AGENDA

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

February 7, 2019 – Thursday
10:00 am

1. Call to Order / Pledge of Allegiance

2. Roll Call

3. Swearing In:
   a. Ron Collins (City Selection Committee SamTrans Representative)

4. Public Comment For Items Not on the Agenda
   Comments by each individual speaker shall be limited to two (2) minutes. Items raised that require a response will be deferred for staff reply.

5. Consent Calendar
   Members of the Board may request that an item under the Consent Calendar be considered separately
   a. Approve Special Meeting Minutes of January 10, 2019
   b. Approve Meeting Minutes of January 10, 2019
   c. Accept Statements of Revenues and Expenditures for December 2018
   d. Receive Key Caltrain Performance Statistics – December 2018
   e. Receive State and Federal Legislative Update
   g. Amendment to Increase the Fiscal Year 2019 Capital Budget for the Rengstorff Avenue Grade Separation Project

6. Report of the Chair
   a. Resolution of Appreciation to Outgoing Chair Jeannie Bruins

7. Report of the Citizens Advisory Committee

8. Report of the Executive Director

Note: All items appearing on the agenda are subject to action by the Board. Staff recommendations are subject to change by the Board.
Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board
February 7, 2019 Agenda

1. Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project Quarterly Report and Monthly Report for December 2018

9. Award of Contract to Proven Management, Inc. for the Central Equipment Maintenance and Operations Facility Modifications Project for the Peninsula Corridor Electrification Program

10. Resolution of Support for Caltrain’s Participation in Regional Means-Based Fare Pilot Program

11. Update on Diridon Integrated Station Concept Program

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

13. Correspondence

14. Board Member Requests

15. General Counsel Report:
   a. Closed Session: Conference with Legal Counsel - Litigation Pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9: one case

16. Date/Time of Next Regular Meeting: Thursday, March 7, 2019 at 10:00 a.m. San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building, 2nd Floor, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070

17. Adjourn

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Note: All items appearing on the agenda are subject to action by the Board. Staff recommendations are subject to change by the Board.
MINUTES OF JANUARY 10, 2019
SPECIAL MEETING

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: C. Stone


CALL TO ORDER / PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
Chair Bruins called the meeting to order at 9:07 a.m.

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

CALTRAIN BUSINESS PLAN UPDATE

Mr. Petty recalled the purpose of the Business Plan: to address the future potential of the railroad over the next 20-30 years and establish a long-term business strategy. The Plan will address benefits, impacts and costs of future service and allow the public and stakeholders an opportunity to engage in developing a more achievable and financially feasible railroad based on local, regional and statewide needs.

Mr. Petty reviewed the four technical tracks contained in the Business Plan: Service, Business Case, Community Interface and Organization. He posed the main question: “How Should Caltrain Grow?” Continuing, Mr. Petty reviewed the assumptions and the baseline contained in the plan, emphasizing the growing market in the Bay Area.

Mr. Petty reviewed assumptions in the plan, including built-out grade separations and crossing improvements. Further, he reviewed the process for developing higher growth and illustrated options of what Caltrain service could look like using 16 trains in a zone-express, local-express and a skip-stop pattern to facilitate a substantial increase in service.

Mr. Petty discussed expansion concepts south of San Jose, noting that the corridor is owned by Union Pacific (UP). UP’s plan is to electrify the segment and allow for Caltrain
integration with its segment. Mr. Petty shared all-day service plan options as well as options for peak, off-peak and weekend service.

Mr. Petty then presented growth scenarios for 2040, showing baseline, moderate and high-growth scenarios for the varying segments of the line.

A brief pause allowed for Board member commentary:

Director Chavez expressed appreciation to Mr. Petty for the informative presentation. She inquired about who bears responsibility for building of grade separations, discussed competition in the corridor (e.g., from California High Speed Rail), and discussed certain land use perspectives. She asked staff to make it clear in future presentations to show ownership of the various tracks and to include the southern portion of Caltrain service in context with the rest of the right-of-way.

Director Gillett discussed the upcoming 101 Managed Lanes project and its potential impact on the corridor and Caltrain ridership.

Director Pine discussed the challenges of Peninsula cities in building grade separations. He expressed excitement at seeing a finished Business Plan, especially with more service to the south, and added that the plan should address the potential issue of High Speed Rail not coming to fruition.

Mr. Petty continued the staff presentation by introducing Casey Fromson, Director of Government Affairs. Ms. Fromson provided a synopsis of the community meetings held with all cities along the Caltrain corridor, down to Gilroy. She reviewed the respective cities’ key themes as a result of the meetings, namely, service levels, schedules, the physical corridor, land development and station connectivity/access.

Ms. Fromson recapped outreach activities to date and noted the new Business Plan website www.caltrain2040.org also contains upcoming outreach activities.

Chair Bruins thanked Mr. Petty and Ms. Fromson for their incredible work.

Chair Bruins called for public comment.

PUBLIC COMMENT
Doug deLong, Mountain View, suggested that staff review transit operators who provide 24/7 service.

Vaughn Wolffe, Pleasanton, discussed details related to the presentation.

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, discussed details related to the presentation.

Adina Levin, Friends of Caltrain, echoed previous comments regarding competition presented by the highway and urged the Board to prioritize getting cars off the road.
Further Board commentary included Director Brinkman, who thanked the staff for the excellent presentation and stressed the importance of aiming for the “high growth” options in the Plan.

Chair Bruins thanked staff for the quarterly update. She noted that the focus is currently on service planning, but costing out options would be next. Regarding outreach and communication, Chair Bruins suggested promoting the new website, where cities can find updates specific to their areas. She stated the Plan is a huge undertaking and there are many public forums in which to engage in help shaping it.

Executive Director Jim Hartnett thanked the Board for the positive commentary on the Business Plan, emphasizing that it is an extraordinary process and an exciting time to be a part of shaping service to 2040.

**ADJOURN**
The special meeting adjourned at 10:22 a.m.

An audio/video recording of this meeting is available online at [www.caltrain.com](http://www.caltrain.com). Questions may be referred to the Board Secretary's office by phone at 650.508.6279 or by email to board@caltrain.com.
MEMBERS PRESENT: J. Bruins, Chair; C. Brinkman, C. Chavez, D. Davis, G. Gillett, D. Pine, M. Zmuda

MEMBERS ABSENT: C. Stone


CALL TO ORDER/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
Chair Bruins called the meeting to order at 10:23 a.m.

ROLL CALL
A quorum was confirmed.

REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE
Election of Officers For 2019
Director Davis reported that the Nominating Committee met and recommended that Directors Gillett and Pine serve as Chair and Vice Chair, respectively, for 2019.

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

Director Pine commended outgoing Chair Bruins for her hard work over the year as Chair. Director Gillett reiterated Director Pine’s comments.

Director Bruins presented the gavel to Chair Gillett.

PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA
Vaughn Wolfe, Pleasanton, addressed the board regarding transit-oriented development and ridership destinations.

Andy Chow, Redwood City, discussed a decline in Caltrain ridership and whether it was related to the stock market.

CONSENT CALENDAR
Motion/Second: Brinkman/Davis
Ayes: Brinkman, Bruins, Chavez, Davis, Pine, Zmuda, Gillett
Absent: Stone
Noes: None
Approved Special Meeting Minutes of December 6, 2018
Approved Meeting Minutes of December 6, 2018
Approved Special Meeting/Study Session Minutes of December 14, 2018
Accepted Statements of Revenues and Expenditures for November 2018
Received Key Caltrain Performance Statistics – November 2018
Received State and Federal Legislative Update
Adopted 2019 Legislative Program
Received Caltrain Business Plan Monthly Update – December 2018

REPORT OF THE CHAIR
No report

REPORT OF THE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Brian Shaw, Chair of the Citizens Advisory Committee, reported that the committee did not meet in December due to lack of quorum. He requested Board support to allow the meetings to be held, despite a lack of quorum. He reiterated the need for a representative from San Mateo County on the committee.

Director Bruins expressed support for allowing the committee to meet without a quorum but added that if meetings continued with a lack of a quorum, there would be no incentive for members to attend. Director Zmuda requested an update on why San Mateo County does not have a representative.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
Executive Director Jim Hartnett introduced and welcomed the new Board Secretary, Dora Seamans. Mr. Hartnett stated Ms. Seamans most recently worked for the Town of Woodside as Town Clerk and City of Redwood City as Assistant City Clerk. He noted that Ms. Seamans has a Master’s degree in Public Administration and is a Certified Municipal Clerk. Mr. Hartnett thanked Cindy Gumpal and Jean Brook, Assistant Board Secretaries, for their assistance during the transition period.

Mr. Hartnett briefly updated the Board on the Federal government shutdown and its effect on grants that are not being received for Caltrain’s State of Good Repair program and purchase of electric vehicles.

Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project (PCEP) Monthly Report for November 2018
John Funghi, CalMod Chief Officer, provided an update on work along the right-of-way including power substation, transformer, signal house, foundations and pole installation, and the tunnel modification project. Mr. Funghi displayed a video on the progress of the PCEP during 2018.

Monthly Report on Positive Train Control (PTC) System
Michelle Bouchard, Chief Operating Officer, Rail, announced achievements on the PTC project including submitting an alternative schedule to the Federal Railroad
Administration and receipt of a $3.9m grant. She noted the $4 million funding gap that remains. Ms. Bouchard stated she will continue to work closely with Wabtec to meet the certification deadline.

Public Comment
Roland Lebrun, San Jose, addressed the Board regarding details of PTC.

RESOLUTION OF SUPPORT FOR CALTRAIN’S PARTICIPATION IN REGIONAL MEANS-BASED FARE PILOT PROGRAM
Michelle Bouchard, Chief Operating Officer, Rail, outlined a program being led by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) in an effort to create a regional program with the larger transit operators (BART, Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District, S. F. Muni and Caltrain) to address the issue of affordability and equity of fares by providing a fare discount for low-income passengers. Ms. Bouchard recommended support of the pilot program.

Ms. Bouchard introduced Melissa Jones, Principal Planner, Caltrain Planning, who explained the program in more detail. Ms. Jones responded to Board members’ questions and concerns and stated that the Board could postpone a decision on the proposal until next month to allow for continued discussion and a greater understanding of the program details, Caltrain ridership effects and financial impacts.

A lengthy discussion ensued among Board members, with concerns expressed on the following: tying the pilot program to the Business Plan more directly; understanding the financial impact to Caltrain; the length of time that MTC would provide a subsidy to offset lost farebox revenues; eligibility criteria and enrollment under the program; whether the Board’s Resolution of Support would be binding; whether the fare discount would need to continue after the pilot program (and regional subsidy) end; the timeline for when a decision must be made for Caltrain to participate in the pilot; the anticipated impact on Caltrain ridership; whether Caltrain could cap usage during the pilot, and ensuring Caltrain is more inclusive of and accessible for those who cannot afford to ride it.

Chair Gillett called for public comment.

Public Comment
Doug deLong, Mountain View, encouraged the Board to adopt the Resolution of participation in the pilot program.

Adina Levin, Friends of Caltrain and Seamless Bay Area, expressed support from both groups and encouraged the Board to implement and also look beyond the pilot phase.

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, cautioned to not add to the JPB member agencies’ funding challenges, recommended consideration of ending subsidy of the Go Pass and recommended the Board review the cost of the managing agency.

Jim Hartnett, Executive Director, discussed details of the program and stated that the Board could delay action until its next meeting only, as MTC needs to establish parameters of the pilot.

Motion/Second: Chavez/Davis to continue the item to the February board meeting.
Ayes: Brinkman, Bruins, Chavez, Davis, Pine, Zmuda, Gillett
Absent: Stone
Noes: None

AUTHORIZE ISSUANCE OF NOT TO EXCEED $60,000,000 AGGREGATE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF FAREBOX REVENUE BONDS; APPROVE FORMS OF FOURTH SUPPLEMENTAL TRUST AGREEMENT, BOND PURCHASE AGREEMENT, OFFICIAL STATEMENT, CONTINUING DISCLOSURE AGREEMENT AND ESCROW AGREEMENT; TAKE OTHER ACTIONS IN CONNECTION WITH ISSUANCE AND RATIFICATION OF AUTHORIZATION OF INTERIM FINANCINGS APPROVED DECEMBER 6, 2018, AND TAKE OTHER ACTIONS IN CONNECTION WITH THE INTERIM FINANCINGS
Derek Hansel, Chief Financial Officer, addressed the Board and outlined the final steps needed to close on Caltrain’s financing, which had been reviewed by the Board of Directors over the past several months.

Mr. Hansel noted that Caltrain’s bond rating had recently been upgraded by Standard & Poor’s to an A+ rating. He answered questions of Board members and thanked the financing team for their involvement in the project.

Approved by Resolution 2019-61
Motion/Second: Brinkman/Gillett
Ayes: Brinkman, Bruins, Chavez, Davis, Pine, Zmuda, Gillett
Absent: Stone
Noes: None

AWARD OF CONTRACTS TO COOPER PUGEDA MANAGEMENT, INC. AND JACOBS PROJECT MANAGEMENT COMPANY FOR ON-CALL PROGRAM MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT SERVICES
Julie Taylor, Director of Procurement, provided details of the contract award for On-Call Program Management Oversight (PMO) Services, noting it was a joint procurement with the San Mateo County Transit District. The combined contract value for the two firms is $34,660,000 for a five-year term.

In response to Director Davis's query regarding the possibility of utilizing existing employees for the work, Michelle Bouchard, Chief Operating Officer, Rail, stated that some of the PMO work previously performed by consultants had been brought in-house and now is managed by employees, but contractors still are needed to manage the JPB’s large capital projects.

Approved by Resolution 2019-62
Motion/Second: Davis/Chavez
Ayes: Brinkman, Bruins, Chavez, Davis, Pine, Zmuda, Gillett
Absent: Stone
Noes: None

In response to Director Chavez’ request to review draft contracts prior to Board approval, Legal Counsel Cassman responded that contracts are not necessarily ready at the time that the agenda is published but that they are based on previously-approved standard contract language.

UPDATE ON PLANS AND POLICIES INFLUENCING THE USE OF JPB PROPERTY
This item was moved to the February 2019 Board meeting.

CALTRAIN QUARTERLY PERFORMANCE REPORTS
Rail Operations Performance Update 1st Quarter Fiscal Year 2019
Safety and Security Update 1st Quarter Fiscal Year 2019
This item was moved to the February 2019 Board meeting.

CORRESPONDENCE
Correspondence received was included in the packet and posted to the agency’s website.

BOARD MEMBER REQUESTS
None.

GENERAL COUNSEL REPORT
Legal Counsel Cassman stated that the first closed session was not needed and that no action was anticipated from the second closed session.

Closed session: Liability Claims Pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9(d)(2): Claimant: Barbara Calkins
Agency claimed against: Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board

Closed Session Conference with Legal Counsel – Anticipated Litigation
Initiation of litigation pursuant to Government Code section 54956.9 (d)(4): One case

The Board recessed to the following Closed Session at 12:10 p.m.

The Board reconvened in open session at 12:44 p.m.

Legal Counsel Cassman stated that no reportable action was taken in closed session.

DATE/TIME OF NEXT REGULAR MEETING: THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2019 AT 10 A.M. SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT ADMINISTRATIVE BUILDING, 2ND FLOOR, 1250 SAN CARLOS AVENUE, SAN CARLOS, CA 94070
Chair Gillett announced that the next meeting would be held on Feb. 7, 2019 at 10 a.m.

ADJOURN
The meeting adjoumed at 12:45 p.m.

An audio/video recording of this meeting is available online at [www.caltrain.com](http://www.caltrain.com). Questions may be referred to the Board Secretary’s office by phone at 650.508.6279 or by email to board@caltrain.com.
TO: Joint Powers Board
THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
Executive Director
FROM: Derek Hansel
Chief Financial Officer
SUBJECT: STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENSES FOR THE PERIOD ENDING DECEMBER 31, 2018

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

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

SIGNIFICANCE
Annual Forecast: The annual forecast was updated based on actual revenue and expense trends through December 2018. The forecast was derived by analyzing trends and percentage growth patterns as well as reviewing details with cost center managers.

Forecast Revenues: Total revenue (page 1, line 17) is forecast $3.8 million lower than budget. This is primarily driven by lower Farebox Revenue (page 1, line 1) which is $4.3 million lower than budget due to lower ticket vending machine and Clipper sales, partially offset by higher Go Pass revenue. Year-to-date ridership trends have been lower than projected, driving down Farebox Revenue. The decline in Farebox Revenue is partially offset by increased Other Income (page 1, line 5) due to higher advertising and interest income.

The Use of Reserves (page 1, line 13) is $0.7 million lower than budget due to lower forecast expenses, partially offset by lower revenue.

Forecast Expenses: Total Expense (page 1, line 48) is $3.8 million lower than budget. The variance is primarily due to lower expense trends. Shuttles Services (page 1, line 26) is $1.0 million lower than budget due to a labor shortage of drivers causing a reduction in service. Wages & Benefits (page 1, line 37) is $1.3 million lower than budget due to continued vacancies partially offset by $0.4 million higher Managing Agency Overhead (page 1, line 38) due to higher than anticipated costs. Other Office Expenses and Services (page 1, line 42) is $1.4 million lower than budget due primarily to lower
software maintenance, bank fees, and recruiting fees. The forecast for Long Term Debt Expense (page 1, line 46) is the same as budget but may change with the debt issuance and refinancing.

**Year to Date Revenues:** As of December year-to-date actual, the Total revenue (page 1, line 17) is $6.8 million higher than the prior year. This is primarily driven by higher Farebox Revenue (page 1, line 1), Operating Grants (page 1, line 11) and JPB Member Agencies contributions (page 1, line 12).

**Year to Date Expenses:** As of December year-to-date actual, the Total Expense (page 1, line 48) is $7.0 million higher than the prior year-to-date actual. This is primarily due to Rail Operator Services (page 1, line 23), Fuel and Lubricants (page 1, line 27), Insurance Cost (page 1, line 29), and Wages & Benefits (page 1, line 37).

**BUDGET IMPACT**
There are no budget amendments for the month of December 2018.

**STRATEGIC INITIATIVE**
This item does not achieve a strategic initiative.

Prepared By: Maria Pascual, Accountant 650-508-6288
Jennifer Ye, Manager, General Ledger 650-622-7890
null
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF SECURITY</th>
<th>MATURITY</th>
<th>INTEREST RATE</th>
<th>PURCHASE PRICE</th>
<th>MARKET PRICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Agency Investment Fund (Unrestricted)</td>
<td>* Liquid Cash</td>
<td>2.291%</td>
<td>5,989,348</td>
<td>5,989,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Pool (Restricted)</td>
<td>** Liquid Cash</td>
<td>2.220%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Pool (Unrestricted)</td>
<td>** Liquid Cash</td>
<td>2.220%</td>
<td>1,007,092</td>
<td>1,007,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Unrestricted)</td>
<td>Liquid Cash</td>
<td>0.000%</td>
<td>31,989,372</td>
<td>31,989,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Restricted)</td>
<td>*** Liquid Cash</td>
<td>0.200%</td>
<td>20,026,550</td>
<td>20,026,550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$ 60,012,363 $ 60,012,363

Accrued Earnings for December 2018 $ 40,649.07
Cumulative Earnings FY2019 $ 255,899.00

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

** As of December 2018, the total cost of the Total County County was $5,749,785,923 and the fair market value per San Mateo County Treasurer's Office was $5,752,571,036.

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

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

The Joint Powers Board has the ability to meet its expenditure requirements for the next six months.
AGENDA ITEM #5(d)
FEBRUARY 7, 2019

PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD
STAFF REPORT

TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
Executive Director

FROM: Michelle Bouchard
Chief Operating Officer, Rail

SUBJECT: KEY CALTRAIN PERFORMANCE STATISTICS - DECEMBER 2018

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

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

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no budget impact.

MONTHLY UPDATE
In December 2018, Caltrain’s Average Weekday Ridership (AWR) decreased 4.2 percent to 53,258 from December 2017 AWR of 55,574. The total number of passengers who rode Caltrain in December 2018 decreased 4.6 percent to 1,356,071 from 1,422,012 in December 2017. In December 2018, Caltrain ridership was impacted by the Weekend SF Caltrain Closure (effective Saturday, October 6, 2018 through late Spring 2019). In comparing the weekend train counts at Bayshore Station with the 2018 Annual Count baseline, there was a decrease in ridership at Bayshore station by 33.3 percent in December 2018. AWR and Total Monthly ridership has trended down for the previous three months coincident with the weekend shutdowns. Staff has long reported that the current ridership estimating methodology that has been in use since the inception of the Caltrain service does not accurately differentiate between weekday and weekend riders. A new methodology will be implemented in the coming months to more accurately reflect ridership trends for the purpose of monthly reporting. A complete description of the calculation methodology will also be provided.

This month ticket sales for One Way tickets (up 2.4 percent) and ED One Way tickets (up 1.7 percent), increased from December 2017. Ticket sales for Day Passes (down 12.4 percent), ED Day Passes (down 19.8 percent), Monthly Passes (down 8.3 percent) and ED Monthly Passes (down 12.9 percent) decreased from December 2017. Ridership was
also likely impacted by Christmas Eve, Christmas Day, New Year’s Eve and Christmas Day falling on back to back Mondays and Tuesdays leading to customers taking longer winter breaks during the holiday season and the shift in fare product usage to One Way tickets (Clipper cash) due to the Monthly Pass fare increase from 28 one-way rides to 30 one-way rides effective July 2018. The implementation of Caltrain Mobile Ticketing (which includes One Way, ED One Way, Day Pass, ED Day Pass, Zone Upgrades and Joint Caltrain + VTA Day Pass purchases) accounted for approximately 2.9 percent (39,498 rides) of December 2018 rides and 4.1 percent ($287,409) of December 2018 Monthly Ticket Sales Revenue. The number of Eligible Go Pass Employees decreased 2.5 percent to 81,683 from 83,781 from December 2017. The number of participating Go Pass Companies increased to 132 from 125 from December 2017. Farebox Revenue decreased 1.4 percent to $7,370,371 from $7,478,583 in December 2017.

On-time performance (OTP) for December 2018 was 92.2 percent compared to 93.9 percent OTP for December 2017. In December 2018 there were 343 minutes of delay due to mechanical issues compared to 499 minutes in December 2017.

Looking at customer service statistics, there were 6.8 complaints per 100,000 passengers in December 2018 which decreased from 8.1 in December 2017.

Shuttle ridership for December 2018 decreased 7.2 percent from December 2017. For the station shuttles, the Millbrae-Broadway shuttle averaged 149 daily riders. The weekend Tamien-San Jose shuttle averaged 16 daily riders. When the Marguerite shuttle was removed, the impact to ridership was a decrease of 13.3 percent. Shuttle routes continue to have DNOs (Did Not Operate) trips, but the loss of shuttle service has leveled off. With support from the shuttle contractor’s (MV Transportation) corporate management and new shuttle contractor management, there is renewed a commitment to improve shuttle service and address shuttle staffing shortages. FastTrack efforts to streamline training processes for qualified Class B licensed drivers have been implemented. The Belmont-Hillsdale shuttle and Menlo Park Midday Shuttle remain temporarily discontinued.
### Table A
#### December 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>FY2019</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Ridership</td>
<td>1,422,012</td>
<td>1,356,071</td>
<td>-4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Weekday Ridership</td>
<td>55,574</td>
<td>53,258</td>
<td>-4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Farebox Revenue</td>
<td>$7,478,583</td>
<td>$7,370,371</td>
<td>-1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-time Performance</td>
<td>93.9%</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
<td>-1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Caltrain Shuttle Ridership</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>6,682</td>
<td>-7.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Year to Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>FY2019</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Ridership</td>
<td>9,476,324</td>
<td>9,387,686</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Weekday Ridership</td>
<td>60,915</td>
<td>60,520</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Farebox Revenue</td>
<td>$47,977,614</td>
<td>$51,084,660</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-time Performance</td>
<td>94.8%</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>-2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Caltrain Shuttle Ridership</td>
<td>8,726</td>
<td>8,110</td>
<td>-7.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Graph A

#### Caltrain Average Weekday Ridership

- **AWR**: 55,574
- **13-Month Average**: 53,258

Yearly comparison chart with months from December 2017 to December 2018.
Graph B

Caltrain Monthly Sales by Ticket Type

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

Graph C

Caltrain Mobile Ticketing - Monthly Sales by Ticket Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone Upgrade</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Pass</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>2,681</td>
<td>5,108</td>
<td>7,027</td>
<td>8,727</td>
<td>9,307</td>
<td>9,228</td>
<td>9,490</td>
<td>8,026</td>
<td>6,828</td>
<td>6,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Way</td>
<td>2,136</td>
<td>6,194</td>
<td>10,034</td>
<td>14,734</td>
<td>20,668</td>
<td>25,222</td>
<td>28,681</td>
<td>26,979</td>
<td>29,046</td>
<td>26,228</td>
<td>25,554</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph D

Monthly Mechanical Delays

Delay Minutes per Month


Graph E

Caltrain Monthly Complaints

Complaints per 100,000 Passengers
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FY2017

FY2018

FY2019
Caltrain Promotions - December 2018

Holiday Train - Caltrain ran the 2018 Holiday Train in partnership with Silicon Valley Community Foundation on Saturday, December 1, and Sunday, December 2. This family-friendly event brings the spirit of joy and giving to the community. The glittering show train, decorated with more than 70,000 lights, brought thousands of holiday revelers out to selected stations to see costumed characters and holiday carolers. All toy and monetary donations collected were in benefit of the Salvation Army’s Season of Sharing Program and the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve’s Toys for Tots program. The event was heavily promoted using both internal and paid communications. Paid promotions included 30 second Comcast Spotlight TV commercials covering San Mateo, San Francisco and parts of Santa Clara Counties, geo-targeted YouTube pre-roll videos, print ads in local papers covering all three counties, e-mail blasts, and sponsored Facebook ads on the Mercury News feed. Internal communications included organic and paid Facebook/Twitter ads, a dedicated Web page on the Caltrain website, news releases/blogs and VMS/Conductor announcements. Posters were displayed at local businesses throughout the county and inside information cases at stations. More than 3,000 toys were collected for both nights.

Red Bowl at Levi’s Stadium - The Red Bowl, formerly known as the Foster Farms Bowl was held at Levi’s Stadium on Monday, December 31, at noon. This year’s matchup included the Oregon Ducks, who took on Michigan State. No extra pre- or post-game service was provided, but the game was promoted using internal communication channels via Caltrain website, Special Events page and all organic social media posts. Total ridership alighting and boarding at Mountain View station was 815, a 12 percent increase compared to 2017.

New Year’s Eve - Caltrain operated two pre-firework special trains and five additional post-fireworks special trains departing San Francisco. The communications plan included information on the Caltrain website, news releases/blogs, organic social media and VMS/Conductor announcements. Service was also promoted through paid geo-targeted Facebook and display ads. News media outlets heavily urged NYE revelers to use public transportation in order to avoid traffic. Total ridership alighting and boarding at San Francisco station was 11,001, an increase of 9 percent. Post-fireworks service carried 5,913 riders, which represents a 14 percent increase compared to 2017 ridership.

On-going Promotions

49ers at Levi’s® Stadium - In December, the 49ers hosted three games against Denver, Seattle and Chicago. Total ridership alighting and boarding for the three games was 4,768. Pre- and regular season total additional ridership alighting and boarding at Mountain View station was 16,061, a 13 percent decrease compared to 2017 as they failed to make the playoffs and a season ending injury to the starting quarterback in the third game of the season.
San Jose Sharks at Sap Center - For the month of December there were seven home games played. Promotions include sponsored Facebook engagement ads through the end of January. Caltrain carried an additional 917 customers for the month.

Caltrain Digital Metrics - DEC 2018

New Followers
+858
Dec 18 - 175,873
Nov 18 - 175,015
Dec 17 - 171,165

Top Tagged Issues
1. Delay
2. Holiday Train
3. Conductor Complimnt
4. Bike Car
5. CalMod

Caltrain.com Sessions
Dec 18 - 669,471
Nov 18 - 708,983
Dec 17 - 697,213

Monthly Yelp & FB Rating
🌟🌟🌟
(3 Dec reviews)

Social Sentiment
Social Mentions by Sentiment
Neutral 1736
Positive 1287
Negative 1633

Mobile App - DEC 18
- Downloads
- Active Users
2.0 (+0.1) - 78 reviews - iTunes Rating
Twitter Impression Spikes
December, 2018

Your Tweets earned 4.0M impressions over this 31 day period

![Impression Chart]

Prepared by: Patrice Givens, Data Specialist 650.508.6347
James Namba, Marketing Specialist 650.508.7924
Jeremy Lipps, Social Media Officer 650.622.784
TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
Executive Director

FROM: Seamus Murphy
Chief Communications Officer

SUBJECT: STATE AND FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

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

SIGNIFICANCE
The 2019 Legislative Program establishes the principles that will guide the legislative and regulatory advocacy efforts. Based on those principles, staff coordinates closely with our Federal and State advocates on a wide variety of issues that are considered in Congress and the State legislature. The attached reports highlight the recent issues and actions that are relevant to the Board.

