

**CalMod Local Policy Maker Group (LPMG)
Summary Meeting Notes for August 22, 2019**

Summary Notes

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

City / County	Representative or Alternate	Present
Atherton	C. Wiest	X via phone
Belmont	J. Mates	
Brisbane	T. O'Connell	X
Burlingame	E. Beach	X
Gilroy	C. Tucker	
Menlo Park	R. Mueller	
Millbrae	R. Holober	X
Mountain View	J. McAlister	
Morgan Hill	R. Constantine	X
Palo Alto	L. Kou	X
Redwood City	S. Masur	
San Bruno	R. Medina	
San Carlos	R. Collins	X
San Francisco	P. Supawanich	
San Jose	S. Jimenez	
San Mateo	E. Rodriguez	
Santa Clara	K. Watanabe	X
South San Francisco	K. Matsumoto	X
Sunnyvale	N. Smith	
San Francisco BOS	TBD	
San Mateo BOS	TBD	
Santa Clara BOS	TBD	
Chair	G. Gillet	X
Acting Chair	E. Beach	X

VACANT SEATS: Santa Clara BOS, San Francisco BOS, San Mateo BOS

CALTRAIN STAFF: Casey Fromson, Sebastian Petty

1. Call to Order

Chair Gillian Gillet called the meeting to order at 5:31 p.m.

2. Staff Report

Casey Fromson, Caltrain Government and Community Affairs Director, told members that the meeting will not have a presentation by High-Speed Rail (HSR) and will solely be devoted to the Caltrain Business Plan.

3. Caltrain Electrification Update

Casey Fromson, Caltrain Government and Community Affairs Director, told members that electrification work is ongoing throughout the corridor. The Central Equipment Maintenance and Operations Facility (CEMOF) will also be going through a project to retrofit the facility to properly service the new electric trainsets. Fromson also stated that the CalMod outreach team is beginning a Caltrain mini-model roadshow, where a 1:50 scale model will be visiting stations and events throughout the region.

4. Caltrain Business Plan

Sebastian Petty, Caltrain Senior Policy Advisor, provided a condensed version of the full presentation that was given to the Caltrain Board at the August 1, 2019 meeting. The presentation discussed the staff-recommended service vision and the governance structure for the agency.

LPMG members' key comments regarding the Caltrain Business Plan discussion included the following:

- *A member asked the definition of skip stop service. (Caltrain staff explained that skip stop service is between an express and local service, through which different service patterns stop at a series of stations that together cover all the stations.)*
- *A member asked how the \$2.6 billion related to HSR would be used and if this was just for electrification. (Caltrain staff answered that the cost is due to the need to rebuild the corridor south of Tamien from the current condition to three tracks, as well as electrifying the corridor and modifying the signaling.) Another member mentioned that in prior conversations the amount was just over \$3 billion to electrify from Tamien to Gilroy. They then asked what is the difference with this cost estimate. (Caltrain staff answered that the estimated total identified is \$3 billion for this project. In addition to costs identified directly related to high-speed rail (which are included in the \$2.6 billion referenced) there is also a need to rebuild Caltrain stations on the corridor. Caltrain has also included a placeholder estimate for a certain amount of grade separations.)*
- *A member asked if Caltrain would provide the funding for grade separations. (Caltrain staff answered that they are just talking about cost and not funding at this point. Most of the costs shown are currently unfunded. Caltrain will explore potential funding sources as the plan continues.)*
- *A member asked, if the moderate growth scenario is approved, how the high growth scenario cost would be factored in. (Caltrain staff answered that the scenarios are built up from the baseline. The investments layer up and expand upon each other. The moderate growth would cost another \$3 billion above the baseline, and the high growth scenario would cost another \$5 billion above the moderate.)*
- *A member asked if these numbers would change without High Speed Rail. The member also mentioned that HSR does not have secured funding and these scenarios and costs assume HSR will be implemented within the timeframe of the 2040 service vision. (Caltrain staff explained that assumptions are based on what Caltrain could anticipate at the time they started to*

determine how the vision would move forward. There are many uncertainties that will be discussed.) Another member asked, without HSR, could Caltrain potentially run more trains without as significant of an infrastructure investment. (Caltrain staff answered potentially, but this is a very complicated question. It is hard to disentangle the infrastructure costs between HSR and Caltrain needs. Ultimately, Caltrain is planning for a shared corridor (Caltrain Staff)

