JPB Board of Directors
Meeting of July 9, 2020

Correspondence as of June 23, 2020

#	Subject
1	San Jose Diridon Station Integrated Concept Plan
2	Noise, Vibration & Over Grown Vegetation
3	Idling Trains at San Francisco Station Caltrain
4	San Jose to Merced Draft EIR

From:	Roland Lebrun
To:	city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov
Cc:	Board (@caltrain.com); MTC Info; VTA Board Secretary; CHSRA Board
Subject:	Item 2.32 San José Diridon Station Integrated Concept Plan.
Date:	Monday, June 22, 2020 2:16:28 AM

Dear Mayor Liccardo and Council,

Thank you for allocating $1M to this project http://sanjose.legistar.com/gateway.aspx?M=F&ID=463b9b93-8419-409b-8862-c61f05dddc49.pdf

The purpose of this email is to alert you to a specific aspect of "*Specifying the relationship between the station and track approaches",* specifically the Vasona line and the Union Pacific track to Cupertino in particular.

Having worked extensively on the challenges introduced by elevating the station platforms by 20 feet, I do believe that the conflicts with the Vasona line can be resolved, but the final determination of the feasibility of elevating the tracks is going to require some advanced engineering.

It is in this context that I encourage you to direct staff to issue an RFP to study this aspect of the project as a matter of urgency, along the line of this RFP (https://www.sfcta.org/rfp-1920-07-pennsylvania-avenue-extension-study-project-initiation-report) which was crafted to study similarly constrained issues in San Francisco.

Finally, I am happy to share our solution which includes VTA light rail grade separations at Lincoln, Auzerais, Sunol and Dupont as well as double-tracking between Race Street and the relocated Diridon light rail station.

Sincerely,

Roland Lebrun

CC
Caltrain Board of Directors
VTA Board of Directors
MTC Commissioners
CHSRA Board of Directors

From:	Dennis Wan
To:	Board (@caltrain.com)
Cc:	board.secretary@vta.org; edna.campero@vta.org; denniswan88@yahoo.com; dennis@dwinvestment.com
Subject:	Complaints: Noise &Vibration &over grown Vegetation
Date:	Monday, June 22, 2020 12:35:20 PM

Hello PCJPB Board,

Ref : CSR Ticket # ; 778217

VTA Case #: 030420050

This is a complaint about the Noise/Vibration & over grown vegetation along the 2000 block of Main Street, Santa Clara,CA. 95050.

Lately, the trains that passing through that section are more frequent and louder noise/Vibration level due to more Older trains and cargo trains.

In mid Nov. 2019 I contacted Mr. Victor Gauthier of VTA.

In Nov. 27 , 2019 , got an email from Caltran Division of maintenance, CSR Ticket # 778217, saying "Wrong Jurisdiction (Caltran).

On March 4, 2020, I contacted VTA. Got a response from Ms Campero, informed me that portion of the track is owned by PCJPB.

March 28, I wrote to board@caltran.com again, got a return email said they received my correspondence.

No further email or Notice about any action taken on this case.

Attachment to follow.

Your help is much appreciated.

Your truly,

Dennis Wan,
Chinese American Chamber of Commerce
www.cacc_sc@yahoo.com

Email: denniswan88@yahoo.com
www.dwinvesmtent.com

408-667-3070 cell
408-984-6683 fax

From: Rios, Rona
To: Board (@caltrain.com); Tietjen, Brent
Cc: Murphy, Seamus; Fromson, Casey; Wong, Shirley
Subject: RE: Complaint to Caltrain Board & others FW: Emailing: Scan0196.pdf
Date: Monday, June 22, 2020 4:23:47 PM

Dora,

Here's the correspondence exchange I had with Mr. Wan. He is supposed to respond regarding the sound wall. He hasn't followed up on our Caltrain Report #747764.

The report he is referencing as File #778217 and it is a VTA CSR Report.

My last contact with him was April 14th and our report and correspondence is closed. See below.

Thanks,

Rona

From: Dennis Wan <denniswan88@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 14, 2020 10:56 AM
To: Rios, Rona <riosr@samtrans.com>
Subject: Re: Consumer Report #747764 Noise and Overgrown Vegetation

Thanks Ms Rios.

I will work on the comment about the Sound Wall and send it to you.

Your help is much appreciated.

Thanks again.

Dennis Wan, Broker-Notary Public
D W Investment Realty,
DRE#00935827
www.dwinvestment.com
Chinese Chamber of Commerce
http://www.cacc-sc.org
Historic Chinese-American Cemetery
www.sbhcacc.org
408-984-6686
408-984-6683 fax
408-667-3070 cell
email: denniswan88@yahoo.com

On Tuesday, April 14, 2020, 8:52:57 AM PDT, Rios, Rona <riosr@samtrans.com> wrote:

Hello Mr. Wan,

My apologies for the confusion. I work for the San Mateo County Transit District who provides support and administration for both SamTrans and Caltrain (Peninsula Joint Powers Board).

Regarding a sound wall, you can submit your comments/recommendations and I am happy to forward them to our

Real Estate and Property Development Team for review.

Best,

Rona Rios

From: Dennis <denniswan88@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 14, 2020 8:40 AM
To: Rios, Rona <riosr@samtrans.com>
Cc: Board (@caltrain.com) <BoardCaltrain@samtrans.com>
Subject: Re: Consumer Report #747764 Noise and Overgrown Vegetation

Thanks very much Ms Rios for your response.
Still a little confuse about which office you are representing ?
Your email address is : riosr@samtrans.com
And the letter Ending with you as the Director of Caltrain ?
You are the Director of Both.
And
the legal owner is Caltrain!

Who should I contact about the
"Sound Wall" Along that stretch
Of housing?

Stay Healthy !

Thanks again.
Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 14, 2020, at 7:50 AM, Rios, Rona <riosr@samtrans.com> wrote:

Dear Mr. Wan,

Your correspondence to the Board of Directors was forwarded to me for response, they are copied on this email.

First, our sincere apologies for the delayed response – we did some review as to what may have happened to your original complaint, additionally, we wanted to review the issue regarding noise and overgrown vegetation. We found that the delay occurred because your original complaint was sent to Caltrans instead of Caltrain, so unfortunately, we did not receive your correspondence. In regards to the overgrown areas, we forwarded this issue to our Rail Road Infrastructure Maintenance Director who stated they will review the surrounding area and handle the necessary work that falls in the Right of Way to the railroad. The noise you describe is related to the proximity of the railroad which they cannot address.

Thank you for bringing the vegetation issue to our attention, we appreciate your concerns for safety and will handle this issue accordingly.

Best Regards,

Rona Rios
Director, Customer Experience
Caltrain

From: Dennis Wan <dennis@dwinvestment.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 28, 2020 1:31 PM
To: Board (@caltrain.com) <BoardCaltrain@samtrans.com>
Cc: edna.campero@vta.org; dennis@dwinvestment.com; denniswan88@yahoo.com; 'CACC'

<cacc_sc@yahoo.com>
Subject: FW: Complaints about Noise & vibration& over grown vegetation

Dear Board Directors or Concern Parties,.

I contacted different agencies, for a couple of years. but cannot reach the legal owner of the property along the Cal Train tracks along the

2000 block of Main Street, Santa Clara, CA. 95050.

