AGENDA

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

December 6, 2018 - Thursday

10:00 am
(or immediately following 9:00 am Special Board Meeting, whichever is later)

1. Call to Order / Pledge of Allegiance
2. Roll Call
3. Public Comment For Items Not on the Agenda
   Comments by each individual speaker shall be limited to two (2) minutes. Items raised that require a response will be deferred for staff reply.
4. Consent Calendar
   Members of the Board may request that an item under the Consent Calendar be considered separately
   a. Approve Special Meeting Minutes of November 1, 2018
   b. Approve Minutes of November 1, 2018
   c. Accept Statements of Revenues and Expenditures for October 2018
   d. Receive Key Caltrain Performance Statistics – October 2018
   e. Receive State and Federal Legislative Update
   f. Receive 2019 Draft Legislative Program
   g. Receive Caltrain Business Plan Monthly Update – November 2018
   h. Receive 2018 Customer Satisfaction Survey Key Findings
   i. Receive Capital Projects Quarterly Report – 1st Quarter Fiscal Year 2019
   j. Adopt Caltrain Fare Policy
   k. Award of Contract for On-Call Safety & Security Advisory Services
   l. Increase Executive Director’s Contract Change Order Authority by $30,000 for Sunnyvale Station Platform Rehabilitation Project
   m. Authorize Execution of Agreements with Dogpatch and NW Potrero Hill Green Benefits District for Construction of Landscaping Improvements at Southbound Entrance of 22nd Street Station

Note: All items appearing on the agenda are subject to action by the Board. Staff recommendations are subject to change by the Board.
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n. Award of Contract for Ticket Vending Machine Upgrade

o. Authorize Execution of Agreements to Receive Funding and Act as Project Lead for the Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Clearance Phases of Rengstorff Grade Separation Project

5. Report of the Chair
   a. Resolution of Appreciation for Jeff Gee
   b. Appointment of Nominating Committee for 2019 Officers

6. Report of the Citizens Advisory Committee

7. Report of the Executive Director
   a. Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project Monthly Report for October 2018
   b. Monthly Report on Positive Train Control System


9. Approval of the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board Financing

10. Authorize Amendments to Contracts for On-Call Transportation Planning and Support Services

11. Authorize Execution of Agreements and Program Supplements for Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program Funding for the Peninsula Corridor Electrification Expansion Project and Amend Fiscal Year 2019 Capital Budget

12. Authorize Exercise of Contract Option With Stadler USA, Inc. for Procurement of Additional Electric Multiple Unit Vehicles for Peninsula Corridor Electrification Program

13. Adoption of Transit Asset Management Policy

14. Caltrain Safety and Security Quarterly Performance Reports
   a. Rail Operations Performance Update 1st Quarter Fiscal Year 2019
   b. Safety and Security Update 1st Quarter Fiscal Year 2019

15. Approve Term Sheet and Authorize Negotiation of Long-Term Ground Lease for Development of Hayward Park Station Property

16. Correspondence

17. Board Member Requests

18. General Counsel Report

19. Date/Time of Next Regular Meeting: Thursday, January 10, 2019 at 10:00 a.m. San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building, 2nd Floor, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070

20. Adjourn

Note: All items appearing on the agenda are subject to action by the Board. Staff recommendations are subject to change by the Board.
INFORMATION FOR THE PUBLIC

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Note: All items appearing on the agenda are subject to action by the Board. Staff recommendations are subject to change by the Board.
MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 1, 2018
SPECIAL MEETING


MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: J. Hartnett, C. Mau, J. Cassman, M. Bouchard, S. Murphy, J. Funghi, C. Gumpal

CALL TO ORDER
Chair Bruins called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m.

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

GENERAL COUNSEL REPORT
The Board recessed to a Closed Session at 9:04 a.m., and reconvened at 10:25 a.m.

a. Closed Session Conference with Legal Counsel – Anticipated Litigation

Significant exposure to litigation Government Code section 54956.9(d)(2): One case
Initiation of litigation pursuant to Government Code section 54956.9 (d)(4): One case

PUBLIC COMMENT
None

ADJOURN
The meeting adjoumed at 10:26 a.m.
Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board
Board of Directors Meeting
1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos CA 94070

MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 1, 2018

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: None


CALL TO ORDER / PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
Chair Bruins called the meeting to order at 10:30 a.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

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

PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA
Vaughn Wolfe, Pleasanton, discussed the demand for more service and planning transit-oriented developments for the future.

Vincent de Martel addressed the Board regarding bicycles on board and requested that the Board review the on-line petition being circulated.

Jeremy, San Francisco, addressed the Board regarding theft of bikes on Caltrain.

Adina Levin, Friends of Caltrain, spoke regarding her efforts to inform voters on how to vote on Proposition 6 and Measure W.

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, addressed the Board regarding bikes on Caltrain.

CONSENT CALENDAR
Director Gillett recommended amending the regular Minutes October 4, 2018, Page 4, under the Transit and Intercity Passenger Rail Program Update, to read:

Director Gillett commented that she hoped that the bike parking component could be flexible enough to accommodate bike-share parking, if necessary.

Chair Bruins suggested an amendment to the same document on Page 3, under Public Comment, to read:

“Adina Levin, Friends of Caltrain, stated she hoped for eight-car consist sets rather than seven.”
Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board Meeting
Minutes of November 1, 2018

Motion/Second: Stone/Gee
Ayes: Brinkman, Chavez, Davis, Gee, Gillett, Pine, Stone, Zmuda, Bruins
Noes: None

a. Approve Special Meeting Minutes of October 4, 2018
c. Approve 2019 Board Meeting Calendar
d. Accept Statements of Revenues and Expenditures for September 2018
e. Receive Key Caltrain Performance Statistics – September 2018
f. Receive State and Federal Legislative Update
g. Receive Caltrain Business Plan Monthly Update – October 2018
h. Adopt Resolution 2018-42, Award of Contract to Consolidated Engineering Labs for On-Call Special Inspection and Testing Services
i. Authorize Disposition of Equipment
j. Adopt Resolution 2018-43, Award of Contract for Printing and Delivery of Thermal and Non-Thermal Tickets to Canada Ticket, Inc.
k. Adopt Resolution 2018-44, Approve Enrollment in the 100 Percent Renewable Electricity Service Option of the San José’s Clean Energy Community Choice Energy Program

REPORT OF THE CHAIR
Chair Bruins complimented the Citizens Advisory Committee regarding the thoughtful comments on the Business plan. She asked staff to consider calendaring all of the Caltrain Business Plan workshops into the 2019 Board meeting calendar.

REPORT OF THE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Brian Shaw, Chair of the Caltrain Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC), provided highlights of the meeting held recently. He noted the vacancy on the CAC for a member representing San Mateo County.

Public Comment
Roland Lebrun, San Jose, suggested amendments to the CAC minutes.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
Jim Hartnett, Executive Director, announced that Michelle Bouchard, Chief Operating Officer, Rail, had been named by the Railway Age, and Rail, Track and Structures, as a 2018 “Women in Rail” award recipient. He discussed Ms. Bouchard’s background and congratulated her upon being selected for two prestigious awards.

Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project Quarterly Report and Monthly Report for September 2018
John Funghi, CalMod Chief Officer, provided an update on the electrification project, displaying visuals of the work completed in various areas, including the placement of the transformers and static wire installations. He summarized other electrification contracts as well as the tunnel modification work.

Director Gee commented in general on contingency funds as part of capital budgets and stated that the balance after drawing down on funds does not constitute extra funds in any given budget.
Public Comment
Roland Lebrun, San Jose, addressed the Board on details of the CalMod project.

Monthly Report on Positive Train Control System
Michelle Bouchard, Chief Operating Officer, Rail, referred to her written report on the progress to date and added that there are two pending grant applications with the Federal Railroad Administration of approximately $5 million, amounting to the funding gap for the project. She stated the project has proceeded on budget with no change orders and only five remaining on-board installations, which were scheduled at the end of November.

ADOPT THE CALTRAIN FARE POLICY
Michelle Bouchard, Chief Operating Officer, Rail, recalled at the last Board meeting a lengthy discussion regarding the need to establish a Caltrain fare policy and general goals for the Board for the policy. Based on that discussion, Ms. Bouchard presented a draft policy for board consideration in anticipation of proposed approval in December. She noted that the policy would provide the necessary framework and strategies for establishing future fare adjustments. Chair Bruins referenced the red-lined version of the draft policy for ease of discussion.

Further, Ms. Bouchard reviewed the four main components of the policy, all of equal importance: Financial Sustainability, Equity, Customer Experience, and Ridership. She reviewed the thought process behind each draft component and discussed the next steps that would be required in moving the policy from draft to final. Finally, she stated that in order to complete the process, adoption of an updated Codified Tariff would be necessary.

Public Comment
Adina Levin, Friends of Caltrain, commented on several aspects of the draft policy, noting that federal standards did not address excluded riders, agreed with the customer experience goal supporting regional integration, and suggested another review of the policy after electrification to ensure its goals match the Business Plan.

Andy Chow, Redwood City, believed the policy lacked specificity and that it should include minimum partner-agency subsidies.

Jeff Carter, Millbrae, provided written comments and asked that the policy be reviewed by the Caltrain Citizens Advisory Committee.

Board members provided lengthy and extensive commentary on all four components of the draft policy. Ms. Bouchard thanked the Board for its commentary and promised to bring the policy back for proposed adoption at a future meeting.

Director Zmuda requested a separate review of the comprehensive access policy at a future meeting.
AUTHORIZE EXECUTION OF CHANGE ORDER TO THE PENINSULA CORRIDOR ELECTRIFICATION PROJECT CONTRACT WITH BALFOUR BEATTY FOR DESIGN OF POLE CHANGES REQUESTED BY CALIFORNIA HIGH SPEED RAIL AUTHORITY
Stacy Cocke, Deputy Director, CalMod Project, addressed the Board and provided details of the change order which was requested and funded by the California High Speed Rail Authority. Chair Bruins requested that an exhibit be attached to the Resolution with more specific information related to the change order.

Approved by Resolution 2018-47
Motion/Second: Gee/Stone
Ayes: Brinkman, Chavez, Davis, Gee, Gillett, Pine, Stone, Zmuda, Bruins
Noes: None

AUTHORIZE AMENDMENT TO CONTRACT WITH PROVEN MANAGEMENT, INC. FOR THE TUNNEL MODIFICATIONS AND TRACK REHABILITATION PROJECT FOR PENINSULA CORRIDOR ELECTRIFICATION PROJECT TO INCLUDE THE OVERHEAD CATENARY SYSTEM OPTION AND INCREASE CONTRACT AMOUNT
Liria Larano, Deputy Chief Officer, CalMod, recommended Board approval of an amendment to the contract for tunnel modification work with Proven Management, Inc. in the amount of $16.6m. Ms. Larano stated the change order would allow for the installation of the overhead catenary system in four tunnels in San Francisco and noted it was also approved by the Change Management Board.

Approved by Resolution 2018-45
Motion/Second: Stone/Pine
Ayes: Brinkman, Chavez, Davis, Gee, Gillett, Pine, Stone, Zmuda, Bruins
Noes: None

AWARD OF CONTRACTS FOR ON-CALL GENERAL ENGINEERING DESIGN SERVICES
Julie Taylor, Director of Contracts and Procurement, recommended award of a contract to Aecom Technical Services, Inc. and HNTB Corporation for On-call general engineering design services for $25,700,000 for a five-year term.

Director Chavez announced her recusal from the vote due to a potential conflict of interest.

Approved by Resolution 2018-46
Motion/Second: Davis/Brinkman
Ayes: Brinkman, Davis, Gee, Gillett, Pine, Stone, Zmuda, Bruins
Noes: None
Absent: Chavez (Recused)

ADOPT A TRANSIT ASSET MANAGEMENT POLICY
This item was deferred to the December, 2018 meeting.

CORRESPONDENCE
Correspondence was received and posted on line.

BOARD MEMBER REQUESTS
Director Stone wished everyone a Happy Thanksgiving. Chair Bruins thanked board members for their thoughtful work and robust discussions on several agenda items.

**GENERAL COUNSEL REPORT**

Legal Counsel Cassman reported that the Board held a Special Meeting earlier that morning to discuss the following items in Closed Session, on which no action was taken:

**Conference with Legal Counsel – Anticipated Litigation**

- Significant exposure to litigation Government Code section 54956.9(d)(2): One case, and
- Initiation of litigation pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9(d)(4): One potential case

**DATE/TIME OF NEXT REGULAR MEETING:** Thursday, December 6, 2018 at 10:00 a.m. San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building, 2nd Floor, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070

**ADJOURN**
The meeting adjourned at 12:38 p.m.
PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD
STAFF REPORT

TO: Joint Powers Board
THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
Executive Director
FROM: Derek Hansel
Chief Financial Officer
SUBJECT: STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENSES FOR THE PERIOD ENDING
OCTOBER 31, 2018

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

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

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

Year to Date Revenues: As of October year-to-date actual, the Total revenue (page 1,
line 17) is $5.0 million higher than the prior year. This is primarily driven by higher
Farebox Revenue (page 1, line 1), Operating Grants (page 1, line 11) and JPB Member
Agencies contributions (page 1, line 12).

Year to Date Expenses: As of October year-to-date actual, the Total Expense (page 1,
line 48) is $6.0 million higher than the prior year-to-date actual. This is primarily due to
Rail Operator Services (page 1, line 23), Fuel and Lubricants (page 1, line 27), Insurance
Cost (page 1, line 29), and Wages & Benefits (page 1, line 37) due to inclusion of
payments for unfunded CalPERS and Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) liability
(this expense will not recur throughout the year).

BUDGET IMPACT
There are no budget amendments for the month of October, 2018.

STRATEGIC INITIATIVE
This item does not achieve a strategic initiative.

Prepared By: Maria Pascual, Accountant 650-508-6288
Jennifer Ye, Manager, General Ledger 650-622-7890
## PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD
### STATEMENT OF REVENUE AND EXPENSE
### Fiscal Year 2019
### October 2018

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

### REVENUE OPERATIONS:
1. Farebox Revenue 32,394,106 35,374,191 2,980,085 9.2% 107,795,329 107,795,329 - 0.0% 33.3% 1
2. Parking Revenue 1,951,412 1,784,911 (166,501) (8.5%) 5,845,900 5,845,900 - 0.0% 1
3. Shuttles 779,704 658,209 (121,495) (15.6%) 2,683,400 2,683,400 - 0.0% 1
4. Rental Income 685,929 607,002 (78,927) (11.5%) 1,873,000 1,873,000 - 0.0% 3
5. Other Income 417,640 600,882 183,242 43.9% 1,192,000 1,192,000 - 0.0% 5
6. TOTAL OPERATING REVENUE 36,228,791 39,025,195 2,796,404 7.7% 119,389,629 119,389,629 - 0.0% 10

### CONTRIBUTIONS:
10. AM434 Peninsula & TA Shuttle Funding 552,148 589,823 37,675 6.8% 1,767,700 1,767,700 - 0.0% 10
11. Operating Grants 1,421,883 1,739,802 348,919 34.0% 5,444,500 5,444,500 - 0.0% 11
12. PB Member Agencies 10,888,107 12,316,000 1,427,893 13.1% 25,448,014 25,448,014 - 0.0% 12
13. Use of Reserves - 0.0% 1,208,871 1,208,871 - 0.0% 13
14. TOTAL CONTRIBUTED REVENUE 12,862,139 15,096,025 2,233,887 17.4% 32,125,192 32,125,192 - 0.0% 14
15. GRAND TOTAL REVENUE 49,090,929 54,121,220 5,030,289 10.2% 151,514,821 151,514,821 - 0.0% 15

### EXPENSE

### OPERATING EXPENSE:
22. Rail Operator Service 25,265,468 28,331,414 3,065,946 12.1% 87,385,577 87,385,577 - 0.0% 23
24. Positive Train Control 20,481 20,481 - 0.0% 1,442,000 1,442,000 - 0.0% 24
26. Security Services 1,849,088 1,908,899 60,802 3.2% 6,172,151 6,172,151 - 0.0% 26
27. Shuttles Services 1,639,993 1,437,760 (202,233) (12.3%) 5,444,500 5,444,500 - 0.0% 27
28. Fuel and Lubricants 3,088,809 3,988,525 899,716 29.1% 10,765,356 10,765,356 - 0.0% 28
29. Timetables and Tickets 38,003 47,774 (9,771) (20.4%) 143,500 143,500 - 0.0% 29
30. Insurance 1,021,249 1,572,514 551,265 54.0% 5,750,000 5,750,000 - 0.0% 30
31. Licenses and Equipment Maint 608,024 834,923 226,899 37.3% 3,158,276 3,158,276 - 0.0% 31
32. Utilities 622,790 644,990 22,200 3.6% 2,065,720 2,065,720 - 0.0% 32
33. Maint & Services-Bldg & Other 430,896 437,460 6,564 1.5% 1,529,098 1,529,098 - 0.0% 33
34. TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSE 34,565,193 39,181,730 4,616,537 14.3% 123,856,178 123,856,178 - 0.0% 34

### ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE
35. Wages and Benefits 3,424,867 4,196,099 771,233 22.5% 11,487,399 11,487,399 - 0.0% 36
37. Managing Agency Admin OH Cost 1,960,411 2,269,108 308,697 15.7% 5,899,231 5,899,231 - 0.0% 37
38. Board of Directors 6,319 3,470 (2,850) (45.1%) 14,600 14,600 - 0.0% 38
39. Professional Services 1,357,614 1,423,517 65,903 4.9% 5,125,000 5,125,000 - 0.0% 39
40. Communications and Marketing 37,123 61,956 24,833 66.9% 316,500 316,500 - 0.0% 40
41. Other Office Expenses and Services 654,481 806,722 152,241 23.3% 3,517,239 3,517,239 - 0.0% 41
42. TOTAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE 7,440,815 8,760,872 1,320,057 17.7% 26,359,969 26,359,969 - 0.0% 42
43. Long Term Debt Expense 448,866 462,678 13,812 3.1% 1,298,675 1,298,675 - 0.0% 43
44. GRAND TOTAL EXPENSE 42,454,874 48,405,280 5,950,406 14.0% 151,514,821 151,514,821 - 0.0% 44
45. NET SURPLUS /(DEFICIT) 6,636,055 5,715,940 (920,117) (13.9%) (0) (0) - 0.0% 45
PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD

INVESTMENT PORTFOLIO

AS OF OCTOBER 31, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF SECURITY</th>
<th>MATURITY DATE</th>
<th>INTEREST RATE</th>
<th>PURCHASE PRICE</th>
<th>MARKET PRICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Agency Investment Fund (Unrestricted)</td>
<td>Liquid Cash</td>
<td>2.144%</td>
<td>20,675,348</td>
<td>20,675,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Pool (Restricted)</td>
<td>Liquid Cash</td>
<td>2.066%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Pool (Unrestricted)</td>
<td>Liquid Cash</td>
<td>2.066%</td>
<td>1,007,092</td>
<td>1,007,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Unrestricted)</td>
<td>Liquid Cash</td>
<td>0.000%</td>
<td>39,608,396</td>
<td>39,608,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Restricted)</td>
<td>Liquid Cash</td>
<td>0.200%</td>
<td>18,182,602</td>
<td>18,182,602</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$ 80,473,439  $ 80,473,439

Accrued Earnings for October 2018 $ 43,228.17
Cumulative Earnings FY2019 $ 160,901.44

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

** As of October 2018, the total cost of the Total County County was $4,536,554,693 and the fair market value per San Mateo County Treasurer's Office was $4,517,097,339.

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

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

The Joint Powers Board has the ability to meet its expenditure requirements for the next six months.
AGENDA ITEM #4 (d)
DECEMBER 6, 2018

PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD
STAFF REPORT

TO: Joint Powers Board
THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
Executive Director
FROM: Michelle Bouchard
Chief Operating Officer, Rail

SUBJECT: KEY CALTRAIN PERFORMANCE STATISTICS – OCTOBER 2018

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

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

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no budget impact.

MONTHLY UPDATE
In October 2018, Caltrain’s Average Weekday Ridership (AWR) decreased 4.3 percent to 59,159 from October 2017 AWR of 61,834. The total number of passengers who rode Caltrain in October 2018 decreased 2.9 percent to 1,605,671 from 1,653,634 in October 2017. In October 2018, Caltrain ridership was impacted by the Weekend SF Caltrain Closure (effective Saturday, October 6, 2018 through late Spring 2019) and decreases in Special Event Ridership and Sporting Event Ridership (i.e. Fleet Weekend, SF Giants, 49ers, Stanford Football and SJ Sharks). In comparing the weekend train counts at Bayshore Station with the 2018 Annual Count baseline, there was a decrease in ridership at Bayshore station by 21.3 percent in October 2018.

This month ticket sales for One Way tickets (up 6 percent) and ED One Way tickets (up 2.8 percent) increased from October 2017. Ticket sales for Day Passes (down 11.3 percent), ED Day Passes (down 19.5 percent), Monthly Passes (down 7.8 percent) and ED Monthly Passes (down 9.5 percent) decreased from October 2017. The implementation of Caltrain Mobile Ticketing (which includes One Way, ED One Way, Day Pass, ED Day Pass, Zone Upgrades and Joint Caltrain + VTA Day Pass purchases) accounted for approximately 3.0 percent (47,789 rides) of October 2018 rides and 4.0 percent ($329,708) of October 2018 Monthly Ticket Sales Revenue. The number of
Eligible Go Pass Employees decreased 2.8 percent to 81,248 from 83,566 from October 2017. The number of participating Go Pass Companies increased to 131 from 126 from October 2017. Farebox Revenue increased 9.7 percent to $8,691,008 from $7,920,996 in October 2017.

On-time performance (OTP) for October 2018 was 94.8 percent compared to 93.5 percent OTP for October 2017. In October 2018 there were 329 minutes of delay due to mechanical issues compared to 640 minutes in October 2017.

Looking at customer service statistics, there were 9.5 complaints per 100,000 passengers in October 2018 which decreased from 9.7 in October 2017.

Shuttle ridership for October 2018 is down 4.6 percent from October 2017. For the station shuttles, the Millbrae-Broadway shuttle averaged 179 daily riders. The weekend Tamien-San Jose shuttle averaged 22 daily riders. When the Marguerite shuttle was removed, the impact to ridership was a decrease of 16.8 percent. Due to ongoing service issues with the Shuttle Partner contractor as a result of staffing shortage, shuttle routes continues to have DNOs (Did Not Operate) trips. Staff is continuing to work on resolving the issue with the Shuttle contractor. The Belmont-Hillsdale shuttle and Menlo Park Midday Shuttle remain temporarily discontinued.

### Table A

#### October 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>FY2019</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Ridership</td>
<td>1,653,634</td>
<td>1,605,671</td>
<td>-2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Weekday Ridership</td>
<td>61,834</td>
<td>59,159</td>
<td>-4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Farebox Revenue</td>
<td>$7,920,996</td>
<td>$8,691,008</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-time Performance</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
<td>94.8%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Caltrain Shuttle Ridership</td>
<td>9,589</td>
<td>9,147</td>
<td>-4.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Year to Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>FY2019</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Ridership</td>
<td>6,498,931</td>
<td>6,561,376</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Weekday Ridership</td>
<td>62,046</td>
<td>62,835</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Farebox Revenue</td>
<td>$32,394,106</td>
<td>$35,374,191</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-time Performance</td>
<td>94.9%</td>
<td>93.9%</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Caltrain Shuttle Ridership</td>
<td>9,151</td>
<td>8,498</td>
<td>-7.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph A

Caltrain Average Weekday Ridership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>AWR</th>
<th>13-Month Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

61,834
59,159

*Go Passes tracked by Monthly Number of Eligible Employees (not by Sales)
**Graph C**

Caltrain Mobile Ticketing - Monthly Sales by Ticket Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone Upgrade</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>1,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Pass</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>2,681</td>
<td>5,108</td>
<td>7,027</td>
<td>8,727</td>
<td>9,307</td>
<td>9,228</td>
<td>9,490</td>
<td>8,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Way</td>
<td>2,136</td>
<td>6,194</td>
<td>10,034</td>
<td>14,734</td>
<td>20,668</td>
<td>25,222</td>
<td>28,681</td>
<td>26,979</td>
<td>29,046</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graph D**

Monthly Mechanical Delays

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delay Minutes per Month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Caltrain Promotions - October 2018**

**Fleet Week** - The Annual Fleet Week was held at San Francisco’s waterfront on October 6 - 7 and included naval ships, tours of vessels and the popular aerial shows from the world famous Blue Angels flight team. The gorgeous views from Pier 39 also featured live music, food, drinks and other fun attractions for spectators. Caltrain service was promoted through internal organic social media platform, mention in the Caltrain Connection newsletter, GoCaltrain/Special Event page and news releases/blog. October 6 was the first weekend of the San Francisco tunnel closure which provided a Bus Bridge between Bayshore and San Francisco station. Caltrain promoted the event and also educated riders about the tunnel closures and of possible delays. Caltrain carried an additional 6,908 customers over the weekend. Marketing Communications staff was out at the Bayshore station on the first weekend of the Bus Bridge to assist people with directions and hand out information.

**San Francisco Weekend Tunnel Closure** - Beginning Saturday, October 6, Caltrain weekend train service will not be available between the Bayshore, 22nd Street and San Francisco Caltrain stations due to tunnel work needed to complete the Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project (PCEP). During the station closures, free bus service will be available to Caltrain passengers commuting between these stations. The project is expected to be complete by late spring 2019. The Communications Division created a Comprehensive Communication Plan to assist with messaging and notification of the Weekend San Francisco Caltrain Closures through numerous efforts from our media relations, digital communications/social media, marketing, customer...
service/distribution, and government and community affairs departments. The goals of the Communication Plan included:

- Notifying Caltrain customers (regular commuters and weekend riders) about the SF weekend closure and keep them informed throughout the process
- Notifying all general public of the upcoming SF weekend closure
- Notifying elected officials and key stakeholders about the upcoming SF weekend closure
- Planning to communicate contingency plans for Monday service

San Jose Sharks at SAP Center - The regular 2018 and 2019 San Jose Sharks season kicked off on October 3 bringing excited hockey fans to the SAP Center, just one block from the Diridon station. Caltrain service was promoted through paid geo-targeted and retargeted Facebook social media campaign running throughout the entire season, paid search Adwords campaign and targeted cross platform display ads on premium sports websites. Internal communications included organic social media, Caltrain’s Special Events website and news release/blog. The campaign will run throughout the entire season. This year, SAP Center will be assisting with post-game service messaging on the center ice HD monitor and live read announcements after the game ends. For the month of October, there were four home games played and carried an additional 1,872 customers.

On-going Promotions

49ers at Levi’s® Stadium - The 49ers service promotion continues through the end of October. This year, marketing efforts will flight from September through December. To help promote the service as well as inform customers of the weekend Bus Bridge, strategies include geo-targeted with retargeted sponsored Facebook click ads will run one week leading up to each home game. Internal communications include news release/blogs, organic social media, and Special Events web page and station visual messages/conductor announcements. To help promote post-game service, Levi’s Stadium will display digital ads on-field and message on game-day news releases. For the month of October, there were two home games played against Arizona and Los Angeles. Caltrain carried a total of 7,484 additional customers for the month of October.

Stanford Football - Stanford hosted two home games in October. Caltrain service was promoted through sponsored geo-targeted with retargeted Facebook social media ads running one week leading up to each home game. Internal communication included organic social media, Caltrain’s Special Event website and news releases/blog. Stanford will e-mail blast to season ticket holders before each home game and game day social media posts. Stanford also posted interior ad cards and take-ones onboard the train. Total additional ridership alighting and boarding for October was 1,319 fans.

Caltrain September 2018 Social Media Analytics - In October Caltrain social promoted the SF Weekend Closure, Caltrain Mobile app, sports service (49ers, Stanford, Sharks),
Holiday Train, original video and contests and more. On the announcements side Caltrain kept riders informed about community meetings, CalMod rider benefits, Sunnyvale Station Improvements, job openings, SB1 improvements and the 25th Ave Grade Separation project.

*Caltrain has lost followers for the first time ever in recent months. This is due to Twitter removing automated (bot) accounts

---

**Caltrain Digital Metrics - OCT 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>New Followers</strong></th>
<th><strong>Top Tagged Issues</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+508</td>
<td>1. SF Closure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Delay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Bike Car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. CalMod</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Caltrain.com Pageviews**

- Oct 18 - 808,837
- Sept 18 - 851,460
- Oct 17 - 824,844

**Monthly Yelp & FB Rating**

![Star Rating](image)

(6 Oct reviews)

**Social Sentiment**

- Neutral: 1388
- Positive: 980
- Negative: 1181

**Mobile App - OCT, 18**

- Downloads: 24,009
- Active Users: 1.9
- Overall Rating: (70 reviews)
Social Media Impression Spikes
October, 2018

Your Tweets earned 2.1M impressions over this 31 day period

Oct 17
SB258 Trespasser Strike
584 Incident Delay Mins
847 Daily Delay Mins

Oct 23
SB254 Trespasser Strike
SB376 Vehicle Strike
390 Incident Delay Mins
716 Daily Delay Mins

Impressions sometimes appear the day after an incident as Twitter users view the post the next day.

Prepared by:

Catherine David, Principal Planner – Rail Operations 650.508.6471
Patrice Givens, Data Specialist 650.508.6347
James Namba, Marketing Specialist 650.508.7924
Jeremy Lipps, Social Media Officer 650.622.7845
AGENDA ITEM #4 (e)
DECEMBER 6, 2018

PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD
STAFF REPORT

TO: Joint Powers Board
THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
Executive Director
FROM: Seamus Murphy
Chief Communications Officer
SUBJECT: STATE AND FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

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

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

Prepared By: Casey Fromson, Government and Community Affairs Director 650-508-6493
2018 General Election Report
By Mike Robson, Trent Smith, Don Gilbert, and Jason Ikerd
November 9, 2018

Overview
The television and radio ads have stopped and our mailboxes are less full -- the 2018 midterm/gubernatorial elections are over. However, ballots are still being counted and the outcome of many races in California are still to be decided in the coming weeks. There are 4.5 million late and provisional ballots that must be counted and sent to the Secretary of State by December 7.

As expected, Democrats won every significant statewide office on election night with two statewide elections that are still too close to call – Insurance Commissioner and Secretary of State. Though, California’s election results should not be construed as part of a “Blue Wave”. Instead, the election results reflect an ongoing multi-election decline in Republican party electoral success throughout California - all rooted in the fact that Republican party registration in California continues to decline. On October 22, the Secretary of State reported that No Party Preference (NPP) voters comprised 27 percent of the electorate while the Republicans comprised only 24.5 percent. In fact, 49 of the 80 Assembly Districts have a higher percentage of NPP voters than those who identified as Republican. The Republican Party decline does not mean people are turning to the Democratic Party. Democrat registration has declined slightly over the years and there is one Assembly District in California where the NPP numbers are higher than the Democrats.

Statewide Offices

Governor
As expected, Gavin Newsom was elected Governor by a wide margin of nearly 20 points. As the former Mayor of a big city, Governor-elect Newsom has experience balancing a budget, managing a bureaucracy, negotiating with public employees, and advancing a public policy agenda. In the coming weeks, we will learn more about how the Governor-elect will use that experience when he announces a policy agenda and a proposed budget for the 2019-2020 fiscal year. In the near-term all eyes will be focused on who he brings to his staff and cabinet to help govern the state.

Insurance Commissioner
As noted above, the race for Insurance Commissioner is still too close to call. As of November 8, Senator Ricardo Lara (D) was leading the No Party Preference candidate, Steve Poizner by approximately 400,000. The Poizner candidacy was significant in that he made the November General election without being in either party.
Superintendent of Public Instruction
This race between two Democrats was the most expensive race between candidates on the ballot. It is viewed as a proxy fight between the Charter School movement who supported Marshall Tuck and the California Teachers Association who supported Tony Thurmond and is relevant to the progressive and moderate split in the Democratic party.

Legislature
Going into the election, the Democrats in the Assembly enjoyed a 55-vote supermajority while the Democrats in the Senate held 26 votes and needed one seat to gain the same two-thirds supermajority advantage. However, as noted in our pre-election report, there is not unanimity of thought in the Democratic Caucuses, which is evident in the split between moderate/traditional Democrats and the more progressive Democrat. There were two Assembly races and a Senate race where the Progressive Democrat lost to a more Moderate Democrat. Therefore, while a two-thirds majority makes it possible for the party in power to pass general tax increases, Constitutional Amendments, and make changes to the rules of the Legislature, it is not certain that it will happen.

Assembly
At this time, there are certain to be 56 seats held by Assembly Democrats, with three and maybe four races where the election-day outcome is not certain. In those races, we believe the late processed ballots will trend in the Democrat candidate’s favor. If that holds true, there is potential for 59 or 60 Democrats to be sworn in to the Assembly on December 3, 2018.

Senate
In the State Senate, the election outcomes are more certain. Senate Democrats will hold 28 seats when Senators are sworn-in on December 3. However, if Senator Lara wins his race for Insurance Commissioner, the numbers will drop to 27 and a Special Election will be held to replace him.

Ballot Measures
There are no close elections pertaining to statewide ballot measures. As is typical, campaigns for and against ballot measures generated the most mail, television and radio play with spending in the hundreds of millions of dollars. The Initiative and Referendum process, commonly called Direct Democracy, exists to allow citizen to act on policy when the Legislature does not. Interestingly, in this election cycle, the outcomes of the ballot measures only served to validate previous actions by the Legislature, as measures placed on the ballot by the Legislature passed, while measures to circumvent legislative action failed.
Notable ballot measures include:

**Proposition 6 Gas Tax Repeal -- Failed**
Proposition 6, aimed to repeal the legislatively approved increase in the gas tax and vehicle fees, was defeated. This was a significant development given the fact that the proponents early and easily qualified the measure through signatures. However, the repeal campaign lacked significant financial resources to sustain a campaign and really lost momentum after the successful recall of a State Senator who voted for it. The opposition campaign, comprised of a coalition of labor, construction, transit, and local governments ran an effective campaign and defeated Proposition 6 on a 55.2 percent to 44.8 percent margin. Despite this sound defeat, the proponents have vowed to continue efforts to recall legislators who voted for the original legislation and to continue their efforts through litigation.

