April 20, 2016 – Wednesday

Times noted are estimated. Discussion may begin before the times listed.
Items in bold are CAC member-requested presentations.

1. Pledge of Allegiance
2. Roll Call
3. Approval of Meeting Minutes of March 16, 2016 (5:45 p.m.)
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 correspondence, 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. Overview of Social Media Properties and Program Growth (Jayme Ackemann) (6:15 p.m.)
8. Staff Report (Michelle Bouchard) (6:45 p.m.)
   a) Customer Experience Taskforce Update
   b) JPB CAC Work Plan Update
9. Date, Time and Place of Next Meeting
   May 18, 2016 at 5:40 p.m., San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building, 2nd Floor Bacciocco Auditorium, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA
10. Adjournment

All items on this agenda are subject to action

CAC MEMBERS:  
San Francisco City & County:  Jonathan Berk, Brian Shaw (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. Communications to the CAC can be e-mailed to cacsecretary@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 MARCH 16, 2016

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: A. Lee, B. Shaw

STAFF PRESENT: J. Ackemann, J. Averill, D. Chow, M. Martinez, N. McKenna, D. Stewart, S. van Hoften

Chair Chris Cobey called the meeting to order at 5:43 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MARCH 16, 2016
Motion/Second: Tucker/Levin
Ayes: Berk, Levin, Scharff, Tucker, Cobey
Absent: Lee, Mills, Shaw

PUBLIC COMMENT
Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said there were two engine failures last month and a third one tonight. Table 1.2 on page 18 of the Short Range Transit Plan tells what the problem is. He said 20 of 29 locomotives were supposed to be replaced between 2012 and 2015. Maintenance won’t make a difference, they’re shot. The court ruling came through and all the funding for electrification is blocked. Proposition 1A funds can’t be used to electrify the tracks. The opportunity now is to put electrification to the side and buy new trains. The JPB should also focus on signaling and use a third party to do it. He said Caltrain won’t get capacity out of electrification, it would get more capacity out of signaling and track work.

Jeff Carter, Millbrae, said the new schedule is on the website and was advertised as making a few minor tweaks to make the schedule more realistic. He said significant tweaks were made moving Train 156 from 3:07 p.m. to 3 p.m. That makes that train useless for people who work in the city and get off work at 3 pm. He gets on at 22nd Street and the next train is not for 90 minutes. This was done without any discussion or public input. This is not a minor adjustment and will cause a great deal of inconvenience. All the trains that leave seven minutes past the hour will now be leaving on the hour. This affects people who get off work on the hour. It would make more sense to move the train to 10 or 15 minutes after the hour. Now people have to make huge changes to their schedules. There is no valid reason to make these changes. This new schedule should be stopped and trains should go back to normal schedule. Sometimes the doors at 4th and King Caltrain Station are closed prior to train departure time.
Danielle Stewart, Acting Director, Rail Transportation, said Train 156 was adjusted to allow passengers to make the meet for the Altamont Corridor Express (ACE) train. Staff did a number of field studies and took the high ridership, dwell times, and construction activities into account to make the timetable more realistic.

Adina Levin asked if it is true that Caltrain cannot use the bond funds.

Yvonne Mills arrived at 5:52 p.m.

Ms. Levin asked if staff can check if the new schedule will affect a significant amount of riders and if the reaction to the schedule changes will be taken into account.

COMMITTEE COMMENTS
Chair Cobey said the customer experience survey ends on March 20 and he is looking forward to seeing results. One question referred to diesel cars and was not sure if that meant locomotives or passenger cars. He asked the CAC members to identify the priority of work plan items. He asked why a new timetable was printed, because the times are changing in five weeks and customers will need a new timetable.

Jonathan Berk said the trains at 9 p.m. are fuller than the trains at 8 p.m., and the 9 p.m. trains are very slow. Caltrain should experiment with express trains at 9 p.m. He said public comment took up half the Board of Directors (Board) meeting. Public comment can hamper the ability of the committee to do their job. Often members of the public repeat the same issues meeting after meeting. There is a tendency to report on trivial things. He asked members of the public to think if their comment is something that could just be e-mailed instead of brought up at the meetings, and to not be repetitive.

Greg Scharff said Stanford University has to run their shuttles to University Avenue station because there are not enough trains at California Avenue station. When staff looks at ridership numbers to see where trains should be, they should see that a huge number of employees go to University Avenue instead of California Avenue. Caltrain ridership would be much higher if it didn’t take so long to get from the Research Park to the University Avenue station.

Ms. Levin said transportation management agencies are looking to provide transit pass benefits for downtown Palo Alto employees to reduce traffic and parking demand. A larger company can get in bulk Go Passes for their employees, but if the transportation management association could act as a purchasing agent for a consortium of smaller businesses, it would help alleviate Caltrain’s administrative burden and would get Go Passes to employees of smaller companies and lower-wage workers.

Mr. Scharff said it is also an equity issue. Low-wage workers don’t get the benefit of Go Passes because they don’t work for large companies.

Public Comment
Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said the new timetables are useless and stupid. They don’t fit in customers’ pockets. In the old timetable, the northbound was on top and the
southbound was on bottom, but now they are all over the place. When the times are changed the timetables should go back to old format. If staff had listened to the members of the public, they would not have had to change the timetables. He said 16 additional train cars were purchased last year and 11 are unaccounted for.

CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT
Mr. Berk said he made the report to the Board and emphasized the importance of customer service. He offered to help the Board to interview candidates to fill the vacancy on the CAC. He spoke to the Staff Coordinating Council member who said she would work on filling the vacancy.

Chair Cobey said he encourages members of the CAC to keep their comments productive and constructive.

STAFF REPORT
Ms. Stewart said:
- January 2016 on-time performance (OTP) was 93.3 percent compared to 91.6 percent in January 2015.
- There was a trespasser fatality in February. February 2016 OTP was 90.5 percent compared to 88.1 percent in February 2015.
- The new timetable will be rolled out with the third bike car on April 4. There will be an event related to the rolling out of the third bike car.

Mr. Berk asked what “on time” means. Ms. Stewart said it is within five minutes of the scheduled arrival.

Mr. Berk asked if trains can be reported late if they are more than one minute late. Ms. Stewart said that is not how the contract is structured and reporting is compatible with that.

Customer Experience Taskforce Update
Ms. Stewart said:
- Incident management protocol has been added.
- Developing the passenger survey has been added. The survey is out now and is closing on March 20. This item will be moved to the May CAC meeting on the work plan.
- Clipper Card issues will be discussed today to gather information from the CAC.
- Investigating the potential for quiet cars has been added.
- There is no order of priority for this list.

Mr. Berk said the CAC has emphasized some of the items on the list above others and the list should be prioritized. Expansion of express service is a very important issue to the CAC and it should be at the top of the list.

Ms. Stewart said this list is not prioritized and the Customer Experience Taskforce is an umbrella taskforce to a number of subcommittees in the agency. Some of these items are being looked at by different committees.
Chair Cobey asked what subcommittees exist. Ms. Stewart said staff is working on establishing the structure to the subcommittees that already exist to make sure staff knows how all the decisions are made and carried through.

Mr. Berk said staff should take a fresh look at the issues on the list. The Wi-Fi presentation went badly because staff said they can’t do anything unless they have the best Wi-Fi service in the world. Staff should take a step back and find solutions between all and nothing. Caltrain should experiment with express trains.

Chair Cobey said he would like a report on the idea of express trains. There are probably economic and structural and temporal challenges to doing it, but he would like that to be communicated to the committee, perhaps in a staff report.

Cat Tucker asked if the idea about standing versus sitting versus bikes will be part of the customer experience taskforce. Ms. Stewart said she will add it to the list.

Mr. Berk said “improve and define incident management protocol” is very broad. Communication is easy to deal with. Communication on Caltrain is a joke. Customers can’t understand a word of what is being said on the public address system and no one has any idea what was going on. That should be an easy thing to address. Automatic responses are complicated and might require an investment. If tracks get blocked at a specific time and specific place, there should be an automatic response and everyone would know what to do. This would transform the customer experience. Ms. Stewart said staff is working towards a communication to the public that defines basic incidents that are seen on the railroad and a behind-the-scenes look at what the customer may experience if they were on the incident train, on a different train, or on the platform.

Mr. Berk said he hopes staff will have a better response in the future. The response now should be different, so staff might want to wait to publish that communication. If there is an incident now, all trains go local, which is not an optimal response.

Ms. Tucker said she hopes Caltrain staff is following along and getting lessons learned from the ACE derailment and will implement those lessons if it happens on Caltrain.

Chair Cobey asked if there is a written protocol for incident management. Ms. Stewart said yes.

Ms. Levin said she agrees with the potential service expansion that would include different express trains, later trains from San Jose, and other possible solutions such as different stopping patterns.

Yvonne Mills said she disagrees with Mr. Berk about interim solutions or band aids to problems. If something is being considered she hopes it is the best possible solution than can be done, but if something can’t be done well it should be explained why. Sometimes nothing should be done until it can be done right, because interim solutions and band aids can make it seem worse.
Work Plan Update
Ms. Stewart said:
- April
  - Social Media Update
- May
  - Caltrain Modernization Quarterly Update
  - Preliminary Fiscal Year (FY) 2017 Operating and Capital Budget
  - Customer Experience Survey Results
- June
  - Bike Parking Management Plan
  - Annual Passenger Counts

Chair Cobey asked what else would be in April. Ms. Stewart said it is open right now.

Ms. Levin said the topic of bathrooms/bikes/seats is integral to the Electric Multiple Unit purchasing process. The CAC does not want to weigh-in after the Board has made its decision. Ms. Stewart said it will be brought to the CAC before a decision is made.

Ms. Levin said bike parking management and station parking are two common methods for getting to Caltrain. She asked if one of the items could be generalized to station access because there are other ways people get to stations, such as Uber and Lyft, and there are other station access topics that should be rolled into one of these presentations.

Mr. Berk said presentations and reports should be sent ahead of time and the reports at the meeting should be summaries.

Ms. Mills said quiet car should be more a family car and a way to get away from drunk and obnoxious people. It is a misnomer to call it a quiet car. Families don’t want to bring kids onboard around drunken people and people who swear.

Ms. Levin asked if the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Means-Based Fare Pricing Study could be broadened to Fare Equity including the MTC study so the CAC could make other related comments to fare equity that are not specific to the MTC study.

Public Comment
Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said staff is not adding a third bike car, they are taking 24 seats out of the passenger cars that were added last year. He said he wrote a letter to the Board about bullet trains. The budget is still there. He could add 20 bullets a day without any impact to the budget. Another alternative is the private sector, which is willing to pay $3 million a year for using the tracks. He wrote to the CAC and included train configuration specifications. These trains fit within the existing platforms. ACE and Capitol Corridor have quiet cars and Wi-Fi on their trains.

