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: Post Mile From:</th>
<th>Post Mile To:</th>
<th>Toll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All funding in thousands of dollars</td>
<td>FY 2019/19</td>
<td>FY 2019/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 5307</td>
<td>$6,697</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 5309</td>
<td>$13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 5207</td>
<td>$5,166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON OTHER LOCAL</td>
<td>$2,970</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Programmed Funding:</td>
<td>$14,846</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: Post Mile From:</th>
<th>Post Mile To:</th>
<th>Toll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All funding in thousands of dollars</td>
<td>FY 2019/16</td>
<td>FY 2019/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE 5307</td>
<td>$11,259</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE OTHER FEDERAL</td>
<td>$17,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE OTHER LOCAL</td>
<td>$8,780</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE PROP</td>
<td>$9,290</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE SALES/MEASURE</td>
<td>$6,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 5307</td>
<td>$7,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 5309</td>
<td>$8,944</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON FED-DISC</td>
<td>$2,830</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON OTHER FEDERAL</td>
<td>$21,680</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON OTHER LOCAL</td>
<td>$60,507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON PROP</td>
<td>$104,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Programmed Funding:</td>
<td>$268,100</td>
<td></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 (EMUs).

**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: Post Mile From:</th>
<th>Post Mile To:</th>
<th>Toll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All funding in thousands of dollars</td>
<td>FY 2019/16</td>
<td>FY 2019/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV 5309</td>
<td>$3,677</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV OTHER LOCAL</td>
<td>$2,455</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV STP</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE OTHER LOCAL</td>
<td>$8,545</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSE CMAQ</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSE OTHER LOCAL</td>
<td>$1,309</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSE PROP</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSE SALES/MEASURE</td>
<td>$5,235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 5307</td>
<td>$40,667</td>
<td>$44,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 5309</td>
<td>$172,567</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON ST</td>
<td>$39,430</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON CARB</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON CMAQ</td>
<td>$11,168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON OTHER LOCAL</td>
<td>$186,323</td>
<td>$12,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON OTHER STATE</td>
<td>$142,942</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON PROP</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON RTP-LRP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON SALES/MEASURE</td>
<td>$38,693</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Programmed Funding:</td>
<td>$1,236,408</td>
<td>$57,366</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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## Transit Projects

### Caltrain

**TIP ID:** SM-03006B  
**County:** San Mateo  
**System:** Transit  
**RTP ID:** 17-10-0026  
**CTIPS:** 20600000391

**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>Post Mile From</th>
<th>Post Mile To</th>
<th>Toll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2018/19</td>
<td>FY 2019/20</td>
<td>FY 2020/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 5307</td>
<td>$10,378</td>
<td>$10,378</td>
<td>$10,378</td>
<td>$10,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 5337</td>
<td>$51,913</td>
<td>$51,913</td>
<td>$51,913</td>
<td>$51,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 5337</td>
<td>$2,157</td>
<td>$2,157</td>
<td>$2,157</td>
<td>$2,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON OTHER LOCAL</td>
<td>$26,868</td>
<td>$26,868</td>
<td>$26,868</td>
<td>$26,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON SALESTAX-MEASURE</td>
<td>$5,008</td>
<td>$5,008</td>
<td>$5,008</td>
<td>$5,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Programmed Funding</td>
<td>$151,100</td>
<td>$151,100</td>
<td>$151,100</td>
<td>$151,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TIP ID:** SM-050340  
**County:** San Mateo  
**System:** Transit  
**RTP ID:** 17-10-0027  
**CTIPS:** 20600000362

**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 93.128) - Operating assistance to transit agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Post Mile From</th>
<th>Post Mile To</th>
<th>Toll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2018/19</td>
<td>FY 2019/20</td>
<td>FY 2020/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 5307</td>
<td>$79</td>
<td>$79</td>
<td>$79</td>
<td>$79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON OTHER LOCAL</td>
<td>$1,462</td>
<td>$1,462</td>
<td>$1,462</td>
<td>$1,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Programmed Funding</td>
<td>$1,542</td>
<td>$1,542</td>
<td>$1,542</td>
<td>$1,542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TIP ID:** SM-050341  
**County:** Regional  
**System:** Transit  
**RTP ID:** 17-10-0026  
**CTIPS:** 20600000362

