December 16, 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 November 18, 2015

4. Public Comment (5:50 p.m.)
   Public testimony by each individual speaker shall be limited to three minutes

5. Committee Comments (6:00 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 (Alex Sweet) (6:10 p.m.)
   a) Appointment of 2016 Officer Nominating Committee

7. **Advise the Board to Take Action to Improve Customer Service** (Jonathan Berk) (6:15 p.m.)

8. Caltrain Modernization Quarterly Update
   (Casey Fromson) (6:35 p.m.)

9. Support Adoption of Updated Bicycle Parking Rules and Regulations (Jim Castaneda) (6:55 p.m.)

10. **Lost and Found Policy and Program** (Jim Castaneda) (7:15 p.m.)

11. Staff Report (Danielle Stewart) (7:35 p.m.)
   a) **JPB CAC Work Plan**
   b) **Caltrain Corridor Tenants**

12. Date, Time and Place of Next Meeting
    January 20, 2016 at 5:40 p.m., San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building, 2nd Floor Bacciocco Auditorium, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA

13. Adjournment

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.
MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 18, 2015

MEMBERS PRESENT:  J. Berk, C. Cobey (Chair), A. Lee, A. Levin, Y. Mills, G. Scharff, B. Shaw

MEMBERS ABSENT:  A. Sweet, C. Tucker

STAFF PRESENT:  J. Averill, M. Bouchard, C. Kwok, A. Maguigad, D. Stewart

Chair Chris Cobey called the meeting to order at 5:40 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 16, 2015
Motion/Second: Mills/Scharff
Ayes: Berk, Lee, Levin, Mills, Scharff, Shaw, Cobey
Absent: Sweet, Tucker

PUBLIC COMMENT
Doug DeLong, Mountain View, congratulated staff on the successful change out of the Tilton Avenue Bridge in San Mateo. Caltrain managed to do a very complicated construction task over the weekend and get service restored afterward.

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, asked how much capacity Caltrain increases by replacing four bridges that don’t need replacing. He said he drove to this meeting because it is only way to get here on time and get home afterward. The Hillsdale station will have an island platform. This is a heavy rail operation. If Caltrain does not know how to design stations, someone else should take over. He asked why this is the only CAC that recites the pledge of allegiance.

April Maguigad, Manager, Rail Operations, introduced Michelle Bouchard, the new Chief Operating Officer, Rail. Ms. Bouchard said it is nice to be back to the JPB. She said she was not gone very long, but much has changed since she left. She wants to guide the staff through some years of transition. The path toward electrification and bringing Positive Train Control (PTC) online is exciting in the rail industry.

COMMITTEE COMMENTS
Chair Cobey asked to add automated enforcement of railroad crossing violations to the work plan. Ms. Maguigad said she will look to see if it makes sense to put it on the work plan.
Jonathan Berk said if the CAC is supposed to exceed the standards of the Brown Act the law would have been written differently. He said he was on a train yesterday that might have hit a pedestrian, but the communications were not clear. The train was 30 minutes late and the crew needed to be replaced. The train was blocking all railroads. Caltrain decided to inconvenience the entire ridership by 30 minutes to replace the crew. The whole system came to a stop. Customer service does not count at Caltrain, and the only formal place to say anything is this committee.

Ms. Maguigad said the train crew made a decision based on the fact that they thought the train had hit a person. The crew had a traumatic event and had issues to work through.

Annie Lee said riders told her the train was 30 minutes late at Palo Alto and there were no announcements about which train it was. She said conductors need to be reminded to make announcements or label the trains, or show on the Predictive Arrival/Departure System which train is at the station. She said earlier this month she took Train 376 and it is the most congested southbound train. She suggested staff consider shifting trainsets to use Bombardier trains for crowded trains. Ms. Maguigad said Gallery trains are used where there is large bike ridership.

Ms. Lee said there is a safety concern about exiting the train safely. She said the number of passengers should be prioritized over bike capacity. Bikes should not be on crowded trains.

Adina Levin said she would like a report about automated enforcement if it is not going to be agendized. She said someone tried to report a safety issue to 1-800-SAF-RAIL but the customer service agent was not polite. She asked where the right place is to report safety issues is. Ms. Maguigad said 1-800-SAF-RAIL goes to the transit police, not customer service. She said the customer should call Caltrain customer service depending on the nature of the concern.

Ms. Levin said she appreciates Gallery cars with bike capacity because only bicyclists are denied service. She is okay with being uncomfortable in a crowded car if bicyclists are allowed to ride. She would like an update on wayside bike facilities.

Brian Shaw said he was on the train that got stuck in Burlingame a few weeks ago and on the train that had an incident last night. He said there is a complete lack of understanding and appreciation of the customers’ situation, lack of communications, and he has seen better treatment to customers from airlines. He said six weeks have occurred since the change in protocols from the Burlingame incident, but he has not seen any changes. There is no margin for error; when the railroad goes down it affects thousands of people and makes challenging conditions worse. He asked to agendize a discussion on the changes to incident management.

Yvonne Mills said she does not know what the process is to handle incidents on the railroad. She asked when and why a train crew would be changed out. She said outreach to customers would give perspective.
Greg Scharff said would like more information about incident responses. It can be challenging with the rules around unionized employees. He said it is frustrating that it is hard for the CAC to make motions especially on small things and staff hides behind the Brown Act. He said he can go talk to the Board about this.

Mr. Berk said in the years he has been on the committee the only customer service issue that has been addressed is stopping the trains from leaving early. Caltrain does not have quiet cars, the trains aren’t labeled, or many other things. He asked to agendize an item called customer service with a motion that expresses the CACs concern about customer service in general where many examples of the problem are listed.