BROWN ACT WORKSHOP
Shayna van Hoften, Legal Counsel, said she is an attorney at Hanson Bridgett, which is the general counsel to the San Mateo County Transit District (District), the JPB, and the
San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA). She has practiced local government law for 12 years.

Ms. van Hoften presented:

- **Who’s Who and Why**
  - **Committee Membership**
    - Appointed to represent communities by county.
    - Not appointed to represent subgroups of communities; CAC members represent Caltrain riders as a whole.
    - Advisory role to the JPB on policy impacts felt by customers; policy decisions are not made by the CAC.
    - Express views of passengers – good and bad; when CAC members report to the Board, they are to represent the CAC as a whole and should state majority views and minority views or consensus views.
  - **Staff**
    - Caltrain has no employees. Employees here are employees of the District. All employees report to the District general manager. The general manager reports to the three boards. The District is the managing agency of SamTrans, the JPB, and the TA. When staff responds to requests from the Boards, those requests take priority. Staff is not the CAC’s staff to direct to do things.

Ms. Tucker asked if it is not in the CAC’s purview to direct staff, if it is in staff’s purview to tell the CAC they can or cannot write a letter of recommendation to the Board.

Ms. van Hoften said the CAC is an advisory body to provide input to the Board and the CAC can do it verbally or in writing. It would not be appropriate for the CAC to get together on the side to write a letter and circulate it because that would violate the Brown Act, but the group can provide feedback and recommendations to the Board in writing.

Ms. Mills asked if the only exposure the Board gets about what happens at the CAC meetings is from the CAC report at the Board meeting. She asked if the Board reads the minutes. Martha Martinez, Executive Officer, District Secretary/Executive Administration, said the Board receives the CAC agenda packets that include the minutes.

Mr. Berk said he does not think the Board reads the minutes.

Ms. van Hoften continued:

- There are numerous committees and the agency has not opted to have an attorney attend the many committee meetings. Costs would add up. Staff is to perform a role to provide information and to facilitate meeting the CAC’s needs, and to police the CAC’s compliance with the Brown Act. There are many interpretations about the Brown Act and nuances that apply differently in different contexts. Staff is does not to try to stop the CAC from having their meetings. It would be helpful to reset any understanding on how
the Brown Act applies so staff and the CAC can work together to accomplish their goals.

- **Brown Act Overview**
  - State law (California Government Code §§54950, et seq.).
  - Applies to local legislative bodies and their meetings.
  - Requires meetings to be open, public, and accessible.
  - Requires published agendas that provide notice of the meeting, when, where, and what will be discussed. Typically agenda items should be described in no more than 20 words to give the public a sense of what is happening so they can look at the agenda and know if they have an interest in the discussion that is going to happen or any potential outcomes of that discussion.
  - Requires availability of materials, opportunity for public comment before actions taken.
  - Provides for limited closed session.

- **Why Another Brown Act Training**
  - Typically done every two years.
  - Responding to CAC request.
  - Members of CAC with various backgrounds.
  - Some new members.
  - Some disagreements regarding Brown Act application in past few years.
  - All play a role in compliance, but on-the-spot analysis can be hard and views can vary.

- **What is a Meeting**
  - Majority of members of legislative body together at the same place and time to hear, discuss, deliberate or take action on any item within the subject matter jurisdiction of the body.

- **What is not a Meeting**
  - Contact between less than a majority.
  - Contact between a member and non-member.
  - Ad hoc advisory committee discussions.
  - Conferences, other agencies’ meetings that are open to the public
    - No caucusing or discussion among members about business within the body’s subject matter jurisdiction.
    - Exceptions for scheduled/agendized sessions/discussions.

- **Danger Zone: Quorums Outside of Noticed Meetings**
  - A majority of a legislative body shall not, outside a meeting, use a series of communications of any kind, directly or through intermediaries, to discuss, deliberate, or take action on any item of business that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the legislative body.
  - Any communication of any kind can turn into a Brown Act meeting.
  - Serial communications.
  - E-mail, social media sites, blogs, other technology.
  - Social engagements.
  - Parking lot/hallway discussions.

- **Observations from the Outside**
  - Sources: Conversations with several members of staff and the chair, review of several years’ worth of CAC minutes, observation at February
CAC meeting, and 12 years of experiences with other boards and committees.
  o Some level of disagreement is inherent and expected.
    ▪ Different perspectives and approaches in different environments.
    ▪ Different levels of experience, risk-tolerance, and commitment to Brown Act ideals.
    ▪ The law doesn’t look so hard, but applications requires nuance.
  o JPB CAC: Disagreement appears to be broader, more transparent, more frequently approached in public realm over a longer period of time.

Mr. Scharff said the other bodies he sits on, staff agendizes items in a broadly enough way that allows the committee to discuss it. Here, it feels like staff wants to shut the conversation down. Staff has the attitude to take the most conservative approach possible, so if something is not right in view of the agenda, it may not be discussed or voted on. Staff is not doing an appropriate job to write the agenda items broadly enough to deal with the anticipated discussion. Ms. van Hoften said she will work with the CAC and staff to fix this concern and will apply it to the next agenda.