**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 93.128) - Construction or renovation of power, signal, and communications systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Post Mile From</th>
<th>Post Mile To</th>
<th>Toll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2018/19</td>
<td>FY 2019/20</td>
<td>FY 2020/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 5307</td>
<td>$6,496</td>
<td>$6,496</td>
<td>$6,496</td>
<td>$6,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 5308</td>
<td>$20,751</td>
<td>$20,751</td>
<td>$20,751</td>
<td>$20,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON 5337</td>
<td>$4,933</td>
<td>$4,933</td>
<td>$4,933</td>
<td>$4,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON OTHER LOCAL</td>
<td>$9,014</td>
<td>$9,014</td>
<td>$9,014</td>
<td>$9,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Programmed Funding</td>
<td>$44,183</td>
<td>$44,183</td>
<td>$44,183</td>
<td>$44,183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TIP ID:** SM-070348  
**County:** San Mateo  
**System:** Transit  
**RTP ID:** 17-07-0085  
**CTIPS:** 2060000393

**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>Post Mile From</th>
<th>Post Mile To</th>
<th>Toll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2018/19</td>
<td>FY 2019/20</td>
<td>FY 2020/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE OTHER LOCAL</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON PROP</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Programmed Funding</td>
<td>$15,500</td>
<td>$15,500</td>
<td>$15,500</td>
<td>$15,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Transit Projects

#### Caltrain

**TIP ID:** SM-130026  
**County:** San Mateo  
**System:** Transit  
**RTP ID:** 17-10-0026  
**CTIPS:** 2060000577

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

**Project Name:** Caltrain Control Point Installation  
**Description:** Caltrain: On the mainline in San Carlos: Install a new control point (rail crossover)  
**Air Quality Exempt Code:** 2.09 - EXEMPT (40 CFR 93.125) - Rehabilitation or reconstruction of track structures, track, and trackbed in existing rights-of-way

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Post Mile From</th>
<th>Post Mile To</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Prior Years</th>
<th>FY 2018/19</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>OTHER LOCAL</td>
<td>$ 1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2018/19</td>
<td>$ 1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>STP</td>
<td>$ 1,375</td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2019/20</td>
<td>$ 1,375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 1,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>OTHER LOCAL</td>
<td>$ 358</td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2020/21</td>
<td>$ 358</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>STP</td>
<td>$ 2,780</td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2021/22</td>
<td>$ 2,780</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 2,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Programmed</td>
<td>$ 6,493</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 6,493</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TIP ID:** SM-170005  
**County:** San Mateo  
**System:** Transit  
**RTP ID:** 17-10-0026  
**CTIPS:** 2060000612

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

**Project Name:** South San Francisco Caltrain Station Improvements  
**Description:** South San Francisco: SSF Caltrain Station: Demolish and reconstruct the existing station with a new ADA compliant station that meets current Caltrain standards  
**Air Quality Exempt Code:** 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Post Mile From</th>
<th>Post Mile To</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Prior Years</th>
<th>FY 2018/19</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>6327</td>
<td>$ 38,829</td>
<td>FY 2018/19</td>
<td>$ 38,829</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 38,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>SALES-TAX-MEASURE</td>
<td>$ 16,172</td>
<td>FY 2019/20</td>
<td>$ 16,172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 16,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2020/21</td>
<td>$ 55,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2021/22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Programmed</td>
<td>$ 55,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TIP ID:** SM-170010  
**County:** San Mateo  
**System:** Transit  
**RTP ID:** 17-10-0026  
**CTIPS:** 2080000627

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

**Project Name:** Caltrain TVM Rehab and Clipper Functionality  
**Description:** Caltrain: Systemwide: 45 existing TVM machines: Refurbish and incorporate Clipper functionality  
**Air Quality Exempt Code:** 2.04 - EXEMPT (40 CFR 93.126) - Purchase of office, shop, and operating equipment for existing facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Post Mile From</th>
<th>Post Mile To</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Prior Years</th>
<th>FY 2018/19</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>PSE</td>
<td>5907</td>
<td>$ 175</td>
<td>FY 2018/19</td>
<td>$ 175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSE</td>
<td>OTHER LOCAL</td>
<td>$ 44</td>
<td>FY 2019/20</td>
<td>$ 44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>OTHER LOCAL</td>
<td>$ 137</td>
<td>FY 2020/21</td>
<td>$ 137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>RTP-LRP</td>
<td>$ 2,144</td>
<td>FY 2021/22</td>
<td>$ 2,144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 2,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Programmed</td>
<td>$ 2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TIP ID:** SM-190002  
**County:** San Mateo  
**System:** Transit  
**RTP ID:** 17-07-0065  
**CTIPS:** null

