

APPENDIX 5-B, ATTACHMENT D-5: AFTER-ACTION REPORTS FOR SEPTEMBER 2021 MEETINGS



HIGH-SPEED RAIL: **CONNECTING AND TRANSFORMING CALIFORNIA**

EJ PHASE 3 MEETINGS SEPTEMBER 2021 AFTER ACTION REPORT

Title of Event
City of Morgan Hill Implementing Partner Meeting
Date of Event
Tuesday September 7, 2021, 3:00 – 4:15pm
Recorder of Event
Rickie Cleere
Participants/Attendees
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Representatives: Edith Ramirez, Tiffany Brown, Christina Turner, Rebecca Garcia, Chris Ghione • Staff: Audrey Van, Morgan Galli, Rich Walter, Cici Vu, Rickie Cleere
Purpose of Event
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explain/Present on Updates to EJ Analysis, Mitigations, Benefits and Community Improvements • Share Preliminary Conclusions • Gain feedback on directed questions • Address clarifying questions on meeting materials, desired feedback and conclusions
Key Notes
<p>Potential Community Improvements Presented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Alternatives 1 and 3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Funding to the City of Morgan Hill to implement trail and park improvements under the viaduct to offset visual aesthetic effects ○ Alternative 2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Funding to implement complete streets improvements along Railroad Avenue to offset visual aesthetic effects. ▪ Partial funding for affordable housing to offset residential displacement that cannot be relocated locally based on housing market ○ Alternative 4: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Noise insulation for certain residences along 101 helps to offset residual project noise effects <p>Key points of concern from partner; any preliminary feedback to directed questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise insulation along the 101 freeway should not be considered a community improvement, as it benefits community members who mostly live in single family residences and does not mitigate impacts for community members who are the most vulnerable. Alternatively, could there be insulation for schools or other gathering points along the route? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ R: Noise insulation for certain residences along the 101 would help to offset residual project noise effects. Sound insulation installation is proposed in the EIR/EIS for residences located along the project alignment. The community analysis assesses existing sources of noise, and the other main noise source other than the rail is the 101 freeway. The main focus of the analysis was on spaces between the freeway and adjacent to the project

Collaboration

Diversity

Excellence

Innovation

Safety

Sustainability



- Sound walls are not included in the Morgan Hill General Plan.
 - R: Sound walls are not being proposed, but rather sound insulation for adjacent structures.
- Morgan Hill School District is concerned that train traffic experienced under Alternative 4 will impact bus routes
 - R: Four intersections in Morgan Hill would experience adverse effects. Three of these intersections would experience reduced effects with mitigation.

Questions/Responses:

- Q: We will help share the 9/21 meeting with our community. Would it be possible to provide a general HSR update as well? Our Council has requested updated info. Thank you!
 - R: That meeting will not be a general community meeting. It is for specific community representatives our team has been engaging with throughout this process. For that reason, we kindly ask that the city not share the meeting info with the broader community.
 - We can certainly provide general update at the community stakeholder meeting. The targeted audience includes school community and members of the community that the City has identified, so in this sense, it includes a subsection of the broader community.
- Q: The “Summary of Potential Effects” slide table had footnotes. What are they?
 - R: [1] Emergency Response Delay > 30 seconds occurs near E. Middle Avenue east of the railroad corridor, but the affected area is not disproportionately minority or low-income.[2] Morgan Hill Community and Cultural Center– construction disruption of amphitheater use. Villa Mira Monte– construction disruption of outdoor special event use. [3] Bus transit delays during construction.
- Q: Alternative 4 requires noise and traffic mitigations, correct?
 - R: When community benefits are considered, the transportation benefit offsets traffic impacts. However, there are still residual noise impacts that require additional mitigation.
- Q: Potential project effects are above and beyond what was identified to be mitigated within the Draft EIR correct? Are these mitigations not the same as those in the draft EIR/EIS?
 - R: Correct. The draft EIR/EIS had direct mitigations built in to address immediate effects (ex: noise road insulation). The improvements here offset residual DHAЕ effects after the consideration of project benefits.
- Q: Who did the ranking of the other improvements that were considered?
 - R: Authority staff and environmental consultant. The preliminary evaluation was conducted using a 120-point scale.
- Q: While the authority has identified a selection of measures to potential issues, we need to provide feedback grounded in the preferred alternative and whether additional measures could be incorporated that demonstrate a nexus to DHAЕ? For alternative 4, we can identify potential safety and connectivity solutions that also affect transportation.
 - R: The framing of the relationship between the project and its effects is something that you can provide feedback on as well. The analysis of effects and mitigations used by the Authority was done on a point for point mitigation basis (noise for noise, etc.). “Out-of-kind” arguments are generally more difficult to make.
- Q: Some of the measures are more general while others are more geographically focused (ex: Coyote creek). Would measures be across Morgan Hill, also going into San Martin?
 - R: The measures are specific to the Morgan Hill area, though some are further out than others.
- Q: Will there be no community improvements proposed to address traffic, only noise?
 - The transportation benefit is considered to offset the adverse traffic impacts, preventing a need for additional improvements.

- Q: Are the other improvements considered applicable to the four alternatives being analyzed?
 - R: Not all would be appropriate for every alternative based on impacted geographies. The Authority selects improvements only if they are connected to residual DHAEs. The 16 other improvements considered are not viewed as having a relationship to the residual effects at this time, though this may change if communities put forth rationale for the Authority to consider.
- Q: City Staff is tracking the HSR EIR/EIS process, but the community will want to know full set of proposed mitigations. What is schedule for notification?
 - R: The final EIR/EIS is scheduled for completion by February 2022. The Authority's Record of Decision (ROD) board meeting is scheduled for March 2022. Prior to this, meetings will be held with City staff to respond to comments received and other materials applicable to the final EIR. There will also be outreach to Community and Technical Working Groups (CWG/TWG) 1-2 weeks after the final EIR and before the ROD. There may be TWG meetings before the final EIR is released.
- Q: For Alternative 2, displacement of housing was only along 101 (the viaduct option)? This alternative will have the biggest property impacts, but residence impacts are limited?
 - R: Partial funding for affordable housing under Alternative 2 would offset residential displacement that could not be relocated locally based on the housing market. The community summary and table include details on the geographic targets for noise insulation along the 101 freeway.

Next Steps/Actions/Follow-up:

- Community Meeting: Tuesday September 21, 5:00-7:00PM
 - The Outreach team will meet with the new superintendent of Morgan Hill Unified School District prior to this meeting to identify parent/community group representatives that should attend as well.
- By COB Friday September 10.
 - The Authority will check in with City staff on an appropriate date and time to present and discuss with City Council.



**EJ PHASE 3 MEETINGS
SEPTEMBER 2021
AFTER ACTION REPORT**

Title of Event
City of Gilroy Implementing Partner Meeting
Date of Event
Friday September 10, 2021, 3:00 – 4:15pm
Recorder of Event
Rickie Cleere
Participants/Attendees
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Karen Garner, Community Development Director • Daryl Jordan, Public Works Director • Kraig Tamborini, Senior Planner • Staff: Rich Walter, Morgan Galli, Joan Isaacson, Rickie Cleere
Purpose of Event
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explain/Present on Updates to EJ Analysis, Mitigations, Benefits and Community Improvements • Share Preliminary Conclusions • Gain feedback on directed questions • Address clarifying questions on meeting materials, desired feedback and conclusions
Key Notes
<p>Key points of concern from partner; any preliminary feedback to directed questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are concerned about emergency response delay. In the summary, it states that there is emergency response delay for Alternative 4 and then there is reference to mitigation measure sfmm#4. I am not sure what that refers to. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mitigation related to the potential for emergency response delays is in the draft EIR/EIS Section 3.11: Safety and Security. The mitigation is for emergency vehicle response related to station traffic and includes a range of improvements related to the gate downtime effect for Alternative 4. One solution would be to potentially include a partial station with HSR covering operation costs for 5 years. Another solution would include an at grade monitoring station separate from the train monitoring system operated by the Authority, which would be tied into police and fire dispatch. A similar system is currently used in Sugarland, Texas. A monitoring assessment may lag behind the effects, so the Authority will perform more forecasting closer to the 2031 project launch date. Because the gate downtime effect will presumably increase over time, we aim to implement the improvements proactively to address effects. <p>Questions/Responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q: Who are you reaching out to for the Community Meetings. Is there a list available? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ R: Representatives of targeted EJ stakeholder groups. We will share the list. • Q: Will the eventual outcome be the Board's final selection of an alternative after the Final EIR/EIS? Will these EJ measures be included if the project proceeds?



- R: Correct. The Final EIR/EIS will be released in February 2022 and the Board will meet in March to certify the Final EIR/EIS including the mitigation and intent for community improvements, and to decide on an alternative.
- Q: Is there a minimum obligation for the improvements. Is the decision-making flexible?
 - R: We are proposing feasible improvements that we think offset project impacts. The findings assume and incorporate the mitigation that will be included in the Final EIR/EIS. They will become commitments at that time, and implementation will rely on the acquisition of funds for the project section.
- Q: Are we being asked to complete the survey. Will other stakeholders be providing feedback on the same materials?
 - R: Yes, that is correct.
- Q: Is the weight of feedback the same? We have a different perspective than residents may have.
 - R: We will look at all feedback provided. The survey asks respondents to indicate affiliation. As a potential partner for implementing the measures, your feedback will be weighed appropriately.
- Q: Are the mitigation measures in the EIR/EIS separate from the potential community improvements? Are those related to safety and emergency vehicle response for people living near the alignment?
 - Correct. The measure address people living near the alignment who are most impacted as well as impacts to cyclists, sidewalk users, and lighting. The improvements in downtown address gate downtime and enhance safety in environmental justice communities as a different way of offsetting impacts. The mitigations proposed in the EIR are more directly related to the impacts they are intended to address.

Next Steps/Actions/Follow-up:

- Community Meeting: Tuesday September 28, 5:00-7:00PM
- Outreach Team to provide a list of groups/organizations invited to community meeting (below, shared in follow up communication)
 - CARAS South County
 - Gilroy Prep School
 - Navigator Schools
 - Gilroy High School
 - South Valley Middle School
 - Alexander Station
 - Rebekah Children's Services
 - Santa Clara County Office of Supportive Housing
 - HomeFirst
 - Gavilan College
 - City of Gilroy
 - Gilroy Unified School District
 - Santa Clara County Parks and Recreation
 - Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
 - Mission College
 - Center For Employment Training
 - San Jose City College
 - Silicon Valley Rising



**EJ PHASE 3 MEETINGS
SEPTEMBER 2021
AFTER ACTION REPORT**

Title of Event
Gilroy Unified School District: High-Speed Rail Environmental Justice Meeting
Date of Event
Wednesday September 8, 2021, 2:00pm – 3:15pm
Recorder of Event
Rickie Cleere
Participants/Attendees
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Representatives: Alvaro Meza, Guillermo Ramos, Greg Kapaku• Staff: Audrey Van, Rich Walter, Cici Vu
Purpose of Event
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Explain/Present on Updates to EJ Analysis, Mitigations, Benefits and Community Improvements• Share Preliminary Conclusions• Gain feedback on directed questions• Address clarifying questions on meeting materials, desired feedback and conclusions
Key Notes
Potential Community Improvements Presented
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Alternatives 1, 2 and 4:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Noise insulation for certain residences along 101 to help offset residual project noise effects• Alternative 2:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Funding of recreational amenities for the South Valley Middle School to help offset partial acquisition of track/field○ Partial funding for affordable housing to offset residential displacement that cannot be relocated locally based on housing market• Alternative 4 - Funding for the following:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ New pedestrian/bicycle overcrossing of the railroad at IOOF Avenue○ Bikeway improvements (along IOOF Ave., Monterey Road, 6th Street, 4th Street, and Alexander Street)○ Sidewalk gap closure along Murray Avenue○ Neighborhood street lighting and sidewalk and curb improvements within the Gilroy Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area○ Designed to help offset residual project effects associated with emergency vehicle response delays (safety effects)



Key points of concern from partner; any preliminary feedback to directed questions:

- The Superintendent stated that Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 present DHAEs for the IOOF area of Gilroy due to the partial acquisition of the track/field at South Valley Middle School. Land in Gilroy is valuable and sought after, and HSR may need to seek eminent domain. In order for Gilroy schools to remain desirable for students and their families, they need to be accessible as well as have facilities like the track/field for school recreation activities. Right now, our school is surrounded by residences, Rebekah Children's Services, and Gilroy Prep.
- The Superintendent stated that Alternative 2 is the most problematic for the School District, particularly with respect to safety and school land acquisitions.
- The Assistant Superintendent stated that he disagrees with the finding that there are no DHAEs for Alternative 4. 100 mph train crossings present safety risks and mortal danger for students and elderly community members. These risks present DHAEs, even with the incorporation of quad gates and other project safety measures at intersections along the alignment.

