AGENDA

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

March 4, 2010 – Thursday 10:00 a.m.

1. Pledge of Allegiance

2. Call to Order/Roll Call

3. Public Comment
   Public comment by each individual speaker shall be limited to two minutes

4. Consent Calendar
   Members of the public or Board may request that an item under the Consent Calendar be considered separately
   a) Approval of Minutes of February 4, 2010
   b) Authorize Assignment of Contract with Tamalpais Wealth Advisors to CSI Capital Management, Inc. to Provide Investment Management Services

5. Chairperson’s Report

6. MTC Liaison Report

7. Report of the Citizens Advisory Committee

8. Report of the Executive Director
   a) Caltrain Performance Report – January 2010
   b) Peninsula Rail Program Update

9. Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenses for January 2010

10. Authorize Entering into Memoranda of Understanding with the Cities of San Francisco and San Bruno to Receive Section 190 Grade Separation Funding up to $15,000,000

11. Authorize Approval of a Contract Change Order for the Procurement of Railroad Signal Houses with Granite Construction Company for a Not-to-Exceed Amount of $2,000,000

12. Assessment of the Fiscal Year 2010 Fuel Hedge Program and Authorize Adoption of a Fuel Hedging Policy
13. Legislative Update

14. Authorize Support of the Local Taxpayer, Public Safety and Transportation Protection Act of 2010 for California’s November 2010 Statewide Ballot

15. Caltrain Comprehensive Access Program

16. Quarterly Capital Report

17. Correspondence

18. Board Member Requests

19. Date/Time of Next Meeting
   Thursday, April 1, 2010, 10 a.m. at San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building, Bacciocco Auditorium, 2nd Floor, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070

20. General Counsel Report
   a) Closed Session: Real Estate Negotiations – Pursuant to Government Code 54956.8:
      Agency Negotiators: David J. Miller and Brian Fitzpatrick
      Under Negotiation: Price and Terms of Purchase
      Property and Negotiating Parties:

      | Owner                     | Address/Location        | APN     |
      |----------------------------|-------------------------|---------|
      | Welch Family Partnership   | 104 San Bruno Avenue    | 020-111-150 |
      | Usman and Fatima Shaikh    | 111 San Bruno Avenue    | 020-121-360 |
      | Federick J.Firpo Trust     | Huntington Avenue       | 020-111-140 |
      | Lester and Rhoda Kaplan    | 222 San Bruno Avenue    | 020-193-360 |
      | Paul and Rita Kaplan       |                         |         |
      | Artichoke Joes             | 659 Huntington Avenue   | 020-131-570 |
      | Artichoke Joes             | 205 Angus Avenue        | 020-131-410 |
      | City and County of San Francisco | Angus and Huntington | SBE 845-41-5 |
      |                             | Avenue                  |         |
      |                             | San Mateo and Huntington| SBE 846-41-5|

21. Adjourn
INFORMATION FOR THE PUBLIC

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

If you have questions on the agenda, please contact the JPB Secretary at 650.508.6242. Agendas are available on the JPB Website at www.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 Ave., San Carlos, which is located one block west of the San Carlos Caltrain Station on El Camino Real. The building is also accessible by SamTrans bus Routes: 260, 295, 390, 391, and KX.

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 6 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.
MEMBERS PRESENT:    O. Ahmad, M. Church, S. Elsbernd (Chair), D. Gage, A. Kalra, A. Lloyd, K. Yeager

MEMBERS ABSENT:    J. Cisneros, N. Ford

MTC LIAISON:     S. Lempert

STAFF PRESENT:    J. Cassman, C. Cavitt, B. Doty, G. Harrington, C. Harvey, R. Haskin, R. Lake, M. Martinez, N. McKenna, D. Miller, S. Murphy, M. Scanlon, M. Simon

Chair Sean Elsbernd called the meeting to order at 10:03 a.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

PUBLIC COMMENT
Mari Hunter, San Francisco, speaking on behalf of Andy Thornley of the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition (SFBC), thanked the Board for past and continued work on providing bike storage for cyclists. She said this type of accommodation encourages sustainable transportation. Ms. Hunter said four points the SFBC would like to stress today are:

1. Service reliability with greater bike capacity.
2. Passengers rely on and greatly appreciate schedule performance with an on-time performance that was better in 2009. With continued assistance of Caltrain staff directing non-cyclists and cyclists to the proper cars, dwell times shouldn’t increase.
3. More bike capacity enables passengers to “green” both the first and last mile of their Caltrain commute by bringing their bikes on-board.
4. The expense of adding bike capacity this last year was recouped within six months. All trains have empty seats at peak loads and there is still an unmet demand for bike space. The next step is to improve consistency in bike capacity to 80 bikes per train so cyclists aren’t bumped. With consistent capacity more people will be inspired to ride Caltrain.

Jeffrey Oldham, San Jose, said he participated in the bikes-on-board project. He said the SFBC has analyzed the recent increase in on-board bicycle capacity. The Board was given copies of the SFBC’s report “Increased Onboard Bicycle Capacity Improved Caltrain’s Performance in 2009.” Mr. Oldham said the graph on page five of the report shows bumps were increasing until Caltrain added more bicycle capacity in May. Mr. Oldham said, unfortunately, even after full deployment in November, bumps are still occurring. Mr. Oldham said according to Caltrain’s Web site, it strives to run trains with two bicycle cars on less than half of its peak hour trains, but two bike cars is not guaranteed. When a train with two bike cars is expected and only one bike
car arrives a lot of bumps occur. Mr. Oldham said improving service reliability is easy by expanding bicycle capacity to 80 bikes per train.

Shirley Johnson, from the bikes-on-board project, said the report shows bicycles do not cause dwell time delays. There were more bicycles on-board Caltrain in 2009 and the dwell time was shorter. Ms. Johnson said table two, on page six, shows average on-time performance was higher in 2009 compared to 2008 even with more bicycle passengers in 2009. Ms. Johnson said more bike capacity means less overcrowding in bike cars so boarding and exiting is faster and easier. Unfortunately some trains today still have only one bike car even during rush hour. The main message is to increase bike capacity to a consistent 80 bikes per train without the fear of increasing dwell time.

Alpesh Patel, San Francisco, said table three, on page eight of the report, shows the payback of increased bicycle capacity. He said everyone knows cyclists continued to be denied boarding throughout 2009, despite the increased capacity. The SFBC estimates Caltrain earned incremental revenue of over $380,000, which is more than the expenditure to increase bicycle capacity. Mr. Patel said cyclists are still getting bumped so a consistent 80 bikes per train in 2010 is needed.

Mike Cohn, San Francisco, said he enjoys the bikes-on-board program. The increased capacity in 2009 was very positive, but bicyclists are still getting bumped because of the inconsistent trains with one or two bike cars. All gallery cars need two bike cars and Bombardier cars need three bike cars so capacity would be 80 bikes on every train. Mr. Cohn said with consistent bike capacity, Caltrain’s performance will get even better.

Dr. Melanie Brandenberb, Palo Alto, said teen suicides have cast a shadow over the community and staff. She part of the Track Watch group and Slow the Trains committee. Dr. Brandenberb asked that the issue of track safety and suicide prevention be a regular agenda item for the JPB meeting. She asked that there be some consideration of slowing trains in the area until other efforts can be put in force such as screening for depression.

Jean Znidarsic, Palo Alto, said she also is with Slow the Trains and Track Watch committees. She said if someone is spotted in a hot spot on the tracks the committee has no coordinated way of notifying the engineer to slow the train down. Ms. Znidarsic asked for staff to work with the Palo Alto police, the guards at the West Meadow Crossing and the track watch group to come up with a coordinated response when someone is seen on the track. She thanked staff for the additional lighting at the crossing, but would like to see more lighting. Ms. Znidarsic said in the long run the committee would like to see a study of fatalities along the entire corridor.

Morris Brown, Menlo Park, said last summer he made a comment at the JPB meeting about the agreement between the Joint Powers Board and the California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) and the promise to allow CHSRA to use the Caltrain right of way and corridor even though there are trackage rights with Union Pacific (UP). He said has not heard anything since last year regarding the progress of talks with Union Pacific. Mr. Morris said it is a waste of money for environmental studies if UP does not allow HSR on the corridor. He said it is time that some type of answer is given to this question.
Ed Adams, Union Transportation Union representative, said the upcoming Request for Proposal (RFP) and the possibility of going from two conductors to one conductor is a very unsafe approach for this operation. Mr. Adams said the uniqueness of this operation requires two conductors and would request this item be agendized for conductors’ concerns. He distributed a small video union members have created for the Board to review prior to the meeting to see conductor concerns.

Director Art Lloyd said he agrees with Mr. Adams concerns and he recommends this item be agendized for the March JPB meeting. Director Lloyd has some concerns especially during the peak periods of needing an assistant conductor.

CONSENT CALENDAR
The Board approved the following items:
  a) Approval of Minutes of January 7, 2010
  b) Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenses for December 2009
  c) Authorize the Filing of Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Applications

CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT
Chair Elsbernd said he will be requesting the Board adjourn today’s meeting in memory of two very important people to Caltrain. The first is Norm Rolfe, who was a very passionate advocate for public transit in the Bay Area. Secondly, the Caltrain family lost a very important person, Director Lloyd’s wife, Eleanor.

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION (MTC) LIAISON REPORT
MTC Liaison Sue Lempert reported:
  • The recent meeting on the bridge toll increase was very contentious and lengthy. The MTC will be doing congestion pricing and start charging a toll for carpools.
  • The MTC approved, by a very close vote, to go ahead with the Oakland Airporter project. A special meeting will be held to see if BART is meeting their conditions on this project because if not the MTC wants to save the money and distribute it to the other transit agencies.

REPORT OF THE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC)
Vice Chair Brian Wilfley reported on the January meeting:
  • Executive Officer Public Affairs Mark Simon gave a presentation on suicides and what is being done on the issue.
  • The CAC adjourned their meeting in memory of Norm Rolfe.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
Executive Director Michael Scanlon reported:
  • Caltrain is not finished yet with the bicycles-on-board project. Staff has not seen the SFBC report distributed today. Staff will be doing additional bike counts during the peak bike season. The issue is not seats on the train, but dwell times.
  • Thanked the speakers who spoke on suicides and said they are well represented. Staff had a passionate meeting with the mayor, city manager and chief of police of Palo Alto. No one has more at stake in this issue than the men and women who operate Caltrain.
• Staff will review the video from Ed Adams and schedule a meeting to have a discussion on this issue. The Board will have a committee with one representative from each of the partner agencies overseeing the RFP for the new service.
• Monthly Performance Statistics – December 2009
  a. Total Ridership was 888,790, a decrease of 8.1 percent.
  b. Average Weekday Ridership was 32,597, a decrease of 8.7 percent.
  c. Total Revenue was $3,105,282, a decrease of 3.2 percent.
  d. On-time Performance was 93.4 percent, a decrease of 1.2 percent.
  e. Caltrain Shuttle Ridership was 5,171, a decrease of 5.4 percent.
• Year-to-date Performance Statistics ending December 2009
  f. Total Ridership was 6,075,455, a decrease of 9.5 percent.
  g. Average Weekday Ridership was 38,057, a decrease of 9.5 percent.
  h. Total Revenue was $21,405,188, a decrease of 4.4 percent.
  i. On-time Performance was 93.6 percent, a decrease of 0.5 percent.
  j. Caltrain Shuttle Ridership was 4,509, a decrease of 28.6 percent.
• Attended the Transit CEO Conference sponsored by the American Public Transportation Association (APTA) and all transit agencies across the country are in severe financial situations. Caltrain is in good shape for the current budget year primarily due to savings on fuel.
• Looking forward there are great difficulties and opportunities. The short-term is going to be extraordinarily difficult. All three partner agencies are beyond broke due to the suspension and possible elimination of State Transit Assistance (STA) funds, dwindling sales tax revenue and ridership declines that will continue as employment is down.
• The future can be extraordinarily bright with the recent announcement of $8 billion in High Speed Rail (HSR) and inter-city rail grants. The real essence is the fundamental change in the way many Americans will live in the future.
• The special Freedom Train carried an additional 847 riders, which is down considerably from the 2,200 passengers in 2009. An additional 4,636 passengers were carried to the Monster Energy AMA Supercross event at AT&T Park.
• Caltrain will operate regular service on Presidents Day and staff will look at the ridership data to determine if a lower level of service might be adequate in future years.
• There were four fatalities and four interventions in December.
• The Centralized Equipment Maintenance and Operations Facility (CEMOF) experienced a significant failure of a high-pressure water line so that the tracks and the trainwasher cannot be used. Staff is doing everything possible to get the emergency repairs made. Mr. Scanlon expects this will require him to authorize work on an emergency basis based on the safety of the track and the facility itself.
• Condolences were offered to Director Lloyd and Mr. Rolfe’s family.

Peninsula Rail Program Update
Peninsula Rail Program Director Bob Doty reported:
• The waiver request is in the Federal Register as of January 25. There is a 45-day comment period and then it goes to the Safety Committee for approval.
• The American Recovery Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funding is $2.25 billion for the entire State of California and there is still no guidance on how the money will be distributed. Staff is waiting for the Department of Transportation to state the rules.
The alternative analysis report is anticipated to be released at the March HSR meeting in Sacramento.

There was a good turnout for the Voices of San Jose event. There was criticism at the meeting that staff had not followed-up on the outreach program for Context Sensitive Solution. The primary reason for not following up is staff has been working on a stakeholder tool kit. This report is an online tool kit on how to build a transit system. The report will go out to the public in February and it continues to be a work in progress.

There are more than 18,000 people on the e-mail list for information on the Peninsula Rail Program.

Director Omar Ahmad asked what the plan is for the beta testing and who is the user for the online kit. Mr. Doty said staff will be talking to Mr. Ahmad on his expertise in this area.

Director Ken Yeager said transit agencies are near the cliff, but the State is also on the verge of bankruptcy. He asked if the four fatalities in December caused on-time performance to be lowered. Director Yeager said staff should consider breaking out fatalities on the performance number. He also thanked Mr. Doty for a great meeting in San Jose.

**AUTHORIZE AWARD OF CONTRACT TO WILBUR SMITH ASSOCIATES TO PROVIDE ON-CALL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AND PROGRAM SUPPORT FOR UP TO $1,500,000 OVER A THREE-YEAR PERIOD**

Director of Contracts and Procurement Cheryl Cavitt said Staff Coordinating Council is requesting Board approval of this contract. A RFP was issued as a joint procurement with the San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans) and the San Mateo County Transportation Authority for the transportation planning services and program support as well as environmental planning services. In December, staff asked the Board to reject the environmental planning proposals and now is proceeding with up to three awardees for the transportation planning services.

A motion (Church/Gage) to award a contract to Wilbur Smith Associates for on-call transportation planning was approved unanimously by roll call.

**AUTHORIZE AWARD OF CONTRACT TO BECI ELECTRIC, INC. FOR THE ADVANCED TRAVELER INFORMATION SYSTEM – VISUAL MESSAGE SIGN UPGRADE AT FIVE CALTRAIN STATIONS FOR A TOTAL AMOUNT OF $380,000**

Ms. Cavitt said Staff Coordinating Council is recommending Board approval of this construction contract, which will remove the single-line message signs remaining at five stations and replace with two-line visual message signs. The installation of these will complete the update throughout the system.

A motion (Ahmad/Yeager) to award a contract to BECI Electric, Inc. for the Advanced Traveler Information System was approved unanimously by roll call.
AUTHORIZE AWARD OF CONTRACT TO DISNEY CONSTRUCTION, INC. FOR THE SAN BRUNO GRADE SEPARATION BOX CULVERT RECONSTRUCTION PROJECT FOR A TOTAL AMOUNT OF $1,841,650
Ms. Cavitt said Staff Coordinating Council is recommending Board award a contract to Disney Construction to provide reconstruction of a box culvert, which needs to be completed before the San Bruno Grade Separation main project commences. Ms. Cavitt said this will increase capacity to divert water away from the construction site.

A motion (Gage/Yeager) to award a contract to Disney Construction for the San Bruno Grade Separation Box Culvert Reconstruction Project was approved unanimously by roll call.

AUTHORIZE AWARD OF CONTRACT TO VAE NORTRAK NORTH AMERICA, INC. FOR FURNISHING AND DELIVERING TWO NEW POWER CROSSOVERS FOR THE SAN BRUNO GRADE SEPARATION PROJECT FOR A TOTAL PRICE OF $881,601
Ms. Cavitt said Staff Coordinating Council recommends the Board waive the competitive bidding requirement and award a contract to VAE Nortrak. Ms. Cavitt said currently there is no way to switch trains between the two main lines at the project site and in order to avoid delays two new crossovers need to be installed. She said the contract the JPB had with Nortrak expired in December 2009 and staff was unable to use it to add on two additional crossovers. Ms. Cavitt said Metrolink just had a similar crossover procurement and Nortrak was the lowest responsive responsible bidder with pricing staff needed for comparison for this project.

A motion (Church/Gage) to award a contract to VAE Nortrak North America, Inc. for two new power crossovers for the San Bruno Grade Separation Project was approved unanimously by roll call.

AUTHORIZE APPROVAL OF UPDATES TO JPB’S PROCUREMENT POLICY TO INCORPORATE PROVISIONS OF ASSEMBLY BILL 116
Ms. Cavitt said Staff Coordinating Council recommends Board approval of updates to JPB’s Procurement Policy to incorporate changes in State law and parallel the updates that were made to the SamTran’s Procurement Policy. This update will include changes that were brought to law by AB116. Some of the changes are:
   a. Raise the threshold for formal competitive bidding from $25,000 to $100,000 and allow staff to use best value approach for procuring equipment, materials and supplies that are usually done on a sealed bid/low bid basis. This also allows staff to consider other things besides price.
   b. Notice for bids has been reduced from two consecutive weeks to one advertisement in the newspaper published 10 days prior to the procurement and also allows for use of the Web site.
   c. For goods purchased between $2,500-$100,000 staff needs to obtain three bids, of which one must be from a small business. AB116 did not change the threshold for construction or public works procurements.
   d. Staff is requesting a competitive or formal competitive procurement process for procuring professional services when they exceed $100,000.
e. Request authorization for the Executive Director to act for the Board on procurements of equipment, supplies and services that are under $100,000 and to review and determine any protest that might occur from those procurements.

f. Authorize the Executive Director to sign contract documents within his signature authority and for those that are Board-approved.

A motion (Yeager/Lloyd) to approve updates to JPB’s Procurement Policy to incorporate provisions of Assembly Bill 116 was approved unanimously by roll call.

ACCEPTANCE OF THE QUARTERLY INVESTMENT REPORT AND FIXED INCOME MARKET REVIEW AND OUTLOOK FOR THE QUARTER ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2009
Bill Osher, Tamalpais Investment Wealth Advisors said the portfolio had a great 2009 and was up 3 percent in a year, well above the benchmark return of less than 1 percent. He said looking forward the expectation is the economy is going to have a very good showing for at least the next couple of quarters. Mr. Osher said the Feds need to raise short-term rates a bit to keep long-term rates from going higher.

A motion (Gage/Church) to accept the quarterly investment report and fixed income market review was approved.

Mr. Scanlon said, without the fatalities in December, the on-time performance would have been 96 percent.

