

**CalMod Local Policy Maker Group (LPMG)
Summary Meeting Notes for November 19, 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	X
Brisbane	T. O'Connell	
Burlingame	E. Beach	X
Gilroy	C. Tucker	X
Menlo Park	B. Nash	X
Millbrae	R. Holober	
Mountain View	J. McAlister	X
Morgan Hill	R. Constantine	X
Palo Alto	L. Kou	X
Redwood City	S. Masur	
San Bruno	M. Salazar	X
San Carlos	R. Collins	X
San Francisco	VACANT	
San Jose	S. Jimenez	
San Mateo	A. Lee	
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	X

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

CALTRAIN STAFF: Casey Fromson, Sebastian Petty, John Funghi, Ryan McCauley

HIGH-SPEED RAIL STAFF: Morgan Galli, Paul Hebditch, Rebecca Fleischer

1. Call to Order

Vice Chair Emily Beach called the meeting to order at 5:33 p.m.

2. Staff Report

Casey Fromson, Director of Government and Community Affairs for Caltrain, provided an update that the Measure RR has officially passed, providing a 1/8 cent sales tax to Caltrain. With that, ridership remains low at around six percent, and the funds allocated in the measure will not be available until summer 2021 and available to the agency until fall 2021. There are monthly discussions at the Board level regarding resource allocation and balancing the budget. Casey Fromson also asked members to notify staff if there are any changes to membership for the LPMG.

Public Comments:

- A member of the public commented that the measure did not reach the 2/3 threshold in Santa Clara county and speculates that it may be in part about South County service and governance.

3. Caltrain Business Plan: Service Planning

Sebastian Petty, Caltrain Deputy Chief of Planning, presented on the COVID recovery planning work and the update on the near term service changes.

LPMG members' key comments regarding the Caltrain Business Plan presentation:

- A member asked staff to clarify what would service look like for lower-capacity stations if the more popular stations received 30-minute headways. *(Caltrain staff answered that those stations would likely receive hourly service.)*
- A member commented that they liked the idea of the half-hour service in off-peak. They followed-up asking, if the two trains per hour will continue when the pandemic ends. *(Caltrain staff answered that when the pandemic ends and there is higher demand, they would like to have more frequent service than twice hourly.)*
- A member asked staff if there is a timeline for when service will be re-evaluated. *(Caltrain staff answered that they are targeting a re-evaluation in quarter one of 2021. Staff also noted that they will be constantly monitoring other factors such as vaccines, the tiers in which the three counties are in, major employer trends, occupancy levels, and regional upticks.)*
- A member asked if it was fair to say that staff will keep their finger on the pulse of any COVID-related developments. *(Caltrain staff answered yes, that is a fair characterization and why staff has proposed a service framework that can be easily scaled up or down.)*
- A member asked for staff to clarify which level of service the agency is moving to. *(Caltrain staff answered that the agency is moving to the 'limited service').* The member followed up, noting there is a note on the South County service slide about service increasing when ridership recovers. The member asked staff to clarify is there was a separate standard for ridership recovery in South County, as opposed to the rest of the corridor, and if it ridership does return, what that means for service south of San Jose. *(Caltrain staff answered they do not have a definitive answer at this point, noting that pre-pandemic there were three round trip trains serving South County and there were promises of a fourth train. Staff also noted that South County does not have any different standards for ridership recovery.)*
- Chair Bruins commented in respect to South County, two trains a day makes it extremely difficult to evaluate ridership recovery and staff should work to get back to three round trips as soon as possible. Chair Bruins also noted that this was her last meeting, and thanked staff for their consistently high-quality presentations.

Public Comments:

- A member of the public noted that Capitol Corridor ridership is about 15 percent of pre-COVID levels and speculates that it may be due to the level of service and commented on the capacity to ensure proper social distancing. They also believed that a mix of local and express trains was the way to move forward. They also said if midday express trains do not go to Tamien, it is not useful to for themselves and they assume others South of San Jose.

