

**CalMod Local Policy Maker Group (LPMG)
Summary Meeting Notes for November 29, 2018**

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 | D. Hurt | X |
| Brisbane | T. O'Connell | X |
| Burlingame | E. Beach | X |
| Gilroy | C. Tucker | |
| Menlo Park | R. Cline | |
| Millbrae | R. Holober | X |
| Mountain View | L. Siegel | X |
| Morgan Hill | S. Tate | X |
| Palo Alto | A. Fine | X |
| Redwood City | S. Masur | |
| San Bruno | R. Medina | X |
| San Carlos | R. Collins | X |
| San Francisco | G. Gillett | X |
| San Jose | S. Jimenez | X |
| San Mateo | D. Papan | X |
| Santa Clara | K. Watanabe | X |
| South San Francisco | K. Matsumoto | X |
| Sunnyvale | G. Larsson | X |
| San Francisco BOS | TBD | |
| San Mateo BOS | TBD | |
| Santa Clara BOS | TBD | |

CHAIR: Jeff Gee

VICE CHAIR: Emily Beach

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

CALTRAIN STAFF: Casey Fromson, Sebastian Petty

1. Staff Report

None.

2. Caltrain Business Plan

Sebastian Petty, Caltrain Senior Advisor, provided an update on major service planning work and the development of a “high growth” 2040 service scenario including refinement of travel market assessment and application to service planning work.

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

- *A member asked for clarification regarding what recovery time means in the context of initial rail operating parameters. (Caltrain staff said this is a built-in padding factor used in service planning to allow for flexibility and resiliency.)*
- *A member asked if staff was referring to tracks or stations when describing infrastructure. (Caltrain staff said he was primarily referring to tracks, but station planning and platform lengthening will also be covered.)*
- *A member asked if the areas around the existing Caltrain Stations would be assessed. (Caltrain staff said yes, and that these assessments will be included in the business plan process.)*
- *A member asked whether or not Caltrain will aim to achieve 15-minute frequency during off-peak hours. (Caltrain staff said they are focusing on the peak hours first because it helps size the overall infrastructure needed, but in general they plan to look at higher off-peak service levels and this would be discussed more next month.)*
- *A member pointed out that cities keep approving developments near Caltrain stations assuming capacity will be there. The member asked if there will be a better process for interaction between Caltrain and the cities so that when cities are looking at Transit Oriented Development, they can rely on the train. (Caltrain staff said this would be a desirable outcome of the process as Caltrain would like to have a productive dialogue with the cities.)*
- *A member stressed the need to look at last-mile connections, such as connections to Cupertino via highway 85. (Caltrain staff responded by saying that a larger discussion surrounding last mile connectivity is forthcoming.)*
- *A member asked how flexible the plan will be and how Caltrain will test possible ridership if a city, such as South San Francisco, doesn’t currently have ridership numbers but expects those numbers to grow. The member also asked how this is weighed into level of service. (Caltrain staff noted that while that part of north San Mateo County does not currently see high ridership, they do anticipate growth in that area and have thus included increases in service as part of service planning.)*
- *A member noted that some cities may grow faster than anticipated, and so by implementation the numbers may be out of date. (Caltrain staff said he will talk about the practical limits of what can be supplied along the corridor, but pointed out that even with aggressive investment there are limits to how much service can be supplied on the corridor.)*
- *A member asked how many current Caltrain stations can handle a 10 to 12-car train. (Caltrain staff said the maximum the plan is considering are 10-car trains, and not many stations could handle this length at this time.)*
- *A member asked what the length of a station would need to be in order to accommodate a 10-car train. (Caltrain staff said a 10-car train is 875 feet long.)*