**Proposition 8 Dialysis Clinics – Failed**
This ballot measure is notable for the fact that it had the largest amount of money spent on the campaign opposition, with more than $100 million being spent. Proposition 8 was placed on the ballot by labor unions who have been battling over organizing and working conditions in dialysis clinics for years. A bill on this subject also failed to pass the Legislature.

**Proposition 10 Rent Control – Failed**
This measure would repeal existing state law that restricts local governments from enacting strict rent control measures on landlords and property owners. This measure was placed on the ballot by labor unions in response to the fact that the California Legislature refused to advance a similar bill.

**Proposition 1 Housing Bond -- Passed**
Authorizes $4 billion in general obligation bonds for affordable housing programs for low-income residents, veterans, farmworkers, manufactured and mobile homes, infill, and transit-oriented housing. This measure was placed on the ballot by the Legislature.

**2019 Legislative Outlook**
The new Legislature will be sworn-in on December 3 while Governor Newsom will take office on January 7, 2019, and a proposed State Budget will be released on January 10, 2019.
CONGRESS

Potential Lame Duck Agenda: After reaching an agreement regarding judicial nominations, the Senate adjourned on October 11, joining the House in recess until after the midterm elections. The House and Senate are expected to return on November 13. Though the outcome of the elections will influence Congress' activities for the remainder of 2018, Republican congressional leaders' legislative agenda for the lame-duck session includes: outstanding FY 2019 appropriations bills (including Transportation/HUD), the farm bill conference report, criminal justice reform, a package to extend expiring tax breaks, and the Jobs Act 3.0. Additionally, Republicans are aiming to confirm a batch of executive and judicial branch nominees, including 36 federal district court and three circuit court judges.

A partisan fight may impact legislative priorities on the GOP agenda over President Donald Trump's request for Congress to fund construction of a wall along the U.S.-Mexico border and the outcome of the mid-term elections. If the Democrats take control of the House, consideration of the FY 2019 appropriations bills could be delayed until next year. Currently, many of the federal agencies, including the Department of Transportation (DOT), are operating under a continuing resolution (CR) until December 7, 2018.

Senate Republican Conference Chairman John Thune (R-S.D.) has acknowledged desire among Republicans to pass a package of tax extenders, and to make some corrections to the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act that became law in 2017. He said there would be an attempt to finish that work before the end of the year. Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) said that he plans to put criminal justice reform legislation, the First Step Act, on the Senate floor if it can gain 60 votes to avoid a potential filibuster. Bipartisan sentencing reform provisions would be added to the bill, which was passed by the House on May 22, Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman Chuck Grassley (R-Iowa) and President Trump have supported the legislation.

116th Congress Transportation Outlook: House Democrats are planning to pursue a major infrastructure measure if they win the House majority in the upcoming mid-term elections. House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Ranking Member Peter DeFazio (D-OR), who would serve as committee chairman if Democrats claim control, has said the party will seek a spending measure for roads, bridges, and other public works projects if they are in charge. House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-CA), who could serve as Speaker again, has said that one of her themes is “build, build, build,” and will focus not just on surface transportation but also on broadband and water systems.
On October 17, the President said that he expects infrastructure will come up after the mid-term elections, and anticipates it to be an “easy” issue. House Democrats may begin hearings in late January if they take control, seeking to pass a bill by May. However, how the initiative will be funded remains unclear.

Senate Democrats had released a $1 trillion plan in March, funded by rolling back tax cuts for the wealthy, but Republicans are unlikely to support such a mechanism, as raising federal taxes and more borrowing would increase the federal deficit. While retiring House Transportation Committee Chairman Bill Shuster (R-PA) said in February that he may support increasing the gas tax, many Republicans rejected any tax increase. Shuster also released his own proposal in July to initiate a discussion about fixing infrastructure and the Highway Trust Fund, but the plan did not advance. Additionally, the question will remain of whether Republicans will be willing to pass a major infrastructure spending bill if they retain control of the Senate.

Holland & Knight recently met with Ranking Member Peter DeFazio’s committee staff director and House Highways and Transit Subcommittee Democratic staff director to discuss infrastructure and the FAST Act reauthorization. The staff said that the committee is planning to hold hearings in early 2019 and are looking for ideas for FAST Act authorization. They plan to hold hearings on the reauthorization throughout 2019 and introduce a FAST Act authorization bill in early 2020. The FAST Act expires in September 2020, and the Highway Trust Fund will again be insolvent in mid to late summer 2021. Current spending levels for the Highway Trust Fund programs will require Congress to provide an average of $20 billion per year in additional bailouts.

ADMINISTRATION

President Releases Unified Regulatory Agenda: On October 17, the White House released an update to the Fall 2018-2019 regulatory agenda offering an update on both the pending regulations it plans to pursue as well as those it plans to move ahead with. The agenda is released by the White House Office of Management and Budget’s (OMB) Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (OIRA) each year in the fall and spring, and lists all rules that federal agencies are working on along with the current progress on each one. The President has made deregulation a policy priority of his administration. Several regulations of note from the DOT include:

- **Processing Buy America Waivers Based on Non-Availability**
  Stage: Proposed Rule
  This rule will establish the applicable regulatory standard for waivers from the “Buy America” requirement. This standard will require the use of items and products with the maximum known amount of domestic content. The rule will also establish the required information that applicants must provide in applying for such waivers.

- **Safe Integration of Automated Driving Systems-Equipped Commercial Motor Vehicles**
  Stage: Pre-rule
  The Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) requests public comment about Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations (FMCSRs) that may need to be updated,
modified, or eliminated to facilitate the safe introduction of automated driving systems (ADS) equipped commercial motor vehicles (CMVs) onto the nation's roadways. FMCSA requests comment on specific regulatory requirements that are likely to be affected by an increased integration of ADS-equipped CMVs.

DOT, FTA, FHWA, FRA Publish Joint Final Rule: On October 29, the DOT, along with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), published a joint final rule on changes to the infrastructure permitting processes. The congressionally mandated changes are part of a push from Congress and the Administration to improve efficiency for infrastructure approvals, and to speed up the pace of projects. The final rule amends regulations implementing NEPA and its Section 4(f) requirements. The agencies modified the NEPA and Section 4(f) regulations to reflect provisions in MAP-21 and the FAST Act, and also revised environmental impact procedures to reflect the changes. The rule will take effect on November 28, 2018. Significant changes are:

- Alignment between FRA permitting requirements and requirements for FTA and FHWA.
- Joint issuance of Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) and Record of Decision (ROD) documents, which will shorten timelines by combining the two. When there is a combined FEIS/ROD, the draft environmental impact statements (DEIS) must include fully analyzed alternatives and a section of a preferred action or inaction.
- Short timelines for inviting participating agencies (45 days) and establishing a coordination plan (90 days) that should force the leading agency to take early action on the EIS and to involve agencies to coordinate early.
- Expansion of categorical exclusions (CEs) for the FRA allowance of agencies to recognize CEs listed for other surface transportation agencies when there is an existing railroad right-of-way

CBO Report Analyzes Federal Cost of State/Local Infrastructure Financing: A new report from the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) assesses the actual cost to the federal government of state and local infrastructure spending. The study analyzes four kinds of financing mechanisms used by state and local governments: tax-exempt bonds (including private activity bonds), tax credit bonds (Build America Bonds), state revolving funds (SRF) or infrastructure banks, and direct federal credit. Further, the report estimates that between 2007-2016, the federally supported financing mechanisms have supported an average of $64.4 billion per year in state and local spending on transportation and water infrastructure.

DOT Multi-Agency Effort on Grade Crossing Safety: On October 30, DOT Secretary Elaine Chao requested four DOT agencies to draft a plan to curb the increase in rail grade-crossing fatalities. The FRA, FHWA, FMCSA, and NHTSA will work on a plan to devise new strategies to improve safety, including infrastructure improvements and new communications skills. The FRA has reported that there were 1,019 deaths and injuries at grade crossings in 2017, and 592 in just the first six months of 2018.

DOT Holds Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Roundtable: On October 24, the DOT hosted a small roundtable discussion with six transit agencies and two large real estate developers to
“discuss the opportunities and challenges associated with maximizing development opportunities and related value capture mechanisms around the evolving nature of new cost-effective transit solutions, including bus rapid transit, autonomous shuttles and other promising next generation mobility offerings.” The roundtable examined developers’ cutting-edge perspectives on investing in communities looking to embrace highly effective, but lower-cost transit solutions as well as more dated but seemingly entrenched views. Matt Welbes, FTA Executive Director; Jim Ray, Senior Advisor to the DOT Secretary; and FTA Acting Administrator Jane Williams participated from DOT.
TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
Executive Director

FROM: Seamus Murphy
Chief Communications Officer

SUBJECT: 2019 DRAFT LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

ACTION
This report is for information only. No Board action is required. At the January 3, 2019, meeting, staff will present the final 2019 Legislative Program for Board adoption.

SIGNIFICANCE
The 2019 Program establishes the principles that will guide Caltrain’s legislative and regulatory advocacy efforts through the 2019 calendar year, including the first half of the State legislative session and the first session of the 116th Congress. The program is intended to be broad enough to cover the wide variety of issues that are likely to be considered during that time and flexible enough to allow Caltrain to respond swiftly and effectively to unanticipated developments. Adoption of the Program provides our legislative delegation and our transportation partners with a clear statement of Caltrain’s priorities.

The 2019 Program is organized to guide Caltrain’s actions and positions in support of three primary objectives:

1. Maintain and enhance funding opportunities to support Caltrain’s programs, projects, and services.

2. Seek a regulatory environment that streamlines project delivery and maximizes Caltrain’s ability to meet public transportation service demands.

3. Reinforce and expand programs that build and incentivize public transportation ridership.

The Program is structured to apply these core objectives to a series of issues detailed in the 2019 Legislative Program.

Should other issues surface that require Caltrain’s attention, actions will be guided by the three policy objectives listed above. If needed, potential action on issues that are unrelated to these policy goals will be brought to Caltrain’s Board of Directors for consideration.
Caltrain and its legislative consultants will employ a variety of engagement tools to support the 2019 Legislative Program, including:

1. Direct Engagement
   Engage policymakers directly and sponsor legislation, submit correspondence and provide public testimony that communicates and advances Caltrain’s legislative priorities and positions.

2. Coalition-based Engagement
   Engage local and regional stakeholders to build awareness about specific issues and participate in local, regional, statewide and national coalitions organized to advance positions that are consistent with the 2019 Program.

3. Media Engagement
   Build public awareness and communicate legislative priorities by issuing press releases, organizing media events, and through the use of social media and other electronic media.

**BUDGET IMPACT**
There is no impact on the budget.

**BACKGROUND**
Staff actively monitors legislative and regulatory activity and will seek Board positions on selected bills as appropriate to further Caltrain’s legislative objectives and to provide support for our advocacy efforts. Staff will supply updated reports summarizing relevant legislative and regulatory activities, allowing the Board to track legislative developments and providing opportunities to take appropriate action on pending legislation.

Prepared By: Casey Fromson, 650.508.6493
Government and Community Affairs Director
Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board

2019 Legislative Program

Purpose
Legislative and regulatory actions have the potential to significantly benefit Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) programs and services. They also have potential to present serious challenges that threaten the JPB’s ability to meet Caltrain’s most critical transportation demands.

The 2019 Legislative Program establishes the principles that will guide the Agency’s legislative and regulatory advocacy efforts through the 2019 calendar year, including the second half of the 2019-20 State legislative session and 116th Congress. The program is intended to be broad enough to cover the wide variety of issues that are likely to be considered during that time and flexible enough to allow the Agency to respond swiftly and effectively to unanticipated developments.

Objectives
The 2019 Legislative Program is organized to guide the Agency’s actions and positions in support of three primary objectives:
- Maintain and enhance funding opportunities to support the Agency’s programs and services.
- Seek a regulatory environment that streamlines project delivery and maximizes the Agency’s ability to meet transportation service demands.
- Reinforce and expand programs that build and incentivize public transportation ridership and improve quality transportation choices.

Issues
The Legislative Program is structured to apply these core objectives to a series of State and Federal issues falling in these categories:
- Budget and Transportation Funding Opportunities
- Transportation Projects - Funding Requests and Needs
- Regulatory and Administrative Issues

Within these categories are a detailed list of specific legislative initiatives and corresponding set of policy strategies.

Should other issues surface that require the JPB’s attention, actions will be guided by the three policy objectives listed above. If needed, potential action on issues that are unrelated to these policy goals will be brought to the JPB’s Board of Directors for consideration.
Advocacy Process
Staff will indicate on each monthly legislative update recommended positions for pending bills. Once the board has an opportunity to review the recommended position, staff will communicate the position to the relevant entity (such as the bill author, agency, or coalition). In rare circumstances, should a position on a bill be needed in advance of a board meeting, staff will confer with the Board Chair. If legislation falls outside of the scope of the Board’s adopted Legislative Program, Board approval will be required prior to the agency taking a position.

Public Engagement Strategies
Staff, led by the Communications Division and its legislative consultants, will employ a variety of public engagement strategies to support the 2019 Legislative Program, including:

- **Direct Engagement**
  Engage policymakers directly and sponsor legislation, submit correspondence and provide public testimony that communicates and advances the Agency’s legislative priorities and positions.

- **Coalition-based Engagement**
  Engage local and regional stakeholders to build awareness about specific issues and participate in local, regional, statewide and national coalitions organized to advance positions that are consistent with the 2018 Legislative Program.

- **Media Engagement**
  Build public awareness and communicate the Agency’s legislative priorities by issuing press releases, organizing media events, and through the use of social media.
## State and Regional

### Funding Opportunities and Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue / Background</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **General Funding** The State recently enacted SB 1, which provides $5.2 billion to maintain local streets and roads and highways, ease traffic congestion, and provide mobility options through investments in public transportation and bicycle and pedestrian programs. SB 1 provides more than $700m per year for public transit. This is the largest increase in dedicated transit funding in more than 40 years. In 2014, the Legislature called for, via SB 1077, a pilot program to study a road charge model as an alternative to the gas tax. The nine-month pilot began in July 2016, with over 5,000 participating vehicles statewide. The California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA) reported findings to the CTC and the Legislature in December 2017. | - Protect against the elimination or diversion of any State or regional funds that support the agency’s transportation needs.  
- Support State funding allocation requests for investments that benefit the agency’s transportation programs and services.  
- Work with statewide transit coalitions to identify and advance opportunities for funding that would support the agency’s transportation priorities.  
- Monitor legislative reaction of the Road Usage Charge (RUC) Technical advisory Committee and implementation of a RUC program by the California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA).  
- Monitor efforts to implement a mileage-based user fee as a potential revenue source. |
| **Formula Funding** After years of diversion to support the State’s General Fund, funding for the State Transit Assistance (STA) program has remained stable over the last few budget cycles thanks to successful legal, legislative and political efforts on behalf of the transportation community. Still, more revenue is needed in order to meet the demand of increased ridership, reduce highway congestion – especially on Highway 101 – and adhere to the | - Support the full funding of the STA program at levels called for in the 2011 reenactment of the 2010 gas-tax swap legislation.  
- Advocate for the regularly scheduled issuance of State infrastructure bonds that support the Agency’s services and programs.  
- Support full and timely allocation of the Agency’s STIP share.  
- Support legislation clarifying elements of the STA program recently changed in AB 1113 (Bloom).  
- Support the California Transit Association’s efforts to engage the Legislature on Transportation Development Act (TDA) reform and the review of performance measures for transit. |
State’s mandate of reducing greenhouse gas emissions, and creating livable communities.

**Cap-and-Trade Revenues** In 2012, the State began implementing the cap-and-trade market-based compliance system approved as a part of the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32). Since the program began selling allowances, the program has generated billions of dollars. In 2014, legislation was enacted creating a long-term funding plan for cap-and-trade which dedicates 60 percent of cap-and-trade revenues to transportation. The remaining 40 percent is subject to annual appropriation through the state budget process. In 2017, the legislature extended the program from 2020 to 2030.

Caltrain is eligible for funding through the Low Carbon Transit Operations Program, the Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program, and the Affordable Housing Sustainable Communities Program. Each program’s requirements, oversight, and competitiveness vary. The programs require a certain percentage of funds be expended in state defined “disadvantaged communities” (as defined by CalEnviroScreen). This can prove difficult in jurisdictions with a small number of disadvantaged communities.

- Work with the Administration and like-minded coalitions to secure the appropriation of additional cap-and-trade revenues to support the Agency’s transportation needs.
- Support legislation and regional action that makes a broad array of the Agency’s emissions-reducing transportation projects, programs and services eligible for investment.
- Protect existing cap-and-trade appropriations for transit operations, capital projects and sustainable communities strategy implementation.
- Work to direct additional revenues to transit-eligible programs, including efforts to secure funding from the remaining discretionary funds and revenues dedicated to the high-speed-rail project.
- Support efforts to revise the State’s definition on “disadvantaged communities” to encompass a larger proportion of disadvantaged communities on the Peninsula.

**Voter Threshold** Legislation has been considered in recent years that provide a framework for lowering the thresholds for the State or a city, county, special JPB or regional public agency to

- Support efforts to amend the State Constitution to reduce the voter threshold required for the State or a city, county, special district or regional transportation agency to impose a special tax for transportation projects or programs.
 impose a special tax.

Other State or Local Funding Options Local and regional governments continue to seek methods for funding new infrastructure, facility needs, sustainability initiatives, and projects that will support ridership growth through a variety of methods such as managed lanes and local ballot measures.

- Advocate for legislation that would create new local funding tools to support transportation infrastructure and services.
- Support innovative local and regional funding options that will provide financial support for the agency.
- Support legislation that works to ensure revenues generated through managed lane projects remain in the County of origin.
- Advocate for funding sources that would assist transit agencies in obtaining funds for sustainability initiatives including water conservation, waste reduction, long-term resource efficiency of facilities and equipment, and greenhouse gas reductions.
- Support funding for workforce housing to attract and retain quality personnel.
- Support efforts that allow for public private partnerships that benefit the implementation of capital projects, efficient operation of transit services, or enhanced access to a broad range of mobility options that reduce traffic congestion.

Transportation Projects

General As the Bay Area’s population continues to grow, the region’s transportation infrastructure is being negatively impacted. Highways, local streets and roads are becoming heavily congested, Caltrain is nearing its capacity limits, and the demand for housing with easy access to public transit is increasing.

- Work with partners in the region to bring business, community, and transportation stakeholders together to enhance, support and advocate for transportation and mobility in the Bay Area.

Caltrain Modernization (CalMod) Program In 2012, the State Legislature appropriated $705m in Prop 1A high-speed rail funds to modernize the Caltrain corridor and lay the foundation for future high-speed rail service. Under a multi-party regional funding agreement, this investment will be used to match a variety of local, regional, state

- Advocate for the sale and allocation of Proposition 1A bonds to meet the commitments specified in SB 1029 with respect to the Caltrain corridor.
- Support the allocation of cap-and-trade funding to advance implementation of the CalMod Program.
- Work with state, local and regional partners to advance policies and actions that will help secure funding needed to fulfill local and regional commitments to the CalMod Program.
- Work to address regulatory challenges that limit the implementation of solutions that
and federal funding sources to electrify the corridor, install an advanced signaling system and replace Caltrain’s aging diesel trains with electric trains that will dramatically improve service between San Francisco and San Jose.

### Other Projects Beyond the CalMod Program

Caltrain has identified capital projects such as a fully electrified 8-car EMU fleet with longer platforms that will provide additional capacity and service benefits to Caltrain commuters. The capital needs also include but are not limited to grade separations and station upgrades. The Caltrain Business Plan, a 2040 vision for the corridor is currently underway will help identify future capital and operating needs.

In 2016, a new round of HSR Blended System planning, outreach and environmental clearance work kicked-off in the corridor. While this project is not being led by the JPB, the agency owns the right-of-way and has a significant interest in the process and success of the project that will “blended” with Caltrain service.

### Transit Oriented Development / First and Last Mile

First and last mile projects, as well as transit oriented development projects are an important part of the broad transit ecosystem that will help support robust ridership in the corridor.

- Support efforts to provide commuters with easy and convenient options to travel to and from major transit centers to their final destination.
- Support the development of new and innovative first and last mile options.
- Support increased funding opportunities for first and last mile projects.
- Advocate for policies that promote transit-oriented developments in ways that with compliment transit services.
- Support the State’s GHG reduction goals by supporting transit oriented developments.
| **Transportation Demand Management (TDM)** | • Support state funding incentives and streamlining processes for transit oriented development.  
TDM is the application of strategies and policies to reduce travel demand of single-occupancy vehicles or to redistribute this demand in space or time.  
• Support efforts that provide more TDM tools and funding opportunities  
• Support policies that encourage use of TDM |
| **Regulatory and Administrative Issues** |  
**General** Every year a variety of legislation or regulatory action is pursued that would affect regulations governing transportation-related service operations, administration, planning and project delivery. In addition, opportunities exist to reform or update existing regulations that are outdated, or can be improved to address potential burdens on transportation agencies without affecting regulatory goals.  
• Support opportunities to remove barriers to, and improve the ability to conduct, safe, efficient transportation operations, administration, planning and project delivery efforts, including alternative project delivery methods that provide flexibility to the agency.  
• Oppose efforts to impose unjustified and burdensome regulations or restrictions on the Agency’s ability to conduct efficient transportation operations, administration, planning and project delivery efforts.  
**California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)** Several regional and statewide transportation organizations continue working to modernize CEQA and minimize unnecessary delays during the environmental review process.  
• Closely monitor efforts to modernize CEQA. Without compromising CEQA’s effectiveness as an environmental protection policy, support proposals that advantage transportation projects, such as transit expansion, pedestrian / bicycle improvements, and transit oriented development.  
**Sustainable Communities Strategies** Implementation In conjunction with AB 32 and SB 32 implementation, the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act (SB 375) requires regions to develop Sustainable Communities Strategies (SCS) with integrated housing, land-use and transportation policies that will accommodate population growth and reduce regional greenhouse gas emissions by specific amounts. In 2017, regional authorities in the Bay  
• Advocate for policies that provide adequate and equitable funding to support increased demand and dependence on JPB’s transportation services associated with the implementation of SB 375 and Plan Bay Area. |
Area approved the update to Plan Bay Area, which includes the region’s SCS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Rail Plan</th>
<th>California State Rail Plan which will provide a framework for planning and implementing California’s rail network for the next 20 years and beyond. This plan contemplates a second bay crossing for rail.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closely monitor the State Rail Plan for potential opportunities to leverage resources for the Caltrain corridor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure the State Rail Plan appropriately characterizes the Caltrain system and future plans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure any planning, development, or policy proposals for a second bay crossing are consistent with Caltrain policies and planning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Funding Opportunities and Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue / Background</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Federal Appropriations** Every year, Congress adopts several appropriations bills that cover 12 major issue areas, including the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development bill. These measures provide the authority for federal agencies to spend money during the upcoming fiscal year for the programs they administer. | • Partner with local, regional, State and national coalitions to advocate appropriation of the maximum authorized amount for programs that benefit the agency’s transportation services and needs.  
• Work with local and regional coalitions to support requests for funding from discretionary programs, including the Capital Investment Grant program.  
• Communicate frequently with the agency’s federal delegation and key appropriators on the needs or concerns of pending appropriation bills. |
| In September 2018, Congress passed a continuing resolution (CR) to keep federal agencies funded at the same level as the previous fiscal year, through December 7, 2018. Congress will have to pass a CR or omnibus appropriations bill to fund the government for the fiscal year 2019. The President and the Department of Transportation (DOT) have proposed phasing out the Capital Investment Grant program (New Starts/Small Starts/Core Capacity) in the annual budget request. However, Congress continues to provide funding for the program and has include language in the annual Transportation/HUD Appropriations bills requiring the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) to allocate funding for projects and to continue to sign full funding grant agreements. | |
| **Tax and Finance** Congress also considers legislation that governs tax and finance issues that impact transit agencies. | • Support efforts to ensure tax provisions that benefit the agency’s priorities are included in any tax or finance proposal.  
• Protect against the elimination or diversion of any tax policies that support the agency’s transportation needs. |
**Transportation Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General</th>
<th>Support the efforts of partnering agencies to obtain federal funding for transit projects in San Mateo County.</th>
<th>Work with federal delegation members, as well as local, regional, and state coalitions to support the federal funding requests for our partner transit agencies on projects that provide complimentary services for the agency.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Caltrain Modernization Program</strong></td>
<td>The current Caltrain Electrification Project funding plan includes funding from several federal funding sources including the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Core Capacity Program. Positive Train Control (PTC) is a federal mandate. The current Caltrain Positive Train Control (PTC) project includes funding from the Federal Railroad Administration.</td>
<td>Advocate for the Caltrain Electrification Project FTA Core Capacity funding to be included in the President’s budget request and in the THUD Appropriations bills. Work with federal delegation members, as well as local, regional, and state coalitions to support the PCEP requests for funding. Advocate for additional PTC funding for capital and operating expenses. Support efforts to streamline regulatory administrative hurdles to supporting full PTC operations. Support the allocation of federal funding to advance implementation of Caltrain projects. Work to address regulatory actions or policies that negatively impact future capacity or service improvements. Consistent with existing agreements between JPB and CHSRA, support efforts to plan, engage stakeholders, and implement the Blended System project on the Caltrain corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Projects Beyond the CalMod Program</strong></td>
<td>Caltrain has identified capital projects such as a fully electrified 8-car EMU fleet with longer platforms that will provide additional capacity and service benefits to Caltrain commuters. The capital needs also include but are not limited to grade separations, station upgrades, and supporting regional projects that will increase Caltrain ridership. The Caltrain Business Plan, a 2040 vision for the corridor is currently underway will help identify future capital and operating needs.</td>
<td>In 2016, a new round of HSR Blended System planning, outreach and environmental clearance work kicked-off in the corridor. While this project is not being led by the JPB, the agency owns the right-of-way and has a significant interest in the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regulatory and Administrative Issues

**FAST Act Reauthorization and other Regulations**
The FAST Act expires in September 2020. Congressional authorization committees are expected to begin holding hearings early in 2019 and are looking for recommendations for the next reauthorization bill. The congressional authorization committee leadership are hoping to introduce a bill at the end of 2019. During Congress’ consideration of the reauthorization bill, there will be an opportunity to change, increase funding, and implement new policy for highway, transit, and rail programs.

USDOT will also issue guidance, new rulemaking, and take action in response to Executive Orders on a variety of issues outside the scope of the FAST Act.

- Monitor and review guidance and rulemaking proposals affecting FAST Act implementation and other transportation issues.
- Collaborate with local, regional, state and national transportation advocacy groups to coordinate comments and advocacy efforts that support regulations that maximize benefits for transportation programs, services and users.
- Collaborate with local, regional, state and national transportation advocacy groups to coordinate proposals and advocacy efforts for FAST Act reauthorization.

**Infrastructure Proposals** Congress could consider an infrastructure package in 2019 that would include increased funding for highways, transit, aviation, and water programs. Funding for these programs has yet to be identified.

- Monitor closely and take action as needed on new Administration or Congressional policies that may have a significant impact on transit / transportation projects and programs.
- Advocate for funding for the agency’s projects and needs in the President’s and Congressional infrastructure proposals.
ACTION
Staff Coordinating Council recommends the Board of Directors (Board) receive the attached memo providing an update on Caltrain Business Plan activities and progress during November of 2018.

SIGNIFICANCE
Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) staff has prepared the attached memo describing project activities and outreach related to the Caltrain Business Plan that occurred during November of 2018.

Staff will provide the JPB with written monthly memos and presentation materials on a monthly basis throughout the duration of the Business Plan project. These written updates will periodically be supplemented by a full presentation to the Board.

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

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

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

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

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

ONGOING TECHNICAL WORK

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

- Major service planning work focused on the development of a “high growth” 2040 service scenario for the corridor including;
  - Refinement of travel market assessment and application to service planning work
  - Work with HSR and agency partners to agree to initial operating parameters and service planning methodology
  - Development of service approaches and peak hour concepts for the corridor between San Francisco and San Jose
  - Initial work on terminal planning, service south of San Jose, and off-peak / all-day service plan analysis
- Continued development of technical modeling tools and approaches that will be used to support the articulation of a 2040 service vision and accompanying business case. Key areas of focus include;
  - The ongoing development and calibration of an integrated business modeling tool
  - The development of a capital costing framework
  - Development of economic analysis and regional benefit assessment methodology
- Continued functional mapping of the Caltrain organization and initial research related to national and international peer organizations
- Documentation of community interface and identification of key issues and areas of focus for peer corridor analysis

MEETINGS AND OUTREACH

Late October and November were significant outreach months for the Business Plan. The team presented a quarterly update to the JPB at a special session in early October and continued outreach activities based on this material throughout late October and November. Additionally, in November, initial stakeholder engagement commenced on the next wave of technical work including initial service planning outputs. Key meetings have included;

Quarterly Update Materials

- Caltrain Bicycle Advisory Committee, November 15
- Partner Boards and Committees
  - San Mateo County Transportation Authority Citizen Advisory Committee, October 30
  - San Mateo County Transportation Authority Board, November 1
  - San Mateo County Transit District Board, November 7
  - Valley Transportation Authority Safety, Security, Transit Planning and Operations Committee
- Public Meetings
  - San Carlos, November 13
  - San Francisco, November 14
  - San Jose, November 26
Meetings focused on new Technical Materials

- Project Partner Committee Meetings, October 26 and November 6
- CSCG, November 14
- LPMG, November 29

Additionally, a dedicated website for the Caltrain Business Plan was launched on November 12. The website provides detailed information about the Business Plan and acts as a repository for key documents and resources. The website will be updated regularly and will be periodically promoted through social media and other channels. It can be accessed at www.caltrain2040.org

**NEXT STEPS**

The first part of the Business Plan is focused on the development of a long-range service vision for the railroad accompanied by an assessment of the community-corridor interface and the Caltrain organization. The remainder of the project will be focused on the creation of the implementation plan, including a detailed business plan and funding approach. The Business Plan team will continue to provide monthly updates throughout the Business Plan. During the month of December the team will continue to provide significant updates on the service planning process as well as other work streams.
The 2040 Vision: Planning For More
What is the Caltrain Business Plan?

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

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

What Will the Business Plan Cover?

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

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

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

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

**Technical Tracks**
Where Are We in the Process?

Service Planning
Choosing a Vision: How Will the Railroad Grow?

What  In the Spring of 2019 the team will present two growth scenarios to the Board. One will generally reflect past and ongoing Blended System planning efforts while another will explore a higher level of growth. Each scenario will provide a detailed picture of how the railroad could grow over the next 20-30 years. The Board will be asked to choose one of these growth scenarios as the “Service Vision” for the corridor.

Why  In selecting a long range Service Vision the Board will answer the question “How should the railroad grow?” This will allow Caltrain to further optimize and refine the Vision while developing a Business Plan that builds towards the future in a consistent and efficient manner.
Context: Two Ways to Grow

Amount of Investment / Number of Trains

- 2018 Current Operations
- 2022 Start of Electrified Operations
- 2033 High Speed Rail Phase 1
- 2040 Planned & Programmed Scenario
- 2040 Higher Growth Scenario

What is the Process for Developing the Higher Growth Service Plan?

1. Develop service planning assumptions, parameters, and goals
2. Identify initial service approaches
3. Develop detailed peak hour concepts

Future Steps

4. Refine and evaluate detailed service concepts
5. Expand service concepts to include terminals in San Francisco and San Jose and service to South San Jose and Gilroy
6. Develop all-day and weekend service plans
Initial Service Planning: Geographic Scope

Initial service planning focuses on the Caltrain corridor between San Francisco and San Jose.

Terminal operations in San Francisco and San Jose will be analyzed next as will service to South San Jose, Morgan Hill, San Martin and Gilroy.

Initial Service Planning: Temporal Scope

Initial service planning is focused on the AM and PM peak periods. All day service plans will be developed later in the service planning process.
Key Concept

Improving Service Requires Investment

There are many different ways to invest in a railroad.

Delivery of both the “Planned and Programmed” and “Higher Growth” scenarios will require substantial investment into the corridor.

Operations
- Increased service coordination and expanded operations to maximize the use of physical infrastructure

Systems
- Improved train performance
- Fleet expansion
- Improved train control and signaling

Infrastructure
- Track enhancement and expansion
- Station and terminal improvements
- Grade crossing investments

Example Investments

As service plans are refined, conceptual investments will be detailed, costed and incorporated into the development of the Business Case for each Scenario.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Investment Assumed in All Scenarios</th>
<th>Conceptual Additional Investment Needed to Support Higher Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curve straightening and track upgrades to support up to 110 mph operation</td>
<td>Potential 3- or 4-track overtakes to allow for additional service (either at stations or as &quot;running&quot; overtakes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New signaling system and PTC upgrades to support 2 min headways and 110 mph operation</td>
<td>No further enhancement necessary to support increased service levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catenary pole placement adjustment to enable 110 mph operation</td>
<td>Power supply and catenary system upgrades to support higher service levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some terminal and shared station modification as needed to support the Blended System</td>
<td>Terminal modifications or expansion to accommodate increased service levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platform lengthening and level boarding</td>
<td>Additional platform lengthening to support longer train consists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full fleet electrification and expansion</td>
<td>Further fleet expansion to allow for increased service and longer trains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage and maintenance expansion / reconfiguration</td>
<td>Revised depot and maintenance strategy to accommodate increased fleet size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade separations and grade-crossing improvements</td>
<td>Additional grade separations and improvements to at-grade crossings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General station, customer amenity and access facility improvements</td>
<td>Improvements scaled with service levels and ridership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Initial Rail Operating Parameters

The following rail operating parameters are used as the starting point for 2040 service planning. Some variation to these parameters may be explored as service planning progresses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>HSR</th>
<th>Caltrain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum headway between trains</td>
<td>2 minutes</td>
<td>2 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnaround time at terminal</td>
<td>20 minutes</td>
<td>20 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum station dwell time</td>
<td>2 minutes</td>
<td>1.0 (high-ridership stations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train equipment</td>
<td>High speed trainset</td>
<td>8-car electric multiple unit trainset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed limit</td>
<td>110 MPH</td>
<td>110 MPH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery time</td>
<td>10% distributed</td>
<td>10% distributed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following rail operating parameters are used as the starting point for 2040 service planning. Some variation to these parameters may be explored as service planning progresses.

