March 18, 2015 – Wednesday  5:40 p.m.  
Times noted are estimated.  Items in bold are CAC member requested presentations.

1. Pledge of Allegiance

2. Roll Call

3. Approval of Meeting Minutes of February 18, 2015  
   MOTION

4. Public Comment (5:45 p.m.)
   Public testimony by each individual speaker shall be limited to three minutes

5. Committee Comments (5:55 p.m.)
   Committee members may make brief statements regarding CAC-related areas of concern, ideas for improvement, or other items that will benefit or impact Caltrain service or the CAC, or request future agenda topics

6. Chairperson’s Report (6:10 p.m.)

7. Discussion on Quiet Cars (6:15 p.m.)

8. Discussion on Requesting VTA Make Schedule Changes to Support Caltrain (6:35 p.m.)

9. Discussion of Changes to the CAC By-laws (Chris Cobey) (6:50 p.m.)
   a. Article I – Membership – Section 1
   b. Article II – Officers – Section 1
   c. Article III – Meetings – Sections 1, 3 and 4

10. Staff Report (April Maguigad) (7:00 p.m.)
   a. Follow-up Report
   b. 2015 JPB CAC Work Plan

11. Date, Time and Place of Next Meeting
   April 15, 2015 at 5:40 p.m., San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building, 2nd Floor Bacciocco Auditorium, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA

12. Adjournment
   All items on this agenda are subject to action

CAC MEMBERS:  
San Francisco City & County:  Jonathan Berk, Brian Shaw, Alex Sweet (Vice Chair)
San Mateo County:  Chris Cobey (Chair), Annie Lee, Adina Levin
Santa Clara County:  Yvonne Mills, Greg Scharff, Cat Tucker
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 http://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 ECR, FLX, 260, 295 and 398. Additional transit information can be obtained by calling 1.800.660.4287 (TTY 650.508.6448) or 511.

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 650.508.6279, or TTY 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.
MEMBERS PRESENT: J. Berk, C. Cobey (Chair), A. Lee, A. Levin, B. Shaw, A. Sweet, C. Tucker

MEMBERS ABSENT: Y. Mills, G. Scharff

STAFF PRESENT: J. Averill, D. Couch, C. Fromson, A. Maguigad, S. Petty

Chair Chris Cobey called the meeting to order at 5:41 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JANUARY 21, 2015

Jonathan Berk said on page 6 he would like to add the following statement after the first paragraph: “Mr. Berk said he encourages staff to consider ticket enforcement and the ability to purchase tickets on the trains in the design of Clipper 2.0.”

To approve the minutes as amended:
Motion/Second: Shaw/Sweet
Ayes: Berk, Cobey, Shaw, Sweet, Tucker
Absent: Lee, Levin, Mills, Scharff

PUBLIC COMMENT

Jeff Carter, Millbrae, said at the last meeting someone mentioned the possibility of bikes boarding in one door and leaving out of another door. He said that was tried several years ago but it didn’t work out. He said Communications-based Overlay Signal System (CBOSS) is supposed to protect train workers and other transit systems are looking at ways do to it. He said new mile post markers are being installed, but they are different from the old ones. He said fares need to be integrated for Clipper transit use.

Doug DeLong, Mountain View, said he is eager to hear about the Metrolink cars and the contract to refurbish them. He said when conductors were trying to collect fares on trains it led to fare enforcement problems. He said encouraging people to be late for the train by taking money for fares on the train is a dumb idea.

Andy Chow, Redwood City, said there is a need to add trains during the peak hours and during mid-day hours because of increased ridership. Caltrain is undergoing construction for the San Mateo bridges and is single tracking, and this could be one of the problems if there was 30-minute service in the mid-day. One option would be to run skip-stop service.
Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said bicyclists have stated they need to sit in the bike car to keep an eye on their bikes, and the security exit windows are in the bike car. He said in Gallery cars, the security exits are at the far end where the seats are, not where the bikes are. He asked why bicyclists can’t stand to keep an eye on their bikes. He said if Caltrain needs to get a third conductor for the third bike car, people who bring their bikes onboard should buy two tickets so Caltrain could afford the third conductor.

Josh Averill, Assistant District Secretary, said the CAC received a letter from Robert Kirby, who wasn’t able to attend the meeting but asked that the letter be brought to the attention of the CAC during the public comment section. The letter is in the reading file and staff is working on a response.

**COMMITTEE COMMENTS**

Mr. Berk said the trains are no longer running early and the problem is now solved. He said he wants to be able to make corrections to the minutes before the meeting if the correction is in line with the recording. Mr. Berk said there should be express service during the day. He said he would like to agendize a discussion where Caltrain explains why they don’t want to experiment with bullet service during the day, or explain what experiments they will run.

Brian Shaw said he agrees and would like to agendize schedule improvements for Caltrain during the off peak. He said Caltrain should consider spreading the peak hours out to provide more service and add capacity. He said conductors are not consistent in announcing luggage should not be on seats and enforcing the policy, and Caltrain is not in a position to allow luggage on seats. He said some people who use folding bikes are taking up room in bike cars, and they should be using luggage cars. He said he would like to see a public service process to encourage people to use folding bikes and to put them in the luggage cars.

Alex Sweet said people coming with luggage don’t always know there is a luggage car, and when it gets crowded it makes it hard to get to the luggage car. The conductors should direct the customers.

Cat Tucker said she agrees with the comments from Mr. Kirby in the correspondence packet and would like agendize the topic to discuss the points the customer is making.

