AGENDA

April 20, 2011 - Wednesday 5:40 p.m.

STAFF LIAISON: Michelle Bouchard, Director, Rail Transportation

1. Pledge of Allegiance

2. Roll Call

3. Approval of Meeting Minutes
   a) March 16, 2011
   b) April 5, 2011

4. Public Comment
   Public testimony by each individual speaker shall be limited to three minutes

5. Chairperson’s Report (B. Jenkins)

6. Presentation: Annual Passenger Counts (M. Bouchard)

7. Staff Report (M. Bouchard)

8. Committee Comments

9. Date, Time and Place of Next Meeting
   May 18, 2011 at 5:40 p.m., San Mateo County Transit District Administrative
   Building, 2nd Floor Bacciocco Auditorium, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA

10. Adjournment

All items on this agenda are subject to action

CAC MEMBERS: San Mateo County: Paul Bendix (Vice Chair), Gerald Graham, Sepi Richardson
   San Francisco City & County: François Granade, John Hronowski, Mona Tekchandani
   Santa Clara County: Bruce Jenkins (Chair), Cat Tucker, Brian Willey
INFORMATION TO THE PUBLIC

If you have questions on the agenda, please contact the Assistant District Secretary at 650.508.6223 or cacsecretary@caltrain.com. Agendas are available on the Caltrain Web site at www.caltrain.com.

JPB and Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) meeting schedules are available on the Caltrain Web site.

Location, Date and Time of Regular Meetings
Regular meetings are held at the San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building located at 1250 San Carlos Ave., San Carlos, CA, which is located one block west of the San Carlos Caltrain Station on El Camino Real. The office is also accessible by SamTrans bus routes: 390, 391, 295, 260, and KX.

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

Members of the public may address the Committee on non-agendized items under the Public Comment item on the agenda. Public testimony by each individual speaker shall be limited to three 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 Assistant District Secretary at Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070-1306; or emailed to cacsecretary@caltrain.com; or by phone at 650.508.6223, 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 public records are distributed or made available to the legislative body.
MINUTES OF MARCH 16, 2011

MEMBERS PRESENT:  P. Bendix, G. Graham, F. Granade, J. Hronowski, B. Jenkins (Chair), S. Richardson, M. Tekchandani, C. Tucker, B. Wilfley

MEMBERS ABSENT:  None

STAFF PRESENT:  T. Bartholomew, M. Bouchard, R. Lake

Chair Bruce Jenkins called the meeting to order at 5:41 p.m. Brian Wilfley led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Approval of Minutes
A motion (Richardson/Hronowski) to approve the minutes of February 16, 2011 was passed.

Public Comment
Jeff Carter, Burlingame, said people can lose their jobs because of proposed cuts to Caltrain service and the blame for this resides with former leadership in San Mateo County who put efforts in BART to the San Francisco International Airport. The Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) will go bankrupt building BART to San Jose. Caltrain should be allowed to use capital funds for operating the system.

Chairperson’s Report – Bruce Jenkins
No report

Update on Caltrain Service Suspensions, Station Closures and Fare Increase for Fiscal Year 2012
Mr. Wilfley said the memo from the ad hoc committee (Bendix, Tekchandani and Wilfley) was a collaborative effort. CAC members received a copy of the memo for review prior to the meeting. He said the committee stands ready to make whatever changes the CAC deems appropriate.

Director, Rail Transportation Michelle Bouchard said a multitude of things have transpired which would be addressed under her staff report. She said the CAC discussion at the meeting is absolutely necessary for staff and she could respond to any comments from discussion of the memo and provide additional information on the topics in her report. The CAC has created resolutions, which sometimes don’t leave room for expansive opinion and she wasn’t certain that in this particular area, the CAC wants to resolve something. What has been done very appropriately with the memo is for the CAC to outline and frame some of the issues to provide a springboard for discussion that would be reported to the JPB at their April meeting.