Prepared By: Casey Fromson, Government and Community Affairs Director
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB 5 Gonzalez D</td>
<td>A. PRINT 12/4/2018-From printer. May be heard in committee January 3.</td>
<td>Current law, as established in the case of Dynamex Operations West, Inc. v. Superior Court of Los Angeles (2018) 4 Cal.5th 903 (Dynamex), creates a presumption that a worker who performs services for a hirer is an employee. Current law requires a 3-part test, commonly known as the “ABC” test, to establish that a worker is independent contractor. This bill would state the intent of the Legislature to include provisions within this bill would codify the decision in the Dynamex case and clarify its application.</td>
<td>Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 11 Chiu D</td>
<td>A. PRINT 12/4/2018-From printer. May be heard in committee January 3.</td>
<td>Current law dissolved redevelopment agencies as of February 1, 2012, and designates successor agencies to act as successor entities to the dissolved redevelopment agencies. This bill, the Community Redevelopment Law of 2019, would authorize a city or county, or two or more cities acting jointly, to propose the formation of an affordable housing and infrastructure agency by adoption of a resolution of intention that meets specified requirements, including that the resolution of intention include a pass-through provision and an override pass-through provision, as defined.</td>
<td>Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 51 Gonzalez D</td>
<td>A. PRINT 12/4/2018-From printer. May be heard in committee January 3.</td>
<td>Would prohibit a person from, as a condition of employment, continued employment, the receipt of any employment-related benefit, or as a condition of entering into a contractual agreement, prohibiting an applicant for employment, employee, or independent contractor from disclosing to any person an instance of sexual harassment that the employee or independent contractor suffers, witnesses, or discovers in the workplace or in the performance of the contract, or otherwise opposing any lawful practice, or from exercising any right or obligation or participating in any investigation or proceeding with respect to unlawful harassment or discrimination.</td>
<td>Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 145 Frazier D</td>
<td>A. PRINT 12/13/2018-Introduced. To print.</td>
<td>Current law creates the High-Speed Rail Authority with specified powers and duties relative to development and implementation of a high-speed train system. The authority is composed of 11 members, including 5 voting members appointed by the Governor, 4 voting members appointed by the Legislature, and 2 nonvoting legislative members. This bill would provide that the members of the authority appointed by the Governor are subject to appointment with the advice and consent of the Senate.</td>
<td>Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACA 1 Aguiar-Curry D</td>
<td>A. PRINT 12/4/2018-From printer. May be heard in committee January 3.</td>
<td>The California Constitution prohibits the ad valorem tax rate on real property from exceeding 1% of the full cash value of the property, subject to certain exceptions. This measure would create an additional exception to the 1% limit that would authorize a city, county, or city and county to levy an ad valorem tax to service bonded indebtedness incurred to fund the construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, or replacement of public infrastructure or affordable housing, if the proposition proposing that tax is approved by 55% of the voters of the city, county, or city and county, as applicable, and the proposition includes specified accountability requirements.</td>
<td>Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1 Atkins D</td>
<td>S. RLS. 12/4/2018-From printer. May be acted upon on or after January 3.</td>
<td>Current state law regulates the discharge of air pollutants into the atmosphere. The Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act regulates the discharge of pollutants into the waters of the state. The California Safe Drinking Water Act establishes standards for drinking water and regulates drinking water systems. The California Endangered Species Act requires the Fish and Game Commission to establish a list of endangered species and a list of threatened species, and generally prohibits the taking of those species. This bill would require specified agencies to take prescribed actions regarding certain federal requirements and standards pertaining to air, water, and protected species, as specified.</td>
<td>Watch</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 4 McGuire D</td>
<td>S. RLS. 12/4/2018-From printer. May be acted upon on or after January 3.</td>
<td>Under current law, various agencies administer programs to preserve and expand safe and affordable housing opportunities and promote sound community growth. This bill would state the intent of the Legislature to enact legislation that would limit restrictive local land use policies and legislation that would encourage increased housing development near transit and job centers, in a manner that ensures that every jurisdiction contributes its fair share to a housing solution, while acknowledging relevant differences among communities.</td>
<td>Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 5 Beall D</td>
<td>S. RLS. 12/4/2018-From printer. May be acted upon on or after January 3.</td>
<td>Would establish in state government the Local-State Sustainable Investment Incentive Program, which would be administered by the Sustainable Investment Incentive Committee. The bill would authorize a city, county, city and county, joint powers agency, enhanced infrastructure financing district, affordable housing authority, community revitalization and investment authority or transit village development district to apply to the Sustainable Investment Incentive Committee to participate in the program and would authorize the committee to approve or deny applications for projects meeting specific criteria.</td>
<td>Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 43 Allen D</td>
<td>S. RLS. 12/4/2018-From printer. May be acted upon on or after January 3.</td>
<td>Would require the State Air Resources Board, in consultation with the California Department of Tax and Fee Administration, to submit a report to the Legislature on the results of a study, as specified, to propose and to determine the feasibility and practicality of, a system to replace the tax imposed pursuant to the Sales and Use Tax Law with an assessment on retail products sold or used in the state based on the carbon intensity of the product to encourage the use of less carbon-intensive products.</td>
<td>Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 50 Wiener D</td>
<td>S. RLS. 12/4/2018-From printer. May be acted upon on or after January 3.</td>
<td>Would require a city, county, or city and county to grant upon request an equitable communities incentive when a development proponent seeks and agrees to construct a residential development, as defined, that satisfies specified criteria, including, among other things, that the residential development is either a job-rich housing project or a transit-rich housing project, as those terms are defined; the site does not contain, or has not contained, housing occupied by tenants or accommodations withdrawn from rent or lease in accordance with specified law within specified time periods; and the residential development complies with specified additional requirements under existing law.</td>
<td>Watch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Governor Gavin Newsom held a conference today to present the proposed budget for the 2019-2020 fiscal year. He presented the budget entirely on his own, which is quite unusual in that the director of the Department of Finance typically takes over to present a substantial portion of the presentation.

Big picture, Governor Newsom reiterated the importance of providing funding for uncertain times. The budget proposes spending $209 billion in the 2019-2020 budget year, $144.2 billion of which will be General Fund.

A higher proportion of this budget will be allocated for one-time expenditures in comparison to Governor Brown’s past budgets, a change Governor Newsom says will help sustain the surplus for a number of years into the future. Eighty-six percent of the new expenditures will be one-time investments while 13 percent will be ongoing. The budget reserve will be $15.3 billion. Total spending for the budget is 3.7 percent higher than last year, with a general fund spending increasing by 4 percent.

The budget proposes spending close to $6 billion in one-time funding to pay down some of the unfunded liabilities at both CalPERS and CalSTRs.

Another key point was the prediction of a more moderate growth rate than in previous years (3.2 percent rather than 5 percent) in anticipation of a slowdown or recession in the future. When asked what a recession would look like, he noted it would structurally impact the budget by $40 billion, a matter that should not cause concern because the budget is structurally balanced over the next 4 years. With this growth rate, general fund revenue is anticipated to increase by 3.4 percent, or $4.7 billion over the year.

A majority of the budget funds education (53 percent) and health and human services (28 percent), with the balance left over to fund other programs. He briefly broke down many of the categories for education spending, with an emphasis on early and special education.

Governor Newsom also spent a considerable amount of time discussing homelessness and housing. He is proposing $1.7 billion for housing through incentive-based programs whereby regions receive funding only if they meet pre-set goals.

For health care, he focused on the need for an individual mandate as a means to fund increasing subsidies for low and middle-income families, which would need legislative approval. He discussed the importance of expanding Medi-Cal coverage to
undocumented residents through age 25 as well as expanding mental healthcare funding and other services. He also wants to centralize prescription drug purchasing at the state level in an effort to increase purchasing power and drive down drug prices.

Towards the end of the press conference, the Governor was asked about amending Proposition 13 to differentially assess commercial property from residential property (split-roll property tax). Governor Newsom expressed hope that the split-roll tax initiative scheduled for the 2020 ballot will be used to encourage “compromise on a more comprehensive tax package,” including higher taxes on sales and services.

There were also many somewhat aggressive remarks directed towards the president, especially as it pertained the Affordable Care Act and wildfire prevention.

Finally, the Governor’s Budget sets the stage for a discussion on tying transportation funds to housing production. The Budget states:

“Going forward, the state will strongly encourage jurisdictions to contribute to their fair share of the state’s housing supply by linking housing production to certain transportation funds and other applicable sources, if any. The Administration will convene discussions with stakeholders, including local governments, to assess the most equitable path forward in linking transportation funding and other potential local government economic development tools to make progress toward required production goals.”

In his budget press conference, the Governor stated that, “if you’re not hitting your housing goals, you’re not getting your SB 1 money.” He noted that the implementation of this policy was still a few years off.

The budget proposal will be updated by the administration in early May and adopted by the Legislature in mid-to-late June. We will keep you updated in the coming days as we learn more about the budget and will report on the budget hearings that follow.
Federal Government Shutdown Continues: There are few signs of progress on a spending deal that President Trump would be willing to sign to end the partial federal government shutdown. House Democrats, as expected, proposed a two-part plan to reopen the federal government on their first day in the majority on Thursday, January 3. The legislation would have funded the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) until February 8, and all other closed agencies – including Transportation, Commerce, and Agriculture – for the rest of the fiscal year through September 30. The vote to fund six uncontroversial spending bills that would go through the end of the fiscal year, September 30, passed by a margin of 241-190. The Senate retains its position that they will not take up any bill that the President will not sign.

During the week of January 7th, the House passed four appropriations bills including the Senate-passed Transportation-HUD Appropriations bill which passed by a vote of 244 to 180. 12 Republicans joined 232 Democrats in supported the bill. The other appropriations bills the House passed were Agriculture-FDA, Financial Services, Interior-Environment.

DOT Impact with Federal Government Shutdown: The impact of a federal government shutdown at the Department of Transportation (DOT) depends on the how the program is funded. Programs funded by the Highway Trust Fund will continue but those funded by appropriations will be affected.

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) is funded by the Highway Trust Fund by the FAST Act and will continue to operate as normal. FHWA will continue to be able to provide funding for about six months. On January 10, the FHWA provide the state DOTs an extra $30 billion to start new federal-aid highway projects, but warned that if a short term continuing resolution (CR) is passed, the agency will take back most the money. The state of California will receive $2,832,296,283.

The Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) will also operate normally for at least two to three weeks of a shutdown. The highway safety programs of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) would be able to function as normal for a few weeks.

Since most of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) is funded by discretionary appropriations, most of its employees are furloughed. According to the DOT shutdown plan, “FTA would not continue any of its unfunded core agency functions. No grants, cooperative agreements, contracts, purchase orders, travel authorizations, or other documents obligating funds would be executed.” “FTA would discontinue reimbursements to transit agencies for
ongoing operations and construction projects to enable them to provide transit services and pay employees and contractors.”

Of the 54,179 DOT employees:

- 25,200 (46.5 percent) are deemed essential to DOT activities that protect life and safety and will have to work without pay. Most of these employees are air traffic controllers and others include aviation, pipeline, and trucking safety inspectors.
- 714 employees (1.3 percent) will also have to work out pay because they support the essential employees.
- Nine Senate-confirmed Presidential appointees are required to work.
- 7,814 employees (14.4 percent) will work and be paid because the work for FHWA and FMCSA, which is funded by the Highway Trust Fund.
- 20,442 employees (37.7 percent) would be furloughed.

Congressional Committees Update: On January 8, the Senate elected the Senators to all of the Senate committees for the 116th Congress. Senator Roger Wicker (R-MS) will be the chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee (oversees rail, freight, AVs). On January 11, the committee announced a reorganization of the subcommittees and the chairmen. Chairman Wicker created a new subcommittee for security and the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) which will be chaired by Senator Dan Sullivan (R-AK). The aviation and space subcommittees will be combined to one subcommittee which will be chaired by Senator Ted Cruz (R-TX). Senator Deb Fischer (R-NE) will chair the transportation and safety subcommittee, Senator John Thune (R-SD), the previous full committee chairman, will chair the communications, technology, innovation, and the Internet subcommittee, Senator Jerry Moran (R-KS) will chair the manufacturing, trade and consumer protection subcommittee, and Senator Cory Gardner (R-CO) will chair the science, oceans, fisheries, and water subcommittee.

Senator John Barrasso (R-WY) will continue to chair the Environment and Public Works Committee, which oversees the highway and safety programs, and Senator Chuck Grassley (R-IA) will chair the Finance Committee. Senator Richard Shelby (R-AL) will chair the Appropriations Committee. He also recently announce the committees’ subcommittees and chairmen and ranking members. Senator Susan Collins (R-ME) will continue to be the chair of the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee, and Senator Jack Reed (D-R.I.) will continue to be the ranking member. Senator Dianne Feinstein (D-CA) will continue to be the ranking member of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Subcommittee.

On January 10, Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-CA) announced the new Democratic members for the Appropriations, Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means Committees. The new members on House Appropriations Committee include: Reps. Cherie Bustos (D-IL), Ed Case (D-HI), Charlie Crist (D-FL), Lois Frankel (D-FL), Ann Kirkpatrick (D-AZ), Brenda Lawrence (D-MI), Norma Torres (D-CA), and Bonnie Watson Coleman (D-NJ).

The new members on Ways and Means are: Reps. Gwen Moore (D-WI), Dan Kildee (D-MI), Brendan Boyle (D-PA), Don Beyer (D-VA), Dwight Evans (D-PA), Brad Schneider (D-IL), Tom
Suozzi (D-NY), Jimmy Panetta (D-CA), Stephanie Murphy (D-FL), and Steven Horsford (D-NV).

The new House Energy and Commerce Committee members are: Reps. Nanette Barragán (CA-44), Lisa Blunt Rochester (DE-AL), Robin Kelly (IL-02), Ann Kuster (NH-02), Donald McEachin (VA-04), Tom O'Halleran (AZ-01), Darren Soto (FL-09), and Marc Veasey (TX-33).

DOT Nominees Update: On January 2, the Senate confirmed a large package of nominations, which included eight transportation related nominees. Eleven transportation nominees are still pending and the President will have to renominate them. The transportation nominees that were confirmed include:

- Joel Szabat to be Assistant Secretary of Transportation for Aviation and International Affairs
- Patrick Fuchs and Democrat Martin Oberman to be Surface Transportation Board (STB) members
- Erhard Chorlé as chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board
- Jonathan Bragg as employee representative to the Railroad Retirement Board
- Thomas Jayne as carrier representative to the Railroad Retirement Board.
- Dan Maffei and L.E. Sola as Federal Maritime Commission members

The President will have to renominate Thelma Drake to be Administrator of the FTA, after a controversial hearing before the Senate Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Committee and opposition by Senator Bob Menendez (D-NJ), who has blocked her nomination on the floor over the Gateway project.

On January 3, President Trump nominated Nicole Nason to be Administrator of the FHWA. This position has been open throughout the Trump Administration. Ms. Nason served Rep. Porter Goss (R-FL), the Intelligence Committee chairman, from 2000 to 2002 and then worked in the Congressional Affairs office of the Customs Service. She also worked for the DOT, under Secretary Norm Mineta as Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs. President Bush then nominated her to be the Administrator of the NHTSA in January 2006, and she served until August 2008. Starting in June 2017, she served as a senior advisor to Secretary of State Rex Tillerson, and was then appointed as Assistant Secretary of State for Administration by President Trump in December 2017.

DOT Announces Second Round of INFRA Program: DOT announced the second round of its INFRA grant funding program through a Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) on December 21. The program is expected to make approximately $855 to $902.5 million, subject to funding provided by FY 2019 appropriations, available for projects. The new program promotes incorporating innovative technology. DOT will make awards under the INFRA program to both large and small projects. For a large project, the INFRA grant must be at least $25 million. For a small project, the grant must be at least $5 million. For each fiscal year of INFRA funds, 10 percent of available funds are reserved for small projects. Under a statutory requirement in the FAST Act, the INFRA grant program must award at least 25 percent of funding for rural projects. The NOFO will remain open through March 4, 2019.
AGENDA ITEM #5 (f)
FEBRUARY 7, 2019

PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD
STAFF REPORT

TO: Joint Powers Board
THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
Executive Director
FROM: Michelle Bouchard
Chief Operating Officer, Caltrain
SUBJECT: CALTRAIN BUSINESS PLAN – MONTHLY UPDATE COVERING JANUARY 2019

ACTION
Staff Coordinating Council recommends the Board of Directors (Board) receive the attached memo providing an update on Caltrain Business Plan activities and progress during January of 2019.

SIGNIFICANCE
Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) staff has prepared the attached memo describing project activities and outreach related to the Caltrain Business Plan that occurred during January of 2019.

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

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

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

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

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

The following is one in a series of monthly project updates for the Caltrain Business Plan. These updates provide a high level summary of project activities and progress and are paired, when applicable, with a presentation that reflects project materials and messaging shared with stakeholder groups during the subject month. The following “January” update covers work completed in late December of 2018 and January of 2019.

ONGOING TECHNICAL WORK

In late 2018 the Caltrain Business Plan completed initial service planning activities and developed three illustrative “growth scenarios” that show how the railroad could grow service. Going forward some service planning work will continue but the focus of technical work will begin to shift significantly. Anticipated work over the next several months will include:

- Continued service planning and analysis including:
  - Detailed terminal planning related to San Francisco and the Diridon Station Area
  - Development of additional options and variant concepts showing flexibility in service scenarios and highlighting connections to regional, megaregional and state networks
  - Initiation of network coding and analysis to dynamically simulate service concepts
- Specification and quantification of capital investments needed to support service scenarios including track and system upgrades, station modifications, fleet and support facilities and grade crossing improvements and separations
- Refinement of the integrated business model including the calculation of key operating and maintenance costs
- Organizational assessment work specifying key railroad functionalities, mapping of Caltrain organization and analysis of national and international comparison railroads
- Completion of initial community interface documentation and development of comparison corridor case studies

MEETINGS AND OUTREACH

January marked the second “quarterly update” on the Business Plan. Given this, the spectrum of outreach and stakeholder engagement activities in January was significantly expanded. The following major meetings occurred in January:

- Project Partner Committee Meeting (January 8)
- JPB Business Plan Quarterly Update “Workshop” (January 10)
- SPUR lunchtime forum in San Francisco (January 15)
- Project Partner General Manager / Executive Quarterly Update (January 18)
- Caltrain Bicycle Advisory Committee Quarterly Update (January 17)
- SPUR lunchtime forum in San Jose (January 22)
- Stakeholder Advisory Group Meeting (January 23)

The Project Partner Committee (PPC) held its regular, full meeting on January 8. Sub groups of the Project Partner Committee met to discuss the technical details of terminal planning for the South Terminal on January 7 and for the North Terminal on January 11.

The Business Plan JPB Ad Hoc Committee, CSCG and LPMG meetings were cancelled for the month of January while the project team focused on quarterly update meetings and the transition in technical work. Updates to these groups are anticipated in February and March.
NEXT STEPS

The first part of the Business Plan is focused on the development of a long-range service vision for the railroad accompanied by an assessment of the community-corridor interface and the Caltrain organization. The remainder of the project will be focused on the creation of the implementation plan, including a detailed business plan and funding approach. The Business Plan team will continue to provide monthly updates throughout the Business Plan. Over the next several months the team will provide significant updates on further service planning details, ridership projections, and capital and operating costs associated with each scenario.
AGENDA ITEM #5 (g)
FEBRUARY 7, 2019

PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD
STAFF REPORT

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

SUBJECT: AMENDMENT TO INCREASE THE FISCAL YEAR 2019 CAPITAL BUDGET BY $3.5 MILLION FOR THE RENGSTORFF AVENUE GRADE SEPARATION PROJECT

ACTION
Staff Coordinating Council recommends the Board increase the Fiscal Year (FY) 2019 Capital Budget by $3.5 million, from $298.2 million to $301.7 million, for the Rengstorff Avenue Grade Separation Project.

SIGNIFICANCE
At the December 6, 2018 Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) meeting, the Board of Directors (Board) authorized the execution of agreements and receipt of funding to allow the City of Mountain View (City) to establish the JPB as the lead agency for the implementation of the preliminary engineering/environmental phase of the Rengstorff Avenue Grade Separation Project (Project). The City and JPB are in the process of negotiating a related Memorandum of Understanding, which was identified in December as a precursor to this proposed budget amendment.

This action is the planned follow-up item to increase the FY Capital Budget so the JPB is able to accept, as specified in the MOU, $3.5 million in funding from the City for the preliminary engineering and environmental clearance for the Project.

BUDGET IMPACT
This action increases the Capital Budget by $3.5 million to enable the receipt of $3.5 million in funding from the City of Mountain View Capital Improvement Program funds to conduct preliminary engineering and environmental clearance for the Rengstorff Grade Separation Project.

The requested amendment will increase the FY19 Capital Budget from $298.2 million to $301.7 million, as shown in the JPB Capital Budget Attachment A.

Note: No JPB member agency funds are budgeted for this work. The City is solely responsible for obtaining and providing all funding required for the Project. Additionally, the City is responsible for any costs that exceed the $3.5 million currently set aside for the project.
BACKGROUND
The Rengstorff Avenue at-grade crossing in the City of Mountain View has been designated as a priority grade separation project on the California Public Utilities Commission’s California Grade Separation Program Priority List (for State Fiscal Year 2018-2019).

In 2016, Measure B was passed in Santa Clara County, which established $700 million in funding for the grade separation of eight roads that intersect the Caltrain tracks in the cities of Palo Alto, Mountain View, and Sunnyvale. Rengstorff Avenue, along with Castro Street/Moffett Boulevard, are the two in Mountain View. Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) is currently developing an implementation plan for the expenditure of the Measure B funds.

The City completed the Rengstorff Avenue Underpass and Grade Separation Final Feasibility Study for the grade separation of Rengstorff Avenue in 2004. Alternatives forwarded from the 2004 Study were further refined to add bicycle and pedestrian enhancements in the 2014 Rengstorff Avenue Grade Separation Design Concepts Final Report. As a result of these two studies, the City provided support for an alternative that fully lowers Rengstorff Avenue under the Caltrain tracks, which would allow the tracks to stay at the current grade. The Project also includes the lowering of Central Expressway to maintain the automobile intersection with Rengstorff Avenue. Additionally, the design will consider and accommodate Caltrain/High Speed Rail Blended System improvements and be designed to allow up to four tracks.

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

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

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

Prepared By: Daniel Krause, Principal Planner, Caltrain Planning  650.508.7907
RESOLUTION NO. 2019 -
BOARD OF DIRECTORS, PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

***

AMENDING TO INCREASE THE FISCAL YEAR 2019 CAPITAL BUDGET BY $3.5 MILLION FOR THE RENGSTORFF AVENUE GRADE SEPARATION PROJECT

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

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

WHEREAS, the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) and the City are negotiating a Memorandum of Understanding that designates the JPB as the lead agency to undertake the preliminary engineering and environmental clearance phases of the Project and provides that all Project-related costs incurred by the JPB for the preliminary engineering and environmental clearance phases will be paid for by the City; and

WHEREAS, the City has budgeted $3.5 million from the City’s Capital Improvement Program for the preliminary engineering and environmental clearance work of the Project; and

WHEREAS, the Executive Director recommends and the Staff Coordinating Council concurs that the Board of Directors amend to increase the Fiscal Year 2019 Capital Budget by $3.5 million, from $298,168,255 to $301,628,255, to reflect the receipt and expenditure of funds from the City of Mountain View for the Project.
BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Directors hereby amends the Fiscal Year 2019 Capital Budget to increase it by $3.5 million, from $298,168,255 to $301,628,255, to reflect the receipt and expenditure of $3.5 million from the City of Mountain View for the Rengstorff Avenue Grade Separation Project.

Regularly passed and adopted this 7th day of February, 2019 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

Chair, Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board

ATTEST:

J P B Secretary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>PROJECT TITLE / Description</th>
<th>Previously Programmed</th>
<th>Proposed BUDGET</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>STA SOGR Funds</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>SM</th>
<th>VTA</th>
<th>Members Funds</th>
<th>Non-Federal</th>
<th>Other Funds</th>
<th>Total Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Guadalupe River Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>6,600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Martin St. &amp; Napolian Avenue Bridges Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>System Wide Track Rehab SOGR 2019</td>
<td>4,300,000</td>
<td>4,300,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tunnel 1 &amp; 4 Track and drainage Rehabilitation</td>
<td>4,500,000</td>
<td>5,200,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>San Jose Avenue Bridge Rehabilitation - Preliminary</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Signal &amp; Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Signal system SOGR FY19</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Railroad COM SOGR FY19</td>
<td>532,000</td>
<td>532,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>532,000</td>
<td>532,000</td>
<td>532,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Rolling Stock</td>
<td>3,150,948</td>
<td>3,150,948</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,150,948</td>
<td>3,150,948</td>
<td>3,150,948</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Bombardier Car Mid-Life Overhaul</td>
<td>267,803</td>
<td>267,803</td>
<td>243,206</td>
<td>24,597</td>
<td>24,597</td>
<td>516,160</td>
<td>516,160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Railroad COM SOGR FY19</td>
<td>792,510</td>
<td>792,510</td>
<td>414,145</td>
<td>28,434</td>
<td>349,931</td>
<td>792,510</td>
<td>792,510</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Other MOE(Includes CEMOF, minor parts and activities)</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total SOGR**: $43,506,655

**Total Federal Funds**: $13,277,600

**Total State Funds**: $6,000,000

**Total STA SOGR Funds**: $6,000,000

**Total Members Funds**: $758,542

**Total Non-Federal Funds**: $7,392,000

**Total Other Funds**: $7,500,000

**Total Total Funds**: $17,204,251

**Station & Intermodal Access**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>PROJECT TITLE / Description</th>
<th>Previously Programmed</th>
<th>Proposed BUDGET</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>STA SOGR Funds</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>SM</th>
<th>VTA</th>
<th>Members Funds</th>
<th>Non-Federal</th>
<th>Other Funds</th>
<th>Total Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>CCF Quarters</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>South San Francisco Station Improvement</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>System Wide Station Improvements- SOGR</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ticket Vending Machine Rehabilitation Program</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Wayside Bike Parking Improvements</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Federal Funds**: $13,277,600

**Total State Funds**: $6,000,000

**Total STA SOGR Funds**: $6,000,000

**Total Members Funds**: $758,542

**Total Non-Federal Funds**: $7,392,000

**Total Other Funds**: $7,500,000

**Total Total Funds**: $17,204,251

**LEGAL MANDATES AND REQUIRED ENHANCEMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>PROJECT TITLE / Description</th>
<th>Previously Programmed</th>
<th>Proposed BUDGET</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>STA SOGR Funds</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>SM</th>
<th>VTA</th>
<th>Members Funds</th>
<th>Non-Federal</th>
<th>Other Funds</th>
<th>Total Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Transit Asset Management</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Updated STP</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Personal Credit Information Infrastructure</td>
<td>426,831</td>
<td>426,831</td>
<td>426,831</td>
<td>426,831</td>
<td>426,831</td>
<td>426,831</td>
<td>426,831</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Federal Funds**: $13,277,600

**Total State Funds**: $6,000,000

**Total STA SOGR Funds**: $6,000,000

**Total Members Funds**: $758,542

**Total Non-Federal Funds**: $7,392,000

**Total Other Funds**: $7,500,000

**Total Total Funds**: $17,204,251

**OPERATIONAL IMPROVEMENTS/ENHANCEMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>PROJECT TITLE / Description</th>
<th>Previously Programmed</th>
<th>Proposed BUDGET</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>STA SOGR Funds</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>SM</th>
<th>VTA</th>
<th>Members Funds</th>
<th>Non-Federal</th>
<th>Other Funds</th>
<th>Total Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Clipper CID installation and Relocation plan construction</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>T Transit Asset Management</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Personal Credit Information Infrastructure</td>
<td>426,831</td>
<td>426,831</td>
<td>426,831</td>
<td>426,831</td>
<td>426,831</td>
<td>426,831</td>
<td>426,831</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Federal Funds**: $13,277,600

**Total State Funds**: $6,000,000

**Total STA SOGR Funds**: $6,000,000

**Total Members Funds**: $758,542

**Total Non-Federal Funds**: $7,392,000

**Total Other Funds**: $7,500,000

**Total Total Funds**: $17,204,251
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title / Description</th>
<th>Proposed Budget</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>STA/SOUR Funds</th>
<th>VTA Funds</th>
<th>Member Funds</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>Non-Federal</th>
<th>Other Funds</th>
<th>Total Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning/Studies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Capital Contingency Funds - Engineering</td>
<td>330,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>330,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>330,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Capital Contingency Funds - Rail</td>
<td>660,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>660,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>660,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Capital Program Management</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Capital Project Development</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Grade Crossing Policy Development &amp; Program Management</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Historic Station Evaluation Study</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Rail Corridor Use Policy</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Regional Rail/Mega Regional Rail Planning</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 SF Station Building Corrosion Study &amp; Rehab</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Station Management Toolbox</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Updated Strategic Plan</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 San Jose Diridon Station Planning Project</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Caltrain Business Plan</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>6,365,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,365,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,365,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Caltrain Modernization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 CBOSS / Positive Train Control</td>
<td>51,800,000</td>
<td>42,400,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>6,400,000</td>
<td>6,400,000</td>
<td>51,800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Broadband Communications</td>
<td>14,000,000</td>
<td>14,000,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 EMU Procurement</td>
<td>182,638,000</td>
<td>146,022,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>182,638,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>249,518,000</td>
<td>163,400,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>6,400,000</td>
<td>6,400,000</td>
<td>249,518,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. reserves designated for capital use
2. TIRCP
3. from other grant funds to be secured between now and FY2021
4. City of Mountain View Capital Improvement Program
WHEREAS, JEANNIE BRUINS was appointed by the Caltrain Board of Directors to serve as chair for 2018; and

WHEREAS, JEANNIE BRUINS provided invaluable leadership during 2018 helping to further Caltrain’s goal of providing quality transportation service to improve the quality of life for the communities we serve throughout the region; and

WHEREAS, JEANNIE BRUINS has been instrumental in fostering strong relationships with fellow transportation agencies, including the California High Speed Rail Authority, Caltrain’s partner to fund the Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project that will help connect the Caltrain Corridor to the rest of the state via state-of-the-art high-speed rail on a blended system with commuter rail service; and

WHEREAS, JEANNIE BRUINS fostered collaboration with Stanford University on the Caltrain Business Plan and subsequently chaired numerous workshops and special meetings to ensure the public and Board of Directors were able to better understand all aspects of the Plan; and

WHEREAS, JEANNIE BRUINS supported the development and implementation of the agency’s first mobile app to modernize Caltrain’s fare infrastructure; and

WHEREAS, JEANNIE BRUINS’ guidance helped inform Caltrain’s transformative Modernization Program; an ambitious endeavor that will help the system evolve to meet the mobility demands of our community for generations to come; and

WHEREAS, during Caltrain’s regular board meetings, JEANNIE BRUINS’ friendly, determined presence provided a sense of order and created an air of open engagement between the public and the Board; and

WHEREAS, JEANNIE BRUINS’ work on the Caltrain Fare Policy has brought a renewed sense of equity and transparency to the agency’s fare structure.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Caltrain Board of Directors does hereby thank and commend JEANNIE BRUINS for her outstanding leadership and successful year as Chair on the Board of Directors. Unanimously passed and adopted this 7th day of February, 2019.