Chair Cobey said he would like a consensus to agendize the items discussed for action. Josh Averill, Assistant District Secretary, said Chair Cobey had a conversation with Martha Martinez, Executive Officer, District Secretary/Executive Administration, on the process for action items. Unless the action is established ahead of time and can be agendized, it has to be a two-month process where a topic is agendized, discussed at the meeting where it is agendized, an action is developed at that meeting, and the action is agendized for a future meeting. If the action item is already identified without first going through a discussion with the CAC, it would only be a one-month process where the action and discussion can be agendized at one meeting.

Chair Cobey said according to the standards of the agency, as per Ms. Martinez’s direction, the statement of the motion itself has to be on the agenda. The Brown Act itself says only a brief description is necessary. Mr. Averill said the agenda must provide a clear overview of what will be discussed and what action to be considered so the public will be informed by the agenda what will take place and what the CAC will take action on at the meeting.

Mr. Scharff said that is a completely unreasonable interpretation. He said he is going to talk to Board members about this.

Chair Cobey said it has a stifling effect on the committee.

Mr. Averill said the agency is also concerned about being as transparent as possible because there are members of the public who are interested in attending these meetings and they have a right to know what the group is going to be discussing. Mr. Scharff said everyone feels strongly about being transparent.

Ms. Maguigad said if staff does not know which way the CAC is going to want to comment or recommend something for action, it is impossible to make it clear on the agenda what action would be taken, especially on broad items like potential increases in service. Staff would have no idea what motion the CAC would want to make. The public would not know either. This is where the two-meeting process would take place where the first meeting would establish what the CAC’s recommendations are and the second meeting would be for action on those recommendations.

Chair Cobey said there is significant discontent on the CAC about what is allowed to be agendized for action.
Ms. Maguigad said perhaps Ms. Martinez could come to a CAC meeting to discuss how motions are put on agendas and the rationale behind it.

Mr. Berk said the CAC extensively discussed the question of service increases at the last meeting. He asked why there could not be action at this meeting. Mr. Averill said the CAC did not establish or define an action at the last meeting to put onto this month’s meeting agenda.

Ms. Levin asked if the items discussed here today will be agendized. Ms. Maguigad incident management specifically related to what happened on September 25, what happens in a fatality and the pieces of response management, and a discussion about the Brown Act and how to move forward on discussion items that might turn into motions.

Mr. Shaw said the CAC needs to be educated on customer service processes and regulations it has to follow, which would include incident management. Then the CAC could see if there is anything that the CAC might be able to adjust.

Ms. Mills said incident management and customer service should be different discussion topics.

Mr. Berk said the CAC should not worry about how the CAC manages customer service. He said the CAC should document the problems with customer service and send that documentation to the Board. If the Board then feels they agree with the CAC, since the Board runs Caltrain the Board can then put it into place action to address the CAC’s concerns.

Ms. Mills said even when laws and regulations and processes are being followed sometimes it appears to the customer that nothing is being done. If the CAC understood the process better, the CAC would be able to evaluate whether something is really not happening or if something is happening that the CAC can’t be told about at the time or if there is something the CAC can do to make a difference.

Mr. Berk left at 6:26 p.m.

Public Comment
Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said he discussed automatic enforcement of railroad crossing violations with Burlingame but Burlingame pushed back because they had a bad experience with automatic red light enforcements. Caltrain should have an automatic system that stops trains if something is on the tracks. If Caltrain builds new stations they should have four tracks so trains will be able to get by when one track is blocked. He said SamTrans does the administration for Caltrain and it is costing $20 million a year. The Board can terminate the agreement every year in June. Transit America Services, Inc. (TASI) is on a five-year contract with one-year extensions.

Jeff Carter, Millbrae, said the CAC should understand how other agencies handle incidents and customer service to compare how Caltrain handles similar situations.
would be worthwhile to look into how other agencies handle their advisory committees regarding the Brown Act. He said Caltrain has to increase capacity. The new Bombardiers should be put into service.

CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT
Chair Cobey said Ms. Levin reported the CAC activities to the Board at their last meeting.

2016 Meeting Calendar
Chair Cobey said the 2016 meeting calendar is in the agenda packet.

DISCUSSION ABOUT WHETHER THERE IS OPPORTUNITY FOR INCREASED SERVICE
Ms. Maguigad said last month the CAC discussed the fact that Caltrain will be making tweaks to its schedule to accommodate construction projects. The CAC expressed their desire to add service between now and electrification. Ms. Maguigad provided this information to management who discussed the issue and provided feedback. Ms. Maguigad said with respect to connectivity to Bay Area Rapid Transit and other regional partners, staff will share the new schedule with those partners and work with them as much as possible on connectivity options. Those partners have to make decisions that work best for them and their service. It will always be difficult to match every station with every connecting partner, but staff will be working with them on schedule changes.

Ms. Maguigad brought the possibility of future tweaks to station stop patterns or additional service to management. Staff needs more time to come up with firm answer about whether additional service can be provided. Staff is developing a new schedule to improve the reliability of the system now, mostly based on dwell times, and staff is at the tail end of the analysis and hopes to build the schedule soon. The Generation 2 cars refurbishment and capacity expansion is underway. Staff is finalizing the work windows of the capital programs that need to get done in advance of electrification. Additional trains could cut into the productivity for the capital or maintenance work and needs to be balanced. Once these issues are worked through, staff will be in a better position to review and evaluate service suggestions. Above all else, staff wants reliability for the customer and to deliver a consistently quality product. The only place for service additions is in the peak. With the current signal system and rolling stock, it is not feasible. Staff wants to make data-driven choices, which takes time. Staff wants to provide customers a reliable schedule given the capacity constraints.

Mr. Shaw asked at what point the crowded conditions get to such an issue that something else is going to have to be done if Caltrain cannot add capacity. Bikes are constrained because of some configuration limitation. At some point the trains will get so crowded that more people cannot get on them. If there is no capacity improvement process, there needs to be a plan to mitigate demand. He said he would like to hear how Caltrain plans to deal with the demand. Ms. Maguigad said the JPB purchased extra train cars in order to lengthen trains knowing that Caltrain can’t add more service. That is part of what is being done to increase capacity.
Mr. Shaw said some of the trains are so crowded people can’t even move through them. He asked what Caltrain is going to do to mitigate overcrowding. Caltrain is going to have to mitigate demand.