Ms. van Hoften continued:
  • Three Main Areas of Concern
    o Interpretation of notice provided on agenda.
      ▪ Subject matter.
      ▪ Ability to take action.
      ▪ Form of discussion, involvement of public speakers.
      ▪ Responses to committee comments, public comments, or chairperson’s report.
    o Questions regarding basis of limitations.
      ▪ No, the JPB has not adopted heightened rules.
      ▪ However, the agency boards and committees do not meet when there is no quorum.
    o Results in concern over time lag before next meeting and lack of trust/confidence in staff.
      ▪ Purpose of the CAC is to talk about things that concern the CAC about the customer experience based on the policy decision coming from the Board.
      ▪ The Brown Act needs to be layered on top of that, which is to allow the public to voice their opinions.
      ▪ When items are on the agenda, the CAC cannot discuss beyond what is written on the agenda because then the public loses their opportunity to contribute before the CAC reports their opinions to the Board.
  • Room to work on establishing unified approach.
    o Common goals.
      ▪ Staff wants to know what the CAC thinks.
      ▪ The Board wants to know what the CAC thinks.
      ▪ The CAC wants to share what they think.
      ▪ Staff’s concern has been making a mistake in allowing conversations that should not be allowed, which is fair and
appropriate. Legal, staff, and the CAC will work out some ways to make it clear how far the CAC discussions can go before there is a problem.

- Respectful discourse.
  - Engenders cooperation between the CAC and staff.
  - Let the chair do his job: lead the meeting and set the agenda.
  - Recommend changes to the bylaws.
- Minimize time lost to Brown Act debates.
  - Fact: public governance structures are not the most nimble.
  - Lengthy/repetitive process debates exacerbate the downsides of this reality.
  - Options for addressing them when they arise.

- Words to use on the Agenda
  - Discussion, informal consensus clearly indicated:
    - Update
    - Report
    - Discuss
    - Presentation
    - Consider
  - Grey space:
    - Seek input from CAC
    - Receive
  - Clear action words:
    - Approve
    - Receive and file
    - Accept
    - Recommend
    - Support
    - Oppose
    - Vote
    - Whether
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  - Pledge of Allegiance
    - Pledge itself, not a discussion on whether to say it.

Chair Cobey asked if the CAC is required to recite the Pledge of Allegiance. Ms. van Hoften said no.

Ms. Tucker asked if the Board does it. Ms. van Hoften said yes.

Mr. Scharff said Palo Alto does not do it.

Mr. Berk said he would vote to get rid of it. Mr. Scharff said he would, too.

Ms. van Hoften continued:
  - Roll Call
    - Only action is to take roll, not the time to take up topics like a change to the quorum rule.
Approval of Meeting Minutes of April 18, 2012
- Clear action: approval. The minutes could be revised, corrected, or adopted.

Public Comment
- The chair can limit the time given to each public member, but every member of the public must be allowed to speak.
- The CAC can briefly respond to public comment, or ask the staff to briefly respond, or ask to agendize the topic for a future meeting. Not the place for a new discussion or action.

Chairperson’s Report
- One-sided report. The chair can ask staff for a response. Not the place for discussion.

There was a line on the agenda that read, “All items on this agenda are subject to action.” This line tells the public there is going to be room for actions even if action is not clear on the agenda line. This line meets the needs of the public under the Brown Act. This line will be going back on the CAC agendas.

Mr. Berk left at 7:17 p.m.

Support of JPB Resolution...
- Staff was seeking action, which could be amended or reversed.

Fiscal Year 2013 Budget
- Not clearly an action item, but the line “All items on this agenda are subject to action” allowed for action to be taken.

Staff Report
- No way to take action on subjects of reports because no indication of what will be discussed so impossible to have provided sufficient notice.

Committee Comments
- Brief response, ask for staff to respond or agendize for future meeting. Not the place for discussion or actions.
- Treated just like public comment.

Today’s Agenda:
- Has “Motion” or “Informational” written down the side.
- The “All items on this agenda are subject to action” line was removed.
- The “Motion” or “Informational” will be removed from future agendas and the “All items on this agenda are subject to action” line will be put on future agendas. These two statements would be in conflict with one another if bother were on the agenda.

Mr. Scharff said he thinks this solves his concern.

Chair Cobey asked where the CAC can comment on correspondence. Ms. van Hoften said “Correspondence” is an agenda item on the Board agendas, and usually the Board chair tells the Board that correspondence is in their packet and they move on to the next item. She said correspondence is treated like public comment because the CAC does not get it until the meeting.
Chair Cobey said he gets correspondence for a city council he sat on a week before the meeting.

Ms. Levin said she sits on other bodies and they get correspondence ahead of time. Mr. Scharff said he does, too.

Ms. Tucker said she thought the CAC could comment on it under Committee Comments. Ms. van Hoften said the agenda says, “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.”

Ms. Mills said it might be helpful to add it as a discussion item. Chair Cobey asked to include the word “correspondence” in the description on the agenda of Committee Comments.

Chair Cobey asked if the chair can allow specific speakers to talk longer than the three minutes allowed if no one objects. Ms. van Hoften said yes.

Mr. Scharff said if the public brings up items that are not agendized, the CAC should not engage with the public member except to ask clarifying questions, but if it is on an agenda topic and the CAC wants to ask the public member questions, they should go through the chair. That is a meeting management issue.

Public Comment
Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said the point that no one works for Caltrain is true. Transit America Services, Inc. does the tracks and train operations, and the District is on a one-year automatic renewal for administration. Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) provides the administration for Capitol Corridor. Every year in June the JPB has the opportunity to tell the District their services are no longer required. The managing agency is the root cause of all the problems with Caltrain. He has requested many times an attorney be present for CAC meetings.

