

**CalMod Local Policy Maker Group (LPMG)
Summary Meeting Notes for January 23, 2020**

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	
Belmont	T. McCune	X via phone
Brisbane	T. O'Connell	
Burlingame	E. Beach	X
Gilroy	C. Tucker	
Menlo Park	B. Nash	X
Millbrae	R. Holober	X
Mountain View	J. McAlister	X
Morgan Hill	R. Constantine	X
Palo Alto	L. Kou	X
Redwood City	S. Masur	X
San Bruno	M. Salazar	X
San Carlos	R. Collins	
San Francisco	P. Supawanich	
San Jose	S. Jimenez	
San Mateo	A. Lee	
Santa Clara	K. Watanabe	
South San Francisco	K. Matsumoto	X
Sunnyvale	N. Smith	
San Francisco BOS	TBD	
San Mateo BOS	TBD	
Santa Clara BOS	TBD	
Chair	Jeannie Bruins	
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

Acting Chair Emily Beach called the meeting to order at 5:33 p.m.

2. Staff Report

Casey Fromson, Caltrain Government and Community Affairs Director, mentioned that there are several new members to the group and a member list was included in the agenda packet. The dates for the 2020 LPMG meetings were also shared.

3. California High-Speed Rail Update

Boris Lipkin, Northern California Regional Director for California High-Speed Rail, updated the members on the program progress, the track and systems procurement and an update on the forthcoming business plan.

LPMG members' key comments regarding High-Speed Rail discussion included the following:

- *A member asked for more information on the contracts awarded to small businesses. (HSR staff explained that on all major contracts issued, 30% go to small businesses, 10% go to disadvantaged business enterprises and 3% are awarded to disabled veteran's business enterprises. 500 California small businesses have been issued contracts.)*
- *A member asked for more information on the original bond measure and what it funded. (HSR staff explained that the original bond defined phase 1 of the project as San Francisco to LA/Anaheim. It also provided a down payment, as one-fifth of the cost at a time. It also stated that any dollar spent from the state would need to be a dollar matched by some other revenue stream. The critical path is to get environmental clearance.) The member followed-up asking if the funding gap is still roughly \$50 million. (HSR staff answered, that was accurate for phase 1.) Another member followed-up asking if HSR knows where that deficit will come from. (HSR staff commented, usually the federal government will provide a much larger percentage of funding for these types of project. For now, staff is hoping the federal government will be a part of the answer, as will the private sector and the state.)*

Public Comments:

- *A member of the public stated that the Virgin train from southern California to Las Vegas will be a game changer for U.S. high-speed rail.*

4. Caltrain Electrification Project

Casey Fromson, Caltrain Government and Community Affairs Director, told members that electrification work is ongoing throughout the corridor. The Caltrain team conducted 48 public meetings in 2019 to educate the community on the project and upcoming construction impacts.

5. Caltrain Business Plan

Sebastian Petty, Caltrain Deputy Chief of Planning, provided an update to the work that has occurred since the last meeting in October 2019. This included a market analysis, planning priorities, service concepts and evaluations, and service levels at stations.

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

- *A member asked why the costs for grade separations decreased from previous estimates. (Caltrain staff answered that the estimates have been a range based on the number of grade separations required. The estimate for grade separations that are showing in the presentation*

are the middle of the range, which assumes the majority of the 42 grade crossings are addressed somehow, between separations and grade closures. Caltrain is planning to engage in a corridor-wide grade separation strategy and plan to kick this off in the late spring or early summer.) A member followed up saying that it is important to have a group like this involved in those grade separation discussions, to see the high level.

- *A member asked regarding a passing lane in north Santa Clara County, if the location has been determined. (Caltrain staff answered no. It has not been determined. Caltrain would like to continue coordinating with both Mountain View and Palo Alto.)*
- *A member asked how Caltrain's grade separation efforts align with local jurisdictions' plans, if jurisdictions are ahead of Caltrain in terms of timing. (Caltrain staff answered that Caltrain does not intend to design grade separations, but help with a strategy for funding, sequencing and coordination. Caltrain does not intend to slow down any city processes.) A member followed up, asking if a city would be able to proceed if a grade separation project is already in progress. (Caltrain staff answered yes. Cities can proceed if approvals and funding is already lined up, but added that for most cities this isn't currently the case.) A member followed up asking if Caltrain has identified a coordination process with VTA and Measure B funds. (Caltrain staff answered that they are working on this.)*
- *A member asked which population data is being used. (Caltrain staff answered that the data is 2017 census tract data with updates from the American Community Survey.) A member followed-up asking if the California Department of Finance data would provide a better idea of population than census data. (Caltrain staff answered that the DOF data is good at a city level but the census data is better for neighborhood-level population data.)*
- *A member asked how the future ridership numbers are determined. (Caltrain staff answered that these are based on projections for the next 5-10 years.)*
- *A member asked if during peak periods there would be some stations that would have no trains. (Caltrain staff answered no. All the stations would have some service, ranging from two to six trains per hour.)*
- *A member asked if Caltrain was looking at approved station growth or also looking at other potential projects around the stations. The member also asked how Caltrain is thinking about proposed developments that aren't approved yet. Caltrain staff answered that for the purposes of this analysis, they were only looking at approved projects and developments. Caltrain will need to revisit this as it moves forward.) A member commented that it would be helpful to understand what developments have been proposed and how they fit in to this analysis related to service levels.*
- *A member asked if the distributed skip stop pattern basically eliminates the express trains. (Caltrain staff answered yes. All the trains would have about the same travel time, so it wouldn't matter which train a passenger got on at the larger stations.) A member added that express trains are crowded already, and implying from this that express trains are popular. They are concerned with the concept of eliminating express trains. It's important to have something that is desirable for commuters. (Caltrain staff added they they agree. They would like to have express trains, but the challenge is that those trains are already full, and Caltrain needs to consider balancing loads between all the types of trains.)*

