

**CalMod Local Policy Maker Group (LPMG)  
Summary Meeting Notes for December 20, 2018**

**Summary Notes**

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

<b>City / County</b>	<b>Representative or Alternate</b>	<b>Present</b>
Atherton	C. Wiest	
Belmont	D. Hurt	X
Brisbane	T. O'Connell	
Burlingame	E. Beach	X
Gilroy	C. Tucker	
Menlo Park	R. Cline	
Millbrae	R. Holober	X
Mountain View	L. Siegel	
Morgan Hill	S. Tate	
Palo Alto	A. Fine	X
Redwood City	S. Masur	X
San Bruno	R. Medina	X
San Carlos	M. Olbert	X
San Francisco	G. Gillett	X
San Jose	S. Jimenez	X
San Mateo	D. Papan	X
Santa Clara	K. Watanabe	X
South San Francisco	K. Matsumoto	X
Sunnyvale	N. Smith	X
San Francisco BOS	TBD	
San Mateo BOS	TBD	
Santa Clara BOS	TBD	

CHAIR: Jeff Gee

VICE CHAIR: Emily Beach

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

CALTRAIN STAFF: Casey Fromson, Sebastian Petty

**1. Staff Report**

**a. 2019 Meeting Dates / LPMG Membership**

Casey Fromson, Director of Government and Community Affairs, discussed the 2019 meeting schedule and asked members to let Caltrain staff know of any new or replacement LPMG members.

**2. Caltrain Business Plan**

Sebastian Petty, Caltrain Senior Policy Advisor, provided an update on the development of a “high growth” 2040 service scenario contrasted with a “baseline growth” scenario. The presentation also discussed off-peak and weekend service, South San Jose and Gilroy planning, and outreach being done through cities and community meetings.

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

- *A member asked if the high-growth service vision for local and express trains will be similar to existing service. (Caltrain staff said no, because local trains do not run at peak hours. The higher-growth scenarios being evaluating would be a more standardized, coordinated schedule.)*
- *A member asked if it is possible to move from 12 trains per hour to 16 as infrastructure improvements are implemented. (Caltrain staff said yes, the two plans build on one another.)*
- *A member noted that increasing ridership seems driven by increased supply, and asked if there has been any exploration of what could be possible with a clean slate. (Caltrain staff said yes, staff have explored an unconstrained scenario looking at very high (theoretical) levels of service, to understand the “land based” potential demand for rail service. However, staff reaffirmed that there are real constraints planning must consider.)*
- *A member asked how the analysis would change if high-speed rail (HSR) is not implemented. (Caltrain staff said they are respecting the established commitments made from partner agencies, including HSR, and as such have not extensively looked at HSR not sharing the corridor. If HSR implementation did not move forward, Caltrain staff could consider increasing Caltrain trains in the HSR slots.)*
- *A member pointed out the decision of whether HSR is implemented is a political one. The member suggested that it would be helpful for communities to understand the trade-offs and get an idea of how Caltrain service might change if HSR assumptions changed. (Caltrain staff said they had primarily been looking at service, but costs would be considered later in Business Plan development Staff noted the advantage of being part of a state corridor as related to infrastructure funding.)*
- *A member pointed out that the state is putting restrictions on what local agencies can and should be doing related to growth.*
- *A member appreciated Caltrain staff studying the two options for growth.*
- *A member asked for clarification whether passing tracks would be possible within the Joint Powers Board (JPB) right of way (ROW), or would property acquisitions be needed? (Caltrain staff explained that planning was still being done at a conceptual level so it is unclear. Those questions will be addressed later in the Business Plan process.)*
- *A member expressed appreciation for moving forward with the 10 and 16-train local/express options, as these were the two most interesting for Sunnyvale.*
- *A member advocated for Caltrain staff to take a thoughtful approach to the phasing of the selected scenario as related to infrastructure, specifically passing tracks and grade separations.*
- *A member recommended against increasing fares or additional tolls for riders as it could rule out a large numbers of riders.*
- *A member asked if there had been any analysis as to why off-peak is low as compared to BART. (Caltrain staff answered that it could be due to the fact that there is not as much service being offered and that it may be more of a supply issue rather than demand.)*
- *Another member said it would be great to add more mid-day service.*

