AGENDA

PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD

Bacciocco Auditorium, 2nd Floor
1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos CA 94070

August 4, 2016 – 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 July 7, 2016
   b) Information on Statement of Revenues and Expenses for June 2016
   c) Authorize Approval and Ratification of the Fiscal Year 2017 Insurance Program at a Total Premium Cost Not To Exceed $4,465,147

5. Chairperson’s Report
   a) Resolution of Appreciation to Chuck Harvey, Deputy CEO

6. Report of the Citizens Advisory Committee

7. Report of the Executive Director
   a) Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project Quarterly Update


9. Authorize Entering into a Memorandum of Understanding with the San Francisco Municipal Transit Agency to Jointly Fund Last-Mile Shuttle Service for the San Francisco Caltrain Station Terminal for an Estimated Annual Not-to-Exceed Cost of $250,000

10. Authorize Adoption of Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan and Approval of South Terminal Phase II Project

11. Authorize Amendment to the Investment Policy and Reauthorization to Invest Monies with the Local Agency Investment Fund

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

13. Metropolitan Transportation Commission Transit Sustainability Program Progress Update

14. Lesbian, Gay, Bi Sexual, Transgender Business Enterprise Program Presentation

15. Legislative Update

16. Correspondence

17. Board Member Requests

18. Date/Time of Next Regular Meeting: Thursday, September 1, 2016, 10 a.m. at San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building, Bacciocco Auditorium, 2nd Floor, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070

19. General Counsel Report


 b) Closed Session: Conference with Real Property Negotiators Joan L. Cassman, General Counsel, Elizabeth Scanlon, Manager, Caltrain Planning, pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.8:

Under negotiation: Price and terms of contract.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Location</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>APN</th>
<th>JPB Parcel #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>823 Arguello St.</td>
<td>Longview Trust</td>
<td>052-272-070</td>
<td>JPB-SM2-0130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City, CA 94063</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>911 Arguello St.</td>
<td>Spencer 1995 Living Trust</td>
<td>052-272-030</td>
<td>JPB-SM2-0128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City, CA 94063</td>
<td></td>
<td>052-272-040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300 Old County Rd.</td>
<td>Cohn Family Living Trust</td>
<td>045-241-240</td>
<td>JPB-SM2-0119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont, CA 94002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701 Harbor Blvd.</td>
<td>Harbor Service Station, LLC</td>
<td>045-246-130</td>
<td>JPB-SM2-0123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont, CA 94002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801 Arguello St.</td>
<td>Masetti Trust</td>
<td>052-272-100</td>
<td>JPB-SM2-0132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City, CA 94063</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>797 Arguello St.</td>
<td>May Trust Agreement</td>
<td>052-272-110</td>
<td>JPB-SM2-0133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City, CA 94063</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>923 Arguello St.</td>
<td>Robert Mahony Trust</td>
<td>052-272-010</td>
<td>JPB-SM2-0126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City, CA 94063</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All items appearing on the agenda are subject to action by the Board. Staff recommendations are subject to change by the Board.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Location</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>APN</th>
<th>JPB Parcel #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1306, 1308 Old County Rd.</td>
<td>Ezzat Family 1999 Revocable Trust</td>
<td>045-241-130</td>
<td>JPB-SM2-0120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont, CA 94002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700 Harbor Blvd.</td>
<td>Klopacki Bogdan</td>
<td>045-241-170</td>
<td>JPB-SM2-0122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont, CA 94002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1125 Arguello St.</td>
<td>T.B.T. Investments</td>
<td>052-252-090</td>
<td>JPB-SM2-0124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City, CA 94063</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1003 Arguello St.</td>
<td>Tawasha Investments, LLC</td>
<td>052-252-050</td>
<td>JPB-SM2-0125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City, CA 94063</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>919 Arguello St.</td>
<td>Arguello 919</td>
<td>052-272-020</td>
<td>JPB-SM2-0127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City, CA 94063</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1020 Old County Rd.</td>
<td>Kirberg Motors Inc.</td>
<td>040-331-030</td>
<td>JPB-SM2-0116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont, CA 94002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>899 Arguello St.</td>
<td>Craig P Duling/Mary Ellen Gaston</td>
<td>052-272-180</td>
<td>JPB-SM2-0129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City, CA 94063</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>817 Arguello St.</td>
<td>Chavez Family Revocable Trust</td>
<td>052-272-080</td>
<td>JPB-SM2-0131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City, CA 94063</td>
<td></td>
<td>052-272-090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1030 Old County Rd.</td>
<td>Traverso Living Family Trust</td>
<td>040-331-040</td>
<td>JPB-SM2-0117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont, CA 94002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350 Old County Rd.</td>
<td>Brutsche Family Revocable Trust</td>
<td>045-241-210</td>
<td>JPB-SM2-0121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont, CA 94002</td>
<td></td>
<td>045-241-160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1080 Old County Rd.</td>
<td>Chariot Unlimited, LLC</td>
<td>040-331-050</td>
<td>JPB-SM2-0118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont, CA 94002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. 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 Caltrain website at www.caltrain.com. Communications to the Board of Directors can be e-mailed to board@caltrain.com.

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

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

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

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

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

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

MINUTES OF JULY 7, 2016

MEMBERS PRESENT:  J. Cisneros, J. Gee, R. Guilbault, R. Peralez, J. Ramos, A. Tissier

MEMBERS ABSENT:  M. Cohen, P. Woodward (Chair), K. Yeager


Vice Chair José Cisneros called the meeting to order at 10:07 a.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Paul Jones, Atherton, said it is noteworthy that Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) selected diesel power for the 10-mile extension from Pittsburg to Antioch at half the invested cost of extending its customary electrified line. This extension will reduce greenhouse gas emissions significantly along this industrial corridor that is noted for its poor air quality. He regrets the JPB did not pay more attention to the non-electric alternatives when developing the modernization plan.

Michael Lomio, Silicon Valley Leadership Group, encouraged the Board to move forward and approve the agreement between the JPB and the California High-Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) for funding the Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project (PCEP). He thanked everyone for the years of hard work that have gone into the PCEP. This project is a critical component of the necessary investment in order to maintain an effective transportation system in the region.

Dr. Lawrence Ames, Los Gatos Creek Streamside Park Committee, asked the JPB to retract their request for bids (RFB) for the Los Gatos Creek Bridge. The present bridge needs to be fixed, but it will be impacted by the forthcoming decisions by the CHSRA. The bridge might have to be replaced again in a year or two. The current design for the new Lost Gatos Bridge adversely impacts the planned extension of the Los Gatos Creek Trail. Most of the trail is built, and all that remains is the last mile. Because of the JPB’s change in design, the city of San Jose has had to re-plan the trail at a considerable cost. The design plans have changed again resulting in unacceptable impacts on the Los Gatos Creek Trail.

Martin Delson, Save Our Trails, said Save Our Trails is a California not-for-profit corporation whose mission is to promote trails in Santa Clara County for use by all. He is concerned about the impact of the bridge project on usefulness of the trail. The JPB has not coordinated the redesign with the city of San Jose, and the current design is going to severely impact the usefulness of the trail because it will be underwater for much of the winter. This trail will be a direct link to Diridon station. He is surprised the JPB
is promoting a project that will put people back into their cars rather than encourage them to use trails. He asked the JPB to withdraw the RFB for this project until it can be coordinated with the city of San Jose.

Bill Rankin, President, North Willow Glen Neighborhood Association, asked the JPB to withdraw the RFB for the replacement bridge across the Los Gatos Creek in San Jose. The current design will allow high water during a storm event to cover the future trail, possibly weakening the structure of the trail and covering it with mud that will close the trail for months at a time. Alternative designs are available to mitigate flooding problems. His neighborhood will be affected by high-speed rail (HSR) coming through. CHSRA plans may force yet another design change for this bridge. It is a bad use of taxpayer dollars to go to bid and construction of a $20 million bridge that will be obsolete within 10 years.

Jean Dresden, Coordinator, San Jose Parks Advocates, asked the JPB to withdraw the RFB for the Los Gatos Creek Bridge. JPB staff’s last-minute changes to the bridge design have created unresolved problems with the city of San Jose’s trail planned for over two decades. JPB staff is demanding the city of San Jose remove a retaining wall in order to construct another retaining wall, which will cost the city of San Jose over $1 million. JPB staff has underestimated the impact of flooding on this trail. The trail is estimated to be unusable for 40 days and 14 weeks a year because of the results of flooding and debris. She asked the JPB to coordinate with the city of San Jose and CHSRA.

Deb Davis, San Jose, said she is concerned about the Los Gatos Creek Bridge Replacement Project. The need for a replacement bridge is clear and compelling. The need for close coordination for this project with the city of San Jose and the CHSRA is also clear and compelling. The city of San Jose has been working on the trail for over 30 years. As it is currently designed, the new bridge will negatively impact the trail usability during the winter months. It may also impact the nearby residents flood insurance rates. The numerous design changes and lack of coordination have already cost San Jose over $1 million. She asked the project be better coordinated.

Vaughn Wolfe, Pleasanton, said people should not judge what the future will be like based on what things are like now. If people hadn’t spent 90 percent of all transportation money on ensuring profits for oil companies and ensuring jobs for political attendees in the last 65 years, HSR would probably already be here with 110 mile-per-hour trains from Stockton and Sacramento across the Caltrain right of way, and all the complaints the JPB is hearing now would have been taken care of.

Jeff Carter, Millbrae, said yesterday there was a collision between Train 269 and a vehicle at Whipple Avenue in Redwood City. Caltrain should explore the possibility of grade crossing enforcement similar to red light cameras. It is proven that red light cameras help to reduce accidents and can trace the offenders. This would allow courts to pursue offenders that stop on the tracks.

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said there were two trespasser incidents and one stolen car on the tracks last month, and the tracks were shut down in each case. There were no injuries and no property damage and no one was put in harm’s way. There were two train failures early this month and the vehicle strike last night resulted in severe network
disruptions even though property damage was minimal and there were no injuries. There were 1,050 passengers and 80 bicycles on that train.

Andy Chow, Redwood City, said BART has introduced an off-the-shelf diesel railcar. There is no one train that fits all the regions in the Bay Area. What matters is that the experience is like there is a single system. Other regional systems have different trains for different tracks but it is still a single rail system with one ticket. Transfers from BART to Caltrain should feel the same as a transfer from one BART train to another BART train.

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

a) Approval of Minutes of June 2, 2016  
b) Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenses for May 2016  
c) Rejection of All Bids Received for the Provision of California Air Resources Board Ultra Low-Sulfur Diesel Fuel and Fueling Services  
d) Award of Contract to Carl Warren & Company for Public Liability Claims Administration Services for an Estimated Aggregate Cost of $251,000 for a Five-Year Term

**Public Comment**

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said in 2009 staff discarded the lowest fuel bid for using the wrong Oil Price Information Service rates and awarded a two-year contract with three one-year extensions to Pinnacle Petroleum. In November 2014, staff asked the Board to extend the contract for nine months so they could prepare another invitation for bids. Nothing happened. Nearly two years later, staff has requested to reject bids for the same technicality as in 2009 and is proposing to continue with Pinnacle for another six months. He said he would like to understand why staff is putting what has ballooned to a $90 million contract on consent while wasting time on other items that should be on consent.

Motion/Second: Tissier/Gee  
Ayes: Gee, Gullbault, Peralez, Ramos, Tissier, Cisneros  
Absent: Cohen, Yeager, Woodward

**CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT**

Chair Cisneros said appointments to the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) have been delayed due to scheduling conflicts. The Staff Coordinating Council will work with their respective county Board representatives to make appointments in the next few months. Incumbents have been asked to remain on the CAC until appointments are made.

**REPORT OF THE CAC**

Chris Cobey, Chair, CAC, said:

- At the June meeting the CAC received presentations on:  
  - Passenger counts  
  - Customer Experience Survey  
  - Bicycle Parking Management Plan and expressed concerns about bicycle thefts, storage and parking capacity  
- The July meeting is canceled. The August meeting will focus on incident management and recovery.
One member from San Mateo County and one member from Santa Clara County have resigned.

**REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR**

Jim Hartnett, Executive Director, said:
- Chuck Harvey, Deputy CEO, is retiring. He has served the JPB for many years.

**Caltrain Modernization (CalMod) Update**
- The Local Policy Makers Group (LPMG) met on June 23.
  - The structure of the LPMG was discussed and the following changes were made: 1) a JPB member will chair the CalMod meetings and the CHSRA meetings; 2) a vice chair will be selected from among the membership in July and will serve as chair in the chair’s absence; and 3) members will be able to vote on items presented.
- Assemblymember Kevin Mullin has amended his bill, Assembly Bill 1889, to facilitate the delivery of Proposition 1A funding to bookend projects, including the PCEP. Caltrain is sponsoring the legislation, which cleared the Senate Transportation and Housing Committee last week. The amendment clarifies the Legislature’s intent that the bookend projects that have been appropriated under Proposition 1A by Senate Bill (SB) 1029 are eligible for the funds.

**AWARD OF CONTRACT TO BALFOUR BEATTY INFRASTRUCTURE, INC. FOR DESIGN-BUILD SERVICES FOR ELECTRIFICATION OF THE RAILROAD BETWEEN SAN JOSE AND SAN FRANCISCO FOR A NOT-TO-EXCEED AMOUNT OF $696,610,558**

**AWARD OF CONTRACT TO STADLER US, INC FOR PROCUREMENT OF ELECTRIC MULTIPLE UNIT (EMU) VEHICLES FOR A NOT-TO-EXCEED AMOUNT OF $550,899,459**

Dave Couch, Project Delivery Director, presented:
- Process (electrification and vehicles)
  - 2014
    - April: Industry Day
    - May: Vehicle request for information (RFP) (six firms)
    - June: Electrification pre-qualification process (six firms)
  - 2015
    - February: electrification RFP issued based on JPB direction
    - January – June: vehicle compatible boarding heights discussion
    - July: vehicle RFP issued based on JPB direction (seats/bikes ratio, dual doors)
    - December: electrification best and final offer (BAFO) issued
  - 2016
    - February: proposals received (three for electrification BAFO, one for vehicles)
    - June: vehicle restroom JPB decision
    - February – June: negotiations
- Contracts
  - Electrification infrastructure
    - Best value proposer: Balfour Beatty
    - Highest qualified proposer and lowest price
    - Will comply with Project Labor Agreement
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Vehicle (electric multiple unit)
  - Single proposer: Stadler
  - Will comply with Buy America
Throughout procurement process partner participation: Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, San Mateo County Transportation Authority, San Francisco County Transportation Authority, the city and county of San Francisco, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, CHSRA

- Authorize award (limited notice to proceed)
- Balfour Beatty (electrification)
  - Contract value $697 million, conditioned on CHSRA adopting funding agreement at August 9 board meeting
  - Limited Notice to Proceed (LNTP) $108 million
    - Activities: design, utility and geotechnical work, and advance critical procedures
  - Full Notice to Proceed (FNTP), conditioned on execution Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA) with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA)
    - Activities: construction
  - Executive Director contingency authority up to 5 percent

- Stadler (vehicles)
  - Contract value $551 million, conditioned on CHSRA adopting funding agreement at August 9 board meeting
  - LNTP $41 million
    - Activities: advance design
  - FNTP conditioned on execution FFGA with FTA
    - Activities: procurement of 96 vehicles
  - Executive Director contingency authority up to 5 percent

Other issues
- Amend Fiscal Year (FY) 2017 Capital Budget
- Maintenance options
  - Electrification and vehicles
  - One year to exercise options
- Additional vehicle options

- Recommended Actions
  - Electrification
    1. Award contract to Balfour Beatty
    2. Authorize LNTP conditioned on CHSRA adopting agreements
    3. Authorize execution of negotiated contracts upon Executive Director determining that the funding and prerequisites are in place
    4. Authorize LNTP to not exceed $108 million
    5. Authorize FNTP conditioned on FFGA with FTA
    6. Authorize Executive Director authority on 5 percent contingency

- Vehicles
  1. Award contract to Stadler
  2. Authorize LNTP conditioned on CHSRA adopting agreements
  3. Authorize execution of negotiated contracts upon Executive Director determining that the funding and prerequisites are in place
  4. Authorize LNTP to not exceed $41 million
  5. Authorize FNTP conditioned on FFGA with FTA
6. Authorize Executive Director authority on 5 percent contingency

Michelle Bouchard, Chief Operating Officer, Rail, said there was a communication that referenced the number of seats in the EMU train sets at 550 seats. That number was used in the original RFP document to provide for an apples-to-apples performance comparison. It was the idea that there would be 550 people onboard and staff wanted competing bidders to provide performance under those circumstances. Staff will work with Stadler to maximize capacity for seats and standees. That capacity needs to be balanced with space requirements for Americans with Disabilities Act passengers, bathrooms, and the 8:1 bike:seat ratio. It is likely that the number of seats in a six-car EMU set will be less than today’s Bombardier or Gallery consist. The true benefit of this project comes from increasing frequency. Caltrain is going from five to six trains per peak hour, and it is anticipated to result in 10 percent greater capacity. The true capacity enhancement of this program lies in the fact that it allows Caltrain to pursue these increases in the implementation of a more efficient service pattern with a higher frequency. The EMU technology will allow Caltrain to get from end to end in 60 minutes and to serve many more stations. This will allow staff to tap into the unused capacity in the service plan today. She said when measuring the true benefit of this program people should look at total system capacity, not just the number of seats on a single consist. This project provides more capacity than there is today and in the future the JPB will be able to extend train lengths without degrading reliability or capacity.

Public Comment

Brian Perkins, District Director for Congresswoman Jackie Speier, said Congresswoman Speier wanted to congratulate the Board for awarding contracts for historic change in the performance of the Caltrain system that will bring a great deal of advancement to the system and the public will appreciate it. He said she wanted to encourage all parties to formally agree to the Seven-Party Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) related to funding the PCEP in time for the construction bids to be awarded before they expire. Congresswoman Speier believes it is possible the construction inflation will damage the finances of the project if the bids were to expire without the contracts being signed. In the worst possible case, cost overruns and an inability to meet the increased cost from local sources might force the relinquishment of hundreds of millions of dollars in Federal grants.

Juan Salazar, Facebook Public Policy, said Facebook supports the PCEP and the actions before the Board today. Caltrain is the backbone of the region’s transportation system. Many Facebook employees rely on Caltrain for their daily commutes. Facebook supports the JPB’s efforts to modernize the system to make sure there is faster and more reliable service and an environmentally and economically sustainable region.

Ben Cohn, Office of Assemblymember Kevin Mullin, said Assemblymember Mullin conveys his support and excitement for the milestones of issuing contracts and entering into agreements with CHSRA. Electrification is an effort to improve the quality of life on the Peninsula. Assemblymember Mullin is thankful and grateful and looks forward to continued work in this effort.
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Mike Brady, Community Coalition on High-Speed Rail, said letters are in the correspondence packet indicating the illegality of the approval of contracts for electrification and EMUs and why the JPB should not be doing it. The JPB should not violate Proposition 1A. The JPB would be violating Streets and Highways Code 2704.08 Section D, which states the JPB may not make financial commitments and get Proposition 1A bond funds unless the JPB first has gone through a second funding plan. There are no plans that the public have heard of to submit a second funding plan. Therefore the JPB cannot make or spend Proposition 1A money. Caltrain is an integral partner in the Statewide HSR system. When the JPB seeks $600 million from Proposition 1A, the JPB admits it is part of the Statewide HSR system and are bound by the provisions of Proposition 1A.

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said staff forgot that the 2012 Capacity Analysis had 948 seats per consist. Staff also forgot that when the second set of doors will be opened, 100 seats per train will be removed. This will leave the trains with 450 seats, less than half of what was available in 2012. Stadler is an excellent company and makes great trains until LTK Engineering starts messing with them. He said these trains cost 70 percent more than the same trains in Europe. He said he asked MTC to investigate how the JPB ended up with single bid when there are manufacturers that could build trains with 50 percent more capacity for half of the cost. With the electrification contract there were qualified teams and competitive bidding, but it is a staggering cost. He asked what specifications made the electrification program so expensive. He asked if Balfour Beatty considered electrification factory trains in their bid.

Ratna Amin, Transportation Policy Director, SPUR, said SPUR supports the award of the electrification project. SPUR is looking forward to discussing how to make Caltrain a frequent, reliable, and convenient service and how it could best function together with HSR.

