

**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC)
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (TA)
1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos CA 94070
Bacciocco Auditorium, 2nd Floor**

MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 28, 2012

MEMBERS PRESENT: B. Arietta (Chair), J. Bigelow, J. Fox, R. Hedges, R. Hees, E. Lasensky, J. Londer, D. Maez, L. Shaine, L. Simonson, A. Vargas, B. Warhurst, J. Whittemore

MEMBERS ABSENT: D. Mensing, G. Zimmerman

STAFF PRESENT: J. Ackemann, J. Hurley, M. Lee, N. McKenna

Chair Barbara Arietta called the meeting to order at 4:32 p.m. and Jeff Londer led the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion (Shaine/Bigelow) to approve the January 31, 2012 minutes was passed.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None

John Fox/Randy Hees/Elizabeth Lasensky arrived at 4:36 p.m.

ITEMS FOR REVIEW – MARCH 1, 2012 TA BOARD MEETING

Program Report: Transit: Caltrain Modernization (TA Item 10a)

Director of Caltrain Modernization Program Marian Lee reported:

- High Speed Rail (HSR) was approved by voters.
- The Caltrain corridor was selected to support HSR.
- Both Caltrain and HSR need to be an electrified system and a partnership was made to combine resources.
- The California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) had an original plan to have a “full build” project in the Peninsula with four tracks and grade separated. As this idea was being circulated among the communities it was rejected and CHSRA put the design and environmental activities on hold for this segment.
- While this was on hold elected officials proposed a “blended system” which is:
 - An electrified system from San Jose to downtown San Francisco.
 - Supports both Caltrain and HSR.
 - Uses the existing two tracks to minimize the impact to communities and lower project costs.
- As an operator, Caltrain asked if the blended system was feasible. Staff worked with LTK Consulting who developed a computer simulation of the existing railway. The

simulation modeled the existing mainline tracks, assumed the whole corridor was electrified, assumed the advanced signal system was in place and three HSR stations located at San Jose Diridon, Millbrae and for this exercise at 4th and King. The blended system goes to downtown San Francisco, but the model was an assessment of just the existing infrastructure. The last element tested was passing tracks for a segment, approximately 8-10 miles of the total corridor, adding one or two additional tracks for the purpose of allowing the HSR trains to bypass Caltrain.

- The model showed the two systems could share tracks.
- When there are no passing tracks, a total of eight trains (6 Caltrain 2 HSR) can be supported per direction per peak hour. Today Caltrain operates five trains per direction per peak hour. If the passing tracks are added, up to 10 trains (6 Caltrain 4 HSR) can be supported.
- Speeds were tested at 79 miles per hour, which is what Caltrain operates today, and also tested speeds up to 110 miles per hour. The model shows that both speeds are supportable.
- Staff released a draft Capacity Analysis. One of the biggest questions is what will be done with the 40 at-grade crossings along the corridor. If trains operate at less than 125 miles per hour there is no regulation that requires a grade separation. Staff needs to look at all the crossings, the California Public Utilities Commission considerations, Federal Railroad Administration considerations and local jurisdictions.
- Once these studies are completed, service plan options will be looked at.
- Anything staff contemplates will be a matter of trade-offs. Everyone is going to have to compromise, including Caltrain, cities and CHSRA, and it's staff's job to lay out what those compromises may be for the return on investment we want.
- The blended system alternatives will be environmentally studied before a locally preferred alternative is decided upon.
- The overall effort is two years and staff is about 6 months into the process.
- The early investment proposal:
 - CHSRA released a draft Business Plan that included the blended system concept and discusses early investment in existing rail systems.
 - Input to the CHSRA revised Plan included identification of early investment projects. Southern California projects have been defined and Bay Area projects are being defined.
- Early investment parameters include:
 - Projects identified must be located in the San Francisco to San Jose segment of the HSR system.
 - Projects must support the Caltrain Modernization Program and the HSR system.
 - It is done without compromising the local planning process.
 - Projects are implemented by 2020.
 - The money used would be Proposition 1A HSR funds with local, State or Federal. The amount of money for the Northern California segment is approximately \$2 billion.
- The draft proposal Caltrain would like to submit is a blended system to downtown San Francisco. The early investment would give Caltrain an electrified system and when HSR got to San Jose Diridon, Caltrain would serve as a transfer point for HSR passengers.

