The City of Palo Alto continues to take a leadership role in representing our community’s interests and positions on various rail related matters concerning high speed rail (HSR) and our local rail service provided by Caltrain. There have been many developments since our last update to the City Council in December of last year.

The City has sent several letters to the California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA), the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT), the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), our federal congressional leadership, and state elected officials. We also continue to work cooperatively with regional agencies such as the Peninsula Cities Consortium (PCC), neighboring communities, and other parties with an interest in rail.

The City has, with the Town of Atherton and the City of Menlo Park, introduced fiscal year (FY) 2012 legislation regarding HSR described more fully below. We have formally asked the CHSRA to explain the apparent difference in estimated costs for the overall rail system estimated at $43B but based on their own documentation it shows a total cost of $66B. We have asked the CHSRA to re-do the existing ridership study. The current ridership study has been called into question by the University of California Berkeley Institute of Transportation Studies (UCBITS). UCBITS is the State Legislature’s official consultant on transportation matters. An accurate ridership study is critical as it has significant impacts on what HSR system should be built and on the short and long-term financial viability of HSR. Thus far, the CHSRA has been unresponsive to our request and to other local agencies that have raised this issue.

In the near term, the central focus of the CHSRA is the construction of the initial HSR segment to be built in California’s Central Valley. CHSRA staff has indicated their resources are being allocated to the Central Valley to ensure they meet mandated FRA and American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) expenditure requirements. The practical impact of this is that the publication of the San Francisco to San Jose segment project level environmental impact report (EIR)/environmental impact statement (EIS)
has been pushed back from December 2010 to the fall of 2012. There may be an opportunity for the City of Palo Alto, in cooperation with other Peninsula cities, to assemble a broader coalition of cities to advocate cooperatively for HSR options that are acceptable to the Peninsula.

There has also been significant activity regarding Caltrain service. As the City Council is aware, and the most recent 2011 Caltrain ridership numbers validate, Palo Alto continues to have the 2nd highest ridership along the corridor. The City attended the Silicon Valley Leadership Group (SVLG) Caltrain meeting held early this calendar year at Stanford University. The purpose of this meeting was to identify and develop short and long-term solutions to the current operational and capital funding issues faced by Caltrain. The City Council Rail Committee recently hosted Supervisor Liz Kniss who serves on the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (PCJPB) which oversees Caltrain service. At this same meeting the Rail Committee heard presentations from Caltrain technical staff on the current modernization plans for Caltrain.

In summary, the City is actively engaging in rail activities on a variety of fronts to ensure the community's interests are represented. Please read on for more details on the current status of rail.

**Discussion**

**I. Caltrain**

**Save Caltrain Town Hall Meeting**

The City of Palo Alto has been working in cooperation with the Silicon Valley Leadership Group (SVLG) and other Peninsula cities to get information out on the short and long-term operational and capital issues associated with this rail provider. Further, the City hosted a meeting on April 26th with the SVLG at the Palo Alto Sheraton Hotel to provide information to the community on the current issues facing Caltrain service along the corridor.

**City Council Rail Committee**

On April 13th the City Council Rail Committee hosted Santa Clara County Supervisor and Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (PCJPB) member Liz Kniss at their Committee meeting for a discussion of issues facing Caltrain. At the meeting she provided a presentation (attached) to the Rail Committee on the history of Caltrain while Caltrain technical staff provided a presentation on electrification (attached). The PCJPB then took action at their meeting April 21st in which the board approved measures that will allow them to maintain the current 86 weekday train schedule through fiscal year (FY) 2012.
The Rail Committee will meet again April 28\textsuperscript{th} to again hear from Caltrain technical staff on the 35\% engineering design they have completed for the future proposed electrification program to modernize Caltrain. Caltrain has also retained the services of an engineer with expertise in Diesel Multiple Unit (DMU) and Electric Multiple Unit (EMU) train sets. The Rail Committee will receive a future presentation on these two alternative types of train sets. This information will be provided to the City Council when available.

Key Caltrain Issues

- Short and long-term financial viability and system modernization issues as Caltrain has no dedicated funding source unlike other Bay Area transit systems. Modernization includes electrifying the rail line, purchasing a new signaling system (known as positive train control), and purchasing new train sets. In the near term, Caltrain appears to have developed a short-term (i.e. one year) solution to fund their operations through the end of FY 2012. This was accomplished through a series of one-time funding solutions from both member agencies and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), a $0.25 cent base fare increase, and a $1.00 daily parking fee increase.

- Short and long term capital fund needs remain for modernization of the Caltrain line. As the attached presentations indicate, Caltrain does not have full funding to modernize their line (i.e. electrification). Thus far, and subject to change, Caltrain has linked modernization to the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the CHSRA. The goal of Caltrain has been to secure funding to modernize Caltrain service from HSR funds in exchange for granting the CHSRA rights to use the Caltrain right-of-way.

- Recent federal budgetary actions have reduced the total federal HSR budget from $2.5B to $1B (with the possibility of that number going to zero). Thus, funding to build HSR in California, other than what has been provided so far, may not materialize, casting into doubt the ability of Caltrain to secure funds for its own modernization.

- Currently, Caltrain is in the process of completing, for the first time, a series of independent feasibility studies to determine whether electrification and modernization of the system can meet the future needs of this agency in serving its customer base.

II. HSR

Key CHSRA Issues
• At the CHSRA board meeting on December 20th, the CHSRA allocated the additional $616M in funds received from the FRA, from funds foregone by the states of Ohio and Florida, to the Central Valley segment. Using FRA and California Proposition 1A funds, the CHSRA has a total of $5.5B identified for construction in the Central Valley. The recent allocation of additional FRA funding enables the CHSRA to build up to 120 miles of the 520 project miles. The segment to be built will start in the unincorporated community of Borden and will extend to north of Bakersfield. The segment cost includes the construction of tracks, two new stations (one in downtown Fresno and one east of Hanford), construction of viaducts and rail bridges, site preparation, right-of-way acquisition, and realignment of roadways, existing railways, and utilities. It **does not include** the purchase of HSR trains, catenary wires, or a HSR maintenance facility. Construction cannot commence until the project environmental reviews are complete. These reviews are required to be completed by September 2011, and construction is required to commence by September 2012 in order to meet ARRA funding requirements. Recently, the CHSRA applied for HSR funds foregone by the State of Florida. The CHSRA has indicated they expect to hear in the next thirty days if former Florida HSR funds will be awarded to California.

• In February 2011, CHSRA CEO van Ark asked staff to review and analyze a phased HSR approach for the Peninsula. The concept is to potentially build more limited infrastructure to support HSR operations between San Francisco and San Jose. This would result in shared tracks for HSR and Caltrain. More information on this plan is to be revealed at the May 5th CHSRA board meeting.