I owned the property on 2123 Main Street, Santa Clara, CA. 95050.

Trains pass by throughout the day and night, create noise and vibrations that shake the house and windows.

Also the bushes and branches create a Fire Hazard along the fence.

The agencies I contacted (PG & E, City of Santa Clara, County, VTA, Caltran) but nothing was done or follow up.

Enclosed was the response from Cal Train in Nov. 2019, but no further action or correspondence.

Alos, Ms Edna Campero from VTA emailed me name of the legal owner : PCJPB, but no address or contact person.

Can you direct this request to the right party that can help with the situation.

Your help is much appreciated.

Submitted by :

Dennis Wan,

Contact information:
denniswan88@yahoo.com<mailto:denniswan88@yahoo.com>
cell: 408-667-3070

OR,

Chinese American Chamber of Commerce of Santa Clara.
2021 The Alameda, #130,
San Jose, CA. 95126
408-984-6686
408-984883 fax
cacc_sc@yahoo.com<mailto:cacc_sc@yahoo.com>

_____VTA REPORT

-----Original Message-----
From: Board (@caltrain.com) <BoardCaltrain@samtrans.com>
Sent: Monday, June 22, 2020 3:42 PM
To: Rios, Rona <riosr@samtrans.com>; Tietjen, Brent <TietjenB@samtrans.com>
Cc: Murphy, Seamus <murphys@samtrans.com>; Fromson, Casey <Fromsonc@samtrans.com>; Wong, Shirley

<WongSh@samtrans.com>
Subject: Complaint to Caltrain Board & others FW: Emailing: Scan0196.pdf

Hello - please see these email (2 combined into one) complaints to the Caltrain Board & others and which will be included into the Board's correspondence this week.

Thank you,

Dora

-----Original Message-----
From: Dennis Wan <dennis@dwinvestment.com>
Sent: Monday, June 22, 2020 12:39 PM
To: Board (@caltrain.com) <BoardCaltrain@samtrans.com>; board.secretary@vta.org; edna.campero@vta.org
Cc: denniswan88@yahoo.com; dennis@dwinvestment.com
Subject: Emailing: Scan0196.pdf

9 pages Attachment to the last email.
Re: CSR Ticket: 778217

Thanks,

Dennis Wan.

Your message is ready to be sent with the following file or link
attachments:

Scan0196.pdf

Note: To protect against computer viruses, e-mail programs may prevent sending or receiving certain types of file attachments. Check your e-mail security settings to determine how attachments are handled.

-----Original Message-----
From: Dennis Wan <dennis@dwinvestment.com>
Sent: Monday, June 22, 2020 12:35 PM
To: Board (@caltrain.com) <BoardCaltrain@samtrans.com>
Cc: board.secretary@vta.org; edna.campero@vta.org; denniswan88@yahoo.com; dennis@dwinvestment.com
Subject: Complaints: Noise &Vibration &over grown Vegetation

Hello PCJPB Board,

Ref : CSR Ticket # ; 778217

VTA Case #: 030420050

This is a complaint about the Noise/Vibration & over grown vegetation along the 2000 block of Main Street, Santa Clara,CA. 95050.

Lately, the trains that passing through that section are more frequent and louder noise/Vibration level due to more Older trains and cargo trains.

In mid Nov. 2019 I contacted Mr. Victor Gauthier of VTA.

In Nov. 27 , 2019 , got an email from Caltran Division of maintenance, CSR Ticket # 778217, saying "Wrong Jurisdiction (Caltran).

On March 4, 2020, I contacted VTA. Got a response from Ms Campero, informed me that portion of the track is owned by PCJPB.

March 28, I wrote to board@caltran.com again, got a return email said they received my correspondence.

No further email or Notice about any action taken on this case.

Attachment to follow.

Your help is much appreciated.

Your truly,

Dennis Wan,
Chinese American Chamber of Commerce
www.cacc_sc@yahoo.com

Email: denniswan88@yahoo.com
www.dwinvesmtent.com

408-667-3070 cell
408-984-6683 fax

Ref-1

K-1

Dennis Wan

From: Dennis Wan [dennis@dwinvestment.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 27, 2019 9:51 AM
To: 'Gauthier, Victor A@DOT'
Cc: 'denniswan88@yahoo.com'
Subject: RE: Caltrans Info
Attachments: image001.png

Mr. Gauthier,

Thanks for the email.

Can you send a hard copy in the mail or email a copy to me?

On line filing is not user friendly.

Thanks,

Dennis Wan,
President- D W Investment
Broker-Notary Public
BRE#00935827
www.dwinvestment.com
Chinese American Chamber of Commerce
www.cacc-sc.org
408-984-6686
408-667-3070 cell
408-984-6683 fax

From: Gauthier, Victor A@DOT [mailto:Victor.Gauthier@dot.ca.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, November 26, 2019 3:30 PM
To: dennis@dwinvestment.com
Subject: Caltrans Info

The best, fastest, easiest way to report a road problem to Caltrans is to fill out and submit a Customer Service Request by going to https://csr.dot.ca.gov/.

Below is the website address for the Customer Service Request (CSR) submission form for the Caltrans Maintenance Division. It can be used for any maintenance issue that is noticed on the State highway system, such as irregular traffic signals, potholes, or damaged fencing. Please note that the map feature tends to be the trickiest part for some users, and the easiest way to locate the problem area is to enter a nearby physical address. Thank you.

Caltrans Customer Service Request form: https://csr.dot.ca.gov/

Victor Gauthier
Public Information Officer
Santa Clara County
(510) 286-6115

R-2

Dennis Wan

From: Caltrans Division of Maintenance [no-reply@dot.ca.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, November 27, 2019 11:37 AM
To: dennis@dwinvestment.com
Subject: Customer Service Request - Ticket #: 778217 - Our Response

Wrong Jurisdiction (not Caltrans)

Additional Message:	Under the current policy Caltrans will consider new soundwalls if there is a project to add capacity or change the freeway in a major way (adding or altering an interchange, for example). There are no projects of this type planned or programmed for your area. If there are no major freeway projects, soundwalls may also be constructed under the retrofit soundwall program. The Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) is the regional agency for setting priorities for your county. VTA developed a countywide transportation plan to guide transportation funding priorities. As part of carrying out that plan, VTA created a Sound Barrier Program, intended to provide grant funding for retrofit noise mitigation projects on State highways. To be considered under the program, and for further information on the procedures for getting involved, we recommend you contact the VTA. They can be reached at: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority 3331 N. First Street San Jose, CA, 95134-1906 Phone Numbers: VTA Telephone Information:(408) 321-2300 customer.service@vta.org www.vta.org
CSR Ticket Number:	778217
Commit/No Commit:	no commit
Date Submitted:	2019-11-27 11:17:50
California County:	Santa Clara
State Highway Route:	880
Nearest Town or City:	San Jose
Nearest Cross Street:	cabrillo
Mode of Transportation:	Train
Direction of Travel:	Both
Date & Time Situation Noticed:	2019-11-27 5 am - 6 am
Type of Situation:	Soundwall - Down or Damaged
Nature of Situation:	Concerning Trains going both ways, SJC- SF , The Disturbing Noises and vibrations caused by passing trains deprive the living conditions of the residents in that area . Early morning and late at night trains generate noises and vibrations disturb the sleep of people live along the tracks. Every time a train passed it shakes the foundation of the building. The tracks are not well insulted.
Geographic Location of Situation:	The railroad tracks may be less than 50 ft away from the building. There is no solid sound wall barrier to shelter or absorb the sound of the running trains. A Sound Wall is needed in that area. Where and which Department should we contact to request in building a Sound Wall?
Your Email Address:	dennis@dwinvestment.com

Caltrans (https://dot.ca.gov)

K-3

Division of Maintenance

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) owns or controls 350,000 acres of Right of Way and maintains 15,133 centerline miles of highway and 13,063 state highway bridges. Caltrans also inspects over 12,200 local bridges.