Mr. Cobey asked if there any plans other than adding cars, or if customers are just going to have to deal with more and more people onboard. Ms. Maguigad said staff is going to break down a train consist and add those cars to other train consists to lengthen the sets in the fleet.

Ms. Bouchard said there has been a pledge to add a third bike car to the six-car Bombardier sets. Six cars are being retrofitted and will be added to mix. With the remainder of the cars, the work will be finished by TASI as early as late spring, and then a sixth six-car Bombardier set will be added to the fleet. After that, staff will break up and retrofit Gallery cars so some the Gallery sets can be extended to six cars. This would constitute a significant capacity increase because about 10 trainsets would be extended to six cars. The reliability work being done on the schedule is important for many reasons. It will cause staff to look at how staff strings together train and crew couplets. That gives staff opportunity to look at how trains turn for other trains and potentially redeploy some of the six-car sets onto some schedules that need them. It is important that staff takes time to make the schedule right, get it operating, and then see how much track time it will give the electrification contractor to do their work. Staff does not want to cut service to enable construction, and staff wants to make the service reliable.

Ms. Levin said she would like an update on the progress of supporting customers who use bicycles. People who use bikes don’t use them as a hobby, but as a part of their last mile commute. Off board storage and bike share helps the last-mile need. Understanding where there is crowding and where there will be alternatives for people will help address the crowding issue.

Ms. Levin said there are potential equity issues with congestion pricing or off-peak discounts, but they are things to consider that do not involve adding trains but add a financial incentive to use the capacity that is there. She said she would like a quarterly report about additional cars, schedule changes, bicycles as they relate to congestion, and anything to do with pricing related to congestion and service levels.

Mr. Shaw said Caltrain does not charge a rush-hour premium for riding the trains that are the most congested in the system, but almost every other transit system he has ridden does. That is why trains are so crowded. This is how demand is managed.

Ms. Levin said Caltrain should have inter-county buses since it is a three-county system. She would like this to be considered to address demand.

Mr. Scharff said demand should continue to be increased in order to get people out of their cars. The demand needs to be spread out to other trains. He does not intend to advocate raising the price in order to force people off the train and drive instead.
Public Comment
Jeff Carter, Millbrae, said he does not agree with raising the price for peak trains. Chicago does not have peak pricing. Some cities do. It is regressive to force people to take more time and go out of their way to use a cheaper train. He said he doesn’t want to price people to where they’re going to drive. If bikes were banned, Caltrain would have to add thousands of parking spaces or seats on other transit systems to provide first- and last-mile rides.

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said Caltrain plans to change the schedule to meet train performance instead of changing performance to meet the schedule. He said $2 billion will be spent on electrification and will produce less capacity than Caltrain has now. Caltrain needs new trains. Gallery cars were supposed to be replaced between 2012 and 2015. Caltrain can’t afford to wait. If a customer wants to leave a bike at a station locker, the customer has to pay a fee, but bringing bikes onboard is free.

Andy Chow, Redwood City, said one way to address capacity is to use the bus option. In Seattle, buses runs between train stations during off-peak times. SamTrans already operates the KX, which goes to San Francisco from Redwood City. It would be a good idea for Caltrain passes that are good to San Francisco to be valid on that bus. Ms. Maguigad said if a customer has a monthly ticket that has two or more zones on it, the customer can use SamTrans buses.

Ms. Lee said the KX should run from Palo Alto.

SUPPORT STAFF RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO CODIFIED TARIFF (FARE AND PARKING FEE CHANGES)
Christiane Kwok, Manager, Market Research and Development, said the proposal was presented at a previous CAC meeting. The proposal is for a 50-cent increase on the base fare effective February 28, which will impact the Day Pass, 8-Ride, and Monthly passes. A 15 percent discount will be provided on Clipper if customers use the one-way ticket. On July 1, there will be a 50-cent increase on daily parking and $5 increase on the monthly parking permit. Staff recommends this fare change to support the increase in operating and maintenance needs and to support the Strategic Plan focus areas, which are the financial stability for the agency since the JPB does not have a dedicated funding source, and increasing returns from existing revenue streams, one being the farebox revenue. During the JPB Board meeting in November, the Board requested a financial evaluation on a two-step increase for the fares. The revenue impact on the budget for a one-step increase would be about $10.6 million, but with the two-step increase the impact would be $6.8 million, a difference of 42 percent. With the parking increase, the budget impact would be $400,000 annually.

Ms. Kwok said 54 comments were received from the public. When the proposal was presented to the CAC, members asked if the base fare increase would impact more low-income riders. Staff looked at the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) origin/destination survey from last year and the number of zones low-income riders traveled. About 70 percent of riders with household incomes less than $25,000 travel between two and three zones, 12 to 15 percent travel within one zone. Ms. Kwok said staff will be conducting a comprehensive fare study in the future.
Mr. Shaw said the fare increase is a flat amount, 50 cents across every zone, and is not equitable across distance traveled. He does not see what the additional money will do and what it is needed for and how staff is justifying the increases. Ms. Kwok said the increase on the base versus the zone is because staff flip-flops on the increase. Last time there was a system-wide increase, the zone fare increased. In the same year there was a base fare increase. An increase based on the zone would impact more low-income riders. Different scenarios were reviewed including a 25-cent increase on the base, a 25-cent increase on the zone, a 10 to 15 percent discount on Clipper, and other elements to see if the result would match what the Short-Range Transit Plan (SRTP) called for in terms of balancing the budget. This would include increasing operations costs and projects coming down the pipeline such as PTC.

Mr. Scharff asked if the amount of money this would raise has been decided based on the needs of the future. Ms. Kwok said the SRTP guided this decision and that is how the $10.6 million was determined.

