

**Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board
Board of Directors Meeting
1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos CA 94070**

**MINUTES OF OCTOBER 4, 2018
SPECIAL MEETING**

MEMBERS PRESENT: J. Bruins, Chair; C. Brinkman, C. Chavez (9:13 a.m.), J. Gee, G. Gillett, C. Stone (9:07 a.m.), M. Zmuda

MEMBERS ABSENT: D. Davis, D. Pine

STAFF PRESENT: J. Hartnett, C. Mau, J. Cassman, T. Bartholomew, C. Boland, M. Bouchard, J. Brook, A. Chan, C. Cubba, C. Fromson, J. Funghi, B. Grizard, C. Gumpal, D. Hansel, M. Jones, L. Larano, D. Lieberman, L. Millard, C. Mobley-Ritter, S. Murphy, J. Navarro, S. Petty, M. Reggiardo, D. Stewart

CALL TO ORDER / PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Bruins called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m. She expressed appreciation to everyone for coming to an early meeting/workshop on the Caltrain Business Plan.

ROLL CALL

Acting District Secretary Gumpal called the roll. At the time of roll call, Directors Chavez, Davis, Pine, and Stone were absent. A quorum was present.

CALTRAIN BUSINESS PLAN UPDATE

Chair Bruins introduced Sebastian Petty, Senior Policy Advisor, who provided an in-depth quarterly update on the Caltrain Business Plan progress from July through September of 2018.

Mr. Petty recalled the purpose of the Business Plan: addressing the future potential of the railroad over the next 20-30 years, employing a long-term business strategy. The plan will address benefits, impacts and costs of future service and will allow the public and stakeholders an opportunity to engage in developing a more achievable and financially feasible railroad based on local, regional and statewide needs. Mr. Petty proceeded to present details based on four technical tracks contained in the plan: *Service, Business Case, Community Interface, and Organization* and discussed each segment in detail.

Mr. Petty briefly paused and responded to questions of board members.

Mr. Petty discussed the next steps in the Business Plan process and displayed a project schedule for a spring 2019 draft recommendation at a subsequent workshop, followed by final adoption of the plan. He thanked the partner agencies and stakeholders that have been involved in the formation of the plan and for their attendance at numerous meetings.

Board members provided commentary on the presentation:

Director Brinkman inquired if electrification and high speed rail could operate along the corridor without grade separations. Mr. Petty responded that electrification could operate and there would be issues with high speed rail; but ideally, the corridor should be fully separated for maximum operation.

Director Gee discussed several tension points that need to be considered through the planning process: using unconstrained thinking when it comes to planning the corridor and perhaps looking at what it would take to go to four tracks (versus planning for two future tracks only); keeping in mind that there will be issues, concerns and view in each of the 20 cities along the right of way in San Mateo County; thinking about whether a different partnership model for the agency should be reviewed; and acknowledging that all of these questions are hard questions to ask.

Director Stone thanked staff for an excellent presentation. He cautioned that, as the plan moves forward, we need to be wary of several things: pent up demand created by the system itself; how land use decisions effect the towns along the corridor; a need to embrace the awkward and painful discussions in the visioning process; a need to better define the system's financial challenges, such as lack of a dedicated revenue source; and how to envision what the future looks like without a dedicated funding source, and the resulting struggle between partners' contributions and/or service cuts.

Director Zmuda thanked the staff for such a huge undertaking. She inquired about the potential solutions to accomplish 42 grade separations; if the Business Plan budget was adequate; and if the plan analyzes the contracting out of service versus hiring employees to run the service. Mr. Petty responded that while funding would be an issue for grade separations, analysis needs to be performed on how to construct separations while still running a railroad. He stated that the Business Plan budget is adequate to finish the plan, and that the plan would review whether it is feasible to continue contracting out for employees from the private sector versus employing personnel directly as Caltrain employees.

Director Gillett stated she was delighted to serve on the ad hoc committee. She reiterated and echoed Director Gee's comments. She stated that the critical path in order to achieve electrification is resourcing the critically necessary technical people needed for that implementation of the new system; the needs should be defined and addressed.

Chair Bruins thanked Mr. Petty for his incredible work. She stated she supported some of the comments to broaden the thinking and encourage political will.

After further board member discussion and commentary, Chair Bruins called for public comment.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Nadia Naik, Californians Advocating Responsible Rail Design. She requested that the Local Policymaker Group be video streamed, and discussed train service scheduling and how to engage underserved cities along the corridor.

Jeff Carter, Millbrae, discussed a four track option, grade separations, constrained capacity and longer train consists.

Emily Beach, Burlingame, discussed the great attendance at the Local Policymaker Group, and stated the cities are depending on robust Caltrain service along the corridor as housing decisions are made.

Eric Schotmeier, Friends of the (SF) Downtown Extension and original Caltrain planning manager, discussed the importance of visioning and the importance of having service to downtown San Francisco and connections to regional carriers.

Vaugh Wolfe, Pleasanton, provided several suggestions to incorporate in the plan.

Adina Levin, Friends of Caltrain, expressed support for the Business Plan.

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, provided suggestions to incorporate into the Business Plan.

Director Chavez concluded by thanking staff for the presentation. She requested that when the Business Plan is brought back to the Board for further discussion, she would like to have a better discussion of the partnerships with local agencies, on what sources revenue are available to Caltrain and on the financial health of the agency.

ADJOURN

The special meeting adjourned at 10:24 a.m.

An audio/video recording of this meeting is available online at www.caltrain.com. Questions may be referred to the Board Secretary's office by phone at 650.508.6279 or by email to board@caltrain.com.