Submit a Customer Service Request

Customer Service Request - Customer Confirmation

This is your Customer Service Request Confirmation and Ticket Number. **Please retain this information for future reference. A copy of this confirmation has been sent to the email address that you provided.** Customer Service Requests (**CSR**´s) are handled Monday through Friday, 8AM to 4PM.

Thank You for being a concerned citizen and reporting this maintenance issue.

REMINDER: This Customer Service Request process should NOT be used to report any kind of highway emergency. Report highway emergencies to 911 or the California Highway Patrol immediately.

CSR Ticket Number:	778217
Date Submitted:	2019-11-27 11:17:50
California County:	Santa Clara
State Highway Route:	880
Nearest Town or City:	San Jose
Nearest Cross Street:	cabrillo
Mode of Transportation:	Train
Direction of Travel:	Both
Date & Time Situation Noticed:	2019-11-27 5 am - 6 am
Type of Situation:	Soundwall - Down or Damaged
Describe Nature of Situation:	Concerning Trains going both ways, SJC-SF , The Disturbing Noises and vibrations caused by passing trains deprive the living conditions of the residents in that area . Early morning and late at night trains generate noises and vibrations disturb the sleep of people live along the tracks. Every time a train passed it shakes the foundation of the building. The tracks are not well insulted.

Geographic Location of Situation:	The railroad tracks may be less than 50 ft away from the building. There is no solid sound wall barrier to shelter or absorb the sound of the running trains. A Sound Wall is needed in that area. Where and which Department should we contact to request in building a Sound Wall?
Customer's Email:	dennis@dwinvestment.com
Customer's Name:	Dennis Wan
Customer's Phone Number:	4086673070

R-4

This application is being updated for digital accessibility and will continue to function while updates are in progress.

Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority

Solutions that move you

R-5

From: Dennis Wan [dennis@dwinvestment.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 04, 2020 9:37 AM
To: 'board.secretary@vta.org'
Cc: 'Dennis Wan'; 'dennis@dwinvestment.com'
Subject: Noise level from Cal Train

Dear Madam/ Sir,

Please direct me to the right person or Dept. on the following matters.

1/ Built a Sound Wall to block the Noise and Vibration of passing trains..

Location: 2000 block on Main Street, Santa Clara, CA. 95050.

2/ Outgrown weeds and trees along the fence on same location on Main Street.

Restricted area. No access to the public.

We contacted the Cal Train Office , they refer us to you , Claim that it is under VTA jurisdiction.

Your help is much appreciated.

Thanks ,

Dennis Wan,
President- D W Investment
Broker-Notary Public
BRE#00935827
www.dwinvestment.com
Chinese American Chamber of Commerce
www.cacc-sc.org
408-984-6686
408-667-3070 cell
408-984-6683 fax

(R-6)

Dennis Wan

From: Campero, Edna [Edna.Campero@vta.org]
Sent: Monday, March 23, 2020 1:18 PM
To: Wan, Dennis
Cc: Perez, Lucas; Webb, Staci
Subject: RE: Property Info. Req. -2123 Main St., Santa Clara (Case#030420050)

Good afternoon Mr. Wan,

To consider further we need to hear from Caltrain.

Please have them contact me directly with any questions.

Thank you.

From: Campero, Edna
Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2020 9:40 AM
To: dennis@dwinvestment.com
Cc: Perez, Lucas <Lucas.Perez@vta.org>; Webb, Staci <Staci.Webb@vta.org>
Subject: Property Info. Req. -2123 Main St., Santa Clara (Case#030420050)

"PCJPB"

Good morning Mr. Wan,

Per our conversation, below is the ownership information for the portion of land behind 2123 Main Street, Santa Clara, CA. PCJPB is the owner for APN: 224-65-004.

board@caltrain.com

Thank you.

(R-7)

Parcel Finder

Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority

2123 Main Street, Santa

Sign in

Navigation | Tasks | Analysis | Find Data

Tool Labels

Print | Export | Share | Upload Data | Layer Catalog

Tasks

Y

22465004

FEATURE
PAR

SHAPE_Leng
2977.4705

STATE_CODE
N/A

OBJECTID
28366

STATE_CODE_1
CA

FIPS_CO_CODE
85

CO_NAME_FLAG
Y

MUNICIPALITY_CODE
SC

PARCEL_NUMBER
22465004

F1ST_OWNER_NAME
PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD

LAST_NAME
N/A

FIRST_NAME
N/A

MI
N/A

NAME_SUFFIX
N/A

SPOUSE_FIRST_NAME
N/A

F2ND_OWNER_NAME
N/A

SPOUSE_MI
N/A

SPOUSE_NAME_SUFFIX
N/A

SITE_HOUSE_NUMBER
000000

Edna Campero
Asst. Real Estate Agent

Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
3331 North First Street, Building A
San Jose, CA 95134-1927
Phone **408-321-5781**

3/23/2020

R-8

Dennis Wan

From: Dennis Wan [dennis@dwinvestment.com]
Sent: Saturday, March 28, 2020 1:31 PM
To: board@caltrain.com
Cc: edna.campero@vta.org; dennis@dwinvestment.com; denniswan88@yahoo.com; 'CACC'
Subject: FW: Complaints about Noise & vibration& over grown vegetation
Attachments: MSFaxConsoleTempPreview-#000012bc832250af.tif

Dear Board Directors or Concern Parties,.

I contacted different agencies, for a couple of years. but cannot reach the legal owner of the property along the Cal Train tracks along the

2000 block of Main Street, Santa Clara, CA. 95050.

I owned the property on 2123 Main Street, Santa Clara, CA. 95050.

Trains pass by throughout the day and night, create noise and vibrations that shake the house and windows.

Also the bushes and branches create a Fire Hazard along the fence.

The agencies I contacted (PG & E, City of Santa Clara, County, VTA, Caltran) but nothing was done or follow up.

Enclosed was the response from Cal Train in Nov. 2019, but no further action or correspondence.

Alos, Ms Edna Campero from VTA emailed me name of the legal owner : PCJPB, but no address or contact person.

Can you direct this request to the right party that can help with the situation.

Your help is much appreciated.

Submitted by :

Dennis Wan,

Contact information:
denniswan88@yahoo.com
cell: 408-667-3070

OR,

Chinese American Chamber of Commerce of Santa Clara.
2021 The Alameda, #130,
San Jose, CA. 95126
408-984-6686
408-984883 fax
cacc_sc@yahoo.com

(R-9)

Dennis Wan

From: Board (@caltrain.com) [BoardCaltrain@samtrans.com]
Sent: Saturday, March 28, 2020 1:31 PM
To: Dennis Wan
Subject: Automatic reply: Complaints about Noise & vibration& over grown vegetation

Hello - We have received your correspondence addressed to the Caltrain Board of Directors.

