

SAN MATEO COUNTY COMMUNITY WORKING GROUP MEETING SUMMARY July 24, 2019

SUMMARY

Introductions & Agenda Review

Cici Vu, facilitator, welcomed the Community Working Group (CWG) members, presented the meeting objectives, and reviewed the agenda. She asked members whether they had comments on the May 20, 2019 San Mateo County CWG Meeting Summary.

No questions or comments were recorded during this section of the meeting.

Morgan Galli, Northern California Regional Stakeholder Manager, provided opening remarks and outlined the process and timeline for including community feedback in the staff report and presentation to the Authority Board in September.

No questions or comments were recorded during this section of the meeting.

Refining the Alternatives: Collaboration with Partner Agencies, Stakeholders, and Members of the Public

James Tung, San Francisco to San Jose Project Manager, presented about Authority collaboration with partner agencies, stakeholders, and members of the public has helped shape the range of alternatives.

No questions or comments were recorded during this section of the meeting.

Characteristics of Alternatives

Tung gave a presentation on the differentiating criteria of Alternatives A and B for the San Francisco to San Jose Project Section.

The following questions, comments, and responses were recorded following the presentation. The comments and questions are grouped by topic and do not reflect the order of conversation.

Funding

- A member asked which capital improvements the Authority is paying for relating to the electrification of the existing Caltrain corridor.
 - Staff responded any infrastructure discussed in the environmental document will be paid for by the Authority.
- A member asked when the Authority will provide funding to remove the hold-out rule at both Broadway and Atherton Caltrain Stations.
 - Staff responded that the allocation of funding depends on when the environmental document is approved. The hold-out rules need to be removed to operate the high-speed rail system.

Passing Tracks

- A member asked what the purpose of the passing tracks is.
 - Staff replied that the passing tracks would allow for high-speed rail trains to bypass Caltrain trains that are stopped at Caltrain-only stations.
- A member asked what the operations implications for Caltrain and high-speed rail are without additional passing tracks.
 - Staff responded that a joint analysis conducted by Caltrain and the Authority shows that there is enough flexibility in the scheduled timetables to operate the system without passing tracks.
- A member asked how far into the future operations of both systems were analyzed in the joint analysis.
 - Staff replied that the analysis assumed high-speed rail service along the Peninsula in 2027, Silicon Valley to Central Valley service in 2029, and full service from San Francisco to Los Angeles in 2033 with 6 Caltrain and 4 high-speed rail trains per direction per peak hour.
- A member commented that Caltrain revealed that they will be bringing the moderate service scenario from their business plan to their board. This scenario outlines a plan for 8 Caltrain trains per hour and a need for passing tracks for operation of those higher levels of service assuming high-speed rail service stays at 4 trains per hour.
- A member asked if the Authority is considering different passing track configurations.
 - Staff responded that the Authority identified short middle 4-tracks as the best passing track option in 2017 after analysis showed other configurations are substantially more impactful and expensive.

Other

- A member asked about the impacts of the two alternatives on the San Carlos station.
 - Staff responded that there is no impact on the Caltrain San Carlos station for Alternative A. Alternative B would require the station to be moved a quarter mile south to accommodate the passing tracks.

Identifying a Preferred Alternative

Tung explaining the staff recommendation of Alternative A as the State's Preferred Alternative (PA).

The following questions, comments, and responses were recorded following the presentation. The comments and questions are grouped by topic and do not reflect the order of conversation.

Light Maintenance Facility

- A member asked why the design for the light maintenance facility (LMF) is not symmetrical between Alternatives.
 - Staff responded that the design for Alternative A avoids a Kinder Morgan tank storage facility.
- A member commented that the state passed legislation for units of housing and commercial development on the parcel of the proposed LMF for Alternative A.

- Staff responded that they are aware of the situation and are reaching out to the developer, Universal Paragon, to work on the issue.