Mr. Scharff asked what the eligible discounts are. Ms. Kwok said it is a 50 percent discount of the adult fare. These are for seniors, persons with disabilities, and youth.

Ms. Maguigad said the discount for seniors and persons with disabilities are mandated by the Federal Transit Administration.

Mr. Scharff said given how crowded the trains are, perhaps Caltrain should not give discounts on peak trains if they don’t have to. He asked if it could be looked into. Ms. Kwok said the study could take a look at it.

Mr. Scharff asked why the parking is only increasing 50 cents. It is very cheap. He said in Palo Alto it costs $16.50 for a daily pass. He asked what the rationale is for raising parking 50 cents. Ms. Kwok said she assumes staff compared how much revenue would come in depending on how much the increase would be and the impact it would have on the budget.

Mr. Scharff said he does not have enough information to support this increase. He does not know why Caltrain is asking for this increase and the reasons behind it.

Ms. Shaw said the CAC is lacking the understanding of how Caltrain got to their projected expense line to justify the need to increase the revenue. He asked where the need for the additional expense is coming from, what it is going to do, if it is based on labor rates or fuel or something else. He said there are no service changes to justify changes, and asked what the expenses are that require additional revenue.

Ms. Bouchard said staff completed the SRTP that provides a trend using a financial model that would match cost with revenues. Caltrain does not make money, so the JPB tries to keep a robust farebox recovery ratio. There are cost drivers that are coming up, and staff is trying to cover those cost increases. PTC is coming online, which will cost millions a year to maintain, electrification and the new Electric Multiple Units will be coming onboard, which will generate operating costs, and since the entire fleet is not
being replaced, there will be some of the existing diesel fleet that needs to be maintained. As the cars age, they cost more to maintain. She said Caltrain used to have off-peak pricing, but when the last fare study was conducted it led to the proof-of-payment system and took ticket sales off the train. That was the last time a broad overview of the fare structure was done. She said staff tries to keep fares in line with similar regional and national systems.

Ms. Levin said she is not comfortable with the logic behind which fare increases are being addressed to reach the goal. After Caltrain goes through the fare analysis and has a thought through recommendation for the fare structure, she would be more comfortable. People in Palo Alto can cheat and take a parking spot away from a Caltrain commuter to pay a lower parking price. Many people are priced out of Caltrain. Private charities are helping to provide equitable access to Caltrain, but that should not have to happen.

Ms. Maguigad said this item is about a fare increase, not the fare structure study. Staff may review these concerns in the study. The purpose here tonight is regarding this fare increase.

Ms. Levin said the Communications-based Overlay Signal System (CBOSS) cost increase is driving this need, and CBOSS operation will cost $4 million a year. She said CBOSS is for increased automation and that increased automation should drive costs down, not up. Ms. Bouchard said PTC is not about automation. PTC is a safety system. The PTC system being implemented should not even kick in if the train operator is operating the train in a proper fashion. The PTC system is very sophisticated and because of that, a lot of wayside interface units and other elements have been added that need to be maintained. PTC tells accurately where the train is, so there is a huge amount of database and configuration management on an everyday basis required. The accuracy of the database is paramount to making sure PTC stops the train where it is supposed to in the event it kicks in. There are a lot of skills and resources needed in terms of staff and contracts to maintain the system.

Ms. Levin said she would be more comfortable supporting a comprehensive change. That hasn’t been done yet.

Ms. Lee said she would like to see what the constraints are and why the JPB is aiming for 65 percent farebox revenue recovery. There is an expected increase in ridership. She asked what parameters the JPB is working with. She said the CAC needs to be brought onboard with the assumptions that are being used.

Public Comment
Jeff Carter, Millbrae, said Caltrain needs dedicated funding. Caltrain should go to point-to-point pricing to make things more equitable. Caltrain riders are paying more than other transit systems. There should be a better way to compare the different systems.

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said the CAC should go to the Board without a recommendation because there is not enough information. Caltrain does not have a
structural deficit, SamTrans is broke. SamTrans got $43 million from MTC and used $5.4 million to match the other JPB partners. He said MTC said 30 percent of this increase is due to increased salaries and benefits, and expenses are increasing higher than service. Electrification will provide fewer seats and will be more expensive.

Doug DeLong, Mountain View, said Caltrain should have low-income fares. The MTC is studying how to deal with it. The difference between expenses and revenue for Caltrain is made up by operating subsidies from the three counties. That money gets taken away from other public transit service in those counties. The more deficit Caltrain runs, the less bus or trolley service there is in the counties. He questioned why the parking fee isn’t going up $6 or $10. This is the proposal that has been put out and it can’t be altered at this point in the process.

Ms. Levin said MTC’s study may not address Caltrain because most low-income people use bus service.

Mr. Scharff said he would move that the CAC decline to support the staff recommendation based on the fact that they were not provided enough information to make an informed decision.

Ms. Mills said the CAC would be naive to say costs aren’t going up. She asked what the basis is for the CAC’s decline to recommend the changes. She said she does not disagree there is a need for increased revenue, but she does not agree with the formula used to determine the change.

Mr. Shaw said the CAC was not presented with adequate information about alternatives to this increase. Until the CAC receives information about the implications to not moving forward in this direction, he is not inclined to support the proposal.

Mr. Scharff said the staff report does not say why Caltrain needs the money. It does not say there will be a deficit.

Ms. Levin said the CAC needs to know why Caltrain needs a fare increase to keep up with costs and why it needs this specific fare increase.

Ms. Bouchard said she understands the discussion and doesn’t dispute that if the CAC had received the same PowerPoint the Board will get it might have furthered the CAC’s understanding. She said the CAC should re-consider deferring decisions about increasing revenue until the study is done because the study is not scoped out or funded yet. If the CAC waits until that happens, the opportunity to follow the path outlined to cover operating costs may pass.

Mr. Scharff said he is not suggesting that the CAC not recommend changes to the fare, just that the CAC does not have enough information to support a recommendation.