• The project level EIR/EIS is now projected to be released in the fall of 2012 (updated schedule attached).

• The planned issuance of a revised business plan was February 2011 but has been delayed to the fall of 2011 with formal publication to occur in January 2012.

**FRA**

The FRA has allocated:

• $715M to the CHSRA for HSR in October 2010. The CHSRA has decided to allocate these funds to build HSR in the Central Valley.
• $616M to the CHSRA for HSR in December 2010 from funds originally allocated for HSR in Ohio and Wisconsin. The CHSRA has decided to allocate these funds to build HSR in the Central Valley as well.

Current HSR Cost

The total estimated project cost is $42.6B. However, this total has been called into question by both the City of Palo Alto and other regional groups and communities. Based on data provided by Californians Advocating Responsible Rail Design (CARRD), the HSR cost figure is actually closer to $66B. What is remarkable is the $66B figure is based on data released by the CHSRA; however, the City never received a response to our letter to the CHSRA asking them to confirm or deny the accuracy of this estimate.

Current HSR Funds

The total funding in place specifically for CHSRA expenditure on HSR is $12.181B

The breakdown of that funding is:
• $9B in Proposition 1A bond funds ($950M of the $9.95B approved must be spent on local railroad improvements) - November 2008
• $1.85B in ARRA funds – January 2010
  o Please note that at this time $400M of additional money was awarded for San Francisco’s Transbay Terminal.
• $715M in additional federal funds – October 2010
• $616M in additional federal funds redirected from the Ohio and Wisconsin HSR projects – December 2010

Legislative Activities

• Council supported the 2011 legislative initiatives and staff is working with Capitol Advocates Inc. to execute the plan. The three bills co-sponsored by Atherton, Menlo Park, and Palo Alto include AB 952, AB 953, and AB 1164. On Monday, April 25 language that would have prevented the expenditure of Proposition 1A funds on HSR until a new ridership study is completed was removed from AB 953 in committee. Californians Advocating Responsible Rail Design (CARRD) was represented in the audience at this meeting. Attached are the bill summaries and status.

• Rail Committee Chair Klein visited with federal legislative officials in March 2011 while in Washington DC. Key takeaways from this trip were that federal legislators and their staff members were well aware of the discrepancies in cost
projections for the project (CHSRA’s $43B figure vs. CARRD’s $66B figure), there may be no new funding provided for HSR, and there may be attempts to reclaim federal funding allocations already committed but not yet spent on HSR.

Peer Review Audit Findings

In December 2010, a legislatively initiated HSR peer review group reviewed current CHSRA activities and outlined the following issues, among several, with current CHSRA operations:

- The absence of a “credible financial plan” has become a “critical concern.” A major question facing the CHSRA is whether or not it is realistic to expect the federal government to contribute $17-19B to this project.

- CHSRA officials need to be more transparent regarding estimates of passenger demand, revenues, investment and operating costs, and project timing.

- There needs to be greater CHSRA recognition of potential resistance from private rail operators.

- The CHSRA needs to be clear about how much of the 800-mile system will run at ground level vs. below grade or on elevated tracks.

Program EIR Litigation

The City of Palo Alto joined Atherton and Menlo Park in litigation against the CHSRA certification of the Program EIR. This litigation is still pending and based on current available information it is expected the court will hear the case sometime in the summer of 2011.

Property and Economic Value Analysis

Economic & Planning Systems (EPS) has commenced work, and is near completion, of their report regarding the economic, property, and related impacts of the Caltrain modernization proposal and HSR.

Eshoo/Simitian/Gordon Statement

On Monday, April 18 at the Menlo Park Caltrain station Congresswoman Anna Eshoo, Senator Joe Simitian, and Assemblymember Rich Gordon made a joint statement outlining what HSR “done right” means and called for “a blended system that integrates HSR with a 21st Century Caltrain.”
HSR done right was defined using the following three criteria: one, the rejection of any consideration of an aerial viaduct; two, the system should remain within the existing Caltrain right-of-way; and three, the CHSRA should abandon its EIR preparation/planning of a larger project over a 25 year time-frame and should focus on a project of more limited scope.

The statement also included an explanation of how they thought this could be done and included using some combination of the following: electrification, positive train control, and new rolling sock. Please see the attached statement for more information.

San Mateo County Rail Corridor Partnership (SMCRCP) Meeting with van Ark

This recently formed group, comprised of elected officials from the communities of Burlingame, Millbrae, Redwood City, and San Mateo, met in a non-public meeting with CHSRA CEO Roelof van Ark on April 20th to discuss issues surrounding the project in San Francisco to San Jose segment. This group had sent a letter dated February 14, 2011 to van Ark stating their objectives (attached). Staff from the City of Palo Alto and other cities attended this meeting and staff has prepared a summary outline of what occurred (attached).

III. Additional Information

Rail Corridor Task Force (RCTF)

The RCTF has held eight meetings to date. The City of Palo Alto Planning Department selected BMS Design Group of San Francisco to assist with the completion of a plan to generate a community vision for land use, transportation, and urban design opportunities along the Caltrain corridor

Attachments:

- Supervisor Kniss’s April 13 Rail Committee meeting presentation (PDF)
- Caltrain staff’s April 13 Rail Committee meeting presentation (PDF)
- CHSRA project schedule for the San Francisco to San Jose section (PDF)
- Legislative bill summaries and status for AB 952, AB 953, and AB 1164 (PDF)
- Eshoo Simitian Gordon HSR Done Right Statement dated April 18, 2011 (PDF)
- SMCRCP letter to Roelof van Ark dated February 14, 2011 (PDF)
- SMCRCP meeting with CHSRA CEO van Ark summary dated April 20, 2011 (PDF)
- SMCRCP CHSRA Power Point April 20, 2011 presentation dated April 20, 2011 (PDF)
Caltrain Briefing

LIZ KNISS
SANTA CLARA COUNTY SUPERVISOR, 5TH DISTRICT
APRIL 13, 2011

Presentation Outline

- History of Caltrain
- Caltrain Governance
- Ridership
- Farebox Revenue
- Passenger Survey
- Caltrain Operating Deficit & Needs
  - Revised service proposal
  - Other possible funding sources
  - My position
History of Caltrain