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

**Project Name:** Peninsula Corridor Electrification Expansion  
**Description:** Caltrain: Electric Multiple Unit (EMU) fleet: Expand fleet through procurement of an additional 40 vehicles  
**Air Quality Exempt Code:** NON-EXEMPT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Post Mile From</th>
<th>Post Mile To</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Prior Years</th>
<th>FY 2018/19</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>OTHER LOCAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2018/19</td>
<td>$ 41,340</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 41,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>RTP-LRP</td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2019/20</td>
<td>$ 39,116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 39,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>SB1</td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2020/21</td>
<td>$ 123,162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 123,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>SB1</td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2021/22</td>
<td>$ 80,456</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 203,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Programmed</td>
<td>$ 203,638</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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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/Attachment</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit A - Scope of Work</td>
<td>6 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit B - Budget Detail and Payment Provisions</td>
<td>3 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit C - General Terms and Conditions</td>
<td>4 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit D - Special Terms and Conditions</td>
<td>3 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment 1 - Required Change Order</td>
<td>1 page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment 2 - Passing Tracks Conceptual Design</td>
<td>7 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment 3 - Invoice Requirements</td>
<td>1 page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment 4 - Approved Contractor List</td>
<td>1 page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment 5 - 25th Ave Grade Separation Cost Estimate and Funding Plan</td>
<td>1 page</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 (Other than an individual, state whether a corporation, partnership, etc.)**
Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Authority

**DATE SIGNED (Do not type)**
June 23, 2017

**PRINTED NAME AND TITLE OF PERSON SIGNING**
James Hartnett, Executive Director
Mark Simon

**ADDRESS**
1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070

**STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

**AGENCY NAME**
California High-Speed Rail Authority

**DATE SIGNED (Do not type)**
June 13, 2017

**PRINTED NAME AND TITLE OF PERSON SIGNING**
Thomas Fellanz, Interim Chief Executive Officer

**ADDRESS**
770 L Street, Suite 620, MS1 Sacramento CA 95814
### ADDITIONAL CONTRACTOR SIGNATURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRACTOR</th>
<th>DATE SIGNED (Do not type)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of San Mateo</td>
<td>JUNE 27, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

City of San Mateo

**PRINTED NAME AND TITLE OF PERSON SIGNING**

Larry Patterson, City Manager

**ADDRESS**

330 West 20th Avenue, San Mateo, CA 94403
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 ("PB/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 (JBP 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 "JBP 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 754910B 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
chanashamtrans.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
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

accounts payable@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.
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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 §8330 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.
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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.
EXHIBIT D: SPECIAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS

8 RIGHTS IN DATA

8.1 PCIPB 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 PCIPB is unable for any reason to complete the Grade Separation Project, ownership of Grade Separation Project plans will vest equally in the Authority, the PCIPB 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 PCIPB 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 PCIPB 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 PCIPB's indemnification of the Authority, PCIPB agrees to require any and all PCIPB contractors to list the Authority as an additional insured on all insurance required under the contract between the PCIPB and its PCIPB contractors. The PCIPB shall provide certificates of insurance to the Authority as evidence of the insurance coverage required herein. The PCIPB 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 PCIPB will require PCIPB'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 PCIPB.
ATTACHMENT 2

PASSING TRACKS – CONCEPTUAL DESIGN
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 PCIPB pursuant to JPB Contract 17-J-C-048 Modified)
- Current service billing period costs
- Signature of a PCIPB 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 PCIPB 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)
- Valh 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>Estimate (in $M)</td>
<td>Total Cost (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><strong>Sub-Total: Pre-Construction Phase</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 14.70</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 14.70</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Phase:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contract</td>
<td>$ 82.40</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><strong>Sub-Total: Construction Contract</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 104.40</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 122.78</strong></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>DSDC</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><strong>Sub-Total: Construction Support</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 45.79</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 45.79</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total: Construction Support Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 51.70</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 51.79</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total: Construction Phase</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 150.58</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 150.58</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Cost Estimate</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 165.28</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 165.28</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 25th Ave. Grade Separation Funding Plan

**6/11/17 Update**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised post bid opening</td>
<td>$ 165.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>August 2016 Post-Bid Estimate</th>
<th>CPUC</th>
<th>SMCTA</th>
<th>SM</th>
<th>HSR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post-Bid Estimate Ratio of Contribution</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
<td>41.11%</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>46.67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funding Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>August 2016 Post-Bid Estimate</th>
<th>CPUC</th>
<th>SMCTA</th>
<th>SM</th>
<th>HSR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ 180.00</td>
<td>$ 9.18</td>
<td>$ 67.95</td>
<td>$ 11.02</td>
<td>$ 77.13</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:

- Crossrail: 13 miles of twin-bore tunnels and two ¼ mile-long stations under existing buildings awarded in 2009 for under $2B.  
http://www.crossrail.co.uk/news/articles/crossrail-awards-major-tunnelling-contracts-worth-125bn

- 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:


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 & Towsend 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)

St Pancras domestic platforms 11, 12 & 13
Red Lion Square (London WC1) Crossrail crossover

Whitechapel Crossrail station (London E14) crossover
Dear Bike 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: Board [at caltrain.com]; cacsecretary [at caltrain.com]; CalMOD [at caltrain.com]
Subject: Please keep electrification on schedule.