**Public Comment**

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said the bike policy in London is bikes are not allowed onboard during peak services. Folding bikes are allowed if they are folded before they are brought onto the platform. Most stations have bike racks or lockers.

**CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT**

Chair Cobey said he encourages CAC members to volunteer to give the CAC report to the Board. He said he intends to pursue the possibility of providing a written report.

**Presentation of Board Certificate of**

Chair Cobey presented a Certificate of Appreciation, which was signed by the chair of the Board, to past chair Ms. Tucker thanking her for her service in 2014.
CALTRAIN MODERNIZATION (CALMOD) UPDATE (Dave Couch)

Casey Fromson, Government Relations Officer, said staff is still installing the CBOSS/Positive Train Control (PTC) Project, but is moving into the testing phase, which will occur over the next several weeks at night. In January the Board approved and certified the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR). The town of Atherton is suing the JPB. Staff is in the legal phase of addressing Atherton’s concerns and will likely proceed with the project while litigation continues.

Dave Couch, Project Delivery Director, provided the Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project Delivery Quarterly Update:

- **Design/Build Electrification Project Request for Proposals (RFP)**
  - Staff has been going through a review process with the six prequalified firms and the funding partners. Comments are being incorporated into the Design/Build contract.
  - Staff expects to issue the RFP the week of February 9th.
  - Staff expects to issue several amendments, including a Project Labor Agreement, which is currently in discussion and negotiation. It should come to the Board in March and be incorporated into the contract.
  - The selection process should be completed late this summer and staff will return to the Board for approval in the fall with a recommendation for a contractor.

- **Electric Multiple Unit (EMU) RFP**
  - Staff has completed a technical analysis with the California High-speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) looking at compatibility of boarding heights.
  - Monthly updates of progress are provided to funding partners.
  - Technical feasibility discussions are underway with vehicle manufacturers.
  - The RFP is scheduled to be released in July.
  - The contract is anticipated to be awarded in the winter.

Annie Lee arrived at 6:08 p.m.

- **Vehicle Compatibility Analysis**
  - No fatal flaws have been determined in providing a combination of low- and high-level boarding.
  - A tradeoff analysis is being conducted.
  - The Board will be asked to make policy decisions between March and May.

- **EMU Outreach Phase 1**
  - Public input on capacity
    - The focus was on seats and standees, bathrooms, and bikes onboard.
  - Received 4,196 survey responses and more than 1,200 comments.

- **Survey Methodology**
  - This was an opt-in survey and is not statistically valid, but highlights interests.
  - Available in Spanish, Vietnamese, Chinese and English.
Outreach included in-person surveys at stations, onboard announcements, social media, news releases, and meetings.

- **Survey: Seats/Standee Related**
  - Average trip onboard Caltrain – 28 percent from 31 to 45 minutes, 26 percent from 46 to 60 minutes.
  - Seat availability (destination trip) – 64 percent always, 17 percent standing up to 10 minutes, 7 percent standing more than 20 minutes.
  - Seat availability (return trip) – 57 percent always, 19 percent standing up to 10 minutes, 8 percent standing more than 20 minutes.

- **Survey: Bike Related**
  - Brought bike onboard – 44 percent.
  - Bumped in the last year – 46 percent never, 13 percent once, 30 percent two to 12 times.
  - Staffed bike facility an alternative – 52 percent yes.
  - Bike lockers an option – 49 percent yes.
  - Bike sharing as alternative – 39 percent yes.
  - Shuttles as alternative – 47 yes.
  - Limit the number of bikes brought onboard as a consideration.

Adina Levin arrived at 6:16 p.m.

- **Survey: Bathroom Related**
  - Use of bathroom – 53 percent yes.
  - How often utilized – 2 percent never, 23 percent once a year, 60 percent two to 12 times, 13 percent multiple times per month, 3 percent multiple times per week.

- **Level of Importance**
  - Increase seating capacity – 56 percent very important, 2 percent unimportant.
  - Increase onboard bike capacity – 38 percent very important, 10 percent unimportant.
  - Increase standing capacity – 22 percent very important, 5 percent unimportant.
  - Increase bike storage at stations – 22 percent very important, 13 percent unimportant.

- **Summary Results**
  - Weighted average of what the highest desire is on a scale of 1 to 5
    - Seating – 4.5
    - Standing room/leaning area – 3.26
    - Bike storage – 3.11
    - Bathroom – 2.18
    - Luggage storage – 1.95

- **Technical/Operational Considerations**
  - **Seats/Standees**
    - Current provision
      - Bi-level
      - 620 to 670 seats
      - Standee space limited
- Circulation space for conductor
- Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance for space and accessibility
- Leg space between rows
- Aisle widths

- Bikes onboard
  - Current provision
    - 48 to 80 bikes per train (five trains per peak hour)
    - One bike and customer take up two seats
    - Two bike cars per train
    - Bike bumps occurring
    - Wayside bike parking facilities improvement opportunities
  - Dedicated bike cars more efficient and safer than bikes onboard throughout train
  - Additional bike cars may require crew changes, which could drive up operational costs

- Bathrooms
  - Current provision
    - Portion of fleet has two to five bathrooms per train
    - Not all ADA compliant
    - Two terminal stations have bathrooms
  - Multiple configurations available
  - One ADA compliant bathroom equals eight seats
  - Additional utility during delays
  - Implications of two versus six bathrooms

- Next Steps:
  - Outreach Phase I
    - Public discussion – February and March
    - Staff recommendation on seats, bikes and bathrooms in April
    - Expect to issue vehicle RFP – July
  - Outreach Phase II – after vehicle contract award
    - Interior configuration seating, standee, bikes (design)
    - Interior style and colors
    - Exterior appearance

Ms. Sweet said some of the suggestions that alternatives would not be significant to changing the number of bikes onboard were dismissed. Mr. Couch said not a tremendous number of people in favor of some of the alternatives. It has to do with individual preference. Some people want to have their bikes with them and not leave them in a locker.