Jeff Carter, Millbrae, said sometimes when issues are controversial or staff does not want to discuss them staff claim it is a violation of the Brown Act. The CAC sees presentations after they are seen by the Board. It would be better if the CAC sees them first. He said Mr. Berk said there is too much public comment. These meetings are to hear public comment and concerns from the riders. He said there are different interpretations of fare equity. Some think fare equity is low income versus high income, or other issues. Fare equity to him is how zones work and how inequitable the trips are based on the zones.

Ms. Levin asked what is happening with train breakdowns and if the Proposition 1A funding cannot be used for electrification. Ms. Stewart said staff is looking more closely at maintenance procedures, but given the fleet is aging there are various ways that staff is handling the locomotives. Requests for capital funding have been made for FY2017. Staff is trying to maintain the fleet to the best of their abilities.
Ms. van Hoften said a press release came out about a recent decision that came out of the court regarding high-speed rail funding on the Peninsula. It is not correct that Caltrain cannot use the funding. She said staff will send the press release to the CAC.

**UPDATE ON CLIPPER CUSTOMER EXPERIENCE**

Jayme Ackemann, Director, Marketing and Communications, said staff looked at some of the issues raised by the CAC. Some relate to Clipper as it is today, some relate to business rules and issues that can be addressed with the Clipper 2.0, and some are fare policy questions. She said she will talk about issues that staff is trying to address in the short term before going to Clipper 2.0.

Ms. Ackemann said the areas where staff sees the greatest concern have to do with the way some policy is enacted in using Clipper Cards today. She sees complaints around the auto load delays of three to five days that result in funds not being available in timely fashion. Another issue is the minimum balance of $1.25 in order to use fare instruments on the card. Staff knows there are questions about existing integration between Clipper and the Ticket Vending Machines (TVM) and what can be done to address those issues. Staff is proposing to do away with the minimum balance and will work with Clipper to address the three- to five-day delay, staff is looking for ways to improve customer education. Staff has developed some Frequently Asked Questions that will be used in a Caltrain brochure that conductors can use to help with educating customers who find themselves in violation of a policy they did not understand or know about, there will be some website changes that Clipper is looking at to help improve the customer experience, and staff is also looking at implementing a new generation of handheld readers that have greater functionality. This will be important when there are large events where lots of people will be loading on the train and conductors want to expedite the ticket checking or sales process.

David Chow, Project Manager, said he was on the Clipper Project back in 2001 before Clipper was rolled into place. The soft launch was in 2001 and it was several years later before the actual launch. He used to be the TVM Program Manager. The Clipper system is challenged. It is an old system based on equipment that was rolled out for the Sydney Olympics. It was very difficult to roll out equipment to six Phase 1 and Phase 2 agencies. Caltrain does about $4 million a month in Clipper sales, which does not mean it is a good system, just that people use it. He was asked to participate with Clipper 2.0. He said he understands what happened with Clipper and it needs to be better. The Clipper contract ends in 2019, so all the agencies are speaking together to talk about what they learned from the roll out and peoples’ behavior using Clipper. Every agency is a little different. With the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (MUNI), customers tag when they get on. With Caltrain customers tag on and off. Because Caltrain is a zone-based system, it is different than an average bus. Customers cannot get on BART without tagging on because it is a closed-gate system, and Caltrain is an open-gate system. On any given day, there are 100 to 200 new Clipper users and they don’t understand what to do. Clipper is different from the TVMs. With Clipper 2.0, staff will endeavor to get the CAC up-to-date information with what they are working on. Caltrain participates in Clipper, but it is not the driving force for Clipper, BART and MUNI are. They move 700,000 people and collect tens of thousands
of dollars per week, but Caltrain moves 60,000 people and is number three on revenue for Clipper. He will ask Clipper to provide TVMs that sell Clipper. He said Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority has TVMs that use Clipper, and to load a Clipper Card monthly pass customers would have to go to Mountain View. These issues were on the table with the roll out and he will work on them with Clipper 2.0. He said the three- to five-day delay is not really a delay, it is due to the design of a 15-year-old system and computers that don’t talk to each other. If it was done on a mobile ticketing system it would be instant. The way Clipper does it is they get the six agencies doing 20 million transactions a month and they take the sales from Caltrain and hand type them in to a computer, which is what causes the delay. When he started Caltrain was moving 20,000 riders per day, but Caltrain carries three times that amount now. Clipper needs to grow. With Clipper 2.0 there will be a chance to make improvements. He will try to make sure Caltrain is represented with the other Bay Area agencies that use Clipper.

Ms. Tucker said the biggest complaint she hears is locations for loading up the cards. It is not easy to load up a card. Mr. Chow said the system needs to be improved today. Only 36 percent of Clipper users use auto load because people don’t trust it. Any reload location such as Walgreens that has a person doing it, the value is available immediately. Clipper is trying to improve the website, which may bring the delay down to two or three days. That is high on the list of issues to bring up.

Ms. Mills said it is not easy to deal with Walgreens because there has to be a person who knows how to do it, if that person is there, and if the machine works. Another issue is if there is money on the card, it can’t be converted to a monthly pass. It is a very clunky system. It is not easy to use. Mr. Chow said converting is not the issue, refunding is. Pretax dollars cannot be refunded, but money should be converted and that is one thing he will talk to Clipper about. He said Clipper can do it manually, but there are probably 5,000 people who want to do it every month because the money was loaded incorrectly. He said Walgreens is not a good place to be selling Clipper products, it should be done over the TVMs.