Dear Chair Brunis 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 near 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 8:1 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>Neeraj 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>Erin Steinbauer</td>
<td>6/11/2018</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sacha Selimtorini</td>
<td>6/11/2018</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Demetrius Marcelis</td>
<td>6/11/2018</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fabian Falconett</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>Harry Marshman</td>
<td>6/11/2018</td>
<td>San Bruno</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Peter Coljin</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 Cordeiro</td>
<td>6/11/2018</td>
<td>SAN JOSE</td>
<td>More bikes mean less cars. Let's prioritize all the ways to get more cars off the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Ted Leechterman</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>Jude 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>More capacity for bikes is absolutely necessary to making Caltrain a viable transportation option for commuters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

More capacity for bikes is absolutely necessary to making Caltrain a viable transportation option for commuters.

Supporting people who commute on bikes is critical. Thank you.
Andrew Ness 6/11/2018 23:27 Oakland

I've witnessed many bike theft attempts on Caltrain. If it were not for being 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.

Brandon Paul 6/11/2018 23:27 REDWOOD CITY

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 gridlocked.


I support more bikes and ability to view them on Caltrain.

Scott Jung 6/11/2018 23:29 San Francisco


I currently stand in the bike rack on average 8 trips a week so I can watch my bicycle, rather than seeking a seat where it is not in clear view.

Mike Kahn 6/11/2018 23:29 San Bruno

MORE BIKE SPACES!!

Daniel Shore 6/11/2018 23:29 Redwood City

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.

David Haley 6/11/2018 23:30 Oakland

Have used my bike on Caltrain for 13 years.

Peter Delahanty 6/11/2018 23:31 San Mateo

Kurt Martin 6/11/2018 23:32 San Francisco


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.

LeAnn Baum 6/11/2018 23:33

Ellen Koivisto 6/11/2018 23:33 San Francisco

Shahin Saneinejad 6/11/2018 23:34 San Francisco

Charlotte Campbell 6/11/2018 23:34 Sunnyvale

Brad Taft 6/11/2018 23:36 San Francisco

Ed Ruder 6/11/2018 23:37 San Jose


Michelle Siding 6/11/2018 23:42 San Francisco

Reed Kennedy 6/11/2018 23:43 San Francisco

Jaron Hogeboom 6/11/2018 23:44 SAN FRANCISCO

Segue Fiachin 6/11/2018 23:47 Oakland

Alex Jacobs 6/11/2018 23:53 Berkeley

Aaron Verstraete 6/11/2018 23:53 San Francisco


David Giberon 6/11/2018 23:54 Belmont

Ryan Kifuric 6/11/2018 23:58 San Francisco

Scott Johnston 6/11/2018 23:58 San Francisco

Judith A Butts 6/12/2018 00:02 MOUNTAIN VIEW

Kevin Wang 6/12/2018 00:02 Santa Clara

John Luk 6/12/2018 00:03 San Mateo

Paul Bigbee 6/12/2018 00:04 Palo Alto

Tim O'Brien 6/12/2018 00:05 Belmont

Miguel Lopez Saenz 6/12/2018 00:09 San Francisco

Alex Herrick 6/12/2018 00:10 Menlo Park

Frank Payen 6/12/2018 00:10 San Jose

David Fisher 6/12/2018 00:13 San Mateo

Donna Weber 6/12/2018 00:15 Palo Alto

Steven B Rosen 6/12/2018 00:18 San Francisco

Philip Spiegel 6/12/2018 00:19 Redwood City

Bill Michel 6/12/2018 00:23 Redwood City

Patricia Elson 6/12/2018 00:24 Santa Clara

Chris Merrill 6/12/2018 00:25 San Francisco, CA

Tom Corboline 6/12/2018 00:26 San Bruno

Mike Youngberg 6/12/2018 00:26 San Bruno

Donald Tran 6/12/2018 00:26 Santa Clara

Ted Raab 6/12/2018 00:27 Redwood City

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.
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 stop 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. Thanks!

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 road.