STATE AND FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE UPDATE
Government Affairs Manager Seamus Murphy made the following report:
State Level
• The Legislature is considering the governor’s proposal on a gas tax swap. Staff participated in hearings in opposition to the gas tax swap because of the impact it would have on transit operations. The Legislature is showing a willingness to work with staff to replace some of the funding that has been diverted. One of the ideas being floated is a variation on the gas tax swap that would include a new statewide Legislative authority for each county to impose a 6-cent gas fee, subject to a simple-majority approval by voters in the county or by the county’s regional transit management agency. California Transit Association’s (CTA) legislative committee is meeting today to review the proposal and map out next steps.

Federal Level
• Senate leaders are announcing their Jobs Bill strategy. It looks like they are interested in a multi-bill approach with the first bill including a one-year extension of SAFETEA-LU, which expires at the end of this month, and supplemental transportation spending that is close to the levels passed in the House. There are some tricky obstacles to this approach including offsetting the bill spending with Troubled Asset Relief Program (TARP) funds; the Congressional Budget Office announced recently that TARP funds don’t exactly qualify as offsets in their opinion. There also may not be enough vehicles for a multi-bill strategy since revenue bills need to originate in the House and the House has only given
the Senate one revenue measure to work with. If it passes, the region’s transportation formula shares are expected to be around what the Recovery Act provided, about $495 million for the region and Caltrain would receive about $10.7 million of that share. The eventual allocation would depend on the MTC.

- It was announced last week that California is to get $2.25 billion for HSR. This is obviously very good news for the Peninsula Rail Program. There is still the issue of how these funds will be allocated within the State. The original application was $4.7 billion, which included about $980 million for Caltrain’s section that will be matched with dollar-for-dollar Proposition 1A funds. The CHSRA will now need to negotiate a new spending plan with the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) based on the actual grant amount. Job creation is going to be a priority for the administration. Staff will be working with regional partners to advocate for a strategy that recognizes how competitive Caltrain’s projects are from a readiness perspective. Regardless of where the funding ends up, it is still a huge boost to every section since it increases the total amount of funding available to the entire system statewide. Last year, Congress approved $2.5 billion for HSR and the president’s budget announcement this week included an additional $1 billion. Congress increased that amount last year so staff is hopeful they will do it again and look forward to an eventual service transportation bill that authorizes somewhere around $50 billion for HSR nationwide.

Director Don Gage asked about the governor’s gas tax plan, the swapping of money and transit agencies having the authority to go out and ask for a gas tax increase.

Mr. Murphy said the Legislature is floating an idea that would incorporate the governor’s gas tax swap proposal, but in an effort to provide some local tools for transit agencies to raise revenue it would authorize, on a county-by-county basis, a 6-cent gas tax fee subject to a majority vote approval by the voters.

CORRESPONDENCE
None.

BOARD MEMBER REQUESTS
None.

DATE/TIME/PLACE OF NEXT MEETING
Thursday, March 4, 2010, 10 a.m. at San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building, Bacciocco Auditorium, 2nd Floor, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070

GENERAL COUNSEL REPORT

d) Closed Session: Real Estate Negotiations – Pursuant to Government Code 54956.8:
Agency Negotiators: David J. Miller and Brian Fitzpatrick
Under Negotiation: Price and Terms of Purchase
Property and Negotiating Parties:
Legal Counsel David Miller said staff is asking the Board to convene in closed session to consider matters of real estate negotiations. These discussions have to do with the San Bruno Grade Separation Project and real estate needed to support this project.

Adjourned to closed session at 11:26 a.m.

Reconvened to open session at 11:36 a.m.

Mr. Miller said the Joint Powers Board met in closed session to hear a report from the real estate negotiating team on various parcels that will be required to support the construction of the San Bruno Grade Separation Project. The Board has authorized the real estate negotiators to continue to negotiate for rights and possession with various property owners and continue discussions with the City and County of San Francisco, as well as the business owner of Artichoke Joe’s to replicate the existing parking.

**ADJOURNED**

Chair Elsbernd adjourned the meeting in memory of Eleanor Lloyd and Norm Rolfe.

Adjourned at 11:37 a.m.
AGENDA ITEM # 4 (b)  
MARCH 4, 2010

PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD
STAFF REPORT

TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon  
Executive Director

FROM: Gigi Harrington  
Deputy CEO

SUBJECT: ASSIGNMENT OF CONTRACT FOR PROVIDING INVESTMENT MANAGEMENT SERVICES

ACTION
Staff Coordinating Council (SCC) recommends Board approval of the assignment of the remainder of the current investment management services agreement (Agreement) between the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) and Tamalpais Wealth Advisors (TWA) from TWA to CSI Capital Management, Inc. (CSI) on the same terms and conditions contained in the Agreement.

SIGNIFICANCE
Approval of the above action will provide the JPB with uninterrupted investment advisory services in accordance with the Agreement; with William Osher as the primary representative for the JPB and the same transparent reporting requirements including a quarterly written report and an oral economic forecast presentation by Mr. Osher.

BUDGET IMPACT
The current operating budget includes the cost for this service.

BACKGROUND
TWA has provided investment management services to the JPB since October 2008 and has approximately one and one half years remaining on its current three year Agreement. TWA’s appointment as investment advisor to the JPB was fundamentally due to Mr. Osher consistently providing favorable portfolio performance results for the San Mateo County Transit District since 1987. The JPB’s portfolio is held in the Bank of New York, as the custodial bank, on behalf of the JPB. The JPB’s funds are not held by TWA as they are solely a financial advisory firm and not an investment house.

A sister company to TWA, Tamalpais Bank, has recently experienced liquidity issues, which led Mr. Osher to seek out a new parent company to provide better resources and support for his institutional clients. Consequently, TWA has entered into an agreement with CSI, a San
Francisco-based wealth management firm established in 1978. CSI is an employee-owned, SEC-registered investment advisory firm with approximately $1.5 billion dollars under management, when combined with TWA. The agreement brings the entire TWA team under the CSI name providing the desired resources and support for institutional clients.

To ensure that the JPB continues to receive uninterrupted professional investment portfolio management services, TWA has requested the assignment of the remaining term of the current contract to CSI. CSI has agreed to continue providing all investment management services under the terms of the Agreement and has furnished the JPB with information demonstrating its qualifications to assume such investment management services. Mr. Osher, as Director Fixed Income Investments/Chief Economist for CSI, will continue to be responsible for the daily management of the JPB’s portfolio as well as the preparation of monthly reports and a quarterly economic forecast presentation to the Board.

The JPB will issue a Request for Proposals for future investment advisory services toward the end of the Agreement.

Prepared By:  Lori Snow  

650.508.6425
RESOLUTION NO. 2010 –

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

***

CONSENDING TO ASSIGNMENT OF
INVESTMENT MANAGEMENT SERVICES AGREEMENT
BY TAMALPAIS WEALTH ADVISORS TO
CSI CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, INC.

WHEREAS, by Resolution No. 2008-08 enacted on February 7, 2008 the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) authorized the execution of an Investment Management Services Agreement (Agreement) with Epic Wealth Management, subsequently renamed Tamalpais Wealth Advisors (TWA), for a base three-year term, with two one-year options, with the understanding that William Osher would serve as the primary representative to undertake, render and oversee all contractual services; and

WHEREAS, a sister company to TWA, Tamalpais Bank, has recently experienced liquidity issues, which has led Mr. Osher to seek out a larger institution as a parent company in order to provide better resources and support for his institutional clients; and

WHEREAS, TWA recently entered into an agreement with CSI Capital Management, Inc. (CSI), a San Francisco-based, employee-owned, SEC-registered wealth management firm established in 1978 that, when combined with TWA, will have approximately $1.5 billion dollars under its management and is able provide the desired resources and support for TWA’s institutional clients; and

WHEREAS, the Agreement permits the assignment of TWA’s rights and the transfer of its obligations under the Agreement to another firm upon the prior written consent of the JPB; and
WHEREAS, CSI has agreed to continue providing all investment management services under the terms of the Agreement and has furnished the JPB with information demonstrating its qualifications to assume such investment management services; and

WHEREAS, Staff Coordinating Council recommends that the Board of Directors consent to the assignment of the remainder of the term of the Investment Management Services Agreement from Tamalpais Wealth Advisors to CSI Capital Management, Inc.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board hereby consents to the assignment of the remainder of the term of the Investment Management Services Agreement from Tamalpais Wealth Advisors to CSI Capital Management, Inc. on the same terms and conditions contained in the Agreement; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Executive Director is authorized to execute appropriate documents as approved by General Counsel to give effect to this assignment.

Passed and adopted this 4th day of March, 2010, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

____________________________________
Chair, Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board

ATTEST:

______________________________
JPB Secretary
TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
          Executive Director

FROM: C.H. (Chuck) Harvey
       Deputy CEO

SUBJECT: KEY CALTRAIN PERFORMANCE STATISTICS JANUARY 2010

For January 2010, Caltrain average weekday ridership (AWR) decreased 5.2 percent when compared to January 2009. AWR based on ticket sales was 35,584 for January 2010, a decrease of 1,938 compared to January 2009. The total number of passengers for the month of January 2010 was 920,103. This is a 6.2 percent decrease from last year’s January total of 981,438. The local economy is continuing to negatively impact ridership.

In January 2010, on-time performance was 94.8 percent, as compared to 97.1 percent in January 2009. This represents a decline of about two and a half percentage points and is just short of achieving the JPB goal of 95 percent on-time.

Average weekday shuttle ridership was estimated at 6,551. Marguerite shuttle ridership reporting has continued to be irregular as they are transitioning back to a manual counting method and have changed their management and shuttle service provider. For this reason, staff will be reporting shuttle ridership both with and without Marguerite counts until these issues with Stanford have been resolved. It is estimated that non-Marguerite shuttle ridership is down 12.8 percent from January 2009. There are large variations among individual shuttles that reflect the local area economy impact on companies directly served by these shuttles. For the station shuttles, the Millbrae-Broadway shuttle averaged 97 daily riders. The Tamien-San Jose shuttle averaged 44 riders per Saturday/Sunday. The Belmont-Hillsdale shuttle averaged 46 daily riders.

Table A shows performance indicators for January 2010. Graph A shows AWR for the past 13 months as compared to the rolling average.
Caltrain Promotions – January 2010

**Freedom Train** – Caltrain once again operated the annual Freedom Train, which celebrates the life and accomplishments of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. The train made limited stops to San Francisco for the celebration held at the Yerba Buena Center for the Arts. Caltrain got the word out about the train with a news release, a notice in the special service section of the Caltrain Web site and information in the winter issue of *Weekend Edition*.

**Disney on Ice** – To offer added value to our customers, Caltrain is partnering with the promoters of *Disney On Ice – Worlds of Fantasy*. Caltrain riders receive a discount of $3 when they show a Caltrain pass or ticket at the Disney on Ice box office. Shows will be held at the HP Pavilion and the Oracle Arena in February and March. Caltrain posted adcards inside trains and a photo from the *Disney On Ice - Worlds of Fantasy* show is displayed on the cover of the winter issue of *Weekend Edition* to help promote the shows.

**AMA Supercross** – The clouds parted long enough for the American Motorcyclist Association to continue its Supercross tour of the west at San Francisco’s AT&T Park. Organizers of the event reported an increase in attendance of 5,000 from 2009, as the motocross race continues to gather momentum and expand its fan base. Caltrain recorded an extra 4,642 riders compared to 2009, a 122 percent increase. The event was promoted with a news release and mentioned in the winter issue of *Weekend Edition*.

**San Jose Sharks** – The San Jose Sharks continue to lead their division and are on pace once again to make it to post-season play as the league breaks for the Olympic games. This year’s cooperative promotion with the Sharks includes a print campaign in local newspapers, adcards on the trains and a Web button on the Caltrain Web site. In addition, the Sharks purchased a train wrap early in the season to promote the team. Based on the equal number of games to last year, ridership is up 7 percent this season.

Prepared by: Patrick Boland, Marketing Manager 650.508.6245
Ted Yurek, Senior Planner 650.508.6471
Table A

January 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2009</th>
<th>FY2010</th>
<th>%Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Ridership</td>
<td>981,438</td>
<td>920,103</td>
<td>-6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Weekday Ridership</td>
<td>37,522</td>
<td>35,584</td>
<td>-5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>$3,372,504</td>
<td>$3,214,335</td>
<td>-4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-time Performance</td>
<td>97.1%</td>
<td>94.8%</td>
<td>-2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain Shuttle Ridership</td>
<td>5,713</td>
<td>6,551</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain Non-Marguerite Shuttle Ridership</td>
<td>3,585</td>
<td>3,127</td>
<td>-12.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Year to Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2009</th>
<th>FY2010</th>
<th>%Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Ridership</td>
<td>7,691,493</td>
<td>6,995,558</td>
<td>-9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Weekday Ridership</td>
<td>41,351</td>
<td>37,704</td>
<td>-8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>$25,766,120</td>
<td>$24,619,523</td>
<td>-4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-time Performance</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Caltrain Shuttle Ridership</td>
<td>6,232</td>
<td>5,649</td>
<td>-9.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph A

Caltrain Average Weekday Ridership

![Graph showing the Average Weekday Ridership for Caltrain from January 2009 to January 2010, with a 13-Month rolling average line.
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TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
Executive Director

FROM: Gigi Harrington
Deputy CEO

SUBJECT: STATEMENT OF REVENUE AND EXPENSE FOR THE PERIOD ENDING JANUARY 31, 2010 AND SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

ACTION
Staff proposes that the Board of Directors accept and enter into the record the Statement of Revenue and Expense for the month of January 2010 and supplemental information.

SIGNIFICANCE
Revenue: For January of Fiscal Year 2010, Total Operating Revenue (line 7) is $115,706 or 0.4 percent better than budget. This is due to Other Income (line 5) which is better than budget by $778,472 or 89.0 percent mainly due to an unbudgeted increase in shared track revenue and is offset by lower than anticipated Farebox Revenue (line 1) and Parking Revenue (line 2) which together were $669,969 or 2.5 percent worse than budget. Compared to the prior year, Total Operating Revenue (line 7) is $901,237 or 3.2 percent higher, due to Other Income (line 5) which is $1,970,324 or 621.7 percent higher and is offset by Farebox Revenue (line 1) which is $1,147,004 or 4.5 percent lower.

Expense: Grand Total Expenses (line 44) show a favorable variance of $6,054,818 or 10.8 percent. Total Operating Expense (line 31) is $5,264,686 or 10.6 percent better than budget. Within total operating expense Contract Operating & Maintenance (line 23) is $2,320,703 or 6.6 percent better than budget and Fuel (line 25) is better than budget by $2,192,199 or 27.2 percent. Total Administrative Expense (line 40) is $790,132 or 13.9 percent better than budget.

Compared to prior year, Grand Total Expenses (line 44) are $1,863,542 or 3.6 percent lower. The decrease in expense over the prior year is mainly due to Fuel (line 25) which is $1,671,927 or 22.1 percent lower than the prior year.

Budget Revisions: There are no budget revisions this month.

Prepared by: Rima Lobo, Manager, Financial Services 650.508.6274
David Ramires, Accountant 650.508.6417
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>CURRENT ACTUAL</th>
<th>PRIOR ACTUAL</th>
<th>CURRENT REVISED</th>
<th>% REV APPROVED</th>
<th>% REV (AS PROJECTED)</th>
<th>% OF YEAR ELAPSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPERATIONS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Farebox Revenue</td>
<td>3,214,335</td>
<td>25,766,527</td>
<td>24,619,523</td>
<td>25,027,851</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
<td>43,762,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Parking Revenue</td>
<td>184,801</td>
<td>1,207,891</td>
<td>1,254,377</td>
<td>1,516,018</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
<td>2,598,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Shuttles</td>
<td>107,185</td>
<td>626,157</td>
<td>630,539</td>
<td>640,794</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
<td>1,098,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Rental Income</td>
<td>174,628</td>
<td>973,479</td>
<td>1,000,528</td>
<td>983,070</td>
<td>101.8%</td>
<td>1,682,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Other Income</td>
<td>229,461</td>
<td>(316,942)</td>
<td>1,653,382</td>
<td>874,910</td>
<td>189.0%</td>
<td>1,492,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 TOTAL OPERATING REVENUE</td>
<td>3,910,411</td>
<td>28,257,112</td>
<td>29,158,349</td>
<td>29,042,643</td>
<td>100.4%</td>
<td>50,634,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRIBUTIONS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 AB-434-Peninsula Feeder Shuttle</td>
<td>83,333</td>
<td>600,511</td>
<td>583,333</td>
<td>583,333</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Operating Grant</td>
<td>1,039,575</td>
<td>74,892</td>
<td>1,102,477</td>
<td>1,102,477</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2,316,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 JPB Member Agencies</td>
<td>3,284,715</td>
<td>22,993,010</td>
<td>22,993,010</td>
<td>22,993,041</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>39,416,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Other Sources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,481,511</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3,787,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 TOTAL CONTRIBUTED REVENUE</td>
<td>4,407,623</td>
<td>23,668,413</td>
<td>24,678,821</td>
<td>27,160,362</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>46,520,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPENSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATING EXPENSE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Contract Operating &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>4,681,958</td>
<td>32,709,976</td>
<td>32,643,014</td>
<td>34,963,717</td>
<td>93.4%</td>
<td>60,425,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Shuttles (Including Peninsula Pass)</td>
<td>255,706</td>
<td>1,718,195</td>
<td>1,686,069</td>
<td>1,706,695</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
<td>2,926,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Fuel</td>
<td>843,563</td>
<td>7,552,832</td>
<td>5,880,905</td>
<td>8,073,104</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
<td>13,839,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Timetables &amp; Tickets</td>
<td>2,390</td>
<td>124,927</td>
<td>94,252</td>
<td>115,317</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td>210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Insurance</td>
<td>365,071</td>
<td>2,802,448</td>
<td>2,579,464</td>
<td>2,645,398</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
<td>4,535,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Facilities and Equipment Maintenance</td>
<td>71,656</td>
<td>658,807</td>
<td>583,803</td>
<td>842,910</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
<td>1,595,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Utilities</td>
<td>142,957</td>
<td>695,008</td>
<td>632,328</td>
<td>873,043</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>1,502,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Services</td>
<td>62,914</td>
<td>512,430</td>
<td>507,554</td>
<td>651,891</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
<td>1,155,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSE</td>
<td>6,426,215</td>
<td>46,774,622</td>
<td>44,607,390</td>
<td>49,872,076</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
<td>86,190,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Wages &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>420,865</td>
<td>2,977,737</td>
<td>3,380,791</td>
<td>3,693,038</td>
<td>91.5%</td>
<td>6,318,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Board Of Directors</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>4,288</td>
<td>6,602</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>12,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Communications/Marketing</td>
<td>79,736</td>
<td>1,027,183</td>
<td>698,165</td>
<td>1,053,450</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>1,976,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Other Office Expense and Services</td>
<td>117,283</td>
<td>816,631</td>
<td>711,834</td>
<td>781,243</td>
<td>91.1%</td>
<td>1,289,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 TOTAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE</td>
<td>620,205</td>
<td>4,930,791</td>
<td>4,897,454</td>
<td>5,687,586</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
<td>9,861,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Long Term Debt Expense</td>
<td>91,906</td>
<td>306,316</td>
<td>643,344</td>
<td>643,344</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1,102,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 GRAND TOTAL EXPENSES</td>
<td>7,138,327</td>
<td>52,011,729</td>
<td>50,148,187</td>
<td>56,203,005</td>
<td>89.2%</td>
<td>97,155,296</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"% OF YEAR ELAPSED" provides a general measure for evaluating overall progress against the annual budget. When comparing it to the amounts shown in the "% REV BUDGET" column, please note that individual line items reflect variations due to seasonal activities during the year.
### PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD

#### INVESTMENT PORTFOLIO

#### AS OF JANUARY 31, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF SECURITY</th>
<th>MATURITY DATE</th>
<th>INTEREST RATE</th>
<th>PURCHASE PRICE</th>
<th>MARKET RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Agency Investment Fund (Restricted)</td>
<td>Liquid Cash</td>
<td>0.558%</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,001,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Agency Investment Fund (Unrestricted)</td>
<td>Liquid Cash</td>
<td>0.558%</td>
<td>16,686,095</td>
<td>16,701,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Portfolio (Unrestricted)</td>
<td>Liquid Cash</td>
<td>1.954%</td>
<td>13,826,915</td>
<td>13,972,092</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                         |              |              | 32,513,009     | 32,675,898  |

Accrued Earnings for January 2010   $30,910.45  (1)
Cumulative Earnings FY2010             $194,234.72

(1) Earnings do not include prior period adjustments

* The market value of Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF) was derived from the fair value factor of 1.000947825 as reported by LAIF for quarter ending December 31, 2009.