For your reference:

* All correspondence received by the Board of Directors is posted online weekly. http://www.caltrain.com/about/bod/Board_of_Directors_Meeting_Calendar.html
* Additionally, all correspondence received up to 24 hours before a scheduled Board meeting is provided to the Board of Directors and posted online.

The Board of Directors values your input and appreciates your support for the transportation system in our community.

Caltrain Customer Service: 1-800-660-4287
Information for hearing impaired: (TTY) 650-508-6448
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 3006, San Carlos, CA 94070-1306 or 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070 Office Phone: 650-508-6200

From: Raymond Chang
To: Tietjen, Brent
Cc: Public Comment
Subject: Re: Idling Trains at San Francisco Station Caltrain
Date: Monday, June 22, 2020 3:34:44 PM

Hi Brent,

I appreciate your response to my concerns. I do realize that with the schedule changes due to COVID-19, it might present scenarios where the layover time of trains might be increased compared to the normal schedule. However, I do have some follow up questions / suggestions:

1. In the operation protocol document sent above, it states the following:
> Typically, both the HEP and Main engines run during passenger unloading and cleaning.

Why do both the HEP and main engines need to be on during passenger unloading and cleaning? Isn't that one of the reasons why wayside power exists at the station? According to the Caltrain website:
> Wayside power or “hotel power” allows Caltrain to plug into electricity during key maintenance activities to minimize diesel fuel consumption and idling emissions.

If there is a reason why the engines need to be running while cleaning the train + unloading passengers, then I would like to know why that is. It doesn't seem like an entire diesel locomotive is required to clean a train...

2. I do appreciate having these operation protocols in written form, but is there a way to ensure their enforcement? I'm thinking that if there's a timesheet of when trains are started / stopped would prove helpful (and it would probably be nice if this could be done in an automated fashion) - would be nice if this information could be shared with me, but I understand if it's not possible.

I really wish I don't have to keep on writing these emails, but I think it's important for both the environment and the nearby residents that the idling situation improves - even though I know that the new EMUs are on the horizon, there's still several more years until those are in service.

Thanks,
-Raymond

On Tue, Jun 16, 2020 at 4:36 PM Tietjen, Brent <TietjenB@samtrans.com> wrote:

> Hi Raymond,
>
> Thanks for reaching out again. On Monday, June 15, we implemented a new schedule with additional train service. Our operations team will continue to monitor the crews in the field to ensure they are keeping the idling to a minimum. We understand this can be a frustrating time to be living next to a railroad as we are required to shelter-in-place. I will continue to share your complaints with the operations team to check it against our protocol procedures.

I have worked with our operations team to update the station protocols and I have attached that document here for your information. As mentioned previously, these are protocols that will be followed during normal operations. There will be times where field crews will have to adjust which may result in trains idling longer than one hour. Examples of this would be if an issue with the train was discovered during inspection/arrival. This may require crews to idle the train to troubleshoot and resolve the issue. Unexpected changes in operations (e.g. vehicle strike) may also require changes to the operations at the station.

Thanks,

Brent

From: Raymond Chang [mailto:raymond.cj.chang@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, June 15, 2020 3:46 PM
To: Tietjen, Brent <TietjenB@samtrans.com>
Cc: Public Comment <PublicComment@samtrans.com>
Subject: Re: Idling Trains at San Francisco Station Caltrain

Hi Brent,

I'd like to follow up on this email - I distinctly remember observing that from 6/4 - 6/7 (where 6/4 happened to be the day of the Caltrain board meeting, where I bought attention to the previous email I sent during a public comment), I observed a lot less idling at the station. However, things have reverted back to where they were before, with plenty of instances where there was no train that arrived prior to an hour before, and where there were no trains departing in the next hour, yet there were still several trains idling at once (for example - https://twitter.com/ray__chang/status/1272369753332445185 was a clip I took last night at 8:26 PM, with the last arrival at 7:22 PM, and the next departure at 9:37 PM).

As much as everyone wishes that the new EMUs are up and running soon, currently they're scheduled to enter service by 2022 at the earliest (and based on what I've seen with other public transportation projects in the Bay Area i.e the SF MUNI Central Subway, the BART Berryessa extension, I am highly pessimistic that there won't be any delays, but that's besides the point here). Given the amount of noise and sound pollution these diesel engines make, I don't think it's reasonable for residents of the area to deal with this for the next 2

years, especially considering that there are systems in place to reduce the engine idling. By reducing idling time, Caltrain can save on fuel costs, and help reduce air and noise pollution in the neighborhood.

I've been extremely frustrated over the past 2 months, spending much of my time and energy trying to improve this situation. At times, I've seen improvements in regards to the idling situation, but those improvements only last about 2-3 days, before reverting back to normal. This whole situation with the idling trains has made me strongly consider moving out of the area, but even if I end up doing so, I believe Caltrain has responsibility to not excessively harm the environment, and the mental wellbeing of the residents that live nearby the stations.

I sincerely hope I can receive some sort of resolution on this matter, as this issue is affecting a lot of nearby residents, and with all the craziness going on in the world today, it would be nice if we didn't have to worry about excessive train idling as well.

Thanks,

-Raymond

On Mon, Jun 8, 2020 at 3:43 PM Tietjen, Brent <TietjenB@samtrans.com> wrote:

> Hi Raymond,
>
> I wanted to acknowledge that we have received your email. I am working with our team to get you a response.
>
> Best,
>
> Brent
>
> **From:** Raymond Chang [mailto:raymond.cj.chang@gmail.com]
> **Sent:** Tuesday, June 2, 2020 2:28 PM
> **To:** Tietjen, Brent <TietjenB@samtrans.com>
> **Cc:** Public Comment <PublicComment@samtrans.com>
> **Subject:** Re: Idling Trains at San Francisco Station Caltrain

Hi Brent,

Hope you are doing well - just wanted to follow up on my previous email. I have seen some improvements in regards to idling trains, but the improvements seem to be sporadic (I've noticed over the previous weekends that trains seem to be idling less, but the weekdays are a different story - seems like there's little to no improvement in that regard). A lot of the nearby residents share the same sentiments as me, so I created a petition here: https://www.change.org/p/caltrain-reduce-caltrain-idling-at-4th-and-king and managed to get close to 50 signatures.

I've been recording video of the trains idling and sharing them on my Twitter account, and here are several examples:

https://twitter.com/ray__chang/status/1267546836169920512

https://twitter.com/ray__chang/status/1267348376577732608

https://twitter.com/ray__chang/status/1265361206753157120

(there's a lot more examples and I can share video proof from my apartment. Granted, I can't tell exactly how many trains are idling at a given time, but I can definitely hear them...)

Another resident of the area has also shared with me images of the trains idling without using available wayside power:

https://twitter.com/hadlock/status/1267291792879128577

I've shared correspondence with another nearby resident, Toby Levine (who previously shared her sentiments about the excessive idling in this SF Chronicle article from 2017) and this is what she observed over the years:

> When we moved here in 2007, we were shocked by the Caltrain noise and pollution, much of which was caused by engine idling. We organized a lot of complaints and protests. Eventually, Caltrain began to listen. We came to agreements that included the use of ground power. By using ground electric power, they could really limit their

> engine idling, which they did. However, the diesel engines were still filthy and very, very old and continued to cause pollution. Then two things happened. Funds began to be available to switch to all electric power, and that is what they have been doing for the past several years. However, they also switched to an outside firm to manage the trains, rather than Caltrain doing so. We observed that they were idling much more and had little interest in maintaining the old reduced idling schedules and using their ground power.

