



Memorandum

Date: May 25, 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

Executive Transition

On April 21, 2017, the California High-Speed Rail Authority announced that after five years of service, Chief Executive Officer Jeff Morales will step down from his position early this summer, after the Board of Directors is expected to select a replacement.

“It has been a true honor to be a part of this important and historic program. I am very proud of the progress we have made in advancing the nation’s first high-speed rail system, against the odds and in spite of all the obstacles,” said Morales in a [letter](#) sent today to Governor Jerry Brown and the California High-Speed Rail Authority’s staff and Board of Directors.

Morales was named chief executive officer in May 2012 and will work closely with the Authority’s Board to ensure the smooth transition of a successor. The Authority’s Board of Directors is expected to meet in the coming weeks to consider a new Chief Executive Officer.

May Board Meeting

During the May 10, 2017 meeting, the Board met in a closed session to discuss the appointment of a new Chief Executive Officer (CEO) and adjourned further discussion to a future meeting date and time. In the interim, the Board appointed Chief Counsel Tom Fellenz as acting CEO starting on June 3, 2017.

On May 10, 2017, California Speaker of the Assembly, Anthony Rendon, appointed Assemblymember Dr. Joaquin Arambula as an Ex-Officio member to the California High-Speed Rail Authority Board of Directors. Dr. Arambula has been a long-time advocate for the high-speed rail program and was elected in April 2016 in a special election to represent California’s 31st Assembly District.

The next Board meeting will be on Wednesday, June 14, 2017.

Notice of Shortlist RFQ16-13 Early Train Operator

The Authority has completed its evaluation of all Statements of Qualifications submitted in response to the Early Train Operator Request for Qualifications (RFQ16-13). The Authority has determined that the following teams have submitted qualified Statements of Qualifications and will be invited to participate in the second phase Request for Proposals (RFP16-13) once the RFP is released. The teams on the shortlist are listed in alphabetical order as follows:

- China HSR ETO Consortium

- DB International USA
- FS First Rail Group
- Renfe
- Stagecoach Group plc

Additional information regarding RFQ16-13 can be found [here](#).

Growing Support for High-Speed Rail in the Central Valley

A new Fresno State survey shows 58 percent of San Joaquin Valley residents support the construction of the high-speed rail project. When asked about how they would use the high-speed rail if it was completed, 66 percent of respondents said they would use it for business, pleasure, or both. You can read the full survey results [here](#).

May Construction Update

In the May Construction Update, rapid progress is taking place at various work sites in the Central Valley including a new site that has come online in the southernmost area of Construction Package 1. All of this work is being carried out by more than 180 small businesses and 1,100 construction workers. Read the latest news from our work sites in the May Construction Update [here](#) or watch the new construction video [here](#).

San Francisco to San Jose Project Section Update

April Open House Meetings

In April, the Authority hosted three Community Open House meetings on the range of alternatives under consideration for the San Francisco to San Jose Project Section. The Open Houses provided 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. Over 234 stakeholders attended and 88 written comments were received. Comments focused on a variety of topics including the following key areas and issues:

- Safety
 - Grade separation plans and funding
 - Station platforms
 - Pedestrians and bicycles
 - Speed of trains near residential locations
 - Frequency of high-speed trains through busy at-grade crossings
- Traffic impacts
- Noise impacts (including horn noise, vibrations, decibel levels)
- 4-track Millbrae Station
 - Impacts
 - Design/photos
 - Advantages for operations
- Accessibility
 - Intermodal connectivity
- Eminent domain
- Quality of train trip and rider experience
- Additional outreach in Belmont, Redwood City, San Carlos, Millbrae, Visitacion Valley

- Light Maintenance Facility
 - Impact on Brisbane Baylands (potential site for housing) and Schlage development
 - Size (proposed needed acreage is significantly larger than some European LMFs)
- Impact of high-speed trains on flights out of SFO
- Pedestrian/bicycle access
- Schedules and Service
 - High-Speed Rail impacts on Caltrain schedule and service
 - Preserving integrity of Caltrain service
 - Coordinate schedules of commuter vs. freight trains
 - Clearly articulate the effects of additional passing tracks on Caltrain service
- Pollution
- Impacts of wind speed and related mitigation options
- Funding/budget concerns
- Consider aesthetics in design of:
 - Stations
 - Aerial viaduct into Diridon Station

Materials from the Open House meetings can be found on the website [here, in the Community Meetings section](#). The next round of Open House meetings will occur before the Preferred Alternative (PA) is presented to the Authority Board of Directors.