- Recommended priority projects are:
 - The advanced signal system
 - Caltrain electrification
 - Electric trains
 - Infrastructure upgrades
 - Rail crossing upgrades
 - San Francisco/San Jose upgrades
- Additional investment includes a “one seat” HSR ride from Los Angeles to San Francisco with cost and funding to be determined.
- Key projects that would make up the remainder of the projects to complete a blended system include:
 - The downtown extension project from 4th and King to the Transbay Terminal
 - HSR and Caltrain system integration
 - Infrastructure upgrade
 - Rail crossings upgrade
 - Passing tracks to be determined
 - Storage and maintenance facility to be determined
- Staff is studying five passing track concepts. Staff has not determined if they are needed or where they will be.
- Outreach includes city and county staff coordination, transportation agency coordination and city council meetings. Staff will be meeting with the San Mateo Rail Corridor Working Group on February 29 and the Peninsula Coordinating Council on March 2.
- The revised Business Plan is to be presented to the CHSRA Board on April 5. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) wants to present the regional strategy of the early investment proposal to their committee on March 14.

Randy Hees said he is very impressed with the work staff has done already. There are logically a lot of locations along the corridor that are not constrained that could have passing tracks and how likely are tracks in Santa Clara and Brisbane. Ms. Lee said there are five options. One is in the northern area from Bayshore to San Bruno, two versions in the area of Hayward Park to Redwood City and the southern area from Lawrence to Mountain View. The previous options were to add two tracks, but the fifth option was to add one additional track to support bi-directional HSR. There are other entities that operate this way so staff will study this idea to look at the level of impact to the right of way and Caltrain service.

Elizabeth Lasensky said she attended the San Carlos City Council study session on this topic. She asked when HSR trains come up corridor will they be diesel or electric. Ms. Lee said the trains will be electric.

Ms. Lasensky said people in San Carlos are concerned about the poles and how tall and intrusive they will be and emissions they give off. In the modernization of Caltrain is there a place for upgrading signage when the next train is coming and how many cars? Ms. Lee said the real time effort is finding money to run the program and staff can provide a status update. The poles and wires are all located within the right of way and the only thing out of the right of way is the utility boxes. Stakeholders have asked for the poles and wires be camouflaged.

Larry Shaine congratulated staff on the project to date. If grade separations are not 100 percent, staff should keep in mind the currently active TA projects like the Broadway Interchange and Highway 101. Ms. Lee said peninsula cities have expressed interest in doing some early grade separations and in the TA Program there is a Grade Separation Program. There is about \$170 million available and there is an opportunity to leverage dollar for dollar.

Mr. Shaine asked who the San Mateo Rail Corridor Working Group is. Ms. Lee said it was championed by the cities of San Mateo, Redwood City and Burlingame who were summoned to Congresswoman Anna Eshoo's office to work with CHSRA and their whole premise is to have a dialogue with neighboring cities and provide input to HSR. The group is comprised of elected officials.

Jim Bigelow said the Baby Bullet has an image for speed and in the proposal the residents of the counties might be more receptive if they see the electric multiple unit and HSR have the same speed envelope. HSR doing 110 miles per hour doesn't sell as well as cities looking for what it will do for them. Caltrain could go to a rapid transit format rather than a scheduled system. Two things that are important to get buy-in are the potential of rapid transit for Caltrain and it can travel at the same speed as HSR.

William Warhurst said with this much money being spent for trains, electricity, tracks, etc. is it possible to drop Caltrain and replace with BART and give HSR the tracks. Ms. Lee said staff has looked at a BART technology. There is an environmental document with Federal clearance and staff looked at different technologies of how to modernize the system. BART is a different infrastructure and the rail foundation would have to be redone. What staff is contemplating today builds on the existing infrastructure and it is less costly to do the electrification project than to do a BART like system.

