



LOSSAN Working Group March 27, 2026



Meeting Agenda

1

Welcome and Opening Remarks

2

Review Report Outline and Structure

3

Review Policy Area 1 — Service Coordination & Disruption Reduction

4

Review Policy Area 4 — Federal CID Program Coordination

5

Review Governing Board Approach (LOSSAN, Metrolink, NCTD)

6

Open Discussion

7

Next Steps



Welcome and Opening Remarks



Report Outline & Structure

Working Group Report to the California Legislature — SB 1098



Report Structure: Key Sections

I-II

Transmittal Letter & Executive Summary

Secretary's letter to Legislature + high-level findings across Topics A–D

III

Introduction & Background

Corridor overview, SB 1098 legislative context

IV

Topic A — Service Coordination

Findings and recommendations on resiliency, SGR, track closures, equipment, staffing

V

Topic B — Alternative Management Models

Findings and recommendations on governance structures (TBD)

VI

Topic C — Statutory & Funding Changes

Findings and recommendations on statutes, rules, funding (TBD)

VII

Topic D — Federal CIDP Coordination

Findings, background, and recommendations on CID Program participation

VIII-X

Cross-Cutting Themes, Conclusion & Appendices

Summary, priorities, call to action, membership, meeting notes, glossary



Policy Area A

Strategies to increase rail service coordination and reduce disruptions or delays, including, but not limited to, those caused by resiliency vulnerabilities, track closures, state of good repair, equipment, and staffing.

NOTE: The following recommendations are still in deliberative draft form and are not considered final for the purposes of the SB 1098 report.



State of Good Repair

Challenge

The corridor lacks a comprehensive corridor-wide asset management framework that integrates infrastructure equipment, and facility conditions across all partners.

Recommendations from Working Group Members:

- Led by Caltrans and CalSTA and in coordination with the LOSSAN working group, develop a written fleet and asset management plan that aligns equipment, facilities, and infrastructure needs with funding.

DRAFT CONTENT



State of Good Repair

Challenge

State of good repair projects remain needed and face significant hurdles. Administrative and policy barriers have adversely affected these projects and current federal, state, and local funding sources have proven inadequate in meeting increasing SGR needs.

Recommendations from Working Group Members:

- Allow SGR rail projects to be eligible for state funding grant programs where feasible. Program guidelines should develop and incorporate specific scoring criteria for SGR eligibility, emphasizing safety, reliability, and maintaining existing infrastructure.
- Programs should encourage and prioritize projects that include meaningful non-state local and federal funding contributions, while also recognizing circumstances where state investment may be necessary to address critical needs that exceed local fiscal capacity.

DRAFT CONTENT



State of Good Repair

Challenge

State grant funding deadlines for allocation and timely use of funds are often inflexible, creating potential funding gaps. Rigid timelines fail to account for common rail project uncertainties that are outside the control of project sponsors and may result in funding expiring before project completion. Additionally, while local agencies play a critical role in funding participation, non-state local and federal funding sources do not always prioritize regional and intercity rail investments when faced with competing needs.

Recommendations from Working Group Members:

- Develop administrative solutions, where feasible, by incorporating exceptions for extraordinary and unforeseeable circumstances into state program guidelines.
- Program criteria should allow for the prioritization of projects that demonstrate significant non-state local/federal funding contributions, recognizing local commitment as an indicator of project readiness and shared investment.

DRAFT CONTENT



Resiliency

Challenge

There is a need to carefully balance Coastal Commission policies that prioritize natural bluff, shoreline, and coastal access, with the need to protect critical rail infrastructure that supports statewide passenger service. In locations where existing improvements are vulnerable, there may be limited pathways to facilitate the timely repair or replacement of protective infrastructure necessary to maintain safe and reliable operations.

Recommendations from Working Group Members:

- In coordination with the LOSSAN Working Group, the California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA) and the California Coastal Commission (CCC) should develop a cooperative agreement or Memorandum of Understanding to identify where streamlining solutions for rail projects in the coastal zone can be identified and other solutions to assist in the delivery of rail projects. For example, if a federal nexus is identified project sponsors may coordinate with the Coastal Commission to determine whether the project can proceed through the federal consistency process in lieu of the traditional Coastal Development Permit (CDP). Utilizing the federal consistency pathway can streamline permitting. Additional clarity from the Coastal Commission on when each process applies would help project sponsors make informed decisions early and further improve permitting efficiency.

DRAFT CONTENT



Resiliency

Challenge

There is a need to carefully balance Coastal Commission policies that prioritize natural bluff, shoreline, and coastal access, with the need to protect critical rail infrastructure that supports statewide passenger service. In locations where existing improvements are vulnerable, there may be limited pathways to facilitate the timely repair or replacement of protective infrastructure necessary to maintain safe and reliable operations.

