



**San Mateo County Community Working Group
October 22, 2018, Meeting Summary
Millbrae Library
1 Library Avenue, Millbrae, CA 94030
6:00 PM – 8:00 PM**

Attendance:

CWG Members

Joe Baylock (Burlingame Resident), Ross Bruce (Burlingame Community Leader), Christina Fernandez (San Mateo County Economic Development Association), Paul Jones (Atherton Rail Committee), Christine Kohl-Zaugg (Sustainable San Mateo County), Anthony Lazarus (Redwood City Forward), Brian Oh (San Mateo County Health), Leora Tanjuatco-Ross (Housing Leadership Council of San Mateo)

Members of the Public

Roland Lebrun (Santa Teresa Bernal Neighborhood Association)

California High-Speed Rail Authority Staff and Partners

Boris Lipkin, Bruce Fukuji, Morgan Galli, James Tung, Yosef Yip, Matt Marvin, Kelsey Rugani

1. Introductions

Kelsey Rugani, Facilitator, introduced California High-Speed Rail Authority (Authority) staff. South Peninsula Community Working Group (CWG) members and members of the public also introduced themselves. Gettleman reviewed the agenda and described the purpose of the CWG, noting it consists of a voluntary group of community members representing a broad range of local interests and is intended to deepen community input into the high-speed rail planning process. He then discussed the reorganization of the previous Santa Clara County CWG into the current South Peninsula CWG. This change reflects stakeholder feedback to focus on communities within Santa Clara County, but north of San Jose and includes the cities of Palo Alto, Sunnyvale, Mountain View, and Santa Clara. The San Jose and Morgan Hill-Gilroy CWG will continue to focus their discussions on planning efforts in the southern portion of the county.

2. California High-Speed Rail Program Updates and Background

Boris Lipkin, Northern California Regional Director, provided an update on the statewide program. He began by noting leadership changes within the Executive Leadership and Northern California teams. In addition to Lipkin's appointment to Northern California Regional Director, changes in leadership include:

- Brian Kelly, Chief Executive Officer
- Joseph Hedges, Chief Operating Officer
- Pamela Mizukami, Chief Deputy Officer
- Rebecca Kohlstrand, Northern California Director of Projects

- James Tung, San Francisco to San Jose Project Section Manager

Lipkin continued by noting the Executive Leadership's initial actions to position the program for success in 2018. The first action was the development of the 2018 Business Plan, which was adopted by the Authority's Board of Directors on May 15, 2018. The second step was the approval of a Program Baseline, which identifies the specific scope, schedule, and budget associated with the vision outlined in the 2018 Business Plan. The third step is a revision to the Program Management Plan, which establishes the organizational structure needed to accomplish the targets and goals of Business Plan and Program Baseline.

Lipkin then described the principles and goals for the 2018 Business Plan, which include initiating service as soon as possible; pursuing strategic and concurrent investments that are linked over time and provide mobility, economic and environmental benefits; and positioning the program to initiate the construction of project segments as funding becomes available. The Business Plan outlines the following schedule for delivery of service:

- 2026-2027: Potential early service and operations within the Central Valley and between San Francisco to Gilroy that is currently under review
- 2029: Completing Valley to Valley Service, which connects the Central Valley to Silicon Valley and the Bay Area and will require the completion of tunnels in the Pacheco Pass, which the Authority is currently completing geotechnical analyses and identifying financing packages for

Lipkin discussed the relationship between high-speed rail and the larger picture of other transportation projects in the Bay Area, such as the Diridon Integrated Station Concept (DISC) and the Salesforce Transit Center, among others. Additionally, Caltrain is working on a Business Plan that will outline Caltrain's vision for the Peninsula rail corridor in 2040.

Connecting Communities Strategy

Bruce Fukuji, Northern California Planning Manager, discussed the Connecting Communities Strategy. This process began in 2016 in which CWG members identified community values as they pertain to factors like the economy, mobility, and livability. CWG members also participated in a mapping exercise that identified communities of concern, community resources, and potential areas for development. This information informs the ongoing environmental and engineering analyses. In 2017, the Authority brought the results of the 2016 exercise back to CWG members to validate and allow clarifications or additions to previously stated priorities. Since then, the Authority has gathered additional information on projects from local jurisdictions and organized them into the following categories:

- *Integration*: incorporation of feedback into the Authority's planning efforts, such as the inclusion of a CWG-suggested short viaduct alternative in the approach to Diridon Station in the Authority's environmental document
- *Collaboration*: coordinated efforts between the Authority and local jurisdictions to advance projects of mutual interest, such as improving bicycle and pedestrian access at 4th and King Station
- *Local projects*: projects that fall outside of the parameters for high-speed but that the Authority can assist local jurisdictions secure financing for

By going through this process, the Authority has become a conduit for local jurisdictions to secure financing for projects through a variety of state funding programs. The Authority is one of several state agencies funded by California's Cap and Trade Program that provides investments in natural resources, energy, and transportation projects at a local level. However, it is the only one that has a statewide outreach program that has collected and categorized planned projects being proposed and developed at a local level. As such, the Authority has been able to inform other state agencies as to what is being planned locally and, in turn, can provide local jurisdictions guidance on what grant programs are available for completing their projects.

