MEMBERS PRESENT: J. Berk, A. Lee, A. Levin, Y. Mills, B. Shaw, C. Tucker

MEMBERS ABSENT: C. Cobey (Chair), G. Scharff

STAFF PRESENT: J. Averill, M. Bouchard, C. Fromson, G. Harrington, D. Stewart, S. van Hoften

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JANUARY 20, 2016
Motion/Second: Tucker, Berk
Ayes: Berk, Lee, Levin, Tucker, Shaw
Absent: Cobey, Mills, Scharff

PUBLIC COMMENT
Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said he can’t believe the chair wasted his time on figuring out how many comments were received by the public and the percentage from each person when time could be better spent counting passengers on trains and realizing the trains are over capacity and that something needs to be done.

Jeff Carter, Millbrae, said there were quite a lot of extra riders during Super Bowl week. He surveyed parking at Millbrae. The lot was full on Friday evening, and on Saturday the lot was almost 65 percent full. He appreciated the additional service to handle riders on Super Bowl Sunday. There were not a lot of people parking at Millbrae on Sunday. He said he rode the extra train to Mountain View on Sunday and staff were there helping direct people to Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA).

COMMITTEE COMMENTS
Jonathan Berk said he would like the CAC to address the change in the customer satisfaction survey results from excellent to good. He said on-time performance (OTP) is a problem. He said it does not make sense trains are not reported late if they are only 10 minutes late. He said 10 minutes late might be a problem for him if he has to be somewhere. He said he wants to get rid of the 10-minute rule completely and report out OTP as it really is, even if trains are only five minutes late. He said he does not like excuses staff uses when reporting OTP about taking out incidents so the OTP rises. He said trains are unreliable. He said the JPB switched out the contract operator because of the lowest bidder and asked for an e-mail explaining to him why that happened. He asked if Transit America Services Incorporated (TASI) is more or less reliable than Amtrak.
He said one priority for the taskforce should be expanding express train service. There is a possibility of doing that and it would make trains less crowded.

Annie Lee said she is glad to hear the taskforce is working on the Predictive Arrival/Departure System (PADS) and other methods to communicate schedule changes and delays more accurately. She said to find out information about delays she looks to get online real-time updates for each station, PADS, and Twitter updates. She said the real-time updates online show the train is moving, but that information is not displayed on the PADS. They should be integrated. She likes the suggestion for a Global Positioning System (GPS) application available to everyone on one application. The Super Bowl crowds were significant, but everything was orderly. She noticed a lot of drunken people on the train. She asked what the policy is concerning people who are sick or require medical attention on the train. She asked if someone makes sure they get the attention they need. Danielle Stewart, Acting Director, Rail Operations, said conductors call emergency medical services or the transit police.

Chair Shaw said he learned that a new schedule is coming out a month ago but he just received it today at his work in Stanford. He said he has to shift his drivers at Stanford to coordinate routes to meet the new Caltrain schedule. This takes time. Other transit operators have to do the same thing. He asked staff to be cognizant that coordination of last-mile services has to be taken into account for the implementation of new schedules and they need time for that. These service providers are going to be hard pressed to adjust their schedules. He would like to work offline with staff on a better process for schedule changes with Caltrain.

Public Comment
Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said the reason the trains break down is because all Gallery trains were supposed to be replaced between 2012 and 2015, but they were not. The JPB will spend $50 million a year tearing the cars down to the frame and rebuilding them. These refurbished trains will just be 30-year-old trains that pollute just as much as they do now. The chance of having electrification in five to seven years is zero. The reason why TASI cannot run on time is because on Gallery trains there are only five doors and only so many people through can get through them and up the stairs. Caltrain needs six-car Gallery trains. The schedule change has caused problems with every transit provider in the entire Bay Area.

CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT
The report is included in the agenda packet.

