AGENDA
PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD
Bacciocco Auditorium, 2nd Floor
1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos CA 94070

October 4, 2018 - Thursday
10:00 am
(or immediately following 9:00 am Special
Board Meeting, whichever is later)

1. Call to Order / Pledge of Allegiance
2. Roll Call
3. Public Comment For Items Not on the Agenda
   Comments by each individual speaker shall be limited to two (2) minutes. Items raised that require a response will be deferred for staff reply.
4. Consent Calendar
   Members of the Board may request that an item under the Consent Calendar be considered separately
   a. Approve Special Meeting Minutes of September 6, 2018  
   b. Approve Minutes of September 6, 2018  
   c. Accept Statements of Revenues and Expenditures for August and June 2018
   d. Receive Key Caltrain Performance Statistics – August 2018
   e. Receive State and Federal Legislative Update
   f. Receive Caltrain Business Plan Monthly Update – September 2018
   g. Authorize Receipt of Funding and Amendment of the Fiscal Year 2019 Budget for Positive Train Control Project
   i. Reject Proposals for MP36PH-3C Locomotives Mid-Life Overhaul Services
5. Report of the Chair
6. Report of the Citizens Advisory Committee
7. Report of the Executive Director
   a. Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project Monthly Report for August 2018
   b. Monthly Report on Positive Train Control System

Note: All items appearing on the agenda are subject to action by the Board. Staff recommendations are subject to change by the Board.
8. Caltrain Fare Policy Update

9. Transit and Intercity Passenger Rail Program (TIRCP) Update

10. Correspondence

11. Board Member Requests

12. General Counsel Report
   a.) Discussion of Initial and Continuing Disclosure Obligations
   b.) Closed Session: Conference with Real Property Negotiators
      (Joan L. Cassman, General Counsel, Brian Fitzpatrick and
      Gary Cardona, JPB Real Estate Staff) pursuant to Government
      Code Section 54956.8:
      Property Locations and Parties:
      1. 4000 Campbell Avenue, Menlo Park, CA (APN: 055-253-120)
         (Owners: Julie Del Secco Forrest, Jonathon Del Secco and
         Clayton R. and Carol Del Secco, Trustees of the Del Secco
         Revocable Trust, dated December 16, 1987)
      2. 4020 Campbell Avenue, Menlo Park, CA (APN: 055-253-090)
         (Owner: Campbell Avenue Portfolio, LLC)
      Under negotiation: Price and terms of contracts

13. Date/Time of Next Regular Meeting: Thursday, November 1, 2018 at
    10:00 a.m. San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building,
    2nd Floor, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070

14. Adjourn
INFORMATION FOR THE PUBLIC

All items appearing on the agenda are subject to action by the Board. Staff recommendations are subject to change by the Board.

If you have questions on the agenda, please contact the JPB Secretary at 650.508.6279. Agendas are available on the Caltrain website at www.caltrain.com. Communications to the Board of Directors can be e-mailed to board@caltrain.com.

Location, Date and Time of Regular Meetings

Regular meetings are held at the San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building located at 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, one block west of the San Carlos Caltrain Station on El Camino Real, accessible by SamTrans bus Routes ECR, FLX, 260, 295 and 398. Additional transit information can be obtained by calling 1.800.660.4287 or 511.

The JPB meets regularly on the first Thursday of the month at 10 a.m. The JPB Citizens Advisory Committee meets regularly on the third Wednesday of the month at 5:40 p.m. at the same location. Date, time and place may change as necessary.

Public Comment

If you wish to address the Board, please fill out a speaker's card located on the agenda table and hand it to the JPB Secretary. If you have anything that you wish distributed to the Board and included for the official record, please hand it to the JPB Secretary, who will distribute the information to the Board members and staff.

Members of the public may address the Board on non-agendized items under the Public Comment item on the agenda. Public testimony by each individual speaker shall be limited to two minutes and items raised that require a response will be deferred for staff reply.

Accessibility for Individuals with Disabilities

Upon request, the JPB will provide for written agenda materials in appropriate alternative formats, or disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, to enable individuals with disabilities to participate in public meetings. Please send a written request, including your name, mailing address, phone number and brief description of the requested materials and a preferred alternative format or auxiliary aid or service at least two days before the meeting. Requests should be mailed to the JPB Secretary at Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070-1306; or emailed to board@caltrain.com; or by phone at 650.508.6242, or TDD 650.508.6448.

Availability of Public Records

All public records relating to an open session item on this agenda, which are not exempt from disclosure pursuant to the California Public Records Act, that are distributed to a majority of the legislative body will be available for public inspection at 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070-1306, at the same time that the public records are distributed or made available to the legislative body.

Note: All items appearing on the agenda are subject to action by the Board. Staff recommendations are subject to change by the Board.
MEMBERS PRESENT: J. Bruins (Chair), C. Brinkman, C. Chavez, D. Davis, J. Gee, D. Pine, C. Stone, M. Zmuda

MEMBERS ABSENT: G. Gillett

STAFF PRESENT: J. Hartnett, C. Mau, J. Cassman, B. Fitzpatrick, G. Cardona, C. Gumpal

Call to Order
Chair Bruins called the meeting to order at 9:40 a.m.

Roll Call
Acting District Secretary Gumpal called the roll. A quorum was present. Director Davis arrived at 9:47 a.m.; Director Stone arrived at 9:51 a.m.

Public Comment
Roland Lebrun, San Jose, addressed the Board regarding the lack of information contained in the packet on the closed session and issues surrounding the Hillsdale and South San Francisco stations.

Ken Busch, Senior Vice President/Residential of Sares Regis Group of Northern California, LLC, developers of the transit-oriented development at the Hayward Park station, discussed several aspects of the project including the density of the project and inclusion of an affordable housing component.

General Counsel Report
At approximately 9:40 a.m., Legal Counsel Cassman announced the Board would be recessing to a Closed Session on Real Property Negotiation matters.

Closed Session:
  a. Closed Session: Conference with Real Property Negotiators pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.8
     Negotiators: Joan L. Cassman, General Counsel, Brian Fitzpatrick and Gary Cardona, Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board Real Estate Staff
     Property Location: Hayward Park Caltrain Station, San Mateo, California
     Parties: Sares Regis Group
     Under negotiation: Price and terms of contract.
Adjourn
The meeting reconvened into open session at 10:30 a.m. and adjoumed.
MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 6, 2018

MEMBERS PRESENT: J. Bruins, Chair; C. Brinkman, C. Chavez, D. Davis, J. Gee, D. Pine, C. Stone, M. Zmuda

MEMBERS ABSENT: G. Gillett


CALL TO ORDER / PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
Chair Bruins called the meeting to order at 10:47 a.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL
Acting District Secretary Gumpal called the roll. A quorum was present.

Chair Bruins suggested moving the CORA Recognition of a Transit Police Deputy to the next item and prior to Public Comment. Board members concurred.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

a. CORA (Community Overcoming Relationship Abuse) Transit Deputy Recognition

Representatives from Community Overcoming Relationship Abuse presented San Mateo County Deputy Sheriff Pedro Miqueo with a Proclamation honoring him for his extraordinary act in the line of duty by saving a mother and child from an abusive partner near the Belmont train tracks. Additionally, Chair Bruins presented a Proclamation on behalf of the Board of Directors commending Deputy Sheriff Miqueo for his extraordinary efforts. Michelle Bouchard, Chief Operating Officer, Rail, read the Proclamation in its entirety into the record:

"PROCLAMATION COMMENDING
SAN MATEO COUNTY SHERIFF OFFICE TRANSIT POLICE DIVISION
DEPUTY PEDRO MIQUEO

WHEREAS, DEPUTY SHERIFF PEDRO MIQUEO has served with distinction for 15 years in the San Mateo County Sheriff's Office and his eight months as a deputy in the Transit Police division; and
WHEREAS, in his role in the division, DEPUTY PEDRO MIQUEO has gone above and beyond the call of duty; and
WHEREAS, DEPUTY PEDRO MIQUEO responded to a domestic violence call at the Belmont Caltrain Station and was able to arrest the offender and protect a woman and her child from harm; and
WHEREAS, DEPUTY PEDRO MIQUEO treated the victims with care and compassion, volunteering his own time to help and support them in the proceeding months; and

..."
WHEREAS, DEPUTY PEDRO MIQUEO has been recognized by Community Overcoming Relationship Abuse (CORA) for his actions; and
WHEREAS, DEPUTY PEDRO MIQUEO epitomizes the values and high standards that the Transit Police’s work upholds.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT PROCLAIMED that the Board of Directors of the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board does hereby commend DEPUTY SHERIFF PEDRO MIQUEO for his service to the public, the community and Caltrain. Presented this 6th day of September, 2018."

Deputy Miqueo addressed the Board and thanked them for the recognition. San Mateo County Sheriff, Carlos Bolanos, stated the deputy epitomizes the men and women of the Sheriff’s Office and expressed his gratitude for the compassion and professionalism Deputy Miqueo provided to the community. Finally, Sheriff Bolanos acknowledged Lt. Vickie O’Brien of the Transit Police division for her outstanding leadership.

Public Comment
Jeff Carter, Millbrae, acknowledged the difficult job and expressed appreciation to the Sheriff’s Office for its hard work in keeping the railroad safe.

Director Stone, speaking on behalf of the City Council of Belmont, thanked Deputy Miqueo for his extraordinary skills in averting a disaster.

PUBLIC COMMENT
Jeff Carter, Millbrae, reported on the test train he witnessed using the new positive train control technology. He cautioned the Board to not allow building too close to the train’s right of way in case four tracks are needed in the future.

Aleta Dupree, Oakland, commented on the mobile app. and mobile ticketing and encouraged the continued promotion of the app.

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, discussed insulated joints used by Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority and discussed issues surrounding Metra’s rail cars.

Paul Jones, Atherton, discussed recent train control issues in Denver.

CONSENT CALENDAR
a. Approve Special Meeting Minutes of August 2, 2018
b. Approve Minutes of August 2, 2018
c. Accept Statement of Revenues and Expenditures for July 2018
d. Receive Key Caltrain Performance Statistics – July 2018
e. Receive State and Federal Legislative Update
f. Receive Caltrain Business Plan Monthly Update – August 2018
g. Receive Capital Projects Quarterly Report – 4th Quarter Fiscal Year 2018
h. Reauthorize Investment of Monies with Local Agency Investment Fund

Motion/Second: Gee/Davis approved Consent Calendar items a - h.
Ayes: Brinkman, Chavez, Davis, Gee, Pine, Stone, Zmuda, Bruins
Absent: Gillett
REPORT OF THE CHAIR
Chair Bruins announced a vacancy on the Citizens Advisory Committee, representing San Mateo County, and invited the public to apply before the October 4 deadline.

A. Business Plan Ad Hoc Committee

Chair Bruins stated the Business Plan ad hoc committee met in August to discuss assumptions contained in the Plan and conducted a technical discussion on the development of a long range plan. She announced a public workshop that would be held on October 4 at 9 a.m. at the SamTrans Headquarters Building in San Carlos to further discuss components of the Plan.

In response to a question from Director Davis regarding a dedicated funding source for Caltrain and a future three-county ballot measure, Chair Bruins stated an initial meeting was recently held with the seven partner agencies and a subsequent meeting would be held towards the end of the year to further discuss that important issue.

Public Comment
Roland Lebrun, San Jose, claimed the ad hoc committees were not being conducted legally.

REPORT OF THE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Ricardo Valenciana, Vice Chair of the Caltrain Citizens Advisory Committee, provided highlights of the meeting held recently.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
Jim Hartnett, Executive Director, introduced Tasha Bartholomew, Communications Officer, who announced several rail safety educational events happening throughout the month and displayed a new video entitled, “Stay Off the Tracks.”

Proclamation Declaring September as Railroad Safety Month
Motion/Second: Gee/Brinkman
Ayes: Brinkman, Chavez, Davis, Gee, Pine, Stone, Zmuda, Bruins
Absent: Gillett

Update on Financial Dashboard
Derek Hansel, Chief Financial Officer, referred to the financial information in the Board members’ packet. He noted he would be visiting member agencies’ board meetings over the next month soliciting approval of the upcoming Caltrain bond financing package, as was discussed by the Board in prior months. He anticipated the issue coming back to the Caltrain Board in November.

Monthly Report on Positive Train Control
Michelle Bouchard, Chief Operating Officer, Rail, stated that the progress on the Positive Train Control project was ongoing and testing has continued and has been going well. She noted personnel adjustments at Wabtec but the team remains intact and the project is moving forward. Jim Hartnett added that the Peninsula Corridor Joint
Powers Board received an $18.7m federal grant for the program and is awaiting word on receipt of a $5.3m grant.

**Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project Monthly Report for July**

John Funghi, CalMod Chief Officer, provided a monthly update on the electrification project and the electric train order. He stated potholing for the electrification work was progressing in San Francisco and Brisbane as well as from Belmont to San Jose. Mr. Funghi stated tree trimming had started in Menlo Park and San Jose. Work on the traction power substation in San Jose was currently underway and soon two main transformers would be installed. Mr. Funghi stated the overhead catenary work continues, with 33 percent of the poles installed in segment two. Further, tunnel modification work was scheduled throughout September during non-revenue work times. Regarding the electric multiple unit car manufacturing, Mr. Funghi noted the first train set had passed its structural load tests. Finally, train manufacturing continues with three train sets currently in production and a mock-up of the lead car had been delivered to Menlo Park.

Mr. Funghi responded to questions of Board members regarding the tunnel work (safety and public outreach for the weekend riders). Jim Hartnett noted that a bus bridge was planned during construction.

Director Pine expressed appreciation to Mr. Funghi for his work in relocating Burlingame’s paralleling station to its corporation yard property.

Finally, Jim Hartnett reported on the receipt of an American Public Transit Association Sustainability Award in the “Silver” category, for its bicycle access program, LED lighting, participation in the Peninsula Clean Energy program and the Caltrain electrification project. Chief Officer April Chan accepted the award on behalf of the Board.

**Public Comment**

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, acknowledged the work of Caltrain employee, Joe Navarro. He discussed the safety of train stations and contract with Wabtec, TGV trains in France, tunnel opening date.

Aleta Dupree, Oakland, discussed safety issues and requested continuation of weekly construction notices and updates.

**Authorize Execution of a Change Order to the Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project Contract with Balfour Beatty, Inc. for Designing Shunt Wires at Utility Crossings in Conformance with California Public Utility Commission Requirements**

John Funghi, CalMod Chief Officer, stated a design change order is necessary due to a recent regulatory change by the California Public Utilities Commission after award of the Balfour Beatty contract. He discussed details of the contract change and the amount of the change order, in response to a question from Director Zmuda. At the request of Director Stone, Mr. Funghi discussed contract “unknowns” in general and the use of the established contingency fund as a way to resolve the issues that arise.
Approved by Resolution 2018-38  
Motion/Second: Davis/Gee  
Ayes: Brinkman, Chavez, Davis, Gee, Pine, Stone, Zmuda, Bruins  
Absent: Gillett

**AUTHORIZE EXECUTION OF A CHANGE ORDER TO THE PENINSULA CORRIDOR ELECTRIFICATION PROJECT (PCEP) CONTRACT WITH BALFOUR BEATTY, INC. FOR THE DESIGN OF THE PG&E INTERCONNECTIONS TO THE PCEP TRACTION POWER SUBSTATIONS 1 AND 2**

John Funghi, CalMod Chief Officer, described the need for the design of interconnections poles for power substations. Construction also should be expected to result in a change order to Balfour Beatty’s contract. Mr. Funghi answered questions of Board members.

Approved by Resolution 2018-39  
Motion/Second: Gee/Stone  
Ayes: Brinkman, Chavez, Davis, Gee, Pine, Stone, Zmuda, Bruins  
Absent: Gillett

**INCREASE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S CONTRACT CHANGE ORDER AUTHORITY FOR THE SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO STATION IMPROVEMENT PROJECT**

Rafael Bolon, Deputy Director, Capital Program Delivery, provided a brief presentation on the South San Francisco Station Improvement Project and its purpose, schedule, budget and challenges. Mr. Bolon discussed why increased change order authority in the amount of $3.4 million is needed to complete the project, including to extend the contract end date, address utility relocation issues and increase total contract authority. Finally, Mr. Bolon displayed schematics of the completed station. He responded to questions regarding funding sources.

**Public Comment**

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, discussed the station design details, funding and Union Pacific.

Adina Levin, Friends of Caltrain, addressed the Board regarding the need for better pedestrian and bike safety aspects to be included in the project.

Approved by Resolution 2018-40  
Motion/Second: Brinkman/Davis  
Ayes: Brinkman, Chavez, Davis, Gee, Pine, Stone, Zmuda, Bruins  
Absent: Gillett

**2018 ANNUAL PASSENGER COUNT PRESENTATION**

Michelle Bouchard, Chief Officer, Rail, introduced Catherine David, Principal Planner, Rail Operations Planning. Ms. David provided a comprehensive presentation on Caltrain’s annual counts. Ms. David reviewed average weekday ridership, riders by time period, peak ridership data, top 10 stations, county by county comparison, seating capacity, busiest trains, Gilroy extension ridership, bicycle ridership and statistics on bike bumping and weekend service statistics. Summarizing, Ms. David stated the data
collected would be incorporated into the Caltrain Business Planning efforts to strategize for future scheduling and passenger capacity.

Ms. David responded to questions from Director Chavez regarding Gilroy service ridership, origin/destination survey work, and issues related to last mile connection issues. Ms. David also responded to Director Brinkman regarding the impact of weekend ridership during the tunnel work and impact of scooters and ridership. Director Zmuda expressed appreciation for how the passenger count was conducted, and noted that it should help with assumptions and explanations related to fare elasticity. Chair Bruins also provided commentary on the presentation.

Public Comment
Jeff Carter, Millbrae, addressed the Board and stated he appreciated the passenger count report, noting that Monday through Friday information would have been helpful to include as well as Clipper and ticket vending machine information.

Drew, San Mateo, commented on several of the slides in the presentation and noted that not just the baby bullet trains have high capacity. He stated he appreciated the presentation.

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, referred to Director Chavez's comments regarding South Santa Clara County riders’ origin and destination and asked how can the new bullet trains handle capacity in light of the building in that area. He discussed the Sunnyvale station platform construction. He recommended that the full presentation be presented at the October business plan workshop.

Adina Levin, Friends of Caltrain, addressed the Board regarding the increase in ridership in the South Santa Clara County region.

CORRESPONDENCE
All correspondence was included in the Board’s reading files. Jim Hartnett stated staff is trying to get the correspondence to the Board ahead of time. Chair Bruins stated that it is now posted electronically.

Public Comment
Roland Lebrun, San Jose, requested that the correspondence should be scanned as a searchable .pdf, that two correspondence packets be posted (to include correspondence submitted after the initial deadline for posting with the agenda) and that prior correspondence packages be posted on the website.

BOARD MEMBER REQUESTS
Director Chavez stated there should be a future discussion on housing. Director Stone agreed. Director Brinkman requested that there be adequate time to review the San Francisco downtown extension alignment for the Board to review the options and challenges. Chair Bruins stated discussions are taking place regarding a possible 1/8th-cent sales tax measure. She also noted that while oral public comment is always invited at the meetings, often written correspondence would suffice.
GENERAL COUNSEL REPORT
Legal Counsel Cassman reported that the Board met in closed session during a Special Meeting immediately preceding this regular Board meeting. A matter of real property litigation was discussed and no action was taken.

Date/Time of Next Regular Meeting: Thursday, October 4, 2018 at 10:00 a.m. San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building, 2nd Floor, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA.

ADJOURN
The meeting adjoumed at approximately 12:41p.m.
TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
   Executive Director

FROM: Derek Hansel
   Chief Financial Officer

SUBJECT: STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENSES FOR THE PERIOD ENDING AUGUST 31, 2018

ACTION
Staff proposes that the Board of Directors accept and enter into the record the Statement of Revenues and Expenses for the month of August 2018.

This staff report provides a brief discussion of significant items and trends on the attached Statement of Revenues and Expenses through August 31, 2018. The statement has been designed to follow the Agency wide line item rollup as included in the adopted budget. The columns have been designed to provide easy comparison of year to date prior to current actuals for the current fiscal year including dollar and percentage variances. In addition, the current forecast of Revenues and Expenses is compared to the Adopted Budget for Fiscal Year 2019.

SIGNIFICANCE

Annual Forecast: The annual forecast is currently the same as budget and will be updated twice a year and presented at the February and April board meetings.

Year to Date Revenues: As of August year-to-date actual, the Total revenue (page 1, line 17) is $2.3 million higher than the prior year. This is primarily driven by higher Farebox Revenue (page 1, line 1), Operating Grants (page 1, line 11) and JPB Member Agencies contributions (page 1, line 12).

Year to Date Expenses: As of August year-to-date actual, the Total Expense (page 1, line 48) is $1.6 million higher than the prior year-to-date actual. This is primarily due to Fuel and Lubricants (page 1, line 27), Managing Agency Admin OH Cost (page 1, line 38), Professional Services (page 1, line 40) and Wages & Benefits (page 1, line 37) due to inclusion of unfunded CalPERS and Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) liability (this expense will not recur throughout the year).
BUDGET IMPACT
There are no budget amendments for the month of August 2018.

STRATEGIC INITIATIVE
This item does not achieve a strategic initiative.

Prepared By:  Maria Pascual, Accountant  650-508-6288
Jennifer Ye, Manager, General Ledger  650-622-7890
## Statement of Revenue and Expense

**PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD**  
**STATEMENT OF REVENUE AND EXPENSE**  
**Fiscal Year 2019**  
**August 2018**

### Revenue

#### Operations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Prior Actual</th>
<th>Current Actual</th>
<th>$ Variance</th>
<th>% Variance</th>
<th>Approved Budget</th>
<th>Forecast</th>
<th>$ Variance</th>
<th>% Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farebox Revenue</td>
<td>16,595,006</td>
<td>18,024,136</td>
<td>1,429,130</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>107,795,329</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Revenue</td>
<td>933,925</td>
<td>883,911</td>
<td>(50,014)</td>
<td>(5.4%)</td>
<td>5,845,900</td>
<td>5,845,900</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuttles</td>
<td>378,158</td>
<td>347,611</td>
<td>(30,548)</td>
<td>(8.1%)</td>
<td>2,683,400</td>
<td>2,683,400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Income</td>
<td>322,079</td>
<td>305,420</td>
<td>(16,659)</td>
<td>(5.2%)</td>
<td>1,873,000</td>
<td>1,873,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>194,069</td>
<td>199,132</td>
<td>5,063</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1,192,000</td>
<td>1,192,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Contributions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Prior Actual</th>
<th>Current Actual</th>
<th>$ Variance</th>
<th>% Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB434 Peninsula &amp; TA Shuttle Funding</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>297,768</td>
<td>307,163</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Grants</td>
<td>710,942</td>
<td>1,095,101</td>
<td>384,160</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPB Member Agencies</td>
<td>8,498,131</td>
<td>9,033,000</td>
<td>534,869</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Reserves</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1,208,871</td>
<td>1,208,871</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Total Operating Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Actual</th>
<th>Current Actual</th>
<th>$ Variance</th>
<th>% Variance</th>
<th>Approved Budget</th>
<th>Forecast</th>
<th>$ Variance</th>
<th>% Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18,423,238</td>
<td>19,760,209</td>
<td>1,336,971</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>119,389,629</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expense

#### Operating Expense:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Prior Actual</th>
<th>Current Actual</th>
<th>$ Variance</th>
<th>% Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rail Operator Service</td>
<td>13,288,048</td>
<td>13,184,307</td>
<td>(103,741)</td>
<td>(0.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Train Control</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,481</td>
<td>20,481</td>
<td>1,442,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Services</td>
<td>920,719</td>
<td>981,377</td>
<td>60,658</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuttles Services</td>
<td>787,324</td>
<td>774,158</td>
<td>(13,166)</td>
<td>(1.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel and Lubricants</td>
<td>1,437,890</td>
<td>1,773,799</td>
<td>335,909</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timetables and Tickets</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>143,500</td>
<td>143,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>697,165</td>
<td>812,169</td>
<td>115,004</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and Equipment Maint</td>
<td>243,582</td>
<td>446,413</td>
<td>202,831</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>357,115</td>
<td>329,795</td>
<td>(27,320)</td>
<td>(7.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maint &amp; Services-Bldg &amp; Other</td>
<td>197,372</td>
<td>208,696</td>
<td>11,324</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Total Operating Expense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Actual</th>
<th>Current Actual</th>
<th>$ Variance</th>
<th>% Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17,929,215</td>
<td>18,531,195</td>
<td>601,980</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Administrative Expense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Prior Actual</th>
<th>Current Actual</th>
<th>$ Variance</th>
<th>% Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wages and Benefits</td>
<td>2,300,949</td>
<td>2,768,413</td>
<td>467,464</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Agency Admin OH Cost</td>
<td>1,009,682</td>
<td>1,289,406</td>
<td>279,724</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Directors</td>
<td>2,811</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>(1,711)</td>
<td>(60.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>426,800</td>
<td>633,012</td>
<td>206,212</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications and Marketing</td>
<td>14,155</td>
<td>35,020</td>
<td>20,865</td>
<td>147.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Office Expenses and Services</td>
<td>353,056</td>
<td>353,641</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Total Administrative Expense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Actual</th>
<th>Current Actual</th>
<th>$ Variance</th>
<th>% Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4,407,453</td>
<td>5,080,592</td>
<td>973,139</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Grand Total Expense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Actual</th>
<th>Current Actual</th>
<th>$ Variance</th>
<th>% Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22,253,114</td>
<td>23,832,816</td>
<td>1,579,702</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Net Surplus / (Deficit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Actual</th>
<th>Current Actual</th>
<th>$ Variance</th>
<th>% Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5,676,964</td>
<td>6,362,656</td>
<td>685,693</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board**

**Investment Portfolio**

**As of August 31, 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Security</th>
<th>Maturity Date</th>
<th>Interest Rate</th>
<th>Purchase Price</th>
<th>Market Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Agency Investment Fund (Unrestricted)</td>
<td>Liquid Cash</td>
<td>1.998%</td>
<td>10,604,215</td>
<td>10,604,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Pool (Restricted)</td>
<td>Liquid Cash</td>
<td>1.925%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Pool (Unrestricted)</td>
<td>Liquid Cash</td>
<td>1.925%</td>
<td>997,378</td>
<td>997,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Unrestricted)</td>
<td>Liquid Cash</td>
<td>0.000%</td>
<td>35,621,677</td>
<td>35,621,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Restricted)</td>
<td>Liquid Cash</td>
<td>0.200%</td>
<td>21,599,772</td>
<td>21,599,772</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$69,823,042  $69,823,042

**Accrued Earnings for August 2018** $42,392.41

**Cumulative Earnings FY2019** $74,952.24

*The market value of Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF) is calculated annually and is derived from the fair value factor as reported by LAIF for quarter ending June 30th each year.

**As of August 2018, the total cost of the Total County Pool was $4,457,477,078 and the fair market value per San Mateo County Treasurer’s Office was $4,445,885,293.**

***Prepaid Grant funds for Homeland Security, PTMISEA and LCTOP projects, and funds reserved for debt repayment. The Portfolio and this Investment Report comply with the Investment Policy and the provisions of SB 564 (1995). The Joint Powers Board has the ability to meet its expenditure requirements for the next six months.
Staff proposes that the Board of Directors accept and enter into the record the Statement of Revenues and Expenses for the month of June, 2018.

This staff report provides a brief discussion of significant items and trends on the attached Statement of Revenues and Expenses through June 30, 2018. The statement has been designed to follow the Agency wide line item rollup as included in the adopted budget. The columns have been designed to provide easy comparison of year to date prior to current actuals for the current fiscal year including dollar and percentage variances. In addition, the current forecast of Revenues and Expenses is compared to the Revised Budget for Fiscal Year 2018.

**SIGNIFICANCE**

**Annual Forecast:** As of June year-to-date actual, the Total Revenues (page 1 of the Statement of Revenues and Expenses, line 17) are $0.6 million lower than the forecast. This is primarily due to lower Use of Reserves (page 1, line 13). Total Expense (page 1, line 48) is $1.7 million lower than the prior forecast. This is primarily driven by lower Insurance (page 1, line 29) due to lower insurance claims, and Professional Services (page 1, line 40) due to lower than anticipated litigation costs.

**Year-to-Date Revenues:** As of June year-to-date actual, the Total revenues (page 1 of the Statement of Revenues and Expenses, line 17) are $3.6 million higher than the prior year. This is primarily driven by Farebox Revenue (page 1, line 1) and Rental Income (page 1, line 4). This is partially offset by Parking Revenue (page 1, line 2), and Other Income (page 1, line 5) due to Union Pacific shared track and maintenance revenue.
**Year to Date Expenses:** As of June year-to-date actual, the Total Expense (page 1, line 48) is $0.5 million higher than the prior year-to-date actual. This is primarily due to Rail Operator Service (page 1, line 23), Security Services (page 1, line 25), Fuel and Lubricants (page 1, line 27), Wages & Benefits (Page 1 line 37), and Professional Services (page 1, line 40) offset by Insurance (page 1, line 29) due to decrease in claims expense, reversal of claims reserve and adjustments to incurred-but-not reported (IBNR) claim liabilities in FY2018.

**BUDGET IMPACT**
There are no budget amendments for the month of June 2018.

**STRATEGIC INITIATIVE**
This item does not achieve a strategic initiative.

Prepared By: Maria Pascual, Accountant 650-508-6288
Jennifer Ye, Manager, General Ledger 650-622-7980
## PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD
### STATEMENT OF REVENUE AND EXPENSE
**Fiscal Year 2018**  
**June 2018**

### UNAUDITED

#### YEAR TO DATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR TO DATE</th>
<th>% OF YEAR ELAPSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRIOR ACTUAL</td>
<td>CURRENT ACTUAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### REVENUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPERATIONS:</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>YEAR TO DATE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faresbox Revenue</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>92,428,889</td>
<td>97,050,195</td>
<td>1,621,306</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>98,427,508</td>
<td>97,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Revenue</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>5,827,151</td>
<td>5,603,407</td>
<td>(223,745)</td>
<td>(3.8%)</td>
<td>6,871,603</td>
<td>5,291,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuttles</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>2,083,528</td>
<td>2,186,561</td>
<td>103,033</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>2,461,000</td>
<td>2,326,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Income</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>1,860,920</td>
<td>2,070,335</td>
<td>209,215</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>1,749,200</td>
<td>2,063,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>3,138,745</td>
<td>2,221,012</td>
<td>(917,733)</td>
<td>(29.2%)</td>
<td>993,345</td>
<td>1,543,899</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### OPERATIONS:

| TOTAL OPERATING REVENUE | 3.6% | 105,339,273 | 109,131,310 | 7,792,036 | 7.0% | 110,493,655 | 108,424,517 | (2,069,139) | 1.9% |

#### CONTRIBUTIONS:

| AB434 Peninsula & TA Shuttle Funding | 6.4% | 1,833,559 | 1,723,254 | (110,305) | (6.0%) | 1,796,300 | 1,796,300 | 0.0% |
| Operating Grants | 1.0% | 4,352,665 | 4,265,650 | (67,015) | (1.5%) | 4,265,650 | 4,265,650 | 0.0% |
| JPB Member Agencies | 1.4% | 20,448,014 | 20,448,014 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 20,448,014 | 20,448,014 | 0.0% |

#### USE OF RESERVES:

| TOTAL CONTRIBUTED REVENUE | 0.7% | 26,614,238 | 26,436,918 | (2,655) | (0.0%) | 35,000,943 | 27,735,458 | (7,265,485) | (20.8%) |

#### GRAND TOTAL REVENUE:

| 2.7% | 131,953,510 | 135,568,228 | 3,614,718 | 2.7% | 145,494,598 | 136,159,975 | (9,334,624) | (6.4%) |

#### EXPENSE

| OPERATING EXPENSE:

| Rail Operator Service | 3.4% | 80,442,022 | 83,193,402 | 2,751,380 | 3.4% | 84,189,129 | 83,738,587 | (4,450,618) | 1.3% |
| Positive Train Control | 2.1% | 215,621 | 169,619 | (46,002) | (21.3%) | 488,373 | 166,000 | (322,373) | (66.0%) |
| Security Services | 7.7% | 5,434,038 | 5,850,526 | 416,488 | 7.7% | 5,900,099 | 5,905,000 | 49,901 | 0.8% |
| Shuttles Services | 2.8% | 4,584,884 | 4,713,180 | 128,296 | 2.8% | 5,161,000 | 4,500,000 | (661,000) | (12.8%) |
| Fuel and Lubricants | 19.8% | 8,600,952 | 10,301,806 | 1,700,854 | 19.8% | 10,590,289 | 10,181,604 | (417,686) | (3.9%) |
| Timetables and Tickets | 39.6% | 124,991 | 76,752 | (48,240) | (38.6%) | 144,700 | 104,726 | (40,974) | (27.6%) |
| Insurance | 8.4% | 7,105,001 | 1,177,537 | (5,927,464) | (83.4%) | 6,108,156 | 2,600,000 | (3,508,156) | (57.4%) |
| Facilities and Equipment Maint | 4.9% | 2,503,026 | 2,626,683 | 123,657 | 4.9% | 2,963,300 | 2,470,227 | (493,073) | (16.6%) |
| Utilities | 6.6% | 2,033,313 | 1,899,260 | (134,053) | (6.6%) | 1,964,783 | 1,985,456 | 20,673 | 1.1% |
| Maint & Services-Bldg & Other | 14.0% | 1,172,622 | 1,336,698 | 164,076 | 14.0% | 1,509,598 | 1,407,601 | (101,997) | (6.8%) |

#### TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSE:

| 0.8% | 112,216,471 | 111,345,463 | (871,008) | 0.8% | 119,028,597 | 112,744,201 | (6,284,396) | (5.3%) |

#### ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE

| Wages and Benefits | 3.2% | 7,807,444 | 8,058,146 | 250,702 | 3.2% | 9,547,454 | 8,189,038 | (1,358,416) | (14.2%) |
| Managing Agency Admin OH Cost | 2.3% | 5,732,429 | 5,886,046 | 133,616 | 2.3% | 6,051,231 | 5,899,231 | (152,000) | -2.5% |
| Board of Directors | 29.9% | 10,819 | 14,057 | 3,237 | 29.9% | 14,600 | 14,600 | 0.0% |
| Professional Services | 19.5% | 4,246,015 | 5,073,344 | 827,330 | 19.5% | 6,275,112 | 5,512,184 | (762,928) | (14.2%) |
| Communications and Marketing | 17.2% | 165,926 | 194,390 | 28,464 | 17.2% | 211,500 | 202,045 | (9,455) | (4.5%) |
| Other Office Expenses and Services | 2.4% | 2,434,411 | 2,373,124 | (59,287) | (2.4%) | 3,067,519 | 2,300,000 | (767,519) | (25.0%) |

#### TOTAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE:

| 3.8% | 20,417,045 | 21,601,107 | 1,184,062 | 3.8% | 25,167,416 | 22,117,098 | (3,050,318) | (12.1%) |

#### GRAND TOTAL EXPENSE:

| 0.4% | 133,935,488 | 134,447,029 | 511,541 | 0.4% | 145,494,598 | 136,159,975 | (9,334,624) | (6.4%) |

#### NET SURPLUS / (DEFICIT)

| (0.16%) | (1,981,978) | 1,121,136 | 3,103,114 | (156.6%) | (0) | - | 0 | (100.0%) |
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**Local Agency Investment Fund (Unrestricted)**
- Maturity: Liquid Cash
- Interest Rate: 1.854%
- Purchase Price: 2,073,400
- Market Price: 2,073,400

**County Pool (Restricted)**
- Maturity: Liquid Cash
- Interest Rate: 1.835%
- Purchase Price: 1,000,000
- Market Price: 1,000,000

**County Pool (Unrestricted)**
- Maturity: Liquid Cash
- Interest Rate: 1.835%
- Purchase Price: 988,680
- Market Price: 988,680

**Other (Unrestricted)**
- Maturity: Liquid Cash
- Interest Rate: 0.000%
- Purchase Price: 40,466,643
- Market Price: 40,466,643

**Other (Restricted)**
- Maturity: Liquid Cash
- Interest Rate: 0.200%
- Purchase Price: 22,623,125
- Market Price: 22,623,125

**Accrued Earnings for June 2018**
- $36,992.25

**Cumulative Earnings FY2018**
- $127,939.92

* The market value of Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF) is calculated annually and is derived from the fair value factor as reported by LAIF for quarter ending June 30th each year.

** As of June 2018, the total cost of the Total County County was $4,858,642,498 and the fair market value per San Mateo County Treasurer’s Office was $4,844,458,821.

*** Prepaid Grant funds for Homeland Security, PTMISEA and LCTOP projects, and funds reserved for debt repayment.

The Portfolio and this Investment Report comply with the Investment Policy and the provisions of SB 564 (1995).

The Joint Powers Board has the ability to meet its expenditure requirements for the next six months.
AGENDA ITEM # 4 (d)
OCTOBER 4, 2018

PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD
STAFF REPORT

TO: Joint Powers Board
THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
Executive Director
FROM: Michelle Bouchard
Chief Operating Officer, Rail
SUBJECT: KEY CALTRAIN PERFORMANCE STATISTICS - AUGUST 2018

ACTION
Staff Coordinating Council recommends that the Board receive the Performance Report for August 2018.

SIGNIFICANCE
Staff will provide monthly updates to Key Caltrain Performance Statistics, Caltrain Shuttle Ridership, Caltrain Promotions, Special Event Updates and Social Media Analytics.

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no budget impact.

MONTHLY UPDATE
In August 2018, Caltrain’s average weekday ridership (AWR) increased 2.3 percent to 63,340 from August 2017 AWR of 61,903. The total number of passengers who rode Caltrain in August 2018 increased 1.7 percent to 1,712,362 from 1,684,462 in August 2017. This month ticket sales for One Way tickets (up 34.9 percent) and ED One Way tickets (up 24.8 percent) increased from August 2017. Ticket sales for Day Passes (down 8.9 percent), ED Day Passes (down 14.6 percent), Monthly Passes (down 6.3 percent) and ED Monthly Passes (down 1.7 percent) decreased from August 2017. The shift in fare product usage is due to elimination of the 8-ride ticket and recent Monthly Pass fare increase effective July 2018. The recent implementation of Caltrain Mobile Ticketing (which includes One Way, ED One Way, Day Pass, ED Day Pass, Zone Upgrades and Joint Caltrain + VTA Day Pass purchases) accounted for approximately 2.8 percent (47,137 rides) of August 2018 rides and 3.7 percent ($338,474) of August 2018 Monthly Ticket Sales Revenue. The number of Eligible Go Pass Employees decreased 1.6 percent to 80,172 from 81,513 from August 2017. The number of participating Go Pass Companies increased to 130 from 124 from August 2017. Farebox Revenue increased 8.0 percent to $9,069,681 from $8,398,203 in August 2017.
On-time performance (OTP) for August 2018 was 93.0 percent compared to 95.7 percent OTP for August 2017. In August 2018 there were more minutes of delay due to a trespasser strike resulting in fatality, JPB’s aggressive capital construction program (single tracking in multiple work segments for various projects while coordinating PTC testing in parallel), mechanical issues (related to SOGR issues with locomotives) and dwell time delays from boarding passengers. In August 2018 there were 669 minutes of delay due to mechanical issues compared to 428 minutes in August 2017.

Looking at customer service statistics, there were 9.3 complaints per 100,000 passengers in August 2018 which increased from 8.0 in August 2017.

Shuttle ridership for August 2018 is down 8.1 percent from August 2017. For the station shuttles, the Millbrae-Broadway shuttle averaged 181 daily riders. The weekend Tamien-San Jose shuttle averaged 32 daily riders. When the Marguerite shuttle was removed, the impact to ridership was a decrease of 0.3 percent. Due to ongoing service issues with the Shuttle Partner contractor due to a staffing shortage, Shuttle routes continued to have DNOs (Did Not Operate trips). Staff management is continuing to work on resolving the issue. As a result, the Belmont-Hillsdale shuttle and Menlo Park Midday Shuttle is temporarily discontinued as of Tuesday, September 4, 2018. During the shuttle suspension, riders can use the SamTrans ECR or ECR Rapid, which provides service along El Camino Real and serves Hillsdale and Belmont Caltrain stations.

**Caltrain Promotions - August 2018**

**49ers** – The 49ers pre-season kicked off in August and Caltrain was ready to transport faithful fans heading to Levi’s® Stadium. This year’s train service will include one pre-game special Baby Bullet express train for all weekend games and a post-game local northbound train for weekday and weekend games. The 49ers hosted the Dallas Cowboys on August 9 and the Los Angeles Chargers on August 30 at 7 p.m. Total additional ridership alighting and boarding at Mountain View station for the two games was 2,586, a 57 percent increase compared to the same number of games in 2017. The pre-season games were promoted through organic social media, news release/blog and the 49ers service schedule information page on the Caltrain website. Promotional advertising campaign will launch in September for the first home weekend game on September 16.

**Ed Sheeran at AT&T Park** – On Tuesday, August 21 at 7 p.m. pop sensation Ed Sheeran performed at AT&T Park. Additional post-concert service was added to accommodate the large crowds. The service was promoted through organic social media; Caltrain special events web posting and news release/blog. Caltrain carried approximately 7,549 riders to and from the concert.

**Caltrain August 2018 Social Media Analytics** – In August, Caltrain promoted sporting events for Stanford, Giants and 49ers as well as the Ed Sheeran concert at AT&T Park. Staff also promoted Week in Caltrain videos and contests. On the service side Caltrain promoted shuttles, 25th Ave Grade Separation Project PG&E work, San Carlos Transit Center, Hillsdale and Sunnyvale station construction projects, single tracking for Electrification, Labor Day service and the EMU/CalMod progress.
Caltrain Digital Metrics - AUGUST 2018

**New Followers**
-10,116
**August 18** - 174,058
July 18 - 184,174
Aug 17 - 160,776

**Top Tagged Issues**
1. Delays
2. Bike Car
3. CalMod
4. Giants/Belmont
5. Clipper

**Caltrain.com Pageviews**
**August 18** - 916,197
July 18 - 944,299
Aug 17 - 896,805

**Monthly Yelp & FB Rating**
(3 August reviews)

**Mobile App - August, 18**
13,192 - Downloads
25,298 - Active Users
1.9 (59 reviews) - Overall Rating

---

Social Media Impression Spikes
August, 2018

Your Tweets earned **1.6M impressions** over this **31 day period**

August 24
- SB380 Fatal
- 985 Incdnt Delay Mins
- 1260 Daily Delay Mins

Prepared by:  James Namba, Marketing Specialist  650.508.7924
Jeremy Lipps, Social Media Officer  650.622.7845
Patrice Givens, Data Specialist  650.508.6347

Table A
August 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>FY2019</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Ridership</td>
<td>1,684,462</td>
<td>1,712,362</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Weekday Ridership</td>
<td>61,903</td>
<td>63,340</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Farebox Revenue</td>
<td>$8,398,203</td>
<td>$9,069,681</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-time Performance</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
<td>-2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Caltrain Shuttle Ridership</td>
<td>8,916</td>
<td>8,195</td>
<td>-8.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Year-to-Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>FY2019</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Ridership</td>
<td>3,300,028</td>
<td>3,385,398</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Weekday Ridership</td>
<td>62,489</td>
<td>63,888</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Farebox Revenue</td>
<td>$16,595,006</td>
<td>$18,024,136</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-time Performance</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
<td>-1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Caltrain Shuttle Ridership</td>
<td>9,116</td>
<td>8,328</td>
<td>-8.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph A

Caltrain Average Weekday Ridership

![Graph A](image)
Graph B

Caltrain Mobile Ticketing - Monthly Sales by Ticket Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone Upgrade</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>1,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Pass</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>2,681</td>
<td>5,108</td>
<td>7,027</td>
<td>8,727</td>
<td>9,307</td>
<td>9,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Way</td>
<td>2,136</td>
<td>6,194</td>
<td>10,034</td>
<td>14,734</td>
<td>20,668</td>
<td>25,222</td>
<td>28,681</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph C

MONTHLY MECHANICAL DELAYS
CALTRAIN MONTHLY COMPLAINTS

Graph D

Complaints per 100,000 Passengers

FY2017
FY2018
FY2019
PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD
STAFF REPORT

TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
Executive Director

FROM: Seamus Murphy
Chief Communications Officer

SUBJECT: STATE AND FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

ACTION
Staff Coordinating Council recommends the Board receives the attached memos. Staff will provide regular updates to the Board in accordance with Legislative Program.

SIGNIFICANCE
The 2018 Legislative Program establishes the principles that will guide the legislative and regulatory advocacy efforts. Based on those principles, staff coordinates closely with our Federal and State advocates on a wide variety of issues that are considered in Congress and the State legislature. The attached reports highlight the recent issues and actions that are relevant to the Board.

Prepared By: Casey Fromson, Government and Community Affairs Director 650-508-6493
September 17, 2018

TO: Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board Members

FROM: Mike Robson and Trent Smith, Edelstein Gilbert Robson & Smith, LLC
Joshua W. Shaw and Matt Robinson, Shaw / Yoder / Antwih, Inc.

RE: STATE LEGISLATIVE UPDATE – OCTOBER 2018

Overview

The Legislature adjourned its 2017-2018 Legislative Session just before midnight on August 31 having passed 1,562 bills to the Governor in the final months of the legislative session. The Governor has until September 30 to sign or veto all the bills before him. At the time of this writing the Governor has yet to act on about half of the bills before him.

Members of the Legislature, in the meantime, have returned to their districts to campaign for re-election, travel, meet with constituents and begin preparing for the 2019 Legislative Session. The Legislature will return briefly on December 3 to swear-in members elected in November.

