



CITY OF
**PALO
ALTO**

City Council Rail Committee
MINUTES

Special Meeting
August 10, 2012

ROLL CALL

Chair Klein called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. in the Council Conference Room, 250 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto, California.

Present: Chair Klein, Council Member Burt, and Vice Mayor Scharff

Absent: Council Member Shepherd

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: Vice Mayor Scharff moved, seconded by Council Member Burt to approve the Minutes of March 1, 15, and 22, 2012.

MOTION PASSED: 3-0, Shepherd absent

3. Report from the Professional Evaluation Group, Inc.

John Garamendi Jr., Professional Evaluation Group, Incorporated joined the meeting via conference call. He attempted to locate the comfort letters suggested in the last session, but had no success. He was watching for California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) changes; however, he understood the Governor would not be making major changes. He attended the California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) Board meeting the prior week, where there were discussions about beginning work on the Chowchilla "Y" as soon as possible. He expected the alternative analysis to be released in December 2012, which had an impact on Peninsula actions. The tax initiative was still being discussed.

08/10/2012

MINUTES

Chair Klein inquired if the Legislature adjourned in three weeks.

Mr. Garamendi replied yes.

Chair Klein asked if the date was firm.

Mr. Garamendi believed it was a firm date.

Chair Klein inquired about the High Speed Rail (HSR) clean-up bill.

Mr. Garamendi had not heard anything further about it and did not see any indication it would be moving quickly. The clean-up bill and comfort letters were uncertain.

Council Member Burt contacted Assemblyman Gordon's staff, whose response was focused on the comfort letters rather than the status of the clean-up bill. He sought clarification because Assemblyman Gordon had been assured there would be an opportunity for a clean-up bill.

Mr. Garamendi suggested they work on the clean-up bill through the fall and introduce it in January of 2013.

Chair Klein inquired what Mr. Garamendi intended to introduce in January.

Mr. Garamendi answered new legislation.

Chair Klein inquired who would introduce it.

Mr. Garamendi indicated that would have to be determined.

Council Member Burt reported Assemblyman Gordon had received a commitment from the Assembly leadership that there would be an opportunity for legislation. Assemblyman Gordon was receptive to introducing legislation. He sought clarification as to the content and authors of the bill.

Mr. Garamendi felt that would be informative.

Chair Klein inquired whether the Legislature had accomplished anything in the four days it had met.

Mr. Garamendi answered no.

MINUTES

Chair Klein noted the topic of Agenda Item Number four and asked if the City Council Rail Committee (Committee) should prepare a letter now or wait.

Mr. Garamendi indicated that the list of suggestions was good, and he would craft them into legislation. He was unsure if the Committee should send a letter, but suggested the ideas should be well formulated. He was going to be surprised if there was clean-up language introduced in the current session.

Chair Klein asked if Mr. Garamendi meant the Committee should draft a memorandum to be used in working with legislative staff on a possible clean-up bill.

Mr. Garamendi responded yes. A letter was to be drafted from the memorandum if it was needed.

Chair Klein inquired whether the Town of Atherton would also draft a memorandum along the same lines.

A representative from the Town of Atherton, City Council Member indicated the Town of Atherton was happy to do so. (00:11:10)

Vice Mayor Scharff asked if Mr. Garamendi thought the Committee should discuss all the suggestions in Agenda Item Number four.

Mr. Garamendi felt they should all be discussed.

Vice Mayor Scharff asked which ones were easier or more difficult to discuss.

Mr. Garamendi stated the important topics were limiting HSR to two tracks, establishing local development agreements prior to discussion, and establishing Caltrain as the lead agency. Those topics were controversial and were challenged. Locking the two-track system into a statute was very helpful because comfort letters were not be useful in ten years.

Vice Mayor Scharff inquired if obtaining a guarantee for bookend funding would be difficult.

Mr. Garamendi did not know. He was unsure how the Legislature planned to fund these items.

MINUTES

Chair Klein believed a guarantee for bookend funding was difficult to obtain because funding for the bookends were used to cover cost overruns in the Central Valley.

Council Member Burt felt every suggestion was a battle.

Chair Klein did not believe they could receive a guarantee of a blended system for the life of the system.

Vice Mayor Scharff agreed with Chair Klein. He did not believe any of the suggestions were obtained easily.

Council Member Burt stated a discussion with Assemblyman Gordon could illuminate which suggestions would be more easily obtained.

Vice Mayor Scharff inquired whether the Committee had enough information to draft a memorandum.