Upcoming LPMG Meetings

The next LPMG meeting scheduled for **Thursday, June 29, 2017** from 6:00 – 8:00 pm at SamTrans in the 2nd Floor Auditorium (1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070).



Local Policy Makers Group (LPMG) Summary Meeting Notes for April 27, 2017

Summary Notes

Venue: Caltrain Offices, 1250 San Carlos Ave., 2nd-floor Auditorium, San Carlos, CA 94070

Members Present:

City/County	Representative or Alternative	Present	
		Yes	No
Atherton	C. Wiest	X	
Belmont	E. Reed		X
Burlingame	E. Beach	X	
Menlo Park	R. Cline		X
Millbrae	R. Holober		X
Mountain View	L. Siegel		X
Palo Alto	G. Tanaka	X	
Redwood City	S. Masur	X	
San Bruno	K. Ibarra		X
San Carlos	M. Olbert	X	
San Francisco	G. Gillett	X	
San Jose	D. Davis	X	
San Mateo	J. Goethals		X
Santa Clara	K. Wanatabe	X	
South San Francisco	K. Matsumoto	X	
Sunnyvale	G. Larsson	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: B. Tripousis, R. Graham, M. Galli, W. Gimpel, B. Fukuji, J. Litzinger, R. Walters, 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.

Chair Gee noted that there was a recent press conference in which local elected officials appealed to the federal government regarding the benefits of funding the Caltrain electrification program. The Transbay Joint Powers Authority (TJPA) Board announced that the substantial

completion of the Transbay Transit Center is anticipated to be achieved in December 2017 with revenue service by Muni and AC Transit anticipated in March 2018.

2. High-Speed Rail Program Update

Tripousis provided an update on the statewide program. The 2017 Project Update Report was released on March 1, 2017 and is available on the Authority's website [here](#). This report was submitted to the California Legislature and provides an update on statewide activities and accomplishments.

On March 15, 2017, there were two new appointments made to the Authority Board of Directors: Ernest Camacho was appointed as a voting Board member and Jim Beall was appointed as an ex-officio member. The Authority's next Board of Directors Meeting will be held on May 10 in Sacramento, CA.

Tripousis noted that the Authority is currently reviewing Statements of Qualifications submitted in response to the Early Train Operator Request for Qualifications (RFQ16-13). A short list of teams will be identified and invited to participate in the second phase Request for Proposals (RFP16-13).

Morgan Galli, Northern California Outreach Manager, provided an overview of the Authority's #iwillride program. This program is open to college students interested in the California High-Speed Rail Project. Galli shared that the Authority will host a symposium and high-speed rail construction tour for #iwillride participants in Fresno on April 28, 2017.

LPMG Member Comments, Questions & Answers

- Q: What was the source of funds for the Road 27 and Road 8 grade separations in Fresno?
A: These were federal funds allocated specifically for the construction in the Central Valley.
- Q: Why was there a decision to pursue grade separations in Fresno and not along the Peninsula?
A: The Authority is analyzing what would be the most practicable alternatives along the Peninsula. Having alternatives that are practicable are a federal standard that the Authority needs to meet. With high-speed rail trains operating along a blended corridor at 110 mph, a fully grade-separated alignment is not mandated. The California Public Utilities Commission requires grade separation for rail operations faster than 125 mph. Grade separating 42 crossings before revenue service is a challenge for the Authority and for local communities. The Authority is looking to partner with local cities on grade separation projects, similar to what is being done with the City of San Mateo.

3. San Francisco to San Jose Project Section Update

Tripousis reviewed the milestone schedule for the San Francisco to San Jose Project Section. Station planning, technical analyses, and outreach activities are currently underway. In summer 2017, the Authority intends to identify a Preferred Alternative (PA). The draft environmental

document is planned for release and public comment in fall 2017. The final environmental document and Record of Decision is anticipated to be released in 2018. These schedules are all subject to change and are developed in coordination with the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA).

Project Section Progression

Will Gimpel, San Francisco to San Jose Project Manager, summarized how the Project Section alternatives have progressed and been narrowed over time. Gimpel reviewed the following alternatives and the reason(s) why the Authority screened them out of current consideration. The years in parentheses note when the alternative was eliminated from current consideration.