WI-FI ON CALTRAIN UPDATE
Gigi Harrington, Deputy CEO, presented:
• Key Considerations
  o An outcome of leveraging a wireless communications system used for other purposes on Caltrain
  o Wi-Fi service must be highly reliable and accommodate future growth
  o Competitively bid solution, not a piecemeal solution
  o No net capital cost to the agency
• Early 2013
  o Hired marketing firm to generate interest in a potential Request for Proposals for Wi-Fi services.
  o Marketing firm pitched Caltrain opportunity to a number of Bay Area and nationally known organizations
  o Quantifiable interest would result in the San Mateo County Transit District (District) seeking bids (likely from a consortium of providers)
  o Lots of initial interest from equipment providers willing to donate equipment. Caltrain seeks a total solution wherein the system would be built and maintained by a third party

• Summer 2013
  o With Communications-based Overlay Signal System/Positive Train Control (CBOSS/PTC) also comes a fiber backbone along the right of way
  o Leveraging Caltrain-owned fiber backbone determined to yield a better solution for passenger Wi-Fi than cellular
  o New capital cost estimates required
  o While this will be a more expensive solution, it will provide for a much more robust system that will be more attractive to sponsors
  o Fiber backbone installation and lighted along right of way owned by Caltrain completed by end of 2015

• Fall 2014
  o Engaged two firms to help Caltrain preliminarily design its Wi-Fi system, including developing capacity requirements, coverage design and radio environment surveys
  o Caltrain intends on leveraging the value of its ridership, right of way ownership, and its fiber backbone as part of any agreement
  o Additional work includes establishing the business case for sponsorship including estimates of costs for constructing and operating the system

• Winter 2014 and Spring 2015
  o Completed solution design and cost estimates based upon an engineering design study of the proposed solution
  o Benefits of the engineering design study included:
    ▪ Ensures that a sponsor provides adequate funding for the solution
    ▪ Enables the JPB to understand true costs should it eventually decide to self-fund
    ▪ Solution design will be included in a Request for Interest (RFI) solicitation allowing for improved responses
  o Include the completed design study in an RFI for providing Wi-Fi services
  o Hold an “Industry Day” wherein integrators, sponsors, equipment providers and financiers can come together to understand the opportunity

• Design Solution (30 Percent Design)
  o Use of fiber optic backbone, poles and towers on Caltrain right of way
  o Train-to-ground radios operating on an unlicensed five gigahertz spectrum
  o 100 wayside radio sites (39 existing and 69 new sites)
  o 48 miles of track with poles every .48 miles
  o 24 train sets fit with Wi-Fi equipment plus train-to-ground equipment in the cab car
  o Back office monitoring equipment
• Project Cost Estimate (Based on 30 Percent Design Solution)
  o Cost estimate includes
    ▪ Additional poles (and utilities)
    ▪ Wayside equipment
    ▪ Onboard equipment
    ▪ Back office monitoring equipment
  o Completed solution design and cost estimates based upon an engineering design study of the proposed solution
    ▪ Estimated cost to design and construct: $27.2 million
    ▪ Total installed cost (includes internal costs, bonding and insurance): $42.4 million
    ▪ Annual operating and maintenance costs: $700,000
• Summer 2015
  o Completed RFI document for providing Wi-Fi services
  o Met with contracts and procurement and legal staff concerning RFI process
  o Preliminary planning for an “Industry Day” wherein integrators, sponsors, equipment providers and financiers can come together to understand the opportunity
  o Conducted meeting with Internal Stakeholder Group
• Fall 2015 – Ongoing
  o Potential Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project (PCEP) synergy
  o Current plans do not include building system-wide Wi-Fi-related communication infrastructure
  o Analysis to determine if able to support District Wi-Fi service:
    ▪ Technically feasible to utilize poles and other PCEP infrastructure for Wi-Fi purposes?
    ▪ Potential cost, time, and revenue service disruption savings?
    ▪ Design and associated infrastructure changes?
• Unresolved Policy Issues
  o Pros and cons of different options
  o Is there staff and financial capacity to proceed
• Next Steps
  o Focus future survey efforts to better understand customer utilization of Wi-Fi on Caltrain
  o Complete analysis related to PCEP
  o Evaluate options and business plan

Cat Tucker asked why it is taking so long. She asked if Wi-Fi was not a priority compared to CBOSS. Ms. Harrington said when CBOSS was procured it was a Federally-mandated project that was due to be delivered. That had a higher priority for operational improvements and mandated safety elements.