Shelly Kessler, Executive Secretary-Treasurer, San Mateo County Central Labor Council, said her organization represents 110 unions and 75,000 workers and their families. The PCEP is a transformational project and will move Caltrain from a 150-year-old system to the 21st century. It will better serve the communities and deliver 9,600 new critical jobs. It will also help people get to and from their jobs more efficiently. She encouraged the Board to support the resolution, which takes Caltrain one step closer to a modernized system. This is about vision, leadership, and serving the community.

Mason Fong, Office of Congressman Mike Honda, said Congressman Honda supports Federal funding for the PCEP. He has worked tirelessly to bring funding to the Bay Area region. He is aware of the need for alternative transportation modes, and this project will help to alleviate the issue of traffic and congestion in the region. It will provide an alternative mode of transportation and will bring jobs to the region. He looks forward to seeing the project materialized.

Andrew Berthelsen, Office of Assemblymember Rich Gordon, said Assemblymember Gordon is supportive of this next step towards the rail system that the region needs and deserves. Caltrain is part of the solution for transportation issues, and to Assemblymember Gordon Caltrain is also part of the solution for land use and housing issues. Looking at this project from the benefits to the environment, riders, non-
riders, neighbors, and the agency, Assemblymember Gordon is a strong support of the project.

David Shonbrun, Transportation Solutions Defense and Education Fund, said the two contracts before the Board are reckless proposals. Staff is asking the Board to start down the road to a $2.2 billion project that will become a stranded asset unless funding is secured to complete the entire package. That funding will never arrive. The Legislature approved bond money for the HSR bookends, but that use of funds is prohibited by the bond measure. Without CHSRA funds, this project is a fantasy and this approval ceremony is mere theater. The JPB should ask staff what the fallback plan is in light of the extraordinary risks. If the JPB does not have a solid plan, it runs the risk of being held personally liable for approving these contracts. The staff has recommended actions that fall outside the bounds of responsible financial management of public funds.

Greg Greenway, Board Member, Redwood City/San Mateo County Chamber of Commerce, said he has been tracking and supporting this project for more than a decade. He is thrilled to see it move forward and reach this milestone. The Chamber of Commerce represents 1,000 business members who employ more than 30,000 people. The ability to get those employees to and from work is critical. Now is the time to make this investment. It will be more expensive in the future and the need will be greater. He said he also represents the Peninsula Freight Rail Users Group, a coalition of freight rail shippers on the Peninsula and the two public ports. This group also supports this project and has worked with staff to make sure it is compatible with freight and designed in a way that is forward looking for the movement of people and goods.

Rosanne Foust, President and CEO, San Mateo County Economic Development Association, and Deputy Chair, Redwood City/San Mateo County Chamber of Commerce, thanked the Board, and the staff and the legal team for putting these recommendations before the Board. She encouraged the Board to adopt the recommendations before the Board. This is a historic moment for Caltrain and the future of service on the corridor. She said there are people on both sides of this issue. She asked the Board to not give in to threats and intimidation and the misuse of facts in making this decision. This is a very solid recommendation that the Board can feel good about adopting.

Andy Chow, Bay Rail Alliance, said electrification is something the region needs considering the amount of traffic congestion and the number of passengers Caltrain carries. It should have been done sooner, it should be cheaper, and there shouldn’t be lingering questions about HSR. He said he does not see an alternate path forward. He asked the Board to support this vote. He thanked Mike Scanlon, former JPB Executive Director, and Margaret Okuzumi, former Executive Director of the Bay Rail Alliance.

Jeff Carter, Millbrae, said he supports the project. He is concerned about cost of $5.7 million per car for 96 vehicles. He asked what the cost is for similar cars in other countries. In 1980 the California State Department of Transportation took over management of the train. At that time electrification and the downtown extension would have been much cheaper. He hopes the threats of lawsuits won’t delay the project and increase the cost. It is not possible to get better-than-BART-service if
Caltrain will be limited to six or eight cars per train and six trains per hour. Caltrain needs longer platforms and increased train lengths to increase capacity.

Adina Levin, Friends of Caltrain, said she happy to see this important step in moving forward this long-awaited project. She is eager to use electric service as soon as possible. She urged the Board to take this step today and move the project forward.

Paul Wendt, Belmont, said the Bay Rail Alliance has long been a supporter of electrification and the downtown extension. He is happy the Board is taking this step and he supports it. The Bay Rail Alliance’s top priority has been electrification. He thanked Mr. Scanlon and Ms. Bouchard.

Director Adrienne Tissier thanked everyone who spoke today. She said this is a momentous occasion. It is good to have differing opinions. She said she has been on this Board over 10 years and has been working on this since then. In 2004, the Baby Bullet was a change and not everyone thought it was the right thing to do, but looking back it was absolutely the right thing to do. In 2010 and 2011 during the economic downturn, there were differing opinions about how to proceed and some Board members wanted to cut train service in half, but the Board managed to keep service. Ridership is up over 240 percent, and the revenue stream is up over 360 percent. It took risks and change for those things to happen. Today is another day when it is time to make a change and a shift to increase ridership and revenue and make a smoother rail system. She said she will support the two issues.

Director Jeff Gee said this is a momentous day. There are a number of people who have worked on this for decades. Delaying this does not make it any better or cost any less. The problems with housing, congestion and traffic are the result of saying no decades ago and precluding future from happening. This county said no to BART. This county said no to the mid-bay crossing. This county said no to a lot of things and now it is living results of no today because of the lack of ability to move around the region. He said he is not going to preclude the future from happening. He wants to preserve the opportunity for his kids and grandkids to live around here and move around the area. There is not enough money in the bank today, but he has managed capital improvement programs for over 35 years and rarely has all the money been committed on day one. The government likes to do this in pieces. What the legal team and staff have put together preserves the opportunity to move forward, but does not put the JPB at great risk. He said he is supporting both items.

Director Joël Ramos said he is supportive of this. He appreciates all the efforts he has seen manifested in this proposal to feel good about the direction the JPB is headed. He thanked staff for putting this together. Some big projects in the Bay Area have run high over the estimates such as with the Transbay Terminal and the Bay Bridge. The Central Subway was constructed under budget and on time. BART extensions were on time and under budget. He would like to hear more about oversight and how the JPB will keep from making those types of mistakes and what happened to get the Transbay Terminal and the Bay Bridge to where they are today. He would like to know how staff is going to manage the projects and keep over runs from happening. He would like to start the discussion about the contingency about how to implement electrification. Something will be shut down during construction. It is important to think now about
getting legislation in place to implement mitigation measures to move people around as the system is electrified. Because of the increased capacity, the health that communities will experience from electrified service, the environmental sustainability, the reduced greenhouse gas emissions, new jobs and the new economy, he will support this issue.

Motion/Second: Tissier/Gee
Ayes: Gee, Guilbault, Peralez, Ramos, Tissier, Cisneros
Absent: Cohen, Yeager, Woodward

APPROVAL OF AN AGREEMENT WITH THE CHSRA TO SECURE STATE FUNDING FOR THE PCEP
Seamus Murphy, Chief Communications Officer, presented:

- Background
  - Nine-Party MOU (2012)
    - Established Blended System approach
    - Committed approximately $1.112 billion to PCEP
    - SB 1029 appropriated $600 million from Proposition 1A
    - Led to 2013 JPB/CHSRA agreement
  - Seven-Party Supplemental MOU (2016)
    - Commits additional $210 million to PCEP
    - $113 million from CHSRA
  - FTA Core Capacity Full Funding Grant Agreement (pending)
    - Secures $647 million
    - Triggers FNTP

- Purpose
  - Establish plan to obtain $600 million from Proposition 1A
  - Affirm commitment of additional $113 million
  - Commits alternative funding pending Proposition 1A availability
  - Allows the execution of PCEP contracts

- Scope
  - Limited to PCEP
  - Reaffirms Blended System
  - Shared use terms will be covered in future agreements
  - Reaffirms CHSRA responsibility for Blended System

- Other details
  - FY2017 cash flow invoicing effective July 1, 2016
  - Project management and funding agreement (SB 1029) will establish invoicing and accounting details
  - CHSRA concurrence for FNTP if Core Capacity grant is less than requested
  - JPB conditionally grants future operating rights to CHSRA

Public Comment
Jeff Carter, Millbrae, said he supports the funding agreement. Electrification is the best answer. He said he has concerns that the Blended System might limit capacity by having two tracks through much of the corridor. Caltrain and CHSRA should be looking at four tracks as much as possible within the constraints of the right of way.

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said if Caltrain is electrified now, it will be impossible for CHSRA to fulfill the promises of Proposition 1A, which are Transbay, 12 trains per hour, and
San Jose to San Francisco in 30 minutes. In the United Kingdom, the groundwork gets done first, then they electrify.

Motion/Second: Gee/Guilbault
Ayes: Gee, Guilbault, Peralez, Ramos, Tissier, Cisneros
Absent: Cohen, Yeager, Woodward

AUTHORIZE EXECUTION AND SUBMISSION OF AN ALLOCATION REQUEST FOR $39.4 MILLION IN REGIONAL MEASURE 1 AND REGIONAL MEASURE 2 FUNDS WITH THE MTC FOR THE PCEP

Peter Skinner, Manager, Grants and Fund Programming, said MTC has already approved allocation of funds. $11 million were included as part of the original Nine-Party Funding MOU, and $28.4 million is included in the Seven-Party Supplemental MOU. Funds will be used for electrification infrastructure and EMU procurements.

Motion/Second: Tissier/Gee
Ayes: Gee, Guilbault, Peralez, Ramos, Tissier, Cisneros
Absent: Cohen, Yeager, Woodward

RATIFICATION OF PAYMENT OF AN ADVANCED DEPOSIT TO RAIL TRANSPORTATION SERVICES CORPORATION IN THE AMOUNT OF $162,000 TO SECURE THE ABILITY TO LEASE EIGHT F 40 LOCOMOTIVES

Ms. Bouchard said the aging locomotive fleet will need to be used for several more years. As lease opportunities are rare staff put down a down payment as earnest money for a fleet of locomotives pending a thorough inspection. The inspection will happen later this month.

Motion/Second: Guilbault/Tissier
Ayes: Gee, Guilbault, Peralez, Ramos, Tissier, Cisneros
Absent: Cohen, Yeager, Woodward

KEY CALTRAIN PERFORMANCE STATISTICS MAY 2016

Ms. Bouchard said:
- Key Caltrain Performance Statistics May 2016 compared to May 2015.
  - Average weekday ridership was 62,391, a 2.2 percent increase.
  - Year-to-date total ridership was 17,498,919, a 3.9 percent increase.
  - On-time performance (OTP) was 93.6 percent, a 4.5 percent decrease.
  - Total Farebox Revenue was $8,018,673, an increase of 8.3 percent.

- Service is very popular possibly as a result of some of the enhanced OTP from May.

- Another six-car Metrolink train set is ready to be implemented into the timetable on July 25, which will replace an existing five-car set. This allows staff to take the five vehicles out of service and perform state of good repair work on them.

ADOPT THE REVISED DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS ENTERPRISE (DBE) PROGRAM

John Barker, Manager, Civil Rights Programs, said staff recommends revisions to the current DBE program. Changes include updating the organizational chart, and the implementation of a new online monitoring and reporting system that will help streamline the staff’s ability to report out on DBE utilization.
Motion/Second: Tissier/Gee
Ayes: Gee, Guilbault, Peralez, Ramos, Tissier, Cisneros
Absent: Cohen, Yeager, Woodward

AUTHORIZE AN INCREASE IN EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY BY $2 MILLION TO REIMBURSE PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC (PG&E) FOR DESIGN AND OVERSIGHT SERVICES IN SUPPORT OF THE PCEP

Mr. Couch said this is to complete the scoping, go through the engineering process, take the design through the 100 percent design. With this comes reimbursable project management costs. This is the next step in the process to provide power for electrification.

Public Comment
Jessica Albietz, Program Manager, PG&E, thanked Caltrain staff for coordinating with her over the last few months. This money will be for the project management work and will allow PG&E to get to the final scoping.

Motion/Second: Gee/Tissier
Ayes: Gee, Guilbault, Peralez, Ramos, Tissier, Cisneros
Absent: Cohen, Yeager, Woodward

AUTHORIZE CONSENSUAL TERMINATION OF AGREEMENTS RELATING TO LEVERAGED LEASE TRANSACTIONS

Eli Kay, Chief Financial Officer, said the staff report explains the purpose of the transaction.

Motion/Second: Tissier/Guilbault
Ayes: Gee, Guilbault, Peralez, Ramos, Tissier, Cisneros
Absent: Cohen, Yeager, Woodward

25TH AVENUE GRADE SEPARATION UPDATE

Liria Larano, Director, Engineering and Construction, presented:

- Context
  - City of San Mateo’s desire for a grade separation at 25th Avenue is for safety improvements, development in the area, improved traffic circulation, and coordination with the electrification schedule

- Scope
  - Construct grade separation at 25th avenue
  - Elevate rail between Hillsdale Boulevard and Highway 92
  - Relocate Hillsdale Station and provide station access and parking
  - Construct new east-west connections at 28th and 31st avenues

- Renderings of the separation were shown

- Schedule
  - January 2015 – summary 2016: environmental work
  - January 2016 – fall 2016: design and right of way
  - Fall 2016 – spring 2017: bid and award
  - Summer 2017 – spring 2020: construction

- Coordination with electrification
Electrification construction to start spring 2017  
Overhead contact system installation is expected to be complete by fall 2018  
Construction of elevated track structure needs to be complete before fall 2018

- Cost estimate/funding plan
  - Total project is $180 million  
  - Environmental, design, and right of way acquisition have been funded  
  - Construction and contingency funding has been proposed and is being secured from Measure A, San Mateo, State Section 190, and CHSRA

- Next steps
  - Fall 2016: complete final design, and procure required property and temporary construction easements  
  - Spring 2017: award construction contract

Public Comment
Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said 25th Avenue does not need grade separating. This project is to connect Hillsdale Shopping Center to Bay Meadows. This is a complete waste of $180 million. An island platform with two tracks will not help add capacity. CHSRA needs four tracks at this station. He wrote to MTC to ask them to investigate if the San Mateo County Transit District is fit for the administration of Caltrain.

Jeff Carter, Millbrae, said the Hillsdale station will be moved north. The issue of Hillsdale now is the bus connections to SamTrans and Caltrain are horrible. Customers have to walk up Hillsdale Boulevard to catch buses and navigate signals and cross El Camino Real and other streets. He said he is wondering if this project will make bus connections any better at Hillsdale. This project could make this station closer to Hayward Park, which was recently moved south.

COMMUNICATIONS-BASED OVERLAY SIGNAL SYSTEM (CBOSS)/POSITIVE TRAIN CONTROL PROJECT UPDATE
Gigi Harrington, Deputy CEO/Chief Administrative Officer, said the presentation is available for everyone to review and she is available to answer questions.

Public Comment
Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said staff told the public the trains will have fewer seats but after electrification there will be an extra train. He said when staff started the CBOSS project they promised the public there would be six trains because of closer headways. He asked why the CBOSS project is not delivering and why customers have to wait for electrification to get a sixth train.

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE
Casey Fromson, Manager, Government Affairs, provided the following update:

State
Governor Brown signed the State budget but it was absent transportation issues, which will be taken care of as part of budget trailer bills.

Federal
Appropriations are not moving swiftly so it appears there will be a Continuing Resolution. Legislative delegates will continue efforts to secure the Federal Core Capacity appropriations.

**CORRESPONDENCE**
No discussion.

**BOARD MEMBER REQUESTS**
None

**DATE/TIME/PLACE OF NEXT REGULAR MEETING**
The next meeting will be Thursday, August 4, 2016, 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**
Joan Cassman, Legal Counsel, said only items c and d listed on the agenda will be discussed in closed session today.

Recessed to closed session at 11:48 a.m.

**Closed Session: Conference with Real Property Negotiators Joan L. Cassman, General Counsel, Elizabeth Scanlon, Manager, Caltrain Planning, pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.8: Under negotiation: Price and terms of contract.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Location</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>APN</th>
<th>JPB Parcel #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>150 Charter Street, Redwood City, CA 94063</td>
<td>Ideal Charter Properties, LLC</td>
<td>054-112-160</td>
<td>JPB-SM2-0134-1A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2485 El Camino Real, Redwood City, CA 94063</td>
<td>Dayton Hudson Corp/Target Corp</td>
<td>054-112-230</td>
<td>JPB-SM2-0135-1A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2545 El Camino Real, Redwood City, CA 94061</td>
<td>Regency Centers</td>
<td>054-112-190</td>
<td>JPB-SM2-0136-1A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201 and 205 Dumbarton Avenue, Redwood City, CA 94063</td>
<td>Caballero Family Trust</td>
<td>054-201-490</td>
<td>JPB-SM2-0308-1A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 Dumbarton Avenue, Redwood City, CA 94063</td>
<td>Redwood Apartments</td>
<td>054-201-560</td>
<td>JPB-SM2-0310-1A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside Avenue, Redwood City, CA 94063</td>
<td>Del Rio Trust</td>
<td>054-201-550</td>
<td>JPB-SM2-0311-1A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Closed Session: Conference with Real Property Negotiators Joan L. Cassman, General Counsel, Brian W. Fitzpatrick, Manager, Real Estate and Property Development, and Gary Cardona, Senior Real Estate Officer, pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.8: Under negotiation: Price and terms of contract.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Location</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>APN</th>
<th>JPB Parcel #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101 E. 25th Avenue, San Mateo, CA 94403</td>
<td>Bay Meadows Real Estate, LLC</td>
<td>039-081-020</td>
<td>JPB-SM-0033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2825 S. El Camino Real, San Mateo, CA 94403</td>
<td>Nathaniel Schmelzer Trust</td>
<td>039-351-110</td>
<td>JPB-SM-0043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2833 S. El Camino Real, San Mateo, CA 94403</td>
<td>UM-RO Enterprises, Inc.</td>
<td>039-351-120</td>
<td>JPB-SM-0044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2837 S. El Camino Real, San Mateo, CA 94403</td>
<td>Donoian Trust</td>
<td>039-351-130 (SBE 7775-41-1)</td>
<td>JPB-SM-0045 JPB-SM-0046</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reconvened to open session at 12:08 p.m.

Ms. Cassman said the Board has met on the two closed session real property negotiations. The board received reports and appropriate authorization was given. There is no action to report.

Adjourned at 12:09 p.m.
PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD
STAFF REPORT

TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
            Executive Director

FROM: Eli Kay
            Chief Financial Officer

SUBJECT: INFORMATION ON STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENSES FOR THE PERIOD ENDING JUNE 30, 2016

The Finance Division engages in many activities following the end of the June 30 fiscal year both to close out the old fiscal year and set up the new fiscal year. The demands of these activities require a longer time to produce a complete Statement of Revenues and Expenses than allowed by the normal board meeting cycle. The auditors, Vavrinek, Trine, Day & Co., expect to finish the audit in late October. Consequently, staff will present a Statement of Revenues and Expenses for June at the November 3 meeting of the Board of Directors. We expect to have the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report finalized by December 2016.

Prepared by: Sheila Tioyao, Manager, General Ledger 650.508.7752
TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
Executive Director

FROM: Gigi Harrington
Deputy CEO/Chief Administrative Officer

SUBJECT: APPROVAL AND RATIFICATION OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2017 INSURANCE PROGRAM

ACTION
Staff Coordinating Council recommends the Board approve and ratify the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) insurance program for Fiscal Year (FY) 2017 at a total premium cost not to exceed $4,465,147, inclusive of the following:

- Continue the current $1 million self-insured retention on the liability program;
- Purchase $199 million of coverage for Railroad Liability, Commercial General Liability and Excess Automobile Liability, including terrorism coverage, at an annual premium of $3,397,547;
- Purchase property insurance with limits of $400 million at an annual premium of $803,695 for real and personal property, to include Centralized Equipment Maintenance and Operations Facility (CEMOF), stations, tunnels, bridges, culverts, signals, railroad equipment, and rolling stock. This insurance also continues to provide coverage against terrorism, as well as boiler and machinery perils for real property and CEMOF sufficient to meet the State of California inspection requirements;
- Purchase a $15 million Public Officials Liability policy at an annual premium of $118,869;
- Purchase an annual Special Events and Emergency Drill Liability policy with a $2 million limit for a premium of $27,986; and
- Purchase Railroad Protective Liability coverage at an annual premium of $44,941.