November Election

Proposition 6

As noted above, with the Legislature adjourned, attention is now turning to the November ballot. Of utmost concern to Caltrain is Proposition 6, which is the referendum to repeal the gas tax and fee increases in SB 1. This initiative, if passed, would jeopardize $165 million in planned SB 1 funding for Caltrain electrification, station improvements, and grade crossings. For that reason, the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board has formally opposed Proposition 6.

Caltrain is part of a larger group of opponents comprised of business, local government, labor, and transportation professionals. There is an organized political campaign committee called the No on Proposition 6: Stop the Attack on Bridge and Road Safety Committee that will campaign against the initiative.

The coalition opposing the initiative has successfully secured the endorsement of dozens of editorial boards across the state and is being helped by major business associations ranging from the California Chamber of Commerce, the Bay Area Council, and the Los Angeles based Valley Industry and Commerce Association.
Initial polling indicates that the measure is on track to fail but it is still a long way until November 6. We expect the campaign on Proposition 6 to be one of the more dominant issues of the November election ballot.
Caltrain
Federal Update
August – September 2018

appropriations

2019 Appropriations Update: Fiscal year (FY) 2018 is quickly coming to a close on September 30, and the new fiscal year will begin on October 1. With only seven legislative days remaining before members recess for the midterm election, Congress is expected to pass a short-term spending bill—known as a continuing resolution (CR)—extending current spending levels for the federal agencies until December 7 for the majority of the FY 2019 appropriations bills. The CR will also include the FY 2018 Defense and Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations conference report.

The Senate passed H.R. 5895, the Energy and Water (provides funding for the Department of Energy and the Army Corps of Engineers), Legislative Branch (provides funding for Congress), and Military Construction-Veterans Affairs Appropriations Conference Report on September 12 by a vote of 92-5. The House passed the conference report on September 13 by a vote of 377-20. The President is expected to sign the legislation into law.

The House and Senate are currently conferencing a minibus that includes Transportation-HUD (THUD), Interior-Environment, Financial Services, and Agriculture-FDA Appropriations bills. The conferees met for the first time on September 13, and were unable to finalize the conference report due to disagreement over a number of policy provisions. Therefore, the Department of Transportation (DOT) will be funded at current funding levels thorough the CR.

The members’ statements during the meeting indicate several details on the conference report:

- Funding in the THUD conference report will include $71.1 billion, which is less than both the House ($71.8 billion) and Senate ($71.4 billion) THUD Appropriations bills.
- The additional highway and bridge funding (on top of the FAST Act authorized funding) is $3.25 billion, less than the House’s $4.2 billion and the Senate’s $3.3 billion.
- The conference report contains nearly $300 million for a new port infrastructure grant program that was not in either the House or Senate bills.
- The conference report includes language that “holds DOT accountable” in its implementation of the BUILD grant program and the Capital Investment Grant (New Starts/Small Starts/Core Capacity) program.
FAA Bill Outlook: The current authorization for the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) will lapse on September 30, in the absence of congressional action. Senate Commerce Committee Chairman John Thune (R-SD) has stated that floor consideration of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) authorization bill is riding on lawmakers are dealing with a controversial provision regarding the state rest and meal break rules for truck drivers. Thune noted that he’s not optimistic that the committee can get through the amendments in the manager’s package until Democrats feel the truck driving rules are addressed. Congress will likely have to enact a short-term extension to give the Senate time to pass its multi-year FAA reauthorization bill (S. 1405).

Senate Commerce Committee Approves Nominees and DOT Reporting Bill: On September 5, the Senate Commerce Committee approved two transportation-related nominees and a bill to streamline Department of Transportation (DOT) reporting requirements. The committee approved, by voice vote, the nomination of Joel Szabat to be Assistant Secretary of Transportation for Aviation and International Affairs. Szabat is already leading the office as Deputy Assistant Secretary for Aviation and International Affairs. The committee also approved Rick Dearborn to the Amtrak Board of Directors in the only roll call vote of the executive session, in a 14-13 party line vote. The committee also reported out a bill that would streamline the reports DOT is required to produce, so that, according to Committee Chairman John Thune (R-SD), the department can focus resources on the most important issues. The Department of Transportation Reports Harmonization Act (S. 3367) eliminates or reduces the frequency of several reports that DOT is required to submit to Congress. The bill also includes provisions related to transportation safety:

- The Secretary must respond publicly, within 90 days, to any recommendation about transportation safety from National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB), including whether the Secretary intends to adopt the complete recommendation, part of the recommendation, or refuse, including a timetable for implementation or justification for refusal;
- The Comptroller General of the United States must review DOT’s highway safety programs, report to Congress on the progress states have made towards their safety targets and their utilization of grants to do so, and provide recommendations for improving those programs;
- The Secretary must make publicly available a list of each statutory mandate regarding pipeline safety or hazardous materials safety that has not yet been implemented;
- The DOT Inspector General must make public a list of each open safety recommendation made by the IG regarding pipeline safety or hazardous materials safety; and
- The Secretary must make publicly available biennially a statistical compilation of accidents and casualties related to the transportation of hazardous materials.

PTC Hearing: On September 13, the House Transportation & Infrastructure Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials held a hearing on the status of implementing positive train control (PTC) on the freight and passenger rail network. The witnesses were:

- Ronald L. Batory, Administrator, Federal Railroad Administration (FRA)
• Robert Sumwalt, Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB)
• Susan A. Fleming, Director, Physical Infrastructure Team, Government Accountability Office (GAO)
• Scot Napolstek, Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer, Amtrak
• Edward Hamberger, President and Chief Executive Officer, Association of American Railroads
• Jeffrey D. Knueppel, General Manager, Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority; on behalf of American Public Transportation Association (APTA)
• Stacey Mortensen, Executive Director, Altamont Corridor Express (ACE)

The GAO witness, Susan Fleming, testified that 32 of the 40 railroads with PTC requirements report that they will request an alternative schedule (AS), which will grant those railroads an extension until as late as December 31, 2020 to be full compliance.

All the witnesses agreed that the biggest challenge after 2018 will be ensuring the different railroads’ PTC systems interoperability.

Stacey Mortensen, with ACE, discussed their challenges from meeting the PTC deadline which include that since Caltrain is filing for an AS, ACE will not be able to complete work on the four miles in the San Jose area on the Caltrain rail without Caltrain cooperation and that since ACE is one of the smallest railroads, they have delays in receiving hardware.

ADMINISTRATION

FRA Awards Grant Funding for PTC Implementation: The Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) awarded over $200 million in grant funding for 28 projects in 15 states, to assist with deployment of positive train control (PTC) systems. FRA will make awards to 28 projects for a total of $203 million of the $250 million specifically appropriated under the Consolidated Rail Infrastructure and Safety Improvements (CRISI) program. Caltrain was awarded a grant “up to $18,693,386: for PTC Infrastructure Implementation and Safety Certification.

FTA Announces Pilot Program for Expedited Project Delivery: The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) announced a Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) for the Expedited Project Delivery Pilot Program (Pilot Program), authorized by the FAST Act. The Pilot Program is aimed at expediting delivery of new fixed guideway capital projects, small starts projects, or core capacity improvement projects that utilize public-private partnerships, are planned to be operated and maintained by employees of an existing public transportation provider, and have a Federal share not exceeding 25 percent of the project cost. Expressions of interest to become one of the participants in the Pilot Program for Expedited Project Delivery must be submitted to FTA by November 13, 2018.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1831</strong></td>
<td>A. CHAPTEDER 6/27/2018-Approved by the Governor. Chaptered by Secretary of State - Chapter 43, Statutes of 2018.</td>
<td>Current law specifies the length of terms of appointive members of the Student Aid Commission, except student representatives, the governing body of the California Exposition and State Fair, and the High-Speed Rail Authority as 4 years, and appointive members of the Employment Training Panel as 2 years. This bill would delete the length of terms of the members appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly to the Student Aid Commission, the governing body of the California Exposition and State Fair, the High-Speed Rail Authority, and the Employment Training Panel, and would make conforming changes.</td>
<td>Supported July 2018 (via Board Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1912</strong></td>
<td>A. ENROLLED 9/11/2018-Enrolled and presented to the Governor at 4:30 p.m.</td>
<td>The Joint Exercise of Powers Act generally authorizes 2 or more public agencies, by agreement, to jointly exercise any common power. Under the act, if an agency is not one or more of the parties to the agreement but is a public entity, commission, or board constituted pursuant to the agreement, the debts, liabilities, and obligations of the agency are the debts, liabilities, and obligations of the parties to the agreement, unless the agreement specifies otherwise. This bill would specify that the parties to the joint powers agreement may not specify otherwise with respect to retirement liabilities of the agency if the agency contracts with a public retirement system, and would eliminate an authorization for a party to a joint powers agreement to separately contract or assume responsibilities for specific debts, liabilities, or obligations of the agency.</td>
<td>Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1969</strong></td>
<td>A. DEAD 5/11/2018-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(b)(6). (Last location was A. TRANS. on 3/19/2018)</td>
<td>Current law sets forth alternative ways an transit operator may qualify for funding, including a standard under which the allocated moneys do not exceed 50% of the operator’s total operating costs, as specified, or the maintenance by the operator of a specified ratio of fare revenues to operating costs. Current law generally establishes the required fare revenues to operating cost ratio as 20% in urbanized areas and 10% in nonurbanized areas. This bill would authorize a transportation planning agency to grant an exemption, for up to 5 years, to an operator that fails to maintain the applicable fare-revenue-to-cost ratio if, based on that agency’s determination, an exemption is appropriate, as specified. The bill would require the agency to consider specified factors in determining whether to grant the exemption.</td>
<td>Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 2034</strong></td>
<td>A. ENROLLED 9/4/2018-Enrolled and presented to the Governor at 4:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Would require specified businesses or other establishments that operate an intercity passenger rail, light rail, or bus station, on or before January 1, 2021, to provide training to new and existing employees.</td>
<td>Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Number</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Status and Details</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2065</td>
<td>Local agencies: surplus land.</td>
<td>A. DEAD 5/25/2018-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(b)(8). (Last location was A. APPR. SUSPENSE FILE on 5/2/2018) Current law defines “local agency” for these purposes as every city, county, city and county, and district, including school districts of any kind or class, empowered to acquire and hold real property. This bill would expand the definition of “local agency” to include sewer, water, utility, and local and regional park districts, joint powers authorities, successor agencies to former redevelopment agencies, housing authorities, and other political subdivisions of this state and any instrumentality thereof that is empowered to acquire and hold real property, thereby requiring these entities to comply with these requirements for the disposal of surplus land.</td>
<td>Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2249</td>
<td>Public contracts: local agencies: alternative procedure.</td>
<td>A. CHAPTERED 8/20/2018-Approved by the Governor. Chaptered by Secretary of State - Chapter 169, Statutes of 2018. The Uniform Public Construction Cost Accounting Act permits the governing body of a public agency, in the event all bids received for the performance of that public project are in excess of $175,000, to award the contract at $187,500 or less to the lowest responsible bidder if it determines the cost estimate of the public agency was reasonable. This bill would instead authorize public projects of $60,000 or less to be performed by the employees of a public agency, authorize public projects of $200,000 or less to be let to contract by informal procedures, and require public projects of more than $200,000 to be let to contract by formal bidding procedures.</td>
<td>Supported May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACA 5</td>
<td>Motor vehicle fees and</td>
<td>A. CHAPTERED 4/6/2017-Chaptered by Secretary of State-Chapter 30, Statutes of Would add Article XIX D to the California Constitution to require revenues derived from vehicle fees imposed under a specified chapter of the Vehicle License Fee Law to be used solely for transportation purposes, as defined. The measure would prohibit these revenues from being used for the payment of principal and interest on state transportation general obligation bonds that were</td>
<td>Supported 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**taxes: restriction on expenditures:</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>authorized by the voters on or before November 8, 2016. The measure would prohibit the revenues from being used for the payment of principal and interest on state transportation general obligation bonds issued after that date unless the bond act submitted to the voters expressly authorizes that use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 827</strong>&lt;br&gt;Wiener D</td>
<td>Planning and zoning: transit-rich housing bonus.</td>
<td><strong>SB 827</strong>&lt;br&gt;Wiener D</td>
<td>Would require a local government to, if requested, grant a development proponent of a transit-rich housing project a transit-rich housing bonus if that development at the time of submittal meets specified planning standards, including complying with demolition permit requirements, complying with any local inclusionary housing ordinance or, if the local government has not adopted an inclusionary housing ordinance, agreeing to provide a specified percentage of awarded units as onsite affordable housing, preparing a relocation benefits and assistance plan, complying with any locally adopted objective zoning standards, complying with any locally adopted minimum unit mix requirements, and if the development includes specified types of parcels, agreeing to replace those units and to offer units at one of 2 specified affordable rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 1119</strong>&lt;br&gt;Beall D</td>
<td>Low Carbon Transit Operations Program.</td>
<td><strong>SB 1119</strong>&lt;br&gt;Beall D</td>
<td>Current law requires, for recipient transit agencies whose service areas include disadvantaged communities, as specified, that those recipient transit agencies expend at least 50% of the total moneys they received as part of the Low Carbon Transit Operations Program on projects or services that meet specified requirements and benefit those disadvantaged communities. This bill would waive the above requirement if the recipient transit agencies expend the funding provided on certain transit activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCA 6</strong>&lt;br&gt;Wiener D</td>
<td>Local transportation measures: special taxes: voter approval.</td>
<td><strong>SCA 6</strong>&lt;br&gt;Wiener D</td>
<td>Would require that the imposition, extension, or increase by a local government of a special tax as may otherwise be authorized by law, whether a sales or transactions and use tax, parcel tax, or other tax for the purpose of providing funding for transportation purposes be submitted to the electorate by ordinance and approved by 55% of the voters voting on the proposition. The measure would authorize an ordinance submitted to the voters for approval under these provisions to provide, as otherwise authorized by law, for the issuance of bonds payable from the revenues from the special tax.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Ballot Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition 6</th>
<th>Qualified for placement on the November 6, 2018 statewide ballot through the initiative process.</th>
<th>If approved by a majority of statewide voters, this measure would repeal SB 1, also known as the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017, which enacted an estimated $5.2 billion annual increase in transportation-related taxes and fees, including a $0.12 cents per gallon increase of the gasoline excise tax, a $0.20 cents per gallon increase of the diesel excise tax, a 4 percentage points increase of the diesel sales tax, an annual $25 to $100 Transportation Improvement Fee, and an annual $100 zero-emission vehicles fee.</th>
<th>Opposed August 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 69</td>
<td>Placed on June 5, 2018 statewide ballot by the State Legislature through the enactment of ACA 5 (Frazier), Chapter 30, Statutes of 2017</td>
<td>Proposition 69, was placed on the ballot by the State Legislature as part of a legislative package that included SB 1. SB 1, which was also known as the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017 enacted an estimated $5.2 billion annual increase in transportation-related taxes and fees, including a $0.12 cents per gallon increase of the gasoline excise tax, a $0.20 cents per gallon increase of the diesel excise tax, a 4 percentage points increase of the diesel sales tax, an annual $25 to $100 Transportation Improvement Fee, and an annual $100 zero-emission vehicles fee. The state constitution already prohibits the diversion of gasoline or diesel excise tax revenues for general non-transportation purposes. The main feature of Proposition 69 is that it also protects proceeds derived from the Transportation Improvement Fee ($1.6 billion in vehicle registration fees, which funds competitive programs) and the sales tax on diesel, which funds the Public Transportation Account. The zero-emission fee is left unprotected.</td>
<td>Supported April 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Measures: 14**
**Total Tracking Forms: 14**
PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD
STAFF REPORT

TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
Executive Director

FROM: Michelle Bouchard
Chief Operating Officer, Caltrain

SUBJECT: CALTRAIN BUSINESS PLAN – MONTHLY UPDATE COVERING SEPTEMBER 2018

ACTION
Staff Coordinating Council recommends the Board of Directors (Board) receive the attached memo and PowerPoint presentation providing an update on Caltrain Business Plan activities and progress during September of 2018.

SIGNIFICANCE
Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) staff has prepared the attached memo and PowerPoint presentation describing project activities and outreach related to the Caltrain Business Plan that occurred during September of 2018. The memo also provides a narrative overview of the supporting PowerPoint presentation.

Staff will provide the JPB with written monthly memos and presentation materials on a monthly basis throughout the duration of the Business Plan project. These written updates will periodically be supplemented by a full presentation to the Board. This September update is presented for background and completeness and is separate from, and supplemental to, the broader presentation update that staff will provide directly to the Board at the October meeting.

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no budget impact associated with receiving this memo.

BACKGROUND
In 2017, the JPB secured full funding for the Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project and issued notices to proceed to its contractors for corridor electrification and purchase of Electric Multiple Unit railcars. Now that construction on this long-awaited project is underway, the agency has the opportunity to articulate a long-term business strategy for the future of the system.

The initial concept for a Caltrain “Business Plan” was brought to the Board in April of 2017. The Board reviewed a draft scope of work for the Business Plan in December of
2017 and adopted a final Business Strategy and Scope of Work in February of 2018. The Business Plan has been scoped to include long-range demand modeling, and service and infrastructure planning, as well as organizational analysis and an assessment of Caltrain’s interface with the communities it traverses. It is an extensive planning effort that includes outreach in multiple venues. The plan will be completed in 2019.

Prepared by: Sebastian Petty, Senior Policy Advisor 650.622.7831
PROJECT UPDATE

The following is the third in a series of monthly project updates for the Caltrain Business Plan. These updates provide a high level summary of project activities and progress and are paired with an annotated presentation that reflects project materials and messaging shared with stakeholder groups during the subject month. The following “September” update covers work completed in late August and September of 2018.

ONGOING TECHNICAL WORK

The Caltrain Business Plan consulting team is continuing technical work on the Business Plan. Key areas of focus for the team during September have included:

- Continued development of technical modeling tools and approaches that will be used to support the articulation of a 2040 service vision and accompanying business case. Key areas of focus include the development of service and operational planning tools, the specification of a ridership demand model, and the development of an integrated business modeling tool. The consultant team is also working to develop a detailed framework of assumptions and explorations that will be tested and evaluated as part of the technical work program.
- Ongoing interviews and research related to the organizational assessment and initial data gathering related to the identification of peer organizations
- Initiation of formal outreach and interviews with local jurisdictions as part of the community interface assessment

MEETINGS AND OUTREACH

The Project Partner Committee (PPC) held its third meeting on September 4th and provided initial input and feedback on a draft of the attached presentation materials covering the month of September.

The enclosed “September” outreach materials have also gone to the following additional stakeholder groups during August:

- JPB Ad Hoc Committee (September 17)
- City/County/Staff Coordinating Group (CSCG) (September 19)
- Local Policy Makers Group (LPMG) (September 27)

In addition to the above meetings, Caltrain staff also presented more general information about the Business Plan process to the following groups during the month of September:

- The Redwood City Chamber of Commerce (September 13)
- City of Sunnyvale Public Meeting (September 17)

Starting with the October Board meeting, the team will begin an expanded “quarterly” outreach push with an increased number of meetings and presentations anticipated to occur during the October and November timeframe.

SEPTEMBER OUTREACH MATERIALS

As referenced above, the Business Plan team has developed the attached “September” slide deck to support stakeholder outreach activities in September. This deck was presented to the PPC in draft on their September 4th meeting and was subsequently refined for presentation to the Ad Hoc Committee, CSCG and LPMG in September.
**NEXT STEPS**

The first part of the Business Plan is focused on the development of a long-range service vision for the railroad accompanied by an assessment of the community-corridor interface and the Caltrain organization. The remainder of the project will be focused on the creation of the implementation plan, including a detailed business plan and funding approach.

The Business Plan team will continue to provide monthly updates throughout the Business Plan process similar to this one. This regular cycle of materials will be paired with more extensive, milestone-based outreach to an expanded group of stakeholders and the public. The first wave of expanded outreach begins with the special session of the October JPB meeting on October 4th.

The monthly October project update and stakeholder meetings will cover the following topics (subject to refinement and change):

- Introduction of “growth scenarios” concept
- Focus on the “planned and programmed” growth scenario
- Discussion of service planning assumptions and evaluation criteria
- Outcomes from initial community interface meetings with local jurisdictions
This presentation includes material about the Caltrain Business Plan developed for stakeholder outreach during the month of September, 2018. A similar set of materials will be developed by the team each month and will be presented at various stakeholder venues or as requested.

The theme for September’s presentation is “Rounding out the 2040 Vision.” The presentation continues and expands upon many of the concepts and themes explored in August’s presentation. The majority of the presentation explores the “demand” side of Caltrain service including best practices and priorities as well as an exploration of how the system is used today. The presentation also outlines the “business case” approach that will be used to describe and evaluate the performance of potential service visions.
What is the Caltrain Business Plan?

**What**
Addresses the future potential of the railroad over the next 20-30 years. It will assess the benefits, impacts, and costs of different service visions, building the case for investment and a plan for implementation.

**Why**
Allows the community and stakeholders to engage in developing a more certain, achievable, financially feasible future for the railroad based on local, regional, and statewide needs.

What Will the Business Plan Cover?

**Technical Tracks**

**Service**
- Number of trains
- Frequency of service
- Number of people riding the trains
- Infrastructure needs to support different service levels

**Business Case**
- Value from investments (past, present, and future)
- Infrastructure and operating costs
- Potential sources of revenue

**Community Interface**
- Benefits and impacts to surrounding communities
- Corridor management strategies and consensus building
- Equity considerations

**Organization**
- Organizational structure of Caltrain including governance and delivery approaches
- Funding mechanisms to support future service

The Business Plan is a major effort that is supported by significant analytical work and stakeholder engagement. The technical work of the Business Plan is divided into four major “technical tracks.” This presentation is primarily focused on the “service” and “business case” tracks.
August’s presentation described some of the key “supply side” constraints and issues the corridor must contend with in the development of a long range service vision. These issues are fundamental to the future of the corridor and are briefly reviewed in this month’s presentation.

During the last 10 years, the JPB and its partners have made several key policy decisions regarding the future of the corridor. Specifically, the JPB has committed to operating an electrified Caltrain service on a primarily 2-track mainline corridor that will be shared with High Speed Rail.
Decisions and commitments that have already been made on the corridor bring three fundamental service planning questions into tension with one another:

1. **Service Differentiation**
   How can local, regional and high speed services be blended and balanced on the corridor to best serve multiple markets?

2. **Peak Service Volume**
   How much growth in peak train traffic volume can the corridor support and what kinds of growth may be required to meet long term demand?

3. **Service Investments**
   What types of investments into operations, systems and infrastructure will be required to achieve the desired types and volumes of service?

The commitment to an electrified, 2-track blended system fundamentally shapes and structures how future rail service on the corridor can evolve. Specifically, the commitment raises three critical and interrelated questions that must be answered as a long range service plan for the corridor is developed.

Planning for a long range Service Vision also requires a specific focus on the interface between the rail corridor and the communities it serves. This means thinking about what changes or strategies can be employed in the corridor to maximize the opportunities and benefits of the railroad provides while addressing challenges and mitigating impacts.

The second part of August’s presentation focused on introducing and exploring the concept of the “Corridor-Community Interface.” This work stream supports the development of the Service Vision by specifically focusing on the interface between the rail corridor and the communities it serves while beginning the conversation about how to address the range of opportunities and challenges associated with an active rail corridor- including the issue of at-grade crossings.
Slide 9

**SHARING SESSION**

*Do you have any questions related to the key Service and Community Interface issues we discussed last month?*

---

Slide 10

**Focus on Service**

---

September’s presentation continues the discussion of the future of service on the Caltrain corridor by focusing on the “demand” aspects of the Service Vision.
There are a number of best practices and goals that we will strive for as we work to develop a 2040 Service Vision for Caltrain. These best practices are representative of many of the strategies that modern, high frequency rail systems around the world successfully employ. They also reflect comments and input that Caltrain frequently hears from its stakeholders. In addition to these best practices, planning for a 2040 Service Vision will also require Caltrain to consider how best to balance a number of competing service priorities across a corridor with many different stations, markets and users.
Slide 13

**Seamless Network Integration**

The Caltrain service is part of a statewide, regional and local transportation network. To get the most out of this network, individual operators must plan, coordinate and administer their services in a way that enhances connectivity and achieves a seamless experience for the customer.

Caltrain is part of a transportation network that includes many different modes and services. In order for Caltrain to provide the greatest possible benefit to its users it needs to be seamlessly integrated with local, regional and state transportation networks. There are many different aspects to achieving a truly seamless transit experience ranging from fare integration, to wayfinding to detailed schedule coordination. Within the specific context of long range service planning, achieving a seamlessly integrated network means planning for a service that is structured to achieve maximum connectivity with key regional and statewide services.

Slide 14

**Coordinated Transfers**

Timed, well-coordinated transfers increase the useability of the rail system and help provide high quality service to a larger range of travel markets. Well coordinated transfers are one tool that can help the system balance the competing goals of coverage vs. travel time and service to high demand markets.

Coordinated transfers are a specific, but critical, approach to ensuring a seamless experience for riders. Careful coordination of transfers, both within the Caltrain system and to other connecting modes, helps make the overall transportation network more useable and can also help Caltrain balance the competing service priorities that exist within its own system.
Clock-face scheduling makes the service more legible and predictable to customers. Additionally, a regularized, clockface schedule can make it easier to coordinate connections and transfers with other systems and helps to structure train operations in a way that can improve system redundancy and recovery in the event of a disruption.

Today, Caltrain is a commuter rail system that operates a highly peak-oriented service. As the system electrifies and grows there is an opportunity to expand all day service levels and build new markets. At the same time the railroad will need to balance the potential for expanded all-day service against the reality of needing to maintain infrastructure and construct new capital infrastructure, such as grade separations, on an active railroad.
Planning for continuous improvement means ensuring that services and infrastructure are phased onto the corridor in a way that yields improved frequencies, capacity and travel times over time. By starting the Business Plan with the development of a long range “Service Vision” Caltrain can design interim investments and service plans to ensure efficient growth and continuous improvement.

The Caltrain system has 32 stations, many of which are spaced closely together. Caltrain can design a future service pattern that prioritizes serving as many of these stations as frequently as possible, or it can orient its service to emphasize faster travel times between a subset of busier stations. Providing well-coordinated, convenient transfers within the Caltrain system is one way to approach balancing these competing priorities.
A closely related set of priorities that Caltrain must balance is the extent to which future service patterns are oriented towards serving market demand or providing geographic coverage. Providing more service to high demand stations maximizes the number or riders the system moves and helps maintain Caltrain’s cost efficiency. Alternately, providing good coverage to the full spectrum of stations along the system helps improve the system’s geographic equity and creates new opportunities for ridership growth and land use changes throughout the corridor.

It is important to remember that the best practices and priorities described here cannot be planned for and balanced in isolation - the corridor is not a blank slate. There are real challenges associated with growing service on a constrained corridor. As Caltrain plans for the future, service priorities and goals will need to be weighed and balanced within the framework of the system’s specific physical and technical reality.
**SHARING SESSION**

Which service “Best Practices” are most important to your jurisdiction? Are there any best practices that we are missing?

How do you think we should approach balancing competing service needs?

---

**Exploring the Market for Service**

Service Priorities

Exploring the Market for Service
Understanding the Market for Caltrain Today

1. Ridership is highly concentrated at a few stations
   • The busiest 8 stations account for nearly ¾ of all ridership and nearly all ridership growth over the past 20 years
   • The least busy 8 mainline stations and the San Jose – Gilroy stations have lost ridership over the last 20 years
   • One in four Caltrain riders do not use the station closest to their origin or destination due to differences in service levels and accessibility

2. Caltrain serves multiple markets in both directions
   • Existing riders primarily commute to four major employment centers (San Francisco, Redwood City, Palo Alto, and Mountain View) plus several mid-sized hubs
   • AM peak period ridership exhibits a 64%-36% northbound-southbound split

3. Today caltrain captures a small, but significant percentage of the overall travel market along the peninsula
   • Caltrain captures roughly 8-10% of regional peak hour travel markets along the Peninsula
   • There appears to be significant market growth opportunities, both overall and for off-peak and Gilroy markets

The next section of September’s presentation presents data describing today’s market for Caltrain service. This data is based on analysis of Caltrain survey and ridership data as well as data collected from other regional transit systems and roadways. This data provides an important foundation of information that will be used to support the development and evaluation of future service plans.

Existing Ridership

Caltrain’s ridership has grown significantly over the last 20 years, a result of the corridor’s booming economy as well as the introduction of increased and improved service in the mid 2000’s.
While overall ridership has grown, the vast majority of the system’s growth during this period has been concentrated at a handful of stations. Ridership at many smaller stations in the system has actually declined over the past 20 years.

There are many different and interrelated factors that influence the level of ridership a particular station produces. These can include the type and density of surrounding land uses, availability of connecting services and access facilities, and proximity to other stations. One significant factor that influences station level ridership is the level of service that a station receives. The data in slide 26 describe the correlation between the ridership generated by Caltrain stations and number of trains stopping at the station.
Slide 27

Slide 27 presents data on which stations Caltrain customers choose to use relative to the actual geographic location of their origin and destination. Approximately ¾ of Caltrain riders use the station closest to them but the other 25% access the system using a station that is not their closest station. The data generally suggests that stations receiving higher levels of train service tend to draw customers from a wider catchment area. Some stations may also draw riders from a wider area because of significant transit connections (e.g., the BART connection at Millbrae) or because they have large parking facilities.

Slide 28

Caltrain is unique among US commuter railroads in that it has a strong bi-directional flow of customers and serves multiple different job centers and destinations along the corridor. During commute hours significant flows of passengers board and alight from trains at multiple points up and down the line.
Even though Caltrain has a more complex market profile than many commuter railroads, travel within the system is still highly concentrated among a few top origins and destinations. Travel between the “top 8” stations accounts for more than half the total activity in the system while flows between the smaller stations account for a very small amount of total system activity.

As slides 30 and 31 show, Caltrain currently captures between 8 and 9% of regional travel along the Peninsula during commute hours but this market share percentage drops sharply outside of peak hours.
Today, Caltrain captures a modest percentage of the regional travel market. Average hourly person-trips traveling mid-Peninsula (at Burlingame / Millbrae border). Source: 2017 Caltrain passenger counts and 2017 vehicle counts (adjusted for passenger occupancy).

South of San Jose, where service is currently highly limited, regional market share for Caltrain is negligible.
Slide 33

Understanding the Market for Caltrain Today

Off-Peak & Weekend Service

- Today, Caltrain ridership during off-peak and weekend periods is 70-80% lower than during peak periods
- In contrast, total volume of regional travel is only 10-20% less, while BART travel in San Mateo County is 50-60% less
- There is likely an underserved market for off-peak Caltrain service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>As % of Peak Hour Volume</th>
<th>As % of Weekday Daily Volume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BART</td>
<td>43% 36% 41%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain</td>
<td>19% 23% 27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 and 280 Freeways</td>
<td>97% 75% 90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing Caltrain’s current ridership profile with activity observed on freeways and the BART system suggests that there is an underserved market for midday, evening and weekend Caltrain usage. Caltrain ridership is 70-80% lower in a typical off-peak hour as compared to a typical peak hour- a very sharp drop. The decline in usage between peak and off-peak hours for other major regional facilities like freeways and the BART system is much less pronounced.

Providing improved midday, evening and weekend service is a future growth opportunity for Caltrain but one that must be balanced against the need to build capital projects and maintain the railroad.

Slide 34

Exploring the Market for Caltrain Service

What is the Potential, Long-Term Demand for Caltrain Service?

Purpose
- Understand the underlying long range, order-of-magnitude demand for rail service in the Caltrain corridor.
- Establishes a rough, quantified benchmark that informs how a long range service vision can be calibrated and scaled

Methodology
- Use VTA – C/CAG Model updated with latest Plan Bay Area land use forecasts
- Develop a sensitivity test using an imaginary, high frequency, unconstrained service plan that includes:
  - Realistic train times (60-80 minutes SF-SJ)
  - High level of sustained all-day service (8 to 16 trains per hour per direction. These frequencies are comparable to many sections of the BART system)

In developing a long range service vision for the Caltrain system an important piece of information is understanding what the underlying and unconstrained long term demand for rail service in the corridor could be. This analysis attempts to develop a rough answer to the question of “how many people would choose to ride the train in 2040 if service were abundant and unconstrained?”
Exploring the Potential Long Term Demand for Caltrain Service

This sensitivity test suggests that providing BART-like frequencies on the Caltrain Corridor has the potential to yield BART-like ridership. Today, Caltrain serves approximately 1,300 daily passengers per mile between San Francisco and Tamien Stations, while BART serves approximately 5,200 passengers per mile along its Richmond-Daly City and Fremont-Daly City trunk lines. The sensitivity test suggests Caltrain has a long term (2040) unconstrained demand of about 4,600 passengers per mile, comparable to BART’s core service in San Francisco and the inner East Bay. However, demand per mile south of Tamien is approximately 1/10th demand north of Tamien.

To develop an answer to the question posed in slide 34, the project team updated the VTA-C/CAG regional travel demand model with the latest Plan Bay Area regional growth forecasts for 2040. The team then loaded an imaginary high frequency service pattern into the model (with all stations receiving all day service of either 8- or 16-trains per hour per direction). These frequencies far exceed anything that Caltrain operates today but are roughly comparable to levels of service provided in the BART system.

The results of the analysis showed demand growing at pace with or faster than service, suggesting that there is extremely strong demand for rail service in the corridor both today and in the future. These results are exploratory and should be viewed as order-of-magnitude information only. Nonetheless, the results of this “unconstrained” demand analysis are striking and provide compelling evidence that Caltrain should explore options and implications of a 2040 Service Vision that includes significant service growth.

Remember….Planning within Constraints

Decisions and commitments that have already been made on the corridor bring three fundamental service planning questions into tension with one another:

1. Service Differentiation
   How can local, regional and high speed services be blended and balanced on the corridor to best serve multiple markets?

2. Peak Service Volume
   How much growth in peak train traffic volume can the corridor support and what kinds of growth may be required to meet long term demand?

3. Service Investments
   What types of investments into operations, systems and infrastructure will be required to achieve the desired types and volumes of service?

While The Caltrain corridor is a dynamic market with significant potential for growth it is also a constrained corridor. The extent to which Caltrain can satisfy potential demand and serve different markets must be balanced against the physical constraints and technical reality of the system.
SHARING SESSION

What is your reaction to the analysis of Caltrain’s existing and potential market demand?

What additional kinds of data about Caltrain ridership and markets would you like to see?

To what extent do you think this information should inform the development of a Service Vision?

Focus on the Business Case
Why Do We Need A Business Case?

A Business Case for The Service Vision
The project team will develop at least two “growth scenarios” or versions of a long range “Service Vision.” Each version of the potential service vision will have a business case that lays out the cumulative costs and benefits associated with it.

A Framework for Decision-making
The business case helps the JPB Board select a 2040 Service Vision with a fully informed understanding of what their choice means for the long-term costs and benefits of the system. Once the Board has selected a long range Service Vision the business case can then be further optimized and detailed.

There are many different ways that the Caltrain system can grow and serve the corridor. Evaluating these choices through the lens of a Business Case allows policy makers to better understand the full range of costs and benefits associated with particular decisions. Going forward, the business case is a framework that can be updated, optimized and refined iteratively alongside service plans and investment decisions to ensure that Caltrain uses resources wisely and to the greatest possible benefit.

Building an Integrated Business Model (IBM)

The IBM evaluates changes to the Caltrain System by integrating a broad range of data inputs and analysis. It is a tool that supports the active and informed management of Caltrain’s business.

Major Inputs to the IBM Include
- Railroad Network
- Fleet
- Current and Future Operations
- Ridership and Travel Demand
- Finances
- Policy Assumptions
- Infrastructure Investments

The Integrated Business Model is a key tool that is being built for the Business Plan and will be used to develop a Business Case analysis of the Service Vision. The model is intended to provide a complete, financialized picture of the Caltrain system.
The integrated Business Model is still under development. Slides 41 and 42 present example model outputs developed as part of the Metrolinx Regional Express Rail Business Case in Toronto.
Slide 43

**Wider Economic Benefits of Caltrain and Communities**

Outside of the IBM, User Benefits and Regional Economic Benefits will be Calculated for the Following Major Categories:

- **Direct & Indirect Jobs**: Economic impact model captures effects on regional employment.
- **User Benefits**: Benefits from travel time/cost savings as well as safety improvements.
- **Societal Benefits**: Societal benefits including public health and environmental benefits.
- **Land Value**: Influence of increased rail service on the value of land arounds stations.

In addition to the various costs and benefits that will be directly modeled as part of the Integrated Business Model, Caltrain will also evaluate how long term changes in service could influence a wider set of economic and social indicators. These will be presented alongside potential future “Service Visions” and will help the Board understand the wider implications of choosing a particular path for growth.

Slide 44

**SHARING SESSION**

What kinds of costs and benefits are most meaningful to your community?

Are there any other specific types of costs or benefits you think Caltrain should try to analyze and quantify?
TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
Executive Director

FROM: April Chan
Chief Officer, Planning, Grants, and Transportation Authority

Michelle Bouchard
Chief Operating Officer, Rail

Derek Hansel
Chief Financial Officer

SUBJECT: AUTHORIZATION TO RECEIVE FUNDING AND AMEND THE FISCAL YEAR 2019 BUDGET FOR THE POSITIVE TRAIN CONTROL PROJECT

ACTION
Staff Coordinating Council recommends the Board:

1. Authorize the Executive Director, or his designee, to enter into a funding agreement with the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) to receive $18.69 million for the Positive Train Control (PTC) project;

2. Request the re-allocation of $5.3 million in prior year funding, including $1 million in Fiscal Year (FY) 2018 State Rail Assistance (SRA) funds, from the Control Point Brittan Project to PTC;

3. Affirm that the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) agrees to comply with the conditions and requirements of the SRA program, as set forth in the certification and assurances and applicable statutes, regulations and guidelines;

4. Amend the FY 2019 Capital Budget by $51.8 million, from $239.9 million to $291.7 million; and

5. Authorize the Executive Director, or his designee, to take any other actions necessary to give effect to the above actions, including executing and filing certifications and assurances, authorized agent forms, funding agreements or amendments, or other documents, and furnishing any additional information as may be required.

SIGNIFICANCE
At the JPB's August 2018 Board of Directors (Board) meeting, the Board was presented with an updated budget for the PTC project. This report showed a need for an additional $30 million to complete the project. To close this funding gap, JPB staff has been working on several potential funding options, including:
• Applying for discretionary grants from the FRA; and
• Identifying opportunities to re-budget funds from completed and/or existing, less critical projects that can be delayed without impacting railroad operations or safety.

The JPB was recently awarded an $18.69 million grant from the FRA for the project. The JPB's was one of 28 awards to railroads completing PTC projects in 15 states totaling over $200 million. To receive these funds, the Board must authorize the Executive Director or designee to enter into an agreement with the FRA.

JPB staff also recommends re-budgeting $5.3 million in funding from the Control Point (CP) Brittan project to PTC. CP Brittan has been put on hold as construction bids came in significantly higher than anticipated, and well over the current project budget. The Board rejected all bids for the CP Brittan project at the April 2018 meeting. If the project were to be re-bid, the project schedule would now negatively impact the delivery of the Peninsula Corridor Electrification Program (PCEP), resulting in additional costs and potential delays to PCEP. Given this context, JPB staff believes the most prudent course of action is to re-evaluate the CP Brittan project once PCEP is complete. The remaining funding budgeted for CP Brittan is approximately $5.3 million, consisting of $1 million in Senate Bill 1 (SB1) State Rail Assistance funds, $2.3 million in JPB member agency contributions and $2 million in Federal Transit Administration (FTA) formula funding.

Combined, these actions will provide approximately $24 million of the $30 million needed for the PTC project. Staff is continuing to explore options to fund the remaining need including seeking other grants, long term financing and other opportunities to identify savings from completed capital projects. Updates regarding project funding will be provided to the Board as part of monthly PTC updates.

**BUDGET IMPACT**

The current total budget for the PTC project is $239.9 million. The proposed total budget amendment of $51.8 million would:

1. Transfer $5.3 million from the CP Brittan project to the PTC project, consisting of $1.0 million in SRA funds, $2.3 million from FTA Section 5307 funds, and $2.0 million in JPB matching funds; and
2. Increase the PTC project budget to receive two grants: the FTA PTC award for $18.7 million described above and $21.7 million that was awarded jointly by the FRA and FTA in March 2018 but has not previously been amended into the Caltrain Capital Budget; and
3. Result in a $6.1 million funding gap for the PTC project to be funded by the JPB or through future grant and other opportunities, including applying for a second round of FRA PTC funding.

The requested amendment will increase the funded CBOSS/PTC project budget from $239.9 million to $291.7 million and increase the FY19 Capital Budget from $45.74 million to $97.55 million.
**BACKGROUND**
The PTC System grants awarded by the FRA are part of the Consolidated Rail Infrastructure and Safety Improvements (CRISI) Program. This program had capacity to provide a total of $250 million in FY 2018 to help railroads fund PTC. The FRA awarded only $200 million in the first grant cycle; a second round of PTC grants is anticipated in the near future.

The Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017, Senate Bill (SB) 1 (Chapter 5, Statues of 2017), signed by the Governor on April 28, 2017, includes the 10-year SRA program to provide over $440 million to commuter and intercity rail agencies for operating and capital needs.

Prepared By: Peter Skinner, Manager, Grants and Fund Programming 650.622.7818
RESOLUTION NO. 2018 –

BOARD OF DIRECTORS, PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

***

AUTHORIZING RECEIPT OF FUNDING AND AMENDING THE FISCAL YEAR 2019
BUDGET FOR THE POSITIVE TRAIN CONTROL PROJECT

WHEREAS, the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017, Senate Bill 1 (SB1) (Chapter 5, Statutes of 2017), signed by the Governor on April 28, 2017, includes a program that will provide additional revenues for transit infrastructure repair and service improvements; and

WHEREAS, among the opportunities provided for local transit more generally, SB1 includes funding for commuter rail and intercity rail projects, referred to as State Rail Assistance (SRA); and

WHEREAS, the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) is an eligible project sponsor and may receive SRA funding, including for the Positive Train Control (PTC) project; and

WHEREAS, SB1 named the California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA) as the administrative agency for SRA, and CalSTA has developed guidelines for the purpose of administering and distributing SRA funds to eligible project sponsors; and

WHEREAS, the JPB wishes to request reallocation of $1.0 million in SRA funding originally budgeted for Control Point Brittan to the PTC project; and

WHEREAS, the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) has awarded $18.69 million to the JPB for the PTC project, specifically appropriated under the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2018 for the implementation of PTC systems, via the Consolidated Rail Infrastructure and Safety Improvements (CRISI) program; and
WHEREAS, in accordance with the FRA’s grant conditions, the JPB will provide a 20% local match in the amount of $4.67 million; and

WHEREAS, the FRA and Federal Transit Administration jointly awarded $21.7 million to the JPB for PTC in March 2018, which amount has not previously been amended into the JPB’s Capital Budget; and

WHEREAS, Staff Coordinating Counsel recommends the Board of Directors (Board) authorize the Executive Director, or his designee, to take any actions necessary, including executing and filing certifications and assurances, authorized agent forms, funding agreements or amendments, or other documents, and furnishing any additional information as may be required, to receive the federal and State funds described above; and

WHEREAS, Staff Coordinating Counsel further recommends the Board amend the Fiscal Year 2019 Capital Budget to (1) increase it by $51.8 million, from $45,748,255 to $97,548,255, to reflect State and federal funds for PTC, and (2) transfer $5.3 million from the CP Brittan project to the PTC project, consisting of $1.0 million in SRA funds, $2.3 million from Federal Transit Administration Section 5307 funds, and $2.0 million in JPB matching funds.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors requests the reallocation of $1 million in Fiscal Year 2018 State Rail Assistance funds from the Control Point Brittan project to the Positive Train Control project, and authorizes the submittal of the following project nomination and corrective action plan/allocation request to the California State Transportation Agency for:

- Project Name: Caltrain Positive Train Control
• Amount of SRA funds requested: $1,000,000 (re-allocated from Control Point Brittan)

• Short description of project: This project will implement a positive train control system on the Caltrain corridor to meet all Federal Mandated PTC requirements; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Directors affirms that the JPB agrees to comply with all terms, conditions and requirements of the State Rail Assistance program as set forth in the certifications and assurances, and applicable statutes, regulations and guidelines; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Directors authorizes the Executive Director, or his designee, to (1) enter into a funding agreement with the Federal Railroad Administration for $18.69 million to help fund the Positive Train Control project; and (2) attests that the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board will provide 20 percent local match to the FRA funds in the amount of $4.67 million; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Directors amends the Fiscal Year 2019 Capital Budget to (1) increase it by $51.8 million, from $45,748,255 to $97,548,255, and (2) transfer $5.3 million from the CP Brittan project to the PTC project, consisting of $1.0 million in SRA funds, $2.3 million from Federal Transit Administration Section 5307 funds, and $2.0 million in JPB matching funds; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Directors authorizes the Executive Director, or his designee, to take any other actions necessary to give effect to this resolution, including executing and filing documents such as certifications and assurances, authorized agent forms, funding agreements or amendments, or other documents, and furnishing any additional information as may be required.
Regularly passed and adopted this 4th day of October, 2018 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

Chair, Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board

ATTEST:

JPB Secretary
TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
Executive Director

FROM: John Funghi
Chief Officer, Caltrain Modernization
Joan Cassman
Legal Counsel
Seamus Murphy
Chief Communications Officer

SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO GRAND JURY REPORT "PROJECT MANAGEMENT OF THE CALTRAIN MODERNIZATION PROGRAM"

ACTION
Staff Coordinating Council recommends the Board authorize the Executive Director, or his designee, to submit the attached response to the San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury's report entitled "Project Management of the Caltrain Modernization Program."