1. Caltrain needs to use common-sense, bike-owner supervision and major theft deterrent, not video cameras, which have been proven ineffective. 2. Caltrain needs to follow its own adopted board policy of an 8:1 ratio of bike spaces to passenger seats and provide 96 bike spaces per train.

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, cal 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 eyesight of your bike is really important. It's really stressful to leave your bike a sit elsewhere. Bikes/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. Camerons 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-BF 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’s 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
allowed people to revolutionize their commutes. Don't lose momentum by limiting capacity and adding theft risk!

Current bike capacity is already lacking compared to demand. Do not further reduce it!

The reason why theft isn't a big problem currently is that potential thieves can't count on someone not watching their own bike. Keep bikes in view of at least some seats, and maintain bike capacity per car so there is room to expand with further population growth.

I live right next to a CalTrain station, so do use it. I would use it more if I was sure that there would be space on it for my return ride. I would use it less if I was unsure if my bike would be stolen.

I had to keep your unlocked car in a parking lot with the keys in it you would want to keep it in sight. I would want to get back near my bike on the train.

Having a realistic way for cyclists to bring bikes on board is of paramount importance in the new plan.

I have been a biker on Caltrain for 7 years and would definitely like to see more space for bikes!

One of the main reasons I don't ride Caltrain as often as I'd like to is the lack of bike space. Please don't take one step forward yet two steps back!

I frequently commute with a work stuff in a rear basket. It's important that I keep an eye on my bike.

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 accommodated 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.
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.
I stopped commuting to Palo Alto and changed jobs because there was not enough space for my bike.

I bring my bike on CalTrain from Bayshore to Menlo Park/Palo Alto almost every day. 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.

I bike to Caltrain and would appreciate more bike spots, not less!

I ride Caltrain Daily! Please add space for bikes!

As time goes on, there will only be MORE demand for bikes on trains. Do the work now to make that happen.

We need more bike spaces not fewer.

Yes!
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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 congestion 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.

Been denied boarding on a couple occasions due to insufficient space - northbound to SF
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 stressful 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 a 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 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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Lai</td>
<td>6/21/2018</td>
<td>1:08</td>
<td>Mountain View</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Langbein</td>
<td>6/21/2018</td>
<td>14:38</td>
<td>Redwood City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin Raffel</td>
<td>6/21/2018</td>
<td>15:33</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanna perchier</td>
<td>6/21/2018</td>
<td>15:37</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandre Tachard Passos</td>
<td>6/21/2018</td>
<td>15:47</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valentin Geoffier</td>
<td>6/21/2018</td>
<td>15:56</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Rozzelle</td>
<td>6/21/2018</td>
<td>17:32</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Young</td>
<td>6/21/2018</td>
<td>20:47</td>
<td>Melbourne (visits SF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Stevens</td>
<td>6/21/2018</td>
<td>22:27</td>
<td>Mountain View</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid Haller</td>
<td>6/22/2018</td>
<td>0:41</td>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vadehra Jain</td>
<td>6/22/2018</td>
<td>1:32</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Hills</td>
<td>6/22/2018</td>
<td>1:34</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo Vesco</td>
<td>6/22/2018</td>
<td>4:59</td>
<td>SAN LEANDRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Oey</td>
<td>6/22/2018</td>
<td>5:36</td>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharleen Garcia</td>
<td>6/22/2018</td>
<td>14:42</td>
<td>San Mateo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana Wilson</td>
<td>6/22/2018</td>
<td>15:54</td>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Alon</td>
<td>6/22/2018</td>
<td>16:27</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Strauss</td>
<td>6/22/2018</td>
<td>17:07</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Hazelton</td>
<td>6/22/2018</td>
<td>19:22</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammon Skidmore</td>
<td>6/22/2018</td>
<td>20:16</td>
<td>San Bruno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Mack</td>
<td>6/23/2018</td>
<td>18:08</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Hamachi</td>
<td>6/23/2018</td>
<td>20:52</td>
<td>Mountain View</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley</td>
<td>6/24/2018</td>
<td>13:46</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Elsey</td>
<td>6/24/2018</td>
<td>20:48</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler Ackerson</td>
<td>6/25/2018</td>
<td>2:04</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Dorenberger</td>
<td>6/25/2018</td>
<td>5:01</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Lucey</td>
<td>6/25/2018</td>
<td>7:26</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Manchester</td>
<td>6/25/2018</td>
<td>12:35</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kit Colbert</td>
<td>6/25/2018</td>
<td>13:54</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Axtir</td>
<td>6/25/2018</td>
<td>21:49</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles DeFinney</td>
<td>6/26/2018</td>
<td>1:44</td>
<td>Redwood City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Williford</td>
<td>6/26/2018</td>
<td>1:45</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Stevens</td>
<td>6/26/2018</td>
<td>1:45</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleen McCarbery</td>
<td>6/26/2018</td>
<td>14:46</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Martin</td>
<td>6/26/2018</td>
<td>14:46</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deland Chan</td>
<td>6/26/2018</td>
<td>14:46</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Otorio</td>
<td>6/26/2018</td>
<td>14:52</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALIASTAIR male BARR</td>
<td>6/26/2018</td>
<td>14:57</td>
<td>San Carlos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrahim Halloum</td>
<td>6/26/2018</td>
<td>15:02</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Marley</td>
<td>6/26/2018</td>
<td>15:03</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Marley</td>
<td>6/26/2018</td>
<td>15:03</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kham Truong</td>
<td>6/26/2018</td>
<td>15:03</td>
<td>Mountain View</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Inge Chang</td>
<td>6/26/2018</td>
<td>15:19</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