- 1863 – passenger train service begun
  - San Francisco and San Jose Railroad Company
  - $600,000 of the original $2 million capital stock owned by S.F., S.M. & S.C. counties
- 1870 – acquired by firm eventually consolidated in Southern Pacific Railway (SP)
  - 1904 – SP “double tracks” the corridor
- 1977 - SP petitioned PUC to abandon passenger service
  - The 3 Peninsula counties stepped in with a temporary plan to continue the service
  - Commuter tickets partially subsidized
  - State sponsorship of the “Peninsula Commute” begun in 1980
- 1980 – Caltrans contracted SP to provide passenger service
  - Operating subsidies shared by 3 counties
  - Caltrans responsible for station acquisitions & other capital improvements
- 1985 - Significant improvements made
  - SP trains replaced with new locomotives and rolling stock
  - Stations upgraded, shuttle buses added
  - Operation rebranded as Caltrain
- 1987 – Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) formed
- 1991 – JPB purchased right of way from SP
  - Provision that SP retained right to operate freight service
  - Service extended to Gilroy
- 1992 - SP replaced by Amtrak as contract operator
- 2005 – Baby Bullet service launched

Caltrain Governance

**Board of Directors represent the three counties**

**City and County of San Francisco**
- Jose Cisneros, appointed by the Mayor of San Francisco
- Sean Elsbernd (Chair), appointed by San Francisco County Board of Supervisors
- Nathaniel Ford, appointed by the Municipal Transportation Agency

**San Mateo County Transit District:**
- Omar Ahmad (Vice Chair), appointed by City Selection Committee
- Arthur Lloyd, appointed by San Mateo County Transit District
- Adrienne Thissier, appointed by the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors

**Santa Clara County Valley Transportation Authority**
- Ash Kalra, appointed by VTA
- Liz Kniss, appointed by VTA
- Ken Yeager, appointed by VTA

**Executive Director**
- Michael Scanlon, appointed by Board
  - Also serves as General Manager of SamTrans and the San Mateo County Transportation Authority

**Operations Contractor - Amtrak**
Ridership Summary

- Ridership exceeds previous high seen in 2009, even in current economic climate and with service reduction
- Midday service remains steady even with reduction of four trains, riders redistributed to shoulder peak
- All three counties saw comparable ridership increases
- Onboard bike ridership increased with expanded onboard capacity
- Weekend ridership growth shows demand for the full complement of Caltrain services

Average Weekday Ridership:
2004 – 2011
Farebox Revenue per Operating Dollar

- Caltrain farebox recovery is 2\textsuperscript{nd} highest in Area
  - Caltrain receives $.48 in fares per dollar of operational cost
  - BART is $.61 per dollar
- Caltrain operations are:
  - 2x more self sustaining than MUNI
  - 3x more self-sustaining than SamTrans
  - 4x more self-sustaining than VTA

Passenger Survey

- Main reasons for riding Caltrain:
  - Avoid traffic
  - Save money
  - Don’t have/want a car
- Annual passenger $ saving using Caltrain (vs. private automobile): SJ to SF
  - $8,954.16 (computed by Caltrain staff)
  - If Caltrain didn’t exist, it would take the equivalent of 2-3 lanes on 101 to carry the extra rush hour traffic
Caltrain Operating Deficit and Needs

- Caltrain is only Bay Area transit system without permanent, dedicated source of funding
- Caltrain has had funding shortfalls for several years. Each year, budget balanced with short term solutions
- The JPB partnership - SamTrans, VTA, Muni
  - SamTrans is the managing partner
  - If partner doesn’t fund their total share of the (balanced) budget, then the other two partners may reduce their share.
  - This can result in large budget deficit (e.g., $30 million this year)
- Caltrain staff working to find solutions with
  - Regional, state, federal transit partners,
  - Friends of Caltrain and Silicon Valley Leadership Group (8 public meetings)
- VTA has proposed solutions for funding gaps
  - March 2011 board meeting directed GM Burns to work urgently with partner GMs

Caltrain Operating Deficit ...

- Caltrain staff recently reported that some one time funds have been found. Staff proposal with revised funding:
  - Operate 76 trains (decrease from current 86 trains, and prior 96 trains)
  - Eliminate Baby Bullet service but run (slower) express trains instead
  - Close selected stations on a semi-permanent basis (and others on weekends)
- Planned April 7 JPB decision deferred 2 weeks
  - April 21 special meeting in San Carlos
  - 10 am, SamTrans auditorium.
- Board directed Caltrain staff to continue search for funds
  - Additional $3.5 million + needed to maintain current 86 trains
  - Decision unanimous to continue decision for 2 weeks.
Revised Service Proposal: Weekend Service

- **Stations with suspended weekend service (FY 2012)**
  - 22nd Street
  - Bayshore
  - South San Francisco
  - Broadway
  - Hayward Park
  - Belmont
  - San Carlos
  - Atherton
  - California Avenue
  - San Antonio
  - Lawrence
  - Tamien

Caltrain Operating Deficit ...

- **Other potential sources of funding**
  - Increase "preventive maintenance" money from MTC
  - Increase VTA “right of way” purchase payments to SamTrans ($7.2 M offered by VTA, $2M accepted by SamTrans)
  - Redeploy or “borrow” Dumbarton Rail Project funds (Project unlikely soon - cost & environmental inhibitors)
  - Redeploy or “borrow” Caltrain electrification funds.

- **My position**
  - Caltrain is vital transportation system w/more riders than ever (Riding is a Habit)
  - Use one time money to keep system running in short term
  - Long term solution is critical to system’s continued operation
  - Urgently seek fair and proper long term funding solutions
  - Further reductions risk crippling the system and impacting the greater region
    - Death spiral – ridership drops → service reduced more → Caltrain dies
    - “Ring the Bay with Rail” goal is jeopardized

- **FYI**
  - The Silicon Valley Leadership Group is currently hosting public meetings
  - Focus on long-term funding solutions for Caltrain
Committee Requested Topics

- Electrification Project
- EMU vs. DMU
- HSR and Caltrain MOU
Caltrain Modernization Program

• Key Components
  – PTC/CBOSS
  – Electrification Project
  – Service Expansion

• Guiding Principles
  – Address Structural Deficit
  – Provide More Service
  – Improve the Environment

Project Definition
Electrification Project

- Distance: 51 miles (SF to Tamien)
- Service: 6 trains / peak hour / direction
- Key Structure Elements
  - Traction Power Facilities
  - Overhead Contact System
- Electric Powered Vehicles

Ridership Forecast

- Projected Demand
  - Base Year (2007) 33,420
  - 2035 No Project 65,000
  - 2035 Project 71,000
- Key Modeling Inputs
  - 2005 ABAG population and job projections
  - MTC RTP projects
  - Caltrain service at all stations

Source: Caltrain Electrification EA/FEIR, July 2009
Capital Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Elements</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electrification Infrastructure</td>
<td>$ 785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Replacement</td>
<td>$ 440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$1,225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

($ in Millions, Year of Expenditure)