SIGNIFICANCE
Despite a 6 percent increase in ridership and revenues, some industry-wide hardening of certain liability insurance lines, and higher insurance limits on one policy, the JPB’s overall insurance program has increased only 3.2 percent. The JPB was able to maintain a program with a $1 million self-insured retention, which greatly reduces out-of-pocket payments on large claims. The program is competitive and staff recommends maintaining the current program structure.
Property catastrophes nationwide were infrequent this past year, leading to a flat to softening property insurance market, particularly for good accounts such as the JPB. The JPB’s property values increased 14 percent, resulting in higher premiums. JPB property losses remained below 25 percent, resulting in a 5 percent reduction in the policy rate due to the terms of a two-year program obtained last year. The JPB added a two-year extension to its existing property insurance program and, as an incentive, underwriters agreed to reduce the rate by 5 percent next year, assuming losses stay below 25 percent.

Limits on the JPB’s Public Officials liability program were increased from $10 million to $15 million, and the deductible of $75,000 remained the same. Premiums increased accordingly with the increase of the limit. The JPB was able to renew an annual Special Events liability policy with a limit of $2 million. This coverage includes a $25,000 self-insured retention and protects the JPB during what are sometimes higher hazard operations for its annual special train events and Emergency Training exercises. The JPB renewed its Pollution Liability program this year for a new two-year term at a slight reduction in the premium from FY2015. The premium is paid up front for a two-year term.

Below is an overview of the JPB’s FY2016 and FY2017 premiums:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Premium Element</th>
<th>FY2016</th>
<th>FY2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liability: Railroad, Commercial General, Excess Automobile</td>
<td>$3,427,592</td>
<td>$3,397,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liability: Environmental (no premium was included for FY2016 and no premium will be required for FY2018), Public Officials, Special Events, Emergency Drill Liability, and Railroad Protective Liability</td>
<td>$  154,740</td>
<td>$ 263,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>$  743,666</td>
<td>$  803,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,325,997</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,465,147</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BUDGET IMPACT**
Estimated funds to underwrite most of the cost of the recommended program are included in the FY2017 Operating Budget. A mid-year budget adjustment may be needed to cover the remainder.

**BACKGROUND**
The JPB’s liability limits remain at $200 million with an additional $100 million provided by Transit America Services, Inc. for a total of $300 million in FY2017. This renewal program allows the JPB to maintain the $1 million self-insured retention. Underwriters are continuing to focus on risk selection, adjusting pricing to reflect increased exposures and filed claims. The major driver of the higher premium is the increase in ridership over the past four years.

Prepared by: Marshall Rush, Claims Administrator

650.508.7742
RESOLUTION NO. 2016 –

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

* * *

APPROVING AND RATIFYING THE INSURANCE PROGRAM FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017

WHEREAS, the Executive Director of the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) has approved an insurance program for Fiscal Year (FY) 2017 with premiums totaling $4,465,147, which program was presented to the Staff Coordinating Council (SCC); and

WHEREAS, in conjunction with the expiration of the JPB’s existing insurance program on June 30, 2016, JPB staff renewed its insurance program for FY2017 based on the plan approved by the Executive Director, with the following significant elements:

1. A self-insured retention in the amount to $1 million;

2. Railroad Liability, Commercial General Liability and Excess Automobile Liability policies, including Terrorism coverage, with a total limit of $199 million, in excess of the $1 million self-insured retention, at an annual premium of $3,397,547;

3. Property insurance, including Special Risk property policies, at an annual premium of $803,695 with limits of $400 million to cover real and personal property, including stations, the Centralized Equipment Maintenance and Operations Facility, tunnels, bridges, culverts, signals, railroad equipment, and rolling stock, as well as Boiler and Machinery insurance sufficient to meet the State of California inspection requirements;

4. Public Officials Liability coverage with $15 million limits at an annual premium of $118,869;
5. Annual Special Events and Emergency Drill liability with a $2 million limit at a
   premium of $27,986; and
6. Railroad Protective Liability coverage with an annual premium of $44,941;
   and

WHEREAS, SCC recommends the Board of Directors approve and ratify the
   renewal of the JPB’s insurance program for FY2017, as delineated above.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board
   hereby approves and ratifies the renewal of the JPB’s insurance program for FY2017,
   including the types of coverage, limits and premiums recited above.

Regularly passed and adopted this 4th day of August, 2016 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

__________________________________________
Chair, Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board

ATTEST:

__________________________________________
JPB Secretary
Funding Partners

FTA Core Capacity
FTA Section 5307/5337 (Environmental / Pre Development only)
FTA Section 5307/5337 (EMU only)
Prop 1B (Public Transportation Modernization & Improvement Account)
Caltrain Low Carbon Transit Operations Cap and Trade
Prop 1A
High Speed Rail Cap and Trade
Carl Moyer Fund
RM2
RM1
Bridge Tolls
SFCTA
San Mateo (SMCTA) Contribution
SMCTA Measure A
VTA Measure A
Santa Clara (VTA) Contribution
San Francisco Contribution
Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project
4th Quarter FY 2016 Progress Report
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1.0 PREFACE

Over the last decade, Caltrain has experienced a substantial increase in ridership and anticipates further increases in ridership demand as the San Francisco Bay Area’s population grows. The Caltrain Modernization (CalMod) Program, scheduled to be implemented by 2020, will electrify and upgrade the performance, operating efficiency, capacity, safety, and reliability of Caltrain’s commuter rail service.

The Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project (PCEP) is a key component of the CalMod Program and consists of converting Caltrain from diesel-hauled to Electric Multiple Unit (EMU) trains for service between San Francisco Station (at the intersection of Fourth and King Streets in San Francisco) and Tamien Station in San Jose. The project will entail the installation of new electrical infrastructure and the purchase of electrified vehicles. Caltrain will continue Gilroy service and support existing tenants.

An electrified Caltrain will better address Peninsula commuters’ vision of an environmentally friendly, fast, reliable service. Electrification will modernize Caltrain and make it possible to increase service while offering several advantages in comparison with existing diesel power use, including:

**Improved Train Performance, Increased Ridership Capacity and Increased Service:** Electrified trains can accelerate and decelerate more quickly than diesel-powered trains, allowing Caltrain to run more efficiently. In addition, because of their performance advantages, electrified trains will enable more frequent and/or faster train service to more riders.

**Increased Revenue and Reduced Fuel Cost:** An electrified Caltrain will increase ridership and fare revenues while decreasing fuel costs.

**Reduced Engine Noise Emanating from Trains:** Noise from electrified train engines is measurably less than noise from diesel train engines. Train horns will continue to be required at grade crossings, adhering to current safety regulations.

**Improved Regional Air Quality and Reduced Greenhouse Gas Emissions:** Electrified trains will produce substantially less corridor air pollution compared with diesel trains, even when the indirect emissions from electrical power generation are included. Increased ridership will reduce automobile usage, resulting in additional air quality benefits. In addition, the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions is not only good for our regional air quality, but will also help meet the State’s emission reduction goals.

An electrified Caltrain system would set the stage for an enhanced, modern commuter rail service and for future blended California High-Speed Rail (CHSR) service. While this project will not include or study all infrastructure necessary to implement high-speed rail service on the corridor (such as CHSR maintenance facilities, station improvements, or passing tracks), the electrical infrastructure (such as overhead wire systems) will be compatible with later blended service.
2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

During the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2016, the PCEP team continued to progress the project. As planned in the procurement process for the Electrification contract, an apparent best value proposer was selected and negotiations were initiated in April. The project team worked extensively to negotiate technical and commercial sections with the apparent best value proposer. The negotiations were successfully completed at the end of June. Staff will recommend that the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) award the Electrification contract to Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. at the JPB Board meeting on July 7, 2016.

The procurement process also continued for the Electric Multiple Units (EMU) manufacturer. Staff began negotiations in late-April with Stadler US, Inc. Negotiation discussions focused on technical exceptions and contractual / legal exceptions. The project team issued a letter to Stadler on May 20, 2016 to request a proposal in response to negotiations. Stadler submitted a revised proposal on June 17, 2016 after which negotiations were successfully completed. Staff will recommend that the JPB award the EMU Vehicle contract to Stadler US, Inc. at the JPB Board meeting on July 7, 2016.

The Tunnel Modification project completed the preliminary design phase and will enter into final design in Fiscal Year 2017.

The Central Equipment and Maintenance Operations Facility (CEMOF) modifications design effort is on hold at this time. The preliminary design effort has proceeded to a stage where detailed information from the EMU manufacturer is required to finalize the design. It is anticipated that the modification design efforts will resume in August.

The PCEP team is in the process of evaluating the Master Program Schedule (MPS) in conjunction with responses to the Electrification and EMU RFPs. The team anticipates issuing a revised baseline schedule in the next quarter.

The PCEP team meets monthly with members of the Peninsula Corridor Working Group (PCWG), which is comprised of staff from the agencies that signed the 2012 9-Party Funding MOU. In April members of the PCWG agreed to the 7-Party Regional Funding Supplement. Between May and June the JPB, San Mateo County Transportation Authority (SMCTA), Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA) voted unanimously to approve the 7-Party Regional Funding Supplement. The San Francisco Board of Supervisors and California High-Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) are expected to vote on the 7-Party Regional Funding Supplement in July and August.

In addition the team continues to work towards receipt of a Core Capacity Grant from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). The team has had positive interactions with the FTA and meets with the FTA’s appointed Project Management Oversight Contractor (PMOC) on a monthly basis. The team continues to work with the funding partners to secure commitments to fund the entire program.
Board Actions

There were no PCEP Board items in April.

On May 5, 2016 the JPB Board received the 6th Quarterly Update on the PCEP. The quarterly update highlights PCEP activities on the major contracts, funding updates, and key policy issues regarding the new electric trains.

Also at the May meeting the JPB Board approved two items related to the PCEP:

- Adopted an agreement that invests an additional $211 million in the Caltrain Modernization Program. The 7-Party Regional Funding Supplement to the 2012 9-Party MOU increases funding commitments from Caltrain’s state and local partners, including an additional $113 million commitment from the (CHSRA).

- Adopted granting the Executive Director authority to execute a Comprehensive Agreement with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) for the PCEP. The Comprehensive Agreement memorializes the parties’ consultation and cooperation, designates their respective rights and obligations, and ensures cooperation between the JPB and Caltrans in connection with the design and construction of the PCEP.

A copy of the May board packet can be found here:

At the June 2, 2016 meeting, the JPB Board authorized finalization of contract negotiations for the procurement of EMUs with one restroom for each bi-level trainset. A copy of the June board packet can be found here:
3.0 ELECTRIFICATION

The PCEP team continued to work through the procurement steps as a result of the February 2016 responses to the BAFO Electrification RFP. Staff began negotiations with the shortlisted best value proposer in April 2016. The team worked extensively to negotiate technical and commercial sections with the apparent best value proposer. Staff successfully completed negotiations at the end of June. The team issued a staff report and resolution to recommend award of the Electrification contract to Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. at the July 2016 Board meeting. After the award of the contract a Limited Notice to Proceed (LNTP) is anticipated to be issued to the contractor. The LNTP will allow the contractor to begin design as well as limited procurement of long lead material. Construction effort is not included within the scope of the LNTP.

A Master Agreement was signed and executed with Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) in April 2016 for continued coordination and support for the implementation of electrification. The PCEP team continues coordination with PG&E on a Power Quality study to finalize scope and necessary infrastructure to support Caltrain loads required for electrification. PG&E facilities studies are scheduled to be completed by July 2016 and design of necessary infrastructures will continue through the remainder of 2016.

The PCEP team continued to provide technical support for ongoing coordination efforts with third party jurisdictions such as California Public Utility Commission (CPUC) as well as the local cities and counties.

Tunnel Modification

Tunnel modifications will be required on the four tunnels located in San Francisco. This effort is required to accommodate the required clearance for the overhead catenary system (OCS) to support electrification of the corridor. Work was completed on the preliminary design for the Tunnel Modification including 65% design plans and specification, construction schedule, construction cost estimate and overall constructability of the project. Comments for preliminary cost estimate and construction schedules were reviewed by staff and will be incorporated in the next technical deliverables. The PCEP team will start final design for the Tunnel Modifications in July 2016 with a target completion of the end of 2016.

Central Equipment Maintenance and Operations Facility Modifications for EMUs

The CEMOF Modifications project will provide safe work areas for performing maintenance on the new EMUs. The schematic design for CEMOF modifications is complete. Preliminary design efforts remain on hold until the Stadler vehicle design is available. Selection of a car body is necessary to complete design of maintenance platforms.
4.0 ELECTRIC MULTIPLE UNITS

Negotiations began with Stadler in San Mateo the week of May 2 – 6, 2016. Discussions focused on technical exceptions, contractual and legal exceptions. The PCEP team issued a letter to Stadler on May 20, 2016 to request a proposal in response to negotiations. Stadler submitted a revised proposal on June 17, 2016 after which negotiations were successfully completed in late June. The team issued a staff report and resolution to recommend award of the EMU contract to Stadler US, Inc. in July 2016. Discussion regarding issuance of a Limited Notice to Proceed (LNTP) is underway. The LNTP will allow Stadler to prepare and submit milestone deliverables and begin their design efforts sooner rather than waiting for a Full NTP.

The Buy America Pre-Award Audit and Certification was conducted on May 25 – 27, 2016 at Stadler’s Manufacturing and Assembly Facility in Salt Lake City, UT. A report was issued on June 24, 2016. Based on the data reviewed during the audit, the Audit Team is satisfied that the rail vehicles to be purchased meet the requirements of Section 165(b)(3) of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982, as amended, and as required under the Terms and Conditions of the proposed contract between Stadler and Caltrain.

The JPB reviewed the Maintenance Services Agreement approach in which Stadler would provide the maintenance work for the existing Caltrain diesel fleet in addition to the new EMUs under their named subcontractor. A method will need to be determined with Rail Operations and Maintenance staff to compare the Stadler proposal to the current contract and make sure the decision to exercise the option is made on an equal footing basis.

EMU and overall systems integration efforts continued. The predominant method of controlling the interfaces will be to create an interface control document (ICD) to define the interfaces and allow the parties to agree to the specific details as they evolve. A System Interface Matrix is reviewed at regularly scheduled meetings and updated as items are closed or added. Correspondence will be exchanged to advance the level of detail in each ICD. System integration efforts involve coordinating the following disciplines (as well as others not mentioned here): EMU with wayside, electrification, CEMOF, testing/commissioning site, CBOSS PTC, CHSRA, EMU Testing/Commissioning Site and Track time availability, T/C site access, and schedule coordination with OCS project. A list of EMU tests that can be performed on the Santa Clara Drill Track as well as those that will need to be performed on the Main Line is being finalized.
5.0 **SAFETY**

The PCEP Safety team continues to develop and update the safety and security management processes as committed to within the scope of the project Safety and Security Management Plan (SSMP). The following highlights several areas of focus of the Safety team during the last quarter:

- The project Hazard Management Plan was finalized and approved by the JPB Safety and Security Director. The project team continues to work with the IndustrySafe Hazard Log application that will be utilized throughout the project life cycle as a tool to support the project hazard management program.

- As a means of continuous improvement, an internal audit of the SSMP was performed resulting in several suggestions that were incorporated within the document. In addition the PMOC also provided comments on the content of the SSMP following its detailed review of the document. These comments are in the process of being addressed within the next revision of the document.

- The project safety team is working closely with the JPB Safety and Security Office, Rail Operations, and Engineering and Construction to review and update the Caltrain Roadway Worker Protection (RWP) program as a means to ensure the ongoing priority to consistently support the highest level of on-track safety standards continues to be achieved.

- PCEP Safety staff continues to work closely with the JPB Safety and Security, Rail Operations, and Engineering and Construction in coordinating project requirements.
6.0 QUALITY

Quality Management continues to coordinate with the PCEP team via training, audits and technical support.

Activity This Quarter

- Continued to provide on-going quality-related assistance to the PCEP team
- Performed an audit of LTK (Systems Integration) on April 27, 2016. The audit resulted in no findings.
- Cost Estimating NCR 004 was closed on April 28, 2016. Corrective actions are in place.
- Investigating / lining up Independent Labs for Quality Assurance (QA) Oversight (Electrification / EMU)
- Reviewed the following Quality Control (QC) documents
  - PCEP Cost Estimate Rev 4
  - RFP ICE to Baseline – Rev 2 Report
  - DRAFT Schedule Basis for C14.02 Baseline Schedule
  - PHA / TVA comment incorporation & revision
- Performed an audit of GF Tunnel Design on May 4, 2016. The audit resulted in no findings.
- Developed and implemented a Quality Manager Transition Plan due to the resignation of the PCEP Quality Manager
- Performed an audit of B&G Transportation on June 7, 2016. The audit resulted in no findings.
- Performed an audit of LR Transit on June 8, 2016. The audit resulted in no findings.

The Table below provides details on the status of audits performed through the reporting period.

Table 6-1 Quality Assurance Audit Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Assurance Activity</th>
<th>This Reporting Period</th>
<th>Total to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal Audits Conducted</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Conformances Open</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Conformances Issued</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Conformances Closed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Activity Next Quarter

- Contribute to the preparation of the final submittal of FTA documents.
- Conduct visit to project office to coordinate and meet with Director of Program Management.
- No audits will be conducted in July. The AECOM Management audit scheduled for August may be pushed to September to allow for the replacement Quality Manager (QM) to participate, depending on the QM’s start date. In September an audit of Scheduling will be conducted. A compliance audit of AECOM Document Control is anticipated 60 - 90 days following implementation of the Document Control System on the Aconex platform.
- Continue implementation of Quality Manager Transition Plan until such time as replacement Quality Manager joins the project.
7.0 SCHEDULE

The Master Program Schedule (MPS) was updated in April 2016 to incorporate schedules prepared by the apparent best value Electrification proposer and selected EMU proposer. This update formed the basis of a revised baseline schedule.

The new schedule baseline contains two Revenue Service Dates (RSD). The first RSD represents a “soft opening” with six EMU trainsets providing revenue operations. This date is forecasted as December 2020. The second RSD represents “full service” with all 16 EMU trainsets providing revenue operations. This date without contingency is forecast as July 2021. With the addition of six months of contingency to account for potential risk to the project the Full Service RSD is anticipated as December 2021.

A summary of the overall schedule status for the PCEP is provided in Table 7-1.

Table 7-1 Schedule Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MILESTONES</th>
<th>PROGRAM PLAN</th>
<th>LAST QUARTER*</th>
<th>THIS QUARTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electrification Contract NTP</td>
<td>08/01/2016</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>08/01/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMU Contract NTP</td>
<td>08/01/2016</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>08/01/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start of Electrification Construction</td>
<td>03/20/2017</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>03/20/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start Pre-Revenue Operations</td>
<td>09/08/2020</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>09/08/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSD Soft Opening (w/ Risk Contingency)</td>
<td>12/31/2020</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>12/31/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSD Full Service (w/o Risk Contingency)</td>
<td>07/12/2021</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>07/12/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSD Full Service (w/ Risk Contingency)</td>
<td>12/30/2021</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>12/30/2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The MPS was under reevaluation last quarter, thus the post contract award schedule was still in development.
8.0 BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES

The budget was updated to reflect final negotiations with the Electrification Design Build contractor and the EMU Manufacturer. The negotiations resulted in a reduction in the amount for each contract. The budget was also modified to capture revised cost estimates for private utilities, management oversight costs, TASI support and insurance.

The overall program budget remains unchanged.

