

## CalMod Local Policy Maker Group (LPMG) Summary Meeting Notes for April 26, 2018

### Summary Notes

The purpose of these notes is to capture key discussion items and actions identified for subsequent meetings.

#### Members Present

| City / County       | Representative or Alternate | Present |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|---------|
| Atherton            | C. Wiest                    |         |
| Belmont             | D. Hurt                     | X       |
| Brisbane            | T. O'Connell                | X       |
| Burlingame          | E. Beach                    | X       |
| Gilroy              | TBD                         |         |
| Menlo Park          | R. Cline                    |         |
| Millbrae            | R. Holober                  | X       |
| Mountain View       | L. Siegel                   | X       |
| Morgan Hill         | S. Tate                     | X       |
| Palo Alto           | G. Sharff                   |         |
| Redwood City        | S. Masur                    |         |
| San Bruno           | TBD                         |         |
| San Carlos          | R. Collins                  | X       |
| San Francisco       | S. Gygi                     | X       |
| San Jose            | S. Jimenez                  | X       |
| San Mateo           | J. Goethals                 |         |
| Santa Clara         | K. Watanabe                 |         |
| South San Francisco | K. Matsumoto                | X       |
| Sunnyvale           | N. Smith                    | X       |
| San Francisco BOS   | TBD                         |         |
| San Mateo BOS       | D. Pine                     |         |
| Santa Clara BOS     | TBD                         |         |

CHAIR: Jeff Gee

VICE CHAIR: Emily Beach

VACANT SEATS: Gilroy, San Bruno, Santa Clara BOS, San Francisco BOS

CALTRAIN STAFF: Casey Fromson, John Funghi, Sebastian Petty, Liz Scanlon

### 1. CalMod Staff Report

- a. JPB staff shared a press release from that day, announcing the award of \$164 million in TIRCP funding for Caltrain Electrification.
- b. JPB staff noted that discussion regarding making LPMG a formal committee to the Board is occurring.

## **2. HSR Draft Business Plan / Caltrain Business Plan**

- a. HSR staff provided an overview of their Business Plan released in March.

*LPMG members' key comments regarding the HSR presentation included the following:*

- *One member asked about HSR's risk strategy. (HSR staff noted their Business Plan includes a chapter focused on lessons learned and has more specifics on their risk mitigation and how they're changing their internal processes as they work to deliver their larger projects. He also noted the new CEO is focused on how they deliver their operating services, and how they mitigate and manage those associated risks.)*
- *One member asked about the expanded project costs and how much of that was related to under estimating versus risk mitigation. (HSR staff noted one of the reasons for that difference is when they pushed finishing Phase I out four years; but changing contingencies also played a role.)*
- *A few members were interested in the timing of the different sections, and specifically about service in this region. (HSR staff noted electrifying the line to Bakersfield would occur by 2026/2027; and high speed service from San Francisco to Bakersfield by 2029. He noted high speed service from Gilroy to San Francisco is still being determined, as they need to be sure the operator can recoup the cost of service and figure out how it connects to the rest of the line.)*
- *One member asked about the comment period. (HSR staff said May 7 is the end of the comment period.)*
- *One member asked about the gubernatorial race and how the outcome could impact HSR if the winner is not as committed to HSR as Gov. Brown. (HSR staff noted that the decision to move forward with the project was already made under Governor Brown and funds have been allocated by the legislature and Congress; however, the next governor could impact the order and speed of work, and the governor appoints the majority of the CA HSRA Board.)*
- *One member asked about HSR's ability to sustain itself, even with a subsidy, if it doesn't go to Los Angeles during a certain cycle. (HSR staff noted they can connect two of the regions, but there's a lot of work ahead of them when there's shared corridor service. He also noted they have brought on an early train operator to advise them during the development, design, and early start of service stages, and this operator will be determining if Gilroy to San Francisco service can be done by itself. HSR staff noted that's phase one for the operator, and that phase two would be their running service for a few years to prove the business model works. The operator has signed up for those two phases, but not phase three, which would be a long-term concession.)*
- *One member asked if there are target dates for HSR's Environmental Impact Reports as well as due dates for the different segments, particularly the record of decision, in their Business Plan. (HSR staff said there is a table that lays out the schedules but they are reviewing them and will have more information in December. There was further clarification that previously the record of decision was 2019, but for SJ to Merced it's now April 2021 and for SJ to SF it's August 2021.*

- b. JPB staff provided an update on the Caltrain Business Plan, including the latest on funding for the effort, noting that the LPMG will serve as a primary coordinating venue for the large scale comprehensive planning process.

*LPMG members' key comments regarding the JPB Business Plan include the following:*