Gillian Gillett, Chair
Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board
Chair Brian Shaw called the meeting to order at 5:46 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPOINTMENT OF NOMINATING COMMITTEE
A nominating committee was established. Members Cat Change, Kevin Burke and Larry Klein are to meet via phone at least once prior to the next JPB CAC meeting to provide a recommendation for Chair and Vice Chair. Staff will coordinate the conference call. Chair Brian Shaw advised that the election for Chair and Vice Chair will take place at the February meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 14, 2018
Motion/Second: Klein / Burke
Ayes: Chang, Escobar, Fernandez, Valenciana, Shaw
Absent: Tucker

PUBLIC COMMENTS
Scott Yarborough, San Francisco, said that he and the following two public commenters would like to share some information and to receive input from the CAC regarding Bikes on Caltrain and an alternative EMU designs for seats within view of bikes. Scott said that he supports bike parking, bike sharing and bikes on board as it solves first and last mile problem at both ends of commutes, and frees up seats on heavily subsidized feeder buses, shuttles and spots at expensive parking lots and ultimately saves the transit system money. Scott requested a re-design of the EMU cars to allow seats within view of bikes and said that it is possible with minimal changes to internal design. Scott advised that currently the Gallery bike cars have a capacity of about 40 bikes and 28-34 seats within view of those bikes and on the Bombardier cars the ratio is 24 bikes and 12-15 seats within view of those bike cars. On cars where cyclists are in view of their bikes, it allows for bikes to be moved accordingly which in turn allow for a more rapid exit from the train and reduces dwell time.
Shirley Johnson, San Francisco, stated that there are no fixed seats within view of bikes on the current EMU design. Shirley stated that cyclists need to be in view of bikes to detour bicycle theft. She also stated that it is important for cyclists to be on board with their bikes to shuffle bikes in order of destination. She also stated that the emergency exits are blocked by stacked bikes in its current design. Lastly, Shirley said that due to the different layouts of the cars; bike cars, powered cars and the cab cars, it would be difficult for Rail Operations to reconfigure cars during emergencies and when running smaller trains during midday hours. Shirley proposed two alternative layout options and requested CAC input. The first proposed option is to swap seats and bikes in the powered and unpowered cars. The second option is to swap seats and bikes and distribute the bikes all along the train so that there would be twelve bikes per car. Shirley said the new layout options would detour bike theft because the seats would be in view of bikes and would help keep trains on time because cyclists would be able to arrange their bikes by destination.

Vincent De Martel, Palo Alto, explained that the second layout option would allow bikes to board any car just as BART does. He said that this would not change the capacity for passengers or bikes and that the proposed layout makes more sense for cyclists and passengers in terms of safety. Vincent said that the second option makes it easier for Operations to swap cars when needed. Vincent suggested to make the changes now rather than later. He stated that there is a petition signed by over 1,000 users of the system asking for a redesign and that he is looking forward to feedback on the proposed designs and working together toward a resolution.

Chair Brian Shaw said that since the alternative recommended design for EMU bike car layout was not on the agenda, the CAC is not able to comment or provide input, however they can decide to place it on the agenda for a later meeting.

Joe Navarro, Deputy Chief of Rail Operations, asked Lori Low, Government and Community Affairs Officer, to comment. Lori thanked the public for the comments regarding the bike car layout recommendation and advised that this recommendation was also presented to the BAC and to the Board. Lori said that the recommendation was passed along to the Engineer and Design team and unfortunately, the exact recommended design proposal will not work, however they will consider some of the ideas proposed. Lori shared that staff is looking to discuss a public process with the Board in March, and then to have a workshop with the CAC and BAC to look at the additional electric train vehicles and the bike car design.

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said that 4 years ago he made a proposal with a different train that is now manufactured by Bombardier because the platforms in France could no longer be extended and needed to increase the seating capacity. That proposal would have 400 more seats than the Stadler cars that fit within a 700 ft. platform. He recommended staff to go back to the manufacturers and look at the train design as the RFP does not demand minimum number of seats. Roland said that Stadler trains will not be able to carry the ridership projected ten years from now.
Chair Brian Shaw said that the CAC can decide to put on the agenda the EMU bike car design recommendation for next month or to add it to the Agenda after the workshop takes place. The CAC decided to table this topic until after the workshop takes place.

CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT
Chair Brian Shaw stated that he informed the Board that the CAC did not have a quorum and did not meet for the month of December. The Board recommended to hold a Meeting of the Whole when the CAC does not have a planned quorum. During a Meeting of the Whole the Agenda can be presented, however no action and/or votes can take place. Chair Brian Shaw recommended to hold monthly meetings whether there is a quorum or not so that the public can hear and comment on the planned presentations. The committee had no issues with the recommendation.

PUBLIC COMMENTS CONTINUED
Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said that the committee is unable to table a motion unless there is an item that is tabled for action by the committee. He also suggested to amend the bylaws if attendance becomes an issue.

COMMITTEE COMMENTS
Member Kevin Burke advised that an attendance policy already exists in the bylaws. Chair Brian Shaw advised that in the past 5 years, no more than one meeting a year has been cancelled.

Member Paul Escobar thanked those that presented the public comment regarding the EMU bike car design recommendation. He also mentioned that Caltrain was well represented at a public meeting held with the city of San Jose and other partners that included VTA.

Member Kevin Burke asked whether staff is making plans for the Hillsdale station project where Belmont will serve Hillsdale passengers during the station closure. Joe Navarro, Deputy Chief of Rail Operations, advised that a schedule will be released soon. Member Kevin Burke suggested staff to add a pay station facing the city of San Carlos for those who want to pay to park at the San Carlos Station parking lot in order to increase revenue. Mr. Navarro said that staff will consider the suggestion.

GRADE CROSSING IMPROVEMENTS PROJECTS
Robert Tam, Caltrain Project Manager, presented the Grade Crossing Improvements Projects update.

Robert reported that the project was broken down to three areas due to funding sources.

1. Redwood City Grade Crossing Improvements Project
2. Santa Clara Grade Crossing Medians Project
3. FY16 Grade Crossing Improvements Project
The full PowerPoint presentation can be found on caltrain.com

COMMITTEE COMMENTS
Vice Chair Valenciana asked whether there was further information to be shared about the fatality that occurred near Whipple Ave. Mr. Navarro advised that it is still under investigation and that staff has no further details at this time.

Member Larry Klein asked when the orange speedbumps will be added to all the existing crossings. Robert Tam responded that they exist at the three grade crossings in Redwood City and at the ten grade crossings that were part of the FY16 Grade Crossing Improvements Project. Robert Tam said that it all depends on funding. Mr. Navarro advised that they will be installed.

Member Kevin Burke asked whether Caltrain conducts cost benefit analysis. Robert Tam responded that staff conducted a grade crossing hazard analysis that considered traffic volumes, geometry and physical characteristics and is how the ten crossings were chosen for the FY16 Grade Crossing Improvements Project.

Member Cat Chang said that she has observed pedestrians open the gates and although staff is unable to solve all human behavior, she asked whether there some perspective on seeing what’s most affective on what needs to be done to prevent passengers in a rush opening the gates. Mr. Tam responded that it would need to be enforcement and education that would solve those problems.

Member Kevin Burke asked whether all crossings for High Speed Rail service need to be grade separated or completely closed to car traffic. Mr. Navarro responded that he is unsure as he is not in those negotiations. Brian Shaw responded that quad gates are the solution for High Speed Rail.

PUBLIC COMMENTS
Andy Chow, Redwood City, said that there are several crossings in Redwood City that are still hazardous even after the improvements. Andy said that he witnessed a car stopped behind the gates when there was a train coming. Fortunately the train didn’t have to slow down because it was still clear of the tracks but nonetheless because of the steep angle the car got trapped behind the gate, but before the train tracks.

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, advised that regarding grade separation, below 110 MPH the solution is quad gates and they must have intrusion detection so the secondary gate or the exit gate does not close in the yellow box as it is referred to in UK. Between 110 MPH and 125 MPH, it is uniquely in the United States, an impenetrable barrier is needed, which means it would be impossible for a bus, truck or car to crash into them. Roland advised that in the UK, the danger zones are called the yellow box. When the lights are flashing no one should be in the yellow box and passengers receive a violation if they are found there. Roland said that he has noticed that the United States has red flashing lights and people start crossing when the gates are lifted and should wait for the lights
to stop flashing because a train can come in the other direction as the gates come down again. In the UK, they have a yellow light before the flashing red lights.

Adrian Brandt said that he can confirm that pedestrians are cited when walking across while the gates are activated. He also stated that over 90% of pedestrian deaths are ruled suicide. He agreed with public comment made by Roland that there are no crossing gate mandates unless you get over 125 MPH. Regarding the Grade Crossing presentation, he said that the treatments are great however they are relatively timid and is looking forward to something more aggressive.

PROOF-OF-PAYMENT
Jenny Le, Management Analyst for San Mateo County Sheriff's Office, presented the Proof-Of-Payment program update.

The full PowerPoint presentation can be found on caltrain.com

COMMITTEE COMMENTS
Member Kevin Burke asked whether staff is keeping track of the number of warrants that could have been issued and are not being issued with this new program. Mr. Navarro responded that with the previous process, tickets were thrown out of court and that conductors were being relieved of their job to attend court to testify. He said that the previous process was not beneficial. Ms. Le also stated that the previous process congested the courts. The new process de-criminalizes fare evasion and makes the process run smoother. Member Kevin Burke asked for additional data regarding financial benefits or attendance of conductors. Ms. Le advised that there was a presentation made to the CAC in January of 2018 and that further details can be found online for that meeting.

Member Larry Klein asked how many of the violations are going to hearing. Ms. Le said that she can provide that information with the next update. Member Larry Klein is interested in seeing data year-over-year to determine how well the new process is working.

Member Paul Escobar said that it is great to see the new process roll out and is also interested in seeing the data as well.

Member Cat Chang is interested in seeing violations where passengers were delinquent in having the Go Pass.

Vice Chair Valenciana asked whether there are more passengers receiving violations coming into San Francisco or leaving San Francisco. Mr. Navarro said that San Francisco has gate fare check and receives reports on the trains and conductors that issue violations. He also stated that the new fare process is still in the soft launch stage as the conductors are using fifty percent of the machines and is working on the next phase of full implementation of the process.
Member Lauren Fernandez asked whether the fines collected are now going to Caltrain and Ms. Le confirmed.

Chair Brian Shaw advised that his place of employment, Stanford, and Samtrans have gone to the Clipper card platform of the Go Pass and have had no issues because as long as the Clipper card is in the system as an active Go Pass Clipper card, it does not expire. They now they have a quarterly renewal process. He hopes that Caltrain can expand the use of the Go Pass on the Clipper Card to other clients in the future.
Chair Brian Shaw asked whether Caltrain should look at the same level of fare evasion enforcement that happens at Bart and Muni since they do this type of enforcement on their system to better understand the potential and what they have gone through. Mr. Navarro said that because Caltrain is an open station it operates differently, however there will be upcoming fare enforcement blitzes soon.

PUBLIC COMMENTS
Doug DeLong, Mountain View, said that there was a more extensive presentation made to the Board that could be found online. He stated that over 90% of the violations were due to inappropriate fare media which to him means that the passenger may have bought a ticket to the incorrect zone or going the wrong direction. He said that this may be a red flag telling us that the user finds it difficult to get right.

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, confirmed that the more extensive proof of payment report can be found in the board packet under the quarterly operations report. He read off the statistics. Roland said that the new process is effective because the ridership is dropping however the revenue is going up. Lastly, Roland said that Bart is also conducting fare enforcement in teams of three and that their team is unarmed.

Adrian Brandt stated that the report looks great, however he did not see the evasion ratio, for example for every hundred people that get checked, how many are in violation. This would be a great measure in terms of compliance and would help determine whether staff is inspecting enough.

Chair Brian Shaw asked whether the evasion ratio is a metric that can be tracked. Mr. Navarro responded that he will look into it.

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

On-time Performance (OTP) -

- **December**: The December 2018 OTP was 92.2% compared to 93.9% for December 2017.
  - **Vehicle on Tracks**: There was one day on December 6, with a vehicle on the tracks that caused train delays.
**Mechanical Delays** - In December 2018 there were 343 minutes of delay due to mechanical issues compared to 499 minutes in December 2017.

**Trespasser Strikes** - There were three trespasser strikes on December 5, 19 and 25, all resulting in a fatality.

- **November**: The November 2018 OTP was 93.9% compared to 94.8% for November 2017.

  **Trespasser Strikes** - There was one trespasser strike on November 23, resulting in a fatality.

**SF Weekend Caltrain Closure** - Ms. Navarrete reported that the San Francisco Weekend Closure went well despite a busy weekend with events like Fleet Week, SF 49ers game, Stanford Game and the Hardly Strictly Bluegrass event at Golden Gate Park.

**Special Event Train Service** -

**Services Performed:**

- **San Jose Sharks** - There were nine home games in November and seven home games in December. Total post-game riders, including regular riders and Sharks fans, boarding at San Jose Diridon station in November was 1,829. Caltrain will track post-game ridership for all home games. For weeknight and Saturday night games, the last northbound train departs SJ Diridon station at 10:30 p.m. or 15 minutes after the game ends but departs no later than 10:45 p.m.

  Total year-to-date post-game additional riders, boarding at San Jose Diridon station, was 3,721, which represents a 16 percent decrease compared to the same number of games in the 2017/2018 season.

  For the Sharks home game at SAP Center on Saturday, January 5 at 8 p.m. and in conjunction with the College Football Playoff National Championship - Championship Campus service, the last northbound bullet train departed San Jose Diridon at 12:05 a.m.

- **Holiday Service** - During the following Holidays, Caltrain operated the following services:

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

  o PAC-12 College Football Championship (Washington Huskies vs. Utah Utes) - The PAC-12 College Football Championship game was held at Levi’s Stadium on Friday, November 30 at 5:00 p.m. Caltrain monitored pre- and post-game ridership.

  o Holiday Train - Caltrain operated the Holiday Train in collaboration with the Silicon Valley Community Foundation (SVCF) on Saturday, December 1 and Sunday, December 2. With glittering lights and holiday decorations, the dazzling show-train visited nine Caltrain stations between San Francisco and Santa Clara over two nights in December, providing holiday entertainment and collecting toy and monetary donations for local children who otherwise might not receive a gift during the holidays. Caltrain and SVCF also partnered with local organizations.

  o SF 49ers Regular Season - The 49ers hosted the Indianapolis Colts on Sunday, December 9 at 1:05 p.m., Seattle Seahawks on Sunday, December 16 at 1:05 p.m. and the Chicago Bears on Sunday, December 23 at 1:05 p.m. for their last regular season home game. For the Colts and Seahawks games Caltrain operated one extra pre-game train with limited stops and one extra post-game local train from Mountain View to San Francisco. For the Bears game Caltrain operated one extra pre-game train with limited stops and one extra post-game local train from Mountain View to San Francisco. Event ridership will be provided in February.

  o Redbox Bowl (Oregon Ducks vs. Michigan State Spartan) - The Redbox Bowl College Football game was held at Levi’s Stadium on Monday, December 31 at 12:00 p.m. Caltrain monitored pre- and post-game ridership.

  o 2019 College Football Playoff National Championship - Caltrain operated special event service schedules on Friday, January 4 through Monday, January 7, 2019 to accommodate the College Football National Championship festivities in Downtown San Jose and at Levi’s Stadium. The special event weekend schedule included train service to all San Francisco stations (no weekend bus bridge service January 5 and 6 only). Additional information was available on Caltrain’s dedicated webpage: www.caltrain.com/cfbp

The Championship Campus events in downtown San Jose included:
  • Playoff Fan Central – San Jose McEnery Convention Center
  • The Quad – Plaza de Cesar Chavez
  • AT&T Playoff Playlist Live! – Discovery Meadow Park
  • Media Day – SAP Center
• Extra Yard for Teachers Summit – San Jose McEnery Convention Center
• Extra Yard 5K – Plaza De Cesar Chavez
• Taste of the Championship – The Tech Museum of Innovation.

On Friday, January 4, Caltrain operated one extra late night northbound bullet train that departed San Jose Diridon at 12:05 a.m.

On Saturday January 5 and January 6, Caltrain operated three extra southbound bullet trains and three extra northbound bullet trains between San Francisco and San Jose stations. The last northbound bullet train departed San Jose Diridon at 12:05 a.m.

On Monday, January 7 (game day), Caltrain customers were able to take the train to Mountain View station and transfer to VTA light rail for service to Levi’s Stadium. Caltrain operated one extra express northbound pre-game train and extra post-game service in coordination with the VTA. Additionally Caltrain and VTA offered a special College Football Championship joint ticket to get fans to the game through official Caltrain Mobile ticketing app. This day pass was available for pre-purchase on the app starting January 1 and is valid on game day only.

Customer Experience Taskforce -
• Lost and Found:
  o Customers may be able retrieve lost items within the same day given Customer Service department is open.

• Bikes Board First:
  o Bikes Board First will be rolled out system wide in early spring.

• Grade Crossing:
  o Moving forward with red envelope and the ballast plan and is in the final stage of receiving approval.

PUBLIC COMMENTS
Scott Yarborough, San Francisco, said that he appreciates the Customer Experience on the Agenda as an item to be discussed. Regarding the bikes board first pilot, he said that it is not facilitated at the piloted stations at which he boards. He stated that during his morning commute he feels that it does not need to be facilitated, however he feels that it would greatly help boarding during his evening commute if the bikes board first was facilitated.

Doug DeLong, Mountain View, directed the committee’s attention to item 13a in the board packet as it has a lot of information regarding the cause for delays. He said that most of the delay minutes are due to passenger delays. He said that the schedule design was not designed for today’s ridership and wanted to direct the committee’s attention to that section in the packet.
Roland Lebrun, San Jose, stated that there are special devices in the UK that go between the tracks to prevent cars and pedestrians to cross over onto the rails. He said that it needs to be part of the specification. Secondly, the reason the box is yellow and not red is that red is fine on a clear day however it doesn't work when it is dark or raining. Florescent yellow melted plastic works better. Roland asked staff to start the discussion with the public prior to meeting with the CPUC. Lastly, Roland stated that 4th and King station needs to move to 7th ST. between 16th ST. and Townsend so Caltrain will no longer need 22nd ST station.

Shirley Johnson, San Francisco, reemphasized that bicyclists work to keep the train on time and is concerned with the current EMU design with no seats in view of bikes. Shirley publicly thanked staff for the plan to have a public process to look at the train layout, including the bike car layout.

**JPB CAC Work Plan**

**February 20, 2019**
- Caltrain Business Plan Update

**March 20, 2019**
- Camera System
- Visual Messaging System
- New Electric Bike Car Configuration

**April 17, 2019**
- Legislative Update
- Wi-Fi Update

**May 15, 2019**

**June 19, 2019**

**Items to be scheduled**
- Station Management Plan (getting to stations, capacity, usage, forecast, and planning) - requested by chair 3/2/16, modified 3/16/16 by Adina
- Schedule Audit - requested on 3/6/18 by Member Lauren Fernandez
- Presentation on a plan to clean-up right of way - requested by chair, Brian Shaw on 8/15/18.
- Wi-Fi update

**DATE, TIME AND LOCATION OF NEXT REGULAR MEETING:**
February 20, 2019 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 7:10 pm
Date: January 25, 2019
To: Board of Directors
From: Jim Hartnett, Executive Director
Subject: February 7, 2019 JPB Board Meeting Executive Director’s Report

- **On-time Performance** –
  - **Through January 24:** The preliminary January 2019 OTP was 93.7 percent compared to 96.2 percent for January 2018.
    - Trespasser Strike – There was one trespasser strike on January 11, resulting in a fatality.
  - **December:** The December 2018 OTP was 92.2 percent compared to 93.9 percent for December 2017.
    - Trespasser Strike – There were three trespasser strikes on December 5, 19 and 25, all resulting in fatalities.

- **SF Weekend Caltrain Closure Update** – The SF Weekend Closure effective Saturday, October 6 continues through late Spring 2019 with the exception of Saturday, January 5 and Sunday January 6, 2019 (the weekend prior to the 2019 College Football Playoff National Championship on Monday, January 7, 2019 at Levi’s Stadium). In comparing the weekend train counts at Bayshore Station with the 2018 Annual Count baseline, total year-to-date weekend ridership at Bayshore station decreased by 31.7 percent as of January 21.

- **Caltrain 2019 Annual Count Survey** – The 2019 Caltrain Annual Count Survey started Tuesday, January 22, 2019 (the day after the Martin Luther King Holiday) and is anticipated to be completed in February. No weekend train counts will be conducted due to ridership impacts from the SF
Weekend Caltrain Closure. A presentation to the Board summarizing the findings is targeted for Summer 2019.

- **CAC Meeting** – The Citizens Advisory Committee met on Wednesday, January 16, in San Carlos. Robert Tam, Manager – Technology & Research, provided a presentation on the Grade Crossing Improvements. Jenny Le, Management Analyst – Transit Police, provided a presentation on Proof of Payment. Joe Navarro, Deputy Chief – Rail Operations, provided the Staff Report. The next CAC meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, February 20, in San Carlos.

- **BAC Meeting** – The Bicycle Advisory Committee met on Thursday, January 17, in San Carlos. Sebastian Petty, Senior Policy Advisor, provided a presentation on the Caltrain Business Plan. Daniel Provence, Principal Planner, provided a presentation on Bike Access Survey update & Bike Share Policy Framework. Lori Low, Public Affairs Officer, provided the Staff Report. The next BAC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, March 21, in San Carlos.

- **Special Event Train Service**

  **Services Provided:**

  - **San Jose Sharks** – There were seven home games in December and five home games in January. Total post-game additional riders, boarding at San Jose Diridon station in December was 917 and in January was 1,194.

    Total year-to-date post-game additional riders, boarding at San Jose Diridon station, was 4,638, which represents a 17 percent decrease compared to the same number of games in the 2017/2018 season.

  - **Holiday Service** – During the following Holidays, Caltrain operated the following services:

    - Christmas Eve – Monday, Dec. 24, 2018 (Regular Weekday Schedule)
    - Christmas Day – Tuesday, Dec. 25, 2018 (Holiday Schedule)
    - New Year’s Eve – Monday, December 31 (Regular Weekday Schedule plus Pre & Post-SF Fireworks Special Trains)
      - Caltrain provided **FREE** service beginning at 8:00 p.m. until the last train post-event departs SF at 2:00 a.m., making all local stops.
    - New Year’s Day – Tuesday, Jan. 1, 2019 (Holiday Schedule)
New Year’s Eve Fireworks – Caltrain operated two pre-event northbound and five post-event southbound special trains on New Year’s Eve for SF fireworks show. Post-fireworks service carried 5,913 riders, which represents a 14 percent increase compared to 2017 ridership. Total additional riders alighting and boarding at San Francisco station was 11,001, an increase of 9 percent compared to 2017 ridership.

SF 49ers 2018 Season – The 49ers hosted three home games in December: vs. the Indianapolis Colts on Sunday, December 9 at 1:05 p.m., the Seattle Seahawks on Sunday, December 16 at 1:05 p.m. and the Chicago Bears on Sunday, December 23 at 1:05 p.m. Caltrain operated one extra pre-game train with limited stops and one extra post-game local train from Mountain View to San Francisco. Total ridership alighting and boarding at Mountain View station was 4,768.

2018 pre and regular season total ridership alighting and boarding at Mountain View station was 16,061, a 13 percent decrease compared to the 2017 season.

Redbox Bowl (Oregon Ducks vs. Michigan State Spartan) – The Redbox Bowl College Football game was held at Levi’s Stadium on Monday, December 31 at 12:00 p.m. No special event game service was provided. Caltrain monitored pre- and post-game ridership.

2019 College Football Playoff National Championship – Caltrain operated special event service Friday, January 4 through Monday, January 7, 2019 to accommodate the College Football National Championship festivities (with visiting teams Alabama Crimson Tide and Clemson Tigers) in Downtown San Jose and at Levi’s Stadium. The special event weekend schedule included train service to all San Francisco stations (no weekend bus bridge service January 5 and 6 only). Information was posted to Caltrain’s dedicated webpage: www.caltrain.com/cfbp

On Friday, January 4, Caltrain operated one northbound post-event special train with six riders boarding at San Jose Diridon station. There was no increase in daily total riders boarding and alighting at San Jose Diridon station compared with non-special event ridership.

On Saturday, January 5, Caltrain operated three southbound pre-event special trains with 336 riders alighting at San Jose Diridon station and two northbound post-event special trains with 107 riders boarding at San Jose Diridon station. Total additional daily riders boarding and alighting at San Jose Diridon station was 445. In addition, there was a San Jose Sharks home game at SAP Center at 8 p.m. which impacted ridership.
On Sunday, January 6, Caltrain operated three southbound pre-event special trains with 153 riders alighting at San Jose Diridon station and two northbound post-event special trains with 88 riders boarding at San Jose Diridon station. There was no increase in daily total riders boarding and alighting at San Jose Diridon station compared with non-special event ridership.

Ridership to pre-game festivities in downtown San Jose was impacted by several factors including the rainy weather, interest in the 3rd Championship matchup between Alabama vs. Clemson in the past 3 years and out of town guest centered in downtown San Jose hotels. In addition based on Caltrain ridership for past College Football Games at Levi’s Stadium, College football has not been as popular with Bay Area residents in comparison to local professional sport teams.

On Monday, January 7 (game day), Caltrain operated one pre-game southbound special train and two post-game northbound special trains in coordination with VTA connecting service. Total riders alighting and boarding at Mountain View station was 3,429.

- **Caltrain NorCalMLK Celebration Train** – The Caltrain NorCalMLK Celebration Train operated on Monday, January 21, 2019. The 10-car train departed San Jose Diridon at 9:45 a.m. and made limited stops at Palo Alto and San Mateo prior to its arrival at San Francisco. Total ridership alighting at San Francisco was 913, which represents a 1 percent decrease compared to 2018 service.

**Services Scheduled:**

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

- **NHL All-Star Weekend** – The NHL awarded the 2019 NHL All-Star Game to the hometown San Jose Sharks. No special event service is planned, but Caltrain will monitor post-event ridership for the 2019 SAP NHL All-Star Skills Game on Friday, January 25 at 6 p.m. and the 2019 NHL All-Star Game on Saturday, January 26 at 5 p.m.

- **President’s Day** – On Monday, February 18, 2019, in observance of the President’s Day Holiday, Caltrain will operate a Modified Schedule, Saturday
Service with four extra trains in each direction including one round trip from Gilroy to San Francisco. The Tamien to SJ Diridon Weekend Shuttle will also operate additional shuttles. Schedules are available onboard trains and on the Caltrain Website Holiday Service webpage: www.caltrain.com/Holidays

- **SF Giants Fan Fest** – On Saturday, February 9, 2019, Caltrain will operate one extra pre-event northbound local train for the SF Giants Fan Fest that will be held at Oracle Park from 10 a.m. to 3 p.m. There will be no extra post-event southbound service as the SF Weekend Closure (Weekend Bus Bridge Service between Bayshore and SF stations) will be in effect.

- **Capital Projects** –

  The Capital Projects information is current as of January 15, 2019 and is subject to change between January 15 and February 7, 2019 (Board Meeting). Additional information can be found in the quarterly report presented at this Board meeting.