Chair Jenkins asked if there would be a vote on the memo. Ms. Bouchard said she understands this is not the intent of the ad hoc committee.
Sepi Richardson said the ad hoc committee did a fabulous job. She was concerned that the committee was formed after the last meeting and the selection of the ad hoc committee should have been done at the meeting. Ms. Bouchard said the last meeting ran well beyond the time many members could remain at the meeting and due to the urgency of the issue the ad hoc committee was formed afterwards.

Gerald Graham said the committee did an excellent job and it is the power of the chair to appoint an ad hoc committee. He submitted a report to cut expenses and improve ridership:

1. Northbound rush hour trains can be terminated at Millbrae, where patrons may transfer to BART if going to San Francisco with a few trains continuing north to serve San Bruno, South San Francisco and Bayshore stations. Southbound non-rush hour trains could be terminated at Mountain View and a transfer made to VTA’s light rail, which continues to Diridon Station because few passengers travel beyond Palo Alto.
2. At least one Monday through Friday round trip should be retained for Gilroy service.
3. Certain obstacles to patrons should be modified or abandoned including penalties for unintentional ticket infractions, especially for tourists, foreign language patrons and seniors. Clipper could be improved by keying in the destination zone when tagging on to eliminate tagging on and off problems. There should be the ability for occasional riders to pay for more than 24 hours of parking similar to BART’s policy at certain stations.
4. Weekend and evening service must be preserved for workers.
5. There should be recruitment for volunteer station assistants similar to Amtrak to serve at San Francisco, San Jose and Millbrae stations to assist passengers unfamiliar with ticket machines.

Francois Granade said most transit agencies have penalties that are not technically fines; if a person gets caught without a ticket, she or he pays the transaction with the transit agency so no one is taken to court. Caltrain is different and some passengers with ticket issues end up in court and it is not an efficient use of the judiciary system. He said Caltrain is putting an unfair emphasis on preventing problems with non-ticketed passengers. He has seen foreigners receiving help from conductors.

Cat Tucker commended the work of the ad hoc committee. She said her mindset is to advocate for riders, which does not support staff’s position. She said the memo should not say the CAC understands the problems and reluctantly supports staff because she advocates for riders; they can’t speak for themselves and she must speak for them. She said it is unacceptable to make any cuts and urges the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and other agencies to help fund the issues. If she could vote on the memo, she would vote no because of the tone of the memo.

Ms. Richardson said the CAC voted on past letters.

Mr. Wilfley said the language is a draft memo and the intent was to supply reasoning and language that could be adopted by the committee. He said he would be in favor of voting to adopt or not to adopt as a recommendation of the CAC or as a memo that was accepted by the CAC from the ad hoc committee to allow the memo to go forward in other than draft form.
Ms. Richardson said this letter could go forward from the ad hoc committee or as a letter from the CAC, in which case would require discussion and a vote.

Ms. Bouchard said anything on the agenda is subject to action. She said the ad hoc committee could say it drafted a report and after discussion there could be a vote or vote on a memo with amendments. The intent was to spark discussion.

Chair Jenkins said he understood the memo will be put forth for adoption by the CAC to be forwarded to the JPB.

Mr. Granade said he agrees with Ms. Tucker to have stronger language to express disagreement with the state of things. Something could be lost that is very useful and there is no logic to losing it because Caltrain is an excellent system with excellent fare recovery and growth potential. It is a political problem and no one would choose to cut but it is the role of the CAC and riders to try and defend Caltrain.

Mr. Wilfley said he was not trying to defend or attack the language of the draft memo but the memo reflects the hope that there is a funding adjustment that the worst case scenario doesn’t happen. He said if there was to be a comment made on the memo it would be that the situation is terrible and if someone doesn’t do something firm and fast it is inevitable, in his mind, that Caltrain will suffer a massive reduction in service in the sense of trains running but utility in the sense of people who give a hoot. He is not in favor of cutting Caltrain but he wants to see money on the table and for someone to step up and say, “Here is $20 million,” or he only sees very bad news.