Chair Klein replied yes. He inquired if the Legislature had discussed where it would obtain funding for the Chowchilla "Y."

Mr. Garamendi answered no. Advocates were pushing for the Chowchilla "Y" because other issues would be locked in if the track turned west.

Morris Brown indicated a Joint Legislative Audit Committee meeting was held the prior Thursday. Assemblywoman Harkey and Senator LaMalfa proposed conducting another audit of the CHSRA. It was voted down along party lines.

Mr. Garamendi thanked Mr. Brown for his service to the public on this topic. He hoped to continue advocating for an audit.

Chair Klein inquired about a possible Plan B after the November 2012 election results were known.

Mr. Garamendi indicated there was not a Plan B. He felt if the funding cuts were not enacted, there was another election in June 2013.

4. Discussion of Recommendations on High Speed Rail (HSR) Appropriation Legislation Modification Language. Suggestions to Date Include:

MINUTES

- Guarantee Bookend Funding is not Transferred to the Central Valley
- Specify What Amount of Bookend Funding is Allocated for the San Francisco to San Jose Segment
- Guarantee that all CHSRA Funding Allocations Now and in the Future are Limited to a Two-Track System Plus Necessary Passing Tracks for the San Francisco to San Jose Segment
- Guarantee that the System is Limited to a Blended System for the Life of the System
- In Reference to the Blended System, Provide Clear Definition of the Term "Substantially Within the Right-of-Way"
- Guarantee that Caltrain is the Lead Agent for the San Francisco to San Jose Segment
- Establish Local Development Agreements Prior to Construction With Each Municipality Similar to What California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) does for Highway Construction
- Make the Appropriation Contingent on No Dilution or Alteration of CEQA
- Guarantee that the CHSRA will not Construct any Four-Track System, do not Just Guarantee that the CHSRA will not Construct a "Dedicated Four-Track System"

Council Member Burt inquired whether the City Council Rail Committee (Committee) agreed that the next step was to put the information in a memorandum to allow discussions with legislators.

Vice Mayor Scharff answered yes.

Chair Klein agreed.

Council Member Burt asked if Staff confirmed whether the Committee's understanding of the legislation was correct.

Richard Hackmann, Management Specialist had not received confirmation that legislation was forthcoming.

Council Member Burt stated the bullets in the memorandum were responses to legislation that had already passed. The Committee needed to confirm that its understanding of the legislation currently in effect was correct.

Mr. Hackmann had not discussed those points with legislators' staff, but he would do so.

MINUTES

Chair Klein asked if Council Member Burt meant the items were not clear in the legislation.

Council Member Burt replied yes.

Mr. Hackmann inquired if Staff was to confirm that the Committee's understanding was the same as legislators'.

Council Member Burt responded yes. He suggested Staff engage Californians Advocating for Responsible Rail Design (CARRD) on the topic as well.

Mr. Hackmann agreed.

Council Member Burt reported the Committee drafted each bullet because legislation did not address the topics. For example, legislation specifically allowed bookend funding to be transferred to the Central Valley construction project. The transfer of funds was included because of concerns that the southern California bookend might not receive clearance and those funds were then to be used in the Central Valley project. However, language in the legislation did not make that distinction.

Vice Mayor Scharff asked if the Committee advocated for both of the bookends not to change or if he attempted to lock in northern California.

Council Member Burt advocated focusing on Palo Alto's concerns. If others agencies wanted to advocate for both bookends, they could.

Chair Klein agreed.

Mr. Hackmann recalled that was the discussion at the prior meeting.

Council Member Burt inquired whether Staff knew the ambiguity in the legislation regarding bookend funding for the San Francisco to San Jose segment.

Steve Emslie, Deputy City Manager indicated he did not, but Staff would follow-up for clarification.

Council Member Burt asked Ms. Ackemann whether she had any information on these particular issues.

MINUTES

Jayme Ackemann, Caltrain Government Affairs Officer requested clarification of the Committee's concerns.

Council Member Burt stated the concern was whether the legislation was clear and specific on the dollar amounts dedicated to the San Francisco to San Jose segment.

Ms. Ackemann understood more than \$100 million came from Proposition 1A connectivity funds.

Council Member Burt inquired whether the legislation itself clearly stated that.

Ms. Ackemann said it did, but she did not read the legislation.

Chair Klein noted the legislation was cobbled together in a short period of time, was not vetted by the Legislature, contained gaps, and was vague.