Service Planning Goals

The following directional “goals” are suggested as the basis for developing initial service concepts. Not every goal is fully achievable within the constraints of the Caltrain corridor. Different concepts will achieve different goals with varying degrees of success.

Service
- Achieves 15 minute frequencies at most stations during peak.
- Improves travel times between major markets.
- Maintains service coverage between most origin-destination pairs.

Ridership
- Provides differentiated service levels based on market demand.
- Provides throughput capacity responsive to demand.

Infrastructure
- Can be phased over time.
- Meets multiple objectives.
- Provides flexibility in response to changing demands.
- Efficient design and sizing.

Users
- Regularity, legible route structure & clockface schedule.
- Reliability.
- Facilitate Transfers to local, regional and state connections.

Community
- Maintain local access and circulation.
- Minimize mainline track expansions.
SHARING SESSION

Do you have any initial questions about the service planning process?

2040 Market Demand
Existing Ridership

Today, Caltrain serves bidirectional and polycentric ridership demand
- 62,000 daily boardings\(^1\)
- 64%-36% NB-SB split during AM peak period
- Half of trips occur outside of San Francisco

Ridership is highly concentrated around stations with fastest & most frequent Service
- 73% of ridership at 8 Baby Bullet stations served by 4 or more trains per hour, per direction

Caltrain serves a relatively small share of corridor travel demand
- About 9% mode share for regional north-south travel
- Service, access, and capacity constrain ridership
- Latent demand for increased service at many stations

\(^1\)Based on 2017 ridership data

Existing Land Use & Transportation Context

1/2 Mile Station Area
- 600,000 people and jobs within 1/2 mile of Caltrain stations

2 Mile Station Area
- 3 million people and jobs within 2 miles of Caltrain stations
2040 Demand

The Caltrain corridor is growing
- Corridor expected to add 1.2 million people and jobs within 2 miles of Caltrain (+40%)\(^1\)
- 80% of growth expected in San Francisco and Santa Clara Counties

Major transit investments are opening new travel markets to Caltrain
- Downtown Extension and Central Subway to provide more direct connections to downtown San Francisco
- Dumbarton Rail, BART to San Jose, and improvements to Capitol Corridor and ACE to strengthen connectivity with East Bay
- HSR and Salinas rail extensions to increase interregional travel demand

\(^1\)Based on Plan Bay Area forecasts and approved projects by individual cities

\(^2\)Derived from a rough order-of-magnitude sensitivity test using the C/CAG Model

2040 Land Use & Transportation Context

1/2 Mile Station Area

- 1 million people and jobs within 1/2 mile of Caltrain stations

2 Mile Station Area

- 4.2 million people and jobs within 2 miles of Caltrain stations

Indicates a station where substantial growth beyond Plan Bay Area forecasts is anticipated, but not yet approved.
Exploring the Potential Long Term Demand for Caltrain Service

Using Plan Bay Area numbers for projected growth in jobs and housing, an unconstrained model run of high frequency, all-day BART-like service in the Caltrain corridor suggests that by 2040 there could be demand for nearly 250,000 daily trips on the system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2017: 92 Trains/Day</th>
<th>2040: ~360 Trains/Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>62,000</td>
<td>243,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>188,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Peak</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Throughput Demand vs. Capacity

To comfortably serve this level of demand in 2040, Caltrain would need to operate 8 trains per hour, per direction (TPHPD) with 10 car trains or 12 TPHPD with 8 or 10 car trains.

Seated capacity based on Stadler EMU with different door and bike car configurations. Does not include consideration of potential HSR capacity to serve demand.

SHARING SESSION

Does the analysis of 2040 demand potential shown ring true for your community and stations?

Do you have any questions about the analysis and “sizing” of potential long term demand?
Service Concept Development

Service Planning Goals 2040 Market Demand Service Concept Development Service Concept Evaluation

Planning within Constraints – Tradeoffs and Choices Required

The Caltrain corridor is not a blank slate. Service can be improved and expanded but tradeoffs and choices are required. There is no perfect answer.

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

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

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

The Service concepts shown are intended to illustrate tradeoffs and to help guide the selection of promising options for further study and refinement.

Service at Broadway, Atherton & College Park Stations
- Service to College Park is assumed to continue in the future as it does today (on a limited/exception basis)
- Restoring weekday service to Broadway and Atherton generally requires redistributing service/stops from adjoining stations
- Restored service to Broadway is shown in the following concepts
- Restored service to Atherton is still under study

At Grade Crossings
- All of the concepts shown relate to a potential “high growth” scenario
- We understand that the volumes of train traffic shown will impact at-grade crossings
- Grade separations and improvements to at-grade crossings will be discussed and accounted for in the plan

Overtakes
- Caltrain understands that expansion of rail infrastructure is an extraordinarily sensitive issue for corridor communities
- The concepts shown deliberately analyze a range of infrastructure levels to illustrate trade-offs relative to service outcomes
- Overtakes are shown both at stations (“standing”) and along longer track segments (“running”)

Service Context

Caltrain’s existing service is complex and highly customized across the peak period, including express, zone, and skip stop service.

The diagram to the right shows a “simplified” representation of typical peak hour northbound, weekday service.

The bars on the far right represent the average number of stops per direction each station receives. Today, northbound and southbound service is not symmetrical meaning that some stations receive significantly more stops per hour in either the north- or southbound direction.

Today, 7 of 25 Caltrain stations receive 4 or more TPHPD during the peak period. On average, stations are served by about 2 TPHPD.

Illustrative Stopping Pattern

(NB AM/PM service pattern shown; service varies in SB AM/PM pattern)

Avg Corridor Travel Time
- Local = 95 min
- Zone = 85 min
- Skip Stop = 72 min
- Express = 64 min
Service Approaches & Peak Hour Concepts

The service planning work began by initially considering three different “approaches” or styles of service that could be used on the corridor in 2040. Illustrative peak hour service concepts were then developed using each of the three different approaches.

Zone Express

Description: Local service within a zone, then express service to major markets

Typical Applications: Commuter rail lines with a single major employment center as destination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides semi-express trips to major terminal from all markets</td>
<td>Lacks good internal connectivity, transfer required to get from zone to zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to effectively match available seats to market demand by adjusting size of zone</td>
<td>Requires multiple trains to serve all markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operational complexity results in more difficult transition to off peak and contingency plans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pros Cons

• Provides semi-express trips to major terminal from all markets
• Ability to effectively match available seats to market demand by adjusting size of zone

• Lacks good internal connectivity; transfer required to get from zone to zone
• Requires multiple trains to serve all markets
• Operational complexity results in more difficult transition to off peak and contingency plans
Zone Express: 12 Trains per Hour

**Features**
- Provides 15-minute service to all stations except Broadway/Burlingame with two semi express zone patterns
- Major activity centers receive 8 TPH
- Direct service from all markets to major activity centers, but transfer required between minor stations in different zones

**Passing Track Needs**
- Requires 2 new miles of 4-track passing track between Hayward Park to Hillsdale and a 4-track station in northern Santa Clara county (shown: California Ave)

**Options with Service Structure**
- Each pattern can only stop at 2 of the 4 stations north of Millbrae
- Middle-zone train needs to stop at two stations south of California Ave
- Flexible station-based overtake location in northern Santa Clara County

---

Zone Express: 16 Trains per Hour

**Features**
- Provides 15-minute service to all stations except Broadway/Burlingame with three semi express zone patterns (with major activity centers receiving 12 TPH)
- Direct service from all markets to major activity centers, but transfer required between minor stations in different zones

**Passing Track Needs**
- 15 miles of new 4-track segment required: south of Bayshore to San Bruno, mid-Peninsula (shown: Hillsdale to San Carlos), northern Santa Clara County (shown: California Avenue to north of Mountain View), and south of Lawrence to Santa Clara

**Options with Service Structure**
- Flexible location for 3 mile passing track in mid-Peninsula and 5 mile passing track in northern Santa Clara County
Local/Express

Description:
Local service with express line between major markets

Typical Applications:
High volume transit lines and polycentric corridors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Serves all markets with single train providing simple connectivity between all stations.</td>
<td>• Differential in run times between local and express makes application challenging on two track corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regional express train provides faster direct trips between major markets</td>
<td>• Inclusion of multiple overtakes could result in extended run times for local service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consistent and high level of frequencies at all station types</td>
<td>• Transfers may be required to achieve fast trip times between local markets and terminal stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• &quot;Legibility&quot; of service plan for customer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Easy transition to off peak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local/Express: 12 Trains

Features
• Regional Express serves all Major Activity Centers at 15-minute headways
• All stations receive local service at 15-minute headways except Broadway and Burlingame
• Timed local-express transfer at Redwood City

Passing Track Needs
• 10 miles of new 4-track passing tracks: Hayward Park to Redwood City and northern Santa Clara County (shown: California Avenue to north of Mountain View)

Options with Service Structure
• One stop on Express Train can be flexible between Millbrae and Redwood City
• One or two stops on express south of Palo Alto can be flexible
• Flexible 5 mile passing track location in northern Santa Clara County

Illustrative Stopping Pattern
(Some variation in service levels and stopping pattern possible)

Corridor Travel Time
Local = 78 min
Express = 55 min
Local/Express: 16 Trains

Features
- Complete local stop service
- Two express lines serving major markets
- All stations receive at least 4 TPH, with many receiving 8 or 12 TPH

Passing Track Needs
- 15 miles of new 4 track passing tracks: South San Francisco to Millbrae, Hayward Park to Redwood City, and northern Santa Clara County (shown: California Avenue to north of Mountain View)

Options with Service Structure
- Express B pattern must run non-stop from 22nd St to San Mateo, but has some flexibility in number and location of stops along mid-Peninsula
- Flexible 5 mile passing track location in northern Santa Clara County
- Passing tracks between Lawrence and San Jose may enhance reliability and save 1-2 min of travel time for HSR and Caltrain (for passengers traveling south of Diridon)

Local/Express: 12 Trains

Features
- Regional Express serves all Major Activity Centers at 15-minute headways
- Most stations served by local service at 15 minute headways
- Closely-spaced mid-Peninsula stations served at 30 minute headways (Broadway, Burlingame, San Mateo, Belmont, and San Carlos)
- Timed local-express transfer at Redwood City

Passing Track Needs
- 3 miles of new 4-track passing tracks: Hayward Park to Hillsdale, at Redwood City, and a 4-track station in northern Santa Clara County (shown: California Ave)

Options with Service Structure
- Each local pattern can only stop once Millbrae to Hillsdale
- Each local pattern can only stop once Hillsdale to Redwood City
- Flexible station overtake location in northern Santa Clara County
**Features**
- Local service becomes skip-stop service
- All stations receive 15 minute headways with major stations receiving 8 or 12 trans per hour
- Many station pairs require transfer at regional hubs
- ~50% of station OD pairs between 22nd Street and San Carlos are not served at all

**Passing Track Needs**
- 3 miles of new 4-track passing tracks: Hayward Park to Hillsdale, at Redwood City, and at a 4-track station in northern Santa Clara county (shown: California Ave)

**Options with Service Structure**
- Generally need each pattern to stop at every other station
- Pattern overtaken by express must stop at Hayward Park & Hillsdale; other pattern cannot stop at these stations
- Flexible station overtake location in northern Santa Clara County

---

**Skip Stop**

**Description:**
Multiple lines with limited stopping patterns

**Typical Applications:**
High-volume transit lines with constrained infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faster trip times for local service vs all stop trains.</td>
<td>Many local station pairs not served with direct service, transfer required. Some minor pairs not served at all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast trip times and high frequencies between major stations.</td>
<td>Service plan may be confusing for non-regular users of the system, and in case of service disruption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to deliver more total seats (double the trains, same station headways)</td>
<td>Requires multiple trains to serve all markets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational complexity results in more difficult transition to off peak and contingency plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

![Reduction in Passing Tracks](image1)

**Illustrative Stopping Pattern**
(Some variation in service levels and stopping patterns possible)

![Local/Express: 16 Trains](image2)

**Corridor Travel Time**
Skip Stop Local = 67 min
Express = 55 min
Skip Stop: 16 Trains per Hour

Features
• Provides 15-minute service to all stations with three skip stop patterns
• Major activity centers receive 8 TPH
• Direct service from all markets to major activity centers, but transfer required between minor stations in different zones

Passing Track Needs
• 3 miles of passing track between Hayward Park and Hillsdale, at Redwood City, and at a station in northern Santa Clara county (shown: California Ave)

Options with Service Structure
• Some flexibility in stopping pattern along each line; however, some origin-destination pairs of nearby stations cannot be served

Corridor Travel Time
Skip Stop = 63 min

Service Concept Evaluation
**Zone Express Initial Evaluation**

- Provides good coverage with all stations receiving at least 4 trains per hour with direct service to all major activity centers
- Transfers required to travel between moderate and minor activity centers in different zones – with good connection at Redwood City
- All stations get semi-express service to major activity centers, but no dedicated express train between major activity centers (~70 minute travel time)
- Some challenges with internal connectivity and legibility
- Substantial passing tracks needed to achieve 16 trains per hour

**Local/Express Initial Evaluation**

- Provides dedicated express train service for major activity centers achieving best trip time for the most passengers
- All local stations except Broadway receive regular 15-minute local service; most stations receive express service under 16 train operation
- Mid-Peninsula hub planned at Redwood City allows for seamless connectivity (cross platform transfer) between local and express
- Significant passing track infrastructure required
Local/Express Initial Evaluation  Reduced Passing Tracks

- Provides dedicated express train service for major activity centers achieving best trip time for the most passengers
- Most local stations receive regular 15-minute local service, however, some local stations receive only 30-minute service
- Mid-Peninsula hub planned at Redwood City allows for seamless connectivity (cross platform transfer) between local and express
- 16 train skip stop pattern presents challenges with internal connectivity and legibility: half of OD pairs between 22nd Street and San Carlos are not served at all
- Passing Track length minimized. Flexibility regarding location of station-overtake in north Santa Clara County

Skip Stop Initial Evaluation

- Distributes relatively fast and frequent service across most stations
- Relatively fewer miles of passing tracks needed to achieve 16 trains per hour
- Does not provide differentiated products – end to end travel times are ~70 minutes
- Significant challenges for internal connectivity and legibility – service is difficult to understand and many station origin-destination pairs are not served
- Few comparable examples in operation
## Grade Crossing Impacts and Grade Separation Approaches are Part of the Business Plan:

### The Plan Will:
- Document how the rail/community interface could change as the railroad and its surrounding communities grow.
- Examine approaches used by national and international peer rail corridors to address at-grade crossings and grade separations.
- Include a range of cost estimates for grade separations and treatments in the Business Case for both the Planned and Programed and Higher Growth Scenarios.

### Outcomes
- Work with the communities to identify next steps for how the corridor, not just individual projects, could be better managed to achieve both community and railroad goals. This includes considering both the appetite and need for a corridor-wide approach to address at-grade crossings.
SHARING SESSION

Do you particularly like any of the service approaches and concepts shown? Do any of them concern you? Why?

What kinds of analysis or data would help you further understand and evaluate different service concepts?

Next Steps

Process

• Refine and explore service concepts further
• Evaluate and select service concept to represent higher growth scenario within Business Plan
• Terminal analysis (San Francisco and San Jose)
• South San Jose and Gilroy Service
• All day service plans and weekend service
• Continue grade separation / grade crossing discussion through Community Interface Assessment
# Appendix:
### Land Use Details & Service Concept Stringlines

## Land Use Planning Along Caltrain Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Major Projects Included in Forecasts (Approved or consistent with Plan Bay Area projections)</th>
<th>Major Projects Noted but Not Quantified in Forecasts (Not yet approved and potentially inconsistent with Plan Bay Area)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4th &amp; King</td>
<td>Central SoMa Plan, Mission Bay &amp; Mission Rock</td>
<td>The Hub Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22nd St</td>
<td>Pier 70, Potrero Power Plant, India Basin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayshore</td>
<td>Hunters Point, Candlestick Point, Schlage Lock, Sierra Point buildout, Brisbane Baylands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South SF</td>
<td>6 MSF of approved East of 101 developments and the Downtown Station Area Specific Plan</td>
<td>Other employment projects in pipeline such as Genentech Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bruno</td>
<td>Transit Corridors Plan</td>
<td>Bayhill Specific Plan (Youtube)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millbrae</td>
<td>Station Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlingame</td>
<td>Burlingame Point (Facebook)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>Downtown Area Plan</td>
<td>General Plan/Downtown Plan Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward Park</td>
<td>Nearby TOD projects under construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsdale</td>
<td>Bay Meadows, Hillsdale Station Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont</td>
<td>General Plan Update, Belmont Village Specific Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Carlos</td>
<td>Meridian 25, Downtown TOD projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td>Downtown Precise Plan, Stanford Redwood City Campus</td>
<td>Facebook campus expansion in Menlo Park (Caltrain connection via Dumbarton Rail)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menlo Park</td>
<td>El Camino Real Downtown Specific Plan</td>
<td>Stanford General Use Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
<td>Stanford Hospital Expansion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Ave</td>
<td>Stanford Research Park redevelopment</td>
<td>East Whisman Specific Plan, additional Moffet Field redevelopment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>San Antonio Precise Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>El Camino Real Precise Plan, North Bayshore Precise Plan, Moffet Field redevelopment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>Lawrence Station Plan, City Place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Diridon</td>
<td>Google Campus, Downtown Strategy 2040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>Downtown Specific Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>Station Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How to Read a Stringline

Distance

Shallow lines show slower trains (Local)

Steep lines show faster trains (Express)

Horizontal lines show station dwell (Time but no distance)

Time

Zone Express: 12 Trains per hour

Frequency per Hour

Stringlines shown in terminal areas of San Francisco and San Jose are placeholder values only and have not been conformed to terminal constraints — service levels and operations within terminal areas subject to further analysis.
Zone Express: 16 Trains per hour

Frequency per Hour

Stringlines shown in terminal areas of San Francisco and San Jose are placeholder values only and have not been conformed to terminal constraints – service levels and operations within terminal areas subject to further analysis.

Local/Express: 12 Trains

Frequency per Hour

Stringlines shown in terminal areas of San Francisco and San Jose are placeholder values only and have not been conformed to terminal constraints – service levels and operations within terminal areas subject to further analysis.
Stringlines shown in terminal areas of San Francisco and San Jose are placeholder values only and have not been conformed to terminal constraints – service levels and operations within terminal areas subject to further analysis.
Local/Express: 16 Trains

Stringlines shown in terminal areas of San Francisco and San Jose are placeholder values only and have not been conformed to terminal constraints — service levels and operations within terminal areas subject to further analysis.

Skip Stop: 16 Trains per hour

Stringlines shown in terminal areas of San Francisco and San Jose are placeholder values only and have not been conformed to terminal constraints — service levels and operations within terminal areas subject to further analysis.
AGENDA ITEM #4 (h)  
DECEMBER 6, 2018

PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD  
STAFF REPORT

TO: Joint Powers Board
THROUGH: Jim Hartnett  
Executive Director
FROM: Seamus Murphy  
Chief Communications Officer
SUBJECT: 2018 CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY KEY FINDINGS

ACTION  
This report is for information only. No board action is required.

SIGNIFICANCE  
In May and June 2018, Caltrain conducted its annual Customer Satisfaction Survey to evaluate services provided by the agency’s contract operator, Transit America Services, Inc. (TASI). The customer satisfaction ratings are one of the performance measurements used to determine a portion of the contractor’s compensation. The survey also presents an opportunity to assess customer needs and provides Caltrain customers with a venue to submit comments.

Key findings from the study include ratings of 18 overall services at the stations and onboard characteristics. Also included are questions about fare type, station boardings and alightings, large items brought on board by customers and the Caltrain mobile ticketing app.

The majority of riders (82 percent) report that they are “somewhat” or “very satisfied,” with their overall experience, an increase of 2 percent over the 2017 survey.

Using a scale of 1-5, with 1 meaning “very dissatisfied” and 5 meaning “very satisfied”, Caltrain customers expressed improved satisfaction in a number of specific areas including:

- Overall satisfaction (from 4.05 to 4.07),
- Being informed at stations of delays that exceed 10 minutes (from 3.51 to 3.61),
- Posted information at stations (3.93 to 3.96),
- Ease of use of ticket machines (3.73 to 3.77),
- Courtesy of conductors (4.37 to 4.42),
- Professional appearance of conductors (4.51 to 4.54),
- Availability of printed materials onboard (4.21 to 4.23),
- Cleanliness of train interiors (from 3.82 to 3.85),
- Cleanliness of onboard restrooms (from 3.21 to 3.26),
• Adequacy and clarity of onboard announcements (from 3.72 to 3.81),
• Being informed onboard of delays that exceed 10 minutes (from 3.73 to 3.81),
• On-time arrival at your destination (4.07 to 4.16),
• Your sense of security while on the train (from 4.30 to 4.33).

Declines in ratings included station cleanliness (from 3.99 to 3.90) and functioning of lights at stations (from 4.28 to 4.26).

The results of questions about fare type, station boardings and alightings, Caltrain mobile ticket app and large items brought on board include:
• The Monthly Pass is used by more than one-third of respondents (36%), while more than one-fifth (22%) use Clipper Cash value, and about the same share use a Go Pass (21%). The use of Clipper Cash value increased by 6%, most likely due to the elimination of the Clipper 8-ride Ticket.
• Compared with the 2017 survey there was no change to the top stations most commonly cited by riders for both boardings and alightings from trains: San Francisco, Palo Alto, San Jose Diridon, and Mountain View.
• The mobile ticketing app had been used by 9% of respondents since its launch in February 2018, and respondents gave an average rating of 3.74 (out of 5).
• The majority of customer (75%) did not bring a large item on board when surveyed. More than one in ten (13%) of respondents brought a bike on the train, while other items brought on board included scooters, skateboards, folding bikes and luggage.

The survey also provided respondents with the opportunity to submit comments. 37% of respondents provided a comment of some type. The most common themes were:
• Schedules and frequency - made by 23% of all respondents;
• Car features and amenities - made by 10% of respondents;
• Train/car condition/comfort of ride - made by 10% of respondents;
• Fares/fare policy/ticket validation procedures - made by 10% of respondents.

The comments reveal that riders are more concerned about frequent service and a schedule that suits their needs than they are about other aspects of Caltrain service. More than twice as many comments were made by respondents relating to frequency and schedule compared to car features and amenities, train/car condition/comfort of ride or fares/fare policy/ticket validation procedures.

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no impact on the budget.

BACKGROUND
The survey was conducted through the use of on-call survey contractor Corey, Canapary & Galanis (CC&G). CC&G distributed and collected paper surveys in English and Spanish onboard, randomly selecting cars to represent overall JPB ridership. A total of 44 weekday and weekend trains were targeted with a 70 percent response rate, resulting in 3,313 completed surveys. The survey has a system-wide margin of error of +/- 1.61 percent with a 95 percent confidence level.
Customer Satisfaction ratings have been collected since 1998. The overall onboard and at station ratings are at the highest levels since 2005.

Since the previous survey, Caltrain reduced weekend service, with headways increasing from 60 minutes to 90 minutes, to accommodate construction projects for electrification. Other changes include implementation of fare changes by increasing the zone fare, the Go Pass, the Monthly Pass, the Monthly Parking Permit, and the elimination of the 8-ride Ticket.

The Survey findings will be presented to the Caltrain Citizen’s Advisory Committee on November 14, and the Bike Advisory Committee on November 15. The complete report is available on the Caltrain website.

The Customer Experience Task Force will continue to review the survey data to help improve the rider experience. The Task Force is looking into the results to determine areas of improvement to focus on.

The full report is available online at http://www.caltrain.com/surveys

Prepared By: Julian Jest, Market Research Analyst 650.508.6245
TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
Executive Director

FROM: Michelle Bouchard
Chief Operating Officer, Rail

SUBJECT: CAPITAL PROJECTS QUARTERLY STATUS REPORT - 1st QUARTER FISCAL YEAR 2019

ACTION
Staff Coordinating Council recommends the Board receive the Capital Projects Quarterly Status Report link to report: Capital Projects Report

SIGNIFICANCE
The Capital Projects Quarterly Status Report is submitted to keep the Board advised as to the scope, budget and progress of current ongoing capital projects.

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no impact on the budget.

BACKGROUND
Staff prepares the Capital Projects Quarterly Status Report for the Board on a quarterly basis. The report is a summary of the scope, budget and progress of capital projects. It is being presented to the Board for informational purposes and is intended to better inform the Board of the capital project status.

Prepared by: Gordon Hail, Senior Project Controls Engineer 650.508.7795
TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
Executive Director

FROM: Michelle Bouchard
Chief Operating Officer, Rail

SUBJECT: ADOPT CALTRAIN FARE POLICY

ACTION
Staff Coordinating Council recommends the Board adopt the Caltrain Fare Policy.

SIGNIFICANCE
The Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) does not currently have a fare policy for the Caltrain system. The proposed Caltrain Fare Policy (Fare Policy), attached to the proposed resolution, consists of a framework of high-level goals that will underlie and guide future fare-related decisions for the agency. The agency's Codified Tariff, which sets fare products and prices, should align with and implement the adopted Fare Policy.

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no budget impact caused by adoption of the Fare Policy. Implementation of the Fare Policy through future changes to the Codified Tariff could result in budget impacts.

BACKGROUND
Adoption of a fare policy was a recommendation from Phase 1 of the Fare Study and a request from the Board of Directors (Board). Caltrain does not currently have a Board-adopted fare policy, and it has not established formal goals and principles to guide its decision-making with respect to setting fares. The fare products currently offered were developed at a time when attracting ridership was a primary goal of the agency. The agency currently relies on its fares to cover about 70 percent of its operating costs, because it does not have a dedicated source of funding. Historically, Caltrain has increased its fares every few years without an in-depth analysis of fare elasticities and how different products and pricing could impact ridership; additionally, many of the agency's recent fare changes were adopted in response to budget shortfalls. The Caltrain Fare Policy is sought to establish high-level goals to guide future decision-making regarding fares, thus providing policy guidance for addressing financial, ridership, and equity issues for fares.
Based on extensive discussions about fares that occurred throughout Phase 1 of the Fare Study with the Caltrain Board of Directors, JPB staff and leadership, and members of the public, staff developed four potential topic areas for goals to include in the Caltrain Fare Policy. At the JPB's October 2018 Board meeting, staff presented background information for the Fare Policy and led a workshop-style discussion with the Board. Staff solicited feedback from Board members and the public on four potential topic areas to be covered in the Fare Policy and the specific goals that could be included in each topic area. Following a robust Board discussion, staff drafted a proposed Fare Policy.

At the November 2018 Board meeting, staff presented the proposed Fare Policy for Board consideration and adoption. After extensive Board discussion of the proposed policy document, it was decided that several revisions were needed before the Board would take action to adopt the Caltrain Fare Policy in December 2018.

Following this direction from the Board, staff have revised the Fare Policy to include the changes discussed at the November 2018 JPB meeting. The revised Caltrain Fare Policy is shown as an attachment on the next page, with changes tracked in redline. As discussed, it includes support for other agency policies, including the Caltrain Comprehensive Access Policy, which sets system-level access priorities and was adopted by the Caltrain Board of Directors in 2010.

The Caltrain Fare Policy, including the revisions, is proposed for Board consideration and adoption in December 2018. The resolution to adopt the Caltrain Fare Policy includes a clean version of the revised policy document.

**NEXT STEPS**

After the Fare Policy is adopted by the Board, it is recommended that the Codified Tariff be reviewed to ensure it aligns with and implements the Fare Policy. For any inconsistencies between the Codified Tariff and the Fare Policy, it is recommended that staff develop potential revisions to the Codified Tariff for Board consideration. Any potential future changes to the Codified Tariff would be advanced through the public review and hearing process, which includes a Title VI analysis, before Board adoption.

Prepared by: Melissa Jones, Principal Planner, Caltrain Planning
Caltrain Fare Policy

The Caltrain Fare Policy (Fare Policy) is a framework of high-level goals that underlie and guide fare-related decisions for the Caltrain system. Caltrain’s Codified Tariff is a separate legal document that should align with and implement the Fare Policy by setting the fare strategy (zone- vs. distance-based fares), products, and pricing. When making fare-related decisions, all of the goals in this Fare Policy should be considered as a whole. This Fare Policy may be reviewed and updated as needed, including for alignment with the implementation of the Caltrain Business Plan or the start of electrified train service.

Financial Sustainability

- Ensure the agency’s ongoing financial health, including the need for a balanced Operating Budget and support for State of Good Repair and capital programs.
- Achieve a farebox recovery ratio for the Operating Budget of at least 65 percent. This minimum farebox recovery ratio may be reassessed at such time as there is an independent, stable source of funding to cover a significant portion of the agency’s operating costs.
- Support achievement of other financial policy goals of the agency, such as the Caltrain Reserve Policy.
- Maintain fare products and collection methods that are cost-effective and easy for the agency to administer.

Equity

- Advocate for and participate in State and regional programs that make it more affordable for low-income customers to use transit.
- Strive for consistency across fare products in the revenue generated per passenger and per passenger mile.
- Comply, at a minimum, with federal requirements for providing fare discounts, and for minimizing disparate impacts on minority riders and disproportionate burdens on low-income riders.

Customer Experience

- Strive for a fare system, including strategy, products, and pricing, that is easy for customers to understand and use.
- Provide predictable and incremental fare changes.
- Encourage intermodal connections and consistency with the agency’s Comprehensive Access Policy.
- Seek integration with and participate in State and regional fare programs.

Ridership

- Support achievement of the agency’s goals on ridership.
- Maximize the use of the agency’s infrastructure assets.
- Consider structuring fares to incentivize rider behavior in support of the agency’s policy goals.
Caltrain Fare Policy

The Caltrain Fare Policy (Fare Policy) is a framework of high-level goals that underlie and guide fare-related decisions for the Caltrain system. Caltrain’s Codified Tariff is a separate legal document that should align with and implement the Fare Policy by setting the fare strategy (zone- vs. distance-based fares), products, and pricing. When making fare-related decisions, all of the goals in this Fare Policy should be considered as a whole. This Fare Policy may be reviewed and updated as needed, including for alignment with the implementation of the Caltrain Business Plan or the start of electrified train service.

Financial Sustainability
- Ensure the agency’s ongoing financial health, including the need for a balanced operating budget and support for State of Good Repair and capital programs.
- Achieve a farebox recovery ratio for the operating budget of at least 65 percent. This minimum farebox recovery ratio may be reassessed at, until such time as there is an independent, stable source of funding to cover a significant portion of the agency’s operating costs.
- Support achievement of other financial policy goals of the agency, such as the Caltrain Reserve Policy.
- Maintain fare products and collection methods that are cost-effective and easy for the agency to administer.

Equity
- Advocate for and participate in State and regional programs that make it more affordable for low-income customers to use transit.
- Ensure Strive for consistency across fare products in the revenue generated per passenger and per passenger mile.
- Comply, at a minimum, with federal requirements for providing fare discounts, and for minimizing disparate impacts on minority riders and disproportionate burdens on low-income riders.
- Advocate for and participate in regional programs that make it more affordable for low-income customers to use transit.

Customer Experience
- Ensure that the Strive for a fare system, including strategy, products, and pricing, that is easy for customers to understand and use.
- Provide predictable and incremental fare changes.
- Encourage intermodal connections and consistency with the agency’s Comprehensive Access Policy.
- Seek integration with and participate in State and regional fare programs.

Ridership
- Support achievement of the agency’s goals on ridership.
- Maximize the use of the agency’s infrastructure assets.
- Consider structuring fares to incentivize rider behavior in support of the agency’s policy goals.
RESOLUTION NO. 2018 -

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

***

ADOPTING THE CALTRAIN FARE POLICY

WHEREAS, the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) administers the Caltrain system, including setting fares; and

WHEREAS, Phase 1 of the JPB's Fare Study included a recommendation to adopt a Caltrain Fare Policy (Fare Policy) to establish a framework of high-level goals that underlie and guide fare-related decisions for the Caltrain system; and

WHEREAS, at its October 4, 2018 and November 1, 2018 meetings, the Board of Directors (Board) provided staff with guidance on a series of topic areas and goals for inclusion in the Fare Policy; and

WHEREAS, consistent with the Board's guidance, staff prepared a proposed Fare Policy consisting of goals for four topic areas: financial sustainability, equity, customer experience, and ridership; and

WHEREAS, the Fare Policy supersedes Resolution No. 2013-06, which establishes a farebox recovery goal for the Caltrain system, in its entirety; and

WHEREAS, the Codified Tariff should implement the Fare Policy by setting the fare strategy (zone- vs. distance-based fares), products, and pricing in alignment with the goals of the Fare Policy; and

WHEREAS, Staff Coordinating Council recommends, and the Executive Director concurs, that the Board adopt the attached Fare Policy.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board hereby adopts the Caltrain Fare Policy, attached hereto as Exhibit A, and incorporated by reference; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Directors hereby directs staff to review the Codified Tariff to ensure that it aligns with and implements the Caltrain Fare Policy.