Ms. Sweet said she has heard people want lockers that they can rent hourly, but that is not an option. She said half the responders said yes to using bike lockers as an alternative, but even if 35 percent of people did not brings bikes onboard, it would help. She asked how this survey ties into the Bicycle Access and Parking Plan (BAPP).
Sebastian Petty, Senior Planner, said it is useful data and staff has set up an annual process to prioritize and implement improvements, and apply for grants to install on demand electronic lockers.

Ms. Levin asked if Mr. Couch tallied how many people answered no bike alternatives would work for them and lined it up with the customers’ first- and last-mile choices. Mr. Couch said no but he has the data to be able to do it.

Ms. Levin said this information would help Caltrain figure out how many bike spaces are needed and ensure people who have no alternatives can take their bikes onboard. Mr. Couch said there are larger contingents within San Francisco to do a bike share program, but there are much fewer on the Peninsula. He said shuttles would be another option, but there is no funding for it. For maximum utilization, Caltrain can install bike lockers, and renting them hourly is plausible.

Ms. Levin asked if the survey data is available. Ms. Fromson said the raw data is not available but the summary is. Mr. Couch said not all participants answered all of the questions, so a straight-line relationship between the responders and percentages cannot be made.

Ms. Levin said the raw data would be helpful for the bike community to make reasonable recommendations. She asked how the schedule works with the high-speed rail platform questions that have implications for room onboard. Mr. Couch said the schedule dovetails. Staff has delayed the issuance of the procurement in anticipation of working through this with the CHSRA.

Public Comment
Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said the survey is biased because the survey results show 44 percent of the responders bring their bikes onboard, but less than 15 percent of overall ridership bring their bikes onboard. He said staff refuses to disclose the names of the manufacturers. He said one of the documents in the lawsuit refers to another document, but the link to it is missing so no one knows what is in the document, and it is being used to make the decision to not use hybrid trains. The lawsuit could cause the judge to declare the FEIR inefficient.

Doug DeLong, Mountain View, said the CHSRA wants to have simplex trains with four-foot high boarding heights and they don’t care what anyone else wants. There needs to be pushback because it looks like Caltrain will be responsible for rolling stock with multiple boarding heights.

Andy Chow, Redwood City, said the Bus Rapid Transit is supposed to have level boarding, and it is, vertically, but there is a big gap horizontally, so ramps have to be used anyway. The issue of level boarding is more complicated than it seems. He said one of the options to consider is platforms that can be adjusted. He said women don’t like to use the onboard restrooms because they are messy. He said urinals might help to keep them clean.
Ms. Levin said because bicycle users are oversampled in the survey, the results about people who want alternatives are more accurate.

**PRESENTATION ON THE CALTRAIN SHORT-RANGE TRANSIT PLAN – DRAFT ELEMENTS**

*Sebastian Petty*

Mr. Petty presented:

- **Short-Range Transit Plan**
  - Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) requirement
  - Ten-year horizon (Fiscal Year (FY) 2015-2024)
  - Basis for Regional Transportation Plan and Transportation Improvement Program
  - Key draft elements
    - Capital Improvement Program and funding
    - Operations and maintenance

- **Policy Framework**
  - Caltrain Strategic Plan
  - MTC Transit Sustainability Program
  - CalMod Program
  - Caltrain/high-speed rail blended system

- **Operating Plan Assumptions**
  - FY2016 to FY2020
    - Longer trains (Metrolink cars)
    - Service levels and schedule consistent with today
    - Electrification construction and testing
  - FY2021 to FY2024
    - Mixed-fleet service
    - Service expansion and schedule change

- **Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)**
  - Three Key Components
    - Rehabilitation
    - Reliability and enhancement
    - CalMod
  - Construction priorities
    - Limited construction windows
    - Safety first
    - Electrified revenue service 2020

- **Rehabilitation**
  - Infrastructure rehabilitation
    - Bridge replacement
    - Hold-out rule stations
    - Ongoing track, fencing, security and stations rehabilitation
  - Signals and communications
  - Ticket machine replacement
  - Rolling stock rehab

- **Reliability/enhancement**
  - North Terminal
  - 22nd Street accessibility
  - South Terminal (Phase II and III)
- San Mateo County grade separations
- Mini-high platforms
- Minor six-car train platform modifications
- New control points
- Station access enhancements
- System technology enhancements

- Needs and funding
  - System-wide rehabilitation - $516 million
  - Enhancement program - $575 million
  - Funding available - $430 million
  - Gap - $661 million

- CalMod
  - Phase 1
    - Electrification and initial EMU procurement
    - CBOSS PTC
  - Phase 2
    - Full fleet replacement with six-car EMUs
    - Full fleet expansion to eight-car EMUs, platform lengthening and modifications for level boarding

- Needs and funding
  - CalMod Phase 1 - $1.762 billion needed, $1.456 billion available, $306 million gap
  - CalMod Phase 2 - $624 million needed, $0 available

- Next steps
  - Partner coordination
    - Refine CIP estimates and identify funding sources
    - Operations and maintenance forecast
  - Return to JPB with update and submit draft to MTC
  - Address comments and finalize

Ms. Tucker asked if a project will not get done if it is not listed in this plan. Mr. Petty said projects should be in the plan to be eligible for funding sources, but the plan will get updated every two years.