- *A member encouraged Caltrain staff to think about the different origin-destination patterns on weekends as compared to weekdays, while not overlooking small stations during off-peak service.*
- *A member asked Caltrain staff to consider student ridership, particularly in the afternoon before peak hour.*
- *Regarding HSR negotiating an agreement with Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), a member asked what would happen if that agreement is not successful. (Caltrain staff responded by saying that Caltrain could potentially negotiate directly with UPRR but that would be a challenge as the state has more leverage and resources. If, during the course of this plan, the HSR/UPRR agreement is not possible, Caltrain could look at more modest options that would allow improved service south of the Tamien area, but it would likely not involve full electrification.)*
- *A member commented that expanding the tracks may require acquisition, which would be a slippery slope and a major undertaking. (Caltrain staff noted that the agency is aware of community concerns around the subject and is working with other plans and projects in the area, such as the Diridon Integrated Concept Plan. Staff added that the project is still in the planning phase.)*
- *A member expressed their desire for grade separations where HSR would run in South San Jose.*
- *A member asked Caltrain to consider noise regarding crossings in plans moving forward.*
- *A member asked if Caltrain's ridership assumptions include competition with HSR for service between San Jose and San Francisco. (Caltrain staff said yes, assumptions are being considered for HSR attracting Caltrain riders and noted that HSR riders will also transfer to Caltrain.)*
- *A member advocated for Caltrain staff to consider equity when considering the four-track option.*
- *A member thanked Caltrain staff for putting together the presentation and thanked the other members of the group for attending the meeting.*

*Public Comments:*

- *A member of the public speculated that ridership declines during the day because it's the wrong product on the wrong time of day. They then asked why more development at Tamien station is not being pursued.*
- *A member of the public thanked staff and added that to understand all future infrastructure needs it may be helpful to include all regional connections such as Dumbarton and possible BART extension; she also appreciated the service concepts and stressed the importance of meeting climate goals.*
- *A member of the public advocated for the difference in peak and off peak service to be more fluid and less stark, and also asked:*
  - *Is HSR the equivalent of the bullet service from San Jose to Millbrae to SF?*
  - *Are existing passing tracks functionally useful?*
  - *Would passing tracks work in South San Jose, or would it need to be four-tracked?*

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

Casey Fromson, Director of Government and Community Affairs, highlighted CalMod.org as a resource to learn about the project's progress in 2018. She also noted Caltrain received state funding for additional electric train cars, increasing the 16 six-car trainsets to 19 seven-car trainsets.

*Public Comment:*

- *A member of the public mentioned a technical glitch on the CalMod.org website and commented that when electrifying south of San Jose, it will need to be faster and cheaper.*

#### **4. California High-Speed Rail (HSR) Updates**

Morgan Galli, HSR Government Relations Specialist, shared a statewide construction update, a Northern California community outreach update, and discussed environmental justice outreach efforts throughout the San Jose to Merced Project Section.

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

- *A member thanked HSR staff and commented on how difficult, but necessary their work is, especially when considering all aspects of a large statewide project.*
- *A member thanked HSR staff for the outreach work being done and asked what the next large decision point is regarding HSR in the Peninsula. (HSR staff responded that a preferred alternative for both project sections will be needed [SF to San Jose decision in Dec 2019; San Jose to Merced decision in Sept 2019.]. She noted there will be outreach and a staff report with preferred alternatives.)*
- *A member asked if Santa Clara is affected by both project sections. (HSR staff answered yes, and that staff is scheduled to present to Santa Clara City Council.)*
- *A member commented that they hope to get more detail on negotiations with Union Pacific.*

*Public Comment:*

- *A member of the public commented on how parts of the railroad in Hollister are owned by other companies including San Benito LLC.*

#### **5. Public Comment**

- *A member of the public advocated for an EIR between San Francisco and Gilroy and from Gilroy to Fresno.*

#### **6. LPMG Member Comments/Requests**

- *A member commented on how the recent Camp Fire has sparked an interest in checking the air quality index and advocated for more funds from the state to complete the Business Plan as it will benefit air quality.*

#### **7. Next Meeting**

Thursday, January 24, 2019 at 5:30 p.m.