

**Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB)  
Board of Directors Workshop  
1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos CA 94070**

**MINUTES OF MAY 20, 2015**

Chair Adrienne Tissier called the meeting to order at 9:09 a.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS**

The workshop was open to the public.

JPB Board Members Present: J. Gee, R. Guilbault, T. Nolan, A. Tissier (Chair), K. Yeager

JPB Board Members Absent: J. Cisneros, M. Cohen, A. Kalra, P. Woodward

JPB Staff: D. Couch, G. Harrington, J. Hartnett, C. Harvey, R. Haskin, M. Lee, M. Martinez, M. Simon, S. van Hoften

California High-Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) Staff: F. Banko, B. Tripousis

**ELECTRIC MULTIPLE UNIT (EMU) REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP) POLICY DISCUSSION  
RELATED TO EMU PROCUREMENT AND DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS**

This workshop was held with JPB Board members and the public to discuss the policies related to the EMU RFP, the EMU procurement, and design considerations. Topics discussed were the electrification project update, EMU boarding height at CHSRA stations or all Caltrain stations, the potential path forward, and CHSRA common-level boarding and trainsets.

Stakeholder request for car modifications: Can Caltrain modify EMUs to not preclude 50-inch boarding in the future?

- Two modification options presented:
  - Cars with more doors
  - Cars with traps
- Short-term solution:
  - Design car with two sets of doors (cars with more doors option)
  - Keep high doors sealed and use low doors
  - Car configured similar to original EMUs (mitigate challenges)
  - Request CHSRA to fund modification costs

Marian Lee, Executive Officer, Caltrain Modernization (CalMod) Program, said the 2008 total CalMod Program cost was \$1.5 billion, which included the Communications-based Overlay Signal System Project. Of that \$1.5 billion, \$1.2 billion is for electrification. A revised cost estimate was done last year, and the \$1.2 billion went up to \$1.5 billion, and did not include costs related to purchasing rail cars with many doors. Staff has been working with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and other funding partners on filling the \$300 million to \$400 million gap. An updated Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) would have a funding commitment for the updated electrification cost of \$1.5 billion, and the JPB would ask CHSRA to pay for any

incremental cost associated with more doors. This cost would be defined, which would provide the commitment to issue award for the electrification project.

Ben Tripousis, Northern Regional Director, CHSRA, said CHSRA has discussed helping fund the conversion of the remaining 25 percent of the Caltrain commuter fleet to arrive at a fully operational electrified service in the corridor sooner rather than later. Any added expense associated with adding additional doors to the vehicles is something the CHSRA will consider and investigate, but they are not ready to concede that there will be significant increases. These are not customized vehicles and are in common operation and could be modified in a way that develops an economy of scale that helps keep the costs down, for instance, by taking actions to purchase the remainder of the fleet. At the same time, CHSRA is looking to keep costs down on the broader electrification project by working with Caltrain staff on alternative technical concepts and emphasizing the price of the contract over the specific technical aspects. Any discussion of future additional funding has to be carefully considered. To the extent additional funding is consistent with the MOU and complies with any legislative requirements, CHSRA will absolutely pursue it and is prepared to participate in identifying those numbers and developing a clear path to funding the vehicles and electrification.

Director Ken Yeager said one scenario is to go with the original EMU at 25 inches, along with the diesel cars, and the stations would need to be modified to board either one of those. Chuck Harvey, Deputy CEO, said operations can begin in 2020 with the platforms at the existing eight inches above top of rail, so just like customers now have to come up one step to get into a vehicle for the current bi-level diesels, they will have to take a step up into the EMUs; the new equipment can operate with the existing platforms as they are today. This will have to be done because there is not money, time, engineering, or environmental clearance to raise the platforms to 25 inches by 2020.

Director Yeager said that is one route to go because there is no need for environmental clearance, the costs are somewhat known, it will be a little cheaper to go with a standard car, and it can be done fairly quickly compared to the car with the four doors and the 50-inch platform height. Mr. Harvey said an RFP has been drafted with the original plan, but staff has the ability to modify that document quickly. There is an idea to share the RFP with the industry to get some feedback, which gives staff an opportunity to take what they hear from the builders and find fatal flaws before coming back to the Board to ask for permission to advertise the RFP. He said if the order is delayed too long, the older diesel vehicles will be operated longer in the mixed service. He said he agrees that the costs of having four doors per car aren't completely known until the numbers come back from the builders. There is a possibility to mitigate the cost or structure the RFP in a way to have transparency in the pricing. The real numbers will start coming in this year.

Director Yeager asked if there is an advantage of going with what is known, which might be done quicker, because Caltrain is bursting at the seams and electrification needs to be done now. Ms. Lee said the vehicle makers said they can deliver the cars with more doors in the same timeframe as the original plan, so regardless of which car Caltrain gets, both will be ready in the 2020 timeframe. When the draft RFP is issued,

that will be confirmed. If it were to cost more, there is risk associated with getting the original cars as well as the new cars. There is a funding gap of \$300 million to \$400 million to get the original cars, and the funding gap for cars with more doors could be that same cost plus more, or possibly less, but the vehicle makers will let the JPB know.