Ms. Mills said the last time she lost a card someone used it even though she reported it right away. Mr. Chow said she is not responsible for that usage. He asked what other transit agency allows customers to ride up to $13 negative. He said he works in Safety and Security now and he gets about 150 to 200 cards a month in the trash. Smart cards are not smart anymore, especially considering mobile ticketing and other methods. The entire concept of fares has to change. People shouldn’t be lining up at two TVMs. He said he will suggest some issues for the CAC to look at, such as communicating that triple beeps on the tag readers means the customer did not tag correctly.

Ms. Levin asked if zone upgrades are possible with Clipper. Mr. Chow said a zone upgrade will never be possible with Clipper 1.0 because it should be an e-cash ride at that point. It is not user friendly today. In the future it should be better managed.

Ms. Levin said if customers go from Caltrain to BART and they tag on at BART, the system should know the customer is tagged off of Caltrain. If the customer doesn’t tag off Caltrain it will charge the customer to Gilroy even if the train is not running to Gilroy at that time. Mr. Chow said customers need to tag off so the system understands what to
charge the customer. Monthly Pass holders only need to tag the first time each month that they ride the system. The reason there is a problem with BART and Caltrain Clipper users is because customers go from an open-gate system to a closed-gate system. He hopes the new system will have more information on the rider and the back-end systems between BART and Clipper will marry each other. The system is based on old technology. Some “Add Value” machines use a modem to contact credit card companies, so they are very slow. He will also see if there is a way to move a machine closer to the gates at Millbrae.

Chair Cobey said Mr. Chow should look at the comments from the customer satisfaction survey for comments on Clipper.

Public Comment
Andy Chow, Redwood City, said Caltrain needs to get better technology from Clipper. There are a lot of problems with it. There are only so many Clipper readers at stations, and customers are not sure where readers are. JPB should put up signage to tell customers where Clipper readers are as they are exiting trains. He would like all rail systems to be Clipper only.

Jeff Carter, Millbrae, said the 8-Ride tickets should be available to be used by a group of people so it would be easier for a group of people to go out together. There should be a Regional Fare Program. There are over two dozen agencies and different fare systems, and it makes things difficult to travel from one agency to another.

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said Mountain View used to have a Clipper reader on the way out to the light rail. Customers have to be at the back of the train if they have any chance to make the connection.

DATE, TIME AND LOCATION OF NEXT REGULAR MEETING:
April 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.

Adjourned at 8:15 p.m.
TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
Executive Director

FROM: Seamus Murphy
Chief Communications Officer

SUBJECT: OVERVIEW OF SOCIAL MEDIA PROPERTIES AND PROGRAM GROWTH

ACTION
This report is informational only. No Board action is required.

SIGNIFICANCE
Demand for social engagement with Caltrain’s online presence has grown dramatically in the past year. Social media is now one of the primary tools through which Caltrain communicates with the community and its customers.

In an effort to provide a more complete understanding of Caltrain’s communications, community engagements, and customer interactions, staff will be including more detailed information regarding the agency’s social media interactions in monthly Board reports.

The purpose of this presentation is to provide the board with an update on the current state of Caltrain’s social media program and plans to expand its social presence in the future.

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no budget impact.

BACKGROUND
Caltrain launched its official social media presence in 2012 with the goal of improving customer and community communications and joining the growing social dialogue around public transportation issues.

In its first year, the program grew to 5,324 users following the agency on its primary platforms, Facebook and Twitter. By December 2014, demand for social engagement had grown to more than 27,000 followers engaging across the 12 separate platforms on which Caltrain maintains a social presence.

The past year has seen an explosion in social media growth for the agency as more people seek out information on social platforms and prefer to engage with a brand’s social profile. Since January 2015, Caltrain’s followers have nearly doubled to more
than 50,000 followers engaging with the agency’s brand on various social media platforms. Facebook and Twitter continue to be Caltrain’s primary platforms, but the agency is also active on Instagram, YouTube, LinkedIn, Quora, Foursquare, Tumblr, Vine, Pinterest, Google+, and SoundCloud.

This growth in access to brands via social communication has created an environment where customers, increasingly, expect organizations to be available and responsive via social communications.

Caltrain plans to respond to the rising demand for social engagement by dedicating additional staff to social media, integrating social media into the agency’s customer service group, increasing the use of photo and video platforms to communicate directly with followers and utilizing social media to maximize the effectiveness of marketing and promotions efforts.

Campaigns can be launched using organic content that targets certain concepts or “hashtags” intended to generate attention and increase the visibility of the post. Content that does not have a paid component is generally considered to be organic. An example of recent organic content that generated significant social discussion was the video of the Transit Police Officers rescuing the intoxicated driver from his vehicle as the train approached. That post was considered “viral” because of the number of times it was shared and commented on and because it generated national media.

Paid campaigns offer the opportunity to target specific geographic locations with messages and content appropriate for those followers.

Earlier this year, Caltrain launched the #CaltrainSafe campaign in response to the increase in incidents involving vehicles struck while stopped on Caltrain’s tracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#CaltrainSafe Campaign : October</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Spend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Impressions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Per Engagement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the #CaltrainSafe hashtag staff created content intended to educate drivers and pedestrians on safe behaviors near tracks. The campaign targeted 12 geographic locations along the Peninsula corridor that experience high traffic volumes across at-grade crossings. The campaign, which runs once each quarter, launched in June and ran again in October. Using a fixed spend, staff can control costs and maximize the delivery of content to key users.