Mr. Shaw asked what the public involvement is in the development of this plan. Mr. Petty said the plan is intended to be an administrative document that expresses plans and policies that have already been publicly vetted. There are sections around existing policies and standards from the Strategic Plan and Title VI compliance documents that are going into the plan. Staff is not conducting dedicated public outreach.

Ms. Levin asked if the station access information will be refined with the information received from the EMU procurement and the needs for bicycle access. Mr. Petty said the total dollar value might get refined, but this document will not include a deep level of detail. That information will be used to inform other planning processes.

Ms. Levin said it would be beneficial for Santa Clara County to have a pot of money for grade separations and it would be good to manage it the way San Mateo County
does. She said she would like itemization details behind the CalMod Phase and the cost for the electric fleet and platform modifications. Mr. Petty said the estimates are conceptual.

Ms. Tucker asked if the millions are divided up between the three counties and if there is a formula to spread the money along the entire line, including Gilroy. Mr. Petty said there is a formula, but some issues are defined as system-wide issues and some are local issues, and there is a formula for how the system-wide issues get paid into versus local issues.

Mr. Cobey asked if the details are available for the CAC. Mr. Petty said it is inherent in how the capital budgeting process and the negotiations about what items the JPB partners pay for.

Public Comment
Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said customers are not going to wait until 2021 for expansion of service. He said CBOSS was supposed to give closer headways and increased capacity. He said $800,000 was paid for Wi-Fi on trains, but it went to a communications company that does damage control when there is an image problem. He said he is pretty sure level boarding is not in the RFP for electrification.

Jeff Carter, Millbrae, said bikes address first and last mile. Other alternatives are to provide a parking space or riding transit, and both cost a lot of money, so allowing bikes onboard is economical. He said Caltrain should think about improving service where it can be improved and putting in additional trains outside the peak commute.

TransitAmerica Services Related Topics (Rebecca Hernandez)
Mr. Berk said he wants to know why conductors don’t write citations to non-ticket holders every time.

Mr. Berk left at 7:15 p.m.

Fare Enforcement
Rebecca Hernandez, Customer Service Manager, TransitAmerica Services, Inc. (TASI), said fare enforcement is an important part of conductor’s job, and one of many responsibilities. A conductor’s main responsibility is to get the train to its destination safely. The conductor is responsible for knowing what signal is coming up, signal restrictions, and other limitations, and they have to remind the engineer. They are constantly watching for landmark locations to let the engineer know what is coming up. They are also responsible for the boarding and alighting of customers. Walking the train, checking tickets, and getting through the car in time to take care of the platform responsibilities can be rushed. Conductors have the discretion whether or not to write a ticket, or to give the person a warning or an opportunity to get off the train to purchase a ticket. She said the conductors learn about picking their battles and not antagonizing a person who may escalate the situation. The challenge is the conductor never knows who he or she is dealing with. Another challenge is dealing with the Clipper Card system. There are more conductors than Clipper Card readers, the readers are old, and the battery lives are coming to an end. TASI is working on solutions
to equal out the readers among conductors, put in charging stations, and assign readers to trains. Meetings have been scheduled to discuss the fare enforcement training, challenges, and opportunities for improvement.

Mr. Shaw said fare enforcement is time intensive and difficult, but it has to do with law enforcement. He said maybe it should be done by law enforcement officials. He said other systems have fare enforcement officials. He asked if Caltrain has ever considered hiring supplementary people for fare enforcement. April Maguigad, Manager, Rail Operations, said TASI has a contract with Caltrain to provide fare enforcement and TASI does not have a say in that policy decision. The subject has been discussed internally, but no formal decision has been made.

Mr. Shaw asked if there is a concern from a union about outsourcing the work. Ms. Maguigad said she hasn’t heard of that, it is more a matter of making a policy decision and understanding the best mechanism for Caltrain.

Ms. Levin asked what percent of people do not have a valid ticket and how it is compared to the industry. Ms. Maguigad said a monthly report is provided to staff with the number fare checks, citations, and warnings and it is in the 1 to 3 percent range, which is standard within the industry.

Ms. Levin said it is possible to use a cell phone with minimal functionality just to read a Clipper Card, and it would be cheaper than the Clipper readers. Ms. Maguigad said staff is waiting for the next generation of the handheld Clipper readers. A fourth generation keeps getting pushed back.

Mr. Shaw said San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency is checking Clipper use at the downtown subway stations for homeland security purposes, and they’re using U.S. Department of Homeland Security money. He said this isn’t a resource issue, there is money for this. He said he is asking for Caltrain to be creative about it beyond technology or adding more conductors, to think about where resources can be ascertained, not just to collect revenue but for other reasons.

Training
Ms. Hernandez said the current training program is called Transit Ambassador. She said it is a great program, but she feels it should concentrate more on deescalating situations, handling conflict, and how to provide customer service while dealing with the public. She said she has been researching other training programs, talking with other commuter rails, and met with the Transit Police to see what training they get.