** 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.
TO:       Joint Powers Board

THROUGH:  Michael J. Scanlon
          Executive Director

FROM:     Gigi Harrington
          Deputy CEO

SUBJECT:  AUTHORIZATION TO ENTER INTO MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING WITH THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AND THE CITY OF SAN BRUNO TO RECEIVE SECTION 190 GRADE SEPARATION FUNDING

ACTION
Staff Coordinating Council (SCC) recommends the Board authorize the Executive Director, or his designee, to enter into Memoranda of Understandings (MOUs) with the City and County of San Francisco and the City of San Bruno to be eligible to receive up to $15,000,000 in State Section 190 Grade Separation Program funds for the Jerrold Avenue Bridge Replacement and the San Bruno Grade Separation projects.

SIGNIFICANCE
JPB staff have requested that the cities file allocation requests for State Section 190 Grade Separation Program funds with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) for the following projects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Sponsor</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Grant Request</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>Jerrold Avenue Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$19,630,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bruno</td>
<td>San Bruno Grade Separation</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>$165,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>$184,630,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cities have already sponsored the JPB’s nominations of these projects on the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) Grade Separation Priority List (List), which is a requirement before a project is eligible to receive an allocation of Section 190 Grade Separation Program funds from Caltrans. Although the JPB is the lead agency in designing, constructing and funding these projects, the cities have been asked to sponsor these projects for Section 190 purposes to allow the JPB to maintain maximum flexibility for addressing future grade separation funding needs. Each Section 190 grant recipient is limited to receiving $5,000,000 per project per year, and is eligible for funding for no more than one project receiving a total of...
over $5,000,000 in Section 190 grant money in any ten year period. Therefore, if the cities’
funding requests are successful, the MOUs will allow the JPB to receive the funding from the
cities and still preserve its opportunity to seek additional Section 190 funds for other grade
separation projects in excess of $5,000,000 within the next ten years.

**BUDGET IMPACT**
Budget authority for the Section 190 funds is already included in the adopted Fiscal Year 2010
and prior year Capital budgets for the Jerrold Avenue Bridge Replacement and the San Bruno
Grade Separation projects. The action requested will allow the JPB to accept and receive the
funds from the cities should Caltrans make the grant awards.

**BACKGROUND**
The CPUC is required by law to conduct an Order Instituting Investigation (OII) every two years
for the purpose of establishing a priority list of railroad grade separation projects most urgently
in need of separation. The criteria used to evaluate and prioritize the submitted projects include
accident history, average train and vehicular volume and project site characteristics. Both the
reconstruction of existing grade separations and the elimination of at-grade railroad crossings of
streets are eligible for nomination to the List. Caltrans administers the Section 190 funding
program and the California Transportation Commission awards allocations to those projects that
are ranked highest on the List and that are reasonably expected to go into construction during the
current fiscal year. The San Bruno Grade Separation project is ranked seventh and the Jerrold
Avenue Bridge Replacement Grade Separation is ranked 77th out of a total of 113 projects on
the current List.

Prepared by: Joel Slavit, Manager, Capital Programs and Grants 650.508.6476
RESOLUTION NO. 2010-

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

* * *

AUTHORIZATION TO ENTER INTO MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING WITH
THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AND THE CITY OF SAN BRUNO TO
RECEIVE SECTION 190 GRADE SEPARATION FUNDING

WHEREAS, on July 12, 2007, the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) filed an Order Instituting Investigation (OII) for the purpose of establishing the Grade Separation Priority List for Fiscal Years 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 in accordance with Section 2452 of the Streets and Highways Code; and

WHEREAS, the OII requested nominations from interested parties for grade separation projects involving existing or proposed crossings at-grade of city streets, county roads or state highways in need of separation, or projects affecting the elimination of at-grade crossings by removal or relocation of streets or railroad tracks, or existing separations in need of alterations or reconstruction; and

WHEREAS, Section 2454 of the Streets and Highways Code states that an agency that sponsors a nomination for Section 190 Grade Separation Program (Section 190) funds in excess of $5,000,000, and that subsequently receives an allocation in an amount in excess of $5,000,000, will not be eligible for another such allocation for a period of ten years; and

WHEREAS, the City and County of San Francisco and the City of San Bruno have sponsored nominations to the CPUC for the construction of the Jerrold Avenue Bridge Replacement and San Bruno Grade Separation Projects (Projects) on behalf of the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) so that the JPB would not be precluded from receiving
allocations of Section 190 funds in excess of $5,000,000 for any planned grade separation projects at other locations on the JPB line; and

WHEREAS, on June 5, 2009, the CPUC issued a final decision establishing the Grade Separation Priority List for FY 2009-2010 that included a ranking of 77 for the Jerrold Avenue Bridge Replacement and a ranking of seven for the San Bruno Grade Separation; and

WHEREAS, following the CPUC’s issuance of the Grade Separation Priority List, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) accepts applications for the allocation of State Section 190 Grade Separation funds for projects included in the Grade Separation Priority List; and

WHEREAS, requests for the allocation of Section 190 funds require an agreement between the railroad and the project applicant; and

WHEREAS, the JPB has requested that the City and County of San Francisco file an allocation request in the amount of $5,000,000 and the City of San Bruno file an allocation request in the amount of $10,000,000 for Section 190 funds with Caltrans, and pass through funding to the JPB, should they be successful in securing grant awards, as reimbursement for Section 190-eligible expenses; and

WHEREAS, the City and County of San Francisco and the City of San Bruno and the JPB desire to enter into formal contracts to meet the requirements of the Section 190 program and to further define roles and responsibilities for implementation of the said Projects, and have negotiated MOUs, pursuant to which the JPB obligates itself to complete the Projects and supply the necessary local funds, provided the Section 190 funding is obtained by the cities, and

WHEREAS, the JPB is ready to commence implementation of the Project during the fiscal year of the requested allocation; and
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 MOUs with the City and County of San Francisco and the City of San Bruno on behalf of the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board and to prepare any other documents required to receive a total of up to $15,000,000 in Section 190 funds for the Projects; and

2. Authorizes the Executive Director, or his designee, to take any other actions as may be necessary to give effect to this resolution.

Regularly passed and adopted this 4th day of March 2010, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

________________________
Chair, Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board

ATTEST:

________________________
JPB Secretary
AGENDA ITEM # 11
MARCH 4, 2010

PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD
STAFF REPORT

TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
Executive Director

FROM: Gigi Harrington  C. H. (Chuck) Harvey
Deputy CEO      Deputy CEO

SUBJECT: APPROVAL OF A CONTRACT CHANGE ORDER TO CONTRACT
WITH GRANITE CONSTRUCTION COMPANY FOR A NOT-TO-
EXCEED AMOUNT OF $2,000,000

ACTION
Staff Coordinating Council (SCC) recommends that the Board:
1. Approve a contract change order to contract number 08-PCJPB-C-035 (Signal
   Optimization Project), with Granite Construction, Inc. for the procurement of railroad
   signal houses for a not-to-exceed amount of $2,000,000 for installation under the San
   Bruno Grade Separation Project.
2. Authorize the Executive Director or his designee to execute such contract change order
   covering final negotiated costs and any schedule changes resulting from the added work.

SIGNIFICANCE
The contract for construction of the San Bruno Grade Separation Project (Project) is expected to
be awarded on July 1, 2010. Construction under that contract is scheduled to begin in October
2010. There is currently no ability to switch trains between the two mainline tracks on the
section of track at the Project site. In order to reduce train delays during construction, the first
order of work must be to relocate mainline tracks and install supporting railroad signal houses
near Scott Avenue that will allow trains to be switched between mainline tracks.

These railroad signal houses are custom built for site-specific locations and require advance
manufacturing time. In order to ensure that the railroad signal houses are manufactured in time
for installation when Project construction begins, a contract change order is necessary now.

The approval of this contract change order will allow for expeditious procurement of the signal
houses. Construction work on the signal optimization contract is on-going and additional change
order authority is needed to add this contract change order to this contract. This action will
increase the Board-awarded contract authority (Resolution No. 2009-5) from $4,731,250 by the
final negotiated amount of the change order. This contract includes the installation of the same
type of railroad signal houses as those required by the San Bruno Grade Separation Project.
**BUDGET IMPACT**
Funding for this material is included in the previously approved Fiscal Year 2010 capital budget.

**BACKGROUND**
The San Bruno Grade Separation Project will increase safety in San Bruno by elevating the existing Caltrain tracks and lowering the existing San Mateo, San Bruno and Angus avenues crossings, such that vehicle/pedestrian incidents with trains are eliminated. In addition, the Project will construct a new, elevated, Caltrain station between San Bruno and San Mateo avenues.

In order to construct the Project while continuing to operate rail service, the Project will construct a temporary rail bypass, or “shoofly”, to the east of the existing Caltrain tracks. To build the shoofly it is necessary that the signal systems at the existing at-grade crossings (San Bruno, San Mateo, and Angus avenues) also be shifted to the east. A prerequisite for shifting the signal system at the at-grade crossings is that pre-wired signal houses must be provided at each crossing in order to facilitate a “cutover” from the existing (west) to new (east) location without impacting rail operations. Since construction of the shoofly is required before construction of the grade separation and new San Bruno station can begin, and since the construction of the shoofly cannot begin until the signal houses are in place, the installation of the signal houses must be one of the first orders of work for the Project.

Construction of the Project also will require that a number of construction activities take place using single tracking within the Project limits. Minimizing the impact to rail operations during single tracking requires minimizing the distance between Control Points (CP). Currently the closest CP to the northern limit of the project is located at South San Francisco so the Project is constructing a new CP: CP Scott, south of Scott Street in San Bruno. Construction of CP Scott requires installation of two new signal houses in order to operate the CP. Since the construction of CP Scott is required to minimize operational delays for all subsequent construction activities associated with the Project, it is necessary that CP Scott be constructed prior to any other construction activities beginning on the Project. Since the construction of CP Scott cannot begin until the signal houses have been installed, the installation of the signal houses at CP Scott must occur at the beginning of the Project.

In February, the JPB approved awarding a contract to Nortrak for the purchase of the crossovers required to construct the new CP Scott. The signal houses to be obtained under this change order represent the remainder of the components required to construct the new control point.

The signal houses to be procured under this change order are pre-wired, customized items, designed for the unique, site-specific, application for which they will be used. It was necessary to finish the design of the San Bruno Grade Separation Project before the design of the signal houses could be finalized. However, it is estimated that it may require six months or more for a fabricator to construct the signal houses. Therefore, it was not possible to finish the design of the project and obtain the signal houses through a full solicitation process and obtain the houses in time to construct the San Bruno Grade Separation Project.

A total of six signal houses will be procured. Three of the signal houses will be used for the new
Control Point at Scott Avenue and will be installed in the permanent locations by the construction contractor. The other three signal houses will be installed along the shoofly at grade crossings and will be used for the approximately two-year duration of construction. At the end of that period, when the shoofly is dismantled, they will be stored on JPB property. If a future need for signal houses arises, JPB will be able to modify and use these signal houses at appropriate locations.

It was determined that the most expeditious and beneficial process to obtain the signal houses within the timeframe available is to negotiate a change order to the existing construction contract that has a similar scope of signal work.

Project Manager: Hubert Chan, Project Manager 650.508.7786
Contract Officer: Helen Hoang 650.508.7964
RESOLUTION NO. 2010-

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

*   *   *

APPROVING A CHANGE ORDER TO THE CONTRACT FOR THE SIGNAL
OPTIMIZATION PROJECT WITH GRANITE CONSTRUCTION FOR AN AMOUNT
NOT TO EXCEED $2,000,000

WHEREAS, on February 5, 2009, and pursuant to Resolution 2009-5, the Peninsula
Corridor Joint Powers Board (PCJPB) awarded a contract for the Signal Optimization Project to
Granite Construction Company; and

WHEREAS, award of the San Bruno Grade Separation Project (Project) is scheduled to
occur by July 1, 2010, with construction to begin in October 2010; and

WHEREAS, there is currently no ability to switch trains between the two mainline tracks
on the section of track at the Project site; and

WHEREAS, the PCJPB must relocate mainline tracks and install supporting railroad
signal houses near Scott Avenue that will allow trains to be switched between the two mainline
tracks in order to reduce train delays during Project construction; and

WHEREAS, approval of the proposed contract change order will provide for the
expeditious procurement of the signal houses in time for installation under the San Bruno Grade
Separation Project.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the Peninsula
Corridor Joint Powers Board hereby approves a contract change order to the Signal Optimization
Project with Granite Construction Company for the procurement of railroad signal houses in the
not to exceed amount of $2,000,000; and
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Executive Director or his designee is authorized to execute such contract change order covering final negotiated costs and any schedule changes resulting from the added work; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Executive Director is authorized to take such further actions as may be needed to give effect to this resolution.

Regularly passed and adopted this 4th day of March 2010 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

_________________________
Chair, Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board

ATTEST:

_______________________
JPB Secretary
AGENDA ITEM # 12  
MARCH 4, 2010

PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD
STAFF REPORT

TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon  
Executive Director

FROM: Gigi Harrington  
Deputy CEO

SUBJECT: ASSESSMENT OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2010 FUEL HEDGING PROGRAM AND ADOPTION OF A FUEL HEDGING POLICY

ACTION  
Staff Coordinating Council (SCC) recommends that the Board adopt the attached Fuel Hedging Policy (Policy).

SIGNIFICANCE  
A fuel hedging program was instituted for FY2010 to cover 50 percent of the JPB’s projected diesel fuel usage, which was approximately 2 million gallons. The primary goal of the program was to reduce volatility and uncertainty in the fuel budget. After reviewing several available options for the program, the JPB went forward with a price cap of $2.00 per gallon based on the Gulf Coast Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel (ULSD) index. The estimated budget savings from the diesel fuel price cap for the JPB from the FY2010 adopted budget was $2.5 million. The fuel hedging program allowed the JPB not only to reduce uncertainty in the fuel budget for FY2010, but also to take advantage of the relatively low market prices at the time of execution of the fuel hedging transaction.

The counterparty on the FY2010 transaction was Deutsche Bank AG. The JPB received its first payment from Deutsche Bank in February as the average price in January on the Gulf Coast USLD index was over the $2.00 cap price. The JPB has also realized the primary purpose of the cap, which was to provide budget certainty. The statistics on the current program are represented in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gulf Coast Ultra Low Sulfur Average Price</th>
<th>JPB Average Price Before Fueling Fee*</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>1.9016</td>
<td>2.0674</td>
<td>(0.1658)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>1.7750</td>
<td>1.9334</td>
<td>(0.1584)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>1.9426</td>
<td>2.0058</td>
<td>(0.0632)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>1.9807</td>
<td>2.0436</td>
<td>(0.0629)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>1.9610</td>
<td>1.9970</td>
<td>(0.0360)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>2.0376</td>
<td>2.0816</td>
<td>(0.0440)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A $0.055 fee is added to the JPB price per gallon for trackside fueling.
Based on the success of this initial fuel hedging program, staff recommends continuing the program, utilizing the same strategy of purchasing diesel fuel price caps when it is in the best interest of the JPB to do so, by adopting the attached Policy. No cap option transactions will be off shore transactions. To hedge using any mechanism other than a strategy involving the purchase of diesel fuel price caps would be a change to this Policy and would require returning to the Board for authorization. The Policy will allow fuel hedging transactions to hedge up to 75 percent of projected fuel usage for a fiscal year; however, it is expected that no more than 50 percent of projected usage will be hedged in a normal fiscal year. Transactions would be based on the Gulf Coast ULSD index, which was highly correlated at a rate of 0.971 between 2001 and 2009 with the Oil Price Information Service (OPIS) index on which the price that the JPB pays for fuel is based, indicating a very close relationship between the two indices. Stated another way, the average price difference per gallon between the two indexes was 2.9 cents.

Pursuant to the Policy, Staff shall return to the Board annually to obtain approval on the award of a financial contract for fuel hedging services, provide details concerning the terms of the fuel hedge and provide an assessment of the current year’s program.

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

**BACKGROUND**
The JPB currently purchases fuel from Pinnacle Petroleum based on the weekly spot price for diesel fuel, exposing the JPB to market price fluctuation. Over the past year, the price of diesel fuel has ranged from a high of $2.22 per gallon in the first week of January 2010 to a low of $1.14 in the third week of February 2009.

The FY2010 fuel hedging program utilized a price cap. The diesel fuel price cap was determined to be the most appropriate hedging strategy for the JPB as it mirrors the JPB’s other practices for reducing risk (e.g. purchasing insurance). The approach provides budget reliability and allows the JPB to limit its exposure when fuel prices rise, while continuing to receive the benefit when prices fall.

Prepared by: Trish Reavey, Director of Finance  
650.508.6434
RESOLUTION NO. 2010-
BOARD OF DIRECTORS, PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

ADOPTING A FUEL HEDGING POLICY

WHEREAS, over the last several years, the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) has consistently purchased over four million gallons of diesel fuel each year to conduct train operations; and

WHEREAS, staff has studied a variety of complex fuel hedging products available for reducing volatility in the price to be paid for diesel fuel and recommends adoption of a policy authorizing a strategy involving the purchase of diesel fuel price caps; and

WHEREAS, staff recommends adoption of the attached Fuel Hedging Policy (Policy) as an appropriate method of decreasing the volatility in the price to be paid for diesel fuel in future fiscal years; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Policy, each fuel hedging transaction will be implemented for no more than 12 months at a time and for no more than 75 percent of the JPB’s projected fuel usage for each fiscal year; and

WHEREAS, in order to mitigate risk, the Policy will require the counterparty of each fuel hedging transaction to have a credit rating in the Aa/AA category from at least one nationally recognized rating agency (i.e., Moody’s, S&P or Fitch) at the time of execution of the fuel hedging transaction and to post collateral should the counterparty’s credit rating fall below A3 in the case of Moody’s or A- in the case of S&P or Fitch; and

WHEREAS, in order to maximize the precision and effectiveness of its hedging transactions, the Policy also provides that the JPB will use Gulf Coast Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel
(ULSD) as the reference index based on its high correlation rate (0.971) with the index upon which the JPB’s fuel price is based (the Oil Price Information Service (OPIS) index); and

WHEREAS, the Policy provides that Staff shall return to the Board annually to obtain approval on the award of a financial contract for fuel hedging services, provide details concerning the terms of the fuel hedge and provide an assessment of the current year’s program.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board hereby approves and adopts the attached Fuel Hedging Policy and authorizes the Executive Director or the Deputy CEO to negotiate with financial institutions, as appropriate, and execute and deliver agreements as deemed necessary and advisable in connection therewith.