Council Member Burt understood that legislators were promised that comfort letters would be placed in the record that clarified issues; however, comfort letters did not have legal bearing to any significant degree. The City's position was that if an issue needed a comfort letter, the language of the comfort letter needed to be in the law to be binding. He recommended Staff talk with CARRD, who had performed the most thorough analysis with other agencies.

Chair Klein indicated a variety of sources were needed.

Mr. Hackmann inquired whether the Committee wanted to know if costs for the Southern California Blended System and the Northern California Blended System totaled the amount of funding allocated for the Blended System in SB 1029.

Council Member Burt answered that was one part. The second part was whether the language of SB 1029 was explicit or implied.

Mr. Emslie suggested another point for clarification was whether the legislation allowed funding to be transferred between projects.

Council Member Burt said that was the connection between the first two bullets.

MINUTES

Chair Klein wanted to know if Caltrain staff could state it was absolutely clear that Caltrain had xyz amount of dollars, subject only to the funding being transferred to the Central Valley project.

Council Member Burt noted the legislation stated funding for bookends from this round of bonds were not be used for a four-track system. That did not provide any type of guarantee because the legislation applied only to the current round of bonds and not future bond issues.

Mr. Hackmann noted that was the connection for the third and fourth bullets.

Council Member Burt did not believe the City was likely to obtain that level of guarantee.

Vice Mayor Scharff asked what the life of the system was and suggested 30 years.

Council Member Burt reported Senator Simitian had addressed a time horizon in which the limitations of the blended system were to be binding.

Mr. Hackmann indicated 30 years was logical, because of the bond timeframe.

Council Member Burt thought Senator Simitian's time horizon was 30 years. He asked if the Committee concurred with 30 years being tentatively the time horizon.

Vice Mayor Scharff agreed.

Chair Klein explained a portion of the bonds were issued for a few years, another portion for five years, another for ten years, and up to 30 years. The Committee had to be careful in using the term "life of the bonds" when it meant 30 years.

Council Member Burt felt using the time horizon from the Simitian/Eshoo/Gordon proposal had political meaning as well because they developed the concept of a blended system. The issues the Committee wanted clarified made the legislation consistent with the proposal, political claims, and comfort letters. With regard to the fifth bullet, Palo Alto and San Mateo had some right-of-way segments that could have significant impacts if they were expanded by as little as five

MINUTES

feet. Palo Alto and San Mateo had a few of the narrowest choke points in the whole system.

Chair Klein indicated a guarantee of Caltrain was the lead agency one of the easier guarantees had obtained.

Ms. Ackemann indicated Caltrain was the lead agency.

Council Member Burt expressed concern that the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) did not acknowledge that. He inquired whether there was a subsequent development where MTC had acknowledged or agreed to that.

Ms. Ackemann reported the MOU did not need to acknowledge that Caltrain was the lead agency because the system was on Caltrain property. Caltrain was the lead agency for any project that occurred on Caltrain property. It was out of the norm for a different agency to come in and take a leadership role.

Council Member Burt noted MTC controlled funding. It was conceivable that the agency controlling funding wanted to be the lead agency.

Ms. Ackemann stated MTC did not elect to be the lead agency because the project was located on Caltrain property. MTC was merely the pass-through agency for the funding, as it was on any project that occurred on Caltrain property dating back to 1992.

Council Member Burt said the seventh bullet was not part of the previous discussion and was not clarified in the legislation. He did not expect legislators to be familiar with it; he suggested providing supporting documentation and obtaining assistance from community partners. The California Department of Transportation's (Caltrans) use of local development agreements was a good model and had been successful. A comparable model was appropriate in this circumstance. He inquired whether the packet contained the Caltrain clarification letter.

Mr. Hackmann indicated it was an At-Place item.

Council Member Burt explained that the letter provided additional clarification that Caltrain was interested in allowing California

MINUTES

Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) approve the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) approval for some projects.

Chair Klein reminded the Committee that these were directions dealing with legislation, not negotiations with Caltrain.

Council Member Burt suggested the Committee determine whether it agreed with Caltrain on the CEQA modification, and whether they requested Staff to evaluate the impact of Caltrain's proposed modification.

Mr. Emslie indicated Staff reviewed the proposed Caltrain modification.

Council Member Burt felt the Committee could engage Caltrain Board Members to determine whether they understood the impacts and if the Committee determined there were problems with the modification. With regard to the final bullet, wording in the legislation indicated a dedicated four-track system. The wording meant it was four tracks throughout the entire Peninsula that were shared tracks. Caltrain had asserted that it was opposed to a four-track system. He hoped the Committee would be aligned with Caltrain and other member agencies on areas of the bullets.