- A member, referencing a diagram showing regional rail integration, to define the other Bay crossing, in addition to Dumbarton. (Caltrain staff explained that it is the freight corridor that ACE and Capitol Corridor are already using.) A member asked a follow-up on if ACE the same as BART. (Caltrain staff answered no, this is a separate agency that runs a commuter rail service from the Central Valley into San Jose.)
- A member commented on the differences between baseline, moderate and high, noting the investments increase, and the economic output increases even more with each one. There is a large payoff between each scenario.
- A member asked if the high growth scenario requires grade separations at every crossing along the corridor. (Caltrain staff answered that they would need grade separations anywhere that requires four tracks. Caltrain heard that there is a desire for grade separations within all the scenarios. It is not vital for every crossing, but there would need to be a significant investment.) A member followed up asking if there are some grade crossings that would potentially be closed, and would not need to be separated. (Caltrain staff answered yes, if a crossing is closed it wouldn't need to be separated. Caltrain assumes that in aggregate there would be some closures, and would be mitigated through a bike and pedestrian crossing or something similar. Some cities are already thinking about this. Caltrain has not made specific assumptions about specific crossings beyond what is already being planned by individual cities.)
- A member commented that the Board should remember that even without the business plan; the cities along the corridor can expect more trains just with the baseline. The corridor already has a significant livability issue and need to address the grade crossings regardless.
- A member asked about incremental development and if that means when Caltrain builds something they would be able to upgrade or add more to it later. (Caltrain staff answered yes, they are proposing a cohesive program that could be built up incrementally instead of doing it all at once.) A member noted that with something that the public would react to, where there are impacts and costs associated with each one, this incremental approach should be evaluated, especially considering the lack of funding.
- A member asked how the diesel trains between San Jose and Gilroy and the electric trains would be coordinated. (Caltrain staff answered that in the short term, the goal is for riders to be able to stay on one train and both types of trains would run. In the longer term, which includes HSR, Caltrain may not be able to have diesel trains in the mix so would need to do coordinated transfers- unless or until the corridor is electrified and shared all the way to Gilroy.)
- A member asked if Union Pacific would continue to run their diesel freight trains.(Caltrain staff answered yes, though during peak hour only electric trains would run.)
- A member noted that the Joint Powers Board (JPB) will be asked to make a decision in October. This meeting and the next meeting are important, and the JPB will be provided the minutes of these meetings. If you have a statement, this is a good time to make it or next month. It is important to think about your statements regarding the high growth and regional investments.

