SAN FRANCISCO TO SAN JOSE PROJECT SECTION

Staff-Recommended State’s Preferred Alternative Community Working Group Meetings
July 2019
» Introductions & Agenda Review
» Refining the Alternatives: Collaboration with Partner Agencies, Stakeholders, and Members of the Public
» Characteristics of Alternatives
» Identifying a Preferred Alternative
» Discussion of the Staff-Recommended State’s Preferred Alternative
» Next Steps
» Public Comment
OBJECTIVES

• Share Staff-Recommended State’s Preferred Alternative and process for selecting the State’s Preferred Alternative.

• Provide CWG members with an opportunity to discuss the staff recommendation.

• Collect CWG feedback on the Staff-Recommended State’s Preferred Alternative.

Staff will summarize the comments received at today’s meeting and report to the Authority Board for consideration with the recommended State’s Preferred Alternative on September 17, 2019.

Identifying the State’s Preferred Alternative does not approve or adopt a preferred alternative for final design or construction.
REFINING THE ALTERNATIVES:
Collaboration with Partner Agencies, Stakeholders, and Members of the Public
**ALTERNATIVES DEVELOPMENT**

**2005 - 2008**
- Programmatic Documents

**2009**
- NOP/NOI issued for 4-Track System
- Public Scoping
- Technical Working Group Meetings
- Community Open House Meetings
- Stakeholder Engagement

**2010**
- Preliminary Alternatives Analysis Report
- Supplemental Alternatives Analysis Report
- Stakeholder Engagement

**2012**
- 2012 Business Plan Adopted, calling for a Blended System along the Peninsula
- Senate Bill 1029 Passed, Providing Funding for Caltrain Electrification as part of the Blended System
- Nine-Party MOU
- Final Programmatic Documents

**2013**
- New MOU with PCJPB Committing to Blended System

**2016**
- New NOI/NOP Issued for Blended System
- Public Scoping
- Supplement to 2012 Nine-Party MOU

**2018**
- 2018 Business Plan

**2015 - ONGOING**
- Community Open House Meetings
- Environmental Justice Outreach
- Community/Technical Working Group Meetings
SAN FRANCISCO TO SAN JOSE COMMUNITY OUTREACH
2016 – 2019

Community Working Groups (14)

CSCG/LPMG (82)

Open Houses (11)

Community, Stakeholder & Environmental Justice Outreach (360+)

REFINING THE ALTERNATIVES: Collaboration with Partner Agencies, Stakeholders, and Members of the Public
## INTERFACING WITH NORTHERN CALIFORNIA AGENCIES

Topics covered in 2018 - 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Alignments</th>
<th>Water Management</th>
<th>Transportation/Roads</th>
<th>Engineering/Design</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Joint Outreach</th>
<th>2018 Business Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area Rapid Transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Strategic Growth Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans District 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City and County Staff (throughout corridor)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floodplain Administrators and Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Transportation Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineta San Jose International Airport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco International Airport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transbay Joint Powers Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REFINING THE ALTERNATIVES**: Collaboration with Partner Agencies, Stakeholders, and Members of the Public
KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED DURING OUTREACH

• Aesthetic impacts and visual quality
• Brisbane LMF: air quality, visual, and noise impacts of construction and operation
• Compatibility of project design with future land use development
• Displacements
• Employment opportunities
• Encroachment on BCDC jurisdiction
• Impacts on Caltrain and other transit services
• Noise and vibration
• Safety and security at at-grade crossings and on station platforms
• Traffic congestion

REFINING THE ALTERNATIVES: Collaboration with Partner Agencies, Stakeholders, and Members of the Public
STATE’S PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

REFINING THE ALTERNATIVES: Collaboration with Partner Agencies, Stakeholders, and Members of the Public
CHARACTERISTICS OF ALTERNATIVES
OVERVIEW

• There are differences between the two alternatives and the staff recommendation is based on stakeholder input and analyses completed to date.