Other

- A member asked staff to identify curves that will be straightened throughout the corridor.
 - Staff agreed to follow-up with the CWG member after the meeting.
- A member asked if only Alternative A would be considered in the environmental document.
 - Staff clarified that identifying a PA is required by California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) but both alternatives will be considered and reviewed equally in the environmental document. The staff recommendation and feedback received will be presented to the Authority's Board of Directors at the September 17th Board meeting.
- A member asked how many passing tracks would be installed for Alternative B.
 - Staff responded two passing tracks are included in Alternative B.
- A member asked what the preferred platform format for Alternative B is.
 - Staff responded that standard outboard platforms are provided for Caltrain trains operating on the outer tracks. HSR will operate on the two inside tracks.
- A member requested that additional spatial data be shared in general and specifically regarding the endangered butterfly habitat impacted under Alternative B.
- A member suggested showing a string chart to show where high-speed rail tracks would fit in the existing corridor configuration.
- A member requested to see the detailed analysis of the various differentiating factors.
 - Staff responded that the draft environmental document would contain all detailed analyses and the Authority would provide guidance to the CWG members for reviewing the document prior to its release.
- A member commented that Alternative B would be better for Caltrain but may be more difficult to permit than Alternative A.

Outreach Updates

Galli presented a timeline and next steps for collecting community feedback on the staff-recommended State's Preferred Alternative and sharing feedback with the Authority Board.

No questions or comments were recorded during this portion of the presentation.

Discussion of Staff-Recommended State's Preferred Alternative

Vu asked the CWG members to complete a worksheet with a series of questions about the staff-recommended State's Preferred Alternative. A summary of CWG member feedback provided via the worksheets is presented in Appendix A.

The following questions, comments, and responses were recorded following the worksheet exercise. The comments and questions are grouped by topic and do not reflect the order of conversation.

Platform Configuration

- A member asked if Caltrain agreed with the outside boarding platform configuration where there are passing tracks.
 - Staff responded that Caltrain was involved in reviewing the engineering plans that included the configuration.

- A member commented that a center and single platform configuration helps with safety, user experience, and navigation.
- A member commented that there are a lot of issues not discussed as it relates to the PA such as the difference of platform height requirements from high-speed rail and Caltrain.
 - Staff clarified that platform height is not a differentiator between alternatives and the presentation focused on the differentiators between Alternative A and Alternative B.

Passing Tracks

- A member commented that they did not understand the decision not to include more options regarding the length of the additional passing tracks.
 - Staff responded that the analysis conducted with Caltrain considered the expected number of trains. Previously considered passing track options were eliminated due to the number of at-grade crossings impacted, community impacts, and costs. Electrification and updating the signaling system allow for Caltrain and high-speed rail operations without passing tracks.
- A member asked if the area for the LMF in Alternative A could be used for passing tracks.
 - Staff replied that there are currently existing passing tracks in that area.

Other

- A member requested staff to consider using string charts, like Caltrain, to display relative spatial information along the corridor.
- A member commented that they felt Alternative A would be better for the City of Brisbane.

Vu asked CWG members various questions related to the PA. The discussion is summarized below by discussion question.

What alternative do you personally support? What alternative do your communities support? If different, why?

- Numerous members expressed personal support for Alternative B due to the additional passing tracks but believe their communities would support Alternative A because it would be easier to permit and build and would have the least disruption to daily routines.
- A member suggested that communities would support Alternative B more if the increase in capacity for Caltrain were highlighted.
- A member suggested focusing on how high-speed rail benefits the Bay Area housing market by serving as a connection between job centers and regions of the state with lower real estate costs.
- A member asked if the Authority would provide support to residents displaced by high-speed rail.
 - Staff responded that there is a relocation assistance program for impacted residents. Factsheets related to displacement protocols and the Right of Way (ROW) process are currently being updated and will be distributed to the CWG once completed.
- A member suggested focusing on the benefits of Alternative B in terms of Caltrain scheduling.
- A member expressed full support for Alternative B.