- Altamont Corridor Alternative (2008)
 - Impacts to wetlands, waterbodies and the environment
 - Strong support from local cities, agencies and organizations for maximum service to San Francisco and San Jose high-speed stations
- Highway 101 and I-280 Alternatives (2008)
 - Environmental and socioeconomic impacts
 - Lack of connectivity
 - Constructability and cost factor
- Fully grade-separated, four-track system (2011)
 - Additional community impacts
 - Substantially higher-costs (\$6 billion)
 - Substantial construction impacts
 - Legislation (SB 1029)

Gimpel noted that, while a new tunnel alignment from Brisbane to Transbay Transit Center is feasible under a future environmental review process, it is not being considered in the Authority's current environmental analysis due to construction challenges and cost. Similarly, while a mid-peninsula high-speed rail station is also not currently under consideration, nothing precludes a station from being studied in a future environmental process.

Range of Alternatives Under Consideration

Gimpel review the Range of Alternatives currently being studied. 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 alignment 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: an 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 less construction and environmental impacts than Alternative B.

Common Project Elements

Gimpel shared that there are common project elements that will be developed regardless of the alternative pursued. These elements include:

- At the 4th & King station, there will be two platforms and four platform faces for the exclusive 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.
- Both alternatives will operate trains at up to 110 mph along the Peninsula and will achieve operating four high-speed rail trains and six Caltrain 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 41 at-grade roadway crossings along the Peninsula. This includes three planned grade-separation projects at 25th, 28th, & 31st Avenues in San Mateo.
- 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. The Authority will address the hold-out rule at both the Broadway and Atherton Caltrain Stations.

Light Maintenance Facility (LMF)

Gimpel reviewed the narrowing of alternatives for an LMF location. In 2010, the Authority considered the following locations for an LMF.

- Port of San Francisco
 - Site area was too small
 - Difficult to access from the Caltrain mainline
 - Would require construction of a two-level facility which would increase construction impacts and costs
 - Operationally infeasible
- San Francisco International Airport
 - Difficult to access from the Caltrain mainline
 - Operationally infeasible

Currently, the Authority is analyzing two sites in Brisbane as potential locations for an LMF, designated Brisbane East and Brisbane West. Brisbane East would require approximately 105 acres and would relocate the Caltrain Bayshore Station Southbound platform to the south end of the existing station. Brisbane West would require approximately 95 acres. It would also relocate the Caltrain Bayshore Station southbound platform and east parking lot to the south end of the existing station.

Passing Tracks

The passing track alternatives the Authority previously considered include the Middle 3-Track Passing Track Option and the Long Middle 4-Track Passing Track Option. These alternatives are not being studied in the Authority's current environmental analysis for the following reasons:

- Middle 3-Passing Track Option
 - Greatest amount of community impacts, construction and cost
 - Impacts to 16 at-grade crossings
 - Adjacent to 8.3 miles of residential land uses
- Long Middle 4-Track Passing Track Option
 - More construction and community impacts compared to Short Middle 4-Track
 - Impacts to 6 at-grade crossings
 - Adjacent to 2.3 miles of residential land uses

The Authority is currently reviewing the Short Middle 4-Track Passing Track Option and No Additional Passing Track Option. The operational implications of both passing track alternatives will be included in the Authority's draft environmental document. The No Additional Passing Track Option has fewer environmental impacts than the Short Middle 4-Track Passing Track Option. The No Additional Passing Track Option avoids construction, right-of-way (ROW), and aesthetic impacts that would occur with additional passing tracks. This option would require Caltrain to periodically wait for high-speed trains to pass at existing four-track sections (Brisbane, Redwood City and Lawrence). Gimpel noted that a Millbrae 4-track station would provide another opportunity to pass local trains.

The Short Middle 4-Track Passing Track Option would be six miles long and extend from south of 9th Avenue in San Mateo to north of Whipple Avenue in Redwood City. This alternative would include portions that are aerial and portions that are at-grade, including incorporating the 25th Avenue Grade Separation Project in San Mateo. Should this alternative be pursued, modifications to the Hayward Park, Hillsdale, Belmont, and San Carlos Caltrain stations would be required. The Short Middle 4-Track Passing Track Option provides additional operational flexibility compared to No Additional Passing Track Option.

Approach to Diridon Station

The Authority is studying three approaches to Diridon Station: a short viaduct, a long viaduct; and an at-grade approach. 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 allow for ramping up the viaduct. The assessment of the short viaduct is a result of feedback the Authority received from residents of the Newhall neighborhood. During the Scoping Period for the San Francisco to San Jose Project Section, Newhall residents provided comments proposing that the viaduct start at I-880, which would minimize viewshed and noise impacts. 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. Should an aerial approach not be pursued, high-speed rail would use an at-grade approach following the existing Caltrain corridor.