• All alternatives will be analyzed at an equal level of detail and described in the published Draft EIR/EIS.
SAN FRANCISCO – SAN JOSE PROJECT ALTERNATIVES A AND B

- **San Francisco to San Jose Project Section**
  - Alternative A Features
    - East Option Light Maintenance Facility
    - No Additional Passing Tracks
  - Alternative B Features
    - West Option Light Maintenance Facility
    - Additional Passing Tracks

- **Light Maintenance Facility**
  - East Option (Alt A)
  - West Option (Alt B)

- **No Additional Passing Tracks**
  - Alt A
  - Additional Passing Tracks (Alt B)

- **Relocation of San Carlos Station**

- **HSR Stations**
- **San Jose to Merced Alignments**
- **Downtown Extension**
SAN FRANCISCO TO SAN JOSE
Common Project Elements – Alternatives A & B

• High-Speed Rail stations
  » San Francisco 4th and King
  » Millbrae

• Up to 110 mph speeds
  » Track modifications to support higher speeds

• Peak operations
  » 4 High-Speed Rail trains and 6 Caltrain trains per hour/per direction

1 Salesforce Transit Center has been environmentally cleared by Transbay Joint Powers Authority and will not be part of the California High-Speed Rail Authority’s environmental analysis. San Jose Diridon Station is being evaluated as part of the San Jose to Merced Project Section but will be included in both project sections’ environmental analysis.
SAN FRANCISCO TO SAN JOSE
Common Project Elements – Alternatives A & B

- Remove hold-out rule at Broadway and Atherton Caltrain Stations
- Safety modifications at Caltrain-only stations and at-grade crossings
- Corridor fencing
BLENDED AT-GRADE

Typical Section North of Santa Clara

• Uses Caltrain electrification infrastructure and tracks

• Predominantly within the existing railroad right-of-way

• At-grade tracks with quad gates at each road crossing
GRADE CROSSING FEATURES

- Channelization
- Quad road barriers
- 8ft high right-of-way fence
LIGHT MAINTENANCE FACILITY

Alternatives Carried Forward

Brisbane

Alternative A
M East

Alternative B
M West

LEGEND

- San Francisco to San Jose Alignment
- Proposed HSR Stations
- Proposed Maintenance Facilities
- San Jose to Merced Alignment
PASSING TRACKS EVALUATION TIMELINE

- 2011: Shift to Blended System
  - Feedback from Alternatives Analysis
  - 2012 Business Plan
  - MTC 9-party MOU
  - SB 1029/SB 557

- 2012: Caltrain Blended Service Study
  - Five Passing Track Options: North, Short-Middle-4, Long-Middle-4, Middle-3, South
  - Dismissed: North and South due to poor performance

- 2013: Joint HSR/Caltrain Blended System Planning Analysis
  - Three Passing Track Options: Short-Middle-4, Long-Middle-4, Middle-3, No passing tracks
  - Dismissed: Long Middle-4 and Middle-3 due to community impacts

- 2014: HSR EIR/EIS Evaluation
  - Alt. A – No additional passing tracks
  - Alt. B – Short-Middle-4 passing tracks

- 2015: Caltrain Business Plan
  - Evaluation of future need for passing tracks

REFINING THE ALTERNATIVES: Collaboration with Partner Agencies, Stakeholders, and Members of the Public
PASSING TRACKS
Alternatives Carried Forward

• Alternative A: No Additional Passing Track Option

• Alternative B: Short-Middle 4-Track Passing Track Option (6 miles)
  » San Mateo to Redwood City
  » Adjacent to 1.8 miles of residential uses
  » Relocates San Carlos Caltrain station

Note: “Middle” means middle of the corridor
IDENTIFYING A PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE CRITERIA

System Performance, Operations, & Costs
- Alignment Length
- Maximum Authorized Speed
- Proximity to Transit Corridors
- Travel Time
- Capital Costs
- Operations & Maintenance Costs

Environmental Factors
- Biological and Aquatic Resources

Community Factors
- Displacements
- Aesthetics and Visual Quality
- Land Use and Development
- Transportation
- Emergency Vehicle Access/Response Time
- Environmental Justice

All data is preliminary and subject to change
Environmental documents will include the entire project section from San Francisco to Alma St., San Jose.