Ms. Tucker said Wi-Fi has been the goal forever and asked if it slipped through the tracks that the people who bid on electrification did not bid on Wi-Fi. Ms. Harrington said it was not included as part of the electrification Request for Proposals (RFP), but staff sees an opportunity to do planning work to see if there is a nexus with the project. Staff
wouldn’t recommend putting in infrastructure now that would later have to be removed because of electrification.

Ms. Tucker said it seems like there is no choice but to continue on this path, but it is a long time to wait. Every customer wants Wi-Fi and she hopes all of the studies are not justification to not get Wi-Fi.

Mr. Berk said the JPB should find the cheapest solution for the interim period to provide Wi-Fi as soon as possible.

Adina Levin said Friends of Caltrain did outreach years ago before Caltrain had budget to look into Wi-Fi and getting Wi-Fi was the biggest request. Over the last several years, more people have access to a network through cell phones. Friends of Caltrain recently asked if Wi-Fi is now obsolete or if there is still a need for it. She got back 45 to 50 responses and two or three said no and the rest said yes. She asked if staff looked into the costs from VTA, which has Wi-Fi on the light rail and on buses, and Capitol Corridor. Ms. Harrington said a different solution is being investigated for Caltrain than the VTA solution.

Ms. Levin asked what the difference is and why Caltrain is not considering it. Ms. Harrington said there is a different set of technical requirements because the train goes up to 79 miles per hour, goes through four tunnels, and has up to 200 people in a car. Caltrain has bigger capacity with more need. Staff wants to make sure that anything that is built will meet the needs of the customers. There have been some not-so-good Wi-Fi installations on trains throughout the country and one was even removed because it was not robust enough to meet the customers’ needs.

Ms. Lee said she is concerned about overdesigning the system and drawing out the timeframe. Technology changes so quickly and this solution might not make sense in a few years. The JPB is spending money evaluating and planning for this. It makes sense to just have something that works like MiFi and personal cell phones as hotspots. She said JPB might compare how much people pay for those services and see if it is feasible to implement a program in that cost range.

Mr. Berk said the JPB should get out of the business of figuring this out and let any private person who wants to put Wi-Fi on Caltrain bid for it. They will figure out what the customers want and they will pay for putting it on the train. They want to make a profit and the JPB should just let them do it.

Yvonne Mills arrived at 6:14 p.m.

Chair Shaw said this is just another thing that Caltrain is trying to figure out how to do that other people already do. Wi-Fi is everywhere and Amtrak does it. He would like to see what everyone else is doing. Peer review, case studies, and benchmarking should be in this report. This is a problem that has been solved by others and it should be done here.
Ms. Mills said she rode Amtrak from San Jose to Sacramento and the Wi-Fi that was offered was awful. She hopes there is an understanding of why it doesn’t work. She looked it up online and saw how horrendously it was reviewed. She was offline the whole time.

Public Comment
Aron Hall, Mountain View, said the $50 million quoted in the presentation pays for all the data for all carriers for 10 years. He said the JPB should think about leveraging Verizon and the $100 billion they spent on the 4G network, and AT&T’s network. There is plenty of capacity and bandwidth out there and the hard part is putting it together into a usable service. He has been doing this for 10 years and is a patent holder for combining networks. He has had considerable success with services to Netflix, Tesla, Amazon, LinkedIn, Walmart, and many others. He said this is hard because there are many layers of getting the connection to work properly and needed expertise. Building towers in the right of way and fiber are not going to solve the problem. There will be many reasons that connectivity does not work. What is not a problem is the speed of trains. It is not a signal problem, it is a congestion problem and other layers of service that go into making a great connection for everyone onboard. This is a staggering amount of money for Wi-Fi service. He said that there should be a level playing field for companies that provide this service to try putting it onboard.