Motion to not support the staff recommendation to adopt a revised codified tariff based on the fact that the CAC was not provided enough information to make an informed decision.
Motion/Second: Scharff/Shaw
Ayes: Lee, Levin, Mills, Scharff, Shaw, Cobey
Absent: Berk, Sweet, Tucker

Mr. Scharff left at 8:10 p.m.

STAFF REPORT

Work Plan
Ms. Maguigad said a 2016 Officer Nominating Committee will be appointed in December for January’s elections.

Staff Report
  • The Tilton Avenue Bridge was replaced on November 7. The first bus bridge had fairly big delays. Staff has looked at what all those factors were and will continue meeting until the next bus bridge on December 19 to remedy the issues. The third of the four bridges will be replaced in February.
  • The Holiday Train, sponsored by the Silicon Valley Community Foundation, is coming back on December 5 and 6 and will accept toy donations.
  • Last month the CAC received a public comment about Clipper, which was forwarded to customer service who are working on it.
  • September on-time performance (OTP) was 86.2 percent, but nearly 60 percent of the trains that were delayed arrived within 10 minutes of the scheduled arrival time. When trains that arrived within 10 minutes are included, the OPT was 94.4 percent.
  • Average Weekday Ridership was up in September to 62,833.
  • This is Ms. Maguigad’s last meeting. She has accepted another position with a different agency. Danielle Stewart, Acting Director, Rail Operations, will be the CAC liaison.

Ms. Levin said the person she mentioned earlier who called 1-800-SAF-RAIL was calling because she saw a person on the tracks who might have been suicidal. Ms. Levin said the people who answer those phones should have compassion, so she encouraged the caller to write to the Board and CAC about this experience. Ms. Maguigad said the person should contact Caltrain customer service to get that complaint logged into the system. This would give staff the opportunity to investigate the complaint.

Ms. Levin said she would like to hear a report back on this issue. Ms. Maguigad said the transit police answer those phones, which is the San Mateo County Sheriff’s Office, so she is not sure what can and cannot be reported out.

Ms. Lee asked how much of the OTP statistics are peak versus off peak. Most delays are during the peak and she would like an indication of the temporal variability in the statistics, or normalizing the OTP with ridership to get a more accurate idea of how many people are getting delayed.

Public Comment
Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said Ms. Bouchard gave an extensive report about the corrective actions that were taken regarding the Burlingame incident at the Board
meeting. He said the system cannot grow any more, and so the increase in ridership is slowing.

**DATE, TIME AND LOCATION OF NEXT MEETING:**
December 16, 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 8:23 p.m.
FROM: Jonathan B. Berk
TO: JPB Citizens Advisory Committee
DATE: December 6, 2015
RE: Motion for consideration at the regular meeting of December 16, 2015

Motion: The current level of customer service on Caltrain is unacceptable.

Background

The current level of customer service is well below the standard that is acceptable. In the last two years the CAC has brought a number of service deficiencies to the attention of Caltrain staff. These deficiencies are detailed below. In each case the deficiency falls below the minimum standard a customer should expect on a commuter railroad. This problem is serious and demands immediate attention.

Service Deficiencies

The major service deficiencies that have been identified by the CAC are:

- In the face of a steady increase in the number of Caltrain users, Caltrain has apparently developed no plan for the expansion of service until electrification, which is likely at least 5 years away. Even with the addition of the extra cars that were recently purchased, many express trains are currently at capacity, yet there appears to be no plan in place to handle the large projected increase in passenger volume in the next 5 years. While management attributes this increase to the introduction of baby bullet service, they have yet to develop any plans for expanding the baby bullet service beyond the current times it is offered.

- When an incident occurs that disrupts service, there appears to be no consistent, effective emergency response plan in place. Nor is there a system that reliably informs customers of the extent of the problem and the likely outcome. Examples abound of a response that aggravated what was already a poor customer experience. Members of the CAC themselves have repeated personal experience with this acute problem.

- Trains are inadequately labeled.1 As a result, once the train pulls into the station a passenger has no idea which stations the train will be stopping at. This problem is particularly acute when the trains are not running on time.

---

1 The only identifying characteristic on a train is a display, either on the outside corner of the lead car, or in the center of the engine, of the last two digits of the train
- The information system on the platform informing customers about which train is arriving identifies trains by train number, with no reference to which stops the train is making. Identifying trains by number alone is akin to an airline listing flights by flight number alone rather than destination city. In addition the system is often inaccurate. The system indicates that a train is arriving before it arrives. Sometimes, prior to the train’s arrival, the train disappears from the system so that passengers on the platform are uninformed about which train is pulling into the station.
- In response to customer complaints (especially about Giants baseball trains), the CAC requested that Caltrain staff consider experimenting with a quiet car on each train. The idea was rejected by staff citing the increased need for enforcement. The idea was not revisited even after it was pointed out that quiet cars are self enforcing, and that it would be impossible to tell if they would improve the customer experience without running an experiment.
- Caltrain continues to not provide WiFi service on its trains.
- The on time performance of the system is in decline.

number. There is nothing on the train that identifies what this number means. Once the train pulls into the station the two-digit number is no longer visible.
TO: JPB CAC

FROM: Michelle Bouchard Danielle Stewart
Chief Operating Officer, Rail Acting Director, Rail Operations

SUBJECT: CAC’S MOTION TO ADVISE THE BOARD TO TAKE ACTION TO IMPROVE CUSTOMER SERVICE

Staff supports the JPB CAC’s proposed motion on the current level of customer service on Caltrain being unacceptable.