Questions/Responses:

- Q: How often would a train pass through Gilroy during curfew hours (10pm-6am)?
 - R: The overall service schedule is projected for 6am to 12am. During peak hours, 6-9am and 4:30-7pm, seven trains would pass through per hour in each direction in roughly 4 to 5-minute intervals. Four to five trains would likely pass through after 9pm, including non-revenue trains.
- Q: Not all trains will stop in Gilroy, right?
 - R: Correct. Some express trains would only stop at locations such as San Francisco and San Jose.
- Q: Would widening of tracks go onto campus, and by how much?
 - R: Alternative 4 is at grade and would require some additional tracks. For Alternative 2, there is some encroachment onto the track/field at South Valley Middle School and a nearby park. The preliminary engineering drawing are in the Draft EIR/EIS, and we can provide you with the pages that contain details on acquisitions for each of the alternatives.
 - R: The plan sheets for the Preferred Alternative are available here (pages 24-27 for Gilroy) and was provided in the chat during the meeting: https://hsr.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/docs/programs/san_jose_merced/Draft_EIRS_JM_V3-18_PEPD_Alternative_4_Book_4_A_Composite_Plan_Profile_and_Cross_Sections.pdf
- Q: Is Alternative 4 the Preferred Alternative?
 - Yes, currently. The Board will be making a final decision next year.
- Q: What does the traffic footprint look like around South Valley Middle School?
 - R: The IOOF crossing would still be available. Fencing would be along the ROW on both sides, and the intersection would also have quad gates, pedestrian gates, and warning devices.
- Q: Is the three-page list of Community Improvements a good summary to use for reference?
 - R: Yes, the Community Summary and Community Improvements are good resources that we would appreciate you feedback on.

Next Steps/Actions/Follow-up:

- Community Meeting: Tuesday September 28, 5:00-7:00PM
 - The District's outreach team will reach out to parent and school stakeholder groups via Square and other means for their participation in the meeting.
 - The meeting should include Spanish interpretation and a Spanish slide deck will be made available.
- By COB, Friday September 10
 - HSR Team to provide Gilroy USD with land acquisition details for Alternative 4. (Provided during the meeting.)

EJ PHASE 3 MEETINGS SEPTEMBER 2021 AFTER ACTION REPORT

Title of Event
Los Banos Unified School District
Date of Event
September 8, 2021, Start time (11:25) – End time (12:05)
Recorder of Event (Name)
CeCe Horbat
Participants/Attendees
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Partner(s):<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Alejandra Garibay○ Amer Iqbal- Assistant Superintendent• Staff: Audrey Van, Cici Vu, Rich Walter, CeCe Horbat
Purpose of Event
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Meeting Objectives<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Explain/Present on Updates to EJ Analysis, Mitigations, Benefits and Community Improvements• Share Preliminary Conclusions• Gain feedback on directed questions• Address clarifying questions on meeting materials, desired feedback and conclusions• Update from meeting of last year
Key Notes
<p>Key points on community-specific presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Not at this time <p>Potential Community Improvements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• How partnership will be structured for implementing improvements.• Management of park and related facilities is out of school district's purview; need to partner with Merced County on park. <p>Key points of concern from partner/community; any preliminary feedback to directed questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• None at this time <p>Questions/Responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Q: Window and other improvements to school facilities – how will implementation work? Does school pay and get reimbursed or does the school receive funding<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ R: Partners would do the actual implementation and use the funds from the authority. Authority would not contract and do it. Authority would just provide funding.<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Preliminary improvements can be forwarded and estimate was made previously and Los Banos USD can provide feedback on the improvements <p>Next Steps/Actions/Follow-up:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• ICF: Send out preliminary improvements so the school district can see what the original

estimate was for the windows (this week – by 9/10)

- Send announcements to the school
- **Amer: Speak with lead parent groups and will check in with Volta Principal (TODAY)**
 - Possibly have a community café appearance
 - Could come into a board meeting
- **K&W: Follow up with Amer and Alejandra about parent outreach to families in SJV (1 week – 9/15)**

Updates from Internal Staff

- **Community meeting September 22nd from 5-7**
 - Cici Vu asked for a more connections to parent groups and Principal Thomas

Update from Los Banos USD

- school boundaries new of 2021 impacting families in different districts

Post Meeting Follow Up

- Rich (ICF): Recall notes Follow up with Merced County (Parks and Rec) via conference call to include Audrey, Rich and other authority staff to specific improvement (the potential new park)



**EJ PHASE 3 MEETINGS
SEPTEMBER 2021
AFTER ACTION REPORT**

Title of Event
City of San Jose
Date of Event
September 9, 2021, Start 1:05 – End time 2:30 pm
Recorder of Event (Name)
CeCe Horbat
Participants/Attendees
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City of San Jose, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Brian Stanke, Rail Planning Manager, City of San Jose ○ Jessica Zenk, Deputy Director, Transportation Planning & Project Delivery ○ Stacey Lu, Stacey Lu, Engineer II, Department of Transportation • Staff Name <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Joey Goldman ○ Rich Walter ○ Bruce Fukuji ○ Boris Lipkin ○ CeCe Horbat
Purpose of Event
<p>Meeting Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explain/present on updates to EJ analysis, mitigations, benefits and community improvements • Share preliminary conclusions • Gain feedback on directed questions • Address clarifying questions on meeting materials, desired feedback and conclusions
Key Notes
<p>Potential Community Improvements Presented (Key points on community-specific presentation)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • San Jose Diridon <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Alternatives 1, 2, and 3:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Funding for Delmas Neighborhood streetscape improvements to help offset visual aesthetic effects of viaduct. ○ <i>Alternative 4:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Noise insulation for certain residences along SR87 and I-280 helps to offset residual project noise effects. • Washington/Guadalupe/Tamien/Alma/Almaden <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Alternatives 1, 2, and 3:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Streetscape improvements along Goodyear Street, Humboldt Street, and Floyd Street to improve visual aesthetics.



- Funding to support community art installations in the local community to improve visual aesthetics and a sense of community.
- *Alternative 4:*
 - Noise insulation for residential buildings immediately adjacent to the east side of SR 87 to offset residual noise effects.
- **South San Jose**
 - *Alternatives 1, 2, and 3:*
 - Funding for Monterey Road Grand Blvd. landscaping improvements to help offset visual aesthetic effects of HSR structures.
 - *Alternative 4:*
 - Noise insulation for certain residences along 101 helps to offset residual project noise effects
 - Funding to City of San José for new pedestrian/bicycle overcrossings at Skyway, Branham, Chynoweth helps to improve safety.

Key points of concern from partner/community; any preliminary feedback to directed questions:

- **Gardner/Willow Glen**
 - Suggestion to specify/change Gardner/Willow Glen to Gardner/**North** Willow Glen
- **Alt 1-3 Comment**
 - City of San Jose looks forward to having landscaping/green space additions.
 - “That’s a great idea (re: Monterey Road/Grand Blvd. landscaping). Would be ideal to have green infrastructure and trees as part of that.”
- **Discussion regarding overcrossing versus undercrossing**
 - The Authority would prefer overcrossings as opposed to undercrossings.
 - Overcrossing details will be modeled off existing overcrossings (i.e., Xander’s Crossing). Cost estimates exist but specific design work has yet to be done. ICF works with HNTB.
 - **City of San Jose:** City of San Jose followed up with the Authority to continue working on the MOU language regarding the implementation of the bike/ped crossings in S. San Jose.
- **Representative Involvement**
 - Boris/Morgan/Authority members have been working to give a briefing to representatives/councilmembers.
 - David Tran (staffer for Councilmember Raul Peralez), requested a briefing
- **VTA’s Gardner Elementary Sound Wall (Highway 280)**
 - Slow 20+ year process with CalTrans.
 - The Authority looked to see if it could do sound walls on school property as a potential way to work with VTA.
 - Jessica Zenk forwarded contacts including Cindy Chavez and Jason Nesdahl (Jason.Nesdahl@vta.org). Jason is the VTA point-person for the sound wall project.
 - Takeaway: possible points of collaboration.

Questions/Responses:

- **Q: Will additional sound walls be implemented (See Alt 4: Noise Mitigation San Jose Diridon)?**





- **R:** Instead of sound walls along freeway, there will be noise insulation installed in affected buildings. Sound walls will impact one or two stories of a building as opposed to building insulation, which can reduce noise for the entire building. However, noise barriers in the form of sound walls will be included in EIR/EIS but not for improvements.
- **Discussion:** City of San Jose emphasized the importance of incorporating community feedback/involvement when implementing sound insulation. City of San Jose also referenced the BART Phase 2 Noise Abatement project for the Authority to look into.
- **Q: Why is the "reference community" selected to be all of the three counties.**
 - **R:** See PowerPoint slide 4. Threshold for reference communities is adjusted based on census data and income differentials. Income is adjusted based on where populations are geographically located.
- **Q: Displacement refers to DIRECT displacement, right?**
 - **R** (From Boris in chat pod): Yes, acquisition of property needed along the rail alignment will result in direct displacement of structures adjacent to HSR).
- **Q: Is there a commitment to a program office/community staff to ensure mitigation?** Concerned about low-income, disadvantaged people trying to navigate getting the sound insulation installed.
 - **R:** In reference to the noise improvements, the Authority would be responsible for the design, implementation, hiring of contractors, and outreach for noise improvements.
 - Jessica emphasized that it is important to utilize community connections to reduce the onerous impact on low income/communities of color and ensure equitable participation in the sound insulation program.
- **Q: Can you expand on next steps surrounding SS-MM4?** See 4A pg. 2 of materials on S. San Jose Meet HSR NorCal
 - **R:** Listed below are potential revisions to the final EIR/EIS:
 1. Revisions will continue to be modified and the evaluation is ongoing. Emergency response delay times will be monitored on a rolling basis. The Authority will continue to monitor and forecast how response times will be impacted over time. If response time increases significantly, the Authority will act accordingly (see Emergency Response Delay below).
 2. Initial funding will be allocated if fire station is needed. Funding will exist for the first 5 years.
 3. The Authority is looking into a monitoring system for at-grade crossings tied into fire and police dispatch to consider real time info. about gates being down (exists in Sugarland, Texas)
 - **Emergency Response Delay:** The adverse emergency response delays for Alternative 4 are related to increased gate down time at the at-grade crossings at Skyway Drive, Branham Lane, and Chynoweth Avenue. Adverse delays greater than the delay threshold could occur if the City of San Jose chooses to not implement the improvements included in proposed direct mitigation measure SS-MM#4 based on the construction funding and partial operational funding proposed by the Authority.
- **Q: How will the Authority implement community art improvements?** The City of San Jose looks forward to having community art improvements. Community artists add a lot of goodwill and potentially pay you back in spades.
 - **R:** In terms of implementing improvements, the Authority will deal with the funding side when it comes to art. Coordination of the art project would be the City's responsibility.

Next Steps/Actions/Follow Up:

- Boris:
 - Will work with City of San Jose to incorporate MOU language.
 - Will follow up regarding Councilmember briefings, specifically David Tran (staffer for Councilmember Raul Peralez).



HIGH-SPEED RAIL: **CONNECTING AND TRANSFORMING CALIFORNIA**

- Will loop in team members accordingly after receipt of emails on VTA-Gardner Elementary sound wall email chain from Jessica Zenk.
- Jessica/Boris will coordinate on a carwash plan
 - Boris review materials from Stacey and follow up regarding information on a project "preliminary review" request for a development at 32 Stockton (the carwash site).
- Upcoming Community Meetings | September (5 – 7 pm)
 - 13th Guadalupe Washington
 - 14th Gardner
 - 20th San José - Diridon
 - 23rd South San José





**EJ PHASE 3 MEETINGS
SEPTEMBER 2021
AFTER ACTION REPORT**

Title of Event
African American Community Services Agency EJ Meeting
Date of Event
Monday September 13, 2021, 2021, 2:30-3:15
Recorder of Event
Rickie Cleere
Participants/Attendees
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Representatives: Milan Balinton, Rebekah Melesse, Lavere Foster, Ariadna Luna • Staff: Morgan Galli, Rich Walter, Cici Vu, Rickie Cleere
Purpose of Event
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explain/Present on Updates to EJ Analysis, Mitigations, Benefits and Community Improvements • Share Preliminary Conclusions • Gain feedback on directed questions • Address clarifying questions on meeting materials, desired feedback and conclusions
Key Notes
<p>Questions/Responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q: How did you determine that there was a need for this project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ R: The project need goes back to a statewide environmental assessment conducted in 2000. A general system framework first developed in 2005 included termini in LA and San Francisco as well as a station in San Jose, with plans for later expansion. In 2008, Proposition 1A was put on the ballot in support of partial project funding. Since the passing of Prop 1A, the Authority has been implementing it along with additional pieces of legislation concerned with the northern sections of the project. Per legislative oversight, the Authority prepares a business plan every 2 years which to routinely reevaluate project need. The 2020 business plan confirms the project's economic viability, projected ridership, and overall benefit. Over the years, a shared understanding of the need for alternative transportation has developed in California. High-Speed rail is an opportunity to modernize and augment the existing passenger rail system with a fully electric travel alternative to intrastate car and air travel. Most research on potential benefits have focused on ridership analysis and the provision of a more environmentally friendly travel alternative. They ridership analysis has involved travel demand projections for 2031-2040, which have demonstrated a need for costly highway and airport infrastructure improvements across California. The project would by provide an electric rail option that produces fewer emissions, promoting compliance with state carbon dioxide emissions reduction goals. We will send fact sheets and additional links to our website with further information. ○ R: Sent in chat: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft environmental report (April 2020): https://hsr.ca.gov/programs/environmental-planning/project-section-environmental-documents-tier-2/san-jose-to-merced-project-section-draft-environmental-impact-report-environmental-impact-statement/ • Draft environmental justice analysis (April 2020): https://hsr.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/docs/programs/san_jose_merced/Draft_EIRS_JM_V1-30_CH_5_Environmental_Justice.pdf



- Q: What is the project's anticipated completion date? Would low-income people be able to regularly ride?
 - Project construction is underway in the Central Valley and project operation is anticipated to begin in 2030. Expansion of project construction will begin as soon as funding become available. The full rail system may be complete by 2033, but this timeline is contingent on funding. There was an appropriation request before the legislature earlier this year and the legislature did not take action. The current bill (4.2) is still in bond and will be decided upon by the legislature in January 2022. In the meantime, the Authority is assessing how non-action will impact project delivery timelines across project sections. Regarding pricing and fares, the Authority expects the project to be competitive with airfare. Case studies in other regions across similar medium-range distances reveal a tendency for rail to outcompete airfare. The Authority and future operator will assess fares once service becomes closer to fruition.
- Q: Will the completed rail be electric-powered.
 - R: Yes.