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

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

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

    In January, the relocation of underground PG&E electrical lines, and, third-party and Caltrain’s Fiber Optic cable continued. Work will not be complete by the February 1 deadline for the JPB Fiber Optic cable thereby resulting in potential delay to the contractor. Construction of the Pedestrian Underpass, and, 28th Avenue, and 31st Avenue Bridges also continued.
The substructure, abutments of bents of the 25th Avenue Bridge was completed in November. The precast bridge girders for the 25th Avenue Bridge will not be placed until the temporary street closure period, for street lowering, due to vertical vehicle clearances until the street is lowered. Construction of the 4th of 5 tiers of Mechanically Stabilized Earth (MSE) retaining walls was completed at the northern section of the project between Borel Creek and 25th Avenue.

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

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

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

In January, third party utility relocations for water, gas and electric continued. Construction of a storm water treatment facility on Poletti Way also continued. Construction of foundations for the Overhead Contact System (OCS) poles for the Electrification project began.

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

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

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

Construction was substantially completed on December 19, 2018 with completion of thermoplastic pavement striping at Castro Street. Substantial completion was achieved approximately 6-weeks ahead of schedule. Punchlist activities continued in January 2019. This will be the final report for this project.

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

In January, final construction continued of the amenities, such as striping, fencing and railings, that are necessary for the cutover and activation of the new north pedestrian crossing gates and the extended platform that is
scheduled for January 19, 2019. This will eliminate the blockage of the southern crossing by 6-car train consists, and, also eliminate the potential tripping hazards of the uneven platform surfaces. These activities substantially complete the project. This will be the last report for this project.

- **Ticket Vending Machine (TVM) Rehabilitation:** Upgrade the existing TVM Server and retrofit and refurbish two existing TVM machines to become prototypes for new TVM’s so that the machines are capable of performing the functions planned for the current Clipper program. The prototype machine are to be able to dispense new Clipper cards (excluding discount Clipper cards that require verification of eligibility) and have the ability of increasing the cash values of existing Clipper cards. There is also an option to retrofit 12 additional TVM’s.

  In December, the contract approved by the Board to be awarded to VenTek; the manufacturer of the existing TVM’s. The contract is currently being executed and a Notice to Proceed is to be in late January and completion of the 2 prototype machines by the Summer 2019. The option for retrofitting 12 additional TVM’s, if executed, would follow on.

- **Mary and Evelyn Avenue Traffic Signal Preemption Project:** Perform upgrades to train approach warning systems at the Mary Avenue and Evelyn Avenue crossings in Sunnyvale. The project will improve vehicle safety at the at-grade crossings by increasing the traffic signal advance warning times for approaching trains in order to clear vehicles at the crossings. This project will mimic the previously completed traffic signal preemption project that was completed in 2014 in Redwood City, Palo Alto and Mountain View.

  The design for this project is scheduled to begin in February 2019 and design completion by the Fall of 2019. A contract for construction is planned to be advertised in the Fall of 2019 and construction is scheduled to begin by mid-2020 and complete in 2021.

  This project is being funded through the State of California Public Utilities Commission Section 130 program to eliminate hazards at existing grade crossings.

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

Locomotives #’s 920 and 921 were shipped to the vendor’s facility in February and March of 2018. Both locomotives are still undergoing overhaul; the expected returned to the CEMOF facility in San Jose for acceptance testing has been delayed until January 31, 2019 for #920 and March 26, 2019 for #921 due to the vendor’s labor shortages. Locomotive #922 is now scheduled to be shipped to the vendor’s facility after Locomotive #920 is returned to minimize the number of locomotives that are off the property at any one time.

**MP-36 Locomotive Mid-Life Overhaul Project:** Perform mid-life overhaul of six MP-36-3C Locomotives. The mid-life overhaul of the locomotives shall include complete disassembly of the main diesel engine, overhauling by reconditioning re-usable main frame components and re-assembly with new engine components and the replacement of the Separate Head-End Power (SEP-HEP) unit and all electrical components of the SEP-HEP compartment. All areas of the locomotive car body, trucks, wheels and electrical components shall be reconditioned to like-new condition or replaced with new material. The project work shall be completed off-site at the contractor’s facility location. The six locomotives are Locomotive #’s 923, 924, 925, 926, 927 and 928.

Technical specifications for the work were completed in February 2018. The Request for Proposal was advertised on June 12, 2018. Proposals were received from 2 bidders on July 31. A bid protest was received and all bids were rejected at the October 4, 2018 Board meeting. The RFP is undergoing contract review to address the bid protest. A Resolicitation of the RFP is forecast for the Spring of 2019.
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TO: Joint Powers Board
THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
Executive Director

FROM: John Funghi
Chief Officer, Caltrain Modernization Program

SUBJECT: PENINSULA CORRIDOR ELECTRIFICATION PROJECT MONTHLY PROGRESS REPORT

ACTION

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

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no impact on the budget.

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

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

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
   Executive Director

FROM: Michelle Bouchard
   Chief Operating Officer, Rail

SUBJECT: CALTRAIN POSITIVE TRAIN CONTROL PROJECT UPDATE - JANUARY 2019

ACTION
Staff Coordinating Council recommends that the Board receive the Positive Train Control (PTC) report for January 2019.

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

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no budget impact.

MONTHLY UPDATE

1. Status on Major Milestones for Completion of Caltrain PTC Implementation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Project Activity</th>
<th>Expected Completion</th>
<th>Progress as of 1/31/19</th>
<th>Progress On Track?</th>
<th>Mitigation Required or Approvals Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approval of Designated RSD Test Request</td>
<td>May 31st</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Formal conditional approval received on September 10. Team incorporating FRA conditions in test plan to insure compliance to approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of revised project PTC Implementation Plan (PTCIP) and Request for Amendment (RFA)</td>
<td>May 31st</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Formal approval received on September 20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot Installations (4) Completed</td>
<td>June 20th</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>All pilots completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit Designated RSD Application</td>
<td>Oct 15th</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>RSD Application submitted and in review by FRA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Critical Feature V&amp;V for Designated Track RSD</td>
<td>Oct 30th</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Designated RSD Training</td>
<td>Nov 14th</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Training for designated RSD personnel completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated RSD - Complete Required Vehicle Installation</td>
<td>Dec 3rd</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>(44) installs required for designated RSD completed, punch list items being addressed by Wabtec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet FRA Statutory Requirements and substitute criteria</td>
<td>Dec 31</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Met FRA December 31, 2018 deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Remaining Vehicle Installation</td>
<td>March 15, 2019</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtain Alternative Schedule approval from FRA</td>
<td>Mar 15th, 2019</td>
<td>In Process</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Submitted Alternative Schedule Request on December 14, 2018; FRA's review cycle is 90 days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full RSD - Complete Remaining Critical Feature V&amp;V</td>
<td>Jan 2019</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full RSD - Complete WIU V&amp;V</td>
<td>March 31, 2019</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full RSD - Complete of Lab Integrated End to End Testing</td>
<td>June 30, 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Project Activity</td>
<td>Expected Completion</td>
<td>Progress as of 1/31/19</td>
<td>Progress On Track?</td>
<td>Mitigation Required or Approvals Needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full RSD - Complete Field Integrated Testing (FIT)</td>
<td>Aug 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full RSD - Complete Field Qualification Testing (FQT)</td>
<td>Sept 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commence Full RSD - Caltrain ROW</td>
<td>Oct 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Interoperability Testing with UPRR South of CP Lick</td>
<td>Dec 2019</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Interoperability Testing with Tenant Railroads</td>
<td>June, 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit Caltrain PTC Safety Plan to the FRA</td>
<td>June 30, 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Caltrain PTC Implementation</td>
<td>Dec 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Key project milestones targeted for 2019/2020 will be part of a contract negotiation with Wabtec for performance incentive payments once the project schedule rebaseline effort is complete.

**Major Wabtec activities started and / or completed in January:**
- Completed Critical Features V&V testing on the entire Caltrain property (including non-designated RSD areas).
- Continued installations of onboard equipment on Caltrain locomotives and cab cars
  - Punch list items are still being addressed by Wabtec
  - Completion of all onboard installations projected for March 2019
- Vehicle Acceptance Testing began on all PTC-installed locomotives and cab cars to ensure PTC equipment is functional under real-time track conditions.
- Wabtec has brought back the first Project Manager in December (a key personnel position requiring Caltrain approval) began transition onto project.
- Wabtec and Caltrain commenced re-baseline schedule effort through scheduling workshops; the effort will continue until an agreed-to re-baseline achieves all project requirements in a timeframe agreeable to Caltrain Alternative Schedule request and sequence.
- Contract submittals continue to be submitted and re-submitted by Wabtec, reviewed and comments returned by Caltrain project team. A sampling of the submittals in January included:
  - WIU V_V Test Plan-Entire Alignment
  - Caltrain Frequency and Slot Plan
  - Base Stations O&M Binder for All Equipment
  - F40PH-2CAT Installation Guide
  - MP36PH-3C Installation Guide
  - PTC Schematic J PBX F40PH-2CAT
  - DTS RSD Training Results

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

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

To date no risks have been identified requiring use of the risk funds. There are also risks to be monitored outside the Wabtec specific contract that the project team monitors and
mitigates as necessary. The following table captures the top risks both external (outside the Wabtec contract) and internal (specific to the Wabtec contract):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Item</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mitigation Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential EMU delay due to move from I-ITCS to I-ETMS</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Project team continues to support EMU team effort to bring Wabtec under contract to provide PTC solution required for EMU cars with minimal delay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRA process changes</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Maintain close and open relationship with key FRA contacts to ensure all submittals are done correctly and within required time frame to achieve approval for an alternative schedule to achieve RSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interoperability delays</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Caltrain is working with UPRR and tenants to ensure agreed to interoperability schedule dates are maintained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onboard installation delays</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Onboard installations are complete, excluding punch list items. Wabtec must ensure production installation schedule is maintained to achieve remaining fleet installs in first quarter 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track access delays</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Ensure field test schedule is maintained by coordinating all field work in combination with other capital project’s needs, particularly the PCEP project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back Office Server (BOS) documentation scope creep</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Ensure standard documentation supplied by Wabtec meets requirements of Caltrain specification criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRA approval of an Alternative Schedule</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Caltrain has received FRA approval of Substitute Criteria to be used rather than the statutory requirement of achieving RSD on one subdivision of the railroad by Dec 31, 2018. Caltrain submitted an Alternative Schedule request on December 14th for FRA approval showing RSD and full system certification after 2018.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Weekly calls with FRA review team instituted in August have continued through January. Continued progress occurred this month to gain FRA approval of key project documents required to enter RSD (see below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Name</th>
<th>Status - Through January 23, 2019</th>
<th>Projected Submittal Date</th>
<th>Actual Submittal Date</th>
<th>Need FRA Approval By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Updated PTC Implementation Plan and Request for Amendment of the PTCIP</td>
<td>Formal approval received 9/26/18</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>6/22/2018 (final)</td>
<td>Received September 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Request</td>
<td>Formal approval received 9/10/18</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>6/22/2018 (final)</td>
<td>Received September 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdivision and Critical Asset Configuration Management Plan</td>
<td>Final approved by FRA - 8/13/2018</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>7/25/2018</td>
<td>Received September 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Features Verification and Validation Procedure</td>
<td>Final approved by FRA - 8/16/2018</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>8/15/18</td>
<td>Received August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Features Verification and Validation Plan - Designated Track Section</td>
<td>Final approved by FRA - 8/16/2018</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>8/15/18</td>
<td>Received August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Features Verification and Validation Plan - Brake Test Area</td>
<td>Final approved by FRA - 8/16/2018</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>8/15/18</td>
<td>Received August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal and Switch (WIU) Verification and Validation Procedure</td>
<td>Final approved by FRA - 8/16/2018</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>8/15/18</td>
<td>Received August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal and Switch (WIU) Verification and Validation Plan - Designated Track Section</td>
<td>Final approved by FRA - 8/16/2018</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>8/15/18</td>
<td>Received August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static Bulletin Delivery Confirmation</td>
<td>Final approved by FRA - 8/16/2018</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>8/15/18</td>
<td>Received August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Name</td>
<td>Status - Through January 23, 2019</td>
<td>Projected Submittal Date</td>
<td>Actual Submittal Date</td>
<td>Need FRA Approval By</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brake Test Plan - F40 locomotive</td>
<td>Final approved by FRA - 8/22/2018</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>8/21/2018</td>
<td>Received August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brake Test Plan - Gallery cab car</td>
<td>Final approved by FRA - 8/22/2018</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>8/21/2018</td>
<td>Received August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brake Test Plan - MP36 locomotive</td>
<td>Final approved by FRA 9/21/2018</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>9/20/18</td>
<td>Received September 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brake Test Plan - Bombardier Cab Cars</td>
<td>Final approved by FRA 9/21/2018</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>9/20/18</td>
<td>Received September 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Integrated Test (FIT) Plan - Designated Track Section</td>
<td>Final approved by FRA 10/19/2018</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>10/10/18</td>
<td>Received October 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Qualification Test (FQT) Plan - Designated Track Area</td>
<td>Final approved by FRA 11/28/2018</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>11/27/18</td>
<td>Received November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSD Application</td>
<td>In FRA review process</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>11/8/18</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitute Criteria Strategy</td>
<td>Final approved by FRA 11/9/2018</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>09/20/18</td>
<td>Received November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to Substitute Criteria Conditions</td>
<td>In FRA review process</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>11/30/2018</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Schedule Request and revised PTCIP/RFA</td>
<td>In FRA review process</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>12/14/2018</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal and Switch (WIU) Verification and Validation Plan - Remainder of Railroad</td>
<td>Draft in FRA review process</td>
<td>Already submitted</td>
<td>1/21/19</td>
<td>February 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Caltrain Roadmap to Alternative Schedule and Full RSD**
   - Caltrain is pursuing the following steps to first achieve FRA approval of an Alternative Schedule, followed by Revenue Service Demonstration (RSD) and Interoperability Testings in order to achieve overall system certification.
    1. Submission of RSD application – submitted to FRA for approval in November. FRA reviewing.
    2. Caltrain has completed all the required statutory criteria as well as the FRA required substitute criteria necessary by mid-December of 2018;
    3. Caltrain submitted an Alternative Schedule and Sequence Request to the FRA in December of 2018. The FRA review cycle is approximately 90 days, completion of review anticipated for mid-March.
    4. Caltrain has also submitted revised PTCIP that is consistent with the Alternative schedule and sequence request; Caltrain will complete all field validation by first quarter of 2019 to enable commencement of Laboratory Integrated Testing for full track in April of 2019. Caltrain will complete training remaining personnel and performing field integrated testing for full track to achieve full RSD. Caltrain will complete Interoperability testing with UPRR on their Right of Way by December of 2019 and also complete all tenant testing on Caltrain property to achieve interoperability requirements by June 2020. Full system certification to be achieved by December 2020.
6 Cost - Spend vs. budget with Actuals and Accrual through December 31, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Analysis</th>
<th>Original Budget (US$MM)</th>
<th>Approved Changes (Contractor) (US$MM)</th>
<th>Project Current Budget (US$MM)</th>
<th>Expended and Accrual To Date (US$MM)</th>
<th>Estimated at Completion (EAC) (US$MM)</th>
<th>Variance at Completion (US$MM)</th>
<th>% Expended of EAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBOSS PTC Project (Jan 2008 - Feb 2018)</td>
<td>$ 231.00</td>
<td>$ 239.88</td>
<td>$ 202.26</td>
<td>$ 202.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain PTC Project (March 1st 2018 - June 2020):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrator WABTEC Contract</td>
<td>$ 43.01</td>
<td>$ 43.01</td>
<td>$ 11.55</td>
<td>$ 43.01</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 26.84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contractors</td>
<td>$ 6.00</td>
<td>$ 6.00</td>
<td>$ 0.43</td>
<td>$ 6.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 7.21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Changes</td>
<td>$ 2.00</td>
<td>$ 2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 2.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Incentive - WABTEC</td>
<td>$ 30.34</td>
<td>$ 30.34</td>
<td>$ 6.58</td>
<td>$ 30.45</td>
<td>$ (0.11)</td>
<td>$ 21.62%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Program Costs</td>
<td>$ 6.06</td>
<td>$ 6.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 5.95</td>
<td>$ 0.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total PTC Project</td>
<td>$ 89.41</td>
<td>$ 89.41</td>
<td>$ 18.56</td>
<td>$ 89.41</td>
<td>$ (0.00)</td>
<td>$ 20.76%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

7 Items of note in January - This section reports on PTC project general progress and issues being performed and tracked in addition to the Wabtec contract during the current reporting month.

1) Team hosted joint Wabtec and ARINC workshops in January to review consist data, configurable parameters, ROCS modification for consist data effort will commence once data are reviewed and agree upon with all parties;
2) Team continued to work with ARINC to establish and finalize a scope of work for long term maintenance and service for all systems residing in the CCF and BCCF that support Rail Operations once PTC ROCS is in production. The new long term maintenance service contract will replace the current ROCS and other maintenance contracts.
3) The PTC project continues its coordination efforts with the Electrification and EMU programs via regularly scheduled status meetings such as the Biweekly CalMod Systems Integration, the PCEP Delivery Coordination and the PTC-PCEP coordination meetings. Ad hoc meetings to discuss topics requiring in-depth or immediate decisions are held as needed. Data sharing of fiber audit results and testing schedules (sharing of track and time) is ongoing to ensure both teams coordinate needs.
4) Caltrain configuration management (CM) manager continues full integration into project team to ensure all Caltrain CM requirements are maintained during project execution and transition to daily operations upon project completion.
5) Caltrain Go Live team reinstated to ensure smooth transition of PTC operations and maintenance upon project completion. These efforts include drafting a RSD rollout strategy, manload planning for both Caltrain and TASI operations and maintenance, and coordination of Master Service Agreements (MSA) negotiations with key suppliers required to support PTC long term service needs.

8. Upcoming Key Activities in February -
1) Assuming approval of the test procedure by the FRA, start the Signal and Switch (WIU) Verification and Validation testing on the remainder of the Caltrain property.

2) Approve the project re-baseline schedule that ensures all required activities are planned in the timeframe required to support the Alternate Schedule and Sequence Request under review by the FRA.

3) Catrain management team to meet with Wabtec management to discuss project resources and strategy to improve performance and complete the project.

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

5) Continue meeting with UPRR PTC counterparts to strengthen relationship needed to successfully implement interoperability on both properties. Caltrain must complete interoperability requirements on UPRR territory in 2019.

6) Continue regular monthly review with Wabtec senior management to ensure the Wabtec project team maintains focus on 2019 key milestones and full Caltrain RSD.

7) Continue to work closely with the FRA regional and national representatives to ensure all aspects of documentation and testing requirements are maintained and approvals (by FRA) granted.

9. **Vehicle Installation**

   Wabtec has completed installation of (44) I-ETMS modules on the Caltrain locomotives and cab cars required based on Caltrain’s Implementation and statutory criteria requirements. Wabtec is continuing to perform installations on the remaining Caltrain fleet (23 additional locomotives and cab cars) by first quarter 2019. Table below provides the overall status of 67 vehicle installation as of January 21, 2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>In Progress</th>
<th>Pending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bombardier Cab</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS Gallery Cab</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP1500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td><strong>78%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>21%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prepared By: Matt Scanlon, Deputy Director, Systems 650.622.7819
PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD
STAFF REPORT

TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
Executive Director

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

SUBJECT: AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR CEMOF MODIFICATIONS PROJECT FOR THE PENINSULA CORRIDOR ELECTRIFICATION PROGRAM

ACTION
Staff Coordinating Council recommends the Board:

1. Award a contract to the lowest, responsive and responsible bidder, Proven Management, Inc. (PMI) of Oakland, California, for a total lump sum amount of $6,550,777 for the Central Equipment Maintenance and Operations Facility (CEMOF) Modifications Project (Project), which is a component of the Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project (PCEP).

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

SIGNIFICANCE
The Project will provide required improvements to CEMOF to accommodate system electrification and an expanded vehicle fleet that will include electrified vehicles. The scope of work consists of furnishing all labor, equipment and materials required for civil construction modifications, which include:

- Extension of the maintenance track 5 inspection pit;
- Conversion of a supervisor’s office into an electrical component repair room;
- Construction in the east yard of a new prefabricated parts storage building including the foundation, fire suppression system, utilities and appurtenances; and
- Purchase and installation of a prefabricated office to be located within the parts storage building.

The Project is anticipated to be completed by the Spring of 2020.
**BUDGET IMPACT**

Funding for this Project includes $1,344,000 from the original PC\(^2\)P budget and $5,206,777 from the contingency fund as approved by the Change Management Board. Of the total $5,206,777 contingency fund, $421,200 will be drawn from allocated contingency and $4,785,577 from unallocated contingency funds.

**BACKGROUND**

An Invitation for Bid was advertised in a newspaper of general circulation and on the JPB’s procurement website, which includes Small Business Enterprises and Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBE) registered in the vendor database. Over 65 construction contractors, subcontractors, suppliers, and plan rooms downloaded the solicitation documents and a pre-bid meeting and site walk was attended by two potential bidders. Only one bid was received. Staff polled all firms that did not submit bids; they responded with various reasons for not doing so, including that they did not have the expertise to provide the required specialty services or did not have the capacity to complete the work by 2020. A 16 percent DBE goal was assigned to this Project.

One bid was received as listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Total Bid Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineer’s Estimate</td>
<td>$5,731,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proven Management, Inc. Oakland, CA</td>
<td>$7,197,777 – Bid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$6,550,777 – Negotiated Amount</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PMI submitted all required bid documentation. Staff has determined, and legal counsel concurred, that the bid submitted by PMI is responsive. The bid from PMI was approximately 25.58 percent higher than the engineer’s estimate. Due to PMI’s higher than anticipated bid amount, staff reviewed the engineer’s estimate and noted that recent market conditions for construction costs have trended upwards. Staff determined it was in the agency’s best interests to negotiate with the sole bidder because rebidding the contract is unlikely to attract more bidders. The contract is too small for contractors that typically work on JPB projects and too large for small, local contractors. Staff negotiated with PMI and was able to reduce the bid amount to $6,550,777, a reduction of $647,000 or 9 percent. As is required for a single bid, a price analysis was conducted, which compared the negotiated bid price against other recent bids for construction projects. The analysis indicated that the negotiated price compared favorably against other projects for similar work and that the price is fair and reasonable.

DBE staff reviewed the bid, which included a 16.4 percent DBE utilization commitment, and determined that it meets the established DBE goal. PMI is an established regional contractor with more than 23 years of construction experience. The firm currently has a contract for the Tunnel Modifications and Track Rehabilitation Project, which was awarded in June 2018. Staff concludes that PMI is appropriately qualified and capable of meeting the requirements of the contract.

Procurement Administrator II:  Cathy Hoang  650.295.6866  
Project Manager:  Liria Larano, Deputy Chief Officer, Cal\(^2\)Mod  650.622.7828
RESOLUTION NO. 2019 -

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

* * *

AWARDING A CONTRACT TO PROVEN MANAGEMENT, INC. FOR THE
CEMOF MODIFICATIONS PROJECT FOR THE PENINSULA CORRIDOR
ELECTRIFICATION PROGRAM FOR A TOTAL AMOUNT OF $6,550,777

WHEREAS, the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) issued an Invitation for
Bids (IFB) for the CEMOF Modifications Project (Project), a component of the Peninsula
Corridor Electrification Project (PCEP); and

WHEREAS, in response to the IFB, the JPB received one bid; and

WHEREAS, staff and legal counsel have reviewed the bid and determined that
Proven Management, Inc., (PMI) of Oakland, CA is the lowest, responsive and
responsible bidder; and

WHEREAS, Staff Coordinating Council recommends, and the Executive Director
concurs, that a contract be awarded to PMI, whose bid meets the requirements of the
solicitation documents.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the Peninsula
Corridor Joint Powers Board hereby awards a contract to Proven Management, Inc. for
the CEMOF Modifications Project for the Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project for a
total amount of $6,550,777; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Executive Director, or his designee, is authorized
to execute a contract on behalf of the JPB with PMI, in full conformity with all the terms
and conditions of the solicitation documents and in a form approved by legal counsel.
Regularly passed and adopted this 7th day of February, 2019 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

Chair, Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board

ATTEST:

J PB Secretary
AGENDA ITEM #10  
FEBRUARY 7, 2019

PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD  
STAFF REPORT

TO: Joint Powers Board
THROUGH: Jim Hartnett  
Executive Director

FROM: Michelle Bouchard  
Chief Operating Officer, Rail

SUBJECT: RESOLUTION OF SUPPORT FOR CALTRAIN’S PARTICIPATION IN REGIONAL MEANS-BASED FARE PILOT PROGRAM

ACTION
Staff Coordinating Council recommends the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) adopt a resolution of support to indicate support for Caltrain’s continued participation in the regional means-based fare pilot program.

SIGNIFICANCE
This resolution of support indicates that the JPB supports Caltrain’s continued participation in the regional means-based fare pilot program (Pilot Program) and intends to formally approve Caltrain’s participation in the Pilot Program in the months to come. An effort led by staff from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and regional transit operators, the Pilot Program will provide a discount for low income transit riders and is anticipated to commence in fall 2019. If the Board of Directors (Board) approves the resolution, additional Board actions would be necessary to formally approve Caltrain’s participation in the Pilot Program, including completing the process of updating the agency’s Codified Tariff and approving a Pilot Program agreement with MTC.

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no budget impact associated with adopting this resolution of support.

Staff and MTC estimate that there would be a gross revenue loss associated with the fare discounts if Caltrain participates in the Pilot Program. However, net revenue loss would depend on the balance of (a) the lower fares generated by current passengers’ existing trips, (b) offsetting regional program subsidies provided to the JPB to replace lost fares, and (c) new fares generated by increased trips of existing passengers and by trips of new passengers incentivized to ride by the Pilot Program.

At this time, it is estimated that the gross fare revenue loss from existing riders due to Caltrain’s participation in the Pilot Program would be in the range of approximately -$400,000 to -$1,800,000 annually. MTC estimates that up to 50 percent of fare revenue impacts would be offset by regional program subsidies to Caltrain; thus, the adjusted program revenue impact is estimated to be approximately -$200,000 to -$900,000.
annually for Caltrain. On balance, staff estimates that the program revenue loss related to current system trips will be on the lower end of the estimated range.

The positive financial impact of increased trips and ridership is difficult to estimate; however, on balance, the net revenue impact of participating in the Pilot Program is estimated to range from approximately -$300,000 to +$600,000. Table 3 (below) details the revenue impact estimate and assumptions. Staff's current, conservative estimates suggest implementation of the Pilot Program is likely to be revenue-neutral or even net-positive for Caltrain.

**BACKGROUND**
This staff report summarizes program information shared at prior Board meetings and supplements with additional information responsive to questions raised by Directors. The information is presented as follows:

1. Background on Regional Means-Based Fare Pilot Program
2. Information related to Caltrain ridership, Caltrain Fare Policy, and potential future fare changes
3. Current implementation efforts for the Pilot Program
4. Completion of Pilot Program
5. Next steps

### 1. Background on Regional Means-Based Fare Pilot Program

**Regional Pilot Program Overview**
MTC has been leading an effort to create a regional means-based fare pilot program with large transit operators in the region to help address the issue of transportation affordability in the Bay Area. Under this new Pilot Program, participating agencies would provide a fare discount for low-income transit riders.

MTC approved a Means-Based Fare Pilot Program Framework (Pilot Program Framework) on May 23, 2018. In addition to the JPB/Caltrain, the other potential Pilot Program participants include the Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART); Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District (GGBHTD) for both its bus and ferry services; and San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), with program participation subject to approval from each transit operator's governing board. MTC staff has been working in partnership with staff from the potential participants, including the JPB, to define, develop, and implement the Pilot Program.

**Regional Pilot Program Framework**
Per the approved Pilot Program Framework, the Pilot Program will run for 12 to 18 months and be implemented through a Clipper card discount coupon on the existing Clipper system. The discount amount offered to eligible adults will be a minimum of 20 percent on single-ride adult Clipper card fares. As part of this Pilot Program, Caltrain is intending to offer the minimum discount in order to collect data and make decisions regarding future participation based on the Pilot results. Two other participating agencies, BART and GGBHTD, have chosen to offer the minimum discount as well. Only one other participating agency, SFMTA, has chosen to participate at a higher level discount level, 50 percent. The eligibility criteria for the program is adults earning less than 200 percent of the Federal Poverty Level annually.
Much of the Pilot Program will be centrally administered on behalf of all participating agencies using a program implementation structure modeled on the existing Clipper-based Regional Transit Connection (RTC) card administration. This is intended to help defray the overhead costs that normally would be shouldered by any single agency wanting to establish and operate its own program. Aspects of the Pilot Program that are intended to be centrally administered include:

- Developing and implementing the discount coupon on Clipper;
- Creating an application process for the program (online and by mail);
- Evaluating applications for those seeking to enroll in the program and verifying eligibility;
- Sending Clipper cards to eligible applicants;
- Providing customer service support as needed; and,
- Developing and implementing the Pilot Program’s branding, outreach, and marketing plan in coordination with the participating operators.

While MTC staff is leading implementation of this Pilot Program, this process requires significant and ongoing coordination between staff at MTC, participating transit agencies, county social services agencies, and Cubic, the Clipper contractor. A working group with staff from these agencies has been formed and meets regularly to work on tasks related to the creation and implementation of the Pilot Program. Once launched, the Pilot Program’s performance will be monitored and evaluated for improvements and potential revisions based on financial sustainability, efficiency, and effectiveness.