**STAFF-RECOMMENDED STATE’S PREFERRED ALTERNATIVES**

SAN FRANCISCO to SAN JOSE PROJECT SECTION
4th & King Station (San Francisco) to W. Alma Avenue (San Jose)

SAN JOSE to CENTRAL VALLEY WYE PROJECT EXTENT
Scott Boulevard (City of Santa Clara) to Carlucci Road (Merced County)

*Environmental documents will include the entire project section from San Francisco to Alma St., San Jose.
**Bold text** in tables indicates best-performing alternative(s).  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>ALT A</th>
<th>ALT B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alignment length (miles)</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Operating Speed (mph)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Up to 110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSR Peak Hour Average Representative Travel Time San Francisco to San Jose (minutes)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 1A Service Travel Time Compliance</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Capital Costs (2017$)</td>
<td>$2.6 billion</td>
<td>$3.5 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Annual Operations and Maintenance Costs (2017$)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$78 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain Peak Hour Average Representative Travel Time (minutes)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Operational service time includes station stops, schedule pad, and other operating parameters
### DISPLACEMENTS

**Bold text** in tables indicates best-performing alternative(s).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>ALT A</th>
<th>ALT B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential displacements (number of units)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial and industrial displacements (# of businesses)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(square feet)</td>
<td>211,261</td>
<td>466,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and public facilities displacement (number of units)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example:** overlay of footprint in urban area

**HSR Temporary and permanent footprint**

**Identifying A State’s Preferred Alternative**
AESTHETICS AND VISUAL QUALITY

**Bold text** in tables indicates best-performing alternative(s).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERION</th>
<th>ALT A</th>
<th>ALT B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of key viewpoints with decreased visual quality</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

San Carlos Station

El Camino Real at 39th Avenue, San Mateo
LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT

• Both alternatives potentially reduce available land for development at Brisbane Baylands
• Alternative B would also convert 8 acres of land at Icehouse Hill

Alternative A
Impacts 93 acres planned commercial and 2 acres planned mixed use (with residential permitted)

Alternative B
Impacts 90 acres planned commercial and 21 acres planned mixed use (with residential permitted)
Bold text in tables indicates best-performing alternative(s).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>ALT A</th>
<th>ALT B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temporary interference with local vehicle circulation</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Along El Camino Real during passing track construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Access from Downtown San Carlos to Caltrain Station</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Reduced pedestrian access due to the relocation of the station 2,260 feet south of current location</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**EMERGENCY VEHICLE ACCESS/RESPONSE TIME**

*Bold text* in tables indicates best-performing alternative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERION</th>
<th>ALT A</th>
<th>ALT B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temporary increases in emergency vehicle access/response time in south</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo, Belmont, San Carlos, and northern Redwood City due to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>short-term road closures and construction traffic associated with passing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>track construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IDENTIFYING A PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE**
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**ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE**

**Bold text** in tables indicates best-performing alternative(s).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>ALT A</th>
<th>ALT B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction-related disruption to Caltrain Service</td>
<td>Less than Alt. B due to no passing track construction</td>
<td>More than Alt. A due to passing track construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Effect on Planned Mixed Use Development (residential uses allowed) in Brisbane (acres)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IDENTIFYING A PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE**

**EJ Populations**

**EJ Populations + Impacts**

**Adverse & Beneficial Impacts**
BIOLOGICAL AND AQUATIC RESOURCES

**Bold text** in tables indicates best-performing alternative(s).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>ALT A</th>
<th>ALT B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total permanent impacts on wetlands and other waters of the U.S. (acres)</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Impacts on endangered callippe silverspot butterfly habitat (acres)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Photo 2: Visitacion Creek, east of Tunnel Road

**IDENTIFYING A PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE**
### SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION – SYSTEM PERFORMANCE, OPERATIONS, AND COST FACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>ALT A</th>
<th>ALT B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alignment length (miles)</td>
<td>No Difference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Operating Speed (mph)</td>
<td>No Difference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSR Peak Hour Average Representative Travel Time San Francisco to San Jose (minutes)</td>
<td></td>
<td>![Symbol]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 1A Service Travel Time Compliance</td>
<td>![Symbol]</td>
<td>![Symbol]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Capital Costs (2017$)</td>
<td>![Symbol]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Annual Operations and Maintenance Costs (2017$)</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain Peak Hour Average Representative Travel Time (minutes)</td>
<td>![Symbol]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Symbol] = Best-performing alternative