At this point, I'm not sure how strictly these anti-idling measures have been enforced. Given the current schedule, there should be 1-2 trains idling at once max, but sometimes it seems like there are 5+ trains idling all at once. This makes it really hard for the people in our community to have our windows open (and given that summer is approaching, there are times where we need to have our windows open), due to both the noise and pollution. Even with all windows closed, I can still hear a constant rumbling noise (using my phone, it measures at around 91hz, which can't be easily blocked with just windows, and sounds similar to this 90hz test tone).

I would appreciate some sort of resolution on this matter - and if trains are indeed only idling for 1 hour pre-departure and post-arrival, I would like to get some proof of that, because from what I can tell, it just doesn't seem to be the case. I truly appreciate your time to listen to my concerns (and the concerns of those who live near the station).

Thanks,

-Raymond

> On Thu, May 21, 2020 at 4:19 PM Tietjen, Brent <TietjenB@samtrans.com> wrote:
>
> > Hi Raymond,
> >
> > Our operations team went to the station earlier this week and worked with the field crews to review the schedule and minimize the need for idling when possible. They confirmed that, in general, trains should not be idling more than an hour prior to departure or an hour after arrival. There may be some extraordinary circumstances that may require idling for longer periods of time, however, this should not be the norm.
> >
> > For your first question, there are a number of factors that require us to complete the light maintenance work at the terminal stations. The main reasons is that to service all trains at the maintenance facility in San Jose would require us to run trains back and forth from the

facility prior to each day of service. The maintenance facility in San Jose is also used for more intensive maintenance/inspections, such as wheel grinding and engine repairs. The daily operations of our service does not allow us to utilize that facility for the lighter maintenance activities that occurs at the terminal stations. There are no alternative locations to perform this work. There is some construction for Caltrain Electrification nearby and that can affect the ability for trains to come in and out of the station, but overall the maintenance activities have been occurring at the station for many years .

We appreciate the comments about reducing service, but at this time there are no plans for further reductions.

I hope this helps. Let me know if you'd like to discuss further via a call.

Thanks,

Brent

From: Chad Hedstrom <chad.hedstrom@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 22, 2020 9:41 PM
To: Public Comment <PublicComment@samtrans.com>
Subject: Wayside power use @ 4th & King Station

Today I went down (9:15pm Tuesday 6/22/20) and saw that the train that Engine #909 was pulling, was actually hooked up to wayside power. I periodically inspect the train yard and this is the first time I've ever seen it in use. Unfortunately, the train engine was not turned off while plugged in to the wayside power. What is the point? I feel that adequate training of the noise levels of the trains is not being acknowledged by train yard staff, and/or they do not understand the restriction on engine idling and the purpose of using the wayside power. Please advise them that residents continue to be bothered by noise levels caused by lack of use of wayside power and actually turning the engine off when not needed. I live in the neighborhood and the excessive idling is greatly disturbing to me since you resumed service after the February outage.

Thank you

Chad Hedstrom

From: Chad Hedstrom <chad.hedstrom@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 22, 2020 9:47 PM
To: Public Comment <PublicComment@samtrans.com>
Subject: Excessive Idling

Hi, I went down to the caltrain station on 4th & King today around 9:15pm on 6/22. There were five engines idling at the station. According to the updated weekday timetable, there are only three additional departures. Based on the policy that engines should not idle for more than 45 minutes, at a bare, bare minimum there should have only been three engines idling. Why are there two engines that won't be used until 5am the next day, idling at 9pm? And if maintenance is not being done, why not put them on wayside power? Please do not contribute any more to the neighborhood noise levels than absolutely necessary. In addition to "tech bros" there are families, wives and children that make this neighborhood that has grown up around your train yard that have to live with this unnecessary noise.

Thank you

Chad Hedstrom

From: Chad Hedstrom <chad.hedstrom@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 22, 2020 9:56 PM
To: Public Comment <PublicComment@samtrans.com>
Subject: Free and easy suggestion to dramatically cut down on noise at 4th & King

Hi, I have a suggestion that would cost nothing to implement. Platform #12 at 4th & King is the platform that DIRECTLY FACES a number of apartments on King Street. It is about 90 feet from the train engine to the building. This is a simple two step solution.

1. The first train that is ready to be shut down for the night, park it at Platform #12. This will create a wall that blocks noise from other trains. The trains are over 12 feet wide and almost 20 feet high, they act as a fantastic noise wall.
2. Do not idle trains at platform #12. The noise echoes down King street and adds significantly to neighborhood noise. If you need to idle trains past 9pm in the neighborhood, park those trains on platforms 4-9, and as a backup on platforms 2-3

This is a FREE modification that can be made at any time. This only needs to be communicated to the dispatch/station manager.

Also, the "baby bullet" trains appear to be 50% louder on average than the older rolling stock. Is there any way that you could simply not park those on platform 12? Our unit is not even directly facing caltrain with good sound proofing, and it's always very obvious when engine #924 is idling at platform #12. It's LOUD, really loud.

Thank you,

Chad Hedstrom

From:	Roland Lebrun
To:	CHSRA Board
Cc:	HSR san.jose_merced@HSR; VTA Board Secretary; Board (@caltrain.com); cacsecretary [@caltrain.com]
Subject:	San Jose to Merced Draft EIR
Date:	Tuesday, June 23, 2020 1:49:56 AM
Attachments:	Morgan Hill comments.pdf

Dear Vice Chair Richards and Board members,

Please find attached my comments on the San Jose to Merced Draft EIR (DEIR) and the section between San Jose and Gilroy in particular.

Sincerely,

Roland Lebrun

The California high speed line alignments as proposed by the High Speed Rail Authority in south Santa Clara County are inappropriate, specifically that high speed lines either completely bypass or terminate at city boundaries and transfer to conventional lines to gain access to existing stations at reduced speeds (125 MPH or lower) through densely populated urban areas.

This assertion is based on personal experience in the UK, specifically High Speed One (200 MPH) & the North Kent main commuter line (90 MPH) and, more recently, LGV Sud Europe Atlantique (220 MPH) which runs parallel to the existing 125 MPH network and systematically by-passes every single town and city between Tours and Bordeaux.

Moving on to south Santa Clara County, a similar approach would consist of a 220 MPH high speed line that would veer north off Highway 152 and continue east of Highway 101 until eventually connecting with the Caltrain alignment north of Capitol Expressway in south San Jose.

Downtown Gilroy HSR service would be provided via a branch to the Hollister line and the trains would continue north on the existing Union Pacific tracks at speeds below 125 MPH until eventually connecting to the Caltrain alignment north of Capitol Expressway in south San Jose.

