

**CalMod Local Policy Maker Group (LPMG)
Summary Meeting Notes for July 25, 2019**

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	X
Belmont	J. Mates	X
Brisbane	T. O'Connell	X
Burlingame	E. Beach	X
Gilroy	C. Tucker	
Menlo Park	D. Combs	X
Millbrae	R. Holober	
Mountain View	J. McAlister	X
Morgan Hill	R. Constantine	
Palo Alto	L. Kou	
Redwood City	S. Masur	X
San Bruno	R. Medina	X
San Carlos	R. Collins	X
San Francisco	P. Supawanich	
San Jose	S. Jimenez	
San Mateo	E. Rodriguez	
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	G. Gillet	X
Acting Chair	E. Beach	X

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

CALTRAIN STAFF: Casey Fromson, Sebastian Petty

1. Call to Order

Chair Gillian Gillet called the meeting to order at 5:32 p.m.

2. Staff Report

Casey Fromson, Caltrain Government and Community Affairs Director, told members that the July LPMG meeting will focus primarily on High-Speed Rail and their staff-recommended alternative. The August meeting will be a large update on the Caltrain Business Plan and the staff recommended service vision.

3. Caltrain Business Plan

Sebastian Petty, Caltrain Senior Policy Advisor, provided a brief verbal update on Business Plan and the recommended service vision. Materials were prepared for an August 1 Board workshop in which staff is recommending pursuit of moderate growth scenario without precluding high-growth. No action will be taken in August.

Public Comment:

- *A member of the public applauded the recommended goal of tripling ridership and converting to a clock-faced schedule. The member of the public also advocated to message the moderate growth vision without precluding high growth should be told in a more positive way.*
- *A member of the public explained that they were at a recent Legislative Committee meeting, where there was a presentation on the Caltrain Business Plan, and didn't believe the committee members could fully grasp the entire presentation. The member of the public suggested a separate board workshop entirely dedicated to the Governance section.*

4. Caltrain Electrification

Casey Fromson, Caltrain Government and Community Affairs Director, provided an update on the Electrification Project, stating there have been roughly a thousand pole foundations formed and 400 poles.

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

- *A member asked if the electrification crews were taking into account any potential passing tracks associated with the Caltrain Business Plan or High-Speed Rail. (Caltrain staff answered that they are coordinating, and that more information will be included in the High-Speed Rail update.)*

5. High-Speed Rail

Boris Lipkin, Northern California Regional Director for California High-Speed Rail, updated the members that staff was explaining their preferred alternative for the two project sections (SF-SJ, SJ-Merced). James Tung, Project Manager for the San Francisco to San Jose Section, provided members an update on northern section and the key factors that went in to determining the recommendation. Lipkin provided the update for the San Jose to Merced section. HSR was granted Environmental Assignment allowing the acceleration of the environmental review process.

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

- *A member asked if staff could explain the hold out rule Broadway and Atherton Stations. (HSR staff answered that for passengers to get on the train, they must cross the tracks to get to a middle platform. When a train sees passengers on tracks it must hold).*
- *A member asked if staff could talk about the number of businesses displaced in Alternative B. 108 is really significant. The member asked if HSR analyzed what type of businesses they are and*

how they will be helped. (HSR staff explained that this was a conservative estimate for this stage. If just part of ROW is in parcel, it is counted as a full displace. HSR is recommending Alternative A, partly for this reason. For folks that are impacted, they will be reimbursed depending on how much they are affected. HSR will do an appraisal and pay for the business to do an appraisal to do an evaluation. Business Good Will is also accounted for. Hopefully a settlement is reached, and relocation assistance is offered. Eminent domain is a last resort). The member followed up by thanking staff for clarifying the process and suggested that one of the things to consider is not just dollar amount, but place-making and character building.