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said Singer and Associates marketing firm was hired for $800,000 in 2013 to generate interest. For that money, all that people got was a four-slide PowerPoint presentation. Altamont Corridor Express and Capitol Corridor have Wi-Fi. The annual operating and maintenance cost for VTA is $100,000 for every bus and light rail. The real reason VTA got Wi-Fi was to have real-time access to everything on their network, including onboard video, to know where buses are, automatic passenger counters, and because it allows them, based on the load, whether to have two- or three-car trains. The way out is Michael Burns, Interim Chief Officer, Caltrain Planning/CalMod Program. He is the former Chief Executive Officer for VTA and the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency. He made Wi-Fi happen for VTA.

Doug DeLong, Mountain View, asked why JPB is even devoting staff resources to study this. There is ubiquitous cellular data coverage now, and that was not the case when people first considered putting Wi-Fi on transit systems. The provision of cell companies’ networks makes Wi-Fi on transit obsolete. He asked how much customers want to pay for Wi-Fi service. Caltrain does not have enough seating capacity. Given a choice between paying train crews and putting diesel fuel in locomotives or paying for Wi-Fi, money should go to crews and fuel. On other transit systems most of the trains are running empty vehicles. VTA and other providers wanted Wi-Fi to attract customers.

Andy Chow, Redwood City, said Wi-Fi originally would have been a great idea five or 10 years ago, but the 4G network has advanced a lot and is more reliable. As long as users have a data plan they can get done what they need. He questions whether this should be a priority at this time especially due to the staffing effort and the money needed to go into it. Getting the trains running more reliably is more important. It may be potentially easier to put Wi-Fi at stations where people stay for longer periods of time.
Ms. Tucker asked what the allocation in the budget is for this and how much has been spent. Ms. Harrington said the money in the budget has been partially used this year, and she would have to look up what is remaining. The proposal is to recommend some planning money for the Fiscal Year 2017 budget process.

Ms. Levin asked how much this type of service should cost and if there is a way to provide a pilot program to test out an approach. Mr. Hall said a free pilot has been tested on Caltrain before and many passengers said they liked it. The costs are tiny. He said he could install all the equipment and run it for more than 10 years for the cost the JPB is proposing for this project.

Ms. Mills questioned the need for Wi-Fi at this point if the JPB is planning on removing seats to make room for people to stand up. People want Wi-Fi if they can sit down and work on laptops, not if they are standing and using it on their phones.

Ms. Tucker said people will only be standing during peak hours. She said she agrees that Caltrain should not spend money on more studies. She asked if the Board will be updated on this project. Casey Fromson, Government Relations Officer, said it is not on the agenda, but there are policy questions that will need to go to the Board.

Ms. Tucker said if funding and catching up from the economic downturn and other priorities are the issue, then she could understand why Wi-Fi is not a priority, but other than that she is in favor of going forward with this plan.

Mr. Berk said if people want Wi-Fi on Caltrain and it has no budgetary implications there is no reason not to do it. If it does cost that much no one will bid on it. The JPB should not spend any money on this, and should invite private companies to bid on providing the service.

Eric Dentcer, Belmont, said he went through the first two RFPs when he worked at Cisco. He said he led the Smart Cities Wi-Fi effort at Cisco. He suggested the JPB think about future ridership, the millennial generation. The last thing they want is to send a lot of money to incumbent carriers. He said the capacity is there, but he is not sure the future ridership will want to boost their data minutes. Those plans are getting more expensive. People expect good, free Wi-Fi. It could potentially be bundled into the cost of a premium Caltrain pass.

Chair Shaw said Wi-Fi is not so people don’t have to pay data plans or to get onto Facebook. Caltrain can’t say today how many people are on their trains. Caltrain has people with clipboards to get passenger counts. That is a 19th century idea. Wi-Fi is not needed just to make customers happy. It is needed so Caltrain can be directive and make strategic decisions. The icing on the cake is that passengers could use it. Caltrain does not have the ability to know what is going on from a passenger standpoint.