- *A member stated that the baseline would be a huge improvement alone. The moderate is even better. However, in Morgan Hill along, they have two of the top five highest crossings – so will definitely want to talk about grade separations. Overall, the moderate scenario would best serve the entire system.*
- *Caltrain staff read statements from LPMG members who could not attend:*
 - *Caltrain should be more proactive toward achieving the high growth scenario.*
 - *The JPB should consider stronger language in the staff recommendations, such as “Caltrain will adopt and pursue the moderate while also taking steps to plan for the high growth scenario.”*
- *A member stated that they support the moderate scenario at a minimum and are looking forward to funding discussions.*
- *A member stated that a tax measure would be a three-county measure and would require 2/3 majority support. They noted that a massive marketing campaign that targets everyone – not just train riders would be needed. The measure would help everyone. Another member asked if all three counties on board with the measure. (Caltrain staff answered that there are a few different processes going on. There are representatives from the seven different bodies coordinating on timing and what would be on a tax measure. Legislation is for a three-county measure, but there is also a larger nine-county measure being considered.) Another member asked if the measures are going to help fund Caltrain operations and capital improvements, or if cities would get some of the revenue for grade separations. A member answered that the measure is flexible. The larger measure will have a big focus on capital projects and commented that people don’t like to be taxed for operations. Another member noted that there must be trust when encouraging constituents to pass a measure of this magnitude.*
- *A member asked if the viability of either of these scenarios is dependent on the tax measures.? A member noted that Caltrain has a revenue problem today, with doing nothing. More money is needed in the short term. (Caltrain staff explained that doing anything toward reaching one of these scenarios would require more money, regardless of how we get it. Caltrain will address funding options in the next phase of the Business Plan, which are likely to include a mix of funding sources – local, regional, state and federal.)*
- *A member noted that it is important to keep in mind that even the moderate scenario will be transformative. They appreciate consideration of grade separations, and the thoughtful public comments have been amazing. Talking about equity is important. Caltrain right now is for wealthy people; there are a lot of people who can’t make the choice to ride Caltrain. To realize carbon emission reductions, Caltrain should be more accessible to everyone. Regarding element 2-B of the staff recommendation: The member would feel better if “not to preclude” the high growth scenario was changed to “work toward” the high growth scenario. This should be more proactive and not as passive. Two other members agreed with this statement.*
- *A member noted that Google is the fourth largest transit provider in CA, and yet transit ridership in the Bay Area is low. There is an amazing opportunity to partner with tech companies and shuttle/bus connections. The member asked if there is a parallel process with buses. (Caltrain staff answered that they need to quantify connections and how important they are, and start to understand how these connections are fundamental to Caltrain’s growth and business. Caltrain also needs to link this back to the core goals of the system – to help justify making this a top priority.) A member followed-up commenting that there are not regional transit agencies in the way needed to evaluate regional connections. The member asked if that limits what can*

achieved and if Caltrain is limited to just a rail operator. They mentioned other connected services are coming from many different places and asked who evaluates this. A regional voice is needed. Another member noted that bus service has been declining. SamTrans buses connect with Caltrain service and there are many different bus and shuttle options. The member agreed that a strategy is needed as opposed to the Band-Aid approach currently being used. Another member noted that the notion of having a one-seat ride is very American and that there are ways to do things differently and lower costs. It is much more than first and last mile – there needs to be a regional analysis done but it is not clear who owns that.

- A member asked, regarding element 2-B of the staff recommendation, and specifically the wording “does not preclude” – how is it defined. (Caltrain staff answered that while they don’t want to just require cities to make the investments needed for the high growth scenario themselves, Caltrain also wants to be sure they’re not preventing this from happening at some point in the future by making it materially impossible or orders of magnitude more expensive. This may be an area where recommendations that are more detailed are needed.)
- A member asked how many trains are currently running on the system, and how many are needed to have four trains running between San Jose and Gilroy? (Caltrain staff answered that there are currently six trains running between San Jose and Gilroy, three in morning going north, and three in evening going south. There is a funding element, but the bigger element is fleet availability. Caltrain does not have the equipment to have the fourth train, because when each train goes to Gilroy, it is the last trip of that day. Other constraints that can be clarified offline.)

Public Comments:

- A member of the public stated that level boardings, timed-transfers, and coupled trains should be considered. Passing tracks and level boarding should be implemented together. We are going to have high speed trains. The new Transbay crossing will not affect Caltrain. Not grade separating in Morgan Hill is not an option.
- A member of the public stated that the original HSR plan along this corridor was to have a four-track system with separated and elevated tracks- at a much higher cost. Legislation mandated a blended corridor. This makes the baseline scenario even worse, because HSR must run in groups of two while Caltrain runs in groups of three – there would be bunching. Without HSR, Caltrain could run the moderate scenario.
- A member of the public stated the following points;
 - if you wait for funding to make your decision, nothing will ever happen. You may wish to make a recommendation to actively pursue funding.
 - feeder connections vs. first and last mile and that Caltrain should study connected service and not just first and last miles.
 - Equity analysis. Consider the option of trying to diversify ridership through an equity analysis.
 - Governance. One of the goals is addressing lack of stability

5. Public Comment

- A member of the public invited members to an event during Transit Week to celebrate the use of public transit. They also noted that there are couple regions where bus ridership has grown thanks to dedicated bus lanes and reconfigured networks.

6. LPMG Member Comments/Requests

None.

7. Next Meeting

Thursday, September 26, 2019 at 5:30 p.m.

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:33 p.m.