SIGNIFICANCE
On July 24, 2018, the San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury issued a report to respond to the following question:

Does Caltrain have the necessary processes in place to manage effectively and efficiently the Caltrain Modernization Program (CalMod) and is the public able to easily obtain useful information about the project’s status?

The Grand Jury conducted an extensive investigation and summarized its findings as follows:

The Grand Jury finds that the [sic] Caltrain has adequate management processes in place to implement a project of this scale. The Grand Jury concludes, however, that it is difficult for the public to find and access useful, summary project information and that searching for key project terms on the Caltrain and CalMod websites does not yield useful results.

The Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) is required to respond to a list of findings and recommendations set forth in the report within 90 days of publication of the report. In this case, the JPB must submit its response by October 22, 2018 to meet this obligation.
**BUDGET IMPACT**

There is no budget impact associated with this action.

**BACKGROUND**

The Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project is a key component of the CalMod Program. The PCEP will electrify the Caltrain Corridor from San Francisco’s 4th and King Caltrain Station to approximately the Tamien Caltrain Station, convert diesel-hauled to electric trainsets (“Electric Multiple Unit” or “EMU”), and increase service to up to six Caltrain trains per peak hour per direction.

Each county’s Civil Grand Jury is authorized by California Penal Code section 925a to investigate any joint powers authority operating within that county. The San Mateo County Grand Jury typically issues approximately 10 reports per year on cities, county agencies, special districts and joint powers agencies.

Prepared By: Seamus Murphy,  
Chief Communications Officer  
Shayna van Hoften, Legal Counsel  

650.622.7818  
415.995.5880
Attachment 1: Draft Response to Civil Grand Jury Report on CalMod

October 4, 2018

Honorable V. Raymond Swope
Judge of the Superior Court
Hall of Justice
400 County Center, 2nd Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063-1655

Dear Judge Swope:

I am writing on behalf of the Board of Directors of the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB). This letter will serve as the JPB’s formal response to the July 24, 2018 letter from the Superior Court transmitting the report from the 2017-2018 Civil Grand Jury with regard to management of the Caltrain Modernization (CalMod) Program and the relative ease with which the public can locate information on CalMod. The JPB's Board of Directors reviewed and approved (on October 4, 2018) this response to the Grand Jury report's 11 findings (numbered F1 and F3-F12) and three recommendations (R1-R3).

As the report notes, the $1.98 billion CalMod Program includes electrification of the Caltrain right-of-way between San Jose and San Francisco and phased replacement of Caltrain's fleet of diesel rail cars with new high-performance electric-powered rail cars (known as Electric Multiple Units or "EMUs").

It is apparent, and the JPB appreciates, that the report was extensively and carefully researched, and takes appropriate notice of the numerous oversight mechanisms in place for the CalMod Program. The JPB also appreciates the opportunity to respond to the report's findings and recommendations.

Findings

The JPB agrees with all of the findings set forth in the report. Relative to findings F9, F11 and F12, and as addressed further below, the JPB has made and will continue to make improvements to information available on the Caltrain and CalMod websites, including CalMod Monthly Progress Reports, which will include more detail on the use of contingency funds, project schedules and milestones.

Recommendations

The JPB values the Grand Jury's recommendations, all of which concern the transparency of CalMod information. As the three recommendations are so intertwined, we offer the following response to all of them.
As the report notes, publicly-available CalMod budget and schedule information is updated regularly and made available through the PCEP Monthly Progress Reports. To access these reports, it is not necessary to navigate through each Board of Directors agenda link. Rather, these reports are consolidated in the online "CalMod Documents Library," which is accessible in two clicks from either the Caltrain homepage or the Calmod.org homepage. Still, it is concerning that the Civil Grand Jury was not able to navigate to this resource. In response, the JPB has changed both webpages to make this information more readily accessible, including by making updates to the sites' search functionality.

Furthermore, the CalMod Monthly Progress Reports currently include a chart that tracks CalMod's progress vis a vis its projected budget. Also, the Executive Summary of each CalMod Monthly Reports lists critical milestones, and tracks the completion of these milestones against their projected completion dates. However, Caltrain will explore strategies for elevating and expanding this information within the Monthly Progress Report and on the websites, and will focus such improvements on providing meaningful transparency for the public.

In addition, the JPB wishes to address some of the Grand Jury report's assumptions and recommendations related to the CalMod contingency. For "mega" projects like CalMod, the contingency is not simply a dollar amount added to an overall project budget. Instead, it is an essential part of the funding plan and is actively managed throughout project implementation as risks are anticipated and then retired, one by one, over time. This contingency and risk register process and progress are addressed in the CalMod Quarterly Reports, located on the same webpage as the CalMod Monthly Reports. To date, all CalMod contingency expenditures have been within the contingency budget.

In sum, the JPB believes that the completed and planned changes will fully address recommendations R2 and R3, and will address underlying needs expressed in recommendation R1. However, the JPB has determined that development of an interactive dashboard would be disproportionately costly relative to its value as all of the information that would be contained in such a resource already is available or planned through the means described above.

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to your report; I trust you will find our comments helpful.

Sincerely,

Jim Hartnett
Executive Director, Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board.

cc: Board of Directors
    via email to: grandjury@sanmateocourt.org
ISSUE

Does Caltrain have the necessary processes in place to manage effectively and efficiently the Caltrain Modernization Program (CalMod) and is the public able to easily obtain useful information about the project’s status?

SUMMARY

Caltrain has experienced a 132 percent increase in ridership since 1998 and expects that upturn to continue due to anticipated population and job growth. To address this increase as well as other concerns, Caltrain has undertaken a $1.98 billion modernization program. The program includes the electrification of the commuter rail system from San Francisco to San Jose (52 of Caltrain’s 77 miles between San Francisco and Gilroy) and the replacement of 75 percent of Caltrain’s diesel trains with electric trains (recent new funding may increase that number). These changes are expected to increase passenger capacity and revenues, improve train performance, reduce engine noise, and improve regional air quality.

The San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury (Grand Jury) investigated whether the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (PCJPB), which owns (San Francisco to San Jose) and operates (San Francisco to Gilroy) the Caltrain commuter rail system, has adequate management processes in place for a project of this scale. The Grand Jury also investigated whether the public has access to meaningful information about the status of the project.

The Grand Jury finds that the Caltrain has adequate management processes in place to implement a project of this scale. The Grand Jury concludes, however, that it is difficult for the public to find and access useful, summary project information and that searching for key project terms on the Caltrain and CalMod websites does not yield useful results.

GLOSSARY

**Caltrain Modernization Program (CalMod)** - Caltrain Modernization Program of which the Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project is the major component, along with other associated future upgrades to Caltrain’s systems.

**Caltrain** – The name under which the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (PCJPB) operates passenger train service from San Francisco to Gilroy.

**Caltrain Peninsula Corridor** - The transportation corridor along the San Francisco Peninsula, including Caltrain rail service and the cities from San Francisco to San Jose.  

---

1 Grand Jury email exchange with a Caltrain senior manager.
**Caltrans** - California Department of Transportation, a department of the California State Transportation Agency.

**Full Funding Grant Agreement** – The Full Funding Grant Agreement is used by the Federal Transit Administration for making a major grant, which in exchange for federal funds the grantee commits to complete its project on time, within budget, and in compliance with all applicable federal requirements, and to bear any cost increases that might occur after award and execution of the agreement.³

**Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (PCJPB)** - The Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board owns (San Francisco to San Jose) and operates (San Francisco to Gilroy) Caltrain’s rail service. The PCJPB is made up of nine representatives, three from the City and County of San Francisco, three from the San Mateo County, and three from Santa Clara County.⁴

**Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project (PCEP)** – The Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project is the key component of the Caltrain Modernization Program. The PCEP will electrify the Caltrain Peninsula Corridor from San Francisco to San Jose, replace diesel-trains with electric trains, and increase service by one train per peak hour per direction (from five to six trains).⁵ Depending on potential High Speed Rail scheduling, capacity will exist for additional trains.⁶

**Positive Train Control (PTC)** – Positive Train Control is an advanced system designed to automatically stop a train before certain accidents occur. PTC is designed to prevent train-to-train collisions, derailments caused by excessive train speed, train movements through misaligned track switches, and unauthorized train entry into railroad work zones. PTC will not prevent vehicle-train accidents at grade crossings, or those due to track and other equipment failures.

**San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans)** – The administrative body for the principal public transit and transportation programs in San Mateo County. SamTrans operates San Mateo county bus service. By contract it manages the operation of both Caltrain and the San Mateo County Transportation Authority.


⁶ Grand Jury email exchange with a Caltrain senior manager.
BACKGROUND

Rail travel on the Peninsula Corridor began in 1863 as the privately-owned San Francisco and San Jose Railroad Company. Ownership of the railroad has gone through several changes, including long-term ownership by the Southern Pacific Railroad. Since 1991, the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (PCJPB) has owned and operated Caltrain, which now runs 77 miles from San Francisco to Gilroy. The PCJPB is made up of representatives appointed by the City and County of San Francisco, the San Mateo County Transit District, and the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority.

Passing through seventeen cities across three counties, Caltrain’s total service area has over 3 million residents from urban San Francisco through suburban Silicon Valley, and on to rural Gilroy. With world-class universities and concentrations of high-tech and bio-tech firms, the area serviced by Caltrain has experienced rapid job growth and is expected to continue to grow in the coming years.

Currently, Caltrain serves an average of 62,190 weekday riders, up from 26,794 in 1998. Steady increases in ridership have strained Caltrain capacity during peak commute hours, with some trains running up to 139 percent of seating capacity. According to a report from the San Francisco Bay Area Planning and Urban Research Association (SPUR), the projected population and job growth in the Caltrain Peninsula Corridor may overwhelm current Caltrain capacity in just a few years.

To address ridership increases and other issues, in 1999 the Caltrain strategic plan made CalMod one of its priorities. CalMod will electrify Caltrain from San Francisco to San Jose (52 of Caltrain’s 77 miles between San Francisco and Gilroy) using an overhead electric wire contact system such as that currently in use in the northeastern U.S. corridor and in many locations in Europe.

CalMod will replace most of Caltrain’s diesel trains with high-performance electric trains and will upgrade associated signaling systems. Due to the electric trains’ ability to start and stop more quickly, there will be an increase of one train per peak hour, in each direction (from five to six).
Depending on potential High Speed Rail scheduling, capacity will exist for additional trains. With electrification, Caltrain will run a “mixed fleet” of 75 percent electric trains and 25 percent diesel trains (recent new funding will increase the percentage of electric trains). Electric train service is expected to begin in late 2021 or early 2022.

With the passage of California’s Proposition 1A in 2008, a $10 billion bond issue to support high-speed rail, and with the promise of funding from the California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA), Caltrain moved forward with CalMod planning. Caltrain coordinates with the CHSRA so that CalMod will support high-speed rail in a future “blended system.” In 2015 Caltrain received environmental clearance for the electrification project and the following year Caltrain awarded the initial contracts.

In 2017, Caltrain held the groundbreaking for the electrification project.

According to Caltrain, the electrification project is designed to:

- Improve train performance by increasing ridership capacity and service
- Increase revenue and reduce fuel cost
- Reduce engine noise emanating from trains
- Improve regional air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions

---

15 Grand Jury email exchange with a Caltrain senior manager.
16 Ibid.
18 “News: Governor Signs Bill Ensuring CalMod Receives Prop 1A Funding,” Caltrain, October 7, 2016. [http://www.caltrain.com/about/MediaRelations/News_Archive/News__Governor_Signs_Bill_Ensuring_CalMod_Receives_Prop_1A_Funding.html](http://www.caltrain.com/about/MediaRelations/News_Archive/News__Governor_Signs_Bill_Ensuring_CalMod_Receives_Prop_1A_Funding.html).
DISCUSSION

Caltrain’s Previous Management Problems with the CBOSS PTC Project

The Grand Jury began investigating the management of CalMod, in part after noting the difficulties Caltrain was having in managing the Communications Based Overlay Signal System (CBOSS) Positive Train Control (PTC) project. The CBOSS PTC project is separate from CalMod but integral to its final functioning.

In response to a 2008 Metrolink train collision in Los Angeles that killed 25 people, Congress mandated that all passenger, commuter, and hazardous materials trains install PTC by 2015. After it became clear that railroads would be unable to comply, the hardware installation deadline was pushed back to December 2018. In 2011, Caltrain awarded the contract for its own version of PTC, the CBOSS system. CBOSS would not only satisfy the federal requirements for PTC but would also be interoperable with all other rail systems that access the Caltrain corridor, including commuter rail, freight rail and, in the future, high-speed rail.

Caltrain contracted with Parsons Transportation Group (Parsons) for the design and installation portion of the $231 million CBOSS PTC project. After significant problems with the project, Caltrain terminated the Parsons contract in February 2017, resulting in dueling lawsuits between Caltrain and Parsons. Caltrain spent over $201 million on the canceled CBOSS PTC project. While many components of the CBOSS PTC will be used by the new contractor Wabtec.

25 Positive Train Control is an advanced system designed to automatically stop a train before certain accidents occur. PTC is designed to prevent train-to-train collisions, derailments caused by excessive train speed, train movements through misaligned track switches, and unauthorized train entry into work zones. PTC will not prevent vehicle-train accidents at grade crossings, or those due to track and equipment failures. (“Positive Train Control,” Union Pacific, accessed April 4, 2018. https://www.up.com/media/media_kit/ptc/about-ptc/.)
27 Officials from Caltrain: interviews by the Grand Jury.
Corporation\textsuperscript{32} and its proprietary I-ETMS\textsuperscript{33} PTC system, the Federal Rail Administration notes that the discontinuation of the CBOSS PTC project will result in “significant onboard and back office hardware modifications from this point forward.”\textsuperscript{34,35}

The Wabtec system contract is designed to ensure that Caltrain meets the federal December 2018 deadline for installation of a PTC system. However, that system, which is designed for Caltrain’s diesel fleet, will not initially have the capability of controlling the CalMod electric trains. Consequently, Stadler, the electric train car (known as Electric Multiple Units or EMUs) manufacturer, will install and integrate the Wabtec PTC system within the EMUs prior to the completion of CalMod.\textsuperscript{36}

Prior to terminating the Parsons contract, Caltrain requested a peer review of the CBOSS PTC project from the American Public Transportation Association (APTA). The report noted problems with both Caltrain and Parsons’ management of the project. Among other findings, the APTA noted Caltrain management issues in both personnel and processes (see Appendix A for the APTA report).\textsuperscript{37}

Among the Caltrain management issues noted by APTA were:

- No commonly approved project schedule between Caltrain and Parsons
- Lack of a strong in-house technical team to oversee the project
- No commonly agreed upon definition of some final deliverables or how to test them
- Lack of a working escalation method to resolve issues raised between Caltrain and Parsons\textsuperscript{38}

Concerned that if Caltrain had difficulties in managing a $231 million project, it may be unable to manage CalMod, a project ten times the size, the Grand Jury began its investigation into

\textsuperscript{32} Wabtec Corporation is a supplier of value-added, technology-based products and services for freight rail, passenger transit and select industrial markets. It is the owner of the proprietary I-ETMS PTC System. \url{http://wabtec.com/products/1454/i-etms%E2%84%A2}.

\textsuperscript{33} Interoperable Electronic Train Management System. \url{http://wabtec.com/products/1454/i-etms%E2%84%A2}.


\textsuperscript{36} Grand Jury email exchange with a Caltrain senior manager.


\textsuperscript{38} Escalation is a formal process to raise the issue at hand to a higher authority per the escalation method for the project. Risks or issues related to project objectives, resource and inter-group conflicts, ambiguous roles and responsibilities, scope disagreements, and third-party dependencies are some situations calling for escalations. (“A Guide to Escalation in Project Management,” Project-Management.com, accessed May 23, 2018. \url{https://project-management.com/a-guide-to-escalation-in-project-management/}.)
CalMod. Specifically, the Grand Jury focused on whether these management issues had sufficiently been addressed to ensure that CalMod avoids the fate of the CBOSS PTC project.

**Tendency of Large Projects to Exceed Budget and Fall Behind Schedule**

At a current budget of $1.98 billion CalMod is a “megaproject”. Projects of this size and complexity are well known for being over budget and behind schedule. Consultants McKinsey & Company report that:

The risks associated with megaprojects—those that cost $1 billion or more—are well documented. In one influential study, Bent Flyvbjerg, an expert in project management at Oxford’s business school, estimated that nine out of ten go over budget. *Rail projects, for example, go over budget by an average of 44.7 percent,* and their demand is overestimated by 51.4 percent. (emphasis added)

Flyvbjerg has posited the Iron Law of Megaprojects: Over budget, over time, over and over again.

In California, recent megaprojects have followed Flyvbjerg’s “Iron Law.” According to the California High Speed Rail Authority’s new business plan, the high-speed rail project is now at least four years behind schedule and 35 percent over 2016 cost estimates. In San Francisco the cost of the Transbay Transit Center Phase I has risen from $1.9 billion in 2013 to $2.4 billion today.

---

final cost of $6.5 billion. Since 2016, the estimated cost of CalMod itself has increased by $298 million, from $1.7 billion to $1.98 billion.

Complexity of CalMod

CalMod is highly complex and consists of many parts designed and installed by several contractors. Those contractors are (1) Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. for the overhead catenary system (poles and wires to carry electricity and associated infrastructure), (2) Stadler U.S. Inc. for the electric trains, and (3) ARINC Incorporated for the Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition System. As of this writing, contracts yet to be awarded include those for tunnel modifications (the tunnel contract is expected to be complete in late June or early July 2018) and upgrades to the Central Equipment Maintenance and Operations Facility. Adding to the complexity of the project is the need to schedule work windows in and around Caltrain’s continuing operations. The result is a design and installation plan that jumps segments and work areas. The following map shows the segments and work areas involved.

---

49 A system of overhead wires supported by poles used to supply electricity to electric trains.
51 An industrial control system used to control infrastructure processes, facility-based processes, or industrial processes.
52 Grand Jury mail exchange with a Caltrain senior manager.
53 Official from Caltrain; interview by the Grand Jury.
Figure 1
Project Work Segments

[Map of Caltrain electrification project with segments labeled]

In recent years, few railroad electrifications have taken place in the U.S. Consequently, electrification contractors with experience in the American regulatory environment are scarce. However, the current Denver electrification project (Eagle P3 Commuter Rail network) also uses Balfour Beatty as a main contractor. Hence, the CalMod contractor has experience in this arena. Nonetheless, the Denver project has seen delays and cost overruns and according to the Denver Post, “…has been beset with a number of performance issues, including stoppages due to lightning strikes and the ongoing problems with the timing of at-grade crossing gates.”

When CalMod electrification is complete the Caltrain Peninsula Corridor will have a complex system of electrical wires and poles much like the Amtrak Northeast Corridor shown in Figure 2.

Figure 2
Typical Overhead Catenary System

---

57 Official from Caltrain: interview by the Grand Jury.
Top Management Experience and Turnover on CalMod

Successful management of CalMod requires an experienced Chief Officer who can facilitate a high degree of communication and coordination among staff, contractors, and funding partners. CalMod has undergone frequent turnover in the top project position with three chief officers in the last two years, including a part-time, 18-month interim chief. The current Chief Officer started in February 2018. While turnover has been high, there has not been the same turnover in the senior manager positions below the Chief Officer.

Currently, two senior managers report directly to the Chief Officer with a third senior manager reporting to one of those two. The Grand Jury’s investigation has found that the new Chief Officer, his direct reports and the third senior manager all have significant experience in rail projects and management as well as engineering and other relevant educational backgrounds.

While the ranks of senior management have remained stable, there are some lower-level positions on the CalMod project that are not filled. Although, filling these positions is not critical for the current phase of the CalMod project, they will have to be filled as CalMod moves forward.

While initially concerned with Chief Officer turnover, the Grand Jury has found that the interim Chief was hired, in part, for specific skills in federal government relations and it was under his watch that the federal Full Funding Grant Agreement was completed.

The new Chief is a licensed civil engineer and licensed general contractor with 35 years of manager/engineer experience he holds a Bachelor of Science in civil engineering from California Polytechnic State University – San Luis Obispo. For the past 11 years he was Program Director of the San Francisco Central Subway Project, Phase 2 of the Third Street Light Rail Program.

---

61 Official from Caltrain: interview by the Grand Jury.
62 Officials from Caltrain: interviews by the Grand Jury.
63 Officials from Caltrain: interviews by the Grand Jury.
64 Officials from Caltrain: interviews by the Grand Jury.
65 Official from Caltrain: interview by the Grand Jury.
66 Officials from Caltrain: interviews by the Grand Jury.
68 Officials from Caltrain: interviews by the Grand Jury.
CalMod Funding Partner Oversight and Budget Variance Analysis

Not only is CalMod a complex project, but its funding streams are as well. The budget of $1.98 billion is funded by following nine major partners:

- Federal Transit Administration
- Caltrans
- California High Speed Rail Authority
- Bay Area Air Quality Management District
- Metropolitan Transportation Commission
- San Francisco County Transportation Authority/San Francisco Metropolitan Transportation Agency
- San Mateo County Transportation Authority
- Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
- City and County of San Francisco

Their relationships are governed by a seven-party agreement, another nine-party agreement, and the federal Full Funding Grant Agreement.171,72,73,74

The complexity of the funding, and by extension the specific reporting to each funder, can be seen in the funding chart in Appendix B.

The funding partners, per the agreements, play a significant role in oversight of CalMod. Depending on the issue, they are involved in quarterly, monthly, and biweekly oversight meetings with CalMod management, which focus on risk assessment, change management, master schedule updates, systems integration delivery coordination, funding, and meeting federal agency requirements.75

At its monthly meetings the PCJPB reviews CalMod progress and its budget. The monthly budget updates within the Monthly Progress Reports provided by staff to the PCJPB for these meetings (see Appendix C) include budget information for each high-level line item in the project. The Monthly Progress Reports do not, however, present a budget variance analysis that

---

72 “Caltrain’s Board Approves Multi-party Caltrain Modernization Funding Agreement; High Speed Rail Commits Additional $113 Million,” Caltrain, May 5, 2016. http://www.caltrain.com/about/MediaRelations/News_Archive/Caltrain_s_Board_Approves_Multi-party_Caltrain_Modernization_Funding_Agreement__High_Speed_Rail_Commits_Additional__113_Million.html.
75 Ibid.
shows the difference between planned and actual expenditures and reasons for any variance. Consequently, it is hard for anyone reviewing these reports to easily tell what the reasons for budget deviations may be.

In early 2018 CalMod management began delivering a quarterly graph to the PCJPB showing draw down on the $315 million contingency fund versus expected drawdown. Associated contingency fund tables show the reasons for contingency draws, but again no variance analysis or discussion is presented. Recently, management has also begun producing a quarterly graph showing actual versus baseline budget and funds currently available to the CalMod program. However, without an associated variance analysis narrative neither the public nor the PCJPB can gain a firm understanding of what is driving observed trends and gaps by reading the Monthly Progress Reports. The Grand Jury notes that neither graph was being produced when its investigation of the CalMod management process began.

**CalMod Risk Management Processes**

As with all major projects, CalMod faces several known risks, some more serious than others. Risks are detailed in the Program Risk Register (See Appendix D). The register details each identified risk, its potential effects, cost, owner, mitigation plans, and retirement date. A Risk Assessment Committee (made up of representatives from funding partners and CalMod management) meets monthly to identify risks and mitigation measures. Progress in mitigating risks enumerated in the Program Risk Register is reviewed at this meeting and on an ongoing basis by the person employed as Risk Management Lead. As of March 31, 2018, 282 risks had been identified. Of those 190 had been retired and 92 were still active.

---

76 Variance analysis is the quantitative investigation of the difference between actual and planned behavior. It involves the investigation of these differences and an interpretation of why the variance occurred. “Variance Analysis,” Accounting Tools, accessed May 16, 2018. [https://www.accountingtools.com/articles/what-is-variance-analysis.html](https://www.accountingtools.com/articles/what-is-variance-analysis.html).


80 Official from Caltrain: interview by the Grand Jury.

CalMod management reports the top risks to the PCJPB in the Monthly Progress Reports. However, some details from the Program Risk Register are left out of the publicly available Monthly Progress Reports due to confidentiality issues.\(^{82,83}\)

Risks, including unanticipated site situations, demands from local jurisdictions, and project design and scope changes, can bring about project changes and added costs to CalMod. To track and control those changes CalMod has instituted a change management program. A Change Management Board, made up of representatives from the funding partners and CalMod management, meets monthly to review and approve all changes over $200,000. While there was some internal discussion over the make-up of the Change Management Board, which slowed full implementation of the change management process, those concerns have mostly been resolved and the board is evaluating and approving changes as they occur.\(^{84,85,86}\)

Changes under the $200,000 Change Management Board level are approved by different managers depending on the monetary threshold. Any change over $2 million must be approved by the PCJPB. Nonetheless, no matter the size of the change it must go through the same analysis, including its potential effect on the project schedule and budget (see Appendix E).\(^{87}\)

The total contingency fund is $315 million. However, if the project were to face unanticipated problems and use up those funds, it is not clear where additional funds to cover the unanticipated costs would come from.\(^{88}\)

**CalMod Schedule Management Processes**

CalMod is a design-build project.\(^{89}\) In design-build projects work on the project is begun before all the components are fully designed. As work starts on the first several tasks, the design of the

---


\(^{83}\) Official from Caltrain: interview by Grand Jury.

\(^{84}\) Official from Caltrain: interview by Grand Jury.


\(^{86}\) Caltrain is still seeking representation from both CalMod and Caltrain operations on the Change Management Board. Grand Jury email exchange with a Caltrain senior manager.

\(^{87}\) Official from Caltrain: interview by Grand Jury.

\(^{88}\) Official from Caltrain: interview by Grand Jury.

\(^{89}\) A method of project delivery in which a single contractor is responsible for both design and construction. “What is Design-Build,” Design-Build Institute of America, accessed March 23, 2018. [https://www.dbia.org/about/Pages/What-is-Design-Build.aspx](https://www.dbia.org/about/Pages/What-is-Design-Build.aspx).
following tasks is begun. Design-build project delivery has become the preferred method for implementation of large projects such as CalMod.\textsuperscript{90,91}

CalMod has an internal Master Program Schedule, a summary of which is included in the Monthly Progress Reports (Appendix F).\textsuperscript{92,93} CalMod management holds a monthly Master Program Schedule meeting with funding partners to review the status of major milestones and near critical paths.\textsuperscript{94,95}

CalMod integrates contractors and consultants’ schedules using sophisticated project management software which creates the Master Program Schedule.\textsuperscript{96} Caltrain has hired the international consulting firm of Gannett Fleming to help manage the CalMod Master Program Schedule process as well as other electrification program management services.\textsuperscript{97}

Major milestone dates in the main text of the Monthly Progress Reports are few. For example, the updated Progress Schedule milestone “Arrival of First Vehicle at JPB” ends on July 15, 2019, but the next milestone, “PG&E Provides Permanent Power,” is 26 on September 9, 2021. Without more milestones in this 26 month period, it will be difficult for readers to know if CalMod is on schedule or not.\textsuperscript{98}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{90} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{91} Edward J. Pabor and Richard Pennington, “The growth (and growing pains) of design-build construction,” American City & County, \textit{Government Product News}, April 1, 2012. \url{http://americancityandcounty.com/contracts/growth-and-growing-pains-design-build-construction}.
\item \textsuperscript{92} Official from Caltrain: interview by the Grand Jury.
\item \textsuperscript{94} Critical path method is a project management algorithm for scheduling a set of project activities. CPM calculates the earliest and latest that each activity can start and finish without making the project longer. The “near critical paths” of a project may have small amounts of “wiggle room,” but they still must be completed on time or the overall project plan may slow. ("Critical path method," Wikipedia contributors, \textit{Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia}, accessed May 17, 2018. \url{https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Critical_path_method&oldid=838973945}).
\item \textsuperscript{96} Official from Caltrain: interview by the Grand Jury.
\end{itemize}
While the Master Program Schedule summary provided in the appendix of the Monthly Progress Reports does provide more detail, it requires some knowledge of Gantt charts to fully understand.99,100

**CalMod Quality Assurance**

CalMod has instituted a rigorous quality control/quality assurance program, which is necessary for a project of this size and complexity.101 The process follows general guidelines suggested by the International Risk Management Institute, Inc. (IRMI®).102

For the electrification portion of CalMod, Balfour Beatty oversees quality control (the testing for quality) while CalMod management oversees quality assurance (making sure the correct process and procedures are followed). CalMod follows the ISO 9000 family of quality standards.103

The Monthly Progress Reports to the PCJPB note the number of quality assurance audits and their status.104

**CalMod and Best Practices in Project Management**

To evaluate the processes in place for effective and efficient management of CalMod, the Grand Jury investigated best practices in project management. The Grand Jury is aware that project management, especially of mega projects, is a highly technical and specialized field. Moreover, mega projects are by their nature unique and not amenable to cookie-cutter management

---

100 A Gantt chart is a visual view of tasks scheduled over time. Gantt charts are used for planning projects of all sizes and they are a useful way of showing what work is scheduled to be done on a specific day and provide start and end dates of a project in one view. (“The Ultimate Guide to Gantt Charts,” ProjectManager, accessed May 24, 2018. https://www.projectmanager.com/gantt-chart.)
101 Official from Caltrain: interview by the Grand Jury.
103 ISO 9000 is a set of international standards on quality management and quality assurance developed to help companies effectively document the quality system elements to be implemented to maintain an efficient quality system. They are not specific to any one industry and can be applied to organizations of any size. “What Is the ISO 9000 Standards Series?,” American Society for Quality, accessed May 6, 2018. http://asq.org/learn-about-quality/iso-9000/overview/overview.html.
approaches. Nonetheless, there are overall principles that good project management follows. The Grand Jury investigated whether CalMod is following those principles.

The following chart shows those monitoring and controlling processes required for successful project management, according to a project management guide published by the federal government.

**Figure 3**

**Monitoring and Controlling Processes**

---


108 Ibid.
The Grand Jury’s investigation found that CalMod has in place the processes and personnel to address each area of monitoring and controlling listed below.

## Areas of Monitoring and Controlling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>CalMod Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance Reporting</td>
<td>Monthly and Quarterly Progress Reports to PCJPB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope Verification</td>
<td>Electrification-Engineering Weekly Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Control</td>
<td>Master Program Schedule Monthly Meeting, Consultant Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Control</td>
<td>Quality Assurance Audits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Change Control</td>
<td>Change Management Board and Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope Change Control</td>
<td>Change Management Board and Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Control</td>
<td>Change Management Board and Process, Monthly and Quarterly Progress Reports to PCJPB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Monitoring and Control</td>
<td>Risk Register and Risk Assessment Monthly Meetings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Project Management Institute (PMI)\(^{109}\), the world’s leading project management organization, explains that basic project management consists of five main process interactions with sub-tasks for each. These main processes are initiating, planning, execution, controlling, and closing. Sub-tasks include such items as scope definition, project definition, task definition, task sequencing, cost estimating, cost budgeting, risk identification, and risk assessment.\(^{110}\) In the Grand Jury’s estimation CalMod management processes have addressed each of these areas.

The Grand Jury has found no evidence to suggest that any of the four Caltrain management issues described above with respect to the CBOSS PTC project are present on the CalMod project. This investigation has shown that the CalMod project has:

- A commonly approved project schedule
- An apparently strong in-house technical team in place,
- Commonly agreed-upon definitions of deliverables
- A method in place for escalating work issues\(^{111}\)

---


\(^{111}\) Officials from Caltrain: interviews by Grand Jury.
To help remedy the CBOSS PTC shortcoming, CalMod has instituted closer partnering with its contractors. The location of the Balfour Beatty project office in the same building just a few floors above the CalMod office is one example of this effort.

**CalMod Transparency and Public Communication**

Through its new CalMod website and community outreach meetings, Caltrain communicates directly to the public about CalMod issues raised by bicycle riders and residents living near the tracks, such as the availability of bike racks or which trees will be cut.\(^\text{112}\) However, it does not communicate directly with the public about more complicated project issues concerning project budget, schedule, and deliverables.

For example, a local resident or a member of the press may want to find out if CalMod is on budget and on schedule. A logical first stop would be the CalMod website. However, neither the homepage nor the resources page provides links or references to the project’s budget or schedule.\(^\text{113}\) Moreover, using the search box provided, a search for Caltrain Modernization or CalMod Budget yields no relevant results. The same is true for a search on Caltrain Modernization or CalMod Schedule. Substituting PCEP for CalMod again yields no relevant results.

If that resident now turned to the main Caltrain website, the homepage provides a link to the Caltrain Modernization Program, which points back to the CalMod site.\(^\text{114}\) A search on CalMod budget or schedule again yields no relevant results but substituting PCEP for CalMod does produce some Monthly Progress Report links.

The only way to view documents related to CalMod budget, schedule, and deliverables is to know exactly where they are on the Caltrain website, or to know to use PCEP rather than CalMod in some searches. Using CalMod, a visitor must first go to the Caltrain (not CalMod) website, click on the Board of Directors link, then the Agendas/Minutes link, then the Agenda link for a specific month’s meeting, and finally scroll through hundreds of pages of the board report to attempt to find the information sought.\(^\text{115}\) And, as noted above, some of the budget and schedule information is unclear, incomplete, or buried in large amounts of data.

In contrast, other transportation agencies easily and cleanly present project information to the public through an interactive project status website dashboard. Such interactive dashboards are


\(^{113}\) Ibid.


used by the LetsGoCT! Transportation Ramp Up, the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT), and the Federal Rail Administration’s Positive Train Control Safety Plan.  

Figure 4 is a screen capture of the VDOT website home dashboard. This interactive dashboard allows visitors to click on the dials, which link to more detailed information.

**Figure 4**

**VDOT Dashboard**

![VDOT Dashboard](image)

While not as descriptive as the VDOT dashboard, the LetsGoCT! Transportation Ramp Up dashboard provides more detailed interactive information once the various graphic links are clicked.

The importance of such transparency can be seen in a paper published in *Construction Management and Economics*, where the authors note that improved stakeholder engagement can reduce “negative actions or reactions that have potential impact upon project success.”

---

The Boston Big Dig project with its multiple challenges and failures provides a laboratory for investigating issues such as public participation in the project process. In one such investigation, Virginia A. Greiman writes in *Megaproject Management: Lessons on Risk and Project Management from the Big Dig* that, “…transparency measures must be instituted that will enable the public to be informed and engaged throughout the term of the infrastructure project.”

Or as Justice Louis Brandeis said, “Publicity is justly commended as a remedy for social and industrial diseases. Sunlight is said to be the best of disinfectants; electric light the most efficient policeman.”

**Conclusion**

The Grand Jury began its investigation into whether Caltrain had put in place the processes necessary for effective and efficient management of the almost $2 billion CalMod program based in part on the reported Caltrain management issues in the CBOSS PTC project. The Grand Jury wanted to know if those issues might also be present in CalMod. It also examined the management processes put in place to implement a project of this scale.

The Grand Jury also explored the extent to which interested members of the public could easily determine the status of the CalMod project, including whether the project is on time and on budget.

In the Grand Jury’s view, Caltrain has hired a Chief Officer and senior managers with the education and experience necessary to manage the program. The Grand Jury also believes that reasonable processes and procedures are in place to properly manage this mega project. However, the Grand Jury is not auditing the project or speculating on its success.

The Grand Jury is aware that a 140-page Monthly Progress Report and Quarterly Update within an almost 300-page agenda packet and others like it presented to the PCJPB leaves readers, especially the public, drowning in data but starving for information. Moreover, Monthly Progress Reports are difficult for the public to find because they are not prominently highlighted on either the Caltrain or CalMod websites.

---


FINDINGS

F1. The CBOSS PTC project had several management failings as noted by the American Public Transportation Association (APTA) report. Among the Caltrain management issues noted by APTA were:
   - No commonly approved project schedule between Caltrain and Parsons
   - Lack of a strong in-house technical team to oversee the project
   - No commonly agreed upon definition of some final deliverables or how to test them
   - Lack of a working escalation method to resolve issues raised between Caltrain and Parsons

F3. The CalMod project schedule process appears coordinated and integrated among the main contractors, consultants, and CalMod. The duties of the consulting firm of Gannett Fleming include schedule coordination.

F4. While membership in the Change Management Board is not completely settled, the board is evaluating and approving changes as they occur.

F5. CalMod’s Risk Assessment Committee (made up of representatives from funding partners and CalMod management) meets monthly to identify risks and mitigation measures. Progress in mitigating risks enumerated in the Program Risk Register is reviewed at this meeting and on an ongoing basis by the person employed as Risk Management Lead.

F6. CalMod appears to have an experienced Chief Officer and senior managers in place.

F7. Quality control and quality assurance processes appear to be functioning as designed.

F8. Caltrain has adequate management processes in place to implement a project of this scale.

F9. Most CalMod project information is available to the public, but it is not readily accessible to members of the public who do not know exactly where to look for it. It is difficult for the public to understand if the CalMod project is on budget and schedule without access to easily decipherable summary reports.

F10. Transportation agencies such as the Virginia Department of Transportation and LetsGoCT! use interactive project status dashboards to keep the public informed about their large and complex projects and budgets.

F11. The Monthly Progress Reports delivered to the PCJPB show total current expenditures compared to the overall budget. In particular, they show “Cost this Month” and “Cost to Date.” but do not show a budget timeline of current expenditures to planned expenditures on a monthly basis. Graphs showing draw downs on CalMod’s $315 million contingency fund that are provided to the PCJPB do not include a narrative explanation. Without a variance analysis and narrative, it is difficult for members of the public to understand why a deviation from the budgeted amount occurred.
F12. The summary information provided to the public regarding scheduling milestones in the body of Monthly Progress Reports is insufficient. The public cannot tell from that summary if CalMod is on schedule when the published milestone chart and the critical path charts in that summary have entries that have gaps as long as two years. The appendix to each Monthly Progress Report does contain more detailed schedule information in the form of a summary Master Program Schedule, but understanding it requires some knowledge of Gantt charts to fully understand the information.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The 2017-2018 San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury recommends that the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board implement the following recommendations.

R1. Caltrain should publish an interactive dashboard focusing on overall project schedule, budget, and deliverables that is readily visible on the CalMod homepage (calmod.org). The dashboard should include links to the supporting data in the Monthly Progress Reports and other places. This recommendation should be implemented by June 30, 2019.

R2. CalMod should publish an explanation of how total project spending is tracked against the planned budget. Spending more or less than budgeted should be explained and a brief explanation of how the budget will be returned to plan (if possible) should be included. This information should be appended to the Monthly Progress Reports. This recommendation should be implemented by December 31, 2018.

R3. A high-level CalMod project schedule should be published every month showing the progress of the project against the planned timeline. The schedule should have quarterly milestones so that the public can determine if the overall project is on schedule. This schedule should be included in the Executive Summary and Schedule sections of the Monthly Progress Reports. This recommendation should be implemented by December 31, 2018.

REQUEST FOR RESPONSES

Pursuant to Penal Code Section 933.05, the Grand Jury requests responses as follows: From the following governing bodies:

- Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board to respond to the foregoing Findings and Recommendations referring in each instance to the number thereof no later than 90 days after the date of this Grand Jury Report.

The governing bodies shown above should be aware that the comments or responses of the governing body must be conducted subject to the notice, agenda, and open meeting requirements of the Brown Act.
METHODOLOGY

In investigating CalMod the Grand Jury conducted interviews of Caltrain employees and other transportation experts, reviewed Caltrain documents and website, consulted online resources and other documents, and made several site visits.

Site Tours

The Grand Jury attended PCJPB meetings, CalMod community outreach meetings, visited the CalMod Project Outreach Office, rode Caltrain, and observed CalMod work areas.

Interviews

The Grand Jury interviewed seven current Caltrain staff members and others involved in CalMod or assessments thereof.

Documents

See the Bibliography for a comprehensive list of resources consulted by the Grand Jury.


http://www.caltrain.com/about/MediaRelations/News_Archive/Former_SFMTA_and_VTA_CEO_To_Lead_Caltrain_Modernization_Program.html.

http://www.caltrain.com/about/Caltrain150/Milestones.html.


http://www.caltrain.com/about/MediaRelations/News_Archive/News__Governor_Signs_Bill_Ensuring_CalMod_Receives_PROP_1A_Funding.html.
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INTRODUCTION

In April 2016, James Hartnett, Executive Director, Caltrain, contacted the American Public Transportation Association (APTA) to request a peer review of the agency’s Communications Based Overlay Signal System (CBOSS) Positive Train Control (PTC) Project. APTA, through its wholly owned subsidiary the North American Transit Services Association (NATSA) and through discussions between NATSA and Caltrain staff, determined the review would be conducted May 31 – June 3, 2016. This final report was completed July 4, 2016.

A panel of industry and related industry peers was assembled and was comprised of individuals with experience in the implementation of PTC system technology and other complex signal system train control projects as well as experience in large technology and software-based projects. The onsite peer review panel consisted of the following individuals and the organizations from which they were selected:

**MR. MICHAEL HURSH**

General Manager
AC Transit
Oakland, CA

**MR. KEITH HOLT**

Deputy Chief Engineer, Communications & Signals
AMTRAK
Philadelphia, PA

**MR. TIMOTHY SHIRK**

Director of Communications and Signal Engineering
SEPTA
Philadelphia, PA

**MR. JACK COLLINS**

Chief Capital Officer (retired)
Metrolinx/GO Transit
Toronto, Canada

**MR. KAY NEUENHOFEN**

Software Engineer
Davis, California

**MR. GREG HULL**

Peer Review Facilitator
APTA, Washington, DC
The panel convened in San Carlos on Tuesday, May 31st. Panel coordination and logistical support was provided by NATSA Peer Review Facilitator, Greg Hull. Mr. Hull also coordinated panel member input in the drafting of this peer review report.
BACKGROUND

The Communication Based Overlay Signal System (CBOSS) Positive Train Control (PTC) solution is an overlay component to the existing fixed wayside signal system and integrated into the existing CTC mainline tracks. The purpose of the system is to prevent train to train collisions, enforce civil speed, prevent intrusion into work zones, prevent train movement over misaligned switches, reduce gate down time, enforce adherence to the schedule and to accommodate capacity for future high speed rail. This state of the art system will improve safety for passengers, workers, the general public and highway traffic crossing the tracks.

METHODOLOGY

The APTA Peer Review process is well established as a valuable resource to the public transit industry. Highly experienced and respected professionals voluntarily provide their time and support to address the review scope identified to assist the transit system and in turn assist the transit industry as a whole.

The panel conducted this peer review through documentation review, field observations, briefings, as well as listening sessions and interviews with Caltrain staff and contracted support.

SCOPE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of the review was to have the panel assist Caltrain in reviewing the progress of the project and project team organization. The review focused on two particular areas:

Programmatic:
- Performance of contractor relative to contract
- Engagement and oversight of contractor
- Engagement of Joint Powers Board (JPB) executive oversight and issue escalation/ process for decision making

Technological:
- Interoperability design viability
- Effectiveness of design
- Technical team resources
OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

OPENING COMMENTS

The peer review panel found Caltrain’s community outreach efforts on the project to be extensive and commendable. The PTC design is robust and appears to meet industry standards.

However, in the view of the panel, the probability of meeting the October implementation schedule is doubtful. A definition of “interoperability” and how to test “interoperability” needs to be agreed upon by the parties. However, at this juncture, activation of PTC on Caltrain property should not be delayed and should be regarded as a priority.

Caltrain oversight and TASI engagement needs to be strengthened, and operational training needs to be expedited. Additionally, a long term operations and maintenance strategy need to be determined. In the view of the panel in order to effectively address these operations and maintenance issues the decision to re-bid or extend the TASI contract needs to be addressed as soon as possible.

1. PROGRAMMATIC: CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE RELATIVE TO CONTRACT

In the view of the panel, friction between the owners’ project team and PTG has impacted responsiveness and transparency by PTG in PTG communicating cost and schedule progress. PTG also regards the scope of the project to have changed due to changes by Class 1 railroads which then impacts the interoperability of CBOSS. Additionally, both the owner and contracted parties do not appear to be working on a commonly approved schedule, so it is unlikely that the PTG Revenue Service Demonstration (RSD) date of October 2016 will be achieved. The panel also believes that project performance has also been impacted, in part, by the lack of TASI engagement, which results in harm to the project.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Establish weekly stakeholder meetings to include Caltrain, the Program Manager, PTG and TASI
- Caltrain needs to come to terms (negotiate) with PTG to agree upon a realistic schedule for the implementation of PTC. The current moving schedule target must stop.
- Identify what specifics and to what degree PTC-related changes brought about by Class 1 railroads have impacted the scope of this project
- Caltrain needs to direct PTG to commence information/ knowledge transfer with TASI
2. **Programmatic: Engagement and Oversight of the Contractor**

The oversight of PTG has included Caltrain and its program management consultants. In the view of the panel, in the absence of a strong technical team within Caltrain, Caltrain management has delegated decision making on the PTG contract to its program management consultant. PTG does not regard the program management consultant as the owner and this has consequently led to unresolved technical and contractual issues. Despite the recent partnering session, there continues to be a lack of commitment to resolving contractual issues such as scheduling and cost. The question remains as to where the cure or resolution presently stands.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

- Caltrain needs to directly hire a project manager with requisite technical experience and provide that person with the authority to manage the interests of Caltrain
- Immediately engage TASI for revenue startup and handover with a focus on training and knowledge transfer
- Take action now to place CBOSS equipped Caltrain trains on Caltrain track into revenue service as soon as possible
- Engage with PTG to establish a clear and real plan for implementation of PTC interoperability (ability to synchronize safe train movement with all relevant parties)
- Determine common ground for resolving current outstanding contractual issues

3. **Programmatic: Engagement JPB Executive Oversight and Issue/Escalation Decision Making Process**

Notwithstanding Caltrain’s role on behalf of JPB, it is not clear to the panel whether JPB itself has played a role in the day to day project oversight. The initial partnering session established an issue escalation process, however, this process appears to have broken down. As previously noted, despite the recent partnering session, there continues to be a lack of commitment to resolving contractual issues such as scheduling and cost.