Director Yeager said going with an RFP that would include both types of cars keeps the options open, without forcing the Board to make a final decision. Ms. Lee said there is flexibility with the draft RFP to explore all types of options and get confirmation, but ideally staff would like to have a clearer path by the time the RFP is released. If the path forward continues to make sense, in July there will be an action item for the Board to release the RFP with definition on the framework to procure cars with double sets of doors, configured in a way to activate only one set of doors now, with flexibility to do something different in the future. The second key policy issue will be a framework to balance the seats, standees, bathrooms, and bikes.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said he came across a train in Europe that has separated the doors and toilets from the rest of the train, so regardless of the platform height the rest of the train with passengers never changes. These trains could alternate between different platform heights. The train is unique in the world and is a breakthrough in commuter passenger design. He said the people who are deciding how this will work for the United States are the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA).

Jeff Carter, Millbrae, said CHSRA should not dictate Caltrain's platform designs. Caltrain is the number one priority for this Board. The dual door configuration shows promise. He hopes a workable solution will be found soon. Caltrain needs to look at eight- or 10-car trains to make up for lost seating due to bathrooms and doors and other factors. Caltrain should have more than six trains per hour on the system because Caltrain is at capacity now and couldn't handle more than twice the existing capacity without longer trains and more trains per hour.

David Parkinson, San Francisco, said all of the East Coast trains are operated in a push/pull configuration, which has a benefit over EMUs because old cars can still be used until high-speed rail exists in California. That would allow electric trains to run until CHSRA starts, and when CHSRA starts, high level boarding can begin on new cars. He said EMUs might not be the best option for this corridor.

Margaret Okuzumi, Sunnyvale, said it is important to get a ruling from the FRA because it would have an impact on the configuration of the cars. The blended system approach will have a huge impact on Caltrain operations. Compatibility issues with multiple platform heights will confuse passengers and impact dwell time. She said it would be better to figure out how CHSRA trains could work with a lower platform height. Dwell time impacts on CHSRA will affect fewer people than dwell time impacts on Caltrain.

Vaughn Wolffe, Pleasanton, said at some point in the distant future, all the passenger platforms will have to be the same height throughout the country. The four-door consideration depends on if the price is tolerable with the ability to make changes to the platforms in the future. This way, Caltrain can carry the maximum number of

people. This is a 100-year decision. He said there should be A and B trains and A and B stations where only certain doors open at certain stations.

Paul Jones, Atherton, said he has not heard any mention of not providing common boarding height with CHSRA. Three CHSRA stations are anticipated on the line: the Transbay Terminal, which is under construction, San Jose Diridon, which will require modifications to accommodate CHSRA anyway, and Millbrae. For the Board to modify all of the trainsets for the purpose of matching platform heights with CHSRA at one station makes no sense. He said Gilroy is not an issue because CHSRA cannot use the Union Pacific lines, so the CHSRA Gilroy station will be displaced from Caltrain's. The Board should build the cars to suit Caltrain's needs and let CHSRA worry about itself.

Shirley Johnson, San Francisco Bicycle Coalition, said level boarding is important for people who have trouble walking, people in wheelchairs, people with luggage, bicycles, or strollers. As a customer, she is happy that level boarding will happen.

Clem Tiller, San Carlos, said level boarding is the generational issue facing Caltrain, is critically important, and is the enabler for the blended system. Level boarding provides short and predictable dwell times. He said every single platform will be rebuilt regardless of the option the Board selects, so the cost isn't necessarily a big deal because in the past 16 years, Caltrain has rebuilt 37 platforms. The transition is very complicated when considering the additional complexity of the option with cars with more doors.

Greg Conlon, Atherton, said he questions the safety of the options being proposed. He said four trains per hour for CHSRA exceeds the capacity of the tracks. He is concerned the JPB will not be able to run the railroad with that amount of passing tracks and meet the demands of both CHSRA and Caltrain. He said Caltrain might have to go to four tracks to make this system work with the demands the JPB is putting on it, but he is not sure any city would support four tracks. He said he is concerned about rogue engineers and the Board should take precautions until Positive Train Control is on the trains.

Andy Chow, Redwood City, said Caltrain should take the best floor height for its operations. Even though compatibility is highly desirable, there is a tradeoff. Level boarding is important for bikes, wheelchairs, and disabled persons who have trouble walking. Requiring people to change levels once inside the train may not be Americans with Disabilities Act compliant. He said the Transbay Joint Powers Authority should be involved in the conversation and solution because the Transbay Terminal is too small to hold all the trains. He said there should be alternative platform designs to meet the goal of level access.

Adina Levin, Friends of Caltrain, said the Board member's suggestion to create a matrix to evaluate the choices is a great idea. One of the considerations is the benefits to both CHSRA and Caltrain, and it would be great to see on one page the numbers or qualitative estimates of the impact of seating and standing capacity, the number of trains and amount of service into the Transbay Terminal—which is going to be the highest usage station on the line—and the relative impacts on dwell time, which contributes to overall passenger time. These are things that may negatively or positively affect Caltrain service, not just CHSRA. She would like to hear about the timeline to get

Joint Powers Board Workshop Meeting  
Minutes of May 20, 2015

to level boarding and how it would be funded. She said Europe is moving toward the standard of having lower-platform compatible high-speed trains. She asked what the risk is of looking at low-platform level-boarding options for CHSRA.

The next regular meeting will be Thursday, June 4, 2015, 10 a.m. at San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building, Bacciocco Auditorium, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070.

The meeting adjourned at 11:57 a.m.