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.

We need more bike cars, as well as seats to view our bikes during transit please!

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Wizgold</td>
<td>6/26/2018</td>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td>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!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caleb Steffen</td>
<td>6/26/2018</td>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tawio J</td>
<td>6/26/2018</td>
<td>San Jose, CA</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brannon Klopfer</td>
<td>6/26/2018</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>Need seats in the bike area. 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaetano D'Amato</td>
<td>6/26/2018</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>I have been taking the bicycle train to work every day 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Finley</td>
<td>6/26/2018</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Farber</td>
<td>6/26/2018</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>Never had my bike stolen yet, largely due to always sitting near it!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas Oliver Oswald</td>
<td>6/26/2018</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Reiva</td>
<td>6/26/2018</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael C Leung</td>
<td>6/26/2018</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thibault Loyet</td>
<td>6/26/2018</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Delaval-Valentina</td>
<td>6/26/2018</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devendra Modin</td>
<td>6/26/2018</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danny</td>
<td>6/26/2018</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southill</td>
<td>6/26/2018</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Ward</td>
<td>6/26/2018</td>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
<td>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!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sathish Uppaluri</td>
<td>6/26/2018</td>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Make</td>
<td>6/26/2018</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>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 &quot;last mile&quot; solutions for both ends of the commute. We need bicycle capacity, and we need seats in view of our bicycles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchel Miglis</td>
<td>6/26/2018</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Goldman</td>
<td>6/26/2018</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailey Wall</td>
<td>6/26/2018</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Lenaghan</td>
<td>6/26/2018</td>
<td>East Palo Alto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ming Yan</td>
<td>6/26/2018</td>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Dougherty</td>
<td>6/26/2018</td>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
<td>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!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben E Machado</td>
<td>6/26/2018</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie Love</td>
<td>6/26/2018</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Cauthen</td>
<td>6/26/2018</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Chu</td>
<td>6/26/2018</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romain Roux</td>
<td>6/26/2018</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Rudner</td>
<td>6/26/2018</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanya</td>
<td>6/27/2018</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Jones</td>
<td>6/27/2018</td>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Jones</td>
<td>6/27/2018</td>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Urbach</td>
<td>6/27/2018</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>I have commented on every previous petition and request for comments, but I'll say it again: the more bike capacity the better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sasanka Panguluri</td>
<td>6/27/2018</td>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>Please don't make this dumb move of eliminating safety of the bikes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafael Canova</td>
<td>6/27/2018</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igor Shadik</td>
<td>6/27/2018</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Eide</td>
<td>6/27/2018</td>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristian Eide</td>
<td>6/27/2018</td>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yehuda Gottlieb</td>
<td>6/27/2018</td>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>In an already crowded and at-capacity bike car commute, limiting the number bike spaces is a major cause of concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Tsuruda</td>
<td>6/27/2018</td>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob</td>
<td>6/27/2018</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Keough</td>
<td>6/27/2018</td>
<td>Menlo Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.
I support increasing the number of cars to transport bicycles to deter property theft and encourage commuting.

We definitely need more bike capacity!

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.

Seeing the bike is a must when on the train, thefts are way too common.

We need space on trains

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.

Anything that meets the ratio is fine with me.

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.

Having to lock bikes onboard to prevent theft would induce significant delays and become unworkable.

Please stand in support of configuring train car configurations to allow for secure storage of bicycles within train cars and reduce likelihood of increased bicycle theft.