CWG Members' Questions and Comments

The following questions, comments and responses were recorded following Lipkin and Fukuji's presentations (Q= question, R= response, C= comment):

- Q: When will the Authority make a decision on the procurement of trains?
 - R: The procurement of train sets is still under discussion.
- Q: How much will the tunnels in the Pacheco Pass cost?
 - R: Around \$6-8 billion.
- Q: Is Pennsylvania Avenue still the preferred alternative for the downtown extension (DTX) from 4th and King to the Salesforce Transit Center?
 - R: The Authority does not manage that project. The City of San Francisco recently selected Pennsylvania Avenue as the preferred alternative for an extension of the DTX.
- Q: Will the Authority be paying for DTX?
 - R: The Authority is a funding partner for DTX but is not responsible for providing all funding to complete it.
- Q: What state agency does the Authority coordinate with for transit-oriented development (TOD) projects as it relates to the Connecting Communities Strategy?
 - R: TOD projects are primarily handled by the Strategic Growth Council.
- Q: Is the Authority identifying locations for affordable housing south of San Jose?
 - R: While the Authority does not have land-use authority, it does support planning grants for high-speed rail station areas that can include affordable housing.
- Q: Understanding the Authority does not have land use authority, what can be done to ensure high-speed rail connects to affordable housing and access to job centers?
 - R: The Authority has working partnerships with station cities to support those kind of results. Additionally, the Authority acts as a conduit between grant programs and local projects as part of the Connecting Community Strategies.
- Q: What is the nature of the relationship between the Authority and individual cities? For example, can the Authority ensure that housing is developed densely and accommodates low-income populations?
 - R: Outside of the property the Authority acquires for the purposes of building and operating high-speed rail, it does not have any land use control so it is dependent on the cities to develop station areas.

3. San Francisco to San Jose Project Section Overview

James Tung, San Francisco to San Jose Project Section Manager, provided an overview of the range of alternatives under consideration for the San Francisco to San Jose Project Section. There are two alternatives for the project section, which are described below:

- Alternative A
 - East side option light maintenance facility in Brisbane
 - No additional passing tracks
 - At-grade (or on existing facilities) throughout the project section
- Alternative B
 - West side option light maintenance facility in Brisbane
 - Six miles of additional passing tracks between San Mateo and Redwood City
 - Short or long viaduct in the approach to Diridon Station
 - Short viaduct: 1.5 miles between Interstate-880 and Diridon Station
 - Long Viaduct: 3.9 miles between Scott Boulevard and Diridon Station

Common features amongst the two alternatives include initial operations (two trains per direction per peak hour running at 79mph) and ongoing operations (four trains per direction per peak hour running at 110mph). Additionally, the Authority will be installing a suite of safety modifications throughout the corridor, including quad gates at all 38 at-grade crossings, channelization of vehicular traffic, and perimeter fencing along the right of way.

Authority staff met with local jurisdictions to review the preliminary engineering designs. The Authority hosted a round of meetings in summer 2018 with cities and counties along the corridor to discuss these designs. Key themes raised by city/county staff include safety, noise, radio tower locations, traffic, and at-grade crossings.

The Authority is currently completing its project definition in order to initiate the technical analysis of the proposed design as it pertains to noise, traffic, and other factors. After the completion of this analysis, a staff recommended Preferred Alternative (PA) will be released in December 2019. A Draft Environmental Impact Report/Statement (EIR/S) will be released in March 2020 and a 45-day comment period will commence upon its release. A Final EIR/S and Record of Decision (ROD) will be reached in March of 2021.

CWG Members' Questions and Comments

The following questions, comments and responses were recorded following Tung's presentation (Q= question, R= response, C= comment):

- Q: Are the safety features the Authority will be implementing in lieu of grade separations?
 - R: The Authority is looking to improve safety at the grade crossings but is not pursuing grade separations. Cities and counties across the corridor are pursuing individual grade separation projects.
- Q: It was mentioned that the Authority will be installing quad gates at all grade crossings – does that include those in San Mateo?