CUSTOMER EXPERIENCE QUESTIONNAIRE REVIEW
Ms. Fromson said staff wants the CAC’s feedback to help make the survey useful. This survey came out of the Customer Experience Taskforce and suggestions from the CAC
that the JPB needs to better know what customers’ priorities are to help tailor JPB’s efforts to implement some of them. Each of the items in the survey will be ranked on how important it is to customers. There will be intensity questions for each topic and then respondents will rank the topics of importance. Service elements are first ranked against each other. Amenities questions will then be asked. Electric Multiple Unit (EMU)-related questions will also be asked. With the information gathered from this opt-in survey, staff would be able to create a statistically valid survey. The process for distributing this survey is through conductor announcements, Take Ones onboard, social media, news releases, the website, station outreach, e-mail blasts, the customer hotline, and 511.org. The survey will be sent out to groups including the CAC in the hopes that the groups would help distribute it. The survey will be live until the mid-March.

Chair Shaw asked if the survey will be mobile enabled. Ms. Fromson said yes.

Ms. Mills said ranking things of importance from the last survey was how staff determined that bathrooms onboard were not important to customers. She questioned if this would result in skewed results. She suggested staff break out some of the more controversial questions separately and ask them differently.

Ms. Levin said cross tabs are important. From the last survey it was found that on average bathrooms were not as important to everyone, but they were very important to people who have longer trips. Answers might be different by station. She asked why the survey is asking how important it is to have a smartphone application given the fact that she already has three applications on her phone. The survey should ask if it is important to have quiet cars during sporting events. The survey should ask what customers’ secondary purpose for using Caltrain is as well as the primary purpose because some people use it for commuting and entertainment.

Ms. Tucker said a question on the survey asks if people want expanded service between San Jose and Gilroy. Every Gilroy rider will say yes, but out of 55,000 riders, that is only 400 people. She asked what that would tell staff. That is not enough to make a difference. Some of the questions will not tell anything other than confirming what staff already knows. Ms. Fromson said Gilroy service is an issue that comes up often and staff felt it should be left in, but staff is willing to remove the question.

Ms. Levin asked what is being done to reach people who are not current Caltrain users, but are potential users. Ms. Fromson said that is in the outreach plan she identified and she is happy to take other suggestions.

Ms. Levin said it would be good to reach out to cities that are working on creating transportation management associations.

Mr. Shaw said all Go Pass participants and employers should send out the link. He said since the survey will be mobile enabled, JPB staff should create a Quick Response Code and post it on the trains and stations to get more responses.
Mr. Berk said Caltrain is not trying to attract more passengers. He asked what the point is in finding out information from non-riders. He said he does not think staff should do outreach, but should only survey the current ridership.

Ms. Levin said the survey is looking at the short, medium, and long term. Since staff is thinking about what type of service to offer with the electrified service, they should survey non-riders.

Public Comment
Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said in Europe capacity is measured by the number of seats per hour per direction. He submitted a train specification that was ignored and the impact of one bathroom is the loss of four flip-ups or four bike spaces. Because there will be two sets of doors on the new trains, more seats will be lost. Very soon people will understand that when the California High-Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) starts running single-level trains, capacity of every train would be cut in half. He said CHSRA will probably run double decker trains and that will resolve all the problems with platform issues.

Doug Delong, Mountain View, said questions that tease out the issue of spreading peak service hours out to grow capacity by having more trains in the extended peak commute should be asked.

CUSTOMER EXPERIENCE TASKFORCE UPDATE
Ms. Stewart said the taskforce identified short-, medium-, and long-term goals and projects. This is a partial list of issues.

