the two LMF alternatives in Brisbane. The similarities and differences of the two alternatives are listed below.

- Similarities
  - Both allow for the planned Geneva Avenue Extension.
  - Both will require reconstruction of the Tunnel Avenue Overcrossing.
  - They are of comparable size: approximately 108 acres (West) and 114 acres (East).
  - Caltrain Bayshore Station will maintain a planned connection to Schlage Development.
  - Caltrain Bayshore Station would be near the existing location, and the northbound platform would remain in its current location.
- Differences
  - Alternative A relocates the Bayshore Station Southbound platform to the south end of the existing station.
  - Alternative B relocates the Bayshore Station Southbound platform and east parking lot to the south end of the existing station.

### Passing Track Alternatives

Gimpel reviewed the alternatives for passing tracks the Authority and Caltrain are analyzing. Under Alternative A, no additional passing tracks would be constructed. Under Alternative B, multiple alternatives are currently under consideration: Short Middle 4, Long Middle 4, and Long Middle 3. One of these alternatives will be carried forward in the EIR/EIS.

### *LPMG Member Comments, Questions & Answers*

- Q: If there are existing passing tracks, why is an additional one necessary?  
A: The Authority's analysis indicates that additional passing tracks are not needed to ensure operations and time requirements for Caltrain and high-speed rail. An additional passing track alternative will be carried through to the EIR/EIS in order to ensure that Caltrain operations will not be negatively affected if an additional passing track is not pursued.
- Q: What criteria is the Authority using to determine that additional passing tracks are not necessary?  
A: Inputs such as stopping patterns as well as operational, community, and environmental impacts will all be considered. Summaries of the studies completed on passing track alternatives will be available in the environmental document.
- Q: Is a tunnel along the Peninsula being considered for high-speed rail?  
A: A tunnel is not being considered due to its cost and environmental impacts.

### Approach to Diridon Station Alternatives

Gimpel discussed two alternatives for the approach into Diridon Station, a short viaduct and a long viaduct, both of which would be aerial (an at-grade approach into Diridon is still under consideration as well). The long viaduct would begin at Scott Boulevard; consist of a longer elevated section and narrower footprint than the short viaduct; and allow UP tracks to remain in their current location. The short viaduct would start at I-880; consist of a shorter elevated section and wider footprint than the long viaduct; and necessitate moving Union Pacific (UP) tracks to the east to accommodate a ramp up to the viaduct. The assessment of the short viaduct is a result of feedback the Authority received from residents of the Newhall neighborhood in Santa Clara. During the 2016 Scoping Period for the San Francisco to San Jose Project Section, Newhall residents provided comments proposing that the viaduct start at I-880. The short viaduct would minimize viewshed and noise impacts.

### *LPMG Member Comments, Questions & Answers*

- Q: How wide are the viaducts being considered for the Diridon Station Approach?  
A: These viaducts will be at least 60 feet in width.

### Common Project Elements

The common project elements of the alternatives include:

- At the 4<sup>th</sup> & King station, there will be two platforms and four platform faces for the sole use of high-speed rail.
- Millbrae Station modifications that entail expanding the station west towards El Camino Real and configuring a 4-track station to allow for simultaneous use by Caltrain and high-speed rail.
- Under both alternatives high-speed rail will operate trains at up to 110 mph along the Peninsula and a service pattern will include 4 high-speed rail trains and 6 Caltrain commuter trains per hour/per direction in the peak period.
- For both alternatives, tracks will have to be modified to support higher speeds.
- The Authority will partner with Caltrain to address safety modifications at 39 at-grade roadway crossings along the Peninsula.
- The Authority will address the hold-out rule at both the Broadway (Burlingame) and Atherton Caltrain stations. Hold-out stations are those that, when a train is loading/unloading passengers, prohibit a train traveling in the opposite direction from entering the station.

### *LPMG Member Comments, Questions & Answers*

- Q: Many Palo Alto residents want Caltrain and high-speed rail underground. How can this be achieved? Is cost the prohibitive factor?  
A: The alternatives presented at this meeting are the most practicable and have the least environmental impacts of all the alternatives studied. An alternative being practicable is a Federal standard that the Authority needs to meet. Tunneling along the Peninsula is not practicable nor is it the least environmentally impactful alternative. Cost is another factor, as are community impacts.
- C: There are a number of at-grade crossings in Burlingame. It seems like traffic will be at a standstill with the lengths of gate down times needed for the proposed schedule of 6 Caltrain trains and 4 high-speed rail trains per direction during peak hours.

A: The Authority is aware of the concern over gate down time and will analyze it in the environmental document.

- Q: Will six Caltrain trains and four high-speed rail trains per direction during peak hours be sufficient as the population of Peninsula communities continues to grow?

A: The Authority's analysis of ridership projections indicates that that level of train service will suffice over the next 40 years.

- Q: Will there be an opportunity for grade separating the Peninsula even after high-speed rail becomes operational?

A: Yes. The Authority is working with Caltrain and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) to address grade crossings along the Peninsula.

- Q: Should an additional passing track be pursued, will Millbrae station remain a 4-track station?

A: Yes. Since Millbrae Station will be a high-speed rail stop, 4-tracks are necessary in order to avoid disrupting Caltrain operations.

- C: The City of Millbrae is concerned with the proposed 4-track Millbrae station as currently envisioned as it impacts other proposed developments in the surrounding area.

A: The Authority will continue to meet with the City of Millbrae and local developers in order to work towards a mutually beneficial solution.

- Q: Are there specifications for the grade that freight rail needs to operate on?