Prepared By: Jayme Ackemann, Manager, Communications 650.508.7934
TO: JPB CAC

FROM: Danielle Stewart
Acting Director, Rail Transportation

SUBJECT: STAFF REPORT

On-time Performance (OTP) –

- February:
  - The February 2016 OTP was 90.5 percent compared to 88.1 percent for February 2015. For trains within 10 minutes, the OTP was 95.7 percent.
  - Trespasser Fatality – There was one fatality in February. On Monday, February 1, at 8:12 p.m., a trespasser was struck by southbound Train 190 at Milepost 19.6 between Hayward Park and Hillsdale.

- March:
  - The preliminary March 2016 OTP was 93.2 percent compared to 87.9 percent for March 2015. For trains within 10 minutes, the OTP was 98 percent.
  - Trespasser Fatality – There was one fatality in March. On Sunday, March 6 at 7:47 p.m., a trespasser was struck by southbound Train 442 at Milepost 44.3 at CP De La Cruz.

Caltrain 2016 Annual Count – The 2016 Caltrain Annual Count survey has been completed. Survey data is being reviewed and analyzed. The 2016 Caltrain Annual Count Report will be issued in late spring and is on the Work Plan for June.

Caltrain Timetable Update – Caltrain’s updated timetable to improve schedule reliability for customers was effective on Monday, April 4, 2016. No additional trains or stations stops were added to the schedule and weekend schedules were unaffected. Caltrain has been coordinating with stakeholders and connecting Bay Area Transit agencies. Caltrain will be monitoring OTP to assess the changes and to further evaluate if additional timetable changes will be needed in the future.

Caltrain Bombardier Third Bike Cars (Generation II) – Caltrain rolled out a third bike car on all five Bombardier six-car train sets. Bike capacity has been increased on Bombardier trains from 48 bikes to 72 bikes. With the added bike capacity, Caltrain also revised designated train equipment to better allocate capacity to meet demand. The train assignments and bike car schematic is available at http://www.caltrain.com/riderinfo/Bicycles/BikesOnBombardiers.html.
To commemorate this occasion, Caltrain hosted a celebratory “Bikes on Bombardier” Event on Monday, April 4, 2016 at the San Francisco 4th & King Caltrain Station from 8:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. The public event included a ribbon cutting ceremony, snacks and refreshments, goodies, and speakers Joél Ramos - JPB Board Member, Wes Brinsfield - Chair of the Caltrain Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC), Catherine Young - San Francisco Bicycle Coalition and Caltrain BAC member, and Shiloh Ballard - Executive Director of the Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition.

Special Event Train Service –
Services performed:
- **San Jose Sharks** – There were 11 regular season home games in March. Total additional ridership post-game boarding at San Jose station was 2,534. Year-to-date additional ridership is 11,561, a 13.7 percent decrease compared to the same number of games in 2014/2015 season.
- **Giants Baseball** – There was one Giants exhibition game in March (vs. the A’s.)

Services scheduled:
- **San Jose Sharks** – Regular season continues. The last regular season home game will be on Saturday, April 9, 2016. The Sharks have clinched a wild card spot in the playoffs. Caltrain will be tracking post-game service ridership for all regular season and post-season home games. No additional special trains are planned.
- **Giants Baseball** – The regular season home opener against the Los Angeles Dodgers will be on Thursday, April 7 at 1:35 p.m. Caltrain will provide baseball service for all home games. Caltrain has updated the Special Event webpage for Giants 2016 Service and has a 2016 Giants Brochure in circulation. Starting in 2016, post-game service (weekday evening games and weekend games) will serve the Belmont Station in anticipation of construction and reduced parking at the San Carlos Station for the San Carlos Transit Center Project.
- **Monster Jam** – On Saturday, April 9 at 7:00 p.m. Monster Jam comes to Levi’s Stadium for the second year in a row. Caltrain will provide regular weekend service and will monitor ridership in coordination with the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority. No extra post-event service is planned.
- **San Mateo Bridges Replacement Project, Revised Caltrain Schedule & Bus Bridge** – On Saturday, April 16, 2016 Caltrain will operate a revised schedule for the replacement of the Poplar Avenue Bridge. SamTrans will provide the bus bridge for access between Hayward Park, San Mateo, and Burlingame stations.
- **Quint Street Replacement Project, Revised Caltrain Schedule & Bus Bridge** – On Saturday, April 30, 2016 Caltrain will operate a revised schedule for the replacement of Quint Street Bridge. SamTrans will provide the bus bridge for access between San Francisco 4th & King, 22nd Street, and Bayshore stations.
Capital Projects

- **Quint Bridge Replacement Project**: The scope of this project is to replace the structurally deficient steel bridge with an earthen berm. Quint Street was permanently closed in late October 2015 and PG&E relocations were completed in January 2016. Construction commenced with underground storm drains and sanitary sewer work in February. Construction of the retaining walls that help to support the earthen berm began in March. Cutover to the new berm and removal of the existing bridge is planned for the weekend of April 29 to May 1, 2016. A bus bridge between the 4th & King station and Bayshore station will be established to shuttle passengers during the cutover. Monthly bridge inspections have not shown any new defects and will continue until the bridge is replaced. 45 mph passenger operations on Main Track (MT) 1 and 30 mph passenger operations on MT2 remain in effect.