- R: Yes except for the crossings that are being grade separated at 25th, 28th, and 35th Avenues.
- Q: If cities and counties are considering grade separation projects, is the Authority requiring them to finalize plans by a certain date?
 - R: No. These grade separation projects are at various stages of development, from conceptual designs to actual construction. Caltrain, local jurisdictions, and the Authority have and will continue to coordinate so that train service is not impacted by grade separation projects being constructed simultaneously.
- Q: How is the Authority coordinating with Caltrain as it pertains to the analysis of the additional passing tracks Alternative B requires?
 - R: The nature of the conversations around passing tracks between Caltrain and the Authority generally pertain to service planning, stopping patterns, signaling, and needed infrastructure that will help determine whether those passing tracks will be necessary.
- Q: What are the benefits of having viaducts for the approach into Diridon Station as opposed to running at-grade?
 - R: Under that alternative high-speed rail would have its own separated facilities at Diridon station.
- Q: How is the proposed Baylands development influencing the Authority's decision for a light maintenance facility in Brisbane?
 - R: The Authority has and will continue to coordinate with the City of Brisbane and the proposed developer of the Baylands to determine the feasibility of accommodating their planned development and the need for a light maintenance facility in Brisbane.
- Q/C: To what extent has Caltrain and high-speed rail's operational schedule been determined? Freight users are concerned that the level and hours of operations of passenger rail will disrupt freight service, particularly during their current hours of operation from 9pm to 5am.
 - R: The Authority is operating under the assumption that temporal separation will be maintained and freight rail will continue to operate at night. As Caltrain owns the San Francisco to San Jose corridor, they will be the ones who ultimately decide on operational schedules for freight. There is no agreement yet between the Authority and Caltrain on an operating schedule so there will be more on this in the future.
- Q: How many hours a day will high-speed rail be operating?
 - R: For planning purposes, the Authority is using an 18-hour operational schedule. Part of the reason the early train operator is on board at this point of the process is to help us identify a schedule that makes sense from a business perspective.
- Q: Is there a timeframe in which high-speed rail's hours of operations will be decided?
 - R: We will need to go back to the operations team to find out when that type of decision will be made when. Determining hours of operations is not necessary for completing the Authority's current environmental analysis.
- C/Q: Caltrain has designed their new trains to have two sets of doors at different levels. Will platforms be raised along the corridor even at stations high-speed rail is not stopping at?

- R: Operationally, it would make sense for Caltrain to have level boarding at their stations over time along with the platforms that the Authority will need to raise to 51 inches for its level boarding. This will support Caltrain's rationale for having two sets of doors on their new trains. The Authority is looking at raising the height of a couple of existing platforms at 4th and King. We are pursuing a dedicated high-speed rail station at Millbrae and it is yet to be determined whether Diridon will be shared or dedicated.
- Q: What is driving the EIR/S to be completed by March 2021?
 - R: This is the shortest timeframe we can establish given the technical work that still needs to be done. One key target is our commitment to having all Records of Decision (RODs) by 2022.
- Q: How were cities selected for engineering outreach in summer 2018?
 - R: The Authority contacted all cities, counties, and jurisdictions along the alignment. We met with everyone aside from South San Francisco, who declined an invitation to meet at this time.
- Q: How is the Authority handling uncertainty around the priority of this project with a new governor coming into office?
 - R: Governor Brown had a "go/no-go" decision as it relates to high-speed rail. The project has progressed to the extent where the decision now is not whether we continue the project, but rather how it gets completed.
- Q/C: How many people jobs have been created through construction in the Central Valley? It would be helpful to know the number of anticipated jobs and other economic benefits of high-speed rail specifically in San Mateo County.
 - R: Currently, there are over 2,000 construction trades workers on site. Of the total number of jobs that have been created in Fresno County over the last year, roughly a third came from high-speed rail.

4. Stakeholder Engagement and Outreach

Morgan Galli, San Francisco to San Jose Outreach Manager, provided an update of the Authority's planned outreach and how it relates to the environmental milestone schedule. The Authority will be hosting a series of Open Houses in fall 2019 prior to the release of the PA. Community feedback received will be included when the PA is presented to the Authority's Board of Directors in winter 2019. An additional round of Open Houses as well as a Public Hearing will be held in spring 2020 during the 45-day comment period following the release of the Draft EIR/S in March 2020. Feedback received during the comment period will be evaluated in the Final EIR/S prior to it being presented to the Authority's Board of Directors in March 2021. This Board Meeting will be open to the public to provide comments on the Final EIR/S.

Additionally, the Authority will be hosting three rounds of CWG meetings in 2019 in advance of the release of the PA. One more round of meetings will be held prior to the 45-day comment period for the Draft EIR/S. The Authority will continue to conduct a variety of stakeholder and community outreach activities throughout the environmental milestone schedule and welcomed CWG members' suggestions on organizations and communities that the Authority meet with.