Next Steps/Actions/Follow-up:

- In a follow up telephone call (9/13/21) with Lavere Foster to ensure understanding that HSR is planning to advance the improvements on the potential (vs. other considered) list, Lavere mentioned that he'd like to advocate that the measure to redevelop the Inez Jackson library be advanced on the potential list citing that it would serve as a sanctuary for the underserved community of San Jose from potential noise effects of the project. He indicated that many of the community members AACSA serves are unhoused or don't have stable homes and AACSA endeavors as an organization to provide a welcoming place of comfort to its members. Lavere will make sure AACSA submits a feedback survey to this effect.
- Community Meeting: Monday September 28, 5:00-7:00PM
 - **AACSA – Is there a need for Spanish Interpretation at this meeting?**
- Outreach Team to provide web resources with additional project information (below, sent in follow up communication):
 - HSR Website: <https://hsr.ca.gov/>
 - Fact Sheets (also attached)
 - General CA fact sheet: https://hsr.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/docs/communication/info_center/factsheets/Connecting_California.pdf
 - Northern California Fact Sheet: https://hsr.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/docs/communication/info_center/factsheets/Northern_California_Factsheet.pdf
 - SJ to Merced Preferred Alternative Fact Sheet: https://hsr.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/SJ_Merced_Project_Section.pdf
 - Business Plan: <https://hsr.ca.gov/about/high-speed-rail-business-plans/2020-business-plan/>
 - Draft environmental report (April 2020): <https://hsr.ca.gov/programs/environmental-planning/project-section-environmental-documents-tier-2/san-jose-to-merced-project-section-draft-environmental-impact-report-environmental-impact-statement/>
 - Draft environmental justice analysis (April 2020): https://hsr.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/docs/programs/san_jose_merced/Draft_EIRS_JM_V1-30_CH_5_Environmental_Justice.pdf



**EJ PHASE 3 MEETINGS
SEPTEMBER 2021
AFTER ACTION REPORT**

Title of Event
Guadalupe Washington Community Meeting
Date of Event
September 13, 2021, Start 5:00 – End time 7:00 pm
Recorder of Event (Name)
Vidya Bhamidi
Participants/Attendees
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Representative Name(s), <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Brian Stanke, San Jose DOT ○ Elizabeth Figueroa, (CommUniverCity SJSU) Special Programs Manager ○ Hugo Meza (District Attorney's Office) ○ Kerry Duncan, Rep. Lofgren Staff ○ Rosalinda Aguilar (GW Neighborhood Association) ○ Stacey (CSJ) ○ Maricela Alcala Franco (Principal Washington Elementary) ○ Imelda Rodriguez (CommUniverCity) • Staff Name <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Cici Vu, Facilitator ○ Rich Walter, Presenter ○ Audrey Van, Presenter ○ Rachel Bickert, Tech Support/Webinar Manager ○ Vidya Bhamidi, Documentarian
Purpose of Event
<p>Meeting Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explain/Present on Updates to EJ Analysis, Mitigations, Benefits and Community Improvements • Share Preliminary Conclusions • Gain feedback on directed questions • Address clarifying questions on meeting materials, desired feedback and conclusions
Key Notes
<p>Key points on community-specific DHAE : Preliminary conclusions presented</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Potential disproportionately high and adverse effects (DHAE): Aesthetics and Visual Quality ○ Visual and Noise Benefits: Reduced need for airport highway expansion and associated visual and noise effects. Helps to offset the adverse visual effects or noise effects.



- **Alternatives 1, 2, and 3:** Residual disproportionately high and adverse visual effects related to the elevated viaduct.
- **Alternative 4:** No disproportionately high and adverse effects.

Key points of concern from community; any preliminary feedback to directed questions:

- Impact on neighboring properties and unhoused populations
- Construction and operation related air pollution
- Timeline, details, and impact of construction
- Financial packages for businesses that will be impacted by construction

Questions/Responses:

- **Q:** A participant asked whether additional homes will be taken down on each side of the railroad tracks.
 - **R:** Only the two homes mentioned will be removed with Alt 4 (preferred alt), that too in Gardner/North Willow Glen
- **Q:** A participant asked about fossil fuels or air pollutant emissions
 - **R:** There will be diesel equipment during construction. But during operations, the train is electric so there won't be any emissions. There will be some emissions at the power plant, but the power plant is not in GW. Keep in mind that existing trains are presently operating on diesel, but Caltrain is electrifying its trains.
- **Q:** Is there a plan to mitigate those emissions?
 - **R:** In the EIR, we've looked at construction impacts as well as operational impacts. We also have some additional commitments working with the Air Districts. For example, HSRA is doing construction in Central Valley and incorporating all those mitigation measures in contracts with contractors. HSRA oversees this through a mitigation monitoring and enforcement plan.
- **Q:** What is the duration of construction of this project?
 - **R:** Overall is about 5 years where there are tunnels and 2-3 years where there aren't. Alternatives 1,2,3 will have more construction due to viaducts.
- **Q:** Could there be displacement to businesses during construction? Will parking be taken away?
 - **R:** We have requirements for impact avoidance and mitigation measures to make sure housing and businesses aren't negatively impacted.
- **Q:** How many community groups have you contacted?
 - **Cici:** We have contacted close to 300 community groups from San Francisco to Merced. Reached 200,000 community members in our EJ-focused outreach and engagement. General outreach has reached more.
- **Q:** A participant asked whether any structures will be erected in this community, because he is concerned about gang-related conflicts arising, graffiti, and the potential of related violence
 - **R:** The community art won't be on HSR structures, it will be on fencing. The intent is that it will be in other locations. Alts 1,2,3 have columns to hold up the viaduct – can follow up with specifics on whether these columns will be fenced off or open to public
- **Q:** A participant asked about sound walls in the community
 - **R:** There are no sound walls but will have to expand an existing rail bridge and create another bridge
- **Q:** What will be the impact on homeless populations? Does HSRA have plans to conduct a study?
 - **R:** For this community, the rail line follows Caltrain right of way so it will be Caltrain's responsibility. No plans to conduct our own study, will cooperate with CalTrans or Caltrain.
 - **Cici** adds that we've done on-ground outreach – we've done walks along the alignment where unhoused members are located, and have qualitative data



- **Q:** Clarification on any kind of start date?
 - **R:** The document says construction starting as soon as 2022, but doubtful that'll happen. We don't have funding and even if funding was identified tomorrow, our design is not finalized. It would still take several years.
- **Q:** Can you clarify the point about bridge widening in the area over Virginia St? Will there be any closure during the time when that work is being done?
 - **R:** Not aware of any road closures at this time. That section over the Guadalupe River is Valley Water's right of way.
- **Q:** A participant asked about slide 14: emergency response delays not having a circle
 - **R:** There is no station so there is no station traffic. There are impacts at the Diridon station for example, but those impacts don't reach the neighborhood. There are also no at grade crossings, so there are no operational delays for emergency response in this particular community.

Next Steps/Actions/Follow-up:

- Follow up with Hugo Meza regarding specifics on whether columns will be fenced off or open to public
 - RE Follow up High-Speed Rail - Question re Noise Barriers and Viaduct Columns in San Jose on Thursday, September 23, 2021 2:18 PM



**EJ PHASE 3 MEETINGS
SEPTEMBER 2021
AFTER ACTION REPORT**

Title of Event
Rocketship Schools (Guadalupe/Washington Area) – Interested Parties
Date of Event
September 13, 2021 Start Time 10 am End Time 10:50 am
Recorder of Event (Name)
CeCe Horbat
Participants/Attendees
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Representative Name(s) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Courtney English – Principal English at Mateo Sheedy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Contact Information: 408-464-2472 • Staff Name, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Morgan Galli ○ Rich Walter ○ Cici Vu ○ CeCe Horbat
Purpose of Event
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explain/Present on Updates to EJ Analysis, mitigations, benefits and community improvements • Share preliminary conclusions • Gain feedback on directed questions • Address clarifying questions on meeting materials, desired feedback and conclusions
Key Notes
Potential Community Improvements Presented
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternatives 1, 2, and 3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Streetscape improvements along Goodyear Street, Humboldt Street, and Floyd Street to improve visual aesthetics. ○ Funding to support community art installations in the local community to improve visual aesthetics and a sense of community. • Alternative 4: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noise insulation for residential buildings immediately adjacent to the east side of SR 87 to offset residual noise effects. <p>Other improvements considered involving Rocketship Schools</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rocketship Mateo Sheedy Elementary School play fields/landscaping <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Benefits/Ranking: Ranking 3- safety, recreation, livability • Rocketship Mateo Sheedy Elementary School circulation and safety improvements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Benefits/Ranking: Ranking 11- safety



Key points of discussion partner/community; any preliminary feedback to directed questions:

- Principal English expressed gratitude regarding transparency and inclusion in this update involving Rocketship Schools.
 - Principal English will provide an update at an upcoming school council meeting that meets with families and parents / parent groups active and interested in the project.

Next Steps/Actions/Follow-up:

- 9/13: Guadalupe Washington Community Meeting tonight 9/13 from 5-7 pm
 - Principal English will pass along invite to community stakeholders/ parent groups.
- 9/13: K&W forwarded meeting invite and flyer with zoom information for 9/13 Community Meeting.





**EJ PHASE 3 MEETINGS
SEPTEMBER 2021
AFTER ACTION REPORT**

Title of Event
City of Santa Clara
Date of Event
September 13th 2021 Start time 3 pm, End 4:25 pm
Recorder of Event (Name)
CeCe Horbat
Participants/Attendees
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City of Santa Clara <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Jonathan Yee, City of Santa Clara Transportation Manager (Dennis Ng was previously in the position) ○ Michael Liw, Assistant Director of Public Works/City Engineer • Staff Name, Outreach Team <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chris Diwa, HSR ○ Rich Walter, ICF ○ Joey Goldman, K&W ○ CeCe Horbat, K&W
Purpose of Event
<p>Meeting Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explain/Present on updates to EJ analysis, mitigations, benefits and, community improvements • Share Conclusions • Gain feedback on directed questions • Address clarifying questions on meeting materials, desired feedback, and conclusions
Key Notes
<p>Key points on community-specific presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A <p>Key points of concern from partner/community; any preliminary feedback to directed questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion/Point of concern: The City of Santa Clara shared that excluding some of the proposed improvements in the recent analysis was surprising and disappointing. City staff mentioned that this might not go over well with the community, and might be a point of concern resulting in pushback and loss of faith from the audience. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Presenters encouraged City staff to relay this feedback in the survey. The Authority wanted to leave this opportunity open-ended when first accepting improvement (formerly enhancement) proposals. However, the Authority's programmatic direction has changed, and through the survey, if there are other improvements the City wants to advocate for or add, they will be read.



- **Explanation of Operational Traffic (see *Summary of Potential Effects* dot table 4. A in Santa Clara/North San Jose Materials)**
 - The City of Santa Clara suggested explaining the long-term versus short-term impacts of operational traffic and why this part of the table is blank.

Questions/Responses:

- **Q: We had many meetings last year, and it appears there are no actual transportation impacts. How are we reconciling the work that we did in the fall of 2020? Previously the discussion was open-ended. What's going on now/how did we end up here? Additionally, how do we explain to people that last year's feedback is not moving forward?**
 - **R:** This year's direction (in 2021) was to look at relationships between effects and improvements more closely and to have a narrower scope. This moved the City of Santa Clara's improvements to "other improvements." This new analysis took the existing feedback and incorporated what they could to offset any residual effects. There are general benefits to the project. Currently, the Authority would like to hear feedback on the methodology, conclusions, and propositions presented by the Authority.
 - In 2019, the City of Santa Clara proposed a bike/pedestrian plan. Back in 2019, the direction broadly looked at community improvements. At that time, no decisions were final, and the Authority wanted to collect information on effects and benefits on a general level.
- **Q: How did the Authority designate the current division of the project? It appears that parts of Santa Clara fall into both project sections. Is there different staff for the two sections?**
 - **R:** The Authority split up the Northern California Section into two parts: San Francisco to San Jose (FJ) and San Jose to Merced (JM). While they are two separate teams, the review process is similar, and information overlaps.
 - Scott Blvd. is where the overlap roughly begins. In areas of overlap, the viaduct impacts both the JM and FJ sections. Within the station design, a viaduct might be in Santa Clara. However, the Authority needs to analyze and capture the whole impacted area in the Santa Clara region, resulting in the overlap. Overlap exists from Scott Blvd. to West Alma in San Jose and overlaps the Tamien Caltrain station.
 - The same analysis and most of the team have close communication with the larger Northern California team. Teams communicate with each other and flag items to the other team when necessary. Timelines of FJ and JM are about a month apart (range from 2-3 months). The JM section of the project is likely to advance to the final EIR/EIS before the FJ section.
- **Q: How does the Authority classify what is a DHAE?**
 - **R:** The Authority's definition of DHAE is as follows: "The focus of the environmental justice analysis is to determine whether the project would result in high and adverse effects that disproportionately affect minority populations or low-income populations." This definition looks at census data and then looks at income or race/ethnicity demographics compared to the rest of the study area and determined on an end-to-end basis. This methodology for determining Disproportionately High and Adverse Effects (DHAE) is identical to the Draft EIR/EIS.