Source: Caltrain Electrification EA/FEIR, July 2009

Capital Funding

• Status
  – Committed: $269 million
  – Expected: $352 million
  – Needed: $604 million

• Funding Plan
  – Federal and State HSR Funding
  – PPP
  – Financing

Source: Caltrain Electrification EA/FEIR, July 2009
O/M Revenue & Expense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008 (Diesel)</th>
<th>2035 (Electric)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Trains</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$47M</td>
<td>$206M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expense</td>
<td>$87M</td>
<td>$229M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net</td>
<td>(39)</td>
<td>(23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Caltrain Electrification EA/FEIR, July 2009

Positive Environmental Impacts

- Reduced congestion
- Reduced energy consumption by 64%
- Reduced air pollutants by 90%
- Reduced noise and vibration by 81%
### Negative Environmental Impacts

#### Proposed Mitigation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>Visual clutter</td>
<td>Landscaping &amp; Screening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>Tree trimming</td>
<td>Vegetation Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Potential of archeological remains</td>
<td>Burial and Programmatic Agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Waste and Materials</td>
<td>Encountering existing hazardous waste and materials</td>
<td>Focused Phase II, Worker Health and Safety Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology / Floodplain</td>
<td>Groundwater impacted by foundations</td>
<td>Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (temporary impacts)</td>
<td>Noise, vibration, emissions, traffic impacts during construction</td>
<td>Best Management Practice Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation / Traffic</td>
<td>Increased parking at stations</td>
<td>Caltrain Access Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Status
Key Milestones

- 1999 Caltrain Rapid Rail Plan
- 2001 MTC RTP
- 2004 Caltrain Strategic Plan
- 2008 Preliminary Engineering
- 2009 FRA Waiver
- 2009 Federal Environmental Clearance

Electrification EIR Certification

- FEIR Certification – JPB Board Consideration
  - April 2010
  - Timeout to address local concerns
- Discussions with Community Coalition on HSR
  - Guiding Principles
  - Tiered Environmental Clearance
- JPB Board certification in summer 2011?
Public Project Schedule

• Outdated: 2015 Revenue Service
• Duration by Phase
  – Final Design: 18 months
  – Construction: 3 years
  – Testing: 1 year

Caltrain / HSR Coordination
Project Coordination

• PTC/CBOSS
  – RFP
  – Access HSR Funding

• Electrification Project
  – Input to HSR Design
  – Input to HSR EIS/EIR Analysis

1 – 2 Year Planning Focus

• Strategic plans & ridership forecast

• HSR EIS/EIR
  – Alternatives
  – Design review

• Supplemental efforts
  – Caltrain system and station area impact analysis
  – Station area planning
  – Local economic analysis / value capture
HSR Revised Schedule

- SF to SJ
  - EIS/EIR public release Fall 2012
  - Completion Summer 2013
- SJ to Merced
  - EIS/EIR public release Early 2012
  - Completion Fall 2012
- Construction / Revenue Service TBD

Discussion
CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPEED TRAIN PROJECT SCHEDULE, SAN FRANCISCO - SAN JOSE SECTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan Feb Mar Apr May Jun Jul Aug Sep Oct Nov Dec</td>
<td>Jan Feb Mar Apr May Jun Jul Aug Sep Oct Nov Dec</td>
<td>Jan Feb Mar Apr May Jun Jul Aug Sep Oct Nov Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preliminary Engineering &amp; Environmental Milestones</strong></td>
<td><strong>Phased Project Implementation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Final EIR/EIS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refine Full Build Alternatives (Options A, B, B1, B2)</td>
<td>Admin Draft EIR/EIS</td>
<td>NOD ROD Final EIR/EIS to CHSRA Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Draft EIR/EIS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Checklist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Public Hearings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TWG Meetings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch IOP Phased Implementation</td>
<td>IOP/Build Alternatives</td>
<td>Prep for Release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An act to add Section 185025 to the Public Utilities Code, relating to high-speed rail.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 952, as introduced, Jones. High-speed rail.
Existing law creates the High-Speed Rail Authority with specified powers and duties relative to development and implementation of a high-speed train system. The authority is composed of 9 members, including 5 members appointed by the Governor. Members of the authority are subject to the Political Reform Act of 1974.
This bill would prohibit a member or employee of the authority from being the recipient of any gift, as defined, for purposes of the Political Reform Act. The bill would prohibit a construction company, engineering firm, consultant, legal firm, or any other company, vendor, or business entity with a contract or seeking a contract with the authority, or subcontractor of any of the foregoing, or owner, employee, or any member of their immediate families of any of these companies, firms, vendors, entities, or subcontractors, from making any gift to a member or employee of the authority, or to any member of their immediate families. The bill would allow the authority itself to receive gifts, subject to approval of the Senate. The bill would also allow the authority to transfer the gifts it receives to any person only with the approval of the Senate.
This bill would prohibit a member or employee of the authority from appearing before the authority on behalf of, or in any way representing before the authority, any individual or private or public entity for 3 years after termination of the employment or contract relationship with the authority.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Section 185025 is added to the Public Utilities Code, to read:
185025. (a) No member or employee of the authority shall be the recipient of any gift, as defined in Section 82028 of the Government Code, for purposes of the Political Reform Act of 1974 (Title 9 (commencing with Section 81000) Government Code), except as provided in this section. No construction company, engineering firm, consultant, legal firm, or any other company, vendor, or business entity with a contract or seeking a contract with the authority, or subcontractor of any of the foregoing, or owner, employee, or any member of their immediate families of any of these companies, firms, vendors, entities, or subcontractors, shall make any gift to a member or employee of the authority, or to any member of their immediate families. The authority itself may receive gifts, subject to approval.

http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/11-12/bill/asm/ab_0951-1000/ab_952_bill_20110218_intro... 4/20/2011
of the Senate by resolution. The authority may transfer the gifts it receives to any person subject to this section only with the approval of the Senate by resolution.

(b) A member or employee of the authority shall not, for compensation, appear before the authority on behalf of, or in any way represent before the authority, any individual or private or public entity for a period of three years after termination of the person's relationship with the authority.
CURRENT BILL STATUS

MEASURE : A.B. No. 952
AUTHOR(S) : Jones.
TOPIC : High-speed rail.
HOUSE LOCATION : ASM

TYPE OF BILL :
Active
Non-Urgency
Non-Appropriations
Majority Vote Required
Non-State-Mandated Local Program
Fiscal
Non-Tax Levy

LAST HIST. ACT. DATE: 04/14/2011
LAST HIST. ACTION : From committee: Do pass as amended and re-refer to Com.
on E. & R. (Ayes 11, Noes 0.) (April 11).
COMM. LOCATION : ASM ELECTIONS AND REDISTRICTING

TITLE : An act to add Section 185025 to the Public Utilities Code, relating to high-speed rail.
AB 953, as introduced, Jones. High-speed rail.