Ms. Sweet said the correspondence shows customers feel conductors treat bicyclists like second class riders and are rude. Ms. Hernandez said the conductors should treat all passengers equally. She said there are two sides to the story. She said she received a complaint that some bicyclists were pushing their way onto the train after the conductor had told them there was no more room.

Ms. Sweet said if the conductor tells a bicyclists to go to the other bike car, the conductor should wait for that bicyclist to get on the other car before the train leaves,
even if it means more dwell time. She said better communication between conductors and bicyclists is important and should be worked on.

Ms. Levin said the disposition of conductors makes a difference in terms of customer service.

Mr. Shaw said if Stanford was running the railroad there would be bike car attendants, because the conductors have too important of a job to deal with bike handling. He said if there was a bike car attendant, the customer service issue around bikes would be less of a problem. If bicyclists paid for the privilege of putting their bikes on the trains, the funding would be available to hire a bike car attendant.

Ms. Sweet said an idea for improving communication and bike regulation is signage and volunteer bike car ambassadors.

Public Comment
Jeff Carter, Millbrae, said a lot of people don’t understand how the proof of payment system works and that there are random checks. Depending on the circumstance people can get a warning or a fine. He said maybe the conductors shouldn’t be doing fare enforcement. He said he has been riding Caltrain for 38 years, and it has been proven that missed fares are quite low and fare evasion is low, so he is not troubled when he sees someone get a warning or a chance to buy a ticket at the next station.

STAFF REPORT (April Maguigad)
Ms. Maguigad said:
• The Bicycle Advisory Committee met in January and discussed the bikes onboard program, the BAPP, and bump reporting.
• Staff is working on getting the Metrolink cars shipped to this area. Staff will assess them to find out how to get them into service quickly. Staff will have a better idea of the implementation schedule once the cars are on property.
• January on-time performance was 91.7 percent. There were a few fatalities in January close to the peak period. If the two worst days were taken out, it goes up to 94 percent on time.
• The annual onboard passenger counts are underway. They help staff ensure the ridership formulas are accurate.
• The Freedom Train was operated on January 19. The Dr. Martin Luther King Junior Association of Santa Clara Valley decided it would be the last year. Staff has been discussing helping to provide the service in the future.
• The outdoor National Hockey League game is the weekend of February 21.
• Staff is continuing to work on the San Mateo Bridges Replacement Project, which is why there is single tracking in the area.
• The Quint Street Bridge needs to be repaired and a slow order is in effect.

Mr. Shaw said he is curious to know the causes of delays other than fatalities and accidents. He would like to know how much is caused by operational constraints, construction, and delays in boarding. Part of the communication effort to people is to explain the delays are caused by unforeseen circumstances would be a good news story and would help identify operational issues that need to be addressed.
Ms. Maguigad said the data is not compiled in that way and it would be difficult to communicate that to customers. She said she will look into it.

DATE, TIME AND LOCATION OF NEXT MEETING:
March 18, 2015 at 5:40 p.m., San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building, 2nd Floor Bacciocco Auditorium, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA.

Meeting adjourned at 7:52 p.m.
Thank you for passing the suggestion to the committee staff. Since I have time conflicts with the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) meeting, I ask that the ASCII text enclosure be included as a public comment to the CAC meeting and with the reading files. The enclosure contents are also given below the original message.

Robert L. Kirby, Ph.D.
kirby.bob@gmail.com
1-408-736-6757 (home in Sunnyvale)
http://www.linkedin.com/in/bobkirby

On Thu, Jan 22, 2015 at 8:21 AM, Averill, Joshua <AverillJ@samtrans.com> wrote:
Subject: Agenda Request - Bus to Caltrain

Dr. Kirby,

I passed your request to staff to add an item to the JPB CAC agenda to discuss a VTA hub-and-spoke program to Caltrain from the bus rapid transit line on El Camino Real in Santa Clara County. I was informed that we thank you for this information, but because this is a VTA project, we will not put it on a future agenda. We will let the planning department know about this, and they will work through this as needed on the staff level.

With Regards,

Josh Averill
Assistant District Secretary
San Mateo County Transit District
1250 San Carlos Avenue
Although VTA may be the primary actor on Bus Caltrain interconnection, nonetheless, the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) should and can take actions.

From the CAC By-Laws Article I Membership:
"Its activities shall include seeking the views of various groups of users and potential users of Caltrain and ancillary transit facilities, and to develop proposals and recommendations for meeting the needs of these various groups."

The potential interconnecting bus and train passengers are a mostly unserved group. Most of few 13% of current Caltrain passengers who also bus are probably to the north where interconnections are better.

VTA seemingly views Caltrain stations as higher-traffic bus stops rather than as opportunities for a coordinated transportation system. Instead of coordinating with Caltrain, VTA proposes dedicated bus lanes in its El Camino Real Bus Rapid Transit (ECR BRT) http://www.vta.org/projects-and-programs/brt-el-camino-real-brt-project project, which would unnecessarily disrupt automobile traffic. Such attempts to speed bus traffic to 40 minute travel between the SAP arena at Diridon Station and the Palo Alto transit center ignore the faster times of 30 minutes for current local trains, before Electric Multiple Unit (EMU) speedups, and 20 minute express Caltrain.

Caltrain is the natural owner of efficient longer distance public transportation while VTA naturally provides local, within city or between neighboring sides of cities, services. Caltrain coordinated with VTA busses would provide the most efficient, environmentally friendly, south bay area transportation without provoking longer automobile trip times.

The CAC could take several, mostly low cost actions.