John Hronowski said he appreciated the draft from the ad hoc committee. He is not in favor of any service cuts. He asked if this could be tabled because Ms. Bouchard said she had information to add to the discussion.

Ms. Bouchard provided current details on Caltrain issues:
- Attendance for the March 3 JPB public hearing on Caltrain’s future filled the auditorium and lunchroom across the hall.
- Twenty-five hundred comments have been received on Caltrain issues, which speak to the relevance of the service.
- Of the 2,500 comments, 800 were against proposed closure of 10 stations.
- The 48-train schedule is a worst-case scenario.
- Since the March 3 JPB meeting, staff has been meeting with the MTC and the general managers of the three JPB agencies to overturn every rock. In a recent news article Executive Director of the MTC Steve Heminger said he thought a solution might be close.
- A $30 million budget gap could only be closed with a combination of all sorts of things.

Ms. Bouchard referred to Ms. Richardson’s comment about what is the use of CAC comments if there will be a 48-train schedule scenario. Ms. Bouchard said CAC comments as community members, riders and CAC members are important for staff to understand. If a rock is overturned and $5 million is found, staff needs to understand where to add service if possible.

- Staff is very confident that there is some measure of funding that will be found that will enable a proposal that is measurably different than the 48-train schedule.
• Staff is working to develop proposals that would serve to maximize additional funding.
• Staff wants to schedule a special CAC meeting the week of March 28 to share a draft service scenario on what might be done given the level of funding that might be attained throughout the next two weeks. This would be the same proposal presented at the April 7 JPB meeting.
• A solution that addresses Caltrain’s issues must be in place by July 1, 2011. Typically four months are needed to implement any changes from the time a vote is made and three months are now available for any timetable, connecting shuttles, etc.

Ms. Bouchard said CAC input is key because all input is important in developing a service scenario and staff is looking at things that were previously off the table with the 48-train schedule, which includes serving as many stations as possible and looking at midday and off-peak service, etc.

Ms. Tucker asked where the memo falls into the timelines. Ms. Bouchard said it is important for staff to hear preferences of the CAC in the development of the service plan. It would be valid to adopt the opinion of the CAC to be reported at the April 7 JPB meeting.

Public Comment
Doug DeLong, Mountain View, reported:
• Public comment didn’t indicate a hue and cry against the possibility of a fare increase.
• Replace the senior discount with a low-income category.
• A bike brought on board should be charged a full fare in addition to the rider’s full fare.
• There was no loud public cry to take away the 57-minute Bullet trains and the public may accept the idea of a 70-minute run time with three flavors of 70-minute end-to-end trains to cover almost all the stations.
• While the San Bruno grade separation is underway, a temporary station in San Bruno may not be needed and construction savings could be used to pay out of capital money for a shuttle to Millbrae Intermodal and do the same for the South San Francisco Station project when appropriate.

Jeff Carter, Burlingame, said the $30 million deficit is about one-third of the budget and asked if Caltrain could run at a full schedule for six months and then do the worst-case scenario, which would give Caltrain more time to find money to bridge the budget gap. He said charging bike riders a bike fare could kill bike ridership.

Andy Chow, Redwood City, said the 48-train schedule is unacceptable. Caltrain’s financial issues stem from SamTrans’ inability to provide further subsidy; it’s not Caltrain losing ridership and revenue. He is against Caltrain running short trains cutting off north of Millbrae Intermodal or south of Mountain View. There isn’t sufficient signage in San Jose and these types of small customer service issues will turn people away. He said station-to-station fare pricing can be done with Clipper, which could eliminate unfair zone pricing.

Mr. Wilfley said the final proposal to put before the JPB is not known because funding is not known. In view of that, any proposal that comes before the JPB will need to be self-consistent and it’s difficult to edit out or edit in any one thing. He suggested taking the ad hoc committee memo to staff as input and to incorporate comments made by each CAC member. He said the final recommendation to the JPB may be on the actual presented solution to the problem.
Ms. Bouchard said this was a great suggestion. In terms of getting the point to the JPB, they will see the minutes of this meeting and the next.