Staff concurs that the various projects identified in Committee Member Jonathan Berk’s report would enhance or meet the customer experience on Caltrain. Staff recommends an appointment of an ad hoc committee or expanding the Train Identification and Schedule Communication ad hoc committee to collaborate with staff to address the concerns and come back to the committee with updates.
TO: JPB CAC

FROM: Jim Castaneda
    Director, Safety and Risk Management

SUBJECT: UPDATED BICYCLE PARKING RULES & REGULATIONS

ACTION
Staff requests the CAC support the recommendation to the Board to adopt the revised Bicycle Parking and Bicycle/Skateboard Use regulations previously adopted by the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) pursuant to Resolution No. 2002-39. The existing regulations govern the use and parking of bicycles, scooters, skates, rollerblades, skateboards and similar equipment (Personal Transportation Vehicles) on JPB property. The revised regulations (Rules & Regulations) expand the existing regulations to provide for removal of such equipment by authorized personnel when parked, stored or abandoned in violation of existing laws and regulations, or when the placement, storage or parking creates an unsafe condition.

SIGNIFICANCE
Existing regulations do not address the removal of improperly stored, parked or abandoned Personal Transportation Vehicles. Improper parking and placement of such equipment can create tripping hazards, obstruct routes of ingress and egress, and interfere with access for individuals with disabilities. In addition, abandoned Personal Transportation Vehicles can contribute to an environment that is conducive to blight, can be inviting of theft and nuisance activity, and can make the discovery of other potentially dangerous conditions more difficult.

Approval of this recommendation will allow the Transit Police or other authorized personnel to legally move, remove and/or cause the controlled storage of such items in accordance with the procedures set forth in Exhibit A, and will aid in increasing public safety and reducing conditions conducive to blight and criminal conduct in and about the transit system.

Abandoned Personal Transportation Vehicles will be disposed of in accordance with the JPB's Lost and Unclaimed Property Policy.

BUDGET IMPACT
No fiscal impact is anticipated and additional funding is not required.
BACKGROUND
The proposed Rules & Regulations are consistent with the practices of other transit agencies and with guiding principles identified by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security and the American Public Transportation Association for the purpose of improving system safety and security. Removing abandoned Personal Transportation Vehicles will also create more space for legitimate Personal Transportation Vehicle use and parking.

Staff will also be seeking feedback from the Caltrain Bicycle Advisory Committee.

AUTHORITY
Various provisions of California law provide the JPB with authority to enforce the Rules & Regulations including, but not limited to, California Penal Code Section 640 and California Vehicle Code Sections 21113, 21210 and 42001.

Transit agencies may enforce regulations, rules and/or restrictions on, in and about transit system properties, facilities and vehicles, provided that appropriate signage is provided and a resolution that lists and explains the conditions and regulations is on file and available for public inspection at the agency’s headquarters.

Prepared by: Jim Castaneda, Director, Safety and Risk Management
The San Mateo County Transit District (District) provides public transportation services within San Mateo County, San Francisco County and Santa Clara County, California. The District is also the managing agency of the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB), a joint powers agency that provides Caltrain passenger rail service between San Francisco and Gilroy. These Rules & Regulations apply to the use and parking of all bicycles, scooters and other similar personal transportation vehicles on all District and JPB Property.

(a) Definitions:

The term “contracted operator” means any railroad corporation that operates public rail commuter transit services of any kind for the JPB.

The term “District” means the San Mateo County Transit District.

The term “District Property” means all property owned or used by the District in furtherance of the operation of SamTrans.

The term “JPB” means the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board.

The term “JPB Property” means all property owned or used by the JPB in furtherance of the operation of Caltrain.

The term "personal transportation vehicle" means a device having one or more wheels upon which a person may ride. “Personal transportation vehicle” includes, but is not limited to, bicycles, mopeds, unicycles, tricycles, skateboards, scooters, roller-skates, roller-blades or similar equipment, whether human-, gas- or electric-powered. “Personal transportation vehicle” does not mean motorcycles, Segways or automobiles.

(b) No person may ride, use or operate personal transportation vehicles on any District Property or JPB Property, except to transition through District or JPB parking lots in order to get to and from a bus station, rail station, or transit center. At no time may personal transportation vehicles be ridden, used or operated aboard busses or trains, or in pedestrian tunnels, ramps or other walkways, or in violation of other applicable state or local laws. When using personal transportation vehicles on District or JPB Property, users may not use them in an unsafe or negligent manner, or in such a way that would potentially cause property damage or result in personal injury. Abandonment of personal transportation vehicles on District or JPB Property is prohibited.

(c) Personal transportation vehicles, and part(s) thereof, may be left, parked, or stored in or on District Property and JPB Property only in areas specifically designated by the presence of bicycle racks, lockers, sheds, or other similar devices, or in areas designated
by the posting of signs indicating the space as a bicycle parking area (collectively, "bicycle parking area").

(d) No personal transportation vehicle, or part(s) thereof, may be left, parked or stored on District Property or JPB Property for a period of more than 72 hours.

(e) Whenever a personal transportation vehicle, or part(s) thereof, has been left, parked or stored in, on District or JPB Property other than in a bicycle parking area, and whenever it appears that a personal transportation vehicle has been left, parked or stored in a bicycle parking area for a period of 48 or more hours, a representative of the District or JPB may attach a 72-hour Warning Notice Tag (sample attached herein), thereby notifying the owner that the personal transportation vehicle is subject to impoundment as set forth in these Rules & Regulations.

Enforcement and Impoundment Procedures

(f) Any person operating, leaving, parking or storing a personal transportation vehicle in violation of these Rules & Regulations, or other federal, state or local regulations or laws, may be cited by the District’s/JPB’s contracted law enforcement provider ("Transit Police") pursuant to the California Vehicle Code (including sections 21113 and 42001) and/or the California Penal Code (including section 640).

(g) Any personal transportation vehicle left, parked, or stored on District or JPB Property in violation of these Rules & Regulations, or other federal, state or local regulations or laws, may be removed by the Transit Police or other authorized personnel in accordance with these Rules & Regulations, the California Vehicle Code (including sections 21113 and 42001), and/or the California Penal Code (including section 640).