A summary of the overall budget and expenditure status for the PCEP is shown in the following tables. Table 8-1 reflects the Electrification budget, Table 8-2 reflects the EMU budget, and Table 8-3 reflects the overall project budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Work</th>
<th>Budget (A)</th>
<th>Actual This Quarter (B)</th>
<th>Accrued To Date (C)</th>
<th>Estimate To Complete (D)</th>
<th>Estimate At Completion (E) = (C) + (D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electrification</td>
<td>$696,610,558</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$696,610,558</td>
<td>$696,610,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunnel Notching</td>
<td>$11,029,649</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$11,029,649</td>
<td>$11,029,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>$28,385,456</td>
<td>$674,185</td>
<td>$4,319,739</td>
<td>$24,065,717</td>
<td>$28,385,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Utilities</td>
<td>$66,526,406</td>
<td>$66,300</td>
<td>$1,714,683</td>
<td>$64,811,723</td>
<td>$66,526,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Oversight</td>
<td>$142,814,887</td>
<td>$3,027,504</td>
<td>$57,264,144</td>
<td>$85,550,843</td>
<td>$142,814,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Management</td>
<td>$7,494,952</td>
<td>$167,506</td>
<td>$2,031,842</td>
<td>$5,463,110</td>
<td>$7,494,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$7,235,808</td>
<td>$47,286</td>
<td>$3,960,334</td>
<td>$3,275,474</td>
<td>$7,235,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>$2,826,900</td>
<td>$27,660</td>
<td>$754,901</td>
<td>$2,072,059</td>
<td>$2,826,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Security</td>
<td>$2,350,737</td>
<td>$9,221</td>
<td>$441,523</td>
<td>$1,909,214</td>
<td>$2,350,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management Services</td>
<td>$20,905,616</td>
<td>$929,874</td>
<td>$5,732,467</td>
<td>$15,173,149</td>
<td>$20,905,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Construction</td>
<td>$11,934,024</td>
<td>$1,064,515</td>
<td>$13,300,202</td>
<td>$25,902,046</td>
<td>$11,934,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrification Engineering &amp; Management</td>
<td>$49,093,647</td>
<td>$1,064,515</td>
<td>$13,300,202</td>
<td>$35,793,445</td>
<td>$49,093,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Support</td>
<td>$818,790</td>
<td>$43,362</td>
<td>$297,191</td>
<td>$521,071</td>
<td>$818,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Support</td>
<td>$1,423,335</td>
<td>$4,550</td>
<td>$296,964</td>
<td>$1,126,371</td>
<td>$1,423,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Support</td>
<td>$3,859,806</td>
<td>$48,356</td>
<td>$1,000,107</td>
<td>$3,859,806</td>
<td>$3,859,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget / Grants / Finance</td>
<td>$1,268,408</td>
<td>$1,715</td>
<td>$80,663</td>
<td>$1,187,745</td>
<td>$1,268,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>$2,480,274</td>
<td>$379,636</td>
<td>$1,404,869</td>
<td>$1,075,405</td>
<td>$2,480,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Direct Costs</td>
<td>$5,583,917</td>
<td>$221,876</td>
<td>$1,134,750</td>
<td>$4,449,167</td>
<td>$5,583,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Costs 2002 - 2013</td>
<td>$25,336,12</td>
<td>$1,355</td>
<td>$25,122,004</td>
<td>$416,708</td>
<td>$25,336,12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASI Support</td>
<td>$53,063,531</td>
<td>$124,767</td>
<td>$254,845</td>
<td>$52,808,686</td>
<td>$53,063,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRP Insurance</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigations</td>
<td>$17,685,498</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$17,685,498</td>
<td>$17,685,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Projects</td>
<td>$17,337,378</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$497,318</td>
<td>$16,840,060</td>
<td>$17,337,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Training</td>
<td>$1,021,808</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$1,021,808</td>
<td>$1,021,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Charges</td>
<td>$3,168,203</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$3,168,203</td>
<td>$3,168,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$276,970,649</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$276,970,649</td>
<td>$276,970,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner’s Reserve</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ELECTRIFICATION SUBTOTAL $1,318,114,119 | $3,892,756 | $64,050,729 | $1,254,063,390 | $1,318,114,119
### Table 8-2 EMU Budget & Expenditure Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Work</th>
<th>Budget (A)</th>
<th>Actual This Quarter (B)</th>
<th>Accrued To Date (C)</th>
<th>Estimate To Complete (D)</th>
<th>Estimate At Completion (E) = (C) + (D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EMU</td>
<td>$550,899,459</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$550,899,459</td>
<td>$550,899,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEMOF Modifications</td>
<td>$1,344,000</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$1,344,000</td>
<td>$1,344,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Oversight</td>
<td>$62,150,192</td>
<td>$1,527,460</td>
<td>$12,791,844</td>
<td>$49,358,348</td>
<td>$62,150,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Management</td>
<td>$4,715,388</td>
<td>$102,786</td>
<td>$1,276,990</td>
<td>$3,436,398</td>
<td>$4,715,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>$1,631,907</td>
<td>$12,479</td>
<td>$184,358</td>
<td>$1,447,549</td>
<td>$1,631,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Security</td>
<td>$570,000</td>
<td>$23,728</td>
<td>$109,268</td>
<td>$460,732</td>
<td>$570,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management Services</td>
<td>$11,713,423</td>
<td>$766,609</td>
<td>$3,763,096</td>
<td>$7,950,327</td>
<td>$11,713,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Construction</td>
<td>$89,113</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$89,113</td>
<td>$89,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMU Engineering &amp; Management</td>
<td>$33,083,374</td>
<td>$406,849</td>
<td>$5,686,034</td>
<td>$27,397,340</td>
<td>$33,083,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Support</td>
<td>$501,839</td>
<td>$27,280</td>
<td>$173,034</td>
<td>$328,805</td>
<td>$501,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Support</td>
<td>$1,879,350</td>
<td>$9,857</td>
<td>$235,998</td>
<td>$1,643,392</td>
<td>$1,879,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Support</td>
<td>$2,373,849</td>
<td>$27,385</td>
<td>$213,512</td>
<td>$2,160,337</td>
<td>$2,373,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget / Grants / Finance</td>
<td>$603,101</td>
<td>$1,524</td>
<td>$167,208</td>
<td>$435,893</td>
<td>$603,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>$1,258,753</td>
<td>$80,854</td>
<td>$331,690</td>
<td>$927,063</td>
<td>$1,258,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Direct Costs</td>
<td>$3,730,966</td>
<td>$68,089</td>
<td>$648,656</td>
<td>$3,081,440</td>
<td>$3,730,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASI Support</td>
<td>$2,740,000</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$2,740,000</td>
<td>$2,740,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Projects</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Charges</td>
<td>$1,941,800</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$1,941,800</td>
<td>$1,941,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$38,562,962</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$38,562,962</td>
<td>$38,562,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner's Reserve</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMU SUBTOTAL</td>
<td>$662,138,414</td>
<td>$1,527,460</td>
<td>$12,791,544</td>
<td>$649,346,570</td>
<td>$662,138,414</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8-3 PCEP Budget & Expenditure Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Work</th>
<th>Budget (A)</th>
<th>Actual This Quarter (B)</th>
<th>Accrued To Date (C)</th>
<th>Estimate To Complete (D)</th>
<th>Estimate At Completion (E) = (C) + (D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRIFICATION SUBTOTAL</td>
<td>$1,318,114,119</td>
<td>$3,892,756</td>
<td>$64,050,729</td>
<td>$1,254,063,390</td>
<td>$1,318,114,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMU SUBTOTAL</td>
<td>$662,138,414</td>
<td>$1,527,460</td>
<td>$12,791,544</td>
<td>$649,346,570</td>
<td>$662,138,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCEP TOTAL</td>
<td>$1,980,252,533</td>
<td>$5,420,216</td>
<td>$76,842,573</td>
<td>$1,903,409,960</td>
<td>$1,980,252,533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes regarding tables above:**

1. A revised baseline budget was established on April 14, 2015 at the time of the Core Capacity Grant, Entry into Engineering application.

2. Based on the status of the PeopleSoft 9.1 data available, the above table is an estimate of the incurred costs and Estimate to Complete.

3. During the Entry into Engineering estimate update costs and budget were reassigned under different headers to better align with the Scope of Services.

4. Accrued To Date is the combination of invoices received and accrued costs.
9.0 FUNDING

The PCEP has been working with FTA staff as well as the FTA’s appointed Project Management Oversight Contractor (PMOC) to provide needed documentation required to achieve the Entry into Engineering milestone for the $647M Core Capacity grant. This includes an update to the 20-Year Financial plan reflecting changes in the project cost estimate and project funding.

Negotiations continue with California High-Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) regarding oversight and technical issues. These negotiations are in support of finalizing the CHSRA’s $600M grant which is included in the 9-Party Funding Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) as well as the additional $113M included in the 7-Party Regional Funding Supplement.

The JPB is also in the process of working with the funding partners to execute the 7-Party Regional Funding Supplement to provide the additional project funding. The JPB Board approved the funding supplement at the May 2016 Board meeting.

Figure 8-1 shows the percentage of contributions from the various sources that comprise the total $1.980B funding plan.

Figure 9-1 Funding Plan

- $647,000,000  □ FTA Core Capacity
- $28,900,000  □ FTA Section 5307/5309 (Environmental/PreDevelopment Only)
- $299,775,000  □ FTA Section 5307/5307 (BMU only)
- $8,000,000  □ Prop 1B (Public Transportation/Modernization & Improvement Account)
- $600,000,000  □ Prop LA
- $113,000,000  □ High-Speed Rail Cap and Trade
- $80,000,000  □ Transit & Intercity Rail Capital Program
- $20,000,000  □ CalTrans
- $20,000,000  □ SRP
- $8,100,000  □ SFCTA
- $43,170,000  □ SJMTA Measure A
- $43,170,000  □ VTA Measure A
- $11,000,000  □ San Mateo Bond Funds
- $9,000,000  □ Other Local Carbon Transit Operations Cap and Trade
- $20,000,000  □ San Mateo (VTA) Contribution
- $20,000,000  □ San Francisco Contribution
- $20,000,000  □ San Mateo (SAMTrans) Contribution
10.0 RISK MANAGEMENT

Risk Management continues to actively monitor the Risk Register originally produced in 2014. This active monitoring consists of updating risk descriptions, effects, and mitigations based upon weekly input from risk owners and through a monthly cycle of risk updating per the process established in the Risk Identification and Mitigation Plan. An updated Risk Register is based on decisions made at Risk Assessment Committee meetings. Selected risks are forwarded to risk owners for grading and planning of mitigation measures.

The following are the top risks at the end of the quarter:

- If overhead utilities are not relocated on time the Electrification contractor may incur delays.
- Upgrades to the electrical service needed for the electrification project are dependent upon final agreement with PG&E for which technical and contractual issues must first be resolved.
- Modifications to proposed catenary pole locations may need to be revised to avoid sight distance problems.
- TASI may not be able to deliver sufficient staff resources to support the construction and testing of the electrification system.
- Existing Caltrain processes for reviewing and approving site specific work plans (SSWP) are not sufficiently flexible to allow the design-build contractor to maximize efficiencies in the construction of the electrification system.
- JPB’s current system integration and configuration program will require additional staff expertise and systems improvements to accommodate proposed electrification improvements.
- The final configuration of the electrification system requires the installation of a duct bank under UPRR tracks requiring coordination with UPRR the negotiation of a broad range of issues that may not be completed in a timely manner.
- All funding for the electrification program is not in place and will require agreements with all parties to the 9-Party MOU and FTA and may be affected by legal challenges associated with the CHSRA project.
- Delays in locating and relocating underground utilities may result in delays to the installation of the electrification system.

Table 10-1 provides insight into the number of risks in each classification and the changes for the previous quarter.
Table 10-1 Summary of Risks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Classification</th>
<th>Original (August 2014)</th>
<th>Last Quarter (ending 3/31/16)</th>
<th>This Quarter (ending 6/30/16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant Risks</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risks</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Risks</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>164</strong></td>
<td><strong>129</strong></td>
<td><strong>126</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired Risks</td>
<td>35*</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Risks</strong></td>
<td><strong>199</strong></td>
<td><strong>221</strong></td>
<td><strong>223</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*After initial identification 35 risks were deemed to be a duplication of other existing risks and were either retired or combined to add additional context.*
11.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) environmental clearance for the PCEP scope to date has been completed.

Permit Activity:

- Section 106 National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) process has concluded.
- Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) process has concluded.
- The target completion date for completing the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board (SFRWQCB), California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and the San Francisco Bay Conservation Development Commission (SF BCDC) is 2016.

PCEP Mitigation Program: The JPB has prepared a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) to ensure that mitigation measures identified in the PCEP EIR are fully implemented during project implementation. The JPB will implement the mitigation measures through its own actions, those of the Electrification contractor and actions taken in cooperation with other agencies and entities.

12.0 UTILITY RELOCATION

Monthly Utility Coordination meetings continued during the quarter with all Telecom and power carriers within the JPB Right of Way (ROW). Discussions have been focused on the utility relocation timeline as it relates to the overall project schedule, responsibilities of relocation, applicable design standards of relocation, and reconciliation of agreements and records.

Final verification requests were submitted to utility companies during the quarter for final concurrence of existing utility conditions and records. Field verifications will be performed during the next quarter prior to the issuance of final relocation notices.

Utility companies began submission of relocation schedules and the PCEP team will continue to work with all utility companies to refine relocation schedules and relocation criteria in the 1st quarter of Fiscal Year 2017.
13.0 REAL ESTATE

Preparation of appraisal maps, plats and legal descriptions have continued for all segments throughout the project corridor. Appraisal packages contain preliminary title reports, plat maps and the proposed acquisition appraisal map. The initial appraisal packages required for appraisal work have been completed for all segments (1 – 4).

Segment 4 (Santa Clara – San Jose) Offer presentation packages have been completed. Offer presentation meetings have begun with property owners on Segment 4 and will continue through the 1st quarter of FY2017.

Segment 2 (South San Francisco – Atherton) Offer presentation packages will be complete in 1st quarter of FY2017. Fee simple purchase acquisitions in Segment 2 offer packages are currently complete and offers will begin in 1st quarter FY2017.

The PCEP team will seek JPB Board approval in July for the acquisition of six fee acquisition parcels in Segment 2 and one parcel in Segment 4 to be used for the construction of Paralleling Station 7 (PS-7).

Table 13-1 provides an overview of property status.

Table 13-1 Overview Real Estate Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Appraisal Packages*</th>
<th>Appraisals Completed</th>
<th>Acquisition Offers</th>
<th>Acquisition Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Escrow Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment 4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment 2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment 1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment 3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Appraisal Packages include Plat Map, Legal Description and Appraisal Map. Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) packages include Appraisal Maps only.
14.0 THIRD-PARTY AGREEMENTS

Third-party coordination is necessary for work impacting public infrastructure, utilities, ROW acquisitions, and others. The table below outlines the status of necessary agreements for the PCEP.

Table 14-1 Third-Party Agreement Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Third-Party</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governmental Jurisdictions</td>
<td>Construction &amp; Maintenance¹</td>
<td>City and County of San Francisco</td>
<td>In Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Brisbane</td>
<td>In Process²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City of South San Francisco</td>
<td>In Process²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City of San Bruno</td>
<td>In Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Millbrae</td>
<td>Executed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Burlingame</td>
<td>In Process²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City of San Mateo</td>
<td>Executed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Belmont</td>
<td>In Process²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City of San Carlos</td>
<td>Executed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Redwood City</td>
<td>In Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Atherton</td>
<td>In Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>County of San Mateo</td>
<td>In Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Menlo Park</td>
<td>In Process²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Palo Alto</td>
<td>In Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Mountain View</td>
<td>In Process²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Sunnyvale</td>
<td>In Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Santa Clara</td>
<td>In Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>County of Santa Clara</td>
<td>In Process²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City of San Jose</td>
<td>In Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Condemnation Authority</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>In Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>Executed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>Executed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Pacific Gas &amp; Electric (PG&amp;E)</td>
<td>Executed³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating Rules</td>
<td>California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)</td>
<td>In Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation &amp; Railroad</td>
<td>Construction &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART)</td>
<td>Executed⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)</td>
<td>In Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trackage Rights</td>
<td>Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR)</td>
<td>Executed⁴</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes regarding table above:

1. Agreements memorialize the parties’ consultation and cooperation, designate respective rights and obligations and ensure cooperation between the JPB and the cities and counties in connection with the design and construction of the PCEP. A comprehensive agreement is planned for each of the 17 cities and three counties along the Caltrain ROW and within the PCEP limits.

2. Approved by City Council and awaiting signature for execution.

3. Master agreement and two supplemental agreements.

4. Utilizing existing agreements.
15.0 COMMUNITY RELATIONS AND OUTREACH

The following PCEP related community meetings and briefings took place in the last quarter:

- Testimony at Senate Transportation and Housing Subcommittee Hearing
- Testimony at Assembly Budget Subcommittee Hearing
- Meeting with Peninsula Corridor Working Group (3)
- Meeting with Diridon Station Working Group
- Presentation at the City / County Staff Coordination Group (3)
- Meeting with Caltrain Commuter Coalition Steering Committee
- Presentation at the Menlo Park Chamber Transportation Committee
- Presentation at Local Policy Maker Group (3)
- Presentation at San Carlos City Council
- Presentation at Belmont City Council
- Presentation at SAMCEDA (2)
- Presentation at South San Francisco City Council
- Presentation at the VTA Citizen Advisory Committee
- Presentation at the VTA Policy Advisory Committee
- Presentation at the Brokers North Tour Group
- Tabled at HSR Open House Meeting in San Jose
- Presentation at the JPB Citizen Advisory Committee
- Quarterly Call with State and Federal Staff
- Presentation at the JPB Bicycle Advisory Committee
- Tabled at HSR Scoping Meeting in San Francisco
- Meeting at Menlo Park City Council (2)
- Tabled HSR Scoping Meeting in Mountain View
- Presentation at the SFCTA Citizen Advisory Committee
- Presentation at the Menlo Park Chamber
- Presentation at the Caltrain Accessibility Advisory Committee
- Presentation at the Local Policy Maker Group (special meeting)
- Presentation at the Caltrain Commuter Coalition
- Presentation at the SMCTA Citizen Advisory Committee
- Unanimous support VTA Board of Directors on the 7-party Regional Funding Supplement
- Tabled HSR Community Meeting in San Jose
- Unanimous support MTC Programming and Allocations Subcommittee on the 7-party Regional Funding Supplement
- Unanimous support Brisbane City Council on the PCEP Agreement
- Presentation at the Diridon Station Joint Policy Advisory Board
• Presentation / Action by the SFCTA Plans and Program Subcommittee
• Unanimous support Mountain View Council on the PCEP Agreement
• Unanimous support MTC Commission on the 7-party Regional Funding Supplement
• Unanimous support from the SFCTA Board on the 7-party Regional Funding Supplement
• Quarterly meeting with Silicon Valley and SF Bicycle Coalitions
• Presentation at the Mineta Transportation Institute

Press Release on 7-Party Regional Funding Supplement:
http://www.caltrain.com/about/MediaRelations/news/Caltrain_s_Board_Approves_Multi-party_Caltrain_Modernization_Funding_Agreement__High_Speed_Rail_Commits_Additional__113_Million.html

The PCEP received the WTS Innovative Transportation Solutions Award. Link to the press release:
http://www.caltrain.com/about/MediaRelations/news/San_Francisco_Women_s_Transportation_Seminar_to_Honor_Transit_District_Employee__Caltrain_Electrification_Project.html
16.0 DBE PARTICIPATION AND LABOR STATISTICS

Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) and labor statistics will be reported after construction has commenced.
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Appendix A – Acronyms
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIM</td>
<td>Advanced Information Management</td>
<td>FEIR - Final Environmental Impact Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARINC</td>
<td>Aeronautical Radio, Inc.</td>
<td>FONSI - Finding of No Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAAQMD</td>
<td>Bay Area Air Quality Management District</td>
<td>FRA - Federal Railway Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAFO</td>
<td>Best and Final Offer</td>
<td>FTA - Federal Transit Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalMod</td>
<td>Caltrain Modernization Program</td>
<td>GO-26D - General Order 26D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>California Department of Transportation</td>
<td>ICD - Internal Control Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDFW</td>
<td>California Department of Fish and Wildlife</td>
<td>ITS - Intelligent Transportation System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEMOF</td>
<td>Centralized Equipment Maintenance and Operations Facility</td>
<td>JPB - Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA</td>
<td>California Environmental Quality Act (State)</td>
<td>LNTP - Limited Notice to Proceed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHSRA</td>
<td>California High-Speed Rail Authority</td>
<td>MMRP - Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP</td>
<td>Capital Improvement Plan</td>
<td>MOU - Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPUC</td>
<td>California Public Utilities Commission</td>
<td>MPS - Master Program Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-B</td>
<td>Design-Build</td>
<td>NCR - Non Conformance Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>Disadvantaged Business Enterprise</td>
<td>NEPA - National Environmental Policy Act (Federal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMP</td>
<td>Design, Engineering, and Management Planning</td>
<td>NHPA - National Historic Preservation Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Environmental Assessment</td>
<td>NMFS - National Marine Fisheries Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAC</td>
<td>Expenditure at Completion</td>
<td>NTE - Not to Exceed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIR</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Report</td>
<td>NTP - Notice to Proceed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMU</td>
<td>Electric Multiple Unit</td>
<td>OCS - Overhead Contact System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESA</td>
<td>Endangered Species Act</td>
<td>PCEP - Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Acronym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG&amp;E</td>
<td>Pacific Gas and Electric</td>
<td>SFMTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHA</td>
<td>Preliminary Hazard Analysis</td>
<td>SFRWQCB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMOC</td>
<td>Project Management Oversight Contractor</td>
<td>SOGR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA</td>
<td>Quality Assurance</td>
<td>SSMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC</td>
<td>Quality Control</td>
<td>TASI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMP</td>
<td>Quality Management Plan</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMS</td>
<td>Quality Management System</td>
<td>UPRR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAMP</td>
<td>Real Estate Acquisition Management Plan</td>
<td>USACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>USFWS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP</td>
<td>Request for Proposals</td>
<td>VTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFQ</td>
<td>Request for Qualifications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCS</td>
<td>Rail Operations Center System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRP</td>
<td>Railroad Protective Liability Insurance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSD</td>
<td>Revenue Service Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWP</td>
<td>Roadway Worker Protection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SamTrans</td>
<td>San Mateo County Transit District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCADA</td>
<td>Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>Standard Cost Categories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFBCDC</td>
<td>San Francisco Bay Conservation Development Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFCTA</td>
<td>San Francisco County Transportation Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B – Schedule
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MASTER CPM SCHEDULE C14.05</td>
<td>2001d</td>
<td>05/01/14 A</td>
<td>12/30/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLANNING / APPROVALS PHASE</td>
<td>1946d</td>
<td>05/01/14 A</td>
<td>12/30/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL</td>
<td>926d</td>
<td>05/01/14 A</td>
<td>11/22/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>DESIGN/BUILDER PROCUREMENT</td>
<td>572d</td>
<td>05/01/14 A</td>
<td>02/11/16 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>AGENCY COORDINATION / APPROVALS</td>
<td>561d</td>
<td>05/01/14 A</td>
<td>12/15/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>PERMITS</td>
<td>403d</td>
<td>12/01/14 A</td>
<td>02/05/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>RIGHT-OF-WAY</td>
<td>732d</td>
<td>02/02/14 A</td>
<td>11/22/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SCADA</td>
<td>481d</td>
<td>03/20/13 A</td>
<td>02/17/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>DESIGN / ENGINEERING PHASE</td>
<td>966d</td>
<td>10/01/14 A</td>
<td>07/12/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ELECTRIFICATION (D/B)</td>
<td>410d</td>
<td>08/02/16</td>
<td>03/14/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>PG&amp;E INFRASTRUCTURE</td>
<td>511d</td>
<td>07/06/16</td>
<td>07/12/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>TUNNEL MODIFICATION</td>
<td>822d</td>
<td>10/31/14 A</td>
<td>12/09/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>CEMOF</td>
<td>796d</td>
<td>10/01/14 A</td>
<td>11/21/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>VEHICLES PHASE</td>
<td>1877d</td>
<td>05/01/14 A</td>
<td>07/09/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>SPECIFICATION</td>
<td>134d</td>
<td>07/01/14 A</td>
<td>01/12/15 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>PROCUREMENT</td>
<td>587d</td>
<td>05/01/14 A</td>
<td>08/01/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>DETAILED DESIGN (CTR)</td>
<td>364d</td>
<td>08/01/16</td>
<td>01/08/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>PROCUREMENT (MATERIAL &amp; EQUIPMENT) (CTR)</td>
<td>410d</td>
<td>12/01/16</td>
<td>07/20/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>MOK-UPS (CTR)</td>
<td>170d</td>
<td>11/01/17</td>
<td>07/03/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>ELECTRIC LOCO</td>
<td>675d</td>
<td>07/01/16</td>
<td>03/29/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>MANUFACTURING, TESTING, &amp; TAKE OVER (CTR)</td>
<td>953d</td>
<td>10/29/17</td>
<td>07/09/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION / INSTALLATION PHASE</td>
<td>1044d</td>
<td>08/30/16</td>
<td>09/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>PERMITS (D/B)</td>
<td>538d</td>
<td>08/30/16</td>
<td>09/28/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>PROCUREMENT (D/B)</td>
<td>321d</td>
<td>03/02/16</td>
<td>03/02/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION / INSTALLATION (D/B)</td>
<td>832d</td>
<td>03/20/17</td>
<td>09/23/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>SEGMENT 4</td>
<td>451d</td>
<td>04/28/17</td>
<td>03/07/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>SEGMENT 2</td>
<td>475d</td>
<td>03/20/17</td>
<td>01/31/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>SEGMENT 1</td>
<td>386d</td>
<td>11/29/17</td>
<td>06/07/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>SEGMENT 3</td>
<td>485d</td>
<td>11/22/17</td>
<td>09/23/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>PG&amp;E INFRASTRUCTURE</td>
<td>547d</td>
<td>07/13/16</td>
<td>09/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>TUNNEL MODIFICATION</td>
<td>281d</td>
<td>01/02/18</td>
<td>03/07/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>SCADA</td>
<td>606d</td>
<td>02/17/17</td>
<td>11/13/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>UTILITY RELOCATION</td>
<td>323d</td>
<td>01/02/18</td>
<td>03/29/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>CEMOF</td>
<td>158d</td>
<td>11/22/17</td>
<td>04/01/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>TESTING / STARTUP PHASE</td>
<td>957d</td>
<td>03/28/18</td>
<td>12/30/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>TESTING (D/B)</td>
<td>418d</td>
<td>03/28/18</td>
<td>11/13/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>PRE-REVENUE OPERATIONS</td>
<td>642d</td>
<td>09/08/20</td>
<td>12/18/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>REVENUE OPERATIONS</td>
<td>149d</td>
<td>12/09/20</td>
<td>07/12/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>RISK CONTINGENCY</td>
<td>539d</td>
<td>11/14/19</td>
<td>12/30/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>OPERATIONAL READINESS PHASE</td>
<td>675d</td>
<td>07/13/17</td>
<td>03/24/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>OPERATIONS &amp; MAINTENANCE STAFFING</td>
<td>543d</td>
<td>07/13/17</td>
<td>09/18/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>NON-REVENUE EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>295d</td>
<td>03/20/19</td>
<td>03/24/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>SPARES</td>
<td>258d</td>
<td>01/16/19</td>
<td>01/21/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>OPERATIONS &amp; MAINTENANCE TRAINING</td>
<td>255d</td>
<td>07/31/17</td>
<td>07/31/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>LOCAL AGENCY TRAINING</td>
<td>642d</td>
<td>04/23/18</td>
<td>07/22/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In June 2016, Caltrain’s average weekday ridership (AWR) set an all-time high of 65,049, which is 1.3 percent more than the June 2015 AWR of 64,202. The total number of passengers who rode Caltrain in June 2016 also set an all-time high of 1,734,508, which is 1.5 percent more than June 2015 ridership of 1,709,708. Preliminary Farebox Revenue for June 2016 set a record total of $8,402,596 and increased 15.6 percent over June 2015. Finalized Farebox Revenue data for the fiscal year end is targeted to be provided for the November 3 Board meeting.

On-time performance (OTP) for June 2016 was 90.4 percent, compared to 85 percent OTP for June 2015. When trains arriving within 10 minutes of the scheduled arrival time are included, OTP rises to 95.2 percent. Overall in June 2016, there were 871 mechanical minutes of delay compared to 1,110 mechanical minutes of delay in June 2015. There were two days that operated with 100 percent of the trains on time and seven additional days with 95 percent or better OTP.

Looking at customer service statistics, there were 8.4 complaints per 100,000 passengers in June 2016 which is lower than the 9.7 complaints in June 2015.

Shuttle ridership for June 2016 is up 9.1 percent from June 2015. For the station shuttles, the Millbrae-Broadway shuttle averaged 188 daily riders. The Belmont-Hillsdale shuttle averaged 50 daily riders. The weekend Tamien-San Jose shuttle averaged 75 riders per day. Stanford’s Marguerite shuttle accounted for approximately 74 percent of Caltrain shuttle ridership in June 2016. When the Marguerite shuttle was removed, the impact to ridership was a decrease of 8.2 percent.

FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2016
Looking back at FY2016 average AWR was 60,219, which surpassed the previous high of 58,367 in FY2015 by 3.2 percent. Total ridership for the fiscal year also set a record at 19,233,427, which surpassed the previous high of 18,544,667 set in FY2015, by 3.7 percent. Preliminary Farebox Revenue for the FY2016 also set a record total of $89,104,295 by 6.9 percent over FY2015.
OTP decreased over the past year. For FY2016 OTP was 89.5 percent, which is down from 90.2 percent in FY2015. Some issues that contributed to lower OTP included mechanical issues, trespasser fatalities, vehicle strikes, bicycles, large crowds, passengers needing assistance, and speed restrictions. On April 4, 2016 Caltrain updated its timetable to increase reliability. Caltrain also increased bike capacity on trains by adding a third bike car to Bombardier train sets. To address passenger capacity issues on trains, train equipment cycles were also adjusted to prioritize and assign Bombardier sets to trains with the highest passengers.

For the fiscal year, complaints have averaged 9.3 per 100,000 passengers. This is slightly lower than the number of complaints from FY2015, which averaged 10.4 complaints per 100,000 passengers.

Shuttle AWR was 9,283 for FY2016, which is an increase of 717 or 8.4 percent over the 8,566 AWR in FY2015. Shuttle ridership continues to be largely influenced by Stanford’s Marguerite shuttle, which constitutes for approximately 71 percent of Caltrain FY2016 shuttle ridership.

**Caltrain Promotions – June 2016**

**Copa America Centenario** – The international soccer competition kicked off on June 3 when team USA took on Chile at Levi’s Stadium. Two other games were played on June 6 and June 13. The quarterfinal on June 18 was the fourth match where Mexico took on Chile. Additional post-game train service was provided and station ambassadors were on hand to assist customers with information at all four games. Additional communication to promote the event included website information, social media engagement, news release, the Peninsula Moves blog, and Visual Message Signs (VMS) messaging and conductor announcements.

**California Clasico at Stanford Stadium** – The San Jose Earthquakes took on the Los Angeles Galaxy in their annual grudge match at Stanford Stadium on Saturday, June 25. Selected trains made extra stops at the Stanford station, making it easier to get to the game. Promotions included posting information on the special events web page, social media engagement, news release, Peninsula Moves blog and VMS platform messages, and conductor announcements leading up to the game. Caltrain carried an additional 1,303 riders to the game.

**Gay Pride Parade** – Caltrain provided extra train service to the 46th annual San Francisco Pride Parade and Festival on Sunday, June 26. To accommodate the larger crowds, five extra trains were added to the schedule. The alternate schedule showing the extra trains was posted on the Pride Parade landing page and main weekend schedule to promote the special service trains and inform customers. Caltrain used social media, news releases, the Peninsula Moves blog and VMS platform messaging and conductor announcements. Caltrain carried an additional 4,846 riders to the parade.
Caltrain Social Promotions – June 2016

Caltrain gained more than 5,000 new followers during the month, pushing its reach to more than 84,000 individuals and organizations. With a number of new riders using the special event service, the spike in growth is likely related to these individuals looking for information on Caltrain services. One area that enjoyed a surge in growth was Caltrain’s Quora account, which added nearly 2,000 additional followers in June. Quora is a chatboard platform where users can pose and respond to questions. Staff moderates the Caltrain topics each month and uses it as another way of providing answers to “frequently asked questions.” Caltrain experienced a spike in social media tied to the June 1 fatality and an increase in social activity throughout the first week of June as a result of policy decisions made by the Board at its June meeting.

Prepared by: Jayme Ackemann, Director, Marketing and Communications
Catherine David, Senior Planner

650.508.7934
650.508.6471
Social Media Impression Spikes
June, 2016

Your Tweets earned 1.6M impressions over this 30 day period

June 1
Fatality
1352 Delay Minutes

Total Followers - All Networks

84,138
Table A

June 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2015</th>
<th>FY2016</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Ridership</td>
<td>1,709,178</td>
<td>1,734,508</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Weekday Ridership</td>
<td>64,202</td>
<td>65,049</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Farebox Revenue*</td>
<td>$7,270,551</td>
<td>$8,402,596</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-time Performance</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>90.4%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Caltrain Shuttle Ridership</td>
<td>9,118</td>
<td>9,945</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Year to Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2015</th>
<th>FY2016</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Ridership</td>
<td>18,544,667</td>
<td>19,233,427</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Weekday Ridership</td>
<td>58,367</td>
<td>60,219</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Farebox Revenue*</td>
<td>$83,351,480</td>
<td>$89,104,295</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-time Performance</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Caltrain Shuttle Ridership</td>
<td>8,566</td>
<td>9,283</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Preliminary Farebox Revenue data as of July 21, 2016

Graph A

Caltrain Average Weekday Ridership

June 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>AWR</th>
<th>13-Month Rolling Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jun-15</td>
<td>64,202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-15</td>
<td>65,049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-15</td>
<td>65,049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-15</td>
<td>65,049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-15</td>
<td>65,049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-15</td>
<td>65,049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-15</td>
<td>65,049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-16</td>
<td>65,049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-16</td>
<td>65,049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-16</td>
<td>65,049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-16</td>
<td>65,049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-16</td>
<td>65,049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-16</td>
<td>65,049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA ITEM # 9
AUGUST 4, 2016

PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD
STAFF REPORT

TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
Executive Director

FROM: David Olmeda
Chief Operating Officer, Bus

SUBJECT: AUTHORIZE MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WITH THE SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY FOR LAST-MILE SHUTTLE SERVICE

ACTION
Staff Coordinating Council recommends the Board:

1. Authorize a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) and the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) to collaborate and jointly fund last-mile shuttle service for the San Francisco Caltrain Station Terminal at 4th and King streets for a base amount of $250,000 per year, adjusted annually based on the Consumer Price Index (CPI).

2. Authorize the Executive Director, or his designee, to execute the MOU in a form approved by legal counsel.

SIGNIFICANCE
Execution of this MOU will allow the JPB to continue providing crucial last-mile transit service to patrons detraining at the San Francisco Caltrain Station at 4th and King streets. Also, this action will facilitate ongoing efforts by the JPB to grow Caltrain ridership and enhance revenue in this high-traffic transportation corridor.

BUDGET IMPACT
Funding for this service will be available under current and projected operating budgets.

BACKGROUND
In an effort to maintain and expand its ridership to and from the San Francisco Caltrain Station Terminal at 4th and King streets, the JPB has explored options for the last-mile connection for passengers who detrain at this station. As a result of discussions between the JPB and SFMTA, it was agreed that SFMTA would provide crucial last-mile shuttle service. The parties entered into an MOU in 1984, which stated that SFMTA would furnish the vehicles and operators to convey Caltrain passengers from the
Caltrain station at 4th and King streets to their respective final destinations for a not-to-exceed annual amount of $200,000. This cost represented a significant discount to the JPB.

The proposed MOU is valued at a base annual amount of $250,000 which is equivalent to approximately 3,430 hours on SFMTA express routes 81x and 82x. The service provides an approximate 310,000 rides per year delivered with eight buses. The CPI increase will include an additional 68 hours. The base amount will be adjusted annually based on changes in the CPI. The MOU has no definitive end date; however, it may be terminated by either party by providing to the other 90 days’ advance written notice, or such advance notice as the SFMTA may require with regard to developing schedules and implementing necessary changes. Continuation of this program will provide benefits for the JPB in its efforts to grow, monitor, and manage Caltrain’s ridership in this corridor.

Prepared by: Ashish John, Manager, Bus Contracts 650.508.6490
RESOLUTION NO. 2016 –

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

* * *

AUTHORIZING A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WITH THE SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY FOR LAST-MILE SHUTTLE SERVICE

WHEREAS, in an effort to maintain and expand its ridership to and from the San Francisco Caltrain Station Terminal at the 4th and King streets, the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) has explored options for the last-mile connection for passengers who detrain at this station; and

WHEREAS, as a result of discussions between the JPB and the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), it was agreed that SFMTA would provide crucial last-mile shuttle service; and

WHEREAS, the parties entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) in 1984, which stated that SFMTA would furnish the vehicles and operators to convey Caltrain passengers from the Caltrain station at 4th and King streets to their respective final destinations for a not-to-exceed annual amount of $200,000, which cost represented a significant discount to the JPB; and

WHEREAS, the parties now desire to enter into a new MOU to collaborate and jointly fund last-mile shuttle service for the San Francisco Caltrain Station Terminal at 4th and King streets for a base annual amount of $250,000, which will be adjusted annually based on changes in the Consumer Price Index (CPI); and

WHEREAS, execution of this MOU will allow the JPB to continue providing crucial last-mile transit service to patrons detraining at the San Francisco Caltrain Station at 4th and King streets and will also facilitate ongoing efforts by the JPB to grow Caltrain
ridership and enhance revenue in this high-traffic transportation corridor; and

WHEREAS, staff recommends, and Staff Coordinating Council concurs, that the JPB enter into the MOU with SFMTA to continue this important last-mile transit service.

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

1. Authorizes a Memorandum of Understanding between the San Francisco Municipal Transit Agency and the JPB to collaborate and jointly fund last-mile shuttle service for the San Francisco Caltrain Station Terminal at 4th and King streets for a base amount of $250,000 per year, adjusted annually based on changes in the Consumer Price Index; and

2. Authorizes the Executive Director, or his designee, to execute the Memorandum of Understanding in a form approved by legal counsel.

Regularly passed and adopted this 4th day of August, 2016 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

Chair, Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board

ATTEST:

JPB Secretary
AGENDA ITEM # 10
AUGUST 4, 2016

PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD
STAFF REPORT

TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Jim Harnett
Executive Director

FROM: Michelle Bouchard
Chief Operating Officer, Rail

SUBJECT: SOUTH TERMINAL PHASE II PROJECT

ACTION
Staff Coordinating Council recommends the Board:

1. Make the requisite findings and adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) environmental document and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP) for the South Terminal Phase II Project (Project); and

2. Approve proceeding with the Project.

SIGNIFICANCE
The purpose of the Project is to ensure that all passenger trains can efficiently maneuver between the tracks at San Jose Diridon Station and the main tracks north of the station, and to provide capacity for Caltrain non-revenue equipment moves between Caltrain’s Centralized Equipment Maintenance and Operation Facility (CEMOF) and San Jose Diridon Station without conflicting with revenue service. The additional track is needed for the operational flexibility of operations north of Diridon Station and will improve the ability of Caltrain service to respond to unanticipated events, such as delayed trains, weather, or mechanical issues when the Diridon area becomes an operational bottleneck.

Implementation of the Project will:

- Increase operational flexibility to decrease train delays and improve service reliability
- Eliminate conflicts between in-service and out-of-service trains destined to/from CEMOF
- Address an operational bottleneck north of Diridon that will be worsened in the future by increases in train services by Caltrain, Altamont Corridor Express (ACE), Capitol Corridor, etc.
A PowerPoint presentation will be made on the Project scope, funding, schedule, public outreach and environmental review.

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

**BACKGROUND**
The Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) completed operational analyses that indicate the need for track improvements north and south of San Jose Diridon Station. The South Terminal program of improvements includes multiple phases, each of which has independent utility from the other and from the JPB’s plans to electrify the corridor. Phase I of the South Terminal improvement program was completed in 2012 and involved the addition of two new platforms and four new tracks at San Jose Diridon Station. South Terminal Phase III is being advanced separately, in conjunction with the replacement of Los Gatos Creek Bridge, and will improve the reliability of the Diridon-Tamien Station segment and allow greater flexibility at San Jose Diridon Station by enabling out-and-back movements of empty trains switching tracks without competing with revenue trains at Control Point (CP) Alameda (north of the station) or south of the station.

There are currently three mainline tracks (MT) between Diridon Station and CEMOF (MT-1, MT-2 and MT-3). Caltrain operates on MT-2 and MT-3. ACE and Capitol Corridor operate on MT-1 and MT-3. Amtrak Coast Starlight and Union Pacific Railroad operate bi-directionally on MT-1. The proposed Project will add a fourth track and new interlockings between the south end of CEMOF and the north end of San Jose Diridon Station. The addition of the fourth track will improve operational flexibility and minimize system delays.

To comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), JPB prepared and published a Draft Initial Study/MND document, which was reviewed by the public. In compliance with CEQA, a public meeting was held by JPB in the city of San Jose. Three sets of comments were received, including by two members of the CEMOF Monitoring Committee. JPB prepared responses to comments and incorporated them in the final environmental document. The final MND and MMRP documents can be viewed at this link: https://fileshare.louisberger.com/?ShareToken=F3695B942F1ACC3F4F67EF871908FE6C1E28AB81

Prepared By: Rafael Bolon, Program Manager 650.622.7805
Hilda Lafebre, Manager, Capital Project and Environmental Planning 650.622.7842
RESOLUTION NO. 2016 –

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

* * *

ADOPTING MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR AND
APPROVING SOUTH TERMINAL PHASE II PROJECT

WHEREAS, the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) owns the railroad right of way between San Francisco and San Jose and operates commuter rail service between San Francisco and Gilroy; and

WHEREAS, there are three mainline tracks (MT) between Diridon Station and the Centralized Equipment Maintenance and Operation Facility (CEMOF), MT-1, MT-2 and MT-3; and

WHEREAS, Caltrain operates on tracks MT-2 and MT-3, Altamont Corridor Express and Capitol Corridor operate on tracks MT-1 and MT-2 and Amtrak and Union Pacific Railroad operate on track MT-1; and

WHEREAS, the multi-operator use of these tracks has increased system delays due to inadequate operational flexibility, making it imperative to add a fourth track between the south end of CEMOF and the north end of Diridon Station; and

WHEREAS, the addition of the fourth track (known as the "South Terminal Phase II Project" or "Project") will provide operational flexibility and minimize delays by allowing non-revenue (out-of-service) trains to move to and from CEMOF without conflicting with revenue service (trains carrying passengers); and
**WHEREAS**, the new fourth track will be located on the east side of the three existing tracks and the Project will also include realignment of the existing track system, cross-overs, turnouts, slip-switches, overhead signal bridges and track and signal upgrades; and

**WHEREAS**, the JPB has prepared an Initial Study of the possible environmental effects of the proposed Project pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); and

**WHEREAS**, that Initial Study concluded that the Project’s effects can be mitigated to the extent that the Project would not have a significant effect on the environment, and therefore recommended that a Mitigated Negative Declaration be prepared by the JPB; and

**WHEREAS**, the JPB published a notice of the availability of the Draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (Draft IS/MND) and invited comments thereon and also received public comment on the Project at a public meeting; and

**WHEREAS**, written comments on the Draft IS/MND were received during the comment period and were reviewed by staff and legal counsel, who concluded that none of the points raised required a change in the conclusion of the Draft IS/MND; and

**WHEREAS**, the Executive Director recommends, and Staff Coordinating Council concurs, that the Board of Directors adopt the requisite findings for and adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration; adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration and mitigation monitoring and reporting program, and approve the Project.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED the Board of Directors of the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board hereby:

1. Finds that, in light of the need for the immediate action to address system delays and impacts to Caltrain passengers, and in order to maintain operational flexibility for all operators of MT-1, MT-2 and MT-3 tracks between Diridon Station and CEMOF, it is necessary to proceed with adding a fourth track and necessary track and signal improvements, implementing the mitigation measures described in the Mitigated Negative Declaration to avoid any significant effects on the environment; and

2. Finds and declares that, based upon its independent judgment following review of the proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration and consideration of the record of the Project as a whole, there is no evidence before the Board that the proposed Project will have a significant effect upon the environment; and

3. Finds that the Project will not have a significant effect on the environment and therefore adopts the Mitigated Negative Declaration;

4. Adopts the mitigation monitoring and reporting plan; and

5. Directs the Executive Director or his designee to file a Notice of Determination promptly with the County Clerk of Santa Clara County and the State CEQA Clearinghouse.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Directors hereby approves the South Terminal Phase II Project.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED the record of this action shall be maintained by the JPB Secretary at the JPB’s offices at 1250 San Carlos Avenue in San Carlos, CA.

Regularly passed and adopted this 4th day of August, 2016 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

Chair, Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board

ATTEST:

______________________________
JPB Secretary
AGENDA ITEM # 11  
AUGUST 4, 2016

PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD  
STAFF REPORT

TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett  
Executive Director

FROM: Eli Kay  
Chief Financial Officer

SUBJECT: AMENDING THE PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD INVESTMENT POLICY AND REAUTHORIZING INVESTMENT OF MONIES WITH THE LOCAL AGENCY INVESTMENT FUND

ACTION
Staff Coordinating Council recommends the Board:

1. Amend the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) Statement of Investment Policy to align with current State law, including California Government Code Section 35601. This Investment Policy provides guidelines for the investment of JPB funds and includes delegations of authority to invest such funds.

2. Adopt an updated resolution authorizing monies to be invested in Local Agency Investment Funds (LAIF) in compliance with LAIF requirements.

SIGNIFICANCE
The Executive Director or his designee serves as the JPB’s trustee for purposes of placing investments pursuant to the Investment Policies. The Board of Directors, in accordance with California Government Code Section 53646(a), may review the Investment Policy and also reauthorize the included delegations of authority on an annual basis at a public meeting. The proposed action will:

- Amend the Investment Policy benchmarks to reflect the JPB’s current portfolio and to be updated annually by the Executive Director or his designee;
- Update authorized investment descriptions to those used in California State Codes; and
- Update the authorized investments explicitly listed in the policy to include bonds, notes, warrants, or other evidences of indebtedness of any local agency within the state.

BUDGET IMPACT
The amendment of the Investment Policy will have no impact on the JPB budgets.
**BACKGROUND**
The JPB's investments have always been in accordance with sound treasury management practices and complied with the objectives of safety, liquidity, and yield in that order of priority.

The JPB originally adopted its Investment Policy in August 1999 and has, from time to time, amended this policy. The JPB most recently amended this policy on November 1, 2012 with the following minor changes:

1. Clarification of the allowable investment provision. (Pages 5-6)
2. Update to two statutory citations. (Page 3 and Page 6)

Prepared by: Carl Cubba, Director of Treasury

650.508.6206
I. **PURPOSE**

This Statement of Investment Policy (Investment Policy) provides guidelines for the prudent investment and cash management of the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board's (JPB) funds. It is the goal of this Investment Policy to establish investment objectives in accordance with the provisions of the *California Government Code, Section 53600 et seq.* (hereafter “Code”), and investment guidelines to ensure that the funds under its purview are prudently invested to preserve capital, provide necessary liquidity, and achieve a market-average rate of return over an economic cycle consistent with the JPB’s goals of preserving principal and minimizing the risk of diminishing the principal.

Investments may only be made as authorized by this Investment Policy, and subsequent revisions. This Statement of Investment Policy may be reviewed annually by the JPB’s Board of Directors at a public meeting. (*California Government Code Section 53646(a)*). Irrespective of these policy provisions, should the provisions of the *Code* be, or become, more restrictive than those contained herein, then such provisions will be considered immediately incorporated into this Statement of Investment Policy.

II. **OBJECTIVE**

The JPB’s cash management system is designed to monitor and forecast accurately, expenditures and revenues, thus enabling the JPB to invest funds to the fullest extent possible. Idle funds of the JPB shall be invested in accordance with sound treasury management and in accordance with the provisions of the *Code* and this Investment Policy.

Investments shall be made with judgment and care, under circumstances then prevailing, which persons of prudence, discretion and intelligence exercise in the management of their own affairs, not for speculation, but for investment, considering the probable safety of their capital, as well as the probable income to be derived. The standard of prudence to be used by investment officials shall be applied in the context of managing an overall portfolio. JPB officials shall act in accordance with written procedures and the Investment Policy, and should report deviations from expectations in a timely fashion and take appropriate action to control adverse developments.
The JPB's primary objective with respect to its invested funds is to safeguard the principal of the funds. The second objective is to meet the liquidity needs of the JPB. The third objective is to achieve a return on its invested funds.

III. POLICY

At all times, the JPB shall invest its funds in accordance with the rules and restrictions established by the law of the State of California (including Government Code Section 53600 et seq.). In addition, the JPB shall conduct its investments under the "prudent investor standard": "When investing, reinvesting, purchasing, acquiring, exchanging, selling or managing public funds, a trustee shall act with care, skill, prudence and diligence under the circumstances then prevailing, including, but not limited to, the general economic conditions and the anticipated needs of the agency, that a prudent person acting in a like capacity and familiarity with those matters would use in the conduct of funds of a like character and with like aims, to safeguard the principal and maintain the liquidity needs of the agency." (California Government Code Section 53600.3).

The Executive Director of the JPB, or his designee, shall serve as the JPB's trustee for purposes of placing investments pursuant to this Investment Policy. The Board of Directors may review and specifically reauthorize this delegation of authority on an annual basis.

1. **Criteria for Selecting Investments.** Criteria for selecting investments and the order of priority are:

   a. **Safety.** The safety and risk associated with an investment refer to the potential loss of principal, interest or a combination of these amounts. The JPB shall invest only in those investments that are considered safe. Investments in instruments and with institutions permitted under Section 2, Diversification; Section 6, Allowable Investment Instruments and Section 7, Local Agency Investment Fund & San Mateo County Investment Fund, are deemed to constitute safe investment within the meaning of this Investment Policy.

   b. **Liquidity.** An adequate percentage of the portfolio, in the approximate amount of six months' operating expenses, should be maintained in liquid short-term investments which can convert to cash if necessary to meet disbursement requirements. For purposes of this Investment Policy, fixed income securities maturing in one year or more are considered investment term, and fixed income securities maturing in less than one year are considered short-term cash equivalents.

   c. **Return on Investment.** The JPB's investment portfolio shall be designed with the objective of attaining the safety and liquidity objectives first, and then attaining a market rate of return throughout the budgetary and economic cycles, consistent with the portfolio’s benchmark as described in Section IV - Benchmarks. This benchmark takes into account the JPB's
investment risk constraints and the cash flow characteristics of the portfolio.

2. **Diversification.** The JPB will limit its investments to securities as defined by California Government Code Section 53601 (k). The portfolio should consist of a mix of various types of securities, issuers, and durations from among the allowable investment instruments described in Sections 5, 6 and 7 so as to minimize the risk of loss and maximize the rate of return when prudent to do so.

3. **Safekeeping and Custody.** All security transactions, including collateral for repurchase agreements will be executed on a Delivery versus Pay Basis (DVP). The assets of the JPB shall be held in safekeeping by the JPB's safekeeping agent, or secured through third party custody and safekeeping procedures. A due bill or other substitution will not be acceptable.

4. **Investment Maturities and Average Life.** The specific security guidelines including maximum maturities and qualified Fixed Income instruments can be found in Section 10 “Summary of Instruments & Limitations” of this Investment Policy.

The maximum dollar weighted average maturity of the fund is five years. This policy limitation leaves open the flexibility to take advantage of interest rate fluctuations as well as yield curve differences to maximize the return on investment. The imposed maximum dollar weighted five year average maturity limits the market risk to levels appropriate for an intermediate income fund. For the purposes of calculating the “average life” of the fund, callable and asset backed securities will be run to their stated final maturity.

5. **Deposit of Funds.** As far as possible, all money belonging to or in the custody of the JPB including money paid to the JPB to pay the principal, interest or penalties of bonds, shall be deposited for safekeeping in state or national banks, savings associations or federal associations, credit unions or federally insured industrial loan companies in California (as defined by California Government Code Section 53630). Pursuant to California Government Code Sections 53635, 53637 and 53638, the money shall be deposited in any authorized depository with the objective of realizing maximum return, consistent with prudent financial management.

6. **Allowable Investment Instruments.** The JPB also may invest in any investment instrument as authorized by the California Government Code, as it may be amended from time to time, and subject to any conditions set forth in the California Government Code. These investment instruments include but are not limited to:

a. United States Treasury notes, bonds, bills, or certificates of indebtedness, or those for which the faith and credit of the United States are pledged for the payment of principal and interest.
b. Federal agency or United States government-sponsored enterprise obligations, participations, or other instruments, including those issued by or fully guaranteed as to principal and interest by federal agencies or United States government sponsored enterprises.

c. Bankers’ acceptances otherwise known as bills of exchange or time drafts that are drawn on and accepted by a commercial bank. Purchases of bankers’ acceptances shall not exceed 180 days’ maturity or 40 percent of the agency’s moneys that may be invested pursuant to this section. However, no more than 30 percent of the agency’s moneys may be invested in the bankers’ acceptances of any one commercial bank pursuant to this section. This subdivision does not preclude a municipal utility district from investing moneys in its treasury in a manner authorized by the Municipal Utility District Act (California Public Utilities Code Section 11501, et seq.).

d. Commercial paper of “prime” quality of the highest ranking or of the highest letter and number rating as provided for by a nationally recognized statistical rating organization (NRSRO).

e. Negotiable certificates of deposit issued by a nationally or state-chartered bank, a savings association or a federal association (as defined by California Financial Code Section 5102), a state or federal credit union, or by a federally licensed or state-licensed branch of a foreign bank. Purchases of negotiable certificates of deposit shall not exceed 30 percent of the agency’s moneys that may be invested pursuant to California Government Code Section 53601.

f. Investments in repurchase agreements or reverse repurchase agreements or securities lending agreements as defined in California Government Code Section 53601 (j).

g. Medium-term notes, defined as all corporate and depository institution debt securities with a maximum remaining maturity of five years or less, issued by corporations organized and operating within the United States or by depository institutions licensed by the United States or any state and operating within the United States. Notes eligible for investment under this subdivision shall be rated “A” or better by an NRSRO. Purchases of medium-term notes shall not include other instruments authorized by this section and may not exceed 30 percent of the agency’s moneys that may be invested pursuant to California Government Code Section 53601(k).

h. Shares of beneficial interest issued by diversified management companies that invest in the securities and obligations as authorized by California Government Code Section 53601 (l).
i. A mortgage passthrough security, collateralized mortgage obligation, mortgage-backed or other pay-through bond, equipment lease-backed certificate, consumer receivable passthrough certificate, or consumer receivable-backed bond of a maximum of five years’ maturity. Securities eligible for investment under this subdivision shall be issued by an issuer having an “A” or higher rating for the issuer’s debt as provided by an NRSRO and rated in a rating category of “AA” or its equivalent or better by an NRSRO. Purchase of securities authorized by this subdivision may not exceed 20 percent of the agency’s surplus moneys that may be invested pursuant to this California Government Code Section 5360.

j. Bonds, notes, warrants, or other evidences of indebtedness of any local agency within this state, including bonds payable solely out of the revenues from a revenue-producing property owned, controlled, or operated by the local agency, or by a department, board, agency, or authority of the local agency.

k. Collateral is defined in this Investment Policy to mean property (as securities) pledged by a borrower to protect the interest of the lender. For purposes of this Investment Policy, the following investments are considered to have collateral backing: Certificates of Deposit protected by either the FDIC or pledged securities in conformance with California Codes and this Investment Policy; or Bankers’ Acceptances (protected by an irrevocable time draft or bill of exchange) whereby the accepting bank incurs an irrevocable primary obligation thus guaranteeing payment on the draft or bill. A secondary obligation rests with the issuing company; Commercial Paper (protected by an unsecured promissory note from the issuer who must be rated A1/P1/F1 or better) thereby guaranteeing that the earning power and/or liquidity had been established to fulfill the obligation to pay; and, asset backed securities which are rated AAA by both Moody’s and Standard & Poors.

7. Local Agency Investment Fund & San Mateo County Investment Fund. The Board of Directors also authorizes the JPB to invest in the Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF) pursuant to California Government Code Section 16429.1 and in the San Mateo County Investment Fund (SMCIF).

8. Prohibited Investments. The JPB shall not invest any funds in inverse floaters, range notes or mortgage derived interest-only strips. The JPB shall not invest any funds in any security that could result in zero interest accrual if held to maturity; however, the JPB may hold this prohibited instrument until its maturity date. The limitation does not apply to investments in shares of beneficial interest issued by diversified management companies as set forth in California Government Code Section 53601.6.
9. **Portfolio Transactions.** The JPB is expected to seek best execution for all portfolio transactions. Best execution relates to the expected realized price net of commissions and is not necessarily synonymous with the lowest commission rate. The JPB is to obtain three independent bids from SEC licensed brokerage institutions, licensed by the state as a broker-dealer, as defined in *California Government Code Section 53601.5*, or from a brokerage firm designated as a primary government dealer by the Federal Reserve Bank, prior to the execution of each portfolio transaction. The JPB will choose which broker dealers or brokerage firms from which to solicit bids and final selection is to be made based on the best interests of the JPB. Realized capital losses may be incurred in order to minimize the decrease in real purchasing power of the assets over an indefinite period of time.

10. **Summary of Instruments & Limitations.** Subject to the limitations set forth in *California Government Code Sections 53600 et seq.* which may be amended from time to time, the Executive Director or his designee may invest in the following instruments, subject to the limits of flexibility described above:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) U.S. Treasury Obligations</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Obligations of U.S. Agencies or Government Sponsored Enterprises</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Bankers Acceptances</td>
<td>A1/P1/F1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic ($500 million minimum assets)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign ($500 million minimum assets)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Commercial Paper</td>
<td>A1/ P1/F1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>($500 million minimum assets)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Additional 10% (for a total of 25%) if the dollar weighted average maturity of the entire amount does not exceed 31 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Negotiable Certificates of Deposit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Repurchase Agreements Secured by U.S. Treasury or Agency Obligation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max 5 yr. maturity (102% collateral)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverse Repurchase Agreements &amp; Security Lending</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Medium Term Notes</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>Limitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) Shares of beneficial interest issued by diversified management companies</td>
<td>Rating: AA, % of Fund: 10, % of Fund Per Issuer: 5, Maturity: 30 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) A mortgage pass through security No Inverse Floaters No Range Notes No Interest Only Strips Derived from a Pool of Mortgages</td>
<td>Rating: AA, % of Fund: 20, % of Fund Per Issuer: 5, Maturity: 5 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(j) Bonds, notes, warrants, or other evidences of indebtedness of any local agency within California</td>
<td>Rating: AA, % of Fund: 50, % of Fund Per Issuer: 50, Maturity: 10 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF) Up to the current limit.
San Mateo County Investment Fund Up to the current limit.

11. **Oversight.**

   a. On a quarterly basis the JPB staff shall submit an investment report which provides a market review, the outlook for the market and strategy for investing JPB funds. The report will also compare the portfolio against the benchmark established by the Investment Policy in terms of duration and yield.

   b. Quarterly, the Executive Director shall submit an investment report to the Board of Directors within 30 days of the end of the quarter. The report shall include the following information:

   1. type of investment, issuer, date of maturity, par and dollar amount invested in all securities, investments and money held by the JPB;

   2. description of any of the JPB’s funds, investments or programs that are under the management of contracted parties, including lending programs;

   3. for all securities held by the JPB or under management by any outside party that is not a local agency or the State of California LAIF, a current market value as of the date of the report and the source of this valuation;
4. statement that the portfolio complies with the Investment Policy or the manner in which the portfolio is not in compliance; and

5. statement that the JPB has the ability to meet its pool’s expenditure requirements (cash flow) for the next six months or provide an explanation as to why sufficient money shall or may not be available.

c. Annually, the Executive Director shall perform, or cause to be performed, an independent audit of the JPB’s assets as reported for the investment program’s activities. It is to be conducted in such a way as to determine compliance with the JPB’s Investment Policy and State Codes. Such independent auditors will express an opinion whether the statement of assets is presented fairly and in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.

d. If the JPB places all of its investments in the LAIF, FDIC-insured accounts in a bank or savings and loan association, or the SMCIF(or any combination of these three), the Executive Director can simply submit, on at least a quarterly basis, the most recent statements from these institutions to meet the requirements of items 1-3 above, with a supplemental report addressing items 4 and 5 above. (*California Government Code Section 53646(b)-(e)).