- **San Mateo Bridges Replacement**: Construction work for the replacement of four bridges in San Mateo is ongoing with three of the four bridges completed. Santa Inez Avenue was reopened to traffic on March 21, 2016 and Poplar Avenue was closed for construction on the same day. The final bridge replacement at Poplar Avenue Bridge is scheduled for the weekend of April 15-17, 2016. A bus bridge between Burlingame station and San Mateo station will be in place during the replacement. Restoration of street sidewalks and pavement on Poplar Avenue is expected to continue through May. Final trackwork improvements throughout the project will be performed after the Poplar Avenue Bridge work is completed.

- **San Francisco Highway Bridges**: Construction work for replacement of three vehicular bridges located at 22nd Street, 23rd Street, and Paul Avenue in San Francisco, is ongoing. At the 23rd Street Bridge, construction of sidewalks, bus pads and road pavement is in progress. The new 23rd Street Bridge is forecast to be complete and reopened to traffic in mid-April. Upon reopening of the 23rd Street Bridge, the 22nd Street Overcrossing will be closed to traffic to allow construction of the new 22nd Street Bridge to ensue. During construction of the new 22nd Street Bridge, a temporary pedestrian overpass will be in place to provide east-west access across 22nd Street to both the northbound and southbound station platforms. At the Paul Avenue Bridge, the demolition of the existing bridge was completed, and work on the foundations and columns of the replacement bridge is underway.

- **San Mateo 25th Avenue Grade Separation Project**: The scope of this project is to raise the elevation of the alignment from Hillsdale Avenue to south of the Highway 92 Overcrossing. The project creates a grade separation at 25th Avenue, and, creates two new east-west street connections at 28th and 31st Avenues in San Mateo. Accompanying this change is a relocation of the existing Hillsdale Station further north towards 28th Avenue. Environmental Clearance, Final Design, Right of Way acquisition and coordination with affected utility companies are ongoing. The current schedule is to complete the design by the summer of 2016.

- **Los Gatos Creek Bridge**: The scope of this project is to replace the substandard 80-year-old railroad bridge that is located south of the
Diridon Caltrain Station in San Jose. The new bridge is designed to meet current seismic standards in order to maintain safe railroad operations. Final Design continues with design completion planned for spring 2016. Coordination with the Union Pacific Railroad and affected utility companies is in progress. Advertising and bidding of the construction contract is targeted for the summer and fall of 2016. Due to environmental regulations, work within the creek’s waterways is restricted from mid-June to mid-October of 2017.

a) Customer Experience Taskforce Update
The mission of the Customer Experience Taskforce is to identify and develop ways to improve the customer experience on Caltrain service. This taskforce is a joint effort between the Agency and Transit America Services, Inc. and includes both operations and communications staff. The taskforce has identified short-term, medium-term and long-term goals. This item will remain as a standing update through this staff report.

Service Planning
In the short-term (six-18 months), the taskforce is spearheading efforts to:
- Study potential service expansion
- Monitor a new public timetable to improved service reliability (Implemented April 4)

Conductor Training
In the short-term (six-18 months), the taskforce is spearheading efforts to:
- Improve sensitivity training

Communications
In the short-term (six-18 months), the taskforce is spearheading efforts to:
- Identify current issues with the Predictive Arrival and Departure System and provide immediate fixes to the system
- Trend customer complaints to establish patterns
- Implement a customer/passenger survey to identify the top priorities for short-, medium- and long-range improvements (presentation to CAC in May)

Incident Management
In the short-term (six-18 months), the taskforce is spearheading efforts to:
- Improve and define incident management protocol

Fare/TVM Related
In the short-term (six-18 months), the taskforce is spearheading efforts to:
- Investigate Clipper Card issues
- Implement mobile ticketing
In the long term (24 months+), the taskforce is spearheading efforts to:
- Investigate potential of procurement of new Ticket Vending Machines
- Investigate and follow updates to Clipper Readers
Other Efforts
In the short-term (six-18 months), the taskforce is spearheading efforts to:
• Investigate Wi-Fi on trains (presentation to CAC 2/17/16)
• Investigate potential of a quiet car
• Identify ways to improve vehicle signage
In the medium term (18-24 months), the taskforce is spearheading efforts to:
• Investigate potential of a GPS app available for train tracking on website

b) Work Plan
AGENDA ITEM # 8 (b)  
APRIL 20, 2016

JPB CAC Work Plan

April 20, 2016
➢ Social media update

May 18, 2016
➢ * Cal Mod qtly update
➢ * Preliminary FY2017 Operating and Capital Budget
➢ Results of the Customer Experience Survey

June 15, 2016
➢ Annual Passenger Counts
➢ Bike Parking Management Plan – requested 11-18-15

July 20, 2016
➢ Fare Equity (including the MTC means-based fare pricing study)

August 17, 2016
➢
➢
➢

September 21, 2016
➢
➢
➢

Items to be scheduled
➢ Mobile ticketing – requested 12-16-15
➢ Incident management and recovery – requested by chair 3/2/16
➢ Station Access and Parking (getting to stations, capacity, usage, forecast, and planning – requested by chair 3/2/16, modified 3/16/16 by Adina)
➢ Bathrooms/bikes/ seats capacity (recommendation - motion)
➢ Short Range Transit Plan update

* Date certain (time sensitive item)
Items in bold are CAC member-requested