



CITY OF
**PALO
ALTO**

RAIL COMMITTEE

Wednesday, September 21, 2022
Regular Meeting
Community Meeting Room
1:00 PM

Pursuant to [AB 361](#) Palo Alto City Council and Committee meetings will be held as “hybrid” meetings with the option to attend by teleconference/video conference or in person. To maximize public safety while still maintaining transparency and public access, members of the public can choose to participate from home or attend in person. Information on how the public may observe and participate in the meeting is located at the end of the agenda.

HOW TO PARTICIPATE

VIRTUAL PARTICIPATION

[CLICK HERE TO JOIN](https://cityofpaloalto.zoom.us/j/86388142528) (<https://cityofpaloalto.zoom.us/j/86388142528>)
Meeting ID: 863 8814 2528 Phone:1(669)900-6833

The meeting will be broadcast on Cable TV Channel 26, live on YouTube at <https://www.youtube.com/c/cityofpaloalto>, and streamed to Midpen Media Center at <https://midpenmedia.org>.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Public Comments will be accepted both in person and via Zoom meeting. All requests to speak will be taken until 5 minutes after the staff’s presentation. Written public comments can be submitted in advance to city.council@cityofpaloalto.org and will be provided to the Committee and available for inspection on the City’s website. Please clearly indicate which agenda item you are referencing in your email subject line.

Call to Order

Oral Communications

Members of the public may speak to any item NOT on the agenda.

Action Items

1. Verbal Update on Interagency Activities

- A. Caltrain
- B. VTA
- C. City Staff

Presentation

Study Session

- Presentation** 2. Caltrain Presentation/Discussion on San Francisco Creek Bridge

Next Steps and Future Agendas

CORRESPONDENCE (INFORMATION ONLY)

A. August 11, 2022 - Letter to Northern California Regional Office
California High-Speed Rail Authority

B. September 1, 2022 Caltrain Response To Key Technical Issues and
Four-Tracking Refinement Request

Adjournment

PUBLIC COMMENT INSTRUCTIONS

Members of the Public may provide public comments to hybrid meetings via email, in person, teleconference, or by phone.

1. **Written public comments** may be submitted by email to city.council@cityofpaloalto.org.
2. **In person public comments** please complete a speaker request card located on the table at the entrance to the Council Chambers, and deliver it to the City Clerk prior to discussion of the item.
3. **Spoken public comments using a computer or smart phone** will be accepted through the teleconference meeting. To address the Council, click on the link below to access a Zoom-based meeting. Please read the following instructions carefully.
 - You may download the Zoom client or connect to the meeting in- browser. If using your browser, make sure you are using a current, up-to-date browser: Chrome 30+, Firefox 27+, Microsoft Edge 12+, Safari 7+. Certain functionality may be disabled in older browsers including Internet Explorer. Or download the Zoom application onto your phone from the Apple App Store or Google Play Store and enter the Meeting ID below
 - You may be asked to enter an email address and name. We request that you identify yourself by name as this will be visible online and will be used to notify you that it is your turn to speak.
 - When you wish to speak on an Agenda Item, click on "raise hand." The Clerk will activate and unmute speakers in turn. Speakers will be notified shortly before they are called to speak.
 - When called, please limit your remarks to the time limit allotted.

- A timer will be shown on the computer to help keep track of your comments.
4. **Spoken public comments using a phone** use the telephone number listed below. When you wish to speak on an agenda item hit *9 on your phone so we know that you wish to speak. You will be asked to provide your first and last name before addressing the Council. You will be advised how long you have to speak. When called please limit your remarks to the agenda item and time limit allotted.

[Click to Join](#) **Zoom Meeting ID: 863 8814 2528 Phone: 1(669)900-6833**

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITY ACT (ADA)

Persons with disabilities who require auxiliary aids or services in using City facilities, services or programs or who would like information on the City's compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, may contact (650) 329-2550 (Voice) 48 hours or more in advance.



City of Palo Alto
City Council Rail Committee Staff Report

(ID # 14757)

Meeting Date: 9/21/2022

Report Type: Study Session

Title: Caltrain Presentation/Discussion on San Franciscquito Creek Bridge

From: City Manager

Lead Department: Transportation Department

There is no written report for this item. A verbal presentation will be made during the meeting.