Existing law, the California High-Speed Rail Act, creates the High-Speed Rail Authority to develop and implement a high-speed rail system in the state, with specified powers and duties. Existing law, pursuant to the Safe, Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the 21st Century, approved by the voters as Proposition 1A at the November 4, 2008, general election, provides for the issuance of $9.95 billion in general obligation bonds for high-speed rail and related purposes. Under federal law, funding is made available for allocation nationally to high-speed rail and other related projects.

This bill would provide that no funds from Proposition 1A shall be available to the High-Speed Rail Authority for construction of the high-speed train system until adequate environmental studies are completed based on a new ridership study that uses an acceptable ridership evaluation methodology. The bill would require the authority to contract with the Institute of Transportation Studies at the University of California at Berkeley to complete a revised ridership study, using the ridership methodology of the institute. The bill would require the authority to use that ridership study as the basis for subsequent environmental studies. The bill would also require the authority to reconsider its adoption of the optimal high-speed rail route based both on the new ridership study and the ridership methodology.


THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Section 2704.77 is added to the Streets and Highways Code, to read:

2704.77. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds from the Safe, Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the 21st Century (Chapter 20 (commencing with Section 2704)) shall be available to the High-Speed Rail Authority for construction of the high-speed train system until adequate environmental studies are completed based on a new ridership study that uses an acceptable ridership evaluation methodology. The authority shall contract with the Institute of Transportation Studies at the University of California at Berkeley to complete a revised ridership study, using the ridership methodology of the institute. That ridership study, in turn, shall be used as the basis for subsequent environmental studies. The authority shall also reconsider its adoption of the optimal high-speed rail route based both on the new ridership study and the ridership methodology.
CURRENT BILL STATUS

MEASURE: A.B. No. 953
AUTHOR(S): Jones (Principal coauthor: Valadao) (Coauthor: Harkey).
TOPIC: High-speed rail.
HOUSE LOCATION: ASM

TYPE OF BILL:
- Active
- Non-Urgency
- Non-Appropriations
- Majority Vote Required
- Non-State-Mandated Local Program
- Fiscal
- Non-Tax Levy

LAST HIST. ACT. DATE: 03/10/2011
LAST HIST. ACTION: Referred to Com. on TRANS.
COMM. LOCATION: ASM TRANSPORTATION
HEARING DATE: 04/25/2011

TITLE: An act to add Section 2704.77 to the Streets and Highways Code, relating to high-speed rail.
An act to amend Section 185020 of the Public Utilities Code, relating to the High-Speed Rail Authority.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 1164, as amended, Gordon. High-Speed Rail Authority: appointees: Senate confirmation.

Existing law creates the High-Speed Rail Authority within the state government with various powers and duties relative to development and implementation of a high-speed passenger train system. Existing law provides that 5 of the 9 members comprising the authority shall be appointed by the Governor.

This bill would require that those gubernatorial appointments be made with the advice and consent of the Senate.


THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Section 185020 of the Public Utilities Code is amended to read:

185020. (a) There is in state government a High-Speed Rail Authority.

(b) (1) The authority is composed of nine members as follows:

(A) Five members appointed by the Governor, with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(B) Two members appointed by the Senate Committee on Rules.

(C) Two members appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly.

(2) For the purposes of making appointments to the authority, the Governor, the Senate Committee on Rules, and the Speaker of the Assembly shall take into consideration geographical diversity to ensure that all regions of the state are adequately represented.

(c) Except as provided in subdivision (d), and until their successors are appointed, members of the authority shall hold office for terms of four years. A vacancy shall be filled by the appointing power making the original appointment, by appointing a member to serve the remainder of the term.

(d) (1) On and after January 1, 2001, the terms of all persons who are then members of the authority shall expire, but those members may continue to serve until they are reappointed or until their successors are appointed. In order to provide for evenly staggered terms, persons appointed or reappointed to the authority after January 1, 2001, shall be appointed to initial terms to expire as follows:

(A) Of the five persons appointed by the Governor, one shall be appointed to a term which expires on December 31, 2002, one shall be appointed to a term which expires on December 31, 2003, one shall be appointed to a term which expires on December 31, 2004, and two shall
be appointed to terms which expire on December 31, 2005.

(B) Of the two persons appointed by the Senate Committee on Rules, one shall be appointed to a term which expires on December 31, 2002, and one shall be appointed to a term which expires on December 31, 2004.

(C) Of the two persons appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly, one shall be appointed to a term which expires on December 31, 2003, and one shall be appointed to a term which expires on December 31, 2005.

(2) Following expiration of each of the initial terms provided for in this subdivision, the term shall expire every four years thereafter on December 31.

(e) Members of the authority are subject to the Political Reform Act of 1974 (Title 9 (commencing with Section 81000)).

(f) From among its members, the authority shall elect a chairperson, who shall preside at all meetings of the authority, and a vice chairperson to preside in the absence of the chairperson. The chairperson shall serve a term of one year.

(g) Five members of the authority constitute a quorum for taking any action by the authority.
CURRENT BILL STATUS

MEASURE : A.B. No. 1164
AUTHOR(S) : Gordon.
TOPIC : High-Speed Rail Authority: appointees: Senate
        confirmation.
HOUSE LOCATION : ASM
+LAST AMENDED DATE : 04/07/2011

TYPE OF BILL :

   Active
   Non-Urgency
   Non-Appropriations
   Majority Vote Required
   Non-State-Mandated Local Program
   Non-Fiscal
   Non-Tax Levy

LAST HIST. ACT. DATE: 04/11/2011
LAST HIST. ACTION : Re-referred to Com. on TRANSPORTATION
COMM. LOCATION : ASM TRANSPORTATION
HEARING DATE : 04/25/2011

TÍTLE : An act to amend Section 185020 of the Public Utilities
         Code, relating to the High-Speed Rail Authority.
April 18, 2011

Since the passage of Proposition 1A in 2008, each of us has expressed our support for "high-speed rail done right," by which we mean a genuinely statewide system that makes prudent use of limited public funds and which is responsive to legitimate concerns about the impact of high-speed rail on our cities, towns, neighborhoods and homes.

To date, however, the California High Speed Rail Authority has failed to develop and describe such a system for the Peninsula and South Bay. For that reason, we have taken it upon ourselves today to set forth some basic parameters for what "high-speed rail done right" looks like in our region.
We start with the premise that for the Authority to succeed in its statewide mission it must be sensitive and responsive to local concerns about local impacts. Moreover, it is undeniable that funding will be severely limited at both the state and national levels for the foreseeable future.