A member commented that, as a resident of the City of Brisbane, they felt the city is in a difficult position in planning for the Baylands with the incorporation of a LMF considering various tradeoffs to uphold its recently passed General Plan, protecting endangered species habitat, and accommodating state housing requirements. The member also expressed concern that the

Authority did not sufficiently consider the level of soil toxicity in its analysis of the LMF location for both alternatives. They concluded that their preference would be for the west side LMF because it would result in less potential toxic exposure from polluted soil disruption.

How well did staff balance different criteria to inform their identification of the PA?

- A member commented that, as a resident of the City of Brisbane, they would support Alternative B because the LMF under this alternative would be built in an area that is already heavily industrialized and polluted. They argued they would not want to see more industrial uses in another part of Brisbane.
- Other members reacted favorably to this argument. A member expressed concern that staff did not consider health and safety of local residents in identifying the location of the LMF.
- A member expressed concern that the staff-recommended PA does not consider operational improvements like clock-face scheduling for Caltrain.

Has your opinion changed after the information presented today?

- Numerous members originally supported Alternative A but indicated they support Alternative B as a result of the discussion held amongst members during the meeting. Their opinion was that Alternative A would provide an inferior skip-stop service to Alternative B, which would provide the possibility of offering a clock-faced schedule.
- One member stated they support Alternative A because there are fewer impacts to the endangered butterfly habitat.
- Numerous members suggested decoupling the additional passing tracks from the west side LMF option.
- While many members showed support for the City of Brisbane's representative who expressed a preference for the west side LMF (Alternative B), a discussion about impacts to future housing developments resulted in members drawing a correlation to and offering support for the staff's recommendation of Alternative A because an east side LMF would have the fewest impacts on planned housing in Brisbane.

PUBLIC COMMENT

- A member of the public commented that passing tracks are not necessary in Millbrae because all trains will stop as they would in the Los Angeles to Anaheim California High-Speed Rail project section; additionally, there is no need for curve straightening if all trains stop. The member of the public continued by noting that he gave a presentation to the City of Brisbane and documents to Caltrain for highlighting how light and heavy maintenance facilities in Europe need less than 10 acres. The member of the public concluded that Caltrain could be the lead agency for compliance with the National Environmental Protection Act and the California Environmental Quality Act in the Peninsula as high-speed rail would only be operating at 110 mph.
- A member of the public indicated that separate maps are needed that show where exactly the tracks are and what properties will be impacted and what the estimated take is. The member of the public commented that the square footage of the right-of-way takes by property should be considered in the Authority's analysis in that a one-foot take should not carry the same weight as a 50-foot take.

- A member of the public commented that the Environmental Impact Report/Statement represents a snapshot in time and may only consider what is being planned currently. The member of the public continued by noting that the current Caltrain Business Plan considers clock-face scheduling attainable with additional passing tracks. The member of the public concluded by stating it would be helpful if the Authority's presentation represented how not pursuing additional passing tracks would impact Caltrain's future operations.

ATTENDANCE

Working Group Members

Atherton Rail Committee	Paul Jones	Yes
Beresford Hillsdale Neighborhood Association	Robert Sellers	No
Burlingame Community Leader	Ross Bruce	Yes
Burlingame Resident	Joe Baylock	Yes
Caltrain Accessibility Advisory Committee	Fernanda Castello	No
Clean Coalition	Craig Lewis	No
Friends of Caltrain	Adrian Brandt	Yes
Greater East San Carlos Neighborhood	Dimitri Vandellos	No
Homeowners Assoc. of North Central San Mateo	Ben Toy	No
Housing Leadership Council of San Mateo	Karen Camacho (alternate)	Yes
Housing Leadership Council of San Mateo	Leora Tanjuatco Ross	No
Legal Aid Society of San Mateo County	Stacey Hawver	No
Menlo Park Chamber of Commerce	Fran Dehn	No
Millbrae Chamber of Commerce	Lorianne Richardson	No
Next Path Consulting	Debra Horen	Yes
North Fair Oaks Community	Ever Rodriguez	Yes
Peninsula Freight Rail Users Group (PFRUG)	Clem Molony (alternate)	Yes
Redwood City Chamber of Commerce	Amy Buckmaster	No
Redwood City Forward	Anthony Lazarus	Yes
Samaritan House	Laura Bent	No
San Francisco International Airport	Roger Hooson	No
San Francisco International Airport	Nile Ledbetter	Yes
San Mateo Area Chamber of Commerce	Matthew Jacobs	No
San Mateo County Central Labor Council	Richard Hedges	Yes
San Mateo County Economic Development Association	Rikki Hawkins	Yes
San Mateo County Economic Development Association/ Peninsula Mobility Group	Don Cecil	No
San Mateo County Health System	Brian Oh	No
Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition	Emma Shlaes	No
South San Francisco School Board/Samtrans Citizens Advisory Committee	John Baker	Yes
Sustainable San Mateo County	Christine Kohl-Zaugg	No