Regularly passed and adopted this 6\textsuperscript{th} day of December, 2018 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

__________________________
Chair, Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board

ATTEST:

__________________________
Acting JPB Secretary
TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
    Executive Director

FROM: Derek Hansel    John Funghi
    Chief Financial Officer    Chief Officer, CalMod Program

SUBJECT: AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR ON-CALL SAFETY AND SECURITY ADVISORY SERVICES

ACTION
Staff Coordinating Council recommends the Board:

1. Award an on-call contract to B&G Transportation Group, LLC (B&G) of San Mateo, California to provide safety and security advisory services for an estimated not-to-exceed amount of $4,600,000 for a five-year term.

2. Authorize the Executive Director, or his designee, to execute a contract with B&G in full conformity with the terms and conditions set forth in the solicitation documents and negotiated agreement, and in a form approved by legal counsel.

SIGNIFICANCE
The Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) requires on-call safety and security advisory services for the Caltrain Modernization Program (CalMod Program). Approval of the above action will benefit the JPB by having a qualified firm available for the successful completion of current and future projects within the CalMod Program requiring specialized safety expertise.

Award of this contract will not obligate the JPB to purchase any specific level of service from B&G. All work performed under this contract will be performed under Work Directives (WDs) issued on an as-needed, project-by-project basis.

BUDGET IMPACT
Each WD issued under this contract will contain a defined scope of services, separate schedule and budget for each construction project. Funds will come from approved budgets for the Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project (PCEP) and JPB capital projects.

BACKGROUND
The JPB has an ongoing need for safety and security advisory services for PCEP. These
services will support various tasks associated with the procurement of the electric rail cars, coordination with the integration of the Communication Based Overlay Signal System Positive Train Control project, Central Equipment & Maintenance Facility modifications, tunnel modifications, Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition system, Capital Improvement Program projects, and State of Good Repair projects in support of the overall CalMod Program.

The safety and security advisory consultant will develop and monitor rail safety and security systems to ensure projects are developed and constructed to meet federal requirements governing safety and security. As part of this work, the consultant may complete tasks including performance of safety hazard/risk analysis, development of a safety and security risk register, performance and review of security threat and vulnerability assessments, and certification of safety and security systems on the electrified rail corridor. The consultant will interface daily with JPB staff in operations, as well as other contractors in the corridor, to identify and resolve any issues and to guide the integration and implementation of work within the CalMod Program.

A Request for Proposals (RFP) was issued and advertised in a newspaper of general circulation and on the JPB’s procurement website. Two proposals were received. An Evaluation Committee (Committee) composed of qualified JPB staff from the Rail department and PCEP reviewed, scored and ranked the proposals according to the evaluation criteria stated in the RFP, which included the following weighted factors:

- Approach to Scope and Services 30 points
- Qualification and Experience of Firms 50 points
- Cost Proposal 20 points
- Small Business Enterprise Preference 5 points

After the initial scoring and ranking of proposals, only B&G was found to be in the competitive range. The Committee deemed that oral interviews would not be necessary and reached a final consensus ranking that found B&G to be the highest-ranked firm. It possesses the depth of experience and qualifications required to successfully perform the services. Staff successfully negotiated contract terms and conditions with B&G and determined the prices to be fair, reasonable, and consistent with those currently paid by the JPB, and other public agencies in the Bay Area, for similar services.

Staff assessed Small Business Enterprise (SBE) preference points to both firms for their proposed utilization of SBEs. B&G committed to utilizing SBEs for 100% of the total contract value.

Similar services are currently being provided by B&G as a result of a competitively procured solicitation, which expires December 31, 2018.

Procurement Administrator II: Cathy Hoang 650.295.6866
Project Manager: Lin Guan, Deputy Director, CalMod Project Delivery 650.508.7976
RESOLUTION NO. 2018 – XX

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

***

AWARDING A CONTRACT TO B&G TRANSPORTATION GROUP, LLC FOR
ON-CALL SAFETY AND SECURITY ADVISORY SERVICES FOR
THE CALTRAIN MODERNIZATION PROGRAM FOR
A NOT-TO-EXCEED AMOUNT OF $4,600,000 FOR A FIVE-YEAR TERM

WHEREAS, the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) issued a Request for
Proposals (RFP) for on-call safety and security services for a five-year term in support of
the Caltrain Modernization Program (CalMod Program), including the Peninsula
Corridor Electrification Project; and

WHEREAS, in response to the RFP, the JPB received two proposals; and

WHEREAS, an Evaluation Committee (Committee) composed of qualified staff
reviewed and evaluated the firms’ proposals, scored and ranked the proposals
according to the evaluation criteria set forth in the RFP; and

WHEREAS, the Committee determined that B&G Transportation Group, LLC (B&G)
of San Mateo, California to be the highest ranked firm; and

WHEREAS, the Committee further determined that B&G will perform the required
services at fair and reasonable prices; and

WHEREAS, staff and legal counsel reviewed B&G’s proposal and determined that it complies with the requirements of the solicitation documents; and

WHEREAS, Staff Coordinating Council recommends, and the Executive Director concurs, that the Board of Directors award a contract to B&G for on-call safety and security advisory services for the CalMod Program for a total not-to-exceed amount of $4,600,000 for a five-year term.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board hereby awards a contract for on-call safety and security advisory services to B&G Transportation Group, LLC of San Mateo, California for a five-year term for a total not-to-exceed amount of $4,600,000; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED the Executive Director, or his designee, is authorized to execute a contract with B&G in full conformity with all the terms and conditions of the RFP and in a form approved by legal counsel.

Regularly passed and adopted this 6th day of December, 2018 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

Chair, Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board

ATTEST:

J PB Secretary
PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD
STAFF REPORT

TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
Executive Director

FROM: Michelle Bouchard
Chief Operating Officer, Rail

SUBJECT: INCREASE THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S CONTRACT CHANGE ORDER AUTHORITY BY $30,000 FOR THE SUNNYVALE STATION PLATFORM REHABILITATION PROJECT

ACTION
Staff Coordinating Council recommends the Board approve an increase to the Executive Director’s change order authority by $30,000 for the Sunnyvale Station Platform Rehabilitation Project (Project) contract with Sposeto Engineering, Inc. (Contract).

SIGNIFICANCE
The Project reconstructs portions of both platforms at the Sunnyvale Station where settling has occurred, creating tripping hazards. In addition, this Project extends both platforms to allow longer trains to use the station.

In late March 2018, the Project scope was increased to add grounding and bonding required for the installation and operation of electrification infrastructure at the station. All but $30,000 of the new Contract costs associated with the additional scope can be accommodated within the Executive Director’s existing Contract contingency.

BUDGET IMPACT
The funding of the increase in contract authority will come from existing funds from the Station Improvement State of Good Repair projects. In addition, PCEP will account for specific requirements on the Sunnyvale Station that are necessary for the completion of the electrification project.

BACKGROUND
Per Board Resolution No. 2017-47, the original Contract award amount was $753,000. The Executive Director’s standard Contract change order authority is 10 percent of the total Contract amount, or $75,300.

A total of $59,852 in change orders have been issued to-date, primarily to address grounding and bonding requirements for electrification within the platforms, including
the addition of adjacent metal structures within station new construction limits.

The requested additional $30,000 in authority will enable staff to issue the Contract change orders required for Sposeto to complete the Project.

Prepared By: Rick Peredia, Project Manager 650.508.7941
RESOLUTION NO. 2018 -  
BOARD OF DIRECTORS, PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
***  
INCREASING THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S CONTRACT CHANGE ORDER AUTHORITY  
BY $30,000 FOR THE SUNNYVALE STATION PLATFORM REHABILITATION PROJECT  

WHEREAS, on September 7, 2017, pursuant to Resolution No. 2017-47, the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) awarded a contract to Sposeto Engineering, Inc. to perform construction for the Sunnyvale Station Platform Rehabilitation Project (Project), in an amount not to exceed $753,000 (Contract); and  

WHEREAS, the Executive Director's original Contract change order authority was established at 10 percent of the total Contract amount, or $75,300;  

WHEREAS, a total of $59,852 in change orders have been approved to-date to address grounding and bonding requirements for electrification; and  

WHEREAS, the combined total of executed and additional change orders will exceed the Executive Director's Contract change order authority by $30,000; and  

WHEREAS, Staff Coordinating Counsel recommends the Executive Director's Contract change order authority be increased by an amount not to exceed $30,000, which will permit execution of the essential change orders required for the Project.  

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board hereby increases the Executive Director's contract change order authority by $30,000 for the Sunnyvale Station Platform Rehabilitation Project contract with Sposeto Engineering, Inc., resulting in total Contract change order authority of $105,300.
Regularly passed and adopted this 6th day of December, 2018 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

__________________________
Chair, Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board

ATTEST:

__________________________
JPB Secretary
TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Jim Hamett
Executive Director

FROM: Michelle Bouchard
Chief Operating Officer, Rail

SUBJECT: AUTHORIZE THE EXECUTION OF AGREEMENTS WITH THE DOGPATCH AND NW POTRERO HILL GREEN BENEFITS DISTRICT FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF LANDSCAPING IMPROVEMENTS TO THE SOUTHBOUND ENTRANCE OF THE 22ND STREET CALTRAIN STATION

ACTION
Staff Coordinating Council recommends the Board:

1. Authorize the Executive Director, or his designee, to execute a Right of Entry and other agreements with the Dogpatch and NW Potrero Hill Green Benefit District (GBD) for the construction of landscaping improvements to the southbound entrance of the 22nd Street Caltrain Station (Station); and

2. Authorize the Executive Director, or his designee, to file any other required documentation and to take any other actions necessary to give effect to this action.

SIGNIFICANCE
The proposed action would allow the GBD to construct improvements to the rundown southbound entrance within Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) right-of-way at no capital costs to JPB. The 22nd Street Caltrain Station Southbound Entrance Landscaping Improvement Project (Project) will lead to a more pleasant user experience by beautifying the entrance area with better landscaping, new fencing, better lighting, and replacing deteriorating asphalt with a high-quality concrete surface. The improvements would also serve to discourage the illegal parking of scooters within the southbound entrance area of the Station. Additionally, as part of a separate project being implemented by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) on City of San Francisco right-of-way, new dedicated scooter parking will be established adjacent to the northbound entrance of the Station to provide an alternative for scooter users to park legally.

The GBD has also agreed to provide maintenance of the new landscaping at the expense of the GBD until at least June 30, 2025.
**BUDGET IMPACT**
There is no impact to the Capital Budget associated with the Project, as all capital expenditures would be the sole responsibility of GBD. Additionally, the GBD would provide monthly maintenance of landscaping installed as part of the Project at GBD’s expense until the GBD expires as an entity on June 30, 2025, after which time the JPB will likely become responsible for maintaining the improvements. The impact on the Operating Budget to conduct ongoing maintenance of the landscaping improvements is estimated to be $2,400 per year. The GBD could opt to continue maintenance if it is extended as a property assessment district after June 30, 2025.

The only immediate impact to the Operating Budget would be a nominal increase associated with the cost to provide electricity to one additional light fixture that would be installed by the GBD.

**BACKGROUND**
The southbound entrance of the Station is a small area immediately off 22nd Street through which Caltrain patrons walk prior to reaching the stairway that leads to the southbound platform below. The area currently consists of an asphalt surface with limited landscaping (see Figure 1 below). The entrance lacks a sense of place. Scooters also typically utilize much of the asphalt walkway for unauthorized scooter parking, crowding the flow of pedestrians. To improve the experience of Caltrain users as they are entering the Station, discourage scooter parking, and help continue its efforts to beautify the neighborhoods it represents, the GBD has proposed landscaping improvements to the site.

![Figure 1 (courtesy of Bing).](image)

**Proposed Improvements by GBD:**
The GBD approached JPB in mid-2017 to discuss the improvements being considered. Initial site visits were conducted with JPB. Following these initial conversations, the GBD produced site plans in the Spring of 2018, on which the JPB has provided comment.

Proposed improvements include:
- Creation of a larger walkway between 22nd Street and the top of the existing stairway with a high-quality concrete surface.
- Re-grading of the surface of the walkway to improve storm water management.
- New landscaping with drought-tolerant plants around the expanded walkway surface on the east, west and south edges.
- New water service to the site for use by a proposed irrigation system.
- Removal of the current fencing and installation of new fencing farther to the east of the pathway.
- Addition of a new light fixture within proposed landscaping to improve lighting.
- Removal of dead branches off the existing pine trees adjacent to the proposed landscaping.
- Excluded: No work would be done on the stairway.

Below is an image of proposed improvements by Fletcher Studios for GBD.

![Image of proposed improvements](image)

Figure 2.

These plans have been refined into construction documents, and are now being reviewed by JPB as part of an official 3rd Party Review process to ensure the plans meet all Caltrain and regulatory requirements.

Additionally, as part of the 3rd Party Review process, GBD has submitted a Site Specific Work Plan (SSWP), which outlines how construction will take place. This SSWP is being reviewed by Rail Operations and other relevant departments to ensure ingress/egress to the Station’s southbound platform is not disrupted during construction. One aspect of the SSWP is the need to close the entrance over one weekend to complete the final concrete pour. GBD is hoping the Project can be underway soon to take advantage of the current weekend closures of the Station for the tunnel notching project related to the electrification project.
Landscaping Maintenance:
As discussed above, the GBD would be responsible for all maintenance of all Project improvements, such as the landscaping (including waterproofing via a sprinkler system), concrete surface, plants and fencing through June 30th, 2025, for a period of approximately six years following completion of construction.

The JPB will likely become responsible for maintaining the improvements thereafter unless the GBD is extended as an entity and agrees to continue funding the ongoing maintenance.

Prepared By: Daniel Krause, Principal Planner, Caltrain Planning 650.508.7907
RESOLUTION NO. 2018 -

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

***

AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF AGREEMENTS WITH THE DOG PATCH AND NW POTRERO HILL GREEN BENEFITS DISTRICT TO CONSTRUCT LANDSCAPING IMPROVEMENTS TO THE SOUTHBOUND ENTRANCE OF THE 22ND STREET CALTRAIN STATION

WHEREAS, the Dogpatch and NW Potrero Hill Green Benefit District (GBD) is a San Francisco neighborhood-based property assessment district; and

WHEREAS, the GBD has identified improvements at the southbound entrance of the 22nd Street Caltrain Station as a high priority for the GBD and the residents it represents with the goals of creating a better user experience for Caltrain riders and to further beautification efforts in the area; and

WHEREAS, several improvement projects have either been recently completed or are being pursued in the area to improve multi-modal connectivity to the 22nd Street Caltrain Station, including a sidewalk bulb-out, the striping of scooter/motorcycle parking spaces and installation of electronic bicycle lockers, improved bus stops, and the relocation of the Ford Bikeshare Station to a more prominent location; and

WHEREAS, the GBD has completed construction documents for the 22nd Street Caltrain Station Southbound Entrance Landscaping Improvement Project (Project) by utilizing GBD funds; and

WHEREAS, the total cost for construction of the Project is estimated at $260,000; and
WHEREAS, the GBD has received a commitment of $250,000 in grant funding from the University of California San Francisco which can be programmed for construction of the Project; and

WHEREAS, the GBD will provide an additional $10,000 of existing GBD funds for construction of the Project; and

WHEREAS, all Project-related construction costs incurred would be paid for by GBD; and

WHEREAS, the GBD would be the lead entity constructing the Project; and

WHEREAS, the GBD would provide monthly maintenance of landscaping installed as part of the Project at GBD’s expense until the GBD expires as an entity on June 30, 2025; and

WHEREAS, if the GBD is extended as a property assessment district beyond that time, the GBD could opt to continue to provide ongoing maintenance of the landscaping improvements, or alternatively, the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board would be responsible for doing so at an estimated cost of $2,400 per year; and

WHEREAS, the Staff Coordinating Council recommends the Board of Directors authorize the Executive Director, or his designee to execute Right of Entry or other agreements, and to take any other actions necessary, to facilitate the GBD’s construction and maintenance of the Project.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board hereby:

1. Authorizes the Executive Director, or his designee, to execute a Right of Entry and other agreements with the to provide the Dogpatch and NW Potrero Hill
Green Benefit District with access to JPB right-of-way to construct landscaping improvements at the 22nd Street Caltrain Station; and

2. Authorizes the Executive Director, or his designee, to file any other required documentation and to take any other actions necessary to give effect to this resolution.

Regularly passed and adopted this 6th day of December, 2018 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

Chair, Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board

ATTEST:

J P B Secretary
AGENDA ITEM #4 (n)
DECEMBER 6, 2018

PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD
STAFF REPORT

TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
Executive Director

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

SUBJECT: AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR TICKET VENDING MACHINE UPGRADE

ACTION
Staff Coordinating Council recommends the Board:

1. Award a sole source contract to VenTek Transit of Petaluma, California, to upgrade two Ticket Vending Machines (TVM) for testing purposes and upgrade a TVM server for a total not-to-exceed amount of $241,368.

2. Authorize the Executive Director, or his designee, to execute a contract with VenTek Transit in full conformity with the terms and conditions set forth in the solicitation documents and negotiated agreement, and in a form approved by legal counsel.

3. Authorize the Executive Director, or his designee, to exercise an option to upgrade an additional 12 TVMs with Clipper card functionality and replace obsolete components, for a not-to-exceed amount of $381,264, if it is deemed in the best interest of the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) to do so.

SIGNIFICANCE
Award of the contract will provide the JPB with two upgraded TVMs with Clipper card capabilities for testing purposes and new components, which will extend their useful life. The TVM and back office server upgrades will allow passengers to use TVMs to purchase new Clipper cards and to load cash or other fare media onto existing cards. This work is the first phase of a multi-year TVM refurbishment program (Project), which will include all of Caltrain’s 114 TVMs.

The proposed option would upgrade an additional 12 TVMs, located at Caltrain stations, as part of the second phase of the Project. These TVMs are anticipated to be upgraded in 2019, when funding is available. Approval to award contracts for subsequent phases of the Project will be presented to the Board as funding becomes available.
BUDGET IMPACT
The Board-approved budget authority for the Project is a total of $995,000 ($495,000 in Fiscal Year (FY) 2018 and $500,000 in FY19). The combined Board-approved budget authority will be funded by member contributions from the City and County of San Francisco, San Francisco's Proposition K, plus Federal and State contributions.

BACKGROUND
In March 1998, VenTek International was awarded a Fare Collection Equipment contract with the JPB through a joint competitive solicitation with the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) for the design, delivery and maintenance of 101 TVMs, four (4) Ticket Office Machines (TOMs) and a Central Data Collection System. The equipment was designed and installed in 2000 and 2001 under a contract that included maintenance, warranty and revenue collection for the first two years of operation. In 2004, VenTek International was awarded a contract to manufacture and install an additional 13 TVMs. In 2009, VenTek Transit (formally VenTek International) was awarded a contract to replace all 114 System Controllers with new hardware, an updated Operating System and upgraded application software.

The JPB needs to upgrade TVMs to add Clipper card functionality, replace obsolete components, and upgrade the Operating System, including new hardware components. The highly specialized software that controls the hardware, and developed by VenTek, can only be modified easily and reliably by the firm. Since VenTek is the original TVM manufacturer, there are no other firms that can perform this upgrade efficiently; therefore a sole source procurement method was selected. As required by the JPB’s procurement policy, a cost analysis was conducted, which found the proposed unit pricing for each TVM to be fair and reasonable as compared to prices paid by other public agencies.

VenTek has performed satisfactorily for the JPB since 1998 and has significant experience integrating and installing Clipper card readers for Sonoma-Marin Area Rail Transit and VTA.

Procurement Administrator III: Juanita Vigil 650.508.7731
Project Manager: Robert Tam 650.508.7969
RESOLUTION NO. 2018 -

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

***

AWARDING A CONTRACT TO VENTEK TRANSIT
FOR TICKET VENDING MACHINE UPGRADES FOR
A NOT-TO-EXCEED AMOUNT OF $622,632

WHEREAS, the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) requires services, software and hardware components to upgrade existing Ticket Vending Machines (TVMs) for testing purposes and at Caltrain stations; and

WHEREAS, VenTek International of Petaluma, California was awarded a contract in March 1998 following a competitive procurement to provide 101 TVMs; and

WHEREAS, in 2004, VenTek International was awarded a contract to provide an additional 13 TVMs and, in 2009 VenTek Transit (formerly VenTek International) was awarded a contract to upgrade the application software, update the operating system, and replace system controller hardware; and

WHEREAS, VenTek Transit (VenTek) is the original equipment manufacturer of the TVM hardware and software, which cannot be purchased from any other source; and

WHEREAS, the JPB issued a sole source Request for Proposal (RFP) to VenTek to upgrade two TVMs for testing purposes, upgrade the operating system of the back office server, add Clipper functionalities, and replace hardware components for 12 additional TVMs; and

WHEREAS, staff and legal counsel reviewed VenTek’s proposal and determined that it complies with the requirements of the solicitation documents; and

WHEREAS, Staff Coordinating Council recommends, and the Executive Director concurs, that the Board of Directors award a contract to VenTek Transit to upgrade two 2
TVMs for testing purposes and upgrade a TVM server for a total not-to-exceed amount of $241,368 with one option to upgrade an additional 12 TVMs with Clipper card functionality and replace obsolete components for a not-to-exceed amount of $381,264.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board hereby awards a contract for VenTek Transit of Petaluma, California to upgrade two Ticket Vending Machines for testing purposes and upgrade a TVM server for a total not-to-exceed amount of $241,368; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED the Executive Director, or his designee, is authorized to execute a contract with VenTek in full conformity with all the terms and conditions of the RFP and in a form approved by legal counsel; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED the Executive Director, or his designee, is authorized to exercise one option to the contract with VenTek to upgrade an additional 12 TVMs with Clipper card functionality and replace obsolete components for a not-to-exceed amount of $381,264, if it is deemed in the best interest of the JPB to do so.

Regularly passed and adopted this 6th day of December, 2018 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

Chair, Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board

ATTEST:

J PB Secretary
TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Jim Hamett
Executive Director

FROM: Michelle Bouchard
Chief Operating Officer, Rail

SUBJECT: AUTHORIZE EXECUTION OF AGREEMENTS TO RECEIVE FUNDING AND ACT AS PROJECT LEAD FOR THE PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING AND ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE PHASES OF THE RENGSTORFF AVENUE GRADE SEPARATION PROJECT

ACTION

Staff Coordinating Council recommends the Board:

1. Authorize the Executive Director, or his designee, to execute agreements with the City of Mountain View (City) for the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) to receive funding and to act as project lead for the preliminary engineering and environmental clearance phases of the Rengstorff Avenue Grade Separation Project (Project); and

2. Authorize the Executive Director, or his designee, to file any other required documentation and to take any other actions necessary to give effect to this action.

SIGNIFICANCE

The Rengstorff Avenue at-grade crossing in the City of Mountain View has been designated as a priority grade separation project on the California Public Utilities Commission’s California Grade Separation Program Priority List (for State Fiscal Year 2018-2019).

The City completed the Rengstorff Avenue Underpass and Grade Separation Final Feasibility Study for the grade separation of Rengstorff Avenue in 2004. Alternatives forwarded from the 2004 Study were further refined to add bicycle and pedestrian enhancements in the 2014 Rengstorff Avenue Grade Separation Design Concepts Final Report. As a result of these two studies, the City provided support for an alternative that fully lowers Rengstorff Avenue under the Caltrain tracks, which would allow the tracks to stay at the current grade. The Project also includes the lowering of Central Expressway to maintain the automobile intersection with Rengstorff Avenue. Additionally, the design will consider and accommodate Caltrain/High Speed Rail Blended System improvements and be designed to allow for up to four tracks.
The JPB and the City, as reflected in a Letter of Concurrence dated October 5, 2018, have mutually agreed to have the JPB serve as the Project lead, as the Project is located within the Caltrain right-of-way and the JPB already has an established working relationship with the Federal Transit Administration, which will be responsible for approving the federal environmental clearance for this Project. Though the JPB's work as Project lead will be fully funded by the City, approval by the Board of Directors is required for the JPB to enter into associated agreements, and for staff to proceed with Project work.

**BUDGET IMPACT**

The engineer's estimate of the total cost of this environmental and preliminary design phase of work is approximately $3.4 million. Currently, the City has set aside a total of $3.5 million in City Capital Improvement Program funds for preliminary engineering and environmental clearance for the Project.

The receipt and authorized expenditure of funds for the environmental and preliminary design phases of work, are not included in the adopted Fiscal Year 2019 Capital Budget. Following execution of an agreement documenting the roles and responsibilities of the JPB and the City, staff will bring a new item for Board action to increase the Fiscal Year 2019 Capital Budget to allow for JPB to accept and expend the funds to conduct the environmental and preliminary design phases of the Project.

No JPB member agency funds are budgeted for this work. The City will be solely responsible and will bear full financial responsibility for obtaining and providing all funding required for the Project. A funding plan for future phases of work will be developed by the City in cooperation with the JPB and the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA). The JPB may be required to be a party to resulting funding agreements as the Project lead, though no JPB member agency funds are expected to be committed to this Project.

**BACKGROUND**

Grade separations have been shown to improve safety for drivers and pedestrians/cyclists, relieve traffic congestion, and enhance operational flexibility of the railroad. In 2016, Measure B was passed in Santa Clara County, which established $700 million in funding for the grade separation of eight roads that intersect the Caltrain tracks in the cities of Palo Alto, Mountain View, and Sunnyvale. Rengstorff Avenue, along with Castro Street/Moffett Boulevard, are the two in Mountain View. VTA is currently developing an implementation plan for the expenditure of the Measure B funds.

In the last 10 years, the JPB has served as the lead agency for the engineering design and environmental clearance, and eventual construction, of grade separations in San Mateo County, including projects in San Bruno and San Mateo, which will ultimately result in a total of six new grade-separated intersections.

In the City of San Bruno, the JPB constructed a grade separation of San Bruno, San Mateo and Angus Avenues. This project was funded by $100 million in San Mateo County Transportation Authority (SMCTA) Measure A funds, $55 million in various State grants, and $6 million in Federal Transit Administration grants.
Prior to the construction of the grade separation, the San Bruno Avenue grade crossing was ranked by the State as the top priority for grade separation.

In the City of San Mateo, the JPB recently awarded the construction contract for the 25th Avenue Grade Separation Project. This project is funded by $65 million in SMCTA Measure A funds, $84 million in California High Speed Rail Authority funds, $6 million in City of San Mateo funds and $10 million in State Section 190 Grade Separation Program funds.

The JPB also is currently the lead agency conducting preliminary engineering and environmental clearance for the Broadway Grade Separation Project in the City of Burlingame.

No costs have been incurred by the JPB or its member agencies for any of the projects discussed above, with all funding coming from cities, the SMCTA, and other State and Federal sources.

Prepared By: Daniel Krause, Principal Planner, Caltrain Planning 650.508.7907
RESOLUTION NO. 2018 -
BOARD OF DIRECTORS, PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

***

AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF AGREEMENTS TO RECEIVE FUNDING AND ACT AS PROJECT LEAD FOR THE PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING AND ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE PHASES OF RENGSTORFF AVENUE GRADE SEPARATION PROJECT

WHEREAS, the City of Mountain View (City) desires to grade-separate the Rengstorff Avenue at-grade crossing to improve safety and reduce traffic congestion; and

WHEREAS, the City completed a feasibility study for the Rengstorff Avenue Grade Separation Project (Project) in 2004 and completed an update of the 2004 study in 2014; and

WHEREAS, the City desires to proceed with the preliminary engineering and environmental clearance phases of the Project; and

WHEREAS, the total cost of the preliminary engineering and environmental clearance phases of the Project is estimated to be approximately $3.4 million; and

WHEREAS, the City has budgeted $3.5 for the preliminary engineering and environmental clearance work of the Project; and

WHEREAS, the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) and the City desire that the JPB serve as the lead implementing agency for the preliminary engineering and environmental clearance phases of the Project; and

WHEREAS, all Project-related costs incurred by the JPB for the preliminary engineering and environmental clearance phases will be paid for by the City.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board hereby:

1. Authorizes the Executive Director, or his designee, to execute agreements with the City of Mountain View for the JPB to receive funding and act as lead implementing agency for the preliminary engineering and environmental clearance phases of the Rengstorff Avenue Grade Separation Project; and

2. Authorizes the Executive Director, or his designee, to file any other required documentation and to take any other actions necessary to give effect to this resolution.

Regularly passed and adopted this 6th day of December, 2018 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

______________________________
Chair, Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board

ATTEST:

______________________________
JPB Secretary
RESOLUTION

EXPRESSING APPRECIATION TO

JEFF GEE

FOR HIS OUTSTANDING PUBLIC SERVICE ON THE
CALTRAIN BOARD OF DIRECTORS

WHEREAS, JEFF GEE was first appointed to the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board in 2014 by the San Mateo County City Selection Committee, representing SamTrans; and

WHEREAS, JEFF GEE was selected to serve as the Vice Chair of the Board and subsequently as Chair in 2017; and

WHEREAS, following in the footsteps of his father, Richard Gee, a former SamTrans employee, JEFF GEE, possessed an engineering background, professional acumen and sound advice which proved instrumental in assisting the Board in making critical decisions regarding capital projects and other major decisions; and

WHEREAS, JEFF GEE, during his tenure on the Board, always had the region’s best interests at heart in making each and every decision, which engendered widespread respect from his colleagues, high regard among staff and other leaders in the community; and

WHEREAS, JEFF GEE was a strong advocate for the electrification of Caltrain, having worked to obtain funding for the project and having publicly declared his intention to be present at the project’s ribbon cutting in 2022; and

WHEREAS, JEFF GEE served with distinction as the Caltrain representative on the Transbay Joint Powers Authority, laying out a future for the agency extending further into downtown San Francisco; and

WHEREAS, JEFF GEE has been an effective spokesperson for the agency, playing the role of emcee at the groundbreaking for the 25th Avenue Grade Separation Project and the South San Francisco Caltrain Station Improvement Project; and

WHEREAS, during JEFF GEE’S tenure, he has been a leader and an advocate, dedicated to fulfilling the agency’s mission and improving the lives of San Mateo County residents; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Caltrain Board of Directors hereby commends and expresses its sincere appreciation to JEFF GEE for his outstanding service to the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board and his many accomplishments on the Caltrain Board of Directors.

Regularly passed and adopted this 6th day of December, 2018.

__________________________________
Jeannie Bruins, Chair,
Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board
MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 14, 2018

MEMBERS PRESENT:  K. Burke, P. Escobar, L. Fernandez, L. Klein, C. Tucker, R. Valenciana (Vice Chair), B. Shaw (Chair),

MEMBERS ABSENT:  C. Chang,

STAFF PRESENT:  J. Navarro, M. Jones, J. Jest, J. Navarrete,

Chair Brian Shaw called the meeting to order at 5:41 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Vice Chair R. Valenciana arrived at 5:48 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF OCTOBER 17, 2018
Motion/Second:  Escobar/Burke
Ayes:  Klein, Tucker, Valenciana
Recuse:  Shaw
Absent:  Chang, Fernandez

PUBLIC COMMENT
Jeff Carter, Millbrae, stated that Prop 6 did not pass and should be good for TIRCP and other projects. Measure W is still too close to call and he hopes that if it loses, it does not affect Caltrain too much and requested staff to report on the outcome.

CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT
Chair Brian Shaw attended the JPB meeting and the Board decided that the Fare Policy is to be reviewed by the JPB CAC prior to it going back to the Board. Mr. Shaw notified the committee that the JPB CAC Agenda has been adjusted for this review.

COMMITTEE COMMENTS
Member Kevin Burke attended the Belmont Electrification community meeting and advised that staff was very helpful in answering questions. Additionally, Mr. Burke wanted to reiterate a public comment from the previous JBP CAC meeting from Roland Lebrun.
APPROVAL OF THE 2019 JPB CAC MEETING CALENDAR

Motion/Second: Tucker/ Klein
Ayes: Escobar, Burke, Valenciana, Shaw
Absent: Chang, Fernandez

Member L. Fernandez arrived at 5:53 p.m.

FARE POLICY
Melissa Jones, Principal Planner, presented the Fare Policy Update

Member Comments:
Member Larry Klein asked, based on what was done previously, how will the Tariffs be set and how will they be approved and from a process standpoint, when will the Board reevaluate the policy and Tariffs going forward. Ms. Jones advised that the last update to the fares was in August 2017. There is a long public process prior to the Board adopting the fares. There are required analyses that are required before fare changes. Fares have been changed in the past in order prevent major changes to service due to a projected deficit.

Member Larry Klein also asked about zone vs. distance fares. Ms. Jones advised that if Caltrain decides to go from zone to distance, it will have many impacts and will affect all aspect of the agency and how it operates. The recommendation from staff and the board is to not make a decision either way until future service is established.

Member Cat Tucker asked how the 65% cost recovery was derived. Ms. Jones advised that Caltrain has one of the highest in the country, second to BART. That number is based on farebox recovery ratio over the past several years. Ms. Tucker also asked whether the policy will indicate timeframe for revaluation. Ms. Jones advised it is not being considered at this time. Ms. Tucker would like to recommend that language be added.

Member Kevin Burke asked about goals. He mentioned that two of the four goals can be measured; however there is no clear target to measure Ridership and Customer Experience goals and whether it will be considered. Ms. Jones advised that it is an important data point that could be considered in the future as part of possible fare changes, however for Ridership it was decided not to include a specific ridership target as the Agency’s target may change over the years. Mr. Burke asked whether staff will revisit the Go Pass system. Ms. Jones advised that it could be considered in the future. Member Kevin Burke recommended revisiting fares after electrification.