- *A member asked for a description of the CSCG. (JPB staff noted the City County Staff Coordinating Group is an advisory group and the staff equivalent to the LPMG, meeting a week prior to the LPMG where similar presentations are given and feedback is received that may inform or influence what's presented to the LPMG.)*
- *A member asked if the community interface included construction of office and residential properties at Caltrain Stations. (JPB staff noted that work around the toolbox and a Transit Oriented Development (TOD) policy is occurring, which will be integrated into the Business Plan.)*
- *A member asked for clarification on if the technical assistance Stanford is providing is through the engineering school or the administration, as there might be some conflict of interest. (JPB staff clarified it's with the administrative arm, specifically the real estate and development group, and that some areas of concern were excluded. JPB staff noted that the terms that were signed could potentially be shared with the LPMG.)*
- *A member asked how the area south of San Jose, and communication with Union Pacific, will be integrated into the Business Plan. (JPB staff clarified that it will be integrated but it may be processed differently due to its specific set of circumstances; but regardless of corridor ownership, there are crossing issues that will need to be examined).*
- *A member asked about the interaction between HSR and JPB regarding grade separations and what occurs if the agencies do not agree. (JPB staff noted the HSR Business Plan is a reflection of their vision for a statewide system; whereas the Caltrain Business Plan will have a lot more detail and that grade crossings will need to be addressed and discussions regarding cost and potential funding will need to occur, and that the LPMG will be involved.)*
- *A member asked about a timeframe for when any changes to the structure of the LPMG and other advisory bodies might be determined. (JPB staff noted that it should be determined in the coming months.)*
- *A member asked for a timeframe for both electrified service and an EIR. (JPB staff clarified that the electrification project that's currently under construction has already been environmentally cleared and anticipates starting electrified service in 2022; however, if other individual projects arise out of the Business Plan they will need to go through their own environmental processes.)*
- *A member asked if there was a lease end date for the 4<sup>th</sup> and King Station and if there were any changes anticipated to it as part of the Business Plan. (JPB staff noted the land is owned by Prologis and JPB has a perpetual rail operating easement on it so there is no end date. JPB staff also clarified that there is no immediate projects, steps or decisions that would change this, and that there are no changes to the terminus as part of PCEP other than installing electrified infrastructure; however, over the course of the next six months the Business Plan will contemplate the long-term evolution of the system.*
- *A member asked for clarification regarding an earlier staff comment on big changes to operations. (JPB staff clarified the "big change" was in regards to JPB operating as a blended system with HSR.)*

*Public Comments:*

- A public speaker discussed HSR dates for the SJ and SF segments and suggested stopping work in the Central Valley and rethinking the alignment; he also noted his opposition to connecting Silicon Valley to Fresno.
- A public speaker noted it was an exciting time for looking at how the big rail picture works together. She noted the SF downtown extension potential design change to extend a tunnel, saving money and future grade separations; and the major developments being planned in San Jose, potentially bringing new workers and residents into the area. With these changes, she also noted the need to carry more people, run more trains, and the need for grade separations.
- A public speaker discussed the need for grade separations as more trains per hour are contemplated for potential future service, and the need to think through if grade separations should be done individually by each city or regionally, and how they will be funded.

### **3. Caltrain Electrification Project**

- a. John Funghi, Caltrain Electrification Chief Officer introduced himself and gave a brief overview of construction activities for the project and shared a pole installation time-lapse video which can be seen at [www.CalMod.org/gallery](http://www.CalMod.org/gallery).

*LPMG members' key comments include the following:*

- A member asked about pile driving. (JPB staff clarified that they are auguring and not pile driving.)
- A member asked about the electrification testing schedule. (JPB staff said there would be a start-up and testing program that would last about a year and would occur during non-revenue or off-peak hours.)
- A member asked about the parameters of the project. (JPB staff said the current project is from SF to Tamien. Staff note, that looking to the future, a CalMod 2.0 could include platform extensions; more vehicles; facility upgrades; and storage, maintenance, and operating requirements. Staff added that to electrify south of Tamien, that scope would need to be identified and it would need to include these components as well.)

*Public Comments:*

- A public speaker asked about "Buy America" compliance, discussed seating capacity, and noted the need to double track for Gilroy service.

### **4. Caltrain Positive Train Control Project**

- a. JPB staff provided background information and an update on its positive train control(PTC) program.

*LPMG members' key comments include the following:*

- A member asked if Wabtec's contract was awarded competitively. (JPB staff clarified it was awarded on a sole source basis and summarized the robust justification included in the memo.)
- A member asked for clarification regarding what funding is left from the former contract, and if there's duplication of work. (JPB staff said \$59 million was the remainder from the original \$239 million which allowed for systems to be installed; staff estimated approximately 60% of the onboard will need to be changed, but the majority of what's been installed overall can be used.)

- *One member asked about the timeframe for filing for an extension. (JPB staff noted after installation is complete, JPB will revise its FRA submittals by December and then can enter into an alternative RSD; and all PTC systems will need to be certified by 2020.)*
- *One member asked for clarification regarding an assessment. (JPB staff clarified that an assessment of the funding plan is coming back to the Board in the summer.)*
- *A member asked for clarification regarding the current funding. (JPB staff noted that the \$59 million pays for the Wabtec contract and \$10 million is to support program implementation.)*
- *One member asked about the legal work occurring against PTG and if they're a solvent company. (JPB staff noted details could not be discussed, but the legal process is proceeding and PTG is a solvent company.)*
- *One member asked about JPB's position in comparison to other railroads and the consequences for not meeting the deadline. (JPB staff responded some consequences could be the tenants would not be able to operate, fines, and Caltrain would not be able to operate; but the JPB is in a good position to make the deadline. It was also noted that there is a JPB Board adhoc committee on the project.)*

*Public Comments:*

- *A member of the public noted his concerns with the project.*

**5. Public Comment**

None.

**6. LPMG Member Comments/Requests**

- Grade Separation Toolkit
  - JPB staff gave an update on the Toolkit's progress and noted more information would be given in the summer timeframe.
- JPB staff noted that HSR would be a standing item each month and 5:30 is the start time for the meetings.

**7. Next Meeting**

- Thursday, June 28, 2018 at 5:30 p.m.