1 Operational service time includes station stops, schedule pad, and other operating parameters
## SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION – COMMUNITY FACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>ALT A</th>
<th>ALT B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential displacements</td>
<td></td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial and industrial displacements</td>
<td></td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and public facilities displacement</td>
<td></td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of key viewpoints with decreased visual quality</td>
<td></td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary interference with local vehicle circulation</td>
<td></td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Access from Downtown San Carlos to Caltrain Station</td>
<td></td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary increases emergency response time in south San Mateo, Belmont, San Carlos, and northern Redwood City due to short-term road closures</td>
<td></td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction-related disruption to Caltrain Service</td>
<td></td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Effect on Planned Mixed Use Development (residential uses allowed) in Brisbane</td>
<td></td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Best-performing alternative (fewest/least community impacts)
### SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION – ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>ALT A</th>
<th>ALT B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total permanent impacts on wetlands and other waters of the U.S.</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Impacts on endangered callippe silverspot butterfly habitat</td>
<td></td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

○ = Best-performing alternative (fewest environmental impacts)
2040 Baseline Growth Scenario (6 Caltrain + 4 HSR)

Features
- Blended service with up to 10 TPH north of Tamien (6 Caltrain + 4 HSR) and up to 10 TPH south of Tamien (2 Caltrain + 8 HSR)
- Three skip stop patterns with 2 TPH – most stations are served by 2 or 4 TPH, with a few receiving 6 TPH
- Some origin-destination pairs are not served at all

Passing Track Needs
- Less than 1 mile of new passing tracks at Millbrae associated with HSR station plus use of existing passing tracks at Bovshure and Lawrence

Options & Considerations
- Service approach is consistent with PCEP and HSR EIRs
- Opportunity to consider alternative service approaches later in Business Plan process

Identifying a State’s Preferred Alternative
ALTERNATIVE A – Staff-Recommended State’s Preferred Alternative

Conclusions of Technical Analysis

- Fewest major visual impacts
- Fewest displacements
- Fewest road closures
- Fewest impacts on wetlands and habitats
- Fewest impacts on natural resources
- Lowest capital cost
- Slower HSR, faster Caltrain peak hour travel time
- Policy-level alignment with the Caltrain Business Plan
ALTERNATIVE A – STAFF-RECOMMENDED STATE’S PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

IDENTIFYING A PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
DISCUSSION OF THE STAFF-RECOMMENDED STATE’S PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
NEXT STEPS
NEXT STEPS

2019

- CWG Meetings
- Open Houses on Staff-Recommended State’s Preferred Alternative

2020

- Board Meeting Identification of State’s Preferred Alternative
- Publish Draft EIR/EIS
  - Ongoing Communication/Engagement
  - Public Hearings
- Close of 45-day Public Comment Period

2021

- Complete and Certify EIR/EIS
  - Community Open Houses & Briefings
  - Project Approval

NEXT STEPS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Peninsula Open House</td>
<td>August 6, 5:00 to 8:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Adrian Wilcox High School</td>
<td>Santa Clara, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilroy Open House</td>
<td>August 8, 5:00 to 8:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Gilroy Portuguese Hall</td>
<td>Gilroy, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Open House</td>
<td>August 12, 5:00 to 8:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Bay Area Metro Center</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Open House</td>
<td>August 15, 5:00 to 8:00 p.m.</td>
<td>City Hall Council Chambers</td>
<td>San Jose, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo County Open House</td>
<td>August 19, 5:00 to 8:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Sequoia High School</td>
<td>Redwood City, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Banos Open House</td>
<td>August 21, 5:00 to 8:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Los Banos Community Center</td>
<td>Los Banos, CA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REQUEST FOR COMMUNITY FEEDBACK
CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPEED RAIL

Please share the information presented today with your communities and give us your feedback.

• Comments received by **August 22, 2019** will be summarized in the staff report to the Authority Board.

• Comments can be submitted via email to [San.Jose_Merced@hsr.ca.gov](mailto:San.Jose_Merced@hsr.ca.gov) and [San.Francisco_San.Jose@hsr.ca.gov](mailto:San.Francisco_San.Jose@hsr.ca.gov) or via mail to:
  Northern California Regional Office
  California High-Speed Rail Authority
  100 Paseo De San Antonio, Suite 300
  San Jose, CA 95113

• **Or** share feedback in person at an upcoming Open House or at the Authority Board meeting on September 17 in San Jose, CA.
PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD GUIDELINES

• Please submit a speaker card to be added to the comment queue

• 2 minute time limit

• Public comment is intended for working group members to hear from the public

• Staff will be available after the presentation to respond to questions, as necessary

• Please be respectful and follow meeting guidelines