- A member noted that HSR conducted a robust presentation in Brisbane and the project will have major impacts to the city. It is not only taking out fire station, but changing bridges, and changing entrances to the city. One concern the member had, was other areas for maintenance facilities were glossed over and not addressed in depth. Another concern the member has is having to dig into landfill and not having done the adequate environmental review for that.
- A member asked if HSR looked at cumulative gate downtime. (HSR Staff answered that there would be more gate downtime. It was not shown because they were just looking at differentiators between Alternatives A and B. All that information will be in the draft EIR).
- A member noted that there were still processing the differentiators for the alternatives. The member understood the recommendation for A over B is the impact of passing tracks. The member asked, which areas were analyzed and how did the areas for passing tracks align with Caltrain passing tracks. (HSR staff answered that there have been several previous passing tracks studies. They took the one from a few years ago and the middle option is reflected in Alternative B. At the level of 4 HSR trains and 6 Caltrain trains, they have found there is not a substantial need and benefit for more passing tracks. There has been more recent joint analysis done with Caltrain, if Caltrain were running more than 6 trains and that passing track need is reflected in the Caltrain Business Plan documents).
- A member asked, with regard to the criteria for Environmental Justice, they understand why they are looking at the mixed use development in Brisbane and asked if that was the only development being looked at. (HSR staff answered no. They look at all developments and are looking at multiple EJ communities, but the differences in impacts between the Alternatives are minimal).
- A member asked, with studying Environmental Justice, is there a business component. (HSR staff explained that there is a socio-economic section of NEPA that works with the environmental justice section).
- A member asked if HSR could explain more about the permanent impacts to the wetlands and the waters of the U.S. (HSR staff answered, that the wetlands are governed by the Army Corps of Engineers. The analysis is based on total footprint, so the displayed amount of acres would be disturbed).
- A member asked if there are passing tracks between Mountain View and Palo Alto? (HSR staff answered no. Caltrain staff added that those passing tracks are part of the Caltrain Business Plan, but would benefit both Caltrain and HSR).
- A member asked if HSR has plans to participate or lead the Downtown Extension project. (HSR staff answered that they have a legal mandate that the northern terminus will be the Salesforce Transit Center. HSR has been involved in the review and want it to be successful).
- A member asked how will the convergence impact Scott Blvd in Santa Clara. (HSR staff answered that Scott Blvd is the location where the different EIR sections meet. HSR will be discussing the project in detail at the upcoming Santa Clara City Council meeting).

- A member asked how many NEPA documents there will be. (HSR staff answered two, with some overlapping materials).
- A member noted that to local policy makers, quiet zones and quad gates are very important. The member asked if HSR staff could go into detail on how to apply for quiet zones and the process. (HSR staff answered that the question of quiet zones is a relationship to local governments and the federal government. The US FRA will do an assessment, such as needing quad gates, channelization and fences. There is a liability component the city would have to take).
- A member noted that the infrastructure will come through before the trains. They then asked if that will come with electrification or later on. (HSR staff answered that it will not come with electrification, but will be done when HSR has available resources).
- A member noted that their constituents want to know about the phasing of construction post environmental clearance. (HSR staff answered “funding permitted” the next steps would be advancing engineering, ROW acquisition, third-party agreements then construction. The goal would be San Francisco to Bakersfield by 2029. HSR can get to Los Angeles by 2033. In terms of construction in Northern California, they are several years away).
- A member asked which section would be constructed first. (HSR staff answered that it is not known yet).

Public Comment:

- A member of the public believes that the first problem is that HSR will do three EIRs and the construction packet timing does not make sense. They also believe HSR wanted to put a heavy maintenance facility in Brisbane and that [passing tracks are not needed in Millbrae.
- A member of the public noted that 16 businesses are being shown to be taken in the presentation, but is not needed. The existing ROW is 40 ft wide, adding two more tracks doesn't need to be 250 feet. With Alternative B, they are showing more passing track than the Caltrain Business Plan is. They also believe HSR is using outdated data and noted that every city in the SMART line corridor is a quiet zone.
- A member of the public stated there is some understandable confusion about the passing tracks. When HSR plans to get here, if Caltrain runs a clock face schedule, we should not go back to infrequent skip stop patterns. I would recommend another study when moving forward.
- A member of the public stated they would find it less confusing to separate A and B in the northern section. One point on the takings, that if they take one foot of property, they take all of property, there should be greater differentiation. If passing tracks were done, there is extra room for bike/ped paths.

Closing Remarks:

- A member asked as a practical manner, what the process is for ongoing coordination between HSR and Caltrain on passing tracks. (Caltrain and HSR staff answered that coordination has been a longstanding conversation. There is a blended-system working group and these conversations are ongoing. There are regular venues to pursue a blended system and coordinate on passing tracks). A member followed-up, asking as coordination continues that they anticipate coming to the two boards. (Caltrain and HSR staff answered that high-level decisions would come to the board, but smaller issues would probably be handled at a staff level).

- *A member asked if the Caltrain Board have time to make a comment on the HSR preferred alternative. (Caltrain staff answered, yes. At key milestones, Caltrain has always commented on HSR developments). Another member noted that the August Board meeting is devoted almost entirely to the Caltrain Business Plan, so although not an official agenda item, it will be discussed.*

6. Public Comment

- *A member of the public advocated that the increase in service involved in the Business Plan should be coordinated with other public transportation agencies to create seamless transfers. They also noted that there is a regional business case study for fare integration and suggested the board look at that sooner rather than later.*

7. LPMG Member Comments/Requests

- *A member noted that in honor of the 100 -year anniversary of women's suffrage, the member handed out Women's Caucus fliers.*

8. Next Meeting

Thursday, August 22, 2019 at 5:30 p.m.

9. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:09 p.m.