Recommendations from Working Group Members:

- In coordination with the Coastal Commission, identify regulatory or administrative changes that help streamline and improve project delivery for passenger rail projects within the coastal zone. Changes that establish expedited or streamlined review processes for projects that repair, maintain, or enhance existing passenger rail infrastructure, including existing protective measures such as seawalls. This could include clearly defined pathways for the repair or replacement of existing protective infrastructure where necessary to maintain safe and reliable rail operations, particularly in areas vulnerable to erosion and slope instability.

DRAFT CONTENT



Track Closures

Challenge

Emergency closures resulting from bluff failures, slope instability, storm damage, sea level rise, or other coastal resiliency challenges have historically lacked a standardized, systemwide response protocol. In many cases, responses are developed in an ad hoc manner, varying by jurisdiction, owning agency, or incident type. This lack of a unified framework can complicate coordination among state agencies, local jurisdictions, rail operators, emergency responders, and regulatory bodies, particularly when rapid action is required to ensure public safety and restore essential transportation services.

Recommendations from Working Group Members:

- Develop a corridor-wide playbook that defines roles, decision thresholds, and timelines for agencies when bluff instability is detected. Include pre-defined triggers (e.g., erosion rates, track exposure, geotechnical warnings) to reduce ad hoc decision-making. This should include a standardized communication protocols across agencies and to the public to avoid fragmented messaging during closures.

DRAFT CONTENT



Track Closures

Challenge

Emergency closures resulting from bluff failures, slope instability, storm damage, sea level rise, or other coastal resiliency challenges have historically lacked a standardized, systemwide response protocol. In many cases, responses are developed in an ad hoc manner, varying by jurisdiction, owning agency, or incident type. This lack of a unified framework can complicate coordination among state agencies, local jurisdictions, rail operators, emergency responders, and regulatory bodies, particularly when rapid action is required to ensure public safety and restore essential transportation services.

Recommendations from Working Group Members:

- CalSTA, in coordination with Caltrans, may develop a state emergency response protocol that mirrors the state's established role in freeway incidents for emergency incidents that exceeds a defined threshold. This may include but is not limited to, Caltrans activating a standardized incident command structure for rail-related emergencies, including rapid deployment of field crews, engineers, and operations coordination. Utilize pre-positioned emergency contracts and resources to immediately stabilize infrastructure and protect the rail right-of-way. Coordinate directly with regional partners with authority to elevate issues to the Caltrans Director or CalSTA Secretary of Transportation.
- Designate Caltrans as the public-facing source/media coordinator for closure status similar to the 511 system and Caltrans should maintain a duty officer function for rail corridors comparable to its District traffic management centers for freeways.



Track Closures

Challenge

Track closures resulting from trespasser and vehicle strikes along the LOSSAN corridor occur with relative frequency and can lead to significant service disruptions, delays, and cascading impacts across the regional rail network. These incidents often involve interactions at grade crossings or along the right-of-way, where a lack of physical separation, inconsistent safety treatments, and human factors contribute to vulnerability. There is a need for a standardized, corridor-wide approach to reduce the frequency and severity of passenger and vehicle strikes.

Recommendations from Working Group Members:

- Establish a Vision Zero framework for rail within the LOSSAN Corridor, with the explicit goal of eliminating passenger and vehicle strike incidents through a combination of data-driven prioritization, targeted infrastructure investment, and coordinated interagency action.
- Compile and maintain a unified safety dataset to identify and map high-risk locations with the greatest frequency and severity of incidents. Use that analysis to prioritize a ranked pipeline of targeted improvements: grade separations, enhanced barriers and fencing, upgraded crossing controls, and visibility and warning enhancements.
- Implement ongoing performance monitoring to ensure continuous reduction of risk and measurable progress toward eliminating strikes corridor-wide.



Track Closures

Challenge

While corridor-wide coordination among operators and infrastructure owners has improved through regular monthly forums, maintenance scheduling practices remain misaligned in terms of advance confirmation and temporal distribution. Short lead times for finalizing Absolute Work Windows (AWWs), combined with a concentration of closures on weekends when intercity ridership is highest, creates uncertainty for long-term planning, complicates customer communication and ticketing, and contributes to service disruptions, reduced ridership, and increased operational costs, often disproportionately affecting intercity services.

Recommendations from Working Group Members:

- Establish a corridor-wide standard for earlier and more consistent confirmation of AWWs, aligning toward 60–90 day confirmation where feasible, while continuing annual and long-range AWW planning to preserve operational flexibility.
- Expand coordination within existing monthly coordination calls to prioritize alignment of work windows — shifting where possible to nighttime or weekday closures that minimize intercity passenger impacts.
- Proactively consolidate maintenance activities across operators to reduce the frequency and overlap of disruptions.