A: Union Pacific generally requires a grade of no more than 1%. A short-line operator is being considered for freight rail operations along the Peninsula. Should a short-line operator be pursued, there is a possibility that the grade requirements for freight rail may change.

- Q: Would a short-line operator change the decibel level of horns used?

A: That is a possibility. In response to community input, Caltrain has moved horns from the top of its trains to beneath the trains so that any sound from them is projected into the tracks. This still allows for the horns to meet the decibel level required by the Federal Rail Administration (FRA). Implementing a similar technique may be discussed with the short-line operator as and when one is selected.

- C: A 1% grade versus a 2% grade can have significant impacts on the costs of grade separations. It would be useful for the LPMG to consider weighing in on the short-line operator selection process, especially as it pertains to grade percentage.

- C: Given that \$2 billion will be spent to electrify the Caltrain corridor, it would make sense for the short-line operator to be electric.

- Q: What are the pros and cons of having an elevated or at-grade station at Diridon?

A: Diridon Station is a busy station now and will continue to be so as it matures. It is already a stop for Amtrak, Capital Corridor, Caltrain, VTA, and will be a stop for high-speed rail. The station footprint cannot be widened as VTA tracks lay to one side of the station and the historic brick station lies on the other. Given these restrictions and as traffic into and out of the station continues to grow, an aerial component becomes necessary. Having an aerial structure allows for more flexibility in operations.

Maintaining a strictly at-grade station would result in complicated logistics, limitations on service growth, and train stopping patterns.

- C: A briefing for new LPMG members lead by Caltrain and the Authority would be helpful to get everyone up to speed on the work done on the alternatives studied and why some are no longer being carried forward, including tunnels.

A: The Authority and Caltrain would be happy to participate in such a meeting.

- C: For LPMG members advocating for tunnels, the majority of the LPMG and the communities they represent do not want to spend money needed for the San Francisco to San Jose Project Section as a whole on trenching and tunneling projects. Should cities like Palo Alto want to pursue those options, they will need to pay for them themselves.

- Q: What mechanisms do freight operators have to provide input on the proposed alternatives for the San Francisco to San Jose Project Section?

A: The Pacific Freight Rail Users Group (PFRUG) is an association of all freight users along the Peninsula that both Caltrain and the Authority meets with to discuss developments on the high-speed rail project.

- C: It would be beneficial to include PFRUG's concerns, goals, and comments on the blended system in future presentations to the LPMG.

### Outreach Update

Morgan Galli, Northern California Outreach Manager, provided an overview of recent and upcoming outreach activities, and invited suggestions from CWG members for additional outreach events. Upcoming Authority activities include:

- Bayview Hill Neighborhood Association (San Francisco): March 6
- Old Quad Residents Association (City of Santa Clara): March 14
- Open House Meetings: April 2017

Galli then discussed ConnectHSR, a vendor registry for high-speed rail, and a small business workshop the Authority will be hosting on March 10 in San Jose.

### **3. Public Comments/Questions**

- C: Thank you for raising the potential for flexibility in grade, especially as it relates to lowering the costs for grade separations. It is something that should be pursued if it is practicable.
- C: Please release the effects of the blended system on the Caltrain schedule to the public as soon as they become available.
- C: At the Authority's Land Use Committee meeting this month, an EIR was presented that confirmed a 4-track at-grade system that is not grade separated is not feasible. Dusseldorf Station in Germany was given as an example of a fully grade separated 4-track system, one that should be followed for Millbrae Station.
- C: A March 2016 court ruling determined it is illegal to extend Prop 1A bonds to develop a high-speed rail station at 4<sup>th</sup> & King. The judge made it very clear that the intent of the bonds is for a connection to the Transbay Terminal, not 4<sup>th</sup> & King.
- C: According to the California Public Utilities Commission, the Authority has the exclusive right to plan, design, and operate at speeds above 125 mph. However, any other entity has a right to manage a system that operates under 125 mph. Given that the Authority intends to operate high-speed rail at 110 mph along the San Francisco to San Jose Project Section, Peninsula communities have an opportunity to tell the Authority they have been eliminated from any further consideration for developing a high-speed rail system along this corridor.
- C: PFRUG requests that Caltrain continues to provide updates on the search for a short-line freight operator along the Peninsula. PFRUG appreciates Caltrain's efforts in this



regard to-date as both parties seek to uphold and progress both freight and passenger rail service. Please include local policy makers in these discussions moving forward.

- C: Caltrain awarded contracts in September 2016 for work on the electrification project. Caltrain's Limited Notice to Proceed for this project noted that, on March 1, 2017, Caltrain anticipated to have all funds in place to begin construction along the corridor. The outstanding funds of \$647 million for this work are core capacity funds from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). Caltrain has been working with FTA over the last two years for these funds. Caltrain has met all FTA criteria and went through the 30-day Congressional Review Period. Given this and that electrification will create jobs locally and across the county, it was anticipated that federal approval of these funds would come after the Congressional Review Period (February 17, 2017). However, Caltrain has been informed that FTA is deferring this decision in order for it to be considered in the context of the national budget. Given the deferral and that electrification work was contracted to begin on March 1, 2017, Caltrain is evaluating its current options. These include terminating contracts, negotiating with contractors, and extending the Limited Notice to Proceed.

#### **4. LPMG Member Comment/Requests**

- Q: To what degree has Governor Brown addressed the deferment of Caltrain funds?  
A: The Governor and his administration have been and will continue to be a full and good-faith partner in the electrification of Caltrain and the high-speed rail project.

#### **5. Next Meeting**

The next Caltrain hosted LPMG meeting will occur on March 23, 2017. The next Authority hosted LPMG meeting will be held on April 27, 2017.