LPMG Member Comments, Questions & Answers

- Q: Where in relation to the proposed LMF facilities is the Baylands project planned for?
 - A: The developer of the Baylands project, Universal Paragon Corporation (UPC), is considering development in the same areas the Authority is proposing for both the Brisbane East and Brisbane West LMF options. The Authority is meeting with UPC and the City of Brisbane to discuss the needs of the high-speed rail system and the development goals of the Baylands project.
- Q: Passing tracks have been discussed in regards to operational versus infrastructure impacts. Is there evidence that additional passing tracks are safer?
 - A: Additional passing tracks themselves would not necessarily make the peninsula corridor safer.
- Q: How would the Short Middle 4-Track Passing Track Option be constructed? I have heard 75-foot structures would be needed, which is very concerning for San Carlos residents.

- A: Specific details of the Short Middle 4-Track Passing Track Option will be presented at a later date. The Authority intends to avoid significant impacts and is weighing operational benefits with community impacts. There would be no 60-75-foot structures for the Short Middle 4-Track Passing Track Option. The 75-foot structure alluded to is for sea level elevation, not linear footage of the structure itself. This means there would be a 50-foot structure to allow for clearance of the historic station, which cannot be relocated. If the historic station could be moved, the structure for the Short Middle 4-Track Passing Track Option could be lower.
- Q: Is the Authority only considering the Short Middle 4-Track Passing Track Option as an additional passing track?
 - A: The Authority is currently only studying the Short Middle 4-Track Passing Track Option and the No Additional Passing Track Option.
- C: Caltrain has raised concerns over the Short Middle 4-Track Passing Track Option and the No Additional Passing Track Option. In 2012 and 2013, the Authority and Caltrain conducted a joint study of four additional passing track alternatives. This study indicated the Long Middle 4-Track Passing Track was best operationally, however, it did not consider right-of-way or community impacts. Caltrain's current analysis shows considerable delays with two high-speed rail trains being added to the blended system without an additional passing track. Both parties are looking to balance uninterrupted, reliable service with community impacts. Caltrain has asked the Authority to study all four additional passing track options studied in 2012-2013 in its current environmental analysis.
 - A: The Authority will be meeting with Caltrain and FRA in the coming weeks to have in-depth conversations on passing tracks. The Authority would be happy to discuss the outcomes of these discussions with the LPMG. This discussion could be part of a future LPMG meeting or a fully separate, agenized working session.
- C: What matters to local communities in regards to the passing track alternatives is the impacts to Caltrain and high-speed rail schedules. This is a missing component in the Authority's outreach efforts, especially with the release of the PA in the summer of 2017. Community members are not fully briefed on the issue and are unable to provide informed feedback on their preference.
 - A: The Authority will host public meetings before the PA is announced. During these meetings, the Authority will have a better understanding of operations and impacts on schedules for both Caltrain and high-speed rail trains.
- C: If the Authority is considering a 4-track station at Millbrae for an additional passing opportunity, it should be shown explicitly on the maps the Authority presents publically. The City of Millbrae needs to be involved in discussions regarding a 4-track Millbrae Station.
 - A: The Authority can certainly add the potential 4-track station at Millbrae in its maps. The Authority meets with elected officials from Millbrae and its city staff regularly.
- Q: Is the Authority planning on meeting with city councils and community organizations that would be effected by passing tracks?
 - A: Yes, the Authority is happy to meet with any and all councils and community groups and welcomes LPMG suggestions on further outreach.