Roland Lebrun recommended the Committee read the text provisions in SB 1029 and then the MOU regarding funding amounts. Proposition 1A connectivity was \$106 million, Proposition 1A from the main source was \$600 million, and Proposition 1B was Caltrain's \$24 million. With regard to the lead agency, the Committee needed to read the Resolution of the Caltrain Board at its May 3, 2012 meeting.

Adina Lem believed local development agreements would not work for electrification. If one city decided against one electric pole and Caltrain could not reach an agreement with that city, then the entire electrification project was going to be stopped.

Mr. Lebrun stated dedicated tracks were tracks used purely for high speed traffic. The way the legislation was written, there could be a four-track system, two tracks of which would be dedicated. He did not support a dedicated four-track system for that reason.

Herb Borock suggested a time horizon of 40 years rather than 30 years. The Committee needed to review SB 1029 to determine whether the blended system money of \$1.1 billion referred to the Business Plan and whether there was any dollar amounts mentioned

MINUTES

there. The wording of the Resolution adopted by the Caltrain Board on May 3, 2012, did not guarantee Caltrain was to be the lead agency. August 17, 2012 was the last day for legislative fiscal committees to meet and report bills to the floor; the last two weeks were floor sessions, with the exception of conference committees and rules committees; and, August 24, 2012, was the last day to amend bills on the floor.

Morris Brown reported his analysis of transfer of funds from the bookends to the Central Valley project and how they differed from CARRD's analysis. Senator Alquist wanted to ensure that bookend funding could not be transferred. Mark Leno indicated the Legislature could move money only from bookend authorities to bookend authorities, not from bookend authorities to the Central Valley. The legislation seemed to indicate removal of the bookend allocation would remove the right to fund the Central Valley project. With regard to funding, Caltrain staff directed him to the MTC memorandum Resolution of March 2012, which detailed funding.

Chair Klein clarified that Palo Alto was not negotiating for a resolution but determining a list of potential issues to discuss with legislators regarding a clean-up bill.

Council Member Burt noted the bullet regarding local development agreements was not in the current legislation and was not discussed. He was interested in exploring the concept; however, the Committee needed to understand its implications. He requested additional information on how local development agreements might work in a rail system before including it in recommendations.

Chair Klein asked if he wanted the suggestions deleted from the list.

Council Member Burt suggested the Committee request Staff research the topic and make recommendations to the Committee.

MOTION: Council Member Burt moved, seconded by Chair Klein that the City Council Rail Committee include the nine bullets, except for Bullet Number 7; that Bullet Number 7 be subject to additional evaluation on its merits; and, that lead agent be changed to lead agency and Caltrain be changed to Caltrans. If Staff was able to receive clarification on any of the items subsequent to the meeting they would be excluded from recommendations.

MINUTES

Vice Mayor Scharff felt Bullet Number nine belonged with the guarantee regarding all funding allocations being limited to a blended system, because it was a subset legal argument.

Council Member Burt requested Staff structure the bullet points in a rational manner.

Chair Klein indicated Staff should return to the Committee with ambiguities inconsistent with City policy if they discovered any.

Mr. Emslie agreed to do so.

MOTION PASSED: 3-0 Shepherd absent

5. Update from Caltrain Staff on the Caltrain Modernization Program

Marian Lee, Caltrain Modernization Program Acting Director reported the budget request for the High Speed Rail (HSR) project for Fiscal Year 2013 passed. The bill appropriated slightly more than \$700 million specifically for Caltrain modernization and referenced the nine-party Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) among Caltrain, HSR, and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). The MOU provided a total of slightly more than \$700 million for Caltrain. The bill stated that the blended system improvements had to be consistent with the MOU. The MOU had language concerning a blended system and not a four-track system and stated funds were not to be used to expand the system to a dedicated four-track system. With approval of the budget and regional support for early investment, Caltrain staff had two timeframes in mind. The first timeframe of 2019 was committed to electrifying Caltrain service. There were no HSR trains; although, the infrastructure investment supported future HSR trains. The second timeframe of 2029 provided HSR trains for the Central Valley. Caltrain needed additional investment to support HSR service at that time. Regarding the 2019 timeframe, Caltrain staff was considering ways to improve or restructure outreach. Cities had asked Caltrain staff to facilitate a meeting of cities along the Peninsula to brainstorm outreach. The advanced signal system project was currently in the critical design phase and needed to move to the final design stage. Caltrain staff needed to define cash flow to pay for those activities. With regard to electrification infrastructure and conversion of vehicles, Caltrain staff had to update and re-circulate the environmental document. There was an immediate need to form the team to work with environmental consultants. Related to the 2029

