

APPENDIX 4-A: SAMPLE LETTER FOR COORDINATION

November 4, 2016

BOARD MEMBERS

Dan Richard
CHAIR

Thomas Richards
VICE CHAIR

Lou Correa

Daniel Curtin

Bonnie Lowenthal

Lorraine Paskett

Michael Rossi

Lynn Schenk

Jeff Morales
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

[Click and type addressee first and last name]
[Click and type addressee's title]
[Click and type company name]
[Click and type street address]
[Click and type city, state, and zip]

Dear [Click and type addressee's name]:

A joint Draft Environmental Impact Report/Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIR/EIS) is being prepared for the proposed high-speed rail project section between San Jose and Merced (Project). As a part of the Draft EIR/EIS, analysis is being conducted to support the Federal Railroad Administration's (FRA's) determinations necessary to comply with the provisions of 49 United States Code (U.S.C.) 303 (hereinafter referred to as "Section 4[f]") and the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) Act of 1965 (hereinafter referred to as "Section 6[f]"). We need to assess potential impacts to Section 4(f) and 6(f) properties near the high-speed rail station areas, maintenance facilities, road closures, and temporary road conditions. Your response is requested to proceed with the EIR/EIS analysis.

Please provide your responses to my office and to Mr. Peter Feldman of ICF by **[two weeks after postmark]**.

Information Requests for Public Park and Recreational Resources

Because of the potential for encroaching upon public parks/recreational areas, the project alternatives trigger the application of Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1996 (Title 49 United States Code [U.S.C.] Section 1653(f) as amended). In January of 1983, as part of an overall recodification of the Department of Transportation Act, Section 4(f) was amended and codified in 49 U.S.C Section 303 (Section 4(f) Policy Paper, Federal Highway Administration, 1987; 1989), which states:

The Secretary may approve a transportation program or project requiring use of publicly owned land of a public park, recreation area, or wildlife/waterfowl refuge or land of a historic site of national, state, or local significance (as determined by the officials having jurisdiction over the park, recreation area, refuge, or site) only if 1) there is no prudent and feasible alternative to such use and 2) the project includes all the possible planning to minimize harm...

Public parks and recreational resources found to be within 1,000 feet of the project footprint are listed below. The attached figure includes the project alignment in relation to the region.

- **"[Click and type resource name]"**

EDMUND G. BROWN JR.
GOVERNOR



Please advise if the above list is correct within your jurisdiction.

Section 4(f) regulations (23 Code of Federal Regulations 774.5 [a]) require that there be documented concurrence from the agency having jurisdiction over the affected resource. Accordingly, we request assistance from your agency in establishing and documenting the primary use of each of the above-listed parks and determining the significance of the recreational resources to the city. ***Specifically, we would appreciate any assistance you can provide for each of the resources listed above in developing the following information:***

- Activities or functions of the property;
- Public access to the park, usage fees, hours of operation, events, etc.;
- Relationship to other similarly used lands in the vicinity;
- Applicable clauses that affect ownership, such as leases, easements, covenants, restrictions, or conditions, including forfeiture;
- Unusual characteristics or special features that either reduce or enhance the value of all or part of each property (e.g., amphitheaters, special events, historic significance, etc.); and
- A description and location for any existing or planned public park or recreational facilities in the general vicinity of the San Jose to Merced High-Speed Rail Project.

Draft High-Speed Rail Project Description for San Jose to Merced Section

The San Jose to Merced Project Section would be a critical link in the state high-speed rail (HSR) system connecting San Francisco and the Bay Area to Los Angeles and Anaheim. The corridor for the San Jose to Merced Section was selected through analyses of HSR alignment alternatives in the 2005 Final Program EIR/EIS for the Proposed California High-Speed Train System, and the 2008 Bay Area to Central Valley Program HSR EIR/EIS (Authority and FRA 2008). The program-level Statewide and Bay Area to Central Valley environmental documents provided information used by the California High-Speed Rail Authority and Federal Railroad Administration to select the corridor for the Bay Area to Central Valley section of the HSR System between San Francisco and San Jose along the San Francisco Peninsula and between San Jose and the Central Valley through the Pacheco Pass and via Henry Miller Road. The selected Pacheco Pass alternative included general alignments between San Jose and Gilroy, over the Pacheco Pass, across the San Joaquin Valley, and north to Merced, which would be designed and analyzed further in project-level environmental studies. The infrastructure and systems of the HSR alternatives are composed predominantly of trains (rolling stock), tracks, stations, train control, power systems, and maintenance facilities. The design includes a double-track rail system to accommodate planned project operational needs for uninterrupted intercity passenger rail movement.

The conceptual design of the San Jose Diridon and Gilroy station areas provides intermodal connectivity, drop-off facilities, an entry plaza, a station house area for ticketing and support services, an indoor station room where passengers wait and access the HSR, and parking facilities. Station design is presently at the conceptual stage and is under collaborative development with stakeholders in both station cities. In addition to at-grade and aerial alternatives for an HSR station at San Jose Diridon, a downtown and peripheral site (and associated track routes) have been identified for design and analysis of an HSR station at Gilroy.

HSR passenger trains are stored and receive daily maintenance at a light maintenance facility. There are two proposed locations for this facility with an overall footprint ranging from about 40 to about 110 acres between Gilroy and Pacheco Pass. Each proposed facility would cover an approximate area of 100 acres along the HSR mainline, with an approximate maximum width from 1,000 feet to 2,000 feet. The majority of the area would be for storage of rail vehicles on tracks parallel to the HSR mainline. These tracks would taper out from lead tracks connected to the HSR mainline tracks at both ends of the facility. A light maintenance facility would include HSR passenger train maintenance buildings (approximately 1,500 feet by 100 feet) capable of containing two complete HSR trains on parallel tracks. Maintenance of Infrastructure Sidings locations provide for layover of maintenance of infrastructure equipment and temporary storage of materials and other resources needed in the adjacent section. The Los Banos MOIS facility would be approximately 5 acres in size and include siding track (approximately 1,600 feet), tail track (approximately 200 feet) as well as stockpile areas for ballast and other bulk material, secured stockpile for non-bulk materials, and road-rail vehicle access locations.

Thank you for your assistance. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me or Peter Feldman of ICF, at (213) 312-1773 or peter.feldman@icfi.com.

Sincerely,

Guy Preston
Northern California Regional Delivery Manager
(408) 227-1083
guy.preston@hsr.ca.gov

Attachment(s):
[Click and type enclosure titles—or delete if not used.]

cc: [Click and type recipient's name—or delete if not used.]