Regularly passed and adopted this 4th day of March, 2010 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

Chair, Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board

ATTEST:

JPB Secretary
Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board
Fuel Hedging Policy

Goal: The primary goal for the JPB’s fuel hedging program is to reduce volatility in the fuel budget.

Mechanism: There are several mechanisms available to hedge fuel in the market today including cap options, futures contracts, commodity swaps and physical hedging. This Policy authorizes an on shore cap option mechanism.

Index: The index to be utilized in the cap option is the Gulf Coast Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel (ULSD) index which was correlated at a rate of 0.971 between 2001 and 2009 with the Oil Price Information Service (OPIS) index. The price that the JPB pays for fuel is based on the OPIS index.

Duration: Each transaction will be implemented for no more than 12 months at a time and will not extend beyond one fiscal year.

Transaction Amount: Each transaction will be implemented for no more than 75 percent of JPB’s projected fuel usage for a fiscal year.

Counterparty Credit Criteria: As a condition for bidding a financial institution must be rated in the “Aa” or “AA” category by at least one national rating agency. If the counterparty is downgraded to or below A3 from Moody’s or A- from S&P or Fitch, the counterparty must post collateral to secure its performance. The JPB retains the right to terminate the contract with the counterparty if their ratings are downgraded below Baa1 in the case of Moody’s or BBB+ in the case of S&P or Fitch.

Monitoring: Monthly monitoring of the Gulf Coast ULSD average price must be calculated to ensure payments are received from the counterparty if and when due. Hedging practices should also be monitored to ensure this Policy remains up to date with current best practices.

Board Approval: Staff shall return to the Board annually to obtain approval on the award of a financial contract for fuel hedging services and the authorization of the Executive Director or designee to execute such a contract for the current fiscal year.

Reporting: Annual reports will be presented to the Board in the form of an informational staff report, which will provide details concerning the terms of the fuel hedge and provide an assessment of the current year’s program.

Risks: Some of the risks associated with a price cap include:

Counterparty Risk – The risk that the counterparty fails to make required payments or otherwise comply with the terms of the agreement. This risk is
mitigated by requiring the financial institution to have a double-A category rating by at least one of the national rating agencies as a condition for bidding.

**Termination Risk** – The risk that there will be a mandatory early termination of the transaction. This risk is mitigated by the collateral posting provision, requiring the posting of collateral should the counterparty’s credit rating fall below A3 in the case of Moody’s or A- in the case of S&P or Fitch.

**Basis Risk** – The risk that there is a mismatch between the cap option rate and the cost paid for fuel. This risk is mitigated by selecting the Gulf Coast ULSD index which is highly correlated to the rates the JPB pays for fuel.
AGENDA ITEM # 13  
MARCH 4, 2010

PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD  
STAFF REPORT

TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon  
Executive Director

FROM: Mark Simon  
Executive Officer, Public Affairs

SUBJECT: STATE AND FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

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

SIGNIFICANCE
Staff will provide regular updates to the Board consistent with the approved Legislative Program.

STATE ISSUES
State Budget
The California Legislature is expected to vote soon on a revised version of the Governor’s proposed “gas tax swap”. The Governor’s proposal would eliminate virtually all Public Transportation Account (PTA) revenues by eliminating the sales tax on gasoline and diesel fuel and replacing it with an increase in the State fuel excise tax.

The proposal allows for State General Fund savings since excise tax revenues can be used to fund State transportation bond debt service, whereas gasoline sales tax revenues are required to fund public transportation according to the court’s ruling in Shaw v Chiang last year.

The Legislature’s compromise proposal would still create State General Fund savings through the gas tax swap, but it would retain the sales tax on diesel fuel, increase the tax rate from 4.75 percent to 6.75 percent and direct these revenues toward the State Transit Assistance (STA) program and other PTA programs including intercity passenger rail. The excise tax on diesel fuel would be concurrently reduced to maintain current fuel prices.

The compromise proposal also includes a $400 million STA appropriation covering the remainder of the current year along with Fiscal Year 2010-11.

The proposal would provide a minimum of $350 million for the STA program in FY 2011-12, and 2012-13. STA revenues would grow to approximately $511 million by FY 2020-21.
The package also contains a provision permitting local metropolitan planning organizations, subject to voter approval, to impose a regional fee on motor vehicle fuels to supplement transit funding.

Other transportation programs, including local streets and roads and highway programs, which are traditionally funded through the sales tax on gasoline, would see their funding replaced by revenues generated through the increased excise tax. Funding for these programs would be increased by approximately $200 million. However, because of the source, this funding is less reliable, more prone to diversion and would increase at a slower rate compared to the gasoline sales tax allocations through Proposition 42.

FEDERAL ISSUES
Jobs for Main Street Act of 2010 – (H.R. 2847)
The Senate is expected to approve the Hiring Incentives to Restore Employment Act (S.A. 3310), also known as the HIRE Act, which is the first component of a multi-bill jobs package.

The HIRE Act includes an extension of SAFETEA-LU authorization through the end of the year and also includes the transfer of $19.5 billion to the Highway Trust Fund, including $4.8 billion to the Mass Transit Account (MTA). This transfer is expected to ensure the solvency of the MTA through the end of FY 2011. The Senate Finance Committee based the transfer on restoring interest payments to the Highway Trust Fund. The HIRE Act would also expand the Build America Bonds program, allowing states and local governments to borrow at lower costs to finance more infrastructure projects.

The HIRE Act will need to be approved by the House prior to the expiration of SAFETEA-LU authorization on February 28 in order to ensure continued surface transportation expenditures.

Staff is working with the American Public Transportation Association (APTA) to ensure that future components of the Senate’s jobs package will include supplemental transportation funding and an extension of the alternative fuels tax credit. APTA members have identified more than $15 billion in public transportation projects that could provide much needed American jobs and crucial funding for financially strapped public transportation systems that have been affected by the recession.

Like the HIRE Act, future jobs-related legislation approved by the Senate will need to be approved by the House, or reconciled with the Jobs for Main Street Act of 2010, which the House approved last year. This bill would authorize and appropriate supplemental transportation funding including:

- $8.4 billion for Federal Transit Administration (FTA) programs
- $27.5 billion in Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) programs

The bill would also allow agencies to reserve 10 percent of their allocation for emergency operating expenses.

Prepared By: Seamus Murphy, Manager, Government Affairs 650.508.6388
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 153 Ma (D)</strong>&lt;br&gt;High-Speed Rail Authority.</td>
<td>SENATE T. &amp; H. 07/02/2009-In committee: Set, first hearing. Hearing canceled at the request of author.</td>
<td>Existing law creates the High-Speed Rail Authority with specified powers and duties relating to the development and implementation of an intercity high-speed rail system. Existing law authorizes the authority to prepare a plan for the construction and operation of that system and to enter into contracts, acquire rights-of-way through purchase or eminent domain, and take other actions, subject to specified contingencies. Under existing law, a public entity may not commence an eminent domain proceeding until its governing body has adopted a resolution of necessity that meets certain requirements. Existing law generally prohibits a state agency from employing legal counsel other than the Attorney General unless there is a specific statute authorizing that employment. This bill would eliminate those contingencies to the exercise of the authority's authority and would specify that the authority constitutes a &quot;governing body&quot; for the purpose of adopting a resolution of necessity. The bill would authorize the authority to employ its own legal staff or contract with other state agencies for legal services, or both. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 231 Huffman (D)</strong>&lt;br&gt;California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006: Climate Protection Trust Fund.</td>
<td>SENATE E.Q. 06/18/2009-From committee chair, with author's amendments: Amend, and re-refer to committee. Read second time, amended, and re-referred to Com. on EQ.</td>
<td>Requires that revenues collected pursuant to the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 be deposited into a Climate Protection Trust Fund, and establishes parameters by which those funds can be distributed for the reduction of GHG and mitigation of climate change impacts.</td>
<td><strong>Last Amended on 06/26/2009</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 266 Carter (D)</strong>&lt;br&gt;Transportation needs assessment.</td>
<td>SENATE RLS. 06/11/2009-Referred to Com. on RLS.</td>
<td>Requires the California Transportation Commission (CTC) to, on an every-5-year basis, to develop an assessment of the unfunded costs of programmed state projects and federally earmarked projects in the state, as well as an assessment of available funding for transportation purposes and unmet transportation needs on a statewide basis.</td>
<td><strong>Last Amended on 04/20/2009</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 289 Galgiani (D)</strong>&lt;br&gt;High-speed rail.</td>
<td>SENATE T. &amp; H. 02/11/2010-Re-referred to Com. on T. &amp; H.</td>
<td>Existing law, the California High-Speed Rail Act, creates the High-Speed Rail Authority to develop and implement a high-speed rail system in the state, with specified powers and duties. Existing law, pursuant to the Safe, Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the 21st Century, approved by the voters as Proposition 1A at the November 4, 2008, general election, provides for the issuance of $9.95 billion in general obligation bonds for high-speed rail and related purposes. Existing law provides for appointment of an executive director by the authority, who is exempt from civil service and serves at the pleasure of the authority. This bill would authorize the Governor to appoint up to 5 deputy directors exempt from civil service who would serve at the pleasure of the executive director. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.</td>
<td><strong>Last Amended on 01/25/2010</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board
## State Legislative Matrix as of 2/16/2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 619</strong> Blumenfield (D)</td>
<td>SENATE T. &amp; H. 06/17/2009-In committee: Set, first hearing. Hearing canceled at the request of author.</td>
<td>Existing law provides that the Department of Transportation has full possession and control of the state highway system. Existing law provides for allocation of federal transportation funds made available to the state. This bill would require the department to notify the Legislature within 30 days of making a determination that a project, including a project designated in the National Corridor Infrastructure Improvement Program, will be delayed beyond its scheduled completion date due to state cashflow or other funding issues, if the delay places at risk federal funds, including funds earmarked for the project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 726</strong> Nielsen (R)</td>
<td>SENATE T. &amp; H. 06/16/2009-In committee: Set, first hearing. Hearing canceled at the request of author.</td>
<td>Existing law generally provides for allocation of transportation capital improvement funds pursuant to the State Transportation Improvement Program process. Existing law provides for 75% of funds available for transportation capital improvement projects to be made available for regional projects, and 25% for interregional projects. Existing law describes the types of projects that may be funded with the regional share of funds, and includes local road projects as a category of eligible projects. This bill would state that local road rehabilitation projects are eligible for these funds.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 732</strong> Jeffries (R)</td>
<td>SENATE APPR. SUSPENSE FILE 08/27/2009-In committee: Held under submission.</td>
<td>Existing law authorizes the Department of Transportation, until January 1, 2010, to conduct phase 2 of a pilot project through the utilization of design-sequencing contracts, as defined, for the design and construction of not more than 12 transportation projects, which are selected by the Director of Transportation taking into consideration specified geographical considerations. This bill would extend the operative date of those provisions until July 1, 2010, thereby extending the authority of the department to conduct phase 2 of the pilot project. The bill would instead specify that the pilot project consist of not more than 9 transportation projects. <strong>Last Amended on 06/16/2009</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 987</strong> Ma (D)</td>
<td>SEN LOCAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>Existing law, the Transit Village Development Planning Act of 1994, authorizes a city or county to create a transit village plan for a transit village development district. A transit village plan is required to include all land within not less than 1/4 mile of the exterior boundary of the parcel on which is located a transit station, as defined. Existing law separately authorizes a legislative body, as defined, to create an infrastructure financing district, adopt an infrastructure financing plan, and issue bonds, for which only the district is liable, to finance specified public facilities, upon voter approval. This bill would eliminate the requirement of voter approval for the formation of an infrastructure financing district, adoption of an infrastructure financing plan, and an issuance of bonds for the purpose of implementing a transit village plan adopted pursuant to the Transit Village Development Planning Act of 1994. The bill would require a transit village plan financed by these bonds to include demonstrable public benefits regarding housing and provisions for the dedicated use of bond proceeds to finance certain types of housing. This bill would recast the area included in a transit village plan to include all land within not more than 1/2 mile of the main entrance of a transit station. The bill also would make technical, nonsubstantive changes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill ID/Topic</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1375</td>
<td>SENATE T. &amp; H. 02/11/2010-Referrals to Coms. on T. &amp; H. and RLS.</td>
<td>Existing law, the California High-Speed Train Act, creates the High-Speed Rail Authority to develop and implement a high-speed train system in the state, with specified powers and duties. Existing law, the Safe, Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the 21st Century, approved by the voters as Proposition 1A at the November 4, 2008, general election, provides for the issuance of $9.95 billion in general obligation bonds for high-speed rail and related purposes. This bill would revise and recast these provisions by repealing and reenacting the California High-Speed Train Act. The bill would continue the High-Speed Rail Authority in existence to make policy decisions relative to implementation of high-speed rail consistent with Proposition 1A. The bill would create the Department of High-Speed Trains within the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency, which would implement those policies. The bill would transfer certain of the existing powers and responsibilities of the authority to the department and would specify additional powers and duties of the authority and department relative to implementation of the high-speed rail project, including the annual submission of a 6-year high-speed train capital improvement program and progress report to the Legislature. The director of the department would be appointed by the Governor, who would serve at the pleasure of the authority, and the Governor would be authorized to appoint up to 10 executive employees of the department who would be exempt from civil service and serve at the pleasure of the director. The bill would provide for acquisition and disposition by the department of rights-of-way for the high-speed rail project. The bill would enact other related provisions. Last Amended on 01/15/2010.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1609</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY BUDGET 01/21/2010-Referrals to Com. on BUDGET.</td>
<td>This bill would make appropriations for support of state government for the 2010-11 fiscal year. This bill contains other related provisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1747</td>
<td>ASM TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>Existing law creates the High-Speed Rail Authority with specified powers and duties relating to the development and implementation of an intercity high-speed rail system. Existing law, pursuant to the Safe, Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the 21st Century, authorizes $9.95 billion in general obligation bonds for high-speed rail development and other related purposes. This bill would authorize the authority to consider, to the extent permitted by federal and state law, the creation of jobs in California when awarding major contracts or purchasing high-speed trains, as specified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1794</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY PRINT 02/11/2010-From printer. May be heard in committee March 13.</td>
<td>The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, establishes the State Air Resources Board as the state agency responsible for monitoring and regulating sources emitting greenhouse gases. The act requires the state board to adopt a statewide greenhouse gas emissions limit, as defined, to be achieved by 2020, equivalent to the statewide greenhouse gas emissions levels in 1990. The act requires the state board, on or before January 1, 2011, to adopt greenhouse gas emission limits and emission reduction measures, as defined, by regulation to achieve the maximum technologically feasible and cost-effective reductions in emissions of greenhouse gases, in furtherance of achieving the statewide greenhouse gas emissions limit, with the regulations to become operative beginning January 1, 2012. This bill would make technical and nonsubstantive revisions to the above requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires a lead agency, as defined, to prepare, or cause to be prepared, and certify the completion of, an environmental impact report (EIR) on a project that it proposes to carry out or approve that may have a significant effect on the environment or to adopt a negative declaration if it finds that the project will not have that effect. CEQA also requires a lead agency to prepare a mitigated negative declaration for a project that may have a significant effect on the environment if revisions in the project would avoid or mitigate that effect and there is no substantial evidence that the project, as revised, would have a significant effect on the environment. CEQA provides for the judicial review of a lead agency's decision to certify an EIR.

The bill would enact the CEQA Litigation Protection Pilot Program of 2010 and would require the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency to select projects that meet specified requirements from specified regions for each calendar year between 2010 and 2014. The bill would exempt from judicial review, pursuant to CEQA, a lead agency's decision to certify the EIR of, or to adopt a mitigated negative declaration based on an initial study for, the selected projects, a lead agency's and responsible agency's approval of the selected project, and the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency's selection of the projects. The bill would require the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency, by December 31 of each year, to submit an annual report to the Governor and to the Legislature summarizing the designation of projects, and the job creation and investment attributable to the designated projects. The bill would repeal the pilot program as of January 1, 2016.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires a lead agency, as defined, to prepare, or cause to be prepared, and certify the completion of, an environmental impact report (EIR) on a project that it proposes to carry out or approve that may have a significant effect on the environment or to adopt a negative declaration if it finds that the project will not have that effect. CEQA also requires a lead agency to prepare a mitigated negative declaration for a project that may have a significant effect on the environment if revisions in the project would avoid or mitigate that effect and there is no substantial evidence that the project, as revised, would have a significant effect on the environment. CEQA provides for the judicial review of a lead agency's decision to certify an EIR.

The bill would enact the CEQA Litigation Protection Pilot Program of 2010 and would require the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency to select projects that meet specified requirements from specified regions for each calendar year between 2010 and 2014. The bill would exempt from judicial review, pursuant to CEQA, a lead agency's decision to certify the EIR of, or to adopt a mitigated negative declaration based on an initial study for, the selected projects, a lead agency's and responsible agency's approval of the selected project, and the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency's selection of the projects. The bill would require the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency, by December 31 of each year, to submit an annual report to the Governor and to the Legislature summarizing the designation of projects, and the job creation and investment attributable to the designated projects. The bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACR 14</strong></td>
<td>ASSEMBLY NAT. RES. 04/27/2009-In committee: Refused adoption.</td>
<td>This measure would call upon the State Air Resources Board, prior to any regulatory action being taken consistent with the scoping plan for the implementation of the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, to perform an economic analysis that will give the State of California a more complete and accurate picture of the costs and benefits of the act's implementation. The measure would also call upon the Governor to use the authority granted by the act to adjust any applicable deadlines for regulations.</td>
<td>Last Amended on 03/27/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 409</strong></td>
<td>ASSEMBLY TRANS. 02/11/2010-To Com. on TRANS.</td>
<td>Existing law creates the Department of Transportation in the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency, with various powers and duties relative to the intercity passenger rail program, among other transportation programs. Existing law creates in state government the High-Speed Rail Authority, with various powers and duties relative to development and implementation of a high-speed passenger train system. The authority has 9 members, 5 appointed by the Governor and 4 appointed by the Legislature. Existing law also creates in state government the California Transportation Commission, with various powers and duties relative to programming of transportation capital projects and assisting the Secretary of Business, Transportation and Housing in formulating state transportation policies. This bill would place the High-Speed Rail Authority within the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency. The bill would require the 5 members of the authority appointed by the Governor to be appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate. The bill would require the authority to annually submit a funding plan to the California Transportation Commission for approval, identifying the need for investments during the fiscal year and the amount of bond sales necessary to accommodate those investments. This bill contains other related provisions.</td>
<td>Last Amended on 01/26/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 454</strong></td>
<td>ASSEMBLY DESK 01/25/2010-In Assembly. Read first time. Held at Desk.</td>
<td>The Planning and Zoning Law authorizes the legislative body of a city or county to adopt zoning ordinances regulating, among other things, the use of buildings, structures, and land as between industry, business, residences, open space, and other uses. This bill would delete the repeal of these provisions, thereby extending their operation indefinitely. This bill contains other existing laws.</td>
<td>Last Amended on 12/17/2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires a lead agency, as defined, to prepare, or cause to be prepared, and certify the completion of, an environmental impact report (EIR) on a project that it proposes to carry out or approve that may have a significant effect on the environment or to adopt a negative declaration if it finds that the project will not have that effect. CEQA also requires a lead agency to prepare a mitigated negative declaration for a project that may have a significant effect on the environment if revisions in the project would avoid or mitigate that effect and there is no substantial evidence that the project, as revised, would have a significant effect on the environment. CEQA provides for a public review period for the public to review a draft EIR, proposed negative declaration, or proposed mitigated negative declaration made during the public review period and authorizes a lead agency to evaluate and respond to comments made on a draft EIR when the comments are submitted after the public review period. CEQA requires an action or proceeding alleging noncompliance with its requirements to be based on grounds that were presented to the public agency orally or in writing by any person, and prohibits a person from maintaining an action or proceeding unless the person objected to the approval of the project orally or in writing, during the public comment period provided under CEQA or prior to the close of the public hearing on the project before the issuance of the notice of determination.

