

**CalMod Local Policy Maker Group (LPMG)
Summary Meeting Notes for August 27, 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
Brisbane	T. O'Connell	
Burlingame	E. Beach	X
Gilroy	C. Tucker	X
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	
San Bruno	M. Salazar	X
San Carlos	R. Collins	X
San Francisco	VACANT	
San Jose	S. Jimenez	
San Mateo	A. Lee	X
Santa Clara	K. Watanabe	
South San Francisco	K. Matsumoto	X
Sunnyvale	N. Smith	X
San Francisco BOS	TBD	
San Mateo BOS	TBD	
Santa Clara BOS	TBD	
Chair	Jeannie Bruins	X
Vice Chair	E. Beach	X

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

CALTRAIN STAFF: Casey Fromson, Sebastian Petty, Ryan McCauley

HIGH-SPEED RAIL STAFF: Boris Lipkin, Yvonne Chan, Morgan Galli, James Tung, Rich Walter, Rebecca Fleischer

1. Call to Order

Chair Jeannie Bruins called the meeting to order at 5:32 p.m.

2. Staff Report

Casey Fromson, Director of Government and Community Affairs for Caltrain, updated the members on the status of the 1/8th cent sales tax measure. All seven parties granted their approval to place the measure on the November 2020 Ballot. The ballot measure is now Measure RR. Chair Jeannie Bruins added that the Silicon Valley Leadership Group (SVLG) is working on fundraising for the measure.

Public Comments:

- A member of the public noted that there was a change to Caltrain's bylaws allowing it to transition into its own administration separate from SamTrans. They also asked how much money is being paid to SVLG by Caltrain. *(Chair Bruins responded stating that no money is being paid to SVLG and as a public agency they are forbidden to spend public agency dollars on ballot measures.)*
- A member of the public mentioned that they were eagerly anticipating the Constant Warning Time (CWT) presentation. They believe it needs to be thoroughly vetted by the public and corridor cities before too much work is done to alter plans. They believe the presentation should include current gate down times and anticipated gate down times with the new solution. *(Chairs Bruins noted that it is staff's intention to have a CWT presentation at the September LPMG Meeting.)*

3. California High-Speed Rail Update

Boris Lipkin, Northern California Regional Director for California High-Speed Rail, updated the members on the release of the Draft EIR/EIS for the San Francisco to San Jose section of the project, including how to navigate the document, a summarization of key points and a noise analysis and proposed mitigations. Included in the EIR/EIS are two alternatives under study; Alternative A and Alternative B. The two largest differences are the location of the light maintenance facility, inclusion of passing tracks, and the rail alignment near Diridon Station in San Jose.

LPMG members' key comments regarding the San Francisco to San Jose Project Features:

- Chair Bruins asked which the preferred alternative is. *(HSR staff answered that Alternative A is the staff-recommended alternative.)* Chair Bruins followed up asking about travel times and whether they include Caltrain or just high-speed rail. *(HSR staff answered that with the addition of passing tracks, high-speed rail improves travel time marginally. HSR staff added that the preferred alternative is consistent with the Baseline growth assumptions included in the Caltrain Business Plan.)*
- A member follow-up asked if the HSR plan only incorporated the Baseline Growth scenario and not the Moderate Growth scenario. *(HSR staff answered yes, the baseline was considered as an incremental step toward the moderate growth scenario.)* The member followed-up asking that if the moderate growth scenario is pursued by Caltrain, the passing tracks in Alternative B would eventually need to get built. *(HSR staff answered yes, but Caltrain staff would have a better idea of what infrastructure would be needed for the Moderate growth scenario.)*

LPMG members' key comments regarding the San Draft EIR/EIS and Noise Analysis:

- Chair Bruins asked what the regulated lowest height for a train horn by the Federal Railroad Administration is. *(HSR staff answered that they did not know off the top of their head, but when*

studied determined 7 ft. above rail worked.) Chair Bruins followed up asking Caltrain where their horns are located. *(Caltrain staff answered that the horn is located at the bottom of the train but would check on the exact height. The Caltrain horn height is located 3 ft above rail).* Chair Bruins added that if it could be lower, that HSR staff explore having two horns, one for urban centers and one for less-populated regions.