More bike spaces, please!
497 Chris Potter 7/12/2018 21:25 San Jose
498 Omar Riaz 7/13/2018 2:44 San Jose
499 Madhan 7/15/2018 19:20
500 Tibor Gal 7/15/2018 19:33 Cupertino
502 Milind 7/15/2018 19:35 Palo alto Keep cars off the road by keeping more bikes on trains.
503 Johnny root 7/15/2018 19:38 Redwood city
504 Tony Fossati 7/15/2018 20:05 MISSION VIEJO
505 Catherine Elizabeth Carter 7/15/2018 22:01 San Francisco
506 Bradley Freitag 7/16/2018 14:49 San Mateo Everyone wins.
507 Aroon Maron 7/16/2018 14:52
508 Jonathan Brand 7/16/2018 23:44 Mountain View, CA 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.
509 Justin Ney 7/17/2018 13:56 Sunnyvale, CA
510 Venkata Saja 7/17/2018 14:15 Sunnyvale
511 Humayun Imtiaz 7/17/2018 14:21 Sunnyvale Vote for electric train and more train route.
512 Richard Au 7/17/2018 15:15 Cupertino
513 Sunan Nag 7/17/2018 15:16 Sunnyvale
514 Tanmay 7/17/2018 15:20 Sunnyvale
515 Anthony 7/17/2018 15:26 Sunnyvale
516 Sarang Hennant Borude 7/17/2018 15:42 Santa Clara
517 Motasim 7/17/2018 16:24 Sunnyvale
518 Ben Allen 7/17/2018 16:38 Sunnyvale I support this initiative!
519 Shengwu Liu 7/17/2018 17:36 Sunnyvale it has been too crowded in the current caltrain, cannot imagin we will have fewer sets and less bike capacity.
520 Jane Grayce Casanovas 7/17/2018 18:59 SANTA CLARA more bike capacity is critical. rush hour trains are already overloaded
521 Darren Quintero 7/17/2018 19:06 Sunnyvale 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.
522 Michael D Bennett 7/17/2018 23:37 Sunnyvale
523 Albert Chang 7/18/2018 0:01 San Jose 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!
524 Sandra 7/18/2018 1:24 Sunnyvale I've seen theft and people trying to leave with bikes that aren't theirs. People need to be near their bikes.
525 Leann Bond 7/18/2018 1:48 Mountain View
526 John Denne 7/18/2018 3:00 San Jose
527 Karina Cantes 7/18/2018 14:29 San Mateo 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.
528 Rob Jordan 7/18/2018 17:06 Menlo Park
529 C Miller 7/18/2018 20:08 Sunnyvale
530 Linda Was 7/19/2018 0:17 San Mateo 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.
531 Irving Arguello 7/19/2018 0:25 San Francisco I don't want my bike stolen
532 Alli Rico 7/19/2018 1:07 San Jose 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.
533 Cyrus Mankal 7/20/2018 7:31 Sunnyvale
534 Cristina Munoz 7/20/2018 14:53 San Jose
535 Stanley 7/20/2018 22:07 San Jose
536 Alison Hamblin 7/23/2018 17:19 Los Altos
537 Jeff Fisher 7/23/2018 20:42 Mountain View 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.
538 Divya 7/24/2018 0:46 Sunnyvale I strongly support seats next to the bikes for the security of the bikes
539 Sam Falter 7/24/2018 3:57 San Bruno I've already had one bike stolen... I'd like to keep the one I currently have by being able to see it on the train.
540 Susannah Barsom 7/24/2018 15:21 San Jose 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arna Marie</td>
<td>7/24/2018</td>
<td>15:32</td>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaurav Sawant</td>
<td>7/25/2018</td>
<td>1:25</td>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafael Ramos</td>
<td>7/25/2018</td>
<td>1:26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom D’Arezzo</td>
<td>7/25/2018</td>
<td>19:50</td>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Knapstein</td>
<td>7/25/2018</td>
<td>20:59</td>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Cretarolo</td>
<td>7/25/2018</td>
<td>21:23</td>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Thompson</td>
<td>7/25/2018</td>
<td>21:40</td>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Saum</td>
<td>7/25/2018</td>
<td>21:56</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Wang</td>
<td>7/25/2018</td>
<td>22:06</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Higham</td>
<td>7/25/2018</td>
<td>22:15</td>
<td>San Jose, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Giambruno</td>
<td>7/25/2018</td>
<td>22:17</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Southeray</td>
<td>7/25/2018</td>
<td>22:23</td>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline Sanchez</td>
<td>7/26/2018</td>
<td>1:08</td>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat Collins</td>
<td>7/26/2018</td>
<td>1:48</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Badenooch</td>
<td>7/26/2018</td>
<td>4:25</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd Cha</td>
<td>7/26/2018</td>
<td>4:52</td>
<td>Saratoga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Carter</td>
<td>7/26/2018</td>
<td>5:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caleb Fowler</td>
<td>7/26/2018</td>
<td>6:06</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Reimert</td>
<td>7/26/2018</td>
<td>13:26</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Funk</td>
<td>7/26/2018</td>
<td>13:55</td>
<td>Saratoga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martina Sbicca</td>
<td>7/26/2018</td>
<td>13:56</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Barone</td>
<td>7/26/2018</td>
<td>14:03</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesham</td>
<td>7/26/2018</td>
<td>14:06</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panjaj Dugar</td>
<td>7/26/2018</td>
<td>14:29</td>
<td>MTV station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Moor</td>
<td>7/26/2018</td>
<td>15:01</td>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karmothan</td>
<td>7/26/2018</td>
<td>15:04</td>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sasha Oviankin</td>
<td>7/26/2018</td>
<td>15:08</td>
<td>Sunnyvale, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kavit</td>
<td>7/26/2018</td>
<td>15:10</td>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nguyen</td>
<td>7/26/2018</td>
<td>15:16</td>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Parry</td>
<td>7/26/2018</td>
<td>15:28</td>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TK Tsi</td>
<td>7/26/2018</td>
<td>15:34</td>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staw Ashuri Zohar</td>
<td>7/25/2018</td>
<td>15:43</td>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moya Damberger</td>
<td>7/26/2018</td>
<td>19:31</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyrus Vafadari</td>
<td>7/26/2018</td>
<td>19:39</td>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Leberknig</td>
<td>7/26/2018</td>
<td>21:01</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stan Wong</td>
<td>7/26/2018</td>
<td>22:36</td>
<td>san jose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Lawrence</td>
<td>7/26/2018</td>
<td>23:04</td>
<td>Mountain View, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I support more capacity.