- C: When the Authority presents to communities and city councils about impacts of the high-speed rail project, it would be beneficial to include metrics that speak to traffic impacts and how a lack of grade separations would compound that issue. A measurement of the business hours a crossing is closed would also be helpful.
 - A: The Authority is analyzing all impacts related to at-grade crossing. While those specific metrics are not currently available, the Authority will have a clearer understanding on effected intersections as it completes its environmental analysis. Gate down time on a location basis will also be analyzed in the EIR.
- Q: Are more detailed maps of the proposed alignments available?
 - A: These are available on the Authority's website [here](#).
- Q: Is there a high-speed rail train schedule available?
 - A: Schedules have not yet been determined. The Authority is currently reviewing Statements of Qualification to bring an Early Train Operator on-board. The Early Train Operator will assist the Authority in determining the design and operations of the statewide system, which will include determining the schedule.
- Q: I have heard \$4 billion is being spent in Southern California for grade separations. Is that correct? Why does Southern California get money for grade separations but not the Peninsula? How fast would high-speed rail trains be traveling there?
 - A: That is not an accurate statement. Our 2016 Business Plan estimates that approximately \$4 billion dollars is needed to build the entire Burbank to Anaheim Project Section. This includes new high-speed rail tracks, electrification, the signaling systems, stations, etc. This also includes some grade separation projects along this corridor as necessary. This is similar to our plans for the Peninsula where beyond Caltrain electrification, we will be making additional investments in the corridor to facilitate high-speed rail service there. For more details on the Southern California investments, please see pages 53-57 in our 2016 Business Plan: http://hsr.ca.gov/docs/about/business_plans/2016_BusinessPlan.pdf. As for the speed of our trains in Southern California, they would travel up to 110 mph in urbanized areas (just as in Northern California) based on regulations set forth by the Federal Railroad Administration. This practice is also consistent with existing high-speed rail systems around the world, where trains operate slower in urban corridors.
- C: If a city or county provides funds for a grade separation project, would the Authority match it?
 - A: Yes, the Authority would consider such an arrangement. The 25th, 28th, and 31st Avenue grade-separation project in San Mateo is an example. For this project, the Authority has committed \$84 million, the City of San Mateo has committed \$12 million, and the County of San Mateo has committed approximately \$85 million. Having the Authority as a partner in these types of investments makes addressing grade separations along the Peninsula more feasible.

April Open House Meetings

Galli summarized the Authority's April 2017 Open Houses, which focused on the range of alternatives under consideration. Galli noted that 234 people signed into these meetings and that over 86 comments were received. Key themes of the comments received at these meetings include: safety; noise; traffic impacts; funding/budget concerns; multi-modal connectivity;

urban/economic impacts around high-speed rail stations; and high-speed rail Caltrain service times and operations.

Galli then discussed the April 19th City/County Staff Coordinating Group (CSCG) meeting. In this meeting, CSCG members engaged in a discussion with Authority staff on the alternatives for project elements the San Francisco to San Jose Project Section. Key themes of this discussion included the following:

- LMF
 - The East LMF option would afford the City of Brisbane with more opportunities for development projects closer to the rest of the city
- Passing Tracks
 - Request for both operational and environmental impacts and to consider all potential tradeoffs of the passing track alternatives
 - The potential to use the existing 4-tracks in Redwood City as passing tracks
 - Request for more outreach to cities that could be impacted by the potential additional passing tracks (San Mateo, Belmont, San Carlos, Redwood City)
 - How planned and future grade separation projects will be considered as the Authority analyzes passing track alternatives
- Approach into Diridon
 - Level of detail of impacts that will be captured in the EIR/EIS
 - The degree to which existing grade separations would be modified with each of the Approach to Diridon options

Galli proposed scheduling the next Authority-hosted LPMG on June 29th. Chair Gee asked LPMG members in attendance if this schedule change was acceptable, which LPMG members affirmed.

LPMG Member Comments, Questions & Answers

- Q: Has the Authority met with City of Santa Clara staff regarding the Approach to Diridon Station alternatives?
 - A: Yes, City of Santa Clara staff are represented on the CSCG. The Authority is happy to address any other questions on the Approach to Diridon Station that they may have.

4. Public Comments/Questions

- C: Additional passing tracks would make the Peninsula corridor safer if they are designed correctly.
- C: The \$84 million in funds outlined in the Memorandum of Understanding for Hillsdale Station still has not been signed.
- C: The building size and acreage for both LMF options the Authority is proposing are significantly larger than the heavy maintenance facilities for high-speed rail in London.
- C: Five years ago, the California High-Speed Rail Peer Review Group noted that the Authority appears to be proposing an approach where a train operator would be excluded from an effective role in the design of the tracks, signals, and rolling stock of the statewide system. In doing so, the Authority is jeopardizing the health of system and

discouraging private investment by making decisions that are best suited to be made by the operator. The private sector needs to be brought into process much sooner than what is being proposed.