IV. BENCHMARKS

Investment performance will be compared to the performance benchmark selected by the JPB annually, which approximates the JPB’s portfolio and the specific restrictions on the JPB’s portfolio in accordance with applicable current legislation by the State of California.
RESOLUTION NO. 2016 –

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

* * *

AMENDING THE STATEMENT OF INVESTMENT POLICY
FOR THE PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD

WHEREAS, as encouraged by applicable State law and in accordance with best practices, the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) adopted a Statement of Investment Policy in August 1999; and

WHEREAS, the JPB may annually render a statement of said Investment Policy to the Board of Directors for review and approval pursuant to Section 53646 of the State of California Government Code; and

WHEREAS, the JPB has amended its Statement of Investment Policy over the years, most recently in November 2012, to clarify an allowable investment provision and to update two citations; and

WHEREAS, in presenting the Statement of Investment Policy to the Board of Directors for this year, staff recommends amendment of the Statement of Investment Policy to align with descriptions of investments contained in the California state codes and to more clearly reflect the JPB’s strategy for the investment of JPB funds; and

WHEREAS, staff further recommends reappointment of the Executive Director or his designee as trustee for purposes of placing investments pursuant to the aforementioned policy.
NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED the Board of Directors of the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (1) Approves and adopts the amended Statement of Investment Policy attached hereto as Exhibit A; and (2) Appoints its Executive Director, or his designee, as the trustee for purposes of placing investments pursuant to said policy.

Regularly passed and adopted this 4th day of August, 2016 by the following vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:

_______________________________
Chair, Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board

ATTEST:

_______________________________
JPB Secretary
RESOLUTION NO. 2016 –

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

***

AUTHORIZING INVESTMENT OF PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD MONIES IN LOCAL AGENCY INVESTMENT FUND

WHEREAS, pursuant to Government Code Section 16429.1, a Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF) was created in the State Treasury for the deposit of local agency monies for purposes of investment by the State Treasurer; and

WHEREAS, staff recommends that the deposit and withdrawal of money in the LAIF in accordance with the provisions of Government Code Section 16429.1 is in the best interests of the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB).

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED the Board of Directors of the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board does hereby authorize the deposit and withdrawal of JPB monies in LAIF in the State Treasury in accordance with the provisions of Government Code Section 16429.1, for the purpose of investment; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED the Executive Director, or his designee, shall be authorized to order the deposit or withdrawal of JPB monies in the LAIF.

Regularly passed and adopted this 4th day of August, 2016 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

Chair, Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board

ATTEST:

______________________________
JPB Secretary
TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
          Executive Director

FROM: Seamus Murphy
      Chief Communications Officer

Eli Kay
      Chief Financial Officer

SUBJECT: CALTRAIN FARE POLICY STUDY

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

SIGNIFICANCE
In late 2015, the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) requested that staff review and study the Caltrain Fare policies and structure to identify potential opportunities to maximize revenue, enhance ridership and safeguard social and geographic equity. Staff will present an overview of the Caltrain Fare Policy Study, including the draft Scope of Work and key issues to be explored over the course of the Study.

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no impact on the budget.

BACKGROUND
The last system-wide Caltrain fare study was conducted in 2001, when fare elasticity was determined to represent a significant deterrent to fare increases. The elasticity measured at that time indicated that ridership was highly influenced by price, resulting in a high anticipated elasticity (meaning that any fare increase would be expected to generate a corresponding ridership decline). Since 2001, however, onboard surveys of Caltrain customers reveal that many riders along the corridor have high relative incomes and may not be as price sensitive as riders during the early 2000s. Additionally, Caltrain ridership has continued to climb rapidly, signaling that there may be missed opportunities to improve farebox recovery ratios.

Caltrain continues to lack a dedicated source of funding and struggles every year to balance its operating budget. To plan effectively for long-range service changes and expansions, Caltrain needs to have the right technical inputs and policy framework in place to equitably maximize farebox revenues. To achieve this, Caltrain intends to conduct a phased fare policy study. It is anticipated that the fare study process will fully engage Caltrain’s riders as well as the JPB’s funding partners.
The Caltrain Fare Study will explore various questions regarding the potential for the fare structure, and supporting policy including:

1. How much revenue can and should Caltrain generate from fares? What should the “domain” of a Caltrain fare policy be?
   - What is the fare elasticity of Caltrain’s ridership? How does this vary between different rider groups?
   - Should Caltrain explore developing an explicit fare box recovery goal for policy documentation?
   - Should the Caltrain fare policy include specific fare increase indexing? Should the Caltrain fare policy contemplate regular fare increase timeframes?
   - Pricing of trips includes access by other modes such as parking. Are Caltrain parking prices reasonable? Too high/low? What is the elasticity of the parking costs? How does/doesn’t this affect ridership?

2. Is the current Fare and pass structure the right fit for Caltrain?
   - Should congestion pricing in the peak hour be explored?
   - Does the Zone based fare structure optimize fare revenue and ease of use for Caltrain riders?
   - Should Caltrain charge surcharges? If so, applicable to what services?
   - Other related fare pricing?
   - Is the pricing of Caltrain’s monthly pass appropriate relative to single-ride pricing?
   - Is the Go Pass financially optimal and equitably priced?
   - Should Caltrain offer a Student Pass or other product similar to San Francisco Muni’s free youth pass?
   - What types of passes could Caltrain offer that are more financially viable?
   - What are the overall revenue impacts of various pass programs/structure?

3. How should Caltrain phase and implement changes to its fare system?
   - What are the operational impacts of adopting a new fare program?
   - What agency equipment, departments and processes will be impacted?
   - What are the costs and trade-offs associated with implementing fare policy changes?

Phase 1 will comprise a technical investigation to determine the correct fare elasticity to apply to any potential changes to the Caltrain fare structure. Developing this information will allow Caltrain to craft a more nuanced fare policy and make an informed assessment of how changes to the fare structure may impact ridership and revenue.

Phase 2 will use the technical information developed in Phase 1 as the basis for drafting and evaluating options for a full Caltrain fare policy. The full scope of Phase 2 will be developed during Phase 1, along with refining the data collection efforts that support the Phase 2 analysis, such as rider surveys. At a minimum, Phase 2 will combine the technical information developed in Phase 1 with a substantial public outreach component and equity analysis to yield a formal fare policy for JPB consideration.
Considerations during Phase 2 will include potential implementation strategies dependent on the Policy adopted, interfaces with fare media tools, and timing relative to Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project.

Prepared By:   Elizabeth Scanlon, Manager, Caltrain Planning   650.295.6867
Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board
Draft Document – August 4, 2016
Caltrain Fare Policy Study

Purpose:
The purpose of the Caltrain Fare Study is to develop a Caltrain Fare Policy that allows the agency to maximize revenue while substantially preserving ridership and safeguarding social and geographic equity.

Background:
The last system-wide Caltrain fare study was conducted in 2001, when fare elasticity was determined to represent a significant deterrent to fare increases. The elasticity measured at that time indicated that ridership was very influenced by price, resulting in a high anticipated elasticity (meaning that any fare increase would be expected to generate a significant ridership decline). Since 2001, however, on-board surveys of Caltrain customers reveal that many riders along the corridor have high relative incomes and may not be as price sensitive as riders during the early 2000s. Additionally, Caltrain ridership has continued to climb rapidly, signaling that there may be missed opportunities to increase farebox revenue and improve farebox recovery ratios.

Looking forward, Caltrain still lacks a dedicated source of funding and must struggle every year to balance its operating budget. To plan effectively for any long range service changes and expansions, Caltrain needs to have the right technical inputs and policy framework in place to equitably maximize farebox revenues. To achieve this, Caltrain intends to conduct the phased fare study described below. It is anticipated that the fare study process will fully engage Caltrain’s riders as well as the JPB’s funding partners.

The Caltrain Fare Policy Study will ensure it is consistent with the principals and objectives of the Caltrain FY2015-2024 Strategic Plan. The Caltrain Strategic Plan includes an objective to establish financial stability, minimize the operating subsidy and fund system improvements. Further, the Strategic Plan includes goals and objectives to maximize revenues by developing strategies to increase returns from existing revenue streams including fares, as well as to explore new funding streams. The Caltrain Strategic Plan also includes a goal conduct business in a socially responsible way, including providing an inclusive and equitable system.

This study will also be closely coordinated with other related planning studies including the Station Management Toolbox.

Key Issues to Explore:
There are a number of key issues related to the area of fares for Caltrain. These fall into three main areas;

1. How much revenue can and should Caltrain generate from fares? What should the “domain” of a Caltrain fare policy be?
   o What is the fare elasticity of Caltrain’s ridership? How does this vary between different rider groups?
1. Should Caltrain explore developing an explicit fare box recovery goal for policy documentation?
   o Should the Caltrain fare policy include specific fare increase indexing? Should the Caltrain fare policy contemplate regular fare increase timeframes?
   o Pricing of trips includes access by other modes such as parking. Are Caltrain parking prices reasonable? Too high/low? What is the elasticity of the parking costs? How does/doesn’t this affect ridership?

2. Is the current Fare and pass structure the right fit for Caltrain?
   o Should congestion pricing in the peak hour be explored?
   o Does the Zone based fare structure optimize the fare revenue?
   o Should Caltrain charge surcharges? If so, applicable to what services?
   o Other related fare pricing?
   o Is the pricing of Caltrain’s monthly pass appropriate relative to single-ride pricing?
   o Is the Go Pass financially optimal?
   o Should Caltrain offer a Student Pass similar to MUNI’s free youth pass?
   o What types of passes could Caltrain offer that are more financially viable?
   o What are the overall revenue impacts of

3. How should Caltrain phase and implement changes to its fare system
   o What are the operational impacts of adopting a new fare program?
   o What agency equipment, departments and processes will be impacted?
   o What are the costs associated with implementing fare policy changes?

Scope of Work:
The scope has been broken into two phases.

1. Phase 1 will comprise a technical investigation to determine the correct fare elasticity to apply to any potential changes to the Caltrain fare structure. Developing this information will allow Caltrain to craft a more nuanced fare policy and make an informed assessment of how changes to the fare structure may impact ridership and revenue.

2. Phase 2 will use the technical information developed in Phase 1 as the basis for drafting and evaluating a full Caltrain fare policy. The full scope of Phase 2 will be developed during Phase 1, along with refining the data collection efforts that support the Phase 2 analysis. Minimally, however, Phase 2 will combine the technical information developed in Phase 1 with a substantial public outreach component and equity analysis to yield a formal fare policy for JPB adoption. Considerations during Phase 2 will include potential implementation strategies dependent on the Policy adopted, interfaces with fare media tools, and timing relative to Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project.

Phase 1: Tasks
The primary purpose of Phase 1 is to conduct and study fare elasticity modeling in order to inform the development of Fare Policy. Primarily, Phase 1 will collect existing conditions by understanding the current Caltrain fare products and structure; collect information from peer agencies as well as agencies such as APTA; determine the correct fare elasticity rate to use when suggesting fare changes; evaluate influencing factors related to the fare elasticity; and fully develop the scope and schedule for Phase 2.
work. Phase I work will also establish several working groups to assist staff/consultant in the technical work:

- Executive Steering Committee; and
- An external technical advisory committee including core staff from Samtrans, VTA and CCSF (to be expanded during Phase 2 of the study)

**Task 1) Refine Purpose and Need**
Working with the TAC, the study team will review the goals for the fare study that will inform the process for determining the appropriate Fare Elasticity level. This task will also lay out the decision processes and refine the schedule, along with comparative agencies that should be considered.

*Deliverable:* Refined scope and schedule

*Time Frame:* 3 months from Notice to Proceed (concurrent with Task 2)

**Task 2) Existing Conditions and Background**
The study team will develop existing conditions documentation with background information including, existing Caltrain fare products and structure, historical fare revenue and ridership, and other service and/or fare metrics to provide a better understanding of the historical fare changes and their influence upon new fare levels.

*Deliverable:* Caltrain Existing Conditions Report

*Time Frame:* 3 months from Notice to Proceed

**Task 3) Rider Survey Scope Development and Timeline**
In Phase I, the study team will prepare the scope of work for survey of Caltrain passengers regarding potential changes to the fare policy and structure. This task will assess the data points desired, and the methods of data collection that will efficiently yield valid results.

*Deliverable:* Data collection scope and schedule

*Time Frame:* 3 months from Notice to Proceed (concurrent with Task 1 and 2)

**Task 4) Research and Peer Review Findings**
Using recent literature and/or peer studies, the study team will compile agency profile information, as well as other relevant studies or findings that can influence the fare elasticity determination. Even though comparable agencies may prove difficult, a variety of rail operations will be considered for their similarities and differences to provide a wide view of comparable data.

Information gathered will include documentation regarding service type, fare structure, farebox ratio, parking provision and cost, ethnicity and income of ridership, pass programs (such as Ecopass or other pass programs) and other conditions that may influence their elasticity projections. Additionally, other information will be considered, including studies that review the impact of income or service availability on elasticity such as those developed by the Transportation Research Board (TRB) and/or the American Public Transportation Association (APTA). Information will be provided in a tabular format to facilitate comparison.
These review findings will inform the selection of the values to use for the elasticity modeling and may be used in the future to help right-price pass programs.

Results will be presented to the internal JPB team as well as the TAC for review and comments. If findings are strong enough to suggest fare elasticity based on operators with similar ridership profiles, recommendations will be crafted and reviewed by the JPB Team and the TAC.

**Deliverable:** 1) Research Findings  
2) Peer Review Comparison  
3) Draft Fare Elasticity Recommendations for Analysis

**Time Frame:** 4 months occurring after completion of Task 1 and 2

**Task 5) Fare Elasticity Modeling**  
Based on the results of Task 4, a proposed series of fare elasticity scenarios will be studied. This may involve regression analysis, or other statistical analyses, if it’s determined to be required in order to increase confidence with the fare elasticity levels being developed. Fare elasticity modeling should also consider different segments of Caltrain’s ridership including analysis of the sensitivity of different demographic groups as well as geographic markets.

Modeling is assumed to review several elasticity scenarios and their performance against stated goals. Results will be presented internally to JPB as well as TAC for review and input.

As a result of the modeling exercise and TAC review, it is anticipated that preferred fare elasticity level(s) will be selected to be used in Phase 2 of the study.

**Deliverable:** Fare Elasticity Scenarios Modeling Results  
**Time Frame:** 4-5 months occurring after completion of Task 4

**Task 6) Phase 2 Work Scope Development**  
The purpose of this task is to develop the work scope that will be undertaken during Phase 2 of the fare study. The work scope will minimally describe:

- The framework for developing fare policy goals with the stakeholders that would include ridership, revenue, and social equity outcomes.
- The extent of fare structure changes contemplated and the areas of agency activity impacted.
- An agency engagement and public outreach plan.

**Deliverable:** Work scope and schedule for Phase 2  
**Time Frame:** 2-3 months occurring after completion of Task 5
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PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD
STAFF REPORT

TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
Executive Director

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

SUBJECT: METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION TRANSIT SUSTAINABILITY PROGRAM – PROGRESS UPDATE

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

SIGNIFICANCE
The Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) is required to make annual reports of its progress towards performance targets identified in the Metropolitan Transportation Commission’s (MTC) Transit Sustainability Program (TSP) and must update MTC on any new programs or strategies intended to help achieve further improvements.

It has now been four years since the program’s inception and the JPB remains on track to meet its regional performance target.

This informational item describes the annual update submitted to MTC. Staff will make a brief PowerPoint presentation at the August Board meeting.

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no impact on the budget.

BACKGROUND
The MTC launched the TSP in January 2010 to address operating and capital shortfalls experienced by transit operators in the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area. The purpose of the TSP is to help improve transit performance and to attract more customers to the transit systems. The TSP focused on financial, service performance and institutional frameworks of the transit agencies.

The MTC adopted the TSP final recommendations on May 23, 2012, establishing efficiency performance measures and targets for the seven large San Francisco Bay Area transit operators: San Mateo County Transit District, Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District, Bay Area Rapid Transit District, JPB, Golden Gate Bridge, Highway, and Transportation District, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, and Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority.
MTC requires each of the seven large operators to each achieve a 5 percent real reduction in at least one of the following performance measures by Fiscal Year (FY) 2017 and no growth beyond Consumer Price Index thereafter:

- cost per service hour
- cost per passenger
- cost per passenger mile

The 5 percent real reduction is measured against the highest reported costs between FY2008 and FY2011 for one of the three performance measures listed above.

As required by the MTC, the JPB adopted the Caltrain TSP Strategic Plan, outlining the JPB’s intended approach to improving operating efficiency and achieving the targets identified in the TSP, on March 7, 2013.

Prepared by: Sebastian Petty, Principal Planner  650.622.7831
PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD
STAFF REPORT

TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
Executive Director

FROM: Gigi Harrington
Deputy CEO/Chief Administrative Officer

SUBJECT: LESBIAN, GAY, BI-SEXUAL, TRANSGENDER BUSINESS ENTERPRISE PROGRAM PRESENTATION

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

SIGNIFICANCE
A presentation will be made in response to a Board request for a Lesbian, Gay, Bi-sexual, Transgender Business Enterprise program as part of the JPB’s Disadvantaged Business Enterprise program.

Prepared by: John Barker, Manager, Civil Rights Programs  650.508.7940
TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
Executive Director

FROM: Seamus Murphy
Chief Communications Officer

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 in accordance with the approved Legislative Program.

STATE ISSUES
As of 7/25/16:
Nothing to report as the Legislature was on recess in July. They will reconvene on August 1.

FEDERAL ISSUES
As of 7/25/16:
We are still waiting for the House to schedule a floor vote on their Fiscal Year (FY) 2017 Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies (THUD) Appropriations Act bill. The Senate approved their THUD bill on May 24, 2016.

The current House THUD bill contains $100 million for the Caltrain Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project. The Senate approved THUD bill includes $332 million for the overall Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Core Capacity Program and did not call out specific projects for funding. The Senate bill leaves that to the discretion of FTA.