MINUTES

timeframe, Caltrain staff was studying how to define the blended system. More than electrification was needed to support HSR. The results of the Blended System Service Plan Operations Considerations Analysis was ultimately to inform the service plan. Under the different service plans, Caltrain studied longer trains with the ultimate goal of increasing capacity by lessening train traffic. In terms of the passing track options, Caltrain reviewed five options and vetted two of the five options: the four-track full midline and the four-track short midline. The four-track options consisted of adding two tracks to existing two-track areas, so that those tracks were used by HSR trains to bypass Caltrain trains. The two new tracks allowed HSR trains to travel in each direction. The three-track option added one track to existing two-track areas. The third track supported bi-directional HSR traffic. In some of these passing track situations, Caltrain was forced to add some stops. The full midline option performed best; the short midline and the southern options were not quite as good; and the northern option did not do well. HSR trains passing Caltrain trains seemed to work best when they passed in the middle of the corridor. Caltrain staff called out the three-track option, because of concerns over the bi-directional traffic on one track. With the advanced signal system in place, the automated system stopped the system if there was an intrusion. Additional safety precautions not currently in place had made the three-track option more feasible. Results of the commuter simulation work was only one factor to be considered in determining if passing tracks were needed and where to locate them. The next Caltrain meeting at the staff level was held at the end of August or in early September 2012. The second study that was performed was the grade crossing and traffic analysis of 40 at-grade crossings. The intent was to determine the gate downtime at all 40 intersections once the system was electrified and once two HSR trains were added. The models were designed to determine gate downtime and service impacts for all local entities along the corridor. The model was not sophisticated enough to address complex traffic signal configurations; however, staff was working on that. Caltrain staff was going to have future conditions information by the end of August or in early September 2012.

Council Member Burt appreciated Caltrain's use of the 2029 date because that was the projection in the Business Plan. There were misconceptions that the blended system was on the horizon and that there was funding related to a blended system. He asked about the amount of funding the California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) needed to make the project happen.

MINUTES

Ms. Lee did not know the cost.

Council Member Burt reported approximately \$30 billion in additional funds was needed for the initial operating segment. After that, CHSRA needed a great deal of additional funds to move from Chowchilla to San Jose. Only at that point was the blended system needed.

Ms. Lee agreed.

Council Member Burt encouraged everyone to look for opportunities to educate the public that the project was not imminent. He noted the capacity analysis concern, in connection to track capacity, rather than system capacity, and how the press misconstrued the results. He suggested Caltrain continue to clarify that as well. He asked how many trains in the Phase one analysis triggered the need for a blended system.

Ms. Lee indicated that without passing tracks, the system handled a total of eight trains: six Caltrain trains and two HSR trains. More than two HSR trains triggered the need for passing tracks.

Council Member Burt felt it was important to layout the foundation for the public. He inquired whether it was Caltrain's intention to proceed with the context sensitive solutions process.

Ms. Lee reported Caltrain had reviewed that possibility for the design and environmental stages.

Council Member Burt suggested Caltrain engage with experts who had used context sensitive solutions for roadways.

Vice Mayor Scharff inquired when Caltrain would receive funding.

Seamus Murphy, Caltrain stated Caltrain was identifying cash flow needs, when they needed to be appropriated, and when matching funds were needed. Each source of funding required specific approvals that had not been obtained.

Vice Mayor Scharff asked if he was talking about connectivity funds.

Mr. Murphy indicated they were local and regional funds matching the State connectivity funds. The California Transportation Commission (CTC) needed to allocate connectivity funds to the project. Proposition 1A of HSR funds were funneled through the CHSRA.

MINUTES

Vice Mayor Scharff inquired if modernization meant electrification and signalization.

Ms. Lee explained modernization had three components: electrification, signalization, and vehicle conversion.

Vice Mayor Scharff asked if current trains were converted or if new trains were purchased.

Ms. Lee indicated new trains were purchased.

Vice Mayor Scharff inquired whether Caltrain was considering any options other than electrification.

Ms. Lee stated electrification was the chosen option.

Vice Mayor Scharff asked when the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was to occur.

