



Memorandum

Date: December 19, 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

Statewide Update

December Board Meeting

The California High-Speed Rail Authority (Authority) Board of Directors met on December 13, 2016. The meeting agenda (found [here](#) on the Authority website) included approvals of the San Francisco to San Jose Peninsula Corridor Segment Funding Plan and the Central Valley Segment Funding Plan and the Request for Qualifications for Early Train Operator Services procurement.

By approving the San Francisco to San Jose Peninsula Corridor Segment Funding Plan, the Board completed another required step necessary in order to begin using Proposition 1A funds for the Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project. This is consistent with the 2016 Business Plan and the Legislature's appropriation and direction in Senate Bill 1029. The Board Briefing on Agenda Item 3 is included [here](#) with supplemental materials on the Authority website.

November Construction Update

Construction is continuing on nine active sites in the Central Valley, including Construction Package 2-3 (CP 2-3) which is a 65-mile segment between Fresno County and Tulare-Kern County. To find out the latest information about High-Speed Rail construction, visit www.BuildHSR.com or read the November Construction Update [here](#).

Sustainability Report

On Thursday, December 15, the Authority issued the 2016 Sustainability Report which describes the innovative approach it is taking to the design, construction and operations of California's high-speed rail system. High-speed rail is the most sustainable option to keep Californians moving in the 21st Century and is a vital cornerstone of California's progressive policies to tackle climate change, protect the environment and enhance quality of life. Work is underway now to deliver a high-quality, zero-emissions transportation system that benefits Californians both now and in generations to come. Accompanying the report will be fact sheets and an interactive graphic which can be found [here](#).

San Francisco – San Jose Project Section Update

2017 Look Ahead

As we continue our environmental analysis and technical review we look forward to three important environmental milestones in 2017:

- Spring 2017 – Identify a Staff Recommended Preliminary Preferred Alternative
- Summer 2017 – Release the Draft Environmental Document
- End of 2017 – Release the Final Environmental Document and Record of Decision

Community Working Group Meetings

The next round of Community Working Group meetings for the San Francisco to San Jose Project Section is expected to take place in late January/early February 2017. The focus of this round of working group meetings will be on the San Francisco to San Jose Project Section alternatives under consideration for environmental review.

Recent Outreach Activities

The Authority has been meeting with a variety of stakeholder groups, over the past few months, to provide an overview of the San Francisco to San Jose Project Section and to solicit input on community priorities and outreach strategies. Recent outreach meetings include:

- **November 2016:**
 - Redwood City Chamber of Commerce Presentation: November 10
 - East Palo Alto City Council Presentation: November 15
 - Santa Clara County Board of Supervisor Briefing: November 15
 - Visitacion Valley Planning Alliance Presentation: November 19

- **December 2016**
 - Bayview Citizens Advisory Committee Presentation: December 7
 - San Bruno City Council Presentation: December 13

Input received has focused on the speed and volume of the high-speed trains, the potential impacts of the proposed light maintenance facility in Brisbane, how high-speed rail operations may affect other construction and development projects along the corridor, and how the Authority is collaborating with Caltrain and city/county agencies.

Grade Separation Study Update

On December 9, members of the LPMG, led by Chair Adrienne Tissier, met with Steve Heminger, Executive Director, and Randy Rentschler, Director of Legislation and Public Affairs, at the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) to discuss the potential involvement of MTC in a corridor-wide study of the at-grade crossings in the Caltrain corridor. The concept of the study has been discussed at length over recent months by the LPMG.

The LPMG members are in agreement that the study should discuss potential funding strategies for the implementation of grade separations, and should provide a “toolkit”-type resource for the cities to utilize in the development of grade separation projects. MTC is willing to participate in the study, and the next step will be to develop a scope of work. It should be noted that this study is completely separate from the high-speed rail environmental work. Traffic impacts and potential mitigations will be evaluated as part of the technical review during the high-speed rail environmental process.