(h) If the Transit Police or other authorized District or JPB employee or agent, including but not limited to the JPB’s contracted operator, (collectively “Bicycle Parking Enforcement Officers”) reasonably believes that a personal transportation vehicle, or part(s) thereof, has been left in such a manner as to constitute an immediate safety hazard or an obstruction to the District’s or JPB’s use of District or JPB Property, or has been reported stolen to a law enforcement agency, the owner may be cited and/or their personal transportation vehicle may be removed and impounded without notice, unless otherwise required by law. Bicycle Parking Enforcement Officers will use whatever reasonable measures are necessary to impound the personal transportation vehicle, including removing any lock or other securing mechanism. Alternatively, Bicycle Parking Enforcement Officers may ask local law enforcement officers, consistent with applicable law, to impound and cite a personal transportation vehicle which is left, parked or stored in violation of any section of these Rules & Regulations without further notice. Neither Bicycle Parking Enforcement Officers authorized to remove and impound a personal transportation vehicle in this manner, nor the District or JPB, will be liable to the owner of the securing device or the owner of the personal transportation vehicle for the cost of repair of the personal transportation vehicle or the repair or replacement of such securing device.

(i) For any personal transportation vehicle, or part(s) thereof, to which a 72-hour Warning Notice Tag has been attached as set forth in section (e), above: Upon expiration of 72 hours from issuance of the 72-hour Warning Notice, the personal transportation vehicle may be impounded and placed into Lost & Found in accordance with the District’s/JPB’s
Lost and Unclaimed Property Policy. The District or JPB may make reasonable efforts to contact the owner, if known, prior to impounding a personal transportation vehicle.

(j) Any personal transportation vehicle, or recognizable part(s) thereof, impounded pursuant to any section of these Rules & Regulations will be stored in a secure location. A fee of $120.00 will be charged to the owner prior to the release of any impounded personal transportation vehicle or other property to him or her.

(k) Impounded personal transportation vehicles, or recognizable part(s) thereof, will be stored for a minimum of 90 days. Notices will be sent whenever possible, and as soon as practicable, to the owners of all impounded property. After 90 days the personal transportation vehicle, or part(s) thereof, may be disposed of consistent with the District's/JPB's Lost and Unclaimed Property Policy.

These Rules & Regulations will be available for examination by interested persons at the District's/JPB's office at 1250 San Carlos Ave, San Carlos, California. Any information about removed and/or impounded property may be obtained from the District's/JPB's Transit Police at 1-877-723-7245.
72-hour Warning Notice
RESOLUTION NO. 2002 - 39
BOARD OF DIRECTORS, PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

* * *

ADOPTING REGULATIONS APPLICABLE TO BICYCLE PARKING AND USE OF
BICYCLES, SKATEBOARDS, SCOOTERS, ROLLER-SKATES AND
ROLLER-BLADES ON PCJPB PROPERTY,
AS AUTHORIZED BY THE CALIFORNIA VEHICLE CODE

WHEREAS, California Vehicle Code §21113 authorizes a joint power agency operating
or managing a commuter rail system to establish conditions and regulations governing the use of
bicycles, skateboards, scooters, roller-skates and roller-blades on its property; and

WHEREAS, the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board ("PCJPB"), a California joint
powers agency, desires to adopt regulations applicable to the use of bicycles, skateboards,
scooters, roller-skates and roller-blades on PCJPB property; and

WHEREAS, the establishment of regulations will allow for the consistent application
and enforcement of the regulations; and

WHEREAS, staff proposes implementing specific regulations regarding bicycle parking
and the use of the PCJPB’s property by bicycles, skateboards, scooters, roller-skates and roller-
blades in accordance with the specific regulations attached to this Resolution as Exhibit A.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers
Board hereby adopts the regulations, attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by this reference;
and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the regulations shall be available for
examination by interested persons at the PCJPB’s office at 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos,
California; and
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Executive Director of the PCJPB is authorized to execute all documents on behalf of the PCJPB necessary for the implementation of the parking regulations listed in Exhibit A and to take such actions as may be necessary to give effect to this Resolution.

Regularly passed and adopted this 9th day of December 2002 by the following vote:

AYES: Ayerdi, Burns, Janney, Lloyd, McLemore, Valerio Yeager, Nevin
NOES: 0
ABSENT: 0

Chair, Board of Directors

ATTEST:

Board Secretary
PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD

BICYCLE PARKING REGULATIONS

Bicycles shall be left, parked or stored on JPB property only in areas specifically designated by the presence of racks or other devices, or in areas designated by the posting of signs indicating the space as a bicycle parking area.

Permission to enter and park a bicycle on or at any JPB property may be revoked at any time by an authorized JPB representative or JPB agent and the JPB reserves the right to restrict the use of any JPB property at any time.

The owner of any bicycle parked, stored or left standing in violation of these Regulations or any provisions of the California Vehicle Code or any other applicable law may be cited and/or their bicycle may be removed by appropriate JPB representatives or JPB agents in accordance with the California Vehicle Code (including sections 21113, et seq.), the California Penal Code (including section 640) or any other applicable law.

These Regulations shall be available for examination by interested persons at the JPB’s office at 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, California. Any information about removed bicycles may be obtained from the JPB Transit Police at 1-877-723-7245.

BICYCLE/SKATEBOARD USE REGULATIONS

Pursuant to California Vehicle Code §21113(f) and Penal Code §640, no person may ride or use bicycles, skateboards, scooters, roller-skates or roller-blades on any JPB property, except through JPB parking lots in order to get to and from a train station. No person shall ride or use bicycles, skateboards, scooters, roller-skates or roller-blades in JPB parking lots in an unsafe manner or in a way that may cause property damage or personal injury.