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 unreasonnable 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 unattended 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.

Please! Good design facilitates increased ridership. It's a beneficial cycle. Unless CalTrain is replacing stolen bikes, we don't need a rolling bike mart 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 crushed 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.

I commute via Caltrain with my bike and the current situation could be improved on in so many ways I can't believe that Caltrain is considering making it worse.
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 heard about it with CalTrain! Get it together! Bike cars are overcrowded, and unsafe!

Please do not force bicyclists to choose between sitting for a long ride and potentially having their bike stolen due to their not watching it during the train ride. Please provide bicyclists the opportunity to watch their bikes. And acknowledge the volume of bicyclists riding Caltrain by providing reasonable capacity.

daily commuter has very expensive bike don't want to lose it.
daily commuter has very expensive bike don't want to lose it.
bikes on board is great! keep them safe is 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 alleviate 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 too 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>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kastenbaum</td>
<td>8/6/2018</td>
<td>1:59</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos A Tarango</td>
<td>8/6/2018</td>
<td>17:06</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon Clark</td>
<td>8/7/2018</td>
<td>23:39</td>
<td>Redwood City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaghan Brosnan</td>
<td>8/8/2018</td>
<td>21:53</td>
<td>Mountain View</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawai Washburn</td>
<td>8/11/2018</td>
<td>12:58</td>
<td>San Carlos, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Ma</td>
<td>8/12/2018</td>
<td>18:21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Strowbunenko</td>
<td>8/12/2018</td>
<td>20:47</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corentin Fabry</td>
<td>8/14/2018</td>
<td>16:27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Semfel</td>
<td>8/14/2018</td>
<td>21:29</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Desk</td>
<td>8/19/2018</td>
<td>1:11</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ximin Lao</td>
<td>8/23/2018</td>
<td>4:01</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Rastowicz</td>
<td>8/24/2018</td>
<td>15:15</td>
<td>Mountain View</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark tsiodra</td>
<td>8/24/2018</td>
<td>17:11</td>
<td>Menlo Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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 | murohy@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

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

Good morning,
Yes, I will forward this email to the Caltrain Transit Police and staff.

Thank you,

Cindy Mamaradio-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
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-sign-up-form/](https://operationlifesaver.wufoo.com/forms/operation-clear-track-sign-up-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
riosn@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, I 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/marinsommer

"Turn technical vision into reality."

On 2018-04-20 17:24, I 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/martinsommer

"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/martinsommer

"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/martinsommer
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: 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

Nolan Moore
Analyst
101 2nd St.
Suite 800
San Francisco, California 94105
nmooore@hffip.com
Important Disclosure. This email from Hollday 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, constitutes 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.