1. The CAC could encourage coordination with the VTA on behalf of potential interconnecting bus and train passengers with a declaration. Although CAC would usually make such declarations only to the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (PCJPB), they can communicate with VTA or suggest that the PCJPB communicate with VTA. Such a declaration might be;
The CAC of the PCJPB encourages the VTA to improve coordination with Caltrain.

2. With the current environment of long (30 minute) headways of bus service to Caltrain stations, the CAC of the PCJPB or the PCJPB itself could explicitly request that VTA buses meet trains to reduce passenger wait times. VTA bus meetings could be improved by having layovers occur near Caltrain stations rather than at the ends of each bus line. Then busses could be scheduled to arrive just, with slack, before Caltrain arrivals and then leave after passengers walk to each bus from Caltrain when the train is not excessively (over 5 minutes) late.
3. VTA could be requested to serve several large areas of cities without needing bus transfers. For instance, VTA bus 26, which serves east side of Sunnyvale at its closest comes only within several blocks of the Sunnyvale Caltrain station. There is no bus service for the west of the city of Santa Clara to the obvious Lawrence Caltrain station. The San Antonio station is over a 1/2 mile from the nearest bus transfer centers that could serve western Mountain View, Los Altos, and eastern Palo Alto. Each instance could be improved with rerouted bus lines or additional bus services. Caltrain hub and VTA spoke services could be a rubric for an intent to provide better services.

4. Caltrain staff responsible of scheduling and the communication of schedules could have coordination or at least communication of schedules to VTA be a criteria in personnel performance reviews.

5. Caltrain could provide more fare incentives, particularly to Clipper Card holders even without Caltrain monthly passes, to transfer on or off VTA buses.

6. Caltrain electronic signage could be extended to the VTA bus stops of Caltrain stations. If long VTA headways remain in effect, VTA drivers could see expected Caltrain delays and operated according to protocols that could, for instance, delay bus departures, to transfer passengers from Caltrain service delayed less than 5 minutes. The new, quite successful, Caltrain electronic signage would also reassure passengers.

7. Caltrain could advertise its coordination with VTA buses. Inexpensive advertising could appear on board trains, in platform display cases, in Caltrain newletters, and on its website.

I hope that you and Caltrain staff will revisit the earlier decision and consider VTA Caltrain interconnections on the agenda of the next CAC meeting.

Robert L. Kirby, Ph.D.
kirby.bob@gmail.com
1-408-736-6757 (home in Sunnyvale)
http://www.linkedin.com/in/bobkirby

CC: Josh Averill CAC Secretary,
Adam Burger VTA Transportation Planner,
CAC Board Member Yvonne Mills,
CAC Board Member Greg Scharff,
County Supervisor Joe Simitian,
County Supervisor Ken Yeager,
VTA Board of Directors,
Sunnyvale councilman David Whittum,
council@sunnyvale.ca.gov,
Sunnyvale citizen Steve Scandalis
Thank you for responding to my message to the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (PCJPB) Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC), which has been forwarded to the PCJPB. My message was not so much about the customers that Caltrain and VTA have but about changes, which involve tradeoffs, that could attract new customers with a better integrated, overall transportation system.

Since Caltrain is not directly responsible for VTA busses, suggesting that Caltrain ask VTA for improvements that would improve Caltrain service to the entire population is appropriate. If the PCJPB or its CAC does not specify improvements to VTA that would help Caltrain, how can the PCJPB CAC hope to meet its charter to improve service to groups that are not currently well served or served at all? It should be the role of the VTA, rather than Caltrain, to decide which services the VTA can provide.

Perhaps twenty years ago, I rode a VTA north-south bus route in Sunnyvale that took its layover near the downtown train station. Although I was inconvenienced by the delay, I understood that it was part of the schedule while I waited aboard the bus and then proceeded according to the schedule. I suggested such layovers be reconsidered to further what should be a priority, attracting riders to an integrated system. Alternatively, bus headways could be shortened but I assume that would unacceptably increase expenses.

Currently, I see few signs of Caltrain and VTA cooperation that help the general public. For instance, VTA route 55, which along with routes 32, 53, 54, and 304 serves the Sunnyvale Caltrain station, has rigid 30 minute headways with no advertised provisions to meet trains. Caltrain with bus 55 riders can expect 25 minute transfer delays. Most potential customers will opt for some other form of transportation to avoid waiting so long. If southbound Caltrain 192 arrives after its scheduled 9:55PM arrival, passengers won’t even have a minute to run to the last bus 55 at 9:56PM. A good interconnection could guarantee a ride for at least some of the later Caltrain arrivals. The east side of Sunnyvale, through which VTA bus 26 travels, has no usable service to the Sunnyvale or Lawrence Caltrain stations.

Moreover, current improvement efforts are not helping. The VTA North-South study interim results presented to the Sunnyvale City Council on February 10, 2015 included no north-south changes that would improve Caltrain connections. I do not see many good results for interoperability from any collaboration of Caltrain and VTA. With such efforts, using Caltrain with VTA busses will remain an odious choice for most people.

Again, thank you for the response. I have included other addressees to my reply who might change VTA and Caltrain priorities and actions.

Bob Kirby

Robert L. Kirby, Ph.D.
kirby.bob@gmail.com
On Fri, Feb 27, 2015 at 12:05 PM, Haskin, Rita <haskinr@samtrans.com> wrote:

Good afternoon, Dr. Kirby. Your message to members of the Caltrain Board of Directors and Citizens Advisory Committee regarding connections between VTA and Caltrain was referred to me for response.