Ms. Lee stated the goal was to complete the EIR by the end of 2013. Caltrain was setting completion goals by working backward from the 2019 completion date.

Vice Mayor Scharff clarified that by 2019 electrified trains were operating.

Ms. Lee explained many studies had to be updated. The context of electrification had changed with the addition of the blended system; therefore, the EIR had to capture that change. She needed to better state when electrified trains began operating once Caltrain determined how to explain the blended system.

Vice Mayor Scharff asked if HSR trains would begin operating in 2029 at the earliest.

Ms. Lee answered yes and said 2029 was an optimistic date.

Vice Mayor Scharff inquired when construction of passing tracks needed to begin if 2029 became a realistic date.

Ms. Lee indicated passing tracks were constructed before or after 2029.

MINUTES

Council Member Burt explained the blended system did not necessarily require passing tracks.

Mr. Murphy stated passing tracks were constructed only if they were needed.

Ms. Lee reported if passing tracks were needed by 2029, then Caltrain needed approximately ten years to perform the feasibility study, complete design work, and complete the environmental process.

Vice Mayor Scharff inquired if Caltrain had begun considering passing tracks in 2019.

Ms. Lee answered yes, in terms of needing passing tracks. Some stakeholders wanted to know about passing tracks now, even though the need was not to be determined until later.

Vice Mayor Scharff asked if any of the passing tracks passed through Palo Alto.

Ms. Lee indicated a three-track option passed through Palo Alto.

Vice Mayor Scharff understood from her presentation that the three-track option had been eliminated.

Ms. Lee stated the three-track option required more study before it was determined to be fatally flawed.

Vice Mayor Scharff asked when the studies on at-grade crossings and traffic capacity were available, and whether Caltrain operated more than six trains.

Ms. Lee reported Caltrain was modeling six Caltrain trains and zero HSR trains, six Caltrain trains and two HSR trains, and six Caltrain trains and four HSR trains. The anticipated completion date was early fall 2012.

Vice Mayor Scharff inquired about the number of Caltrain trains currently operating.

Ms. Lee answered five during peak hours.

Vice Mayor Scharff asked if one additional train was sufficient with increased ridership.

MINUTES

Chair Klein noted Caltrain was also considering longer trains.

Council Member Burt asked if preliminary results indicated longer trains were feasible at high volume stations.

Ms. Lee explained very early results indicated that the impact to operations and the length of platforms were major considerations. Caltrain was reviewing the costs associated with platform adjustments at select stations and the costs associated with changes in operations.

Council Member Burt clarified that an alternative to adjusting platform lengths was making operational changes.

Ms. Lee agreed.

Council Member Burt inquired whether Caltrain had reviewed the various stations and determined which ones could accommodate longer platforms.

Ms. Lee said the review of stations was only one of several issues Caltrain was considering.

Council Member Burt explained Palo Alto did not have many options for lengthening platforms.

Mr. Murphy indicated one of the potential benefits of electrification was the frequency of service to every station. Once trains were electrified, riders had more choices regarding which train to take.

Vice Mayor Scharff asked why that was possible.

Mr. Murphy reported Electric Multiple Unit (EMU) vehicles could start and stop in less time and less distance than diesel vehicles. The baby bullet train traveled from San Francisco to San Jose in 60 minutes and stopped five or six times. EMU trains could make the same trip in the same time and stop 12 or 14 times.

Vice Mayor Scharff requested the benefits of electrification.

Ms. Lee stated practical benefits were increased revenue, decreased costs, and reduced subsidies.

MINUTES

Vice Mayor Scharff inquired if the structural deficit would be reduced by \$20 million.

Mr. Murphy answered yes. Increased ridership estimates and decreased operating costs would reduce the subsidy by approximately \$20 million.

Vice Mayor Scharff asked if increased ridership could ever reduce the subsidy to \$5 million or \$10 million.

Chair Klein stated no system in America reduced its subsidy to that level.

Ms. Lee felt the subsidy could be reduced to that level if the fare was increased substantially; however, that was unacceptable to riders. A second benefit was reduced emissions and decreased noise. A third benefit was economic, in terms of creating jobs.

Mr. Murphy stated emissions were reduced 90 percent over the existing system including the increased draw on the grid. A recent study indicated the electrification project would create 9,000 construction jobs. Another benefit was the economic value associated with the amount of travel time riders saved. A third benefit was approximately \$1 billion in increased real estate values.

Council Member Burt reported the Bay Area Council study assumed electrification of Caltrain would translate to reduced travel time; whereas, Caltrain's current plan was to increase service.