John Fox said in the models studied, where were the passing tracks considered? Ms. Lee said the first section tested was Bayshore to Millbrae. It wasn't ideal for Caltrain because in that section it includes Millbrae and HSR will be stopping in Millbrae. The middle section studied was from Hayward Park to Redwood City and there is no HSR stops in this area. Stakeholders said just because this area worked don't forget to examine all the other options.

Mr. Fox asked what a rapid transit system is for Caltrain. Ms. Lee said the trains come frequently enough, headways are improved and no schedule is needed. Mr. Fox said how frequently Caltrain would run. Ms. Lee said a scenario with six Caltrains per hour would be one train every 10 minutes and with two HSR trains, the time may change.

Laurie Simonson said this early investment idea is great for Caltrain and a good case scenario especially if HSR doesn't come to fruition. She asked about the March 2 meeting. Ms. Lee said it is the Peninsula Cities Consortium and the meeting is at 8:15 a.m. in Brisbane.

Jeff Londer said he is concerned about the overhead wires and is there something other than overhead wires that can be used. Also how many miles of three tracks and four tracks currently exist? Ms. Lee said she can get that information and provide it to the CAC.

Jim Whittemore said when staff goes to the cities, don't ask for ways to get buy-in, just tell them exactly what you do and do not know. He asked if the software is off the shelf or in-house and how old is the software being used for this modeling. Ms. Lee said it is the LTK in-house model and it is called Train Ops. The Capacity Report dedicates two pages on what it is, when it was born and other properties it has been used.

Mr. Whittemore asked how accurate the modeling is and what is the last project this modeling was used. Ms. Lee said the model has been validated by other clients and staff has seen the projects where this software was used. Staff did have to do some validation of their own because of the corridor. They did do a few test runs and results fall within industry standards and then scenarios were carried out.

Mr. Whittemore asked if there is anywhere in the world where HSR trains are used on non-HSR tracks. Mr. Hees said in France.

Mr. Whittemore asked if there is a blended system with HSR and local system sharing same tracks anywhere. Mr. Hees said in the north east corridor between Washington D.C. to Boston. Ms. Lee said in all scenarios in the simulation model the Caltrain trains and HSR trains are running the same speed when sharing the tracks. The only exception is a hybrid was tested when there were passing tracks, the HSR trains were sped up.

Mr. Whittemore asked if there is any concern for running Caltrain and HSR at 110 miles per hour with the amount of distance between stations. Ms. Lee said there are two things that limit from running at 110 miles per hour and that is the number of station stops that we have and some of the curves on the tracks need some work to go at higher speeds.

Mr. Whittemore asked how this plays in with Union Pacific (UP) and the right of way. Ms. Lee said staff is in discussions with UP. The contractual relationship between UP and the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) is that we need to provide them at least one 30 minute slot between 10 a.m. and 3 p.m. and from midnight to 4:00 a.m. there will always be a track available for them. Staff has been asked to assess the impact to freight traffic and understand future plans to increase freight.

Mr. Whittemore said Canadian National Railroad is very actively working with Cummins Diesel to retrofit diesel trains to run on natural gas and the alternative of natural gas to electrification may turn out to be very advantageous. Why does it have to be electric because HSR is electric and can the diesel trains be converted? Mr. Hees said the equipment is at the end of its useful life and needs to be replaced. Ms. Lee said if HSR is forgotten Caltrain doesn't have to electrify, but we want to electrify and have had wanted to since before HSR. Staff was looking for greener technology, trying to contain operating and maintenance costs and going electric would help grow the system.

Mr. Whittemore said for trains to go from 4th and King to the Transbay Terminal a tunnel would have to be dug. Does this mean there will be two tunnels in this location because of the tunnel for Muni's Central Subway? Mr. Hees said this system goes underground before 4th & King. Ms. Lee said this configuration is another task under service plan/operations.

Approval of Minutes (TA Item 4a)

No discussion

Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenditures for January 2012 (TA Item 4b)

A motion (Hees/Shaine) to support acceptance of the Statement of Revenues and Expenditures for January 2012 was approved.