Please note that this alternative is fully compliant with California Streets & Highways Code Section 2704.09 (b) *"Maximum **nonstop** service travel times for each corridor that shall not exceed the following: 4) San Jose-Los Angeles: two hours, 10 minutes"* http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=shc&group=02001-03000&file=2704.04-2704.095

Recommendations:

1) The first priority should be to electrify the tracks between San Jose and Gilroy to provide a "blended" Caltrain/HSR service to Gilroy, Morgan Hill and south San Jose until the Pacheco tunnels are completed. The east of 101 bypass should be planned but not constructed until sufficient ridership has been established between San Jose, Merced and Fresno.

2) Santa Clara County should consider establishing the Valley Transit Authority (VTA) as the lead agency for the Gilroy extension subject to California Public Utilities Code Section 185032 (b) "*Except as provided in paragraph (2), nothing in this subdivision precludes other local, regional, or state agencies from exercising powers provided by law with regard to planning or operating, or both, passenger rail service"* http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=puc&group=185001-186000&file=185030-185038. This recommendation is based on the VTA's outstanding track record of working collaboratively with Union Pacific on grade separations in the BART corridor between Warm Springs and Berryessa.

From:	KAREN LATTIN
To:	San.Jose_Merced@hsr.ca.gov
Cc:	boris.lipkin@hsr.ca.gov; northern.california@hsr.ca.gov; boardmembers@hsr.ca.gov; senator.beall@senate.ca.gov; senator.monning@senate.ca.gov; assemblymember.kalra@assembly.ca.gov; assemblymember.stone@assembly.ca.gov; Chavez, Cindy [cindy.chavez@bos.sccgov.org]; supervisor.wasserman@bos.sccgov.org; dave.cortese@bos.sccgov.org; supervisor.simitian@bos.sccgov.org; supervisor.ellenberg@bos.sccgov.org; Board (@caltrain.com); board.secretary@vta.org; Carrasco, Councilmember Magdalena; Liccardo, Mayor; Jimenez, Councilmperson Sergio; Davis, Councilmember Dev; Esparza, Councilmember Maya; Jones, Councilmember Chappie; Diep, Councilmember Lan; Arenas, Councilmember Sylvia; Khamis, Councilmember Johnny; Foley, Councilmember Pam; Peralez, Councilmember Raul; john.ristow@sanjoseca.gov
Subject:	Draft EIR/EIS Comment
Date:	Tuesday, June 23, 2020 10:23:02 AM
Attachments:	Comment Letter SJ D2 LC & D2 CWG Members on Draft EIR-EIS June 2020 FINAL.pdf

---

Dear CSHRA Board Members & Staff,

Please find attached a letter from a united group of leaders representing the San Jose District 2 community with our comments related to the Draft EIR/EIS for the San Jose to Merced Project Section. We look forward to a your responses in the final EIR/EIS document.

Sincerely,

Karen Lattin (on behalf of District 2 Community Leaders)
San Jose CWG Member
D2 NLC Member
LPNA, VP
District 2 Resident

South San Jose High Speed Rail Community Working Group
District 2 Leadership Council

June 22, 2020

California High Speed Rail Authority
Draft San Jose to Merced Project Section EIR/EIS
100 Paseo de San Antonio, Suite 300
San Jose, California 95113

Subject: **Comments on the Draft Project EIR/EIS**
San Jose to Merced Project Section

Dear CHSRA Board Members and Staff:

Introduction and Background

Thank you for the opportunity to review the April 2020 Draft Project EIR/EIS for the San Jose to Merced Section of the High-Speed Rail (HSR) Project. The South San Jose Community Working Group (CWG) has been working with the California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) on behalf of the thousands of San Jose residents who live and work along the proposed HSR alignment in San Jose's Monterey Corridor. As a way of highlighting the importance of the Monterey Corridor, we note the following:

- Within a 500-foot wide band along the west side of the Corridor, there are more than 2,000 single- family, multi-family, and mobile home residences, many of which are directly adjacent to the UPRR tracks.
- Within a 500-foot wide band along the east side of the Corridor, there are more than 2,400 single- family, multi-family, and mobile home residences, many of which are directly across Monterey Road from the UPRR tracks.
- Assuming an average of 2.5 persons per dwelling unit, there are approximately 11,000 residents living along the Corridor.
- Within 500-feet of the Corridor, noise-sensitive land uses include the above-listed residences, Edenvale Garden Park, Ramac Park, and the Edenvale Library.
- There are hundreds of businesses in the Corridor whose access is directly to/from Monterey Road.
- Within the Corridor, there are three major east-west roadways that intersect with Monterey Road and cross the UPRR tracks at-grade: Chynoweth Avenue, Branham Lane, and Skyway Drive. These roadways carry substantial volumes of traffic and Skyway Drive is an important emergency response route as San Jose Fire Station #18 is located at the northeast corner of Monterey Road/Skyway Drive.

Modified Alternative 4

Our primary comment is that the Draft EIR/EIS is deficient because it fails to include and evaluate a HSR alternative for the Monterey Corridor that would avoid or minimize the environmental impacts that are identified in the Draft EIR/EIS. As described in our March 20, 2019 letter to the CHSRA, a copy of which is attached and is submitted as part of our comments, we believe that a modified version of Alternative 4 should have been studied in the Draft EIR/EIS and we request its inclusion in the Final EIR-EIS. That alternative would consist of a blended system in a trench in the Monterey Corridor. The Draft EIS/EIR identifies significant and unavoidable safety & security and noise & vibration impacts for Alternative 4 in the Monterey Corridor, impacts that we believe would be avoided or lessened by placing the blended system in a trench (with or without the freight track in the trench). Most importantly, placing the blended system in a trench would avoid the identified significant and unavoidable impacts to emergency vehicle response times because grade-separations would be constructed at Skyway Drive, Branham Lane, and Chynoweth Avenue. It would also avoid the traffic impacts associated with at-grade crossings. Without the grade separations, total gate-down time during peak hours would approach 30% (i.e., 20 minutes of every hour), which is unacceptable to the community.

We note the CHSRA staff response of April 23, 2019 to our March 20, 2019 letter in which it is stated that the range of alternatives analysis was completed in 2018 and the focus was on completing the Draft EIR/EIS for the four alternatives that emerged from that analysis. However, after reviewing both Alternatives Analysis and the Supplemental Alternatives Analysis for the San Jose to Merced Section including Table 4 of Appendix 2.1, we did not see an evaluation of the trench option in the Monterey Corridor.

We note that EIR/EIS Alternative 2 places the HSR in a trench between Capitol Expressway and Skyway Drive. If that option is feasible in that segment of the Monterey Corridor, what would be the reason(s) continuing the trench farther south is not feasible? If the answer is increased cost, please be specific as to the amount of the increase and we question why that would equate to infeasibility in the context of the current estimated cost of $80.3 billion (CHSRA, 2020) to construct Phase 1 of the HSR between San Francisco and Los Angeles. Further, we note that Santa Clara County Measure B, which was passed in 2016, includes $314 million for Caltrain improvements between San Jose and Gilroy. Those funds could be used to contribute to the total cost of a modified Alternative 4 since the blended system directly benefits Caltrain.

To summarize, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6, we request that the trench variation of Alternative 4 be evaluated in the Final EIR/EIS because it meets the project objectives while at the same time avoiding or substantially lessening some of the significant environmental impacts of the project.