- *A member asked if Caltrain is looking at 10 trains per hour or more. (Caltrain staff responded by saying that within the “high growth” scenario they are considering what it would mean to operate 12 to 16 trains per hour including the HSR trains through the blended system, noting the Caltrain trains would need to be longer – so both longer trains and increasing the number of trains would be needed.)*
- *A member asked what happened to the option that examined using an overtake with a passing track down the middle. (Caltrain staff said they looked at these in the past but for the purposes of these concepts, they started with service. Staff also said they believe the overtakes shown are the smallest /most efficient possible to achieve these levels of service.)*
- *Another member asked if Caltrain is looking at mid-line transfers. (Caltrain staff said they had been looking at it and will get back to the member.)*
- *A member asked what are the right of way assumptions around passing tracks. (Caltrain staff said that generally 4-track segments are roughly 100 feet wide, but the exact amount of right of way varies based on specific designs and site conditions. Staff noted feasibility analysis and design efforts would be required to understand the exact requirements for any one specific overtake.)*
- *A member noted they are making improvements along the corridor and want to be sure they’re not building things that will then need to be torn down; therefore, they’d like to know ahead of time as much as possible about passing tracks and infrastructure needs that might impact city right of way. (Caltrain staff said they understood, and that is one of the reasons they’re going through this process.)*
- *A member said that two service concepts stand out as being better for Belmont – 1) local express with reduced passing tracks, and 2) zone express with 12 trains. The member noted there is fear regarding what one track means to the corridor in terms of transportation and the economy. The member said they are planning for a future downtown that involves both sides of the corridor and encouraged Caltrain to be thoughtful about the smaller cities that use the corridor for different needs.*
- *A member said they want more stops in Belmont and asked for specifics about what future Belmont service would look like. (Caltrain staff responded by saying all of the concepts are illustrative, but noted if one counts the stops on the diagrams, one can see direct trade-offs between service and infrastructure. Staff noted they created individual city-focused factsheets that are based on existing conditions, and that Caltrain will update these to help cities evaluate options and impacts.)*
- *A member asked what the current two-track ROW width is. (Caltrain staff answered the ROW Caltrain owns varies substantially along the corridor.)*
- *A member said it would be helpful to understand origin-destination patterns on the corridor, as well as passenger travel times for key OD pairs. (Caltrain staff said they will incorporate this information into future presentations and factsheets.)*
- *A member asked how many feet of platform is needed for 6-car, 8- car and 10-car trains as it would help them evaluate how much room they have and what they need to budget for in terms of city contributions. (Caltrain staff said they will provide this information.)*
- *A member asked if the service plan assumes a max speed of 80mph. (Caltrain staff said the maximum speed will be 110 mph when it’s a fully blended system, although not all trains would operate at that speed.)*

- *A member noted the end-to-end time doesn't seem to be reduced compared to current baby bullet trains. (Caltrain staff confirmed this but pointed out the number of station stops made between San Francisco and San Jose would be significantly higher than the number of stops made today.)*

Public Comments:

- *A member of the public said construction enhancements should be prioritized. He also said the Blossom Hill data is out of date and that a platform length of 1400 feet is needed to accommodate a 16-car consist.*
- *A member thanked staff and noted the need to assess ridership differences in terms of infrastructure (number of cars the concept would take off the road); and the need to evaluate OD pairs; as well as the need for an explicit explanation of how the infrastructure will help service.*
- *A member noted his appreciation for the presentation and said it would be helpful to compare Caltrain travel times to HSR from San Francisco to San Jose times. He also encouraged consideration of sister cities like Foster City and Redwood Shores.*

3. Caltrain Electrification Project

Casey Fromson, Director of Government and Community Affairs, noted that information about the project was provided in the monthly report

4. HSR Updates

Boris Lipkin, HSR Acting Northern California Regional Director, discussed HSR milestones and statewide updates. Morgan Galli, HSR Government Relations Specialist, shared a Northern California update and discussed environmental justice outreach and HSR's connecting community strategy.

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

- *A member inquired about a new Brisbane map for the HSR project to San Francisco. (HSR staff said that they would send the member two maps. One corridor-wide map and one more detailed map that show different alternative plans for a passenger rail yard in Brisbane.)*
- *A member requested that future HSR updates include information about what is being constructed and what the projected timelines are for the construction. (HSR staff said that they would provide construction videos and additional information during the next month's presentation.)*

5. Public Comment

- *The speaker asked when HSR will release information about electrification to Gilroy and whether or not HSR's plans will include Caltrain's plans for electrification.*

6. LPMG Member Comments/Requests

No items to report.

7. Next Meeting

Thursday, December 20, 2018 at 5:30 p.m.