This bill instead would prohibit these actions or proceedings unless the oral or written presentation or objection occurs during the public comment period provided under CEQA or prior to the close of the public hearing on the project before the filing, rather than issuance, of the notice of determination.

Last Amended on 04/30/2009
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| SB 964       | 02/05/2010 - SENATE PRINT  
               2/08/2010-From print. May be acted upon on or after March 8. Read first time. | Existing law, the California High-Speed Train Act, creates the High-Speed Rail Authority to develop and implement a high-speed train system in the state, with specified powers and duties. Existing law, the Safe, Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the 21st Century, provides for the issuance of $9.95 billion in general obligation bonds for high-speed rail and related purposes.  
This bill would require the authority to contract with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's office to develop a labor market assessment of the workforce and identify the education and skills needed for high-speed rail, and to develop a comprehensive workforce training and certification program or programs to facilitate the availability of that workforce. The bill would require the authority and the chancellor's office to form a Jobs Advisory Task Force, as specified, to advise the authority and the Chancellor’s office on the establishment and operation of training and certification programs required to produce an adequate skilled workforce for this project. The bill would require the labor market assessment to be incorporated into the authority's biennial revised business plan. This bill contains other related provisions. | |
| SB 965 (D)   | 02/05/2010 - SENATE PRINT  
               02/08/2010-From print. May be acted upon on or after March 8. Read first time. | Existing law, the California High-Speed Train Act, creates the High-Speed Rail Authority to develop and implement a high-speed train system in the state, with specified powers and duties. Existing law, the Safe, Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the 21st Century, approved by the voters as Proposition 1A at the November 4, 2008, general election, provides for the issuance of $9.95 billion in general obligation bonds for high-speed rail and related purposes.  
This bill would authorize the authority to receive and expend any federal funds awarded to the authority for the purposes of developing a project or projects along the high-speed rail network, thereby making an appropriation. The bill would require the authority to take various actions in that regard. The bill would also require the authority to submit to the Legislature an expenditure plan for the federal funds within 30 days of enactment of this act and to submit a progress report on expenditure of the funds to the Legislature within 180 days of the award of those funds and annually thereafter. The bill would make legislative findings and declarations relative to the award of federal funds to the state under the federal American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) for high-speed rail purposes. | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 1010</strong></td>
<td>SENATE PRINT 02/11/2010-From print. May be acted upon on or after March 13.</td>
<td>The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires a lead agency, as defined, to prepare, or cause to be prepared, and certify the completion of, an environmental impact report (EIR) on a project that it proposes to carry out or approve that may have a significant effect on the environment or to adopt a negative declaration if it finds that the project will not have that effect. CEQA also requires a lead agency to prepare a mitigated negative declaration for a project that may have a significant effect on the environment if revisions in the project would avoid or mitigate that effect and there is no substantial evidence that the project, as revised, would have a significant effect on the environment. CEQA provides for the judicial review of a lead agency's decision to certify an EIR. The bill would enact the CEQA Litigation Protection Pilot Program of 2010 and would require the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency to select projects that meet specified requirements from specified regions for each calendar year between 2010 and 2014. The bill would exempt from judicial review, pursuant to CEQA, a lead agency's decision to certify the EIR of, or to adopt a mitigated negative declaration based on an initial study for, the selected projects, a lead agency's and responsible agency's approval of the selected project, and the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency's selection of the projects. The bill would require the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency, by December 31 of each year, to submit an annual report to the Governor and to the Legislature summarizing the designation of projects, and the job creation and investment attributable to the designated projects. This bill contains other related provisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correa (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1012</td>
<td>SENATE PRINT 02/11/2010-From print. May be acted upon on or after March 13.</td>
<td>The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires a lead agency, as defined, to prepare, or cause to be prepared by contract, and certify the completion of, an environmental impact report on a project, as defined, that it proposes to carry out or approve that may have a significant effect on the environment, or to adopt a negative declaration if it finds that the project will not have that effect. This bill would make technical, nonsubstantive changes to those provisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runner (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBX8 1</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY THIRD READING 02/11/2010-Permission granted to take up without reference to committee or file. Read second time. To third reading.</td>
<td>This bill would express the intent of the Legislature to enact statutory changes relating to the Budget Act of 2009. The California Constitution authorizes the Governor to declare a fiscal emergency and to call the Legislature into special session for that purpose. The Governor issued a proclamation declaring a fiscal emergency, and calling a special session for this purpose, on January 8, 2010. This bill contains other related provisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCA 15</td>
<td>SENATE B. &amp; F. 04/13/2009-From committee with author’s amendments. Read second time. Amended. Re-referred to Com. on B. &amp; F.R.</td>
<td>The California Constitution requires the Governor to submit to the Legislature by January 10 of each year a budget for the ensuing fiscal year, accompanied by a Budget Bill itemizing recommended expenditures. The Constitution requires specified bills, including a bill making a change in state taxes for the purpose of raising revenue, a bill containing an urgency clause, and a bill, including the Budget Bill, that makes certain appropriations from the General Fund, to be passed in each house of the Legislature by a 2/3 vote. This measure would exempt General Fund appropriations in the Budget Bill for the ensuing fiscal year from the 2/3-vote requirement if the total amount of General Fund revenues estimated by the Legislative Analyst, on or after May 15, for the current fiscal year is at least 5% below the estimate of General Fund revenues set forth in the Budget Bill enacted for the current fiscal year. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws. Last Amended on 04/13/2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA ITEM # 14
MARCH 4, 2010

PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD
STAFF REPORT

TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
Executive Director

FROM: Mark Simon
Executive Officer, Public Affairs

SUBJECT: RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE LOCAL TAXPAYER, PUBLIC SAFETY AND TRANSPORTATION PROTECTION ACT OF 2010 FOR CALIFORNIA'S NOVEMBER 2010 STATEWIDE BALLOT

ACTION
Staff Coordinating Council (SCC) recommends the Board adopt a resolution in support of the Local Taxpayer, Public Safety, and Transportation Protection Act of 2010.

SIGNIFICANCE
This resolution supports a statewide ballot measure sponsored by the California Transit Association (CTA), the League of California Cities and the California Alliance for Jobs that would protect local government revenues including historic sources of public transportation funding.

BUDGET IMPACT
This action would result in no immediate budget impact. If the ballot measure is approved by the voters, it would potentially result in significant revenue benefits.

BACKGROUND
In collaboration with the League of California Cities and the California Alliance for Jobs, the CTA is sponsoring the Local Taxpayer, Public Safety and Transportation Protection Act of 2010, which has been filed with the California Secretary of State for inclusion on the November 2010 ballot. The measure would protect local government revenues, including public transportation funding, from cuts or diversions by the State.

The measure has received a Title and Summary from the California Attorney General and the sponsoring coalition’s committee, Californians to Protect Local Taxpayers and Vital Services, has launched a statewide signature gathering effort. The sponsors will need to collect approximately 700,000 signatures in order to qualify the measure for the ballot.

The transportation component of this measure would protect against the diversion of State transportation funding sources including:
• The state sales tax on gasoline and diesel fuel, including Proposition 42 and spillover
• The state excise taxes on gasoline and diesel fuel
• The sales tax on nine cents of the excise tax
• The quarter-cent sales tax specified by the Transportation Development Act
• Local transportation sales tax generated by self-help counties

The measure would also preserve the traditional uses of these revenues for:
• The Public Transportation Account, including the State Transit Assistance program
• The State Transportation Improvement Program
• Local transportation needs funded through the Transportation Development Act
• The Highway Users Tax Account

Over the past several years, the Governor and the Legislature have consistently diverted voter-approved public transportation funding in order to balance the State’s General Fund deficit. Since 2007, the State has diverted approximately $2.8 billion from the State Transit Assistance program. According to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, had this funding been available, the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board would have received an additional $37 million.

Prepared By: Seamus Murphy, Manager, Government Affairs 650.508.6388
RESOLUTION NO. 2010 –

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

***

SUPPORTING THE LOCAL TAXPAYER, PUBLIC SAFETY, AND
TRANSPORTATION PROTECTION ACT OF 2010, TO BE PLACED BEFORE THE
VOTERS OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR THEIR CONSIDERATION

WHEREAS, the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) operates Caltrain
commuter rail service between Gilroy and San Francisco with 34 stations and 77 route-miles of
track; and

WHEREAS, the Caltrain rail system serves more than 39,000 passengers on the average
weekday and is a vital transit link for communities on the Peninsula and a fundamental
component of the regional transportation network; and

WHEREAS, the voters of the State of California have passed several statewide ballot
measures designed to provide guaranteed funding for public transportation services; and

WHEREAS, since 2007, the Governor of California and the California State Legislature
have diverted approximately $2.8 billion from the State Transit Assistance program to the State
General Fund resulting in the diversion of more than $37 million from the JPB and Caltrain
commuter rail service; and

WHEREAS, the California State Budget signed into law by the Governor on
February 20, 2009 eliminates 100 percent of funding for the State Transit Assistance Program
through 2013; and

WHEREAS, following the diversion of State Transit Assistance funding, the JPB has cut
Caltrain service, raised fares and laid off administrative and service employees; and
WHEREAS, this continued loss of revenue greatly limits the JPB’s ability to achieve the principle of “developing a solid financial foundation that ensures long term sustainability,” as adopted in the JPB’s 2004-2023 Strategic Plan; and

WHEREAS, the California Transit Association, as part of a coalition of taxpayers and public safety, local government, transportation, business and labor interests, seeks to place the Local Taxpayer, Public Safety, and Transportation Protection Act of 2010 before the voters of the State of California; and

WHEREAS, this measure, if approved by a majority of voters, will require that existing sources of State public transportation funding be used to fund public transportation programs and will prevent the State from diverting these funds in the future.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Directors of the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board does hereby support the Local Taxpayer, Public Safety, and Transportation Protection Act of 2010, which would preserve and protect funding for public transit investments, and does urge that the measure be placed before the voters of California for their consideration and approval; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the California Transit Association.

Regularly passed and adopted this 4th day of March 2010, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

___________________________
Chair, Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board

ATTEST:

___________________________
JPB Secretary
PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD  
STAFF REPORT  

TO: Joint Powers Board  

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon  
Executive Director  

FROM: Marian Lee  
Executive Officer, Planning and Development  

SUBJECT: CALTRAIN COMPREHENSIVE ACCESS PROGRAM  

ACTION  
This is an informational item and a presentation will be made.  

SIGNIFICANCE  
There is a need to develop a Comprehensive Access Program for Caltrain. Forecasts indicate that ridership could increase by 100 percent by 2030. We need to do several things to capture the future market, including increased transit-oriented development, expanded Caltrain service and enhanced access capacity.  

The purpose of developing the Comprehensive Access Program is to figure out how to increase access capacity. The most sustainable way to maximize access capacity is to reduce dependency on driving and increase dependency on walking, riding transit and biking. Key elements of this program are a policy framework, a strategic plan, a capital improvement plan and a monitoring program.  

Staff will make a presentation providing an overview of the comprehensive access program and introduce the first key element of the program: the policy framework. Staff plans to conduct stakeholder outreach in March and April and return to the board in May with a request for policy adoption and an action plan for advancing the remaining key elements of the program.  

BUDGET IMPACT  
There is no impact to the budget.  

BACKGROUND  
In 2009, the JPB adopted its first Bike Access and Parking Plan. Through that experience, staff learned a larger, more comprehensive access plan is necessary to meet future needs for all riders. Given that there are physical and financial limitations, our challenge is to develop a comprehensive access program that balances the needs of our current and future riders while maximizing ridership, which is crucial to the financial sustainability of the Caltrain system.  

Prepared By: Marian Lee  
Executive Officer, Planning and Development  
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This page is intentionally left blank.
Some of the major projects completed include, but are not limited to the following:

- Ponderosa - Construction of Station Platforms, Track, Bridge Rehab, & Grade Crossing Project
- Passenger Car Overhaul
- Passenger Car Procurement
- CTX - Caltrain Express (Baby Bullet Train) Engineering / Construction Project
- CTX - Baby Bullet Train - Procurement of Rolling Stock
- Centralized Traffic Control Project
- Purchase and Installation of Ticket Vending Machines (TVM) - Phase 2
- Centralized Equipment & Maintenance Operations Facility Related Projects
- 4th and Townsend Station Improvements
- San Mateo Station Improvements
- Sunnyvale Multi-Modal Project
- Tunnel Rehabilitation Project
- Hillsdale Station Outboard Platform Improvements
- Bridge Seismic Retrofit and Deck Replacement Project
- Centralized Equipment & Maintenance Operations Facility (CEMOF)
- North Terminal Operations Improvements Project
- Burlingame Station Platform & Track Improvements Project
- Diridon Station Improvements
- Guadalupe River Bridge Interim Repair Project
- Cal Ave Station Improvements / Palo Alto Ped Underpass & Platform Improvements / Bridge Deck Repair Project
- San Bruno / South Linden Interim Safety Improvement Project

Note: (1) The "Total Board Approved Budget by FY" reflects the annual budget approved by the PCJPB Board of Directors at the beginning of each fiscal year. This authorizes the amount that could be spent on projects. Unspent budget in a fiscal year will be carried forward to subsequent budget years.

(2) "Total Audited Expenditures by FY" reflects total cost expended in the fiscal year; funding source for the expenditures could be from prior fiscal years.

(3) Expenditure shown for FY10 through December 31, 2009 are unaudited.
This page is intentionally left blank.
The following projects represent a sub-set of the total Capital Program and have been selected for inclusion into the Quarterly Report due to project value, operational significance, and/or impact on customers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>SCHEDULE</th>
<th>BUDGET / COST</th>
<th>HSR IMPACT</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd ATCS Channel Project</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atherton Station Improvements (Project On-Hold)</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway Station Improvements (Project On-Hold)</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain Right-Of-Way Fencing Project</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumbarton Rail Corridor Project</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrification - Environmental and 35% Design</td>
<td>⚠️</td>
<td>⚠️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>⚠️</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerrold Avenue Bridge Replacement Project</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>⚠️</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Gatos &amp; Guadalupe Bridges Replacement</td>
<td>⚠️</td>
<td>⚠️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>⚠️</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase (8) Caltrain Passenger Cars</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quint Street Bridge Project</td>
<td>⚠️</td>
<td>⚠️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>⚠️</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Operations Control System Project</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Time Transit Information Project</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bruno Grade Separation</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>⚠️</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Roadway Bridges Replacement</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>⚠️</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo Bridges Rehabilitation Project</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo County At-Grade Crossing Improvement</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South San Francisco Parking Lot</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Terminal and Santa Clara Stations Improvements Project</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemwide Track Rehab Program - FY10</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*= Project On-Hold  * = No Issues  ⚠️ = Notable Issues  R = Significant Issues
SCOPE:
The purpose of this project is to refine, adjust and modify Caltrain’s Signal Data Radio Communications Network which links signal control points to the central control/dispatch office. The modifications are required to improve the reliability, quality, and speed of data transmissions within the radio network, specifically between the antennas at control points, the two base stations located on the San Bruno and Monument Peak Mountain Tops and along the right-of-way.

Issues: None.

SCHEDULE:

Progress:
Oct - Dec 2009
(1) Completed cutover of 2nd ATCS radio channel at all locations.
(2) Conducted final site walk through.
(3) Completed punch list work.

Future Activities:
Jan - Mar 2010
Project close out.

Issues: None.
2nd ATCS Channel Project

BUDGET:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment Group</th>
<th>Current Board Approved Budget</th>
<th>Expended to Date</th>
<th>Committed to Date</th>
<th>Estimate at Completion</th>
<th>Variance at Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>$485,290</td>
<td>$485,167</td>
<td>$508,658</td>
<td>$485,167</td>
<td>$123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$2,364,290</td>
<td>$2,324,452</td>
<td>$2,449,431</td>
<td>$2,367,042</td>
<td>($2,752)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>$792,400</td>
<td>$617,803</td>
<td>$618,802</td>
<td>$761,881</td>
<td>$30,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$808,955</td>
<td>$799,476</td>
<td>$799,476</td>
<td>$881,862</td>
<td>($72,907)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$49,065</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,048</td>
<td>$45,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,500,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,226,898</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,376,367</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,500,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Issues: None.

OTHER: None.
ATHERTON STATION IMPROVEMENTS

SCOPE:

This project provides for the design and construction of new station facilities at Atherton Station (MP 27.80) to eliminate the "hold out rule". The scope of the project includes demolishing the center platform and providing outboard boarding platforms with a center inter-track fence and a signalized/gated pedestrian crossing at the northern end of the platforms.

Issues:

Design has been completed; project was placed on hold for further efforts (see note in "Other" section). Scope of project is on hold; Caltrain capital program management team is reviewing the impacts of other improvements in the vicinity of the station to determine the appropriate scope definition for the Atherton Station project.

SCHEDULE:

- **01572 - Atherton Interim Outboard Platform**
  - **Activity ID**: 01572
  - **Activity Description**: Atherton Interim Outboard Platform
  - **% Complete**: 100%
  - **Start/Finish**: 15JUN09A/18DEC09A
  - **Notes**: Project On-Hold

- **01572 - Preliminary Engineering**
  - **Start/Finish**: 06JUN09A/15JUN09A

- **01572 - Engineering Design**
  - **Start/Finish**: 06JUN09A/30AUG09

Progress: Project is on hold.

Oct - Dec 2009

Future Activities:

Jan - Mar 2010

Issues: Project is on hold; schedule needs to be redefined and re-baselined.
thane Station Improvements

The project was put on hold for any further design efforts. Estimate at Completion will be re-evaluated when project is re-activated.

HSR Impact:
Project scope, budget and delivery schedule will likely be impacted by High Speed Rail development along the Caltrain corridor.

Others:
Project has been placed on hold; Capital Program Management team is currently reviewing the impact of capital improvements (incl. Dumbarton Rail Extension) in the vicinity of Atherton Station.
SCOPE:
This project is to eliminate the “hold out rule”, reduce gate down time and provide pedestrian/patron safety by providing outboard boarding platforms at the Broadway Station (MP 15.2). The platforms are to be staggered, the Northbound platform north of Broadway Avenue and the Southbound platforms remaining south of Broadway Avenue. Scope includes track work, signal work, pedestrian active warning devices, lighting and general construction work on platforms and associated amenities. This work shall eliminate the hold out rule and reduce gate downtime. Most of the track rehab work in the vicinity of the Broadway station has been transferred to the Burlingame Outboard Platform Project.

Issues:
The project was put on hold for any further design efforts. Scope of project is on hold; Caltrain capital program management team is reviewing the impacts of other improvements in the vicinity of the station to determine the appropriate scope definition for the Broadway Station project.