The panel notes that the PTC CBOSS project is just one of several complex infrastructure projects that will require Caltrain to take a serious look at in-house technical management resources.

**RECOMMENDATION**

- Caltrain and PTG CEO’s should continue their weekly phone call to discuss project status and issues
4. **TECHNOLOGICAL: INTEROPERABILITY DESIGN VIABILITY**

It appears that the current status of software does not support interoperability with tenant and host railroads and that configuration management of the versions of system software control is lacking. It does not appear that interoperability will be included with the October 2016 revenue service demonstration.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

- A priority needs to be given to implement PTC operation on Caltrain property
- There needs to be agreement on a clear definition of interoperability as it pertains to tenant and host railroads along with a test plan and schedule
- Establish configuration management of system software version controls

5. **TECHNOLOGICAL: EFFECTIVENESS OF DESIGN**

The logic for the fiber optics design and distribution was well planned and can be leveraged for future revenue. The control center design incorporates state of the art technology, and is well laid out and labeled. The On Board Computer (OBC) has approximately 10,000 lines of code which is considered a small system that promotes maintainability and robustness. However, in reviewing the open software defects list, it appears that at least one of the defects is said to crash the OBC. As noted by the current defect list, there are multiple communication network issues that remain to be resolved.

The panel notes that the security layer of the software is an older application that is vulnerable to cryptographic intrusion.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

- The panel encourages that the back-up Central Control facility PTC network be physically isolated from external open networks (physically disconnect VPN connections)
- Review current security layers of the software and research whether security can be hardened without incurring unintended consequences. Continue efforts to deploy planned key exchange server.
- Review the vehicle equipment installations and systems design. Include TASI in this review.
- Consider the establishment of a configuration management function within Caltrain to ensure that modifications to PTC systems are controlled
6. TECHNOLOGICAL: EFFECTIVENESS OF DESIGN

In the view of the panel, animosities between the prime contractor and project management oversight present an impediment to resolving outstanding technical issues. PTG appears to have appropriate technical resources to complete CBOSS requirements for Caltrain running on Caltrain tracks. It is apparent that TASI resources have not been fully engaged during the course of the project.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- The panel encourages Caltrain to bring PTG and the project management team together to resolve interface issues in order to be more effective in resolving outstanding technical issues
- TASI can provide additional resources to strengthen current implementation and future maintenance of the system

OTHER OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The panel encourages that technical and commercial issues be separated and allow technical issue resolution to drive the schedule. It does not appear that training has progressed to the degree needed to meet the October deadline. It also needs to be realized that seasonal events will limit the availability of operations personnel for training. If not currently developed, establish a master test plan that is coherent, regularly updated, and is communicated to all relevant parties. Also ensure that on-going responsibilities for the rules, rulebook and bulletins are clarified and understood by all relevant parties.
CONCLUDING REMARKS

The findings and recommendations of this review are intended to assist Caltrain in implementing strategies that will assist the organization and its partners to successfully implement the CBOSS PTC project.

The panel sincerely appreciates the support and assistance extended throughout the entire peer review process by all Caltrain personnel as well as their contracted support. The panel stands available to assist with any clarification or subsequent support that may be needed.
Appendix
April 5, 2016

Mr. Richard White
American Public Transportation Association
1300 I Street, NW, Suite 1200 East
Washington, DC 20005

RE: REQUEST FOR APTA PEER REVIEW – CBOSS PTC PROJECT

Dear Mr. White:

This letter will serve as our formal request for APTA to assist Caltrain with a Peer Review of our CBOSS PTC.

Attached is a briefing document that includes background on the agency, the CBOSS PTC project purpose and goals, problem statement, and requested APTA Peer Review team scope of work. This document also includes the Caltrain point of contact for coordination of the Peer Review Process and the requested schedule for Peer Review activities to begin. Also enclosed is the required executed indemnification form.

The agency is processing the APTA $9,000.00 fee and will mail this check under separate cover to your attention. This letter will also confirm our commitment to reimburse appropriate Peer Review expenses including coach class air travel, and hotel and meal expenses. Caltrain typically reimburses meal expenses on a per diem rate under the GSA schedule for the San Francisco region. Prior to booking hotels for the Peer Review Team we would ask that these reservations be coordinated with our staff.

Please do not hesitate to contact me at 650 508-6221 if you have any questions or concerns with our request. We appreciate APTA’s assistance with this important agency initiative.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Jim Hartnett
Executive Director

Attachment
Agenda for CBOSS PTC APTA Peer Review  
May 31 - June 3, 2016  
Meetings Held in 4th Floor Dining Room  
1250 San Carlos Ave, San Carlos CA

May 31st:

6:00 pm  Dinner at Positano - 617 Laurel Street, San Carlos –  
APTA Team, Jim Hartnett, Michelle Bouchard & Gigi Harrington

June 1st:

8:15 am  Kick off  Confirm Objectives/Outcomes  
APTA team, Jim Hartnett, Michelle Bouchard, Gigi Harrington & Sal Gilardi

9:00am-10 am  Caltrain funding, governance and service overview-present and future (PCEP)  
Michelle Bouchard, Gigi Harrington, Danielle Stewart, Seamus Murphy

10:00am - 12:00pm  History of the Program – Karen Antion, Dave Elliot, Michelle Bouchard & Sal Gilardi  
including Luis Zurinaga (SFCTA) and Jim Lawson (VTA)

12:00pm - 1:00pm  Working Lunch with PTG Team. What is working and what is not?

1:15pm - 2:30pm  CBOSS technology overview Karen Antion, Dave Elliot, Michelle Bouchard & Sal Gilardi  
including Luis Zurinaga (SFCTA) and Jim Lawson (VTA)

2:45PM - 3:45pm  Integration and Interoperability – Karen Antion, Dave Elliot, Michelle Bouchard & Sal Gilardi  
including Luis Zurinaga (SFCTA) and Jim Lawson (VTA)

4:00pm – 5:00pm  Stakeholder Viewpoints – Seamus Murphy, Casey Fromson, Michelle Bouchard & Sal Gilardi

June 2nd:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:15am - 9:30am</td>
<td>Follow-up from previous day, missing pieces –</td>
<td>Gigi Harrington, Michelle Bouchard, Karen Antion, Dave Elliot &amp; Sal Gilardi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30am - 11:30am</td>
<td>Tour BCCF and Hi-Rail and discussion of Safety Certification and Safety for the Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00pm - 1:30pm</td>
<td>Contractor Management</td>
<td>Gigi Harrington &amp; Michelle Bouchard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00pm – 5:00pm</td>
<td>Peer Review Working Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

June 3<sup>rd</sup>:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:15am - 10:30am</td>
<td>Project Closeout</td>
<td>Jim Hartnett, Michelle Bouchard, Gigi Harrington, Sal Gilardi, Karen Antion &amp; Dave Elliot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

DOCUMENT LIST

1. Caltrain Positive Train Control Project- APTA Peer Review (general summary of milestones and related networks)
3. JPB CBOSS Project Organization Structure (6/1/16)
4. Interoperability Coordination Efforts (timeline)
5. Caltrain PTC Project Training Schedule (updated May 2, 2016)
6. Table 2-1 Hazard Log Status Levels/ Table 2-4 Hazard Risk Index
7. CBOSS PTC Integration and Interoperability (presentation: June 1, 2016)
8. Advanced Signal System (CBOSS PTC) System Overview (presentation: June 1, 2016)
10. Caltrain PTC Implementation Plan (PTCIP) (September 24, 2014)
11. JPB Board Presentations (2011-2016)
12. CBOSS Weekly Executive Dashboards (2016)
14. CBOSS PTC Project Plan to Completion Partnering Session (Rev Approach, 11-4-15)
15. Caltrain CBOSS PTC Project Partnering Session (April 29, 2015)
16. JPB/ PTG/ GE Partnering Meeting (August 31, 2015)
17. Breach of Contract/ Demand to Cure Correspondence: JPB to PTG/ PTG to JPB (2016)
APPENDIX B

PCEP Funding Plan
Modernization Program
Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project (PCEP)
January 2018 Monthly Progress Report

**Fund Source**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTA Core Capacity</td>
<td>$647,000,000</td>
<td>32.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Section 5307 (EVU only)*</td>
<td>$315,000,000</td>
<td>15.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Section 5307 (Environmental / Pre Development only)</td>
<td>$15,676,000</td>
<td>0.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop 1A</td>
<td>$600,000,000</td>
<td>30.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Speed Rail Cap and Trade</td>
<td>$113,000,000</td>
<td>5.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit &amp; Intercity Rail Capital Program</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop 18 (Public Transportation Modernization &amp; Improvement Account)</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Toll Funds (RV/1/2)</td>
<td>$39,430,000</td>
<td>1.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Moyer</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFCTA/SFMTA**</td>
<td>$41,382,177</td>
<td>2.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCTA Measure A</td>
<td>$41,382,177</td>
<td>2.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTA Measure A</td>
<td>$41,382,177</td>
<td>2.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara (VTA) 7-Party MOU Contribution</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco 7-Party MOU Contribution</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo (SMCTA) 7-Party MOU Contribution</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain Low Carbon Transit Operations Cap and Trade</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Local Contribution</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,980,252,533</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

*Includes necessary fund transfer with SMCTA

**Includes S4M CMAQ Transfer considered part of SF local contribution
APPENDIX C

Budget and Expenditures
Modernization Program
Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project (PCEP)
January 2018 Monthly Progress Report

## Table 8-2EMU Budget & Expenditure Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Work</th>
<th>Budget (A)</th>
<th>Current Budget (B)</th>
<th>Cost This Month (C)</th>
<th>Cost To Date (D)</th>
<th>Estimate To Complete (E)</th>
<th>Estimate At Completion (F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EMU</td>
<td>$550,899,459</td>
<td>$551,774,959</td>
<td>$550,899,459</td>
<td>- $60,716.941</td>
<td>$491,058,018</td>
<td>$551,774,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEMOF Modifications</td>
<td>$1,344,000</td>
<td>$1,344,000</td>
<td>- $1,344,000</td>
<td>- $1,344,000</td>
<td>- $1,344,000</td>
<td>- $1,344,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Oversight</td>
<td>$64,139,103</td>
<td>$64,139,103</td>
<td>$344,903</td>
<td>$24,198,722</td>
<td>$39,940,332</td>
<td>$64,139,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Management</td>
<td>$5,022,302</td>
<td>$5,022,302</td>
<td>$41,594</td>
<td>$2,449,644</td>
<td>$2,581,508</td>
<td>$5,022,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>$1,685,614</td>
<td>$1,685,614</td>
<td>2,457</td>
<td>$399,172</td>
<td>$1,286,442</td>
<td>$1,685,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Security</td>
<td>$556,067</td>
<td>$556,067</td>
<td>10,814</td>
<td>$299,631</td>
<td>$265,436</td>
<td>$556,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Mgmt Services</td>
<td>$13,275,280</td>
<td>$13,275,280</td>
<td>83,883</td>
<td>$5,823,250</td>
<td>$7,452,031</td>
<td>$13,275,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng &amp; Construction</td>
<td>$89,113</td>
<td>$89,113</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$66,296</td>
<td>$89,113</td>
<td>$89,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMU Eng &amp; Mgmt</td>
<td>$32,092,556</td>
<td>$32,092,556</td>
<td>$40,411</td>
<td>$10,905,936</td>
<td>$21,176,621</td>
<td>$32,092,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Support</td>
<td>$1,027,272</td>
<td>$1,027,272</td>
<td>10,512</td>
<td>$356,073</td>
<td>$671,199</td>
<td>$1,027,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Support</td>
<td>$1,878,889</td>
<td>$1,878,889</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$277,202</td>
<td>$1,601,286</td>
<td>$1,878,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Support</td>
<td>$2,999,547</td>
<td>$2,999,547</td>
<td>43,903</td>
<td>$1,090,715</td>
<td>$1,909,832</td>
<td>$2,999,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget / Grants / Financi</td>
<td>$712,123</td>
<td>$712,123</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>$348,890</td>
<td>$363,153</td>
<td>$712,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>$1,207,500</td>
<td>$1,207,500</td>
<td>34,258</td>
<td>$907,515</td>
<td>$299,965</td>
<td>$1,207,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Direct Costs</td>
<td>$4,003,139</td>
<td>$4,003,139</td>
<td>35,842</td>
<td>$1,416,628</td>
<td>$3,586,311</td>
<td>$4,003,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS1 Support</td>
<td>$2,740,000</td>
<td>$2,740,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2,740,000</td>
<td>$2,740,000</td>
<td>$2,740,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Projects</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Charges</td>
<td>$1,941,800</td>
<td>$1,941,800</td>
<td>151,563</td>
<td>$829,275</td>
<td>$1,121,526</td>
<td>$1,941,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$38,562,962</td>
<td>$37,607,462</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$38,562,962</td>
<td>$38,562,962</td>
<td>$38,562,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forecasted Costs and Changes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(879,240)</td>
<td>(879,240)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMU SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$664,127,325</td>
<td>$664,127,325</td>
<td>$406,466</td>
<td>$85,735,987</td>
<td>$578,391,338</td>
<td>$664,127,325</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes regarding tables above:
1. “Current Budget” includes executed change orders and awarded contracts.
2. Column C “Cost This Month” represents the cost of work performed this month.
3. Column D “Cost To Date” includes actuals (amount paid) and accruals (amount of work performed) to date.
4. The agency labor is actual through November 2017 and accrued for December 2017.
5. The lower accrued amount for EMU Eng & Mgmt is the result of lighter consultant support performed than was estimated in the previous reporting period.

## Table 8-3 PCEP Budget & Expenditure Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Work</th>
<th>Budget (A)</th>
<th>Current Budget (B)</th>
<th>Cost This Month (C)</th>
<th>Cost To Date (D)</th>
<th>Estimate To Complete (E)</th>
<th>Estimate At Completion (F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electrification Subtotal</td>
<td>$1,316,125,208</td>
<td>$1,316,125,208</td>
<td>$14,436,810</td>
<td>$302,756,866</td>
<td>$1,013,368,322</td>
<td>$1,316,125,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMU Subtotal</td>
<td>$654,127,325</td>
<td>$654,127,325</td>
<td>$448,466</td>
<td>$85,735,907</td>
<td>$578,391,338</td>
<td>$654,127,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PCEP TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$1,960,252,533</td>
<td>$1,960,252,533</td>
<td>$15,083,276</td>
<td>$389,492,873</td>
<td>$1,591,759,660</td>
<td>$1,960,252,533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes regarding tables above:
1. Column B “Current Budget” includes executed change orders and awarded contracts.
2. Column C “Cost This Month” represents the cost of work performed this month.
3. Column D “Cost To Date” includes actuals (amount paid) and accruals (amount of work performed) to date.

Appendix D includes costs broken down by Standard Cost Code (SCC) format. This format is required for reporting costs to the FTA. The overall project total in the SCC format is lower than the project costs in table 8-3. This is due to the exclusion of costs incurred prior to the project entering the Project Development phase.

Budget and Expenditures
8-2 December 31, 2017

Appendix-18
# APPENDIX D

## PCEP Risk Register

### Sample Page Part I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>RBS</th>
<th>FUNC. (P)</th>
<th>FUNC. (S)</th>
<th>RISK DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>EFFECT(S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 56 | EMU  | Interface |           | Lack of O&M support for testing and/or vehicle operations. Includes operational readiness and personnel trained and scheduled to be trained. | • Testing delayed.  
• Change order for extended vehicle acceptance. |
| 64 | Elect. | Shkhd-Ext |           | Relocation of underground utilities must precede construction of catenary pole foundations. Potholing will identify any need for revisions to pole placement, which may result in a need for additional ROW or relocation of the utility by others. | Delay in installation of catenary poles resulting in claims and schedule delay. CBSS FAC conflicts additional costs and delays include:  
1. Potholing  
2. Design  
3. OCS materials  
4. Encasement  
5. ROW  
JPB Signal Cable conflicts additional costs and delays include:  
1. Trenching  
2. Splicing  
3. Cable |
## PCEP Risk Register
### Sample Page Part II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>PROBABILITY</th>
<th>COST</th>
<th>SCHEDULE</th>
<th>OWNER</th>
<th>MITIGATION ACTIONS</th>
<th>RETIREMENT DATE(S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Navarro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VERY HIGH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SIGNIFICANT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Communicate with TASI on testing requirements
- Language in TASI contract for what they support for EMUs and electrification
- Maintain ongoing communication with TASI
- Sufficient advance notice to be able to adjust schedule

Make sure requirements are provided to TASI well in advance and monitor their preparation (and all other parties as well) via the Commissioning and Operational Readiness weekly meeting.

**Completion of Integrated Testing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>PROBABILITY</th>
<th>COST</th>
<th>SCHEDULE</th>
<th>OWNER</th>
<th>MITIGATION ACTIONS</th>
<th>RETIREMENT DATE(S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Hurley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VERY HIGH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SIGNIFICANT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the field verification work the location of the CBoss FOC may have significant impact to the OCS pole installation. Based on the location of the FOC pull boxes and field markers, their FOC follows the same path of the UPRR duct bank, which greatly limits the location where the OCS poles can be installed. The CBoss FOC appears to be 9’ to 12’ from the nearest rail. OCS pole foundations are located 9’-3” from Centerline of track to OCS Pole face. OCS pole foundations are 3’ in diameter. To mitigate possible delay to the contractor, the final As-Builts for CBoss FOC need to be received and compared with current OCS pole locations for any potential conflicts.

CBoss FOC (parallel to track) found during potholing are treated as follows:
1. OCS Foundations relocated further offset from track.
2. If ROW permits, offset 4 ft.
3. If ROW does not permit, offset no closer than 2 ft.
4. Encase FOC 7 ft. and place temporary steel plate between encaissement and new OCS foundation location during drilling.
5. If ROW does not permit, purchase additional ROW in.

**Completion of foundation construction for all segments.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RETIREMENT DATE(S)</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>STATUS &amp; REMARK(S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Integrated Testing</td>
<td>Please update with Joe Navarro’s name – Last conversations entailed the DB providing support until TASI staff is properly trained. - M. Verhoff 8/17/2016</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduced state-of-good repair staffing to support all capital projects. PCEP, 25th Avenue, Los Gatos. Will hire starting October 30. Interviewing during the month of October. Training will take 1-1/2 months. - J&gt; Navarro 10/10/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of foundation construction for all segments.</td>
<td>Leeway in locating OCS poles reduces severity of this risk. For lateral crossing utilities poles can be relocated. For fiber optics and signal cables some flexibility to relocate utilities. - A. Brick-Turin 6/12/2017 Notes from Risk Assessment Committee 3/15/2017. - $10,000 per conflict, 400 likely conflicts = $4 million relocation costs.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Potholing at proposed OCS foundation locations continues in Segment 2 &amp; 4 Mitigation measures are underway in Segment 4. - J. Hurley 11/2/2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX E

## Change Order Logs

**Modernization Program**

**Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project (PCEP)**

**January 2018 Monthly Progress Report**

---

### Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project

**Monthly Progress Report**

### Change Order Logs

#### Electrification Contract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>CCO Amount</th>
<th>Percent of Authority</th>
<th>Remaining Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/31/2017</td>
<td>CCO 00001 - Track Access Delays for 2016, Quarter 4</td>
<td>$85,472</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>$34,746,056</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** $85,472 0.25% $34,745,056

**Notes:**

1. When the threshold of 75% is reached, staff may return to the Board to request additional authority.

#### EMU Contract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>CCO Amount</th>
<th>Percent of Authority</th>
<th>Remaining Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09/22/2017</td>
<td>CCO 00001 - Contract General Specification and Special Provision Clean-up</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>$27,546,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/27/2017</td>
<td>CCO 00002 - Prototype Seats and Special Colors</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>$27,489,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/02/2017</td>
<td>CCO 00003 - Car Level Water Tightness Test</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>$27,489,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/29/2017</td>
<td>CCO-00004 - Onboard Wheelchair Lift 800 Pound Capacity Provisions</td>
<td>$848,000</td>
<td>3.08%</td>
<td>$26,641,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/03/2017</td>
<td>CCO 00005 - Design Progression (multiple)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>$26,641,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/12/2017</td>
<td>CCO 00006 - Prototype Seats and Special Colors ($27,500)</td>
<td>($27,500)</td>
<td>-0.10%</td>
<td>$26,669,473</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** $875,500 3.18% $26,669,473

**Notes:**

1. When the threshold of 75% is reached, staff may return to the Board to request additional authority.

#### SCADA Contract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>CCO Amount</th>
<th>Percent of Authority</th>
<th>Remaining Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None to date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$551,038</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** $0 0% $551,038

**Notes:**

1. When the threshold of 75% is reached, staff may return to the Board to request additional authority.
TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
Executive Director

FROM: Derek Hansel     Michelle Bouchard
Chief Financial Officer   Chief Operating Officer, Rail

SUBJECT: REJECTION OF PROPOSALS FOR MP36PH-3C LOCOMOTIVES MID-LIFE OVERHAUL SERVICES

ACTION
Staff recommends the Board exercise its right to reject all proposals to provide overhaul services for three MP36PH-3C locomotives.

SIGNIFICANCE
Staff has identified the need to refine the scope of services in the solicitation documents. Pursuant to the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board’s (JPB) rights set forth in the Request for Proposals (RFP), staff has determined that it would be in the best interest of the JPB to reject all proposals and issue a revised RFP for overhaul services for the MP36PH-3C locomotives.

BUDGET IMPACT
Rejection of the proposals will have no budget impact.

BACKGROUND
An RFP was issued to overhaul three MP36PH-3C locomotives and outreach was conducted, including placing the RFP on the JPB’s procurement website for interested proposers.

The JPB received two proposals from:

1. Higher Power Industries, Inc., Yonkers, NY
2. MotivePower, Inc., Boise, ID

After reviewing the proposals, the Evaluation Committee determined that Higher Power Industries, Inc. was the highest ranked firm. After firms were notified of the evaluation results and recommendation of award of contract to Higher Power Industries, Inc., the JPB received a protest from MotivePower, Inc.

During the protest evaluation process, staff determined that the scope of services described in the RFP needed to be further refined and clarified. As a result, and pursuant to the JPB's rights under the RFP, staff recommends that all proposals be...
rejected and the services be resolicited in an upcoming procurement. If the JPB acts to reject all proposals as recommended by staff, Legal Counsel advises that no action is required to be taken with respect to the merits of MotivePower, Inc.’s protest.

Procurement Administrator II: Kevin Kelley 650.622.7892
Project Manager: Joe Navarro, Director, Rail Operations 650.508.7792
MEMBERS PRESENT: K. Burke, C. Chang, C. Tucker, R. Valenciana (Vice Chair), B. Shaw (Chair)

MEMBERS ABSENT: P. Escobar, L. Fernandez, L. Klein,

STAFF PRESENT: J. Navarro, J. Navarrete, M. Jones, L. Low, C. David

Chair Brian Shaw called the meeting to order at 5:48 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF AUGUST 15, 2018
Motion/Second: Tucker / Valenciana
Ayes: Burke, Chang, Shaw
Absent: Escobar, Fernandez, Klein, Tucker

PUBLIC COMMENT
Jeff Carter, Millbrae, stated that he has noticed construction progression along the corridor and is pleased that the electrification project is moving along. Secondly, Jeff stated that the JPB minutes are brief compared to the Caltrain CAC minutes. He stated that the JPB board video is the only way to gain a better understanding of the meeting than the meeting minutes. He hopes that the previous method of capturing JPB Minutes can be implemented again.

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, stated that he has forwarded pictures of the San Bruno platform to staff. He said that the pictures show 6 ft. cracks at the base of the cantilever poles. Roland said that these cracks exist before the wires have been put up and that these wires will hold two tons of tension on each line. Secondly, Roland stated that in regards to his correspondence regarding the format of the minutes available online, although he understands that the problem will be corrected going forward, he requested the minutes be reposted in the updated format.

CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT
Chair Brian Shaw stated that the staff for Stanford, Caltrain and Clipper met last week to correct a problem with the Clipper cards used for the Go Pass. The problem was that the Go Passes would expire in 6 months if it was not used, however the employer purchased the Go Pass for the year. Mr. Shaw stated that with the help of Caltrain the matter was resolved with Clipper.
Chair Shaw also stated that Stanford is now receiving data from Clipper to better understand travel patterns and usage of the Go Pass which will help with Stanford’s future planning and decisions.

COMMITTEE COMMENTS
Member Kevin Burke stated that he had questions from passengers. Kevin stated that the Hillsdale Shuttles were shut down due to contractual issues and asked whether staff has considered paying the shuttle drivers more to help resolve contract issues. Joe Navarro, Deputy Chief, Rail Operations responded that it is difficult to get drivers and that the shuttles are not the only entity having this problem due to the cost of living. Mr. Navarro stated that staff is doing the best to resolve shuttle issues. Member Kevin Burke also asked whether there will be any schedule changes before Electrification. Mr. Navarro responded no schedule changes anticipated, at this time. Mr. Burke, thanked staff for considering his concern regarding bike and pedestrian alignment at the undercrossing in South San Francisco. Lastly, Mr. Burke advised that the clock across the concession stand at 4th & King is two minutes slow. Mr. Navarro said that he will look into that.

Member Cat Chang expressed her appreciation of the Business Plan presentation between meetings and the update of progress being made. Ms. Chang also stated that she has noticed a drop in On Time Performance and asked staff to elaborate in the Staff report. Mr. Navarro said that he would speak to it during the Staff Report.

Vice Chair Ricardo Valenciana recognized the Social Media staff for a job well done updating weekend service disruption as it was very informative and was provided with enough time to consider alternative transportation plans. Mr. Valenciana suggested staff to partner with a ride share organization that may potentially earn revenue for Caltrain.

STATION TOOLBOX -
UPDATE ON CALTRAIN PLANNING STUDIES AND TRANSIT-ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT POLICY
Melissa Jones, Principal Planner, presented the Update On Caltrain Planning Studies And Transit-Oriented Development Policy Development

Overview:
- Purpose and Relationship between the Projects
- Rail Corridor Use Policy Overview
- Station Management Toolbox Overview
- Transit-Oriented Development Policy Overview
- Relationship to Caltrain Business Plan

Purpose of the Three Projects:
- Three interrelated planning and policy analyses to address station access and transit-oriented development (TOD)
- Key questions for each project:
  - Rail Corridor Use Policy: What can be developed on JPB property? Who can use JPB right-of-way and real estate?
  - TOD Policy: How should Caltrain develop available property?
Station Management Toolbox: Help answer “Why?” questions, to help assess outcomes and trade-offs of station access and TOD decisions

Rail Corridor Use Policy (RCUP):
- **Purpose:**
  - Develop a policy to facilitate the processing, review, and approval of proposed uses and projects on JPB property
- **Objectives:**
  - Create a framework to evaluate potential conflicts between future transit uses and long-term development opportunities
  - Provide a coherent process for the review of proposed uses and projects on JPB property
  - Provide Board-level input and transparency on long-term, high dollar value decision-making processes and outcomes related to JPB property
- **Tasks include:**
  - Update inventory of JPB-owned property assets
  - Establish broad “property use” zones based on current, planned, and potential future needs for railroad uses
  - Analyze the tradeoffs between preserving JPB property for potential future railroad needs and allowing potential commercial leases and joint-development projects on the property
  - Develop an administrative framework for processing property use decisions (including distinguishing between staff-level decisions and Board-level decisions)
- **Timing:** TBD – aligning with Business Plan

Station Management Toolbox:
- **Purpose:**
  - Provide a decision-making tool and technical analysis to help assess potential outcomes and trade-offs associated with access improvements and TOD at stations
- **Funded by FTA planning grant objectives:**
  - Establish performance goals and metrics related to Caltrain’s station-based assets and programs
  - Provide Caltrain with a methodology to quickly and transparently evaluate the performance of potential access investments and transit oriented developments at and near stations.
- **Tasks include:**
  - Phase 1 – Create the Toolbox Framework: Establish the range of decision and planning scenarios where the Toolbox is needed, and propose tools for quantitative analysis to aid in decision-making
  - Phase 2 – Build the Toolbox: Create the set of tools that will comprise the Toolbox and facilitate technical analysis
  - Phase 3 – Test the Toolbox: Use case studies of three Caltrain stations (South San Francisco, Belmont, and Redwood City) to test the Toolbox and develop case study plans.
- **Timing:**
  - Phase 1 and 2 – completed
Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Policy

- **Purpose:**
  - Establish agency goals related to TOD and set forth a series of policies for disposition of JPB real estate assets

- **Objectives:**
  - Hone the list of development “opportunity sites” from the RCUP to identify key opportunities to promote TOD, and analyze trade-offs with the Toolbox
  - Adopt policies related to the agency’s role as an advocate and stakeholder related to third-party development near Caltrain
  - Develop a set of general business objectives to guide disposition of agency property for development (including balancing revenue vs. affordable housing)

TOD Policy:

- **Tasks include:**
  - Create detailed summary of potential opportunity sites, potential development scales, and potential revenue
  - Characterize key trade-offs for JPB’s goals, business terms, and other activities (e.g., affordability targets vs. revenue)
  - Identify potential value capture strategies
  - Explore benefits of development in broader station areas near Caltrain corridor and possible criteria for endorsement of development projects near stations

- **Timing:** targeting Board adoption summer 2019

Relationship to Caltrain Business Plan:

- These three projects will form a comprehensive technical and policy-based understanding of the extent to which the JPB’s real estate assets can be effectively monetized
- Caltrain Business Plan will closely coordinate with these three initiatives, leveraging their technical findings and incorporating any policy direction the Board provides through these studies

Vice Chair Ricardo Valenciana asked about the housing built around the San Carlos station and whether it falls under the RCUP Policy. Ms. Jones responded that it would in the future. Mr. Valenciana asked what policy it fell under when the decision was made. Ms. Jones advised that, at that time, there was no policy. Mr. Valenciana asked whether the housing is affordable housing. Ms. Jones responded that there is a portion of affordable housing and not sure of what percentage.

Member Cat Chang asked since the Management Toolbox will align with the Business Plan whether will there be assumptions built in to incorporate the Business Plans. Ms. Jones advised that it will include Business Plan assumptions and plans as it is driven by the ridership model which will be incorporated to the Management Toolbox.
Member Kevin Burke asked whether staff has talked to BART as they have gone through similar situations. Ms. Jones replied that staff has worked with BART staff and are in communication. Mr. Burke also asked whether Caltrain receives a discount on construction of housing overtime. Ms. Jones advised that the Caltrain Real Estate staff would have those details. Mr. Burke asked whether staff has ever considered buying out Union Pacific. Ms. Jones said not to her knowledge. Mr. Burke also asked whether Caltrain can provide local governments how zoning around the station areas affects potential Caltrain ridership. Ms. Jones advised that the Management Toolbox has a little bit of that functionality as it allows for analysis using the number of potential dwelling units within a half a mile of station area plans. Lastly, Mr. Burke asked whether staff has a tool to determine how much foot traffic is needed in order to consider adding retail or concession shops near a station. Ms. Jones replied that staff does not.

Member Cat Tucker asked how much property is being considered along the corridor. Ms. Jones said that she does not have that information. Member Cat Tucker said that Caltrain is a train business and that Transit-Oriented Development property should be left up to the region.

Chair Brian Shaw asked what is Caltrain’s current decision making process on land use for Caltrain owned property. Ms. Jones responded that ultimately it is a board decision. Caltrain does not have sites that are available for non-railroad use when considering future growth and is why this tool has been developed to better evaluate trade-offs. Chair Shaw asked whether the Station Management toolbox is available for public use. Ms. Jones advised that it is primarily for staff to facilitate decision making internally and results can be shared publicly. Chair Shaw asked whether a developer or contractor working on municipal planning can reach out to Caltrain staff to run numbers on their behalf. Ms. Jones responded that it is possible.

Public comment:
Jeff Carter, Millbrae, appreciates the report and also stated that it is important for Caltrain not to give up valuable right of way that could be used for possible expansion of the railroad and the eventual need to handle a projected ridership of 150k - 200k. Jeff said that it would be costly to expand to four tracks in the long run.

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, asked whether the primary mission is to handle real estate deals or to transport passengers throughout the corridor. Roland said that if ridership increased from 60k to 200k, that farebox would jump from $18M/year to $300M/year. Roland asked how mixed traffic will be handled in the future and how will trains pass. He also asked how residents that live near the tracks will react and how will passenger safety happen when High Speed Rail zooms at 110MPH. Lastly, Roland asked staff to plan for longer platforms and increased ridership of 100k – 200k.

Doug DeLong, Mountain View, stated that the construction signage is not accurate at the San Carlos station. He stated that there are two signs pointing to the Historic Depot building that read “Caltrain Parking”, however all parking has moved to South of the station.

Chair Brian Shaw allowed additional public comment.
Ian Quirk, Redwood City, stated that cell phone service between Millbrae and San Francisco is spotty and completely cuts out at every tunnel. He also stated that passengers are unable to be productive during their commute which results in longer hours at the office and less time with family. Ian acknowledges Caltrain’s long term goal to obtain Wi-Fi, however asks staff to consider alternate solutions for passengers as BART, Amtrak, major airlines and the Tech Company buses have. He suggests that if Caltrain were to launch an RFO today, that Caltrain would receive multiple vendor options. He said that although Wi-Fi enabled trains in 4 – 5 years is encouraging, it is not enough and an interim solution is needed.

Chair Brian Shaw advised the members that the Wi-Fi update has been moved Items to be scheduled section of the JPB CAC Work Plan.

**TUNNEL NOTCHING/MODIFICATIONS PROJECT**

Joe Navarro, Deputy Chief, Rail Operations, presented the Tunnel Modification Project presentation.

San Francisco Tunnel Work:
- Work on the four San Francisco Tunnels:
  - Grouting and Notching
  - Drainage and Track Work
  - Overhead Contact System Installation
- Pre-construction: September 2018
  - Prepare Staging Areas
  - Site/Tunnel Survey
- 24 hour/day weekend work:
  - Start: Friday Night after Revenue Service
  - Finish: Monday Morning before Revenue Service

Weekend San Francisco Station Closure:
- Weekends - Oct 6, 2018 to Spring 2019
  - Caltrain service north of the Bayshore Station will be suspended on the weekends
  - Caltrain service south of Bayshore will remain unchanged
  - Bus service will be provided from Bayshore to 4th and King and 22nd Street stations
- Caltrain weekday service will remain unchanged
- Bus Bridge Schedule available at [caltrain.com/SFWeekendClosure](http://caltrain.com/SFWeekendClosure)

San Francisco Weekend Caltrain Closure Outreach:
- Station Signage and Announcements
- Onboard Signage and Announcements
- Station Ambassadors
  - Weekend prior to first closure and every closure weekend
- News Releases and Media Advisory
- Paid and Organic Social Media Campaigns
Nextdoor, Twitter, Facebook
- Paid Print and Digital Ads
- E-Newsletters
- Dedicated Webpage
  - Alert on every Caltrain page and homepage
  - Includes Transit Alternatives
- Coordination with stakeholders:
  - Cities, Counties, Chambers, Event Organizers and Community Based Organizations
- Alerts on 511.org
- Google Maps Alert
- Customer Service Number Message
- Physical Mailers to residents near tunnels

Member Kevin Burke asked about parking at Bayshore and Mr. Navarro advised that there will be no station parking and limited street parking as the buses will be staging in that area for passenger transportation to 4th & King and 22nd St. Mr. Burke asked whether staff asked SFMTA to run additional weekend service on the T Muni Line. Mr. Navarro advised that there are a lot of projects going on and that all transit agencies are having a hard time with man power at this time.

Chair Brian Shaw asked whether the tunnel work will be complete this year or will it continue next winter in another phase. Mr. Navarro advised that the plan is to complete all work during this phase and that if unexpected issues arise staff will make those decisions, as they come, however if there are any delays on this particular work, it will not affect the start date of electrification. Mr. Shaw asked whether Caltrain will coordinate schedules with BART to help move people from Millbrae to San Francisco as the Bus Bridge will not provide enough bandwidth to transport passengers effectively from Bayshore. Mr. Navarro advised that BART has 20 minute headway on the weekends and that passengers getting off at Millbrae will wait 20 minutes, at most. Mr. Navarro said that after the first week staff will work with BART to coordinate.

Public comment:
Jeff Carter, Millbrae, asked why the work could not be completed one tunnel at a time and have trains single track during construction, instead. Jeff also requested staff to not only coordinate schedules with BART, but to also coordinate fares. Jeff suggested staff to work with BART to honor Caltrain fare to San Francisco.

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, asked whether Caltrain will provide service on Thanksgiving. Mr. Navarro advised that Caltrain will run regular holiday service on Thursday and Friday. Roland asked staff what method will be used for tunnel notching. Mr. Navarro advised that he does not have the answer. Roland requested staff to share the method that will be used for tunnel notching as there is a method where the tracks can be lowered while addressing the draining and would be a safer method.

Doug DeLong, Mountain View, advised that the tracks are already as low as they can go. Doug also addressed an earlier comment regarding schedule changes and that
although there will be no service design changes, the Hillsdale station will be
demolished next year to support the 25th Ave. grade separation project in San Mateo
and would like to know the schedule impacts and whether it will overlap the tunnel
notching project.

Member Kevin Burke asked staff to have conductors make announcements regarding
the weekend service disruption. Mr. Navarro advised that there is a timeline in place to
notify the public.

BIKE SECURITY OUTREACH
Lori Low, Public Affairs Officer, presented the Bike Security Task Force Update.

Presentation Outline
• Interdepartmental Effort
• Data Gathering & Improvements

Interdepartmental Effort
• Monthly Meetings - Departments Involved
  o Social Media
  o Transit Police
  o Rail Operations
  o Safety & Security
  o Planning
  o Marketing
  o Community Affairs
  o Customer Service

Social Media
• Data Gathered
  o Reviewed all bike security related social media posts 2016 & 2017
  o Reviewed protocol and response
• Improvements
  o Coordinated with Transit Police and Safety and Security on standardized
  messaging/response

Transit Police
• Data Gathered
  o Bike theft reports 2016 & 2017
• Improvements
  o Sheriff’s online reporting form updated (separate “onboard” and “at
  station”)
  o Bike theft data incorporated into monthly Safety and Security Reports
  o Annual bike security presentation to BAC
  o Bike safety tips posted to both Sheriff’s and Caltrain websites
  o 529 Garage: Technology help with registering bikes, education,
  prevention, reporting, and theft recovery. Implementation Fall/Winter 2018

Rail Operations
• Data Gathered
Conductor Survey (June 2018)

- Improvements
  - Retraining response protocol with conductors
  - Possibility of security cameras at stations
  - Security cameras in electric trains
  - Bike counters in electric trains

Lost and Found

- Data Gathered
  - Inventory bikes in lost and found

- Improvements
  - Updated lost and found website with bike information
  - Lost and found recovery in San Jose and San Francisco. Implementation Fall 2018.
  - Streamline process and new online system (Auto-generates detailed questions and automatic matches). Implementation Winter 2018/2019

Other Sources

- Data Gathered
  - Customer Service: Bike security related comments from 2016 & 2017
  - Marketing: Surveys from 2015 to 2017
  - Community Affairs:
    - BAC bike security related comments from 2016 & 2017
    - Requested best practices from advocacy organizations and public agencies

- Improvements
  - 2018 Annual Survey: Bike security related data
  - Caltrain website (more accessible safety tips, best practices, Transit Police info)
  - Onboard Bike car (decals: inclusion of Transit Police information)
  - Take Ones: Transit Police flyer

Member Kevin Burke requested staff to make it easier to rent bikes at the stations. Ms. Low agreed the bike sharing is an exciting opportunity and that the new Planner of Station Access will be looking closer at bike share and bike parking options. Ms. Low also advised that the cities determine which bike shares are allowed in their jurisdiction and once the city decides which bike shares are allowed, staff can work with them.

Vice Chair Valenciana asked Ms. Low how many bikes were reported stolen last year? Mr. Navarro responded that 27 bikes were reported stolen and is minimal as Caltrain handles 5000 bikes a day.

Public comment:
Jeff Carter, Millbrae, appreciated the presentation and the bike security efforts as passengers are concerned with the new EMU design and not being able to sit with their bikes. He also appreciated the updated Lost and Found process.

Doug DeLong, Mountain View, also appreciated the updated Lost and Found process. Doug asked staff to consider putting cameras at the Palo Alto station as, according to the safety and security report, it is the station with the most reported bike thefts.

Adrian Brandt stated that the best way to prevent bike theft is to have people in close proximity of their bike. Bike theft happens quickly and by the time someone watching from a camera notices a bike theft, it is too late to catch the thief.

**STAFF REPORT UPDATE**

Joe Navarro, Deputy Chief, Rail Operations, reported:

**On-time Performance (OTP) -**

- **August:** The August 2018 OTP was 93.0% compared to 95.7% for August 2017.
  - **Vehicle Strikes** - There were two vehicle strikes on August 3 and 23.
  - **Vehicle on Tracks** - There was one day on August 17, with a vehicle on the tracks that caused train delays.
  - **Mechanical Delays** - In August 2018 there were 669 minutes of delay due to mechanical issues compared to 428 minutes in August 2017.
  - **Trespasser Strikes** - There was one trespasser strike on August 24, resulting in a fatality.

- **July:** The July 2018 OTP was 90.5% compared to 95.8% for July 2017.
  - **Trespasser Strikes** - There were two trespasser strikes on July 5 and 19, both resulting in a fatality.

Mr. Navarro advised that some of the reasons for the dip in on time performance area:

1. Electrification construction has ramped up.
2. Locomotives are being overhauled in Boise, Idaho
3. PTC – Locomotives and cab cars are being pulled out of service in order to place onboard devices
4. Special Event Services

**Caltrain Electrification Construction**

Work is organized by four segment areas, with work currently occurring in segments 2, 3 and 4. Please visit [http://calmod.org/construction/](http://calmod.org/construction/) for further work segment and construction details.
Weekend Bus Bridge & Timetable Change
Caltrain will operate a weekend bus bridge between San Francisco and Bayshore Stations, including 22nd Street, due to the shutdown of tunnels to accommodate the construction activities for the Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project. Caltrain will alter its Weekend Timetable starting Saturday, October 6, 2018 through late Spring 2019.
- Buses will connect to trains at the Bayshore Station.
- Bus schedules will be reflected in revised Weekend timetable.
- Train schedules south of Bayshore Station will remain the same.

Other details regarding ticketing, parking and special events during the tunnel closures are available on the Caltrain website

Fare Enforcement Ordinance
Adopted by the board on January 4th and launched on July 25, 2018. The appeal process has been established and accepted by the committee. As of August 23rd there has been 937 violations issued and 297 violations have been paid.

Member Cat Tucker responded to the public comment regarding Wi-Fi. She said that it has been an item that has been requested of Caltrain since Wi-Fi was made available and that Caltrain has many needs and that Wi-Fi has not bubbled to the top. She stated that the latest update regarding Wi-Fi is to wait for the EMUs to have Wi-Fi capability in 4 to 5 years. Cat advised him to lobby the Board in order to make Wi-Fi a priority sooner.

Public comment:
Roland Lebrun, San Jose, advised staff to communicate with VTA regarding Fare Violations as they do it well. Regarding the switches, Roland stated that trains do not decelerate to 45 mph at the passing station at Lawrence and has clocked them at 55 MPH and causes maintenance issues. Regarding Wi-Fi, years ago there was a company that offered to do it for free, the same company that services the Golden Gate buses and Caltrain missed that opportunity. Lastly, regarding PTC Roland stated that Caltrain will not make the December 2018 deadline and will get fined because Caltrain will not qualify for an extension.

Adrian Brandt stated that the request for Wi-Fi has been going on since 1990, when he was serving on the CAC and that it is not one of Caltrain's priorities. Adrian asked how the conductor's will keep track of those riders that have been banned for evading fare and not paying the fines. Mr. Navarro advised that the hand held ticket machines have a camera if the passenger does not have identification at the time of citation. In addition, if the identification is in the database more than three times and fits the criteria, Transit Police gets involved. Adrian would like to ensure that the train doesn't stop moving when Transit Police gets involved. Mr. Navarro advised that there is a process in place for Transit Police to meet trains accordingly. Lastly, Adrian asked staff to invest in atomic clocks that receives a signal from Colorado for precise time.
Member Kevin Burke announced that next Wednesday there is an MTC meeting to review the new Clipper contract award which received a single bid.

**JPB CAC Work Plan**

**October 17, 2018**
- Caltrain Business Plan Update
- Camera System
- Visual Messaging System Station Signage

**November 21, 2018**
- Proof of Payment
- Grade Crossings Improvement

**December 19, 2018**
- None scheduled yet

**DATE, TIME AND LOCATION OF NEXT REGULAR MEETING:**
October 17, 2018 at 5:40 p.m., San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building, 2nd Floor Bacciocco Auditorium, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA.

Adjourned at 7:18 pm
rejected and the services be resolicited in an upcoming procurement. If the JPB acts to reject all proposals as recommended by staff, Legal Counsel advises that no action is required to be taken with respect to the merits of MotivePower, Inc.’s protest.