Galli then discussed the outreach the Authority has conducted since 2016. This includes:

- 6 Scoping Meetings and Open Houses with over 400 attendees
- 4 rounds of CWG meetings (12 total meetings) with 70+ organizations participating
- Over 350 stakeholder meetings and outreach events utilizing a multi-faceted, multi-language, and multi-community approach

Galli reviewed proposed topics for future CWG meetings. These include:

- Winter 2019: Early Train Operations, NEPA/CEQA 101, Project Elements, Connecting Communities Strategy
- Spring 2019: Safety, Noise, Project Elements
- Summer 2019: Preferred Alternative, Mitigation, Project Elements
- Winter 2020: Draft Environmental Impact/Report Statement

Galli concluded by opening a discussion with CWG members for their suggestions on future CWG meeting topics. This discussion is summarized below (Q= question, R= response, C= comment):

- C: When early train operations are discussed, please provide several levels of service and corresponding impacts on communities. This would include hours of service, frequency of service, and the return of weekday service to places like Atherton. It would be beneficial to have a Caltrain representative at that meetings so they can discuss what their operations will be like during high-speed rail's early operations.
- C: Ongoing updates from Caltrain would be appreciated.
- Q: How would the distribution of costs for things like shared infrastructure and track maintenance be decided?
 - R: These are part of the Authority's ongoing discussions with Caltrain.
- Q/C: When will the price of tickets be discussed? I am worried Environmental Justice populations will not be able to afford to ride high-speed rail.
 - R: Happy to discuss this in greater detail at future meetings. The Authority's Board has not identified prices – the early train operator would likely decide that. Equity considerations would be a component of the pricing structure.
- C: Having answers in hand with respect to Caltrain's planned operations instead of saying you will need to follow up with them would play out better with the public. The two projects are being seen as a packaged deal and wholly coordinated whether that is true or not.
- Q: What sections of the EIR/S is the Authority looking for feedback on and what can our feedback actually change?
 - R: Stakeholder and community input has and will continue to be incorporated into the EIR/S. An example of this is the Authority's analysis of the short viaduct in the approach to Diridon Station. This alternative was provided by residents of the Newhall neighborhood in Santa Clara given the degree of local impacts associated with the long viaduct. The Authority is also seeking communities' feedback on preferences for specific alternative components as well as the development of mitigation options related to topics like noise and aesthetics.
- C: Having a discussion on grade separations and Caltrain's role in developing them would be beneficial when the topic of safety at large is discussed.

- R: We are happy to discuss this and other processes that are not directly tied to the Authority's EIR/S but have corresponding relevance.
- C: Please provide updates on the Authority's conversations with Union Pacific as it relates to the ability for high-speed rail to operate at-grade between San Francisco and Gilroy and any subsequent impacts to freight service.
- Q: Is there an opportunity to add a conference call option to these meetings?
 - R: While wider participation in these meetings is encouraged, conference calls do not guarantee the same level of engagement. The Authority will consider a conference line and how to encourage more participation moving forward.
- C: Clearly identifying the ways this group can have an impact on the Authority's decision making process would go a long way in ensuring regular and active participation of CWG members.
- C: Please provide us with the types of organizations you want to reach out to and invite to join the CWG and we can provide specific suggestions.
 - R: We can send out the CWG roster and a list of meetings we have held to help identify where any gaps are.
- C: Statewide updates as a future meeting topic would be of interest if they are related to the planning, design, and operations within the San Francisco to San Jose Project Section.
- C: The number of jobs, economic improvements, and other regional benefits would be a useful future meeting topic.

5. Conclusions

Rugani thanked attendees for their time and invited them to reach out to Authority staff with any questions.

6. Public Comment

- C: San Jose has been producing hundreds of low-income units adjacent to the Blossom Hill Caltrain Station. Similar efforts should be undertaken with the stations high-speed rail will stop at.
- C: I am concerned about the issues of safety at Caltrain stations with an island platform design, especially trains begin to operate at 110mph.
- C: High-speed rail trains and freight share right-of-way in Europe. This should be pursued to the greatest extent possible in California to avoid community impacts and property takes.

Action Items and Next Steps

- The Authority will circulate the PowerPoint presentation from this meeting to San Mateo County CWG members (completed). The PowerPoint presentation can also be found on the high-speed rail website [here](#).
- The Authority will continue to conduct Environmental Justice outreach, including hosting information tables and making presentations at community events and meetings.
- The Authority will distribute the CWG roster and list of outreach activities/meetings since 2016 to CWG members.

- CWG members to review and provide suggestions on additional groups, organizations and individuals to connect with and/or invite to join a CWG.
- A meeting summary will be developed and distributed to CWG members.