Member Paul Escobar also recommended revisiting fares after electrification. Vice Chair Valencaina asked what parties put the Fare Policy together and what committees were consulted. Ms. Jones advised that the Rail Division, including Caltrain Planning and Caltrain Operations, Marketing and Communications and the Finance team were involved.

Member Lauren Fernandez reiterated other committee member comments and asked how goals will be prioritized and how will the Tariff and final Fare Policy be evaluated.
against those goals. She advised that setting them in advance would be more transparent. Ms. Jones advised that her team will revisit if and when the Fare policy is adopted.

Chair Brian Shaw asked whether the four topic-goals listed are typical goals found with other fare policies with other properties. Ms. Jones confirmed that they are found in other fare policies. Mr. Shaw said that in order to determine goals are being achieved goals need to be measurable. It helps determine whether Caltrain is living up to the policy. Mr. Shaw suggested tying a number to each of the goals or a follow-up addendum to discuss how they are being evaluated. Mr. Shaw recommends that other committees and the public have an opportunity to provide input to better help the Board adopt the Fare Policy.

Public comment:
Jeff Carter, Millbrae, said that regarding elasticity how Caltrain judges the elasticity of those passengers that receive the Go Pass, subsidized transit, from their employer versus passengers that do not. The Go Pass brings a good revenue stream into Caltrain. Jeff asked regarding a Staff report that reported that BART rewards their riders when they do not provide a monthly pass and Metra in Chicago offer their riders monthly passes. Regarding the Fare Study and the one way TVM fare per rider and the Clipper pass fare per rider doesn’t understand the discrepancy as the difference is only $0.55. Lastly, Jeff provided a chart that reports the monthly pass fare and the ridership going back to 1975.

Adrian Brandt, Redwood City, said that Caltrain’s Zone based fares are highly inequitable and skews ridership and is exclusionary for low income people. Distance based fares are revenue neutral.

Andy Chow said that the Go Pass is controversial however he thinks that there is value in the Go Pass. Without the Go Pass, Caltrain would need to market to individual employees to purchase a pass that needs to be renewed monthly versus a Go Pass that is purchased annually. Keeping the Go Pass is efficient from a process aspect and is a revenue stream for Caltrain. Andy also said that the Fare Policy does not mention station to station versus zone and how Clipper 2.0 might impact that.

CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY KEY FINDINGS
Julian Jest, presented the Customer Satisfaction Key Findings

Julian reported that going back over the past five years Caltrain is on an upward trend and that these are the highest Overall ratings Caltrain has received.

Mr. Jest advised that the passengers were asked whether they brought any large items onboard and the trend indicates that the riders that brought a large item with them rated Caltrain higher than those that did not.

Julian advised that the detailed report is on Caltrain.com.
Member Comments:
Member Lauren Fernandez asked whether any action is taken from these results. Mr. Jest advised that the results are shared with the Customer Experience Taskforce to determine priorities. Ms. Fernandez asked what initiatives have come from these results in the past year. Mr. Jest advised that the Mobile Ticketing app has been rolled out that enable passengers to purchase their tickets on their mobile device. Mr. Joe Navarro also advised that Caltrain acts upon survey results just as staff did with the restroom odors on the train.

Member Paul Escobar asked what the demographic information is collected when passengers are surveyed. Mr. Jest advised that demographic information is not collected for this survey; however, the customer triennial survey does and is scheduled to be conducted in October 2019. Mr. Escobar asked beside English and Spanish, what are the other languages riders have. Mr. Jest advised that there was a small percentage, 39 out for approximately 3,000 riders did not speak English or Spanish.

Mr. Jest advised 41% of the train cars surveyed were bike cars and that 13% of riders brought a bike onboard and it tracks roughly with the annual count at 9%. The customer satisfaction survey reflects that passengers that brought a bike on board felt the most secure amongst other riders.

Member Kevin Burke asked how staff surveys trains with full trains above capacity. Mr. Jest advised that staff has an experienced team that can navigate through the train, however when the passenger is unable to complete the survey onboard, they are provided with a paper survey to complete and mail in via business reply mail.

Member Cat Tucker asked how the response rate is 70% with an average weekday ridership at 65k. Mr. Jest advised that staff keeps track of all eligible riders that can take the survey and those that decline and that is how staff gets response rate.

Member Larry Klein asked what percentage was English and what percentage was Spanish. Mr. Julian advised that 16 surveys were in Spanish. Mr. Klein then asked how staff will address the written comments from the surveys. Mr. Jest advised that the Customer Experience Taskforce reviews the comments. Mr. Klein said it would be helpful to include a timeline in the summary page.

Chair Brian Shaw recommended to ask questions related to Internet usage on the train. He said it may help with interim solutions with knowing the activity of passengers to gain a better understanding of passenger needs.

Vice Chair Valenciana asked why the survey is not available online. Mr. Jest advised that the reason for the paper survey is so that staff has better control over who takes the survey. Online surveys are open to abuse and may skew the results.

Member Larry Klein recommended having an informational business card to inform the public of the mobile ticketing app.
Public comment:
Jeff Carter, Millbrae, said that he agrees with the survey results in improvement with delays. Regarding bike security, he stated that right now passengers rated security high due to the fact that bikes are in view of bicyclists, however with the EMU’s, it is proposed that bikes will no longer be in passenger view. Mr. Carter also mentioned that the station origin and destination are not found in the detailed report online and requested it be made available.

STAFF REPORT UPDATE
Joe Navarro, Deputy Chief of Rail Operations, reported:

On-time Performance (OTP) -

- **October**: The October 2018 OTP was 94.8% compared to 93.5% for October 2017.
  - **Vehicle Strikes** - There was one vehicle strike on October 23.
  - **Vehicle on Tracks** - There was one day on October 26, with a vehicle on the tracks that caused train delays.
  - **Mechanical Delays** - In October 2018 there were 329 minutes of delay due to mechanical issues compared to 640 minutes in October 2017.
  - **Trespasser Strikes** - There were three trespasser strikes on October 17, 23 and 28, one resulting in a fatality.

- **September**: The September 2018 OTP was 92.6% compared to 94.7% for September 2017.
  - **Trespasser Strikes** - There were two trespasser strikes on September 23 and 26, one resulting in a fatality.

SF Weekend Caltrain Closure -
The first weekend of the SF Weekend Closure on October 6 and 7 was a success due to collaborative planning and execution efforts between Caltrain and SamTrans. During the busy weekend with same day events including the Fleet Weekend, Hardly Strictly Blue Grass Festival, Stanford college football game and 49ers football game, staff was at San Jose Diridon, Millbrae, Bayshore and SF stations to assist customers and provide information. Caltrain Bayshore Station Ridership for the first three weekends is significantly lower (24-37%) compared to the 2018 Annual Count Baseline ridership when excluding days when extra service for special events was provided.
• **Special Event Train Service -**

**Services Performed:**

- **Giants Baseball** - September Close Out: There were 14 home games in September. Total additional ridership alighting and boarding at San Francisco station, was 57,670.

  Total pre and regular season additional ridership alighting and boarding at San Francisco station was 452,538, representing a 13 percent decrease over 2017.

- **San Jose Sharks** - There were 3 pre-season home games in September. Total post-game riders, including regular riders and Sharks fans, boarding at San Jose Diridon station in September was 416.

  The season home opener was on Wednesday, October 3 at 7:30 p.m. vs. the Anaheim Ducks. They hosted two more regular season games (total of 4 games) in October. Event ridership will be provided in December.

  Stanford Football - The Stanford Cardinal hosted Utah on Saturday, October 6 (the same day the SF Weekend Closure took effect) at 7:30 p.m., and Washington State on Saturday, October 27 at 4:00 p.m. Caltrain served the Stanford Stadium station with both northbound and southbound trains before and after the game. Event ridership will be provided in December.

- **SF 49ers Regular Season** - The 49ers hosted the Arizona Cardinals on Sunday, October 7 at 1:25 p.m. (the same weekend the SF Weekend Closure took effect), LA Rams on Sunday, October 21 at 1:25 p.m. and the Oakland Raiders on Thursday, November 1 at 5:20 p.m. Caltrain operated one extra pre-game train with limited stops and one extra post-game local train from Mountain View to San Francisco. Event ridership will be provided in December.

**JPB CAC Work Plan**

December 19, 2018

- Proof of Payment
- Legislative Update
- Wi-Fi Update

**Items to be scheduled**

- Station Management Plan (getting to stations, capacity, usage, forecast, and planning) - requested by chair 3/2/16, modified 3/16/16 by Adina
- Schedule Audit - requested on 3/6/18 by Member Lauren Fernandez
- Presentation on a plan to clean-up right of way - requested by chair, Brian Shaw on 8/15/18.
- Camera System - to be scheduled in January
- Visual Messaging System Station Signage - to be scheduled in January
Grade Crossing Improvement – to be scheduled in January

DATE, TIME AND LOCATION OF NEXT REGULAR MEETING:
December 19, 2018 at 5:40 p.m., San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building, 2nd Floor Bacciocco Auditorium, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA.

Adjourned at 7:07 pm
Memorandum

Date: November 21, 2018
To: Board of Directors
From: Jim Hartnett, Executive Director
Subject: December 6, 2018 JPB Board Meeting Executive Director’s Report

- On-time Performance –
  - Through November 20: The preliminary November 2018 OTP was 93.5 percent compared to 94.8 percent for November 2017.
  - October: The October 2018 OTP was 94.8 percent compared to 93.5 percent for October 2017.

  ➢ Trespasser Strikes – There were three trespasser strikes on October 17, 23 and 28, one resulting in a fatality.

- SF Weekend Caltrain Closure Update – The SF Weekend Closure effective Saturday, October 6 continues through late Spring 2019 with the exception of Saturday, January 5 and Sunday January 6, 2019 (the weekend prior to the 2019 College Football Playoff National Championship on Monday, January 7, 2019 at Levi’s Stadium). In comparing the weekend train counts at Bayshore Station with the 2018 Annual Count baseline, total year-to-date weekend ridership at Bayshore station decreased by 26.3 percent as of November 19.

- Caltrain Mobile App Release Update – The new system update is targeted to roll out in December 2018. Both the current and new Mobile app versions are valid through the end of the year. The system updates are listed below.

  Customer interface:
  - Improved navigation
  - Additional payment options: Apple and Google Pay
  - “Buy again” feature
• **CAC Meeting** – The Citizens Advisory Committee met on Wednesday, November 14, in San Carlos. Melissa Jones, Principal Planner – Policy & Programming for Caltrain Planning, provided a presentation on Fare Policy Update. Julian Jest, Market Research Analyst, provided a presentation on 2018 Annual Customer Satisfaction Survey. Joe Navarro, Deputy Chief – Rail Operations, provided the Staff Report. The next CAC meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, December 19, in San Carlos.

• **BAC Meeting** – The Bicycle Advisory Committee met on Thursday, November 15, in San Carlos. Sebastian Petty, Senior Policy Advisor, provided a presentation on the Caltrain Business Plan. Julian Jest, Market Research Analyst, provided a presentation on 2018 Annual Customer Satisfaction Survey. Daniel Provence, Principal Planner, provided the Keyed Locker update and provided a presentation on the Station Bike Parking and Access Assessment. Lori Low, Public Affairs Officer, provided the Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program update and Staff Report. The next BAC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, January 17, in San Carlos.

• **Special Event Train Service**

  **Services Provided:**

  o **San Jose Sharks** – There were 4 home games in October. Total post-game riders, including regular riders and Sharks fans, boarding at San Jose Diridon station in October was 1,872.

  o **Stanford Football** – The Stanford Cardinal hosted Utah on Saturday, October 6 (the same weekend the SF Weekend Closure took effect) at 7:30 p.m. and Washington State on Saturday, October 27 at 4:00 p.m. Caltrain served the Stanford Stadium station with both northbound and southbound trains before and after the game. Total riders alighting and boarding at Stanford station in October was 1,319. The average ridership per game was 659, a 30 percent decrease compared to the 2017 season average.

  The Stanford Cardinal hosted Oregon State on Saturday, November 10 at 6:00 p.m. Caltrain served the Stanford Stadium station with both northbound and southbound trains before and after the game. Total riders alighting and boarding at Stanford Station was 384, a 59 percent decrease compared to 2017 average ridership per game.

  Season total ridership alighting and boarding at Stanford station was 4,264. Average ridership per game was 852, a 10 percent decrease compared to the 2017 season average.
SF 49ers Regular Season – The 49ers hosted the Arizona Cardinals on Sunday, October 7 at 1:25 p.m. (the same weekend the SF Weekend Closure took effect) and the LA Rams on Sunday, October 21 at 1:25 p.m. Caltrain operated one extra pre-game train with limited stops and one extra post-game local train from Mountain View to San Francisco. Total ridership alighting and boarding at Mountain View station was 2,832.

The 49ers hosted the Oakland Raiders on Thursday, November 1 at 5:20 p.m. and the NY Giants on Monday, November 12 at 5:15 p.m. Caltrain operated one extra pre-game train with limited stops and one extra post-game local train from Mountain View to San Francisco. Total ridership alighting and boarding at Mountain View station in November was 3,809.

Total year-to-date ridership alighting and boarding at Mountain View station was 11,293, a 15 percent decrease compared to the same number of games in 2017.

Services Scheduled:

- **San Jose Sharks** – The Sharks will host nine games in November. Caltrain will track post-game ridership for all home games. No extra special trains are planned. For weeknight and Saturday night games, the last northbound train departs SJ Diridon station at 10:30 p.m. or 15 minutes after the game ends but departs no later than 10:45 p.m.

- **SF 49ers Regular Season** – The 49ers will host the Indianapolis Colts on Sunday, December 9 at 1:05 p.m., Seattle Seahawks on Sunday, December 16 at 1:05 p.m. and the Chicago Bears on Sunday, December 23 at 1:05 p.m. For the remaining weekend 49er home games, Caltrain will operate one additional pre-game southbound train with limited stops from Bayshore to Mountain View for passengers to connect to the VTA light rail. The extra train will then express to San Jose Diridon station, the last station stop. After all 49er home games, Caltrain will operate one extra post-game local train that will depart Mountain View station approximately 75 minutes after the game ends, or when full. While the Weekend Bus Bridge is in effect, all trains (including Special trains) will start and terminate at the Bayshore Station and connect to SamTrans Buses. Bus service will be provided to and from 22nd Street and San Francisco stations.

- **Holiday Service** – During the following Holidays, Caltrain will run the following services:
  - Thanksgiving Day – Thursday, Nov. 22, 2018 (Holiday Schedule)
  - Day After Thanksgiving – Friday, Nov. 23, 2018 (Modified Schedule)
- Christmas Eve – Monday, Dec. 24, 2018 (Regular Weekday Schedule)
- Christmas Day – Tuesday, Dec. 25, 2018 (Holiday Schedule)
- New Year’s Eve – Monday, December 31 (Regular Weekday Schedule plus Pre & Post-SF Fireworks Special Trains)
  - Caltrain will provide FREE service beginning at 8:00 p.m. until the last train post-event departs SF at 2:00 a.m., making all local stops.
- New Year’s Day – Tuesday, Jan. 1, 2019 (Holiday Schedule)
- Presidents Day – Tuesday, Feb. 18, 2019 (Modified Schedule)

Schedule Information is available at www.caltrain.com/Holidays

- **PAC-12 College Football Championship Game** – The PAC-12 College Football Championship game will be held at Levi’s Stadium on Friday, November 30 at 5:00 p.m. The teams are still to be determined. Caltrain will track pre- and post-game ridership.

- **Holiday Train** – Caltrain will operate the Holiday Train in collaboration with the Silicon Valley Community Foundation (SVCF) on Saturday, December 1 and Sunday, December 2. With glittering lights and holiday decorations, the dazzling show-train will visit nine Caltrain stations between San Francisco and Santa Clara over two nights in December, providing holiday entertainment and collecting toy and monetary donations for local children who otherwise might not receive a gift during the holidays. Caltrain and SVCF also partner with local organizations to collect toys at each station for underserved children in our communities. On Saturday, December 1, the train will depart San Francisco and make stops at Burlingame, Redwood City, Mountain View, and Santa Clara. On Sunday, December 2, the train will depart San Francisco and make stops at Millbrae, San Mateo, Menlo Park, and Sunnyvale.

Due to operational changes to enhance safety at the Holiday Train stations, there will be impacts to regular train service. On Saturday, December 1 Southbound Train 434 will stop on the Northbound Platform at the Broadway, Burlingame, San Mateo, Belmont (Island Platform), San Carlos and Redwood City. Southbound Train 436 will also stop on the Northbound Platform at Santa Clara. On Sunday, December 2 Southbound Train 434 will stop on the Northbound Platform at Millbrae, Broadway, Burlingame and San Mateo. Southbound Train 436 will also stop on the Northbound Platform at Sunnyvale and Lawrence.

- **Redbox Bowl (PAC-12 vs. Big Ten Team)** – The Redbox Bowl College Football game will be held at Levi’s Stadium on Monday, December 31 at
12:00 p.m. The teams are still to be determined. Caltrain will track pre- and post-game ridership.

- **2019 College Football Playoff National Championship** – The City of San Jose will be hosting events (including the 2019 Championship Campus, Playoff Fan Central, Media Day, Watch Parties and the Extra Yard 5K in downtown San Jose from Friday, January 4, 2019 to Sunday, January 6) leading up to the 2019 College Football Playoff National Championship Game on Monday, January 7, 2019 at 5:00 p.m. at Levi’s Stadium. The event details are posted to: [http://www.bayarea2019.com](http://www.bayarea2019.com)

In order to increase connectivity between San Francisco, San Mateo and Santa Clara county cities, Caltrain will be providing extra service for the weekend events including the game day. A dedicated webpage that will outline the Caltrain Special Service and will be activated in December 2018.

The Weekend Bus Bridge will be suspended on Saturday, January 5 and Sunday, January 6 in anticipation of large crowds and out of town guests traveling along the Caltrain corridor.

- **Capital Projects** –

The Capital Projects information is current as of November 16, 2018 and is subject to change between November 16 and December 6, 2018 (Board Meeting). Additional information can be found in the quarterly report presented at this Board meeting.

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

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

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

In November, PG&E gas pipeline relocation along Delaware was completed. The relocation of underground PG&E electrical lines, and, third-party and Caltrain’s Positive Train Control (PTC) Fiber Optic cable continued. Construction of the Pedestrian Underpass, and, 25th and 28th Avenue Bridges also continued. Construction of the foundations for the 31st Avenue Bridge has begun. Construction of the 1st two tiers of Mechanically Stabilized Earth (MSE) retaining walls was completed at the northern section of the project near Borel Creek and 25th Avenue.

The temporary closure of the Hillsdale Station, to allow completion of the project, is now forecast to occur in the Fall of 2019 until Spring of 2020. During the temporary closure, enhanced bus and shuttle service to the Belmont Station will be provided to minimize the temporary inconvenience.

Due to delays associated with obtaining UPRR approvals and its impact to beginning 3rd party fiber optic relocations; the project schedule has been affected. Overall construction completion is forecast to be approximately 10-months late, with the completion date extended from early 2020 to October 2020. In addition, to the schedule impacts, the project has experienced significant impacts due to the inefficiency of working around a live fiber facility, as well as incurring additional construction costs associated with installing and working around temporary steel plate, and soldier pile walls, required to protect the 3rd party fiber optic during construction.

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

In November, third party utility relocations for water, gas and electric continued, and, construction of a retaining wall for the parking lot and improvements for Poletti Way were also in progress. Coordination for foundations for the Overhead Contact System (OCS) poles for the Electrification project also continues.

Critical third-party utility relocations that were originally scheduled to begin in November 2017 were delayed until August 2018 due to delays in
obtaining Caltrans permits. Due to physical conflicts between third-party utility relocations and civil construction for critical path activities such as the pedestrian underpass, a partial suspension has been issued for construction to minimize delays and inefficiencies that would be caused by the stacking of the utilities and construction work. Critical path construction is now planned to resume in April 2019. Non-critical path activities such as OCS foundations for the Electrification project and work on Poletti Way will continue during the suspension period. Project delays due to Caltrans issues are projected to extend project completion from mid-2019 to mid-2020.

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

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

  In November, work began at 16th Street in San Francisco and continued at Rengstorff Avenue and Castro Street in Mountain View. These sites are the last three work locations of the construction contract. Most of the punchlist work for medians in Santa Clara County was also completed. Overall construction is on schedule and expected to complete by February 2019.

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

In November, final construction of the extension of the platforms to the north continued. Cutover and activation of the new north pedestrian crossing gates and the extended platform is scheduled for December 3, 2018. This will eliminate the blockage of the southern crossing by 6-car train consists, and also eliminate the potential tripping hazards of the uneven platform surfaces. These activities will substantially complete the project.

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

  Locomotives #’s 920 and 921 were shipped to the vendor’s facility in February and March. Both locomotives are still undergoing overhaul; the expected returned to the CEMOF facility in San Jose for acceptance testing has been delayed by approximately 5 months to January and February return dates due to the vendor’s labor shortages. Locomotive #922 is now scheduled to be shipped to the vendor’s facility after Locomotive #920 is returned on January 30, 2019 to minimize the number of locomotives that are off the property at any one time.

- **MP-36 Locomotive Mid-Life Overhaul Project:** Perform mid-life overhaul of six MP-36-3C Locomotives. The mid-life overhaul of the locomotives shall include complete disassembly of the main diesel engine, overhauling by reconditioning re-usable main frame components and re-assembly with new engine components and the replacement of the Separate Head-End Power (SEP-HEP) unit and all electrical components of the SEP-HEP compartment. All areas of the locomotive car body, trucks, wheels and electrical components shall be reconditioned to like-new condition or replaced with new material. The project work shall be completed off-site at the contractor’s facility location. The six locomotives are Locomotive #’s 923, 924, 925, 926, 927 and 928.
Technical specifications for the work were completed in February 2018. The Request for Proposal was advertised on June 12, 2018. Proposals were received from 2 bidders on July 31. A bid protest was received and all bids were rejected at the October 4, 2018 Board meeting. A timeline for the re-solicitation is under development.
TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
        Executive Director

FROM: John Funghi
        Chief Officer, Caltrain Modernization Program

SUBJECT: PENINSULA CORRIDOR ELECTRIFICATION PROJECT MONTHLY PROGRESS REPORT

ACTION

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

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no impact on the budget.

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

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

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
Executive Director

FROM: Michelle Bouchard
Chief Operating Officer, Rail

SUBJECT: CALTRAIN POSITIVE TRAIN CONTROL PROJECT UPDATE - NOVEMBER 2018

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

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

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no budget impact.

MONTHLY UPDATE

1. Status on Major Milestones to Successfully Obtain An Alternative Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Project Activity</th>
<th>Expected Completion</th>
<th>Progress As Of 11/30/18</th>
<th>Progress On Track?</th>
<th>Mitigation Required or Approvals Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approval of Designated RSD Test Request</td>
<td>May 31st</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Formal conditional approval received on September 10. Team incorporating FRA conditions in test plan to insure compliance to approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of revised project PTC Implementation Plan (PTCIP) and Request for Amendment (RFA)</td>
<td>May 31st</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Formal approval received on September 20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot Installations (4) Completed</td>
<td>June 20th</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>All pilots completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit Designated RSD Application</td>
<td>Oct 15th</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>RSD Application submitted and in review by FRA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Critical Feature V&amp;V for Designated RSD area</td>
<td>Oct 30th</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Designated RSD area V&amp;V survey completed and submitted to FRA. Integrator is surveying remainder of Caltrain property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated RSD Training Complete</td>
<td>Nov 14th</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Training for designated RSD personnel completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated RSD - Required Vehicle Install Completion*</td>
<td>Dec 3rd</td>
<td>In Process</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(44) installs required completed, punch list items being addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete All Designated RSD Testing (Lab, Functional and FQT)</td>
<td>Dec 18th</td>
<td>In Process</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2 cycles of Lab testing completed, Functional testing delayed, System Integrator investigating comm issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start of Designated RSD*</td>
<td>Dec 19th</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Caltrain Substitute Criteria has been approved by FRA, Alternative Schedule request will be submitted to FRA early December</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Key project activity that is tied to Wabtec performance incentive payment
Major Wabtec activities started and / or completed in November:
- Completed installations on (44) locomotives and cab cars required per Caltrain’s Implementation Plan. Punch list items are being completed. On board installations is a statutory criteria to requesting an alternative schedule and was a critical path item until completed.
- Training by Wabtec for Caltrain and TASI staff (62 total to support RSD) completed in November. Training began in October after delays in receiving Wabtec training material for review and approval. Training is a statutory criteria to requesting an alternative schedule and was a critical path item until completed.
- Second round of lab testing completed at the Wabtec Jacksonville facility, results analyzed, no safety defects found requiring closure prior to commencement of FIT (Field Integration Test).
- FIT testing began in November but was stopped due to wayside communication issues requiring Wabtec to analyze and perform modifications as necessary. Testing expected to recommence in early December.
- Senior management review held in November between Caltrain and Wabtec senior staff to discuss project progress. Meetings will continue to ensure all Caltrain concerns are addressed promptly.
- Significantly large number of contract submittals continue to be submitted and re-submitted by Wabtec, reviewed and comments returned by Caltrain project team. A sampling of the submittals in October included:
  - Training material for
    - I-EMTS Maintenance Training
    - Wayside Fiber Optic Network
    - Onboard Operator
    - Base Stations
    - BOS Admin
  - Vehicle Acceptance Test Plan
  - Route Navigation and Speed Verification Test
  - Critical Feature V and V Test Plan
  - Functionality Integration Testing
  - WIU Troubleshooting Guide
  - DCS RF Drive Test Plan
  - Integrated Work Plan
  - PTC RAM Analysis
  - Multiple Requests for Information

2. Change Order Log – There have been no change orders requested from Wabtec during this reporting period, and there are none in process or review by Caltrain.

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

To date no risks have been identified requiring use of the risk funds. There are also risks to be monitored outside the Wabtec specific contract that the project team monitors and mitigates as necessary. The following table captures the top risks both external (outside the Wabtec contract) and internal (specific to the Wabtec contract):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Item</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mitigation Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential EMU delay due to move from I-ITCS to I-ETMS</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Project team continues to support EMU team effort to bring Wabtec under contract to provide PTC solution required for EMU cars with minimal delay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRA process changes</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Maintain close and open relationship with key FRA contacts to ensure all submittals are done correctly and within required time frame to achieve 2018 RSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRA review cycle delays</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Delays were being incurred initially due to significant volume of submittals from all properties requiring review and approval of RSD documentation prior to year end. Team working with FRA to minimize any delays incurred with Caltrain documentation and speed FRA review process (see #4 FRA document status below).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interoperability delays</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Caltrain is working with UPRR and tenants to ensure agreed to interoperability schedule dates are maintained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onboard installation delays</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Onboard installations are complete, excluding punch list items. Wabtec must ensure production installation schedule is maintained to achieve remaining fleet installs in early 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track access delays</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Ensure field test schedule is maintained by coordinating all field work in combination with other capital project's needs, particularly the PCEP project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back Office Server (BOS) documentation scope creep</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Ensure standard documentation supplied by Wabtec meets requirements of Caltrain specification criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRA approval of an Alternative Schedule</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Caltrain has received FRA approval of Substitute Criteria to be used rather than the statutory requirement of achieving RSD on one subdivision of the railroad by Dec 31, 2018. Caltrain will submit an Alternative Schedule request in December for FRA approval showing RSD and full system certification after 2018.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Name</th>
<th>Status - Through November 21, 2018</th>
<th>Projected Submittal Date</th>
<th>Actual Submittal Date</th>
<th>Need FRA Approval By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Updated PTC Implementation Plan and Request for Amendment of the PTCIP</td>
<td>Formal approval received 9/26/18</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>6/22/2018 (final)</td>
<td>Received September 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Request</td>
<td>Formal approval received 9/10/18</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>6/22/2018 (final)</td>
<td>Received September 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdivision and Critical Asset Configuration Management Plan</td>
<td>Final approved by FRA - 8/13/2018</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>7/25/2018</td>
<td>Received September 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Features Verification and Validation Procedure</td>
<td>Final approved by FRA - 8/16/2018</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>8/15/18</td>
<td>Received August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Features Verification and Validation Plan - Designated Track Section</td>
<td>Final approved by FRA - 8/16/2018</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>8/15/18</td>
<td>Received August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Features Verification and Validation Plan - Brake Test Area</td>
<td>Final approved by FRA - 8/16/2018</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>8/15/18</td>
<td>Received August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Name</td>
<td>Status - Through November 21, 2018</td>
<td>Projected Submittal Date</td>
<td>Actual Submittal Date</td>
<td>Need FRA Approval By</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal and Switch (WIU) Verification and Validation Procedure</td>
<td>Final approved by FRA - 8/16/2018</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>8/15/18</td>
<td>Received August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal and Switch (WIU) Verification and Validation Plan - Designated Track Section</td>
<td>Final approved by FRA - 8/16/2018</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>8/15/18</td>
<td>Received August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static Bulletin Delivery Confirmation</td>
<td>Final approved by FRA - 8/16/2018</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>8/15/18</td>
<td>Received August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brake Test Plan - F40 locomotive</td>
<td>Final approved by FRA - 8/22/2018</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>8/21/2018</td>
<td>Received August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brake Test Plan - Gallery cab car</td>
<td>Final approved by FRA - 8/22/2018</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>8/21/2018</td>
<td>Received August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brake Test Plan - MP36 locomotive</td>
<td>Final approved by FRA 9/21/2018</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>9/20/18</td>
<td>Received September 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brake Test Plan - Bombardier Cab Cars</td>
<td>Final approved by FRA 9/21/2018</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>9/20/18</td>
<td>Received September 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Integrated Test (FIT) Plan - Designated Track Section</td>
<td>Final approved by FRA 10/19/2018</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>10/10/18</td>
<td>October 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Qualification Test (FQT) Plan - Designated Track Area</td>
<td>In FRA review process</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>11/30/18</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSD Application</td>
<td>In FRA review process</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>11/8/18</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitute Criteria Strategy</td>
<td>Final approved by FRA 11/9/2018</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>09/20/18</td>
<td>Received November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to Substitute Criteria Conditions</td>
<td>In development</td>
<td></td>
<td>November 2018</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Schedule Request</td>
<td>In development</td>
<td></td>
<td>December 2018</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Caltrain Roadmap to RSD

- Caltrain is pursuing the following steps to first achieve FRA-approved Designated Revenue Service Demonstration (RSD), followed by full RSD status:
  1. Complete training of personnel required to support Designated RSD – completion expected by November 30th.
  2. Complete installation of I-ETMS equipment on vehicles required to support Designated RSD – required I-ETMS modules completed in November, punch list items nearing completion.
  3. Completed required brake testing of designated RSD vehicles and two rounds of lab integration testing, FIT (Field Integrated Test) testing for the Designated RSD area (15 miles of track on Caltrain property) was temporarily stopped in November for Wabtec to work through some wayside communication issues. Re-start of FIT expected by early December.
  4. Submission of Designated RSD application for approval by FRA – submitted in November, FRA reviewing.
5. Once Designated RSD is achieved, Caltrain will complete remaining vehicle installations, train remaining personnel, and finish testing the remainder of the Caltrain property in 2019 to achieve full RSD. Caltrain will also complete tenant testing on Caltrain property and interoperability requirements on UPRR property as well.

- To limit the risk of not completing the above steps, Caltrain is also pursuing an alternative FRA-approved path to achieve RSD:
  - Submission for FRA approval of Caltrain-specific Substitute Criteria activities to be completed in 2018. Caltrain’s requested Substitute Criteria includes a detailed list of testing results that support completion of one cycle of Lab Integration End to End (LIEE) testing. Caltrain received FRA conditional approval of Substitute Criteria on November 9th. Caltrain must respond to conditions by December 9th, no issues anticipated.
  - Upon completion of Statutory and Substitute Criteria activities, submission for FRA approval of Alternative Schedule to be followed to achieve RSD – submission in early December.
  - Upon approval and completion of Alternative Schedule, submission of RSD application for entire property for approval by FRA.

- To date, the FRA has been very receptive and supportive to both the Caltrain Designated RSD strategy as well as the Caltrain Substitute Criteria strategy.

- Now that Caltrain has completed the Statutory Criteria on installs and training, as well as receiving FRA approval of the Caltrain Substitute Criteria, Caltrain will focus on submitting an Alternative Schedule request for FRA approval, allowing for continued testing and implementation and full system certification by December 2020.

### Cost - Spend vs budget - through October 31, 2018 -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Analysis</th>
<th>(A) Original Budget (US$MM)</th>
<th>(B) Approved Changes (Contractor) (US$MM)</th>
<th>(C) Project Current Budget (US$MM)</th>
<th>(D) Expended and Accrual To Date (US$MM)</th>
<th>(E) Estimated at Completion (EAC) (US$MM)</th>
<th>(F) = (C - E)</th>
<th>(G) = (D / E)</th>
<th>% Expended of EAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBOSS PTC Project</td>
<td>$231.00</td>
<td>$239.88</td>
<td>$202.26</td>
<td>$202.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain PTC Project (March 1st 2018 - June 2020):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrator WABTEC Contract</td>
<td>$43.01</td>
<td>$43.01</td>
<td>$6.11</td>
<td>$43.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-14.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contractors</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>$0.43</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Changes</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Incentive - WABTEC</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Program Costs</td>
<td>$30.34</td>
<td>$30.34</td>
<td>$5.20</td>
<td>$30.45</td>
<td>$0.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Contingency</td>
<td>$6.06</td>
<td>$6.06</td>
<td>$5.95</td>
<td>$6.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total PTC Project</td>
<td>$89.41</td>
<td>$89.41</td>
<td>$11.74</td>
<td>$89.41</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

1) Team received formal written FRA conditional approval of Caltrain Substitute Criteria which will lead to submittal of Caltrain Alternative Schedule request to achieve full system certification beyond 2018.

