

**CalMod Local Policy Maker Group (LPMG)
Summary Meeting Notes for June 23, 2016**

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	
		Yes	No
Atherton	C. Wiest		X
Belmont	E. Reed	X	
Brisbane	C. Lentz		X
Burlingame	E. Beach	X	
Menlo Park	K. Keith		X
Millbrae	R. Holober	X	
Mountain View	L. Siegel	X	
Palo Alto	P. Burt		X
Redwood City	S. Massur	X	
San Bruno	K. Ibarra		X
San Carlos	R. Collins	X	
San Francisco	S. Gygi	X	
San Jose	Raul Perelez		X
San Mateo	J. Goethals		X
Santa Carla	L. Gillmor		X
South San Francisco	K. Matsumoto	X	
Sunnyvale	J. Davis	X	

CHAIR – Adrienne Tissier

VACANT SEAT(S): San Francisco County, San Mateo County, Santa Clara County

CALMOD TEAM PRESENT: D. Chung, C. Fromson

1. JPB Staff Report

- Staff announced that several agencies that are part of the 7-Party Supplemental MOU approved the MOU. The City and County of San Francisco and the California High-Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) are scheduled to vote on the item before the end of August. Given the progress with the contract negotiations and the progress on the MOU, staff will recommend at the July 7, 2016, Caltrain Board meeting that the

- *There was discussion from many members on the position of the Chair and Vice Chair. Several members suggested that the role of the Chair should be to help facilitate the meeting and the Chair should not also be a presenter, which occurred at some of the CHSRA hosted meetings.*
- *Many members expressed support for Supervisor Tissier or a Caltrain Board member being the Chair for both the CalMod and CHSRA Blended System hosted LPMG meetings. The members thought that Caltrain Board members have a broad base of knowledge on Caltrain issues and are in the best position to express opinions of the LPMG at Caltrain Board meetings.*
- *The LPMG decided, without objection, that a Caltrain Board member would be the Chair of the LPMG. The Chair position is tied to the role on the Caltrain Board, not to the individual person.*
- *There was discussion about the role of a Vice Chair, which is not part of the current LPMG structure. Several members expressed support for a Vice Chair to help with continuity if the Chair was not able to attend a meeting.*
- *The LPMG decided, without objection, that a Vice Chair would be selected at the July 28, 2016 LPMG meeting. (Note: The LPMG did not discuss the term of the Vice Chair and if the position would rotate to different counties.)*
- *One member suggested that key items that go to the Caltrain Board to a vote go to the LPMG first. (The Chair and staff stated that has been the typical process, key items related to the CalMod Program usually go to the LPMG before they go to the Caltrain Board such as the restroom decision. Staff and a couple members also noted that all LPMG members can request items on the agenda, through the standing members request agenda item)*

Public Comments:

- *A member of the public expressed support for the LPMG voting. The member of the public explained how the Caltrain Citizen Advisory Committee votes on issues and agreed that the Chair should help facilitate the meeting and not present.*
- *A member of the public expressed support for the LPMG voting. The member of the public also expressed disappointment that the Caltrain Board usually votes in favor of the staff recommendation. (The Chair noted that is not always the case. Staff originally recommended zero restrooms on the train and changed the recommendation after feedback from groups like the LPMG, which was given an opportunity to comment before the Caltrain Board vote.)*

Board award a Limited Notice to Proceed for the electric vehicle and electrification infrastructure contracts, contingent on all of the local / state funding being secured.

2. Information / Discussion Items

a. LPMG Role and Structure

As a result of the April LPMG discussion, Caltrain staff provided another overview of the role and structure of the Local Policy Maker Group (LPMG) and focused on the two areas that the LPMG discussed changing from the current structure: the selection of a Chair and Vice Chair and the ability of the LPMG to vote on items. Staff also confirmed that any changes in the structure would apply to both the CalMod LPMG meetings, hosted by Caltrain as well as the Blended System LPMG meetings, hosted by CHSRA. Once these decisions are finalized, an LPMG handbook that reflects these decisions will be made available and posted on the website.

LPMG members' key comments include the following:

- *Several members discussed the benefits of straw votes. Members expressed support for voting on items because it helped facilitate discussion and could provide a stronger record of the LPMG opinion on issues.*
- *A few members expressed support for the current structure and did not see the need for it to be changed. They felt their opinions were adequately expressed to the Caltrain Board and they were given appropriate information that allowed them to take official action at their own city council, if needed.*
- *There was discussion about whether members would be voting on behalf of their city or as individuals, if the vote should be a consensus opinion or individual votes and if there should be a minority report if there wasn't consensus.*
- *A couple LPMG members asked clarifying questions about how the LPMG opinions are expressed to the Caltrain Board. (Caltrain staff explained that the Caltrain Executive Director has a standing item on the agenda called "CalMod Updates" where a verbal summary of the relevant LPMG discussion is mentioned. The Chair and one LPMG member agreed that this occurred and felt it was an accurate representation of the LPMG discussions. An audio recording of the LPMG meeting is also on the website.)*
- *The LPMG decided, without objection, that the LPMG would be able to vote on agenda items. Not all items required action, and the action, individual votes or consensus positions, may vary depending on the item. (Note: Going forward, the words "all items are actionable" will be stated on the agenda.)*

3. Public Comments

- *A member of the public asked questions about the intercity rights that Union Pacific holds on the corridor and if CHSRA needs those rights to operate the Blended System on the corridor. (Note: The Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board holds the rights for commuter rail passenger service on the Caltrain Corridor. Union Pacific holds the rights for intercity passenger rail service. CHSRA is an intercity rail service and will intercity rights in order to operate on the Caltrain Corridor.)*
- *A member of the public expressed concern that Caltrain has not put all the used Metrolink diesel train cars into service. The member of the public also suggested that MTC should look into the procurement process for the new Caltrain electric trains. (Note: Caltrain has been in the process of retrofitting the used cars and this [press release](#) explains the timing for the roll out the additional cars. MTC, as a funding partner from the 2012, 9-Party MOU, was a participant / observer throughout the procurement process for the electric trains.)*
- *A member of the public encouraged the LPMG to have an agenda item on freight activity on the corridor and how it influences issues such as design of grade separations.*

4. LPMG Member Comments / Requests

- *Lenny Siegel, the Mountain View LPMG member updated the group on the recent council action to approve a grade separation alignment at Castro Street. He also requested that the group get more information about the safety elements (such as passenger screening) that may be needed at stations as part of the Blended System when trains travel up to 110mph.*
- *A member requested that CHSRA update the group on the Union Pacific discussions, if they are able to.*
- *A member requested an update on how freight is handled on the corridor.*