JPB Citizens Advisory Committee  
1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070  
Bacciocco Auditorium, 2nd Floor

June 15, 2016 – Wednesday  
5:40 p.m.

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 May 18, 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. Chairperson’s Report  
   (6:00 p.m.)

6. Committee Comments  
   (6:05 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.

7. Annual Passenger Counts (Catherine David)  (6:15 p.m.)

8. Customer Experience Survey Results (Christiane Kwok)  
   (6:35 p.m.)

9. Bike Parking Management Plan (Sebastian Petty)  
   (6:55 p.m.)

10. Staff Report (Danielle Stewart)  
    (7:25 p.m.)
    a) Customer Experience Taskforce Update
    b) JPB CAC Work Plan Update and Discussion of Possible Bye Month
    c) Caltrain Electrification Update

11. Date, Time and Place of Next Meeting  
    July 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

12. Adjournment

   All items on this agenda are subject to action

CAC MEMBERS:  
   San Francisco City & County: Jonathan Berk, Clarissa Cabansagan, 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.
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC)  
PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD (JPB)  
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT ADMINISTRATIVE BUILDING  
Bacciocco Auditorium, 2nd Floor  
1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos CA 94070  

MINUTES OF MAY 18, 2016

MEMBERS PRESENT:  J. Berk, C. Cabansagan, C. Cobey (Chair), A. Lee, A. Levin, C. Tucker

MEMBERS ABSENT:  G. Scharff, B. Shaw, Y. Mills

STAFF PRESENT:  J. Averill, E. Bettman, C. Fromson, A. Ly, D. Stewart

Chair Chris Cobey called the meeting to order at 5:45 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW CAC MEMBER, CLARRISSA CABANSAGAN, REPRESENTING SAN FRANCISCO

Clarrissa Cabansagan said she is a transportation advocate at Transform. She grew up on the Peninsula and is now a resident of San Francisco. She is a regional transit user and cyclist.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF APRIL 20, 2016

Motion/Second: Tucker/Berk  
Ayes: Berk, Cabansagan, Lee, Levin, Tucker, Cobey  
Absent: Scharff, Shaw, Mills

PUBLIC COMMENT

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said some trains with 650 seats are five-car Gallery trains and are at 146 percent capacity, and some trains with 762 seats are six-car Bombardier trains and are at 90 percent capacity. The Board minutes of January 9, 2014 read, “The plan is to have every Bombardier set become a six-car train and there will be an additional Bombardier six-car train for a total of 6 six-car Bombardier train sets.” He said there are only five six-car Bombardier trains. He said the sixth train never happened and these cars are currently parked in Diridon for the last two years. The minutes also read, “creating an extra train allows staff to break down a Gallery train and add cars to other Gallery sets so there will be five Gallery sets with six-cars.” He said if there were five trains with six cars, there would not be any overcrowding problems right now. He said this option was supposed to cost about $8 million, but within six months the cost went up to $15 million. He said staff did not want too many older style cars because it is going to electrify in 2019, but the entire fleet was supposed to be replaced last year. He is going to ask the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) to do something about it.
Jeff Carter, Millbrae, said last month he made comments about 22nd Street. There are signs that say 22nd Street is closed. The train station is still open. It would be helpful to the customers if there was better signage that 22nd Street Caltrain Station is open. More clarity during bridge construction would be helpful.

COMMITTEE COMMENTS
Jonathan Berk said any train more than one minute late should be counted as late, not if they’re more than five minutes late. He would like to see statistics about late trains. The trains slow down between Burlingame and San Mateo because of construction whether or not there are workers out there. People are not working between 6 a.m. and 7 a.m. and so the trains at that time should not have to slow down. He would like to know how that decision was made.

Chair Cobey the CAC used to schedule meetings at alternate locations in San Francisco and Santa Clara County, and if anyone wants to do that to contact him. He asked when the last time there was a non-Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) shuttle between Millbrae and San Francisco International Airport (SFO).

Public Comment
Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said he lives in south San Jose and has to drive to the CAC meetings because there are not enough trains that go from San Carlos to San Jose after the meeting, and he would appreciate more service to that area.

CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT
Chair Cobey said Vice Chair Brian Shaw provided the report to the Board at the last meeting. He said he would like the staff report to be the next item.

STAFF REPORT
Danielle Stewart, Acting Director, Rail Transportation, said
- There were a number of passenger strikes in April.
- Staff is continuing to monitor the timetable effect. Staff is isolating and evaluating specific trains to see how the adjusted timetable is working.

Adina Levin asked how long it takes for passengers needing assistance to get on and off a train. Ms. Stewart said she does not have a general timeframe because there are some variables to the situation. Casey Fromson, Manager, Government Affairs, said to load passengers using the mini-high ramps takes between one and two minutes, and if the manual crank is used it takes up to five minutes.