Chair Jenkins asked if there would be a special CAC meeting. Ms. Bouchard said staff is looking at a meeting on March 28, 29 or 30.

Ms. Richardson said the memo is too gentle with too many “ifs.” She said people support Caltrain and it is successful but she does not support cuts and has said many times Caltrain needs a stable source of funding. She is very frustrated that nothing has happened year after year until now with a $30 million deficit. The memo must state firmly that people want Caltrain to operate, stations must be protected and management must do everything possible to find a stable source of funding. Priorities could be listed in a bulleted form in the memo rather than the lovey-dovey approach offered in the memo. She will support staff recommendations and interim steps but does not support sending the memo to the JPB in the form presented to the CAC. Caltrain should not be dependent on employers or the VTA. Station closures and service cuts must stop.

Chair Jenkins suggested Ms. Richardson argue these points at the California Transportation Commission.

Mr. Bendix said he could not see what direct action Ms. Richardson was advocating and asked if she meant shutting the system down if a stable source of funding isn’t found. He said Caltrain is faced with cuts and everything is based on, “if,” because details are not available. He asked that she provide some kind of guess as to what should be done in a general policy way. He said short of details, he could see scrapping the memo and commenting on whatever staff comes up with when they have a budget available.

Ms. Richardson said she supports staff recommendations for the urgency they feel in closing the budget gap. At the same time, she asked what the priority is because people don’t want stations to close.

Mr. Bendix said the CAC can oppose fare cuts, station closures and changes in the schedule across the board in the noblest way, but the CAC will have to say yes to the JPB eventually because that will eventually happen and it’s a matter of selective response.

Mr. Granade said if the memo doesn’t begin with, “This is unacceptable,” and ends with “This is not acceptable,” he would not be inclined to vote for it. He does not want to have to provide an opinion between a bad solution and another bad solution because he is not a professional and may not know. He said staff can do a good job and has done more with less. He prefers to have bullet points in the memo but not a list of preferences. It is important to speak about Caltrain in a proactive, positive attitude. He likes the idea of having propositions that all may not agree with but they are ideas to consider. Caltrain has not reached the elasticity of ridership and may be able to do something for low-income riders.

Mr. Graham said the memo does set priorities and there may be disagreement on the tone presented. He said the CAC may need to agree on priorities and the forms of service cuts, revenue enhancement or expense reductions and perhaps redraft the memo in a different tone.
Ms. Tekchandani said a redraft might not be necessary because it was based on a scenario that is somewhat unlikely. She suggested the CAC hold on this and hear the presentation planned for the special meeting and create a draft based on that presentation. She suggested each member take 60 seconds to voice their final comment on the memo and then close discussion.

Mr. Hronowski said the memo should be tabled until the presentation is heard at the special meeting.

Chair Jenkins asked if the memo should be tabled until after the special meeting. Ms. Bouchard said that is possible and said the memo has suited its purpose to provide good feedback beyond her expectations. She said it would be beneficial to hear a final comment from each member, which would be taken under advisement.

Mr. Hronowski said he is against any service reductions and station closures and does not want trains curtailed in Millbrae or Mountain View. He said the memo should be tabled until after the special meeting presentation.

Mr. Wilfley is satisfied with discussion thus far and tabling consideration of the memo. He reiterated that Caltrain is being asked to make a “Sophie’s choice,” and it is toying with catastrophe to do so. The fact that Caltrain’s benefactors have turned their backs on Caltrain is maybe, “Shame on them and shame on us for not seeing through it before, and not somehow securing dedicated funding.” His own opinion has changed in that regard rather dramatically in favor of dedicated funding. He hopes a lot of money is found very soon.

Mr. Granade said he could not vote for any motion that would clearly state that any cuts are acceptable. Caltrain is a successful, growing system with lots of potential and it does not make sense to reduce it. The only solution he would support would be a solution that would not involve cuts. It is a political problem and not the CAC’s to solve. The people who are making the political decisions have to assume them.

