

**CalMod Local Policy Maker Group (LPMG)  
Summary Meeting Notes for August 25 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	C. Stone	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. Masur	X	
San Bruno	K. Ibarra	X	
San Carlos	R. Collins	X	
San Francisco	G. Gillett	X	
San Jose	R. Peralez	X	
San Mateo	J. Goethals	X	
Santa Carla	L. Gillmor		X
South San Francisco	K. Matsumoto	X	
Sunnyvale	J. Davis		X

**CHAIR** – Acting Chair Peralez

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

**CALMOD TEAM PRESENT:** M. Bouchard, D. Chung, C. Fromson, L. Scanlon

**1. JPB Staff Report**

- Staff announced that in August, Caltrain participated in an event with Transportation Secretary Foxx at Santa Clara Station. The press event highlighted the importance of the Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project and the BART extension.

- Staff also mentioned that in August, the Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project was approved to enter into the Engineering Phase of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Core Capacity Program.

## 2. Information / Discussion Items

### a. Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project (PCEP) Quarterly Update #7

The quarterly update highlighted PCEP activities on the major contracts, project activities, and funding updates for the months of April, May, and June. The full quarterly report can also be viewed on the website here:

<http://www.caltrain.com/Assets/Caltrain+Modernization+Program/Documents/PCEP+Quarter+4+2016+Report.pdf>

*LPMG members' key comments include the following:*

- *One member asked clarification questions about the funding commitments and if they would pay for full electrification, level boarding, and longer platforms. (Staff noted that all local, regional, and state funding have been secured for the PCEP. The only outstanding funding is \$647m in Federal Transit Administration Core Capacity funding. Funding for CalMod 2.0 projects such as longer platforms, 8-car EMU trains have not yet been fully secured. Caltrain will be kicking off an effort to develop more substantial analysis on the costs, potential ridership, and other benefits of those projects in the coming months. There will be a public outreach process associated with this CalMod 2.0 visioning effort.)*
- *One member asked a clarifying question about Buy America. (Staff noted that Stadler plans to exceed the current federal requirement of 60 percent Buy America.)*
- *One member asked why only one car builder bid on the project. (Staff noted that throughout the procurement process there were multiple car builders that expressed interest and staff expected they would bid on the project. There is some speculation that the additional customization with two-sets of doors and the fact that it is a relatively small order may have reduced the number of bids.)*

*Public Comments:*

- *A member of the public expressed concern about the EMU procurement process and the capacity of the new trains. (Staff noted that the major structural elements such as bathrooms and 8:1 ratio of seats to bikes have been determined. The exact number of seats that will be on the new electric trains has not yet been determined. Further design and public input will be needed to have the exact number. What is clear, the overall capacity will increase because there will be more trains per hour so the ability to carry more people will increase. With electric trains, there is also the potential to modify the*

*schedule to better spread the capacity over the peak periods. Caltrain followed all appropriate and required procurement guidelines.)*

b. LPMG Vice Chair – ACTION

There was discussion about the role and length of time of the Vice Chair. It was decided that the Vice Chair would serve one year terms. Each January, the Vice Chair would be voted on by the LPMG.

- **ACTION:** Council Member Emily Beach was unanimously selected as the Vice Chair.

c. Grade Separation Update

Staff provided a high-level presentation of all active grade separation projects along the Caltrain corridor. This presentation was meant to educate LPMG members about the grade separation work taking place in neighboring cities and the role Caltrain has played to assist those efforts. The presentation also provided detailed information on three grade separation case studies. Following the presentation, LPMG members discussed the potential focus / scope of a corridor-wide grade separation study.

*LPMG members' key comments include the following:*

- *One member noted that Rengstoff Avenue in Mountain View should be included in the presentation as a crossing that is being actively looked at as part of the city's planning efforts.*
- *Several members expressed support for including pedestrian and bike crossings as part of any grade separation project.*
- *One member asked how many pedestrian crossings are located on the corridor. (Note: there are 12 pedestrian crossings - 10 at stations and two outside of stations, in addition to the 42 at-grade vehicular crossings.)*
- *One member suggested that the LPMG should develop a "problem statement" for the potential corridor-wide grade separation study.*
- *One member asked a question about the cost of closing Castro Street and if that was less than constructing a grade separation. (Note: Mountain View Councilmember Siegel stated that it is cheaper to close the street than build a grade separation. Potentially, 1/3 of the cost.)*
- *A couple members suggested that cities that already have grade separations take an active role in participating in the development of a corridor-wide study so they can talk about what they learned from their experience.*
- *A couple members encouraged cities to work closely with Caltrain on any grade separation crossing and study.*
- *One member stated that they are working on a grade separation study scope that would help define "placemaking" and design principles for the corridor. The member thought it could be a roadmap for funding and MTC was in the best position to do the study. The*

*member thought the study would cost between \$900,000 to \$1 million. (The Acting Chair asked that the scope be shared in advance of the next meeting.)*

- *One member suggested that staff evaluate the need to have legal counsel at future meetings to help clarify when it is appropriate to take action on items.*
- *One member, who is also a member of the staff level City / County Staff Coordinating Group (CSCG) suggested that the LPMG be staffed by the CSCG.*
- *A couple members questioned how and if LPMG should be the “client” of the potential grade separation study and who would receive the funds. (The LPMG member from SF suggested that MTC administers the study and the LPMG could be on the steering committee.)*
- *One member suggested that they don’t need a study to look at crossings and cities can get started right away at placemaking.*
- *One member stressed the importance of the local lens to any project and that additional funds are needed for individual city planning efforts.*
- *One member suggested that the goal of the study should be to eliminate all crossings along the corridor and one member suggested that might be a local land use decision and not appropriate to have a goal that tells cities what to do.*
- *One member suggested that the study contain a template for process and design issues.*
- *One member suggested that it is important to message the benefits of grade separations including safety, noise reduction, and multi-modal traffic flow.*

#### *Public Comments:*

- *A member of the public spoke in favor bike and pedestrian safety as part of grade separations.*
- *A member of the public suggested that four tracks are needed at any grade separation and a tunnel could be built for the corridor.*

### **3. Public Comments**

- *A member of the public suggested that Caltrain should complete grade separations before any construction for the PCEP. (Note: It would delay the PCEP by decades if the corridor was completely grade separated before construction began on the PCEP.)*

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

- *One member suggested that there be a lessons learned segment of the future grade separation study agenda item.*