2) Team received approval of Critical Features V&V test plan for non-designated RSD area from FRA, allowing for start of formal CF V&V of non-designated RSD Caltrain property.

3) Team submitted formal RSD application (including extensive Appendices) to FRA for review and comment.

4) Team submitted final FQT (Field Qualification Test) plan for the Designated RSD track area to FRA for review approval. FQT testing occurs after successful completion of FIT (Field Integrated Test).

5) Team supported visit by FRA representatives to view field testing, specifically vehicle acceptance testing of locomotives and cab cars containing I-ETMS modules. Team also held close-out meeting with FRA representatives to discuss FRA observations from testing as well as Caltrain strategy to achieve approval of Alternative Schedule and RSD rollout.

6) Team continued to work with ARINC to clarify modifications required for ROCS to support PTC implementation, including CCF and BCCF updates as required.

7) The PTC project continues its coordination efforts with the Electrification and EMU programs via regularly scheduled status meetings such as the Biweekly CalMod Systems Integration, the PCEP Delivery Coordination and the PTC-PCEP coordination meetings. Ad hoc meetings to discuss topics requiring in-depth or immediate decisions are held as needed. Data sharing of fiber audit results and testing schedules (sharing of track and time) ongoing to insure both teams coordinate needs.

8) Caltrain configuration management (CM) manager continues full integration into project team to ensure all Caltrain CM requirements are maintained during project execution and transition to daily operations upon project completion.

9) Caltrain Go Live team reinstated to ensure smooth transition of PTC operations and maintenance upon project completion. These efforts include drafting a RSD rollout strategy, manload planning for both Caltrain and TASI operations and maintenance, and coordination of Master Service Agreements (MSA) negotiations with key suppliers required to support PTC long term service needs.

7. **Upcoming Key Activities in December** -

1) Meet with FRA representatives on December 5th to review Caltrain Alternate Schedule application prior to formal submittal to FRA for approval.

2) Continue Critical Feature Validation and Verification (V&V) field testing of non-designated RSD.

3) Re-start Field Integration Testing (FIT) once Wabtec determines and implements corrective actions required to resolve wayside communication issues.

4) Close out all punch list items on onboard installs and continue installations on remaining Caltrain fleet.

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

6) Continue regular monthly review with Wabtec senior management to ensure the Wabtec project team maintains focus on completing all 2018 activities as well as planning 2019 activities.
7) Continue to work closely with the FRA regional and national representatives to ensure all aspects of documentation and testing requirements are maintained and approvals (by FRA) granted.

8. Vehicle Installation
- The project integrator has completed installation of I-ETMS modules on the Caltrain locomotives and cab cars required based on Caltrain’s Implementation Plan. Caltrain is working with Wabtec to insure all punch list items are completed as quickly as possible. Wabtec must also focus on completing the remaining Caltrain fleet (23 additional locomotives and cab cars) in early 2019.

| I-ETMS On-Board Installation Progress (As of 11/30/18) |
|---------------------------------|----------|----------|---------|
| Equipment                      | Completed| In Progress| Pending |
| F40PH-2CAT                     | 16       | 0         | 0       |
| MP36                           | 5        | 0         | 0       |
| Bombardier Cab                 | 5        | 0         | 0       |
| Gallery Cab                    | 17       | 0         | 0       |
| **Total**                      | **44**   | 0         | 0       |
| %                               | **100%** | 0%        | 0%      |

Prepared By: Matt Scanlon, Deputy Director, Systems 650.622.7819
AGENDA ITEM #8
DECEMBER 6, 2018

PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD
STAFF REPORT

TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
Executive Director

FROM: Derek Hansel
Chief Financial Officer

SUBJECT: COMPREHENSIVE ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 2018

ACTION
Staff Coordinating Council proposes that the Board of Directors accept the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board’s (JPB) Fiscal Year (FY) 2018 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR).

The FY2018 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report is available online at http://www.caltrain.com/about/statsandreports/Comprehensive_Annual_Financial_Reports.html

SIGNIFICANCE
The CAFR is prepared in accordance with the guidelines set forth by the Government Accounting Standards Board and is organized into four sections – Introductory, Financial, Statistical and Single Audit.

- The **Introductory** Section includes a Transmittal Letter and provides general information on the District’s structure, personnel, economic outlook and finances.

- The **Financial** Section includes audited financial statements which provide detailed financial information as well as comparative financial data. The Management Discussion & Analysis (MD&A) is also found in the Financial Section. Along with the Transmittal Letter, the MD&A is of most interest to those looking for a narrative annual review of the District’s finances.

- The **Statistical** Section provides a broad range of data covering key financial trends including revenue and debt capacity, economic and demographic data and operating information.

- The **Single Audit** Section provides the Independent Auditor’s Report on Internal controls and compliance, and the Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards and Findings and Recommendations from the Auditors.
Together, all sections of the CAFR provide the detail as well as the perspective with which to assess the JPB’s financial condition.

**BUDGET IMPACT**
There is no impact on the Budget.

**BACKGROUND**
The JPB contracts with an independent auditor, Vavrinek, Trine, Day & Co. LLP (VTD) to conduct yearly audits of the Financial Statements in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in Government Auditing Standards, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States of America. The introductory section and the statistical section presented in the CAFR are not required by California Government Code to be reported as part of the audited financial statements of the JPB. These sections are required when producing a CAFR which the JPB chooses to do in order to provide detailed information about the financial condition of the JPB in a form that is understandable to our customers and constituents.

The CAFR is prepared and presented to the Government Finance Officers Association for their review, evaluation and to apply for the certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting. The JPB has received an award for every year that the report was submitted.

Prepared by: Jennifer Ye, Manager, Financial Reporting and General Ledger 650.622-7890
Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board
Fiscal Year 2017-2018

Comprehensive Annual Financial Report
Single Audit Report

Board of Directors
December 6, 2018 – Agenda Item#8
Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR)

Fiscal Year 2017-2018
Major Sections of the CAFR

- Introductory
- Financial
- Statistical
AUDITOR’S COMMUNICATION

- VTD issued an unmodified “clean” opinion on the financial statements and compliance with federal grants
- No adjustments were proposed to the financial statements
- No difficulties were encountered in the performance of the audit
Fiscal Year 2017-2018 Highlights

- Operating revenue increased ($5 million)
- Capital contribution increased ($74.5 million)
- Internal Control over Financial Reporting and on Compliance: *No audit finding reported*
Single Audit Report
Single Audit Report

- Expenditures of Federal Award
  $170.6 million

- Internal Control over Major Programs:
  No finding reported
TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
Executive Director

FROM: Derek Hansel
Chief Financial Officer

SUBJECT: APPROVAL OF THE PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD FINANCING

The Report will be provided under separate cover prior to the December 6, 2018 Board meeting.
AGENDA ITEM #10
DECEMBER 6, 2018

PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD
STAFF REPORT

TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
Executive Director

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

SUBJECT: AUTHORIZE AMENDMENTS TO CONTRACTS FOR PROVISION OF ON-CALL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AND SUPPORT SERVICES

ACTION
Staff Coordinating Council recommends the Board:

1. Approve amendments to contracts with the firms listed below to increase the aggregate contract total amount by $2.7 million, from $6.6 million to $9.3 million, a 41 percent increase, to be shared as a pool for authorized tasks amongst:
   • CDM Smith, Inc.,
   • Fehr & Peers, Inc.,
   • HNTB Corporation, and
   • STANTEC Consulting Services, Inc.

2. Authorize the Executive Director, or his designee, to execute a contract amendment with each of the above firms in a form approved by legal counsel.

SIGNIFICANCE
Approval of the above actions will ensure uninterrupted services in connection with current and upcoming transportation planning efforts within the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) capital program and Caltrain Modernization Program, such as:

• Caltrain Stations Access
• Caltrain Fare Study
• Caltrain Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Policy
• Hayward Park Station TOD
• Caltrain Business Plan: Outreach and Technical Studies
• Communication and Outreach Program Support for Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project (PCEP)
• Bike Management Program

BUDGET IMPACT
The services to be provided pursuant to the contract amendments will be performed
under Work Directives (WDs) issued to each firm on an on-call basis. The WDs will be funded from previously adopted capital budgets and those approved in Fiscal Year 2019. WDs will be funded by a mix of Federal, State and regional grants, local revenues and/or private funds.

**BACKGROUND**
In October 2013, Board Resolution No. 2013-46 authorized award of three-year contracts with an aggregate contract total amount of $4 million to be shared as a pool under authorized WDs assigned to the four firms listed above. This resolution also authorized two, one-year option terms for an aggregate total of $1 million per year. The option terms have been exercised, the current aggregate contract value is $6.6 million (including $600,000 in contingency). The contract term was subsequently extended for one year and contracts are currently set to expire November 30, 2019.

Over the past five years, the JPB has been tasked with undertaking a significant number of transportation planning and support projects, efforts, and initiatives that were not anticipated when the contracts were awarded. The unanticipated work resulted from the JPB receiving additional grants and private sector funding for time-sensitive tasks. To date, an aggregate total of $4.05 million in WDs has been issued under the subject contracts and $5.25 million in additional WDs (a total of $9.3 million) is needed to meet current, ongoing anticipated and unanticipated needs of the JPB through November 30, 2019.

An increase of $2.7 million, from $6.6 million to $9.3 million, in the aggregate contract total amount is therefore needed to accommodate and complete these projects. Increasing the contract total will not obligate the JPB to purchase any specific level of services from each firm as WDs are issued on a project and as-needed basis.

The performance of all four firms to date has been satisfactory and in accordance with the requirements of each contract. Staff will resolicit for these services in early 2019.

Prepared By: Hilda Lafebre, Manager, Capital Project & Environmental Planning 650.508.7842
RESOLUTION NO. 2018-

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

*   *   *

AUTHORIZING AMENDMENT OF CONTRACTS FOR ON-CALL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AND SUPPORT SERVICES TO INCREASE THE AGGREGATE CONTRACT TOTAL AMOUNT BY $2,700,000

WHEREAS, pursuant to Resolution No. 2013-46, the Board of Directors (Board) of the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) awarded contracts for on-call transportation planning and support services to CDM Smith, Inc., Fehr & Peers, Inc., HNTB Corporation, and STANTEC Consulting Services, Inc., for a three-year base term with two, one-year options, and contracts were subsequently extended for one additional year until November 30, 2019; and

WHEREAS, due to existing and new projects, tasks and additional consultant support now needed, but not anticipated at the time of solicitation issuance and contract award, additional contract capacity is required; and

WHEREAS, the Staff Coordinating Council recommends, and the Executive Director concurs that the Board authorize amendments to the contracts with CDM Smith, Inc., Fehr & Peers, Inc., HNTB Corporation, and STANTEC Consulting Services, Inc., to increase the aggregate contract total amount by $2,700,000, from $6,600,000 to a new aggregate contract total amount of $9,300,000, to be shared amongst the four firms, with the understanding that increasing the contract total will not obligate the JPB to purchase any specific level of services from any firm, as services are provided on an as-needed basis.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the Peninsula Joint Powers Board hereby authorizes amendments to the contracts with CDM Smith,
Inc., Fehr & Peers, Inc., HNTB Corporation, and STANTEC Consulting Services, Inc. to increase the aggregate contract total amount by $2,700,000 from $6,600,000 to a new aggregate contract total amount of $9,300,000, to be shared amongst the four firms; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board authorizes the Executive Director, or his designee, to execute an amendment with each of the firms listed above in a form approved by legal counsel.

Regularly passed and adopted this 6th day of December, 2018 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

___________________________
Chair, Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board

ATTEST:

___________________________
JPB Secretary
AGENDA ITEM #11
DECEMBER 6, 2018

PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD
STAFF REPORT

TO: Joint Powers Board
THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
Executive Director
FROM: April Chan Derek Hansel
Chief Officer, Planning, Grants Chief Financial Officer
and Transportation Authority
Michelle Bouchard
Chief Operating Officer, Rail

SUBJECT: AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF AGREEMENTS TO RECEIVE STATE FUNDING FOR
THE PENINSULA CORRIDOR ELECTRIFICATION EXPANSION PROJECT, AND
AMENDING TO INCREASE THE FISCAL YEAR 2019 CAPITAL BUDGET BY
$200,638,000 FROM $97,548,255 TO $298,186,255

ACTION
The Staff Coordinating Council (SCC) recommends the Board:

1. Authorize the Executive Director, or his designee, to execute all required agreements
   and program supplements with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)
   to allow the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) to receive Transit and
   InterCity Rail Program funding from the California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA)
   for the Peninsula Corridor Electrification Expansion Project.

2. Amend to increase the Fiscal Year 2019 Capital Budget by $200,638,000 from
   $97,548,255 to $298,186,255.

3. Authorize the Executive Director, or his designee, to take any other actions that
   may be necessary to receive the subject funding.

SIGNIFICANCE
In May 2018, CalSTA awarded the JPB a grant of $164,522,000 from the Transit and
InterCity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP) to help the JPB expand the ongoing electrification
project to achieve a number of objectives including:

1. Reducing diesel trips on the corridor in the near term and enhancing corridor
   seating capacity by exercising existing contract options with Stadler Inc.;
2. Minimizing the need to extend platforms and expand maintenance and storage
   facilities;
3. Retaining a one-seat ride between Gilroy and San Francisco;
4. Implementing wayside bike improvements identified in the recently adopted bicycle parking master plan;
5. Installing a corridor-wide broadband communications network to support operations and Wi-Fi on-board Caltrain; and
6. Developing a Caltrain Business Plan that articulates a future service vision for the corridor including blended service with California High Speed Rail.

To be eligible to receive the funds, the Board of Directors (Board) must authorize the Executive Director, or his designee, to execute:

- A revised Master Agreement related to the general provisions of TIRCP program funding;
- A multi-year funding agreement to codify the project scope, schedule and cash-flow needs; and
- Program supplement agreements to provide annual allocations of funding.

**BUDGET IMPACT**

The TIRCP grant funds are being provided for a number of individual project elements as previously shared with the Board and as shown in the table below. The Board previously approved a budget amendment at the August 2018 meeting for $3 million of the TIRCP grant to support the Caltrain Business Plan development and network integration planning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope Element</th>
<th>TIRCP Grant</th>
<th>Match</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Plan and Network Integration</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Additional EMUs</td>
<td>$144,022,000</td>
<td>$38,616,000</td>
<td>$182,638,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayside Bike Parking Improvements</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadband Communications</td>
<td>$14,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$14,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$164,522,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$39,116,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$203,638,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SCC recommends amending the Fiscal Year (FY) 2019 Capital Budget to include the remaining $161,522,000 of TIRCP funding, along with the required local match of $39,116,000. The local match for the bike parking component has been provided by FY 2018 State Rail Assistance funding. The balance of the local match is associated with the procurement of additional electric multiple units and does not need to be available until FY 2021 based on the cash-flow plan provided to CalSTA. It is anticipated that remaining match will come from a number of sources including an upgraded credit facility (ultimately to be repaid from farebox revenues or other sources), SB1 State Rail Assistance funds, or other grant funds that can be secured between now and FY 2021.

With the budget amendment of $200,638,000, the FY 2019 Capital Budget will be increased from $97,548,255 to a total of $298,186,255 as shown in Attachment A to this report.
**BACKGROUND**
The goal of the TIRCP is to provide competitive grants to fund transformative capital improvements that modernize California’s intercity rail, bus, ferry, and rail transit systems to achieve the following objectives:

- Reduce greenhouse gas emissions;
- Expand and improve rail service to increase ridership;
- Integrate the rail service of the state’s various rail operations, including integration with the high-speed rail system; and
- Improve safety.

Caltrans, in collaboration with CalSTA, is responsible for administering TIRCP funding.

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

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

***

AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF AGREEMENTS TO RECEIVE STATE FUNDING FOR THE
PENINSULA CORRIDOR ELECTRIFICATION EXPANSION PROJECT, AND AMENDING
TO INCREASE THE FISCAL YEAR 2019 CAPITAL BUDGET BY $200,638,000 FROM $97,548,255
TO $298,186,255

WHEREAS, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), in cooperation
with the California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA), is responsible for administering
grant funding allocated by the California Transportation Commission; and

WHEREAS, in May 2018, CalSTA awarded the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers
Board (JPB) a $164,522,000 Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP) grant; and

WHEREAS, the JPB intends to use $161,522,000 of the grant to fund various capital
improvements to the Caltrain commuter rail system relating to the Peninsula Corridor
Electrification Expansion Project, and $3 million to fund the development of the Caltrain
Business Plan and network integration planning; and

WHEREAS, to receive the funds, the JPB's Board of Directors (Board) must
authorize the Executive Director, or his designee, to execute the following agreements
with Caltrans:

1. A revised Master Agreement related to the general provisions of TIRCP program
   funding.

2. A multi-year funding agreement to codify the project scope, schedule and cash-
   flow needs.

3. Program supplement agreements to provide annual allocations of funding; and
WHEREAS, to receive the funds, the JPB is required to provide $39,116,000 in local matching funds, totaling $200,638,000 in new capital improvements funding; and

WHEREAS, to receive the funds, the Board must amend to increase the Fiscal Year (FY) 2019 Capital Budget by $200,638,000 from $97,548,255 to $298,186,255; and

WHEREAS, the Board previously amended the FY 2019 Capital Budget at its August 2018 meeting to reflect the $3 million in funds for the Caltrain Business Plan and network integration planning; and

WHEREAS, the Staff Coordinating Council recommends the Board:

1. Authorize the Executive Director, or his designee, to execute the following agreements with Caltrans:
   - A revised Master Agreement related to the general provisions of TIRCP program funding;
   - A multi-year funding agreement to codify the project scope, schedule and cashflow needs.; and
   - Program supplement agreements to provide annual allocations of funding;

2. Amend to increase the FY 2019 Capital Budget by $200,638,000 from $97,548,255 to $298,186,255; and

3. Authorize the Executive Director, or his designee, to take such other actions as may be necessary to receive the subject funding.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board:

1. Authorizes the Executive Director, or his designee, to execute the following agreements with Caltrans:
   - A revised Master Agreement related to the general provisions of TIRCP program funding;
• A multi-year funding agreement to codify the project scope, schedule and cash-flow needs; and
• Program supplement agreements to provide annual allocations of funding; and

2. Amends to increase the Fiscal Year 2019 Capital Budget by $200,638,000 as noted in Attachment A, attached hereto and incorporated by reference; and

3. Authorizes the Executive Director, or his designee, to take such other actions as may be necessary to receive the subject funding.

Regularly passed and adopted this 6th day of December, 2018 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

Chair, Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board

ATTEST:

J PB Secretary
TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
Executive Director

FROM: Michelle Bouchard
Chief Operating Officer, Rail

John Funghi
Chief Officer, CalMod program

SUBJECT: AUTHORIZE EXERCISE OF CONTRACT OPTION WITH STADLER USA, INC. FOR AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED $174,600,000 FOR THE PROCUREMENT OF ADDITIONAL ELECTRIC MULTIPLE UNIT (EMU) VEHICLES WITH AN ADDITIONAL $3,500,000 IN CONTRACT AUTHORITY FOR CONTINGENCY

ACTION
Staff Coordinating Council (SCC) recommends that the Board:

(a) Authorize the Executive Director to exercise the contract option with Stadler for up to 37 additional EMU vehicles in an amount not to exceed $174,600,000;

(b) Include contract contingency at an appropriate level by increasing the contract contingency in the amount of $3,500,000 and authorize the Executive Director to issue change orders for the option order up to that limit.

SIGNIFICANCE
Approval of the above actions will benefit the JPB by maximizing the use of EMU trains for the Peninsula Corridor Electrification Program (PCEP) at the most efficient contracted-for option price. Increasing the fleet of EMUs supports the JPB’s business plan and will allow for both improved and increased service levels in compliance with terms and conditions of the Transit Intercity Rail Capital Program.

BUDGET IMPACT
The total budget impact of this EMU option exercise will be $183,100,000. This includes previously stated amounts for the Stadler contract in addition to associated consultant and staff costs to support the project in addition to finance charges related to cash flowing the grant to match the payment milestones of the contract. The budget breakdown for the EMU procurement through TIRCP is as follows:
This project is the largest of several that will be funded by the TIRCP grant award. A related board item will incorporate the TIRCP award and matching funds into the Capital Budget. The total amount will be $203,638,000 comprised of $164,522,000 in state TIRCP funds and matching funds of $39,116,000.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Element</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Electric Multiple Units (EMUs)</td>
<td>$183,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayside Bike Parking Improvements</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Agreement Support</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadband Communications</td>
<td>$14,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$203,600,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is anticipated that the source of matching funds will be identified from various sources including State Rail Assistance Funds (SRA), funds from resale of retired fleet, member contributions and other available funds.

**BACKGROUND**

At its meeting on July 7, 2016, after a rigorous and lengthy competitive procurement process, the Board awarded Contract #14-PCJPB-P-056 to Stadler in the total amount of $550,899,459 for the design, manufacture, and delivery of 96 EMUs, as well as mock-ups, spare parts, special tools, test equipment, manuals, training, and related parts and services.

The Contract with Stadler includes options for the JPB to purchase additional EMUs (Option Cars) at competitively bid and negotiated prices. Under the terms of the Contract, to secure the most advantageous pricing the JPB must exercise this option during the base-order manufacturing process—no later than eighteen months prior to the start of fabrication of the last new car shell under the base contract. This time period will end on December 31, 2018. The JPB may exercise options after this period, but at a higher price as Stadler will incur additional costs if it has to restart a new manufacturing process.
In April 2018 JPB was awarded $164,522,000 in TIRCP funds to be matched for a total of $203,638,000. This funding is intended to be delivered in two tranches, with the first tranche beginning in Fiscal Year (FY)19 and the second tranche delivered in FY24. This was a subset of the original total request of $631,500,000.

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

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

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

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

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

- **Enhance corridor seating capacity**: Front-loading the allocation to purchase the maximum number of powered coaches under the first option maximizes the number of sets of equipment that can be extended to 7-cars with a maximum seating capacity of 667 seats (subject to finalizing configuration). From a technical perspective powered coaches must be added to the 6-car consist prior to adding the 8th non-powered car.

- **Minimize rework of platforms and maintenance and storage facilities**: The allocation supports the extension of electric train sets to 7-cars which are capable of being accommodated on the line currently. This also precludes the need for extensive infrastructure changes in the maintenance facility. Additionally, subject to a detailed commissioning plan, higher capacity EMU sets allow the potential for incremental decommissioning of the existing 5-car diesel trains once the line is electrified.

- **Retain one seat ride from Gilroy to SF, and enable future extension to Monterey County**: The proposed service plan provides the ability to limit diesel trips only to those that will provide a one seat ride to and from San Francisco. In the future, these diesel trains have potential to be extended to provide future service to and from Salinas, CA.
• Procure additional vehicles in the most cost effective manner; this allocation requests a front loading of funds to leverage the JPB's currently available options on the existing rolling stock contract with Stadler to advance additional electrified service and to significantly improve corridor operations and capacity.

To accomplish the abovementioned goals the intent is to exercise of options on the JPB's existing contract with Stadler for the procurement of 37 additional EMUs to increase capacity of the electrified system and provide the opportunity to operate fully electrified Caltrain service between San Jose and San Francisco with the exception of through-running Gilroy service. Diesel trains may also be used for contingency purposes. The additional EMU order will provide Caltrain with an additional three seven-car EMU consists and will extend the 16, 6-car sets currently on-order to seven cars each, resulting in a total of 19 seven-car EMU consists.

Stadler will manufacture and deliver the Option Cars subject to the same contractual terms as the base order. One exception may be bonding costs, which, depending on the outcome of ongoing discussions with Stadler, may be less than anticipated, reducing the actual cost of the exercise of the option to an amount less than the Not-to Exceed amount requested under this item.
RESOLUTION NO. 2018 - 

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

*** 

EXERCISING CONTRACT OPTION WITH STADLER USA, INC. FOR AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED $174,600,000 FOR THE PROCUREMENT OF ADDITIONAL ELECTRIC MULTIPLE UNIT (EMU) VEHICLES WITH AN ADDITIONAL $3,500,000 IN CONTRACT AUTHORITY FOR CONTINGENCY 

WHEREAS, at its meeting on July 7, 2016, after a rigorous and lengthy competitive procurement process, the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) awarded Contract #14-PCJ PB-P-056 to Stadler in the total amount of $550,899,459 for the design, manufacture, and delivery of 96 EMUs, as well as mock-ups, spare parts, special tools, test equipment, manuals, training, and related parts and services (the Contract); and

WHEREAS, the Contract includes options for the JPB to purchase additional EMUs (Option Cars) at competitively bid and negotiated prices under the same contractual terms as the base order; and

WHEREAS, under the terms of the Contract, to secure the most advantageous pricing the JPB must exercise this option during the base-order manufacturing process--no later than eighteen months prior to the start of fabrication of the last new car shell under the base contract--this time period will end on December 31, 2018; and

WHEREAS, staff has determined that purchasing up to 37 additional Option Cars will support the Caltrain Business Plan, reduce diesel trips on the JPB's corridor, and enhance seating capacity on the JPB's commuter rail service, all in furtherance of the ultimate goal of providing improved and increased service levels in compliance with the Transit Intercity Rail capital program; and
WHEREAS, the total cost for the purchase of the Option Cars is $174,600,00, with a total budget of $183,100,000 to support an appropriate $3,500,000 contract contingency as well as $5,000,000 in consultant costs and interest payment on anticipated grant funds; and

WHEREAS, the JPB was awarded $164,522,00 in State Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP) funds, with the remainder necessary to fund the Option Car total budget available in the JPB’s Capital Budget through State Rail Assistance Funds, funds from resale of retired railcars, as well as additional sources; and

WHEREAS, the Staff Coordinating Council recommends the Board of Directors (a) authorize the Executive Director, or his designee, to exercise the Contract option with Stadler for up to 37 additional EMU vehicles in an amount not to exceed $174,600,000, and (b) increase the contract contingency by the amount of $3,500,000 to a new total of $31,044,973, and authorize the Executive Director to issue change orders up to that limit.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board hereby:

1. Authorizes the Executive Director, or his designee, to exercise the Contract option with Stadler for up to 37 additional EMU vehicles in an amount not to exceed $174,600,000; and

2. Increases the Contract contingency by the amount of $3,500,000 to a total of $31,044,973, and authorizes the Executive Director to issue change orders to the Contract up to that limit.

Regularly passed and adopted this 6th day of December, 2018 by the following vote:
AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

______________________________
Chair, Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board

ATTEST:

______________________________
JPB Secretary
AGENDA ITEM #13
DECEMBER 6, 2018

PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD
STAFF REPORT

TO: Joint Powers Board
THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
Executive Director
FROM: Michelle Bouchard
Chief Operating Officer, Rail

SUBJECT: ADOPT A TRANSIT ASSET MANAGEMENT POLICY

ACTION
Staff Coordinating Council recommends the Board adopt a Transit Asset Management Policy for the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB).

SIGNIFICANCE
The purpose of Transit Asset Management (TAM) is to help achieve and maintain a State of Good Repair (SOGR) for an agency's public transportation assets. TAM is a business model that uses transit asset condition to guide the optimal prioritization of funding.

If the Board of Directors (Board) adopts this TAM Policy, staff will move forward with implementing the TAM Plan that describes and formalizes the steps to develop a TAM Program, maintain JPB assets in a SOGR, and communicate JPB's progress to all relevant stakeholders.

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no budget impact that results from the adoption of the TAM Policy. However, future implementation of TAM Plan requirements will require additional resources, such as consultant and/or software support for updating an asset inventory that corresponds to asset condition ratings, or identifying SOGR needs. The TAM Plan also identifies the potential systems and staff enhancements that may be needed to achieve full compliance with Federal Transit Administration (FTA) regulations. Furthermore, the TAM Plan provides recommendations for SOGR investments which will need to be prioritized and integrated with future budget activities. Finally, resources will need to be identified to update the TAM Plan every four years, and to monitor and report on the JPB's progress.

BACKGROUND
In July 2016, FTA published the Transit Asset Management Final Rule (TAM Rule). The TAM Rule requires the JPB to develop its own TAM Plan and designate an Accountable Executive to ensure that necessary resources are available to carry out the TAM Plan. The initial TAM Plan was required to be completed by October 1, 2018. The TAM Plan must then be updated at least every four (4) years.
On September 28, 2018, the JPB’s Executive Director approved the TAM Plan, meeting this requirement of the TAM Rule. The TAM Plan can be viewed at http://www.caltrain.com/Assets/planning/pdf/Transit+Asset+Management+Plan.pdf. The Executive Summary of the TAM Plan is included as Attachment A. The TAM Plan contains several key elements, such as:

- Agency-wide TAM Policy
- TAM Program implementation details
- An asset inventory
- A recommended capital reinvestment plan.

The TAM Plan aligns with the JPB’s vision to “provide a safe, reliable, sustainable modern rail system that meets the growing mobility needs of the San Francisco Bay Area region.” Naturally, the TAM Policy is an extension of the vision statement and sets the direction for establishing and continually improving asset management strategies and practices.

The JPB’s proposed TAM Policy reads as follows:

Caltrain is committed to sustainably maintaining its assets in a State of Good Repair in order to deliver a safe and reliable passenger rail service. This commitment will be ensured through financial stewardship and resource allocation, promoting a culture that supports asset management across the organization, and focusing on high quality information to provide the foundation for a risk-based approach for decision making.

The proposed TAM Policy also includes the following Focus Areas and Goals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOCUS AREA</th>
<th>TAM GOAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Maintain assets in a SOGR to support a safe operating environment for employees, customers, and the public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Sustainability</td>
<td>Build and promote financial sustainability through implementation of asset management best practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure &amp; Rolling Stock</td>
<td>Maintain assets in a SOGR to support a high quality passenger rail service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Efficiency</td>
<td>Strengthen asset management processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People and TAM Culture</td>
<td>Promote asset management culture throughout the organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff will be providing a supplemental presentation to discuss the TAM Plan, including the TAM Policy and findings.

Prepared By: Aaron Lam, Manager, Engineering, Configuration Management and Transit Asset Management 650.508.7785
Attachment A - TAM Plan Executive Summary

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The overarching goal of transit asset management (TAM) is to ensure that a transit agency’s assets are maintained and operated in a consistent, measurable state of good repair (SOGR). The TAM Plan is a document required by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) per MAP-21 legislation for all agencies that receive federal funding and provides guideposts by which an agency can track progress toward a mature, data-driven asset management program. TAM involves all activities related to maintaining physical assets, such as rolling stock, maintenance facilities, and rail infrastructure, in SOGR, in order to provide safer and more reliable public transit service. MAP-21 also includes requirements for prioritizing reinvestments based on performance, condition, and risk assessment of assets that are within a provider’s direct capital responsibility.

The Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (PCJPB), which owns and operates the commuter rail line, known as Caltrain, conducts reinvestment process and oversees maintenance tasks performed by its Rail Operator, TransitAmerica Services, Inc. (TASI), to maintain its passenger rail service in a SOGR. With the emergence of new national best practices in asset management and Federal regulations, Caltrain has identified areas of asset management opportunity and growth for itself. These include, among others, developing a TAM strategic plan, performance monitoring against this strategic plan, identifying TAM leadership and governance, and managing and integrating asset data information.

This TAM Plan was developed during 2017-18, reflecting the reality and Caltrain maturity at this time. The TAM Plan is based on current asset management best practices and FTA guidance that reflect a practical and cost-effective asset management implementation program for years to come. This TAM Plan is a living document and can be easily updated to be consistent with any future regulations or requirements.

TAM PLAN DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

Development of Caltrain’s TAM Plan was led by Caltrain’s TAM representative in the Engineering department, in close cooperation with asset owners and subject matter experts from other departments under the guidance of executive staff. These asset owners and subject matter experts are responsible for overseeing SOGR activities for various asset types. Caltrain’s TAM representative has acted as an agency-wide liaison for TAM through this process:

- Identify TAM stakeholders responsible for TAM implementation and for SOGR activities
- Conduct interviews with TAM stakeholders to identify current asset management practices and systems, and interest for TAM implementation
- Develop TAM and SOGR policy, goals, and objectives
- Identify gaps between current and best practices
- Develop a performance measurement framework, review asset systems, and consolidate asset information
- Develop capital reinvestment priorities
- Complete the TAM Plan and prepare for implementation
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TAM Policy, Goals, and Objectives
With this TAM Plan, Caltrain adopts a new TAM policy to communicate throughout the agency its commitment to maintain its assets in a SOGR and foster an asset management culture within the organization.

Policy: Caltrain is committed to sustainably maintaining its assets in a State of Good Repair in order to deliver a safe and reliable passenger rail service. This commitment will be ensured through financial stewardship and resource allocation, promoting a culture that supports asset management across the organization, and focusing on high quality information to provide the foundation for a risk-based approach for decision making.