- JPB procured GPS units to help better address non-user errors with PADS. There were issues related to user error and problems with malfunctioning GPS units and antennas. These will help the real-time display be more accurate.
- Auditing procedures related to the subcontractors and contractors to test the public announcement systems onboard and externally.
- Improve conductor training and sensitivity training and issues that need improvement.
- The new public timetable will improve service reliability. There is no change to stopping patterns. Staff will work on improving coordination with other transit providers.
- Will come back to talk about Clipper Card issues in March.
- Working on better ways to trend customer complaints and establish patterns.
- Mobile ticketing is on the near-term radar.
- Identifying ways to improve vehicle signage. May reestablish the ad hoc committee. Looking at low- and higher-cost alternatives.

Mr. Berk said in the next six months the taskforce should expand express train service. People work late at night and get up late. Caltrain should run a bullet at 9:30 a.m. and 8 p.m. and if it is empty take it away. Ms. Stewart said it could be put on the list, but there are many logistical issues to be taken into account.

Chair Shaw said there is the ability to add shoulder expresses. It is a concept Caltrain has thought about. The CAC is asking what the feasibility is to do it and how quickly it
could happen. Ridership needs to be spread out to get riders into a different time when the train is running. Caltrain needs to do something with the schedule to add capacity with the equipment Caltrain already has.

Ms. Levin asked if it is in the short term to look at ways of adjusting the schedule to increase capacity. Ms. Fromson said there are discussions about the schedule and it just needs to be put it on this list.

Ms. Levin said it would be helpful to look at the potential for fare equity as it relates to Caltrain whether it is coming from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) or some other means.

Ms. Mills said she heard announcements that because of the platform size, in order to exit the train customers had to move to a different car. That is almost impossible to do in a crowded train. The taskforce should look into that issue. Ms. Fromson said that is being discussed internally.

Ms. Lee said the CAC and taskforce needs to think about having a functional system to be able to accommodate this demand without unduly delaying the electrification timeline. If the taskforce is talking about changing the schedule, they should look into connectivity to other systems like Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) going south. Caltrain expects other agencies to match Caltrain. It makes sense for Caltrain to reach out to BART proactively. Ms. Stewart said staff does that outreach when establishing new timetables.

Ms. Lee said Caltrain needs to allow time for people to go up and around at Millbrae because it is a long walk to get from BART to Caltrain.

Ms. Levin said transfers are important to people and should be added to the survey.

Mr. Shaw said incident management and recovery is not on the list and whatever Caltrain uses does not work. He would like an understanding of what the process is and what can be done to improve it. There should be performance standards for getting the system back to normalcy. It should be measured like airlines do. Ms. Fromson said there is a dedicated committee just on incidents and there is a good deal of focus just on that issue.

Ms. Stewart said an incident command committee has set thresholds for turning trains within 25 minutes of an incident and has established standard operating procedures.

Ms. Mills said she read an article about suicides in Palo Alto and many of them are on Caltrain. She asked if there is a rise in suicides. Ms. Fromson said there are more and Caltrain has been working with mental health organizations to help raise awareness of other options and partner with cities.

**Public Comment**

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said trains are 30 years old and should be retired every 15 years. When the engine gets blown, all the power on the train will be lost. There will be
no lights and no air conditioning. Caltrain does not even know where the train is and to find out Caltrain tweets customers to ask. He said he made a proposal in the June budget to add another 20 trains a day, a minimum of one express every hour as well as a local. He budgeted fuel and crews at $80 million a year. He budgeted it out of a totally inflated fuel budget. The JPB’s fuel budget is $18 million and they are only using $7 million a year, so there is $11 million unaccounted for. He forecasted 50 percent farebox recovery in the first year, so the net cost would be $4 million. He has given up taking Caltrain to these meetings because there are no trains that go to Tamien for a period of two hours in the evening. The trains he made in his specifications are eight-car EMUs and they fit within the existing platforms and carry 900 seats and 120 bikes.

Jeff Carter, Millbrae, asked if the new proposed timetable is available for the public. Several years ago Caltrain experimented with weekend bullet trains and it was at minimal costs because trains and crews were already there and the experiment was successful. It is a no brainer to add additional express trains on the shoulder period. What must not be done is to remove a train to make another train, because that is a disservice. Maybe there could be a reorganization of the schedule to make it more efficient and run more trains more frequently. Some stations don’t get good service, but there would be more demand if they had better service. Caltrain should look at how other agencies handle incidents because incidents happen at other agencies as well.