Customer Experience Taskforce
Ms. Stewart said she tried to lay out the structure to be more transparent as to the rollup of new and existing committees of the Customer Experience Taskforce. A system cleanliness committee is being formed, which was raised via the survey concerning stations and facilities and maintenance of way and equipment.

Mr. Berk said he has only achieved one thing while on this committee, and that is to reduce trains leaving the San Francisco station early. Conductor training has succeeded. Trains don’t leave early at 4th and King anymore.
Chair Cobey said doors close consistently early in San Jose. The train he took today was moving out of the station at the time it was supposed to leave, which indicates the doors closed early.

Cat Tucker said the policy or methods to improve signage and train labeling will need to be thought about going forward with the new trains. If the answer is that signage can’t be improved now for any reason, she hopes that going forward with the new trains the issue is embedded to be addressed. Ms. Fromson said it will be part of the discussion for the new electric trains.

Ms. Levin asked if there is an update on rehabilitating the preowned trains and putting them into service. Ms. Stewart said she will need to look into it.

Annie Lee said communications and incident management is not limited to vehicle signage and possibilities on the platforms should be considered, like using the Predictive Arrival/Departure System (PADS) to display train type, whether it is limited, express, or local, or having a monitor that lists all stations.

**Work Plan**
Ms. Stewart said the June agenda items include annual passenger counts, bike parking management plan, and the results of the Customer Experience Survey.

**Public Comment**
Jeff Carter, Millbrae, said BART to SFO opened in June 2003, and before that there was a free shuttle between the Millbrae station and SFO that met every train and worked very well. Before that SamTrans had Route 3B, which ran from Millbrae to the airport and to Daly City BART.

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said trains arrive early in Diridon in time for people to catch the light rail. The train is made to wait in Diridon because it cannot leave early. By the time he gets to Tamien he misses the light rail between five and 15 seconds. Capitol Corridor is going to place display screens in every car that gives full information about the trains. The cost for the entire fleet is $4 million. He said the lobby of this building is an example of every San Mateo County Transit District (District) project that does not go anywhere. PADS does not work. Communications-Based Overlay Signal System (CBOSS), the refurbishment of the cars, and every other project goes the same way. At some point another managing agency should take over the JPB.

**PRELIMINARY FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2017 OPERATING BUDGET**
Eileen Bettman, Manager, Budgets, presented:
- Farebox revenues have increased 4.4 times since FY2004
- Farebox recovery is 63 percent
- Farebox revenue is projected to be at $91.7 million, a $5.5 million increase
- Total preliminary revenue is $146.4 million, an increase of $7.2 million
- Total preliminary expenses are $146.4 million, an increase of $7.2 million
• Service Investment
  o New equipment includes the third bike car added to Bombardier trains, additional maintenance personnel needed for increased fleet size, budgeting for additional railcars in FY2017
  o CBOSS/Positive Train Control (PTC) operation and maintenance will be initiated in FY2017
  o Special service demands approximate cost per each special service train is $2,000
• Percentage of total administration cost to total operating expenses:
  o Caltrain: 5.3 percent
  o Altamont Corridor Express: 14.6 percent
  o Virginia Railway Express: 7 percent
  o TRI-Rail: 9.6 percent
  o Metrolink: 11.5 percent
• Member contributions
  o San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA): $5.6 million
  o VTA: $9 million
  o District: $6.5 million

Mr. Berk asked why member contributions went down. Ms. Fromson said staff will bring information back to the CAC about the history of member contributions.

• Reserves used to balance budgets – historically Caltrain uses cash reserves to balance its budget, but when actuals came in the reserves were not needed. $18.7 million in reserves is budgeted for FY2017, but staff does not expect to need it

Mr. Berk asked if the reserves are previously built up surpluses or reserves from maintenance. Ms. Bettman said it is budget surplus that have been built up, but only takes a year or two with the deficit to wipe out.

• Caltrain’s structural deficit
  o Deficit has historically been covered by members
  o Starting in 2011, right of way repayments bolstered member contributions
  o Right of way repayment funding has been exhausted
  o Prior year savings cannot support current deficit
  o Dedicated funding and/or increased member contributions is essential
• Reducing the structural deficit
  o Increase member agency contributions to historical levels (short term)
  o Comprehensive fare study findings
  o Obtain new, dedicated funding source (long term)
• Next steps
  o Near term: June Board meeting: budget approval
  o Long term:
    ▪ Continue discussions with member agencies and funding partners on funding options
    ▪ Review fare study findings and proposed actions
- Continue to work with stakeholders and the MTC to develop strategies for new revenue sources including a dedicated, permanent funding source

Ms. Levin asked if the added railcars in 2017 are over and above the additional railcars that have been put into service. Ms. Stewart said that cost refers to the additional staff costs that were hired up in FY2016 to maintain the additional cars.

Ms. Levin asked how many special event trains need special event tickets. Ms. Stewart said the majority are regular ticket.