City of Palo Alto
City Council Rail Committee Staff Report

(ID # 14756)

Meeting Date: 9/21/2022

Report Type: Information Only

**Title: A. August 11, 2022 - Letter to Northern California Regional Office
California High-Speed Rail Authority B. September 1, 2022 Caltrain Response
To Key Technical Issues and Four-Tracking Refinement Request**

From: City Manager

Lead Department: Transportation Department

There is no report for this item. Attachments are included for information only.

Attachments:

- City of Palo Alto - Comments on the High Speed Rail Final EIR-EIS
- Caltrain ED Response to Palo Alto (09.01.22)

August 11, 2022

Northern California Regional Office
California High-Speed Rail Authority
100 Paseo De San Antonio, Suite 300
San Jose, CA 95113
Email: san.francisco_san.jose@hsr.ca.gov

RE: The San Francisco to San José Project Section Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS)

Thank you for including the City of Palo Alto (City) in the environmental review process for the above-referenced project. The California High Speed Rail (HSR) will have a long-lasting and far-reaching impact on the City of Palo Alto; therefore, we appreciate the opportunity to comment on this Final EIR/EIS as a responsible agency for the Project.

Executive Summary

The Final EIR/EIS, similar to the Draft EIR, remains seriously flawed in numerous respects, as outlined in this letter. As the City previously commented, the document fails to adequately analyze or to mitigate a variety of clear and significant impacts on the environment. The City disagrees with the Authority's conclusion that grade separation of at grade crossings does not warrant evaluation, either as mitigation or as an alternative in the EIR, to address the clear and significant impacts on multi-modal transportation, land use, noise, and emergency response. We support the Authority's addition of four quadrant gates, which improve pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular safety at these crossings when compared to a project that does not include four quadrant gates. However, the EIR/EIS is flawed in its conclusion that there would be no impacts on safety and, therefore, mitigation to address safety concerns would not be warranted. The City also disagrees with the Authority's position that the cumulative impacts of this project with the adopted Caltrain Vision Plan do not warrant analysis. By not planning for this reasonably foreseeable future condition, the Authority does not properly disclose impacts in accordance with CEQA and NEPA. For example, underreporting the realistic impacts on delays for emergency responders. In addition, it avoids identification of the need for passing tracks that the City understands would be necessary in Palo Alto, among other jurisdictions, under this cumulative scenario. Avoidance of appropriate planning for this reasonably foreseeable future condition jeopardizes local planning efforts in the design of grade separation projects. Therefore, the Final EIR continues to fall short of reasonable analysis, mitigation, and public disclosure in accordance with state law.

Project Understanding

The City understands that the San Francisco to San Jose Project Section (project) would provide High Speed Rail (HSR) service from the Salesforce Transit Center in San Francisco to Diridon Station in San Jose along approximately 49 miles of the Caltrain corridor. Within the City of Palo Alto, the project would be located along 3.8 miles of Caltrain right-of-way through the middle of Palo Alto, where the existing Caltrain tracks bifurcate the City from east to West. The current project design proposes a blended infrastructure with Caltrain operations through the City. The current proposed project, as well as both Alternatives carried forward in the environmental analysis, propose two at-grade tracks through the City, mostly within the existing Caltrain right-of-way. The City understands that within Palo Alto, the project would require slight modifications (typically of less than one foot) to the tracks in several areas to straighten curves in order to support higher speeds. The project also requires the installation of two radio towers (one north of Embarcadero Road and one north of West Charleston Road), four-quadrant gates at existing at-grade

crossings, and either fencing or sound walls along the entire corridor within the City. The Project will provide HSR services at a downtown San Francisco station, a Millbrae station, and the San Jose Diridon Station; no station is proposed within the City of Palo Alto under the current proposed project or either of the two alternatives.

The blended system would accommodate operating speeds of up to 110 mph for up to four HSR trains and six Caltrain trains per hour per direction in the peak period. HSR and Caltrain are the only passenger rail services that would operate in the blended system. North of the Santa Clara Caltrain Station, freight would use the same tracks as HSR and Caltrain but would operate at night with temporal separation to avoid conflicting with HSR and Caltrain operation, similar to existing conditions.

Rail Alignment, Profile, and Safety

1. The EIR concludes that there would be a significant impact related to emergency response times within several jurisdictions, including within the City of Palo Alto's jurisdiction at the Menlo Park/Palo Alto Boundary west of El Camino Real and North of Sand Hill Road. The impacted areas include specific land uses where response times for emergency vehicles would be particularly important, including, but not limited to, assisted living facilities. The EIR/EIS identifies SS-MM #4 which indicates that the City should implement measures to reduce impacts related to the Authority's HSR project. Suggested measures provided in the EIR/EIS include construction of emergency vehicle and transit queue bypass lanes, modifying roadway capacity and operational improvements to facilities paralleling the rail line to improve access to adjacent grade-separated rail crossings, construction of new fire stations to reduce fire station response times in affected areas, and/or expansion of existing fire stations to reduce fire station response times in affected areas in order to reduce impacts from the Authority's project. Alternatively, SS-MM #4 indicates that the Authority, with agreement from the local jurisdiction, could make a one-time contribution toward a project that reduce impacts related to emergency response such as those listed above or grade separation.

The identified mitigation improperly defers the responsibility of mitigation for the HSR project to the City, both with respect to cost and implementation. It's unclear whether any of these measures could be feasibly implemented (for example due to lack of right-of-way for expanding roadways, lack of land to build a new or expanded fire station, or with respect to funding or staffing to facilitate any of these future projects). Further, the EIR/EIS fails to analyze the associated environmental impacts of implementing such measures, improperly stating that the responsibility of preparing environmental analysis for that mitigation would fall on the local jurisdiction. The vague alternative mitigation of providing a one-time contribution toward an unspecified project for emergency response times fails to provide any realistic, concrete reduction to the identified impacts and therefore does not provide any meaningful mitigation.

Grade separation would reduce this identified significant and unavoidable impact to a less than significant level and therefore must be analyzed. As stated in the City's previous comments on this project, if the Authority does not pursue at-grade crossings as part of an alternative or as mitigation to restore response times, the Authority must bear the full cost of restoring response times to existing conditions.

2. The EIR/EIS analyzes the effect of HSR train operations on safety for vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians crossing at at-grade crossings in section 3.11, Safety and Security. The EIR/EIS concludes that, with considerations of planned safety improvements as part of the project, there would be no significant safety impacts associated with the project and that no mitigation is therefore required. While the City concurs that the addition of four quadrant gates improves safety at these crossings, particularly for vehicles, the City disagrees that this measure reduces the significant safety impacts from the proposed project to a less than significant level. Two at-grade crossings along this corridor in Palo Alto are listed in

the top 5 locations on the FRA Accident Prediction Report (See attached Exhibit A). The addition of four quadrant gates alone would not serve to significantly reduce impacts when considering the increased hazards associated with increases in the number of trains and higher speed of trains. The conclusion also fails to consider other safety impacts caused by increased gate down times. For example, vehicle delays would result in extensive queueing spilling on to through lanes, which would create safety hazards near at grade crossings.

3. The City recognizes that the Authority's implementation of four-quadrant gates as part of the proposed project in the Final EIR/EIS would assist the City in establishing a quiet zone for Palo Alto Crossings. The City also appreciates modifications to NV-MM#4 requiring that the Authority assist with the preparation of technical analysis and materials needed for local jurisdictions to file a Quiet Zone application with the Federal Railroad Administration. The City supports this requirement and appreciates the Authority's response to the City's comments on this matter to reduce operational noise impacts on surrounding uses. However, because approval of quiet zones is outside of the Authority's purview and because alternative mitigation that requires construction of sound walls across most of the City's jurisdiction would result in further impacts to aesthetics and land use, the City continues to assert that grade separation should be evaluated to reduce the identified significant impacts related to operational noise. This mitigation would be within the Authority's purview and would eliminate the improper need for the City to provide resources and funding to mitigate the impacts of the Authority's project. To the extent that sound walls are installed along the corridor within the City of Palo Alto (e.g. where required regardless of implementation of a quiet zone or across most of the City if quiet zones are not implemented), the City requests that the Authority perform outreach and seek local input when preparing the design.

Cumulative Impacts

4. The City reiterates the concerns raised in its previous comments that the EIR/EIS does not address the cumulative impacts of CAHSR and Caltrain service vision plans. The EIR assumes 6 trains per direction per peak hour per day, however the Caltrain Vision Plans considers up to 12 trains per direction per peak hour per day. By not analyzing the reasonably foreseeable cumulative impacts of the Caltrain Vision Plan and the proposed project, the EIR/EIS does not properly disclose the realistic delays in response times, among other environmental impacts, including but not limited to, transportation operations and safety, which may result in new or more significant impacts than those identified. The City continues to assert that impacts to all elements combined, including vehicular, bike and pedestrian safety, delays, and emergency response warrants analysis of grade separation as an alternative to the proposed project or as mitigation. Proper analysis of the reasonably foreseeable future condition would only further demonstrate the need for a comprehensive plan to address the identified impacts such as grade separation. Because passing tracks and grade separation are necessitated by the proposed project, the CHSRA must be responsible for implementation and funding of these projects. The High-Speed Rail should not commence service until these infrastructure improvements are complete.

Transportation

5. The EIR/EIS contemplates the gate close time of 40-48 seconds for peak hour for 8 trains during any weekday period. Considering the advanced preemption and gate down initiation and opening times, the times assumed in the analysis are not indicative of actual field conditions. Furthermore, there are existing gate closures due to the existing Caltrain running along this corridor. The EIR/EIS must evaluate the cumulative conditions for these gate time closures and based on the realistic delays on traffic.

Even when utilizing less conservative assumptions for anticipated gate down times, as noted above, Appendix 3.2A (Page 45, 46, 94, 95) indicates that eight of Palo Alto's intersections would be significantly impacted. TR-MM#1 in Section 3.2, Transportation, of the Final EIR/EIS discusses site-specific mitigation

identified for adverse LOS effects under NEPA. The Authority developed site-specific mitigation for the Final EIR/EIS for certain locations where adverse NEPA traffic effects were identified. However, the Authority concludes that no feasible mitigation was identified that could address the effects of any of these intersections, including: El Camino Real/Palo Alto Avenue/Sand Hill Road, Alma Street/Palo Alto Avenue, Alma Street/Churchill Avenue, Mariposa Avenue/Churchill Avenue, Park Boulevard/Meadow Avenue, Park Boulevard/Charleston Road, Castilleja Avenue/Churchill Avenue, and Wilkie Way/West Charleston Road. Therefore, the significant impacts at all of these Palo Alto intersections remain unmitigated. The related impacts on the City with respect to multi-modal transportation and the physical division of the City due to these substantial delays is unacceptable. Grade separation would serve to address these impacts and therefore must be analyzed in the EIR/EIS.

6. Despite significantly higher train speeds, as noted in the Authority's response to comments 1118-2530, the requirements for warning times and gate down times would not change. As the City previously asserted, this presents safety concerns in that there is reduced reaction time for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles. The addition of four-quadrant gates does not address this reduction in reaction times, especially for young kids that may be crossing the tracks to attend one of the many nearby schools. Therefore, the conclusion that the project would have no impact on safety is flawed. The EIR/EIS must conclude that this is a significant impact and accordingly mitigate for the impact.
7. The Authority also notes that "Caltrain is the host railroad and is responsible for compliance with FRA safety regulations with regard to track and warning systems and would be responsible to make any adjustments in gate activation and any connection to preemption of nearby traffic signal systems." Again, no clarity on how the Authority may change the nearby traffic signal systems is provided and there is no requirement in the EIR/EIS to coordinate with local agencies to their traffic signal system. The EIR/EIS must be revised to address this.

Land Use

8. The City continues to assert that the EIR/EIS fails to properly identify and mitigate land use impacts within the City of Palo Alto. The analysis concludes that because these tracks are existing, the project would not physically divide an established community. However, under current conditions, the gate down times do not discourage transit across the tracks. The significant increase in gate down times and substantial increase in delays at nearby intersections as a result of the proposed project will serve to discourage transit across these tracks, effectively dividing the community in a way that the existing conditions do not. Increasing the number of trains further divides the community and because these impacts have not been properly identified, appropriate mitigation to reduce impacts, such as grade separation, similarly has not been identified.

Noise

9. Impact NV#1 in Section 3.4 of the EIR/EIS identifies temporary exposure of sensitive receptors to construction noise as a significant and unavoidable impact. The proposed mitigation (NV-MM#1) encourages, but does not require, daytime construction. Although the Authority's response to comments states that some track realignments would require nighttime construction work that could exceed FRA construction noise limits at night, it's unclear which locations these would occur, how often they may occur, and how many/what types of uses would be affected. The EIR/EIS must disclose this information. The City continues to assert that NV-MM#1 should be revised to require daytime construction given that no other measures can effectively reduce impacts to a less than significant level in accordance with the established thresholds for nighttime noise.

Historic

10. The City appreciates the Authority's response and reference to the arborist report and MM #39, which identifies protection measures that would be implemented when working within the tree protection zone of protected trees, including the El Palo Alto Redwood. The City understands that work within the vicinity of this tree includes minor track modifications that would shift the track further from the tree. The Final EIR/EIS indicates that tree trimming of the historic Palo Alto redwood would be required. The City of Palo Alto's Urban Forestry Division requests to be notified in advance of any tree trimming work or activities within the tree protection zone of the El Palo Alto Redwood so that the City's arborist may be on site to monitor the work on, or within the tree protection zone, of this historic tree

We appreciate the opportunity to comment and look forward to reviewing the Final EIR/EIS, including responses to the City's comments. Should you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact Philip Kamhi, Director of the Office of Transportation at (650) 329-2136 or via e-mail at Philip.Kamhi@CityofPaloalto.org.

Sincerely,



Patrick Burt
Mayor, City of Palo Alto



BOARD OF DIRECTORS 2022

STEVE HEMINGER, CHAIR
 CHARLES STONE, VICE CHAIR
 DEVORA "DEV" DAVIS
 CINDY CHAVEZ
 JEFF GEE
 GLENN HENDRICKS
 DAVE PINE
 SHAMANN WALTON
 MONIQUE ZMUDA

MICHELLE BOUCHARD
 ACTING EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

September 1, 2022

Ed Shikada
 City Manager
 City of Palo Alto
 250 Hamilton Avenue
 Palo Alto, CA 94301

Re: Caltrain Responses to the City of Palo Alto, CA.

Dear Mr. Shikada,

Caltrain is in receipt of the two letters forwarded on behalf of the City of Palo Alto, entitled *Request to Review and Respond to Key Technical Issues/Questions* and *Four-tracking Refinement Request*, both dated June 14, 2022.

Grade separations advance safety for all modes, improve circulation, and reduce emissions from idling vehicles. Caltrain is committed to the efficient and effective delivery of Measure B grade separation projects in Palo Alto with our City and VTA partners. Through continuous collaboration and a robust, open line of communication, the Caltrain and City partnership will only grow stronger. Caltrain strongly supports the completion of projects that improve connectivity and maintain quality of life in the City of Palo Alto.

Technical Issues/Questions

Caltrain staff have been coordinating with City staff to develop a mechanism for addressing the technical questions surrounding the City's three grade separation projects. To support this coordination, Caltrain and the City are in the process of developing a Third-Party Service Agreement (SA). This SA will provide the framework for Caltrain technical staff to review the City's proposed grade separation alternatives, provide technical support and guidance, and to offer ongoing coordination with the City as these alternatives continue to advance. This includes review of specific technical and design related questions raised in the letter, such as **the curve of the track alignment at Palo Alto Ave, the vertical clearance standard, and the thickness of the bridge deck.**

While the SA is being finalized, we also wanted to provide additional information regarding **maximum allowable grade design, freight speed standards, and the usage of space underneath future elevated tracks.**

PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD
 1250 San Carlos Ave. – P.O. Box 3006
 San Carlos, CA 94070-1306 (650) 508-6200

Caltrain has a standard procedure for cities to request design variances. However, any changes that impact the **maximum allowable grade design** or **freight speed standards** requires an additional process. A Trackage Rights Agreement (TRA) between the Joint Powers Board (JPB) and Union Pacific (UP) describes JPB's contractual obligations and the freight operator's rights, including UP's right to use both mainline tracks and JPB's obligation to maintain the right of way at the levels necessary to accommodate UP's present and future freight operations to allow UP to maintain competitive service levels. TRA Peninsula Main Line, § 9.3.

Any arrangement that would alter the horizontal and vertical physical clearances on the mainline tracks will require notification to be sent to UP and the JPB to cooperate with UP to provide any additional clearances needed by UP. TRA Peninsula Main Line, § 2.10. Caltrain is prepared to initiate conversations with UP to discuss the City of Palo Alto's request to **reduce freight speed standards** and **increase the allowable grade design** as well as other related topics addressed in the TRA. Caltrain will make every effort to ensure the success of these conversations and will advise you of our progress.

Caltrain's approach to **allowing cities to use newly created space underneath elevated tracks** as public space will need to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. First, the City of Palo Alto would have to determine the specific use of the space. Once selected, the specific use, configuration, and related elements would require a threat and vulnerability assessment that considers bridge depth, alignment, and many other factors.

Four Track Refinement

Caltrain also appreciates the City's inquiry into the potential future four track segment within the City of Palo Alto as identified in Caltrain's Business Plan. As the City is aware, the Caltrain Business Plan addressed the future potential of the railroad over a 20–30-year horizon and assessed the benefits, impacts, and costs of different service visions, building the case for investment and a plan for implementation.

A primary component of the Business Plan was Caltrain's Long Range Service Vision (2040 Service Vision). The Service Vision addresses two key questions: long-term demand for rail service in and beyond the Caltrain corridor; and strategies Caltrain could use to meet this demand. To complete the 2040 Service Vision, Caltrain developed three growth scenarios (Baseline, Moderate, and High) that included a range of options for how Caltrain service could grow, given the different levels of investments in the corridor. In 2019, the JPB Board adopted the moderate-growth improvement program as part of the 2040 Service Vision to address Caltrain's future growth.

With the adoption of Caltrain's 2040 Service Vision, the JPB Board further directed Caltrain staff to continue its consideration of a potential higher growth level of service in the context of major regional and state rail planning and to take certain actions to consider and, where feasible, **not preclude** such higher levels of service as they specifically relate to:

- The planning of rail terminals and related facilities;
- The sale or permanent encumbrance of JPB land;
- The design of grade separations in areas where 4-track segments may be required; and
- The sizing of future maintenance facilities and storage yards

The JPB Board directed staff to pursue a Vision compatible with the Moderate Growth Scenario while also taking a series of steps to plan for and not preclude the potential realization of the High Growth Scenario. Implementation of the High Growth Scenario would require up to 15 miles of new four track segments along the Caltrain corridor. Within Palo Alto, this includes potential four-track segments at Palo Alto Avenue, Churchill Avenue, E. Meadow Drive, and Charleston Road.

This information can also be found in the City of Palo Alto Booklet, May 2019 on page 11, [Developing a Long-Range Vision for Caltrain](https://caltrain2040.org/wp-content/uploads/CBP_CIA_R2_Booklet_PaloAlto-2.pdf) (https://caltrain2040.org/wp-content/uploads/CBP_CIA_R2_Booklet_PaloAlto-2.pdf)

If the City of Palo Alto's timeline to advance the conceptual planning efforts for the three-grade separation projects **can accommodate the timing** necessary, the process to determine a specific future four-track segment would involve consideration of four-tracking beyond the boundaries of Palo Alto and would need to account for the needs of the full Caltrain Corridor but could be initiated and completed via the proposed Service Agreement. Caltrain would then present these options to the JPB Board to finalize a decision as to the segments requiring four tracks to accommodate the future of the rail system.

Alternatively, should the City's timeline for advancing these projects **not accommodate the timing needed** to determine the limits of a future four-track segment, Caltrain would require the City of Palo Alto to pursue a design that does not preclude a four-track segment. For example, during the City of San Mateo's conceptual planning efforts for the 25th Ave. Grade Separation Project, Caltrain staff worked closely with their team to develop a solution that would not preclude a future four-track segment. Caltrain will support the City in exploring design solutions that will not preclude four tracks through execution of the SA. Potential cost implications of not precluding four tracks will be audited by Caltrain staff under the SA. Later in the process, an amendment to the SA would include the development of a Cooperative Agreement that would address funding responsibilities.

Closing

Caltrain is committed to working alongside the City of Palo Alto in moving the grade separation projects forward. Caltrain staff will continue to work closely with the City to provide a briefing on the San Francisquito Bridge Replacement project for the September Rail Committee, develop and execute a Service Agreement, and support the grant evaluation process. In addition, Caltrain has made significant strides toward enhancing planning and engineering resources to support both Palo Alto and the entire Measure B program and completion for the electrification design criteria.

Caltrain looks forward to continuing our collaboration with Palo Alto to help deliver the community's vision for these projects in an efficient and cost-effective manner. Nicole Soultanov, will be in touch to calendar a meeting with staff to continue the advancement of the SA and the Palo Alto projects. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Navi Dhaliwal, Government and Community Affairs Officer at (650) 730-6077 and/or Dhaliwaln@samtrans.com .

Sincerely,



Michelle Bouchard
Acting Executive Director
Caltrain

cc: Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board of Directors