



JPB Board of Directors
Meeting of May 14, 2021

Correspondence as of May 13, 2021

Subject

- 1 Potential Caltrain Governance Workshop Schedule Conflict
- 2 Paths A & B – Criteria 2 Comments

From: [Roland Lebrun](#)
To: [Board \(@caltrain.com\)](#)
Cc: [MTC Commission](#); [SFCTA Board Secretary](#); [Baltao, Elaine \[board.secretary@vta.org\]](#)
Subject: Potential Caltrain Governance Workshop schedule conflict
Date: Monday, May 10, 2021 11:31:18 AM

ATTENTION: This email came from an external source. Do not open attachments or click on links from unknown senders.

Dear Caltrain Board,

Kindly be aware that the Caltrain Board workshop scheduled for Friday 14th may conflict with the following MTC meetings and consider starting the Governance workshop no earlier than 1.00 PM.

Thank you in advance if your consideration.

Roland Lebrun

Friday, May 14, 2021

[Operations Committee](#)

[Attendee Link\(link is external\)](#)

Bay Area Metro Center - Board Room - 1st Floor (REMOTE)

Friday, May 14, 2021

9:35 am

[Meeting Agenda](#)

[Joint MTC Planning Committee with the ABAG Administrative Committee](#)

[Attendee Link\(link is external\)](#)

Bay Area Metro Center - Board Room - 1st Floor (REMOTE)

Friday, May 14, 2021

9:40 am

[Meeting Agenda](#)

[Joint MTC ABAG Legislation Committee](#)

[Attendee Link\(link is external\)](#)

Bay Area Metro Center - Board Room - 1st Floor (REMOTE)

Friday, May 14, 2021

9:45 am

[Meeting Agenda](#)

[BATA Recovery Ad Hoc Working Group](#)

Bay Area Metro Center - Board Room - 1st Floor (REMOTE)

Friday, May 14, 2021

2:00 pm

CC

MTC Commissioners

SFCTA Commissioners

VTA Board

VTA PAC

From: [Davis Turner](#)
To: [Public Comment](#)
Subject: Caltrain Governance Special Meeting #2
Date: Thursday, May 13, 2021 2:17:23 PM

ATTENTION: This email came from an external source. Do not open attachments or click on links from unknown senders.

Hello,

My name is Davis Turner, a frequent Caltrain rider from Burlingame. Below is my public comment for the meeting tomorrow.

With regards to criteria 2 for Paths A&B and how Caltrain will focus on further accountability, I think equitable fare structures need to be slightly changed under these guiding questions. I am pleased with Clipper START and it is certainly a great start, yet just 3.7% of all trips are coming from Clipper START—indicating that Caltrain equity programs are not as fleshed out as an optimal one should be. Even though fare discounts exist for lower-income individuals, regular Clipper users also get a small fare discount and with expanded Apple Pay access, some of these discounts seem minimal with the number of discounts going around. AC Transit board member Jovanka Beckles has been considering a free AC Transit system which could be feasible under a regional taxation measure or a small raise to an existing tax. Even with a 50% fare decrease for some Caltrain riders, there is still a fare hurdle some riders have to overcome—so dropping the fee entirely for certain income brackets would do a lot for advancing equity. I feel that a future Caltrain governance system should consider such a fare system as it has the potential to drastically improve rider satisfaction and appeal to more community members as a means of transit which could increase long-term ridership. Option B seems to have more potential on this front, since the current governing system in place makes it hard for widespread equity changes to occur and it would be hard for modifications to make this drastically easier.

For so long the Peninsula JPB has gotten away with poor and slow governance that led to a funding crisis necessitating Measure RR, and such a crisis needs to be avoided. With this in mind I am also concerned that maintaining the current system (Option A) with little change to public input that ensures accountability will only replicate past events.

The Measure RR funds also bring up some personal concerns; the way in which some RR funds will be used is unclear—especially between expansion and maintenance programs in partnership with organizations like VTA. Relying entirely on those funds is a bad idea as I think Caltrain should focus on a governance model that allows them to be "self-sustainable" while not sacrificing rider-first ideals. The funds won't last forever and they ought to be used on effective maintenance or some form of improvement that allows Caltrain to meet such self-sustainability goals. Governance Path C, I think, is best for this. While the third special meeting will devote more time to regional governance, I find these proposals and this path the most compelling. Recent reports found that a lot of Bay Area residents are in favor of Caltrain joining a regional governance program in coordination with BART, which I think is not only good for Caltrain, but good for regional businesses and organizations who benefit from both services—since riders will have a seamless transition between the two. This regional governance network could also have the potential to create a more robust, equitable fare

system (either integrated or free) that could improve BART at the same time. As was mentioned in the public comments at the last meeting, this could also pave the way for a renaming of Caltrain as part of the integrated system to better represent the Bay Area, since a train is often viewed more as a privilege for white-collar commuters (even if this isn't always true) and less as an integral part of a seamless public transit network serving every community member.

Thank you for your time and consideration, and I am appreciative of the Board for holding these meetings as it displays their commitment to improving Caltrain for the better and focusing on rider input.

Thanks,
Davis

(650)-504-2224

davturn@nuevaschool.org