SCHEDULE:

<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>01574</td>
<td>Broadway Interim Outboard Platform</td>
<td>J JAS 010</td>
<td>J JAS 010</td>
<td>J JAS 010</td>
<td>J JAS 010</td>
<td>J JAS 010</td>
<td>J JAS 010</td>
<td>J JAS 010</td>
<td>J JAS 010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16JUL03A</td>
<td>16JUL04A</td>
<td>16JUL03A</td>
<td>16JUL04A</td>
<td>16JUL03A</td>
<td>16JUL04A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering Design</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16JUL04A</td>
<td>16JUL04A</td>
<td>16JUL04A</td>
<td>16JUL04A</td>
<td>16JUL04A</td>
<td>16JUL04A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Progress: Project is on hold.

Oct-Dec 2009

Future Activities:
Jan-Mar 2010

Issues: Project is on hold; schedule needs to be redefined and re-baselined.
### BROADWAY STATION IMPROVEMENTS

#### Project Budget / Cost Status

![Budget Cost Status Chart]

#### Issues:

The project was put on hold for any further design efforts. Estimate at Completion will be re-evaluated when project is re-activated.

#### HSR Impact:

Project scope, budget and delivery schedule will likely be impacted by High Speed Rail development along the Caltrain corridor.

#### Other:

Project has been placed on hold; Capital Program Management team is currently reviewing the impact of future capital improvements in the vicinity of the Broadway station.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment Group</th>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
<th>(d)</th>
<th>(e) = (a - d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>$243,196</td>
<td>$1,059,935</td>
<td>$1,059,935</td>
<td>$1,265,000</td>
<td>($1,021,804)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$1,864,500</td>
<td>$23,854</td>
<td>$30,906</td>
<td>$4,174,947</td>
<td>($2,310,447)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>$162,130</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$460,959</td>
<td>($298,829)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$194,557</td>
<td>$326,493</td>
<td>$326,493</td>
<td>$980,039</td>
<td>($785,482)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$324,958</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$616,155</td>
<td>($291,197)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$2,789,341</td>
<td>$1,410,282</td>
<td>$1,417,334</td>
<td>$7,497,100</td>
<td>($4,707,759)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- (a) Current Board Approved Budget
- (b) Expended to Date
- (c) Committed To Date
- (d) Estimate at Completion
- (e) Variance at Completion

---

CALTRAIN RIGHT-OF-WAY FENCING PROJECT

SCOPE:
The project consists of the installation of fencing along the Caltrain Corridor based on location and exposure requirements. Fencing contracts will be authorized in the following two (2) phases:

Phase 1: Previously completed by Amtrak at the following locations: San Bruno, Burlingame, San Mateo, Belmont and Redwood City.

Phase 2: Base work and Option 1 and Option 2 fencing along the Right of Way at the following locations: San Francisco, San Bruno, San Mateo, Redwood City, Menlo Park, Sunnyvale and San Jose

Phase 2 Base: consists of: 900 LF (Linear Feet) of fence demolition, 400 LF chain link fence, 400 LF expanded wire mesh fence and 7,000 LF welded wire mesh fence.

Phase 2 Option 1: consists of: 450 LF chain link fence, 350 LF expanded wire mesh fence and 20,000 LF welded wire mesh fence.

Phase 2 Option 2A: consists of: 200 LF chain link fence and 10,000 LF welded wire mesh fence.

Phase 2 Option 2B: consists of: 200 LF chain link fence and 10,000 LF welded wire mesh fence.

Issues:
Phase 2 Option 2 work will be executed as two (2) work packages. Option 2A and Option 2B. Option 2A work has been executed.

Progress:
Oct - Dec 2009
(1) Contractor installed approximately 7,500 LF of fencing along the Right of Way.
(2) Continued Phase Option 2A construction work.

Future Activities:
Jan - Mar 2010
(1) Continue installation of fencing along the PCJPB Right of Way.
(2) Begin preparing Phase 2 Option 2B work package.

Issues:
None.
**CALTRAIN RIGHT-OF-WAY FENCING PROJECT**

**BUDGET:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment Group</th>
<th>Current Board Approved Budget</th>
<th>Expended to Date</th>
<th>Committed to Date</th>
<th>Estimate at Completion</th>
<th>Variance at Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>$27,500</td>
<td>$20,528</td>
<td>$20,528</td>
<td>$27,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$3,480,467</td>
<td>$2,620,366</td>
<td>$2,899,804</td>
<td>$3,480,467</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>$278,970</td>
<td>$186,722</td>
<td>$186,722</td>
<td>$278,970</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$427,677</td>
<td>$298,784</td>
<td>$298,784</td>
<td>$427,677</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$178,405</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$178,405</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,393,019</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,126,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,405,838</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,393,019</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Budget / Cost Status**

- Current Board Approved Budget
- Estimate at Completion
- Expended to Date

**Issues:** None.

**OTHER:** None.
The Dumbarton Rail Corridor (DRC) Project will extend commuter rail service across the Bay between the Peninsula and the East Bay by rehabilitating and reconstructing rail facilities on the existing railroad alignment and right-of-way. Three new passenger rail stations in Menlo Park/East Palo Alto, Newark, Union City, and a new layover facility in the East Bay will be constructed, as well as upgrading the Fremont Centerville Station. The proposed Dumbarton train service will consist of six trains across the bridge during the morning commute and six during the evening commute. Morning trains will originate at the Union City Intermodal Station, cross the bay to Redwood City, and then three trains will travel north to San Francisco and three will travel south to San Jose. In the evening, all trains will reverse pattern and travel back to Union City.

The current scope and budget is for Environmental Clearance and Preliminary Engineering only.

Issues:

1) Environmental Mitigation – Pending the result of the findings in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the project may be required to implement various mitigation conditions in the bay and the wetlands. This may result in additional studies, schedule delays and or cost increase.

2) Future required negotiations for right-of-way acquisition and operating and capital agreements with other affected railroads and agencies (i.e., the Union Pacific Railroad and the Capitol Corridor) may result in potential schedule delays, additional studies, or capital and operating costs.

3) Dumbarton Bridge – The existing bridge has been out of service since the mid-1980s. Uncertainties surrounding the existing condition of the bridge and also various regulations and other needs may significantly affect the options and the designs for rehabilitation and replacement of the Dumbarton Bridge.

### SCHEDULE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity ID</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Orig. Dur</th>
<th>Rem. Dur</th>
<th>% Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05463</td>
<td>Dumbarton Rail Corridor</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>73.21%</td>
<td>04-Jan-05 A - 01-Nov-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>1732</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>73.21%</td>
<td>04-Jan-05 A - 01-Nov-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>26-Jul-07 A - 26-Jul-07 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering Design</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>82.16%</td>
<td>01-Aug-07 A - 04-Apr-11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Progress:


1) Conducted PDT December 1, 2009 Meeting in Newark, CAP December 9, 2009 Meeting in Newark, and PAC December 18, 2009 Meeting at the Palo Alto Council Chambers. An informational presentation was made to PAC on the UPRR Oakland Subdivision negotiation plan (for Segment G in Union City) and on the potential use of RM2 Operating Funds for Interim Bus Service. The PAC motioned to approve the staff recommendation on the proposed technical analysis scope and budget.

2) The geotechnical and structural analyses are almost complete and the cost estimate has been updated. The bridge design and constructability reports focus on better reliability and performance, and minimizing environmental impacts.

3) The Capitol Corridor is preparing a grant application to the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) High Speed Intercity Passenger Rail program (HSIPR) in Spring 2010 for eight projects that include the procurement and construction of Segment G of the Dumbarton Rail Corridor project in Union City. Staff will continue to provide updates in the future on the application status and the strategy for right-of-way negotiation.

4) Continued to coordinate with the Dumbarton bus consortium in planning for interim bus enhancements in the corridor.

### Future Activities:

Jan. - Mar. 2010

1) Conduct PDT meeting, CAP meeting, and PAC meeting in Spring 2010. An update on the status of the technical analysis, interim bus enhancement plans, and the status of the Capitol Corridor’s FRA funding application are expected to be presented to the PAC.

2) Complete the technical analysis for updating the draft environmental document for FTA review and public circulation.

3) Continue to coordinate with stakeholders to explore funding opportunities and interim measures. Evaluate viable funding strategies and possible alternatives for the project implementation.

4) Continue to work on a strategy for negotiations with UPRR on right-of-way issues, and evaluate the status of any interim bus enhancement plan.

5) Coordinate with High Speed Rail Authority and Altamont Corridor project teams to integrate their service plan and alignment alternatives into environmental planning and analyses.

### Issues:

Environmental reviews will take longer than expected. This is due to a delayed start of the scoping period, the development of new phasing options, a delay in obtaining concurrence with project partners MTC and the FTA regarding inputs to the ridership model and the need to consider phasing options in the environmental evaluation. The project has also encountered significant funding and implementation issues when the MTC approved shifting $91 million RM2 funding from the Dumbarton project to the BART Warm Springs project in January 2009 and repayment is deferred until 2019-2020.
### BUDGET:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment Group</th>
<th>Current Board Approved Budget</th>
<th>Expended to Date</th>
<th>Committed To Date</th>
<th>Estimate at Completion</th>
<th>Variance at Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>$10,393,420</td>
<td>$7,333,067</td>
<td>$8,106,061</td>
<td>$10,393,420</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>$3,068</td>
<td>$2,028</td>
<td>$2,028</td>
<td>$3,068</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$4,253,580</td>
<td>$3,876,556</td>
<td>$3,876,560</td>
<td>$4,253,580</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$817,932</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$817,932</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$15,468,000</td>
<td>$11,211,651</td>
<td>$11,984,649</td>
<td>$15,468,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Budget / Cost Status**

- **Current Board Approved Budget**
- **Estimate at Completion**
- **Expended to Date**

**Issues:**

Funding approved is sufficient to complete the environmental and preliminary engineering phase of the project.

MTC reprogrammed $91 million of the project's funding to the BART Warm Springs extension in September 2008, and the $91M is proposed to be re-paid after FY 2019-20. Remaining project funding would be insufficient even for Phase 1 construction. The repayment of the $91 Million after FY 2019-20 would delay the project ten years. The certainty of the payback is in question, as it depends upon the willingness of a future Alameda County Congestion Management Agency (ACCMA) action to honor the action of its current board. A public hearing was held on January 14, 2009, for the RM2 funding reassignment and the action was formally approved by the MTC commissioners at the January 28, 2009, MTC Meeting. It places the Dumbarton Project focus on near-term and interim actions as a consequence of the 10+ year delay in capital funding: 1) completion of the draft EIR/EIS; 2) steps towards purchase of needed right-of-way; 3) expansion of bus service in the corridor in the interim.

**OTHER:**

None.
**SCOPE:** The Electrification Program will electrify the 52-mile Caltrain Commuter line from San Francisco to Tamien. The project will include the following activities: (1) an approved Environmental Assessment / Environmental Impact Report (EA/EIR); (2) the design and installation of approximately 150 single track miles of overhead contact system (OCS) that will distribute power to the electrically-powered locomotives or electric multiple unit (EMU) trainsets; (3) the design and construction of two traction power substations (TPS) and eight autotransformer stations to deliver the 25kV, 60Hz, single-phase, alternating current to the OCS; (4) the design and installation of enhancements to the signaling and grade crossing control systems to make the system compatible with electrification and to provide for future operations service levels; and (5) the integration of the Electrification System, Signaling modifications and Electric Rolling Stock.

Current program scope is funded through the completion of environmental activities and 35% design engineering activities.

**Issues:** Caltrain is currently working with California High Speed Rail Authority, among others, to determine the impact of high speed rail development on this project. Project scope is under review.

**Future Activities:**
(1) Continue coordination of project with JPB Capital Program and engineering to keep Electrification documents current.
(2) Coordinate project with CHSTP engineering and planning activities for the Caltrain Corridor.

**Issues:** Caltrain is currently working with California High Speed Rail Authority, among others, to determine the impact of high speed rail development on this project. Project scope is under review. Until review is complete, project remains at the 35% design phase; thereby, significantly slipping from the original project schedule.
PCJPB QUARTERLY REPORT
Active Capital Projects

ELECTRIFICATION

BUDGET:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment Group</th>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
<th>(d)</th>
<th>(a - d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>$20,658,149</td>
<td>$15,734,009</td>
<td>$15,772,868</td>
<td>$20,658,149</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$1,023,051</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$1,023,051</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction*</td>
<td>$1,094,408</td>
<td>$702,395</td>
<td>$702,395</td>
<td>$1,094,408</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management*</td>
<td>$161,417</td>
<td>$80,004</td>
<td>$80,004</td>
<td>$161,417</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$7,688,688</td>
<td>$7,048,214</td>
<td>$7,048,214</td>
<td>$7,688,688</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$421,750</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$421,750</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$31,047,463</strong></td>
<td><strong>$23,582,622</strong></td>
<td><strong>$23,621,481</strong></td>
<td><strong>$31,047,463</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE: Budget and cost are for construction planning, constructability review and value engineering support activities.

Issues:
Total Estimate-at-Completion (EAC) shown above is through 35% Engineering Design only. Once the scope of the project is coordinated with California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA), the budget for the balance of the project will be updated and reflected in the report. Full funding for the project will depend on the coordination of the project with CHSRA.

HSR IMPACT:
Caltrain is currently working with California High Speed Rail Authority, among others, to determine the impact of high speed rail development on this project. Project scope is under review.

OTHER:
None.
Jerrold Avenue Bridge Replacement Project

SCOPE:
Final design and construction of the Jerrold Avenue (MP 2.85) Bridge including:
(1) Replacement of the existing intermediate three-spans of the Jerrold Avenue bridge with a single span bridge (including the installation of two (2) jump-spans to conform to the present bridge layout);
(2) Reconstruction of tracks impacted by the new structures;
(3) Reconstruction of the traveled way and sidewalks.

Issues: None.

SCHEDULE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity ID</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Orig Ded</th>
<th>Rev Ded</th>
<th>% Complete</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Finish Date</th>
<th>2009 Q1</th>
<th>2009 Q2</th>
<th>2009 Q3</th>
<th>2009 Q4</th>
<th>2010 Q1</th>
<th>2010 Q2</th>
<th>2010 Q3</th>
<th>2010 Q4</th>
<th>2011 Q1</th>
<th>2011 Q2</th>
<th>2011 Q3</th>
<th>2011 Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01917</td>
<td>Jerrold Ave. Bridge Re...</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>05-Mar-09</td>
<td>07-Nov-11</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase Gate/Programmatic Reviews</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>05-Aug-09</td>
<td>01-Feb-10</td>
<td></td>
<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>Environmental</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>05-Aug-09</td>
<td>11-Sep-09</td>
<td></td>
<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>Funding</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20-Sep-09</td>
<td>08-Mar-10</td>
<td></td>
<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>Engineering Design</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>31-Mar-09</td>
<td>29-Jan-10</td>
<td></td>
<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>Procurement/Bid &amp; Awards</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>01-Feb-10</td>
<td>16-Jul-10</td>
<td></td>
<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>Construction</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15-Jul-10</td>
<td>02-Sep-11</td>
<td></td>
<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>Project Closure</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>06-Sep-11</td>
<td>07-Nov-11</td>
<td></td>
<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>

Progress:
Oct - Dec 2009 Completed 95% design.

Future Activities:
Jan - Mar 2010
(1) Incorporate 95% design comments.
(2) Submit Invitation to Bid (IFB) package to Contracts and Procurement and Legal Departments for review.

Issues: Construction material procurement extended schedule by two months.
Oct. 1, 2009 - Dec. 31, 2009 PCJPB QUARTERLY REPORT

Active Capital Projects

Jerrold Avenue Bridge Replacement Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment Group</th>
<th>Current Board Approved Budget</th>
<th>Expended to Date</th>
<th>Committed To Date</th>
<th>Estimate at Completion</th>
<th>Variance at Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>$2,121,253</td>
<td>$905,311</td>
<td>$1,126,073</td>
<td>$2,121,253</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$11,847,307</td>
<td>$1,956</td>
<td>$32,137</td>
<td>$11,847,307</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>$2,177,205</td>
<td>$37,558</td>
<td>$37,558</td>
<td>$2,177,205</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$1,840,298</td>
<td>$438,474</td>
<td>$438,474</td>
<td>$1,840,298</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$1,699,423</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,699,423</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$19,685,486</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,383,299</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,634,242</strong></td>
<td><strong>$19,685,486</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Issues: None.

HSR IMPACT:

Caltrain is currently working with California High Speed Rail Authority, among others, to determine the impact of high speed rail development on this project. Project scope is under review.
SCOPE: The Los Gatos and Guadalupe Bridge Replacement Project includes:
(1) Preliminary design, preparation of the Environmental Document, Final Design, removal and replacement of the existing Main Track #1 (MT-1) and Main Track #2 (MT-2) bridges crossing the Los Gatos Creek. As recommended in the Project Study Report, the new replacement structure to be constructed will be a pre-stressed / pre-cast concrete bridge with new foundations and may include a new widened bridge deck that will act as a construction shoo-fly and a permanent third track.
(2) The preliminary design (only) of a replacement bridge for the existing MT-1 timber bridge crossing the Guadalupe River.

Issues:
(1) The project is located over a sensitive riparian habitat which requires the JPB to design a bridge structure that has minimal environmental impacts.
(2) Project Change Control Board (PCCB) is currently reviewing a proposed scope change to build only a two track bridge with future provisions for a third track, due to funding availability.

Progress:
Oct - Dec 2009
(1) Established the environmental clearance requirement to be pursued: Documented Categorical Exclusion (DCE).
(2) Federal Transit Administration (FTA) field visit to site occurred on November 20, 2009. The FTA confirmed that the DCE is the level of environmental clearance required.
(3) Awarded Work Directive to HNTB to perform additional environmental report work (Biological Report and Wetland Delineation).
(4) Conducted Capital Project Status Review (CPSR) to present design options and cost alternatives to Senior Management.

Future Activities:
Jan - Mar 2010
(1) Complete additional DCE environmental report work (Biological Report and Wetland Delineation).
(2) Complete the final 35% design for the Preferred Alternate with Phased Construction schedule which is required for the environmental clearance document.
(3) Complete final 35% design alternatives and phased construction schedules to construct bridge foundations, superstructure and deck (only).

Issues:
As federal funds are to be used, the project will be on-hold at 35% design until environmental clearance from the FTA is obtained. This action will delay the original baseline schedule by approximately twenty (20) months. Current schedule is based on a DCE. If more of an environmental clearance is required, then the schedule may be delayed an additional six (6) months.
**LOS GATOS AND GUADALUPE BRIDGES REPLACEMENT**

**BUDGET:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment Group</th>
<th>(a) Current Board Approved Budget</th>
<th>(b) Expended to Date</th>
<th>(c) Committed To Date</th>
<th>(d) Estimate at Completion</th>
<th>(e) = (a - d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>$2,630,314</td>
<td>$1,312,358</td>
<td>$1,443,657</td>
<td>$2,630,314</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction*</td>
<td>$18,199</td>
<td>$9,080</td>
<td>$9,080</td>
<td>$18,199</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management*</td>
<td>$8,887</td>
<td>$4,434</td>
<td>$4,434</td>
<td>$8,887</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$1,235,754</td>
<td>$616,562</td>
<td>$616,562</td>
<td>$1,235,754</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,893,154</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,942,434</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,073,733</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,893,154</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE: Budget and cost are for construction planning, constructability review and value engineering support activities.*

**Issues:**

Estimate at Completion of about $3.9 million is for the preliminary design and environmental review phases only. Once the scope is refined, the Budget and Estimate-Completion will be updated and reflected in the report.