Authority Staff: James Tung, Phyllis Potter, Morgan Galli, Cici Vu, Matt Marvin, Zach Barr

ACTION ITEMS AND NEXT STEPS

- A meeting summary will be developed and distributed to CWG members for their review by August 19.
 - CWG members should send comments on the July Meeting Summary to staff by August 22 for inclusion in the version that will be appended to the Board Memo.
- CWG members who did not already fill out a Discussion Worksheet may submit a completed worksheet to Authority staff by August 22.
- CWG members interested in knowing where curves will be straightened throughout the corridor should contact Authority staff.
- Right-of-way and relocation assistance materials will be distributed to CWG members once they have been updated.
- Authority staff will follow up with Debra Horen to discuss LMF multi-use opportunities.

APPENDIX A

CWG members were asked how they personally felt about Alternative A, the staff-recommended State’s Preferred Alternative, with regard to the location of the LMF (East option).

Responses	Number of CWG Members
Support East option (Alternative A)	7
Support West option (Alternative B)	4
Write-in responses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Either option would be supported • No preference 	2

CWG members were asked how the community/organization/neighbors they represent would feel about the staff-recommendation for the location of the Light Maintenance Facility.

Responses	Number of CWG Members
Support East option (Alternative A)	6
Support West option (Alternative B)	4
Write-in responses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not enough information • Either option would be supported • No preference 	3

CWG members were asked how they personally felt about the staff-recommended State’s Preferred Alternative with regard to the need for additional passing tracks.

Responses	Number of CWG Members
Support no additional passing tracks (Alternative A)	2
Support additional passing tracks (Alternative B)	10
Write-in responses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not enough information 	1

CWG were asked how the community/organization/neighbors they represent would feel about the staff-recommended State’s Preferred Alternative with regard to the need for additional passing tracks.

Responses	Number of CWG Members
Support no additional passing tracks (Alternative A)	12
Support additional passing tracks (Alternative B)	5
Write-in responses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conflict with Caltrain? 	1

CWG members were asked how well they thought the staff-recommended State’s Preferred Alternative balances tradeoffs between (1) system performance, operations, and costs, (2) community, and (3) environmental factors.

Responses	Number of CWG Members
Very poorly	1
Somewhat poorly	2
Moderately/no opinion	4
Somewhat well	4
Very well	2

CWG members were asked to identify the five differentiating factors that are most important to their community.

Responses	Number of CWG Members
Caltrain service time	12
Residential displacements	8
HSR travel time	7
Capital costs	7
Commercial/industrial displacements	5
Community/public facility displacements	4
Mitigation needed to minimize emergency vehicle delays	4
Waters and wetlands	4
Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental impacts from toxic particulate substances that will be disrupted by moving soil for the LMF 	3

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public health • Safety 	
Impacts to butterfly habitat	2
Temporary interference with vehicle circulation	1
Pedestrian access to San Carlos Caltrain Station	1

CWG members were asked if their opinion of the PA (Alternative A) changed based on today's discussion.

Responses	Number of CWG Members
Yes	6
No	2