Mr. Murphy indicated the Bay Area Council reviewed the maximum potential of the system for travel time reduction. Caltrain had focused operations exclusively on improving travel time or improving frequency or some combination of the two.

Council Member Burt explained the Bay Area Council erroneously assumed that electrification benefits would all go to reduction in travel time and none to increase in service.

Mr. Murphy stated there was not an operating plan yet.

Council Member Burt said Caltrain had a Board policy to increase capacity by increasing service.

MINUTES

Ms. Lee was not aware of a Board policy of applying performance attributes to service schedules. Given the superior performance of electrified trains, Caltrain had yet to determine how to apply that to service schedules.

Council Member Burt explained Caltrain's consultant presented that information.

Mr. Murphy reported the consultant was Dominic DiBrito.

Council Member Burt recalled his exchange with the consultant regarding increased capacity making up lost service. The consultant indicated there was a Board policy directive to that effect, and his study was based upon that directive.

Mr. Murphy reported there was a Caltrain commitment to restore service to the stations that lost service as part of the electrification project. There was not a Board policy directing staff to focus exclusively on frequency to the detriment of travel time.

Council Member Burt stated another benefit was increased capacity, which had potential trade-offs.

Chair Klein inquired whether Caltrain anticipated having the EIR ready for Board certification by the end of 2013.

Ms. Lee reported the aggressive goal was to have Board certification and federal clearance completed by the end of 2013.

Chair Klein asked if Ms. Lee expected to begin circulation of the EIR by July 1, 2013.

Ms. Lee hoped to go through the typical process and to have an additional level of outreach to stakeholders.

Chair Klein did not believe Caltrain would be ready for Board certification by the end of 2013.

Ms. Lee indicated that was the goal. Caltrain staff was reviewing the schedule to determine how to complete all phases in that timeframe.

Chair Klein posed the hypothetical scenario of Caltrain concluding that one or more grade crossings would be severely impacted without a

MINUTES

grade separation, and asked what Caltrain would do then, since it had no funds for grade separations.

Ms. Lee reported the current environmental document stated the electrification project did not trigger the need for grade separation. The next environmental document had to confirm that fact. If the electrification project did trigger a grade separation and Caltrain did not find other mitigation measures, then Caltrain had to list all mitigation measures, cost them out, and find funds to implement those mitigation measures. That was required by law.

Steve Emslie, Deputy City Manager noted a project impact could be overridden if it could not be mitigated economically.

Chair Klein stated it could be mitigated economically, but it had to be paid for.

Mr. Emslie explained Caltrain could say the mitigation was infeasible and then override the impact.

Aaron Akin, Assistant Director of Planning and Community Environment stated Caltrain could say the benefits were greater than the economic infeasibility.

Vice Mayor Scharff asked if the Caltrain Board would make the decision to override.

Mr. Emslie answered yes.

Chair Klein inquired about a city's recourse and what happened if it did not accept the override decision.

Mr. Emslie indicated the city would have to litigate. The lawsuit was based on the adequacy of the findings used to make the override decision.

Chair Klein stated another solution was to slow down the train.

Mr. Emslie said that would be mitigation.

Chair Klein inquired about the number of trees that would be cut back to accomplish installation of the wires for electrification.

MINUTES

Ms. Lee did not know. The Town of Atherton was also concerned about that. The arborist study had to be updated, and Caltrain wanted to use an arborist that all parties were confident in.

Chair Klein assumed an engineering standard existed for electrification programs regarding the area being free of trees.

Ms. Lee would follow-up. There were standards for electrifying a system.

Council Member Burt understood that advancements in catenary systems provided a range of potential width and physical impacts.

Ms. Lee reported Caltrain had 35 percent of the electrification project. That portion was designed using the assumption that tracks carried both HSR and Caltrain trains. Caltrain engineers reviewed the 35 percent portion and ensured it accommodated both HSR and Caltrain trains. She did not know if the aesthetics were different for the Caltrain electrification system only.

Chair Klein requested to see preliminary answers to his questions.

Ms. Lee said she would research the design options and provide that information.

Chair Klein inquired about the difference in costs between modernizing Caltrain alone and including HSR.

Ms. Lee indicated the approximate amount for Caltrain electrification infrastructure was \$780 million. Anything above that amount, that supported HSR, moved into the range of billions of dollars.

Chair Klein meant to ask how much of the \$780 million were attributed to preparation for HSR.

Ms. Lee did not know.