Any person using a bicycle, skateboard, scooter, roller-skates or roller-blades in violation of these regulations may be cited by JPB representatives or JPB agents pursuant to the California Vehicle Code (including section 21113) and the California Penal Code (including section 640).
RESOLUTION NO. 2012-06
DECEMBER 16, 2015

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

** **

APPROVING AN UPDATED POLICY FOR LOST AND UNCLAIMED PROPERTY

WHEREAS, pursuant to Resolution 1992-33, the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) adopted a policy setting forth procedures pertaining to lost and unclaimed property found upon or within property owned or used by the JPB (Policy); and

WHEREAS, staff desires to update the Policy to make it consistent with current law and to reflect the upcoming change in the Caltrain operator from Amtrak to TransitAmerica Services, Inc. (TransitAmerica); and

WHEREAS, staff has updated the Policy and presented it for Board approval, with the understanding that the Policy shall be effective upon transition of the Caltrain Peninsula Commute Service to TransitAmerica.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board approves the attached Policy pertaining to lost and unclaimed property, which Policy shall be effective upon transition of the Caltrain Peninsula Commute Service to TransitAmerica; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board authorizes the Executive Director, or designee, to make future administrative changes to the Policy.

Regularly passed and adopted this 2nd day of February 2012 by the following vote:

AYES: CISNEROS, COHEN, DEAL, KALRA, KNISS, LLOYD, YEAGER, TISSER
NOES: NONE

ABSENT: NOLAN

Chair, Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board

ATTEST:

JPB Secretary
LOST AND UNCLAIMED PROPERTY POLICY

PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD

I. DEFINITION

A. "JPB" shall mean the joint powers authority, known as the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board, comprised of three member agencies: the San Mateo County Transit District ("District"); the Santa Clara County Transit District; and the City and County of San Francisco.

B. "JPB Representatives" shall mean officers or employees of any of the three member agencies of the JPB, of TransitAmerica Services, Inc. ("TransitAmerica") as the operator of the Caltrain Service under contract with the JPB, or of any other contractors or consultants of the JPB.

C. "Lost and unclaimed property" or "property" shall mean any money, goods, or other personal items or articles brought to the JPB or found upon or within the property owned or under the jurisdiction of the JPB or property used by the JPB for public meetings, where the owner of such lost or unclaimed property is unknown; provided, however, that property held as evidence, dangerous weapons or deadly weapons, narcotics or dangerous drugs, explosives or any property of any kind whatsoever, which is prohibited by law as the same are defined or described in State or Federal statutes, shall not constitute lost and unclaimed property as herein defined.

D. The "District" is the member agency of the JPB which has been designated and authorized by the JPB to serve as the managing agent of Caltrain. On behalf of the JPB, the District shall also implement this policy.

II. CARE AND RESTITUTION

The Executive Director of the JPB or his or her designee shall designate a safe place as a central repository for lost and unclaimed property. All JPB Representatives who find such property shall deliver it to the appropriate District employee in charge of the central repository for the JPB, who will arrange for its delivery to the central repository where the article shall be properly tagged, inventoried and stored.

All lost and unclaimed property shall be kept by the JPB using ordinary care to keep such property safely. If an owner appears and the property in question is in the possession of the JPB, the owner shall produce proof of his or her ownership and offer reimbursement to the JPB for any storage charges incurred. The property shall be delivered to said owner upon his or her payment of the storage charges, if any, and upon said owner executing a receipt for the property.
Property excepted from the definition of lost and unclaimed property in Section I shall be turned over to the law enforcement agency of the jurisdiction in which it is found or, if it may be used by the JPB as evidence, it shall be retained by the JPB.

III. PERIOD TO BE HELD

All lost and unclaimed property in the possession of the JPB shall be stored in the central repository designated by the District for at least three (3) months.

IV. NOTICE AND SALE

At any time after the expiration of said three (3) month period, the JPB may dispose of the lost and unclaimed property in accordance with procedures set forth in this section and Section VI. The Executive Director or his or her designee shall cause to be published once, in a newspaper of general circulation in San Francisco, San Mateo and Santa Clara counties, a notice of the JPB’s intention to sell at public auction to the highest bidder at the time and place therein specified, all such lost and unclaimed property having a value of One Hundred Dollars ($100.00) or greater and those lost and unclaimed property items or articles having a value of less than One Hundred Dollars ($100.00) that the Executive Director or designee deems appropriate for auction. Such notice of sale shall be published not less than five (5) days prior to the time fixed for the auction.

The auction may be conducted by the Executive Director or his or her authorized representative; the JPB may enlist the services of a professional auctioneer to conduct the auction on behalf of the JPB. Each item shall be sold to the highest bidder at public auction.

Lost and unclaimed money in the custody of the JPB that is not claimed within the three (3) month period shall be delivered to the District’s Director of Finance for deposit into the JPB’s general fund.

V. EXPENSES AND PROCEDURES OF SALE

The expenses of the auction or any other method of disposition authorized in Section VI shall be a proper charge against the funds of the JPB and all proceeds received from the auction or any other method of disposition of the property under Section VI shall be delivered to the District’s Director of Finance for deposit into the JPB’s general fund.

VI. UNSOLD ITEMS

All property for which no bid is made at an auction or items of a value less than One Hundred Dollars ($100.00) that are not included in an auction may be given to a non-profit charitable organization, destroyed or disposed of in some other manner as the Executive Director or his or her designee may direct.
JPB CAC Work Plan – As of 12-16-15

December 16, 2015
- * Cal Mod qtply update
- 2016 Officer Nominating Committee
- Bike Parking Rules and Regulations
- Lost and Found Policy and Program
- Advise the Board to Take Action to Improve Customer Service 12/7/15
  Jonathan Berk
- Caltrain Corridor Tenants

January 20, 2016
- Elections
- Wi-Fi Update
- Overview on surveys
- 2015 Customer Survey results

February 17, 2016
- * Cal Mod qtply update
- Customer Service presentation – requested 10/21/15

March 16, 2016

April 20, 2016

May 18, 2016

Items to be scheduled
- MTC means-based fare pricing study
- Quiet cars

* Date certain (time sensitive item)