Procurement Administrator II: Kevin Kelley
Project Manager: Joe Navarro, Director, Rail Operations
Date: September 21, 2018

To: Board of Directors

From: Jim Hartnett, Executive Director

Subject: October 4, 2018 JPB Board Meeting Executive Director’s Report

- **On-time Performance** –
  - **Through September 20**: The preliminary September 2018 OTP was 92.7 percent compared to 94.7 percent for September 2017.
  - **August**: The August 2018 OTP was 93.0 percent compared to 95.7 percent for August 2017.
    - **Trespasser Strike** – There was one trespasser strike on August 24, resulting in a fatality.

- **SF Weekend Caltrain Closure** – Trains will not serve the San Francisco or 22nd Street stations on weekends from October 6, 2018 to Late Spring 2019. Trains will terminate at Bayshore Station. Free bus service will be available for Caltrain riders from Bayshore Station to 22nd Street and San Francisco stations during regular weekend Caltrain service.

  Bus schedules will be included in Caltrain’s weekend timetable. Buses are ADA accessible and will have limited capacity for luggage and bikes onboard. In addition to the free bus service provided, there are other transit alternatives to get to SF that may work better for some passengers.

  Details regarding ticketing, parking and special events during the tunnel closures are available on the Caltrain’s dedicated webpage: [caltrain.com/SFWeekendClosure](http://caltrain.com/SFWeekendClosure).
• **CAC Meeting** – The Citizens Advisory Committee met on Wednesday, September 19, in San Carlos. Melissa Jones, Principal Planner - Policy & Programming for Caltrain Planning, provided a presentation on the Update of Caltrain Planning Studies and Transit-Oriented Development Policy Development. Joe Navarro, Deputy Chief - Rail Operations, provided a presentation on the Tunnel Modification Project. Lori Low, Public Affairs Officer, provided a presentation on the Bike Security Task Force update. Joe also provided the Staff Report. The next CAC meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, October 17, in San Carlos.

• **BAC Meeting** – The Bicycle Advisory Committee met on Thursday, September 20, in San Carlos. Daniel Provence, Principal Planner, presented the Caltrain Infrastructure Design and Construction update related to bikes. Lori Low, Public Affairs Officer, provided an update on the Bike Webpage and Bike Security Task Force Update. Lori also provided the Caltrain Modernization update and Staff Report. The next BAC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, November 15, in San Carlos.

• **Special Event Train Service** –
  
  **Services Provided**
  
  o **Giants Baseball** – The Giants hosted 13 regular season home games in August. Total additional riders alighting and boarding at the San Francisco station, was 68,801. Year-to-date pre and regular season ridership, alighting and boarding at the San Francisco station, was 398,303, a 14 percent decrease compared to the same number of games in 2017.
  
  The Giants hosted 14 regular season home games in September. Event ridership will be provided in November.

  o **SF 49ers Pre-Season** – The SF 49ers hosted the Dallas Cowboys on Thursday, August 9 at 7:00 p.m. and the Los Angeles Chargers on Thursday August 30, at 7:00 p.m. at Levi’s Stadium. Caltrain operated one extra post-game local train from Mountain View to San Francisco. For preseason home games in August, the total year to date ridership alighting and boarding at Mountain View station was 2,586, a 57 percent increase compared to the same number of games in 2017.

  o **Ed Sheeran Concert at AT&T Park** – On Tuesday, August 21 at 7:00 p.m. Ed Sheeran performed his 2018 North American Stadium Tour concert at AT&T Park. Caltrain operated two extra post-event local trains from San Francisco station. Total additional ridership alighting and boarding at San Francisco was 7,549.
o **Stanford Football** – The Stanford Cardinal hosted their first weekend home game on Saturday, September 8 at 5:30 p.m. vs. USC. Stanford also hosted UC Davis on Saturday, September 15, 2018 at 11:00 a.m. Caltrain served the Stanford Stadium station with both northbound and southbound trains before and after games. For the two games total riders alighting and boarding at Stanford station was 2,561. Average ridership per game was 1,281, a 36 percent increase compared to 2017.

o **SF 49ers Regular Season** – The 49ers hosted the Detroit Lions for their season opener on Sunday, September 16 at 1:05 p.m. at Levi’s Stadium. Caltrain operated one extra pre-game train with limited stops and one extra post-game local train from Mountain View to San Francisco. Total ridership alighting and boarding at Mountain View station was 2,066. Total year-to-date preseason and regular season ridership alighting and boarding at Mountain View station was 4,652, a 13 percent increase compared to the same number of games in 2017.

o **Eagles, Zac Brown and Doobie Brothers Concert at AT&T Park** – On Thursday, September 20 the Eagles, Zac Brown and the Doobie Brothers performed at AT&T Park starting at 5:00 p.m. Caltrain operated two extra post-event local trains that departed San Francisco after the concert. Event ridership will be provided in November.

o **Journey, Def Leppard and Foreigner Concert at AT&T Park** – On Friday, September 21 Journey, Def Leppard and Foreigner performed at AT&T Park starting at 6:00 p.m. Caltrain operated two extra post-event local trains that departed San Francisco after the concert. Event ridership will be provided in November.

o **San Jose Sharks** – There were three pre-season SJ Sharks home games at SAP Center in late September. Event ridership will be provided in November.

**Services Scheduled:**

o **Jay-Z and Beyoncé Concert at Levi’s Stadium** – On Saturday, September 29 at 7:30 p.m. Jay-Z and Beyoncé Concert will return to Levi’s Stadium for their ‘OTR II’ concert tour. Caltrain will provide one extra post-event northbound local train that will depart approximately 75 minutes after the event ends, or when full. Caltrain will coordinate connecting service with VTA light rail.
o **San Jose Sharks** – The regular season home opener will be on Wednesday, October 3 at 7:30 p.m. vs. the Anaheim Ducks. Caltrain will track post-game service ridership for all home games. No extra special trains are planned. For weeknight and Saturday night games, the last northbound train departs SJ Diridon station at 10:30 p.m. or 15 minutes after the game ends but departs no later than 10:45 p.m.

o **San Francisco Fleet Week** – On Saturday, October 6 and Sunday, October 7, Caltrain will provide one extra train with limited stops from San Jose to Bayshore on both days before the Fleet Week airshows from 12:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. in anticipation of large crowds. There will be no extra post-event service as this event occurs the same weekend the SF Weekend Closure will take effect. Due to large crowds anticipated this weekend, riders should allow extra time and plan accordingly or consider using one of the alternative transit options posted to [caltrain.com/SFWeekendClosure](http://caltrain.com/SFWeekendClosure).

o **Stanford Football** – The Stanford Cardinal will host Utah on Saturday, October 6, 2018 (the same day the SF Weekend Closure will take effect) at time still to be determined. For weekend home games, Caltrain will serve the Stanford Stadium station with both northbound and southbound trains before and after games. Fans can tag on and tag off using their clipper cards at the Stanford Stadium station for all weekend home games.

o **SF 49ers Regular Season** – The 49ers will host the Arizona Cardinals on Sunday, October 7 at 1:25 p.m. (the same weekend the SF Weekend Closure will take effect) and the LA Rams on Sunday, October 21, 2018 at Levi’s Stadium. For the remaining weekend 49er home games, Caltrain will operate one additional pre-game southbound train with limited stops from Bayshore to Mountain View for passengers to connect to the VTA light rail. The extra train will then express to San Jose Diridon station, the last station stop. After all 49er home games, Caltrain will operate one extra post-game local train that will depart Mountain View station approximately 75 minutes after the game ends, or when full. While the Weekend Bus Bridge is in effect, all trains (including Special trains) will start and terminate at the Bayshore Station and connect to SamTrans Buses. Bus service will be provided to and from 22nd Street and San Francisco stations.

o **Warriors vs. Lakers Pre-Season** – The Warriors will host a Pre-Season game vs. the Lakers on Friday, October 12 at 7:30 p.m. at SAP Center. Caltrain will track post-game service ridership. No extra special trains are planned. In order to promote Caltrain service to Warriors fans in advance of the 2019 Warriors season opener at Chase Center, the last northbound train departs SJ Diridon station at 10:30 p.m. or 15 minutes after the game ends but departs no later than 10:45 p.m.
• **Capital Projects –**

The Capital Projects information is current as of September 14, 2018 and is subject to change between September 14 and October 4, 2018 (Board Meeting).

- **San Francisco Highway Bridges:** Replace three obsolete overhead vehicular bridges located in San Francisco at 23rd Street, 22nd Street, and Paul Avenue. Construction started in March 2015 and was substantially completed in May 2017.

  Resolution of a Buy America issue with Caltrans continues that will also resolve funding issues for the project. Discussions regarding cost reimbursement from the City of San Francisco for their Auxiliary Water Supply System (AWSS) also continue. The AT&T relocation reimbursement request for performing utility relocation on their behalf is in the process of being transmitted.

- **San Mateo 25th Avenue Grade Separation Project:** Raise the elevation of the alignment from Hillsdale Boulevard to south of the Highway 92 Overcrossing in the city of San Mateo. The project creates a grade separation at 25th Avenue, relocates the Hillsdale Station to the north, and creates two new east-west street grade-separated connections at 28th and 31st Avenues in San Mateo. Construction of the elevated rail alignment and the new Hillsdale Station will be phased to limit impact to the operating railroad.

  In September, PG&E gas pipeline relocation along Delaware continued as well as underground PG&E electrical and third-party Fiber Optic relocations. Construction of the 25th and 28th Avenue Bridges superstructures also continued. The Pedestrian Underpass by 28th Avenue is now largely completed. Subgrade preparations and levelling pads for the Mechanically Stabilized Earth (MSE) walls continued and MSE wall construction is expected to start by the end of September.

  The temporary closure of the Hillsdale Station, to allow completion of the project, is now forecast to occur in the Summer of 2019 until late 2019. During the temporary closure, enhanced bus and shuttle service to the Belmont Station will be provided to minimize the temporary inconvenience.

  Due to delays associated with obtaining UPRR approvals and its impact to beginning 3rd party fiber optic relocations; the project schedule has been affected. Overall construction completion is now forecast to be approximately 7-months late, with the completion date extended from early 2020 to mid-2020. In addition, to the schedule impacts, the project has
experienced significant impacts due to the inefficiency of working around a live fiber facility, as well as incurring additional construction costs associated with installing and working around temporary steel plate, and soldier pile walls, required to protect the 3rd party fiber optic during construction.

- **South San Francisco Station Improvements**: Replace the existing side platforms with a new centerboard platform, construction of a new connecting pedestrian underpass to the two new plazas in downtown South San Francisco to the west and the shuttle area to east. Upon completion, the hold-out rule at this station will be removed that currently impacts the overall system operational efficiency.

In September, third party utility relocations for water, gas and electric were in progress. Critical third-party utility relocations that were originally scheduled to begin in November 2017 were delayed until August due to delays in obtaining Caltrans permits. Due to physical conflicts between third-party utility relocations and civil construction for critical path activities such as the pedestrian underpass, a partial suspension has been issued for construction to minimize delays and inefficiencies that would be caused by the stacking of the utilities and construction work. Critical path construction is now planned to resume in April 2019. Non-critical path activities such as OCS foundations for the Electrification project and work on Poletti Way will continue during the suspension period. Project delays due to Caltrans issues are projected to extend project completion from mid-2019 to mid-2020.

- **FY16 Grade Crossing Improvements Project**: The scope of this project is to improve the safety at 10 grade crossings along the corridor. Work items included are the installation of signals, fences, gates, curbs, lighting and signs. The existing grade crossing warning devices will be retrofitted to meet the latest California Public Utilities Commission standards. The crossings to be improved include 16th Street in San Francisco, Broadway in Burlingame, Peninsula and 4th Ave. in San Mateo, Ravenswood in Menlo Park, Alma and Charleston in Palo Alto, Rengstorff and Castro in Mountain View, and Mary in Sunnyvale.

The construction contract also includes the installation of medians at five crossings in Santa Clara County. The scopes of two projects were combined into a single construction contract to improve cost and administrative efficiency. These medians are required by the FRA and are intended to create a barrier that discourages vehicles from driving around down crossing gates. The five crossings are Churchill and East Meadow in
Palo Alto, Sunnyvale Avenue in Sunnyvale, and Auzerais and West Virginia in San Jose.

In September, work was completed at Sunnyvale Avenue. Work is in progress Ravenswood Avenue in Menlo Park, Peninsula Avenue in San Mateo, and Broadway in Burlingame. Overall construction is expected to complete by February 2019.

- **Sunnyvale Station Rehabilitation Project:** Replace the surface pavers in the station platform with colored cast-in-place concrete and the relocation of the north pedestrian crossing to the north by approximately 83 feet. Some of the surfaces of the platform pavers have become uneven and this project will create a smooth and even platform surface. The relocation of the north pedestrian crossing will help to clear the southern crossing that is currently partially blocked when northbound 6-car consists arrive at the Sunnyvale Station.

  The construction is being phased in six partial sections of the station platforms so that passenger service may continue during construction. The construction of the second section of the northbound platform was completed and work has commenced in the 3rd section. The schedule impact of additional work and work suspension for Electrification related electrical grounding has extended the forecast date for completion from August to October.

- **F-40 Locomotive Mid-Life Overhaul Project:** Perform mid-life overhaul of three F40PH2C locomotives. The mid-life overhaul of the locomotives shall include compete disassembly of the main diesel engine, overhauling by reconditioning re-usable main frame components and re-assembly with new engine components and replacement of the Separate Head-End Power (SEP-HEP) unit and all electrical components of the SEP-HEP compartment. All areas of the locomotive car body, trucks, wheels and electrical components shall be reconditioned to like-new condition or replaced with new material. The work shall be completed off-site at contractor’s (Motive Power) facility location at Boise, Idaho. The three locomotives are Locomotive #’s 920, 921 and 922.

  Locomotives #’s 920 and 921 were shipped to the vendor’s facility in February and March. Both locomotives are still undergoing overhaul; the expected returned to the CEMOF facility in San Jose for Final Acceptance testing has been delayed by approximately 5 months to January and February return dates due to the vendor’s labor shortages. Locomotive #922 is now scheduled to be shipped to the vendor’s facility in December.
MP-36 Locomotive Mid-Life Overhaul Project: Perform mid-life overhaul of six MP-36-3C Locomotives. The mid-life overhaul of the locomotives shall include complete disassembly of the main diesel engine, overhauling by reconditioning re-usable main frame components and re-assembly with new engine components and the replacement of the Separate Head-End Power (SEP-HEP) unit and all electrical components of the SEP-HEP compartment. All areas of the locomotive car body, trucks, wheels and electrical components shall be reconditioned to like-new condition or replaced with new material. The project work shall be completed off-site at the contractor’s facility location. The six locomotives are Locomotive #’s 923, 924, 925, 926, 927 and 928.

Technical specifications for the work were completed in February 2018. The Request for Proposal was advertised on June 12, 2018. Proposals were received from 2 bidders on July 31. Proposals have been evaluated and contract negotiations are complete. Award of the contract is expected to occur at the October 4, 2018 Board meeting and the overall completion of the work is scheduled for the Fall 2020.
TO:          Joint Powers Board

THROUGH:    Jim Hartnett
            Executive Director

FROM:       John Funghi
            Chief Officer, Caltrain Modernization Program

SUBJECT:    PENINSULA CORRIDOR ELECTRIFICATION PROJECT MONTHLY PROGRESS REPORT

ACTION
Staff Coordinating Council recommends the Board receive the Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project (PCEP) Monthly Progress Report (MPR) link to report: PCEP August monthly report. No action required.

SIGNIFICANCE
Staff prepares and submits a report covering the PCEP on a monthly basis.

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no impact on the budget.

BACKGROUND
The MPR is intended to provide funding partners, stakeholders, and the public a PCEP overview and an overall update on project progress. This document provides information on the scope, cost, funding, schedule, and project implementation.

Prepared by: Josh Averill, Program Management Administrator 650.508.6453
TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
Executive Director

FROM: Michelle Bouchard
Chief Operating Officer, Rail

SUBJECT: CALTRAIN POSITIVE TRAIN CONTROL PROJECT UPDATE - SEPTEMBER 2018

ACTION
Staff Coordinating Council recommends that the Board receive the Positive Train Control (PTC) report for September 2018.

SIGNIFICANCE
Staff will provide monthly updates covering PTC related activities during the previous month and provide a preview of activities anticipated to take place during the current month.

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no budget impact.

MONTHLY UPDATE

1. Status on Major Milestones to Successfully Enter RSD December 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Project Activity</th>
<th>Expected Completion</th>
<th>Progress As Of 9/30/18</th>
<th>Progress On Track?</th>
<th>Mitigation Required or Approvals Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approval of Designated RSD Test Request</td>
<td>May 31\textsuperscript{st}</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Formal conditional approval received on September 10. Team incorporating FRA conditions in test plan to insure compliance to approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of revised project PTC Implementation Plan (PTCIP) and Request for Amendment (RFA)</td>
<td>May 31\textsuperscript{st}</td>
<td>In FRA review</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Revised PTCIP and RFA submitted on June 22 based on initial FRA comments. Verbal approval received, waiting written approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot Installations (4) Completed</td>
<td>June 20\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>All pilots completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit Designated RSD Application</td>
<td>Oct 15</td>
<td>Formal in process</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Draft submitted and reviewed by FRA, formal application to be submitted in October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Critical Feature V&amp;V</td>
<td>Oct 30</td>
<td>In Process</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Designated RSD area V&amp;V informal survey completed and submitted to FRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated RSD Training Complete</td>
<td>Nov 14</td>
<td>In Process</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Training material in review, training to start in October, now on critical path for RSD success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated RSD - Required Vehicle Install Completion*</td>
<td>Nov 27</td>
<td>In Process</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(44) Total installs required - (4) pilots plus (40) other vehicles - 55% completed thru September 18\textsuperscript{th}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete All Designated RSD Testing (Lab, Functional and FQT)</td>
<td>Dec 18</td>
<td>In Process</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lab in development, lab testing began in Aug, field testing to start Sept, PTC functional testing Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start of Designated RSD*</td>
<td>Dec 18</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td>Complete (44) installs and receive FRA approval to run in PTC mode in Designated RSD area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\*Key project activity that is tied to Wabtec performance incentive payment
Major Wabtec activities started and / or completed in September:

- Production installations of I-ETMS onboard equipment on Caltrain locomotive and Caltrain cab cars ongoing, cars may be used in normal operations with PTC not engaged. (24) completed through September 18th.
- Key Personnel changes: Replacement Wabtec project manager and Test Manager in place. Caltrain management has maintained need for onsite Test manager to provide needed testing focus, new test manager is local to area and will be available at all times to support test needs.
- Senior management review held between Caltrain and Wabtec senior staff to discuss project progress. In September, Caltrain emphasized in strongest manner the lack of Wabtec system integration focus. Meetings will be held monthly through year end to ensure all Caltrain concerns are addressed promptly.
- Field Verification & Validation testing continues, Wabtec began the mandatory FRA brake testing for the two locomotive and two cab car vehicle types required, testing has been successful to date.
- Required lab testing began at the Wabtec Jacksonville facility after initial delays due to material and resource planning issues.
- Significantly large number of contract submittals have been submitted by Wabtec, reviewed and comments returned by Caltrain project team. A sampling of the submittals in September included:
  - F40 and MP36 locomotive brake test plans
  - Bombardier and Gallery car brake test plans
  - Integrated Work plan
  - RAM Analysis
  - RSD Application
  - Commissioning and Cutover plan
  - DCS Base Station Audit report
  - Bombardier car and MP36 locomotive installation plans
  - Field V&V test results
  - Static Bulliten Delivery report

2. **Change Order Log** - There have been no change orders requested from Wabtec during this reporting period, and there are none in process or review by CALTRAIN. This section will track all change activity on the contract.

3. **Risk Management** - Caltrain and Wabtec have agreed to share the management of an identified list of risk items which were identified during the contract negotiations. The total cost allocated to these risks is $1.9M to be shared amongst both parties. Unrealized risks will result in cost savings to the Caltrain.

Risk review meetings are now held during the monthly Caltrain / Wabtec executive reviews. To date no risks have been identified requiring use of the risk funds. There are also risks to be monitored outside the Wabtec specific contract that the project team monitors and mitigates as necessary.

The following table captures the top risks both external (outside the Wabtec contract) and internal (specific to the Wabtec contract):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Item</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mitigation Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential EMU delay due to move from I-ITCS to I-ETMS</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Project team continues to support EMU team effort to bring Wabtec under contract to provide PTC solution required for EMU cars with minimal delay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRA process changes</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Maintain close and open relationship with key FRA contacts to ensure all submittals are done correctly and within required time frame to achieve 2018 RSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRA review cycle delays</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Delays were being incurred due to significant volume of submittals from all properties requiring review and approval of RSD documentation prior to year end. Team working with FRA to minimize any delays incurred with Caltrain documentation and speed FRA review process (see #4 FRA document status below).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interoperability delays</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Caltrain is working with UPRR and tenants to ensure agreed to interoperability schedule dates are maintained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onboard installation delays</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Pilot installations are complete, production units in progress. Wabtec must ensure production installation schedule is maintained to achieve required 2018 installs to achieve RSD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track access delays</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Ensure field test schedule is maintained by coordinating all field work in combination with other capital projects needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back Office Server (BOS) documentation scope creep</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Ensure standard documentation supplied by Wabtec meets requirements of Caltrain specification criteria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Caltrain PTC Project FRA Documentation Status** - **green** indicates Final is approved by FRA

Weekly calls with FRA review team instituted in August have continued through September. Continued progress occurred this month to gain FRA approval of key project documents required to enter RSD (see below), in particular receiving the formal written approval of the Test Request.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Name</th>
<th>Status - Through September 19th</th>
<th>Projected Submittal Date</th>
<th>Actual Submittal Date</th>
<th>Need FRA Approval By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Updated PTC Implementation Plan and Request for Amendment of the PTCIP</td>
<td>FRA processing formal approval response</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>6/22/2018 (final)</td>
<td>Informal approval received July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Request</td>
<td>Formal approval received 9/10/18</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>6/22/2018 (final)</td>
<td>Informal approval received July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdivision and Critical Asset Configuration Management Plan</td>
<td>Final approved by FRA - 8/13/2018</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>7/25/2018</td>
<td>Received September 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Features Verification and Validation Procedure</td>
<td>Final approved by FRA - 8/16/2018</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>8/15/18</td>
<td>Received August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Features Verification and Validation Plan - Designated Track Section</td>
<td>Final approved by FRA - 8/16/2018</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>8/15/18</td>
<td>Received August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Features Verification and Validation Plan - Brake Test Area</td>
<td>Final approved by FRA - 8/16/2018</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>8/15/18</td>
<td>Received August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal and Switch (WIU) Verification and Validation Procedure</td>
<td>Final approved by FRA - 8/16/2018</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>8/15/18</td>
<td>Received August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal and Switch (WIU) Verification and Validation Plan - Designated Track Section</td>
<td>Final approved by FRA - 8/16/2018</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>8/15/18</td>
<td>Received August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static Bulletin Delivery Confirmation</td>
<td>Final approved by FRA - 8/16/2018</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>8/15/18</td>
<td>Received August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brake Test Plan - F40 locomotive</td>
<td>Final approved by FRA - 8/22/2018</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>8/21/2018</td>
<td>Received August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brake Test Plan - Gallery cab car</td>
<td>Final approved by FRA - 8/22/2018</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>8/21/2018</td>
<td>Received August 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. **Caltrain Roadmap to RSD**

- Caltrain is pursuing the following steps to first achieve FRA-approved Designated Revenue Service Demonstration (RSD), followed by full RSD status:
  1. Complete training of personnel required to support Designated RSD (training to start in October, targeting November completion).
  2. Complete installation of I-ETMS on vehicles required to support Designated RSD (in process, targeting early December completion).
  3. Complete field testing, including brake testing and lab integration testing, for the Designated RSD area (15 miles of track on Caltrain property).
  4. Submission of Designated RSD application for approval by FRA.
  5. Once Designated RSD is achieved, Caltrain will complete remaining vehicle installations, train remaining personnel, and finish testing the remainder of the Caltrain property in 2019 to achieve full RSD. Caltrain will also complete tenant testing on Caltrain property and interoperability requirements on UPRR property as well.

- To limit the risk of not completing the above steps, Caltrain is also pursuing an alternative FRA-approved path to achieve RSD:
  o Submission for FRA approval of Caltrain-specific Substitute Criteria activities to be completed in 2018.
  o Upon completion of Substitute Criteria activities, submission for FRA approval of Alternative Schedule to be followed to achieve RSD.
  o Upon completion of Alternative Schedule, submission of RSD application for approval by FRA.
  o Once RSD achieved, Caltrain will complete necessary steps to complete tenant testing on Caltrain property as well as interoperability requirements on UPRR property as well.

- To date, the FRA has been very receptive and supportive to both the Caltrain Designated RSD strategy as well as the Caltrain alternative path strategy.
  o Caltrain will continue working toward achieving the Designated RSD approval in 2018 while preparing submissions as needed to pursue the alternative path should conditions warrant its use.
6. Cost – Spend vs budget – through August 31, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Analysis</th>
<th>(A) Original Budget (US$MM)</th>
<th>(B) Approved Changes (Contractor) (US$MM)</th>
<th>(C) Project Current Budget (US$MM)</th>
<th>(D) Expended and Accrual To Date (US$MM)</th>
<th>(E) Estimated at Completion (EAC) (US$MM)</th>
<th>(F) (C - E)</th>
<th>(G) = (D / E)</th>
<th>% Expended of EAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBOSS PTC Project (Jan 2008 - Feb 2018)</td>
<td>$231.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$239.88</td>
<td>$202.26</td>
<td>$202.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain PTC Project (March 1st 2018 - June 2020):</td>
<td>$43.01</td>
<td>$43.01</td>
<td>$5.54</td>
<td>$43.01</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>12.87%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrator WABTEC Contract</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>$0.43</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>7.21%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contractors</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Changes</td>
<td>$30.34</td>
<td>$30.34</td>
<td>$3.75</td>
<td>$29.77</td>
<td>$ 0.57</td>
<td>12.59%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Contingency</td>
<td>$6.06</td>
<td>$6.06</td>
<td>$5.95</td>
<td>$88.73</td>
<td>$ 0.06</td>
<td>10.95%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total PTC Project</td>
<td>$89.41</td>
<td>$89.41</td>
<td>$9.72</td>
<td>$88.73</td>
<td>$ 0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
1). Expended and Accrual to Date is through August 31, 2018;
2). Integrator Wabtec Contract Value includes Shared Risk with Not to Exceed Total of $1.91MM;
3). Other Contractors amount includes ROCS Modification and potential fiber fixes;
4). Potential Changes amount is set for future project change orders as result of WABTEC assessment and survey for the communications and office subsystems;
5). Potential incentive amount reflects what is in the WABTEC conformed agreement;
6). Other Program Costs includes JPB project oversight costs, TASI support and Other Direct Cost for PTC project delivery;
7). Project contingency includes a) contingencies for WABTEC contract per Board Staff Report; b) JPB project team cost contingency;
8). CBOSS PTC project budget and actual cost are highlighted to reflect prior March 1st, 2018 CBOSS project financial data.

- Note – Caltrain continues effort to reduce previously identified $30M funding gap. Award of $18.7M CRISI grant (noted below) is used to reduce gap, Caltrain will reallocate funds from other resource avenues.

7. Items of note in September – This section reports on PTC general progress and issues being tracked outside the Wabtec contract during the current reporting month.

1) Received formal written conditional approval of Caltrain Test Request (submitted June 22) from FRA. Team incorporating conditions as needed into test plans.
2) Team drafted substitute criteria letter and reviewed with multiple levels of FRA representatives (both regional and national). Strong positive feedback received at all levels, team is preparing formal letter for submittal.
3) Team continued FRA required brake testing on F40 and MP36 locomotives and Bombardier and Gallery cab car equipment, based on approval of test plans by FRA. Test plans submitted for review, comments received, test plans revised and re-submitted, FRA approval received. Testing will continue to completion on all vehicle types (4 total) through the fall.
4) Team initiated a project status review meeting with UPRR counterparts to discuss PTC implementation and related interoperability requirements for the Caltrain and UPRR properties. Meetings will continue as progress on both sides continues.
5) Team participated in MTA04 design meeting with regional partners and TTCI representatives to continue to ensure Spectrum radio bandwidth needs are met for all participating railroads.
6) Team worked with ARINC to clarify modifications required for ROCS to support PTC implementation, including CCF and BCCF updates as required.
7) The PTC project continues its coordination efforts with the Electrification and EMU programs via regularly scheduled status meetings such as the Biweekly CalMod Systems Integration, the PCEP Delivery Coordination and the PTC-PCEP coordination meetings. Ad hoc meetings to discuss topics requiring in-depth or immediate decisions are held as needed. Data sharing of fiber audit results and testing schedules (sharing of track and time) ongoing to insure both teams coordinate needs.
8) Caltrain configuration management (CM) manager continues full integration into project team to ensure all Caltrain CM requirements are maintained during project execution and transition to daily operations upon project completion.

9) Caltrain Go Live team reinstated to ensure smooth transition of PTC operations and maintenance upon project completion. These efforts include manloading planning for both Caltrain and TASI operations and maintenance, as well as coordination of Master Service Agreements (MAS) negotiations with key suppliers required to support PTC long term service needs.

8. Upcoming Key Activities in October -

1) Begin Critical Feature Validation and Verification (V&V) field testing of non-designated RSD track, once all Designated RSD section testing is completed as necessary for FRA approval.

2) Continue meeting with UPRR PTC counterparts to strengthen relationship needed to successfully implement interoperability on both properties. Caltrain requires UPRR continued support to receive FRA 2019 extension, no issues foreseen at this time.

3) Continue brake testing on Caltrain locomotives and cab cars as required by FRA to complete prior to entering RSD.

4) Continue production onboard installations on Caltrain fleet - Continue production effort to complete onboard PTC product installation on (40) production vehicles that have been chosen for the (44) total vehicles to be installed and tested to complete the RSD requirements for fleet installations.

5) Continue regular monthly review with Wabtec senior management to ensure the Wabtec project team maintains focus on completing all activities required to meet 2018 RSD requirements.

6) Continue V&V testing activities in designated RSD area to ensure all PTC equipment is in good working condition.

7) Continue to work closely with the FRA regional and national representatives to ensure all aspects of documentation and testing requirements are maintained and approvals (by FRA) granted.

9. Vehicle Installation -

- Progress good, installation time reducing as experience increases, integrator needs to focus on remaining 2018 installs as gaining cars to retrofit will be harder as pool to complete is reduced. 44 vehicles require full installation of PTC equipment by December 2018 to achieve RSD goal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>In Progress</th>
<th>Pending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F40PH-2CAT</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bombardier Cab</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallery Cab</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td><strong>59%</strong></td>
<td><strong>5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>36%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
Executive Director

FROM: Michelle Bouchard
Chief Operating Officer, Rail

SUBJECT: FARE POLICY UPDATE

ACTION
Staff Coordinating Council recommends the Board receive this informational item related to the Caltrain Fare Policy.

SIGNIFICANCE
Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) staff will make a presentation to provide an update on the development of the Caltrain Fare Policy, which is part of Phase 2 of the Fare Study. Staff will be seeking input from the Board of Directors on the goals and issues to be addressed in the Fare Policy, before bringing the Fare Policy for adoption to the Board in November 2018.

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no budget impact. The budget for the Fare Policy is $81,000 and is included in the Fiscal Year 2019 budget, as part of the budget for Phase 2 of the Fare Study.

BACKGROUND
In summer of 2018, Caltrain completed the first phase of its Fare Study. This significant effort focused on establishing existing conditions related to fares, analyzing the current price elasticity of demand for Caltrain, and building a Fare Elasticity Simulator to test and analyze potential fare changes to existing, regular fare products. At the end of Phase 1 of the Fare Study, staff recommended a subsequent phase of work, which was supported by the Board in the May 2018 JPB meeting. This included developing a foundational Caltrain Fare Policy, conducting additional analysis on the Go Pass program, and completing a Parking Study.
INFORMATIONAL UPDATE ON THE CALTRAIN FARE POLICY

1. Context for the Caltrain Fare Policy

Caltrain Fare Study Background
Prior to the commencement of the current Fare Study, the last system-wide Caltrain fare study was conducted in 2001, when fare elasticity was determined to represent a significant deterrent to fare increases. The elasticity measured at that time indicated that ridership was very influenced by price, resulting in a high anticipated price elasticity (meaning that any fare increase would be expected to generate a significant ridership decline). Since 2001, however, on-board surveys of Caltrain customers have revealed that many riders along the corridor have high relative incomes and may not be as price sensitive as riders during the early 2000s. Determining the price elasticity of demand of the current Caltrain ridership has been an important need for the agency.

Caltrain does not currently have a Board-adopted fare policy, and it has not established formal goals and principles to guide its decision-making. The fare products currently offered were developed at a time when attracting ridership was a primary goal of the agency. The agency currently relies on its fares to cover about 70 percent of its operating costs, because it does not have a dedicated source of funding. Historically, Caltrain has increased its fares every few years without an in-depth analysis of fare elasticities and how different products and pricing could impact ridership; additionally, many of these fare changes were adopted in response to budget shortfalls. Meanwhile, ridership and resulting fare revenue have continued to grow, more than doubling since 2005. In light of all this, the agency sought a thoughtful study that would support well-informed decisions regarding fares and fare products and help shape policy that better suits the needs of the agency.

Fare Study Phase 1
Anticipated to be a multi-phase study, the first phase of work on the Fare Study began in spring 2017. The overall objectives for the Fare Study include:

• Identify potential opportunities to maximize revenue,
• Enhance ridership, and
• Safeguard social and geographic equity.

The purpose of the first phase of work was to provide data and analysis to better understand Caltrain’s current fare products, compare Caltrain fares to peer agencies fares, and analyze how fare changes could impact ridership, revenue, and equity for Caltrain. This phase of work resulted in a Caltrain Fare Study Phase 1 Report that documents many of the important findings. It also resulted in the development of the Caltrain Fare Elasticity Simulator, a quantitative forecasting tool that can be used to test changes to existing, regular fare products and assess potential impacts to ridership, revenue, and equity.

The existing conditions research and analysis from Phase 1 on Caltrain’s fare revenue, rider demographics, and fare product usage patterns indicates that there is an equity issue with Caltrain’s current fare products and pricing. Specifically, there are large differences between the fare products regarding how much revenue they earn per
passenger and per passenger mile, and there are also differences regarding which fare products are more likely to be used by passengers in different income groups. Revenue per passenger and revenue per passenger mile are highest for one-way TVM and day pass products, two products that are much more likely to be used by lower income riders. In contrast, revenue per passenger and revenue per passenger mile are lowest for Go Pass, which is much more likely to be used by higher income riders. Ultimately, this means that Caltrain derives more revenue per ride from products that are most likely to be used by lower income riders, while its higher income riders are more likely to use products that earn Caltrain less revenue per ride.

Phase 1 results also demonstrated that Caltrain ridership has a relatively low price elasticity of demand, which means that in general, passengers' demand for Caltrain is not highly influenced by price. Increased fares are not expected to lead to substantial ridership declines at this time. Additionally, Phase 1 results showed that Caltrain's lower income passengers have more inelastic demand for Caltrain than higher income passengers, meaning that lower income passengers are more likely to absorb higher fares to continue riding Caltrain, raising an important equity issue. This finding is consistent with trends observed in other transit systems, especially commuter rail. It is generally explained by differences in demand between transit user types: transit-dependent riders are less price sensitive because they do not have many other transportation alternatives, while discretionary or “choice” riders are more price sensitive because they have other transportation options available. Transit-dependent riders in the United States are often from lower income households.

Need for a Fare Policy
In this context, it was recommended that through Phase 2 of the Fare Study, the Board develop and adopt a formal fare policy to guide decision-making regarding Caltrain fares. This policy will establish the principles, goals, and procedures that will underlie and guide the agency's pricing-related decisions. As part of the process of developing the policy, the project will include research into how other transit agencies set or change fare policy. Then, building on those best practices, a draft policy will be crafted and adopted by the Caltrain Board of Directors.

It is recommended that other longer-term issues related to fares and fare policy be advanced within the context of the Caltrain Business Plan. This includes studying Caltrain’s current zone-based fare structure in contrast to a station-to-station structure; innovative fare products and pricing, such as the off-peak discount; integration with regional and statewide ticketing innovations; and technological improvements to fares (advanced mobile ticketing, integrated ticketing with parking and access programs, etc.). These are farther-reaching policy considerations that must be aligned with the scope and outcomes of the Caltrain Business Plan.

Existing Policies Related to Fares
There are existing Caltrain policies that could help shape a fare policy for the agency, as described below.

- In January 2013, the Caltrain Board updated its farebox recovery ratio policy to establish a range between 45 to 65 percent as the goal for the agency. The
policy prior to that was to have a farebox recovery ratio in the range of 38 to 50 percent.

- In July 2017, the Caltrain Board adopted Reserve Policy. This is derived off of the Caltrain annual operating budget, with a goal to maintain an operating reserve of at least 10 percent, but strive for a reserve up to 15 percent when possible. The funds are to be held in reserve, except to meet emergency needs that cannot be funded from any other source. Surplus funds generated at the end of a fiscal year are automatically included in the operating reserve.

- Finally, in June 2018 with the adoption of the FY2019 budget, the Caltrain Board has established a Revenue Stabilization Fund that is intended to be used to address smaller and/or less predictable budget shortfalls.

2. What is a Fare Policy?
Prior to outlining issues that could be addressed by a fare policy, it is important to define what a fare policy is, and how it is different from a codified fare tariff. A fare policy represents the principles and goals that guide a transit agency in setting and collecting fares. Generally, a fare policy is structured around goals that the agency hopes to achieve with its fares (they may be short- or long-term goals), as well as strategies to achieve those goals. A codified fare tariff is guided by and serves as an implementing agent for a fare policy. A codified fare tariff is a legal document that is adopted by the Board of Directors and sets the specific fare products and pricing.

Based on analysis of the peer agencies’ fare policies, goals of a fare policy may generally be organized around the following broad categories:

1. Those which are **customer-related**: increasing ridership, rewarding certain types of customers over others, promoting ease of use and fare structure transparency, addressing equity concerns.

2. Those which are **finance-related**: maximizing revenue, achieving a certain farebox recovery rate.

3. Those which focus on **management and administration**: promote ease of data collection, promote modal integration, minimize administration of monitoring payment compliance.

4. Those which focus on **political concerns**: addressing geographic or social equity issues, being especially responsive to a certain group of riders or stakeholders.

These categories may have elements which overlap, and further, they may represent competing priorities. For example, maximizing ridership can compete with maximizing revenue, and having a simple fare structure can compete with a fare structure that promotes economic equity. Policy makers are often asked to prioritize which goals are most important, and/or decide if all goals are equal.

3. Peer Agency Approaches to Fare Policy Goals
A number of commuter rail agencies were consulted to see if they had formally adopted fare policies, and if they did, what were the stated goals of these policies. Four agencies were focused on: BART, Chicago Metra, MARTA, and WMATA/Metro. These agencies were selected because they are rail agencies and all have adopted fare policies that include broad principles and goals for fares. Table 1 summarizes the findings for goals that were most often identified in these agencies’ fare policies.
Table 1: Summary of Fare Policy Goals from Peer Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>BART</th>
<th>Metra</th>
<th>MARTA</th>
<th>WMATA Metro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equity (often defined as compliance with Title VI)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent Fare Increases</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Fare Increases Rather than Large</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep Fares at Pace with Inflation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximize Ridership</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximize Revenue/ Financial Stability</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set Farebox Recovery Goal</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Frequent Riders</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Satisfaction</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Potential Topics to be Addressed by Caltrain Fare Policy Framework

As seen in Table 1 above, there is wide variation across transit agencies in setting goals for their fare policies. In part this reflects the unique operating environment of each agency. For example, MARTA was created by an act of the Georgia Legislature, and is required by legislative statute to have a farebox recovery of at least 35 percent of operating costs. Therefore, while it is interesting to look to peer agencies to see how they address these issues, Caltrain must evaluate issues within its current circumstances and craft fare policy goals that are responsive to its current circumstances.

Based on discussions with the Caltrain Board of Directors, conversations with JPB staff and leadership, members of the public, and the findings from Phase 1 of the Fare Study, a list is presented below, containing potential topics that could be addressed by the Caltrain Fare Policy through its goals. This list is a draft and is intended for discussion purposes with the Caltrain Board of Directors at its October 2018 JPB meeting.

Potential Topics to be Addressed by Caltrain Fare Policy:

1. Ridership
   - Caltrain’s vision is to provide a safe, reliable, sustainable modern rail system that meets the growing mobility needs of the San Francisco Bay Area region.
   - Ridership has grown tremendously in recent years and remains high today.
     - Potential fare policy goals could focus on maintaining existing ridership levels and/or encouraging ridership growth.

2. Financial Sustainability
   - Due to a lack of a dedicated funding source for the agency, fares provide an important source of the revenue for Caltrain, often comprising the majority of the operating budget each year.
   - Caltrain is an open, proof-of-payment system, with fare enforcement on board the trains. Passengers must purchase tickets before boarding the train. Ticket purchase is administered using a variety of different mechanisms,
including Ticket Vending Machines (TVMs), Clipper Card readers, and a mobile ticketing application.

- Potential fare policy goals could focus on financial sustainability, maximizing revenues, a balanced budget, and/or a farebox recovery ratio goal. Additionally, potential goals could also include preventing fare evasion, ease of ticket purchase, ease of administering the fares themselves, and/or reducing the administrative burden for the agency.
- This topic could come into conflict with others due to Caltrain’s current operating circumstances, such as those related to ridership or equity.

3. Equity
   - Several issues related to equity for Caltrain riders have been raised as a concern with regards to fares.
     - Potential fare policy goals could focus on social and economic equity, geographic equity, and/or fare products’ structural equity.
     - This topic could come into conflict with others, such as those related to financial sustainability.

4. Customer Experience
   - Caltrain strives to provide a high level of satisfaction for its customers, including their experience paying for travel on the system.
     - Potential fare policy goals could include a transparent fare structure, ease of understanding the fare system, ease of purchasing and using fare media for riders, reducing confusion regarding fares, connections to and integration with other transit systems, and/or options for payment methods.

5. Frequency of Fare Changes
   - Caltrain does not have a set schedule for changing its fares, and fare changes are often initiated and adopted in response to projected operating budget deficits.
     - Potential fare policy goals could focus on how and when fares would be changed.
     - This could be tied to other goals, such as financial sustainability goals.

6. Size of Fare Changes
   - The size of Caltrain’s fare changes is often set in response to projected operating budget deficits.
     - Potential fare policy goals could focus on the size of fare changes.
     - This could be tied to potential goals related to frequency of fare changes and financial sustainability. It could also link fare changes to annual inflation adjustments.

7. Discounts
   - Caltrain currently offers a number of fare discounts for certain riders, and a formal approach to discounts can be set in a fare policy.
Potential fare policy goals could be to use discounts to encourage certain groups of passengers to ride Caltrain, such as discounts based on age, disability, or household income size; they could also use discounts to reward certain passenger behaviors, such as frequent use, short or long rides, or riding during specific times of the day (congestion reduction).

8. Weighting of Goals
   • The fare policy should articulate if all of its goals are equal to each other, or if there is any prioritization, with some goals taking precedence over others.

5. Recommended Next Steps
At the October 2018 JPB meeting, staff will discuss and solicit feedback from Board members on the potential topics to be included in Caltrain’s fare policy. Feedback will also be sought regarding how to address these topics through the policy’s goals. Staff will also seek Board input on the concept of weighting goals in the policy.

Following Board discussion in October, staff intends to draft goals for the Caltrain Fare Policy and complete additional study of peer agencies’ approaches to fare policy. Then, a full policy will be drafted and presented for Board adoption in November 2018.

Prepared by: Melissa Jones, Principal Planner, Caltrain Planning  650.295.6852
TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
Executive Director

FROM: Michelle Bouchard
Chief Operating Officer, Rail

SUBJECT: TRANSIT INTERCITY RAIL CAPITAL PROGRAM UPDATE

ACTION
Staff Coordinating Council recommends the Board receive this informational item related to the Transit Intercity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP).

SIGNIFICANCE
Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) staff will provide information on the recommended request to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) for the scope of the TIRCP grant award that was announced earlier this year. As further described below, JPB will be proceeding with a scope that maximizes the effectiveness of the state grant and matching funds to purchase 37 additional Electric Multiple Units (EMUs), implement a corridor-wide broadband communications network, implement significant wayside bike access improvements and support planning of these and future TIRCP funded improvements.

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no budget impact associated with this update.

The budget for the proposed scope of work to be funded by the TIRCP grant award and associated matching funds is $203,638,000 comprised of $164,522,000 in state TIRCP funds and matching funds of $39,116,000. It is anticipated that the source of matching funds will be identified from various sources including State Rail Assistance Funds (SRA), funds from resale of retired fleet, member contributions and other available funds. The funding plan and budget amendment will be brought to the JPB following the successful allocation of these funds at the October CTC meeting.

BACKGROUND
In November 2017 JPB applied for a phased TIRCP grant totaling $631,500,000 which included funds for the following:
### Project Element Costs ($\text{000})

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Element</th>
<th>Cost ($\text{000}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of 40 Electric Multiple Units (EMUs)</td>
<td>$224,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Platform Modifications</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayside Bike Parking Improvements</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Agreement Support</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$242,200</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>System Enhancements</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadband Communications</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$14,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Fleet Conversion</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of 56 Electric Multiple Units (EMUs)</td>
<td>$375,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$375,300</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$631,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In April 2018 JPB was awarded $164,522,000 in TIRCP funds to be matched for a total of $203,638,000. This funding is intended to be delivered in two tranches, with the first tranche beginning in Fiscal Year (FY)19 and the second tranche delivered in FY24.