**HSR IMPACT:**

Caltrain is currently working with California High Speed Rail Authority, among others, to determine the impact of high speed rail development on this project. Project scope is under review.
SCOPE: This project is for the purchase of eight (8) rail cars to replace the VRE cars that were purchased to implement the first two (2) years of the SF Giants service. Staff has identified the need for eight (8) additional Bombardier cars in order to shore up an inadequate spare ratio and to provide the required train capacity to meet passenger demand through 2011.

The project scope includes the purchase of two (2) cab cars and six (6) trailer cars, including all ancillary services and costs, QA/QC inspection and spare parts as well as the costs incurred for legal, technical and financial services.

Issues: Late delivery of spare parts and Buy America audit close out have delayed project close-out until First Quarter 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity ID</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Orig Dep</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01807</td>
<td>Procure (8) Caltrain P....</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>02-Jan-07 A</td>
<td>26-Feb-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>02-Jan-07 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Design</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>01-Mar-07 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement/Bid &amp; Awards</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>04-Jun-07 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolling Stock Manufacturing</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>02-Nov-07 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Closure</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>02-Feb-09 A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Progress: Oct - Dec 2009
(1) Continued to receive spare parts.
(2) Completed trainline tests.
(3) Initiated project close-out activities.

Future Activities:
Jan - Mar 2010
(1) Complete receipt of all spare parts.
(2) Complete project close-out activities.

Issues: None.
## PURCHASE (8) CALTRAIN PASSENGER CARS

### BUDGET:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment Group</th>
<th>(a) Current Board Approved Budget</th>
<th>(b) Expended to Date</th>
<th>(c) Committed To Date</th>
<th>(d) Estimate at Completion</th>
<th>(e) = (a - d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>$47,109</td>
<td>$45,395</td>
<td>$45,395</td>
<td>$45,895</td>
<td>$1,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement/ Rolling Stock</td>
<td>$20,929,361</td>
<td>$19,990,515</td>
<td>$20,319,995</td>
<td>$20,390,000</td>
<td>$539,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>$47,217</td>
<td>$29,856</td>
<td>$44,281</td>
<td>$46,000</td>
<td>$1,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$305,962</td>
<td>$256,077</td>
<td>$298,242</td>
<td>$298,077</td>
<td>$7,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$363,085</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$353,728</td>
<td>$9,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$21,692,734</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20,321,843</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20,707,913</strong></td>
<td><strong>$21,133,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>$559,034</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Budget / Cost Status

- **Current Board Approved Budget**
- **Estimate at Completion**
- **Expended to Date**

### Issues:
None.

### OTHER:
None.
QUINT STREET BRIDGE PROJECT

SCOPE:

Proposed Scope:
1. Close Quint Street permanently to vehicular traffic.
2. Remove the Quint Street Bridge.
3. Fill the bridge opening with an embankment.
4. Perform other related work such as utility protection, trackwork and street utilities.

The scope change for Quint Street from bridge replacement to street closure and bridge removal is to enable completion of the project within the approved budget without compromising PCJPB goals on seismic vulnerability, state of good repair and safety. If the street closure is approved by the City of San Francisco, PCJPB will take the lead in getting environmental clearance for the project. Design will not proceed until approval is received from the City of San Francisco.

Issues:

PCJPB is seeking community support from the City of San Francisco on the concept of Quint Street closure. The project scope may have to be re-visited or modified to address community concerns and issues.

SCHEDULE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Projected</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1 Programmatic Reviews</td>
<td>1 Jan-09</td>
<td>1 Jan-09</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance - NEPA</td>
<td>14-May-09</td>
<td>14-May-09</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Closure</td>
<td>9 May-09</td>
<td>9 May-09</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>17 Aug-09</td>
<td>17 Aug-09</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Design</td>
<td>15 Aug-09</td>
<td>15 Aug-09</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>19 Aug-09</td>
<td>19 Aug-09</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement/BID &amp; Awards</td>
<td>19 Aug-09</td>
<td>19 Aug-09</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>19 Aug-09</td>
<td>19 Aug-09</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>19 Aug-09</td>
<td>19 Aug-09</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Close</td>
<td>19 Aug-09</td>
<td>19 Aug-09</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Progress:

Oct - Dec 2009
(1) Continued with environmental work to obtain National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) clearance.
(2) Held meeting with environmental consultant to discuss and prepare future scope of work for the extended archaeological work. A strategy was developed to mitigate the environmental clearance schedule delay due to the extended field investigation and State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) / Federal Transit Administration (FTA) reviews.
(2) Received Phase 1 Archeological Report from consultant, and it is currently under review by PCJPB Planning Department.
(3) PCJPB Public Affairs Department contacted the City of San Francisco to initiate coordination on the proposed street closure.

Future Activities:
Jan - Mar 2010
(1) Prepare to issue a Work Directive Proposal Request (WDPR) to consultant for the extended archeological field investigation plan.
(2) Complete the review and provide comments on the Phase 1 Archeological Report.
(3) The Environmental Group to complete an environmental clearance schedule.
(4) Work with the Public Affairs Department to complete an engagement strategy for future outreach activities and coordination with City of San Francisco.

Issues:

None.
### QUINT STREET BRIDGE PROJECT

#### BUDGET:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment Group</th>
<th>Current Board Approved Budget</th>
<th>Expended to Date</th>
<th>Committed To Date</th>
<th>Estimate at Completion</th>
<th>Variance at Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>$2,422,288</td>
<td>$619,772</td>
<td>$1,175,869</td>
<td>$2,350,684</td>
<td>$71,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$2,976</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$2,976</td>
<td>$2,976</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$11,890,633</td>
<td>$1,956</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$11,539,138</td>
<td>$351,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>$2,421,368</td>
<td>$658</td>
<td>$658</td>
<td>$2,349,791</td>
<td>$71,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$2,649,972</td>
<td>$314,135</td>
<td>$314,135</td>
<td>$2,571,637</td>
<td>$78,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$1,749,725</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$1,697,914</td>
<td>$51,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$21,136,963</strong></td>
<td><strong>$936,555</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,496,638</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20,512,146</strong></td>
<td><strong>$624,823</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Issues:

None.

#### HSR IMPACT:

Caltrain is currently working with California High Speed Rail Authority, among others, to determine the impact of high speed rail development on this project.
SCOPE:

This project provides for the procurement and commissioning of a new operating control system for the Caltrain corridor. The project includes software procurement and development, hardware procurement and installation, testing, training, support and maintenance of the new system. The new system will meet all functionality and features necessary for current operations as well as accommodate for future projects identified by the JPB, such as Electrification, Communications Based Overlay Signal System (CBOSS), and various communication improvements.

Issues:
None.

SCHEDULE:

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01729</td>
<td>Operations Control Co..</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>25-Mar-08</td>
<td>21-Mar-12</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual Study</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>25-Mar-08</td>
<td>26-Nov-08</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>25-Sep-08</td>
<td>21-Feb-09</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering Design</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>15-Mar-09</td>
<td>24-Apr-09</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procurement/Bid &amp; Awards</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>01-Mar-09</td>
<td>31-Dec-09</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>04-Jan-10</td>
<td>04-Mar-11</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Closure</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>02-Mar-11</td>
<td>08-Jun-11</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warranty Period</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>31-Jan-11</td>
<td>20-Feb-12</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Progress:
Oct - Dec 2009
(1) Completed contract negotiations.
(2) Obtained Board approval to award contract to ARINC., Inc. at the December 2009 Board meeting.

Future Activities:
Jan - Mar 2010
(1) Notice to Proceed scheduled for January 2010.
(2) Conduct kick-off meeting.
(3) Contractor to begin software development, hardware procurement and installation.

Issues:
None.
Rail Operations Control System Project

**BUDGET:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment Group</th>
<th>Current Board Approved Budget</th>
<th>Expended to Date</th>
<th>Committed To Date</th>
<th>Estimate at Completion</th>
<th>Variance at Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>$141,910</td>
<td>$217,165</td>
<td>$360,321</td>
<td>$643,280</td>
<td>($501,370)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$4,550,258</td>
<td>$18,387</td>
<td>$2,058,590</td>
<td>$3,675,088</td>
<td>$875,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>$291,995</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$480,000</td>
<td>($188,005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$1,438,358</td>
<td>$933,584</td>
<td>$3,168,464</td>
<td>($1,730,106)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$1,277,479</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$789,912</td>
<td>$487,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,700,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,169,136</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,852,495</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,756,744</strong></td>
<td><strong>($1,056,744)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Issues:**

Additional budget authority for this project will be secured as part of the FY2011 budget development process.

**OTHER:**

None.

PCJPB QUARTERLY REPORT

Active Capital Projects

REAL TIME TRANSIT INFORMATION PROJECT

SCOPE:

The Real Time Transit Information Project will provide predictive arrival/departure times for all Caltrain trains and Samtrans buses. The real time predictions data will be provided to MTC's 511 system to be disseminated to the public. The train predictive arrival/departure times will be displayed on the visual message signs at the San Francisco 4th & King, Millbrae, San Mateo, Redwood City, Palo Alto, Mountain View, Sunnyvale, and the San Jose Diridon stations. The bus predictive arrival/departure times will be displayed on new electronic signs at the bus bays at the Daly City BART, Colma BART, Redwood City Sequoia and the Palo Alto stations. Project was funded by MTC for both SamTrans and Caltrain.

Issues:
None.

SCHEDULE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity ID</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Orig Est</th>
<th>Rev Est</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01648</td>
<td>Real Time Transit Information Project</td>
<td>1290</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>74.38%</td>
<td>06-Mar-66 A</td>
<td>27-Apr-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase Gate/Programmatic Reviews</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>16-Dec-06 A</td>
<td>16-Feb-07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual/Study</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>07-Mar-66 A</td>
<td>22-Nov-06 A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Design</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>06-Mar-66 A</td>
<td>25-Apr-07 A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement/Bid &amp; Awards</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>01-Aug-07 A</td>
<td>31-Dec-09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Engineering Management...</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>80.7%</td>
<td>03-Jul-96 A</td>
<td>30-Jun-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>41.16%</td>
<td>01-Apr-09 A</td>
<td>02-Mar-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Closure</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>03-Mar-11</td>
<td>27-Apr-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Progress:

Oct - Dec 2009

For SamTrans, the following was completed:
(1) Obtained construction permit and completed electrical conduit work at Daly City BART Station.
(2) Consultant continued with software development and demonstrated prototype sign for (Americans with Disabilities ACT of 1990) ADA compliance.

For Caltrain, the following was completed:
(1) Received final proposal from vendor and completed negotiation.
(2) Obtained December 2009 Board approval to award contract to ARINC.

Future Activities:

Jan - Mar 2010

For SamTrans, the following is planned:
(1) Obtain construction permit from BART for Colma and Millbrae stations.
(2) Continue with software development.
(3) Complete electrical installation at Millbrae and Colma BART stations.
(4) Order signs.

For Caltrain, the following is planned:
(1) Issue Notice to Proceed to ARINC and conduct kick-off meeting.
(2) Contractor to complete system design.
(3) JPB review design.

Issues:

Project is currently 28 months behind the baseline schedule due to delay in procurement. The Caltrain PADS procurement was combined with the Railroad Operations Control System (ROCS) (Project 01729) procurement. The combined procurement process shortened the schedule by two months, from a 30-month delay to a 28-month delay. As a result of combining the Caltrain PADS project with the ROCS project, the project schedule will be rebaselined in the next quarter.
REAL TIME TRANSIT INFORMATION PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment Group</th>
<th>Current Board Approved Budget</th>
<th>Expended to Date</th>
<th>Committed To Date</th>
<th>Estimate at Completion</th>
<th>Variance at Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>$60,654</td>
<td>$35,364</td>
<td>$35,364</td>
<td>$60,654</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$2,665,636</td>
<td>$429,875</td>
<td>$1,247,857</td>
<td>$2,665,636</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>$976</td>
<td>$976</td>
<td>$976</td>
<td>$976</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$899,600</td>
<td>$631,930</td>
<td>$631,930</td>
<td>$899,600</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$146,182</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$146,182</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$3,773,048</td>
<td>$1,098,145</td>
<td>$1,916,127</td>
<td>$3,773,048</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Budget and EAC reflect the reduction of $125K due to the elimination of five kiosks at five stations. Total EAC reflects project scope for both Samtrans buses and Caltrain trains.

Issues:

Other:

None.
SCOPE: The project will raise the railroad in a retained embankment and lower roadways crossing the railroad right-of-way from just south of the I-380 flyover to approximately San Felipe Road in San Bruno. The project will eliminate at-grade vehicular crossings at San Bruno Avenue, San Mateo Avenue and Angus Avenue and replace them with grade separated vehicular access with a four-track footprint. Pedestrian under-crossings will be constructed at Euclid and Sylvan Avenues in San Bruno. The existing San Bruno station will be relocated onto an elevated structure at San Bruno and San Mateo Avenues. The former site of San Bruno Lumber will become a surface parking lot for the new San Bruno station.

Issues: None.

SCHEDULE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>02-Jan-09</td>
<td>22-Jul-09</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Speed Rail</td>
<td>15-Dec-00</td>
<td>15-Dec-00</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>02-Mar-09</td>
<td>30-Apr-10</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>22-May-09</td>
<td>22-Jun-09</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>03-May-09</td>
<td>18-Jun-10</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Relocation</td>
<td>01-Apr-10</td>
<td>25-Aug-10</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Furnished Material</td>
<td>30-Nov-09</td>
<td>30-Aug-10</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRD Party Negotiations</td>
<td>02-Mar-09</td>
<td>26-May-10</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Bid Build (DBB)</td>
<td>01-Apr-10</td>
<td>30-Jul-10</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>08-Jun-10</td>
<td>31-Jul-12</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Completion</td>
<td>01-Aug-12</td>
<td>30-Oct-12</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Progress:
Oct - Dec 2009
(1) Obtained National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Environmental Clearance.
(2) Completed review of 95% Box Culvert submittal and issued Invitation for Bids (IFB); advertised IFB and received 16 bids. Started bid evaluation and recommendation for PCJPB February 2010 Board meeting.
(3) Signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the City of San Bruno, endorsing the city’s commitment to the project.
(4) Received 95% final Grade Separation design submittal and initiated PCJPB design review of plans & specifications.
(5) Continued negotiations with BART concerning design review approvals.
(6) Received Board instructions pertaining to real estate parcel acquisition. Began negotiations with five (5) property owners.
(7) Continued negotiations with City relative to design issues and C&M Agreement.

Future Activities:
Jan - Mar 2010
(1) Board reviews staff recommendation for award of Box Culvert contract work at the February 2010 Board meeting.
(2) Finalize PCJPB design review of 95% final Grade Separation plans & specifications. Incorporate comments into IFB and issue draft IFB. Advertise final Grade Separation IFB.
(3) Continue negotiations with BART concerning design review approvals.
(4) Prepare Purchase Order for Owner Furnished Signal Equipment (March Board) and Rail Crossovers (February Board).
(5) Continue negotiations with City relative to design issues and C&M Agreement.
(6) Initiate utility relocation work.
(7) Issue Limited Notice to Proceed (LNTP) to the Box Culvert contractor to mobilize staff and begin construction planning and administrative activities.
(8) Continue negotiations pertaining to real estate acquisition with five (5) property owners.

Issues: None.
### Active Capital Projects

#### BUDGET:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment Group</th>
<th>Current Board Approved Budget</th>
<th>Expended to Date</th>
<th>Committed To Date</th>
<th>Estimate at Completion</th>
<th>Variance at Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>$15,035,565</td>
<td>$14,040,566</td>
<td>$15,232,164</td>
<td>$15,272,017</td>
<td>($236,452)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$1,975,574</td>
<td>$111,153</td>
<td>$111,153</td>
<td>$2,760,000</td>
<td>($784,426)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$107,368</td>
<td>$58,740</td>
<td>$87,735</td>
<td>$104,250,850</td>
<td>($104,143,482)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>$35,789</td>
<td>$23,945</td>
<td>$23,945</td>
<td>$7,965,633</td>
<td>($7,929,844)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$2,147,363</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$27,067,250</td>
<td>($24,919,887)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$24,980,899</strong></td>
<td><strong>$16,642,161</strong></td>
<td><strong>$17,862,754</strong></td>
<td><strong>$165,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>($140,019,101)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Issues:**
Current Board Approved Budget of $25.0 million has been approved by both the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (SMCTA) and PCJPB Boards for the design phase of the project. Additional budget authority of $73M for the construction of this project will be requested at the January 2010 Board meeting; however, that is still short of the EAC of $165M required to complete the project. Additional budget authority will need to be approved by the Board later in the Spring 2010 to fully fund the project.

**HSR IMPACT:**
Caltrain is currently working with California High Speed Rail Authority, among others, to determine the impact of high speed rail development on this project. Project scope is under review.
SCOPE:
The San Francisco Roadway Bridges Replacement project upgrades the JPB owned vehicular bridges located at 22nd Street, 23rd Street and Paul Avenue and includes:
(1) Remove and replace the existing two-span steel-through girder superstructures as the bridges have reached the end of their useful lives, and allowing sufficient vertical clearance to accommodate future projects such as electrification.
(2) Remove and reconstruct the existing utility lines attached to the bridges. Provide temporary supports until the bridges are reconstructed.

Issues:
A Cooperative Agreement is needed between the JPB and the City of San Francisco to assign responsibilities during design and construction.

SCHEDULE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity ID</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Orig %</th>
<th>Rem %</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01758</td>
<td>San Francisco Roadway Bridges Replacement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase Gate/Programmatic Reviews</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>04-Oct-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>1069</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>07-Jul-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>1206</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>02-Dec-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3RD Party Negotiations</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>06-Apr-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering Design</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>07-Oct-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procurement/Bid &amp; Awards</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>14-Apr-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DBE Goals</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13-Feb-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>21-Jan-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Closure</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>29-Oct-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Progress:
(1) Project received environmental clearance for all three bridges in November.
(2) Sent revised traffic study memo to Caltrans for approval.
(3) A Cooperative Agreement is needed between the JPB and the City of San Francisco to assign responsibilities during design and construction. Project team is discussing the Cooperative Agreement with the City.
(4) Design was held at the 35% Design stage, pending Phase Gate approval.

Future Activities:
(1) Submit additional funding request to Caltrans.
(2) Continue to engage with the City on the Cooperative Agreement.
(3) Prepare for project Phase Gate review and approval to continue with the 65% detailed design.

Issues:
(1) Lack of additional Caltrans funds may delay project design completion.
SAN FRANCISCO ROADWAY BRIDGES REPLACEMENT

**BUDGET:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment Group</th>
<th>Current Board Approved Budget</th>
<th>Expended to Date</th>
<th>Committed To Date</th>
<th>Estimate at Completion</th>
<th>Variance at Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>$2,261,250</td>
<td>$875,981</td>
<td>$1,164,561</td>
<td>$2,261,250</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$24,588</td>
<td>$24,588</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction*</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$35,710</td>
<td>$35,710</td>
<td>$35,710</td>
<td>($35,710)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management *</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,587</td>
<td>$8,587</td>
<td>$2,109</td>
<td>($2,109)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$753,750</td>
<td>$540,006</td>
<td>$540,006</td>
<td>$715,931</td>
<td>$37,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,015,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,484,872</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,763,452</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,015,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: EAC and costs are for construction planning, constructability review and value engineering support activities.