4. Caltrain Electrification Project

John Funghi, Caltrain's CalMod Chief Officer, presented on the Grade Crossing Activation System that is being designed and installed as part of the Caltrain Electrification Project.

LPMG members' key comments and questions:

- A member asked what this would mean in terms of gate down time for residents. *(Caltrain staff answered that most residents will likely not notice any difference, that some crossings will have slightly longer gate down times, and other crossings will have slightly shorter gate down times, but it is a matter of seconds. Other factors that more heavily impact gate down times are the train schedule and frequency.)* The member followed up, asking if there is any quantification of gate down times that may inform how quickly cities proceed with grade separation projects. *(Caltrain staff answered that the agency is working to complete side-by-side analysis of total gate down time for each intersection, but does not have an exact comparison for every crossing at this point. Caltrain staff added that the CalMod team will coordinate with each city along the corridor individually to ensure that the Grade Crossing Activation System works and is matched to the intersection's unique qualities and characteristics.)* Chair Bruins followed up, asking all things being equal, including number of trains and train schedule, that there is very little difference in gate down time. *(Caltrain staff answered that that was a fair characterization.)* Chair Bruins noted that gate down time is more affected by train schedule and frequency.

Public Comments:

- A member of the public commented that they knew about this issue for ten years and that a solution was developed by Invensys. They also noted that this issue is similar to an issue in CBOSS, and they proposed they test multiple solutions at a test track in Colorado before implementing a system along the corridor. They also suggested that the solution be separated from the Electrification contract and bid on through an RFP process.
- A member of the public stated that the system proposed, will treat trains as either going 79 mph or 59mph. They believe that if a train moving at a lower speed than 59 mph through an intersection may dramatically increase gate down time. The member of the public noted that they created a graph of the difference in times and will send to the members and noted that they do not believe the proposed system will be satisfactory. *(Caltrain staff answered that they appreciated the comments from the public, and noted that the system is an expansion of an existing system in use today. Staff also noted that the solution will be tested on rails as it is cut over prior to full electrification of the system. Staff added that all cities will be given exact data about how gate down times will change during the design process.)*

5. California High-Speed Rail Update

Morgan Galli, Northern California Regional Stakeholder Manager, provided updates to the high-speed rail project and findings from the outreach survey conducted in fall of 2020. Paul Hebditch, Lead for Operations with the High-Speed Rail Authority, provided some international examples of blended operations.

LPMG members' key comments and questions:

- A member noted that the visuals are very excited, but asked if the renderings showing Brisbane included the Bay Lands Development or if it is with existing conditions. *(HSR staff answered that the renderings do not include the proposed development – it is just existing conditions, but the Environmental Document takes the adopted development in consideration.)* The member stated that they hope the CA High-Speed Rail Authority is in close communication with Brisbane. *(HSR staff added that they are in communication with the City and the Developer).*
- Chair Bruins added that it would be helpful if any renderings and visualizations included approved developments noting it is easier for local elected leaders to show to members of the public. *(HSR staff stated that they noted the comment and will take the comment back to the project team.)*

Public Comments:

- A member of the public commented that if the second Transbay Tube is complete, the maintenance facility can be placed in Oakland where the old Amtrak maintenance facility was. They also noted that they shared videos with HSR of blended systems in the United Kingdom showing freight and passenger rail.

6. Public Comments on Items Not on the Agenda

- A member of the public stated that they are saddened that Chair Bruins will no longer be on the Caltrain Board and therefore Chair of the LPMG, and thanked her for her service. They believe that directors should be elected directly, and not limited by local government term limits.

7. LPMG Member Comments/Requests

LPMG members' key comments:

- A member thanked Chair Bruins for being a fantastic Chair for the LPMG and noted that she has consistently shown up and been present.
- Another member echoed the sentiments thanking Chair Bruins, and noted that every election serves as a proposed term-limit. They noted Chair Bruins' thoughtfulness and caring displayed at the meetings.
- Another member wanted to add thanks to Chair Bruins for her commitment and her insights.

8. Next Meeting

Thursday, December 17, 2020 at 5:30 p.m.

9. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:35 p.m.