DRAFT CONTENT



Equipment

Challenge

Equipment spare availability is a primary contributor to operational challenges. LOSSAN, SJJPA, and CCJPA share a common pool of passenger equipment and historically operated under a shared equipment maintainer. NCTD and Metrolink do not share a common pool of equipment.

Recommendations from Working Group Members:

- Develop a written statewide fleet strategy covering maintenance, lifecycle planning, and financial planning that can be applied across multiple operators and corridors. The strategy should align asset inventories, performance standards, and replacement cycles to improve consistency and ensure more predictable funding and procurement timelines.
- Leverage the Rail Fleet Consortium being led by the Caltrans Division of Rail as a primary vehicle for coordination. Use this venue to explore joint procurements and service contracting to attract more bidders and aggregate buying power statewide — broadening vendor competition, reducing unit costs, improving equipment interoperability, and strengthening overall fleet reliability and availability.

DRAFT CONTENT



Policy Area D

Coordination of Planning and Project Development through the Federal Corridor Identification and Development Program

NOTE: The following recommendations are still in deliberative draft form and are not considered final for the purposes of the SB 1098 report.



CIDP Background and Context



Why CIDP Participation Matters for the LOSSAN Corridor

- California's participation in the CID Program through the LOSSAN Corridor presents a significant opportunity to align state and regional planning processes with federal expectations, strengthen California's competitive position for federal capital funding, and establish a durable pipeline of investment-ready projects.
- Step 2 of the process comes with a 90% non-state federal match to complete the comprehensive Service Development Plan.
- Key output is a prioritized list of capital projects tied to specific service goals and outcomes.



CIDP Coordination

Recommendations from CalSTA/Caltrans

- Acknowledging that Caltrans serves as the lead agency and primary coordinator for California's participation in the CID Program, LOSSAN member agencies and the LOSSAN Agency will support and actively engage in the CIDP process by providing timely data, participating in federally required planning activities, and coordinating local project development work with the state-led corridor planning effort.
 - This is consistent with FRA's expectations for state rail authority involvement and positions California to speak with a unified voice in federal planning processes. Full LOSSAN corridor participation will strengthen the quality and credibility of the corridors selected for participation in the CIDP and improve the competitiveness of projects that emerge from the process for federal capital funding.

DRAFT CONTENT





CIDP Coordination

Recommendations from CalSTA/Caltrans

- To the extent possible, CalSTA and Caltrans should endeavor to align state grant programs such as TIRCP, TCEP, SCCP, with the project priorities established through the CIDP process. Inclusion of projects on the CIDP capital project list should be an explicit selection consideration in grant evaluations, recognizing that CIDP inclusion reflects a rigorous, federally coordinated prioritization process.
 - This approach reinforces the integrity and utility of the CIDP project list as a planning tool, and it positions LOSSAN Corridor projects to present a coherent funding strategy that pairs state investment with competitive federal applications under programs such as CRISI, the Federal-State Partnership Program, and other federal funding opportunities.

DRAFT CONTENT



CIDP Coordination



Recommendations from CalSTA/Caltrans

- Recommend that the LOSSAN JPA, in coordination with Caltrans, establish a standing interagency coordination structure specifically organized around stage 2 CID Program milestones and deliverables. This structure will provide regular touchpoints aligned with FRA's staged development process, with clear expectations for member agency participation and data contribution at each stage. This approach reinforces the integrity and utility of the CIDP project list as a planning tool, and it positions LOSSAN Corridor projects to present a coherent funding strategy that pairs state investment with competitive federal applications under programs such as CRISI, the Federal-State Partnership Program, and other federal funding opportunities.
- CalSTA, Caltrans and the LOSSAN member agencies should actively leverage California's participation in the CID Program as a foundation for federal legislative and advocacy on behalf of the LOSSAN Corridor.
 - Corridors with formal CIDP status occupy a recognized position within FRA's national passenger rail framework, and that status should be used strategically in engagements with FRA leadership, the Office of the Secretary of Transportation, and California's congressional delegation. Advocacy efforts should connect corridor-specific investment needs to national policy priorities and should seek to advance LOSSAN Corridor projects in FRA budget discussions and competitive program design.

DRAFT CONTENT



Governing Board Approach

Discussion Item

This agenda item will present and discuss the approach to presenting recommendations to the LOSSAN Agency, Metrolink, and NCTD as required by SB 1098. CalSTA can also inform other governing boards as requested.

LOSSAN Agency (JPA)

Metrolink

NCTD



Open Discussion and Next Steps



Next Steps

1

Next meeting: April 28th, location TBD – discussion of policy areas 2 & 3

2

Aim for transmittal of report content to governing boards no later than May 11th

3

Transmit report to legislature after board feedback is received

4

Resume regular quarterly cadence for future Working Group meetings, starting in July

5

Final quarterly Working Group of 2026 meeting will be planned for October