Ms. Tucker does not support any cuts. She said many citizens in the Gilroy area bought the fact that there are 10 stations in Santa Clara County and VTA has the money to fully fund them. Because of their Joint Powers Agreement, they are not able to fund at the level they should be funding. The question was why Santa Clara couldn’t pay for their stations not to be closed and this should be discussed. She agreed with end-to-end pricing. She said another key component is increasing ridership.

Mr. Graham said there are some stations that are not being fully utilized including Hayward Park and there are few cars in that parking lot. The low ridership stations could be used for rush hour trains. There may be other stations that could be closed to save money. He likes the idea of station-to-station pricing. He thinks there should be as much work on the expense side as the revenue side. Mr. Graham thinks Caltrain is underpriced when compared to BART and other systems and feels fare increases are a sensitive thing but thinks two bits are not much to ask.

Ms. Richardson supports staff’s suggestions for any interim measure but focus has to be on a stable source of funding. She does not support cuts.
Ms. Tekchandani said in reference to a stable source of funding, she wanted to talk more about the second to last paragraph in the memo, which is customer service. She said it is critical in importance that if there is something on some sort of November ballot in 2012 based on what the press is saying, there has to be a full-out assault on trying to win hearts and minds up and down the Bay Area before anybody casts a vote. She doesn’t want Caltrain to be the second best in farebox revenue. She doesn’t want to see cuts but the reality may be some. She wants everyone to think about customer service as a really important mindset because sometimes that does not come across when just talking about what should be reduced; this has to be about winning people over before they cast a vote.

Mr. Bendix said he would like to build on those comments with a slightly different spin. Public information is incredibly important. There is a level of misunderstanding, unawareness and foolishness around Caltrain and its achievements. He still hears people talking about bringing BART to the Peninsula. He said there is a big uphill battle and if there are 18 months to help fight that battle, it would be an excellent use of all of our energies.

Chair Jenkins withheld comment for now.

Staff Report – Ms. Bouchard
- Asked for a hand vote on scheduling a special meeting. Availability is best on March 29 with March 30 as the second choice. This will be confirmed.
- Ridership is not the problem because February was the second month of the fare increase implemented in January and average weekday ridership is up 4.7 percent, which is hovering around a consistent 5 percent increase. February revenue increased 18.3 percent and is up 11.5 percent for the year compared to 2010. Revenue is about $2 million over budget. This may be helped by gas prices. Anything Caltrain can do in this year is another dollar that can be rolled into next year. Things have been done to control costs within Caltrain including a hiring freeze with the contract operator with the exception of essential positions. The hope is to maintain as much of that ridership as possible moving forward.
- She expressed thanks to the ad hoc committee to accomplish an understanding of the CAC’s perspective and to come back for a special meeting.

Committee Comments
Mr. Graham said there were no trains southbound that anyone working in Silicon Valley could use on President’s Day. The first train arrived at 9:29 a.m.

Date, Time, and Location of Next Meeting:
A special meeting is tentatively scheduled for Tuesday, March 29, 2011, 5:40 p.m., San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building, 2nd Floor Bacciocco Auditorium, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:03 p.m.
Chair Bruce Jenkins called the meeting to order at 5:44 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Update on Caltrain Fare Increase and Service Suspensions for Fiscal Year (FY) 2012

Director, Rail Transportation Michelle Bouchard thanked the committee for their flexibility and support in efforts to address Caltrain’s issues. She said staff at all levels are working with Caltrain’s funding partners and regional entities to find solutions for Caltrain.

Deputy CEO Chuck Harvey said final negotiations on the financing package and the service proposal with the JPB funding partners and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) were just finalized.