Authorize Execution of Master Agreement for State-Funded Transit Projects with the California Department of Transportation Division of Mass Transportation (TA Item 4c)

Mr. Whittemore asked if there is a copy of the Master Agreement available and is it different from the last one. Director of Transportation Authority Programs Joe Hurley said it is very similar to the agreement that expires today. Mr. Whittemore expressed concern that this agreement hadn't been brought to the CAC earlier being the current agreement is about to expire.

A motion (Bigelow/Hees) to support execution of a master agreement with Caltrans was approved.

Measure A Program Status

Mr. Whittemore said there are calls for projects coming up in spring 2012 besides the shuttle program, but noticed there were notations for alternative congestion relief and highway, yet there have been no presentations on these items. Mr. Hurley said this group received a presentation on the Highway Plan and in the Highway Plan they were told staff was going forward with a Call for Projects. There will be further presentations prior to the Highway Program Call for Projects.

Mr. Warhurst asked what "EXP Period Plan Percentage" is. Mr. Hurley said the Expenditure Plan that the voters approved has a distribution of how the sales tax will be funded.

Sam Trans Liaison Report – January 11, 2012 (TA Item 7)

No discussion

Update on State and Federal Legislative Program (TA Item 10b)

Government Affairs Officer Jayme Ackemann said everyone received an email this month from staff regarding House Resolution 7, which is the American Energy and Infrastructure Jobs Act of 2012. Staff was actively opposing it and sent letters urging Congresswomen Anna Eshoo and Senator Jackie Speier to oppose the legislation. The committee that was considering this legislation has decided to table this piece of legislation. Legislatures have said they are going to rework the provision in the legislation that would defund the mass transit account which is good news for us as long as what they come back with continues the 30 year commitment to funding mass transit through the collection of fuel taxes. Staff continues to support the president's proposal and the Senate bill that is also moving along the same lines to reauthorize transportation legislation.

In March, staff will be working closely with Assemblyman Jerry Hill and state coalition to introduce a piece of legislation that would authorize Caltrain to seek a three-county solution to the dedicated funding challenge that Caltrain finds itself in every year. Caltrain has an ongoing structural deficit that Caltrain looks each year to plug, often through one-time revenue sources,

but last year the San Mateo County Transit District was not able to meet its funding commitment and as a result all the funding partners reduced their funding commitment. Staff was able to work out a solution last year and have a framework for a solution for 2013 and potentially 2014, but beyond that there is no one-time money. Assemblyman Hill and his coalition would give staff an opportunity to place a sales tax measure or some type of tax measure on each of the three county ballots.

April Vargas said one of the questions people will have in the discussion of the blended system and electrification is how we are going to guarantee that Caltrain can keep running.

Ms. Ackemann said there is a two-step proposal for ensuring Caltrain's long-term solution to bridge the service until modernization. Farebox rough estimates, through modernization improvements, can make up as much as 50 percent of what is put into Operating Budget. Farebox revenue covers 50 percent of the budget to run the system, but the JPB partners have to make up the other 50 percent.

Ms. Simonson asked how procedurally this would work to put a tax measure on the ballot and suppose one county says no. Ms. Ackemann said staff would have to go to each county's Board of Supervisors and ask that they authorize the sales tax be placed on the ballot. This legislation would need a two-thirds majority to pass, not two-thirds majority in each county.

Chair Arietta asked about the San Mateo County only transit tax measure and would this be an option to the three county Caltrain funding bill. Ms. Ackemann said this is another tool in the kit. Whatever is decided, the earliest it will go to the voters is 2013 or 2014. Ms. Ackemann said anything staff proposes would have a sunset provision.

Doris Maez said one of the difficulties of sales tax is always the volatility issue and how is the volatility leveled out. Ms. Ackemann said when people are buying less, less is collected. When polling was done, a fuel tax was very unpopular and less likely to pass than a sales tax.

Capital Projects Quarterly Status Report – 2nd Quarter Fiscal Year 2012 (TA Item 10c)

Mr. Hurley said the only change in the report from last quarter is the Calera Parkway project with the schedule going from green to yellow due to a schedule slippage. In 2007, the Federal Highway Administration delegated Caltrans the authority to review the National Environmental Policy Act component of an environmental document. As part of that process, Caltrans put into place a trigger mechanism where if a project were of a certain complexity or have high public interest it would require additional Caltrans review. As a result of the number of comments received on this project and the complexity of the project, that trigger mechanism was put into effect. The additional review will add about four months (October 2012) to the environmental process.