**Pilot Program Funding**

MTC is setting aside about $11 million in funding each year for the program. MTC’s funding sources for this Pilot Program include a combination of the State Transit Assistance (STA) funds through SB-1, the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017, and funds from the Low Carbon Transit Operators Program (LCTOP).

Per the Pilot Program Framework, these funds will first cover the Pilot Program’s annual operating and administrative costs (which are currently unknown but estimated to be approximately $3 million), including costs for the activities described above, while the remaining funds will be available to defray up to 50 percent of operators’ gross fare revenue impacts from the Pilot Program. It is important to note that per the Pilot Program Framework, MTC will subsidize at most 50 percent of each agency’s gross revenue impact from the Pilot Program, no matter the level of program participation and total revenue impact for each agency. In spring 2019, through the working group, a mathematical formula will be established to calculate the maximum amount of funding that could be available to each agency to offset up to half of their revenue impacts from the Pilot Program. These details will be specified in each participating agency’s program agreement with MTC.

At this time, MTC is setting aside $3 million for initial start-up and operations costs for the Pilot Program implementation, leaving about $8 million available to defray operators’ revenue impacts in the first year (or more, if implementation and administrative costs total less than $3 million initially). The precise portion of the estimated $8 million that
could be available for revenue impact reimbursement for each transit operator will be determined in spring 2019. The program is focused on keeping on-going operations costs to a minimum and maximizing the amount of Pilot Program funding that could be available for revenue loss reimbursement for transit operators.

**Eligibility for Regional Means-Based Fare Pilot Program**

Adults in households who earn less than 200 percent of the Federal Poverty Level will be eligible to participate in the Pilot Program. The annual household income threshold varies by household size, as shown in the table below. Per the Pilot Program Framework, there will not be a limit or “cap” on the number of participants that may participate in the regional Pilot Program if they meet the eligibility requirements.

**Table 1: 200% Federal Poverty Level - Household Size and Annual Household Income**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Size</th>
<th>Annual Household Income for 200% of FPL (2019)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$24,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$33,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$42,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$51,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$60,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$69,180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2. Additional Information about Caltrain Ridership, Caltrain Fare Policy, and Potential Future Fare Changes**

**Caltrain Ridership and Demographics**

To provide additional context for the Board, Caltrain ridership statistics and riders’ demographics are presented below.

- **Caltrain ridership statistics:**
  - Average mid-week ridership: 65,095
  - Percentage of average mid-week ridership in the AM and PM peak periods: 84.6 percent
  - Average mid-week ridership trip distance: 22.9 miles
  - Total annual passengers: 18,648,850

The most recent demographic information from Caltrain riders was collected in the 2016 Triennial Survey. This survey included a question regarding annual household income, with results as shown below, but did not include a question related to household size.

---

1 Source: 2018 Annual Passenger Count Report
2 Source: FY17 NTD Annual Total Ridership
Table 2: Caltrain Riders’ Annual Household Income (2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $49,999</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $29,999</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 - $39,999</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $99,999</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 - $150,000</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 - $200,000</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000+</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2016 Triennial Survey. Numbers may not add up due to rounding.

Caltrain Fare Policy
Throughout fall 2018, Caltrain staff worked with the Board to develop a foundational Caltrain Fare Policy to guide future decision-making regarding the agency’s fares. The Caltrain Fare Policy was adopted by the Board at its December 6, 2018 meeting. Under the Equity category, the Caltrain Fare Policy contains the following goal: “Advocate for and participate in State and regional programs that make it more affordable for low-income customers to use transit.”

Potential Future Fare Changes
As initially presented and discussed at the December 2018 Board Budget Workshop, Caltrain is projected to have substantial budget deficits in the fiscal years to come. As discussed in December, initial projections indicate that there will be a $5.07 million deficit for Fiscal Year (FY) 2020, a $13.08 million deficit for FY 2021, and a $17.80 million deficit for FY 2022. While budget discussions are currently underway, at this time it is understood that in the absence of increased JPB member financial contributions, it may be necessary to change Caltrain’s fares as one of the “levers” to pull to help address the forecasted budget deficits.

As part of the budget discussion with the Board at the December 2018 workshop, a number of potential fare changes were presented to the Board for discussion. The regional means-based fare program was included as one potential fare change, as it is anticipated that Caltrain’s participation in this Pilot Program would help mitigate the impact of any potential future fare changes to Caltrain’s most vulnerable riders. The potential fare changes that were shown at the December 2018 workshop and their estimated annual revenue impacts are shown as numbers one through four below. A fifth, new potential fare change for the Go Pass program is also shown.

Potential fare changes to help address Caltrain’s projected budget deficit:
1. Increasing Base Fare by $0.25: $1.4M - $1.9M
2. Increasing Zone Fare by $0.25: $2.7M - $4.0M
3. Reducing Clipper Card discount to $0.20 off Base Fare: $1.7M - $2.4M
4. Removing Clipper Card discount of $0.55 off Base Fare: $2.7M - $3.9M
5. Increasing Go Pass by 15 percent: $1.5M in FY 2020, $3M in FY 2021
6. Participating in Regional Means-Based Fare Pilot Program: ($0.3M) - $0.6M

**Calculation of Regional Means-based Revenue Impact**

As previously described, the total impact of the program would be a combined result of revenue lost from the discount as calibrated by subsidies from MTC and induced revenue from newly-generated trips.

Based on Caltrain’s fare model elasticity of -0.1 to -0.2, it is estimated that a 20 percent discount would increase annual trips by 2 to 4 percent for existing riders (approximately 34,000 to 68,000 trips). It is unknown how many trips from new riders would be generated by the Pilot Program. For every 100,000 new trips, $130,000 of program discounts would be provided and $520,000 of net revenue would be generated.

Table 3 shows an estimate of Caltrain’s annual revenue impact from participating in the Pilot Program for the first 12 months. For existing riders, estimated gross revenue loss is approximately $1,100,000, which is in the middle of the range of the MTC estimate (-$400,000 to -$1,800,000). The middle of the range of existing rider new trips is also assumed at 3 percent (2 percent to 4 percent range). The new rider trips for the Pilot Program is unknown and is estimated at 200,000 annually.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Annual Revenue Impact Estimate from Pilot Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Fares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Rider Trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Rider New Trips (+3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Rider Trips (200K)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These revenue impacts from the Pilot Program are only estimates; actual revenue impacts are dependent on actual participation rates for the Pilot Program and participants’ Caltrain ridership. As noted above, the Pilot Program will be closely monitored and evaluated for its effectiveness and efficiencies, including participation rates and financial impacts to participating agencies.

**3. Current Implementation Efforts**

---

3 Estimate generated from Caltrain’s Fare Elasticity Simulator, a model derived from rider survey data. Revenue estimate applies to regular, existing fare products and excludes Go Pass.

4 Updated revenue impact range for participation in Pilot Program is detailed in Table 5. The low end of the range, approximately -$300,000, is the net fares from existing rider trips and a 3% increase in existing rider trips.
As discussed above, staff from MTC are leading efforts to implement the Pilot Program, and they are working in close coordination with staff from transit agencies and county social service and public health agencies in the process through a working group. This significant effort involves a number of start-up tasks to get the program launched, as well as establishing on-going operations tasks to administer the program. Currently, these start-up and operations tasks are estimated to total about $3 million, as specified in the MTC Program Framework. As implementation efforts proceed through winter and spring 2019, more detailed information will become available on the start-up costs and on-going operating costs for the program. If this resolution of support is approved, Caltrain staff will report back to the Board on the detailed cost estimates for program initiation and on-going administration when more details are available later in the spring.

The following tasks have been identified to create and implement the means-based fare program on the existing Clipper system and are currently underway:

a. **Contracting with a third party entity to develop an application portal to accept and track applications in a central database system.** The portal is anticipated to be capable of processing both online and regular mail applications.

b. **Contracting with a third party entity to serve as the eligibility verifier, which will be responsible for processing applications and determining which applicants are eligible to participate in the program** (this is a similar process to the region’s existing RTC program). The contractor will use the application portal, manage the application database, and communicate with Cubic to issue cards for those eligible for the cards.

c. **Creating the new discount coupon on the existing Clipper system with Cubic.** The Clipper cards for the Pilot Program will have full inter- and intra-agency functionality, including transfers between agencies. Cubic will also be responsible for producing the unique Clipper cards for each eligible participant.

d. **Working with social service and public health agencies to maximize their existing client network with residents in the Bay Area who may be eligible for this Pilot Program.** MTC will be reaching out to social service agencies to engage their assistance sending pre-qualification letters to their clients who are already qualified for other similar programs, such as CalFresh. If these pre-qualified individuals choose to participate, they will be able to sign up and be automatically qualified, skipping the eligibility verification step.

e. **Creating and launching a marketing and outreach campaign to brand the program and successfully attract users to this new program.**

f. **Defining a framework and process for evaluating the performance of the Pilot Program.**
4. Completion of Pilot Program and Evaluation

**MTC Evaluation of Pilot Program**
As part of the Pilot Program, a formal evaluation of the Pilot Program will be completed beginning after 12 months and concluding at the end of 18 months (the end of the Pilot Program’s duration). Staff have identified initial desired outcomes and indicators but will work with the University of Notre Dame de Namur to refine the evaluation framework and analyze the results. A separate firm will be retained for data collection. The evaluation is anticipated to include both qualitative and quantitative metrics, and it is likely that the metrics will relate to the financial and administrative feasibility of the Pilot Program, as well as customer experience and awareness of the Pilot Program and increased use of transit and access to goods and services. Data is anticipated to be sourced from Clipper card trip data, as well as a potential survey that participants may be asked to complete a survey about the Pilot Program.

**Caltrain Evaluation of Pilot Program**
In addition to the regional evaluation of the Pilot Program, Caltrain staff plan to complete an independent evaluation of the Pilot Program for Caltrain, to understand the Pilot Program’s outcomes and effects for this agency. Staff will be developing and finalizing performance metrics for Caltrain’s evaluation in the months to come, but it may include the following draft metrics:
- Total number of trips from participants
- Average weekday ridership from participants
- Participants’ frequency of Caltrain use
- Number of new Caltrain riders from program
- Participants’ trip time distribution (peak vs. off-peak)
- Gross revenue loss
- Total subsidy provided by MTC
- Estimated financial gains from new ridership
- Net revenue impact

Caltrain staff intend to monitor the Pilot Program once it launches and periodically report back to the Board with information related to the program and Caltrain’s evaluation metrics. The great benefit of administering the Pilot Program through the Clipper program is that Caltrain will have free access to the trip data, allowing staff to incrementally assess the number of rides, trip characteristics, and overall revenue impact of the Pilot Program for the agency. The participants’ survey data from MTC’s evaluation could be used to determine to what degree existing riders were riding more and the degree to which new riders were brought into the system as a result of the program.

**Completion of Pilot Program – Creating a Permanent Program?**
At the end of the Pilot Program, following its evaluation and assessment of its successes and challenges, MTC and the region may decide to create a long-term regional means-based fare program. MTC has set aside LCTOP and SB-1 funds not only for the Pilot Program but an ongoing, long-term program if the program continues. These annual fund sources total about $11 million per year. Additional operators may choose to join the program after completion of the Pilot, which will affect the amount of funding available to individual operators.
If a long-term/permanent program is developed and implemented for the region, it is important to note the JPB would need to take additional action in the future to formally approve Caltrain’s participation in the permanent program.

The current proposed resolution of support, and subsequent Board action to formalize Caltrain’s participation, only apply to the Pilot Program and its 12-18 month duration.

5. Next Steps

Board Direction Sought on Pilot Program
At this time, staff requests the Board’s direction on Caltrain’s potential participation in this Pilot Program. By approving this nonbinding resolution of support, the Board will indicate that it supports Caltrain’s participation in the Pilot Program and intends to go through the processes to formalize the agency’s participation in the months to come. As a result, JPB staff will continue to work with staff from the other transit operators and MTC to develop this new regional Pilot Program.

Though additional action is needed by each transit operator to formalize participation, the governing boards of BART, SFMTA, and Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District already have indicated that they intend to support their agencies’ participation in the Pilot Program.

Next Steps
If the Board adopts this resolution of support, indicating its support for Caltrain's participation in the Pilot Program, Caltrain staff would continue to participate in the regional working group to create and implement the Pilot Program. Staff would also begin to proceed with the additional steps that must be taken to formalize Caltrain’s participation in the Pilot Program:

1. It will be necessary to change the Codified Tariff to add the new means-based fare discount for eligible persons. This will include a Title VI fare equity analysis and public hearing process, similar to the process for changing other Caltrain fares. The update to the Codified Tariff would need to be complete by late summer 2019, before the program begins testing and then launches in fall 2019. The changes to the Tariff would be considered as part of a single public hearing process that would also incorporate fare changes required to balance the FY 2020 budget and other recommended changes emanating from the adoption of the Fare Policy.

2. Additionally, the Board will need to authorize a formal agreement with MTC for Pilot Program participation, which would specify the revenue loss reimbursement distribution from MTC to Caltrain. Caltrain would also work with MTC to incorporate other elements into the agreement that would provide for appropriate off-ramps for Caltrain should their use be warranted by on-going evaluation of the program from the Caltrain perspective.

These actions would unfold in winter 2019 to late summer 2019, and Caltrain staff would report back to the Board on progress with the Pilot Program’s creation and implementation in spring 2019. Pending all of the agencies’ necessary approvals, the Pilot Program is currently scheduled to begin in the region in fall 2019.

Prepared by: Melissa Jones, Principal Planner, Caltrain Planning 650.295.6852
RESOLUTION NO. 2019-
BOARD OF DIRECTORS, PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

***

SUPPORTING CALTRAIN’S PARTICIPATION IN THE
REGIONAL MEANS-BASED FARE PILOT PROGRAM

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is the regional transportation planning agency for the San Francisco Bay Area pursuant to Government Code Section 66500 et seq.; and

WHEREAS, transit affordability has been highlighted as a regional issue in MTC’s Coordinated Plan, Plan Bay Area, and other plans; and

WHEREAS, MTC has conducted a Regional Means-Based Fare Pricing Study, and on May 23, 2018, approved the implementation of a regional means-based fare pilot program (Pilot Program), which would offer discounted transit rides to eligible low-income adults on participating transit systems in the Bay Area during the pilot period; and

WHEREAS, MTC has allocated approximately $11 million per year for the Pilot Program to first cover administrative costs and then defray participating transit operators’ revenue losses, drawing on funds from the State Transit Assistance (STA) through SB-1, the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017, and funds from the Low Carbon Transit Operators Program (LCTOP); and

WHEREAS, the participating agencies in the Pilot Program, as planned by MTC, are the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District; Bay Area Rapid Transit District; Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB); and San Francisco Municipal
Transportation Agency, with each agency’s participation subject to its governing board’s approval; and

WHEREAS, the Pilot Program will be centrally-administered on behalf of all participating agencies; and

WHEREAS, the Pilot Program, expected to begin in fall 2019 and run for 12 to 18 months, would offer eligible adults a standardized 20 percent discount on single-ride adult Clipper fares on Caltrain; and

WHEREAS, it is estimated that Caltrain would experience gross annual fare revenue impacts in the range of -$400,000 to -$1,800,000 from existing riders depending on the level of program participation; and

WHEREAS, MTC expects to subsidize up to half of Caltrain’s gross annual fare revenue impact from the Pilot Program, drawing on the funds allocated to the Pilot Program, resulting in an adjusted annual revenue impact to Caltrain of -$200,000 to -$900,000; and

WHEREAS, it is estimated that the Pilot Program would induce an increase in trips and ridership on Caltrain, resulting in an estimated net annual total revenue impact to Caltrain of -$300,000 to +$600,000 from the Pilot Program; and

WHEREAS, Staff Coordinating Council recommends that the Board of Directors (Board) adopt a resolution of the JPB’s support for Caltrain’s participation in the Pilot Program; and

WHEREAS, prior to returning to the Board for final approval of participation in the Pilot Program, staff will follow its fare change policies and processes, including conducting a Title VI fare equity analysis, public hearing process, and change to the Codified Tariff, and negotiate a program agreement with MTC.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board hereby expresses its support for Caltrain's participation in the regional means-based fare pilot program as described above.

Regularly passed and adopted this 7th day of February, 2019 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

______________________________  
Chair, Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board

ATTEST:

______________________________  
JPB Secretary
Regional Means-Based Fare Pilot Program

Board of Directors
February 7, 2019
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Pilot Program Overview
Pilot Program Overview

• Provide a minimum 20% discount off of one-way adult Clipper Card fares to low-income transit riders
  - 20% discount: BART, Golden Gate Transit Bus & Ferry, and Caltrain
  - 50% discount: Muni

• Eligible participants: Adults in households earning less than 200% of Federal Poverty Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Size</th>
<th>Annual Household Income for 200% of FPL (2019)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$24,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$33,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$42,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$51,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$60,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$69,180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pilot Program Overview

• Duration: 12 – 18 months
  - Targeted launch: Oct – Nov 2019
• Implemented on existing Clipper system; participants will receive special Clipper card
• Centrally administered for the region
• Funding for pilot program:
  - $11M per year from MTC, using SB1 and LCTOP funds
  - Funding will first cover administrative costs for program (estimated at $3M per year)
  - Remaining funds will then defray transit operators’ revenue losses (total per year to be distributed estimated at $8M)
Caltrain Ridership and Demographics
Caltrain Ridership – 2018 Ridership Stats

- Average mid-week ridership\(^1\): 65,095
- Percentage of average mid-week ridership in the AM and PM peak periods\(^1\): 84.6%
- Average mid-week ridership trip distance\(^1\): 22.9 mi
- Total annual passengers\(^2\): 18,648,850

Notes:
2. Source: FY17 NTD Annual Total Ridership
Caltrain Ridership – 2016
Annual Household Income

• Over 60% of Caltrain riders earn more than $100,000 each year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016 Annual Household Income</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $49,999</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $29,999</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 - $39,999</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $99,999</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 - $150,000</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 - $200,000</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000+</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2016 Triennial Survey.
Numbers may not add up due to rounding.
Caltrain Fare Policy Goal
• “Advocate for and participate in State and regional programs that make it more affordable for low-income customers to use transit.”
Potential Effects of Caltrain’s Participation in Regional Means-Based Fare Pilot Program
Estimated Pilot Program Participation

- **Existing riders** - Based on the fare model elasticity, a 20% discount would increase trips by 2% - 4% (34K - 68K trips)
- **Potential new riders** - It is unknown how many new trips the program would generate. For every 100K new trips, we will generate an estimated $520K of new revenue and $130K of program discount
Program Impact Estimates

- Working with MTC, a potential program revenue loss of $0.4M - $1.8M was estimated for existing riders.
- New trips generated by the program will generate additional offsetting revenue.
- Participation in the program is estimated to be revenue accretive if new trips are generated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New Fares</th>
<th>Discounted Fares</th>
<th>MTC Subsidy</th>
<th>Net Fares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Rider Trips</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$(1.10)M</td>
<td>$0.55M</td>
<td>$(0.55)M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Rider New Trips (+3%)</td>
<td>$0.27M</td>
<td>$(0.07)M</td>
<td>$0.03M</td>
<td>$0.23M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Rider Trips (200K)</td>
<td>$1.04M</td>
<td>$(0.26)M</td>
<td>$0.13M</td>
<td>$0.91M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1.3M</td>
<td>$(1.4)M</td>
<td>$0.7M</td>
<td>$0.6M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Caltrain’s Projected Budget Deficits: FY20 – FY 22

- Caltrain is facing budget deficits for FY20-FY22 which were presented at the December 2018 Board Budget Workshop,:
  - FY20: $5.1M deficit projected
  - FY21: $13.1M deficit projected
  - FY22: $17.8M deficit projected

- The projections do not include future fare changes
- Budget discussions are currently underway
Closing the Gap - Fares

• All of the scenarios tested are estimated to have relatively modest negative impacts on ridership

• Each of the scenarios tested are estimated to generate incremental annual revenue:

  1. Increasing Base Fare by $0.25 - $1.4M - $1.9M
  2. Increasing Zone Fare by $0.25 - $2.7M - $4.0M
  3. Reducing Clipper Card discount to $0.20 off Base Fare - $1.7M - $2.4M
  4. Removing Clipper Card discount of $0.55 off Base Fare - $2.7M - $3.9M
  5. Increasing Go Pass by 15% - $1.5M in FY20, $3M in FY21
  6. Participating in Regional Means-based Fare Pilot Program – ($0.3M) - $0.6M
Cost of Running a Similar Program

- **OrcaLift (Seattle) Low-Income Fare Program**: $1.50 flat fare on participating transit agencies
  - Total administration cost per year: $3.2M
  - Launched 2015; 69,000 enrollees so far
  - Survey results indicate users are riding transit more, likely reducing revenue loss

- **Tri-Met’s (Portland) Low-Income Fare Program**: 50% discount off of adult single-ride fares; 72% discount off of monthly pass
  - Total cost per year: $12M (including administration and revenue loss)
  - Launched fall 2018; aiming for 15,000 enrollees in first year
Pilot Program Conclusion
MTC Evaluation Process

- MTC will complete an evaluation of the program beginning at 12 months and concluding at 18 months (the Pilot Program’s duration).
- Creation of a long-term, permanent program will be assessed during/after the evaluation
  - MTC has set aside LCTOP and SB-1 funds not only for the Pilot Program but an ongoing, long-term program if the program continues – totaling ~$11M each year
  - Operators will assess at that time whether or not to continue participating in permanent program. New operators may opt to join the program then as well.
Caltrain Evaluation Process

• Caltrain staff plan to complete an evaluation of the pilot program at its conclusion, using Clipper data and any participant survey data available

• Potential metrics to use (TBD in spring 2019):
  - Total number of trips from participants
  - Average weekday ridership from participants
  - Participants’ frequency of Caltrain use
  - Number of new Caltrain riders from program
  - Participants’ trip time distribution (peak vs. off-peak)
  - Revenue impact: Gross revenue loss; subsidy provided by MTC; estimated financial gains from new ridership; net revenue loss
Recommended Next Steps
Recommended Next Steps

• Adopt resolution of support for Caltrain’s participation in pilot program

• Staff to proceed with the following tasks in winter/spring 2018:
  - Continue to participate in pilot program development
  - Update the Codified Tariff to include means-based fare pilot program
  - Develop a pilot program agreement with MTC

• Report back to Board in spring 2019 with pilot program update
TO: Joint Powers Board
THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
   Executive Director
FROM: Michelle Bouchard
   Chief Operating Officer, Rail
SUBJECT: UPDATE ON THE SAN JOSE DIRIDON INTEGRATED STATION CONCEPT PLAN

ACTION
Staff Coordinating Council recommends the Board receive the attached memo and brief presentation regarding the current status of the Diridon Integrated Station Concept Plan (Plan).

SIGNIFICANCE
Since September Caltrain staff have been engaged in co-creating the Diridon Integrated Station Concept Plan, which is developing a vision for the future of San Jose Diridon Station in partnership with the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), the California High Speed Rail Authority (CAHSR) and the City of San Jose (City) (together, the "Partners").

The Plan is being developed with the assistance Arcadis/Benthem Crouwel (ABC), a consultant team solicited and managed by the Partners. ABC is tasked with developing three spatial scenarios for a future Diridon Station, which draws upon their international expertise in areas such as transit operations, urban design, architecture and engineering.

Spatial scenarios will include the configuration and space devoted to various station facilities as well as access to and from the station and integration with the surrounding community and supporting private development. ABC and the Partners are taking a “transit first” or “design from the tracks out” approach where rail infrastructure needs are established first to ensure sufficient space is set aside to accommodate future rail service as rail infrastructure is a less flexible, long-lasting and significant investment. To ensure assumptions about future rail service are consistent with the Caltrain Business Plan, ABC is actively coordinating with the Business Plan team to develop inputs to the Concept Plan effort. These include the program of platform, track and supporting facilities needed to support the long range growth of Caltrain and other passenger rail services.

Simultaneous to this spatial design effort, ABC is helping the Partners develop organizational and governance scenarios that could fund, finance, deliver, operate and maintain a redeveloped intermodal station.
This body of work will contemplate programming for transit and transportation components and integration with potential development, both within the Station and in the surrounding area.

The Plan is expected to be completed in two main phases. Phase 1 of the Plan will conclude with the Partners selecting a preferred spatial scenario by spring/summer 2019. The preferred scenario would need to be endorsed by the governing body of each partner agency. Assuming consensus is reached, Phase II of the Concept Plan effort would begin around summer 2019 and include further development of the preferred spatial scenario to arrive at a fully detailed Concept Plan.

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

**BACKGROUND**
San Jose Diridon Station is a major transit hub located within downtown San Jose, the nation’s 10th largest city. It is a historic train depot with not only Caltrain service, but also train service provided by Amtrak, Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority (CCJPA), and Altamont Commuter Express (ACE), as well as VTA light rail and bus service. The JPB owns the historic station depot, the Caltrain parking lots, the bus loop area, and the tracks and platforms. As the landowner, the JPB has a vested stake in the planning process not just for potential shaping of the Station itself, but also as it relates to development in the surrounding area.

With the planned addition of Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) and California High Speed Rail service at the Station, as well as expanded Caltrain, ACE, Capitol Corridor and Amtrak service, the Station is expected to become one of the busiest intermodal stations in North America. To effectively accommodate such planned activity and future capacity needs, the Station must be reconfigured in an integrated fashion that connects all transit services with each other and with the surrounding urban environment.

Private development of the surrounding area in conjunction with the City of San Jose is accelerating, providing opportunities to fully integrate development with the Station itself. In recent months, Google has publically announced intentions for development near the Station.

By the Partners working together to prepare the Plan, they hope to maximize funding to implement the Plan and deliver a world-class destination and transportation hub that provides seamless customer experience for movement between transit modes within the Station and into the surrounding neighborhoods and Downtown.

The estimated cost for the completion of Phases I and II is approximately $6.5 million, with Phase I estimated at about $3.4 million, Phase II at about $2.5 million and a contract contingency. Currently, the Partners' contributions plus additional grant funds will adequately fund Phase I. The Partners have agreed to jointly pursue funding for Phase II.

Prepared by: Melissa Reggiardo, Principal Planner 650.508.6283
SUBJECT

Update on work accomplished to date on the San José Diridon Integrated Station Concept Plan

BACKGROUND

San José Diridon Station, owned by the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (PCJPB), is the primary transit hub of the South Bay, currently serving approximately 17,000 daily passengers. Today’s Station is a historic depot with passenger rail service provided by PCJPB (the “Caltrain” commuter rail service), Amtrak, Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority, Altamont Commuter Express (ACE), with connecting Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) light rail and bus service as well as other regional bus transportation providers. With the introduction of Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) and California High-Speed Rail service to San José Diridon in the next decade, the Station’s importance as a transportation node will increase significantly. In addition to these new rail services, electrified Caltrain and expanded services from ACE, Capitol Corridor, and Amtrak will lead to San José Diridon becoming one of the busiest train stations in California. Increased rail and bus service in the Station area will also support the development envisioned in San José’s guiding land use policy documents. The 2040 General Plan and the Diridon Station Area Plan (DSAP) foresee a marked expansion of the city’s relatively small downtown core to a size and density more appropriate for a city of one million people.

AGENCY PARTNERSHIP - COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT

The City of San José, VTA, PCJPB, and the California High-Speed Rail Authority (the “Partner Agencies”) have formed a public agency partnership via a Cooperative Agreement to redesign and expand Diridon Station. Key to this is the agreement to coordinate their respective capital projects in a manner that integrates the transit station facilities and the surrounding development area.

The Concept Plan was shaped through insights gained over the course of a study trip that City, VTA/County, PCJPB and Bay Area leaders participated in summer 2017. The trip highlighted the need to think boldly, comprehensively, and long-term about the Station, urban redevelopment, and the multiple transportation and development projects that will intersect at the station and in the surrounding area.
The Partner Agencies agree that a unified vision and cohesive strategy for investments at the Station and the broader Station area will generate more value than if the Partner Agencies planned and acted on development opportunities individually. The Partner Agencies have hired a consultant team led by Arcadis and Benthem Crouwel Architects (“Team ABC”) to prepare the Integrated Station Concept Plan (“Concept Plan”). Team ABC is familiar with complex, multi-agency infrastructure and urban design projects, such as major capital transit and station projects, through their experience in Europe and elsewhere.

WHAT IS THE DIRIDON INTEGRATED STATION CONCEPT PLAN?

When BART, commuter rail, high-speed rail, light rail, and supporting bus services converge, Diridon Station will support more high-capacity transit connections than any other place in the Bay Area. To effectively accommodate this planned growth in transit and development activity as well as to make it easy to use, the Station should be redesigned and expanded to function as an integrated whole. Instead of having individual transit projects “tack onto” the Station in a piecemeal manner, the Concept Plan will combine the major transportation and land use components into a single, unified vision. The result of this unified vision will be a wholly integrated station.

The Concept Plan scope includes two primary parts:
1. A spatial design component
2. An organizational component

**The spatial design component** will establish (a) transportation infrastructure to enable capacity for future, expanding transit services (b) an optimal physical relationship between transportation modes and (c) a balanced relationship between the Station and surrounding neighborhoods. This will frame the vision for what the Station will become over time. The Concept Plan will focus on the functionality of the Station, rather than its architectural appearance. Later phases of work will include detailed design and engineering, as well as environmental review.

**The organizational component** will begin to frame an organizational structure that can effectively deliver and operate the future Station. The redevelopment of Diridon Station is a project that is not simply complex from a physical design perspective but also from an organizational perspective.