**CALTRAIN MODERNIZATION – PENINSULA CORRIDOR ELECTRIFICATION PROJECT QUARTERLY UPDATE**
Ms. Fromson presented:

- **Funding Update**
  - Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Core Capacity
    - Package submitted for inclusion in presidential Fiscal Year (FY) 2017 Budget
    - Request in engineering phase and full funding grant agreement to be done
    - Local funding commitments required for full funding grant agreement
  - Six-party supplemental Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)
    - Funding partners oversight role
    - Target spring 2016
  - CHSRA funding agreements
    - Ongoing discussions
    - Target summer 2016

- **Electrification Infrastructure**
  - Confidential information, transparent process
  - Complete
    - Three shortlisted firms selected
    - Partner participation
    - Issued addendum for best and final offer process
    - Additional site tour for shortlisted firms
  - To do
    - Receive and evaluate best and final offer proposals
- Negotiations to finalize contract

- EMUs
  - Confidential information, transparent process
  - Complete
    - Request for Information, Request for Proposals, pre-proposal meeting and site tour
    - Received expanded Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) vehicle waiver
    - Partners will participate in evaluation
  - To do
    - Vehicle proposal due February
    - Maintenance proposal due March
    - Revised contract award date to be determined

- Other contracts/environmental
  - Tunnel notching: preliminary design review complete, continue coordination with CHSRA, waiting for Union Pacific (UP) Railroad comments
  - Centralized Equipment Maintenance and Operations Facility to be modified in coordination of the final design pending EMU selection
  - Environmental consultation and permits: completed Federal consultation, Paralleling Station 7 to be approved, ongoing coordination for remaining permits

- Local coordination/utilities
  - City/county agreements: one approved, draft agreements sent to 18 remaining
  - Utilities: potholing complete, kickoff meeting held with utilities, coordination for potential relocation

- Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E)/real estate/safety
  - PG&E: Scoping and design on hold until agreement finalized
  - Real estate: Segment #4 properties appraisals are complete and JPB will have closed sessions for real estate acquisition in spring and summer
  - Safety: Safety and security certification plan complete, developing project specific hazard management plan, safety statistics to be added when design-build contract is awarded

- Quality/risk/FTA
  - Quality: four internal audits conducted, zero non-conformance reports
  - Risk management: 88 risks are retired and 125 risks remain
  - FTA oversight: monthly roadmap meeting

- Future updates (post award) and augmented quarterly report
  - Labor statistics
  - Disadvantaged and small business enterprises
  - Construction pictures

- Schedule
  - Award contract in summer/fall 2016
  - Award contract in 2016
  - Service in 2020
Ms. Mills asked if the shortlisted firms are American companies. Ms. Fromson said all six of the prequalified firms are available online. Many of the teams have joint venture multiple partners.

Ms. Levin said there is a lawsuit on the status of Proposition 1A funds and the outcome could blow up the entire project or make funds conditional on things that haven’t happened yet. She asked if there is a contingency plan for any delay associated with the lawsuit. She asked if there is any information about potential shutdown plans to accelerate the construction schedule. Ms. Fromson said staff would like a contingency plan and staff is discussing this with CHSRA. The RFP document included what work windows would be appropriate for the design builder and would allow Caltrain to have as much service as it could for customers. Staff needs to give the builder as much flexibility as possible. Staff has made adjustments to the work windows as part of the best and final offer process. The original scope may have widened and staff is doing that to try to make sure the project can be built as quickly as possible.

Chair Shaw asked what the funding gap is. Ms. Fromson said the six-party MOU is asking for an additional $20 million from each of the three partners for a total of $60 million, $447 million in Core Capacity funds, $113 for CHSRA, $29 million for MTC, and $9 million from Caltrain as part of the Cap and Trade formula funds.