Chair Klein inquired whether Caltrain would track the amounts for each.

Mr. Murphy explained the cost for Caltrain electrification infrastructure was \$785 million before HSR and \$785 million today. There was some deviation but the best cost estimate was \$785 million to support Caltrain.

MINUTES

Ms. Lee did not know if HSR standards influenced designs or added any costs.

Chair Klein felt the public would like to know that information.

Mr. Murphy reported that the Caltrain electrification project, at \$785 million, was designed to HSR standards. The amount was going to be lower if the project was going to be designed for Caltrain only.

Chair Klein believed there could be a waste of funds if HSR did not occur.

Adina Lem asked if electrified trains would be implemented in 2019.

Ms. Lee answered yes.

Ms. Lem inquired whether any organization had calculated the impact of right-of-way in passing track scenarios and were these scenarios going to require an expansion of right-of-way.

Ms. Lee indicated it would be reviewed.

Ms. Lem asked if that review was part of the current planning or was that after the 2013 EIR.

Ms. Lee reported that initially, Caltrain wanted to consider encroachment on right-of-way as part of infrastructure. Now Caltrain was considering some scan of the level of encroachment outside of the right-of-way.

Ms. Lem said that topic was being presented in a number of local land use questions. She suggested Caltrain present benefits as well as costs to the public.

Herb Borock recalled previous discussions without Caltrain representatives regarding two EIRs. He did not understand how it was possible to perform an EIR for Caltrain service, and then use that EIR to make decisions for future HSR service. With regard to the track system analysis already being performed, there was no service on HSR that complied with the AB 3034 requirement of a 30-minute trip between San Francisco and San Jose. Although it studied the different numbers of tracks per hour, the CHSRA indicated it needed four trains per hour per direction in order to be financially feasible. He asked

MINUTES

whether Caltrain would perform a single EIR covering for both Caltrain and HSR, or have an electrification EIR covering Caltrain only.

Morris Brown asked if the \$600 million allotted to Caltrain and labeled as HSR funds were spent in exactly the same way as connectivity funds. He asked whether the \$600 million could be used to purchase EMUs, which HSR could not use.

Mr. Murphy explained EMUs were part of the overall program and the overall package of projects. Caltrain matched the State contribution in funding that would be used to purchase EMUs. The CHSRA and State saw some benefit for the HSR program associated with the operation of modernized Caltrain service during the interim phase of HSR.

Mr. Brown inquired whether there would be a legal problem if this money was taken from the \$9 billion rather than from the \$950 million.

Mr. Murphy reported there were different requirements for the two funds. Caltrain believed the funding plan was legally sound.

Mr. Brown stated that position was not consistent with the Legislative Counsel ruling.

Roland Lebrun reported power consumption was essentially a question of speed and train number. There was every indication that power requirements had been overdesigned for the line. Caltrain was currently replacing the diesel fleet with hybrids because there was a lack of continuous power on the line. With regard to trees around the lines, the issue was not trees touching wires; it was leaves getting on rails and causing tires to spin.

NO ACTION TAKEN

6. Reports on Meetings
 - California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA)
 - Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (PCJPB)
 - Peninsula Cities Consortium (PCC)
 - San Mateo County Rail Corridor Partnership (SMCRCP)

Richard Hackmann, Management Specialist reported the California High Speed Rail Authority's (CHSRA) next meeting was scheduled for September 11, 2012. Russell Burns, an Assembly appointment, resigned from CHSRA. On September 14, 2012, CHSRA held its first

MINUTES

Business Contractor Forum. The Peninsula Cities Consortium (PCC) meeting scheduled in August 2012 was canceled; the next meeting was September 7, 2012. The Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (PCJPB) did not discuss modernization at its August 2012 meeting. The next meeting was scheduled for September 6, 2012.

FUTURE MEETINGS AND AGENDAS

Chair Klein inquired if there was a need for the City Council Rail Committee (Committee) to meet on August 23, 2012.

Richard Hackmann, Management Specialist suggested canceling the August meeting because the Agenda for the meeting in September was full. He also suggested a second meeting for the Committee in September.

Chair Klein asked for the date of the September Committee meeting.

Mr. Hackmann replied September 27, 2012.

Chair Klein suggested tentatively scheduling a second Committee meeting for September 13, 2012, and authorizing him to work with Staff to determine if the meeting was essential.

Mr. Hackmann inquired if the August meeting was going to be canceled.

Chair Klein replied yes.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 5:24 P.M.