The Concept Plan began in early September 2018. The 18-month Concept Plan process includes two phases and the following steps:

**Phase I: Development of Spatial Configuration**
- Ambitions, scenario development and evaluation
- Selection of a Single Preferred Option (SPO)

**Phase II: Advance the Single Preferred Option and Preparation of Concept Plan**
- 10% engineering and design plans
AMBITIONS, GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The Partner Agencies established a philosophy for what the future Diridon Station is aimed to become. This provides a guiding set of goals and objectives, or ambitions, for the Concept Plan development. These ambitions articulate what the Partner Agencies hope to achieve for both the urban design form and the associated organization for the project.

The goals and objectives are:

- A Multi-modal, Integrated, and Human-centered Station
- The Station as Catalyst for the Urban Environment
- The Station as a Destination
- A Compelling Vision for the Future of Diridon Station
- A Futureproof, Flexible, Adaptive, and Innovative Station
- Partnership Organization
- Internal & External Stakeholder engagement
- Funding Objectives and Risk Management

DIRIDON INTEGRATED CONCEPT PLAN APPROACH

Team ABC is working with the Partner Agencies to establish requirements, such as design criteria, site constraints, and agency needs, and to also understand the ambitions of each agency for the future Station. These set an important foundation in the concept planning process. To turn requirements into a conceptual program, Team ABC is leading a series of interactive workshops with the technical experts from each Partner Agency on myriad topics. The workshops are structured around urban integration, station configuration, track configuration and access planning.

The organizational framework for the project is being developed simultaneously with the conceptual design and planning work. Team ABC is leading a series of organizational workshops on topics, such as governance, funding, risk sharing, and project management. Experience in delivering similar projects in Europe led Team ABC to believe that concept and organization must move in tandem for successful project delivery.

DESIGN PROCESS AND PROGRESS TO DATE

The initial focus has been on the Caltrain rail corridor and platforms. An important lesson from the 2017 Study Trip was the notion to “design from the tracks out” since rail infrastructure is a long-lasting and significant investment and the least flexible project element. At the same time, the way in which this heavy infrastructure is brought through a city has profound place-defining
effects. The track design and configuration will enhance the quality of the urban places that the tracks go through. As such, while the Concept Plan is being developed with an understanding that while the heavy rail infrastructure must be designed first, it must also be designed with an appreciation of its effects on the urban fabric. The Concept Plan contemplates the benefits and trade-offs of the relationships between these elements.

Team ABC and the Partner Agencies have explored many different vertical configurations for the station. These options are generally described as:

- **At-Grade:** The station remains at the current at-grade elevation;
- **Elevated 25’ above existing grade:** All tracks and platforms would be elevated approximately 25 feet above the current track elevation;
- **Recessed:** The tracks and platforms would be lowered by about 20-25’ below the existing elevation; and
- **Stacked:** High-speed rail tracks are in a shallow tunnel, approximately 30’ below grade, while the other rail modes are placed in an elevated viaduct, approximately 25’ above grade.

Thus far, there are several options emerging that appear to best align with the ambitions expressed by the Partners and the community. Specifically, the Partner Agencies will continue to further explore the at-grade and elevated track options. These appear to hold the most promise over the other two options to align with the ambitions, goals and objectives as well as meet the various requirements.

The Concept Plan is being closely coordinated with the Caltrain Business Plan, which is the strategic, long-range rail operations planning effort for the Peninsula Corridor. It contemplates future rail service growth for Caltrain while operating in blended fashion with California High-Speed Rail. Coordination with the Caltrain Business Plan is essential to ensure that the number of tracks and platforms considered at Diridon Station accommodate future rail service growth.

Team ABC and the Partner Agencies are also considering the location of the main station entrance relative to the rail platforms and how it relates to the surrounding area. Two of the options currently appear to hold the most promise to best meet the ambitions for the future vision, and they are

- the station entrance hall generally in the same location as the Diridon Depot today
- the station entrance shifts to the north closer to Santa Clara Street.

The rationale for locating the station entrance north to Santa Clara Street would be to bring the heavy rail modes as close as possible to the planned BART station and other transit facilities.

As described above, Team ABC and the Partner Agencies are also considering the track and station hall options’ effect on the overall urban integration of the area for development, movement of people to/from and through the station, and connections between other transit modes (buses and VTA light rail).
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

The Partners developed a Community Outreach Strategy with the aim to:

- Inform and educate the public about the project and decision-making process
- Gather feedback for the Partner Agencies to consider during preparation of the Concept Plan
- Foster a sense of pride and collective ownership in the vision established by the Concept Plan

The Partner Agencies are seeking to encourage active participation from a broad cross-section of the community.

Completed and future activities include:

- October 18, 2018: Presented to the City’s Diridon Station Area Advisory Group
- December 10, 2018 Community Kick-off Meeting
- Supported SJSU Masters of Urban Planning capstone class project on Diridon Station, which included focus groups of community leaders, an interactive event on December 1, 2018, and final report and presentation
- Updated www.diridonsj.org with information on the Concept Plan
- Maintaining email list to provide updates

The Partner Agencies will continue to engage the community throughout the process using a variety of methods, such as additional community meetings, presentations to the SAAG and other advisory groups, and online tools.

Community Engagement - Emerging Themes

Based on input received, the following priorities are emerging for the future of the Station:

- The Station must work well for the passenger above all
- The Station should function as a community hub, a destination in and of itself
- The Station should reflect the cultural diversity of San José through its design, art, accessibility, public spaces, and amenities
- The Station should be easy to get to from anywhere in the city, region and state. It should facilitate mobility across scales.

NEXT STEPS

Team ABC and the Partner Agencies will continue to explore the at-grade and elevated track options with the station entrance located either around the current location or shifted to the north. While the efforts so far have looked at individual components, the next step will be to start to combine these various elements into full station scenarios and to explore trade-offs between them. These scenarios will include the track spatial organization, the station entrance, and all transit modes.
COORDINATION WITH OTHER MAJOR PROJECTS

The Partner Agencies each have their own initiatives or major projects in development at the same time as the preparation of the Concept Plan. Part of the intent of the Cooperative Agreement is to ensure that the agencies are aligned with each other to realize not only their individual projects but also to work together to develop a new Diridon Station. The following projects are actively being coordinated with the Concept Plan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>BART to Silicon Valley Phase II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHSRA</td>
<td>San José – Merced Project Segment of the statewide High-Speed Rail system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain</td>
<td>Caltrain Electrification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain</td>
<td>Caltrain Business Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Jose</td>
<td>Diridon Station Area Plan amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Jose</td>
<td>Google master plan/development project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Jose</td>
<td>Downtown Transportation Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Additional information on the Concept Plan, including Frequently Asked Questions, can be found on the project website at [www.diridonsj.org](http://www.diridonsj.org).
- Work as a cohesive group
- Shared vision for a fresh, bold look
- Co-create an integrated project (i.e., tracks, station, development)
- Partner resources & commitments (funding, grants, etc.)
- “You won’t get everything you want, but you will get more than you expected!”
KEY OBJECTIVES

A Multi-modal, Integrated, and Human-centered Station

The Station as Catalyst for the Urban Environment

The Station as a Destination

A Compelling Vision for the Future of the Diridon Station

A Futureproof, Flexible, Adaptive, and Innovative Station

Partnering Organization

Internal & External Stakeholder

Funding Objectives and Risk Management
CONCEPT PLAN SCOPE

18 Month Process

PHASE I: Spatial Configuration
- Scenario Development
- Scenario Evaluation
- Single Preferred Option Selection

PHASE II: Advance the Preferred Option
- Prepare 10% engineering and design plans
- Roadmap to Delivery (potential phasing program)
- Preliminary cost estimate

Organizational framework developed in tandem with design and engineering
WHAT IS A SCENARIO?

- Track configuration
- Spatial configuration of the Multimodal Hub
- Urban integration
- Position of Bus Stops, Light Rail, Taxis, TNCs, Vehicles, etc...
- Intermodal transfer
- Station Access
- Basis for evaluation

- NOT: Architectural Vision
- NOT: Detailed Engineering
- NOT: Atmosphere, Colors, Materials, Look & Feel
- Support future capacity for multiple rail operators (passenger platforms, number of tracks, etc.)
- Balanced with integration with surroundings
- Coordinate with Caltrain Business Plan
CONCEPT 1 – AT GRADE, SAN FERNANDO
CONCEPT 2 – ELEVATED, SAN FERNANDO
CONCEPT 3 – AT GRADE, SANTA CLARA
- Relationship to the Urban fabric

- Points North and South:
  - Interface with UPRR
  - Interface with Roadway crossings
  - Guadalupe Creek
- How the intermodal station relates physically to the surroundings
- Resolve or address any barriers that the current situation creates
- Connections and pathways through and to the intermodal station
- Easy, seamless connections
KEY MILESTONES AND TENTATIVE TIMELINE: PHASE I

Kick-off: Fall 2018
Scenarios: Winter 2019
Single Preferred Option: Spring 2019
Direction from City Council/Partner Agency Boards: Summer 2019
TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
Executive Director

FROM: Michelle Bouchard
Chief Operating Officer, Rail

SUBJECT: CALTRAIN FY2019 1ST QUARTER RAIL OPERATIONS PERFORMANCE

ACTION
The report is for information only. No Board action is required at this time.

SIGNIFICANCE
The presentation of Caltrain FY2019 1st Quarter Rail Operations Performance summarizes On-Time Performance, Minutes of Delays, Maintenance of Equipment and Fare Enforcement.

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no impact on the budget.

BACKGROUND
The Rail Operations quarterly report is prepared to provide funding partners, stakeholders, and general public an overview of Caltrain railroad operations performance in the reporting quarter. This provides the following information:

- On-time performance
- Major causes and significance of delays
- Fare enforcement

Prepared by: Joe Navarro, Deputy Chief 650.508.7792
Yu Hanakura, Senior Planner 650.508.7700
FY 2019 1st Quarter Rail Operations Performance

Board of Directors
Feb. 7, 2019
Agenda Item #12 a
Presentation Outline

• On-Time Performance
• Delays
  – Major causes
  – Significance
  – Correlation between mechanical delays and Maintenance of Equipment (M of E)
• Fare Enforcement
• Ridership
On-Time Performance (OTP)

• On-Time = train arrives no later than 5’ 59” from the scheduled arrival time at end-line locations (SF, SJ, Tamien, and Gilroy)

• Goal: 95% of trains on-time at end-line locations

• OTP Tracked daily and monthly
Monthly OTP Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th># of Trains Scheduled</th>
<th># of Trains On-Time (At End-Line)</th>
<th>On-Time Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sep-2017</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-2017</td>
<td>2256</td>
<td>2110</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-2017</td>
<td>2108</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>94.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-2017</td>
<td>2124</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>93.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-2018</td>
<td>2256</td>
<td>2170</td>
<td>96.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-2018</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>93.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-2018</td>
<td>2260</td>
<td>2132</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-2018</td>
<td>2164</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-2018</td>
<td>2256</td>
<td>2133</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-2018</td>
<td>2168</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-2018</td>
<td>2188</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2018</td>
<td>2324</td>
<td>2162</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-2018</td>
<td>2032</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OTP Goal: 95%
5 Main Categories of Delays

- On-Board/Passenger
- Major Incidents
- Maintenance of Infrastructure
- Maintenance of Equipment (M of E)
- Capital Projects
# 5 Main Categories of Delays

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category/Type</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>On-Board/Passenger</strong></td>
<td>• Bicycles&lt;br&gt;• PNAs&lt;br&gt;• Large crowds, slow loading, and luggage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major Incidents</strong></td>
<td>• Fatality&lt;br&gt;• Trespasser Strike&lt;br&gt;• Vehicle Strike&lt;br&gt;• Vehicle on Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance of Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>• Crossings and signals (C &amp; S)&lt;br&gt;• Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance of Equipment (M of E)</strong></td>
<td>• Door Failure&lt;br&gt;• Engine Failure&lt;br&gt;• Brake Issue&lt;br&gt;• Wheel Chair Lift&lt;br&gt;• Air Issue&lt;br&gt;• Head end power issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Projects</strong></td>
<td>• Single track&lt;br&gt;• Slow orders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Delay Minutes – Monthly

- M of E: 415, 640, 534, 499, 439, 240, 515, 1007, 1014, 905, 1144, 669, 1514
- Infrastructure: 73, 161, 256, 124, 83, 322, 81, 160, 170, 119, 163, 190, 92
- Major Incidents: 970, 1049, 251, 336, 1362, 866, 1215, 213, 0, 209, 969, 1439, 2053
- On-Board/Passenger: 4571, 5192, 4645, 4485, 5320, 5737, 6103, 6061, 6280, 6613, 6078, 6191, 5446
On-Board Passenger Delay Minutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large crowds/Slow loading/Luggage</td>
<td>2240</td>
<td>2367</td>
<td>2119</td>
<td>2119</td>
<td>2609</td>
<td>2768</td>
<td>2890</td>
<td>2814</td>
<td>2874</td>
<td>3275</td>
<td>3032</td>
<td>3366</td>
<td>2830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNAs</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>1137</td>
<td>1118</td>
<td>1003</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>795</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>1455</td>
<td>1714</td>
<td>1631</td>
<td>1585</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>2183</td>
<td>2110</td>
<td>2269</td>
<td>2220</td>
<td>2043</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1821</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Major Incident Delay Minutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle on Track</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Strike</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1125</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trespasser Strike</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1136</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>1898</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maintenance of Infrastructure
Delay Minutes

![Graph showing maintenance delays from September 2017 to September 2018 for Track and Crossings & Signals (C&S).]

- **Track**:
  - Sep-2017: 0
  - Oct-2017: 43
  - Nov-2017: 10
  - Dec-2017: 4
  - Jan-2018: 8
  - Feb-2018: 11
  - Mar-2018: 8
  - Apr-2018: 17
  - May-2018: 26
  - Jun-2018: 16
  - Jul-2018: 38
  - Aug-2018: 2
  - Sep-2018: 0

- **Crossings & Signals (C&S)**:
  - Sep-2017: 73
  - Oct-2017: 118
  - Nov-2017: 246
  - Dec-2017: 120
  - Jan-2018: 75
  - Feb-2018: 311
  - Mar-2018: 73
  - Apr-2018: 143
  - May-2018: 144
  - Jun-2018: 103
  - Jul-2018: 125
  - Aug-2018: 188
  - Sep-2018: 92
M of E – Mean Distance Between Failure (MDBF)
Capital Projects Delay Minutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Delay Minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sep-2017</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-2017</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-2017</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-2017</td>
<td>707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-2018</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-2018</td>
<td>1491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-2018</td>
<td>726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-2018</td>
<td>1030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-2018</td>
<td>729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-2018</td>
<td>1010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-2018</td>
<td>908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-2018</td>
<td>909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-2018</td>
<td>788</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fare Enforcement

- Implemented in end of July 2018
- Total Notice of Violations for Fare Evasion given for Q1FY18/19: 1905
  - Closed: 1410
  - Open: 495
  - Delinquent: 397
- Total Appeals: 333
  - Appeals granted: 166
## Fare Enforcement

(NO DATA: PROGRAM IMPLEMENTED IN JUL 2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of citations issued</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Caltrain*
Average Weekday Ridership

Average Weekday Ridership (FY17/18) 58,814 57,046 52,404 55,271 57,618 58,991 60,099 61,142 62,057 63,074 61,903 61,372

Average Weekday Ridership (FY18/19) 61,834 61,735 55,574 57,018 59,657 59,364 62,192 62,823 65,324 64,435 63,340 64,405
Questions
TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
Executive Director

FROM: Carter Mau
Deputy General Manager/CEO

SUBJECT: SAFETY AND SECURITY QUARTERLY PERFORMANCE REPORTS

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

SIGNIFICANCE
Staff will provide quarterly performance updates on Safety and Security which encompasses services provided by the San Mateo County Sheriff's Office. Key performance indicators will give the board an overview of significant reportable events.

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no fiscal impact.

BACKGROUND
The Safety and Security quarterly performance reports will give stakeholders an overview of key performance indicators from the previous quarter. The safety section will encompass employee, contractor, and passenger safety along with customer safety concerns. The transit Police Bureau will present details on law enforcement services including calls for service, response times, trespasser incidents, grade crossing accidents, community education, and quality of life issues.

Prepared by:
Jenny Le, Management Analyst, Transit Police Bureau 650.622.8050
Alex Ocegueda, District Temporary Employee 650.622.6216
Bill Grizard, Director Safety and Security 650.622.7856
Victoria O'Brien, Lieutenant, Transit Police Bureau 650.622.8045
Quarterly Safety and Security Performance Review
First Quarter
FY 2019 July – September 2018

Board of Directors
Feb. 7, 2019
Agenda Item 12 (b)
Safety

*There are currently 505 contracted TASI Employees.

Employee Reportable Injuries (TASI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Q1FY17</th>
<th>Q2FY17</th>
<th>Q3FY17</th>
<th>Q4FY17</th>
<th>Q1FY18</th>
<th>Q2FY18</th>
<th>Q3FY18</th>
<th>Q4FY18</th>
<th>Q1FY19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Safety

Passenger Injuries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Non-Reportable</th>
<th>FRA Reportable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1F17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2F17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3F17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4F17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1F18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2F18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3F18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4F18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1F19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Safety

*Safety violations applicable to all projects and activities.

Quarterly Rail Safety Violations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q1FY18</th>
<th>Q1FY19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rule/Procedure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Strikes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Track Incidents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Safety

- Contractor Injuries (Peninsula Corridor Elec. Project).
  - Zero reportable Injuries for Q1FY17 and Q1FY18.
  - One reportable injury for the reporting quarter (Q1FY19).
- Roadway Worker Protection Training (RWP).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1FY19</th>
<th>Number of Training Sessions (RWP)</th>
<th>Registered</th>
<th>No Show</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Fail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Safety

*Additional safety complaints processed through Transit Police.
Transit Police Bureau

- Contracted Law Enforcement Services - San Mateo County Sheriff’s Office
  - 20 hour contract
  - 77 Miles of Track
  - 32 Stations
  - 2 Teams
    - 1 Sergeant (1000-2200 hrs.)
    - 2 Deputies (0500-1700 hrs.)
    - 2 Deputies (1300-0100 hrs.)
Transit Police Calls for Service

- Total Calls for Service for Q1: 2806
  - 10% Increase from Q1FY18
Transit Police Response Times

- Decreased by 2 Minutes 51 Seconds Q1FY18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Average Response Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1FY17</td>
<td>22 Minutes 33 Seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1FY18</td>
<td>25 Minutes 24 Seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1FY19</td>
<td>23 Minutes 5 Seconds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does not reflect local agency response or Priority 1 calls*
Transit Police Visibility Statistics

- **Station Checks**
  - 10% Increase from Q1FY18
- **Subject Stops**
  - 24% Decrease from Q1FY18
- **Dispersals**
  - 13% Increase from Q1FY18
Behavioral Health Interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Interventions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q1 Total Number of Life Endangering Interventions

- **Q1FY17**: 1
- **Q1FY18**: 4
- **Q1FY19**: 6

July
- **FY17**: 1
- **FY18**: 3
- **FY19**: 6

August
- **FY17**: 1
- **FY18**: 4
- **FY19**: 2

September
- **FY17**: 1
- **FY18**: 6
- **FY19**: 2
Collisions/Strikes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Q1 FY17</th>
<th>Q1 FY18</th>
<th>Q1 FY19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trespasser Strike - Non-Fatal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trespasser Strike - Fatality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Strikes - Non-Fatal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Strikes - Fatality</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Strikes - Occupied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Strikes - Unoccupied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Railway Safety: Education, Enforcement & Training

• Education:
  - Operation Clear Track, Redwood City
  - 14 High Intensity Strategic Enforcement Citations
  - 45 Informational Pedestrian Stops

• Enforcement:
  - 116 Citations: High Intensity Strategic Enforcement
  - 15 Citations: Trespassing
  - 9 Trespassing Arrests

• Trainings:
  - July 19, Yearly Emergency Exercise
  - K-9 EOD Training
Quality of Life: Transit Police Special Enforcement Team

- **City and County of San Francisco**
  - San Francisco Homeless Outreach Team
    - Tunnel 1 Encampment, San Francisco
    - Tunnel 3 Encampment, San Francisco

- **County of San Mateo**
  - Redwood City Project SAFE
    - 30 Truants Contacted
    - Sheriff’s Office Psychiatric Emergency Response Team

- **County of Santa Clara**
  - HomeFirst, Homelessness Response Team
Enforcement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Citation</th>
<th>Q1FY17</th>
<th>Q1FY18</th>
<th>Q1FY19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>1753</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>1621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infraction - Traffic</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infraction - Other</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trespassing</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISEP</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number of Citations
Arrests

![Graph showing arrests by type for Q1 FY17, Q1 FY18, and Q1 FY19. The categories are: Adult Felony (4, 6, 6), Adult Misdemeanor (39, 27, 52), Juvenile (2, 4, 1).]
JPB BOARD MEETING
FEBRUARY 7, 2019

Correspondence Packet as of January 31, 2019, 1 p.m.
From: Berry, Annette Rene [mailto:Annette.Berry@amtrak.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 06, 2018 7:08 AM
To: Board (@caltrain.com)
Cc: Berry, Annette Rene; Petito, Barbara
Subject: "Operation Clear Track" Safety Detail In Your Community

Good Day Caltrain Executive,

This is Barbara Petito at Amtrak Police Headquarters in Washington DC. We are organizing a railroad safety detail later this month and wanted to invite Caltrain Transit Police to participate, especially those that have unfortunately responded to a train-related vehicle or trespasser strike. The information on the operation is below and includes the two attachments here.

Would there be a way to get this out to all of your members? I have been contacting law enforcement officials one by one in each state, and I fear I will be long dead by the time I reach every department in the 46 states where Amtrak operates.

Please advise if this is something that can be disseminated by your organization.

Thank you Sir.
Be safe.

Respectfully,
Barbara Petito

Barbara A. Petito
Amtrak Police Department
Lead Program Specialist
900 2nd Street NE
Suite 110
Washington, DC 20002

(202) 906-3337
Cell Phone: 717-439-2925
ATS: 777-3337
Petitob@amtrak.com

Dear Caltrain Transit Police Official,

This email is your official invitation to participate in “Operation Clear Track” on Tuesday, September 25, 2018 hosted by Amtrak and Operation Lifesaver Inc. to mark National Rail Safety Week. If you can devote three hours to railroad safety on this day, we would be honored to have you as a member of our national railroad safety law enforcement team.

As background, “Operation Clear Track” is a one-day safety initiative that brings police and sheriff’s departments together nationwide to enforce state grade crossing and trespassing laws on America’s railroad tracks.
Since its inception last year, we have enhanced the operation by allowing each department to set their own schedules and determine which railroad grade crossings they would like to cover during the requested three-hour enforcement period. On **September 25th**, participants will be asked to report to at least two different railroad grade crossings in their communities to issue verbal/written warnings or citations to individuals trespassing on railroad property or failing to comply with state grade crossing safety laws. The three-hour commitment can be carried out all at once or spread out over different shifts throughout the day.

Attached is a letter from our Police Chief with more information on the event and a link to register your department and request free pocket safety cards that Amtrak will ship to you for public distribution during the enforcement window. I have also provided the link here: [https://operationlifesaver.wufoo.com/forms/operation-clear-track-signup-form/](https://operationlifesaver.wufoo.com/forms/operation-clear-track-signup-form/)

If you agree to participate, please register today and put in your request for cards ASAP as we are trying to bring more than 400 law enforcement agencies on board as this year’s goal.

We hope you and your staff can dedicate this time to railroad safety to keep your community safe. We look forward to working with you on this critical safety initiative. Please contact me if you have any questions or concerns.

Thank you and be safe.

Respectfully,

Barbara Petito

*Amtrak Police Department*

*Lead Program Specialist*

*900 2nd Street NE Suite 110*

*Washington, DC 20002*

*(202) 906-3337 Cell Phone: 717-439-2925*

*Petitob@amtrak.com*
Amtrak Police Department
900 2nd Street Suite 300
Washington, DC 20002

Dear Chief/Sheriff,

This September 23-29, 2018 is “Rail Safety Week” across the U.S. and Canada, and Amtrak and Operation Lifesaver would like to invite you to participate in the second annual “Operation Clear Track,” which was created to call attention to train safety laws along the railroad tracks within your community.

“Operation Clear Track” is the largest single day railroad safety law enforcement initiative in the U.S. This year’s deployment will be held on Tuesday, September 25 and will require three hours of law enforcement participation. An enforcement period can occur during any portion of any work shift to accommodate staffing needs.

During the event, we would ask that you assign personnel to two railroad grade crossings of your choice, to enforce your state’s grade crossing and trespassing laws. Violators should receive a verbal or written warning or a citation where appropriate. Railroad safety pocket cards will be provided for your employees to distribute to motorists and pedestrians traveling over these crossings. Any remaining cards can be distributed to driver’s education programs or local businesses.

At the completion of “Operation Clear Track,” your department’s total number of verbal or written warnings, along with the total number of citations issued should be reported back to Amtrak. In addition, the press will be notified of your participation in advance.

Raising public awareness about the dangers of failing to comply with railroad safety laws is a critical step in preventing railroad-related deaths and injuries in your community. We look forward to adding your department to our list of agencies that have agreed to work with us on this major national railroad safety campaign.

To participate in “Operation Clear Track” 2018 please use the following link to register your department, http://bit.ly/OCT-signup. For additional information please contact Amtrak Police Department Lead Program Specialist Barbara Petito at PetitoB@Amtrak.com or 202 906-3337 (w) or 717 439-2925 (c).

Thank you and be safe.

Respectfully,

Neil Trugman
Chief of Police
Amtrak Police Department
Grade Crossing Safety Tips

- **Never** drive or walk around lowered grade crossing gates.
- **Never** attempt to outrun an approaching train.
- **Never** stop your vehicle on a grade crossing waiting for traffic to move.
- **Never** begin to drive across the tracks unless you can get all the way across.
- **Always** call the Emergency Notification System (ENS) number 24 hours a day to report problems or obstructions at the crossing. Look for the number on the blue sign near the crossing or on the crossbuck.
- **Always** remember a train can take a mile or more to stop.
- **Always** know that the average train is three feet wider than the track on each side.
- **Always** slow down and stop your vehicle prior to train tracks when lights begin to flash.
Railroad Trespassing

• Never walk, run, play or take pictures on the railroad right-of-way. If you are on or near the tracks, you are trespassing on private property and breaking the law.

• Never attempt to outrun an approaching train. It can take a train a mile or more to stop.

• If you’re standing on the train tracks, you may not hear or feel an oncoming train in time to get away safely.

• Only cross the tracks at designated public crossings.

• For more safety tips, visit oli.org

Amtrak is a registered service mark of the National Railroad Passenger Corporation.
Dear Joint Powers Board,

I have been asking this question for months and have not received a response.

**What percentage of diesel trains will be running in the seven-car mixed fleet?** Because diesel trains have significantly more seats than EMU trains, the percentage of diesel trains in the mixed fleet has a profound impact on system capacity. When Caltrain was planning to run six-car EMUs, the stated percentage was 25% diesel and 75% electric although in this line capacity figure, the percentage is 33% diesel and 67% electric. What is the plan now?

I understand that seven-car EMU trains will have 84 bike spaces to meet the required 8:1 ratio of seats-to-bike spaces. I’d encourage this to be accomplished by distributing bike spaces among more cars to allow seats within view of bikes.

Thank you for continuing to work with passengers to help Caltrain be the best it can be.

Sincerely,

Shirley Johnson
January 24, 2019

Ben Metcalf, Director
California Department of Housing and Community Development
2020 West El Camino Ave.
Sacramento, CA 95833

Re: Support for the City of South San Francisco’s Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities (AHSC) Round 4: Integrated Connectivity Project

Dear Mr. Metcalf:

I am writing to express my strong support of the City of South San Francisco’s application for funding through the California Department of Housing and Community Development’s (HCD) Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Grant Program Round 4. I hope you join me in appreciation of the City’s dedication to promoting affordable housing in the Bay Area, where housing shortages are particularly acute.

Currently, the cost of housing in California is sky rocketing, while wages and household incomes struggle to keep up. This situation is exacerbated in the Bay Area where jobs easily outnumber available units, which has caused affordable housing to become practically unobtainable. South San Francisco’s proposed project would directly address this problem by increasing the number of affordable units in close proximity to job centers.

The City of South San Francisco’s Project will also help reduce greenhouse gas emissions by increasing active modes of transportation, such as commuting by public transit, biking and walking, thus reducing the number of vehicles on regional streets and reduce carbon emissions. The project will accomplish this by building new housing units in dense urban areas and next to transit stations, along with bike and pedestrian infrastructure.

For these reasons I am proud to support the City of South San Francisco’s application through HCD’s Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Grant Program. For any further information please do not hesitate to contact Casey Fromson, Director of Government and Community Affairs, at (650) 508-6493 or via email at fromsonc@samtrans.com.

Sincerely,

Jim Hartnett
General Manager/Chief Executive Officer/Executive Director

cc: Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board of Directors
San Mateo County Transit District Board of Directors
San Mateo County Transportation Authority Board of Directors
Dear Lori,

Thank you for sending these drawings to your designer. They are intended as conceptual and we understand they may need adjustment for a final design. Thank you for continuing to examine possible options.