Mr. Harvey provided the following details:

- Caltrain was initially formed without a dedicated funding source and the JPB was organized to save Caltrain after the State of California said they were through with subsidizing service. The economic downturn in the early 2000s caused significant reduction in ridership and revenues and the reinvention in 2004 and 2005 led to increases in ridership and revenues.
- SamTrans’ structural deficit initiated a reduction in its member contribution to Caltrain in FY2010 and 2011 and proposes to continue its reduction to $4.9 million in FY2012.
- Caltrain has relied on one-time funds in the past. The structural deficit will continue due to the lack of a dedicated funding source. The JPB doesn’t have the statutory right to pursue a tax for the purpose of funding operations of Caltrain service. In order to secure a dedicated funding source, Caltrain must seek sponsors to pursue a tax measure on its behalf and is working with stakeholders to determine if a source can be secured by 2014.
- A public hearing was held on March 3 on the proposal to address the $30 million deficit, which included a 48-train schedule with commute-hour service only, minimizing train crews and equipment with service to the most heavily used stations, an end-to-end run time of about 70 minutes, suspension of weekend, holiday and special event service and weekday service to Gilroy, and suspension of service at up to seven stations.
- Caltrain received a total of 2,592 comments.
- Details of the tentative budget solution will be presented to the JPB at the April 7 meeting. Balancing the FY2012 budget requires a combination of fare and parking fee increases and service reductions to improve operating efficiency.
- Competing objectives must balance local community needs with overall system needs.
- Since the March 3 public hearing, a revised service proposal has been developed.
  - Service will be restored from 48 to 76 trains per weekday, service hours will be from 4:40 am until midnight, off-peak service is restored to hourly all-stop service during
the early morning/late night and midday hours, Gilroy service will run with service suspended at the Capitol Station, hourly weekend service will run with a revised stopping pattern and Giants, holiday and other service to special events will be restored.

- Weekday peak service is proposed to have four trains per hour in both directions but there will be no 57-minute Baby Bullets in the schedule and all peak period trains will retain express service design with an approximate 70-minute travel time.
- The origin destination station travel time comparisons for several pairs for minimum travel time will change to a maximum of 13 minutes in the worst-case and a minimum of about one to five minutes.
- Service will be suspended to Bayshore, Hayward Park and Capitol stations. Service at 22nd Street and San Bruno will have service in reverse peak and South San Francisco, Tamien and San Antonio stations will have service in traditional peak.
- Saturday and Sunday service are proposed to be hourly frequency on a 71-minute run time to 11 intermediate stops.
- Weekend service will be suspended at 22nd Street, Bayshore, South San Francisco, Broadway, Hayward Park, Atherton, California Avenue, San Antonio, Lawrence and Tamien.
- Net savings for the revised service proposal totals $5.3 million with an estimated $2 million loss in fare revenue due to reduced ridership for a net savings of $3.3 million.
- Fares and service proposals include an increase in the base fare by 25-cents, increased parking fees to $4 per day and $40 per month, elimination of the Tamien weekend shuttle and reduction of other shuttles based on train service.
- Proposed service and fare changes will have a net positive impact on the Operating Budget of $6,000,000. The other $24 million is made up through the creative financing and the financial package through negotiations with the MTC and the three JPB partners.

- Draft Title VI analysis reveals no unmitigated impacts to minority or low-income communities.
- The JPB will consider the revised proposal at the April 7 meeting to be effective on July 1, 2011. The cost of delaying the decision is $500,000 per month.
- If the proposal is adopted, service, revenue and ridership patterns will be monitored with adjustments as needed and negotiations for the FY2013 Operating Budget must be completed.
- Strategies for new revenue sources and a permanent funding source will continue with stakeholders including the Silicon Valley Leadership Group and MTC’s Transit Sustainability Project.

Sepi Richardson said she was not happy the Bayshore Station was closing. She asked what would happen if parking was increased to $5. She would prefer parking up to $6 per day and a fare increase to 30-cents to closing a station. Mr. Harvey said a parking increase of $1 will raise approximately $500,000. He said when trains are stopped at all stations, trains are slowed down and crews must be added and that will cost more than the revenue earned. Slowing trains may drive away customers.