Questions concerning alternatives 2 and 3

- **Q: Speaking from the perspective of community members after looking at the *Summary of Potential Effects* dot table (see table 4. A in Santa Clara/North San Jose Materials). What can be done to offset impacts in alternatives 2 and 3?**
 - **R:** Currently, the Authority sees that the offsetting value of project benefits are general transportation, noise, and visual benefits. The only potential community improvement included is under alternative 4.



- If there is a disagreement about the offsets to alternatives 2 and 3, think of this prompt when giving feedback: Does the community have feedback on whether they agree with the Authority's perception of out-of-kind improvements? Are there additional ways to offset impacts or improvements that benefit the community even if they are not "directly" related? If so, the Authority would like to hear.
- **Q: Regarding alternatives 2 and 3 (parks): What are the specific potential effects and why are they not considered high and adverse? What is happening to offset these potential effects?**
 - **R:** The Summary of Potential Effects dot table states in the footnotes for parks in alternatives 2 and 3- "[2] Limited partial acquisitions at Reed Street Dog Park and Reed and Grant Streets Sports Park."
 - The Authority's updated analysis for alternatives 2 and 3 requires limited partial acquisition that can be mitigated by the Authority, avoiding DHAЕ status. In 2019, the City of Santa Clara provided feedback regarding impacts to these parks via a comment letter incorporated into the Authority's updated analysis and revisions.

General Project Questions

- **Q: How are you tailoring your outreach?**
 - R: Outreach is tailored to interested parties, implementing partners, and community stakeholders. All those invited to meetings have had some involvement in the high-speed rail project.
 - The City of Santa suggested reaching out to the communications department at the City, but the Authority described a more tailored approach.
- **Q: How have these meetings and this process been going with other members of the community?**
 - **R:** The Authority first met with the City and will continue to meet with interested parties and other stakeholders. The Santa Clara community meeting takes place on September 15th from 5-7 pm. The following organizations have been invited to the community meetings: Charities Housing/HomeSafe, Next Door Solutions, Council on American Islamic Relations (CAIR), HomeFirst, ImmigrantInfo.org, Muslim Community Association, Santa Clara County Emergency Assistance Network, Santa Clara County Refugee and Immigrant Forum, South Bay Islamic Association (SBIA).
- **Q: What caused the change to update the analysis?**
 - **R:** A shift in policy resulted in a more refined analysis. The perspective of what defines *out-of-kind* also changed. What was considered as an impact to the project had been resolved or mitigated, decreasing residual impacts.

Closing Remarks

- Authority: The Authority has been working on these documents since 2014/2015. Over the years, personnel, policy, and methodology changed. Our efforts in 2019-2020 allowed us to have a set of ideas and see what was feasible for the Authority. Part of this environmental process resulted in adjustments and mitigations. Some of the adjustments and mitigations resolved previous DHAЕs. The Authority looks forward to community participation to help influence updating Chapter 5 for incorporation into the final EIR/EIS.

Additional Notes

- The City of Santa Clara is also working with BART regarding new station construction.
- The City of Santa Clara submitted a letter of support for the no-viaduct alternative and met with Dave Shpak and Boris Lipkin in past meetings.



Next Steps/Actions/Follow-up:

- Santa Clara Community Meeting (9/15)





**EJ PHASE 3 MEETINGS
SEPTEMBER 2021
AFTER ACTION REPORT**

Title of Event
Gardner Community Meeting
Date of Event
Tuesday September 14, 2021, 5:00 – 6:20 pm
Recorder of Event (Name)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jennifer Vazconcelo
Participants/Attendees
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Representative Name(s) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brian Stanke, San Jose Department of Transportation Stacey Lu, City of San Jose Kerry Duncan, Rep. Lofgren Staff Kristine Nguyen, GoKids Ben Leech, Preservation Action Council of San Jose Staff Name <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cici Vu, Facilitator Rich Walter, Presenter Chris Diwa, Presenter Rachel Bickert, Tech Support/Webinar Manager Jennifer Vazconcelo, Documentarian Victor Hernandez, Spanish Interpreter
Purpose of Event
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explain/Present on Updates to EJ Analysis, Mitigations, Benefits and Community Improvements Share Preliminary Conclusions Gain feedback on directed questions Address clarifying questions on meeting materials, desired feedback and conclusions
Key Notes
<p>Key points on community-specific presented</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of Potential effects in the Gardner/Willow Glen community <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preliminary conclusion takes into consideration direct mitigation, project benefits and potential community improvements. Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4: will have effects due to Aesthetics and Visual Quality, but effects not considered high and adverse. Alternative 4: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential disproportionately high and adverse effect related to operational noise effects. Potential operational noise effects not disproportionately high and adverse for the entire project section, but a particular community may still be affected. Effects in parks, construction traffic/bus transit delay and operational traffic but these effects are not considered high and adverse.



- Effects shown are after consideration of direct mitigation, but before consideration of the offsetting value of project benefits or community improvements.

Key points of concern from partner/community; any preliminary feedback to directed questions:

- Displacements due to expansion of the right of way
- Impacts on protected historical resources

Questions/Responses:

- **Q:** Do you have specific information on what parcels in the neighborhood would potentially be impacted with an expanded right of way?
 - **R:** There is a list of all the parcel numbers with the displacements in the DEIR/EIS appendix. The third volume of the Draft EIR/EIS is a preliminary engineering drawing; those include identifying the temporary right of way and the permanent right of way. The displacements are at the end of the neighborhood, closer to SR87 along the tracks; we're adding a track to the existing routes to handle the capacity; that is why we had to widen the right of way, which would require the acquisition of two residences in the neighborhood.
- **Q:** We have been tracking what is proposed in the DEIR/EIS regarding potential impacts to the Diridon station as a historic resource; the discussion tonight didn't seem to address the historic resources. As this process evolved, when is the next leverage point to discuss what is being considered in accommodating the station on-site?
 - **R:** The DEIR/EIS has a detailed analysis of the effects on cultural resources, like the Diridon station. We haven't identified any cultural resource impacts that would fit those definitions in the environmental justice analysis. Still, since this is a federal project, we also consult with the State Historic Preservation Office.
- **Q:** Does the analysis look at specific grade crossings? I know that there is at least one grade crossing, is that proposed to stay a grade crossing, or is there a plan to close off that street to avoid the grade crossing, or Virginia converts into Drake?
 - **R:** Within Gardner Northland, Virginia is turning into Drake, and then across on the other side is Azariah. With alternative four, which is the at grade, those are proposed to remain at grade crossings. At the grade crossing, we're going to add quad gates and fencing where needed; right now, there are two gates; the quad gates help prevent anybody from going around the gates. We're also going to be adding median channelization to stop people from going in the opposite lane. Some vehicle detections are required in the entrances to prevent cars while gates are coming down from getting trapped.





**EJ PHASE 3 MEETINGS
SEPTEMBER 2021
AFTER ACTION REPORT**

Title of Event
Santa Clara Community Meeting
Date of Event
September 15, 2021, Start 5:10 – End time 6:25 pm
Recorder of Event (Name)
Vidya Bhamidi
Participants/Attendees
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Representative Name(s), Title <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Aparna Dhoraje, Next Door Solutions ○ Michal Healy, Santa Clara Unified School District ○ ML Work Iphone (unknown) • Staff Name <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Joan Issacson, Facilitator ○ Rich Walter, Presenter ○ Chris Diwa, Presenter ○ Rebecca, Tech Support/Webinar Manager ○ Vidya Bhamidi, Documentarian
Purpose of Event
<p>Meeting Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explain/Present on Updates to EJ Analysis, Mitigations, Benefits and Community Improvements • Share Preliminary Conclusions • Gain feedback on directed questions • Address clarifying questions on meeting materials, desired feedback and conclusions
Key Notes
<p>Key points on community-specific presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Visual and Noise Benefits ○ Noise insulation for certain residences ○ Residential and Business Displacements ○ Construction Impacts <p>Key points of concern from community; any preliminary feedback to directed questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No feedback <p>Questions/Responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q: Where is the link to the actual improvements to Santa Clara roads and crossings located?



HIGH-SPEED RAIL: **CONNECTING AND TRANSFORMING CALIFORNIA**

- **R:** There are descriptions of changes to roadways, especially for Alt 2 and 3 that have more roadway changes. There isn't an engineering design, those are at a conceptual level. We can follow-up via email.
 - Draft environmental justice analysis (April 2020): https://hsr.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/docs/programs/san_jose_merced/Draft_EIRS_JM_V1-30_CH_5_Environmental_Justice.pdf
 -

Next Steps/Actions/Follow-up:

Follow-up via email with Michal Healy (mhealy@scusd.net)

- Re: Followup on location of Potential and Other Community Improvements in Santa Clara on Fri, Sep 17, 2021 at 5:20 PM



**EJ PHASE 3 MEETINGS
SEPTEMBER 2021
AFTER ACTION REPORT**

Title of Event
Santa Clara County Agencies
Date of Event
September 15th 2021 Start time 2:05 pm, End 2:50 pm
Recorder of Event (Name)
CeCe Horbat
Participants/Attendees
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City of Santa Clara <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Jeremy Farr, Parks and Recreation • Staff Name: Audrey Van, Rich Walter, Joey Goldman, CeCe Horbat
Purpose of Event
<p>Meeting Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explain/Present on updates to EJ analysis, mitigations, benefits, and community improvements • Share Conclusions • Gain feedback on directed questions • Address clarifying questions on meeting materials, desired feedback, and conclusions
Key Notes
<p>Key points on potential community improvements in community-specific presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jeremy Farr from SCC Parks and Rec received slides and materials from South San Jose and the City of Morgan Hill communities. See previous feedback from 2020 <p>S. San Jose</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternatives 1, 2, and 3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Funding for landscaping improvements along Monterey Road (as part of the City of San Jose Grand Blvd. initiative) to help offset visual aesthetic effects of HSR structures. • Alternative 4: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noise insulation for certain residences along 101 helps to offset residual project noise effects ○ Funding to the City of San Jose for new pedestrian/bicycle overcrossings at Skyway, Branham, Chynoweth helps to improve safety. <p>City of Morgan Hill</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternatives 1 and 3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding to the City of Morgan Hill to implement trail and park improvements under the viaduct to offset visual aesthetic effects • Alternative 2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding to implement complete streets improvements along Railroad Avenue to offset visual aesthetic effects. • Partial funding for affordable housing to offset residential displacement that cannot be relocated locally based on the housing market • Alternative 4:



- Noise insulation for residences along 101 helps to offset residual project noise effects

Key points of concern from partner/community [none shared]; any preliminary feedback to directed questions:

- **No DHAES under the new analysis impacting SCC Parks and Rec in S. San Jose or City of Morgan Hill**
 - Other improvements impacting parks and recs include the following
 - S. San Jose
 - Coyote Creek Trail-Fisher Creek Trail Connection (ranked 5)
 - City of Morgan Hill
 - Coyote Creek low-flow crossings replaced with bridges
 - Perry's Hill staging area, Coyote Creek Parkway in Hellyer County Park
 - Llagas Creek Trail
- The only DHAES impacting parks are in the City of Gilroy
- Jeremy Farr has experience with NEPA and appreciated the meeting. Jeremy understands needing to move previously discussed improvements to other improvements. Jeremy also shared reflections that many of these DHAES don't impact these urban area communities. This reflection was a double-edged sword as many of these parks do not serve residents living in the identified dense urban areas.