Regarding emergency exit windows, I'm copying FRA regulations below that you sent to me on March 26, 2018, where you highlighted the section stating that seat backs are not an obstruction. Could you please clarify why you are now saying that seat backs are an obstruction?

Best regards,
Shirley Johnson for BIKES ONboard

§238.113 Emergency window exits.

(a) Number and location. Except as provided in paragraph (a)(3) of this section, the following requirements in this paragraph (a) apply on or after April 1, 2008—

(1) Single-level passenger cars. Each single-level passenger car shall have a minimum of four emergency window exits. At least one emergency window exit shall be located in each side of each end (half) of the car, in a staggered configuration where practical. (See Figure 1 to this subpart; see also Figures 1b and 1c to this subpart.)

(2) Multi-level passenger cars—main levels. Each main level in a multi-level passenger car is subject to the same requirements specified for single-level passenger cars in paragraph (a)(1) of this section.

(3) Multi-level passenger cars—levels with seating areas other than main levels.

(i) Except as provided in paragraphs (a)(3)(ii) and (iii) of this section, on or after August 1, 2009, any level other than a main level used for passenger seating in a multi-level passenger car, such as an intermediate level, shall have a minimum of two emergency window exits in each seating area. The emergency window exits shall be accessible to passengers in the seating area without requiring movement through an interior door or to another level of the car. At least one emergency window exit shall be located in each side of the seating area. An emergency window exit may be located within an exterior side door in the passenger compartment if it is not practical to place the window exit in the side of the seating area. (See Figures 2 and 2a to this subpart.)

(ii) Only one emergency window exit is required in a seating area in a passenger compartment if:

(A) It is not practical to place an emergency window exit in a side of the passenger compartment due to the need to provide accessible accommodations under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990;

(B) There are no more than four seats in the seating area; and

(C) A suitable, alternate arrangement for emergency egress is provided.

(iii) For passenger cars ordered prior to April 1, 2009, and placed in service prior to April 1, 2011, only one emergency window exit is required in a seating area in a passenger compartment if—
(A) It is not practicable to place a window exit in a side of the passenger compartment (due to the presence of a structure such as a bathroom, electrical locker, or kitchen); and

(B) There are no more than eight seats in the seating area.

(4) Cars with a sleeping compartment or similar private compartment. Each level of a passenger car with a sleeping compartment or a similar private compartment intended to be occupied by a passenger or train crewmember shall have at least one emergency window exit in each such compartment. For purposes of this paragraph (a)(4), a bathroom, kitchen, or locomotive cab is not considered a “compartment.”

(b) Ease of operability. On or after November 8, 1999, each emergency window exit shall be designed to permit rapid and easy removal from the inside of the car during an emergency situation without requiring the use of a tool or other implement.

(c) Dimensions. Except as provided in paragraphs (c)(1) and (c)(2) of this section, each emergency window exit in a passenger car, including a sleeping car, ordered on or after September 8, 2000, or placed in service for the first time on or after September 9, 2002, shall have an unobstructed opening with minimum dimensions of 26 inches horizontally by 24 inches vertically. A seatback is not an obstruction if it can be moved away from the window opening without using a tool or other implement.

On 2019-01-14 09:38, Caltrain, Bac (@caltrain.com) wrote:

Dear Bikes ONBoard,

Thank you for your feedback. As soon as we received these we sent them to our designer for a closer look. Unfortunately, some of the items included are too large in the aggregate for the space. In addition, we know you care deeply about ensuring proper access to the emergency exit windows, and unfortunately in this design the transverse seats block access. Staff is continuing to examine possible options and appreciates your input.

Best,

Lori Low

From: Bikes on Board [mailto:bikesonboard@sonic.net]
Sent: Wednesday, December 05, 2018 9:55 AM
To: Board (@caltrain.com)
Cc: CalMod@caltrain.com; Caltrain, Bac (@caltrain.com); cacsecretary [@caltrain.com]; bikesonboard@sonic.net
Subject: Drawings for redesigned EMU trains to put seats within view of bikes

Dear Chair Bruins and Members of the Joint Powers Board,
Please see the attached file for to-scale drawings of two options for putting seats within view of bikes on EMU trains. We offer these as preliminary options and look forward to working with staff on a final design that works for both passengers and operations.

Thank you for your support of 'green' commuting.

Respectfully,

BIKES ONboard Team
Dear Ms. Rios,

I appreciate your detailed response to my communication. It contrasts with Caltrain’s perfunctory, boilerplate “sorry for the inconvenience” message without any attempt to resolve the underlying issue. I think the grave inconvenience passengers were subjected to the weekend of January 5-6, 2019 can easily be resolved by stopping the bullet trains at Bayshore as per the printed schedule if Caltrain again decides to restore weekend service direct to 4th and King Street. At the present time, the Caltrain web site, stations, and local media have been saturated with notices of the suspension of weekend train service direct to San Francisco. Accordingly, Caltrain should take that fact into consideration when it arbitrarily decides to make an exception to the rule so as to better meet the reasonable expectations of its regular riders.

I think what happened at Bayshore station on January 5-6, 2019, however, is indicative of a more serious problem afflicting Caltrain, probably because its administrators and managers do not rely on the service to meet their basic transportation needs. In the more than a decade that I have been boarding Caltrain at Bayshore, for example, I have frequently noticed that trains will arrive early and leave before the scheduled time, and Union Pacific freight trains will use the freight siding at Bayshore minutes before Caltrain is scheduled to stop, thereby blocking passenger ingress to the station. If Caltrain’s callous attitude does not change, there will no significant increase in ridership after electrification is completed, raising serious questions as to why taxpayer money was wasted on this project.

Thank you for your courtesy.

Very truly yours,

Thomas Andrew O’Keefe

From: Rios, Rona <riosr@samtrans.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 10:16:31 AM
To: Thomas Andrew O’Keefe
Cc: Board (@caltrain.com)
Subject: Consumer Report File Number 706349

Dear Mr. O’Keefe,

Your email to Director Stone was referred to me for response. The Caltrain Board will receive a copy of this correspondence.
First, please accept our sincere apology for the problem you experienced at the Bayshore Station when our Bus Bridge service was cancelled during the NCAA Championship weekend. I understand from your correspondence that there were numerous customers waiting over a half an hour for a train because we reverted back to normal service. We understand that our customers had to adjust their commutes accordingly and we regret that this particular weekend change in service caused frustration and confusion.

I followed up with our staff who had a plan to reach out to the community to inform them of this change and I’ve been informed that in addition to updating various pages on our website, we placed notices on our social media platforms, ran announcements through our PA system and Visual Message Signs and asked our conductors to make announcements. No matter our intentions or efforts, I realize it does not change the fact you still missed a train and had to wait in inclement weather conditions.

We aim to provide the community with a high-quality transit system. Your feedback is valuable and please know that we will continue working towards improvement – including our communication plan to ensure we provide our ridership with the best possible service. We hope your future travel with us will reflect this philosophy and prove to be pleasant.

Should you want to reach out to me directly, please feel free to do so at 650-508-6239.

Best Regards,

Rona Rios
Manager, Customer Service | Distribution
SamTrans | Caltrain | SMCTA
1250 San Carlos Avenue
San Carlos, CA 94070
riosr@samtrans.com

Caltrain has no consideration for its passengers. Caltrain left almost a dozen of us waiting for over half an hour on a windy platform in the pouring rain at Bayshore on Sunday when the scheduled 12:11 PM sped past the station as Caltrain arbitrarily decided to "restore" service to 4th & King without advance notice. If Caltrain decides to make last minute changes to its much ballyhooed suspension of weekend service to San Francisco through the Spring 2019 it should at least STOP at the station in its printed schedule calls for a stop. How does Caltrain ever expect to increase ridership with this type of cavalier attitude?

Patron also sent e-mail
Email: Caltrain has lost sight of the fact that it needs to meet the needs of its regular riding public rather than engage in quixotic schemes to "drum up" new, one time riders. A case in point is what happened last Sunday, January 6, 2019 when Caltrain restored its weekend bullet service to 4th & King station, and failed to stop the southbound train at Bayshore station at 12:11 pm as per the printed schedule. In doing so, it left about a dozen persons stranded for over half an hour on a cold and windy platform during a major rainstorm. There were no notices posted at Bayshore station regarding this last minute service change. Caltrain claims it posted information about the change on its web site, oblivious to the fact that not all its riders have 24/7 (if any) access to the Internet. In any event, there is only a Facebook notice on Caltrain’s website announcing the change that was posted on Friday, January 4, 2018.
Good Afternoon,

I am transmitting the City of San José appointments for 2019. Please direct this to the appropriate person in your organization.

The attached appointments were approved by the City Council on January 15, 2019.

The appointments are for one year unless otherwise noted.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you, and have a good day.

Toni J. Taber, CMC
City Clerk
City of San Jose
200 E Santa Clara Street
San José, CA 95113
408-535-1260

How is our service? Please take our short survey.
Live updates of City Council Meetings can be found on Facebook and Twitter.
Memorandum

TO: CITY COUNCIL

FROM: Mayor Sam Liccardo

SUBJECT: CITY COUNCIL COMMITTEE, BOARD AND COMMISSION APPOINTMENTS

DATE: January 10, 2019

APPROVED:

RECOMMENDATION

1. Apprise the Council of the Mayor’s Appointments for each of the standing committees, as described in Exhibit “A” of this Memorandum.

2. Appoint the following Councilmembers to each of the committees and assignments, as described in Exhibit “B” of this Memorandum.

DISCUSSION

With the attached recommended Council appointments, I am also recommending two additional changes to commissions and committees.

First, in light of the severity of our housing crisis, I’ve sought to re-cast the Ad Hoc Development Services Committee as the Ad Hoc Housing Construction and Development Services Committee. While all development services will continue to remain within the committee’s purview, there will be particular emphasis given to housing starts, and whatever polices or management practices need attention to substantially boost housing production to meet our goals. I recommend that Councilmember Magdalena Carrasco chair this committee.

Second, I recommend the creation of a “Monterey Corridor Working Group” led by Councilmembers Maya Esparza and Sergio Jimenez. This working group will focus on many pending issues relevant to communities along Monterey Road, about which each councilmember is acutely aware, including High Speed Rail alignment, the impacts of additional CalTrain service, land use changes (i.e., through the General Plan’s 4- year review) that might enable greater densification and redevelopment in the corridor, the redevelopment of the County Fairgrounds, and homelessness. Staff will work with the Councilmembers and the Mayor’s office to seek resources—such as with Metropolitan Transportation Commission planning grants—to further the
working group's and Council's goals. The working group will fashion a 2-year workplan with City staff, which should include submission of a proposed project providing enhanced transit service—such as autonomous bus-rapid-transit—for inclusion in the VTA's 2045 Valley Transportation Plan, so that planning and funding can proceed. City staff should invite relevant stakeholders—including CHSRA, VTA, UP, and CalTrain—to the working group meetings, and notice should be provided to nearby neighborhoods through low-cost (NextDoor, email) means. The working group will meet in public quarterly or at some other interval agreeable to staff and the Council.

With those changes, I respectfully submit my recommendations for Council consideration.
## EXHIBIT A

### 2019 City Council Standing Committee & AD-HOC Committee Appointments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rules &amp; Open Government Committee</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Vice Chair</th>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liccardo</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Arenas</td>
<td>Khamis</td>
<td>Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety, Finance, &amp; Strategy Support</td>
<td>Peralez</td>
<td>Jimenez</td>
<td>Carrasco</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Arenas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation &amp; Environment</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Peralez</td>
<td>Esparza</td>
<td>Diep</td>
<td>Arenas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community &amp; Economic Development</td>
<td>Khamis</td>
<td>Foley</td>
<td>Diep</td>
<td>Peralez</td>
<td>Esparza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Services &amp; Education</td>
<td>Arenas</td>
<td>Carrasco</td>
<td>Esparza</td>
<td>Foley</td>
<td>Jimenez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart City and Innovation</td>
<td>Diep</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Liccardo</td>
<td>Jimenez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD-HOC Committee for Housing Construction &amp; Development Services</td>
<td>Carrasco</td>
<td>Esparza</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Peralez</td>
<td>Foley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EXHIBIT B

#### 2019 Council Appointments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board, Commission or Committee</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Appointee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABAG – Executive Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABAG – Executive Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>Esparza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABAG – Executive Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>Perez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABAG – Executive Board</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Arenas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABAG – Executive Board</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Foley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABAG – Executive Board</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Jimenez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABAG – General Assembly Delegate</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jimenez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Commission</td>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>Perez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals Hearing Board</td>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>Foley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Commission</td>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>Carrasco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>Jimenez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain Centralized Equipment Maintenance &amp; Operations Facilities Oversight Committee</td>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain Joint Powers Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain Local Policy Makers Group</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Jimenez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Corps Council</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Esparza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Corps Council</td>
<td>Vice Chair</td>
<td>Foley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service Commission</td>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>Khamis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Energy Community Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>Jimenez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Compensation Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>Khamis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination: Home</td>
<td></td>
<td>Liccardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Parking Board</td>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>Perez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Preparedness Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>Foley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressway Plan 2040 Project Advisory Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>Khamis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federated Employees Retirement Board</td>
<td>Non-Voting Member</td>
<td>Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Boulevard Initiative Task Force</td>
<td></td>
<td>Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat Conservation Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jimenez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Landmarks Commission</td>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and Community Development Advisory Commission</td>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>Jimenez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services Commission</td>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>Carrasco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Venture Silicon Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td>Liccardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League of California Cities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jimenez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League of California Cities – Women’s Caucus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arenas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library &amp; Early Education Commission</td>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>Arenas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor's Gang Prevention Task Force</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Liceardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor's Gang Prevention Task Force</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peralez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor's Gang Prevention Task Force</td>
<td></td>
<td>Carrasco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor's Gang Prevention Task Force</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arenas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Transportation Commission</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Liceardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Corridor Working Group</td>
<td>Vice Chair</td>
<td>Jimenez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Corridor Working Group</td>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods Commission</td>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>Esparza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>Jimenez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police and Fire Retirement Board</td>
<td>Non-Voting</td>
<td>Foley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Athletic League Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling and Waste Reduction Commission of Santa Clara County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycled Water Policy Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San José Arena Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San José Arena Authority</td>
<td>Mayor's Staff</td>
<td>Inamine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San José Sports Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San José Sports Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara County Human Trafficking Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(HTC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara County Human Trafficking Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(HTC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara County Cities Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara County Cities Association – Legislative Action Committee</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Diep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara County Cities Association – City Selection Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara County Emergency Operational Area Council (formerly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Preparedness Council)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara County Emergency Operational Area Council (formerly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Preparedness Council)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara County Fairgrounds Ad hoc Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara County Health Benefits Coalition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara County Local Agency Formation (LAFCO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara County Local Agency Formation (LAFCO)</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Esparza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara County Reentry Network Governance Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Habitat Agency Governing Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Habitat Agency Governing Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Habitat Agency Governing Board</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Carrasco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Habitat Agency Governing Board</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Diep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Habitat Agency Implementation Board</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Esparza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Habitat Agency Implementation Board</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Foley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Habitat Agency Implementation Board (staff position)</td>
<td>Staff Alternate</td>
<td>Meenaxi Panakkal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Habitat Agency Implementation Board</td>
<td>VTA Representative</td>
<td>Diep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Habitat Agency Implementation Board</td>
<td>VTA Representative</td>
<td>Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Board</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Liccardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Board</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Board</td>
<td>Peraldez</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Board</td>
<td>Diep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Board</td>
<td>Carrasco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara VTA Board – Policy Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara VTA Policy Advisory Board – Diridon Station</td>
<td>Jimenez</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara VTA Policy Advisory Board – Diridon Station</td>
<td>Peraldez</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara VTA Policy Advisory Board – Eastridge to BART</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara VTA Policy Advisory Board – Eastridge to BART</td>
<td>Arenas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara VTA Policy Advisory Board – El Camino Real Rapid Transit</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara VTA Policy Advisory Board – El Camino Real Rapid Transit</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara VTA Policy Advisory Board – Silicon Valley Rapid Transit Corridor</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Peralez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara VTA Policy Advisory Board – SR 85 Corridor</td>
<td>Khamis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Water District – Water Commission (two year appt)</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Foley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Water District – Water Commission (two year appt)</td>
<td>Romanow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools City Collaborative</td>
<td>Liccardo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools City Collaborative</td>
<td>Carrasco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools City Collaborative</td>
<td>Arenas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Citizens Commission</td>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>Khamis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF Bay Area Regional Water System Financing Authority</td>
<td>Liccardo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Name</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td>Liccardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silicon Valley Regional Interoperability Project</td>
<td></td>
<td>Foley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silicon Valley Regional Interoperability Project</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silicon Valley Regional Interoperability Project</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Arenas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silicon Valley Regional Interoperability Project</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Peraldez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ/SC Clean Water Financing Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ/SC Clean Water Financing Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ/SC Treatment Plant Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jimenez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ/SC Treatment Plant Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ/SC Treatment Plant Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ/SC Treatment Plant Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Liccardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ/SC Treatment Plant Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Esparza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning Advisory Board (Therapeutic Services)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Khamis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team San Jose/Convention and Visitors Bureau</td>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>Peraldez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Valley Sanitation District – Sewer Advisory Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work2future Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Commission</td>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>Arenas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans Affairs</td>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>Khamis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum

TO: CITY COUNCIL
FROM: Mayor Sam Liccardo

SUBJECT: CITY COUNCIL COMMITTEE, BOARD AND COMMISSION APPOINTMENTS
DATE: January 10, 2019

APPROVED: 
DATE: 1/10/19

RECOMMENDATION

1. Apprise the Council of the Mayor’s Appointments for each of the standing committees, as described in Exhibit “A” of this Memorandum.

2. Appoint the following Councilmembers to each of the committees and assignments, as described in Exhibit “B” of this Memorandum.

DISCUSSION

With the attached recommended Council appointments, I am also recommending two additional changes to commissions and committees.

First, in light of the severity of our housing crisis, I’ve sought to re-cast the Ad Hoc Development Services Committee as the Ad Hoc Housing Construction and Development Services Committee. While all development services will continue to remain within the committee’s purview, there will be particular emphasis given to housing starts, and whatever policies or management practices need attention to substantially boost housing production to meet our goals. I recommend that Councilmember Magdalena Carrasco chair this committee.

Second, I recommend the creation of a “Monterey Corridor Working Group” led by Councilmembers Maya Esparza and Sergio Jimenez. This working group will focus on many pending issues relevant to communities along Monterey Road, about which each councilmember is acutely aware, including High Speed Rail alignment, the impacts of additional CalTrain service, land use changes (i.e., through the General Plan’s 4-year review) that might enable greater densification and redevelopment in the corridor, the redevelopment of the County Fairgrounds, and homelessness. Staff will work with the Councilmembers and the Mayor’s office to seek resources—such as with Metropolitan Transportation Commission planning grants—to further the
working group’s and Council’s goals. The working group will fashion a 2-year workplan with City staff, which should include submission of a proposed project providing enhanced transit service—such as autonomous bus-rapid-transit—for inclusion in the VTA’s 2045 Valley Transportation Plan, so that planning and funding can proceed. City staff should invite relevant stakeholders—including CHSRA, VTA, UP, and CalTrain—to the working group meetings, and notice should be provided to nearby neighborhoods through low-cost (NextDoor, email) means. The working group will meet in public quarterly or at some other interval agreeable to staff and the Council.

With those changes, I respectfully submit my recommendations for Council consideration.
### 2019 City Council Standing Committee & AD-HOC Committee Appointments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Vice Chair</th>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rules &amp; Open Government Committee</td>
<td>Liccardo</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Arenas</td>
<td>Khamis</td>
<td>Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety, Finance, &amp; Strategy Support</td>
<td>Peralez</td>
<td>Jimenez</td>
<td>Carrasco</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Arenas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation &amp; Environment</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Peralez</td>
<td>Esparza</td>
<td>Diep</td>
<td>Arenas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community &amp; Economic Development</td>
<td>Khamis</td>
<td>Foley</td>
<td>Diep</td>
<td>Peralez</td>
<td>Esparza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Services &amp; Education</td>
<td>Arenas</td>
<td>Carrasco</td>
<td>Esparza</td>
<td>Foley</td>
<td>Jimenez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart City and Innovation</td>
<td>Diep</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Liccardo</td>
<td>Jimenez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD-HOC Committee for Housing Construction &amp; Development Services</td>
<td>Carrasco</td>
<td>Esparza</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Peralez</td>
<td>Foley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# EXHIBIT B

## 2019 Council Appointments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board, Commission or Committee</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Appointee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABAG – Executive Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABAG – Executive Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>Esparza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABAG – Executive Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peralez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABAG – Executive Board</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Arenas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABAG – Executive Board</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Foley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABAG – Executive Board</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Jimenez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABAG – General Assembly Delegate</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jimenez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Commission</td>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>Peralez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals Hearing Board</td>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>Foley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Commission</td>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>Carrasco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>Jimenez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain Centralized Equipment Maintenance &amp; Operations Facilities Oversight Committee</td>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain Joint Powers Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain: Local Policy Makers Group</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Jimenez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Corps Council</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Esparza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Corps Council</td>
<td>Vice Chair</td>
<td>Foley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service Commission</td>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>Khamis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Energy Community Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>Jimenez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Compensation Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>Khamis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination: Home</td>
<td></td>
<td>Liccardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Parking Board</td>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>Peralez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Preparedness Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>Foley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressway Plan 2040 Project Advisory Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>Khamis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federated Employees Retirement Board</td>
<td>Non-Voting Member</td>
<td>Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Boulevard Initiative Task Force</td>
<td></td>
<td>Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat Conservation Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jimenez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Landmarks Commission</td>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and Community Development Advisory Commission</td>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>Jimenez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services Commission</td>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>Carrasco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Venture Silicon Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td>Liccardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League of California Cities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jimenez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League of California Cities</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Esparza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League of California Cities -- Women's Caucus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arenas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library &amp; Early Education Commission</td>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>Arenas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board/Committee</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Habitat Agency Governing Board</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Diep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Habitat Agency Implementation Board</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Esparza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Habitat Agency Implementation Board (staff position)</td>
<td>Staff Alternate</td>
<td>Meenaksi Panakkal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Habitat Agency Implementation Board</td>
<td>VTA Representative</td>
<td>Diep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Habitat Agency Implementation Board</td>
<td>VTA Alternate</td>
<td>Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>Liccardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peralez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>Carrasco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Board</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara VTA Board - Policy Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jimenez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara VTA Policy Advisory Board - Diridon Station</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peralez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara VTA Policy Advisory Board - Diridon Station</td>
<td></td>
<td>Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara VTA Policy Advisory Board - Eastridge to BART</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arenas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara VTA Policy Advisory Board - Eastridge to BART</td>
<td></td>
<td>Carrasco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara VTA Policy Advisory Board - El Camino Real Rapid Transit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara VTA Policy Advisory Board - El Camino Real Rapid Transit</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara VTA Policy Advisory Board - Silicon Valley Rapid Transit Corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara VTA Policy Advisory Board - Silicon Valley Rapid Transit Corridor</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Peralez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara VTA Policy Advisory Board - SR 85 Corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Khamis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Water District - Water Commission (two year appt)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Foley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Water District - Water Commission (two year appt)</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Romanow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools City Collaborative</td>
<td></td>
<td>Liccardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools City Collaborative</td>
<td></td>
<td>Carrasco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools City Collaborative</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arenas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Citizens Commission</td>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>Khamis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF Bay Area Regional Water System Financing Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td>Liccardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td>Liccardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silicon Valley Regional Interoperability Project</td>
<td></td>
<td>Foley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silicon Valley Regional Interoperability Project</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silicon Valley Regional Interoperability Project</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Arenas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silicon Valley Regional Interoperability Project</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Peraldez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ/SC Clean Water Financing Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ/SC Clean Water Financing Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ/SC Treatment Plant Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jimenez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ/SC Treatment Plant Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ/SC Treatment Plant Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ/SC Treatment Plant Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Liccardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ/SC Treatment Plant Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Esparza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning Advisory Board (Therapeutic Services)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Khamis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team San Jose/Convention and Visitors Bureau</td>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>Peraldez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Valley Sanitation District -- Sewer Advisory Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work2future Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Commission</td>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>Arenas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans Affairs</td>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>Khamis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sincerely,
Thomas Heiser
Hi Thomas,

Thank you for your comment on the Caltrain Business Plan. I have passed your letter on to the team. I agree with you that transit oriented development and value capture are important things for the railroad to look at as it contemplates its long range future—particularly in light of recent and proposed state legislation. The Business Plan will discuss these issues and consider next steps the agency could take with regard to development around its stations. TOD and value capture will also be discussed as part of related ongoing policy efforts and plans including the Rail Corridor Use Policy, the Station Management Plan and the Transit Oriented Development Policy. Updates on all of these ongoing efforts will go to the Board and the public throughout 2019.

Thanks again for your interest in Caltrain.

Sebastian Petty
Senior Policy Advisor, Caltrain
1250 San Carlos Ave
San Carlos, CA 94070
t: 650.622.7831 c: 650.730.8858
www.caltrain.com

---

From: Thomas [mailto:tparise830@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 09, 2019 9:48 PM
To: BusinessPlan@caltrain.com
Cc: Adina Levin; Board (@caltrain.com)
Subject: Caltrain Business Plan

Dear Caltrain Joint Powers Board,

As a resident of San Mateo, Caltrain rider, and concerned citizen, I hope that Caltrain will pursue measures the ensure long term financial viability and healthy ridership.

Primarily, I hope that Caltrain will work aggressively at the state level with legislators to allow Caltrain to construct high density housing transit oriented developments (TODs) on its properties. To remedy Caltrain’s comparatively meager landholdings (compared to BART), I hope mechanisms can be devised whereby Caltrain is allowed to purchase imminently developable parcels, such as surface parking lots, that come up for sale contiguous to or near to Caltrain stations with the goal that these may be developed into more TOD housing.

Secondarily, I hope that Caltrain can seek to increase its revenues through value-capturing parcel taxes on residences and businesses near Caltrain stations. Caltrain service provides tremendous value to these parcels and Caltrain should be able to retain some of this value.
Dear Mr. O’Keefe,

Your email to Director Stone was referred to me for response. The Caltrain Board will receive a copy of this correspondence.

First, please accept our sincere apology for the problem you experienced at the Bayshore Station when our Bus Bridge service was cancelled during the NCAA Championship weekend. I understand from your correspondence that there were numerous customers waiting over a half an hour for a train because we reverted back to normal service. We understand that our customers had to adjust their commutes accordingly and we regret that this particular weekend change in service caused frustration and confusion.

I followed up with our staff who had a plan to reach out to the community to inform them of this change and I’ve been informed that in addition to updating various pages on our website, we placed notices on our social media platforms, ran announcements through our PA system and Visual Message Signs and asked our conductors to make announcements. No matter our intentions or efforts, I realize it does not change the fact you still missed a train and had to wait in inclement weather conditions.

We aim to provide the community with a high-quality transit system. Your feedback is valuable and please know that we will continue working towards improvement – including our communication plan to ensure we provide our ridership with the best possible service. We hope your future travel with us will reflect this philosophy and prove to be pleasant.

Should you want to reach out to me directly, please feel free to do so at 650-508-6239.

Best Regards,

Rona Rios
Manager, Customer Service | Distribution
SamTrans | Caltrain | SMCTA
1250 San Carlos Avenue
San Carlos, CA. 94070
riosr@samtrans.com

Caltrain has no consideration for its passengers. Caltrain left almost a dozen of us waiting for over half an hour on a windy platform in the pouring rain at Bayshore on Sunday when the scheduled 12:11 PM sped past the station as Caltrain arbitrarily decided to "restore" service to 4th & King without advance notice. If Caltrain decides to make last minute changes to its much ballyhooed suspension of weekend service to San Francisco through the Spring 2019 it should at least STOP at the station in its printed schedule calls for a stop. How does Caltrain ever expect to increase ridership with this type of cavalier attitude?
Patron also sent e-mail

Email: Caltrain has lost sight of the fact that it needs to meet the needs of its regular riding public rather than engage in quixotic schemes to "drum up" new, one time riders. A case in point is what happened last Sunday, January 6, 2019 when Caltrain restored its weekend bullet service to 4th & King station, and failed to stop the southbound train at Bayshore station at 12:11 pm as per the printed schedule. In doing so, it left about a dozen persons stranded for over half an hour on a cold and windy platform during a major rainstorm. There were no notices posted at Bayshore station regarding this last minute service change. Caltrain claims it posted information about the change on its web site, oblivious to the fact that not all its riders have 24/7 (if any) access to the Internet. In any event, there is only a Facebook notice on Caltrain's website announcing the change that was posted on Friday, January 4, 2018.
Dear Terry,

Thank you for your feedback, and for making a bike and Caltrain part of your commute. Bikes are an excellent first and last mile solution, and riders who use their bikes to access Caltrain reduce pollution, relieve congestion, and help promote healthy, active transportation.

Caltrain currently has one of the most extensive onboard bicycle programs among passenger railroads in the nation. In 2015, after a two-year outreach effort that included public meetings, multiple surveys, station outreach, and over 10,000 comments; and then in 2017, after 56 meetings, surveys, and station events; staff heard from the bicycle community that maximizing bicycle capacity on the electric trains was of the utmost importance. Thus, under the current Electrification Project there will be a 17% increase in onboard bike capacity.