Ms. Richardson asked if there were any operational cuts for travel or training, etc. Mr. Harvey said the FY2012 budget includes a substantial amount that addresses the cost side of the equation. The JPB is in the process of negotiating a new operating contract and everything has been done to reduce overhead administrative expenses.
Ms. Richardson asked what the future would be for the Bayshore Station if there was a stable source of funding. Mr. Harvey said it should have a great future due to a number of potential transit-oriented developments.

Ms. Richardson said every station is named after a city except the Bayshore Station.

Mona Tekchandani said she was saddened to see elimination of Baby Bullet service. She asked what projects could be done to make people happier with the proposed fare and service changes if parking was increased by $2. Mr. Harvey said Caltrain is happy to be able to run express service and keep travel times very competitive. He will take this issue to staff.

Paul Bendix asked about the possibility of having 24-hour parking at stations, especially ones attractive to the San Francisco International (SFO) airport. Ms. Bouchard said this is not under consideration due to liability issues but will up for consideration in the future. Staff has thought about looking at express versus local differential parking rates. Staff needs to monitor how the proposals affect the pattern of how people access the system and will then be able to gauge how parking might be leveraged both as a resource for access and for revenue.

Mr. Bendix asked if non-stop Millbrae to 4th and King trains are one minute longer, which is slower than in the past. Mr. Harvey said that is possible and probably set up due to construction activities between the two points.

Mr. Bendix asked what marketing would do with Caltrain’s somewhat revised image because Baby Bullet service can’t be touted. Mr. Harvey said the marketing department is brainstorming this and welcomed any suggestions.

John Hronowski said he had concerns about elimination of the San Francisco weekend stops. Mr. Harvey said customers on the north end of the Caltrain line can get to San Francisco on BART.

Mr. Hronowski asked if there will be special event trains on weekends with limited stops. Ms. Bouchard said there are plans for Giants service, which will mimic the proposed service pattern.

Ms. Tekchandani asked if fewer trains will have a positive impact on bicycles with more two bike car trains. Mr. Harvey said every train will soon have two bike cars and funding is in place to upgrade on the last of the Gallery cars. When service is reduced from 86 to 76 trains per day, there will be a reduction in available bike slots and staff will monitor this.

Mr. Bendix said there will also be pressure on wheelchair customers. Mr. Harvey said this is an example of competing objectives.

Francois Granade asked if the farebox receipts of $2.2 million have a breakdown between the fact that the trains are not as fast and there are fewer stations. Mr. Harvey said he didn’t have that level of breakdown in the analysis.
Mr. Granade asked how many people will be laid off, and marginally what is the cost of this and the cost of the change itself. Mr. Harvey said the vast majority of the savings are due to the reduction of the head counts on the operating and maintenance crews. The service proposal allows Caltrain to reduce at least seven total crews on the operating side, significant numbers in the maintenance department along with maintenance of some of the stations. There will be schedule change costs but these are built into the budget.

Mr. Granade said the major changes will be station closures and the complete reworking of the morning and evening schedule including removal of Baby Bullet service. He asked if it is worth doing all these changes because people are quite ready to see an increase in price and it would make more sense to try to increase prices and minimize schedule changes. Caltrain riders are rich and want a fast, predictable service. The proposals might undo this and there is a risk that is higher than taking the risk of reaching inelasticity. Mr. Harvey said Caltrain has not reached the full elasticity of fares. Fares were increased in January 2011 and are proposed to increase on July 1, 2011. These fare increases are in excess of 10 percent and nearing BART fares on a per-mile basis. Fares cannot be raised high enough to run an 86 train schedule. The proposed schedule still retains extremely attractive trip times versus paying $1 more a day and people will have to decide whether or not to ride with an additional few minutes of travel time. Mr. Harvey said there is a risk to Caltrain with proposed changes but the risk of not doing anything is $500,000 a month on the deficit and a 48-train schedule would have to be adopted in January 2012 if the problem is not fixed. A dedicated funding source must be secured for continued future service and there will be short-term pain to get there.