- A member asked for HSR staff to explain the difference of horn height for nearby residents. *(HSR staff answered that the noise radiates out like an energy pulse, and the closer to the ground, the more noise is absorbed. However if at the same level will be a more direct line of noise.)*
- A member asked what a receptor is. *(HSR staff answered that receptors are individuals or areas that are sensitive to the noise.)*
- A member asked why a city would not do a Quiet Zone. *(HSR staff answered that it often comes down to how much liability the city wants to take as it is an agreement between the city and the FRA, not the rail agency. A hazard mitigation analysis would need to be done by the FRA.)* Chair Bruins added that there are quiet zones in San Jose for the light rail system and that they may be able to provide information from a city's perspective.
- A member asked if the cost for noise mitigations are borne by the jurisdictions. *(HSR staff answered no, they would be covered by the High-Speed Rail Authority. The city would bear the costs of aesthetics and staff time.)*
- A member asked if noise walls would still be needed if a city elected to pursue a Quiet Zone, because of wheel noise. *(HSR staff answered yes and the analysis done assumed Quiet Zones all along the corridor, but less would be needed with the Quiet Zones. Horn noise at stations would continue to be activated.)*

Public Comments:

- A member of the public commented that they did believe High-Speed Rail would operate in sections above 110 mph. They also commented that with a second Transbay tube a maintenance facility would not be needed in Brisbane and that the travel time estimated by the authority goes against Prop 1A conditions. They also believe the EIR should be sent back by the FRA.
- A member of the public thanked staff for the presentation. The member was concerned about the confirmation that the HSR EIR/EIS does not contemplate the moderate growth vision for Caltrain. The specific schedule that HSR is contemplating would bunch Caltrain trains and doesn't take into account regional connectivity goals.
- A member of the public had a similar concern regarding the lack of incorporation of the Caltrain Business Plan Board adopted service vision. They also mentioned that Atherton has a quiet zone and the SMART Rail Corridor has incorporated Quiet Zones in all cities along its corridor.

LPMG members' final questions and comments.

- HSR staff mentioned at the outset of the discussion that comments made at this meeting will not be counted as official comments on the EIR/EIS.
- Chair Bruins asked if Caltrain staff could address the issues with High-Speed Rail EIR/EIS not incorporating the Caltrain Business Plan growth scenarios. *(Caltrain staff mentioned that the Board adopted service vision was 8 trains per hour per direction, not precluding ability to go higher- and that the Board adopted Service Vision also specified an express + local version of service with regular, repeating train patterns. Within the moderate Caltrain 8 train growth plan*

with the additional 4 HSR trains there were four areas on the main-line (north of San Jose) corridor in which passing tracks were identified:

- *At the Millbrae Station – associated with HSR use of the corridor*
- *Around the Hillsdale Station – associated with HSR use of the corridor*
- *At or around Redwood City Station – associated with Caltrain train’s Service Vision (specifically a transfer station between express and local trains)*
- *In Northern Santa Clara County (in Mountain View or Palo Alto area) – associated with HSR use of the corridor.*
- *The Caltrain Board has expressed a desire to go to a clockface schedule and mix of express and local trains. Those schedule elements (clockface and any local trains) would mean that HSR would need passing tracks to accommodate their service, even with Caltrain operating a lower level of service (e.g. even at the 6 Caltrain train per hour per direction level). The HSR EIR assumes a lower service level and older schedule that was never formally adopted and is no longer being considered by Caltrain. Staff mentioned that the need for additional Caltrain/HSR blended system planning was part of the agency’s comments on the draft HSR EIR SJ – Merced segment and would likely be part of the SF-SJ segment comments. Staff added all these issues would be included in the official comments to the High-Speed Rail Authority.)*
- *Chair Bruins asked if the Caltrain height of horns has been determined. (Caltrain staff answered that their horns are three feet above rail.)*
- *A member asked for HSR staff to address the public comment that the plan was not Prop 1A compliant. (HSR staff answered that they were compliant with Prop 1A.)*
- *A member wanted clarification on whether or not passing tracks or infrastructure would be needed even if the Baseline growth scenario was pursued. (Caltrain staff answered that there was a difference of opinion between the agencies when it comes to infrastructure needed to meet the market demand.) The member followed up noting that this may be something the cities needed to comment on. (HSR staff added that it is necessary to put things into perspective on what planning efforts are at what stages. The HSR EIR/EIS builds on the schedule highlighted in the EIR/EIS for the Caltrain Electrification project.) The member added that from the perspective of a member of the public that although the infrastructure might not be completely necessary, it would be needed to have efficient and useful service on the corridor. The member also added that they wish grade separation funding would be included in the project.*
- *A member asked if someone caught what the member of the public mentioned about Gilroy. (HSR staff said they did not catch it.)*
- *A member asked if Alternative B aligns with the passing tracks called for in Caltrain’s Moderate Growth Scenario. (HSR and Caltrain staff answered that the passing tracks included in the HSR’s Alternative B are a subset of the passing tracks identified in the Caltrain Plan that was completed in consultation with HSR staff. Alternative B does not cover all the passing tracks identified in the Moderate Growth Scenario.) The member followed up asking if an EIR would be needed to be redone if Alternative B was chosen. (HSR staff answered that while additional work would be needed, there was already some analysis available and may not need to start over.) The member asked what it would take for the plans to align. (HSR staff answered that they don’t believe the plans do not align, but rather the HSR plan is an incremental step.)*
- *A member commented that this project highlights how important electrification is for the corridor south of San Jose to Gilroy.*
- *Chair Bruins added that horn placement is something that they hope is explored and the possibility of a dual horn system.*