Much of the projected cost for the San Jose to San Francisco leg of the project is driven by the fact that the Authority has, to date, proposed what is essentially a second rail system for the Peninsula and South Bay, unnecessarily duplicating existing usable infrastructure. Even if such a duplicative system could be constructed without adverse impact along the CalTrain corridor, and we do not believe it can, the cost of such duplication simply cannot be justified.

If we can barely find the funds to do high speed rail right, we most certainly cannot find the funds to do high speed rail wrong.
Accordingly, we call upon the High-Speed Rail Authority and our local CalTrain Joint Powers Board to develop plans for a blended system that integrates high-speed rail with a 21st Century CalTrain.

To that end:

- We explicitly reject the notion of high-speed rail running from San Jose to San Francisco on an elevated structure or “viaduct”; and we call on the High-Speed Rail Authority to eliminate further consideration of an aerial option;

- We fully expect that high-speed rail running from San Jose to San Francisco can and should remain within the existing CalTrain right of way; and,

- Third and finally, consistent with a project of this more limited scope, the Authority should abandon its preparation of an EIR (Environmental Impact Report) for a phased project of larger
dimensions over a 25 year timeframe. Continuing to plan for a project of this scope in the face of limited funding and growing community resistance is a fool's errand; and is particularly ill-advised when predicated on ridership projections that are less than credible.

Within the existing right-of-way, at or below grade, a single blended system could allow high-speed rail arriving in San Jose to continue north in a seamless fashion as part of a 21st Century CalTrain (using some combination of electrification, positive train control, new rolling stock and/or other appropriate upgrades) while maintaining the currently projected speeds and travel time for high-speed rail.

The net result of such a system would be a substantially upgraded commuter service for Peninsula and South Bay residents capable of accommodating high-speed rail from San Jose to San Francisco.
All of this is possible, but only if the High-Speed Rail Authority takes this opportunity to rethink its direction.

Over the course of the past 18 months the Authority has come under considerable criticism from the California Legislative Analyst’s Office, the Bureau of State Audits, the California Office of the Inspector General, the Authority’s own Peer Review Group and the Institute of Transportation Studies at the University of California at Berkeley. The Authority would do well to take these critiques to heart, and to make them the basis for a renewed and improved effort.

Frankly, a great many of our constituents are convinced that the High-Speed Rail Authority has already wandered so far afield that it is too late for a successful course correction. We hope the Authority can prove otherwise.
An essential first step is a rethinking of the Authority's plans for the Peninsula and South Bay. A commitment to a project which eschews an aerial viaduct, stays within the existing right-of-way, sets aside any notion of a phased project expansion at a later date, and incorporates the necessary upgrades for CalTrain - which would produce a truly blended system along the CalTrain corridor - is the essential next step.
February 14, 2011

Mr. Roelof van Ark
California High Speed Rail Authority
925 L Street, Suite 1425
Sacramento, CA 95814

Subject: Local Agency Requests

Dear Mr. van Ark:

The undersigned cities are united in our interest to maintain a constructive relationship with the High Speed Rail Authority staff, consultants and Board of Directors. We believe that progress is being made to improve communication between the High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA) and our cities. Recent Authority decisions to add a below grade alignment option in Redwood City and evaluate a light maintenance facility in addition to the one being considered in Brisbane are evidence of the Authority’s efforts to address local concerns regarding the Alternatives Analysis and the range of alternatives being considered in the Draft environmental document (DEIR/DEIS).

We support high speed rail if done correctly. Neither the HSRA nor the local agencies can determine what it means to be done correctly unless there is adequate information available within the Alternatives Analysis and environmental review process. Toward this end our cities have agreed upon the need for the following to be analyzed in the DEIR/DEIS:

1. Alternatives to Open Trench Alignment Sections: Covered Trench, Intermittent Covering of Trench and Bored Tunnel
2. Phased Implementation
3. 2-Track Alternative
4. Land Use and Economic Impacts
5. Use of Rail Right of Way Post Construction

**Alternatives to Open Trench Alignment** - We are requesting that the DEIR/DEIS include an evaluation of the comparative impacts of the open trench option versus a fully covered trench and intermittent lengths of covered trench as well as a bored tunnel. It is understood that the locations where this may be considered are not fully known at this time. However, our interests would be met if illustrative
examples are selected within segments where the trench option is being considered. The fully covered trench option would need to be of sufficient length to demonstrate all of the impacts, mitigated impacts and benefits of this type of alignment. If the impacts and benefits of fully covered trench segments or short covered trench lengths are not evaluated in the DEIR/DEIS, it will be very difficult to consider this design option in the future.

**Phased Implementation** – It may be appropriate for the HSRA to obtain environmental clearance for a four track, fully grade separated and electrified rail project to serve the ultimate needs of both Caltrain and High Speed Rail. However, it is highly unlikely that funding will be available to build the ultimate system initially. Therefore, a phased project is likely. We ask that the potential phasing of the project be described in the 15 percent design and evaluated in the DEIR/DEIS. Our interest is to determine if a 2- track alignment could be built initially and then expanded to a 4-track system as demand for the rail service increases.

**Two-Track System** – There has been considerable discussion regarding the ridership forecasts. We understand that they are forecasts and may not reflect actual ridership levels achieved when the system is in operation. We request that a 2-track project be considered in the 15 percent engineering and evaluated in the DEIR/DEIS as an alternative to the 4-Track project. Considering such an option has the obvious benefit to HSR of controlling the initial build out costs as well as managing the environmental impacts, maintaining CalTrain operations, etc. A two-track system has great advantages where the right-of-way width is restricted.

**Consideration of Existing Agency Land Use Plans and Economic Impacts of HSR** – The signatory cities request that the draft EIR/EIS consider local agency plans when evaluating alignment options and project impacts. This must include consideration of the Millbrae Station Area Plan; the Redwood City General Plan and Downtown Precise Plan; the San Mateo Downtown Plan and General Plan; and the Burlingame Downtown Area Plan and General Plan. The DEIR/DEIS is not required to include an analysis of economic impacts of the project. However, given the existing urban setting of the alignment corridor and potential impacts to commercial areas in most cities along the Peninsula, we believe that it is important that an economic analysis be prepared.