Next Steps/Actions/Follow-up:

- City of Santa Clara Community Meeting 9/15
- Morgan Hill Community Meeting 9/21
- S. San Jose Community Meeting 9/23





**EJ PHASE 3 MEETINGS
SEPTEMBER 2021
AFTER ACTION REPORT**

Title of Event
Interested Party: Gavilan College
Date of Event
September 16, 2021, 4 pm – 5 pm
Recorder of Event (Name)
Henry DeRuff
Participants/Attendees
<p><u>Gavilan College</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Susan Sweeney, Interim Dean of Student Success and Workforce Pathways • Linda Bernabe, Interim Director of Community and Educational Pathways • Not Present: Jan Chargin, Denee Pescarmona, Kathleen Rose, Lisa Scott (who we met with in Phase 2) <p><u>Outreach Team</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rich Walters, ICF • Audrey Van, HSR • Cici Vu, K&W • Henry DeRuff, K&W
Purpose of Event
<p>The event purpose was to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explain/Present on Updates to EJ Analysis, Mitigations, Benefits and Community Improvements • Share Preliminary Conclusions • Gain feedback on directed questions • Address clarifying questions on meeting materials, desired feedback and conclusions • Focus in on informing the College about how the updated EJ analysis impacted the previously proposed work force development community improvement measure.
Key Notes
<p>General points of observation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Susan and Linda were <i>briefed</i> on the topic, but both live in Gilroy; they had not read the materials. Dr. Rose and Denee, who attended previous meetings, were not in attendance. • Because we met with staff new to the project, Cici & Rich gave a general overview/history of the project due to lack of prior knowledge • Additional mention: considered additional job training at Gavilan (not on short list at present for EJ process because not a close relationship to project effects – not a lot of job loss; HSR does have a partnership with skilled craft unions, didn't want to double efforts; also not part of DHAEs) <p>Stakeholder response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impressed with the project benefits and how it would positively impact travel.



- Clearly understood and reiterated that work force development as a community improvement measure is not on the “potential” community improvements list

Questions/Responses:

- **Q (Susan):** This is a nice opportunity for *travel*, but not for what we asked for, and in particular for the workforce training piece. What are the next steps for Gavilan?
 - **R:** There are the three options that include Gavilan, although they are not necessarily likely: low-income housing, bike lanes, and job training. Alternative 2 involves funding for affordable housing, which could include funding for Gavilan low-income housing. I’d encourage you to provide feedback on whether any of those three are connected to the effects we’ve identified. If you have questions about relationships with unions, we can put you in contact with the members of our team who have worked on that. Additionally, please fill out the survey we’ve sent, call/email us, or come to the community meeting on 9/28. If students or other members of the Gavilan community are interested, please encourage them to attend.
- **Q (Linda):** We have a campus in Hollister. Will there be any impact or connection to the campus in Hollister?
 - **R:** Hollister is pretty far away from the alignment, so we haven’t explored that yet.

Next Steps/Actions/Follow-up:

- By **9/17**: The Outreach team will send a thank-you email with relevant materials & links.



**EJ PHASE 3 MEETINGS
SEPTEMBER 2021
AFTER ACTION REPORT**

Title of Event
San Jose Unified School District: EJ High-Speed Rail Implementing Partner Meeting
Date of Event
Thursday September 15, 2021, 11:00am
Recorder of Event
Rickie Cleere
Participants/Attendees
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Representative: Ben Spielberg – Manager of Strategic Projects • Staff: Chris Diwa, Rich Walter, Cici Vu, Rickie Cleere
Purpose of Event
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explain/Present on Updates to EJ Analysis, Mitigations, Benefits and Community Improvements • Share Preliminary Conclusions • Gain feedback on directed questions • Address clarifying questions on meeting materials, desired feedback and conclusions
Key Notes
<p>Key points on community-specific presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SJ USD will consult its Director of Procurement for input on potential design elements. Their staff can think more about implementation once the funding is committed, with enough lead time. • The Authority invites input on project direction from implementing partners as long as it works to address noise impacts. <p>Questions/Responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q: From the District’s perspective, Gardner Elementary School is most impacted. When SJ USD met with Cici Vu and Cathy Paskin 2 years ago, we developed and provided a list of ideal measures. SJ USD wanted to know what the projected funding would be for the Gardner School mitigation since the District does not have sufficient funds to implement. I appreciate the Authority’s point-for-point approach to mitigating direct project directs, but it would be ideal if indirect impacts were also addressed. SJ USD will defer with the City of San Jose and the Authority on the measures that are moved forward. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ R: The improvement offsets the residual impacts of the project after mitigation. Initially, Gardner Elementary had no noise improvement, only a parking and circulation improvement. The \$588k projected funding for the improvement would be for barriers on the school property, adjacent sidewalk, and/or on the north side of the school on Williams Street. The cost estimate for our concept was based on a 600-foot long and at 14 feet high structure at \$70 per square foot. The actual barrier will be less than 600 feet and will likely cost less than the estimate. There is also the possibility for building and window treatment for structures on the north side of the school. Site assessment would be needed on school property and along Caltrans ROW.



- Q: Due to District understaffing and the need to focus on core school services, our team will not likely enter into the process until implementation is near, what is the likely timeline for having design and implementation discussions and the use of the improvement funds?
 - R: The Authority will make a decision in its Record of Decision (ROD) in March 2022, however, project funding has not yet been secured. The timing for the improvements is contingent on securing funds, which is still uncertain. At the present time, the designs are more conceptual. The policies are going to be adopted as mitigations post ROD, and interaction with implementing partners has not yet been planned. There will need to be time to refine concepts and establish a funding timeline for planning, design, and construction. We want to know whether SJ USD would be supportive of the potential improvements. We will coordinate funding through an agreement with our implementing partners. If there are concepts you want or any concerns that you have, let us know. If there is any qualitative feedback from the school Principal, let us know.
- Q: What is the approval or audit process on reporting the use of improvement funds?
 - R: Because the improvement will be funded as a mitigation, it would have to result in noise reduction for school users. This would be ensured during design, and the Authority will conduct follow up reporting to confirm that the funds are meeting their purpose.
- Q: I'll consult our team for any other suggestions before the comment period deadline. Would feedback on soundwalks and insulation in the school cafeteria be helpful at this time?
 - R: Conceptual feedback would help, and any feedback on potential ways to address noise would be useful. We are currently creating an improvement profile and cost estimate in the EIR. Input could also inform subsequent post ROD discussions around advancing concepts further.
- Q: Should we continue to use the initial price estimate for reference in our feedback?
 - R: Any proposed costs in your feedback would need to be appropriately connected to a concept.

Next Steps/Actions/Follow-up:

- Once funding is allocated
 - The authority will return to coordinate with the school district on improvement implementation details.



**EJ PHASE 3 MEETINGS
SEPTEMBER 2021
AFTER ACTION REPORT**

Title of Event
Franklin McKinley School District
Date of Event
September 17th, 2021, Start 1:00 pm – End time 2:15 pm
Recorder of Event (Name)
CeCe Horbat
Participants/Attendees
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Franklin McKinley SD Staff <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Juan Cruz, Superintendent for Franklin McKinley ○ Jason Vann, Assistant Superintendent for Franklin McKinley • Staff Name <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Joey Goldman, Rich Walter, Chis Diwa, CeCe Horbat
Purpose of Event
<p>Meeting Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explain/present on updates to EJ analysis, mitigations, benefits and community improvements • Share preliminary conclusions • Gain feedback on directed questions • Address clarifying questions on meeting materials, desired feedback, and conclusions
Key Notes
<p>Potential Community Improvements Presented (Key points on community-specific presentation)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South San Jose <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Funding for Monterey Road Grand Blvd. landscaping improvements to help offset visual aesthetic effects of HSR structures. ○ <i>Alternative 4 (at grade crossing):</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Noise insulation for certain residences along 101 helps to offset residual project noise effects ▪ Funding to City of San José for new pedestrian/bicycle overcrossings at Skyway, Branham, Chynoweth helps improve safety. • Washington Guadalupe <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Alternatives 1, 2, and 3:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Streetscape improvements along Goodyear Street, Humboldt Street, and Floyd Street to improve visual aesthetics. ▪ Funding to support community art installations in the local area to improve visual aesthetics and build a sense of community. ○ <i>Alternative 4:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Noise insulation for residential buildings immediately adjacent to the east side of SR 87 to offset residual noise effects. <p>Key points of concern from partner/community; any preliminary feedback to directed questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas of concern in Washington Guadalupe for Franklin-McKinley <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Captain Jason M. Dahl Elementary School





- Lairon College Preparatory Academy

Questions/Responses:

- **Q: To avoid delays for emergency vehicles, what is the viability of under-the-train track options for car traffic?**
 - **R:** There is a trade-off in the San Jose corridor near Monterey Rd crossings. Due to the City's 2040 "Road Diet" Proposal, congestion and slower traffic effects occur, regardless.
 - Preferred Method
 - Current alternatives propose viaducts as they are most cost-efficient and do not impact traffic. The Authority's preferred alternative is Alternative 4.
 - The Authority explored an option parallel to 101. However, the Authority did not pursue this option due to significant displacements and curvature not ideal for high-speed rail.
 - Other methods explored
 - Tunnels/Ferry Trenches: In the beginning, tunnels and ferry trenches were ruled out early in the analysis due to cost. Tunneling solves the issues of traffic congestion; however, the cost excluded this avenue. Additionally, Downtown San Jose considered below-ground tunneling. However, high groundwater and intractability halted this option. The challenge with San Jose's possible trenches required construction ramps costing hundreds of millions of dollars. At times, trenches can be cost-efficient. However, changing the elevation of roads and rail lines requires more land and money to complete.
 - Below tunnels for cars- The challenge in south San Jose is next to Monterey Road. Tunnels for cars would require pushing down Monterey Road and constructing ramps that cost hundreds of millions of dollars. Estimates are \$400+ million to \$1 billion to do 3 tunnels. The closest alternative similar to the undercrossing mentioned is Alternative 2.
 - Current at-grade crossings
 - San Jose: 5 crossings
 - South San Jose: 3 crossings
 - San Jose Diridon: 2 crossings
- **Q: How will the S. San Jose DHAEs under traffic congestion impact our community?**
 - **R:** The document's reference for Guadalupe Washington contains additional figures to show where traffic effects occur after mitigation in areas south of Capitol Expressway. Specifically, south toward Skyway and Chynoweth has more significant future impacts. The Authority expressed that this will not impact commuters north of the areas listed above and shouldn't be an issue until closer to Diridon station. The portion of the Monterey Corridor that is impacted is between Skyway and Blossom Hill.
 - Franklin-McKinley administrators expressed concern about Monterey Rd.'s already high traffic congestion for Lairon, Dahl, and Franklin Elementary (located on Tully Rd.) – schools within the district. Additionally, Franklin-McKinley is worried about traffic impacts as the district constructs a new school.
- **Q: What is the current timeline for review?**
 - **R:** The Authority looks to have a decision to propose to the board by February/March of 2022 to select one of the 4 alternatives. The proposal brought forward in February/March allows for a 30-day public comment period.

Actions/Next Steps/Follow Up

- *Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement ([Link to full EIR/EIS](#))*
 - [Section 3.2 Transportation](#) describes the various types of transportation profiles/traffic analysis
- Provided links for Washington Guadalupe Materials (see thank you email/slide deck)
- Upcoming Community Meetings | September (5 – 7 pm)
 - 23rd South San José



**EJ PHASE 3 MEETINGS
SEPTEMBER 2021
AFTER ACTION REPORT**

Title of Event
SJ Diridon Community Meeting
Date of Event
September 20, 2021, Start 5:00 – End time 6:15 pm
Recorder of Event (Name)
Vidya Bhamidi
Participants/Attendees
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Representative Name(s), Title<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Brian Stanke, San Jose DOT○ Jason Kim, VTA○ David Tran, CSJ District 3○ Huascar Castro, Silicon Valley Rising○ Kerry Duncan, Assembly Member Zoe Lofgren, CA-D 19th District○ Greg Felix, Delmas Park Neighborhood Association○ Stacey Lu, CSJ DOT• Staff Name<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Joey Goldman, Facilitator○ Rich Walter, Presenter○ Bruce Fukuji, Panelist○ Rebecca, Tech Support/Webinar Manager○ Vidya Bhamidi, Documentarian
Purpose of Event
Meeting Objectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Explain/Present on Updates to EJ Analysis, Mitigations, Benefits and Community Improvements• Share Preliminary Conclusions• Gain feedback on directed questions• Address clarifying questions on meeting materials, desired feedback and conclusions
Key Notes
Key points on community-specific presentation <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Alternatives 1, 2, and 3: Residual disproportionately high and adverse visual effects related to the elevated viaduct.○ Alternative 4 noise effects



Key points of concern from community; any preliminary feedback to directed questions:

- Housing and business displacement
- Other community improvements considered
- Reasons for Alternative 4 being preferred
- Noise impacts

Questions/Responses:

- **Q:** An attendee asked about the difference in horn blows for at-grade versus elevated alternatives.
 - **R:** There are three locations where horns would be blown relative to Downtown SJ and nearby – at the station, at-grade crossings and also at West Virginia before it turns into Drake.
 - **R** gave a brief overview of the technical report that provides more details: Volume 2, Section 3.4-A of the EIR/EIS
 - Link was shared in chat: https://hsr.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/docs/programs/san_jose_merced/Draft_EIRS_JM_V2-16_APP_3.2-A_Transportation_Data_Roadways_Freeways_Intersections.pdf
- **Q:** An attendee asked where they could find details about specific intersections for their neighborhood. Their concern was related to noise effects.
 - **R** gave a brief overview of the comprehensive noise analysis (Volume 1, Section 3.4 of the EIR/EIS)
 - Link was shared in the chat: <https://hsr.ca.gov/programs/environmental-planning/project-section-environmental-documents-tier-2/san-jose-to-merced-project-section-draft-environmental-impact-report-environmental-impact-statement/>
- **Q:** An attendee asked whether there was a difference between Alt 4 vs Alt 1,2,3 when it comes to noise. They asked for more information about at-grade versus elevated alternatives.
 - **R** explained that Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 are all elevated on a viaduct in the area and don't have any at-grade crossings. They are on a dedicated viaduct track that is separate from the station area. They will still have some minimal noise of a moving train, likely along with sounding some warning as it approaches stations. But overall, they have less noise effects.
 - **R** gave a brief overview of Chapter 2, Volume 1 of EIR EIS – at grade vs elevated
 - Link was shared in the chat: https://hsr.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/docs/programs/san_jose_merced/Draft_EIRS_JM_V1-08_CH_2_Alternatives.pdf
- **Q:** An attendee asked about the potential displacement, both residential and commercial. They also asked about relocation assistance.
 - **R** gave an overview of the Community Impacts Assessment and the Draft Relocation Impact Report. He explained that an analysis of residential and business displacement was conducted for the different alternatives in the different sections. The analysis differentiates between the effect of relocating locally vs. having to move out of the community. It was found that there was adequate market availability for relocation within the community without needing to move far out.
 - **R** explained the difference between acquisition assistance and relocation assistance.
 - **R** gave a brief overview of the socioeconomic section of the EIR/EIS – Volume 1, Chapter 3, Section 3.12.