JPB staff conducted a series of discussions with CalSTA to determine the objectives of the award and potential for funds to be “front loaded” or advanced.

The JPB intends to submit the remainder of its originally requested funds in subsequent TIRCP funding rounds.

Discussions with CalSTA resulted in a project scope that is intended to achieve a series of objectives:

- **Support Caltrain Business plan**: Caltrain staff is currently involved in the development of the Caltrain Business Plan which will articulate a future service vision for the corridor that includes blended service with California High Speed Rail. This request incrementally supports the anticipated service outcomes of that Plan and the initial six train per peak hour per direction 2022 service plan.

- **Reduce Diesel trips on the corridor**: Subject to additional detailed planning the reduction in diesel trips comes in two phases. In phase one, this grant allocation will support advanced decommissioning of the existing fleet prior to full electrification in 2022. Following electrification, this grant allocation will minimize the number of trips performed by the remaining diesel fleet and potentially limit diesel trips to those through-running trains to/from Gilroy prior to Gilroy segment electrification.

- **Enhance corridor seating capacity**: Front-loading the allocation to purchase the maximum number of powered coaches under the first option maximizes the number of sets of equipment that can be extended to 7-cars with a maximum seating capacity of 667 seats (subject to finalizing configuration). From a technical perspective powered coaches must be added to the 6-car consist prior to adding the 8th non-powered car.
- **Minimize rework of platforms and maintenance and storage facilities**: The allocation supports the extension of electric train sets to 7-cars which are capable of being accommodated on the line currently. This also precludes the need for extensive infrastructure changes in the maintenance facility. Additionally, subject to a detailed commissioning plan, higher capacity EMU sets allow the potential for incremental decommissioning of the existing 5-car diesel trains once the line is electrified.

- **Retain one seat ride from Gilroy to SF, and enable future extension to Monterey County**: The proposed service plan provides the ability to limit diesel trips only to those that will provide a one seat ride to and from San Francisco. In the future these diesel trains have potential to be extended to provide future service to and from Salinas, CA.

- **Implement effective series of wayside bike improvements**: This allocation will alleviate demand for on-board bike capacity by providing a complementary series of effective wayside bike improvements consistent with the recently completed and adopted Caltrain Bike Management Plan.

- **Enhance system efficiency and reliability**: The project also includes targeted funding for installation of a broadband communications system that provides onboard Wi-Fi and enhances reliability by facilitating remote diagnostics that will optimize ongoing operations and maintenance.

- **Procure additional vehicles in the most cost effective manner**: this allocation requests a front loading of funds to leverage the JPB’s currently available options on the existing rolling stock contract with Stadler to advance additional electrified service and to significantly improve corridor operations and capacity.

**October 2018 Allocation elements**

**Scope of EMU procurement**: Exercise of options on the JPB’s existing contract with Stadler for the procurement of up to 37 additional EMUs to increase capacity of the electrified system and provide the opportunity to operate fully electrified Caltrain service between San Jose and San Francisco. The additional EMU order will provide Caltrain with an additional three seven-car EMU consists and will extend the 16, 6-car sets currently on-order to seven cars each, resulting in a total of 19 seven-car EMU consists.

**Scope of Bike Parking Enhancements**: Caltrain will seek to enhance ridership and safeguard capacity on the electrified system by implementing a robust wayside bike parking program as defined through its recently adopted “Bicycle Parking Management Plan”. Nearly 7,000 passengers a day access the Caltrain system by bicycle, with most of these riders choosing to bring their bike on board. To maintain this high rate of cycle usage while also preserving overall system capacity, it is essential that the agency provide a viable system of bike parking amenities at its stations as an attractive supplement and alternative to having passengers bring their bike on board the train.
Scope of Broadband Communications: The project contemplates the installation of a corridor wide Broadband communications network that will have several public and railroad-facing uses. Railroad uses include 1) the installation of this network that will take advantage of the newly installed fiber backbone will allow for the more efficient maintenance of the fleet by allowing for “over the road” diagnostics during failure and regular maintenance events; 2) the ability to remotely view station platforms and connect to on-board cameras to properly assess capacity issues and enable better information to be accessed by first responders; 3) remote downloading of passenger count information to enable tailoring of onboard capacity needs 4) faster PTC initialization times. Public facing uses include on-board wifi for passengers and dynamic display of on-board information such as schedules, special event information, etc.

The table below shows the elements of the JPB request for fund allocation at the CTC in October:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Element</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Electric Multiple Units (EMUs)</td>
<td>$183,138,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayside Bike Parking Improvements</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Agreement Support</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadband Communications</td>
<td>$14,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$203,638,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SB-1 Repeal Potential Impact

The predominant funding source for TIRCP would be repealed if Proposition Six passes in November 2018. Staff has recently discussed the impact of the potential outcomes with CalSTA. The availability of funds identified in this grant award is unclear and complicated. Funds already collected to support the TIRCP program will be available to support the State’s commitments regardless of the outcome of Proposition Six. The TIRCP program will also continue to receive funding through the Cap-and-Trade program.

Regardless of the uncertainty the JPB must take all actions necessary in the near term to ensure that it is positioned to maximize the utility of the grant award for Caltrain service. Staff will continue to work with the State to assess the impact of the grant award should Proposition Six pass, and will develop adjustments to this scope as needed.

Prepared by: Michelle Bouchard, Chief Operating Officer 650.508.6420
Overview

• Award of $164.5 million requiring $39 million match - $203 million total project
• Collaborating with CalSTA to receive allocation in October at CTC meeting.
• Several objectives achieved with proposal that is 1/3 of original request
• Option 1 vehicle pricing available until December 31, 2018
• SB1 repeal vote
CTC Request

- 37 powered coaches will result in 19 seven car EMU sets
- Wayside bike improvements will facilitate implementation of the Bike Parking Management Plan
- Broadband Communications
- Planning support for future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Element</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of 37 Electric Multiple Units (EMUs)</td>
<td>$183,138,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayside Bike Parking Improvements</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Agreement Support</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadband Communications</td>
<td>$14,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$203,638,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goals of the Request

• Support Caltrain Business Plan
• Add on-board capacity
• Reduce diesel trips in the corridor
• Retain one seat ride from Gilroy
• Minimize platform and CEMOF rework
• Increase efficiency of operations and maintenance and customer experience
• Implement the Bike Management Plan
Next steps

• Seek allocation at October CTC
• Refine plan and cost estimates
• Develop funding plan and accelerate state tranches
• Execute contract with Stadler (Dec 31, 2018)
• Develop projects for communications system and wayside bike improvements
Questions?
J PB BOARD MEETING

CORRESPONDENCE

October 4, 2018
Dear Chair McKenzie and Commissioners,

Pursuant to Government Code §6250 et seq.

1) Please refer to the attached Draft 2019 Caltrain TIP and the new Hillsdale station (AKA "25th Avenue Grade Separation Project") Full Funding Agreement and provide an explanation as to why this project is not included in the TIP (the $180M funding plan is located on page 29 of the agreement).

2) Please refer to page 14 (page 6 of Attachment D) of resolutions 4374 & 4375 and provide the following information:
   - Updated copy of the Caltrain Electrification (SF-010028) funding plan reflecting the latest programming decisions
   - Specific source(s) of the $97M Local being swapped for 5307
   - Specific source of the 5307
   - Project(s) the $97M Local is being reassigned to (if any)

I look forward to your response.

Roland Lebrun
### Transit Projects

#### Caltrain

**TIP ID:** REG090051  
**County:** Regional  
**System:** Transit  
**RTP ID:** 17-10-0026  
**CTIPS:** 2060000449

**Sponsor:** Caltrain  
**Implementing Agency:** Caltrain

**Project Name:** Caltrain: Revenue Vehicle Rehab Program  
**Description:** Caltrain: Systemwide: Provide overhauls and repairs/replacements to key components of the Caltrain rolling stock to maintain it in a state of good repair.

**Air Quality Exempt Code:** 2.03 - EXEMPT (40 CFR 93.126) - Rehabilitation of transit vehicles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Post Mile From</th>
<th>Post Mile To</th>
<th>Toll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>All funding in thousands of dollars</td>
<td>FY 2019/19</td>
<td>FY 2019/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>6307</td>
<td>$6,887</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>5309</td>
<td>$13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>5337</td>
<td>$5,166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>OTHER LOCAL</td>
<td>$2,970</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$14,845</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TIP ID:** REG110030  
**County:** Regional  
**System:** Transit  
**RTP ID:** 17-10-0008  
**CTIPS:** 2060000531

**Sponsor:** Caltrain  
**Implementing Agency:** Caltrain

**Project Name:** Caltrain Positive Train Control System  
**Description:** Caltrain: Systemwide: Implement PTC, an advanced train control system that allows for automated collision prevention, and improved manual collision prevention.

**Air Quality Exempt Code:** 2.06 - EXEMPT (40 CFR 93.126) - Construction or renovation of power, signal, and communications systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Post Mile From</th>
<th>Post Mile To</th>
<th>Toll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>All funding in thousands of dollars</td>
<td>FY 2019/16</td>
<td>FY 2019/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>5307</td>
<td>$11,280</td>
<td>$11,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>OTHER FEDERAL</td>
<td>$12,250</td>
<td>$12,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>OTHER LOCAL</td>
<td>$8,760</td>
<td>$8,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>PROP</td>
<td>$2,780</td>
<td>$2,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>SALESTAX-MEASURE</td>
<td>$3,300</td>
<td>$3,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>5307</td>
<td>$7,300</td>
<td>$7,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>5309</td>
<td>$9,944</td>
<td>$9,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>FED-DISC</td>
<td>$2,830</td>
<td>$2,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>OTHER FEDERAL</td>
<td>$21,580</td>
<td>$21,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>OTHER LOCAL</td>
<td>$50,487</td>
<td>$50,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>PROP</td>
<td>$104,100</td>
<td>$104,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$258,100</td>
<td>$258,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TIP ID:** SF-010028  
**County:** San Mateo  
**System:** Transit  
**RTP ID:** 17-10-0008  
**CTIPS:** 2060000215

**Sponsor:** Caltrain  
**Implementing Agency:** Caltrain

**Project Name:** Caltrain Electrification  
**Description:** Caltrain: From San Francisco to Gilroy: Electrification of the caltrain corridor from San Francisco to Tamien, including catenary poles, wires, power supply, track and signals, and Electric Multiple Units (EMU's).

**Air Quality Exempt Code:** 2.06 - EXEMPT (40 CFR 93.126) - Construction or renovation of power, signal, and communications systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Post Mile From</th>
<th>Post Mile To</th>
<th>Toll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>All funding in thousands of dollars</td>
<td>FY 2019/16</td>
<td>FY 2019/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV</td>
<td>5309</td>
<td>$3,677</td>
<td>$3,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV</td>
<td>OTHER LOCAL</td>
<td>$2,455</td>
<td>$2,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV</td>
<td>STP</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSE</td>
<td>OTHER LOCAL</td>
<td>$8,545</td>
<td>$8,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSE</td>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSE</td>
<td>OTHER LOCAL</td>
<td>$1,309</td>
<td>$1,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSE</td>
<td>PROP</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSE</td>
<td>SALESTAX-MEASURE</td>
<td>$5,235</td>
<td>$5,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>5307</td>
<td>$40,458</td>
<td>$44,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>5308</td>
<td>$172,320</td>
<td>$172,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>BT</td>
<td>$39,430</td>
<td>$39,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>CARB</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>$11,188</td>
<td>$11,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>OTHER LOCAL</td>
<td>$186,323</td>
<td>$186,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>OTHER STATE</td>
<td>$142,000</td>
<td>$142,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>PROP</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>RTP-LRP</td>
<td></td>
<td>$474,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>SALESTAX-MEASURE</td>
<td>$38,663</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,256,408</td>
<td>$1,256,408</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Draft 2019 TIP  
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### TIP ID: SM-030065
#### County: San Mateo  System: Transit  RTP ID: 17-10-0026  CTIPS 206000391
#### Sponsor: Caltrain  Implementing Agency: Caltrain
#### Project Name: Caltrain: Systemwide Track Rehab & Related Struct.
#### Description: Caltrain: Systemwide: Rehabilitate and replace existing track, track structures and related civil infrastructure
#### Air Quality Exempt Code: 2.09 - EXEMPT (40 CFR 93.126) - Rehabilitation or reconstruction of track structures, track, and trackbed in existing rights-of-way

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Prior Years</th>
<th>FY 2019/20</th>
<th>FY 2019/20</th>
<th>FY 2020/21</th>
<th>FY 2021/22</th>
<th>Future Years</th>
<th>Total Programmed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,378</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$13,193</td>
<td>$13,193</td>
<td>$10,578</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td>$64,579</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$64,579</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td>$51,915</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,257</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>OTHER LOCAL</td>
<td>$26,669</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,258</td>
<td>$3,258</td>
<td>$33,465</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>SALES/MEASU</td>
<td>$5,008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Programmed Funding:</td>
<td>$151,100</td>
<td>$15,491</td>
<td>$16,491</td>
<td>$194,093</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TIP ID: SM-050040
#### County: San Mateo  System: Transit  RTP ID: 17-10-0027  CTIPS 206000362
#### Sponsor: Caltrain  Implementing Agency: Caltrain
#### Project Name: Caltrain: ADA Operating Set-aside
#### Description: Caltrain: Systemwide: Set-aside for ADA needs
#### Air Quality Exempt Code: 2.01 - EXEMPT (40 CFR 93.126) - Operating assistance to transit agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Prior Years</th>
<th>FY 2019/20</th>
<th>FY 2019/20</th>
<th>FY 2020/21</th>
<th>FY 2021/22</th>
<th>Future Years</th>
<th>Total Programmed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td>$79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>OTHER LOCAL</td>
<td>$1,482</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,482</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Programmed Funding:</td>
<td>$1,561</td>
<td>$15,491</td>
<td>$16,491</td>
<td>$194,093</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TIP ID: SM-050041
#### County: Regional  System: Transit  RTP ID: 17-10-0026  CTIPS 206000362
#### Sponsor: Caltrain  Implementing Agency: Caltrain
#### Project Name: Caltrain: Signal/Communication Rehab & Upgrades
#### Description: Caltrain: Systemwide: Rehabilitate existing signal system and upgrade/replace communication equipment.
#### Air Quality Exempt Code: 2.06 - EXEMPT (40 CFR 93.126) - Construction or renovation of power, signal, and communications systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Prior Years</th>
<th>FY 2019/20</th>
<th>FY 2019/20</th>
<th>FY 2020/21</th>
<th>FY 2021/22</th>
<th>Future Years</th>
<th>Total Programmed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,485</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$6,485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,761</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,761</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,933</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$7,333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>OTHER LOCAL</td>
<td>$6,014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$6,014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Programmed Funding:</td>
<td>$44,183</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$47,183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TIP ID: SM-070038
#### County: San Mateo  System: Transit  RTP ID: 17-07-0085  CTIPS 206000393
#### Sponsor: Caltrain  Implementing Agency: Caltrain
#### Project Name: Caltrain South Terminal Phase II and III
#### Description: San Jose: Just north of Diridon Station: Phase II - Construct an additional mainline track and new signal controls; Just south of Diridon Station: Phase III - install an additional mainline track and signal controls
#### Air Quality Exempt Code: NON-EXEMPT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Prior Years</th>
<th>FY 2019/20</th>
<th>FY 2019/20</th>
<th>FY 2020/21</th>
<th>FY 2021/22</th>
<th>Future Years</th>
<th>Total Programmed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>OTHER LOCAL</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>PROP</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Programmed Funding:</td>
<td>$15,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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### Transit Projects
#### Caltrain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Name:</strong> Caltrain Control Point Installation</td>
<td><strong>Description:</strong> Caltrain: On the mainline in San Carlos: Install a new control point (rail crossover)</td>
<td><strong>Air Quality Exempt Code:</strong> 2.09 - EXEMPT (40 CFR 93.125) - Rehabilitation or reconstruction of track structures, track, and trackbed in existing rights-of-way</td>
<td><strong>Route:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Post Mile From:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Post Mile To:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All funding in thousands of dollars</strong></td>
<td><strong>Phase</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fund Source</strong></td>
<td><strong>Prior Years</strong></td>
<td><strong>FY 2019/19</strong></td>
<td><strong>FY 2019/20</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>OTHER LOCAL</td>
<td>$ 1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>STP</td>
<td>$ 1,375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>OTHER LOCAL</td>
<td>$ 358</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>STP</td>
<td>$ 2,780</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Programmed Funding:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Name:</strong> South San Francisco Caltrain Station Improvements</td>
<td><strong>Description:</strong> South San Francisco: SSF Caltrain Station: Demolish and reconstruct the existing station with a new ADA compliant station that meets current Caltrain standards</td>
<td><strong>Air Quality Exempt Code:</strong> 2.08 - EXEMPT (40 CFR 93.125) - Reconstruction or renovation of transit buildings and structures (e.g., rail or bus buildings, storage and maintenance facilities, stations, terminals, and ancillary structures)</td>
<td><strong>Route:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Post Mile From:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Post Mile To:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All funding in thousands of dollars</strong></td>
<td><strong>Phase</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fund Source</strong></td>
<td><strong>Priority Years</strong></td>
<td><strong>FY 2019/19</strong></td>
<td><strong>FY 2019/20</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>5327</td>
<td>$ 38,629</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>SALESTAX-MEASURE</td>
<td>$ 16,172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Programmed Funding:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Name:</strong> Caltrain TVM Rehab and Clipper Functionality</td>
<td><strong>Description:</strong> Caltrain: Systemwide: 45 existing TVM machines: Refurbish and incorporate Clipper functionality.</td>
<td><strong>Air Quality Exempt Code:</strong> 2.04 - EXEMPT (40 CFR 93.126) - Purchase of office, shop, and operating equipment for existing facilities</td>
<td><strong>Route:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Post Mile From:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Post Mile To:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All funding in thousands of dollars</strong></td>
<td><strong>Phase</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fund Source</strong></td>
<td><strong>Priority Years</strong></td>
<td><strong>FY 2019/19</strong></td>
<td><strong>FY 2019/20</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSE</td>
<td>5907</td>
<td>$ 175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSE</td>
<td>OTHER LOCAL</td>
<td>$ 44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>OTHER LOCAL</td>
<td>$ 137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>RTP-LRP</td>
<td>$ 2,144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Programmed Funding:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Name:</strong> Peninsula Corridor Electrification Expansion</td>
<td><strong>Description:</strong> Caltrain: Electric Multiple Unit (EMU) fleet: Expand fleet through procurement of an additional 40 vehicles.</td>
<td><strong>Air Quality Exempt Code:</strong> NON-EXEMPT</td>
<td><strong>Route:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Post Mile From:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Post Mile To:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All funding in thousands of dollars</strong></td>
<td><strong>Phase</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fund Source</strong></td>
<td><strong>Priority Years</strong></td>
<td><strong>FY 2019/19</strong></td>
<td><strong>FY 2019/20</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>OTHER LOCAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>RTP-LRP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>SB1</td>
<td>$ 123,162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Programmed Funding:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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STATE OF CALIFORNIA
STANDARD AGREEMENT
STD 213 (Rev 06/03)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HSR16-108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. This Agreement is entered into between the State Agency and the Contractor named below:

   **STATE AGENCY’S NAME**
   California High-Speed Rail Authority

   **CONTRACTOR’S NAME**
   Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board and City of San Mateo

2. The term of this Agreement is: June 1, 2017, or upon execution by all parties, whichever is later, through June 30, 2021.

3. The maximum amount of this Agreement is: $84,000,000.00
   Eighty-Four Million and Zero Cents

4. The parties agree to comply with the terms and conditions of the following exhibits which are by this reference made a part of the Agreement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A - Scope of Work</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B - Budget Detail and Payment Provisions</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C - General Terms and Conditions</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D - Special Terms and Conditions</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Required Change Order</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Passing Tracks Conceptual Design</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Invoice Requirements</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Approved Contractor List</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 25th Ave Grade Separation Cost Estimate and Funding Plan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, this Agreement has been executed by the parties hereto.

**CONTRACTOR (ADDITIONAL SIGNATURE ON FOLLOWING PAGE)**

**CONTRACTOR’S NAME (If other than an individual, state whether a corporation, partnership, etc.)**

Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Authority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE SIGNED (Do not type)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/27/11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PRINTED NAME AND TITLE OF PERSON SIGNING**

James Hartnett, Executive Director

**ADDRESS**

1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070

**STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

**AGENCY NAME**

California High-Speed Rail Authority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE SIGNED (Do not type)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 23, 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PRINTED NAME AND TITLE OF PERSON SIGNING**

Thomas Fellenz, Interim Chief Executive Officer

**ADDRESS**

770 L Street, Suite 620, MS1 Sacramento CA 95814

**California Department of General Services Use Only**

X Exempt per: Public Utilities Code section 185036
### Contractor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor's Name (If other than an individual, state whether a corporation, partnership, etc.)</th>
<th>City of San Mateo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Signed (Do not type)</td>
<td>June 27, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Printed Name and Title of Person Signing**

Larry Petterson, City Manager

**Address**

330 West 20th Avenue, San Mateo, CA 94403
EXHIBIT A: SCOPE OF WORK

1 PARTIES

This agreement ("Agreement") is entered into by and between the California High-Speed Rail Authority, an agency of the State of California, hereinafter referred to as the "Authority," the City of San Mateo, a municipality, hereinafter referred to as the "City" and the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board, a joint exercise of powers agency organized under Chapter 5 of Division 7 of Title 1 of the California Government Code, hereinafter referred to as "PCJPB." The Authority, the City and the PCJPB are referred to herein individually as a "Party" and as collectively the "Parties."

2 BACKGROUND

The Authority is responsible for the planning, design, construction and operation of a high-speed rail ("HSR") system that will connect most of populated California. Between San Francisco and San Jose, the Authority's trains will share the rails in the corridor ("Peninsula Rail Corridor" or "Corridor") that is currently used primarily by commuter rail service operated by the PCJPB. The Corridor passes through the City's limits.

Shared usage of the Corridor by the Authority and PCJPB (and by existing freight) is known as the "Blended System." The Corridor is not currently electrified; current PCJPB trains are diesel.

Functionality of the Blended System requires the Corridor to be electrified, as only an electrified Corridor with PCJPB operating electric trains creates the capacity to add and blend in Authority electric trains. To improve safety and traffic operation in the Corridor, and to create the opportunity (if necessary) for additional track in the Corridor, a project to grade separate the Caltrain operating right-of-way from 25th Avenue, 28th Avenue and 31st Avenue (the "Grade Separation Project" or "Project") is planned.

Electrification of the Corridor and the Grade Separation Project are each of independent utility relative to each other and relative to HSR.

The City, PCJPB, and the San Mateo County Transportation Authority ("SMCTA") executed a Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") on July 11, 2014 (as first amended on March 3, 2016) for the funding and delivery of the Grade Separation Project, whereby the City serves as the Project sponsor, the PCJPB serves as the Lead Implementing Agency, and the SMCTA would, along with the City, provide funding for the Grade Separation Project.

The PCJPB has successfully completed the planning, preliminary engineering and environmental ("PE/ENV") phase and final design ("PS&E") phase; and the Grade Separation Project is currently in the right of way and construction phase. On December 22, 2016, PCJPB issued an invitation for bids (JPB Contract 17-J-C-048, IFB, Plans and Specifications, dated Dec. 22, 2016, as well as 12 Addenda, referred to herein collectively as "IFB") for a construction contract to construct the Grade Separation Project, based on the final design completed in the PS&E phase. The Authority has seen and concurs with the final design drawings upon which the IFB ("IFB Final Design") was based and which will govern the construction contract to be awarded following the IFB, except as noted in Section 3.1 of this Exhibit A and in Attachment 1.

On August 9, 2016, the Authority passed Resolution #HSRA 16-22 authorizing the Chief Executive Officer to execute an agreement to contribute funding in the amount of up to $84 million for the
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construction of the Grade Separation Project. This Agreement is intended to fund 75.72 percent of the costs billed to PCJPB by the IFB construction contractor up to $84 million, in exchange for certain protections, benefits and assurances.

In consideration of the foregoing, this Agreement has been entered into by the Parties to identify and define their respective roles and responsibilities with regard to the Grade Separation Project described in the Agreement. The Parties are fully responsible for their obligations as provided hereunder, whether performed by the Party itself, or through arrangements with others, such as contractors or (in the case of PCJPB) member agencies.

3 WORK TO BE DONE

3.1 Grade Separation Project

PCJPB will construct grade separation structures separating the Caltrain operating right-of-way from the existing grade crossing at 25th Avenue, and new crossings at 28th Avenue and 31st Avenue within San Mateo. The structures shall be constructed pursuant to the design and specifications described in the IFB, except that, within two weeks of the date of execution (or such other timing as the Authority may agree to in writing) of JPB Contract 17-J-C-048, PCJPB shall cause JPB Contract 17-J-C-048 to be amended to include the design and specification elements required for the modified Blended Service alignment depicted in Attachment 1 hereto (as to be modified, hereinafter the "JPB Contract 17-J-C-048 Modified").

The grade separations will allow the above-referenced streets to pass under the structure upon which PCJPB and Authority trains will operate. The crossing at 25th Street has been identified as DOT Crossing Number 754910E aka CPUC Crossing No. 105E-19.70. As they are new crossings, the DOT and CPUC references do not yet exist for the 28th Avenue or 31st Avenue grade separations.

The grade separation will be supported by a mechanically stabilized earth wall located to the west of the existing PCJPB right-of-way.

In addition, the Grade Separation Project at 25th Avenue will relocate the existing Hillsdale Caltrain Station and provide new at-grade parking and station access for the new Hillsdale Station. The new station will be an elevated, center-board platform, located immediately south of 28th Avenue. The Grade Separation Project will construct three new precast box girder concrete bridges (one each at Borel Creek, 25th Avenue and 28th Avenue), one new steel beam span bridge at 31st Avenue, and one new cast-in-place concrete pedestrian and vehicular underpass.

In addition to lowering 25th Avenue, the Grade Separation will construct two new east-west connections between Delaware and El Camino Real, one each at 28th and 31st Avenues. Both 31st and 28th Avenues will have four through-lanes, one left turn only pocket, and two sidewalks/bike lanes. Temporary Parking will be constructed within the PCJPB right of way east of the new track alignment to the north and south of 28th Avenue.

3.2 Description

A detailed scope of work for the construction of the Grade Separation Project is set forth in JPB Contract 17-J-C-048 Modified, and is the work eligible for reimbursement under this Agreement.
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Within forty-five (45) days after execution of this Agreement, and upon completion of good faith negotiations, the Parties will amend this Agreement to permit some or all of the items listed under “Construction Support Costs” in page 1 of Attachment 5 to be reimbursable under this Agreement; the Parties agree to prepare such amendment so as to (a) not result in the Authority contributing more than the lesser of $84 million or 46.67 percent of the total actual Project cost and (b) contain terms providing adequate transparency and Authority oversight regarding accrual of such “Construction Support Costs.”

3.3 Project Uses

The Grade Separation Project is to be used for vehicular traffic and pedestrian crossing under the Corridor rail tracks.

4 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE PARTIES

4.1 Property Ownership, Use and Access Rights

4.1.1 Ownership of Project Site Property (PCJPB)

PCJPB is the owner of the Peninsula Corridor Railroad right-of-way, and specifically that certain real property and fixtures located in the City of San Mateo between milepost (MP) 19.0 and MP 20.3. The PCJPB shall obtain any additional property rights necessary to properly construct and maintain the structure and the roadway resulting from the Grade Separation Project.

4.1.2 Ownership of Project Site Property (City)

The City shall allow use of and access to City-owned property as necessary for the PCJPB to complete the Grade Separation Project.

4.2 Environmental Obligations

4.2.1 During construction, the PCJPB will comply with all applicable environmental laws, and the specific environmental commitments provided for in the following documents: San Mateo 25th Avenue Grade Separation Project CEQA Exemption and San Mateo 25th Avenue Grade Separation Project – Determination of Categorical Exclusion or any other environmental clearance document required for the Grade Separation Project.

4.2.2 PCJPB is and will remain the lead agency under CEQA and will obtain any further required environmental clearance for the Grade Separation Project. PCJPB shall also obtain all required environmental permits and approvals necessary for the Grade Separation Project.

4.3 Responsibility for Obtaining Governmental Permits and Approvals

The PCJPB will be responsible for obtaining all governmental permits and approvals for the Grade Separation Project.

4.4 Construction

The PCJPB will be responsible for completing all construction work for the Grade Separation Project. The Grade Separation Project must be built in material conformance with JPB Contract 17-J-C-048
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Modified. Any material changes PCJPB proposes to make must first be approved by the Authority, after PCJPB communicates such proposed change to the Authority, in writing, return receipt requested. The Authority's review will be limited to ensuring that no aspect of the Authority's planned operations and/or construction will be negatively impacted, including but not limited to increasing potential costs. If the Authority does not respond within five (5) working days, Authority's approval of the change will be deemed given.

4.5 Construction Schedule

The contract for the construction of the Grade Separation Project is expected to be awarded to a contractor selected by PCJPB prior to the end of July 2017 and the PCJPB will use its best efforts to ensure the work is completed within 900 days from the issuance to the contractor of notice to proceed. It is understood, however, that PCJPB will not be responsible for unavoidable delays not caused by the actions or inactions of the PCJPB or its staff.

4.6 Other Obligations Necessary to Cause Completion of the Grade Separation Project

Except as otherwise assigned in this Agreement, the City shall take or cause to be taken all actions (whether identified in this Agreement or not) necessary to cause completion of the Grade Separation Project and its placement into service.

5 OWNERSHIP AND MAINTENANCE OBLIGATIONS

5.1 City Ownership and Maintenance Obligations

After completion of the Grade Separation Project, City shall own and be responsible for maintenance of the roadbeds, pavement delineation, signage, lighting, drainage systems, any other supporting appurtenances and landscape established including irrigation, planting and hardscape. The City's maintenance obligations will not extend to the grade separation structure or the railroad right-of-way. City further agrees that it shall take no action with respect to City maintenance and use (or future modification) of the roadbeds and related improvements that City knows or reasonably should know at the time of the action would effectively preclude or make materially more complicated or expensive Authority future use of the Corridor for Blended System operations or make such use or operations non-compliant with Proposition 1A.

5.2 PCJPB Ownership and Maintenance Obligations

After the completion of the Grade Separation Project, the PCJPB shall own and be responsible for all aspects of the Grade Separation Project structures not covered by Section 5.1, including but not limited to the maintenance of the railroad right-of-way, including the grade-separated structure, associated with the Grade Separation Project in a safe and good condition and state of repair and in compliance with all applicable laws, using such care as a reasonably prudent owner of such infrastructure would use.

PCJPB further agrees that (a) it will not make any material modification to the Grade Separation Structure or the associated railroad right-of-way (between MP 19.0 and MP 20.3) without prior written approval of the Authority and (b) it will take no action with respect to PCJPB's maintenance and use of the Grade
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Separation Structure or the associated railroad right-of-way (between MP 19.0 and MP 20.3) that PCJPB knows or reasonably should know at the time would effectively preclude or make materially more complicated or expensive Authority future use of the Corridor for Blended System operations or make such use or operations non-compliant with Proposition 1A.

5.3 Authority Ownership and Maintenance Obligations

Except as otherwise agreed to by the Authority and a Party (either the PCJPB or the City) in a separate existing or future agreement, the Authority will have no ownership rights nor any maintenance obligations associated with the Grade Separation Project.

6 COST OF WORK

6.1 Authority Cost Responsibilities

The Authority will be responsible to reimburse the PCJPB, as further detailed in Exhibit B, for 75.72 percent of the costs invoiced to the PCJPB by the construction contractor pursuant to JPB Contract 17-J-C-048 Modified, up to a total maximum contribution of $84 million. In no event will the Authority be responsible for more than $84 million.

6.2 City Cost Responsibilities

The City is solely responsible for securing all costs for all phases to complete the Grade Separation Project (regardless of the accuracy or inaccuracy of the plans, estimates and assumptions that form the basis of the Grade Separation Project), through final completion and placement into service, except as specifically set forth in Section 6.1—Authority Cost Responsibilities.

7 QUARTERLY REVIEWS

The Parties shall meet (in person or by phone) quarterly to review PCJPB's progress in completing the Grade Separation Project, and to discuss any pending contract management or invoicing and payment matters. In advance of a quarterly review, any Party may reasonably request, and the holding Party shall provide copies of, then-existing documents to aid the quarterly review.

8 GRADE SEPARATION PROJECT AS RELATES TO BLENDED SYSTEM DESIGN

The Parties acknowledge that passing tracks may or may not be needed (the Authority and PCJPB are currently in disagreement) for operation of the Blended System within the limits of the Grade Separation Project. Should it be determined that passing tracks are necessary in this location, the Parties agree to reasonably cooperate and support the construction of such passing tracks pursuant to the conceptual design set forth in Attachment 2.

Nothing in this Agreement shall be construed to mean any Party has agreed to the need or lack of need for passing tracks or any allocation of implementation or cost responsibility related to the implications of adding any passing track (including but not limited to replacement of displaced parking or other uses).

9 PROJECT REPRESENTATIVES

The Project Representatives during the term of this Agreement shall be as listed below.
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CITY
City Project Representative
Brad Underwood, Director of Public Works
Phone Number
650-522-7303
Address:
330 W. 20th Avenue, San Mateo, CA 94403
E-Mail Address
bunderwood@cityofsanmateo.org

PCJPB
PCJPB Project Representative
April Chan, Chief Officer, Planning, Grants and Transportation Authority
Phone Number
650-508-6228
Address:
1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070
E-Mail Address
chana@samtrans.com

AUTHORITY
Authority Project Representative
Ben Tripousis
Phone Number
(408) 277-1085
Address:
100 Paseo de San Antonio, #206, San Jose, CA 95113
E-Mail Address
ben.tripousis@hsr.ca.gov
EXHIBIT B: BUDGET DETAIL AND PAYMENT PROVISIONS

1 FUNDING CONTINGENCY CLAUSE

1.1 If, following execution of this Agreement, the legislature of the State of California actually or effectively de-appropriates some or all of the funds the Authority has committed under this Agreement ("Funds"), or if forces beyond the Authority’s ability to control (including market forces, litigation, court decisions, and actions or inactions of the Legislature) render the Funds unavailable, the Authority shall have the right, at the Authority’s election, to either (1) cancel this Agreement, with no further liability occurring to the Authority for the portion of the Funds de-appropriated or rendered unavailable, or (2) negotiate with PCJPB and the City changes to the Scope of Work, funding, or timing of the Grade Separation Project or other terms of this Agreement. This Agreement is also subject to any additional restrictions, limitations, and conditions, and any delays, as may be approved or imposed by the Congress of the United States or the legislature of the State of California or any court of law, and which may affect the provisions, terms or funding of this Agreement.

2 INVOICING AND PAYMENT

2.1 For services satisfactorily rendered in accordance with the terms of this Agreement, and upon receipt and approval of the invoices by the Authority Contract Manager, the Authority agrees to reimburse the PCJPB for 75.72 percent of the costs listed in each invoice sent to the PCJPB by the construction contractor pursuant to JPB Contract 17-J-C-048 Modified.

2.1.1 No payment shall be made in advance of services rendered.

2.1.2 The total amount payable by the Authority for this Agreement shall not exceed the amount on the STD. 213, which is $84 million. It is further understood and agreed that (1) this total is the maximum amount payable to the PCJPB and (2) the total amount payable to the PCJPB shall not exceed the lesser of $84 million or 75.72 percent of the total costs invoiced to the PCJPB by the construction contractor pursuant to JPB Contract 17-J-C-048 Modified.

2.1.3 PCJPB shall provide one paper original and two copies of the invoice for payment. Invoices shall be submitted no more than monthly in arrears and no later than 30 calendar days after completion of each billing period or upon completion of a task to:

Financial Office
California High-Speed Rail Authority
770 L Street, Suite 620 MS 3
Sacramento, CA 95814

accountspayable@hsr.ca.gov

(1 original and 2 copies)

AND

The PCJPB shall also submit (electronically) one additional copy of the invoice and supporting documentation to the Authority’s Project Representative or designee at the address identified in Exhibit A, Section 9.
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3 INVOICE FORMAT

3.1 The Authority will accept computer generated or electronically transmitted invoices. The date of "invoice receipt" shall be the date the Authority receives the paper copy at the address listed in Section 2.1.3 of this Exhibit.

3.2 An invoice shall include all aspects and information as set forth in Attachment 3.

3.3 The PCJPB acknowledges that the Authority may add reasonable information or documentation requirements to the above invoice list to meet the Authority's needs, and that the Authority may add any information or documentation requirements to the above invoice list if required by the State Controller's Office or if legally required for the Authority to meet any reporting requirements. The PCJPB, upon receipt of written communication requiring additional documentation or information, shall promptly provide such requested documentation and/or information.

3.4 The PCJPB shall retain back-up documentation for audit purposes available to the Authority upon request. The PCJPB shall include appropriate provisions in each of its subcontracts to secure adequate backup documentation to verify all PCJPB's contractor services and expenses invoiced for payment under this Agreement.

4 PROMPT PAYMENT ACT

4.1 Authority will endeavor to make all payments in the time frames set forth in Government Code Chapter 927, et seq.

5 INVOICE DISPUTES

5.1 Payments shall be made to the PCJPB for undisputed invoices. An undisputed invoice is an invoice submitted by the PCJPB for services rendered and for which additional evidence is not required to determine its validity. The invoice will be disputed if the invoice is inaccurate, or if it does not comply with the terms of the Agreement. If the invoice is disputed, the PCJPB will be notified via a Dispute Notification Form, or with other written notification within 15 working days of receipt of the invoice; the PCJPB will be paid the undisputed portion of the invoice.

5.2 Though this Project is of independent utility relative to the Peninsular Corridor Electrification Project, in the event the project representatives are unable to resolve the issue(s) leading to the disputed invoice, the Parties shall follow the dispute resolution procedures set forth in Section IV of the Agreement Regarding Funding Commitments Towards the Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project between the Authority and PCJPB dated August 9, 2016 ("Two-Party Agreement").

6 COST PRINCIPLES

6.1 The PCJPB agrees to comply with procedures in accordance with OMB Circular A-87, as amended, Cost Principles for State, Local, and Indian Tribal Governments.

6.2 The PCJPB agrees to comply with Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 18, Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments.
6.3 Any costs for which payment has been made to the PCJPB that are determined by subsequent audit to be unallowable under OMB Circular A-87, as amended, or 49 C.F.R. Part 18, are subject to repayment by the PCJPB to the Authority.

6.4 Any subagreement in excess of $25,000 entered into as a result of this Agreement, shall contain all the provisions of Exhibit B Section 6.
EXHIBIT C: GENERAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS

1 APPROVAL

1.1 This Agreement is of no force or effect until signed by all Parties.

2 AMENDMENT

2.1 No amendment or variation of the terms of this Agreement shall be valid unless made in writing, signed by the Parties and approved as required. No oral understanding or Agreement not incorporated in the Agreement is binding on any of the Parties.

3 ASSIGNMENT

3.1 This Agreement is not assignable by any Party, either in whole or in part, without the written consent of all Parties to this Agreement in the form of a formal written amendment.

4 AUDIT

4.1 The PCJPB and the City agree that the awarding department, the Department of General Services, the Bureau of State Audits, or their designated representative shall have the right to review and to copy any records and supporting documentation pertaining to the performance of this Agreement. The PCJPB and the City agree to maintain such records for possible audit for a minimum of three (3) years after final payment, unless a longer period of records retention is stipulated. The PCJPB and the City agree to allow the auditor(s) access to such records during normal business hours and to allow interviews of any employees who might reasonably have information related to such records. Further, the PCJPB agrees to include a similar right of the State to audit records and interview staff in any contract or subcontract related to performance of this Agreement. (Gov. Code §8546.7).

5 INDEMNIFICATION

5.1 The PCJPB and the City agree to indemnify, defend and save harmless the Authority and State, its officers, agents and employees from any and all claims and losses accruing or resulting to any and all contractors, subcontractors, suppliers, laborers, and any other person, firm or corporation furnishing or supplying work services, materials, or supplies in connection with the performance of this Agreement, and from any and all claims and losses accruing or resulting to any person, firm or corporation who may be injured or damaged by the PCJPB or the City in the performance of this Agreement.

6 DISPUTES; SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES

6.1 The PCJPB and the City shall continue with the responsibilities under this Agreement during any dispute.
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6.2 The Parties will follow the dispute resolution procedure set forth in Section IV of the August 2016 Two-Party Agreement. If the City is involved in the dispute, the procedure will be adjusted only as needed to address the involvement of a third party.

7 INDEPENDENT CONTRACTOR

7.1 The PCJPB and the City, and the agents and employees of the PCJPB and the City, in the performance of this Agreement, shall act in an independent capacity and not as officers or employees or agents of the State.

8 NON-DISCRIMINATION CLAUSE

8.1 During the performance of this Agreement, the PCJPB and its contractors shall not unlawfully discriminate, harass, or allow harassment against any employee or applicant for employment because of sex, race, color, ancestry, religious creed, national origin, physical disability (including HIV and AIDS), mental disability, medical condition (e.g., cancer), age (over 40), marital status, and denial of family care leave. PCJPB and contractors shall insure that the evaluation and treatment of their employees and applicants for employment are free from such discrimination and harassment. PCJPB and contractors shall comply with the provisions of the Fair Employment and Housing Act (Gov. Code §12990 (a-f) et seq.) and the applicable regulations promulgated thereunder (California Code of Regulations, Title 2, Section 7285 et seq.). The applicable regulations of the Fair Employment and Housing Commission implementing Government Code Section 12990 (a-f), set forth in Chapter 5 of Division 4 of Title 2 of the California Code of Regulations, are incorporated into this Agreement by reference and made a part hereof as if set forth in full. PCJPB and its contractors shall give written notice of their obligations under this clause to labor organizations with which they have a collective bargaining or other Agreement.

8.2 PCJPB shall include the nondiscrimination and compliance provisions of this clause in all contracts to perform work under the Agreement.

9 CERTIFICATION CLAUSES

9.1 DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE REQUIREMENTS: PCJPB and its contractors will comply with the requirements of the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1990 and will provide a drug-free workplace by taking the following actions:

9.1.1 Publish a statement notifying employees that unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensation, possession or use of a controlled substance is prohibited and specifying actions to be taken against employees for violations.

9.1.2 Establish a Drug-Free Awareness Program to inform employees about:
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9.1.2.1 The dangers of drug abuse in the workplace;

9.1.2.2 the person's or organization's policy of maintaining a drug-free workplace;

9.1.2.3 any available counseling, rehabilitation and employee assistance programs; and,

9.1.2.4 penalties that may be imposed upon employees for drug abuse violations.

9.1.3 Every employee who works on the proposed Agreement will:

9.1.3.1 receive a copy of the company's drug-free workplace policy statement; and,

9.1.3.2 agree to abide by the terms of the company's statement as a condition of employment on the Agreement.

9.1.4 Failure to comply with these requirements may result in suspension of payments under the Agreement or termination of the Agreement or both and PCJPB may be ineligible for award of any future State agreements if the Authority determines that any of the following has occurred: the PCJPB has made false certification, or violated the certification by failing to carry out the requirements as noted above. (Gov. Code §8350 et seq.)

9.2 DOMESTIC PARTNERS: For contracts over $100,000 executed or amended after January 1, 2007, the PCJPB certifies that PCJPB is in compliance with Public Contract Code section 10295.3. PCJPB shall include this clause in all contracts to perform work under the Agreement.

9.3 AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT: PCJPB assures the State that it complies with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability, as well as all applicable regulations and guidelines issued pursuant to the ADA. (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.) PCJPB shall include this clause in all contracts to perform work under the Agreement.

9.4 AIR OR WATER POLLUTION VIOLATION: PCJPB shall not be: (1) in violation of any order or resolution not subject to review promulgated by the State Air Resources Board or an air pollution control district; (2) subject to cease and desist order not subject to review issued pursuant to Section 13301 of the Water Code for violation of waste discharge requirements or discharge prohibitions; or (3) finally determined to be in violation of provisions of federal law relating to air or water pollution.

9.5 RESOLUTION: The City must provide the State with a copy of a resolution, order, motion, or ordinance of the local governing body which by law has authority to enter into an agreement, authorizing execution of the agreement.
10 TIMELINESS

10.1 Time is of the essence in this Agreement.

11 GOVERNING LAW

11.1 This contract is governed by and shall be interpreted in accordance with the laws of the State of California.

12 CHILD SUPPORT COMPLIANCE ACT

12.1 For any Agreement in excess of $100,000, PCJPB acknowledges in accordance with Public Contract Code 7110, that:

12.1.1 The PCJPB recognizes the importance of child and family support obligations and shall fully comply with all applicable state and federal laws relating to child and family support enforcement, including, but not limited to, disclosure of information and compliance with earnings assignment orders, as provided in Chapter 8 (commencing with section 5200) of Part 5 of Division 9 of the Family Code; and

12.1.2 The PCJPB, to the best of its knowledge is fully complying with the earnings assignment orders of all employees and is providing the names of all new employees to the New Hire Registry maintained by the California Employment Development Department. PCJPB shall include this clause in all contracts to perform work under the Agreement.