Alternative 4 with Grade Separations

If an evaluation of a modified version of Alternative 4 that places the blended system in a trench is evaluated and determined to be infeasible, we request evaluation of the following variation of Alternative 4 in the Monterey Corridor: At-Grade Blended System with Grade Separations. Under this variation, the blended system would be constructed at-grade as envisioned in Alternative 4, but with grade separations at Skyway Drive, Branham Lane, and Chynoweth Avenue. The designs for the grade separations could be similar to those shown under Alternative 2 for those three locations or other design options could be studied. In any case, the grade separations would avoid the safety & security and traffic impacts associated with at-grade crossings. Again, the impacts of the at-grade crossings are unacceptable to the community.

Traffic

Pages 3.2-62 to 3.2-64 note that, under NEPA criteria, Alternative 4 will impact five intersections in the Monterey Corridor. Please identify the five intersections and please provide specifics as to how the impacts at those intersections will be mitigated.

Safety and Security

SS-MM-#4, beginning on page 3.11-81, provides no concrete mitigation for the significant impacts of Alternative 4 to emergency vehicle response times. While potential solutions are listed, there are no details provided as to how the measures would mitigate the increase in response times. Also, the proposed monitoring of the situation is only for a near-term period, which does not take into account the full impact of the cumulative increase in the number of trains by year 2040. These deficiencies are a deferral of mitigation that does not comply with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(a). Also, mitigation must be enforceable as required by PRC §21081.6. Please revise SS-MM-#4 to provide the required details.

Noise and Vibration

For the Final EIR/EIS, please provide a table similar to Table 3.4-17 that shows the impacts of the alternatives assuming Quiet Zones are in place.

Will HSR use track ballast containing shredded rubber tires (as does VTA light rail) to reduce vibration impacts?

Comparing Table 3.4-26 to Table 3.4-17, the proposed noise barriers will benefit 905 of Alternative 4's 1,186 severely impacted receptors in the San Jose to Merced segment. That

leaves 281 unbenefited receptors. Why does Table 3.4-26 show the number of residual impacts as zero?

Table 3.4-34 shows that, even with Quiet Zones and noise barriers in place, there would be severe noise impacts at 179 receptors under Alternative 4 in the San Jose to Merced segment. Is there evidence that noise at these 179 receptors cannot be mitigated through acoustical treatment?

Figure 3.4-40 shows ten proposed noise barriers (heights of 8-14 feet) in the Monterey Corridor under Alternative 4. However, Figure 3.4-43 shows only three noise barriers (heights of 8-14 feet) in the Monterey Corridor under Alternative 4 with Quiet Zones in place. Under the Quiet Zone scenario, where noise barriers are no longer proposed, what type/height of barrier (if any) would be constructed along the HSR route?

Cultural Resources

The Monterey Corridor is part of the El Camino Real, which is designated as California Historical Landmark #784. We could not find discussion of this resource in Section 3.17 of the Draft EIR/EIS. Please include this resource in the Final EIR/EIS, along with an evaluation of the project's impacts, if any.

Conclusion

We thank you for your consideration of our comments on the Draft EIR/EIS. We look forward to your responses in the Final EIR/EIS. It is our hope that we can work together with you in achieving our goals and, at the same time, have an improved transportation system. Please contact Karen Lattin at kblattin@comcast.net if you have any questions regarding this letter.

Sincerely,

Leaders in the San Jose District 2 Leadership Council, and
Members of the South San Jose High Speed Rail Community Working Group

Karen Lattin, CWG, D2 Leadership Council, Los Paseos Neighborhood	**Greg Peck**, CWG, D2 Leadership Council, Los Paseos Neighborhood	**Amy Georgiades**, CWG, D2 Leadership Council, Los Paseos Neighborhood	**Norma Callender,** D2 Leadership Council, Santa Teresa Foothills Neighborhood Association
Brian Gurney, CWG, Tulare Hill HOA	**Alan Chan**, Los Paseos Neighborhood	**Barbara Canup,** Los Paseos Neighborhood	**Russ Failing,** President-Oak Grove NA
Manuel Souza, Hayes Neighborhood	**Judy Purrington**, Friends of Edenvale Library	**Perry Henry,** CCNA	**Mila Healy**, Cottle Lean Neighborhood
Sharad Gupta, D2 Leadership Council, Palmia Neighborhood	**Marie Arnold**, D2 Leadership Council, Blossom Valley NA	**Yazmin Rios**, Edenvale Great Oaks NA (EGOPIC)	**Janet Walde**, D2 Leadership Council
Elvera Faria, D2 Leadership Council, Cottle/Lean Neighborhood	**Herb Bowen,** Los Paseos Neighborhood	**Jon Reinke**, Santa Teresa Foothills Neighborhood Association	**John Hesler**, VP Santa Teresa Foothills Neighborhood Association
Ram Iyer, Station 121	**Carole Holcomb**, Cottle Lean Neighborhood	**James Patterson,** Vice President-Oak Grove NA & CWG	**Patricia Carlin,** CWG, Metcalf Neighborhood
Dave Wilkins, D2 Resident	**Lalbabu Prasad**, Hayes NA	**Jennie Han**, D2 Resident	**Darryl Ospring** D2 Leadership Council

Attachment: March 20, 2019 Letter to Brian Kelly

cc: Mayor Sam Liccardo & San Jose City Council
Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors
Nuria Fernandez & Board Members, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
Jim Hartnett & Board Members, Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board
Assemblyman Ash Kalra
Assemblyman Kansen Chu
Assemblyman Mark Stone
Senator Jim Beall
Senator Bill Monning
John Ristow, Director, San Jose Department of Transportation

District 2 Members of the San Jose High-Speed Rail Community Working Group
District 2 Neighborhood Leadership Council

March 20, 2019

Mr. Brian P. Kelly, Chief Executive Officer and Board of Directors
California High Speed Rail Authority
770 L Street, Suite 620
Sacramento, CA 95814

Subject: Request for High Speed Train Alternatives to be Evaluated for the Monterey Corridor in San Jose

Dear Mr. Kelly and CAHSRA Board Members,

The District 2 Members of the San Jose HSR Community Working Group (CWG) have been working with the California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) on behalf of the thousands of San Jose residents who live and work along the proposed High-Speed Rail (HSR) alignment in San Jose's Monterey Corridor. It is our understanding that the CHSRA is scheduled to identify a Preferred Alternative (PA) in September 2019, followed by the preparation of an EIS/EIR for the San Jose to Merced Segment, which includes the Monterey Corridor. The purpose of this letter is to request the study of a modified blended trench alternative that we believe will result in an HSR design that avoids or minimizes the adverse effects of the HSR on our community to the greatest extent feasible.