Recently, Caltrain was awarded State Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP) funds, however the grant award was approximately a 1/3 of the money requested. Caltrain cannot purchase as many additional electric train vehicles as originally planned at this time. Nevertheless, this additional funding will help bring more relief to an already overburdened system. There will be future discussions about how to best utilize space in the additional vehicles that will be purchased with the TIRCP money.

As our riders know, Caltrain is extremely busy during commute times, with some of the trains at 140% capacity. Future ridership growth projections show demand continuing to grow and Caltrain is working to identify opportunities and strategies to meet the needs of the corridor with the development of a Business Plan.

While in the past Caltrain was able to remove excess seats to provide more onboard space for bikes, the landscape has drastically changed with ridership nearly doubling since the beginning of this decade. Space at the stations is more abundant than onboard, and there is now a greater ability to serve people with bikes at stations. The current bike parking options leave a lot to be desired but huge advances in bike sharing, electronic lockers, and controlled access bike parking facilities can provide great options for many people who want to use a bike and Caltrain. Caltrain has designated more than $3.5M to make vast bike parking improvements at the stations; and recently, a full-time station access planner was hired to implement Caltrain’s Bike Parking Management Plan and improve bike access.

In addition, in January 2018, Caltrain created a bike security task force to explore and implement possible improvements to the bike program. An update on its process and progress was given to the Caltrain Bicycle Advisory Committee in September and can be seen here. We plan to have additional public meetings regarding bike security in the future.

Again, we thank you for taking the time to send us your thoughts. Your feedback is valuable, and Caltrain is eager to improve service for all its riders.

Best,

Lori Low

From: Terry Rolleri [mailto:terryrolleri@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, December 03, 2018 12:26 PM
To: Board (@caltrain.com)
Cc: Bikes On Board
Subject: Bikes on the Train

To Whom It Should Concern:

Bike theft on Caltrain is becoming a serious problem with a simple solution. Provide enough seats to accommodate every cyclist in the bike car. When a person must sit in another car, their bike becomes easy picking for a bike thief. Please, before you order new cars, make sure these cars will not force cyclists to abandon their bikes and sit in an adjacent car. It’s so simple to do this BEFORE you order the new cars.

Thank you..............Terry Rolleri
Dear Darrell,

Thank you for your feedback, and for making a bike and Caltrain part of your commute. Bikes are an excellent first and last mile solution, and riders who use their bikes to access Caltrain reduce pollution, relieve congestion, and help promote healthy, active transportation.

Caltrain currently has one of the most extensive onboard bicycle programs among passenger railroads in the nation. In 2015, after a two-year outreach effort that included public meetings, multiple surveys, station outreach, and over 10,000 comments; and then in 2017, after 56 meetings, surveys, and station events; staff heard from the bicycle community that maximizing bicycle capacity on the electric trains was of the utmost importance. Thus, under the current Electrification Project there will be a 17% increase in onboard bike capacity.

Recently, Caltrain was awarded State Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP) funds, however the grant award was approximately a 1/3 of the money requested. Caltrain cannot purchase as many additional electric train vehicles as originally planned at this time. Nevertheless, this additional funding will help bring more relief to an already overburdened system. There will be future discussions about how to best utilize space in the additional vehicles that will be purchased with the TIRCP money.

As our riders know, Caltrain is extremely busy during commute times, with some of the trains at 140% capacity. Future ridership growth projections show demand continuing to grow and Caltrain is working to identify opportunities and strategies to meet the needs of the corridor with the development of a Business Plan.

While in the past Caltrain was able to remove excess seats to provide more onboard space for bikes, the landscape has drastically changed with ridership nearly doubling since the beginning of this decade. Space at the stations is more abundant than onboard, and there is now a greater ability to serve people with bikes at stations. The current bike parking options leave a lot to be desired but huge advances in bike sharing, electronic lockers, and controlled access bike parking facilities can provide great options for many people who want to use a bike and Caltrain. Caltrain has designated more than $3.5M to make vast bike parking improvements at the stations; and recently, a full-time station access planner was hired to implement Caltrain’s Bike Parking Management Plan and improve bike access.

In addition, in January 2018, Caltrain created a bike security task force to explore and implement possible improvements to the bike program. An update on its process and progress was given to the Caltrain Bicycle Advisory Committee in September and can be seen here. We plan to have additional public meetings regarding bike security in the future.

Again, we thank you for taking the time to send us your thoughts. Your feedback is valuable, and Caltrain is eager to improve service for all its riders.

Best,
Lori Low
Hey:

As we move to electrification, please keep in mind that more bikes are being toted on Caltrain every week.

Please make sure we have room, and that we can keep an eye on them.

Thanks.
Darrell Jones
408.393.8069
Dear Ken,

Thank you for your feedback. I’m not sure if you were trying to direct your comment to Capitol Corridor or Caltrain, but I wanted to let you know that Caltrain believes bikes are an excellent first and last mile solution, and riders who use their bikes to access Caltrain reduce pollution, relieve congestion, and help promote healthy, active transportation.

Caltrain currently has one of the most extensive onboard bicycle programs among passenger railroads in the nation. In 2015, after a two-year outreach effort that included public meetings, multiple surveys, station outreach, and over 10,000 comments; and then in 2017, after 56 meetings, surveys, and station events; staff heard from the bicycle community that maximizing bicycle capacity on the electric trains was of the utmost importance. Thus, under the current Electrification Project there will be a 17% increase in onboard bike capacity.

Recently, Caltrain was awarded State Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP) funds, however the grant award was approximately a 1/3 of the money requested. Caltrain cannot purchase as many additional electric train vehicles as originally planned at this time. Nevertheless, this additional funding will help bring more relief to an already overburdened system. There will be future discussions about how to best utilize space in the additional vehicles that will be purchased with the TIRCP money.

As our riders know, Caltrain is extremely busy during commute times, with some of the trains at 140% capacity. Future ridership growth projections show demand continuing to grow and Caltrain is working to identify opportunities and strategies to meet the needs of the corridor with the development of a Business Plan.

While in the past Caltrain was able to remove excess seats to provide more onboard space for bikes, the landscape has drastically changed with ridership nearly doubling since the beginning of this decade. Space at the stations is more abundant than onboard, and there is now a greater ability to serve people with bikes at stations. The current bike parking options leave a lot to be desired but huge advances in bike sharing, electronic lockers, and controlled access bike parking facilities can provide great options for many people who want to use a bike and Caltrain. Caltrain has designated more than $3.5M to make vast bike parking improvements at the stations; and recently, a full-time station access planner was hired to implement Caltrain’s Bike Parking Management Plan and improve bike access.

In addition, in January 2018, Caltrain created a bike security task force to explore and implement possible improvements to the bike program. An update on its process and progress was given to the Caltrain Bicycle Advisory Committee in September and can be seen here. We plan to have additional public meetings regarding bike security in the future.

Again, we thank you for taking the time to send us your thoughts. Your feedback is valuable, and Caltrain is eager to improve service for all its riders.

Best,
Lori Low
To: Board (@caltrain.com)
Subject: Add bike racks and make them visible to the bike owners

Dear Caltrain Board:

To deter bicycle theft on the Capitol Corridor, please add bike racks and make them visible to the bike owners in the bike car! Feel free to contact me if you need further information.

Thank you,

Ken

Kenneth D. Celli
Hearing Advisor II
California Energy Commission
(916) 651-8893
Dear Bikes ONBoard,

Thank you for your feedback. As soon as we received these we sent them to our designer for a closer look. Unfortunately, some of the items included are too large in the aggregate for the space. In addition, we know you care deeply about ensuring proper access to the emergency exit windows, and unfortunately in this design the transverse seats block access. Staff is continuing to examine possible options and appreciates your input.

Best,
Lori Law

---

Dear Chair Bruins and Members of the Joint Powers Board,

Please see the attached file for to-scale drawings of two options for putting seats within view of bikes on EMU trains. We offer these as preliminary options and look forward to working with staff on a final design that works for both passengers and operations.

Thank you for your support of 'green' commuting.

Respectfully,
BIKES ONboard Team
Dear TJPA CAC members,

Here is the information requested by Robert Feinbaum.

**Structural Heal Monitoring (SHM)**

**Structural health monitoring - Wikipedia**

Structural health monitoring (SHM) refers to the process of implementing a damage detection and characterization strategy for engineering structures. Here damage is defined as changes to the material and/or geometric properties of a structural system, including changes to the boundary conditions and system connectivity, which adversely affect the system’s performance.

**Acoustic Emission (AE)**

*Acoustic emission (AE) is the phenomenon of radiation of acoustic (elastic) waves in solids that occurs when a material undergoes irreversible changes in its internal structure, for example as a result of crack formation or plastic deformation due to aging, temperature gradients or external mechanical forces. In particular, AE is occurring during the processes of mechanical loading of materials and structures accompanied by structural changes that generate local sources of elastic waves. This results in small surface displacements of a material produced by elastic or stress waves11 generated when the accumulated elastic energy in a material or on its surface is released rapidly. The waves generated by sources of AE are of practical interest in structural health monitoring (SHM), quality control, system feedback, process monitoring and other fields. In SHM applications, AE is typically used to detect, locate3 and characterise4 damage.*

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Acoustic_emission#Uses

**Acoustic emission - Wikipedia**

Phenomena. Acoustic emission is the transient elastic waves within a material, caused by the rapid release of localized stress energy. An event source is the phenomenon which releases elastic energy into the material, which then propagates as an elastic wave. Acoustic emissions can be detected in frequency ranges under 1 kHz, and have
been reported at frequencies up to 100 MHz, but most of the...

SHM/AE monitoring of the Bay Bridge

OAKLAND — Strategically positioned high above the water, in a narrow crawl space between the new Bay Bridge deck and the top of its big pier east of the tower, instruments are listening for the sounds of cracking inside steel anchor rods.

Caltrans placed 10 acoustic emission sensors on select rods in early April after some of the massive bolts — 3 inches in diameter and 17 to 24 feet long — snapped and triggered widespread worry about the replacement eastern span’s seismic safety.

The instrument records the energy produced when a crack initiates, spreads or moves within the rod, said Caltrans materials engineer Bahjat Bagher, who showed off the testing late Friday. But so far, the rods being tested are quiet, a great relief to the agency.

If the bolts — fabricated in 2010, two years after the 32 bolts that broke — were also faulty and had to be replaced, the cost to make the $6.4 billion bridge safe for motorists would rise, and Caltrans would face an even greater hurdle to opening the bridge on time.

A second test for hardness is also showing favorable results, although a third saltwater corrosion test is still to come.

“*We are pretty confident that we don’t have an immediate failure issue with these bolts, but we want to have a strong level of confidence over the long-term.*” said Toll Bridge Program Manager Tony Anziano.

https://www.mercurynews.com/2013/05/06/bay-bridge-technicians-listen-for-cracking-in-the-steel-anchor-rods/

Bay Bridge technicians ‘listen’ for cracking in the steel anchor rods

Bay Bridge technicians ‘listen’ for cracking in the steel anchor rods

Sincerely,

Roland Lebrun
Dear Caltrain Board of Directors,

I'm writing to urge you to pursue a transit-oriented development policy that involves building high-density housing near Caltrain stations. This will increase ridership, reduce transportation emissions, and bring in money to help fund train service. Housing density is low along most of the Caltrain corridor and near most Caltrain stations, which means TOD is a great opportunity to shape land use patterns along the corridor and make transit service along it more viable. I encourage you to work with state legislators to streamline TOD on Caltrain-owned land, as BART successfully did last year.

Roan Kattouw
Dear Caltrain Joint Powers Board,

As a resident of San Mateo, Caltrain rider, and concerned citizen, I hope that Caltrain will pursue measures to ensure long term financial viability and healthy ridership.

Primarily, I hope that Caltrain will work aggressively at the state level with legislators to allow Caltrain to construct high density housing transit oriented developments (TODs) on its properties. To remedy Caltrain’s comparatively meager landholdings (compared to BART), I hope mechanisms can be devised whereby Caltrain is allowed to purchase imminently developable parcels, such as surface parking lots, that come up for sale contiguous to or near to Caltrain stations with the goal that these may be developed into more TOD housing.

Secondarily, I hope that Caltrain can seek to increase its revenues through value-capturing parcel taxes on residences and businesses near Caltrain stations. Caltrain service provides tremendous value to these parcels and Caltrain should be able to retain some of this value.

Sincerely,
Thomas Heiser
Dear Board,

I grew up in Redwood City where I witnessed the revitalization of our downtown. I grew up riding Caltrain to the city, to Palo Alto and San José as a high schooler to get around on my own without a car. All of this was possible because the places, and when I say places I mean the restaurants, shops, theaters, parks, plazas, apartments were all built around the train stops.

In order to welcome more people into the Bay, including those who choose to live here, visit, and commute, we need to build more densely around existing or future (i.e., North Fair Oaks) transit stops. Smaller cities, including arguably the most supportive of TOD Redwood City, see how they can benefit from OTHER cities TOD while limiting their own. Statewide and regional efforts to relax local limitations and encourage TOD are key to reducing GHG emissions, solving the housing crisis, solving increasing traffic, increasing transit use and funding, and making happier and more independent high schoolers like me.

Please advocate for such statewide TOD policies that increase TOD both here in the Bay and beyond.

Sincerely,
Jeremy D Smith
Resident of Redwood City and student in Palo Alto
Dear Directors of the Caltrain JPB,

As a daily Caltrain rider I’d like to encourage the board to pursue a TOD policy that will maximize density around Caltrain stations, simultaneously helping Caltrain increase ridership, lower regional carbon emissions, and get the most value for the agency's land. Now in particular is a great time to work with the state legislature while multiple legislators representing portions of the corridor are exploring policies to allow for denser developments around transit.

Thanks for your service,
Cliff Bargar (Caltrain BAC vice chair)
January 9, 2019

Ms. Elaine Baltao
Board Secretary
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
3331 North First Street
San Jose, CA 95134

Dear Ms. Baltao,

This letter serves to document the appointment of Joint Powers Board (JPB) Member, Charles Stone, to the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority’s Diridon Joint Policy Advisory Board (JPAB). Mr. Stone’s appointment was confirmed by JPB Chair, Jeannie Bruins. Mr. Stone will represent Caltrain at JPAB meetings moving forward.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Jim Hartnett
Executive Director

cc: Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board
Dear Board of Directors,

I hope this email finds you well. I commute to Palo Alto from the 4th St station every day, and I’d love to see another express train added at 9:15am. Many tech workers don’t need to go to work too early, but there’s only two options after 8:45am - either the 9am that slowly gets me in at 10am or the 10am that gets me in at 11am! Please consider this - I think many people would benefit from this.

Thank you.

Regards,
Da-Bin
Dear Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board, I write to strongly encourage the board to utilize JPB land for transit oriented development that provides more housing and increased access to the Caltrain corridor. I also urge the board to promote transit oriented development on adjacent land within a 1/2 mile of each Caltrain station.

As a San Mateo homeowner, a long-time user of Caltrain, and a landscape architect, I see the continued enhancement of the Caltrain corridor as a walkable, transit-first, urban area to be foundational to our efforts to tackle the interrelated problems of housing affordability, unsustainable automobile dependency, climate change, and the increasing inaccessibility of the jobs-rich corridor that the Caltrain serves to middle and lower-income people.

Please use JPB land for transit oriented development and encourage similar land use decisions for adjacent parcels. This endeavor will encourage more transit-first residents have the opportunity to live with easy access to the Caltrain.

Best,
Adam Nugent, PLA
Boland, Christine

From: Sebez, Robert
Sent: Monday, January 07, 2019 11:02 AM
To: martin@sommer.net
Cc: Rios, Rona; Board (@caltrain.com)
Subject: RE: Disrespectful and unprofessional engineer

Martin,

Sorry for the delay in response. Thanks for letting me know. I will look into it and let you know when I get all the information available. Please allow me a few days.

Thanks,

Robert

From: martin@sommer.net [mailto:martin@sommer.net]
Sent: Friday, December 28, 2018 3:40 PM
To: Sebez, Robert <SebezRo@samtrans.com>
Cc: Rios, Rona <riosr@samtrans.com>; Board (@caltrain.com) <BoardCaltrain@samtrans.com>
Subject: Re: Disrespectful and unprofessional engineer

Hi Robert,

Happy Holidays! Your Caltrain engineer is up to his "personal tunes" again, and just rolled into Palo Alto University Station blowing his horn 7 times before stopping. Can you please look into this? I thought he would have either learned, or been dismissed by now.

The train was #928, South bound into Palo Alto University Ave Station, at 3:31pm, today, Dec 28, 2018.

Please investigate, and let me know.

Martin

--
Martin Sommer
650-346-5307
martin@sommer.net
http://www.linkedin.com/in/martinsommer

"Turn technical vision into reality."

On 2018-09-27 11:29, Sebez, Robert wrote:

Mr. Sommer,
I certainly understand, and I will explore any additional information that is available to me. I want you to know that I will continue to keep a close eye on this. Sorry about the wrong number. I sent you another email with the correct number, but I’ll also put it at the bottom of this message as well.

Thank you,

Robert

650-508-7720

---

From: martin@sommer.net [mailto:martin@sommer.net]
Sent: Thursday, September 27, 2018 10:44 AM
To: Sebez, Robert <SebezRo@samtrans.com>
Cc: Rios, Rona <riosr@samtrans.com>
Subject: Re: Disrespectful and unprofessional engineer

Hi Robert, thanks for your voicemail. I tried your number again, and get a Verizon wireless message.

So, what I wanted to say, is:

1) There really were 7 horn blasts coming into the station, and 2 exiting (a total of 9). It’s his same “children’s melody”, that he always uses. He did not use the bell, as many other engineers do.

2) The blasts coming into the station were “after” the Alma St crossing, not before. I can clearly see it, from my home.

3) I believe that they either gave you the wrong train data, are are actively covering up for this engineer.

Thanks again,

Martin

---

Martin Sommer
650-346-5307
martin@sommer.net
http://www.linkedin.com/in/martinsommer

“Turn technical vision into reality.”

On 2018-09-27 08:27, Sebez, Robert wrote:
Mr. Sommer,

Thank you for the warm welcome.

I just wanted to follow up with our conversation as I have reviewed the information regarding Train 192 at 9:31 approaching Palo Alto Station. Before I do, I just want to apologize as I must correct a typo I made in the second to last paragraph of my previous email. I left out the word “inappropriate” preceding to “use of the train horn”. I know that it is implied as we discussed rules and regulations that require the use of the train horn, but it is important to me that I am consistent throughout the course of our correspondence.

As discussed, I’ve requested a download from the event recorder and footage from the inward and outward facing cameras. Unfortunately, we were not able to pull the video footage. However, I did receive and was able to review the data from the event recorder. The data revealed that the engineer initiated the train horn five times on approach and through the Alma St. grade crossing. The cadence of the horn sequence was of two long, one short and two additional long. After a station stop at Palo Alto, the data indicates the train engineer utilized the bells in lieu of the train horn. Now while the sequence of five train horns is not typical, I cannot deem it outside of tolerance as the rules and regulations allow for the sequence to be prolonged or repeated.

That being said, as I take your concern very seriously we ensured that the train engineer has been spoken to and coached in effort to avoid any excess use of the train horn. I’ve also reached out to the Deputy General Manager of Operations. He assured me that any inappropriate use of the train horn will be taken very seriously. Additionally, I will personally monitor train horn sequences on my routine southbound trips through Palo Alto.

Thank you for your patience with this matter.

Sincerely,

Robert Sebez

---

**From:** Martin Sommer (mobile) [mailto:martin@sommer.net]
**Sent:** Friday, September 21, 2018 5:05 PM
**To:** Sebez, Robert <SebezRo@samtrans.com>; Rios, Rona <riosr@samtrans.com>
**Subject:** RE: Disrespectful and unprofessional engineer
Thanks Robert, this is a good synopsis of our call. I look forward to hearing the results you find, and the action that is taken.

Welcome aboard on your new position!

Martin

--

Martin Sommer
650-346-5307
martin@sommer.net
http://www.linkedin.com/in/martinsommer

"Turn technical vision into reality."

-------- Original message -------

From: "Sebez, Robert" <SebezRo@samtrans.com>
Date: 9/21/18 4:21 PM (GMT-08:00)
To: martin@sommer.net, "Rios, Rona" <riosr@samtrans.com>
Subject: RE: Disrespectful and unprofessional engineer

Mr. Sommer,

It was a pleasure speaking with you today. I wanted to make sure I recapped our conversation so that Rona is filled in. Please read below and let me know if there is anything I may missed.

Our conversation began by reviewing the series of occurrences of what appears to be excessive train horn use near Palo Alto. We discussed that you have observed several times over the past year. It had also been brought to my attention that the horn cadence is not that of a typical horn sequence, but rather a sequence in a playful manner. We talked about
the location of your residence in relation to the nearest crossings in the station so that I could better understand where a mandated horn sequence would initiate. It has been brought to my attention that on these instances, the engineer had initiated these particular horn sequences after the highway grade crossing at Alma.

For the purpose of ruling out the possibility of the engineer initiating a mandated horn sequence, we went over some applicable rules and regulations. We both agreed that it was unlikely due to roadway workers working along the right of way based off your observations and my research.

We discussed the actions that have taken place up until this point which includes a review with the engineer, followed by a compliance audit conducted at Palo Alto Station for rules pertaining to horn sequences. I made you aware that currently I have requested data from the event recorder and if available, footage from the inward and outward facing cameras from the night on 9/17.

Lastly, we discussed that I will be reviewing all of the information available and any findings of the use of a train horn will result in disciplinary action.

I appreciate your patience with this issue Mr. Sommer. Please feel free to contact me any time regarding this matter.

Thank you,

Robert

From: martin@sommer.net  [mailto:martin@sommer.net]
Sent: Thursday, September 20, 2018 3:26 PM
To: Rios, Rona <riosr@samtrans.com>; Sebez, Robert <SebezRo@samtrans.com>
Subject: Re: Disrespectful and unprofessional engineer

Thanks Rona!

Hi Robert, I look forward to hearing back from you.

Martin

--
Martin Sommer
On 2018-09-20 15:14, Rios, Rona wrote:

Hi Mr. Sommer,

Please know that Ben Burns has transitioned into a different position and will no longer be responding to these types of concerns. I have copied Mr. Robert Sebez who will be his replacement. Mr. Sebez has informed me that he is in fact looking in to what exactly happened the night of 9/17 and will be getting back to you as soon as he has the information he needs.

I apologize for the frustration this is causing and thank you for your patience.

Rona Rios
Manager, Customer Service | Distribution
SamTrans | Caltrain | SMCTA
1250 San Carlos Avenue
San Carlos, CA, 94070
riosr@samtrans.com

From: martin@sommer.net [mailto:martin@sommer.net]
Sent: Monday, September 17, 2018 9:37 PM
To: Burns, Ben
Cc: Rios, Rona; Board (@caltrain.com)
Subject: Re: Disrespectful and unprofessional engineer

Ben,

9:31pm, 09/17/2018, South bound Caltrain into University Ave Station, your engineer blows his horn 9 times; 7 coming in, and 2 going out. Are quality engineers that hard to find? What do we need to do, to stop this guy?
Martin Sommer
650-346-5307
martin@sommer.net
http://www.linkedin.com/in/martinsommer

"Turn technical vision into reality."

On 2018-08-11 15:10, martin@sommer.net wrote:

Ben,

If I do not hear back from you on this issue, I will look into filing a FRA Violation investigation. I think this engineer is having serious mental/drinking/drugs issues, and we do not need this in our area.

Martin

--
Martin Sommer
650-346-5307
martin@sommer.net
http://www.linkedin.com/in/martinsommer

"Turn technical vision into reality."

On 2018-08-08 21:34, martin@sommer.net wrote:

Ben,

Your engineer is up to his 9 horns blows in Palo Alto again. Can you please give me a direct contact with the operator out of Missouri? I feel that our efforts, are not getting anywhere.

Thank you,

Martin

--
Martin Sommer
650-346-5307
martin@sommer.net
http://www.linkedin.com/in/martinsommer

"Turn technical vision into reality."

On 2018-07-23 21:26, Burns, Ben wrote:
Hello Mr. Sommer,
I will follow up with your observations. Two horn cadences are required when a train releases its brakes and initiates movement. However, the seven horn sequence will have to be investigated. I appreciate you notifying me and I will contact the contractor's management team tomorrow.

Kind regards,
Ben

Sent from VMware Boxer

On Jul 23, 2018 8:41 PM, martin@sommer.net wrote:

Ben,

Your engineer is up to his "personal tones" again. At 8:30pm heading south, we received 7 horn blast coming into the Palo Alto University Ave station, and 2 going out. Nine horn blast at a station is excessive, and out of line. There was no emergency, or justification for his actions.

Can you please have this engineer removed from the Caltrain line? Either you are not passing on the message, he is insubordinate to authority, or he is drinking on the job, and is unconscious of his actions. We do not need him, running our public transportation!

Martin

--
Martin Sommer
650-346-5307
martin@sommer.net
http://www.linkedin.com/in/martinsommer

"Turn technical vision into reality."

On 2018-04-20 17:24, martin@sommer.net wrote:

Hi Ben,

Your engineer is starting his "personal tones" again coming into the University Ave station in Palo Alto. He just rolled in with 7 horn blows coming in, and 1 going out (total of 8). I have to wonder, if he is not drinking or ding drugs on the job?

Can you please check into this? It was the 5:14pm south bound train, into University Ave Palo Alto.

Thank you,

Martin

--
Martin Sommer
650-346-5307
martin@sommer.net
http://www.linkedin.com/in/martinsommer

"Turn technical vision into reality."

On 2018-02-28 07:32, Burns, Ben wrote:

Mr. Sommer,
Thank you for reaching out and informing us about this Engineer. I did reach out to the contractor and their management team did review the Engineer’s event recorder. You were
absolutely correct in your observation of the individual’s whistle/bell sequence. The contractor’s management team has spoken to this individual and coached him on his use of the bell and whistle.

Again, I appreciate your field data and we will continue to ensure our Engineer’s follow the whistle/bell policy put in place. Have a great rest of your week.

Best regards,

Ben

From: martin@sommer.net [mailto:martin@sommer.net]
Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 2018 9:50 AM
To: Rica, Rona <riocr@samtrans.com>; Burns, Ben <BurnsB@samtrans.com>
Cc: Board (@caltrain.com) <BoardCaltrain@samtrans.com>
Subject: Disrespectful and unprofessional engineer

Dear Rona and Ben,

You have a train engineer, that seems to live in his own world, with no personal respect for others. Ben, you and I have discussed this engineer, who has his own personal horn sequence, for entering the Palo Alto University Ave station. It is seven (yes, 7) horn blows coming in, and two exiting, with a grand total of 9 horn blows per visit.

This engineer used to be on the 6:54 pm south bound train entering Palo Alto, and now he is doing his sequence at 1:02 am, when most people are trying to sleep. Last night, he woke our entire family, and since my place looks down at the station, I can guarantee you that there was no imminent danger of someone being on the tracks.

Can you please get this engineer to stop? Ben, you mentioned that some of these guys have been doing this for 30 years, well, times have changed. If he is not able to adjust, please have him removed.

Thank you,

Martín

--
Martín Sommer
650-346-5307
martin@sommer.net <mailto:martin@sommer.net>
http://www.linkedin.com/in/martinsommer

"Turn technical vision into reality."
From: Steve Raney <steve@paloaltotma.org>
Sent: Sunday, January 06, 2019 9:57 PM
To: Board (@caltrain.com)
Subject: re: Jan 10 agenda item #9 re Means Based Fare Policy and Pilot

355 Alma Street, Palo Alto, CA 94301, www.paloaltotma.org

DATE: January 6, 2019

TO: Caltrain Board of Directors, board@caltrain.com

SUBJECT: re: January 10 agenda item #9 re Means Based Fare Policy and Pilot

Dear Caltrain Board of Directors,

The Palo Alto Transportation Management Association (PATMA) is a nonprofit focused on reducing Palo Alto traffic by helping workers in Palo Alto shift mode away from SOV. Our programs include:
- Buying and managing transit passes for 240 low-income commuters who work in downtown
- Providing "after hours" Lyft subsidy for low-income commuters before 6AM and after 8PM
- Providing subsidized Waze Carpool and Scoop rides to downtown Palo Alto commuters, without income restriction.

Since our launch in 2016, we have undertaken regular door-to-door, in-person outreach to 300 downtown Palo Alto businesses. In just this past November, PATMA purchased
- 153 Caltrain monthly passes
- 41 SamTrans monthly passes
for a total expenditure of $26,963 to help low income workers.

We laud San Mateo County and the Caltrain Board for Caltrain leadership: advancing funds to acquire the rail line, operating at very low operating overhead and securing an extra 10% contingency for much-needed electrification. Thank you.

We are pleased that Caltrain is considering participation in MTC's fare equity pilot program. While this pilot program per se would not directly help lower costs for complementary efforts and programs like ours, applying to individual ticket subsidies instead of monthly pass subsidies, we still heartily support Caltrain fare equity and see this pilot as an opportunity for your agency to move in a helpful direction to those for whom the cost of transportation is a barrier.

We hope you adopt the Resolution in support of Caltrain participating in the Regional pilot as it will be a demonstration of compassionate fare equity policy.

Thank you for your consideration,
Steve Raney, Executive Director, Palo Alto TMA