**Issues:**

1. Budget and Estimate at Completion (EAC) of about $3.0 million is for 100% design and environmental assessment only.
2. Lack of Caltrans funds may stall the project; JPB is to submit additional funding request to Caltrans.
3. Project is to be funded with Caltrans and City funding.

**HSR IMPACT:**

Caltrain is currently working with California High Speed Rail Authority, among others, to determine the impact of high speed rail development on this project. Project scope is under review.
SAN MATEO BRIDGES REHABILITATION PROJECT

SCOPE:
The scope of the project includes:
Seismic retrofit of foundations/abutments of four Caltrain bridges located at Poplar Avenue, Santa Inez Avenue, Monte Diablo Avenue and Tilton Avenue in San Mateo.

The scope of the project was modified to better coordinate with High Speed Rail (HSR) and also to make certain that a project invested in today isn’t deemed obsolete in the near future. The project has been re-scoped to perform the seismic improvement first as an interim solution. The bridges will also be maintained and kept in a state of good repair. It is anticipated that the bridges will be replaced in the future, once the High Speed Rail alignment is known.

Issues:
None.

SCHEDULE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity ID</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Orig Est</th>
<th>Rev Est</th>
<th>% Complete</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01755</td>
<td>San Mateo Bridges Rep...</td>
<td>1610</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>70.27%</td>
<td>01-Ame-05</td>
<td>07-Jul-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase Gate/Programmatic Reviews</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99.87%</td>
<td>02-Jan-07</td>
<td>20-Jan-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>1087</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>01-Ame-05</td>
<td>29-May-09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54.87%</td>
<td>17-Sep-09</td>
<td>16-Mar-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Relocation</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>01-Aug-08</td>
<td>29-Jan-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Design</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>19-Jan-06</td>
<td>19-Nov-06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>82.76%</td>
<td>01-Dec-08</td>
<td>29-Jan-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement/Bid &amp; Awards</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>21-Jan-10</td>
<td>19-Jul-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20-Jul-10</td>
<td>03-May-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Closure</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>04-May-11</td>
<td>07-Jul-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Progress:
Oct-Dec 2009
(1) Continued coordination of underground gas and water utility relocations.
(2) Completed Issue for Bid (IFB) of the re-design retrofit package.
(3) Continued review of the re-design retrofit package by Caltrans.

Future Activities:
Jan-Mar 2010
(1) Contracts and Procurement and Legal Departments to begin review of IFB package.
(2) Issue Work Directive Amendment Request to perform the required historic documentation for the bridges recordation.
(3) Continue coordination of underground gas and water utility relocations.

Issues:
The project schedule has slipped due to the time required by Caltrans to program the project and include it on the FY10 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP). If the authorization to advertise from Caltrans (E-76) is not obtained before mid-March 2010, the funds from the prop-1B Grade Separation Grant may be jeopardized.
SAN MATEO BRIDGES REHABILITATION PROJECT

BUDGET:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment Group</th>
<th>Current Board Approved Budget</th>
<th>Expended to Date</th>
<th>Committed To Date</th>
<th>Estimate at Completion</th>
<th>Variance at Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$585,516</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$585,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$29,999,981</td>
<td>$7,252</td>
<td>$7,252</td>
<td>$4,035,802</td>
<td>$25,964,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>$2,923,197</td>
<td>$50,224</td>
<td>$50,224</td>
<td>$913,304</td>
<td>$2,009,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$2,748,158</td>
<td>$2,169,783</td>
<td>$2,169,783</td>
<td>$3,204,662</td>
<td>($456,504)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$6,209,466</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$628,611</td>
<td>$5,580,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$45,398,066</td>
<td>$5,534,207</td>
<td>$5,681,607</td>
<td>$12,427,643</td>
<td>$32,970,426</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Issues: None.

HSR IMPACT:

The development of the high speed rail in the vicinity of this project requires a re-visit of the project scope. Project has been phased to first perform seismic retrofit of the foundations of the bridge structure. Once the HSR alignment through the project area is known, the replacement of the bridge structure will be evaluated and programmed.
The scope of the At-Grade Crossing Improvement Program is to evaluate, design and construct safety improvements at, and in the vicinity of (25) at-grade crossings on the Caltrain Corridor in San Mateo County. Improvements will be made in regards to railroad, pedestrian, traffic, and roadway safety systems. At-grade crossings to be considered for improvements include: Center St. in Millbrae; Broadway Ave., Oak Grove Ave. and Peninsula Ave. in Burlingame; Villa Terrace Ave., 1st Ave., 2nd Ave., 3rd Ave., 4th Ave., 5th Ave., and 9th Ave. in San Mateo; Whipple Ave., Brewster Ave., Broadway Ave., Maple Ave., Main St., and Chestnut St. in Redwood City; Fair Oaks Lane and Watkins Ave. in Atherton; Encinal Ave., Glenwood Ave., Oak Grove Ave., and Ravenswood Ave. in Menlo Park. Improvements needed at each location may differ depending on the at grade crossing configurations and diagnostics, among other considerations.

The construction of five (5) additional mini-high platforms was incorporated into this project, as a scope addendum to the construction contract.

Issues:
None.

Future Activities:
Jan - Mar 2010
(1) Complete crossing work at:
- Zone 5: 1st Avenue in San Mateo.
- Zone 6: Fair Oaks Lane and Watkins Avenue in Atherton.

(2) Begin and complete crossing work at:
- Zone 2: Main Street in Redwood City.
- Zone 6: Oak Grove Avenue in Menlo Park.

(3) Signal cutovers are scheduled for Oak Grove (Burlingame) and Fair Oaks (Atherton) in January 2010.

(4) Finalize punch list items and change orders in previous zones.

Issues:
Substantial completion is forecasted for February 2010 with Final Completion in April 2010. This is a 3-4 month improvement in the construction schedule. Project close-out is forecasted for June 2010.
SAN MATEO COUNTY AT- GRADE CROSSING IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

BUDGET:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment Group</th>
<th>Current Board Approved Budget</th>
<th>Expended to Date</th>
<th>Committed To Date</th>
<th>Estimate at Completion</th>
<th>Variance at Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>$1,965,024</td>
<td>$1,967,055</td>
<td>$1,973,266</td>
<td>$1,967,055</td>
<td>($2,031)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$9,810</td>
<td>$9,810</td>
<td>$9,810</td>
<td>($9,810)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$12,620,359</td>
<td>$10,377,416</td>
<td>$10,972,684</td>
<td>$11,481,388</td>
<td>$1,138,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>$1,401,138</td>
<td>$1,752,753</td>
<td>$2,284,044</td>
<td>$2,119,000</td>
<td>($717,862)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$1,962,605</td>
<td>$2,685,393</td>
<td>$2,685,393</td>
<td>$3,028,000</td>
<td>($1,065,395)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$75,874</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$94,747</td>
<td>($18,873)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$18,025,000</td>
<td>$16,792,427</td>
<td>$17,925,197</td>
<td>$18,700,000</td>
<td>($675,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Issues: Current Estimate at Completion (EAC) has been increased to $18.7M based on a forecast on all remaining construction activities for the Grade Crossing project.

A request for $675K in budget authority was scheduled for Board action at the January 2010 meeting.

OTHER: None.
SCOPE: The project will rehabilitate and improve the existing parking lot at the South San Francisco Caltrain station. This will provide interim improvements until such time as High Speed Rail and the new South San Francisco Station Project come to fruition.

The project will rehabilitate the existing parking lot by patching the existing pavement, where necessary, and adding a new asphalt top coat. In addition, the project will provide proper drainage, improve the lighting, and provide traffic islands and striping. This project will provide up to 74 parking spaces.

Issues: None.

SCHEDULE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity ID</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Orig Start</th>
<th>Orig Var</th>
<th>% Complete</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Finish Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01911</td>
<td>South San Francisco P...</td>
<td>15-Dec-09</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>15-Dec-09</td>
<td>10-Mar-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase Gate/Programmatic Reviews</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15-Feb-10</td>
<td>15-Feb-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15-Dec-09</td>
<td>20-Jan-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Design</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15-Dec-09</td>
<td>12-Apr-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement/Bid &amp; Awards</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15-Apr-10</td>
<td>17-Sep-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20-Sep-10</td>
<td>20-Jan-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Closure</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>21-Jan-11</td>
<td>19-Mar-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Progress:

Oct - Dec 2009

(2) Issued Notice to Proceed (NTP).
(3) Began 65% design.

Future Activities:

Jan - Mar 2010

(1) Complete 65% design.
(2) Conduct 65% Design review. Submit comments back to General Engineering Consultant (GEC).
(3) Proceed with 100% Final Design & specifications.

Issues: None.
### SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO PARKING LOT

#### BUDGET:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment Group</th>
<th>(a) Current Board Approved Budget</th>
<th>(b) Expended to Date</th>
<th>(c) Committed To Date</th>
<th>(d) Estimate at Completion</th>
<th>(e) = (a - d) Variance at Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>$101,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$101,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement/ Rolling Stock</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$133,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$133,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$326,000</td>
<td>$7,316</td>
<td>$7,316</td>
<td>$326,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,500,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,316</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,316</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,500,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Issues:

None.

#### OTHER:

None.

---

### Project Budget / Cost Status

- **Current Board Approved Budget**
- **Estimate at Completion**
- **Expended to Date**

### Segment Groups

- Planning & Engineering
- Right of Way
- Procurement/ Rolling Stock
- Construction Management
- Administration
- Contingency

---
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South Terminal and Santa Clara Stations Improvements Project

SCOPE:

The South Terminal Station Project includes construction of two new platforms at the Diridon Station with stairs and ADA ramps to access the existing pedestrian underpass. The platforms will include canopies, signage, mini-high platforms and Ticket Vending Machine (TVM), Visual Message System (VMS), Public Address System (PA), Closed Circuit Television (CCTV), and Card Interface System (CID). The project also includes removal of the maintenance facilities located in the terminal, removal and construction of tracks, installation of new turnouts, fencing, drainage, and maintenance and alteration of the existing signal system to accommodate new track work.

The Santa Clara Station Project includes design and construction of a 700’ long by 30’ wide center platform, a 150’ extension to the existing southbound platform, and a pedestrian underpass between the 2 platforms. The project also includes track work shifting of MT3 (Main Track #3), construction of approximately 1500’ of MT2 (Main Track #2) through the station area, and a relocated turnout of MT2 at the south end of the station.

Issues: None.

SCHEDULE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity ID</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0194</td>
<td>South Terminal &amp; Santa Clara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Terminal Project Phase 1</td>
<td>Phase Gate/Programmatic Reviews</td>
<td>11/02</td>
<td>12/02</td>
<td>12/02</td>
<td>12/02</td>
<td>11/02</td>
<td>12/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual/Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procurement/Bid &amp; Awards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Closure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Station Improvements</td>
<td>Phase Gate/Programmatic Reviews</td>
<td>11/02</td>
<td>12/02</td>
<td>12/02</td>
<td>12/02</td>
<td>11/02</td>
<td>12/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procurement/Bid &amp; Awards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Closure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Progress:

South Terminal:
(1) Completed close-out of the South Terminal Site Prep contract.

South Terminal and Santa Clara:
(1) Received bids for the main station construction contract on October 14, 2009.
(2) Conducted staff and legal reviews of bid documents and prepared recommendation for Board award.
(3) Obtained December 2009 Board approval to award construction contract to Amorso Construction.

Future Activities:
Jan - Mar 2010
South Terminal and Santa Clara:
(1) Conduct pre-construction meetings.
(2) Issue Limited Notice to Proceed (LNTP).
(3) JPJB to review equipment list, resumes, baseline schedule, permits, quality control plans, health and safety plans and technical submittals.

Issues: None.
South Terminal and Santa Clara Stations Improvements Project

**BUDGET:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment Group</th>
<th>Current Board Approved Budget</th>
<th>Expended to Date</th>
<th>Committed To Date</th>
<th>Estimate at Completion</th>
<th>Variance at Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>$7,616,633</td>
<td>$5,830,789</td>
<td>$8,168,064</td>
<td>$6,168,064</td>
<td>$1,448,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$370,455</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$70,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$40,940,716</td>
<td>$4,705,687</td>
<td>$5,416,635</td>
<td>$33,154,408</td>
<td>$7,786,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>$9,776,627</td>
<td>$881,174</td>
<td>$881,174</td>
<td>$7,917,265</td>
<td>$1,859,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$7,939,065</td>
<td>$4,061,397</td>
<td>$4,061,397</td>
<td>$6,429,174</td>
<td>$1,509,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$11,343,232</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,632,000</td>
<td>$5,711,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$77,986,728</td>
<td>$15,579,027</td>
<td>$16,527,270</td>
<td>$59,600,906</td>
<td>$18,385,822</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Issues:**

Current project EAC decreased by $13.7 Million reflects lower than budgeted construction bids.

**OTHER:**

None.
**SCOPE:**

The systemwide track rehabilitation program covers the work required to keep the Caltrain railroad in a state of good repair. The type and scope of work scheduled for each fiscal year is based upon the condition of the railroad as reflected in Caltrain's State of Good Repair database. The scope of work proposed for Fiscal Year 2010 includes the following:

1. Replacement of Stock Rails and Points at ends of #20 Passing Tracks on an as-needed basis.
2. Replacement of Rail Joints - approximately 100 locations.
3. Removal of old or bonded over Insulated (Allegheny) Joints – about 50 locations (100 welds).
4. Production Ties and Surfacing - 30 miles surfacing, 25 turnouts and 1500 ties, various locations.
5. Purchase and installation of rail lubricators for six (6) locations.
6. Purchase of Small Tools and Equipment required for track maintenance activities.
7. Relay of approximately five (5) track miles of rail at approximately MP 9, MP 17 and MP 48.5.
8. Procurement of approximately 8,000 tons (2 trains) of ballast for FY11.
9. Rebuilding grade crossings at Fair Oaks Lane (Atherton), Peninsula Avenue (Burlingame), Villa Terrace Avenue and E. Bellevue Avenue (San Mateo) and shift approximately two (2) track miles of mainline track.
10. Surfacing through grade crossings at 4th Avenue, 9th Avenue and Mary Avenue (San Mateo), Oak Grove Avenue (Burlingame) and pedestrian crossing at Lawrence Avenue (Sunnyvale).

**Issues:**

None.

**SCHEDULE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity ID</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Orig Dur</th>
<th>Rem Dur</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01898-FY10</td>
<td>Systemwide Track Rehabilitation</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>01-Jul-09 A</td>
<td>30-Jun-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td>252</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>01-Jul-09 A</td>
<td>30-Jun-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Progress:**

Oct - Dec 2009

1. Installed 322 main line ties.
2. Surfaced 4.7 miles of track.
3. Performed 22 field welds.
5. FRA’s Geometry car tested the property.
6. Completed weed spray program.
7. Placed 275 tons of ballast.
8. Repaired 2 frog inserts.
9. Ground 6 switch points.
10. Installed 1,036 anchors.

**Future Activities:**

Jan - Mar 2010

1. Continue on-going systemwide track maintenance.
2. Continue on-going inspection and preventative testing.

**Issues:**

None.
### SYSTEMWIDE TRACK REHABILITATION PROJECT - FY10

**BUDGET:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment Group</th>
<th>Current Board Approved Budget</th>
<th>Expended to Date</th>
<th>Committed to Date</th>
<th>Estimate at Completion</th>
<th>Variance at Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$24,380</td>
<td>$36,671</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$6,725,000</td>
<td>$2,254,819</td>
<td>$5,304,179</td>
<td>$6,725,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td>$116,013</td>
<td>$122,200</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$1,390,000</td>
<td>$371,745</td>
<td>$371,745</td>
<td>$1,390,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,625,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,766,957</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,834,795</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,625,000</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Budget / Cost Status

- **Current Board Approved Budget**
- **Estimate at Completion**
- **Expended to Date**

![Project Budget / Cost Status Graph](image)

**Issues:** None.

**OTHER:** None.
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The following is a summary of the PCJPB’s DBE Status:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Q1 FFY10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Contracts Awarded</td>
<td>$28,926,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Contracts Awarded to DBEs</td>
<td>$2,646,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Annual Goal in %</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% DBE Attainment</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Over/(Under) Goal</td>
<td>-3.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From October 1 to December 31, 2009

PCJPB - Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Quarterly Status Report

1st Quarter Fed. Fiscal Year 2010
(From October 1 to December 31, 2009)
Definition of Terms

**Committed to Date** - The committed to date amount includes all actual expenditure of agency labor, other direct costs, the awarded amount of a work directive, a contract, or a purchase order which have been committed in the PeopleSoft accounting system.

**Current Board Approved Budget** - The current board approved budget includes the original board approved budget plus approved change orders or internal budget transfers which have been approved by the board.

**Estimate at Completion** - The forecasted final cost of the project. The estimate at completion can be different from the Current Board Approved Funding, which indicates a variance at completion.

**Expended to Date** - The cumulative project costs that have been expended through the current reporting period as reported in PeopleSoft + the accrual cost of the work performed that has not been recorded in PeopleSoft.

**Variance at Completion** - The difference between the Current Board Approved Funding and the Estimate at Completion. A negative variance indicates that additional funding is needed.
## Performance Status (Traffic Light) Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTIONS</th>
<th>On Target (GREEN)</th>
<th>Moderate Risk (YELLOW)</th>
<th>High Risk (RED)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. SCOPE</strong></td>
<td>(a) Scope is consistent with Budget or Funding.</td>
<td>(a) Scope is NOT consistent with Budget or Funding.</td>
<td>(a) Significant scope changes / significant deviations from the original plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Scope is consistent with other projects.</td>
<td>(b) Scope appears to be in conflict with another project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Scope change has been mitigated.</td>
<td>(c) Scope changes have been proposed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. BUDGET</strong></td>
<td>(a) Estimate at Completion forecast is within plus/minus 5% of the Current Approved Budget.</td>
<td>(a) Estimate at Completion forecast exceeds Current Approved Budget between 5% to 10%.</td>
<td>(a) Estimate at Completion forecast exceeds Current Approved Budget by more than 10%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) Project milestones / critical path are within plus/minus two months of the current baseline schedule.</td>
<td>(a) Project milestones / critical path show slippage. Project is more than two to six months behind the current baseline schedule.</td>
<td>(a) Project milestones / critical path show slippage more than two consecutive months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Physical progress during the report period is consistent with incurred expenditures.</td>
<td>(b) No physical progress during the report period, but expenditures have been incurred.</td>
<td>(b) Forecast project completion date is later than the current baseline scheduled completion date by more than six months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Schedule has been defined.</td>
<td>(c) Detailed baseline schedule NOT finalized.</td>
<td>(c) Schedule NOT defined for two consecutive months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. SCHEDULE</strong></td>
<td>(a) Expenditure is consistent with Available Funding.</td>
<td>(a) Expenditure reaches 90% of Available Funding, where remaining funding is NOT yet available.</td>
<td>(a) Expenditure reaches 100% of Available Funding, where remaining funding is NOT yet available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) All funding has been secured or available for scheduled work.</td>
<td>(b) NOT all funding is secured or available for scheduled work.</td>
<td>(b) No funding is secured or available for scheduled work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. HIGH SPEED RAIL (HSR) IMPACT</strong></td>
<td>(a) No potential impact.</td>
<td>(a) Potential impact.</td>
<td>(a) Significant impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>