Brian Wilfley said this proposal is an amazing job of addressing what is a catastrophic situation and is fabulous compared to a 48-train schedule. He doesn’t think it is true that all Caltrain riders are rich; Caltrain is a service business in addition to just business and a service to the community and includes people who have to ride at odd hours and who don’t have much money. Running the service is a question of competing pain in some sense. He emphasized that the importance of the commitments by those on the outside to fund the $24 million gap cannot be underestimated and hopes they follow up on their commitments.

Mr. Graham asked if there will be no weekend service for San Carlos and Belmont. Ms. Bouchard said that is correct. He said the schedule notes trains will not operate on Sundays. Mr. Harvey said it is just the first and the last, which is the current schedule.

Mr. Graham said BART charges $1 for parking and parking is part of the package. If parking increases too much, people will be pushed away in the same way as raising fares.

Public Comment
Jeff Carter, Burlingame, said it is unfortunate the train will not be stopping at 23rd Street between 3:35 p.m. and 7:35 p.m. and this will be difficult for him. He said Caltrain is a proof-of-payment system and asked if two conductors are needed per train. Mr. Harvey said Caltrain is required by the Amtrak national labor agreement to have two conductors on every train.

Mr. Carter asked how much money SamTrans pays for BART debt per year. Mr. Harvey said it is about $12.5 million. The money is not debt that SamTrans owes to BART. It is debt
service SamTrans took out to buy the Caltrain system and extend the service to SFO and it would be SamTrans’ own bonds that they would be defaulting on.

Mr. Carter added that he is disgusted that people say Caltrain riders are rich.

Andy Chow, Redwood City, said the new schedule is unacceptable. The elimination of Baby Bullet service will have a big impact in terms of what Caltrain is even though trip times only vary by a few minutes; perception means more than reality. People will see Caltrain as a much slower system without Baby Bullet service and turn away from the system. The schedule will be difficult for people who need to travel locally with significant wait time. Many local riders are also low-income riders and these changes will impact them.

Doug DeLong, Mountain View, said the schedule is a good step and reduces the uncertainty for travel time and a rider doesn’t have to pick the one or two opportunities per hour between the station pairs versus the existing schedule. One tremendous improvement is that every origin-destination pair gets a minimum of half-hourly service in the peak. If revenue increases, there could potentially be more trains in the peak hours and a change in the service pattern to still get the 70-minute run time but serve more station pairs. He said there is no one-way for the four-zone fare and it isn’t clear whether there are eight or 10-rides. He suggested the senior category be replaced with a low-income category.

Barbara Arietta, San Mateo County Transportation Authority CAC chair, asked if service changes are for beyond July 1, 2011. Mr. Harvey said the proposal is for the FY2012 budget. If the proposal is adopted by the JPB at its April 7 meeting, changes could be in place by July 1, 2011.

Ms. Arietta asked if there will be Giants service. Mr. Harvey replied yes.

Pat Giorni, Burlingame, said the loss of Baby Bullet service is not so bad because Caltrain riders will feel better about a little extra time on the trains rather than sitting on the freeway. She said the proposal provides a better shot of getting bicycle riders on the trains versus using the Bombardier cars with only 46 bike slots.

Mr. Harvey said Caltrain recognized changing the Baby Bullet service is a significant change. Revenue in the 2004 service model was one-half of current revenue and ridership was 50 percent less. If Baby Bullet service is included in the current proposal, it would mean loss of service to five or six stations in addition to the three that will be closed.

A motion (Wilfley/Graham) that the CAC recommends to the JPB that they adopt the package of service and fare changes as presented was approved. Mr. Granade abstained.

Mr. Granade said removal of the Baby Bullets is too risky.

Date, Time, and Location of Next Meeting:
Wednesday, April 20, 2011, 5:40 p.m., San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building, 2nd Floor Bacciocchio Auditorium, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA

The meeting was adjourned at 7:07 p.m.