- C: Operational flexibility is not something everyone understands; the Authority needs to be clearer that this means trains schedules. I encourage the Authority to provide more concrete examples of the benefits and impacts the passing track alternatives would have on schedules.
- C: I am representing the Greater East San Carlos Neighborhood Association. We have worked with Caltrain, SamTrans, and the JPB and they have submitted legal assurances that Old County Road in San Carlos would never be encroached upon. Now the Authority is proposing a 50-foot structure for passing tracks that would run right above Old County Road. As such, the Greater East San Carlos Neighborhood Association would like to request a meeting with the Authority to discuss passing tracks and to ensure that they not encroach on our community.
- C: The Authority noted that public meetings focused on the PA will be held in the summer of 2017. This should be moved to the fall as many local residents will be away on vacation during the summer. It would be great to see TJPA and Caltrain support Alternative A as it would avoid the impacts associated with building additional passing tracks. I am concerned over the funds going towards Caltrain electrification and if that would mean the Authority would own part of the ROW along the Peninsula. I am also concerned over the impacts high-speed rail trains would have on the Caltrain schedule. More information is needed on the operational benefits, physical and property impacts, and costs associated with the Long Middle 4-Track Passing Track option.

5. LPMG Member Comment/Requests

- C: LPMG members have drafted a letter to Union Pacific which asks for a public comment period on their request for proposal for a short line operator. If the public is not allowed an opportunity to express its concerns on grade separations, the current standards for grade separations will be maintained. The letter to UP was then read aloud and can be found in its entirety in Appendix A.
- Q: To avoid passing through the South Bay, is it possible for freight go over the Dumbarton Bridge?
 - A: That is a separate study that has implications beyond the purview of the LPMG.
- C: The LPMG is not empowered to sign the letter to UP. I would ask LPMG members to review this with their respective councils and for Caltrain to review as well for discussion at the next LPMG meeting.

6. Next Meeting

The next Caltrain-hosted LPMG meeting will occur on May 25, 2017. The next Authority-hosted LPMG meeting will be held on June 29, 2017.

Appendix A: Union Pacific Letter

Francisco Castillo
Director of Public Affairs
Union Pacific Railroad
(916) 789-5957
fcastillo@up.com

Re: Cities' Letter to Union Pacific to inform Short-Haul Freight Operator Request for Proposals (RFP) regarding Peninsula Grade Separations

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on your RFP process. We look forward to the opportunity to develop a close relationship with a smaller, specialized short-line freight operator. We believe that this change will facilitate a collaborative passenger-freight relationship and also allow Union Pacific Railroad to focus its resources on the operation of its extensive mainline network.

The Peninsula cities consider the Caltrain corridor to be a vital resource for a vastly improved passenger operation, as well as a coordinated and complementary rail freight service. We note three concurrent actions along the right-of-way that create significant opportunity:

- Electrification of Caltrain – which will allow higher levels of train service at lower cost;
- Assignment of freight rights to a short-line operator – allowing a coordinated and locally-based collaboration between passenger and freight service; and
- Eventual grade separation of the entire Caltrain right-of-way from San Francisco to San Jose.

We believe that to achieve the most benefit for all parties, all the parties should work together to develop new “ground rules” that strengthen the economy and enhance the quality of life of our dynamic region.

The electrification of Caltrain will allow for higher grades, as electric service can easily deal with up to a two percent grade. At the same time, the short-line operator will be starting service with a “clean slate.” Past design criteria have considered long, heavy freight trains that need limited grades. Short-line operators generally operate short trains during limited windows of operation, and the grade restrictions are less severe.

Grade separations, which are in everyone's interest, are more easily and thoughtfully delivered if the engineering criteria allow for grades in excess of those provided for today (one percent). The existing, restrictive criteria create large projects that consume huge sums and create significant neighborhood impacts.

In anticipation of Caltrain electrification, the Peninsula cities expect to work with Caltrain to amend the design criteria to provide for a two percent grade design standard. Grades exceeding two percent are likely to require design exceptions.

We ask that Union Pacific, as part of your RFP, indicate to potential bidders that this change is likely and that the short-line operator will be expected to operate on a system that includes grades up to two percent. Projects exceeding this standard will still require a design exception, for which the short-line operator will have significant consultation rights.

The undersigned want to see the at-grade crossings eliminated along the entire corridor, to promote the safety and health of the railroads, enhance the safety and quality of life of residents and businesses along the corridor, and create opportunities for smart growth in the historic centers of Peninsula communities.

Separating train traffic from other modes at intersections will take many years and even more capital investment than electrification itself, and it will be led by the cities where those crossings remain. To complete corridor-long grade separation, we wish to partner with Union Pacific, its designated short-line operator, Caltrain, and regional agencies.

We see the selection of a short-line operator as an opportunity to modernize and improve freight rail, possibly including an electrified fleet, as well as to make improvements that will benefit everyone along the corridor.

Working together, we can support the short-line operator, as well as the new Trackage Rights Agreement, when the matter comes to the Caltrain Joint Powers Board as well as the federal Surface Transportation Board.

In partnership.