We’ve shared your message with staff from the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority. The Caltrain and VTA staffs have a good working relationship and coordinate on schedule changes. Our mutual goal is to make transfers work as well as possible. It’s also important to remember that some bus routes have multiple key destinations, not just Caltrain.

When serving a train station, or transit center with other buses, it’s a balancing act between whether the bus should arrive in time to deliver customers to the station or in time to receive customers from the arriving train. It’s generally not feasible to do both because customers traveling on the bus whose destination is past the train station will be inconvenienced.

Caltrain and VTA will continue to collaborate on providing good transportation services to our customers.

Sincerely,

Rita

Rita P. Haskin

SamTrans | Caltrain | TA

Executive Officer, Customer Service and Marketing

1250 San Carlos Ave.

San Carlos, CA 94070-1306

650-508-6248

www.smctd.com
TO: Josh Averill, Assistant Secretary, Citizens Advisory Committee
FROM: Chris Cobey, Chair, CAC
DATE: March 13, 2015
RE: Proposed amendments to CAC bylaws

Following are my reasons for proposing each of the three amendments in the redline version of the Bylaws forwarded with my March 3 email to you as an attachment:

1. Proposed amendment to Art. II, Sec. 1:

   **Now:** Requires a personal report to the Board. In the experience of at least the current and former chair, no Board member has ever asked a single question of the Committee member presenting the report.

   Delivering the report requires a Committee member to travel to the Board meeting site on a Thursday morning for a report which usually takes one to two minutes to deliver.

   **Proposed:** Allows the Committee report to be submitted in writing as part of the Board packet. Reserves the option for the Committee to have a member appear in person to present the report.

2. Proposed amendment to Art. III, Sec. 1:

   **Now:** Bylaw requires that the Committee to hold at least one of its regular meetings each year in San Francisco and Santa Clara Counties.

   **Proposed:** According to the Committee’s posted minutes, the Committee has not had meetings in San Francisco or Santa Clara County in years. Bylaw requirements which are not complied with should be deleted from the bylaws.

   The following could be added to the Section:

   “Meetings will be held at 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, California. Other meeting venues may be determined by the Committee prior to the meeting.”
3. Proposed amendment to Art. III, Sec. 3:

Now: Bylaws refer to "excused absence" without definition, and also "absence" without the modifier; the third sentence has no time period.

Proposed: Delete modifier "excused" from "absence"; add "calendar" time period for counting of absences.

An alternative time period could be:

"immediately preceding twelve-month period from the date of the fourth absence."

4. Possible amendment to Art. III, Sec. 4:

Now: The agenda is normal published the Friday before the regular meeting. This provision permits a Committee member to email staff at 5:39 pm on the Sunday preceding a regular Wednesday meeting with an item the Committee member requests be added to the agenda.

Discussion: If a Committee member requested on the weekend before the regular meeting that an item be added to the agenda, would staff be able to do so within the applicable deadlines? Does the Committee wish to push this deadline further back? Should a single Committee member have the right to put an item on the agenda?
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD
BY-LAWS

ARTICLE I – MEMBERSHIP

Section 1. As prescribed by the Peninsula Joint Powers Board (“JPB” or “Board”), the Citizens Advisory Committee (“CAC” or “Committee”) shall consist of nine (9) members, three appointed from each constituent county (San Francisco County, San Mateo County, Santa Clara County). Each county will select its county committee members and the JPB will affirm these appointments. CAC members should reflect the demographics of Caltrain riders. The Citizens Advisory Committee shall act in an advisory capacity to the JPB. Its activities shall include seeking the views of various groups of users and potential users of Caltrain and ancillary transit facilities, and to develop proposals and recommendations for meeting the needs of these various groups; reviewing and commenting on staff proposals and actions as requested by the JPB; and assisting the JPB in any matter which the Board may deem appropriate.

Section 2. CAC members shall serve three (3) year terms.

ARTICLE II – OFFICERS

Section 1. The Officers of the CAC shall be a Chairperson and a Vice-Chairperson. Their duties shall be as follows:

Chairperson: Presides over CAC meetings; develops the monthly meeting agenda; appoints subcommittees and subcommittee chairpersons; represents the...
responsible for submission of the report of the most recent CAC meeting at- for the monthly JBP meetings or ensures that another representative is present. The Chairperson may call a special meeting of the committee should the Chairperson deem it appropriate.

Vice-Chairperson: Presides over the CAC meetings in the absence of the Chairperson; conducts the other duties of the Chairperson in his/her absence.

Should neither the Chairperson nor Vice-Chairperson be able to perform the duties of the chair, the remaining members shall elect one of themselves to serve as temporary chair.

Section 2. Selection of Officers shall be made as follows:

Chairperson: The Chairperson shall be elected by a majority of the appointed members at the January meeting. The term of office shall be for one year. If the term of appointment of the member elected Chairperson expires before the year is out and that member does not either seek reappointment or the Board does not grant such reappointment, the Vice-Chairperson will serve as Chairperson until the following January.

Vice-Chairperson: This Officer shall be elected by a majority of the appointed members at the January meeting. The term of office shall be for one year. If the term of appointment of the member elected Vice-Chairperson expires before the year is out and that member does not either seek reappointment or the Board does not grant such reappointment, the Committee will hold an election for a Vice-Chairperson to serve out the remainder of the term.