- Link was **not** shared in the chat: https://hsr.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/docs/programs/san_jose_merced/Draft_EIRS_JM_V1-20_CH_3.12_Socioeconomics_Communities.pdf
- **B** gave a brief overview of relocation assistance
 - Link shared in chat: <https://hsr.ca.gov/programs/private-property/>
- **Q:** An attendee asked whether there is a frontrunner out of the four alternatives.
 - **R:** In summer 2019, the Authority went through a process wherein they brought the preliminary review of the environmental effects as well as community input to the Board. Alternative 4 was identified as the preferred alternative. By law and by our process, we don't make any final decision until the environmental review is complete because we go through a process of taking comments and then the Board makes the final decision. The final will be decided by Q1 2022. Still, Alternative 4 is the front runner.
- **Q:** Given that Alternative 4 is the only alternative that doesn't go over I-280 and SR 87, is that a big push/driver for it to be the preferred alternative?
 - **R:** There are a bunch of trade-offs between the alternatives, best expressed in Volume 1, Chapter 8 of the EIR/EIS.
 - Link shared in chat: https://hsr.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/docs/programs/san_jose_merced/Draft_EIRS_JM_V1-33_CH_8_PREFERRED_ALTERNATIVE.pdf
 - In this community, Alternative 4 being mostly at-grade and inside the existing railroad corridor. As a result, it has nowhere near the amount of displacement or disruption during construction as the others. For Alternative 4, a lot less land is required and it is the lowest cost alternative.
 - As they go into the San Joaquin Valley, all the alternatives end up on the same alignment, so there aren't any differences there.
 - **Q:** An attendee asked Rich to shed some light on the "Other Improvements Considered" ranking on page 2 of the Community Improvements Document that was uploaded to MeetHSRNorCal.
 - **R:** In 2020, we evaluated 100 different improvements based on criteria: benefit intensity, relative number of beneficiaries, practicability, defined project or action, satisfying Authority obligations, defined roles and responsibilities, evidence of agreement, and cost-effectiveness.
 - **R** went over each improvement in the "Other Improvements Considered" ranking on page 2
 - Some of the people involved in this outreach were involved in that process as well, so some of these were their ideas. This is to provide them feedback of where those are at this point.
 - We are focusing on noise because it's the only Disproportionately High and Adverse Effect (DHAE) of Alternative 4. We are taking feedback on our methodology and approach, but right now we don't have those other improvements on our list because they don't have noise effects.

Next Steps/Actions/Follow-up:

- Follow-up with Huascar about relocation assistance
 - [Follow up] High-Speed Rail - Question re Relocation Assistance, **sent:** Wednesday, September 29, 2021 3:31 PM



**EJ PHASE 3 MEETINGS
SEPTEMBER 2021
AFTER ACTION REPORT**

Title of Event
Morgan Hill Community Meeting
Date of Event
September 21, 2021, 5-7pm
Recorder of Event (Name)
Henry DeRuff
Participants/Attendees
<p>External Attendees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kerry Duncan, Staffer for Congresswoman Lofgren <p>Staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Morgan Galli, Rachel Bickert, & Kelsey Shockley HSR • Rich Walter, ICF • Joan Isaacson & Henry DeRuff, Kearns & West • Kimberly Larios, OnPoint Language Solutions
Purpose of Event
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explain/Present on Updates to EJ Analysis, Mitigations, Benefits and Community Improvements • Share Conclusions • Gain feedback on directed questions • Address clarifying questions on meeting materials, desired feedback and conclusions
Key Notes
<p>Key points on community-specific presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kerry Duncan was the lone participant; we answered her questions and showed the community-specific slides. <p>Key points of concern from partner/community; any preliminary feedback to directed questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kerry expressed interest in learning the feedback from other meetings to inform the Congresswoman. • She was also interested in the general attendance of these meetings, how people got access to them, and how the materials were being shared. <p>Questions/Responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q: Who did you reach out to? (Kerry Duncan) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ R: We sent the invitation to 56 people, as well as reaching out to Immigrantinfo.org, CARE, SCC Emergency Assistance Network, SCC Refugee and Immigrant Forum, and Voices Charter School specifically. (Henry) • Q: I know there's a feedback survey. Was there a target number of responses? (Kerry Duncan) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ R: There's no specific target. (Rich)



- **Q: Is that feedback survey, and the materials password-protected, so only people with the password can access? (Kerry Duncan)**
 - **R: Correct, although we know that people pass along the materials. (Rich)**

Next Steps/Actions/Follow-up:

- By **9/22**: The Outreach Team **will send materials & Thank You note.**
- By **9/22**: Check with Rich about **what feedback to share with Kerry/the Congresswoman.**
- By **9/22**: Check with Rich/Cici Vu about **whether to share information about the meeting with City Officials.**



**EJ PHASE 3 MEETINGS
SEPTEMBER 2021
AFTER ACTION REPORT**

Title of Event
Los Banos Community Meeting
Date of Event
Wednesday September 22, 2021, 5:00pm
Recorder of Event
Rickie Cleere
Participants/Attendees
No community members were present to for the meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff: Rich Walter, Audrey Van, Rebecca Fleischer, Joey Goldman, Rickie Cleere
Purpose of Event
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explain/Present on Updates to EJ Analysis, Mitigations, Benefits and Community Improvements • Share Preliminary Conclusions • Gain feedback on directed questions • Address clarifying questions on meeting materials, desired feedback and conclusions
Key Notes
Key points of concern from partner; any preliminary feedback to directed questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A Questions/Responses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A Next Steps/Actions/Follow-up: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None



**EJ PHASE 3 MEETINGS
SEPTEMBER 2021
AFTER ACTION REPORT**

Title of Event
Supportive Housing and Homeless Services EJ HSR Update
Date of Event
September 22, 2021 Start time 4:05 End time 5:20 pm
Recorder of Event (Name)
CeCe Horbat
Participants/Attendees
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Representative Name(s), <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Michelle Covert, Housing and Homeless Concerns Coordinator at County of Santa Clara • Staff Name, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Rich Walter (ICF), Greta Brownlow (ICF), Bruce Fukuji (HSR), Cici Vu (K&W)
Purpose of Event
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explain/Present on Updates to EJ Analysis, mitigations, benefits and community improvements <p>Share preliminary conclusions Gain feedback on directed questions Address clarifying questions on meeting materials, desired feedback and conclusions</p>
Key Notes
<p>Potential Improvements in Morgan Hill and Gilroy Presented:</p> <p>Alternative 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide state and federal-required relocation assistance. • Also, provide partial funding for affordable housing to offset residential displacement that cannot be relocated locally based on the housing market (@50% cost of new affordable housing unit) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Morgan Hill – Relocation deficit of 59 units ○ Gilroy – Relocation deficit of 75 units <p>Directed Questions/Responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q: Can you explain the blue boundaries shown in the community-specific materials maps? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ R: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Community Boundary (light blue border): Based on census tract ▪ EJ Effects Study Area (dark blue border): Communities that have higher populations of low income/communities of color • Q: Do the displacement numbers show on slide 16 equal the number of displacements? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ R: Yes. • Q: How will HSR impact the area more than Caltrain already has? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ R: DHAE's list includes displacement of business, displacement of residence, noise, visual, aesthetics, emergency response, park, and operational vibrations. Communities may face one or more of these DHAE's throughout construction and during the high-speed rail operation. Once the trains begin



running, the number of trains running through the community increases up to 100 trains in south San Jose. Traffic will increase around the Diridon Station traffic impacting noise and aesthetics in Washington Guadalupe. Some areas face delays for emergency vehicle access where there are at grade crossings.

- **Q: Who decides which Alternative is selected?**
 - **R:** The HSR Board decided in 2019 that it was the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 4). This Alternative is open to community feedback. Therefore, this alternative is preferred but not final. The steps after this phase are finalizing the Final EIR/EIS in February and the Authority Board is expected to make a decision in March 2022.
- **Q: What are other communities along this project doing with respect to the unhoused issue? Is anything differently being done?**
 - **R:** We've actually had other project section staff ask our team for insights on how to treat the issue of impacts to our unhoused community.
- **Q: When will actual construction occur?**
 - **R:** Construction ebbs and flows due to project management of various phases. Parts of the rail have begun construction in the Central Valley. Funding has also slowed down the process and impacts the timeline.
- **Q: What is the current mitigation regarding housing for those who live along the construction zone? What are we able to communicate to community advocates?**
 - **R:** HSR is a tenant in the existing agreement with the owners (Caltrain and Union Pacific). HSR is not the owner or controller of the situation and, therefore, is left up to Caltrain or Union Pacific. Any forms of relocations are mediated through the landowner and Caltrain/Union Pacific. There are instances where HSR is the owner because of the construction of new railways. These areas include the San Joaquin Valley and Pacheco Pass where there are grade separations. Abatement efforts are in the hands of Union Pacific where Union Pacific owns the railways. Execution of abatements depends on agreements made between HSR and Union Pacific.
- **Q: What is the assessment of residential displacement and relocation availability?**
 - **R:** Currently, Alternative 2 has the most significant impact on displacement. The Preferred Alternative, Alternative 4, has an even impact on EJ and non-EJ communities resulting in no DHAE

Next Steps/Actions/Follow-up:

- By 09/22: Correct and send pdf slides to Michelle Covert so that she can share with her team and the OSH Board – DONE



**EJ PHASE 3 MEETINGS
SEPTEMBER 2021
AFTER ACTION REPORT**

Title of Event
Oak Grove School District
Date of Event
September 23, 2021, 2-3:30pm
Recorder of Event (Name)
Henry DeRuff
Participants/Attendees
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • José Manzo, Superintendent • Laura Phan, Interim/Retired Chief Business Officer • Audrey Van, HSR • Rich Walter, ICF • Joey Goldman & Henry DeRuff, K&W
Purpose of Event
<p>The event purpose was to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explain/Present on Updates to EJ Analysis, Mitigations, Benefits and Community Improvements • Share Conclusions • Gain feedback on directed questions • Address clarifying questions on meeting materials, desired feedback and conclusions
Key Notes
<p>Key points on community-specific presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The community partners emphasized that the Caroline Davis track is a community hub. Investing in it would be a greater priority than – and would endure far beyond – a noise barrier. <p>Key points of concern from partner/community; any preliminary feedback to directed questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Their project (Caroline Davis track) is no longer one of the primary improvements being considered. They are asking for a more holistic approach that considers the generational benefits of improving a community hub as opposed to just reducing noise. <p>Questions/Responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q: As you know, we've been involved in this engagement for the last three years. I sent a clarifying question about some of the ratings for a project we proposed as a mitigation. At some point, the project directly recommended by the Authority was taken off the table. We never were told it was taken off the table and were surprised. Your analysis makes sense (noise for noise, etc.), but with high-poverty communities, it's not as simple as putting up a barrier to stop noise. And our high-poverty communities will not be on the call this afternoon. That's why I'm advocating for this project. It's not just a recreation facility, but rather a hub for community that not only the kids, but also the families, will benefit from. The train is not going to impact these



communities positively, and I'm frankly disappointed that there was not an opportunity by the Authority to seek a greater understanding about why this is important to our community. (José)

- **R:** This is not final. And this is our first opportunity for dialogue. The direction we got from CHSRA as a whole (not community-specific) was that mitigation must be related to the effect. I can't say that they will make that change, but you made your point clearly and holistically and we will share this feedback. The Caroline Davis project scored well, but with the shift in policy, we're headed in a different direction than where we thought we were going last year. (Rich)
- **Q:** Last year, it felt really validating to hear the Authority's interest in our project. With all the previous work and feedback, it all seemed like it was going according to plan and that we were moving along in the direction of implementation for our project, which made it even more disappointing to hear it's not a top choice anymore. What is the decision point from October 1 forward? Are there any more opportunities for input after this? (José)
 - **R:** The next step is to include this feedback (from methodology to specifics) to the Authority and decide where to go in from there. The final EIR/EIS document will be available in February and the board will decide in March. There aren't planned future feedback sessions yet, but it is possible that we will have another opportunity to sit down for follow up based on this information. (Rich)
 - **R:** Just to reiterate, we are taking notes, and we encourage you to encourage your community to attend the community meeting tonight. (Joey)
- **Q:** Looking at the different alternatives, it looks like if we go with Alternative 4, there are certain improvements considered, vs. different ones for 1, 2, 3. The reason I bring this up is that the Caroline Davis track is truly a community hub. If you go out there 7 days a week at any time, you will see not only school children but also community members walking the track. My question is, can this be tied to all 4 alternatives? (Laura)
 - **R:** That's a good piece of feedback, and the direction we will go will be determined by the Authority. (Rich)
- **R:** We know the decision-making is beyond the staff, but we want to say that we appreciate the support of the staff. (Laura)
- **R:** We will be sure to put all of this in the survey! (José)
 - **R:** One thing you could do would be to say that the track is more important than the noise abatement. (Audrey)
- **R:** Well, I understand that nexus, but this community is already so sound-polluted, people might say, "What's one more?" We're advocating from a place of community needs, not a 1:1 tradeoff. (Laura)
- **R:** The nexus-relationship thinking is short-term if it's just about noise. This track would be a generational benefit, where kids throughout generations attend this school and use this track. It would be a tremendous lost opportunity to go beyond the narrow 1:1 noise for noise. (José)

Next Steps/Actions/Follow-up:

- By **9/24**: The Outreach team will share materials and a thank you note.
- By **10/1**: The SD will complete the survey to officially write down their input.
- In **October**: The EIR/EIS team will review the feedback on the holistic benefits of the Caroline Davis project in the final EIR/EIS.