- A member asked about the impact on emergency vehicle response times and how they are impacted. *(HSR staff answered that analysis was done in the EIR/EIS, but that the analysis considered a worst case scenario when all gates are down in a particular area and the effects. HSR used thirty seconds as an example of significant delay, and mitigations such as signal priority and the potential for additional fire stations along the corridor are considered in the document.)* Chair Bruins followed up asking if there were plans about strategically choosing grade separations along the corridor to mitigate extended emergency vehicle response times. *(HSR staff answered that that was not included in the EIR/EIS.)*
- A member noted that they would be interested in documents on pursuing a Quiet Zone. *(HSR staff answered that they can share documents.)*
- A member wanted to highlight that the LPMG didn't discuss during the meeting the HSR train control and communications facility where the mast-height would be 100 feet above rail and spaced out every two and a half miles.
- Chair Bruins thanks High-Speed Rail and their responsiveness to the member requests.

4. Caltrain Draft Equity, Connectivity, Recovery & Growth Policy

Sebastian Petty, Caltrain Deputy Chief of Planning, presented on the Draft Equity, Connectivity, Recovery, and Growth Policy Framework. The policy went through extensive public outreach policy and will be presented to the Caltrain Board on September 3, 2020. Casey Fromson thanked members for helping spread the word on the policy, noting they received 150+ comments.

5. Caltrain Electrification Project

Ryan McCauley, Caltrain Community Affairs Specialist, presented on the construction and train manufacturing progress for the electrification project. Construction crews have been working in the southern segments over the past few months to install foundations and poles from Menlo Park to San Jose. Work is occurring on 8 of the 10 traction power facilities. Work in Salt Lake City continues with the static testing of the train. Plans to do high-speed testing in Colorado have been delayed due to travel restrictions caused by COVID-19. Overall there are 46 car shells shipped and 37 cars shells being worked on in Salt Lake City.

6. Public Comments on Items 4 and 5

- A member of the public noted that they sent the information requested and a link to the legislation that the HSR is not compliant with travel times. They also mentioned that they do not believe the CWT replacement is not workable. They also believe that Caltrain is not publishing the Project Management Oversight Committee (PMOC) reports. *(Chair Bruins responded stating that the latest PMOC report is posted, there has not been one in a while.)*
- A member of the public asked to see the PMOC reports as well. They also noted that the FRA has resources for Quiet Zones and there is a lot of information available.

7. LPMG Member Comments/Requests

- HSR Related Letters From Cities
- Constant Warning Time Presentation

A member asked how frequently the Caltrain Board receives updates on the High-Speed Rail project. Chair Bruins responded that the LPMG receives more frequent updates from the Authority than the

Caltrain Board. At each Caltrain Board meeting, Chair Bruins provides a verbal update to the board and the meeting minutes are included in the Board reading packet.

8. Next Meeting

Thursday, September 24, 2020 at 5:30 p.m.

9. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:35 p.m.