Mr. Berk left at 7:36 p.m.

Public Comment
Roland Lebrun, San Jose, asked if the EMUs will have backup power and if it will be sufficient to move the trains. This project is about to be declared illegal. CHSRA was supposed to go from Diridon to the Transbay Terminal in 30 minutes. They are actually going from Santa Clara to 4th and King in 32 minutes, and the Downtown Extension is another three minutes. They can either appeal or comply. He advised they comply. They cannot carry on with the current rail delivery partners. He estimated it will cost $6 billion in the Peninsula, $3 billion in Proposition 1A funds and $3 billion in matching funds. An eight-mile high-speed tunnel is needed between Mountain View and Redwood City. This would enable a connection between Diridon and the Transbay Terminal in 30 minutes.

STAFF REPORT
Work Plan Update
Ms. Stewart said the Brown Act workshop will be an hour-long presentation in March. The Clipper issues will also be in March.

Ms. Tucker asked if the Clipper issue can be moved to April. With the Brown Act workshop, the March meeting could be very long.

Ms. Levin said she would prefer a meeting that has something substantive so the CAC could advise the Board and not just have training.
Chair Shaw said the workshop is only training and asked if it could be done in another way instead of taking up valuable time in this forum.

Shayna van Hoften, Legal Counsel, said the workshop will be interactive, not an hour-long presentation. Conversations and hypotheticals will be built into the workshop. This is a response for the need for hands-on information. It may not take a full hour.

Chair Shaw said this should not be done at a CAC meeting, it should be offline during a training meeting. No decisions or action will be done during this.

Ms. Tucker said there have been a lot of questions about different interpretations of the Brown Act. This CAC does not do any policy making. This is why several committee members wanted this presentation to be done during the CAC meeting so everyone could understand how Caltrain’s legal counsel interprets the Brown Act the way they do. This presentation is because of the CAC's request.

Ms. Levin said the generic Brown Act training should be done offline so this training can be focused on the specific issues brought up by CAC members who serve on other Brown Act bodies.

Ms. Mills said the public could benefit from the Brown Act discussion as well because it is questioned by CAC members and the public could have an understanding of where the JPB’s interpretation is coming from. The public is also able to participate in that discussion.

Chair Shaw asked if it can be moved to another point in time. Ms. van Hoften said this was a request from the CAC, so if the chair wants to move the presentation, he can.

Public Comment
Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said it is inappropriate to do this during a CAC meeting. Other jurisdictions, like the VTA, would have a regular meeting and the training would follow the regular meeting. If there is a quorum of the body, the meeting must be open to the public. He has suggested to the Board that an attorney be present at CAC meetings to address Brown Act issues.

Ms. Levin asked if there are any regional decisions regarding Clipper or the fare study that would make the CAC's input timely. Ms. Fromson said other items will be coming to the Board that would require timely input from the CAC. She is unsure of the Clipper issue.

Ms. Lee said the CAC should consider delaying the Brown Act presentation to when the new San Francisco representative comes onboard.

Staff Report
Ms. Stewart said:
- Marian Lee’s replacement is Michael Burns.
- There was a request last month to know how much of the JPB budget comes from Federal and State sources. The FY2015 Capital Budget was $115 million, of
which $45 million came from the State and $26 million came from the Federal government. The FY2015 Operating Budget was $126 million, of which $6.5 million came from the State and none came from the Federal government.

Ms. Mills said she heard feedback that the coordination among police and transit agencies and traffic control for Super Bowl 50 was really great and she commended the JPB.

Ms. Levin said she heard things went smoothly, but people were dissatisfied that Caltrain and other cities are paying out of pocket and wished the National Football League would pay more.

Chair Shaw said taxpayers should not be paying the bill.

DATE, TIME AND LOCATION OF NEXT REGULAR MEETING:
March 16, 2016 at 5:40 p.m., San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building, 2nd Floor Bacciocco Auditorium, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA.

Adjourned at 7:57 p.m.