

SAN FRANCISCO TO SAN JOSE COMMUNITY WORKING GROUP MEETING SUMMARY NOVEMBER 17, 2020

SUMMARY

Introductions and Agenda Review

Joey Goldman, facilitator, welcomed San Francisco to San Jose Community Working Groups (CWG) members and thanked them for joining. He reviewed the meeting agenda: overview of Project updates, highlights from the 2020 Sustainability Report, a discussion of the Early Train Operator (ETO) passenger experience primary research, international examples of blended service operations, and an update on outreach activities.

A participant list is in Appendix A. The presentation is available on California High-Speed Rail Authority's (Authority's) website.

Project Update

Boris Lipkin, Northern California Regional Director, provided an overview of the Central Valley Wye Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS), the recent Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) adoption of the Blueprint for Plan Bay Area 2050, and the results of the Draft EIR/EIS public review period for the San Jose to Merced and San Francisco to San Jose Project Sections.

Questions, Comments, and Responses

- A member congratulated the Authority on releasing the Draft EIR/EIS. The member then asked if online outreach due to COVID-19 improved the Authority's ability to reach more and more varied people.
 - Authority staff replied that the outreach team quickly converted planned in-person outreach for the Draft EIR/EIS to be virtual outreach. An equal or greater number of people were reached virtually than in previous in-person outreach rounds.
- A member asked if the large number of comments for the San Jose to Merced Project Section were from a form letter.
 - Authority staff confirmed that over 500 of the responses were generated via a form letter about Coyote Valley wildlife movement. The Authority has engaged the Santa Clara Valley Open Space Authority, The Nature Conservancy, and others about this topic. In EIR/EIS processes, the magnitude of comments received on a topic does not affect the magnitude of the response received (i.e. similar comments get similar responses).
- A member asked if there are plans to secure the 2010 appropriations that President Trump did not release following President-elect Biden's inauguration.
 - Authority staff replied that the Authority filed suit when the federal government rescinded the \$929 million 2010 appropriations grant. With the incoming administration, the Authority hopes a cooperative relationship will be re-established, a settlement filed, and the grant received.
- A member commented that Therese McMillan, who is on President-elect Biden's transition team and was the Acting FTA Administrator under President Obama, may be a key figure for the administration's transportation efforts, which would have positive outcomes for the Bay Area.



- A member asked about the status of Cap-and-Trade revenue during COVID-19.
 - O Authority staff responded that the Authority receives a quarter of the funds generated from Cap-and-Trade each year. The total that the program has generated, on average, has been \$2 to \$3 billion each year with the Authority's share being a quarter of that. The May auction raised funds lower than average, the August auction revenues recovered slightly, and the November auction results have not yet been released. More information on Cap-and-Trade revenues will be included in the 2020 Business Plan.
- A member asked when the Final EIR/EIS will be released and for information regarding comments received.
 - Authority staff responded that the Final EIR/EIS will be released in approximately one year and that the Record of Decision should occur in December 2021. There were approximately 2,000 comments submitted through 150 submissions. Many comments included interest in Brisbane and Millbrae and there are continuing conversations in those areas.

2020 Sustainability Report

Meg Cederoth, Director of Planning and Sustainability, presented a summary of the 2020 Sustainability Report.

Questions, Comments, and Responses

- A member asked what entities comprise the Authority's peers in the GRESB sustainability analysis.
 - Authority staff responded that GRESB, which was developed for major investors to evaluate infrastructure, conducts the evaluation with the Authority's information. GRESB selects the peer groups, which, for the Authority, are transportation projects worldwide and major infrastructure projects in the United States. The Authority has scored incredibly well in these comparisons.
- A member commented that they endorse smart growth and station area development. The member asked if state legislation is required to achieve the goal, for example AB1482 was required for BART to manage its parking lot.
 - Authority staff replied that the Authority does not require legislation to conduct planning or development on its own land. The Authority has provided funding agreements to station communities along the alignment to develop land use plans to better accommodate and leverage high-speed rail stations. On Authority land, the Authority focuses on transit-oriented development that compliments local jurisdictions' plans.
- A member recommended sharing examples of what constitutes avoided or sequestered carbon dioxide.
 - Authority staff clarified that sequestered carbon dioxide refers to land that retains its soil levels and avoided carbon dioxide refers to areas where development that would have happened did not take place. Avoided emissions refers to carbon dioxide that would have been released should materials be deposited in landfills rather than recycled; the Authority recycles 97% of its materials.
- A member pointed out that Cap-and-Trade funds received by the Authority are due to entities paying to
 release carbon that primarily negatively affects disadvantaged communities. Therefore, the Authority's
 funds from Cap-and-Trade are ill-gotten. The member suggests that the Authority share information on
 total carbon emissions allowed by the Cap-and-Trade program when they share their data on
 sequestered and avoided carbon emission.
 - Authority staff note that the Air Resources Board conducts these calculations and they appreciate the interest in a holistic picture of carbon emissions.
- A member asked how the Accountability Framework initiative initial assessment is conducted.