13 UNENFORCEABLE PROVISION

13.1 In the event that any provision of this Agreement is unenforceable or held to be unenforceable, then the Parties agree to work cooperatively to amend this Agreement to restore the original full intent and rights and obligations of the Parties contained in this Agreement, if reasonably feasible. If not reasonably feasible, any Party may terminate this Agreement.
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1 CONTRACT MANAGEMENT

1.1 PCJPB's and the City's Project Representatives are responsible for the day-to-day project status, decisions and communications as outlined in this Agreement.

1.2 Any Party may change its Project Representative at any time by giving written notice to the other Parties.

2 SUBAGREEMENTS

2.1 Nothing contained in this Agreement or otherwise, shall create any contractual relation between the Authority and any PCJPB contractors, and no contract shall relieve the PCJPB of its responsibilities and obligations under this Agreement. The PCJPB agrees to be as fully responsible to the Authority for the acts and omissions of its contractors and of persons either directly or indirectly employed by any of them as it is for the acts and omissions of its contractors and of persons either directly or indirectly employed by the PCJPB. The PCJPB's obligation to pay its contractors is an independent obligation from the Authority's obligation to make payment to the PCJPB. As a result, the Authority shall have no obligation to pay or enforce the payment of any moneys to any PCJPB contractor or subcontractor.

2.2 The City shall not subcontract any of its obligations under this Agreement.

3 CONFLICT OF INTEREST

3.1 All Parties acknowledge their shared interest in avoiding organizational conflicts of interest in the performance of work funded under this Agreement.

3.2 The PCJPB's contractors, subcontractors and their employees will comply with the PCJPB's Organizational Conflict of Interest Policy.

3.3 By inclusion of the authorized contractors listed in the Approved Contractor List attached hereto as Attachment 4 the PCJPB and the Authority agree that no significant conflict exists that would preclude the listed firms from performing work under this Agreement.

3.4 If the PCJPB seeks to add any contractors or subcontractors to this Agreement, the Authority retains authority to analyze whether such additions would present an organizational conflict of interest under the Authority's Organizational Conflict of Interest Policy and, if so, either to decline to add such contractors or subcontractors, or to require mitigation of identified conflicts before the conflicted entity is assigned any work under this Agreement.
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4 NON-WAIVER

4.1 No waiver of any breach of this Agreement shall be held to be a waiver of any other or subsequent breach. No remedy available in this Agreement is intended to be exclusive of any other remedy, and every remedy shall be cumulative, in addition to and not a condition precedent to any other remedy provided herein or available at law or in equity.

4.2 The failure of any Party to enforce any provision of this Agreement or require performance by any other Party of any provision shall in no way be construed to be a waiver of those provisions, affect the validity of this Agreement in whole or in part, or the right of the non-breaching Party to subsequently enforce any such provision.

5 RULES OF CONSTRUCTION

5.1 All references herein to the singular shall include the plural, and vice versa.

6 NONDISCRIMINATION COMPLIANCE

6.1 During the performance of this Agreement, the PCJPB and its contractors shall not deny the Agreement's benefits to any person on the basis of race, religious creed, color, national origin, ancestry, physical disability, mental disability, medical condition, genetic information, marital status, sex, gender, gender identity, gender expression, age, sexual orientation, or military and veteran status, nor shall they discriminate unlawfully against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, religious creed, color, national origin, ancestry, physical disability, mental disability, medical condition, genetic information, marital status, sex, gender, gender identity, gender expression, age, sexual orientation, or military and veteran status. The PCJPB shall insure that the evaluation and treatment of employees and applicants for employment are free of such discrimination.

6.2 The PCJPB shall comply with the provisions of the Fair Employment and Housing Act (Gov. Code section 12990, et seq.) the regulations promulgated thereunder (Cal. Code Regs., Tit. 2, section 11000, et seq.), the provisions of Article 9.5, Chapter 1, Part 1, Division 3, Title 2 of the Government Code (Gov. Code sections 11135-11139.5), and the regulations or standards adopted by the awarding state agency to implement such article.

6.3 The PCJPB shall permit access by representatives of the Department of Fair Employment and Housing to the awarding state agency upon reasonable notice at any time during the normal business hours, but in no case less than 24 hours' notice, to such of its books, records, accounts, other sources of information and its facilities as said Department or Agency shall require to ascertain compliance with this clause.

6.4 The PCJPB and its contractors shall give written notice of their obligations under this clause to labor organizations with which they have a collective bargaining or other agreement.

6.5 The PCJPB shall include the nondiscrimination and compliance provisions of this clause in all subcontracts to perform work under this Agreement.

7 ACCESS TO SITES AND RECORDS

7.1 The Authority staff or its representatives shall have reasonable access to all sites (including the Grade Separation Project construction site) and records related to this Agreement.
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8 RIGHTS IN DATA

8.1 PCJPB and City will provide access and rights of use to the Authority to all reports, documents, plans, specifications, electronic documents and estimates produced in whole or in part with funding provided under this Agreement. Furthermore, in the event PCJPB is unable for any reason to complete the Grade Separation Project, ownership of Grade Separation Project plans will vest equally in the Authority, the PCJPB and the City, although such vesting does not carry with it any obligation to complete the Grade Separation Project.

9 PREVAILING WAGES

9.1 The PCJPB shall comply with all Labor Code requirements applicable to the scope of work set forth in Exhibit A of this Agreement or any additional requirements stemming from the funding provided under this Agreement.

10 LICENSES AND PERMITS

10.1 The PCJPB shall ensure that all contractors hired to complete the scope of work under Exhibit A of this Agreement possess all required licenses and permits.

11 INSURANCE

11.1 Without limiting the PCJPB's indemnification of the Authority, PCJPB agrees to require any and all PCJPB contractors to list the Authority as an additional insured on all insurance required under the contract between the PCJPB and its PCJPB contractors. The PCJPB shall provide certificates of insurance to the Authority as evidence of the insurance coverage required herein. The PCJPB shall ensure that it provides current certifications of insurance to the Authority at all times during the term of this Agreement.

12 PERFORMANCE BOND

12.1 The PCJPB will require PCJPB's construction contractor to provide performance and payment bonds in the full amount of the construction contract and will require a one-year warranty period. The bond shall be maintained in full force and effect during the entire period that work is performed by the contractor until such work is accepted by City and PCJPB.
ATTACHMENT 1

REQUIRED CHANGE ORDER
ATTACHMENT 3

INVOICE REQUIREMENTS

Invoice Cover Sheet containing the following:

- Agreement number
- Date invoice prepared
- Billing and service period
- Cumulative billed amount
- Cumulative percentage of total JPB Contract 17-J-C-048 Modified costs billed to the Authority
  (JPB Contract 17-J-C-048 Modified costs billed to the Authority/Total-billed to the PCJPB
  pursuant to JPB Contract 17-J-C-048 Modified)
- Current service billing period costs
- Signature of a PCJPB official
- Signature block for Authority Contract Manager
- Signature block for Authority Financial Officer

Narrative:
- Narrative setting forth general description of charges contained in the invoice

Invoice Sheet containing the expense information as follows:

- Contractor invoices
  - Detail associated with task completed
  - Total budget, expenditure for the current invoice and cumulative to date.
  - Prime expenditure for the current invoice and cumulative to date.
  - Subcontractors expenditure for the current invoice and cumulative to date, if available.
  - Subcontractors' information:
    - List of all subcontractors in alphabetical order.
    - Small Business Subcontractors designation (SB, Micro, DBE and DVBE) and utilization percentage.

Certification as follows:
- The PCJPB hereby certifies that the work performed and billed under this invoice was reasonable
  and necessary pursuant to JPB Contract 17-J-C-048 Modified for the Grade Separation Project.
ATTACHMENT 4

APPROVED CONTRACTOR LIST

- Bender Rosenthal, Inc.
- Burns, Michael
- Comcast
- Dell Marketing L.P.
- Fehr & Peers
- HDR
- Jacobs Engineer Group Inc.
- OfficeMax
- Pacific Gas & Electric
- Rail Surveyors and Engineers, Inc.
- TransitAmerica Services, Inc.
- URS Corporation (aka AECOM)
- Vali Cooper & Associates
- Wells Fargo Insurance
### ATTACHMENT 5

25th Ave Grade Separation Cost Estimate and Funding Plan (6/11/2017 Update)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Item</th>
<th>Post-Bid Opening Estimate</th>
<th>August 2016 Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(in $M)</td>
<td>(in $M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Construction Phase:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>$ 3.50</td>
<td>$ 3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$ 7.20</td>
<td>$ 7.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW Acquisition (Partial)</td>
<td>$ 4.00</td>
<td>$ 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total: Pre-Construction Phase</td>
<td>$ 14.70</td>
<td>$ 14.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Phase:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contract</td>
<td>$ 82.90</td>
<td>$ 120.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set-Out Track Replacement (To be issued as a change order)</td>
<td>$ 2.00</td>
<td>$ 2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 16.98</td>
<td>$ 28.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total: Construction Contract</td>
<td>$ 101.88</td>
<td>$ 145.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Support Costs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Relocation</td>
<td>$ 4.00</td>
<td>$ 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW Acquisition (Remaining)</td>
<td>$ 8.00</td>
<td>$ 8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>$ 10.80</td>
<td>$ 10.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSIC</td>
<td>$ 2.49</td>
<td>$ 2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency &amp; Consultant Staff</td>
<td>$ 6.30</td>
<td>$ 6.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASI</td>
<td>$ 9.00</td>
<td>$ 9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total: Construction Support</td>
<td>$ 48.70</td>
<td>$ 44.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total: Construction Phase</td>
<td>$ 150.58</td>
<td>$ 165.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Project Cost Estimate: $ 180.13

---

**25th Ave. Grade Separation Funding Plan**

**6/11/17 Update**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Plan</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>CPUC</th>
<th>SMCTA</th>
<th>SM</th>
<th>HSR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 2016</td>
<td>$ 180.00</td>
<td>10 $ 9.18</td>
<td>74 $ 67.95</td>
<td>12 $ 11.02</td>
<td>84 $ 77.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised post bid opening</td>
<td>$ 165.28</td>
<td>180 $ 165.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Supervisor Peskin and members of the SFCTA Board of Directors,

Please find attached my response to Ms. Gygi’s August 14 2018 letter.

Sincerely,

Roland Lebrun

cc
Caltrain Board
TJPA Board
CHSRA Board
SFCTA CAC
TJPA CAC
Caltrain CAC
Caltrain BAC
SFCTA September 11th 2018 Full Board meeting
Item #7 Pennsylvania Avenue Alignment

Dear Chair Peskin and members of the SFCTA Board of Directors

Further to my July 8th letter to the SFCTA Board and Ms. Gygi's August 14th 2018 response , I appreciate the opportunity to respond to some of the points raised by Ms. Gygi.

First, I apologize for any confusion the presentation may have caused. As stated in the last paragraph on page 2 of my July 8 letter (The solution outlined in the attached “Rethinking DTX” (2012) presentation), this presentation was prepared in 2012, approximately two years before the so-called “RAB study”
Most of the presentation stands today with the exception of the following items:

$1.3B cost estimates. The 2012 estimates were based on two contracts awarded during the 2008 Great Recession:


- Central Subway: “The Tunnels contract was awarded in June 2011, to the Joint Venture of Barnard/Impregilo/Healy. The $233.9 million contract consisted of 1.5 miles of twin-bore tunnels” https://www.sfcta.org/sites/default/files/content/CapitalProjects/images/Central_Subway/CentralSubway_factsheet_042017.pdf

The 2012 estimate for the tunnels and the 7th & King station was revised to $2B on page 9 of the July 8 2018 letter and is followed by a table showing an average of $350M/mile for recently awarded tunnel contracts.

Adverse impact to other buildings
As can be seen in the video and the 2012 presentation, the twin bores did not impact any buildings because the 7th street alignment was the only alignment that made it possible to connect the Transit Center to the East Bay without requiring massive building condemnations.
With regards to comments about the 2012 alignment impacting the foundations of the Park Tower building, it should be noted that Ms. Gygi informed Mayor Ed Lee’s office in December 2014 that it was “OK to sell Transbay Block 5” because she had a “Spear Street solution” consisting of “Removing and reconstructing building structures and foundations”

including the entire Rincon Center

Here is a revised draft Transbay tunnel alignment which requires the condemnation of a single building on Main Street.
Relocation of 4th & King Railyard
As can be seen from the above snapshot, the 7th Street alignment makes it possible to fit 1,400-foot platforms (vs. 800 for the 2nd street alignment) within the existing train box, so (assuming double-stacking), the Transit Center could accommodate the same number of trains (12) as the 4th & King railyard and there would be no need for train storage at any other location.

Location of crossover
The 2013 refined alignment introduced two crossovers between the Minna (southbound) and Natoma (northbound) tunnels (11/17 2013 letter to Luis Zurinaga).

The location of the Yerba Buena Garden crossover is deliberate because it has the potential to use the Hall E&F slabs to support the face during excavation without additional support from a layer of grout.
The crossovers are discussed at length in the November 17th 2013 letter (attached) and closely follow Crossrail crossover designs (see engineering diagrams on page 7 and the Whitechapel Station crossover in particular).

Curves would not meet CHSRA standards

This comment is incomprehensible. The curve radii as the tunnels transition from 7th Street to Minna and Natoma are approximately 1,800 feet versus 600 feet for each of the three sharp curves in the current DTX alignment.

Assuming 100-foot piles, there should be no building impacts because the elevation of the tunnels through the curve drops to 130 feet below the surface rising to -110 feet before going under the Central Subway.

With regards to building impacts on Second Street between Minna and Natoma, I reached out to an engineering firm specializing in Sequential Excavation Mining (SEM) and they advised that the properties could be preserved if necessary. Here is their reference project:

"The tunnel passes diagonally under the 100 year old Russia Wharf complex, which comprises three seven-story buildings with steel frames and brick facades listed in the National Register of Historic Places"

http://projects.dr-sauer.com/projects/mbta-russia-wharf-segment-section-cc03a

Operational Constraints and Safety risks

The comment that "The two single-track tunnels proposed by Mr. LeBrun would constrain operations, create severe safety risks, and pose maintenance challenges" does not have any basis in fact, specifically that these tunnels follow best practices developed on the Channel Tunnel Rail Link, Crossrail, High Speed Two (HS2) and the Central Subway.

Please encourage Ms. Gygi to familiarize herself with basic twin bore tunnel ventilation principles:
(page 12: twin bore tunnels)

With regards to "Constructing the passages would disrupt businesses and circulation on Second Street and would be difficult to locate, given the large number of existing buildings with deep foundations and below-grade parking."

Once again, this comment is incomprehensible. First, the 7th Street alignment does not need cross-passages on Second Street and second most of the cross-passages are located under existing streets between Minna and Natoma (no building impacts). Last but not least, Ms. Gygi does not appear to be familiar with recent developments in cross-passage construction:
Design Requirements

Ms. Gygi states that “The proposed alignment would eliminate the connection with the Central Subway.”

Once again, this statement does not have any basis in fact. The Central Subway is one of the “Guiding principles” in the 2012 presentation which shows a MUNI station serving both the N and the T-Third via an extension of the 16th Street turnback loop integrated with the 7th Street underground Caltrain/HSR station (similar to Montgomery and Embarcadero stations). Furthermore, the 7th Street location provides an opportunity to integrate an additional level ready to provide a BART connection to Alameda.

“Additionally, relocating the 4th/Townsend Station would not eliminate the cut-and-cover construction techniques and the resultant impacts, as Mr. LeBrun contends. 7th/Townsend ground conditions still require cut-and-cover construction. The relocation would also lose the advantage of the adjacent 4th/King railyard as a potential staging area for construction materials of the DTX.” Once again this statement does not have a basis in fact because the 2012 Guiding Principles clearly state “No surface impacts north of Townsend.” The 7th Street location additionally eliminates all impacts on Townsend Street and has the advantage of using both the unused portion of the Caltrain railyard at the corner of 7th & Townsend as well as the Recology site for staging. Last but not least, unlike 4th & Townsend, the 7th Street location serves Mission Bay, including UCSF and the Arena as well as SOMA because it straddles China Creek.

Structural Compromise to the SFTC

Once again, had Ms. Gygi paid closer attention to the proposed alignment, she would have realized that there is no need to “demolish the west end of the brand new building” let alone “take the new bridge out of service” or “require the relocation of the already built columns”.

3) Travel times

Ms. Gygi is questioning a travel time saving of 3 minutes between San Jose and San Francisco. This saving was achieved through a series of refinements in 2013 designed to sustain a minimum speed of 80 MPH until approaching Moscone Center.

As an example, a close examination of the video and slide 10 of the 2012 presentation will reveal that the alignment is not under Pennsylvania Avenue per se because this would result in a sharp bend at the junction of Pennsylvania and 7th (this sharp bend is most likely the reason behind the 2017 SMA study showing a speed of 40 MPH as far south as 22nd Street).
Ms. Gigy's assertion that "The curve speeds on the DTX alignment are 35 mph between 7th/Townsend and 2nd/Townsend." appears to contradict the 2015 SMA report.
Conclusions

- The 3-track requirement is a direct afterfact of the poorly designed 2nd Street throat structure
- The 3-track design results in a poorly ventilated tunnel design requiring multiple vent structures while London's twin bore high speed tunnels require a vent structure every 2 miles (see below)

2001 London tunnel contracts

- There has been no attempt to comply with Streets & Highways Codes section 2704.09(b)

"Maximum nonstop service travel times for each corridor that shall not exceed the following:
(3) San Francisco-San Jose: 30 minutes."
http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=shc&group=02001-03000&file=2704.04-2704.095

- There has been no attempt to connect the Transit Center to the East Bay

- There has been no attempt to fit 1,400-foot platforms within the existing 1,543-foot train box

Sincerely,

Roland Lebrun
The purpose of this short paper is to outline a refined northbound DTX tunnel alignment capable of delivering substantially higher TTC capacity if the crossover under Main Street is not available.

The refined alignment enables the implementation of Crossrail crossover designs and construction techniques to deliver a track layout with the same capacity as the connection between the HS1 tunnels and St Pancras platforms 11, 12 & 13.

Background:

The current northbound DTX tunnel proposal avoids existing building foundations by veering east off 7th Street under Howard before lining up with Natoma east of 3rd Street.
The refined northbound tunnel alignment lines up with Natoma east of 7th Street and runs deep enough to avoid any current or future building foundations between 7th and 3rd Street, including Moscone Center which is understood to have foundations supported by micropiles extending 100 feet below the surface.
Moving the northbound DTX tunnel alignment to Natoma makes it feasible to connect the two tunnels with additional crossovers as follows:

1) Crossover from Northbound to Southbound tunnel between 3rd and 4th Street. This crossover’s purpose is to route northbound trains to TTC platforms 1, 2 & 3 (northern-most platforms closest to Mission Street) which should be reserved for high-volume traffic (12 trains/hour).
2) Crossover from Northbound to Southbound tunnel between 6th & 7th Street. This crossover is for southbound traffic originating from TTC platforms 4, 5 & 6 which should be reserved for low-volume traffic (maximum 4 trains/hour) because southbound trains originating from these platforms can potentially interfere with northbound traffic between 7th street and the TTC.

Last but not least, the refined alignment is expected to deliver costs savings through shorter cross-passages between the northbound and southbound tunnels and these savings are expected to cover the construction costs of the two crossovers.
Reference material:

St Pancras track layout
### 2012 Summer Olympics timetable (12 trains/hour)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>08:00</th>
<th>08:10</th>
<th>08:20</th>
<th>08:30</th>
<th>08:40</th>
<th>08:50</th>
<th>09:00</th>
<th>09:10</th>
<th>09:20</th>
<th>09:30</th>
<th>09:40</th>
<th>09:50</th>
<th>10:00</th>
<th>10:10</th>
<th>10:20</th>
<th>10:30</th>
<th>10:40</th>
<th>10:50</th>
<th>11:00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St Pancras International</td>
<td>C15</td>
<td>C16</td>
<td>C17</td>
<td>C18</td>
<td>C19</td>
<td>C20</td>
<td>C21</td>
<td>C22</td>
<td>C23</td>
<td>C24</td>
<td>C25</td>
<td>C26</td>
<td>C27</td>
<td>C28</td>
<td>C29</td>
<td>C30</td>
<td>C31</td>
<td>C32</td>
<td>C33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Cross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterborough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northolt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Euston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Underground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Liverpool Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Paddington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathrow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathrow Terminal 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathrow Terminal 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathrow Terminal 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathrow Terminal 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathrow Terminal 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathrow Airport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathrow Central</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathrow Express</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathrow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Heathrow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Heathrow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatwick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatwick Express</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatwick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatwick Airport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatwick Express</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatwick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatwick Airport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatwick Express</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatwick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatwick Airport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatwick Express</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatwick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatwick Airport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Some stations may have additional services.
- Timings are subject to change.
- Check the official website for the latest information.

---

**St Pancras domestic platforms 11, 12 & 13**
Dear Bikes Onboard Team,

Thank you for your comments. The current design with bikes in front of emergency windows is compliant with FRA regulations. We understand the bike community’s interest in this topic, and should there be additional design changes we will let you know. Thank you again for your feedback.

Best,
Lori

From: Bikes on Board [mailto:bikesonboard@sonic.net]  
Sent: Saturday, September 01, 2018 6:54 PM  
To: Chair Brusis and Members of the Joint Power Board,  
Cc: Caltrain, Inc. (caltrain.com); caltraincom; caltrain.com; caltraincal.com  
Subject: Please keep electrification on schedule

Dear Chair Brusis and Members of the Joint Power Board,

We see that staff has flagged a risk to the electrification project that the FRA may not allow emergency exit windows to be blocked by stacked bikes. Why take the risk of delaying electrification, when a simple re-design of the bike car layout would make this risk go away completely? Please ensure seats (not bikes) are next to emergency exit windows, as specifically permitted by FRA regulations.

In addition, you have heard from many passengers that seats within view of bikes is critical to help prevent bike theft. In fact, 637 people have signed a petition for more capacity and better bike-car layout for electrified Caltrain (please see comments below). If passengers cannot sit within view of their bicycles, they will be forced to stand in the bike car causing congestion and delaying the train.

Electrification is a high-profile and very important advancement for Caltrain. Please ensure its timely implementation by putting seats within view of bikes for the sake of passenger safety (to keep emergency exit windows clear) and security of personal property (to allow passengers to watch their bikes to guard against theft). Thank you.

Respectfully,
The BIKES Onboard Team

Petition for More capacity and better bike-car layout for electrified Caltrain

I support more capacity on electrified Caltrain and seats within view of bikes to deter bicycle theft.
Caltrain plans to electrify its line and run six-car electric trains, which have fewer seats and less bike capacity than today’s diesel trains and no dedicated seats within view of bikes. I urge Caltrain to run eight-car (instead of six-car) electric trains with seats within view of bikes. Eight-car trains with 96 bike spaces per train satisfy the board-mandated R:1 ratio of seats-to-bike spaces and provide more capacity for all Caltrain passengers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Shirley Johnson</td>
<td>6/9/2018</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jyn Dyer</td>
<td>6/9/2018</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Benjamin Chandler</td>
<td>6/9/2018</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Michael Louie</td>
<td>6/10/2018</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Neelanj Chandra</td>
<td>6/10/2018</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Benjamin Allen</td>
<td>6/11/2018</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Erik Steinbauer</td>
<td>6/11/2018</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sasha Talmontini</td>
<td>6/11/2018</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Demetrious Marcolides</td>
<td>6/11/2018</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fabian Falconetti</td>
<td>6/11/2018</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Greg Matthews</td>
<td>6/11/2018</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mark Morey</td>
<td>6/11/2018</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Barry Marchessault</td>
<td>6/11/2018</td>
<td>San Bruno</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Peter Colvin</td>
<td>6/11/2018</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Jennifer Shiu</td>
<td>6/11/2018</td>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Robert Panero</td>
<td>6/11/2018</td>
<td>San Carlos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>6/11/2018</td>
<td>San Jose, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Christine Ricks</td>
<td>6/11/2018</td>
<td>Menlo Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>John O'Sullivan</td>
<td>6/11/2018</td>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Suzie Scales</td>
<td>6/11/2018</td>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Andrea Corredor</td>
<td>6/11/2018</td>
<td>SAN JOSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Ted Leecherman</td>
<td>6/11/2018</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Michael Pence</td>
<td>6/11/2018</td>
<td>Menlo Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Judd Curran</td>
<td>6/11/2018</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Lawrence Garvin</td>
<td>6/11/2018</td>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More bikes mean less cars. Let’s prioritize all the ways to get more cars off the road.

More capacity for bikes is absolutely necessary to making Caltrain a viable transportation option for commuters.

And thank you for the bikes-board-first initiative! It should work well at Hillsdale at least. It might also make sense for the new trains to have two bike cars back to back so that the non-cyclists learn to board elsewhere and thus where best to wait on the platform.

Caltrain: please be more bike friendly!

And thank you for the bikes-board-first initiative! It should work well at Hillsdale at least. It might also make sense for the new trains to have two bike cars back to back so that the non-cyclists learn to board elsewhere and thus where best to wait on the platform.

Supporting people who commute on bikes is critical. Thank you.
I've witnessed many bike theft attempts on Caltrain. If it were not for having been able to sit close by, those cyclists would have lost their bikes. It's critical for bicyclists to sit within sight of their bikes so they can catch thieves and retain their bikes.

We need to make biking a viable alternative to cars for more people. Please don't make us choose between losing our bikes/ getting bumped and gridlock.

I support more bikes and ability to view them on Caltrain.

I currently stand in the bike car on average 8 trips/week so that I can watch my bicycle, rather than seeking a seat where it is not in clear view.

MORE BIKE SPACES!!

It's vital to make bicycle commuting viable & safe. As we move forward with amazing progress electrifying cars, we should support all forms of non-gasoline transportation.

Have used my bike on Caltrain for 13 years.

Having lived in the South Bay a long time, I know there is a big demand for bicycle capacity. And bike riders will want to be able to see their bikes to prevent theft.

Come on, you all! How often do we need to tell you the same thing? We're the people who ride bikes and who ride the trains, and we know what we're talking about here. So does your staff. So why are you trying to screw up the system entirely, making it worse in every way possible? Do you hate bicycles? Do you hate your staff and resent their recommendations? Or are you just like Trump?

Looking at the proposed layouts made me sad and angry. Their lack luster promise for video cameras to upstairs TV was ridiculous: 1) they probably won't be added 2) they'd break easily 3) it would just allow me to watch my bike get stolen, rather than stop it. Please re-think those plans and give us a layout we can work with and not have our bikes stolen! I'm excited for electrification, but currently it has a huge personal cost attached.

All the prototypes I saw didn't consider bike security and bike capacity enough.

I agree with the provided statement.

More bicycle transport support with less rhetoric!!

Need more cars or more scheduled runs in peak times.

Please do this. I don't want to have my bike stolen.

The ability to bring a bike to the work end of our caltrain commute is extremely important to many of us, yet there is often not enough room for bikes. Don't miss this opportunity to make things better!

When on the train, it is difficult to relax and enjoy the ride because I can't see my bike. It is vulnerable to damage and theft. We need more seats in Bike Cars!

Bike riders need to watch their bikes during train rides.

We need more bike capacity on trains and seats where bikes can be monitored by their owners.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Akbar</td>
<td>6/12/2018</td>
<td>0:28</td>
<td>Mt. View</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Marcia Weisbrodt</td>
<td>6/12/2018</td>
<td>0:29</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Jeffrey Oldham</td>
<td>6/12/2018</td>
<td>0:32</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Maria Lade</td>
<td>6/12/2018</td>
<td>0:33</td>
<td>Los Gatos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>David Goldsmith</td>
<td>6/12/2018</td>
<td>0:34</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Ian Emmans</td>
<td>6/12/2018</td>
<td>0:36</td>
<td>Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Patrick Killelea</td>
<td>6/12/2018</td>
<td>0:37</td>
<td>Menlo Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Darby Morris</td>
<td>6/12/2018</td>
<td>0:40</td>
<td>Redwood City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Elka Ermold</td>
<td>6/12/2018</td>
<td>0:43</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Bill Bushnell</td>
<td>6/12/2018</td>
<td>0:44</td>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Robert Krossa</td>
<td>6/12/2018</td>
<td>0:45</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Bart Selby</td>
<td>6/12/2018</td>
<td>0:49</td>
<td>San Carlos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Georgia Andrews</td>
<td>6/12/2018</td>
<td>0:50</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 87 | Brian Oldham  | 6/12/2018  | 0:50     | San Carlos, Ca.
| 88 | Eric H Rhode  | 6/12/2018  | 0:52     | San Francisco  |
| 89 | Terria Brewer | 6/12/2018  | 0:56     | San Mateo      |
| 90 | Lydia Lee     | 6/12/2018  | 0:57     | Menlo Park     |
| 91 | Cameron Erakine | 6/12/2018   | 1:11     | Redwood City   |
| 92 | Scott Barton  | 6/12/2018  | 1:12     | Belmont        |
| 93 | Travis Schuh  | 6/12/2018  | 1:12     |                |
| 94 | Eric Takayama | 6/12/2018  | 1:22     | San Carlos     |
| 95 | Robert Morgan | 6/12/2018  | 1:23     | San Jose       |
| 96 | David Xu      | 6/12/2018  | 1:25     | Redwood City   |
| 97 | Noam Zomerfeld | 6/12/2018   | 1:28     | San Francisco  |
| 98 | Brian         | 6/12/2018  | 1:29     | East Palo Alto |
| 99 | Gary Wu       | 6/12/2018  | 1:34     | Redwood City   |
|100 | Christine     | 6/12/2018  | 1:36     |                |
|101 | Caroline Horn | 6/12/2018  | 1:45     | Los altos      |
|102 | Renato Sztarzynski | 6/12/2018   | 1:47     | Palo Alto      |
|103 | Marilyn Beck  | 6/12/2018  | 2:30     |                |
|104 | Jon Spangler  | 6/12/2018  | 2:34     | Alameda        |
|105 | Dale Low      | 6/12/2018  | 2:35     | SF             |
|106 | Michael Mansour | 6/12/2018  | 2:38     | San Mateo      |
|107 | Michael Gregory | 6/12/2018    | 2:54     | San Francisco  |
|108 | David Kardaniko | 6/12/2018   | 3:04     | San Francisco  |
|109 | Julie Watt    | 6/12/2018  | 3:06     | Mountain View  |
|110 | Mark Rauscher | 6/12/2018  | 3:12     | Morgan Hill    |
|111 | Michael Schumann | 6/12/2018    | 3:37     | Belmont        |
|112 | Marc Aronson  | 6/12/2018  | 3:47     | Cupertino      |
|113 | Jean Gross    | 6/12/2018  | 3:48     | San Francisco  |
|114 | Mike Cohen    | 6/12/2018  | 3:49     | San Francisco  |
|115 | Robert Cronin | 6/12/2018  | 3:54     | Menlo Park     |
|116 | Ken Baker     | 6/12/2018  | 3:58     | Stanford       |

I support the idea for more seating capacity for bikers to watch their bikes. Also to add a strip of rubber to the steps to avoid slipping while carrying your bike in and out of the train car. Hanging straps from the ceiling to hold on while the train comes to a step will be a great support.

Designing the bike cars in a theft-friendly manner (like the current proposal) seems like a sneaky way to deter bicycle riders and eventually decrease demand/availability. Being able to watch your bike is crucial to preventing theft.

I depend on the train and bike.

We need more room for bikes and adequate seating to protect our bikes during the commute times not less.

Please consider seating arrangements that will allow riders to watch over their bikes.

Commuting is stressful enough without having to worry about your bike the whole time. Thank you.

Taking my bike to and from Caltrain keeps a car off the road, uses less fuel and doesn't foul the air. More people should commute on bikes.

I would not be able to use Caltrain if I could not carry my bike onboard. I would simply drive. I applaud Caltrain for expanding bike service for the past 25 years. When I started, only 4 bikes were allowed and cyclists had to have a special permit. I hope Caltrain keeps improving its service and can take even more cars off the roads!

Bikes make Caltrain work for many people we need capacity for bikes and passengers, electrifying will create more demand. Of course bike theft is an incredible problem in the Bay Area, but train should not be a magnet for thieves with poor design. Bike owners who can see the bike are most likely to prevent theft.

More capacity and seats near bikes is essential. One of the key challenges to using Caltrain is the "last mile" problem: Getting to your final destination once you get to your train stop. Bikes solve this problem in both an environmentally friendly and economical way.

Caltrain's charter should be changed to require increased ridership so bikes on board would be welcomed not sabotaged by Caltrain management.

I am a long-time Caltrain bike commuter and feel strongly that being able to sit in sights of your bike is really important. It's really stressful to leave your bike a sit elsewhere. Bike/Caltrain commuting is AMAZING and I hope you can maintain capacity for this to continue in the future, for me, and for our growing Bay Area population.

I am a disabled veteran, who uses a bicycle to go up to the Palo Alto VA to do Aquatic
Therapy on Saturdays, (when the Stanford VA shuttle and VTA Route 89, does not run on weekends). Please do the right thing, because I would rather be "One Less Car", than drive, since I pay for two zones every month to use Caltrain to get to my therapy at the Veterans Hospital.

I've used Caltrain for over a decade to go everywhere from Millbrae to San Jose. My bike is a critical part of every Caltrain trip. I wouldn't take it if I couldn't get my bike on board, or couldn't watch it during my trip.

Please be more bicycle friendly

Security is important. And more bikes on the electric trains is important! Aren't we trying to stop using fossil fuels??

Without being able to use my bike at both ends of my commute, I wouldn't be able to use Caltrain. Protecting my bike while on board is critical as I know bicycles have been stolen. Please retain seats as deterrent to thieves. Thanks,

Caltrain has been a leader in bike commuter accessibility with efficiency and safety for all commuters. Please don't regress!

CalTrain has been a leader in bikes on public transit and with electrification it has a great opportunity to create an even better model for bikes on transit and attract more customers.

Please provide additional capacity for bikers on trains, that would reduce the amount of cars on our roads :) You MUST have seats within view of the bikes. There is no question about that. Cameras will only show a grainy picture of someone with a hoodie stealing a bike. It will do NOTHING to stop the theft. If I can't sit with my bike, I will most likely use a lock to keep my bike safe - and so will many others. With the increasing use of electric bikes, I see more people ditching their car and using bikes from further distances to commute to the train (happening today). Caltrain needs to provide more - not less bike space. You may also look at different seating configurations - more seats for SJ-SF dedicated bullets, less seats for locals where people don't need to sit.

More bike capacity and seats for cyclists to watch their bikes and prevent theft is just common sense. If you want to cut down on cars (i.e. people taking Lyft to the CalTrain), then making biking + Caltrain safe and reliable is the right way to go.

Bringing bikes on CalTrain is how my son gets to visit his grandmother in Los Altos since our family is car free.

Please increase projected bike capacity on electric trains. The current capacity is behind demand, and the board agreed in 2015 to increased capacity on electric trains in a way that staff continue to attempt to back away from. Please add bike space to electric trains with seating available in bike cars to limit the threat of theft. Thank you!

This is a huge opportunity to perpetuate and improve the wonderful way Caltrain has
Winifred Homer-Smith 6/12/2018 22:37 Los Altos Hills allowed people to revolutionize their commutes. Don't lose momentum by limiting capacity and adding theft risk!

Jason Thwaites 6/12/2018 23:38 San Francisco

Joanna Tong 6/12/2018 23:46 San Francisco

Alexander Magee 6/13/2018 00:03 San Francisco

Shane Burke 6/13/2018 03:11 South San Francisco

Kyle Barlow 6/13/2018 04:43 San Francisco

John Atkin 6/13/2018 03:59 San Mateo, CA 94401

Amanda Fennell 6/13/2018 1:25 San Francisco

Noah Coccaro 6/13/2018 1:39 Mountain View

James Edwards 6/13/2018 1:52 Berkeley

Miguel Guerrero 6/13/2018 3:43 Emeryville

Sue Young 6/13/2018 3:53 Los Altos

John Phillips 6/13/2018 4:12 Santa Clara

Sean Reed 6/13/2018 4:25 San Francisco

Nathaniel Kane 6/13/2018 4:35 San Francisco

Ziyan 6/13/2018 5:44 San Francisco

Brian Franke 6/13/2018 9:18 San Francisco

Wesley Beattie 6/13/2018 10:31 Alameda

Daniel Golden 6/13/2018 12:34 Palo Alto

Mike Wood 6/13/2018 13:46 Corte Madera

Annie Armstrong 6/19/2018 15:27 San Francisco

Micah Springut 6/13/2018 15:39 San Francisco

John Burke 6/13/2018 16:28 San Francisco

gianluca cattini 6/13/2018 16:33 Belmont

Asher Cohen 6/13/2018 16:33 San Jose

Mark 6/13/2018 16:45 San Mateo

Ted Thomas 6/13/2018 16:47 San Francisco

Matt 6/13/2018 16:52 San Diego

Marc Brandt 6/13/2018 16:52 San Francisco

Antony Yenzos 6/13/2018 17:08 SF

John Swamad 6/13/2018 17:14 San Francisco

NIK Kaestner 6/13/2018 17:12

NIK Kaestner 6/13/2018 17:29 San Francisco

Emily H 6/13/2018 17:36 Los Angeles, CA

KR 6/13/2018 17:52 SF

John Holtzclaw 6/13/2018 18:00 San Francisco

Michelle Isaac 6/13/2018 18:07 San Jose

Terry Ritteri 6/13/2018 18:13 San Francisco

Martin Bourqui 6/13/2018 18:54 San Francisco

Vadim Grabows 6/13/2018 18:55 San Francisco

Emma Fujii 6/13/2018 18:57 Oakland

Larry Chinn 6/13/2018 19:10 Palo Alto

Jerry Cahill 6/13/2018 19:16 Mill Valley, CA

Donald F Robertson 6/13/2018 19:18 San Francisco

Tim Shea 6/13/2018 19:51 San Francisco

Nicole Apteekar 6/13/2018 20:04 san francisco

Danny Snyder 6/13/2018 20:15 Oakland

Gene Cutler 6/13/2018 20:24 San Francisco

David Edwards 6/13/2018 20:32 Campbell

Brittany Kathleen Candel 6/13/2018 21:04 San Francisco

Bikes on board are better than cars in the parking lot. Bike share is not a fair apples to
apples replacement for the bike onboard benefits that benefit everyone in the long run.
Yes! This is a no brainer

Bikers are a large share of CalTrain ridership and a good way to solve the last mile
problem. We need to make CalTrain as bike friendly as possible.

Bikes are critical for the last mile, but they have to be accommodating on CalTrain
electrification project.

There's not enough bike space as is. More, not less. Also if I can't see my bike I'm not
leaving it without a lock, which will make entry/exit a slow pain

Caltrain needs more room for bikes, not less!

I've been riding Caltrain for years, and bike space is getting more and more full. We need
more future bike spaces, not fewer!

Bike space on southbound rush hour trains is already at a premium. We definitely don't
need less capacity, and we definitely don't need bikes kept out of sight of owners.
211 Michael Escobar 6/13/2018 21:22 San Francisco, CA I commute from SF to Mountain View or San Jose every day and I need to bike to and from my origin and destination stations.

212 Brian 6/13/2018 21:41 San Francisco I stopped commuting to Palo Alto and changed jobs because there was not enough space for my bike.

213 Lee Tramplereuse 6/13/2018 21:52 San Francisco I bring my bike on CalTrain from Bayshore to Menlo Park/Palo Alto almost every day.

214 Matt Sleving 6/13/2018 22:23 San Francisco Strongly support this effort, as bike theft is a real problem on Caltrain and Caltrain should do everything it can to promote alternative transportation to keep polluting, congestion-causing cars off the road.

215 Dorian Lemarchand 6/13/2018 22:59 Campbell I bike to Caltrain and would appreciate more bike spots, not less!

216 Carolyn Scott 6/13/2018 23:02 San Francisco I ride Caltrain Daily! Please add space for bikes!

217 Andrew Davis 6/13/2018 23:19 Berkeley As time goes on, there will only be MORE demand for bikes on trains. Do the work now to make that happen.

218 Steven Gowin 6/14/2018 0:25 San Francisco

219 Lois Kellerman 6/14/2018 4:28 Mountain View We need more bike spaces not fewer.

220 Ruth Radetsky 6/14/2018 4:34 San Francisco

221 Tom Pressburger 6/14/2018 4:47 Redwood City Yes!

222 Reuben Smith 6/14/2018 5:40 San Francisco

223 Cindy erkine 6/14/2018 13:04 Redwood city 94110

224 Justin Bigelow 6/14/2018 16:21 SF

225 Richard Girling 6/14/2018 19:52 San Francisco Bikes are critical for last mile commute on both sides of the Caltrain commute. Bike capacity on Caltrain with capacity for riders to sit near their bikes to prevent theft needs to be part of Caltrain’s design to serve the growing needs of commuters and relieve congestions on the freeways.

226 Karen Allen 6/14/2018 21:31 San Francisco

227 Mara Zeta 6/15/2018 0:24 San Francisco

228 Sean McFerry 6/15/2018 23:49 San Jose

229 Jun Lin 6/15/2018 3:51

230 Adele Madeto 6/15/2018 4:02 Piedmont

231 Jed Charlesworth 6/15/2018 11:35 Danville, Ca

232 Peter Gulexian 6/15/2018 1:17 San Francisco

233 Christina Ignarra 6/15/2018 4:28 San Francisco

234 Sean Fay 6/15/2018 14:31 San Francisco

235 K Lee 6/15/2018 15:14 Palo Alto

236 Patrick Ryan 6/15/2018 15:26 San Francisco

237 Catherine Kirocc 6/15/2018 16:34 San Bruno

238 Daniel Yang 6/15/2018 17:03 Millbrae

239 Julie Nager 6/15/2018 17:04 San Francisco

240 Nathan Duthman 6/15/2018 17:13 San Francisco

241 Larry Aronovitz 6/15/2018 17:16 Los Altos

242 Mert Dikmen 6/15/2018 17:31 San Francisco

243 Medium Chloe 6/15/2018 18:28 San Francisco

244 Maurizio Franzini 6/15/2018 19:13 San Francisco

245 Christian Veer 6/15/2018 19:53 San Francisco

246 David Steele 6/15/2018 22:12 SAN FRANCISCO

247 Christine Ryan 6/15/2018 22:27 SanFrancisco

248 Patrick Kitto 6/15/2018 22:49 San Francisco

249 Scott Perry 6/16/2018 3:53 San Francisco

250 Chris H Takimoto MD 6/16/2018 9:13 Menlo Park

251 Casey Passmore 6/16/2018 15:25 Pacifica

252 Joseph Swisher 6/16/2018 15:35 Berkeley

253 Bruce Halperin 6/16/2018 23:33 San Francisco

254 Steve Sergeant 6/16/2018 23:36 San Jose

255 Thomson Yeh 6/17/2018 16:31 Palo Alto

256 Laurie Bieman 6/17/2018 19:37 Santa Clara

257 Michael Bieman 6/17/2018 19:38 Santa Clara

258 Antonio Rose 6/17/2018 19:38 San Francisco

259 Noriko Nakano 6/17/2018 20:37 San Mateo

260 Dave 6/18/2018 1:43 SF

261 Leif Wehrenberg 6/18/2018 5:21

262 Scott Toh 6/18/2018 15:13 San Mateo

263 Chuck Kamzelinski 6/18/2018 18:52 San Francisco

Bikes are critical for last mile commute on both sides of the Caltrain commute. Bike capacity on Caltrain with capacity for riders to sit near their bikes to prevent theft needs to be part of Caltrain’s design to serve the growing needs of commuters and relieve congestions on the freeways.

Greatly needed.

More capacity for bikes is urgently needed!

I support more capacity on electrified Caltrain and seats within view of bikes to deter bicycle theft.

We need to encourage biking. Given error Caltrain stops in the city, we need to have a bike to get around once we make it to the city.

Am from France, and am really enjoying bike cards here, keep it up!

Even the current level of bike capacity is not enough. Please don’t reduce it! And since you can’t lock your bike in the train, watching it is the only way to keep someone from just walking off with your transportation. Plus, we need to be doing all we can to encourage people to use active transportation instead of cars.

Bikes are sustainable transportation. Please support them. Most people have issues with bookends of commute and bikes solve this perfectly.

Bikes are critical for last mile commute on both sides of the Caltrain commute. Bike capacity on Caltrain with capacity for riders to sit near their bikes to prevent theft needs to be part of Caltrain's design to serve the growing needs of commuters and relieve congestions on the freeways.

Greatly needed.

More capacity for bikes is urgently needed!

I support more capacity on electrified Caltrain and seats within view of bikes to deter bicycle theft.

We need to encourage biking. Given error Caltrain stops in the city, we need to have a bike to get around once we make it to the city.

Am from France, and am really enjoying bike cards here, keep it up!

Even the current level of bike capacity is not enough. Please don’t reduce it! And since you can’t lock your bike in the train, watching it is the only way to keep someone from just walking off with your transportation. Plus, we need to be doing all we can to encourage people to use active transportation instead of cars.

Bikes are sustainable transportation. Please support them. Most people have issues with bookends of commute and bikes solve this perfectly.

Bikes are critical for last mile commute on both sides of the Caltrain commute. Bike capacity on Caltrain with capacity for riders to sit near their bikes to prevent theft needs to be part of Caltrain's design to serve the growing needs of commuters and relieve congestions on the freeways.

Greatly needed.

More capacity for bikes is urgently needed!

I support more capacity on electrified Caltrain and seats within view of bikes to deter bicycle theft.

We need to encourage biking. Given error Caltrain stops in the city, we need to have a bike to get around once we make it to the city.

Am from France, and am really enjoying bike cards here, keep it up!

Even the current level of bike capacity is not enough. Please don’t reduce it! And since you can’t lock your bike in the train, watching it is the only way to keep someone from just walking off with your transportation. Plus, we need to be doing all we can to encourage people to use active transportation instead of cars.