Except in extenuating circumstances as determined by the Committee, at no time shall two officers be elected from the same county. The officers shall be elected
in a rotation between counties on a yearly basis. If the majority of the Committee
chooses, Officers may be retained for a period longer than one year.

Clerk of the Committee: The Clerk shall be appointed by the Executive
Director of JPB who will serve as staff to the Committee. The duties of Clerk to the
Committee shall be to prepare and post the agenda, as advised by the CAC officers. In
addition, the Clerk shall attend all regularly scheduled and special meetings of the CAC
and shall prepare monthly minutes for the CAC, staff reports and public hearing notices
when appropriate.

Section 3. In the case of vacancy.

In the case of any vacancy in office, the vacancy shall be filled by an
election at the first regular meeting after the occurrence of the vacancy.

ARTICLE III – MEETINGS

Section 1. The regular meetings of the CAC shall be held on the third
Wednesday of each month at 5:40 p.m. The CAC can approve amending its regularly
scheduled meeting time and date without having to seek Board authorization. Ten (10)
meetings per year will be held at 1250 San Carlos Avenue San Carlos, California. One
(1) meeting will be held in San Francisco County, and one (1) meeting will be held in
Santa Clara County. The meeting venues will be determined by the committee prior to
the meeting. Any meeting may be cancelled or postponed by majority vote of those in
attendance at any meeting prior to the meeting being cancelled or postponed.

Section 2. The CAC meetings are subject to the Ralph M. Brown Act,
Government Code Section 54950, et seq.
Section 3. Attendance being of prime importance to maintain contact between constituents and committee, attendance of members is required at all meetings. Should a member be unable to attend a meeting they should notify the Clerk to the Committee before the meeting. Should any member have more than two (2) unexcused absences in a calendar year, the Chair shall send the member a reminder of the attendance policy. Any member who is absent for four (4) regularly scheduled meetings during a calendar year shall automatically be terminated. Any resulting vacancy shall be filled for the duration of the departing member’s term.

Section 4. Any Committee member can have an item placed on the agenda by notifying the Clerk to the Committee seventy-two (72) hours prior to the meeting.

ARTICLE IV – SUBCOMMITTEES

Section 1. Subcommittees and Ad Hoc Committees may be established by the Chairperson as necessary.

Section 2. Each subcommittee shall consist of at least three (3) CAC members, one (1) delegate from each county, appointed by the CAC Chairperson.

ARTICLE V – PARLIAMENTARY AUTHORITY

Section 1. The rules contained within the current edition of Robert's Rules of Order (Newly Revised) shall govern the CAC in all cases to which they are applicable and in which they are not inconsistent with these by-laws, and any special rules of order the CAC may adopt.
Section 2. A quorum is defined as a majority of seats currently filled. All official acts of the Committee shall require a quorum of seats currently filled.

ARTICLE VI – AMENDMENT OF BY-LAWS

These by-laws may be amended at any regular meeting of the CAC by a two-thirds (2/3) vote of the CAC members present and voting, provided that the amendment has been submitted in writing at the previous regular meeting.

ARTICLE VII – CONFLICT OF INTEREST

There shall be no personal or monetary gain by members of the CAC as a result of their membership and actions on the CAC. Reimbursement for expenses that may be authorized by the Executive Director from time to time shall not be deemed to be compensation.

ARTICLE VIII – MAJORITY/MINORITY REPORTS

CAC members may elect to present separate reports on decisions and actions by the CAC under the following circumstances: A majority report will reflect at least two-thirds (2/3) of the CAC members present and voting. A minority report will reflect at least twenty-five percent (25%) of the CAC members present and voting.
ARTICLE IX – ORDER OF BUSINESS

The Order of business for a regular meeting shall be as follows:

a. CALL TO ORDER
b. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG
c. ROLL CALL
d. MINUTES - Approval
e. CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT
f. PUBLIC COMMENTS – At this time persons in the audience may speak on any item on the agenda or any other matter within the jurisdiction of the committee. The Brown Act (the State local agency open meeting law) prohibits the CAC from acting on any matter that is not on the agenda. It is the policy of committee to refer such matters to staff for investigation and/or action. Speakers are requested to fill out a "speaker" card located on the table by the door and hand it to staff before the meeting. The Chair may limit speakers to three minutes each.

g. PUBLIC HEARINGS
h. COMMITTEE COMMENTS
i. PENDING ACTION REPORTS
j. STAFF REPORTS
k. OLD BUSINESS
l. NEW BUSINESS
m. OTHER ISSUES
n. ADJOURNMENT
JPB CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
BYLAWS

JPB CAC By-laws Subcommittee
Prepared by:

Jerry Graham – JPB CAC SMC
Bruce Balshone – JPB CAC SFC
Mike Rodriguez – JPB CAC SCC

May 2, 2002
JPB Resolution No. 2002-13

Amended July 1, 2010
JPB Resolution No. 2010-33

Amended December 15, 2010
CAC Motion

Amended March 1, 2012
JPB Motion

Amended December 4, 2014
JPB Resolution No. 2014-54
2015 JPB CAC Work Plan

April 15
- Update on new cars
- CalMod update #1
- CalMod update #2

May 20
- Budget process, funding, etc.
- Service levels – How service levels are decided, when changes are made, what factors are involved

June 17
- Homeless encampments / right of way cleanup
- Service disruption discussion

July 15
- CalMod update
- High-speed rail update

August 19
- Rolling stock overview
- ADA improvements

September 16
- Caltrain Corridor tenants

October 21
- Cal Mod update

November 18

December 16