**Evaluation of Impacts and Benefits of Use of Rail Right of Way** – The existing rail right of way creates a linear barrier within our communities. The high speed rail project creates an opportunity to remove this barrier by increasing opportunities for east-west access and for both active and passive uses of the right of way. We request that the draft EIR/EIS evaluate the potential impacts and benefits of active use of the rail right of way after construction. This would include permitting active uses under aerial alignment segments or over covered trench segments. We believe the use of the air-rights over the right of way has great potential to add value for all parties and is consistent with the expressed desire by the HSRA to find other sources of financing for more expensive alignment solutions.
The signatory cities recognize that right of way, topography, subsurface soil conditions, water table elevation and maintenance of Caltrain operations all affect the range of feasible alternatives. We understand that some alternatives that have been requested may prove infeasible. We request that the basis for the finding of infeasibility be provided. We also request that those design or operational factors that contribute to the finding of infeasibility be disclosed so that we can consider whether these factors could be changed to produce a feasible alternative. Our interest is to have a discussion of alternatives found to be infeasible similar to the recent discussion in Redwood City regarding the below grade alignment. In that case, agency initiated constraints were lifted and a below grade alternative is now being evaluated.

Our cities recognize the difficulty in having meaningful discussions with each local agency individually particularly as to how a change in one city might influence a change in an adjacent city. We know that we must make a local investment in the process and that in some cases it may make sense for us to share resources. We also recognize that we have a responsibility to resolve some of the conflicts that may arise with adjacent agencies as the project proceeds. To that end, we will continue to expand our multi-city partnership and identify areas of common interest and benefit for HSR.

We have evaluated the option of using the Technical and Policy Maker Working Groups for this purpose. However, there are two flaws in this option. First the Working Groups include agencies from multiple local agencies from multiple counties and thus is not of practical size. Second, the Working Groups have been designed to facilitate communication from the Peninsula Rail Program (PRP) to the local agencies and only to a limited degree from local agencies to the PRP. What is missing is a forum for local agencies to work together to resolve issues related to the high speed rail project. We have recently formed a group that includes representation from the signatory cities to provide a forum for improved communications between our respective local agencies and with both the HSRA and the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board/Caltrain. We are inviting other agencies and will welcome their participation.

We believe that initiating discussions with our cities as a group will help advance the project and improve overall communication among agencies. Initially, the discussions should include resolution of any remaining Alternatives Analysis issues; facilitate communication regarding key environmental analyses; and initiate discussions regarding a single cooperative agreement between the HSRA and our agencies. We invite you to meet with our group to discuss and resolve these important and urgent issues and to establish a pattern through which subsequent issues can be raised, analyzed and resolved.

We appreciate the time and effort you, your staff and consultants have made in addressing local issues related to the high speed rail project. We look forward to continued cooperation and collaboration to advance our shared interests and resolve our differences.
Sincerely,

CITY OF SAN MATEO

[Signature]
Jack Matthews, Mayor

CITY OF MILLBRAE

[Signature]
Daniel F. Quigg, Mayor

CITY OF BURLINGAME

[Signature]
Terry Nagel, Mayor

CITY OF REDWOOD CITY

[Signature]
Jeff Ira, Mayor

Cc: High Speed Rail Board of Directors
    Honorable Anna Eshoo, U.S. House of Representatives
    Honorable Jackie Speier, U.S. House of Representatives
    Honorable City Council Members (Signatory Cities)
    Mike Scanlon, Executive Director Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board
    Dominic Spaethling, HNTB
**Meeting Purpose**

Roelof van Ark, Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) was present to provide a presentation on the San Francisco to San Jose Peninsula High Speed Rail Project. Below is a summary of similarities and differences between Congresswoman Eshoo, Senator Simitian and Assembly member Gordon's press statement on high speed rail dated April 18th and the presentation given by CEO van Ark April 20th in San Mateo:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Position</th>
<th>Eshoo</th>
<th>Simitian</th>
<th>Gordon</th>
<th>CHSRA CEO</th>
<th>van Ark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abandon EIR planning for larger project over 25-year time horizon to 2035</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate 4-track option</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus project only on predominantly 2-track alignment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejection of Aerial Viaduct option</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System should remain on Caltrain ROW</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meeting format
The meeting was scheduled from 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. It was “closed to the public” and meeting participation was primarily allowed only for representatives of the four San Mateo Rail Corridor Partnership cities (i.e., Burlingame, Millbrae, Redwood City and San Mateo). These representatives included assigned council members, city managers, public works directors in the cities of Burlingame, Millbrae, Redwood City, San Mateo, South San Francisco and other San Mateo County local agencies on the rail corridor and guests. The meeting was not a public meeting under the Brown Act. The officials from these agencies sat at a table in the front of the room. The meeting was presided by the Mayor of San Mateo. Other public agencies including Palo Alto sat in chairs in the audience section of the room. Others present at the meeting included Mike Scanlon, CEO of Caltrain, Marian Lee, Executive Officer, Planning and Development, Samtrans, councilmember Sepi Richardson from Brisbane and a staff person from the City of Menlo Park.

Presentation
Mr. Van Ark gave a PowerPoint presentation from 3:05 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. The meeting chair then opened the meeting to questions from representatives of the San Mateo County Rail Corridor Partnership cities.

Questions asked of Mr. van Ark by the Partnership agencies included:

Q. What documentation did CHSRA have that said a covered trench could only be covered for 800’ then had to be opened up?
R. “Do not know, but will get back to you.”

Q. Is it your understanding that you cannot run high speed rail trains on same line as freight trains?
R. CHSRA had been granted a waiver to enable both systems to run on the peninsula with freight trains limited to running at times different than HSR and Caltrain trains
Q. What did CEO van Ark think about recent press accounts given by Congresswoman Eshoo, Senator Simitian and Assemblymember Gordon and other legislators regarding HSR on the peninsula?

R. Mr. van Ark responded he thought many of the concepts outlined had been covered by the presentation given today including phased implementation and use of the existing Caltrain ROW.

The City of Palo Alto had a number of questions we were unable to ask due to time limitations and the answers to these questions were not addressed in the presentation by Mr. van Ark:

- Would you be willing to modify the project description of the San Francisco to San Jose EIR to limit the project to a two to three-track system?

- What is the status of the financing plan especially in light of fact that CHSRA’s own documents show a project cost at $66B well in excess of the $43B advertised estimates?

- What is the status of off-shore company investment in High Speed Rail?

- Would you support the “blended” project identified by Congresswoman Eshoo, Senator Simitian and Assemblyman Gordon?

- What role does commuter rail service, (i.e. Caltrain); have in the long-term success of statewide High Speed Rail system? Would improved commuter rail systems in Los Angeles and the Bay Area with connections to a High Speed Rail spine through the Central Valley be a long-term model for success in light of the fact that federal funds have already been committed to the Central Valley?

- The Eshoo/Simitian/Gordon proposal contains a number of elements: elimination of a viaduct or other elevated structure, limit the project to the Caltrain right-of-way, elimination of the concept of a four-track phased project scope during the next 25 years, upgraded Caltrain service, and seamless transitions between HSR and Caltrain in San Jose. Do you agree with these aspects of this proposal and if so which ones are most feasible in your opinion?