Prepared by: Casey Fromson, Manager, Government Affairs 650.508.6493
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB 156 McCarty D</td>
<td>A. ASSEMBLY 5/19/2016-Read third time. Passed. Ordered to the Assembly. (Ayes 24, Noes 15. Page 3899.).</td>
<td>Current law requires the Attorney General to maintain records, including fingerprints, licenses to carry concealed firearms, and information from firearms dealers pertaining to firearms, for purposes of assisting in the investigation of crimes and specified civil actions. In regard to certain of those records, current law authorizes specified peace officers to disseminate the name of the subject of the record, the number of firearms listed in the record, the description of any firearm, and other information reported to the Department of Justice, as specified, if the subject of the record has been arraigned, is being prosecuted, or is serving a sentence for domestic violence or is the subject of specified protective orders. This bill would require the Attorney General to also maintain information about ammunition transactions and ammunition vendor licenses for those purposes. <strong>Last Amended on 5/17/2016</strong></td>
<td>Oppose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 318 Chau D</td>
<td>S. 2 YEAR 7/17/2015-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(10). (Last location was JUD. on 6/11/2015)</td>
<td>Would, until December 31, 2020, provide that if that lost property is found on a vehicle of public conveyance or on public transit property, that it instead be turned in to the public transit agency, and would provide 90 days for the owner to return and claim the property, as specified. The bill, until December 31, 2020, also would require the public transit agency to cause notice of the property to be published under specified circumstances. <strong>Last Amended on 6/11/2015</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 326 Frazier D</td>
<td>S. APPR. 6/9/2016-Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on APPR.</td>
<td>Current law provides that there is no liability for liquidated damages if a contractor, subcontractor, or surety deposits the full amount of the assessment or notice, including penalties, with the Department of Industrial Relations to hold in escrow pending administrative or judicial review. This bill would require the department to release the funds deposited in escrow plus interest earned to those persons and entities within 30 days following either the conclusion of all administrative and judicial review or upon the department receiving written notice from the Labor Commissioner or his or her designee of a settlement or other final disposition of an assessment issued, as specified, or from the authorized representative of the awarding body of a settlement or other final disposition of a notice issued, as specified. <strong>Last Amended on 6/9/2016</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 516 Mullin D</td>
<td>S. THIRD READING 2/10/2016-Read second time. Ordered to third reading. 6/15/2016 #50 SEN THIRD READING FILE - ASM BILLS</td>
<td>Would require the DMV to develop an operational system, no later than January 1, 2018, that allows a dealer or lessor-retailer to electronically report the sale of a vehicle and provide a temporary license plate, as specified. The bill would, commencing January 1, 2017, authorize the department to assess specified administrative fees on processing agencies to support the administration of this system. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws. <strong>Last Amended on 7/16/2015</strong></td>
<td>Support</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><strong>AB 828 Low D</strong></td>
<td>S. E. U., &amp; C. 6/8/2016-Set for hearing. 6/21/2016 9am - Room 3191 SENATE ENERGY, UTILITIES AND COMMUNICATIONS, HUESO, Chair</td>
<td>Would require the Public Utilities Commission to conduct an investigation to consider whether existing statutes and regulations relating to transportation services serve the public interest, encourage innovation, and create a fair and competitive transportation market between companies that provide regulated transportation services. The bill would require the commission to complete the investigation and report its conclusions and recommendations to the Legislature on or before January 1, 2017. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws. <strong>Last Amended on 7/14/2015</strong></td>
<td><strong>Position</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 857 Cooper D</strong></td>
<td>A. ASSEMBLY 5/19/2016-Read third time. Passed. Ordered to the Assembly. (Ayes 24. Noes 14. Page 3903.).</td>
<td>Would, commencing July 1, 2018, and subject to exceptions, require a person who manufactures or assembles a firearm to first apply to the Department of Justice for a unique serial number or other identifying mark, as provided. The bill would, by January 1, 2019, and subject to exceptions, require any person who, as of July 1, 2018, owns a firearm that does not bear a serial number to likewise apply to the department for a unique serial number or other mark of identification. <strong>Last Amended on 5/11/2016</strong></td>
<td><strong>Position</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 869 Cooper D</strong></td>
<td>S. 2 YEAR 9/11/2015-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(14). (Last location was INACTIVE FILE on 7/2/2015)</td>
<td>Current law authorizes a public transportation agency to adopt and enforce an ordinance to impose and enforce civil administrative penalties for fare evasion or other passenger misconduct, other than by minors, on or in a transit facility or vehicle in lieu of the criminal penalties otherwise applicable, with specified administrative procedures for the imposition and enforcement of the administrative penalties, including an initial review and opportunity for a subsequent administrative hearing. This bill would provide that a person who fails to pay the administrative penalty when due or successfully complete the administrative process to dismiss the notice of fare evasion or passenger conduct violation may be subject to those criminal penalties. <strong>Last Amended on 6/18/2015</strong></td>
<td><strong>Position</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1360 Ting D</strong></td>
<td>S. E. U., &amp; C. 7/17/2015-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(10). (Last location was E. U., &amp; C. on 7/2/2015) 6/21/2016 9am - Room 3191 SENATE ENERGY, UTILITIES AND COMMUNICATIONS, HUESO, Chair</td>
<td>Would exempt from specified provisions relating to the Passenger Charter-Party Carriers’ Act a service operated by a transportation network company or a charter-party carrier of passengers that prearranges a ride among multiple passengers who share the ride in whole or in part, provided that the vehicle seats no more than 7 passengers, not including the driver, is operated by a participating driver, as defined, is not used to provide public transit services or carry passengers over a fixed route, is not used to provide pupil transportation services or public paratransit services, and the fare for each passenger is less than the fare that would be charged to a passenger traveling alone. <strong>Last Amended on 7/2/2015</strong></td>
<td><strong>Support</strong></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 1591 Frazier D</td>
<td>A. TRANS. 2/1/2016-Referred to Coms. on TRANS. and REV. &amp; TAX.</td>
<td>Would create the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Program to address deferred maintenance on the state highway system and the local street and road system.</td>
<td>Watch Closely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1595 Campos D</td>
<td>A. DEAD 5/27/2016-Failed Deadline pursuant to Joint Rule 61(b)(8). (Last location was APPR. SUSPENSE FILE on 5/11/2016)</td>
<td>Would require a private or public employer that provides mass transportation services, as specified, in the state to train its employees, who are likely to interact or come into contact with victims of human trafficking, in recognizing the signs of human trafficking and how to report those signs to the appropriate law enforcement agency.</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1640 Stone, Mark D</td>
<td>S. P.E. &amp; R. 6/9/2016-In committee: Set, first hearing. Hearing canceled at the request of author.</td>
<td>PEPRA exempts from its provisions certain public employees whose collective bargaining rights are subject to specified provisions of federal law until a specified federal district court decision on a certification by the United States Secretary of Labor, or until January 1, 2016, whichever is sooner. This bill would extend indefinitely that exemption for those public employees, whose collective bargaining rights are subject to specified provisions of federal law and who became a member of a state or local public retirement system prior to December 30, 2014.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1641 Allen, Travis R</td>
<td>A. TRANS. 4/4/2016-In committee: Set, second hearing. Hearing canceled at the request of author.</td>
<td>Under current law, a person may not stop, park, or leave a vehicle standing alongside a curb space authorized for the loading or unloading of passengers of a bus engaged as a common carrier in local transportation when indicated by a sign or red paint on the curb, except that existing law allows local authorities to permit school buses to stop alongside these curb spaces upon agreement between a transit system operating buses as common carriers in local transportation and a public school district or private school. This bill would also allow local authorities to permit shuttle service vehicles, as defined, to stop for the loading or unloading of passengers.</td>
<td>Watch Closely</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>
</tbody>
</table>
| AB 1665 Bonilla D | S. GOV. & F. 6/14/2016-Action From T. & H.: Do pass to G. & F.. | Current law authorizes the County of Alameda and the County of Contra Costa to impose a transactions and use tax for the support of countywide transportation programs at a rate of no more than 0.5% that, in combination with other specified taxes, exceeds the combined rate of all these taxes that may be imposed, if certain requirements are met.  

This bill would remove this taxing authority from the County of Alameda and the County of Contra Costa and grant this taxing authority to the Contra Costa Transportation Authority. This bill contains other related provisions.  

_Last Amended on 5/9/2016_                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Watch Closely |
| AB 1669 Hernández, Roger D | S. L. & I.R. 6/9/2016-from committee chair, with author's amendments: Amend, and re-refer to committee. Read second time, amended, and re-referred to Com. on L. & I.R.  
6/22/2016 9:30 a.m. - Rose Ann Vuich Hearing Room (2040) SENATE LABOR AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS, MENDOZA, Chair | Current law requires a local government agency letting a public transit service contract out to bid to give a bidding preference for contractors and subcontractors who agree to retain for a specified period certain employees who were employed to perform essentially the same services by the previous contractor or subcontractor. Such a contractor or subcontractor is required to offer employment to those employees, except for reasonable and substantiated cause.  

This bill would expand the application of these provisions to exclusive contracts for the collection and transportation of solid waste.  

The bill would require the information provided to a bona fide bidder to be made available in writing at least 30 days before bids for the service contract are due.  

_Last Amended on 6/9/2016_                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Watch Closely |
| AB 1889 Mullin D | S. T. & H. 6/13/2016-In committee: Set, first hearing. Hearing canceled at the request of author. | Current law, operative under certain conditions, re-designates the Peninsula Corridor Study Joint Powers Board as the Peninsula Rail Transit District, comprised of 9 members appointed from various governing bodies situated in the City and County of San Francisco and the Counties of San Mateo and Santa Clara, with specified powers.  

This bill would repeal obsolete provisions relating to the Peninsula Rail Transit District.  

_Last Amended on 3/17/2016_                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Sponsor       |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 2030</strong> Mullin D</td>
<td>S. T. &amp; H.</td>
<td>Current law requires contracts of the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District for the purchase of supplies, equipment, and materials to be let to the lowest responsible bidder or to the bidder who submits a proposal that provides best value, as defined, if the amount of the contract exceeds $100,000 and requires the district to obtain a minimum of 3 quotations for those contracts between $2,500 and $100,000. This bill would impose those bidding requirements with respect to district contracts for the purchase of supplies, equipment, and materials if the amount of the contract exceeds $150,000 and would require a minimum of 3 quotations for those contracts between $5,000 and $150,000. <strong>Last Amended on 6/1/2016</strong></td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 2090</strong> Alejo D</td>
<td>S. T. &amp; H.</td>
<td>Current law continuously appropriates specified portions of the annual proceeds in the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund to various programs, including 5% for the Low Carbon Transit Operations Program, which provides operating and capital assistance for transit agencies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve mobility, with a priority on serving disadvantaged communities. This bill would additionally authorize moneys appropriated to the program to be expended to support the operation of existing bus or rail service if the governing board of the requesting transit agency declares a fiscal emergency and other criteria are met, thereby expanding the scope of an existing continuous appropriation. <strong>Last Amended on 5/27/2016</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 2126</strong> Mullin D</td>
<td>S. T. &amp; H.</td>
<td>Current law authorizes the Department of Transportation to use the Construction Manager/General Contractor method on no more than 6 projects, and requires 4 out of the 6 projects to use department employees or consultants under contract with the department to perform all project design and engineering services, as specified. This bill would authorize the department to use this method on 12 projects and would require 8 out of the 12 projects to use department employees or consultants under contract with the department to perform all project design and engineering services</td>
<td>Sponsor</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 2222 Holden D</td>
<td>S. T. &amp; H. 6/9/2016-Referred to Coms. on T. &amp; H. and E.Q. 6/21/2016 1:30 p.m. - John L. Burton Hearing Room (4203) SENATE TRANSPORTATION AND HOUSING, BEALL, Chair</td>
<td>Would establish the Transit Pass Program to be administered by the Department of Transportation with moneys from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund, upon appropriation, to support transit pass programs that provide free or reduced-fare transit passes to specified pupils and students. The bill would require the department, in coordination with the state board, to develop guidelines that describe the criteria that eligible transit providers are required to use to make available free or reduced-fare transit passes to eligible participants and the methodologies that eligible participants would use to demonstrate that the proposed expenditures will reduce greenhouse gas emissions. <strong>Last Amended on 5/31/2016</strong></td>
<td><strong>Position</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2382 Lopez D</td>
<td>A. DEAD 4/22/2016-Failed Deadline pursuant to Joint Rule 61(b)(5). (Last location was A. TRANS. on 4/12/2016)</td>
<td>Current law creates the High-Speed Rail Authority with specified powers and duties relative to development and implementation of a high-speed rail system. The authority is comprised of 9 members, with 5 members appointed by the Governor and 4 members appointed by the Legislature. This bill would require at least one member appointed by the Governor beginning with an available vacancy on and after January 1, 2017, to be a person who is from a disadvantaged community, as defined. <strong>Last Amended on 4/11/2016</strong></td>
<td><strong>Position</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABX1 7 Nazarian D</td>
<td>A. PRINT 7/17/2015-From printer.</td>
<td>Current law requires all moneys, except for fines and penalties, collected by the State Air Resources Board from the auction or sale of allowances as part of a market-based compliance mechanism relative to reduction of greenhouse gas emissions to be deposited in the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund. This bill would instead continuously appropriate 20% of those annual proceeds to the Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program, and 10% of those annual proceeds to the Low Carbon Transit Operations Program, thereby making an appropriation. This bill contains other current laws. Support</td>
<td><strong>Support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABX1 8 Chiu D</td>
<td>A. PRINT 7/17/2015-From printer.</td>
<td>Would, effective July 1, 2016, increase the additional sales and use tax rate on diesel fuel to 5.25%. By increasing the revenues deposited in a continuously appropriated fund, the bill would thereby make an appropriation. This bill contains other related provisions. Support</td>
<td><strong>Support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABX1 24 Levine D</td>
<td>A. PRINT 9/12/2015-From printer.</td>
<td>Would, effective January 1, 2017, re-designate the Metropolitan Transportation Commission as the Bay Area Transportation Commission. The bill would require commissioners to be elected by districts comprised of approximately 750,000 residents. The bill would require each district to elect one commissioner, except that a district with a toll bridge, as defined, within the boundaries of the district would elect 2 commissioners. The bill would require commissioner elections to occur in 2016, with new commissioners to take office on January 1, 2017.</td>
<td><strong>Position</strong></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>ABX1 25 Allen, Travis R</td>
<td>A. PRINT 1/12/2016-From printer.</td>
<td>Under current law, a person may not stop, park, or leave a vehicle standing alongside a curb space authorized for the loading or unloading of passengers of a bus engaged as a common carrier in local transportation when indicated by a sign or red paint on the curb, except that current law allows local authorities to permit school buses to stop alongside these curb spaces upon agreement between a transit system operating buses as common carriers in local transportation and a public school district or private school. This bill would also allow local authorities to permit shuttle service vehicles, as defined, to stop for the loading or unloading of passengers alongside these curb spaces upon agreement between a transit system operating buses.</td>
<td>Watch Closely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACA 4 Frazier D</td>
<td>A. APPR. SUSPENSE FILE 8/27/2015-In committee: Hearing postponed by committee.</td>
<td>Would provide that the imposition, extension, or increase of a sales and use tax imposed pursuant to the Bradley-Burns Uniform Local Sales and Use Tax Law or a transactions and use tax imposed in accordance with the Transactions and Use Tax Law by a county, city, city and county, or special district for the purpose of providing funding for local transportation projects, as defined, requires the approval of 55% of its voters voting on the proposition. The measure would also make conforming and technical, nonsubstantive changes. Last Amended on 8/17/2015</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 32 Pavley D</td>
<td>A. NAT. RES. 6/10/2016-From committee with author's amendments. Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on NAT. RES.</td>
<td>Would require the State Air Resources Board to approve a statewide greenhouse gas emissions limit that is equivalent to 40% below the 1990 level to be achieved by 2030. This bill contains other related provisions. Last Amended on 6/10/2016</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 122 Jackson D</td>
<td>A. 2 YEAR 8/28/2015-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(11). (Last location was APPR. SUSPENSE FILE on 7/15/2015)</td>
<td>CEQA establishes a procedure for the preparation and certification of the record of proceedings upon the filing of an action or proceeding challenging a lead agency's action on the grounds of noncompliance with CEQA. This bill would require the lead agency, at the request of a project applicant and consent of the lead agency, to prepare a record of proceedings concurrently with the preparation of a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration, EIR, or other environmental document for projects. This bill contains other related provisions. Last Amended on 6/1/2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 207 Wieckowski D</td>
<td>A. 2 YEAR 7/17/2015-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(10). (Last location was NAT. RES. on 5/14/2015)</td>
<td>Current law requires a state agency expending moneys from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund to create a record, prior to the expenditure, that includes, among other things, a description of the expenditure proposed to be made and a description of how the proposed expenditure will contribute to achieving and maintaining greenhouse gas emissions reductions, as specified. This bill would require that record to be posted on the Internet Web sites of the state agency and the State Air Resources Board prior to the state agency expending those moneys. Last Amended on 3/24/2015</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>SB 321 Beall D</td>
<td>S. INACTIVE FILE 9/11/2015-Ordered to inactive file on request of Senator Beall.</td>
<td>Would, for the 2016-17 fiscal year and each fiscal year thereafter, require the State Board of Equalization on March 1 of the fiscal year immediately preceding the applicable fiscal year, as specified, to adjust the rate in a manner as to generate an amount of revenue equal to the amount of revenue loss attributable to the exemption, based on estimates made by the board that reflect the combined average of the actual fuel price over the previous 4 fiscal years and the estimated fuel price for the current fiscal year, and continuing to take into account adjustments required by existing law to maintain revenue neutrality for each year. This bill contains other existing laws.</td>
<td>Watch Closely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 400 Lara D</td>
<td>A. 2 YEAR 8/28/2015-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(11). (Last location was APPR. on 8/27/2015)</td>
<td>Would require the High-Speed Rail Authority to allocate not less than 25% of the moneys continuously appropriated to the authority from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund to projects that either reduce or offset greenhouse gas emissions directly associated with the construction of the high-speed rail project and provide a co-benefit of improving air quality. The bill would require priority to be given within this expenditure category to measures and projects that are located in communities in areas designated as extreme nonattainment. The bill would expand the purposes of a continuous appropriation, thereby making an appropriation.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 824 Beall D</td>
<td>6/28/2016-A. APPR. 6/28/2016-From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on APPR. (Ayes 12, Noes 1.) (June 27). Re-referred to Com. on APPR.</td>
<td>Existing law requires all moneys, except for fines and penalties, collected by the State Air Resources Board from the auction or sale of allowances as part of a market-based compliance mechanism relative to reduction of greenhouse gas emissions to be deposited in the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund. This bill would require a recipient transit agency to demonstrate that each expenditure of program moneys allocated to the agency does not supplant another source of funds. The bill would authorize a recipient transit agency that does not submit an expenditure for funding under the program in a particular fiscal year to retain its funding share for expenditure in a subsequent fiscal year for a maximum of 4 years. The bill would allow a recipient transit agency to loan or transfer its funding share in any particular fiscal year to another recipient transit agency within the same region, or to apply to the department to reassign, to other eligible expenditures under the program, any savings of surplus moneys from an approved and completed expenditure under the program or from an approved expenditure that is no longer a priority, as specified. The bill would also allow a recipient transit agency to apply to the department for a letter of no prejudice for any eligible expenditures for which the department has authorized a disbursement of funds, and, if granted, would allow the recipient transit agency to expend its own moneys and to be eligible for future reimbursement from the program, under specified conditions. The bill would also require a recipient transit agency to provide additional information to the department to the extent funding is sought for capital projects. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.</td>
<td>Support</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>SB 878</td>
<td>S. DEAD</td>
<td>Would require an employer, which includes a grocery store establishment, restaurant, or retail store establishment, to provide its employees with a work schedule at least 7 calendar days prior to the first shift on that work schedule, except as specified.</td>
<td>Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leyva D</td>
<td>5/27/2016-Failed Deadline pursuant to Joint Rule 61(b)(8). (Last location was APPR. SUSPENSE FILE on 4/25/2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The bill would require an employer, except as specified, to pay its employees modification pay for each previously scheduled shift that the employer cancels or moves to another date or time, for any previously unscheduled shift that the employer requires an employee to work, or for each on-call shift for which an employee is required to be available but is not called in to work that shift. <strong>Last Amended on 3/15/2016</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 882</td>
<td>A. PUB. S.</td>
<td>Current law makes it an infraction or a misdemeanor to evade the payment of a fare on a public transit system, to misuse a transfer, pass, ticket, or token with the intent to evade the payment of a fare, or to use a discount ticket without authorization or fail to present, upon request from a transit system representative, acceptable proof of eligibility to use a discount ticket.</td>
<td>Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hertzberg D</td>
<td>6/13/2016-Referred to Com. on PUB. S. 6/28/2016 9 a.m. - State Capitol, Room 126 ASSEMBLY PUBLIC SAFETY, JONES-SAWYER, Chair</td>
<td>This bill would prohibit a minor from being charged with an infraction or a misdemeanor for those acts. <strong>Last Amended on 5/31/2016</strong></td>
<td>Closely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1197</td>
<td>S. DEAD</td>
<td>Current law defines the boundaries of 3 intercity rail corridors, and requires the preparation of an annual business plan for the corridor by each participating joint powers board. This bill, at any time after an interagency transfer agreement between the department and a joint powers board has been entered into, would authorize the amendment of the agreement to provide for the extension of the affected rail corridor to provide intercity rail service beyond the defined boundaries of the corridor.</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannella R</td>
<td>4/22/2016-Failed Deadline pursuant to Joint Rule 61(b)(5). (Last location was S. T. &amp; H. on 3/3/2016)</td>
<td>The bill would require a proposed extension to first be recommended and justified in the business plan adopted by the joint powers board, and then would require the approval of the Secretary of Transportation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBX1 2</td>
<td>S. T. &amp; I.D.</td>
<td>Would provide that those annual proceeds shall be appropriated by the Legislature for transportation infrastructure, including public streets and highways, but excluding high-speed rail. This bill contains other existing laws.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huff R</td>
<td>9/1/2015-September 1 set for first hearing. Failed passage in committee. (Ayes 3, Noes 9. Page 56.) Reconsideration granted.</td>
<td>Would restrict expenditures of revenues from the July 1, 2016, increase in the sales and use tax on diesel fuel to transit capital purposes and certain transit services. The bill would require an existing required audit of transit operator finances to verify that these new revenues have been expended in conformance with these specific restrictions and all other generally applicable requirements. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws. <strong>Last Amended on 9/3/2015</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBX1 7</td>
<td>S. APPR.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen D</td>
<td>9/3/2015-Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on APPR.</td>
<td></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>SBX1 8 Hill D</td>
<td>S. APPR. 9/2/2015-From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on APPR. (Ayes 8, Noes 0. Page 57. (September 1). Re-referred to Com. on APPR.</td>
<td>Current law requires all moneys, except for fines and penalties, collected by the State Air Resources Board from the auction or sale of allowances as part of a market-based compliance mechanism relative to reduction of greenhouse gas emissions to be deposited in the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund. This bill would instead continuously appropriate 20% of those annual proceeds to the Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program, and 10% of those annual proceeds to the Low Carbon Transit Operations Program, thereby making an appropriation. This bill contains other current laws.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>