



**South Peninsula Community Working Group  
October 15, 2018, Meeting Summary  
Santa Clara Central Park Library  
2635 Homestead Road  
Santa Clara, CA 95051  
6:00 PM – 8:00 PM**

---

**Attendance:**

**CWG Members**

Matt Brunnings (Washington Park Neighborhood Association), Bruce Humphrey (Mountain View Chamber of Commerce), Nick Kaspar (City of Santa Clara Chamber of Commerce), Adina Levin (Friends of Caltrain)

**Elected Officials**

Kathy Watanabe (Vice Mayor, Santa Clara)

**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, Ben Gettleman, Cici Vu

**1. Introductions**

Ben Gettleman, 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 4<sup>th</sup> 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):

- C/Q: Los Angeles and Union Stations are looking into incorporating a three-mile bike shed policy. Are similar efforts being undertaken for this project section?
  - R: Station area city grant programs are available to cities throughout California and include funding for the study of mobility improvements and infrastructure, such as bike sheds. How far the shed extends depends on the ordinances of individual cities. The Authority will evaluate access to the stations but will be working together with local jurisdictions on the projects that fall outside of the station itself.
- Q: Can the Authority assist in identifying barriers to this issue and then work with jurisdictions to reduce barriers?
  - R: Once we work with the cities to identify the barriers, there may be opportunities to engage with them for funding of bike shed projects.
- Q: How well are the Southern California technical working groups (TWGs) functioning and would you recommend joint meetings between CWGs and TWGs in the San Francisco to San Jose Project Section?
  - R: The technical working groups have been effective for cities such as Edison, Palmdale, Burbank and San Fernando as they facilitate communication between staff and TWG members. The City/Staff Coordinating Group (CSCG), which meets on a monthly basis, acts as the TWG for this project section. Caltrain hosts this group and the Authority provides updates at each meeting.
- Q: Is there a single entity that decides on pursuing, design, and funding grade separations?
  - R: Generally, cities and counties have a better idea on the needs for grade separation projects within their jurisdiction. There is, however, a growing recognition of the need for a regional funding strategy.
- Q: Are cities that will have a high-speed rail station supportive of funding grade separations projects?

- R: There is generally a high level of support for grade separations in cities where high-speed rail is planned.

### **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:

- 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: Is additional information or technical analyses for the elements in the alternatives available at this point in time?
  - R: These analyses are in progress. Additional information will be provided at future CWG meetings.

#### 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: I am interested in knowing common topics discussed along the corridor, by city.
- Q: Will you be able to align the CWG topic discussion timeline with Caltrain's business plan decision timeline? The topics timeline you presented seems aggressive considering Caltrain's timing.
  - R: Caltrain's business plan is premised on a longer-term vision for service, whereas the Authority is working from an infrastructure, service and operations standpoint to determine, for instance, whether we have the right passing tracks plan.

- C: Community feedback needs to be incorporated into the long-term planning efforts for the entire project section, particularly as it relates to infrastructure, service, and operations for both Caltrain and high-speed rail.
  - R: The Authority does not have control over the schedule that Caltrain will implement for its system. The Authority has and will continue to work with Caltrain to discuss these kinds of topics.
- Q: Is the Authority analyzing the downtown extension (DTX) to the Salesforce Transit Center as part of the environmental document?
  - R: For the environmental document, the Authority is setting 4<sup>th</sup> & King as a temporary terminus and assumes that DTX will be completed by the TJPA by its out years.
- C: An update on projected ridership would be valuable, especially as it pertains to the eventual connection to the Salesforce Transit Center.
- Q: Will ridership numbers impact the number of trains operating and where to place passing tracks?
  - R: This component is decided based on adopted or more defined plans for land use. Further along in the project, we will look into more detailed market evaluations and train operations considerations to inform the plans.
- Q: At what point will the early train operator be engaged in the planning process for high-speed rail in this project section?
  - R: They are currently engaged and updates on their work to date will be discussed at upcoming CWG meetings.
- Q/C: Does the Authority have a one-pager describing the benefits of the project? It may help get people excited about it.
  - R: There are a few different types of factsheets available on the Authority's website focusing on different topics (e.g., economic development, sustainability and environment).
- C: I would like to request a presentation be made to the Santa Clara Chamber of Commerce.
  - R: The outreach team will follow up to schedule a presentation.

## 5. Conclusions

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

## 6. Public Comment

- C: In reviewing the safety modifications, I don't see any intrusion protection and you cannot have quad gates without this protection. The grade separations at 16<sup>th</sup> Street in San Francisco are not at 1400 feet and will not allow for more than six trains to run.
- C/Q: I have attended many Caltrain and high-speed meetings and it is good to hear a perspective at this level of detail as I did not know about the alternatives for the viaduct leading to Diridon Station. I also see other areas in the city of Santa Clara that need some outreach on the viaduct issue, such as the new development off of Lafayette, Reed, Monroe, and San Tomas Streets. Additionally, I agree that a ridership update

definitely needs to be considered because additional trains mean more traffic for local communities. How has community input informed who the Authority conducts outreach with?

- R: The Authority is working with Michael Fuze on outreach to the areas you mentioned where new developments are occurring. A presentations to the Santa Clara City council will occur after the November 2018 election so that newly elected council members have been updated on the project. The Authority welcomes invitations to present during and participate at a range of outreach events. In the past, this has included information tabling at community events, community canvassing, and presentations to groups like neighborhood associations, chambers of commerce, and other general interest organizations.

### **Action Items and Next Steps**

- The Authority will circulate the PowerPoint presentation from this meeting to South Peninsula 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.
- Outreach team to coordinate with Nick Kasper to coordinate a presentation to the City of Santa Clara Chamber of Commerce.
- Outreach team to follow up with newly elected Santa Clara City Councilmember and connect with neighborhoods north of Old Quad.
- 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.