- *A member asked how would a service pattern be chosen. They noted that in the presentation there is mention of diesel trains all the way south of Tamien. (Caltrain staff answered that this is addressed later in the presentation.)*
- *A member asked On the concept of lengthening trains, would Caltrain need to extend the platforms as well to accommodate people getting on and off for the full length of the train. (Caltrain staff answered that the biggest issue driving this is the maintenance facility. Beyond a certain length, the trains cut across multiple tracks and the facility becomes inoperable.*
- *A member asked if High-Speed Rail the main negotiating agency with UPRR. (Caltrain staff answered that it is the CA High-Speed Rail Authority and the State of California.)*
- *A member asked if there any scenarios in which Caltrain would close stations. (Caltrain answered that they are not recommending closing stations in the business plan. They have a few stations that get extremely minimal service and that would continue, but would not likely close stations.)*
- *A member noted that Caltrain mentioned having stations close together poses a challenge, including a mix of those that are highly utilized vs. not. (Caltrain commented that they are not considering closing stations at this time, however if there are cities who are interested in having this conversation, they would be happy to have it.)*
- *A member said, they appreciate the work and the vision that Caltrain has put forward. Once we start implementing the 2040 vision we are looking forward to those vast service improvements. I don't think we can even consider closing any stations until we increase service and see what happens. I also need to express concern with where we are going – there are not a lot of firm answers yet, which I understand. But using terms like mainline and shuttles isolates south Santa Clara County. When you are talking about service throughout the line you need to be cognizant of this. Electrification is more than just getting the right of way needed from UPRR and we don't yet know where this funding would come from. This also needs to be discussed, as we currently have a false sense of security thinking it sounds easier than it is, there is a \$3 billion funding gap.*
- *A member noted that there is a point of view regarding values tilting toward more service at more stations – for their community. They appreciate that we're not forgetting the lower ridership stations. In Burlingame, we have a lot of growth in the projections and we are depending on that rail line. Thank you for serving the smaller communities. Regarding the maintenance facility being an obstacle for longer trains – this should be explored. Allowing for longer trains as opposed to more frequent trains could reduce gate down time. Thank you for the presentation and making it accessible to everyone.*

Public Comments:

- *A member of the public stated that the materials being presented show impressive and exciting opportunities for improved service. The increase to every 15-minute service really changes what life could be like in cities and reduce the reliance on cars. The connectivity to things like BART and buses can increase the amount of usefulness people can get out of the service. The potential for level boarding addresses accessibility for people with disabilities, strollers, bikes, and makes the service more reliable because trains don't have to wait for people with different mobility needs. I'm looking forward to this coming in time for Plan Bay Area which will determine which projects qualify for regional funding.*
- *A member of the public stated that looking at jobs and housing in south Santa Clara County is ridiculous. The analysis should be based on freeway traffic counts not housing and jobs in this*

area. We need a product people want, something fast and with capacity. The way to achieve this is to have high capacity trains that stop at high capacity stations which need double-length platforms.

5. Public Comment

- *A member of the public commented that Seamless Bay Area is working on building community support for the organization's principles. They invited the members to sign on and advocate for the principles.*

6. LPMG Member Comments/Requests

- A member commented that they were more supportive of a Caltrain-specific funding measure, rather than a mega-regional measure. A member followed-up asking how the 1/8th cent sales tax would be implemented and where. (Caltrain staff answered that legislation was passed in 2017 for Caltrain to put that sales tax on the ballot and would need a 2/3 majority from the three member counties.)

7. Grade Separation Toolkit

Sebastian Petty commented that this item has been put on the agenda for a while now and started as many cities were thinking about grade separations. However, many cities have begun pursuing grade separations. A lot of this information will be put into the final version of the tool kit.

8. Next Meeting

Thursday, February 27, 2020 at 5:30 p.m.

9. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:22 p.m.