

**CalMod Local Policy Maker Group (LPMG)
Summary Meeting Notes for February 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	
Brisbane	T. O'Connell	
Burlingame	E. Beach	
Gilroy	P. Leroe- Muñoz	X via phone
Menlo Park	B. Nash	X
Millbrae	R. Holober	X
Mountain View	J. McAlister	X
Morgan Hill	R. Constantine	X
Palo Alto	A. Fine	X
Redwood City	S. Masur	
San Bruno	M. Salazar	X
San Carlos	R. Collins	X
San Francisco	P. Supawanich	
San Jose	S. Jimenez	X
San Mateo	A. Lee	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	Jeannie Bruins	X
Vice Chair	E. Beach	

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

CALTRAIN STAFF: Casey Fromson, Sebastian Petty

1. Call to Order

Chair Jeannie Bruins called the meeting to order at 5:32 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. Staff Report

None.

3. California High-Speed Rail Update

Boris Lipkin, Northern California Regional Director for California High-Speed Rail, updated the members on the program's progress and the release of the Draft 2020 Business Plan.

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

- A member asked if there are cost comparisons between the Virgin trains and HSR. *(HSR staff answered that they don't have the exact comparison available. They believe the estimate is approximately \$5 billion total for Virgin train. Exact comparisons may not be appropriate due to the differing conditions and alignments.)*
- A member asked about the oversight and controls HSR uses when awarding contracts. *(HSR staff answered that there are multiple teams in charge of contracts and recent governance changes have begun looking at change-orders in a more systemic way.)*
- A member asked about the environmental document from Gilroy to Merced and the eventual alignment. *(HSR Staff answered that there are two sections, from Merced to Fresno and Gilroy to Merced. There is some overlap of the alignment and therefore within the environmental document.)*
- A member asked who the 'Design, Build, Maintain' contract is with for the Tracking System. *(HSR Staff answered that the contract is out to bid. There are three qualified vendors identified. Responses are due June 2020.)* The member then followed up asking what the funding relationship is between HSR and the Virgin Trains in southern California. *(HSR staff answered that the graphic is meant to illustrate high-speed rail around the state. The Virgin train line is primarily privately-funded with some low interest financing from the state and aid with ROW acquisition.)* The member followed-up asking whether the ROW was a lease or a sale. *(HSR answered that they are not sure how the arrangement was made.)*
- A member asked who is doing construction currently. *(HSR staff answered that there are three construction packages. All the contractors are joint-ventures and hire many more of sub-contractors.)* The member followed-up asking if those are the same entities that will bid on the next contract. *(HSR staff answered no, the skillset is much different.)*
- A member commented that there seems to be a sense from the news that the project is in trouble of not being completed due to loss of funding. The member asked why there is a disconnect. *(HSR staff answered that often things get misinterpreted in the news. The Federal Government threatened to renege on funding it had committed to the project previously. HSR and the State are contesting that action as illegal.)*
- A member asked if there is new technology that could be applicable for cities that could be brought in that want to put in transit systems. *(HSR staff answered that they are trying to bring technology that exists throughout the rest of the world and is proven to be effective.)*
- A member asked where in the process HSR is in designing the EMUs. *(HSR staff answered that the next large contract after the tracking system will be for the trains themselves. The documents are being drafted now. The contract would be for the design and build of the trains and 30 years of maintenance.)* The member followed-up asking if HSR is reconsidering it

placement of higher-doors as technology has advanced. When linking into other systems, in order to have level boarding for multiple door heights platforms would need to be adjusted at great cost. *(HSR staff answered that the technology is what is informing the procurement. Staff noted that there is only one service-proven high-speed train set in France that has the lower doors, but the vast majority of proven solutions are the higher-level doors. To keep the bids competitive, they are going with the higher level.)* The member followed-up commenting that hopefully they will not go with the higher-level doors.

- A member asked if the project is on-budget and on schedule. *(HSR staff answered that the way they look at it, is in terms of deliverable for end of construction is beginning of service. In order to get service running in central valley in 2028-2029, is finishing civil works, tracks by 2025 to begin testing. Those timelines have been set since 2018 business plan.)*
- A member asked how many full-time staff the agency employs. *(HSR staff answered approximately above 200 and will put in a budget request in front of legislature to raise up to 300. There are also significant consultant staff)*
- A member asked about the relative locations of stations and the train's top speeds when going through downtown corridors. *(HSR staff answered that the station spacing and service patterns will determine the top speed of trains. It is possible HSR may implement a skip-stop pattern. In terms of the downtown corridors, that is where the most growth and demand is for service. There will be noise mitigations put in place. HSR staff also offered a new member briefing for any new LPMG members.*
- A member asked about the potential HSR land use in Millbrae and conflict with an approved development site that was mentioned in the HSR Business Plan. *(HSR staff said they would take that back to the Business Plan team and that there are ongoing conversations about what the area will look like.)*

Public Comments:

- *A member of the public stated that they believe Virgin train is spending \$24 million per mile and HSR is spending \$110 million per mile. They also commented that they don't believe the train should go into downtown corridors and that the proposed stations are too close together.*

4. Caltrain Business Plan

Sebastian Petty, Caltrain Deputy Chief of Planning, provided a verbal update on the Caltrain Business Plan. Information on potential sources of funding, equity analysis and station access will go to the group at the March meeting.

5. Caltrain Electrification Project

Sebastian Petty, Caltrain Deputy Chief of Planning, provided a verbal update regarding PCEP. There is work going on in San Francisco tunnels while construction crews hang wires. This results in a weekend tunnel closure. Riders can utilize a bus-bridge from Bayshore to 4th and King.

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

- *A member asked if the work will be done before the start of Giants' season. (Caltrain staff answered yes.)*

6. Public Comment

- *A member of the public commented that it is great there is a train with lower door heights that has been proven-effective. The member of the public also commented on SB 787, saying San Francisco and San Mateo County will be providing 45% of revenues and Santa Clara County will provide 55%. They believe each county should have discretion in how their contribution is spent proportional to their contribution.*

7. LPMG Member Comments/Requests

- Chair Bruins commented that although she is new to the LPMG Board, she has been on the JPB board for a number of years and her door is open to other members who may wish to speak about the project and if they would like to change the format of the meeting.
- A member commented that a candidate for state senate proposed diverting funds from HSR to building grade separations along the Caltrain Corridor. The member asked if HSR money can be transferred to Caltrain. *(HSR staff answered legislatively funds can be reallocated. There are several examples of fund-sharing. It may be up to legal interpretation. Funding for San Francisco to San Jose for HSR has not been identified.)* A member followed-up and asked how important it is for HSR to move through the Peninsula. *(HSR answered that grade separations are not needed in the Caltrain Corridor to operate HSR.)* Another member followed-up asking if HSR can advocate for cities receiving federal funding for grade separations. *(HSR staff answered they are happy to write letters of support. They recently wrote a letter of support for Burlingame's federal grant application.)*
- A member asked what the speed will be for the HSR train will be from San Jose to San Francisco. *(HSR staff answered that the HSR train would go the same speed as Caltrain in that corridor.)*
- A member asked what the advantage is of having HSR on Caltrain tracks if it goes the same speed other than a one-seat ride. *(HSR staff answered that there will only be one stop between San Jose and San Francisco [Millbrae] meaning the trains will run faster. The voter mandate is also for the northern terminus is San Francisco.)*

Public Comments:

- *A member of the public stated that they believe they received verbal confirmation that trains will go in excess of 125 mph between Gilroy and South San Jose.*

8. Next Meeting

Thursday, March 26, 2020 at 5:30 p.m.

9. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 6:32 p.m.