**EJ PHASE 3 MEETINGS
SEPTEMBER 2021
AFTER ACTION REPORT**

Title of Event
Sacred Heart EJ HSR Update Phase 3 Meeting
Date of Event
September 23, 2021, Start Time 10:23 am End Time 11:15 am
Recorder of Event (Name)
CeCe Horbat
Participants/Attendees
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Representative Name(s), <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Principal Lorraine Shepherd • Staff Name, Rich Walter (ICF), Bruce Fukuji (HSR), Cici Vu (K&W)
Purpose of Event
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explain/Present on Updates to EJ Analysis, mitigations, benefits and community improvements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Share preliminary conclusions Gain feedback on directed questions Address clarifying questions on meeting materials, desired feedback and conclusions
Key Notes
<p>Washington-Guadalupe, community specific improvements presented</p> <p><i>Alternatives 1, 2, and 3:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Streetscape improvements along Goodyear Street, Humboldt Street, and Floyd Street to improve visual aesthetics. • Funding to support community art installations in the local community to improve visual aesthetics and a sense of community. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ * If Deacon Solorio has the name of an artist in mind, please feel free to pass along* <p><i>Alternative 4:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise insulation for residential buildings immediately adjacent to the east side of SR 87 to offset residual noise effects. <p>Questions/Responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q: Do you have any resources to help visually illustrate the design and location of the viaducts aside from slide 20 in the presentation? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ R: The viaducts are for alternatives 1,2,3, and at grade, crossings occur at alternative 4 (the preferred alternative). Bruce Fukuji shared additional links for Principal Shepherd in chat/thank you email https://www.meethsrnorcal.com/station-3-videos.html



- **Q: What is the estimated duration of time between Los Banos to Guadalupe Washington neighborhood?**
 - **R:** Currently, there is no station at Los Banos, which would require people to take another form of transportation to arrive at a station. Operational time from San Francisco to Los Angeles is less than 3 hours and, on average, about 3.5 hours. Travel time between Fresno and San Jose is shorter, about 1 hour if not closer to 40-45 minutes.
- **Q: What has been some themes of the general public's concerns during the project's review process?**
 - **R:** More recently, people have concerns around construction disruption, noise, visual appearances, and displacements of businesses and residences. Also, traffic continues to be a concern but not in this neighborhood (Washington/Guadalupe). Community members in and around the Diridon station within the first 4 blocks and areas around S. San Jose face increased congestion. Safety and connectivity remain an issue of concern for communities as well.
- **Q: Have you all had to address or speak about the displacement of unhoused populations? (Principal Shepherd acknowledged the increase of encampments near the Tamien station.)**
 - **R:** We've done outreach with the Office of Supportive Housing and working with the authority to adjust to discuss displacements of unhoused populations.
- **Q: Last year, you provided surveys in multiple languages. Is this the case for this year as well?**
 - **R:** Yes. Our survey can be found in English, Spanish and Vietnamese and they are all available with the materials provided on the site: meethsrnorcal.com.
- **Q- How often will these trains be running?**
 - **R:** At Diridon southbound, full service is anticipated to run 7 trains per direction at peak and 4 per hour on non-peak hours. At North of Diridon, the high-speed train will share tracks with Caltrain, with 4-8 trains at peak and 3 trains at off-peak. Trains are anticipated to arrive every 15 minutes at peak and every 20-30 minutes off-peak.

Next Steps/Actions/Follow-up:

- K&W share links from the chat with Principal Shepherd <https://www.meethsrnorcal.com/station-3-videos.html>.
- Principal Shepherd will pass along information to members of the Sacred Heart Nativity community.
- Deacon Solorio to share names of any community artists with whom the Authority can collaborate related to streetscape improvements mentioned in Alternative 2.



**EJ PHASE 3 MEETINGS
SEPTEMBER 2021
AFTER ACTION REPORT**

Title of Event
South San Jose Community Meeting
Date of Event
Thursday, September 23, 2021, 5:00 – 6:20 pm
Recorder of Event (Name)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jennifer Vazconcelo
Participants/Attendees
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Representative Name(s) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Huascar Castro, Silicon Valley Rising Brian Stanke, San Jose Department of Transportation Kerry Duncan, Rep. Lofgren Staff Stacey Lu, City of San Jose Jason Vann, Franklin McKinley School District Staff Name <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cici Vu, Facilitator Rich Walter, Presenter Chris Diwa, Presenter Rachel Bickert, Tech Support/Webinar Manager Jennifer Vazconcelo, Documentarian Kimberly Larios, Spanish Interpreter Priscilla Phoung, Vietnamese Interpreter
Purpose of Event
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explain/Present on Updates to EJ Analysis, Mitigations, Benefits and Community Improvements Share Preliminary Conclusions Gain feedback on directed questions Address clarifying questions on meeting materials, desired feedback and conclusions
Key Notes
<p>Key points on community-specific presented</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of Potential effects in the South San Jose community <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preliminary conclusion takes into consideration direct mitigation, project benefits and potential community improvements. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternatives 1, 2, and 3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funding for landscaping improvements along Monterey Road (as part of the City of San Jose Grand Blvd. initiative) to help offset visual aesthetic effects of HSR structures Alternative 4: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise insulation for certain residences along 101 helps to offset residual project noise effects



- Funding to City of San Jose for new pedestrian/bicycle overcrossings at Skyway, Branham, Chynoweth helps to improve safety.
- Alternatives 1, 2, and 3: Residual disproportionately high and adverse visual effects related to the elevated viaduct or embankment.
- Alternative 4: No disproportionately high and adverse effects
- Preliminary conclusion takes into consideration direct mitigation, project benefits and potential community improvements.
- Effects shown are after consideration of direct mitigation, but before consideration of the offsetting value of project benefits or community improvements.

Key points of concern from partner/community; any preliminary feedback to directed questions:

- VTA had hoped for more transit and access related improvements
- Concerns with disproportionately high and adverse impacts related to emergency response

Questions/Responses:

- **Q:** VTA was hoping that the Monterey Boulevard improvements and the access improvements to the Caltrain stations would be higher up on the list of priorities in the HSR Project. I would like to know what determines which improvements are considered in each area?
 - **R:** In the outreach materials, we analyzed the process; VTA had provided some suggestions when we did outreach in 2020. The improvements are broken up into different community areas. Specific to South San Jose, we had the entire Grand Boulevard as a potential candidate in 2020 -2022. We also had some access improvements for the capital and loss unit at both locations. When we evaluated them, we considered them as related to transportation connectivity; we looked at the close relationship as we were directed by the Authority's policy of relating improvements directly to our residual effects. If we had a residual impact on transportation, we'd be looking for transportation improvements. Essentially that methodology makes things a bit different. Also, the policy came out in 2021; we didn't have that in 2020 to guide us as we do now.
- **Q:** Could you elaborate more on the nexus between emergency response and pedestrian over crossing?
 - **R:** We've identified that emergency vehicles are an issue in the safety context, and safe crossing of the rail corridor and Monterey Road is a safety improvement; that's how we're seeing the nexus and are taking feedback on it. There are two things under consideration as potential improvements to that mitigation. First, we're looking at possible funding for the first five years of any fire stations needed to address this issue. Second, we're looking for a potential at-grade railroad monitoring system. We're looking at potentially finding an independent monitoring system that would be tied into fire and police dispatch, such that they could take this into account when making calls.





**EJ PHASE 3 MEETINGS
SEPTEMBER 2021
AFTER ACTION REPORT**

Title of Event
Rebekah Children's Services: High-Speed Rail Environmental Justice Meeting
Date of Event
Friday September 24, 2021, 10:00am - 11:15pm
Recorder of Event
Rickie Cleere
Participants/Attendees
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Representatives: Christophe Rebboah • Staff: Audrey Van, Rich Walter, Cici Vu, Rickie Cleere
Purpose of Event
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explain/Present on Updates to EJ Analysis, Mitigations, Benefits and Community Improvements • Share Preliminary Conclusions • Gain feedback on directed questions • Address clarifying questions on meeting materials, desired feedback and conclusions
Key Notes
<p>Key points of concern from partner/community; any preliminary feedback to directed questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chris indicated support for the project broadly. He added that specifically, the project will benefit the economy and provide prospective employees with alternative affordable housing options, especially if they have the option to travel from the Central Valley to Gilroy in 30 minutes. He stated that a chief concern for RCS is safety and sound impacts to sidewalks, streets, and gates, as the current fencing around the RCS campus is in disarray. He added that the project will cause traffic around the IOOF area to increase, and that he will advocate for a pedestrian bridge and sound wall in his feedback. • Questions/Responses: • Q: The enhancement specific to RCS that we proposed is ranked third on the list, but there is no guarantee that this improvement will be implemented, correct? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ R: Based on authority review, we are not planning on advancing those measures on the "other considered" list, including the recommendation RCS made in 2020. Instead, the potential improvements list includes the sound wall along the western side, the pedestrian/bike crossover at IOOF. Another Community Improvement that we are thinking of incorporating would be bike/ped improvements on IOOF east of the railroad tracks. The school gym, playground, updated windows, family resource center, and solar carport improvements are not being advanced because we determined, based on the updated analysis that they are not directly tied to residual safety and noise effects of the preferred alternative. • Q: Wouldn't window enhancements be considered a mitigation to address noise? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ R: Residual noise impacts would already be addressed by the proposed sound wall. In considering impacts to property, there are two ratings in the analysis: moderate and severe. In mitigating towards



more moderate impacts, the noise barriers mitigate the severe impacts in areas nearest to the alignment.

- Q: What is the status/trajectory of the budget/funding for the project?
 - R: We are moving forward. The Authority has requested \$4B of Prop 1A funds that would be used for construction in the Central Valley, the Madera to Merced segment, and the Merced to Bakersfield segment. The state legislature has deferred these funds, which we hope to access early next year. We are examining state and federal funding sources.
- Q: To date, what percentage is the project over the original budget?
 - R: We are uncertain, as this is something that has continually changed over time.
- Q: There has been a lot of construction at South Valley Jr. High School, has this work been funded by HSR?
 - R: No, all funding is still currently in the environmental document and has not been disbursed except to fund some preliminary planning work.

Next Steps/Actions/Follow-up:

- Community Meeting: Tuesday September 28, 5:00-7:00PM



**EJ PHASE 3 MEETINGS
SEPTEMBER 2021
AFTER ACTION REPORT**

Title of Event
Gilroy Community Meeting
Date of Event
Tuesday, September 28, 2021, 5:00 – 6:20 pm
Recorder of Event (Name)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jennifer Vazconcelo
Participants/Attendees
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Representative Name(s) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alvaro Meza, Gilroy Unified School District Kraig Tamborini, City of Gilroy Daryl Jordan, City of Gilroy Jason Kim, VTA Jimmy Forbis, City of Gilroy Kelsey Shockley, Civic Parks IGC Marie Blankley, Mayor Kerry Duncan, Rep. Lofgren Staff Staff Name <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cici Vu, Facilitator Rich Walter, Presenter Morgan Galli, Presenter Rachel Bickert, Tech Support/Webinar Manager Jennifer Vazconcelo, Documentarian Ana Cruz, Spanish Interpreter
Purpose of Event
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explain/Present on Updates to EJ Analysis, Mitigations, Benefits and Community Improvements Share Preliminary Conclusions Gain feedback on directed questions Address clarifying questions on meeting materials, desired feedback and conclusions
Key Notes
<p>Key points on community-specific presented</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of Potential effects in the South San Jose community <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preliminary conclusion takes into consideration direct mitigation, project benefits and potential community improvements. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternatives 1, 2 and 4: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise insulation for certain residences along 101 to help offset residual project noise effects Alternative 2:



- Funding of recreational amenities for the South Valley Middle School to help offset partial acquisition of track/field.
- Partial funding for affordable housing to offset residential displacement that cannot be relocated locally based on housing market
- Alternative 4: Funding for the following:
 - New pedestrian/bicycle overcrossing of the railroad at IOOF Avenue,
 - Bikeway improvements (along IOOF Ave., Monterey Road, 6th Street, 4th Street, and Alexander Street)
 - Sidewalk gap closure along Murray Avenue
 - Neighborhood street lighting and sidewalk and curb improvements within the Gilroy Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area
 - Designed to help offset residual project effects associated with emergency vehicle response delays (safety effects)
- Effects shown are after consideration of direct mitigation, but before consideration of the offsetting value of project benefits or community improvements.