 Authority staff shared that the award is based on the entire high-speed rail program and the Authority's practices. The Authority received an initial award based on evidence of the programto-date. Upon submittal of the Final EIR/EIS and construction, the Authority will submit additional documentation. The Envision tool was used to demonstrate practices across the Authority.

Early Train Operator Passenger Experience Primary Research

Madeline Rodriguez, DB Engineering & Consulting USA, presented the process and methodology for research conducted by the ETO on the passenger experience.

Questions, Comments, and Responses

The following questions, comments and responses were recorded following the presentation:

- A member asked if the seating layout presented in the sketches is finalized.
 - ETO staff replied that the seating layout has not been finalized but the survey information was part of informing those future decisions.
- A member asked why the ETO surveyed the general public which is not informed about high-speed rail instead of making passenger experience decisions based on international high-speed rail programs.
 - ETO staff responded that they, Deutsche Bahn, were hired to provide knowledge from international high-speed rail programs. Their international experience in combination with local knowledge and preferences will inform the passenger experience.
- A member asked if the class structure shared during the survey is finalized.
 - ETO staff replied that class structure is not finalized. The purpose of the survey is to gather information so the Authority can make an informed decision based on public interest and international examples.
- A member commented that Californians are inexperienced with high-speed rail and therefore not able to appropriately share their preferences on passenger experience. The member recommended using a two-by-two row pattern due to wheelchair access and comfort.
 - ETO staff shared that a large percentage of survey respondents reported experience with highspeed rail internationally.

International Examples of Blended Service Operations

Paul Hebditch, Operations Planning Lead, provided an overview of blended service operations in Europe.

Questions, Comments, and Responses

- A member asked about international examples of at-grade crossings on blended service operations.
 - Authority staff responded that at-grade crossings function the same for all types of trains.
 Regardless of train type, at-grade crossings require management around gate-down times and frequency of trains. One difference with high-speed rail is that fast trains, trains moving above 125 miles per hour, require a grade-separated corridor.
- A member asked how many trains are expected per hour on shared tracks elsewhere.
 - Authority staff shared an example of the West Coast Main Line in the United Kingdom which has a theoretical capacity of 40 trains per hour but in practice runs approximately 16 trains per peak hour.
- A member asked when sealed corridors are required.



- Authority staff responded that sealed corridors, or fully grade separated tracks, are required where trains travel above 125 miles per hour. In urban areas (i.e., the Peninsula) and where the track is blended (i.e., Gilroy to San Francisco), trains will travel at maximum speeds of 110 miles per hour and; therefore, will not require grade separation based on FRA safety standards.
- A member asked if the Authority would require a waiver to use European equipment, like Caltrain needed, in order to use lightweight equipment rather than heavier equipment required by the federal government. The member commented that a waiver is preferred in order to reach desired speeds.
 - Authority staff responded that this will be addressed when the Authority begins procurement.
 The Authority will comply with Federal Railroad Administration standards.
- A member asked if the Authority is planning to ensure level boarding to allow for unassisted roll-on-rolloff access.
 - Authority staff responded that the system will be built and designed for level boarding, as required by the Americans with Disabilities Act.
- A member commented that 110 miles per hour train speed in areas without grade separation is fast compared to Caltrain's current 79 miles per hour travel speed.
- A member commented that a huge amount of money is invested into creating safe at-grade crossings, but it is impossible to control for those who ignore the obvious danger.

Outreach Update

Rebecca Fleischer, Northern California Outreach Representative, provided a brief update on upcoming outreach events and results from a recent survey to understand how participants want to receive information from the Authority during the COVID-19 pandemic and what types of information they want to receive.

Questions, Comments, and Responses

None

Public Comments

- A member of the public commented that train speed through the Channel tunnel is 100 miles per hour.
 Four to six trains travel through the tunnel each hour, and freight trains account for the majority of train traffic.
- A member of the public requested to share a video of blended service operations.

Action Items and Next Steps

- The Authority will develop and distribute a meeting summary to CWG members.
- The Authority will provide an update on the November 2020 Cap-and-Trade auction when results are released.
 - Auction results can be found here.
- The Authority will share websites for GRESB and Envision.
- The Authority will provide a member information about blended systems.