Significance of the Monterey Corridor

The Monterey Corridor area of concern in San Jose extends for a distance of approximately 7.9 miles between Capitol Expressway on the north and Bailey Avenue on the south. It includes Monterey Road, a major four- to six-lane arterial and the UPRR tracks that are utilized by Caltrain, Amtrak, and freight trains. Unless constructed in a manner that will minimize effects, the proposed construction of the HSR in the Monterey Corridor will result in unacceptable significant short- and long-term impacts to those who live and work along the Monterey Corridor. As a way of highlighting the importance of the Monterey Corridor, we note the following:

- Within a 500-foot wide band along the west side of the Corridor, there are more than 2,000 single-family, multi-family, and mobile home residences, many of which are directly adjacent to the UPRR tracks.
- Within a 500-foot wide band along the east side of the Corridor, there are more than 2,400 single-family, multi-family, and mobile home residences, many of which are directly across Monterey Road from the UPRR tracks.
- Assuming an average of 2.5 persons per dwelling unit, there are approximately 11,000 residents living along the Corridor.
- Within 500-feet of the Corridor, noise-sensitive land uses include the above-listed residences, Edenvale Garden Park, Ramac Park, and the Edenvale Library.
- There are hundreds of businesses in the Corridor whose access is directly to/from Monterey Road.
- Within the Corridor, there are three major east-west roadways that intersect with Monterey Road and cross the UPRR tracks at-grade: Chynoweth Avenue, Branham Lane, and Skyway Drive. These

roadways carry substantial volumes of traffic and Skyway Drive is an important emergency response route as San Jose Fire Station #18 is located at the northeast corner of Monterey Road/Skyway Drive.

- There is a large group of black walnut trees that line Monterey Road from San Jose to Gilroy that are designated Heritage Trees. The group of trees, known as Keesling's Black Walnut Shade Trees, is listed in the Santa Clara County Heritage Resource Inventory (approved by the Board of Supervisors 4/20/82) and the California Historical Resources Directory as a State Point of Interest (approved by the State Historical Resources Commission 7/02/85). A plaque marking this historic resource is located adjacent to the UPRR tracks 0.16-mile north of Skyway Drive.
- The Monterey Corridor is part of the El Camino Real, which is designated as California Historical Landmark #784.

Issues of Importance

In view of the above-listed substantial community and environmental resources that are present along the HSR alignment in the Monterey Corridor, we are focusing solutions that will achieve the following key goals to the greatest extent feasible:

- Avoid vehicular, pedestrian and bicycle safety, traffic operation, and emergency response impacts by grade separating Skyway Drive, Branham Lane, and Chynoweth Avenue from the HSR/Caltrain.
- Minimize noise & vibration impacts, both during construction and during the operational phase.
- Minimize right-of-way impacts, especially those that will require the acquisition of residences and/or businesses.
- Maintain access between Monterey Road and local businesses.
- Minimize disruption during construction by avoiding night-time work, requiring the use of low-emission construction equipment, and avoiding prolonged roadway closures/detours.
- Minimizing visual impacts, especially those associated with any elevated facilities.
- Preserving the historic Keesling Trees where feasible.

HSR Alternatives

We understand fully that there are trade-offs on a large project and that there is no such thing as a project with no effects. However, we believe that it is feasible to build an HSR project in the Monterey Corridor that achieves the objectives we listed above.

Similar to what is planned from the San Francisco to San Jose Segment, it is our understanding that a blended HSR/Caltrain system is being considered, which would allow the electrification of Caltrain to expand from south of the Tamien Station to Gilroy. The blended system would substantially reduce the footprint of the project (as compared to separate systems) and would allow for diesel-powered Caltrain engines to be replaced with electric trains, both of which we support.

To further reduce impacts, we request that one of the alternatives studied in the EIS/EIR be one where the HSR/Caltrain tracks are depressed in a trench along the Monterey Corridor between Capitol Expressway and Metcalf Road. This proposed alternative would consist of 3 tracks, with an existing freight track relocated at-grade to the east side of the UPRR right-of-way (i.e., away from the residences) as a first stage. This would

allow for the existing freight, Amtrak, and Caltrain service to continue uninterrupted, which we understand is mandatory. Once this occurs, construction of the 2-track HSR/Caltrain facility would take place in a trench, including retaining walls, in the vacant westerly portion of the UPRR right-of-way.

The advantages of this alternative would be substantial and would include the following:

- Most important, by depressing the HSR/Caltrain tracks, there would be no future at-grade crossings of Skyway Drive, Branham Lane, and Chynoweth Avenue by HSR/Caltrain, which would avoid the traffic, vehicular, pedestrian and bicycle safety, and emergency response impacts of an at-grade design. The only remaining at-grade crossing would be for the occasional freight trains and twice daily Amtrak trains.
- The noise and visual impacts of this design would be much less than an at-grade or elevated system.
- By only depressing the two HSR/Caltrain tracks, we assume that construction would be quicker and less costly than if all three tracks were depressed. Please let us know if this assumption is accurate.

If it is determined that this proposed alternative is not feasible for Capitol to Metcalf, we would respectfully request that it be considered for a shorter segment that would include the intersections of Skyway, Branham and Chynoweth to avoid the significant impacts not having grade separations at these intersections would create.

While we understand that an elevated design alternative, whereby the system is constructed on a viaduct, may have certain advantages, we believe that its visual and aesthetic aspects would be significant and unmitigable, as well as be incompatible with the surrounding uses and the corridor's designation as a California Historical Landmark. While such a design may be acceptable for an industrial or rural setting, it is not desirable for a corridor that is predominantly bordered by residences, especially when there are other feasible options. To this point, we note the permanent adverse visual effects from where BART is elevated on a viaduct through residential areas in various East Bay cities.

Conclusion

We thank you for your consideration of the requests stated in this letter. It is our hope that we can work together with you in achieving our goals and, at the same time, have an improved transportation system. Please contact Karen Lattin at kblattin@comcast.net if you have any questions regarding this letter.

Sincerely,

District 2 Members of the San Jose High-Speed Rail Community Working Group and Leaders in the San Jose District 2 Neighborhood Leadership Council (D2 NLC)

Karen Lattin CWG D2 NLC Los Paseos Neighborhood	Greg Peck CWG D2 NLC Los Paseos Neighborhood	Amy Georgiades CWG D2 NLC Los Paseos Neighborhood	Patricia Carlin CWG Metcalf Neighborhood	Brian Gurney CWG Tulare Hill HOA
James Patterson CWG Member-at-Large-Oak Grove NA	Manuel Souza CWG Hayes Neighborhood	Barbara Canup Los Paseos Neighborhood	Alan Chan Los Paseos Neighborhood	Russ Failing President-Oak Grove NA
Judy Purrington Friends of Edenvale Library	Perry Henry CCNA	Mila Heally Cottle Lean Neighborhood	Dave Wilkins D2 Resident	Rose Combs D2 Resident
Marie Arnold D2 NLC D2 Resident	Yazmin Rios Edenvale Great Oaks NA (EGOPIC)	Jon Reinke Santa Teresa Foothills Neighborhood Association	John Hesler Santa Teresa Foothills Neighborhood Association	Elvera Faria D2 NLC Cottle/Lean Neighborhood
Herb Bowen Los Paseos Neighborhood	Norma Callender D2 NLC	Janet Walde D2 NLC	Lalbabu Prasad Hayes NA	Jerry Lewis Hayes Neighborhood
Janet Lewis Hayes Neighborhood	Carole Holcomb D2 NLC			

Cc: Boris Lipkin, Northern CA Regional Director, CAHSRA
Morgan Galli, Interim Northern California Regional Stakeholder Manager, CAHSRA
Mayor Sam Liccardo & San Jose City Council
Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors
John Ristow, Acting Director, San Jose Department of Transportation
Board of Directors, Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board
Senator Jim Beall
Senator Bill Monning
Assemblyman Ash Kalra
Assemblyman Mark Stone
Board of Directors, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority