

On Apr 20, 2020, at 9:00 AM, Reggiardo, Melissa <reggiardom@samtrans.com> wrote:

Hi Chantal,

You are correct regarding the “illustrative” extent of the 4-track segments considered in the Business Plan and shown in various diagrams / booklets. The exact location of a potential four track segment are yet to be defined, however. For the purposes of RCUP, which governs Caltrain’s use of its own property, we took the most conservative approach and considered the potential for a 4-track segment between San Francisquito Creek Bridge in Palo Alto to just through the Mountain View Station (the area in which a 4-tracks segment is operationally viable for the intended purpose). The ultimate extent of the area preserved for 4-tracks does not need to encompass this full length. However, we would need to work with the City to advance thinking about the City’s potential capital projects along the corridor to then make decisions that could constrain the extent of the area under consideration. Until that time, Caltrain will take a very conservative approach – as specified through the RCUP – when it comes to any potential long term encumbrance of our property. You are getting this conservative answer in response to a very specific question, which is whether we would allow the City to have long term/ permanent use of our property in this area for a non-rail purpose.

Let me know if you would like to discuss further.

Thanks,
Melissa

From: Gaines, Chantal <Chantal.Gaines@CityofPaloAlto.org>

Sent: Friday, April 17, 2020 5:08 PM

To: Reggiardo, Melissa <reggiardom@samtrans.com>; DeStefano, Peter <peter.destefano@aecom.com>; Litzinger, Millette <millette.litzinger@aecom.com>

Cc: Lightbody, James <James.Lightbody@aecom.com>; Kamhi, Philip <Philip.Kamhi@CityofPaloAlto.org>; Petty, Sebastian <Pettys@samtrans.com>

Subject: Re: Encroachment at Churchill

Thank you so much for the thorough information Melissa! One very quick clarification question, for the four track information, our understanding was that Caltrain was looking at the area south of Oregon expressway and into Mountain View which will cover our other two crossings and not Churchill. Is that different now with the policy that you’re referring to? Just want to make sure I’m clear on what is current.

Thanks
Chantal

Sent from my mobile device. Please excuse brevity and typos.

From: Reggiardo, Melissa <reggiardom@samtrans.com>

Sent: Friday, April 17, 2020 4:54:19 PM

To: Gaines, Chantal <Chantal.Gaines@CityofPaloAlto.org>; DeStefano, Peter <peter.destefano@aecom.com>; Litzinger, Millette <millette.litzinger@aecom.com>
Cc: Lightbody, James <James.Lightbody@aecom.com>; Kamhi, Philip <Philip.Kamhi@CityofPaloAlto.org>; Petty, Sebastian <Pettys@samtrans.com>
Subject: RE: Encroachment at Churchill

Hi Chantal,

See our answers to your questions below. Note that I'm still developing a response to question 2 and I expect to be able to provide an answer sometime next week.

1. In one of the new ideas (at Churchill), the design calls for us to encroach into the Caltrain Right of Way. We wanted to know what the likelihood is that Caltrain would be willing to grant us the ability to do so. This is in the area where the existing bike path is already in the Caltrain ROW (though I don't have the exact dimensions of the ROW. If we are unable to encroach into the Caltrain ROW, it would require us to do full acquisitions to many properties that front Alma in the Churchill area.

To clarify, the City is asking to use Caltrain right-of-way for public access facilities including a bike/ped path and a roadway. In February 2020, the JPB adopted the Rail Corridor Use Policy (RCUP), which serves as an implementation policy for the Caltrain Business Plan. The RCUP guides the agency's decision-making about use of JPB property in support of Caltrain's Long-Term Service Vision – similar to a City's zoning code guiding its land use decisions. Caltrain receives many proposals for non-railroad uses on its property, similar to the City's idea above to use the right-of-way for access facilities. The RCUP will be used to determine if a proposed non-railroad use is compatible with the railroad's current and future needs for its property. As you know, it is anticipated that significant portions of JPB's property holdings will be needed to deliver future infrastructure and support future train operations to achieve the Long-Term Service Vision. The RCUP protects those areas that are needed for current and future railroad use by limiting the types and durations of non-railroad uses that can be located in those areas.

This is directly applicable to the portion of Corridor in which the City is inquiring about a potential encroachment for access facilities. This is an area with multiple potential future capital projects identified in the RCUP to support the Long-Term Service Vision. While a potential grade separation at Churchill is identified, this is also an area of the corridor that could be needed for a potential four-track segment to support increased train service under the Business Plan's High Growth Scenario, which the JPB declared not be precluded in its adopted Long-Term Service Vision. Because of these potential future railroad uses in the area near Churchill, non-railroad uses are limited in this area of the corridor in the RCUP.

While the City could initiate the RCUP review process to have Caltrain staff review the compatibility of the proposed use of JPB property for the access facilities, the City's proposal would most likely be found to be an incompatible use of JPB property. In order to be considered for an exception to the RCUP and be considered compatible, the onus would be on the City to show via conceptual designs that a potential future four track segment would not be precluded in this area – then it would be possible for the encroachment to be potentially viable as a non-railroad use of JPB property. It's important to note that even if the City did this and the proposal was able to be considered "potentially viable" by receiving a compatibility exception through

the RCUP, it would still need to undergo substantial design, engineering, and regulatory review before it would be approved as a use for JPB property.

Following the recent adoption of the RCUP by the JPB, Caltrain staff have been in the process of implementing the RCUP, and more information will be provided on Caltrain's website soon. In the meantime, more information about the steps associated with the RCUP process is located [here](#):

http://www.caltrain.com/Assets/___Agendas+and+Minutes/JPB/2020/Regular+JPB+Session+following+closed.pdf

Sebastian, copied here, is happy to discuss this issue further if you have questions about this particular situation.

2. Lastly, what would it take for Caltrain to say no shoofly is needed of that some other construction method would be considered or allowed?

[A response to this question is still being developed – more to come next week.](#)

3. Added Question on 3/25/2020 by Chantal: Does Caltrain have an agreement with Stanford for the Stanford Game Day station and is that something we can see?

[As discussed over the phone, Caltrain does not have an agreement with Stanford to provide service to the Stanford football games. The service has largely been marketing-driven, with Caltrain wanting to serve weekend events such as the Stanford football games.](#)

Thanks,
Melissa

From: Gaines, Chantal <Chantal.Gaines@CityofPaloAlto.org>

Sent: Monday, April 13, 2020 1:20 AM

To: Reggiardo, Melissa <reggiardom@samtrans.com>; Litzinger, Millette

<millette.litzinger@aecom.com>; DeStefano, Peter <peter.destefano@aecom.com>

Cc: Lightbody, James <James.Lightbody@aecom.com>; Kamhi, Philip <Philip.Kamhi@CityofPaloAlto.org>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Encroachment at Churchill

Hi everyone,

Thanks again for the call last week. I think it was very productive with bringing everyone up to speed. Melissa, is it possible you could let us know the expected timeline for Caltrain by the end of this week? We have to update our Council on our overall workplan and it would be great to include some version of estimated timing from Caltrain in that (as much as realistic to include).

Thanks,

Chantal C. G.

From: Reggiardo, Melissa <reggiardom@samtrans.com>
Sent: Friday, April 3, 2020 11:45 AM
To: Litzinger, Millette <millette.litzinger@aecom.com>; DeStefano, Peter <peter.destefano@aecom.com>
Cc: Lightbody, James <James.Lightbody@aecom.com>; Gaines, Chantal <Chantal.Gaines@CityofPaloAlto.org>; Kamhi, Philip <Philip.Kamhi@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Subject: RE: Encroachment at Churchill

That sounds great! Thanks, Millette.

Regards,
Melissa

From: Gaines, Chantal <Chantal.Gaines@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 26, 2020 2:52 PM
To: Petty, Sebastian <Pettys@samtrans.com>; Kamhi, Philip <Philip.Kamhi@CityofPaloAlto.org>; Reggiardo, Melissa <reggiardom@samtrans.com>; Lightbody <lightbody@yahoo.com>
Cc: Litzinger, Millette <millette.litzinger@aecom.com>; DeStefano, Peter <peter.destefano@aecom.com>
Subject: RE: follow-up on conference call

Ok. Got it. Yes, anything with some additional guidance on the 4-tracks issue would be great. I understand the complexity you reference. Let us know if you want to further discuss.

Re the other questions, that sounds great. Peter will also get you the drawings regarding the encroachment questions.

Thanks,
Chantal

<image004.png>

Chantal Cotton Gaines

Assistant to the City Manager | City Manager's Office
(650) 329-2572 | chantal.gaines@cityofpaloalto.org _
www.cityofpaloalto.org

From: Petty, Sebastian <Pettys@samtrans.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 26, 2020 2:49 PM
To: Gaines, Chantal <Chantal.Gaines@CityofPaloAlto.org>; Kamhi, Philip <Philip.Kamhi@CityofPaloAlto.org>; Reggiardo, Melissa <reggiardom@samtrans.com>; Lightbody <lightbody@yahoo.com>
Cc: Litzinger, Millette <millette.litzinger@aecom.com>; DeStefano, Peter <peter.destefano@aecom.com>
Subject: RE: follow-up on conference call

Hi Chantal,

Sorry for the confusion. We will work to get you answers to the questions below.

The “policy” issue is related to the 4-tracks. I can provide you with the basic illustrative information that was used in the business plan. Developing a policy is looking a bit more complex than I had hoped- that’s what I hoped to discuss with you.

From: Gaines, Chantal <Chantal.Gaines@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 26, 2020 2:37 PM
To: Petty, Sebastian <Pettys@samtrans.com>; Kamhi, Philip <Philip.Kamhi@CityofPaloAlto.org>; Reggiardo, Melissa <reggiardom@samtrans.com>; Lightbody <lightbody@yahoo.com>
Cc: Litzinger, Millette <millette.litzinger@aecom.com>; DeStefano, Peter <peter.destefano@aecom.com>
Subject: RE: follow-up on conference call

Hi Sebastian,

Thanks for getting back to us. That sounds like a good plan regarding the 4 track next steps. A memo would be great.

I am not sure if I read the email correctly below regarding the other items. Are you saying the encroachment conversation is one you are looking at from a policy standpoint or the shoofly? (It is fine if the answer is “both,” I just want to make sure I understand correctly). And if pursuing it as a policy, do you have a general sense of timing? The encroachment issue is a bigger issue for us than the shoofly though it is important too.

Lastly, just making sure you saw the question about the Stanford game day station. Please let me know if you have an agreement on the books somewhere and if we can view a copy of it.

Thanks,
Chantal

<image006.png>

Chantal Cotton Gaines

Assistant to the City Manager | City Manager’s Office
(650) 329-2572 | chantal.gaines@cityofpaloalto.org _
www.cityofpaloalto.org

From: Petty, Sebastian <Pettys@samtrans.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 25, 2020 5:29 PM
To: Gaines, Chantal <Chantal.Gaines@CityofPaloAlto.org>; Kamhi, Philip <Philip.Kamhi@CityofPaloAlto.org>; Reggiardo, Melissa <reggiardom@samtrans.com>; Lightbody <lightbody@yahoo.com>
Cc: Litzinger, Millette <millette.litzinger@aecom.com>; DeStefano, Peter <peter.destefano@aecom.com>
Subject: RE: follow-up on conference call

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Hi Chantal,

Thanks for the follow up and the added question. We are having an internal discussion at Caltrain about some of these issues later this week.