Upcoming CSCG and LPMG Meetings

January’s CSCG and LPMG meetings will be hosted by Caltrain. The next CSCG meeting is scheduled for **Wednesday, January 18, 2017** and the next LPMG meeting scheduled for **Thursday, January 26, 2017**. The Authority will resume hosting the CSCG and LPMG meetings in February; the CSCG is scheduled for Wednesday, February 15, 2017 and the LPMG is scheduled for Thursday, February 23, 2017.



Local Policy Makers Group (LPMG)
Summary Meeting Notes for November 17, 2016

Summary Notes

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

Members Present:

Table with 4 columns: City/County, Representative or Alternative, Present (Yes/No). Rows include Atherton, Belmont, Brisbane, Burlingame, Millbrae, Menlo Park, Mountain View, Palo Alto, Redwood City, San Bruno, San Carlos, San Francisco, San Jose, San Mateo, San Mateo County Board of Supervisors, Santa Clara, South San Francisco, Sunnyvale.

Chair: Acting Chair E. Beach (A. Tissier was unable to attend)

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

Authority Staff: B. Tripousis, M. Galli, W. Gimpel, B. Fukuji, J. Litzinger, M. Marvin, K. Rugani

1. Introductions and Agenda Review

Ben Tripousis, California High-Speed Rail Authority Northern California Regional Director, welcomed LPMG members. Acting Chair Emily Beach, City of Burlingame, conducted roll call of LPMG members in attendance. Tripousis then reviewed the agenda.

2. High-Speed Rail Program Update

Statewide Update

Tripousis provided an update on recent construction developments. Approximately 119 miles are under construction in the Central Valley from Madera to just north of Bakersfield.

Tripousis reviewed the benefits of high-speed rail operations: air quality improvements, environmental benefits of an electric system, safety improvements such as fencing and four quadrant gates along the corridor, regional mobility connecting local transit modes, iconic stations that reflect the goals and consideration of local communities, and connecting California.

Tripousis provided an overview of the Authority's Small Business Program. The Authority's goal for this program is 30 percent participation by small businesses. Currently, 318 small businesses are engaged in the development of the California High-Speed Rail project.

San Francisco to San Jose Project Section Update

Will Gimpel, Project Section Manager, reported that the Scoping Report for the San Francisco to San Jose Project Section was published on November 2, 2016 and is posted on the Authority's website (available [here](#)). The Scoping Report is a complete synthesis of all 197 comments received and outreach completed during the scoping process, which began on May 9, 2016 and concluded on July 20, 2016.

The Authority is currently evaluating the project definition of the San Francisco to San Jose Project Section, including stations and a proposed light maintenance facility in Brisbane. Other project elements are under analysis and are currently being discussed with Caltrain prior to a Preliminary Preferred Alternative (PPA) being identified in spring 2017. The draft environmental document is planned for release and public comment in summer 2017. The release of the final environmental document and Record of Decision is planned for winter 2017.

LPMG Member Comments, Questions & Answers

- Q: What specific changes have been made to the Authority's milestone schedule for the San Francisco to San Jose Project Section?
A: The PPA was originally anticipated to be identified by the end of 2016. The Authority now intends to identify it by the spring of 2017.

Light Maintenance Facility Options

John Litzinger, Engineering Lead, reviewed components of the two proposed light maintenance facilities in Brisbane: one to the east of the alignment, and one to the west.

Litzinger noted that the Authority is also studying two potential light maintenance facility locations in Gilroy as part of the environmental analysis for the San Jose to Merced Project Section. Ultimately, of the locations being studied, there will only be one light maintenance facility either in Brisbane or Gilroy. A maintenance facility in Brisbane is preferable for the Authority as it is closer to the terminus of high-speed rail operations.

Litzinger also provided a summary of key comments from Community Working Group (CWG) members and CSCG members regarding the Brisbane light maintenance facility location, facilities, and issues around Caltrain's Bayshore Station.

