

CalMod Local Policy Maker Group (LPMG)
Summary Meeting Notes for April 22, 2021

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	M. Lempres	
Belmont	T. McCune	X
Brisbane	T. O'Connell	X
Burlingame	E. Beach	X
Gilroy	R. Armendariz	
Menlo Park	J. Wolosin	X
Millbrae	G. Papan	X
Mountain View	M. Abe-Koga	
Morgan Hill	R. Constantine	X
Palo Alto	P. Burt	X
Redwood City	M. Smith	X
San Bruno	M. Salazar	X
San Carlos	R. Collins	X
San Francisco	A. Sweet	X
San Jose	S. Jimenez	X
San Mateo	A. Lee	
Santa Clara	A. Becker	X
South San Francisco	E. Flores	X
Sunnyvale	R. Melton	X
San Francisco BOS	TBD	
San Mateo BOS	TBD	
Santa Clara BOS	TBD	
Chair	Jeff Gee	X
Vice Chair	Emily Beach	X

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

CALTRAIN STAFF: Sebastian Petty, Brent Tietjen, Ryan McCauley

1. Call to Order

Chair Jeff Gee called the meeting to order at 5:32 p.m.

2. Staff Report

Ryan McCauley, Government and Community Affairs Specialist for Caltrain provided updates on the executive leadership at the agency, free rides for people getting their COVID-19 vaccines, the new Hillsdale Station, and the bus bridge between Bayshore and San Francisco stations. Brent Tietjen, Government and Community Affairs Officer for Caltrain, provided a federal legislative update. The update included information on the American Jobs Plan, Surface Transportation Reauthorization bill, and the 2022 Appropriations bill.

LPMG members' key comments regarding the federal legislative update:

- A member asked if there was coordination between cities in lobbying efforts. (*Caltrain staff answered that coordination has gone on through the LPMG as well as the staff-coordinating group.*) The member followed-up asking if Caltrain supports city's earmark requests. (*Caltrain staff answered that they would be happy to send letters of support if they are in line with adopted Caltrain policies and goals.*) The member followed-up asking what the process is to get a letter of support from Caltrain. (*Caltrain staff answered that the agency has written several support letters for city proposals when requested. The requests can be sent Caltrain staff.*) The member followed-up asking for the group to receive copies of the support letters the agency has written. (*Caltrain staff said they would provide them.*)
- A member asked if Caltrain made cities aware that they would be able to provide letters of support. (*Caltrain staff answered that the companion staff-coordinating group was made aware that the agency could provide letters of support.*)
- A member asked how the funding level of the FAST Act compares to previous versions of the bill. (*Caltrain staff noted that they didn't have the information on hand, but can get confirmation and deliver the information to the member. Staff also noted that these bills could be combined and that the numbers are still preliminary.*)
- A member thanked staff for coordinating and advocating for increased grade-separation funding and commented on the necessity of increased funds.
- A member noted in the Advocacy letter the mention of supporting projects in Plan Bay Area, and asked if Caltrain would support any project included in the document. (*Caltrain staff answered that they included the note about projects included in Plan Bay Area to show concurrence among parties to Congressional delegates, but would likely only provide support letters on projects that have an effect on the Caltrain corridor.*)
- A member asked what the procedure is for cities to receive a letter of support. (*Caltrain staff answered that requests can be sent to Caltrain planning and/or Government Affairs and they will determine if it is in line with adopted Caltrain policies.*)

Public Comments:

- A member of the public asked if acting Executive Director, Michelle Bouchard, was on the call and if they were aware of federal regulations requiring new or reconfigured stations to include level boarding platforms. (*Chair Gee noted that she was not at the meeting, but would follow-up with the request.*)
- A member of the public noted the excitement for potential influx of federal funding for transit projects. The member of the public noted there is a call for continued federal funding for transit operations, and asked if Caltrain has a position on the issue. They also commented that they did not see representatives from San Francisco or San Jose at the meeting and coordination with the large cities on the corridor should be included for advocacy efforts. (*Chair Gee followed up asking if by the corridor that included DTX or just the existing corridor as is.*) The member of the

public responded that they meant to include DTX and Diridon. (*Caltrain staff added that the advocacy letter included DTX and Diridon and has been supportive of lobbying efforts for the lead agencies of those projects.*)

- A member of the public asked if funding could be sought for the midline station at Redwood City.

3. Caltrain Electrification Project: Construction and Vehicle Manufacturing Update

Brent Tietjen, Caltrain's Government and Community Affairs Officer, provided an update to member on Caltrain Electrification construction and manufacturing and testing of the electric trains.

LPMG members' key comments and questions:

- A member asked what speed the trains are being tested at in Pueblo, Colorado. (*Caltrain staff responded that trains will be brought up to 110 mph at the testing facility. Staff noted that trains will not be going that speed on the corridor.*)
- A member asked how the trains will be delivered to Caltrain. (*Staff responded that the trains were shipped to the testing facility via flatcar, and presumes that is how they will be shipped to California.*)

Public Comments:

- A member of the public commented that at the Caltrain Citizen's Advisory Committee, Caltrain staff noted that the trains were brought up to 115 mph. The member of the public thought that was insufficient and should build in a 10% safety margin.

4. California High-Speed Rail: Update (Presented by California High-Speed Rail Authority Staff)

Rebecca Fleischer, Northern California Outreach Representative for the High-Speed Rail Authority, gave a presentation on the High-Speed Rail Business Plan and updates to the supplemental draft EIR/EIS.

LPMG members' key comments regarding the High-Speed Rail Authority's Business Plan presentation:

- A member asked for clarification on the EIR/EIS documents and the Business Plan. (*HSR Staff responded that the supplemental EIR addresses biological issues that have surfaced in the last year. Those changes will go through a public comment period and be included in the final draft version of the EIR/EIS, which will be released later this year.*) The member followed-up asking if staff could share some of the concerns or comments made by California legislators. (*HSR staff noted that they did not have that information, but can provide to the member.*)
- A member asked if HSR staff could restate the purpose of the Business Plan. (*HSR staff responded that the purpose is to restate the purpose of the Authority's mission and ability to meet its objectives.*) The member followed-up commenting that they understood the Business Plan as a legislative obligation to ensure lawmakers the Authority's ability to meet its obligations. The member asked if HSR staff could lay out the obligations for the group. (*HSR staff answered stating that the obligations and objectives are on the website and can be shared.*) The member followed-up noting that they understand the Business Plan to be the vehicle to which the Authority is held accountable by the state legislature and took issue with how it was characterized.

Public Comments:

- A member of the public commented that they would like a chat box to be added to the meetings and that they do not understand why there was environmental clearance from San Jose to 4th and King station in San Francisco when Prop 1A mandated the northern terminus to be at the Transbay Terminal. They also commented that they should environmentally clear from Transbay to Gilroy and that they believe the line should go from Gilroy directly to Fresno.

5. Public Comments on Items Not on the Agenda

- A member of the public commented that VTA announced they would withdraw their contribution to Caltrain. They also commented that they disagree with merging Caltrain with BART, but supports having BART run administration for Caltrain.
- A member of the public raised concerns with the direction of the Dumbarton rail study and the evaluation of autonomous vehicle options.

6. LPMG Member Comments/Requests

- A member noted that there are 29 at-grade crossings along the Caltrain corridor in San Mateo County and that they are working with local mayors to advocate for funding for grade separations.
- A member asked for an update on the corridor-wide grade separation strategy when appropriate.
- A member apologized for being late, but wanted to note that they were able to attend.

8. Next Meeting

Thursday, May 27, 2021 at 5:30 p.m.

9. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 6:27 p.m.