In terms of the 4-tracks, I apologize for the delay. My recollection is that you wanted specific information regarding the illustrative mileposts assumed for 4-track segments and that, separately, we had discussed Caltrain providing a memo or letter with further guidance around how we were interpreting the potential for 4-tracks relative to the alternatives being considered by Palo Alto.

On the first, I will work to get the information over to you shortly. The second item will take more time. We are wrestling with how to put this policy guidance into practice on the corridor in a manner that is consistent and fair to cities and the project's they are interested in advancing. I realize this is a pressing consideration for Palo Alto's process but it is also a significant policy determination for the railroad. It may be helpful for us to have another phone discussion on this topic soon.

Thanks

Sebastian Petty, Deputy Chief, Planning
Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board
1250 San Carlos Ave. San Carlos, CA 94070
Phone: 650-730-8858 Website: www.caltrain.com

<image007.png>

From: Gaines, Chantal <Chantal.Gaines@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Sent: Wednesday, March 25, 2020 3:26 PM
To: Kamhi, Philip <Philip.Kamhi@CityofPaloAlto.org>; Petty, Sebastian <Pettys@samtrans.com>; Reggiardo, Melissa <reggiardom@samtrans.com>; Lightbody <lightbody@yahoo.com>
Cc: Litzinger, Millette <millette.litzinger@aecom.com>; DeStefano, Peter <peter.destefano@aecom.com>
Subject: RE: follow-up on conference call

Hello everyone,

I know there is a ton going on right now, but I just wanted to follow up on this and I added another question below. AECOM has put together some drawings related to the encroachment questions below. I am including Peter DeStefano and Millette Litzinger from AECOM on this email so they can provide the most recent drawings related to the encroachment questions for further discussion with Melissa and whomever else you all designate.

Please let us know if you have any questions.

Best,
Chantal C. G.

<image009.png>

Chantal Cotton Gaines

Assistant to the City Manager | City Manager's Office
(650) 329-2572 | chantal.gaines@cityofpaloalto.org _
www.cityofpaloalto.org

From: Kamhi, Philip <Philip.Kamhi@CityofPaloAlto.org>

Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2020 2:35 PM

To: Petty, Sebastian <Pettys@samtrans.com>; Reggiardo, Melissa <reggiardom@samtrans.com>;
Lightbody <lightbody@yahoo.com>

Cc: Gaines, Chantal <Chantal.Gaines@CityofPaloAlto.org>

Subject: follow-up on conference call

Hi Sebastian and team,

I hope you are well. I am emailing you to find out where we are on the follow up items that we discussed on our last conference call in terms of getting that information to the City. I think the major item was follow up about the 4 tracks.

Also, I am bothering AECOM to get you and Melissa the explanation of exceptions information. I really hope we can get it from them by no later than early next week.

In further conversations we have had with the XCAP and the proposers of the new ideas, we came up with a few additional questions that we wanted to discuss with Caltrain and have some sort of response to. They are:

1. In one of the new ideas (at Churchill), the design calls for us to encroach into the Caltrain Right of Way. We wanted to know what the likelihood is that Caltrain would be willing to grant us the ability to do so. This is in the area where the existing bike path is already in the Caltrain ROW (though I don't have the exact dimensions of the ROW. If we are unable to encroach into the Caltrain ROW, it would require us to do full acquisitions to many properties that front Alma in the Churchill area.
2. Lastly, what would it take for Caltrain to say no shoofly is needed of that some other construction method would be considered or allowed?
3. Added Question on 3/25/2020 by Chantal: Does Caltrain have an agreement with Stanford for the Stanford Game Day station and is that something we can see?

Best,

<image011.png>

Philip Kamhi

Chief Transportation Official, Office of Transportation
City of Palo Alto
Phone: 650.329.2520
E-mail: Philip.kamhi@cityofpaloalto.org
www.cityofpaloalto.org