APPENDIX A- Participants

Community Working Group Members			
Affiliation	Name	In Attendance	
Acterra	Lauren Weston	No	
Atherton Rail Committee	Paul Jones	No	
Bay Area Council	Gwen Litvak	No	
Beresford Hillsdale Neighborhood Association	Robert Sellers	No	
Burlingame Community Leader	Ross Bruce	No	
Burlingame Resident	Joe Baylock	Yes	
Caltrain Accessibility Advisory Committee	Bob Planthold, Fernanda Castello	No	
Caltrain Citizens Advisory Committee	Paul Bendix	Yes	
Candlestick Cove Neighborhood Association	Jignesh Desai	Yes	
Chinatown Community Development Center	Chris Man	No	
Clean Coalition	Craig Lewis	No	
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods	George Wooding	No	
Friends of Caltrain	Adrian Brandt	Yes	
Friends of Caltrain (San Francisco)	Andrew Sullivan	No	
Friends of DTX	Brian Stokle	No	
Greater East San Carlos Neighborhood	Dimitri Vandellos	No	
Homeowners Assoc. of North Central San Mateo	Ben Toy	No	
Housing Leadership Council of San Mateo	Evelyn Stivers,	No	
	Leora Tanjuatco Ross		
Legal Aid Society of San Mateo County	Stacey Hawver	No	
Little Hollywood Neighborhood Association	Russel Morine	No	
Loma Prieta Sierra Club	Gladwyn D'Souza	No	
Menlo Park Chamber of Commerce	Fran Dehn	No	
Millbrae Chamber of Commerce	Lorianne Richardson	No	
Millbrae Resident	Nathan Chan	Yes	
Mountain View Coalition for Sustainable Planning	Cliff Chambers	No	
Muslim Community Association (MCA) of San Francisco Bay Area	Faisal Ahmed	Yes	
Next Path Consulting	Debra Horen	Yes	
none	Ted Olsson	No	
North Fair Oaks Community	Ever Rodriguez	No	
North Fair Oaks Community	Rafael Avendaño	No	
Old Quad Residents Association	Patricia Leung	No	
On Lok, Inc.	Vickie Huynh	No	
Peninsula Freight Rail Users Group (PFRUG)	Greg Greenway	Yes	
Peninsula Freight Rail Users Group (PFRUG)	Clem Molony	No	

[T	T
Redwood City Chamber of Commerce	Amy Buckmaster	No
Redwood City Forward	Anthony Lazarus	Yes
Samaritan House	Laura Bent	No
San Francisco Bicycle Coalition	Janice Li	No
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce	Emily Abraham	Yes
San Francisco Giants	Josh Karlin-Resnick	No
San Francisco International Airport	Nile Ledbetter	No
San Francisco Labor Council	Rudy Gonzalez	No
San Francisco Tomorrow	Jerry Levine	No
San Francisco Transit Riders	Thea Selby	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	Don Cecil	No
San Mateo County Health System	Brian Oh	No
Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition	Emma Shlaes	No
Silicon Valley Central Chamber of Commerce	Christian Pellecchia	No
South Bay Islamic Association (SBIA)	Athar Siddique	No
South Beach Mission Bay Business Association	Patrick Valentino	No
South Beach, Rincon, Mission Bay Neighborhood	Alice Rogers, Bruce Agid	Yes
Association		
South San Francisco School Board/Samtrans Citizens	John Baker	Yes
Advisory Committee		
SPUR	Arielle Fleisher	No
SPUR	Laura Tolkoff	No
Stanford University	Jessica Alba	No
Stanford University	Lesley Lowe	No
Sunnyvale Sustainable Affordable Living Coalition	Mike Serrone	No
Sustainable San Mateo County	Bill Schulte	No
Sustainable San Mateo County	Christine Kohl-Zaugg	No
Transportation Advocate	Wilbert Din	No
UCSF	Tammy Chan	Yes
UCSF	Amiee Alden	No
UCSF - Alternate	Leah Pimentel	No
Urban Land Institute	Linda Klein	Yes
Urban Land Institute	Jay Paxton	No
Visitacion Valley Historic Project	Mono Simeone	No
Visitacion Valley Planning Alliance	Fran Martin	No
Visitacion Valley Service Providers Collaborative	Marlene Tran	No
Washington Park Neighborhood Association (Sunnyvale)	Matt Brunnings	No
YIMBY	Jack Harman	No
YIMBY	Cliff Bargar	No
YIMBY	Roan Kattouw	No
	<u> </u>	1



YIMBY Action	Laura Foote	No
Youth United for Community Action	Ofelia Bello	No

Authority Staff: Boris Lipkin, Gary Kennerley, Meg Cederoth, Paul Hebditch, Madeline Rodriguez, Morgan Galli, Rebecca FleischerJoey Goldman, Mary Beth Day, Phyllis Potter, and Abby Fullem