To implement the TAM policy, goals in five focus areas were established to promote asset management principles. For each goal, objectives were identified with corresponding, measurable outcomes. Caltrain’s TAM goals and objectives are listed below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Area</th>
<th>TAM Goal</th>
<th>Proposed Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Maintain assets in a SOGR to support a safe operating environment for employees, customers, and the public</td>
<td>• Maintain infrastructure, systems, and vehicles in SOGR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Measure and manage TAM-related risks to minimize reactive maintenance practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide root cause analyses for any asset failures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Sustainability</td>
<td>Build and promote financial sustainability through implementation of asset management best practices</td>
<td>• Establish linkage between multi-year SOGR needs, annual budget process and Capital Improvement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure &amp; Rolling Stock</td>
<td>Maintain assets in a SOGR to support a high quality passenger rail service</td>
<td>• Establish clear policies and plans for asset replacement and rehabilitation, and monitor adherence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop systematic approach for asset management activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Efficiency</td>
<td>Strengthen asset management processes</td>
<td>• Develop a TAM plan and policy consistent with the FTA TAM rule and MAP-21 requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Assess and implement processes and tools to support data driven asset management decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People and TAM Culture</td>
<td>Promote asset management culture throughout the organization</td>
<td>• Advance TAM awareness across all organizational levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Build understanding and support for asset management at the executive level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Train and develop a workforce familiar with TAM principles and best practices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Asset Profile**

Caltrain is responsible for approximately $3.5 billion worth of assets. Assets are generally grouped into the following categories: Rolling Stock, MOW Equipment and Support Vehicles, Track, Structures, Stations, Maintenance Facilities, Signals, Communications, and Fiber. An overview of the replacement cost for each asset category is shown on the next page.

Additional assets will be introduced into the Caltrain system through positive train control system implementation and electrification of the railroad. Positive train control will introduce approximately $19.2 million of assets before the end of 2018. Electrification will introduce approximately $1.4 billion of assets in 2022.
BACKLOG AND TWENTY YEAR NEEDS

Over the course of the past several years, there have been insufficient funds to address Caltrain’s SOGR needs. These needs have been identified as Caltrain’s SOGR backlog. An overview of the backlog value by asset category is represented below.

As of 2018, Caltrain has a capital needs backlog valued at $726.3 million over the next 20 years. The majority of this backlog is made up of vehicles that have exceeded their 30-year useful life and existing deferred maintenance on revenue vehicles; most of this vehicle backlog will be addressed by the end of 2022 when several existing diesel vehicles will be retired and a new fleet of electric vehicles is put into service.

Currently, Caltrain receives approximately $70 million annually for all SOGR activities, which includes both capital and operating funds. This amount is not sufficient to address or maintain the current backlog due to upcoming SOGR needs as well as the introduction of a new positive train control system and electrified railroad environment. Due to rising future costs, the SOGR backlog value will continue to
grow if additional funds are not allocated to SOGR activities. Caltrain’s forecasted SOGR backlog value will grow to approximately $2.6 billion at the end of 20 years based on the current funding trend shown below.

**TAM IMPLEMENTATION**

This TAM plan includes a roadmap for Caltrain’s TAM Program to implement asset management principles. The implementation identifies various actions, which include developing specific strategies to manage assets, establishing a tool to objectively prioritize SOGR needs, and implementing a new asset management system. The actions are grouped into five categories as illustrated below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAM Program Focus Area</th>
<th>Short Term</th>
<th>Medium Term</th>
<th>Long Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lifecycle Management</td>
<td>0-2 Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>3-5 Years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Support Tool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6+ Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk-Based Framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset Management Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TAM PLAN SELF-CERTIFICATION

Caltrain Executive Officer
Michelle Bouchard, Chief Operating Officer, Rail

Accountable Executive
Jim Hartnett, Caltrain Executive Director

Date
9.28.18
Date
9.7.26
RESOLUTION NO. 2018 -

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

***

ADOPTING A TRANSIT ASSET MANAGEMENT POLICY

WHEREAS, the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) desires to establish a policy that requires the agency to implement a strategic and systematic process for maintenance and improvement of Caltrain assets serving the Counties of San Francisco, San Mateo, and Santa Clara; and

WHEREAS, Transit Asset Management (TAM) is a business model that prioritizes funding based on the condition of transit assets to achieve and maintain a state of good repair for public transportation assets; and

WHEREAS, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) requires the JPB to develop a TAM Plan, including a TAM Policy, per Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations Part 625; and

WHEREAS, on September 28, 2018, the Executive Director approved a TAM Plan, meeting the FTA requirement; and

WHEREAS, Staff Coordinating Council recommends that the Board adopt the TAM Policy as approved by the Executive Director.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board hereby adopts the following policy, to be effective immediately upon its passage:

Caltrain is committed to sustainably maintaining its assets in a state of good repair in order to deliver a safe and reliable passenger rail service. This commitment will be ensured through financial stewardship and resource allocation, promoting a culture that supports asset management across the
organization, and focusing on high quality information to provide the foundation for a risk-based approach for decision-making.

Caltrain’s Transit Asset Management Program will focus on the following areas and goals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Area</th>
<th>TAM Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Maintain assets in a SOGR to support a safe operating environment for employees, customers, and the public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Sustainability</td>
<td>Build and promote financial sustainability through implementation of asset management best practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure &amp; Rolling Stock</td>
<td>Maintain assets in a SOGR to support a high quality passenger rail service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Efficiency</td>
<td>Strengthen asset management processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People and TAM Culture</td>
<td>Promote asset management culture throughout the organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regularly passed and adopted this 6th day of December, 2018 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

______________________________
Chair, Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board

ATTEST:

______________________________
J PB Secretary
Overview

• TAM Requirements
• TAM Policy
• New TAM Program
• Next Steps
TAM Requirements

• Aging Assets - $90B nationwide backlog
• 2016: New FTA TAM Rule
  – Requirement to receive federal funds
  – TAM Plan due Oct 1, 2018
• TAM Plan completed Sep 28, 2018
  – Request Board to adopt new TAM Policy
New TAM Policy

“Caltrain is committed to sustainably maintaining its assets in a State of Good Repair in order to deliver a safe and reliable passenger rail service.

This commitment will be ensured through:
- Financial stewardship and resource allocation
- Promoting a culture that supports asset management
- Focusing on high quality information
- Risk-based approach for decision making”
## New TAM Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOCUS AREA</th>
<th>TAM GOAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Maintain assets in a SOGR to support a safe operating environment for employees, customers, and the public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Sustainability</td>
<td>Build and promote financial sustainability through implementation of asset management best practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure &amp; Rolling Stock</td>
<td>Maintain assets in a SOGR to support a high quality passenger rail service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Efficiency</td>
<td>Strengthen asset management processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People and TAM Culture</td>
<td>Promote asset management culture throughout the organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New TAM Program

Prioritizes funding based on useful-life, age, or condition to maintain a SOGR

- Based on FTA guidelines
- Systematic process
- Risk-based evaluation
- Consistent approach for different types of assets
- Coordinated by Engineering; Agency-wide effort
New TAM Program

What does it provide?

• Distribution of available funds by asset types
• Estimated costs for future SOGR projects
• Asset information to meet reporting requirements
• Planning tool - 20 year outlook
• Transparency
• Lower long-term maintenance costs
• Key Performance Indicators (KPI)
• Increase reliability
• Improve safety
Asset Overview by Replacement Value**

Current Assets
- Rolling Stock
- MOW Equipment & Service Vehicles
- Track
- Structures
- Stations
- Maintenance Facilities
- Signals
- Communications
- Fiber

*Future Assets – (additional $740M)
- Positive Train Control
- Overhead Contact System
- Traction Power System
- Additional Rolling Stock

Total Current Asset Replacement Value: $3.5B*

** excludes real estate
Current Backlog

Total Unaddressed Backlog: $283M

- Facilities: $8M
- Track and Structures: $101M
- Stations: $10M
- Systems: $44M
- *Vehicles: $120M

* EMU replacement addresses an additional vehicle backlog which is not shown here.
Next Steps

- Recommend adopting TAM Policy

- Program Rollout
  - Resource enhancements
  - SOGR investment recommendation
  - Integrate with future budget planning
  - Future TAM Plan updates

- Additional SOGR needed for new assets
TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
Executive Director

FROM: Carter Mau
Deputy General Manager/CEO

SUBJECT: SAFETY AND SECURITY QUARTERLY PERFORMANCE REPORTS

ACTION
Staff Coordinating Council recommends the Board receive the quarterly Safety and Security performance reports. No action required.

SIGNIFICANCE
Staff will provide quarterly performance updates on Safety and Security which encompasses services provided by the San Mateo County Sheriff’s Office. Key performance indicators will give the board an overview of significant reportable events.

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no fiscal impact.

BACKGROUND
The Safety and Security quarterly performance reports will give stakeholders an overview of key performance indicators from the previous quarter. The safety section will encompass employee, contractor, and passenger safety along with customer safety concerns. The transit Police Bureau will present details on law enforcement services including calls for service, response times, trespasser incidents, grade crossing accidents, community education, and quality of life issues.

Prepared by:
Jenny Le, Management Analyst, Transit Police Bureau 650.622.8050
Alex Ocegueda, District Temporary Employee 650.622.6216
Bill Grizard, Director Safety and Security 650.622.7856
Victoria O’Brien, Lieutenant, Transit Police Bureau 650.622.8045
FY 2019 1st Quarter Rail Operations Performance

Board of Directors
December 6th, 2018
Agenda Item #14 (a)
Presentation Outline

• On-Time Performance
• Delays
  – Major causes
  – Significance
  – Correlation between mechanical delays and Maintenance of Equipment (M of E)
• Fare Enforcement
• Ridership
On-Time Performance (OTP)

• On-Time = train arrives no later than 5’ 59” from the scheduled arrival time at end-line locations (SF, SJ, Tamien, and Gilroy)

• Goal: 95% of trains on-time at end-line locations

• OTP Tracked daily and monthly
Monthly OTP Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th># of Trains Scheduled</th>
<th># of Trains On-Time (At End-Line)</th>
<th>On-Time Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sep-2017</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-2017</td>
<td>2256</td>
<td>2110</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-2017</td>
<td>2108</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>94.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-2017</td>
<td>2124</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>93.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-2018</td>
<td>2256</td>
<td>2170</td>
<td>96.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-2018</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>93.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-2018</td>
<td>2260</td>
<td>2132</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-2018</td>
<td>2164</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-2018</td>
<td>2256</td>
<td>2133</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-2018</td>
<td>2168</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-2018</td>
<td>2188</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2018</td>
<td>2324</td>
<td>2162</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-2018</td>
<td>2032</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OTP Goal: 95%
5 Main Categories of Delays

- On-Board/Passenger
- Major Incidents
- Maintenance of Infrastructure
- Maintenance of Equipment (M of E)
- Capital Projects
## 5 Main Categories of Delays

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category/Type</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>On-Board/Passenger</strong></td>
<td>• Bicycles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• PNAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Large crowds, slow loading, and luggage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major Incidents</strong></td>
<td>• Fatality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Trespasser Strike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Vehicle Strike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Vehicle on Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance of Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>• Crossings and signals (C &amp; S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance of Equipment (M of E)</strong></td>
<td>• Door Failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Engine Failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Brake Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Wheel Chair Lift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Air Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Head end power issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Projects</strong></td>
<td>• Single track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Slow orders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Delay Minutes – Monthly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Capital Projects</th>
<th>M of E</th>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>Major Incidents</th>
<th>On-Board/Passenger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sep-2017</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>4571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-2017</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>1049</td>
<td>5192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-2017</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>4645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-2017</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>4485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-2018</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1362</td>
<td>5320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-2018</td>
<td>1491</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>5737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-2018</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1215</td>
<td>6103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-2018</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>1007</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>6061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-2018</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>1014</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-2018</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>6613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-2018</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>1144</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>6078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2018</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>1439</td>
<td>6191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-2018</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>1514</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2053</td>
<td>5446</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### On-Board Passenger Delay Minutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Large crowds/Slow loading/Luggage</th>
<th>PNAs</th>
<th>Bicycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sep-2017</td>
<td>2240</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>1455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-2017</td>
<td>2367</td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>1714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-2017</td>
<td>2119</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>1631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-2017</td>
<td>2119</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>1585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-2018</td>
<td>2609</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>1871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-2018</td>
<td>2768</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-2018</td>
<td>2890</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>2183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-2018</td>
<td>2814</td>
<td>1137</td>
<td>2110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-2018</td>
<td>2874</td>
<td>1137</td>
<td>2269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-2018</td>
<td>3275</td>
<td>1118</td>
<td>2220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-2018</td>
<td>3032</td>
<td>1003</td>
<td>2043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2018</td>
<td>3366</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-2018</td>
<td>2830</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>1821</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Major Incident Delay Minutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle on Track</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Strike</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1125</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trespasser Strike</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1136</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>1898</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maintenance of Infrastructure
Delay Minutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crossings &amp; Signals (C&amp;S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Caltrain

10
**M of E – Mean Distance Between Failure (MDBF)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Service Failure (Coaches &amp; Cabs)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Service Failure (Locomotives)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDBF - Locomotives</td>
<td>6054</td>
<td>9210</td>
<td>10359</td>
<td>7427</td>
<td>7903</td>
<td>16288</td>
<td>7392</td>
<td>7070</td>
<td>8508</td>
<td>5319</td>
<td>7138</td>
<td>10375</td>
<td>12420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDBF - Coaches and Cabs</td>
<td>25826</td>
<td>15630</td>
<td>25795</td>
<td>21131</td>
<td>33792</td>
<td>22412</td>
<td>35908</td>
<td>41610</td>
<td>30403</td>
<td>23325</td>
<td>84261</td>
<td>34953</td>
<td>24913</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fare Enforcement

• Implemented in end of July 2018
• Total Notice of Violations for Fare Evasion given for Q1FY18/19: 1905
  – Closed: 1410
  – Open: 495
  – Delinquent: 397
• Total Appeals: 333
  – Appeals granted: 166
Fare Enforcement

(No data: Program implemented in Jul 2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of citations issued</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>1105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Average Weekday Ridership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY17/18</td>
<td>58,814</td>
<td>57,046</td>
<td>52,404</td>
<td>55,271</td>
<td>57,618</td>
<td>60,099</td>
<td>61,142</td>
<td>62,057</td>
<td>63,074</td>
<td>61,903</td>
<td>61,372</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY18/19</td>
<td>61,834</td>
<td>61,735</td>
<td>55,574</td>
<td>57,018</td>
<td>59,657</td>
<td>59,364</td>
<td>62,192</td>
<td>62,823</td>
<td>65,324</td>
<td>64,435</td>
<td>63,340</td>
<td>64,405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions
Safety

*There are currently 505 contracted TASI Employees.

Employee Reportable Injuries (TASI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Total Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1FY17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2FY17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3FY17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4FY17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1FY18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2FY18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3FY18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4FY18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1FY19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 2 + 4 + 6 + 1 + 2 + 2 + 3 + 2 = 22
Safety

Passenger Injuries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Non-Reportable</th>
<th>FRA Reportable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1FY17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2FY17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3FY17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4FY17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1FY18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2FY18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3FY18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4FY18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1FY19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*Safety violations applicable to all projects and activities.

**Quarterly Rail Safety Violations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q1FY18</th>
<th>Q1FY19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rule/Procedure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Strikes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Track Incidents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Safety

• Contractor Injuries (Peninsula Corridor Elec. Project).
  ✓ Zero reportable Injuries for Q1FY17 and Q1FY18.
  ✓ One reportable injury for the reporting quarter (Q1FY19).

• Roadway Worker Protection Training (RWP).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1FY19</th>
<th>Number of Training Sessions (RWP)</th>
<th>Registered</th>
<th>No Show</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Fail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Safety

*Additional safety complaints processed through Transit Police.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q1FY17</th>
<th>Q2FY17</th>
<th>Q3FY17</th>
<th>Q4FY17</th>
<th>Q1FY18</th>
<th>Q2FY18</th>
<th>Q3FY18</th>
<th>Q4FY18</th>
<th>Q1FY19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vandalism</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sharps</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of Life</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Customer Safety Complaints
Transit Police Bureau

- Contracted Law Enforcement Services - San Mateo County Sheriff’s Office
  - 20 hour contract
  - 77 Miles of Track
  - 32 Stations
  - 2 Teams
    - 1 Sergeant (1000-2200 hrs.)
    - 2 Deputies (0500-1700 hrs.)
    - 2 Deputies (1300-0100 hrs.)
Transit Police Calls for Service

- Total Calls for Service for Q1: 2806
  - 10% Increase from Q1FY18
Transit Police Response Times

- Decreased by 2 Minutes 51 Seconds Q1FY18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Average Response Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1FY17</td>
<td>22 Minutes 33 Seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1FY18</td>
<td>25 Minutes 24 Seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1FY19</td>
<td>23 Minutes 5 Seconds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does not reflect local agency response or Priority 1 calls*
Transit Police Visibility Statistics

- **Station Checks**
  - 10% Increase from Q1FY18
- **Subject Stops**
  - 24% Decrease from Q1FY18
- **Dispersals**
  - 13% Increase from Q1FY18
Behavioral Health Interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Q1 Total Number of Life Endangering Interventions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>1 3 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>1 4 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>1 6 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Interventions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Collisions/Strikes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q1 FY17</th>
<th>Q1 FY18</th>
<th>Q1 FY19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trespasser Strike - Non-Fatal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trespasser Strike - Fatality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Strikes - Non-Fatal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Strikes - Fatality</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Strikes - Occupied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Strikes - Unoccupied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Railway Safety: Education, Enforcement & Training

- **Education:**
  - Operation Clear Track, Redwood City
  - 14 High Intensity Strategic Enforcement Citations
  - 45 Informational Pedestrian Stops

- **Enforcement:**
  - 116 Citations: High Intensity Strategic Enforcement
  - 15 Citations: Trespassing
  - 9 Trespassing Arrests

- **Trainings:**
  - July 19, Yearly Emergency Exercise
  - K-9 EOD Training
Quality of Life: Transit Police Special Enforcement Team

- City and County of San Francisco
  - San Francisco Homeless Outreach Team
    - Tunnel 1 Encampment, San Francisco
    - Tunnel 3 Encampment, San Francisco

- County of San Mateo
  - Redwood City Project SAFE
    - 30 Truants Contacted
    - Sheriff’s Office Psychiatric Emergency Response Team

- County of Santa Clara
  - HomeFirst, Homelessness Response Team
Enforcement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1 Type of Citation</th>
<th>Q1FY17</th>
<th>Q1FY18</th>
<th>Q1FY19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARKING</td>
<td>1753</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>1621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFRACTION - TRAFFIC</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFRACTION - OTHER</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRESPASSING</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISEP</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number of Citations
Arrests

- **ADULT - FELONY**
  - Q1FY17: 4
  - Q1FY18: 6
  - Q1FY19: 6

- **ADULT - MISDEMEANOR**
  - Q1FY17: 39
  - Q1FY18: 27
  - Q1FY19: 52

- **JUVENILE**
  - Q1FY17: 2
  - Q1FY18: 4
  - Q1FY19: 1
JPB BOARD MEETING
December 6, 2018

Correspondence Packet
Attention: Caltrain Board Members

I've been using Caltrain every day to get to work for the past 6 years. I work in San Jose and catch the train at Tamien station and ride to Redwood City. I take my bike along with me to get from home to the train and from the train to work.

I understand Caltrain is purchasing more electric train rail cars. It would be ideal for bike riders that the new cars include a bike layout to include seats for bike riders. Other then locking up bikes on the train or having a conductor monitor bikes, only other bike riders riding in the cars would deter bike thieves from stealing bikes. The analogy of leaving your bike unlocked and unsupervised would be to park your car without locking the doors. Car thieves normally do not steal cars where people congregate and the same goes with bikes on the train. Having multiple video cameras in the bike cars and exits and showing them in the nearby rail cars on monitors may deter thieves. We have a system that works right now where bike riders can sit and monitor their bikes. I understand we need to add more passengers on the train, but I believe you will create a bigger problem where frustrated bike riders will decide to drive their cars and therefore cause more congestion to the overall traffic, which defeats the purpose of trying to use public transportation to reduce traffic congestion.

Please consider this request and understand the impact to the overall bike riders using Caltrain.

Regards,
Jeff Mahe
Hello:

Thank you for embracing electric trains for the Peninsula. Cycling will remain/increase as a paired option for Commuters in the future, and for those of us without cars, bike security is a priority.

Please consider designs for new train cars that provide some fixed seating near bikes.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Regards, Dr. Ted K. Raab
Hello,

I'm writing as a bicyclist on the Caltrain, and have recently learned that the proposed electrified rail cars do not have planned seats within view of the bicyclists. As a normal paranoid-of-bike-theft person who has had 4 locked bikes stolen (fortunately none on caltrain), I never leave my bike out of sight, nor do most of the other bikers who I commute daily from San Mateo to SF with. This typically leaves all the bikers jostling with non-bikers for the overhead seats on the old cars, or standing room only. Occasionally I'm lucky enough to grab a top seat and look down on my bike. Occasionally the bike car is full and I am bumped (I have emailed Caltrain before about this issue). With all this in mind, I urge you to reconsider the bike car layout and install plenty of seats within bicycle view, and provide plenty of room for bikes.

Sincerely,

A bicyclist currently standing near his bike on Caltrain, Caleb Stewart
Dear Caltrain Board-

Thank you for planning to buy more rail cars to run longer electric trains. The new rail cars provide an opportunity to redesign bike-car layout to put seats within view of bikes. I understand Caltrain's current plan is no fixed seats within view of bikes - this is not good as it slows exit flow at each stop and as importantly makes bikes ripe for theft. What is the advantage to not having fixed seats within view of the bikes? I would have to drive if I could not bring my bike on Caltrain from Menlo Park to Union Square in SF. Traffic, gas and parking costs, would be untenable. Bike cars are maxed out today. Also it is important to note how many scooters are now getting on the trains. Both electric and foot powered scooters are getting on the bike cars taking capacity where folding bikes go and also in the normal bike racks. We need at least 96 bike spaces per train plus capacity for 20 scooters to meet demand in 2022. Please take these issues into account during planning. Thank you.

Best Regards,
Alex Herzick
Hello Caltrainers,

I really appreciate being able to bring my bicycle on Caltrain. Without that, I would have to drive over 60 miles each way every day, increasing congestion and carbon emissions. Bicycles and other personal transit vehicles on Caltrain are a critical part of helping people to reduce their carbon footprint and take care of the planet we all share.

Thank you for planning to extend the length and capacity of trains with the electrification project. I believe these new cars provide an opportunity for a redesign of car layouts to enable cyclists and other active commuters to monitor their vehicles and deter theft. More cars with vehicle space will also reduce delays by reducing choke points at which cyclists and active commuters have to board.

This is also an opportunity to plan for the future. As more people begin to commute responsibly, there will be an increased number of riders bringing bicycles, scooters, and skateboards on Caltrain. Current estimates suggest each train will need 96 bike spaces to meet demand in 2022 when electrified service begins, but I would like to see Caltrain reaching well beyond that number to prepare for the future. Let’s stop building infrastructure for the past and start building a future we can all be proud of and excited for!

Peace,
Drew
I’ve been bike commuting on Caltrain for nearly 11 years. It’s key to my work success. I can’t express you how much ridership and the use of bike cars has grown in the last 11 years. What used to be a small intimate group of riders is now uncomfortably packed bike cars where riders are unable to get in and out at their stops.

I’d like to thank Caltrain for planning to buy more rail cars to run longer electric train because these new real cars provide an opportunity to redesign the bike-car layout to put seats within view of bikes (Caltrain’s current plan is no fixed seats within view of bikes).

Seats within within view of bikes deter bicycle theft and help keep trains on time by reducing congestion in bike cars.

I don’t know how I would commute if I didn’t ride Caltrain with your bike. It’s an integral part of my life.

Since bike cars are maxed out today, we need to ensure there are 96 bike spaces per train to meet demand in 2022, when electrified service will begin.

Thank you,

Donna
Dear Lori,

We would be happy to promote the survey for wayside improvements but we see it expires today, so it's unfortunately too late. Please alert us sooner of such requests and we'll be happy to comply. If it's possible to leave the survey open to the end of the month, we could promote after the Thanksgiving holiday.

We are in full support of wayside and onboard improvements to provide as many options as possible for people to ride bicycles to the stations and take Caltrain instead of driving their cars.

Sincerely,
The BIKEs ONboard team

On 2018-11-15 14:37, Caltrain, Bac (@caltrain.com) wrote:

Dear BIKEs ONboard,

Thank you for your efforts to improve Caltrain’s onboard bike program and for your offer to assist in further improvements. It would be wonderful if you could let your community know about the current bike access survey which will help Caltrain plan and implement bike improvements at stations. The survey is at www.caltrain.com/BikeAccessSurvey.

Best,

Lori

From: Bikes on Board <bikesonboard@sonic.net>
Sent: Monday, November 12, 2018 9:37 PM
To: Caltrain, Bac (@caltrain.com)
Cc: Board (@caltrain.com); cacsecretary (@caltrain.com); CalMod@caltrain.com
Subject: Re: Petition for seats within view of bikes and more capacity on EMU trains

Dear Lori,

Thank you for confirming that there was no community outreach on EMU bike-car layout.

We certainly appreciate Caltrain’s bike program and all the benefits it brings to Caltrain and the broader community. We stand ready to assist in supporting further improvements.

Sincerely,
The BIKEs ONboard Team

On 2018-11-12 16:54, Caltrain, Bac (@caltrain.com) wrote:
Dear BIKES ONBoard,

Thank you for your comments. Prior to 2015, there was a two-year outreach effort to determine the bike, seat, restroom, and standing space in the new vehicles. Over 10,000 comments were received from different venues which included 20 public meetings, multiple surveys, and station outreach. In 2017, additional outreach regarding bikes, seats, and restrooms occurred, with 10 outreach meetings/station events, 56 meetings, a permanent outreach office, surveys, and a new website to collect additional feedback.

More recently, in response to the bike community, this past January Caltrain created a bike security task force to explore and implement possible improvements to the bike program. An update on the process was given to the BAC in September and can be seen here:

Caltrain is also working to improve boarding and deboarding of bikes and passengers with its Bikes Board First Pilot, which is now implemented across six of the more bike popular stations.

I also wanted to let you know that Caltrain is currently working to improve bike parking at stations to better meet the needs of its riders. Last November, the Board adopted the Bike Parking Management Plan (BPMP) which recommends a set of management and administrative reforms and implementation strategies to optimize the performance of Caltrain’s bike parking system. Caltrain also created a new staff position that will focus on station access, including implementation of the BPMP.

In addition, earlier this year Caltrain applied for $630 million in grant funding to expand upon the current electrification project. This spring, it was announced that Caltrain was awarded $164 million (from SB 1 funds) for more electric trains, wi-fi, and enhanced bicycle facilities. More information is available here:
http://www.caltrain.com/about/MediaRelations/news/Caltrain_Celebrates_164_million_Grant_Award_from_Senate_Bill_1.html

We’re excited that with the electric trains we will have a cleaner, greener, quieter system that offers better service. Thank you again for your feedback.

Best,

Lori

From: Bikes on Board [mailto:bikesonboard@sonic.net]
Sent: Sunday, October 28, 2018 12:21 PM
To: Board (@caltrain.com)
Cc: cacsecretary [@caltrain.com]; Caltrain, Bac (@caltrain.com); CalMod@caltrain.com
Subject: Petition for seats within view of bikes and more capacity on EMU trains

Dear Chair Bruins and Directors of the Joint Powers Board,

Slide 25 of the Peninsula Corridor Electrification Quarterly Update shows community outreach. While the outreach numbers are impressive, there has been no community outreach on bike-car layout.

To provide the missing input, we created a survey (is.gd/bikesonboard), which now has 845 signatures with 283 comments, please see attached file.

Our main message:

We need fixed seats within view of bikes.

How many seats should each bike car hold?

- Optimal is at least one seat per bike space.
- Minimally acceptable is half as many seats as bike spaces (same as today).

Here are two possibilities to solve the problem:
1. Redesign EMU layout now so the bike cars come in from the factory with fixed seats within view of bikes. 
2. Retrofit after the EMUs are on-site by unbolting seats from non-bike cars, unbolting racks from bike cars, and swapping them. An eight-car EMU train with 96 bike spaces would have four bike cars at a minimum.

Seats within view of bikes is extremely important for the following reasons:

Keep trains on time – Bike riders need to be near bikes to help shuffle bikes in the four-bike stack so the bike on top will get off first to make off-boarding quick and easy. If bike riders must stand in the bike car to watch bikes, it causes congestion and will delay the train.

Help prevent bike theft – We need to keep an eye on our bikes to help prevent bike theft. An unwatched bike is a stolen bike.

Improve passenger safety – Seats should be next to emergency exit windows for accessibility, just as they are in bike cars today. If there are no seats in the bike car, that means stacked bikes and an immovable rail are blocking emergency exit windows, creating a hazardous situation in the event of an emergency.

We look forward to resolution of this serious problem for your passengers.

Respectfully,
BIKES ONboard Team

845 signatures as of 10/28/2018

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.
Dear Caltrain Board:

I wanted to take the time to mention something of importance. Caltrain will soon be ordering new rail cars and now is the time to take into account the growing demand for bicycle access. One problem with the current cars is that there are not enough seats to accommodate all the cyclists in the bike car. Some cyclists have taken to sitting in the adjacent car, which does not allow them to keep an eye on their bike. Sure enough, thieves are very clever and have noticed this security weakness. When the owner of the bike is sitting in the adjacent car, there is no one to stop them from carrying another person's bike off the train. This has happened numerous times. Bicycle passengers must sit in the same car where their bike is parked.

Thank you for continuing to expand bicycle access on the trains. I live in SF and do not own a car. One of the reasons I can live without a car is that over the years our public transit systems have continued to expand bicycle access. I need my bike to reach the transit station and generally need my bike at the other end as well.

Sincerely,

Terry Rolleri
Thank you for planning to buy more rail cars to run longer electric trains. Please include seats within view of bikes to help deter bicycle theft and help keep trains on time.

I'm also asking Caltrain to consider the design flaw of current bike cars, in which the bike car has a smaller egress space (between the vertical bar at the exit) next to the bicycle section. This puts the wide open egress space immediately next to the seating section, which means individuals without bikes have to wait until those with bikes pass through. This creates a small traffic jam and slows down the whole car's boarding and exiting process.

Bike cars are often maxed out, and we need 96 bike spaces per train to meet demand in the years to come.

Thanks,
Steve Hoeschele
Thank you for buying more rail cars to run longer electric trains. It will be a great investment with strong returns in ridership and health for the community.

It's crucial that there are enough bike cars to support the number of current -- but most importantly FUTURE -- bike riders. Bike cars are maxed out today and we need 96 bike spaces per train to meet demand in 2022, when electrified service will begin.

Bike owners are some of the most loyal Caltrain customers. They put up with cattle-style conditions during rush hours and still keep paying and riding. These people likely cannot or won't drive to work, so they won't dump Caltrain when unavoidable delays happen.

Keeping these customers happy is wise, but what is Caltrain missing out on by not accommodating more bikes? There are many many more bike owners who would ride Caltrain if bike capacity was increased and the experience improved.

Making it easier to bring your bike on Caltrain expands the service's area of potential customers because people can get to stations from further away on a bike - without stressing local traffic and parking.

I have been riding Caltrain for a decade with a bike. If I didn't ride Caltrain this way, it would take me more than two hours to get to work, not 1.

These new rail cars also provide an opportunity to redesign bike-car layout to put seats within view of bikes. This will deter bicycle theft and help keep trains on time by reducing congestion in bike cars. At the moment, riders have to funnel into the bike car while other bike owners are trying to exit. This slows the process considerably.

Best wishes,

Alistair Barr

Read my book Travel Bug: https://www.amazon.com/gp/aws/d/B01IYNRRNG?pc_redir=T1
Hi,

I commute to Stanford every day with my bike on Caltrain, and there are already times during commute time that there isn't enough bike storage on the trains. I would be very grateful if the new Caltrain cars increase bike storage, and allow for bikers to sit near their bikes. I've had friends that have had their bikes stolen off the train, and even with the amount of seating in the current cars sometimes I can't get a seat with my bike in-view. Extra bike storage space is necessary to allow people to commute to and from the train station, since many riders live too far away to walk to the station (myself included). We need to be making it easier for people to get around without their cars, not harder!

I hope you consider expanding the bike storage on Caltrain and allow for all of us bikers to sit within view of our bikes!

Thank you,
Andy Meislin
To whom it may concern,

I'm writing to express my dissatisfaction in the new electric bike-car layout.

I’m a Stanford graduate student, and as a daily commuter, I depend on Caltrain and my bike as an integral portion of my commute from San Francisco (22nd) to Palo Alto. I and hundreds of others depend on our bicycles for the "last-mile" commute rapidly, reliably, and inexpensively.

With the new bike car layout, where the bikes are not in my view, I would not feel comfortable taking my bike on Caltrain and would revert to driving to commute to work. Traffic is already bad as it is; we need more people to turn to public transit, not less.

Our trains are already at bike capacity today. Morning SB trains (#330 and #232) are usually at or over capacity, with cyclists denied boarding occasionally.

I urge you to reconsider the electric train car design, and do add more space for bikes. I love riding on the Caltrain, but with the proposed changes, I would not be able to continue riding with Caltrain.

Thanks,

Michael

Michael C. Leung
thank you for your efforts governing Caltrain.
I've been commuting on Caltrain for the last 13 years with my bike in tow. It completely transforms my
day/commute to have an option (from Menlo Park to San Francisco) that doesn't involve a car whatsoever.
As you move to electrify the systems, I'd greatly appreciate efforts to expand capacity for bikes and improve
anti-theft measures.
much appreciated.
Michael Pence
November 15, 2018

Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board
Caltrain Citizens Advisory Committee
1250 San Carlos Ave.
San Carlos, CA 94070

Re: Townsend Corridor Improvement Project

Dear Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board and Caltrain Citizens Advisory Committee,

The Caltrain Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC), a committee of Caltrain riders representing the interests of passengers who access the train by bicycle, would like to express our gratitude to the board of the SFMTA on behalf of the over 1,400 Caltrain riders who bike on Townsend Street every day. Seeing this project approved in such a timely manner sends the message that our streets should be safe for everyone and that we can work together to build a regional multi-modal transit network. We look forward to seeing ground broken soon.