Chair Arietta asked how many comments were received. Mr. Hurley said 260 pages of comments were received.

Mr. Shaine asked if most of the comments were environmental. Mr. Hurley said there was a broad array of comments.

Ms. Maez asked if this project will delay the opening of the tunnel. Mr. Hurley said no.

Mr. Whittemore said there are a few projects that are completed with considerable dollar amounts remaining. He asked what is done with the remaining funds and are there any post project reports done. Mr. Hurley said there is a final project report done that gives a final accounting of the total project. Any funds remaining get turned back to the appropriate funding source, i.e. Highway Programs, Grade Separation Programs, etc.

Mr. Fox left at 6:10 p.m.

Mr. Hees said he is trying to correlate the Caltrain electrification project with the quarterly project report and the report given earlier and the dollar amounts don't align.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR – BARBARA ARIETTA

Chair Arietta reported:

- Found a report from MTC on a new program to promote signalization of traffic signals owned by Caltrans. The cities of Redwood City and South San Francisco have received grants for this program.
- On February 29 at 10:30 a.m. there is a celebration of the completion of the San Jose Diridon and Santa Clara stations.

REPORT FROM STAFF – JOE HURLEY

Mr. Hurley said while the Brown Act has established what a quorum is, the TA Board was asked in 2005 by the CAC to lower the quorum to seven from eight in the event that some of the positions were vacant. There was an agreement that if there were vacant positions on the CAC, the quorum could be lowered, but only to seven and nothing below. Currently the CAC has a full 15 member body so the quorum is eight, but in the event of a vacancy, it would go to seven.

COMMITTEE COMMENTS

Mr. Whittemore asked if staff found out anything on the \$3.5 million in the annual report. Mr. Hurley said it had to do with the right of way acquisition associated with the Dumbarton Rail Corridor Project. The reason there was no payment towards the principal or interest is because there was no interest associated with it. An item was taken to the Board and the CAC to extend that payback period.

Mr. Whittemore asked if there is any place to look at expenditure line items on lobbying legislative costs and advocacy efforts.

Mr. Londer said he is concerned San Francisco is not paying their share for the Caltrain subsidy. On President's Day San Francisco got four trains arriving by 8:39 a.m. yet the first train to San Jose was at 9:05 a.m.

Chair Arietta said at the meeting with Assemblyman Hill, there was a question about the contribution from Santa Clara County, which has more people than San Mateo and San Francisco counties using the system.

Ms. Simonson asked if staff could explain acronyms before using them in a presentation.

Mr. Warhurst said there is a mobility management report in the Board packet and asked what is considered on-time. Mr. Hurley said within 5 minutes is considered on-time and if on-time is moved to 10 minutes the performance improves.

Mr. Warhurst said he was asked to participate in a Caltrans survey and had to completed a travel diary for a 24 hour period and was followed-up by phone calls too.

Ms. Vargas said on February 29 at 6:30 p.m. at Farralone School, there will be a mobility study for Highway 1 in the Montara area. Mr. Hurley asked if Caltrans is participating. Ms. Vargas said they granted the funding for this study.

Chair Arietta said she is producing a debate with senatorial candidates Sally Lieber and Assemblyman Hill at Sharp Park Golf Course on March 17 at 9:30 a.m.

Ms. Lasensky said a few months ago it was asked that there be a presentation on the Transit Village in San Carlos. Mr. Hurley said the question is how it pertains to the TA and since the TA doesn't fund it this is something that would not come before the CAC. But at the request of the CAC, he will look into it further and get back to the CAC.

Date and Time of Next Meeting

Tuesday, April 3, 2012 at 4:30 p.m. at 1250 San Carlos Avenue, Bacciocco Auditorium, 2nd Floor, San Carlos, CA 94070.

The meeting adjourned at 6:38 p.m.