LPMG Member Comments, Questions & Answers

- Q: Would either option for the light maintenance facility in Brisbane be built on the former landfill in the Baylands and, if so, would there be a need for any specialized engineering to account for settling?
A: Yes, development would occur on the former landfill regardless of what option is pursued. Any development in the Baylands requires accounting for settling.
- Q: Will a high-speed rail light maintenance facility in Brisbane affect Caltrain service at the South San Francisco Station?
A: That is being analyzed in the operational models for blended service along the corridor for high-speed rail and Caltrain. An operating principle in the agreement between Caltrain and the Authority is that high-speed rail trains do not impede Caltrain operations.
- Q: How is the Authority engaging the City of Brisbane and Caltrain in regards to a high-speed rail light maintenance facility in Brisbane?
A: The Authority has met with City of Brisbane staff and the developer of the proposed Baylands development project multiple times. All parties are well informed and kept apprised of each other's plans for the area. The Authority cannot preclude local development and action; the City of Brisbane has been working on developing the Baylands site for many years. That process is on its own trajectory. Until the Authority has an approved environmental document, no right-of-way can be purchased for high-speed rail operations.

Station Planning

Bruce Fukuji, Planning Lead, provided an overview of station planning efforts at 4th and King, Millbrae, and Diridon Stations. For the preliminary engineering and environmental clearance efforts, the Authority is conducting conceptual designs and planning for stations. Factors being considered in this process include: analyzing platform/track configurations, ensuring high-speed rail considerations fit within existing stations, and evaluating station access.

Fukuji reviewed station footprints and planning efforts at each station. The Authority is conducting a mode share analysis that, in partnerships with local operators like BART and Caltrain, will be able to determine travel patterns to and from stations and how various modes will determine station design. Also being factored into this analysis is constrained parking at stations, whereas the statewide model assumes unconstrained parking.

Fukuji presented feedback the Authority received on each station during the September CSCG meeting as well as CWG meetings, San Francisco to San Jose Scoping Meetings, and other stakeholder meetings. Key feedback included:

- Ensure safety and provide wayfinding for pedestrians.
- Provide direct connections and seamless accessibility from stations to other modes of transit and surrounding neighborhoods.
- Ensure compatibility with other land use and development projects.
- Provide high-density housing and office development around stations.

LPMG Member Comments, Questions & Answers

- Q: Is the Authority planning to develop any parking areas at 4th and King Station?
R: While the Authority and the City of San Francisco initially considered parking for high-speed rail riders at 4th and King Station, the Authority and city policy does not require additional parking.
- Q: The City of Millbrae is planning a development project along El Camino Real, which overlaps with the Authority's planned ground level parking for Millbrae Station. How much parking is the Authority planning on adding at Millbrae Station?
R: The only parking the Authority is planning for is to replace any spaces that are displaced through the redevelopment of Millbrae Station to accommodate high-speed rail operations. The Authority is also working with intermodal working groups to create multimodal stations that encourage transit use to get to and from high-speed rail stations, thereby reducing the number of vehicles parked at high-speed rail stations.
- C: Currently, the public transit connection from Millbrae Station to San Francisco International Airport (SFO) is very convoluted. Direct BART service or a SFO shuttle would be worth pursuing to ensure a seamless transit connection.
R: The Millbrae Station Intermodal Working Group is working to determine how BART can increase service to SFO from an operations and ridership perspective.
- Q: How easy will it be for transit riders to get from high-speed rail at Diridon Station to Caltrain?
R: With the aerial approach at Diridon, there will be platform mezzanines that will connect high-speed rail and Caltrain. For the at-grade approach, concourses above the tracks would offer a connection.

Outreach Update

Morgan Galli, Outreach Manager, reviewed recent outreach activities, including stakeholder meetings and outreach events, briefings to federal, state and local elected officials and city/county staff, presentations, station planning working groups and briefings. Galli also reviewed upcoming and ongoing outreach activities through January 2017.

Galli summarized the Community Priorities Exercise conducted during the July-August CWG and September 14, 2016 CSCG meetings. Priorities noted by CWG and CSCG members included: connect communities to create value and a stronger sense of community; improve mobility choices, connectivity and accessibility for all modes; need for agencies to collaborate, advocate for needs, and plan/execute transit improvements along corridor; ensure robust and efficient transit for economic hubs; and reduce greenhouse gases and vehicle miles traveled.