Sincerely,
The Caltrain Bicycle Advisory Committee

Cc: SFMTA Director of Transportation Ed Reiskin
    SFMTA Board of Directors
November 15, 2018

Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board
Caltrain Citizens Advisory Committee
1250 San Carlos Ave.
San Carlos, CA 94070

Re: Santa Clara Bicycle Master Plan Update

Dear Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board and Caltrain Citizens Advisory Committee,

As the City of Santa Clara is currently soliciting feedback on an updated Bicycle Master Plan, the Caltrain Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC), a committee of Caltrain riders representing the interests of passengers who access the train by bicycle, would like to affirm our support for improved bicycle access to both the Lawrence and Santa Clara Caltrain stations in the City of Santa Clara. The proposals for the major arteries in the vicinity of these two stations, Kifer Road (Lawrence) and El Camino Real (Santa Clara) to receive Class IV separated bikeways is an important step for improving connectivity and safety for passengers accessing these train stations by active transportation. The Calabazas Creek Trail can provide a much safer alternative to Lawrence Expressway for those traveling to Lawrence Station from the north and south. In the Lawrence Station Area, in particular, there’s an additional emphasis on coordinating these plans with the City of Sunnyvale, which has similarly proposed a road diet (repurposing of automobile-dedicated lanes) from Kifer Road.

While the Caltrain Modernization program will enable Caltrain to carry more passengers than ever before it’s important to provide sustainable, accessible, and safe alternatives for passengers to reach Caltrain’s stations. In light of the two recent bicyclist fatalities in Santa Clara County (one of which was in the City of Santa Clara) it’s particularly important to plan for safer bike infrastructure. The proposed bicycle facilities will greatly enhance the commutes of the many cyclists and Caltrain riders who live, work, go to school, or otherwise spend time in the City of Santa Clara (or nearby).

Sincerely,
The Caltrain Bicycle Advisory Committee

Cc: City of Santa Clara Staff Carol Shariat and Marshall Johnson
City of Santa Clara Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee
October 25, 2018

Jeannie Bruins, Chair
Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board
1250 San Carlos Ave
San Carlos, California 94070-1306

Dear Ms. Bruins,

The City of Palo Alto and members of our community are actively working to identify a preferred solution for our four existing at-grade rail crossings. While we are making progress there are several recurring technical questions that we need answered by Caltrain for the City to be able to evaluate the feasibility of alternatives under consideration. This letter requests your assistance in responding to these time sensitive and highly critical questions.

The questions are generally: what are the economic, engineering, and regulatory constraints that impact our grade separation options? Please clarify current constraints, and how and where Caltrain might be flexible with design criteria exceptions? Specifically, the questions City staff, community and consulting team have are as follows:

1. Under what conditions would Caltrain accept a grade variance from 1% to 2%, and what would the approval process be?
2. Under what conditions would Caltrain accept a variance to the existing vertical clearance for poles and wires, and what would the approval process be?
3. How are grade separation design criteria and constraints likely to change in the future?
4. What should the City of Palo Alto assume regarding freight on the Caltrain right of way in the future?
5. What is Caltrain's criteria regarding Shooflies that are likely needed for several grade separation under consideration (e.g. trench for East Meadow Ave and Charleston Road alternative)
6. What level of funding support needed to grade separate because of the PCEP can or could be expected from Caltrain?
7. The cost of maintenance for grade separation alternatives may vary greatly, what should the City of Palo Alto assume regarding who will pay for the cost of maintenance?
The City of Palo Alto appreciates your attention to these questions so that we can effectively and efficiently proceed with our community focused effort to define a preferred solution for our four at grade crossings.

Thank you,

Cory Wolbach  
Chair, Rail Committee

On behalf of Mayor Liz Kniss

cc: Caltrain Board of Directors  
Palo Alto City Council
TWIMC:

- I commute between San Jose Diridon and San Francisco 4th and Townsend stations 4 out of 5 weekdays, and have been for almost 7 years.
- I ride my bike between my home and Diridon station (~ 2 miles), and between 4th and Townsend and my office on Market & 11th (~ 2 miles), taking my bike on a bike car.
- My work life is scheduled around the express trains.
- I have been looking forward to the new electrified Caltrain line for many years.
- I appreciate the work that Caltrain has been doing to lengthen the electric trains to accommodate more daily riders--I think it's a great commute option that is bound to get more popular with better trains.
- I think using the bike car is also an excellent option that will become more popular if the accommodations for cyclists are good.
- Unfortunately, the bike car designs that Caltrain has considered to date all have the same flaw--an almost complete lack of seats near the bikes. This is a fatal flaw, as it leaves bikes exposed to easy theft, which will be rampant unless the design is changed.
- There simply are not reasonable alternatives for my daily commute to bringing my bike on Caltrain.
  - As it is, my commute is 90 minutes, each way.
  - Any combination of bike parking/bike rentals/scooter rentals/etc. would increase the cost and/or the time of my commute, such that I wouldn't be able to use Caltrain at all.
  - I would probably need to commute by car, adding to the congestion on our deadlocked freeways.
  - Likely, this would not be feasible for me, long term, and I will need to look for a different job.

Please reconsider other designs for the Caltrain bike cars that provide fixed seating near the bikes. This will greatly reduce theft, decrease congestion on bike cars, and increase the utility of Caltrain as a commute option.

Sincerely,

Ed Ruder
To the Board of Caltrain:

I am so excited that Prop 6 has failed and Caltrain now has the opportunity and funds to move to enhance service through electrification and new cars.

I urge the Caltrain Board to address the issue of bike thief on trains by including fixed seating in view of bicycles as it exists now in the older cars. Bike thief is a known problem and it would be negligent to ignore this problem when designing and ordering new equipment.

Sincerely,
Warren Chan
Hi,

I’m a regular commuter on Caltrain and think bicycle cars which don’t enable bike owners to keep an eye on their bikes is a mistake. Please ensure that the new electrified trains allow riders to keep an eye on their bikes.

All the best,

- Steven
Dear Sir or Madam,

PLEASE revisit the new train car designs to accommodate seating within view of our bicycles, so our bicycles can arrive safely at our destinations alongside us. With these new train enhancements, we should have the ability to adequately protect our property and have peace of mind while commuting.

A smart bicycle infrastructure is incredibly important to our future as this becomes a more popular and green way of living!

Thank you,  
Sandee Hall

Typos courtesy of my iPhone.
Dear Caltrain Board,

My name is Claire Phillips, and I have been riding Caltrain for 6+ years from Hillsdale Station for my daily commute to San Francisco.

I purchase a monthly pass and a monthly parking permit. Lately, parking has become increasingly difficult because in addition to the construction which is an understandable circumstance, Loui Motors at 3555 S El Camino is a LENDING CAR business and parks their cars (20+ of them) in the Caltrain Stations in the lots South & North of Hillsdale. Not to mention they place their rubbish cans in the middle of the Caltrain driveway to the South lot, blocking the entrance.

In speaking with my fellow riders, I know this issue has been addressed to Caltrain. We kindly and desperately request parking enforcement in these lots and a notice to the business that they are not allowed to park on Caltrain property.

If cars are illegally parking on your property, thus impacting your ridership, then I feel I must address this issue as it significantly affects me personally.

Thank you for your time, and I hope to hear back from you on any proposed actions.

Sincerely,
Claire
Dear Lori,

It seems your response was intended for someone else.

I'm interested in understanding the reasons behind staff's proposal at the October JPB meeting to run seven-car instead of eight-car EMU trains in the mixed fleet.

Transparency in decision-making will help everyone understand the decisions. I reiterate my question: **Do we want higher system capacity, or do we want fewer diesel trains?**

Best regards,
Shirley

On Monday, November 12, 2018, 4:50:50 PM PST, Caltrain, Bac (@caltrain.com) wrote:

Dear Bikes Onboard,

Thank you for your feedback. Caltrain is excited about the TIRCP award for additional electric vehicles and wayside bike parking. As you note, Caltrain is at capacity during commute hours, with some trains at 130% capacity. This funding will help bring more relief to the system, and help make it cleaner and more sustainable. Caltrain is working to grow its capacity even more, and will continue to seek funding for eight-car trainsets.

Best,
Lori

From: Shirley Johnson
Sent: Saturday, October 27, 2018 11:20 AM
To: Board (@caltrain.com)
Cc: cassecretary [@caltrain.com]; Caltrain, Bac (@caltrain.com); CalMod@caltrain.com
Subject: Higher Caltrain capacity or fewer diesel trains?

Dear Chair Bruins and Joint Powers Board,

I see that Caltrain staff propose using the TIRCP money to run seven-car EMU trains in the mixed fleet instead of eight-car. Seven-car would provide only 4% increase in seat capacity, whereas eight-car would provide 17% increase. The difference is due to fewer diesel trains (which have very high seat capacity) in the seven-car mixed fleet. Please see the attached spreadsheet for comparison.

**The question is: Do we want higher system capacity, or do we want fewer diesel trains?**

Fewer diesel locomotives means less pollution locally, but higher system capacity means less pollution globally by getting more cars off the road.

Are you comfortable with the proposal to run a lower capacity system, when it would be possible to run 17% higher seat capacity with the same number of EMU cars?
Hello all,

As a biker and a rider on Caltrain, thank you for planning to buy more rail cars to run longer electric trains. We need more clean, fast, and reliable transit in the Bay Area!

The new rail cars provide an opportunity to redesign the bike-car layout to put seats within view of bikes. Caltrain's current plan is no fixed seats within view of bikes.

Seats within view of bikes will deter bicycle theft and help keep trains on time by reducing congestion in bike lanes.

If I didn't ride Caltrain with my bike, I would have to pay lots of money to take TNC or taxi rides, or experience longer waits on local transit - the bike is crucial, and I can't afford to have it stolen!

We need 96 bike spaces per train to meet demand in 2022, when electrified service will begin.

So please - **design the new electric Caltrain cars to accommodate plenty of bikes and seating for riders to protect their bikes!**

Thank you for all you do,

Preston Rhea
Briefly put: more bike space, and more seating within view of it, please!

-john schlag
Dear Scott,

Thank you for your feedback. As you mentioned, Caltrain has one of the most extensive bicycle access programs among passenger railroads in the nation, and with electrification there will be a 17% increase in onboard bike capacity.

Caltrain is continuously trying to improve service and access for all its riders, which is one of the reasons the Board adopted the Bike Parking Management Plan (BPMP) which recommends a set of management and administrative reforms and implementation strategies to optimize the performance of Caltrain’s bike parking system. Recently, a full time station access planner was hired to improve bike access at stations, and Caltrain was awarded a TIRCP grant from the state to help fund bike parking improvements.

While the BPMP encompasses a variety of solutions, I wanted to mention that some of the bike share companies have programs for qualifying residents (e.g. here) that make them an attractive solution compared to the cost of gas and car maintenance.

Caltrain sees bikes as an excellent first and last mile solution, and riders who use their bikes to access Caltrain help reduce pollution, relieve congestion, and help promote healthy, active transportation. Thanks again for your feedback.

Best,
Lori

---

Hello,

I regret that I am unable to attend and participate in the form of public comment during this week’s JPB meeting. After listening to the discussion about the fare policy update last month, I wanted to share comments and will do so in writing rather than in person. I encourage the board to ensure bicycle capacity of 96 bikes per train as Caltrain plans for electrification in order for Caltrain to be prepared to serve the SF through Peninsula corridor community’s public needs.

Several issues were emphasized during last month’s fare policy discussion for which an expansive bikes on board policy would help to address. Bikes on board Caltrain improves equity and access, since lower income people often must ride a bike as a more cost effective alternative to a car and typically do not have the disposable income to pay for a bikeshare or scooter program to get to/from Caltrain. Bike share is not an option for many who currently take their bikes on board Caltrain, as many who bike due to income reasons also do not hold jobs at large tech companies or large organizations where the location or size of the employer ensures...
access to bike share. For example, thousands of current cycling train riders are public school staff employed in schools located far away from Caltrain stations and where bikeshare stations are not typically located close to their work sites. Last month's discussion made apparent that the current board members do not bike as their primary form of transportation and do not recognize the implication of the anticipated over-reliance of share options that are not realistic alternatives for many who take their bike on board for financial reasons, or for whom bike share options are not alternatives as the board and staff see them. Taking a Lift or Uber is frequently less expensive than the rate that it costs to take a bike or scooter share to or from Caltrain, leaving fewer options to lower income community members who are not able to afford additional fees for rideshare or bikeshare.

Connectivity concerns, addressing the "first/last mile" issue, are also better addressed through bikes on board Caltrain. Muni, Samtrans, and VTA all serve vast geographic areas that require anyone who must travel more than a mile to/from their home or workplace to spend substantially more time in their cars or on public transportation commutes to/from Caltrain stations if bikes are not permitted on board. Many of the current cyclists who I speak with on board trains with their bikes will not choose to take Muni/Samtrans/VTA to get to/from Caltrain, but will instead drive to Caltrain stations, adding additional burden to the subsidized infrastructure supporting those who drive to Caltrain. Many current cyclists anticipate a change to their Caltrain commutes if they must drive to stations, reporting that they would rely entirely on automobile usage to get to work rather than driving to Caltrain. Formerly reliable bikes on board Caltrain riders will add to the traffic on the roads by driving to/from Caltrain stations, or worse, remain in their car for their entire commute. If Caltrain sees an 8% reduction of rush hour traffic on highways as a result of their service as a definition of their successful service to the community, I would encourage decisions that increases the percentage of people using Caltrain beyond the modest level represented by the 8% reduction mentioned in last month's board meeting. Bikes on board will reduce carbon emissions on the road to a more comprehensive extent than other options projected by Caltrain staff.

If increasing ridership is the long term goal of Caltrain, your largest growing rider group have been and continue to be cyclists who bring their bikes on board Caltrain. The reality of the Santa Clara Valley region served by Caltrain is that area was developed as a sprawling suburban expanse and continues to rely on an infrastructure requiring automobile use. If the rapid, green, and efficient option of having a bicycle at both ends of a person's commute does not exist to current bikes on board riders, many current cyclists will choose to drive since their commutes frequently begin and/or end in a car-favorable area and not a walking/public transportation friendly area. Caltrain will remove incentives to take Caltrain for your largest growing demographic group if bikes on board riders are no longer able to travel with a bike that is necessary on both ends of their regular commutes. Caltrain is making a risky calculation that they will be able to approach 80% or greater farebox recovery in the absence of continued access for your largest current growth market of users.

If one of your priorities is to get people out of their cars, there is no option superior to an expansive bikes on board policy as Caltrain shifts into electrification. Bikes are green no matter how many first and last miles are required to get on board a Caltrain. Bikes on board permit people to virtually never require a car irrespective the lengths or start/end points of their commutes. Bikes result in limited road maintenance infrastructure, potentially making more resources available for public transportation relative to driving over the long term.

Please do not make people like me return to driving commutes or search for jobs where we can take our bikes on BART instead of Caltrain. Please remain the leader in public transportation that your visionary bikes on board policy received so much deserved recognition of your organization's leadership. Please do not abandon the segment of your ridership who have supported so many of the broad development and funding goals that Caltrain has advocated to policy makers and the public. Ensure 96 bikes per train in your consists as you implement electrification.

Scott Yarbrough
Caltrain Zone 1 to Zone 3 commuter
Thanks Caltrain for planning to buy more rail cars to run longer electric trains.

New rail cars provide an opportunity to redesign bike-car layout to put seats within view of bikes.

Seats within view of bikes will deter bicycle theft or damage, and help keep trains on time by reducing congestion in bike cars.

If Caltrain was unavailable, I would have to drive to work.

Bike cars are maxed out today and we need 96 bike spaces per train to meet demand in 2022, when electrified service will begin.

--

Sent from my Gmail account,
Hi,

Thank you for taking the step to electrify Caltrain. I believe that biking is a vital component of Caltrain's future, and that comes from ensuring that bike thefts are minimized in the new electric cars. Please ensure that there are seats in the new bike cars or another way to minimize theft, and ensure there are enough bike spaces in the new cars (96+).

Thanks,
David Hsu
Dear Board and friends:

I am very happy Caltrain plans to buy more rail cars, to run longer electric trains. What is important now is to design those cars for best space use, especially for bike riders.

We love being able to combine our two MOST energy-efficient modes of transport - bikes and trains. However it is VERY important to us to sit within view of our bikes - and we've calculated that that will also make the loading faster and smoother. It is also very important that we know there will be enough bike spaces, because if the danger of being bumped can make me potentially late to a performance (I'm a violinist), I can't afford to risk it. Which would mean driving. Yuck.

We bikers have calculated that we need 96 bike spaces per train to meet the 2022 demand - when the electric service is planned to begin - and that that number is do-able with the right design. Right now our bike spaces are filled to the brim during commutes. So we really want you to plan ahead.

cheers - virginia smedberg
Palo Alto
Hello,

I am very pleased to hear that Caltrain is buying more rail cars. I would encourage you to study alternative layouts that increase bike capacity while also keep seats within view of the bikes. This will reduce thefts. Right now all of us in the bike car are keeping an eye on suspicious activity. It's not just me keeping an eye on my own bike, I am doing the same for my fellow riders. It would be worrying if this is lost in the new layouts.

For me, the bike + train combo is my only option for staying sane on my commute. My alternatives are to:

1) Take a bus from Mill Valley. This requires a car or bike to get to the transit depot and typically includes carsickness from being on the bus for hours.
2) Drive. Way too far and painful from Sausalito to Mountain View every day.

Just two days ago I witnessed a whole bunch of bikes getting bumped at Cal Ave and Palo Alto on a rainy evening - I hope we can avoid these situations in the future because it creates a huge impediment to environmentally-friendly commuting.

I appreciate your continued focus on this matter and identifying solutions for an important Caltrain ridership group: cyclists. We are using creative solutions to reduce the number of cars on the road, and we could use your help to accelerate progress!

Best,

Kieran

Kieran Culligan
Hi Caltrain,

I heard about the new electrification of Caltrain and am excited to see my daily commute become more energy efficient and speedy. I am a daily commuter with a bike and love the bike cars. I have heard that the new electric cars won't have seats in the bike cars. That's really disappointing to me because I've seen bike theft and bike gadget theft (such as lights or cameras being pulled off bikes). The thieves were only stopped because there were cyclists in the bike car, keeping watch on the bikes. Without seats, bike thieves will run rampant (not might, but will. If there's an opportunity you can bet some sorry soul will take it).

I ALWAYS watch my bike and I'm not the only one. If there are no seats in the bike car I'm apt to just stand in the aisle (which would be in the way of everyone and if multiple of us stand in the way so we can keep an eye on our bikes then there will be some serious congestion and slow down loading and unloading the bikes).

In addition, cyclists are always getting bumped off the trains. The bike cars are maxed out constantly. Please, I request that we need at least 96 bike spaces per train to meet future rider demand as well as seats in the bike cars to prevent theft and congestion.

If Caltrain becomes too congested or unsafe for cyclists to use, I won't be buying my daily ticket to ride (and I'm not alone, many of my cycling peers feel the same).

Thank you for your consideration,

Sarah
Dear Bikes on Board,

Thank you for your feedback. Caltrain has one of the most extensive bicycle access programs among passenger railroads in the nation, and riders who use their bikes to access Caltrain help reduce pollution, relieve congestion, and help promote healthy, active transportation.

Caltrain is currently working to improve bike parking at stations to better meet the needs of its riders. The Board adopted the Bike Parking Management Plan which recommends a set of management and administrative reforms and implementation strategies to optimize the performance of Caltrain’s bike parking system; and recently a full time station access planner was hired to improve bike access at the stations.

Best,
Lori

Please see the attached letters.
Hello,

I bring my bike onto Caltrain every day of the work week to commute. I am really excited to hear that there will be new cars added to the trains, as the trains are currently over-crowded. The bike cars are especially overcrowded and because of this cyclists loading onto the train are frequently the bottleneck that prevents the trains from leaving on time. Many cyclists are forced to wait outside the train while others try and find places for their bikes on an already full bike car. Including 96 bike spaces per train will help alleviate the overcrowded bike car bottlenecks in the future. I also urge you to ensure that bikes are within viewing distance of seats to prevent bicycle theft. Placing the bikes out of sight from their owners will make it far too easy for thieves to simply walk away with them. Furthermore, having bikes outside of viewing distance of seats will lead to many paranoid cyclists waiting in the bike area. This will greatly contribute to congestion when others are trying to load and unload their bikes.

Thank you for considering the matter,

Byron
Good Afternoon Caltrain Board,

I recently learned that you are planning to buy more rail cars to run longer electric trains. I wanted to say first as a commuter- Thank You! This is improve my daily commute and I greatly appreciate it. I also wanted to mention that I am a bicyclist and I really enjoy being able to use the bike cars. Lately they have been very full, though, and often I have not been able to sit near my bike. I think it is very important to support the people who are biking to work and contributing to a cleaner environment by allowing them to feel comfortable riding the train without the risk of someone stealing their bikes. It would also deter congestion in the bike cars, which causes delays and potentially accidents. If I was not able to ride the Caltrain with my bike, I would be forced to drive my car which would cause more congestion and contribute to substantial environmental issues.

I want to stress that bike cars are maxed out today, and we really do need at least 96 bike spaces per train to meet demand in 2022, when electrified service will begin. Please consider the benefit this is for the community, the environment and Caltrain commuters!

Thank you,
Jaci Sanchez
Thank you for planning on purchasing more rail cars to run longer electric trains. I hope you take the opportunity afforded by this purchase to redesign the car layout relative to bicycles so that cyclists can sit within view of their bicycles. Providing seating within view of bicycles will deter theft and reduce congestion by facilitating rapid loading and unloading without cyclists being forced to lock and unlock bikes on the train.

Bike cars are maxed out today and we need 96 bike spaces per train to meet demand in 2022 when electrified service is slated to begin.

Thank you,
--
Charles Sowers
To whom it may concern,

First, thanks for all the hard work you do, and especially for planning to buy more rail cars to run longer electric trains. I'd like to encourage you to consider designing the new trains to accommodate more bikes (getting bumped from a train on your morning commute is really no fun and can really mess a day up) and to allow bikers to sit close to their bikes (please don't steal my only mode of transport).

If I wasn't able to take my bike on Caltrain, I'd have to take 3 buses in addition to my train ride and my commute would take over 2 hours. Cars are maxed out today, because of this reason exactly, but we can do better, I know we can!

Thank you!!

Jessie K
Boland, Christine

From: Vicki Pelton
Sent: Tuesday, November 27, 2018 8:30 PM
To: Board (@caltrain.com)
Cc: CalMod@caltrain.com; Caltrain, Bac (@caltrain.com); cacsecretary [@caltrain.com];
bikesonboard@sonic.net
Subject: Bikes on electric trains

Thank you for buying more cars for the electric trains. Please ensure there are seats available in the bike cars so that owners can see their bikes.

--Vicki Pelton
Sent from my handheld super computer
To Caltrain,

Thanks for planning to buy more rail cars to run longer electric trains. I know that the new rail cars provide an opportunity to redesign bike-car layout to put seats within view of bikes.

We need seats within view of bikes will deter bicycle theft and help keep trains on time by reducing congestion in bike cars.

I've been riding for 8 years, I really need this.

Please avoid bike bumps (not being able to board) and think about bike riders.

Thanks!

Daniel Trevino
Thanks for considering adding more cars to the electric trains! I'm excited because this provides an opportunity to redesign the bike-car layout. I think it's really important for you guys to have bike cars where owners can keep an eye on their bikes. This will help deter thieves, and should also help reduce congestion on the bike cars. Bike cars are already pretty maxed out, so to meet demand in 2022, there should be about 100 spaces per train for bikes.

I ride caltrain every day with my bike to and from work. Please keep bike riders in mind as you plan!

--
"I know of no more encouraging fact than the unquestioned ability of a man to elevate his life by conscious endeavor."
--Henry David Thoreau
Dear board members,

I'm very excited about the prospect of Caltrain electrification - faster service with fewer emissions will be a huge win. But as a supercommuter (East Bay to Palo Alto), I need my bike for connections and first and last mile to make a transit commute bearable. I hear that the new bike cars won't have space for cyclists to sit near their bikes, which is disturbing from a security perspective.

Secure capacity for bikes is very important for multimodal commuters. I can't count on space for my bike at Millbrae, so I have to bike from Embarcadero BART to 4th St in the mornings. I'm hopeful that the electrification project will result in the secure bike capacity that Caltrain riders need for the future. Thank you for all that you do.

Best wishes
Kevin Jude
Berkeley
Hi,

I ride Caltrain with my bike every day and I’ve heard the new electrified rail cars have reduced bike capacity and also do not have seating within view of bikes.

I think it’s awesome Caltrain is electrifying and buying more cars to increase planned capacity, but I hope you consider improving the rail car design beforehand to improve the bike seating.

I never sit out of view of my bike when on Caltrain because it is so easy to steal a bike from the train. Many of my fellow commuters feel the same and so the result of the current rail car design will be congestion within the train from people standing by their bikes, which I believe they are entitled to do. Either that or people will start locking their bikes which will slow everything down when it comes to getting on and off. I would be one of those people standing near my bike.

At peak times, bike cars are already maxed out so we need a minimum of 96 bike spaces per train to meet 2022 demand. The current two-tier bike rail car design is awesome (with the single seating and luggage rack on the top deck), it’d be cool if we can see something like that.

I hope my opinion reaches you, I can’t wait to ride electric!

~Sarah Edwards
Thank you for deciding to buy more railcars in order to run longer trains.

This purchase is an opportunity to optimize the design of the railcars. We need at least 96 bike spaces per train in order to meet demand in 2022.

The cars are already at capacity, as I know from experience. I have been a regular commuter on Caltrain since November 2016, boarding with my bike at SF 4th & King or Millbrae, and exiting at Mountain View.

Thank you,

Michael
Dear Caltrain Board,

Due to a recent grant award for more rail cars, I understand there is a pending board vote 12/6.

I am writing to state that as a daily bike+train commuter, I strongly advocate for the redesign of the new bike-cars to allow for seating within view of the bikes.

Caltrain's current plan is no fixed seats within view of bikes, and I believe that is a poor design. Both the current "Gallery" and "Bombardier" cars allow for this, and it works well for (1) loading/unloading, (2) rearranging stacks when necessary, and (3) preventing bike thefts -- bikers look out for each other. The Gallery car's main advantages are higher bike capacity, and shunting of bikers to the upper floor, where they can both watch over their bike and not stand in the way of loading/unloading. The Bombardier car's main advantages are two doors for loading/unloading and increased overall seating. I have some ideas/schematics that combine the best of those two designs, if you are interested.

As I'm sure your data show, bike capacity is already maximized during peak commute hours, exactly when it's most important to give people viable non-driving options. Thank you for your ongoing commitment to modernization and increasing capacity via electrification!

Viet Nguyen, MD
Clinical Associate Professor
Neurology, Neurophysiology & Intraoperative Monitoring
Stanford University Medical Center
Hello,

I’m writing to thank you for making the Bay Area a great place to commute by bike.

I’m hoping you will make it even better with the new electric trains. We hardly have enough bike trains as it is. I hope that you will add more bike train cars especially ones that will enable more bikes to ride and also allow bikers to see their bikes considering the high level of bike theft that occurs.

I love commuting my bike and would hate to add traffic to our roads due to lack of bike trains.

Thank you again!!

Carol Fan. Riding bikes for 4 years!
Boland, Christine

From: Nancy
Sent: Tuesday, November 27, 2018 7:34 AM
To: Board (@caltrain.com)
Cc: CalMod@caltrain.com; Caltrain, Bac (@caltrain.com); cacsecretary [@caltrain.com]; bikesonboard@sonic.net
Subject: Bike car capacity

Make sure there's room on all bike cars for riders. It's important that riders can sit near their bikes to prevent theft and to help move the bikes around when necessary.

Sent from my iPhone
hi caltrain –
thanks for buying more cars for the electrified trains; that will be great for everyone.

please make sure that there are adequate bike spaces on the new trains – there are not enough spaces on current trains at rush hour – I still see people getting bumped from southbound trains at 22nd and milbrae in the mornings (and have been bumped myself).

and please, please design the new bike cars so that riders can sit near their bikes. otherwise, there’s a real risk of bike theft, which will deter ridership and defeat the purpose of having trains!

thanks,
sean.

--------------------------------------------------------
sean f. reardon

--------------------------------------------------------
Hello Team - I’m glad to hear you plan to run higher capacity and longer rail cars with electrification. I want to Express concern that my understanding is that there is currently a plan that all the new bike Karis will not allow us to sit in view of our bicycles. I have personally witnessed bicycles being stolen off of CaltrainMe cars or attempt to be stored, I’m not sure that I could possibly leave my bicycle there but standing for 45 minutes isn’t really an option either. As it is I take a 6 AM train into the city at 4:15 PM train out of the city, pre-rush-hour, and there have been times when the bike park car has been completely full. We need more bike capacity with seating!

Thank you for your consideration.

Best regards,
Meaghan
Hi everyone-

I unfortunately cannot make it to the Dec 6 meeting. But I want to appeal to the board and make my voice heard. I have been using Caltrain five days a week, every week for the last seven years to get from Lawrence to Palo Alto. I take my bike each time, rain or shine. I personally know of two and have heard of another person who has had his bike stolen from the bike cars.

As it is, everyday, we have folks use up the seats that should go to bike owners. NO ONE reads the courtesy notice. And this is NEVER enforced. As a result, there is no place for bike owners to be with the bike.

So its with dismay that I heard that we will be separated from our bikes. Have a camera on board will not stop someone from stealing his or her bike. I would like the Board to seriously reconsider the plan to separate bike owners from their bikes. We also need more bike spots not less.

Please consider the disservice you are going to cause by your new plan. I would love to hear feedback from you on my thoughts. I am pretty certain you have a host of people who are against this idea.

Best, G. Salim Mohammed.
You've probably been bombarded with this already, but see https://sibcmomentum.org/electrified-caltrain-needs-improvement/. I've appended one suggested alternative from it.

Time to replay my busted record: bikes and caltrain are complementary. Both improve the other. Bikes handle the first 1 to 5 miles, trains the long haul. We need bikes on board, and we need to be able to see our bikes. I've seen too many bikes stolen. I've heard that last year 27 were reported stolen. I'm sure a lot more are stolen and not reported, extrapolating the two or three I saw, including the one I helped stop. I travel one one or two of the less busy trains each day, maybe 10 a week. Caltrain has runs roughly 600 trains a week. Stolen bikes reduce the number of folks willing to ride the train, and not being able to keep your eyes on your bike increases thefts. We need more folks out of their cars, and taking the train, and that means more bikes on board, not fewer.

I'd suggest a uniform car layout, with every car having a spots for bikes, luggage, and handicapped seating. Not only is that good for bikes, it's good for all riders. You don't need to figure out which car has which service. I can't count the number of times travelers bring luggage on the wrong car, trains wait for cyclists to run from one full bike car to one with space, and handicapped folks to get to the right car. It'll even make operations simpler: if a car breaks down, any other car can replace it, no need to find a matching car.

Thanks for all Caltrain has done in the past, and all you are doing now,

giuliano
Dear Caltrain Board,

My Caltrain with bike experience over the past two years--commuting with my bike from San Francisco to San Mateo--is greatly improved versus when I did this same commute in 1999-2005. I've not been denied service nearly as often.

Over the past year I've see an increase in ridership. The 8:05, 8:35 and 8:45 are frequently at capacity, unless it's raining. The four northbound afternoon trains I catch at the Hillsdale station are usually standing room only.

I'm happy to hear that capacity will increase with longer electric trains. If you look at how the above mentioned trains are utilized by bike commuters you'll see that more bike capacity is warranted. It will lead to more bike commuters. The bikers need to be able to see their bikes to deter theft. I hope that the new train layout will have sufficient seating in the bike cars.

I look forward to riding the new electric trains.

Thank you.

-james rozzelle
San Francisco
Hi board -

Buy cars with seats in view of the bikes. Please review specify points below.

Thanks
Demetrios

Thank Caltrain for planning to buy more rail cars to run longer electric trains.

Explain that new rail cars provide an opportunity to redesign bike-car layout to put seats within view of bikes (Caltrain's current plan is no fixed seats within view of bikes).

Tell Caltrain that seats within view of bikes will deter bicycle theft and help keep trains on time by reducing congestion in bike cars.

Tell Caltrain that bike cars are maxed out today and we need 96 bike spaces per train to meet demand in 2022, when electrified service will begin.

--
Demetrios Marcouliades, AGNP-C
Adult Gerontological Primary Care Nurse Practitioner with Post-Master HIV & HCV Primary Care Certifications

Johns Hopkins School of Nursing
As you are aware, there is a strong relation between ridership and bike transportation capacity onboard trains. Can you do the right thing and increase the current limited capacity? I see regularly that cars are filled to or over capacity with bikes already, which means that there is demand for more capacity already, because being bumped due to lack of capacity is already an issue - let's not turn more riders away due to insufficient capacity and negative experiences.

Thanks,
Cor van de Water,
Sunnyvale CA.
Dear Board of Caltrain -

First of all, thank you for your work and service. The Caltrain saves me daily from a commuting nightmare, and I am so grateful that this alternative to driving exists. I am also excited by the prospect of more rail cars to run longer electric trains in the future!

I take my bike on my commute whenever I ride the train. On both ends, my home and work are just far enough from the stations that biking is a necessity. I really appreciate the current bike cars, because they allow me to keep an eye on my bike. I would also strongly urge you to consider adding more bike space - basically every evening on the popular trains, there are cyclists who are bumped to the next train, and with expanded service, it will just continue to happen.

I love the Caltrain (really, I do), and want to see it improve for bikers and for everyone!
Thanks for listening!

- Katie Dlesk, SF Resident, Employed in Palo Alto (22nd to Cal Ave)