Key points of concern from partner/community; any preliminary feedback to directed questions:

- Concerns of reaction from residents to change and how it could negatively affect the development of the project
- Support for Alternative 4
- Concerns about Alternative 2 and its impact on the charter school, navigator school, and operations transportation facilities.
- Concerns about the adverse effects on low-income residents.

Questions/Responses:

- **Q:** Can you elaborate a little bit on where the rail yard would be located? You said it was south of town, but that will be within city limits or just outside of city limits?
 - **R:** The draft environmental documents, Volume 1 Chapter 2, shows that the maintenance facility is outside of the City limits, in fact, it is further north. The maintenance facility is just east of 25 and south of Bloomfield.
- **Q:** Is there any advice on how the City of Gilroy can coordinate efforts between HSR and VTA to ensure that everybody's talking to each other?
 - **R:** HSR met with VTA as part of the community improvement planning process. In terms of knowing where the preferred alternative is and the other options that there are. As far as coordination goes, we'll continue to be coordinating with the City going forward between the City's Planning Team and HSR Planning Team. If there are plans that your team is considering, please share any developments with our High-Speed Rail team. We would certainly hope you would consider reaching out to us and talking through anything with the Authority.
- **Q:** Regarding the different Alternatives, when the Authority decides to act on the environmental document and select their preferred plan, I understand that the Preferred Alternative will be agreed on at that time as well? Also, are these concepts or ideas being proposed along the stretch, particularly in Gilroy, consolidated somewhere in a list so that people can see what's being considered?
 - **R:** To your first question, that is exactly the process that we're going through. The current direction from the Authority is where we have feasible community improvements that would have a closer relationship to our residual effects than where we're to bring them in our environmental document forward and recommend them to the Board. The Board then decides on it. Essentially, the Authority is looking at



current policies that have a close connection and are necessary to help offset. Those will be incorporated into our mitigation plan.

- **R:** Regarding the lists of community improvements, the current list that we have and the others that we considered are in the outreach material we shared. We have been working with the City of Gilroy to identified options to advance. We have more detailed descriptions of them, and we've done some assessments to ensure that these are feasible and applicable. Those profiles are going to be included in the final document. So, when we bring that package to the HSR Board, they'll have not only a summary list, but they'll have a more detailed description of what those improvements are to help guide their later deliberation and choices.
- **Q:** I don't see many members from the communities that are impacted present in today's community meeting. I want to make sure that we're doing all that we can to reach out to them, and hopefully, other groups you reached out to have done their part in getting people involved. For example, I don't see Rebekah Children's Services in the community meeting, and I wonder whether they are still fully engaged, or is there something we can do to make sure they stay engaged in the process?
 - **R:** We have had meetings with Gilroy, Gilroy USD, Gavilan College, and Rebekah Children's Services. We've had one-on-one sessions with all of them this month. So those organizations are engaged, and we had robust discussions about providing input on that. Right now, we are in the third round of outreach and engagement. We had round one at the start of 2019. We talked to community members; we held a school community meeting at South Valley middle school, which the principal hosted. We've been out in the community and have talked to Alexander Station residents and the manager. We've held several partner meetings with you all. I think the low turnout today on the community side speaks to challenges everyone faces in terms of school starting, family life, and all that surrounds the public health issues. Last week, we met with Chris Rebboah from Rebekah Children's Services and invited him today and some community members. They are still very actively involved, and they will be submitting their feedback.

Next Steps/Actions/Follow-Up

- The Outreach Team provided the following web resources through the chat to participants during the community meeting.
 - Link to map on the Authority's website: <https://maphsrnorcal.org/SanJose-Merced/>





**EJ PHASE 3 MEETINGS
SEPTEMBER 2021
AFTER ACTION REPORT**

Title of Event
Center for Employment Training
Date of Event
September 28, 2021, 4-5 pm
Recorder of Event (Name)
Henry DeRuff
Participants/Attendees
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hermelinda Sapien, President & CEO, CET • Rosa Ontiveros, Executive Assistant to Hermelinda, CET • Bruce Fukuji, HSR • Rich Walter & Greta Brownlow, ICF • Joey Goldman & Henry DeRuff, K&W
Purpose of Event
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explain/Present on Updates to EJ Analysis, Mitigations, and Benefits <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Emphasize direct relationship between effect and improvements • Share Conclusions • Gain feedback on directed questions • Address CET-specific concerns about workforce development
Key Notes
<p>Key points on community-specific presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No DHAEs related to job loss were identified—in fact, this will create many jobs—therefore there is no nexus in the analysis right now. This was the focus of the presentation, as opposed to a focus on a specific community. <p>Key points of concern from partner/community; any preliminary feedback to directed questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How residential, business, and employment displacements would be addressed. • How to get involved with HSR so that when jobs become available, their graduates have the right skillset to get those jobs. They want to pursue these jobs for their graduates whether they are funded by HSR or not. <p>Questions/Responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q: Is Alternative 4 the preferred alternative? (Rosa) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ R: Yes. (Rich) • Q: What are the types of businesses that will be impacted? (Hermelinda)



- **R:** This varies considerably from location to location. For some, it's an aggregated rock construction site, others are retail, others are agricultural. I don't have a specific breakdown on the types of businesses.
- **Q:** Of course, our services continue whether or not we're funded by HSR. What kind of skills should we be looking at to fill those available jobs? That's a large number of opportunities we should be looking at. (Hermelinda)
 - **R:** I would suggest a follow-up so we can talk with members of the construction arm of HSR. As I understand it, the jobs will primarily be in heavy construction, but also construction, welding, steel, electrical, and more. I will follow up with the Authority to see if they have a summary of the types of jobs created out in the Valley, since ours will be very similar. It's a mix of skilled and unskilled jobs. Operation jobs include running the trains & maintenance. One Maintenance of Infrastructure (MOI) facility will be just south of Gilroy. There will also be jobs at the stations, including ticketing, luggage, etc. There will also be a maintenance facility (LMF) in Brisbane: cleaning the cars, turning around cars in and out of the SF station. (Rich)
- **Q:** Can you speak more about the Community Benefits Agreement in the Central Valley? (Rosa)
 - **R:** I don't know the inner workings of that, but I can connect you with someone who does. (Rich)
 - **R:** Yes, please connect us with those people. We will want to reach out to them so that we know who to connect our graduates to as soon as jobs become available. (Rosa)
 - **R:** The Authority created a workforce development center in Selma that was pre-apprenticeship, so we could connect you with them. You would probably get some really good feedback on specific job training from them. (Bruce)
 - **R:** Pre-apprenticeships are where we want to go and where we're headed, especially if Biden's plan goes through, so we would love any and all connections on that. (Rosa)
 - **R:** This is a good demonstration of the fact that even though there's not a specific mitigation measure focused on CET, there are still opportunities to collaborate between CET & HSR. (Joey & Rich)
- **Q:** As a resident, what will the effects of housing displacement be in the community? (Hermelinda)
 - **R:** We found DHAEs in several of the communities we analyzed but will pay for relocation in all communities where we can. In Gilroy and Morgan Hill, we will subsidize new affordable housing. In Guadalupe-Washington, there is no residential displacement. There is some in Gardner-Willow Glen and around Diridon Station. (Rich)
- **Q:** So how does CET fit into this big picture? (Hermelinda)
 - **R:** What we found is that there's no DHAe to offset; in fact, since we'll create more jobs, it's actually a benefit. There are residual effects: noise, and for Alternatives 1-3, the visual effects of an elevated track; but no employment effect. But if you disagree or if you believe there are other needs that are more important, you can advocate for that. (Rich)
 - **R:** The goal of the Authority is to figure out if there are DHAEs and address them, so if you believe that there are effects that need to be considered, please give that feedback. (Bruce)
- **Q:** When will an alternative be chosen? (Rosa)
 - **R:** The Board will decide in March at the Board Meeting. (Rich)
- **Q:** Since Alternative 4 is at grade, how are homeless encampment displacements being considered? (Rosa)
 - **R:** We've gotten that feedback at a number of different points, so we're taking that feedback and considering it. With construction, we will likely be displacing some folks, so we're considering how to mitigate that effect. That's not part of the typical analysis but we're considering it, especially in Tamien



and along the Guadalupe River, where there are well-established homeless encampments. Thank you for bringing that up. (Rich)

- **Q:** During Gov. Brown's Administration, there was a lot of public consternation about HSR. Is the project well-supported financially? Is that part of the Biden Administration's infrastructure bill? (Hermelinda)
 - **R:** A portion in the Central Valley is funded, but there will be more funding needed to extend it into the Bay Area and Los Angeles. We release business plans every two years that consider new sources of money. Depending on which infrastructure bill makes it through Congress, we may or may not get funding. (Rich)
 - **R:** Depending on the bill, there's between \$10-20 billion available that the state could compete for and HSR has an advocate in the White House in Kamala Harris. Plan Bay Area 2050 also has \$7 billion to bring HSR into the Bay Area. Opportunities for maximizing the benefits of every investment are considered, which is why the tracks were extended through Gilroy and Morgan Hill, as an improved commuter rail system. (Bruce)

Next Steps/Actions/Follow-up:

- **HSR will provide CET with contacts at the Workforce Development Center in Selma, to help CET identify job skills they should prepare candidates for.**
- **Rich will follow up with HSRA to request a list of job types in the Central Valley.**





**EJ PHASE 3 MEETINGS
SEPTEMBER 2021
AFTER ACTION REPORT**

Title of Event
High-Speed Rail EJ Briefing - Morgan Hill Unified
Date of Event
Wednesday September 29, 2021, 3:30 – 5:00pm
Recorder of Event
Rickie Cleere
Participants/Attendees
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Representative Name: Dr. Carmen Garcia - Superintendent • Staff: Morgan Galli, Rich Walter, Cici Vu, Rickie Cleere
Purpose of Event
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide background information and an overview of the project • Explain/Present on Updates to EJ Analysis, Mitigations, Benefits and Community Improvements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Emphasize direct relationship between effect and improvements • Share Preliminary Conclusions • Gain feedback • Address clarifying questions on meeting materials, desired feedback and conclusions
Key Notes
<p>Key points of concern from partner/community; any preliminary feedback to directed questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. Carmen Garcia expressed concern about business displacements and impacts to communities of color along the alignment of Preferred Alternative 4, and prefers alternatives that would not travel through downtown Morgan Hill, based on the team’s presentation of the summary of potential effects to the community. <p>Questions/Responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q: How did you share information about the community meeting? Who was invited? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ R: A targeted invite was sent to stakeholders on in late July. Invitees included the City of Morgan Hill, Morgan Hill USD staff and the prior superintendent, leaders of district parent group, and representatives of interested community organizations. • Q: Is the community/city largely in support of the project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ R: The City submitted a letter with their feedback that we can share with you if needed. We have worked with the city manager and assistant city manager for a long time. They have expressed the benefits of the different alternatives and some things they would want added for the Authority’s consideration. They are concerned with both sets of alternatives (1 and 3, 2 and 4) with respect to community effects, displacements of residents and businesses, noise, traffic, emergency vehicle response time, and construction disruption among other considerations. Morgan Hill USD submitted a detailed technical comment letter. The City is also interested in getting more Caltrain service, and Caltrain electrification and modernization would allow for the service extension. The City opposes





Alternative 2 because it enters through downtown Morgan Hill and has a large footprint. However, they have not expressed a clear preference among the other three alternatives.

- Q: Doesn't Alternative 4, the Preferred Alternative, have the most impacts? (In the context of the Summary of Potential Effects.)
 - R: Alternative 4 has the most impacts, but the scale and context of these impacts is important to consider, as the community effects table looks at the entire project section, San Jose to Merced. Alternative 4 doesn't have aesthetics impacts and will only cause 1 business displacement, there are no substantial or disproportionate impacts to parks, and severe noise impacts will be limited to approximately 20 receptors. Alternative 4 will have no severe noise impacts to schools, no disproportionately high and adverse vibration impacts, and a traffic impact at one location after the incorporation of mitigation. There will be emergency response delays, which will impact people outside the environmental justice area in the southern part of Morgan Hill. The Authority will include mitigation to address severe impacts wherever possible.
- Q: Are the state agency and the Board the same? Do they make the final decisions on the project?
 - R: That's correct. Authority staff are currently accepting and responding to comments, which will be incorporated into the Final EIR/EIS for the project section. Once the EIR is complete in Spring 2022, the Authority Board will come to a final decision on how the project will proceed.
- Q: What happens with feedback that is received?
 - R: There could be adjustments to design, additional mitigation, or other measures taken. A record of comments received and their responses is currently being compiled for reference.

Next Steps/Actions/Follow-up:

- Comment period closing date: October 1, 2021