LPMG Member Comments, Questions & Answers

- Q: How are the priorities outlined in the Community Priorities Exercise going to be integrated into the Authority's planning?
R: These priorities will be incorporated into the environmental review process. The Authority will use this information to address potential ways to mitigate impacts, and then incorporate this into the environmental document.

Grade Separation Study Update

During the October 2016 LPMG meeting hosted by Caltrain, it was determined that a delegation of LPMG members would approach the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) to ask that the MTC fund and administer a high-level grade separation study that will provide a roadmap and toolkit for all of the grade separations between San Francisco and Gilroy. Supervisor Tissier will lead the delegation at the meeting with the MTC, which has not yet been scheduled. Following this meeting with the MTC, the delegation will then report back to the LPMG regarding next steps and study scope definition.

3. Public Comments/Questions

- C: Allotting 90 to 100 acres for the proposed light maintenance facility in Brisbane is unnecessary. There are light maintenance facilities in Europe that are only 23 acres.
- C: The intent of the comment “use Downtown Extension [DTX] spoil to raise Baylands up 10 feet” that the Authority received on the proposed light maintenance facility in Brisbane was to mitigate contamination that exists within the Baylands and to account for potential sea-level rise.
- C: Regarding planning at 4th and King Station, the current DTX alignment’s curve goes underneath the central subway, which is at grade. This will require “cut and cover,” which is going to impede central subway operations.
- C: The reason why a LPMG representative from the City of Brisbane is not in attendance at this meeting is because the Brisbane City Council is meeting at the same time. The City Council is discussing the proposed development on the Baylands in the same area where the Authority is proposing to build a light maintenance facility. It seems odd that the City of Brisbane and the Authority are not having these conversations together.
- C: Regarding station planning at Diridon Station and Millbrae Station, there are separate platforms for Caltrain and high-speed rail being proposed. Caltrain has already gone through a process of procuring trains built to be compatible with shared platforms with high-speed rail trains. Sharing platform heights is going to be important at the Transbay Transit Center as space will be at a premium. However, if the Transbay Transit Center is going to be the only station with shared platform heights, it does not make sense for Caltrain trains to have double doors and support the two platform heights. In the environmental review process, the Authority should review specific benefits and reliability of operations that shared platforms offer as it affects Caltrain capacity.
- C: It would be beneficial if the Authority provided estimates as to how long it will take to transfer between different transit modes at stations along the San Francisco to San Jose corridor.
- C: I just learned about the high-speed rail project. Based on what I have learned, I am concerned about the potential effects trains will have on my neighborhood in the Metcalf area along Monterey Highway in San Jose. I would like to know why the alignment along Monterey Highway was chosen, the impacts it will have, the provisions the Authority will provide Metcalf residents, and if any Authority meetings are planned to occur in my neighborhood.

4. LPMG Member Comment/Requests

- Q: How will the 2016 Presidential Election affect the high-speed rail project’s funding?

A: The funding for projects identified in the Authority's 2016 Business Plan, such as the San Francisco to San Jose and San Jose to Merced Project Sections, will not be affected by the election. These projects are fiscally constrained, and the Authority has the funding to establish revenue service for them.

- C: Passing tracks should be a topic of discussion at the Authority's Open Houses planned for January 2017.

- Q: When will the questions and comments the Authority received during the Scoping Period for the San Francisco to San Jose Project Section, as presented in the in the Scoping Report, be addressed?

A: The Authority will address these in the environmental document.

- Q: Are the intermodal working group meetings for station planning open to the public and, if so, are the meeting locations and dates posted on the Authority's website?

A: Making these meetings open to the public is an ongoing consideration for the Authority.

5. Next Meeting

The next LPMG meeting scheduled for December 15, 2016 is CANCELLED. The next LPMG meeting will be held January 26, 2017.