- Many on the Peninsula have supported “High Speed Rail Done Right”, meaning a system that minimizes local impacts on our communities including below grade designs where appropriate. In your opinion, is “High Speed Rail Done Right” feasible financially?

- What is the status of the business plan? Will you adhere to the October 2011 deadline set by the legislature?
• What commitments will you make for cities and the public to have substantive input and coordination as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) for the San Francisco to San Jose project?
SF-SJ SECTION
PHASED IMPLEMENTATION
APPROACH

presented to the
San Mateo County Rail Corridor Partnership

by
Roelof van Ark

April 20, 2011
The HSR Authority appreciates the approach taken by the San Mateo County Rail Corridor Partnership to discuss rail issues with the Authority.

The HSRA continues to work with Caltrain and the PRP to further the joint development of an integrated transportation system on the Peninsula, which will benefit both agencies and the communities the systems serve.
ALIGNMENT DESIGN OPTIONS – A, B, B1

[Map showing alignment options A, B, and B1 with various stations and potential locations marked with numbers.]
Five Issues

1. Alternatives to Open Trench Alignment: Covered Trench, Intermittent Covering, Bored Tunnel.
2. Phased Implementation
3. 2-Track System
4. Land Use and Economic Impacts
5. Use of Right of Way Post Construction.
LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

- The Authority remain consistent with the following laws:
  - Voter-approved Proposition 1A
  - California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)
- The Authority must consider the full build-out of the system in the year 2035 (the time horizon used by all CA transportation authorities).
Partially Covered Trench Alignment Sections:

- New design option (B2) will investigate partial covered trench [800’ max sections] in city centers on the corridor. Will work with cities to determine locations.

- Designed for lightweight uses such as passenger malls or parking.

- Heavy structures over trench would require additional piling and structures by developers (to be further investigated)
Bored Tunnel Alignment Sections:

- Bored tunnels considered primarily where no alternatives exist (costs) like mountains, to eliminate high-rise building destruction, etc.

- Taking HST exclusively into tunnel will not offer grade separation for Caltrain and freight, nor an upgrade for Caltrain infrastructure.

- Existing diesel freight trains would (a) require additional ventilation if operated in tunnels, (b) require further precautions when the freight trains transport HAZMAT materials (which is the case on the Peninsula)

- Transitions for tunnels are difficult to place as they require wider footprints for portals and long approaches (more intrusive).
Central Valley Selected for Receipt of ARRA funding and early construction between 2012 and 2017

Opportunity for Refined and more Detailed Analysis and increased collaboration on SF-SJ Section
INITIAL CONSTRUCTION
Starting in the Central Valley

The high-speed rail backbone

- Section where California’s HST system will travel 220-mph maximum operating speed for long periods of time (enabling the two-hour, 40-minute requirement for trip time between LA and San Francisco)
- Initial track in the Central Valley will serve as testing and proving ground for new high-speed train technology in the United States
- Less expensive land and less complex engineering in the Valley
- Near-term job creation benefits (conservative estimate of 100,000 jobs – direct and indirect – over life of the first $5.5 billion in construction)
FUTURE EXPANSION
Getting to Passenger Service

From
Initial Construction Section [ICS]

To
Initial Operable Section [IOS]

To
Completion of Phase 1

To
Phase 2
Many Peninsula communities have requested:

- Evaluation of phased service implementation
- Integration of HST and Caltrain services
- Coordination of HST and Caltrain ridership and capacity projections into long-term planning
- Consideration of community specific plans and development projects

HSR is most willing to use the additional time to ensure that these issues are addressed, and to work together with Caltrain to ensure mutual benefits.
CHSRA has announced “Phased Implementation”

- Incremental implementation of HST service along corridor
- Opportunity for greater collaboration with local and regional agencies, and the communities
- Time to select ultimate build alternative subject to the ability to accommodate phased implementation

Goal

- Provide HST “One-Seat Rides” from San Francisco in the most cost effective manner and to enhance ridership of the “Initial Operable Section”
INITIAL OPERATING PROJECT (IOP)

Peninsula IOP

- To define minimum infrastructure required to support an initial level of High-Speed Train service
- Must be feasible as part of the full build DEIR/EIS
- Assumes sharing existing Caltrain tracks/ROW
- Must maintain Caltrain services during phased implementation
- Must consider the freight rail requirements on the Peninsula
- Would require Caltrain electrification, PTC, new generation rolling stock (matching dimensions/platforms)
- Does not necessarily lead to grade separation advantages
2 TRACKS OR MORE?

**Line Capacity (HSR and Caltrain)**
- Relative Operating Speeds
- Stopping Patterns
- Limited Passing Tracks

**Overlapping Peak Hours**

**Infrastructure/Rolling Stock**
- Platform Heights
- Potential wider body HSR vs Narrow Caltrain Vehicles

**Crossings Impact Service**
- Rail line speed (FRA Guidelines: 80-110mph – Install additional automated devices; 111-125mph – Fail-safe vehicle detection devices and full barriers)
- Roadway traffic congestion
- Reliability
CONSTRUCTION STAGING EXAMPLE: TRENCH

Caltrain today

Electrified

Electrified Shoofly

Remove tracks

First Trench

Transfer & 2nd Trench

Final Configuration
CONSTRUCTION STAGING EXAMPLE: AERIAL (1 BRIDGE)
Publication of SF-SJ Section Draft EIR/EIS extended to late summer/early fall of 2012.
RAIL CORRIDOR PARTNERSHIP ISSUES
#3-5

- **Two-Track Alternative:** This has been covered in the “Phased Implementation” discussion.

- **Land Use and Economic Impacts:** Adopted land-use plans on rail corridor (Millbrae Station Area Plan, San Mateo Downtown Plan etc.) will be considered in EIR/EIS. Close relationship between Authority, Caltrain and cities encouraged to ensure best results. Economic issue needs further discussions between HSRA and Caltrain.

- **Use of Rail Right of Way Post Construction:** HSR would like to ensure maximum benefits to local Authorities to benefit from aerial rights as well as areas under aerial structures. The Authority and Caltrain will need to discuss what is possible (ROW belongs to Caltrain). The FRA is also looking at the issue.
RAIL CORRIDOR PARTNERSHIP ISSUES

Q & A
Contact Info

- California High-Speed Rail Authority
  925 L St., Suite 1425
  Sacramento, CA 95814
  916-324-1541
  www.cahighspeedrail.ca.gov

- Visit Twitter, Facebook, Flickr and Posterous

- Terry Lightfoot, Public Involvement Manager
  tlightfoot@hntb.com / (415) 963-6718