Bikes are sustainable transportation. Please support them. Most people have issues with bookends of commute and bikes solve this perfectly.
I expect Caltrain and the state of California to incentivize biking to and from Caltrain. The first and last miles (2.5 miles in my case) are the most congested and are the most expensive to solve for (do you build transit to get to transit? do you build an infinite number of parking spaces?). More room for bikes, not less!

Maintain the ratio of 8:1 should be a good balance.

Of course we need bike space on the trains. People will continue to ride more and more as it is getting safer and more economical. Yes, you absolutely need to support the trend. It’s good public policy, good for the environment, and good for your riders’ health.

Please more room for bikes. There are times when it’s almost impossible to get off the train because of too many bikes and people in the bike car.

History has shown that supporting bikes on CalTrain has been a big win for CalTrain, traffic reduction, lower carbon footprint, healthy commuters. But we won’t bring our bikes if we can’t secure them.

I currently actively avoid taking my bike on CalTrain because of the sketchy setup.

I love bike/CalTrain commuting! Please continue to make it accessible to many. Sitting far away from your bike is very unsettling and stressful. It is critical to have some seating in view of bikes. Thank you!

no one should worry about their bike while commuting to work.

If you take a morning train from the peninsula to SF, you can see the great number of cyclists on board... and the difficulties with constrained space and high participation in mass transit.

I would be very worried about leaving my bike where I couldn’t watch it. And I’m sure you already know that there aren’t enough spaces for bikes currently on many of the trains. I can fortunately avoid crowded trains, but when I cannot, it reminds me of unpleasant this is, much worse than it is for pedestrian passengers. I support all reasonable measures to make mass transit more enjoyable, including higher bicycle capacity.

Watch it or lock it - that’s the rule. Unless I can lock it to the train wall, sitting where I can’t see my bike is not a viable option.

Let’s communicate with our fellow bike car riders to make sure everybody’s aware of the misguided Caltrain plans for bikes! It’s a matter of survival for the Bay Area affecting both bikers and non-bikers.

Please don’t reduce bike capacity on Caltrain! Seats with a view of parked bikes allow me to leave my bike unlocked which will speed up boarding and unboarding.

Being able to take one’s own bike on board and make sure it doesn’t get stolen is essential to many people, including me, who have to run multiple errands with their bikes during the day outside of “downtown” areas. Maintain or improve bike capacity with seats in view of bikes!

IF your bike isn’t with you, its not your’s. If I can’t sit near my bike so I can see it, its anyone’s who want to take it away.

Please assure additional bicycle capacity on new Caltrain cars & also seating near bikes.
I depend on taking my bike on Caltrain to get to work. I've been bumped before due to lack of space and the bike cars as is are often overcrowded and very difficult to navigate. More trains and more people taking trains will no doubt mean more (people with) bikes. Looking forward to the updated caltrain service and fleet and hoping that Caltrain will continue to be a transportation option that encourages and facilitates bike riding.

We need to keep enough bike space on the trains so that people leave their cars at home and commute by bike + train instead. We're already lucky to have this (most trains in Europe and France don't have that) but it could be even better when you see how crowded it can be in the morning.

Bike theft has been a problem and we need everyone's cooperation to prevent it. "I want to ride my bicycle I want to ride it where I like." --Queen

Eight car electric trains good idea.

Bikes greatly expand the reach of who Caltrain can serve. We need more space for bikes and riders on Caltrain. And bicyclists should always be in view of their bikes to prevent theft. 8 car electric trains with 96 bike spaces per train would be best. Thanks!

Please don't make it harder for bicycle commuters to use public transit!

Over the last 10 years the Caltrain Board has made commitments to improve on-board bike capacity. Caltrain needs to live up to these promises to increase on-board bike capacity with electric trains. The train car design needs to allow cyclists to sit near their bikes. If they are not sitting close enough to stop a thief, your are setting up a system that will encourage people to steal bicycles. To more people who can safely take their bikes on-board, the more people who will leave their cars at home and use Caltrain.

I always sit above / near my bike to make sure it isn't stolen. I have a bit of a bike commute to get to the caltrain and it is important that my bike not get damaged / stolen. Just as important is that I'm able to have space on the train for my bike. Getting bumped from a train makes an already long commute more miserable.

We need more bike cars, as well as seats to view our bikes during transit please!

thank you!!

At least it should be better enforced that bike car seats are for people with bikes

At least it should be better enforced that bike car seats are for people with bikes
More seats within view of bike storage!

I have contacted Caltrain a couple times in the past because of this issue. Great to see a unified petition!

We need more seats!

Reducing bike space is not the answer. If Caltrain had a lot more frequent trains and reliability then we could potentially discuss the number of bike spaces, but without that you are not solving anything.

As the Bay Area grows we need to increase bike capacity. The new trains are inadequate in this as well as the lack of dedicated seats so that we can keep an eye on our bikes. For some of us it's not just a bike but our livelihood!

I depend on the train to commute everyday. As it stands now there is barely enough room for bikes, sometimes racks being overfilled. I urge Caltrain to maintain the 8 car trains and increase service during rush hours.

Never had my bike stolen yet, largely due to always sitting near it!

What is Caltrain doing to prevent bike thefts if owners cannot sit within view of their bikes? Not all owners can sit next to their bikes, but some watching bikes will make a difference. Also post in the cars that bike thieves will be jailed and fined on the spot.

I have been taking the bicycle train to work everyday for 5 years. As someone who has had his bicycle stolen from the train, I fully support this petition.

It is very important to have seats within view of the bikes.

Increase capacity, and ensure a layout that allows riders to be in view of their bikes, both for increased speed boarding and deboarding as well as theft prevention!

The Bay Area economy makes it very difficult for most people to live near their workplace. Commuting by car is not feasible, and Caltrain is the only public transit option that runs the full length of the Peninsula and that doesn't run on the same roads that make car commuting impossible. But since Caltrain is not a highly ramified system, like a subway, it is critical to continue to provide "last mile" solutions for both ends of the commute. We need bicycle capacity, and we need seats in view of our bicycles.

Bicycle theft happens today, when riders can sit close to their bikes. If riders aren't close, as with the current design, thieves will have a field day! The current design is a predictable disaster in the making.

Pls improve bike safety and usage on Caltrain!!

I have commented on every previous petition and request for comments, but I’ll say it again: the more bike capacity the better.

Please don't make this dumb move of eliminating safety of the bikes.

In this city is impossible to have a car which is why I use a bicycle all the time. We need more capacity in Caltrain to commute

We must have seats with a view of the bikes! The alternative is to stand next to the bike, which when many people do will cause train delays in addition to being hugely inconvenient. Caltrain is advertising itself as the most bike friendly commuter option in the country, let's keep it that way.

In an already crowded and at-capacity bike car commute, limiting the number bike spaces is a major cause of concern.

I had someone try to take my bike once and if I hadn't been within view of my bike they would have succeeded, and I don't even have a very nice bike. As a graduate student, bike + Caltrain makes it more feasible to live in the Bay on a graduate student stipend.
I appreciate current Caltrain bicycle access, but capacity is at its limit during high use times and requires more, not less bicycle availability as electrification proceeds and demand increases. Theft is an issue now and the data will inevitably show an increase in bike theft if seating is not available in the bicycle storage area. Theft seems like a future liability issue for Caltrain, given the high probability that the number of thefts will increase with the new design proposal.

We need 8 car trains!

Electrified Caltrain is going to be an improvement over the existing system. That being said, we should not forget the needs of cyclists during this change. Caltrain’s support of bikes is already great, let’s use this opportunity to go further! Please add capacity for more bikes on the new electrified Caltrain.

Biking to the train is a critical part of my commute. If there isn’t room for my bike, I’ll have to drive 25 min to the train every day which somewhat defeats the purpose of using public transit.

I use the train to commute daily, and often there is barely enough space for bikes today (on the 6:59am NB train and SB trains from 5-7pm). Fewer bike spots would mean I wouldn’t be able to use my bike, and I’m not sure I’d be able to use public transit if I couldn’t use my bike. Furthermore, bike theft is a huge concern for me; if I can’t get a seat nearby, I’ll usually loiter in the bike car. I see others do the same. That’s not efficient for anyone.

Please honor the 8:1 seat:bicycle ratio that Caltrain promised in 2017.

We need to watch our bikes!

I look forward to electrifying the train, but please include the bike commuters as well!

Bike thefts are real. The conductors warn of it. People (thieves) get on with no bike and disembark with a bike.

Bikes and trains make a wonderful couple. Let their love flourish!

Caltrain is useless without bike capacity. If anything, overall capacity should be increased.

We need to increase bike capacity in order to encourage all to ride, it’s the most complete solution to our congestion and smog.

Doing the right thing for the future!

I don’t need my bike stolen. Caltrain should make it easier for customers to keep an eye on their property instead of making it easier for theft to happen.

I commute with my bike everyday and always try to keep an eye on my bike. A few months ago I witnessed a transient attempt to steal someone else’s bike (a nice road bike with a carbon frame) - the owner of the bike was not sitting within view of his bike because there weren’t enough seats. Fortunately, I, along with a few other cyclists, were able to prevent him from stealing the bike and we got the bike back safely to its owner.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date/Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jason Traughber</td>
<td>6/30/2018 17:46</td>
<td>San Bruno</td>
<td>I support increasing the number of cars to transport bicycles to deter property theft and encourage commuting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Brady</td>
<td>6/30/2018 22:06</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>We definitely need more bike capacity!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Crossman</td>
<td>7/1/2018 0:12</td>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Finn</td>
<td>7/1/2018 3:34</td>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radu Kopetz</td>
<td>7/1/2018 19:13</td>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolas Cejilecz</td>
<td>7/1/2018 20:02</td>
<td>San Bruno</td>
<td>I would like to be able to see my bike while I'm on the train so nobody walks off with it when I can not see it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liam Kelly</td>
<td>7/2/2018 1:33</td>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meredith Tockey</td>
<td>7/2/2018 2:20</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlin</td>
<td>7/2/2018 15:03</td>
<td>SAN FRANCISCO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Ryan</td>
<td>7/2/2018 16:38</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>Seeing the bike is a must when on the train, thefts are way too common.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youzun</td>
<td>7/2/2018 16:46</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nina Sua</td>
<td>7/2/2018 16:46</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron M</td>
<td>7/2/2018 17:01</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steuart Westerman</td>
<td>7/2/2018 17:25</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah McCurdy</td>
<td>7/2/2018 17:41</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary s</td>
<td>7/2/2018 19:06</td>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td>We need space on trains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phelan Bybee</td>
<td>7/2/2018 20:41</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>I bike to work 3 times a week on CalTrain. Not sure how this will be implemented but I want more bike space and seats in a limited space area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guillermo Cornejo</td>
<td>7/3/2018 3:40</td>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcia Feigel</td>
<td>7/3/2018 5:01</td>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>Anything that meets the ratio is fine with me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciara Gallagher</td>
<td>7/3/2018 14:08</td>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Telleria</td>
<td>7/3/2018 14:30</td>
<td>Menlo Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Worthington</td>
<td>7/4/2018 9:55</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Smith</td>
<td>7/4/2018 1:34</td>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pat gonzalez</td>
<td>7/4/2018 18:41</td>
<td>Burlingame</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaine Nelson</td>
<td>7/4/2018 19:00</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Kirk</td>
<td>7/5/2018 15:38</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy langford-lee</td>
<td>7/5/2018 15:38</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesse Morris</td>
<td>7/6/2018 3:38</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl T Beek III</td>
<td>7/6/2018 14:37</td>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Chambers</td>
<td>7/6/2018 23:35</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>More space would be great- and I applaud creative thinking about that, but also some basic education for bikers: how to stack bikes so that everyone fits or don't bring on that electric bike that's basically a motorcycle. For non-bikers, there are plenty of other cars for you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriel N</td>
<td>7/8/2018 16:12</td>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Mizrahi</td>
<td>7/8/2018 16:18</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Kufer</td>
<td>7/8/2018 17:56</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Gonzalez</td>
<td>7/9/2018 0:48</td>
<td>Palo Alto, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stafan Gelger</td>
<td>7/9/2018 14:55</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Kemper</td>
<td>7/9/2018 17:39</td>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td>More bikes, less theft!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyle Link</td>
<td>7/9/2018 18:12</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keleste Bichel</td>
<td>7/9/2018 18:15</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Hinrich</td>
<td>7/9/2018 19:14</td>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Hand</td>
<td>7/9/2018 22:07</td>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td>Having to lock bikes onboard to prevent theft would induce significant delays and become unworkable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heung-Gyu Lim</td>
<td>7/9/2018 22:40</td>
<td>Foster City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Steinbaum</td>
<td>7/10/2018 0:46</td>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanya Maslach</td>
<td>7/10/2018 13:12</td>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Bircher</td>
<td>7/10/2018 14:13</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Maslach</td>
<td>7/10/2018 15:13</td>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>Please stand in support of configuring train car configuration to allow for secure storage of bicycles within train cars and reduce likelihood of increased bicycle theft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byron</td>
<td>7/12/2018 0:24</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanjay</td>
<td>7/12/2018 0:29</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avish Patel</td>
<td>7/12/2018 0:48</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill C</td>
<td>7/12/2018 1:09</td>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Bertrand</td>
<td>7/12/2018 1:18</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Begay</td>
<td>7/12/2018 1:38</td>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andee Tao</td>
<td>7/12/2018 1:58</td>
<td>San Bruno</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belinda Liu</td>
<td>7/12/2018 2:03</td>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Herzlinger</td>
<td>7/12/2018 2:45</td>
<td>Saratoga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giuseppe Puglisi</td>
<td>7/12/2018 15:54</td>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herman</td>
<td>7/12/2018 17:02</td>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>More bike spaces, please!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More bike cars. More seating! More conductors only allowing cyclists onto bike specific cars.

Keep cars off the road by keeping more bikes on trains.

I will sigh, but am curious doesn't electrification mean more trains per hour? So you will be able to support more bikes per hour. The statements from cal train and this petition are unclear.

Vote for electric train and more train route.

I support this initiative!

it has been too crowded in the current caltrain. cannot imagine we will have fewer sets and less bike capacity.

more bike capacity is critical. rush hour trains are already overloaded

If there is a reduction and less view to ensure no theft... then why am I paying more per year for service? If anything this would deter me from taking Cal Train and place more cars on the local roads.

Bike availability is critical to building a greener community - we can't encourage people to use more efficient modes of transportation if we don't have the infrastructure to support it!

I've seen theft and people trying to leave with bikes that aren't theirs. People need to be near their bikes.

As a commuter and transit user I support this petition and strongly do not want the new electric cars to feature only six cars because it would be a huge inconvenience for passangers and bike riders.

Let's be progressive in our thinking here. The need for a bike for the last mile is a real need for Silicon Valley. More bike cars can solve this demand.

I don't want my bike stolen

People should be able to sit near their bikes! There is constant confusion with folks that don't use destination tags. Not having seats in the bike car will ensure absolute chaos boarding at stations with high bike traffic and will increase delays caused by slow boarding.

Caltrain support of cyclists is critical to creating a car-free commute that is greener and clogs roads less than car/train or car commutes. Ignoring cyclists during the change to electric trains is going to encourage more wasteful transportation to and from Caltrain, like driving or using rideshare, or it will lead to people doing things like locking bikes on Caltrain or standing with bikes in order to protect their property, which will slow down the commute and defeat some of the gains of the trains going electric. Simple, thought-through cycling accommodations will make stops smoother and transitions faster, while keeping cyclists from losing their bikes.

I strongly support seats next to the bikes for the security of the bikes

The proposed configuration seems to invite chaos, as most riders want to be able to see their bicycles throughout the commute; getting bikes off and on the train at each station will take a great deal of time.
Very sad to say this, but I would not trust leaving my bike out of sight on the Caltrain ride. And "less bike capacity"?? If anything, the Caltrain should provide more bike capacity for environmental causes and convenience of passengers. Caltrain's plans for new bike cars without seating in view of the bikes is an unreasonable invitation to bike thieves. There are already some problems with vandalism and bike theft on the current bike cars, however, the cyclist community helps thwart those problems by keeping eyes on their own and other cyclists' bikes. Forcing cyclists to temporarily abandon their unlooked bikes on the lower level and out of view from the majority of this niche Caltrain community threatens cyclists' valuable property and means of personal transportation. Cycling and using mass transit are a popular alternative to driving clogged roadways, and will only become more popular in the fight to reduce global warming and pollution. Please run eight-car trains with 96 bike spaces/train and seating within view of bikes instead of six-car trains, which have fewer seats and less bike capacity than today's diesel trains.

We cyclists absolutely need to be able to see our bikes and react quickly if someone messes with it. Please correct this design oversight in the proposed electrified cars. Thanks.

Bicycles are essential to solving the 'last mile' problem for many public transit users. Space for bicycles is already scarce at peak times. The news about more frequent trains is very encouraging, but that does not eliminate the need for more bicycle capacity on every peak hour train trip.

Unless CalTrain is replacing stolen bikes, we don't need a rolling bike mall for bike thieves.

As a daily commuter who brings his bike on board the morning and evening bullet, I see firsthand the stress that bike cars at capacity causes. Please ensure adequate space for bikes and don't underestimate the chaos that would ensue at each stop if people had to shuffle between cars to board their bikes.

Bike cars are a great feature of Caltrain that increases ridership quite a bit. Without convenient view of my bike I would reconsider my transportation options and possibly ride Caltrain less.

Non bikers occupying seats in the cabinet car and bike thefts are known problem since I started using Caltrain in 2015. It's encouraging that now conductors of the busy train announce that allow bikers to board first. These are other few ideas to solve the problem: - Having more signs inside the bike car showing that this is the car for people who has bikes - Having colored signs at the Caltrain stations showing where the bike car is going to stop similar to BART

The bike cars are often cramped today. We need more capacity for bikes. Please find balance on the seat & bike capacity as it is essential to have people travel with bike able to stay with their investment. Thank you.

Watching the bikes is important. Even if it isn't full seats and has "leaning" seats that would go a long way

Encourage bikes instead of making it harder for them!

If you want more commuters on the train, please accommodate and think long term for a continuously GROWING population.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date/Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Hanson</td>
<td>7/27/2018 3:02</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire</td>
<td>7/27/2018 14:32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Weber</td>
<td>7/27/2018 14:49</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Pinch</td>
<td>7/27/2018 16:31</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Kammerer</td>
<td>7/27/2018 22:20</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunal Sangani</td>
<td>7/27/2018 23:36</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthias Bendell</td>
<td>7/28/2018 0:56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Davis</td>
<td>7/28/2018 15:04</td>
<td>Mountain View</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Muller</td>
<td>7/28/2018 18:18</td>
<td>Los Altos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Ellison</td>
<td>7/28/2018 19:52</td>
<td>Redwood City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Reed</td>
<td>7/29/2018 19:27</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe van Beumel</td>
<td>7/29/2018 20:07</td>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank San Miguel</td>
<td>7/29/2018 22:36</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>7/30/2018 14:29</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Lebenthal</td>
<td>7/30/2018 20:34</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Spickler</td>
<td>7/30/2018 20:59</td>
<td>Mountain View</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Gustafson</td>
<td>7/30/2018 21:20</td>
<td>San Mateo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Kashima</td>
<td>7/30/2018 21:23</td>
<td>San Mateo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauren Renuard</td>
<td>7/30/2018 22:10</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Leonian</td>
<td>7/30/2018 23:56</td>
<td>Mountain View</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genevieve Norman</td>
<td>7/31/2018 0:26</td>
<td>Redwood City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos Marin</td>
<td>7/31/2018 13:43</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javier Trueba</td>
<td>7/31/2018 13:45</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernando Marchant</td>
<td>7/31/2018 20:07</td>
<td>Redwood City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Crabill</td>
<td>8/1/2018 4:14</td>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocio Segura</td>
<td>8/1/2018 5:04</td>
<td>Mountain View</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfonso Ramirez</td>
<td>8/1/2018 15:42</td>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie Xu</td>
<td>8/1/2018 16:04</td>
<td>Saratoga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron Meberg</td>
<td>8/1/2018 23:28</td>
<td>Mountain View</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td>8/2/2018 0:06</td>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Hanes</td>
<td>8/2/2018 0:06</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurina Malaki</td>
<td>8/2/2018 0:56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thibault de Breagne</td>
<td>8/2/2018 1:05</td>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Powers</td>
<td>8/2/2018 1:08</td>
<td>San Rafael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Nieset</td>
<td>8/2/2018 1:09</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl Sorensen</td>
<td>8/2/2018 2:57</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Hoyt</td>
<td>8/2/2018 3:49</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy</td>
<td>8/2/2018 4:30</td>
<td>Foster City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Storti</td>
<td>8/2/2018 14:10</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Murphy</td>
<td>8/2/2018 17:32</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Pfefferkorn</td>
<td>8/2/2018 18:24</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reid Erickson</td>
<td>8/3/2018 2:21</td>
<td>Redwood City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Dowling</td>
<td>8/3/2018 19:00</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Johnson</td>
<td>8/4/2018 18:57</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I'm not so bothered by the lesser capacity of the individual trains as I imagine they'll run more frequently. I am however concerned about the threat of theft if I can't sit near my bike. If I can't sit near it I'd have to lock it every time I ride, causing greater disruption to everyone's overall commute.

More space for bikes is needed. Not less!

I like to be able to sit with my bike

Paying more for less! I've about had it with CalTrain! Get it together! Bike cars are overcrowded, and unsafe!

Please do not force bicyclists to chose between sitting for a long ride and potentially having their bike stolen due to their not watching it during the train ride.

Please provide for bikers the opportunity to watch their bikes. And acknowledge the volume of bikers riding Caltrain by providing reasonable capacity.

Daily commuter have very expensive bike don't want to lose it.

Daily commuter have very expensive bike don't want to lose it.

Bikes on board is great! Keep them safe and important.

There's barely enough capacity as it is. I always have to stand in the aisle of the bike car during commute hours. We need more bike cars, not less!

In addition to the theft issue, think of all the people that will want to stand near their bike to watch over it and how difficult it will make it to load and unload on a design of this type. Please reconsider bike car design to allow for seats within view of bikes.

As a young person using CalTrain for the first time this summer, I've been impressed and entertained by the number of Silicon Valley residents using wonderfully low-tech bikes, in combination with train, instead of their cars. There have been many weekdays where the bike cars were extraordinary full, sometimes leaving people standing in the aisle with their bikes throughout the ride. It would be disappointing for a renovation of the system to exacerbate the problem instead of alleviating it. I hope that, as the hero in Bay Area transit that dictates powerful how citizens contribute to traffic and greenhouse gas emissions, CalTrain will consider this revision to its plans.

Security cameras won't stop bike thefts. New bike cars will be choked with people trying to keep an eye on their bikes. If there's not going to be seating within view of bikes, people need to be able to lock them. Doesn't work with stacking. Seems like the worst option at every step was selected for the new bike cars.

Daily commuter Palo Alto to SF & back using bike & caltrain

Remember why there is mass transit. Let's reduce carbon emissions, improve efficiency in transportation infrastructure and make this easy with human powered transport. More bikes on trains help make this happen.

We have design objectives for a reason. Supporting bike commuting is important for the economy and environment. Common folks, stop pulling short cuts in the name of expediency we have heard that excuse to often. Do it right or don't do it at all.

I've witnessed too many bike thefts even in packed cars. Leaving bikes out of view of riders is an invitation for theft.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>Kastenbaum</td>
<td>8/6/2018</td>
<td>1:59</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>624</td>
<td>Carlos A Tarango</td>
<td>8/6/2018</td>
<td>17:06</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>625</td>
<td>Shannon Clark</td>
<td>8/7/2018</td>
<td>23:39</td>
<td>Redwood City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>626</td>
<td>Meaghan Brosnan</td>
<td>8/8/2018</td>
<td>21:53</td>
<td>Mountain View</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>628</td>
<td>Kawai Washburn</td>
<td>8/11/2018</td>
<td>12:58</td>
<td>San Carlos, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>629</td>
<td>Julie Ma</td>
<td>8/12/2018</td>
<td>18:21</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630</td>
<td>Alex Stowbunenko</td>
<td>8/12/2018</td>
<td>20:47</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>631</td>
<td>Corentin Fabry</td>
<td>8/14/2018</td>
<td>16:27</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>632</td>
<td>Alex Semfel</td>
<td>8/14/2018</td>
<td>21:29</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>633</td>
<td>Katie Desk</td>
<td>8/19/2018</td>
<td>1:11</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>634</td>
<td>Ximin Lao</td>
<td>8/23/2018</td>
<td>4:01</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>635</td>
<td>Rose Rastowicz</td>
<td>8/24/2018</td>
<td>15:15</td>
<td>Mountain View</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>636</td>
<td>Mark tidens</td>
<td>8/24/2018</td>
<td>17:11</td>
<td>Menlo Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>637</td>
<td>Walter Huf</td>
<td>8/27/2018</td>
<td>17:45</td>
<td>Santa Clara, CA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Caltrain you're electrifying the line to cut emissions, so why not help the rest of us also cut our emissions by making it less of a problem to use bikes? It takes me 30 minutes to walk to the station and 10 minutes on a bike, if I risk getting it stolen I might have to drive instead!

We need more space for bikes! Thank you!

Bike cars are already too crowded, we need more room to bring our last-mile transportation with us.
Dear Chair Bruins,

Thank you for making Caltrain correspondence packets available for review by the general public.

Please consider the following suggestions for additional improvements:

1) Board correspondence packets should be uploaded as searchable (not image) PDF documents to facilitate copying/pasting of specific issues in subsequent emails.

2) Hyperlinks should be enabled.

3) Attachments should be included. As an example my 8/17 email to the CAC included an attachment depicting station track layout and safety barriers designed to improve passenger safety while simultaneously increasing line speed and capacity (see attached). This attachment is missing from the August correspondence packet.

4) Existing Board policy mandates that “Any correspondence to be included in the Board reading file must be received by 10 a.m. the day before the Board meeting” (not the last day of the month prior to the Board meeting). A potential solution would be to post two correspondence packets per Board meeting:
   - The first packet would cover the period between the previous Board meeting cutoff date and the end of the month.
   - The second packet would cover the period between the first of the month and the Board meeting cutoff date.

5) Links to archived correspondence packets should be added retroactively to the list of materials for every archived Board meeting.

Sincerely,

Roland Lebrun
Dear Chair Bruins,

Please direct staff to provide information about the parcels to be sold, including APNs. This will assist members of the public and other interested parties in assessing whether this sale would result in undesirable impacts such as potential future reduction in line capacity and advise the Board accordingly.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of this request.

Roland Lebrun

I am enclosing an example of the kind of information provided by the VTA when disposing of similar assets.
Mr. Chu,

Thank you for your message.

Caltrain has been working on ways to address this issue. We realize that the single tracking impacts can be confusing for the riders, and we agree that improvements are needed.

Given the increase in single tracking locations throughout the corridor, we are taking additional steps to increase rider awareness. The following steps are being taken:

- Enhanced signage (more eye catching A-frames and clearer language)
- Additional signage (not only will signs be at the visual message system area, they will be placed at the entrance and exits to the platforms)
- VMS improvements (visual messaging displays will now display “platform closed”)
- Dedicated website page (one step place to understand where single tracking is occurring)

Our apologies for the confusion that this has caused. If you additional feedback, questions or concerns, please let me know.

Seamus P. Murphy | Caltrain, SamTrans, SMCTA
Chief Communications Officer
1250 San Carlos Avenue | San Carlos, CA 94070
650.508.6388 | murphy@samtrans.com

From: Kuenley Chu [mailto: ]
Sent: Thursday, August 30, 2018 8:24 PM
To: Board (@caltrain.com); Bartholomew, Tasha; Lieberman, Dan; Communications; Fromson, Casey
Subject: Fwd: Single track operation stranding passengers

Dear Caltrain Board, communications team, managers --

I wrote to you previously about this issue, but the situation has not improved and I have to repeat that your lack of consideration and planning for passengers during single track operations is STRANDING PEOPLE! You need to do something about this urgently.

As your single track operations increase, the announcement your system makes to inform about this situation is INADEQUATE.

When trains are operating on the wrong track, all that passengers hear and see over the audio or visual sign is that "All passengers board from the southbound platform", for example.

BUT THERE ARE NO SIGNS TELLING PEOPLE WHAT A "SOUTHBOUND PLATFORM" IS. ONLY TRAIN PERSONNEL THINK WITH THE WORDS "NORTHBOUND" AND "SOUTHBOUND". ANYONE NOT PAYING ATTENTION WILL NOT PERCEIVE FROM THE ROBOTIC VOICE THAT SOMETHING UNUSUAL IS HAPPENING. THE TRAIN ARRIVAL TIMER STILL APPEARS ON THE SIDE OF THE PLATFORM PEOPLE EXPECT TO BOARD NORMALLY FROM. PEOPLE ARE BEING CONFUSED BY YOUR INCOMPETENCE AND ARE BEING LEFT BEHIND.

I have witnessed over the last few days dozens of people being left behind surprised at various stations, on the wrong platform. They have to wait another hour for a train late at night.

This is getting ridiculous, and you need to do something about this. Someone at Caltrain needs to take responsibility for fixing this problem from the perspective of a passenger.

Thank you.

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Kuenley Chiu <kuenley@gmail.com>
Date: Thu, Mar 29, 2018 at 7:47 AM
Subject: Single track operation stranding passengers
To: <communications@caltrain.com>, <liebermand@samtrans.com>,
<bartholomewt@samtrans.com>

Dear Caltrain communications team --
When you conduct single track operations at night, for example having the northbound trains arrive on southbound platforms, you are continuing to strand and leave behind passengers because of the inadequacy of your announcements. I previously wrote to the website email form about this, but received a pathetic canned response, and nothing has been done and people are continuing to be left behind on the correct track. You are failing your duty to your passengers here.

The automated voice / recording which says "all passengers board from the southbound platform" is ineffective in conveying the urgency / unusual nature of the situation. That robotic voice does not give anyone the sense that something needs to be done. It is only by the courtesy of fellow passengers that (sometimes) people are warned to go to the correct (incorrect) track.
You need to have the announcement say something like, "attention, attention, attention -- northbound trains are stopping on the opposite track" or something that conveys urgency. Or put a human voice to make the recording. "Attention all passengers" is not enough.
I cannot believe that you have not solved this, given how frequently it unfortunately occurs. And at night, when passengers have only 1 chance to get it right or wait another hour, this is unacceptable. Please do something about this, immediately!
Thank you.
Good morning,
I have forwarded this information to staff.

Thank you,
Cindy Gumpal

---

From: Petito, Barbara [mailto:PetitoB@amtrak.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 18, 2018 5:38 AM
To: Board (@caltrain.com)
Subject: RE: "Operation Clear Track" Safety Detail In Your Community

Hi Cindy,
I'm just following up to let you know if you haven’t registered yet for Operation Clear Track next Tuesday, today is the last day to do so.
If you have please ignore this!
Thank you...
Barb Petito
Amtrak Police

---

From: Gumpal, Cindy <GumpalC@samtrans.com> On Behalf Of Board (@caltrain.com)
Sent: Friday, September 14, 2018 11:56 AM
To: Berry, Annette Rene <Annette.Berry@amtrak.com>
Cc: Petito, Barbara <PetitoB@amtrak.com>
Subject: RE: "Operation Clear Track" Safety Detail In Your Community

Good morning,
Yes, I will forward this email to the Caltrain Transit Police and staff.

---

Thank you,

**Cindy Mamaradlo-Gumpal**
Executive Office
1250 San Carlos Ave.
San Carlos, CA 94070-3006
Direct Line: (650) 508-6279
Cell: (650) 465-1058
Email gumpalc@samtrans.com
Good Day Caltrain Executive,

This is Barbara Petito at Amtrak Police Headquarters in Washington DC. We are organizing a railroad safety detail later this month and wanted to invite Caltrain Transit Police to participate, especially those that have unfortunately responded to a train-related vehicle or trespasser strike. The information on the operation is below and includes the two attachments here.

Would there be a way to get this out to all of your members? I have been contacting law enforcement officials one by one in each state, and I fear I will be long dead by the time I reach every department in the 46 states where Amtrak operates.

Please advise if this is something that can be disseminated by your organization.

Thank you Sir.

Be safe.

Respectfully,

Barbara Petito

Barbara A. Petito
Amtrak Police Department
Lead Program Specialist
900 2nd Street NE
Suite 110
Washington, DC 20002

(202) 906-3337
Cell Phone: 717-439-2925
ATS: 777-3337
Petitob@amtrak.com

AMTRAK
Dear Caltrain Transit Police Official,

This email is your official invitation to participate in “Operation Clear Track” on **Tuesday, September 25, 2018** hosted by Amtrak and Operation Lifesaver Inc. to mark National Rail Safety Week. If you can devote three hours to railroad safety on this day, we would be honored to have you as a member of our national railroad safety law enforcement team.

As background, “Operation Clear Track” is a one-day safety initiative that brings police and sheriff’s departments together nationwide to enforce state grade crossing and trespassing laws on America’s railroad tracks.

Since its inception last year, we have enhanced the operation by allowing each department to set their own schedules and determine which railroad grade crossings they would like to cover during the requested three-hour enforcement period. On **September 25th**, participants will be asked to report to at least two different railroad grade crossings in their communities to issue verbal/written warnings or citations to individuals trespassing on railroad property or failing to comply with state grade crossing safety laws. The three-hour commitment can be carried out all at once or spread out over different shifts throughout the day.

Attached is a letter from our Police Chief with more information on the event and a link to register your department and request free pocket safety cards that Amtrak will ship to you for public distribution during the enforcement window. I have also provided the link here: [https://operationlifesaver.wufoo.com/forms/operation-clear-track-signup-form/](https://operationlifesaver.wufoo.com/forms/operation-clear-track-signup-form/)

If you agree to participate, please register today and put in your request for cards ASAP as we are trying to bring more than 400 law enforcement agencies on board as this year’s goal.

We hope you and your staff can dedicate this time to railroad safety to keep your community safe. We look forward to working with you on this critical safety initiative. Please contact me if you have any questions or concerns.

Thank you and be safe.

Respectfully,

Barbara Petito

*Amtrak Police Department*
*Lead Program Specialist*
*900 2nd Street NE Suite 110*
*Washington, DC 20002*
*(202) 906-3337 Cell Phone: 717-439-2925*
Dear Chair Shaw and members of the Citizens Advisory Committee,

Please direct staff to repost the September 19th CAC agenda as a searchable PDF as I am unable to search, copy or click on any of the hyperlinks contained within the agenda.  

Thank You.

Roland Lebrun

CC
Caltrain Board
Caltrain BAC
SFCTA CAC
VTA CAC
Hi there! I am currently on the #222 train (boarded at San Mateo-getting off in Menlo) and in San Mateo I was waiting with three other bikers to board the train. The conductor was very nice about it but had to bump the three others (thankfully I get to the station early to avoid being bumped myself).

When I got in the train I noticed a few racks with only 3 bikes and quite a bit of space but the conductor abides by the 40 TOTAL bikes -thus bumped the others. Just wanted to let someone know -and show a pic- to indicate the plethora of space, even with the max amount of bikes. I definitely understand the safety issue but thought, in a situation like this, it warrants a conversation to help out those bikers who are bumped but could possibly have been accommodated.

Thanks for listening-

Dana

(FYI- I did ask everyone in the bike car for permission to take this photo)
From: Martin Sommer (mobile) [mailto:martin@]
Sent: Friday, September 21, 2018 5:05 PM
To: Sebez, Robert; Rios, Rona
Subject: RE: Disrespectful and unprofessional engineer

Thanks Robert, this is a good synopsis of our call. I look forward to hearing the results you find, and the action that is taken.
Welcome aboard on your new position!
Martin
--
Martin Sommer

http://www.linkedin.com/in/martinsommer

"Turn technical vision into reality."

-------- Original message --------
From: "Sebez, Robert"
Date: 9/21/18 4:21 PM (GMT-08:00)
To: martin@sommer.net, "Rios, Rona"
Subject: RE: Disrespectful and unprofessional engineer

Mr. Sommer,

It was a pleasure speaking with you today. I wanted to make sure I recapped our conversation so that Rona is filled in. Please read below and let me know if there is anything I may missed. Our conversation began by reviewing the series of occurrences of what appears to be excessive train horn use near Palo Alto. We discussed that you have observed several times over the past year. It had also been brought to my attention that the horn cadence is not that of a typical horn sequence, but rather a sequence in a playful manner. We talked about the location of your residence in relation to the nearest crossings in the station so that I could better understand where a mandated horn sequence would initiate. It has been brought to my attention that on these instances, the engineer had initiated these particular horn sequences after the highway grade crossing at Alma.

For the purpose of ruling out the possibility of the engineer initiating a mandated horn sequence, we went over some applicable rules and regulations. We both agreed that it was unlikely due to roadway workers working along the right of way based off your observations and my research.

We discussed the actions that have taken place up until this point which includes a review with the engineer, followed by a compliance audit conducted at Palo Alto Station for rules pertaining to horn sequences. I made you aware that currently I have requested data from the event recorder and if available, footage from the inward and outward facing cameras from the
night on 9/17.
Lastly, we discussed that I will be reviewing all of the information available and any findings of the use of a train horn will result in disciplinary action.
I appreciate your patience with this issue Mr. Sommer. Please feel free to contact me any time regarding this matter.
Thank you,
Robert

From: martin@.
Sent: Thursday, September 20, 2018 3:26 PM
To: Rios, Rona ; Sebez, Robert
Subject: Re: Disrespectful and unprofessional engineer

Thanks Rona!

Hi Robert, I look forward to hearing back from you.

Martin

--
Martin Sommer

http://www.linkedin.com/in/martinsommer

"Turn technical vision into reality."

On 2018-09-20 15:14, Rios, Rona wrote:

Hi Mr. Sommer,
Please know that Ben Burns has transitioned into a different position and will no longer be responding to these types of concerns. I have copied Mr. Robert Sebez who will be his replacement. Mr. Sebez has informed me that he is in fact looking in to what exactly happened the night of 9/17 and will be getting back to you as soon as he has the information he needs.
I apologize for the frustration this is causing and thank you for your patience.
Rona Rios
Manager, Customer Service|Distribution
SamTrans|Caltrain|SMCTA
1250 San Carlos Avenue
San Carlos, CA. 94070
riosr@samtrans.com

From: martin@
Sent: Monday, September 17, 2018 9:37 PM
To: Burns, Ben
Cc: Rios, Rona; Board (@caltrain.com)
Subject: Re: Disrespectful and unprofessional engineer

Ben,

9:31pm, 09/17/2018, South bound Caltrain into University Ave Station, your engineer blows
"Turn technical vision into reality."

On 2018-07-23 21:26, Burns, Ben wrote:

Hello Mr. Sommer,
I will follow up with your observations. Two horn cadences are required when a train releases its brakes and initiates movement. However, the seven horn sequence will have to be investigated. I appreciate you notifying me and I will contact the contractor's management team tomorrow.
Kind regards,
Ben

Sent from VMware Boxer

On Jul 23, 2018 8:41 PM, Martin Sommer wrote:

Ben,

Your engineer is up to his "personal tones" again. At 8:30pm heading south, we received 7 horn blast coming into the Palo Alto University Ave station, and 2 going out. Nine horn blast at a station is excessive, and out of line. There was no emergency, or justification for his actions.

Can you please have this engineer removed from the Caltrain line? Either you are not passing on the message, he is insubordinate to authority, or he is drinking on the job, and is unconscious of his actions. We do not need him, running our public transportation!

Martin

--
Martin Sommer

http://www.linkedin.com/in/martinsommer

"Turn technical vision into reality."

On 2018-04-20 17:24, Martin Sommer wrote:

Hi Ben,

Your engineer is starting his "personal tones" again coming into the University Ave station in Palo Alto. He just rolled in with 7 horn blows coming in, and 1 going out (total of 8). I have to wonder, if he is not drinking or ding drugs on the job?

Can you please check into this? It was the 5:14pm south bound train, into University Ave Palo Alto.

Thank you,
his horn 9 times; 7 coming in, and 2 going out. Are quality engineers that hard to find? What do we need to do, to stop this guy?

Martin

--

Martin Sommer

http://www.linkedin.com/in/martinsonomer

"Turn technical vision into reality."

On 2018-08-11 15:10, i wrote:

Ben,

If I do not hear back from you on this issue, I will look into filing a FRA Violation investigation. I think this engineer is having serious mental/drinking/drugs issues, and we do not need this in our area.

Martin

--

Martin Sommer

http://www.linkedin.com/in/martinsonomer

"Turn technical vision into reality."

On 2018-08-08 21:34, t wrote:

Ben,

Your engineer is up to his 9 horns blows in Palo Alto again. Can you please give me a direct contact with the operator out of Missouri? I feel that our efforts, are not getting anywhere.

Thank you,

Martin

--

Martin Sommer

http://www.linkedin.com/in/martinsonomer
Martin Sommer

http://www.linkedin.com/in/martinsommer

"Turn technical vision into reality."
On 2018-02-28 07:32, Burns, Ben wrote:
Mr. Sommer,
Thank you for reaching out and informing us about this Engineer. I did reach out to the contractor and their management team did review the Engineer's event recorder. You were absolutely correct in your observation of the individual’s whistle/bell sequence. The contractor's management team has spoken to this individual and coached him on his use of the bell and whistle. Again, I appreciate your field data and we will continue to ensure our Engineer’s follow the whistle/bell policy put in place. Have a great rest of your week.
Best regards,
Ben

From: Rios, Rona <riosr@samtrans.com>; Burns, Ben <BurnsB@samtrans.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 2018 9:50 AM
To: Rios, Rona <riosr@samtrans.com>; Burns, Ben <BurnsB@samtrans.com>
Cc: Board (@caltrain.com) <BoardCaltrain@samtrans.com>
Subject: Disrespectful and unprofessional engineer

Dear Rona and Ben,

You have a train engineer, that seems to live in his own world, with no personal respect for others. Ben, you and I have discussed this engineer, who has his own personal horn sequence, for entering the Palo Alto University Ave station. It is seven (yes, 7) horn blows coming in, and two exiting, with a grand total of 9 horn blows per visit.

This engineer used to be on the 6:54 pm south bound train entering Palo alto, and now he is doing his sequence at 1:02 am, when most people are trying to sleep. Last night, he woke our entire family, and since my place looks down at the station, I can guarantee you that there was no imminent danger of someone being on the tracks.

Can you please get this engineer to stop? Ben, you mentioned that some of these guys have been doing this for 30 years, well, times have changed. If he is not able to adjust, please have him removed.

Thank you,

Martin
Mr. Moore,

Thank you for your comment. There are current discussions taking place between the JPB, VTA and Union Pacific Railroad Executives about additional service between Tamien and Gilroy. The UPRR owns the tracks...the VTA owns the service.....and the JPB provides the service. This is a very political process to discuss operational slots, Operational Costs and equipment and crew availability to support. Thank you for your patience.

Please let me know if you need additional information.

Thank you,
Cindy Gumpal
650-508-6279

Good Afternoon Board of Directors,

I am working on some research about Bay Area transit and have run into one specific question:

1. Are there plans to increase the frequency of trains to the Blossom Hill Caltrain station? If so, when do you think the increase in frequency would occur?

Any information on this and the Blossom Hill Caltrain Station would be greatly appreciated!

Thanks,
Nolan
Holiday GP Corp. ("HFF"). CA Dureau of Real Estate Lic. #01365740

Important Disclosure. This email from Holiday Forcogio Fowler, L.P. or any of its affiliates (collectively, "HFF") may contain confidential or proprietary information. If you are not the intended recipient, please advise by return e-mail and delete immediately without reading, copying or forwarding to others. Except as otherwise expressly stated to the contrary, nothing contained in this message or any attachment hereto, constitute an offer to buy or sell, or a solicitation of an offer to buy or sell, any security, property, interest or other asset and does not constitute a binding obligation of any kind, any official confirmation of any transaction or an official statement of HFF. Please further note that absent an agreement in writing between the recipient and HFF, HFF has no duty to restrict the use or disclosure of any information sent to HFF by recipient.
-----Original Message-----
From: Rios, Rona
Sent: Tuesday, September 25, 2018 6:52 PM
To: Le, Jenny; Zaidi, Irfan
Cc: Gumpal, Cindy
Subject: RE: Fare Payment Error

Hi Jenny,
Can you help Mr. Lee with his p-ticket access problem?

Thanks!
Rona

________________________________________
From: Board (@caltrain.com)
Sent: Tuesday, September 25, 2018 4:39 PM
To: Rios, Rona
Subject: FW: Fare Payment Error

Hi Rona,
Can you provide a response to Mr. Lee or direct me to the correct staff.

Thanks,
Cindy
From: Philip Lee
Sent: Thursday, September 20, 2018 6:30 PM
To: Board (@caltrain.com)
Subject: Fare Payment Error

Hello,

My name is Philip and I unfortunately reviewed a ticket for accidental fare evasion (Violation Number 27000056 - Fare Evasion with Inadequate Fare Media). I intend on paying the ticket, but the website pticket.com/caltrain<http://pticket.com/caltrain> does not recognize my Violation Number. I have called multiple Caltrain ticketing numbers (800-660-4287 and 888-442-4088) and they fail to find my Violation Number on the database as well. Attached below is the message pticket.com<http://pticket.com> displays.

Please let me know the next steps I can take to settle my mistake. Would it be possible to search by driver's license number (the representatives I called were unable to do so)?

Thank you for your time,
Philip

Pticket.com/caltrain

No citations match the supplied criteria.

If the citation was recently issued, please allow 72 hours for the citation to appear in the system.