Ms. Levin said the upcoming fare study is looking at the structure of the Go Pass system, which gives corporate customers a really good deal. Ms. Bettman said it has been the subject of discussion.

Mr. Berk asked how farebox revenue went up by the same amount of the costs. Ms. Stewart said it is coincidental that the numbers are similar. The basis behind the expense increase on the contract operator is the increase in salaries, the annualization of the hiring up done in FY2016 for a fully loaded FY2017, and the PTC expenses that are going to be annualized.

Mr. Berk said he would be interested to see what the actual cost is to add one more passenger. If the objective was to maximize profits, the best way to solve the problem is to make farebox revenue 100 percent. He said he is not suggesting that should be the goal, but to figure out how to achieve its goal, the JPB would need to know what the cost is to add one passenger and what the benefit is of adding trains. If the JPB does not want to dip into reserves and adding another train makes money, then adding another train could help avoid dipping into reserves.

Ms. Tucker said the goal is to get people to use trains and get them off the freeway, but if rates are raised people who can’t afford the train are cut off. It costs over $18 to go from Gilroy to her work in Santa Clara.

Ms. Levin said the Strategic Plan has many goals. It would be helpful to refine and prioritize the goals to help clarify operating, fare, and revenue strategies.

Ms. Cabansagan asked if there has been a comprehensive look at increasing parking revenues as a strategy to increase revenue. She would like to know why there was a dip in partner contributions, and whether the JPB looked into surplus land and building housing or developing the land and taking the value capture from that development. Ms. Fromson said surplus land is something JPB is looking into. There are a couple of transit-oriented development projects planned along the corridor. There was a dramatic increase in parking fares partly to address Levi’s Stadium events. There is a study in place to look at access to stations. Part of the dip in partner contributions was due to the recession. If the District is not able to put in as much of a contribution other partners reduce their share. Ms. Fromson would like to make sure the CAC gets the full history of partner contributions.
Public Comment
Roland Lebrun, San Jose, to increase ridership capacity needs to be increased. In Europe the way to increase ridership is to provide something faster, more convenient and less expensive than driving a car. He knows a person who runs a railway in Europe who is willing to pay $4 million a year to the JPB to run trains on the Caltrain right of way. The budget is not balanced because if the operating cost is added to the administrative costs, it costs $145.1 million, and the budget is $146.4 million. He said staff overestimated fuel by over $10 million last year. Staff wasted $200,000 on hedging. This year, staff is artificially increasing the cost of fuel by 50 percent. He said money saved at the end of the year just disappears. He said the District’s contribution is supposed to be $6.5 million, but they are charging $8.8 million for wages and benefits and $6 million for managing agency administrative overhead, which means the net contribution from the District to Caltrain is $500,000.

Jeff Carter, Millbrae, said this agency is a participant of the Go Pass. Agencies that participate have to buy a Go Pass for every employee that works there even if they don’t use Caltrain. It would be great if the committee could get an idea how the Go Pass works and how ridership is estimated. When the right of way was purchased the District fronted the full amount of the purchase because San Francisco and VTA did not have the money. VTA was having issues with their budgets a few years ago and froze their contributions at a certain level and it did not increase for several years, and San Mateo County and San Francisco had to increase their contribution. Staff should provide an incremental cost of adding trains such as after 7 p.m. or 8 p.m. when there is room in the schedule.

PRELIMINARY FISCAL YEAR 2017 CAPITAL BUDGET
Aandy Ly, Manager, Budgets, presented:

- Preliminary FY2017 Capital Budget
  - Presented a preliminary constrained budget of $253.8 million
  - The preliminary budget included $19.5 million in local funds, or a funding request to each JPB member of $6.5 million
  - Reported that JPB members had committed to a contribution of $15 million ($5 million each)
  - Discussed the $25.5 million in deferred capital program and critical ongoing capital needs
- Changes since May 5, 2016
  - Deferred State of Good Repair in Grade Crossing, Rolling Stock and Station, and Operational Improvement projects in the amount of roughly $3 million
  - Increased Caltrain Modernization (CalMod) Program Budget by $100,000 due to revised cash flow
- The total Proposed FY2017 Capital Budget is $250.9 million
  - CalMod: 82.5 percent or $207.2 million
  - Legal mandates: 5.9 percent or $14.7 million
  - Operational improvements and enhancements: 1.9 percent or $4.7 million
  - Planning and studies: 0.8 percent or $2 million
  - Station and intermodal access: 0.6 percent or $1.4 million
Right of way/signals and communication: 5.5 percent or $13.9 million
Rolling stock: 2.8 percent or $7 million

- FY2017 funding sources
  - Federal grants: $11.9 million
  - State and regional grants: $7.2 million
  - Other (includes early investment program (EIP)): $216.8 million
  - Member agency contributions: $15 million

Ms. Levin said in the Board presentation there was some indication that expenses being deferred included some state of good repair money. She asked if the budget is good enough to maintain the vehicles so they won’t break down. Mr. Ly said each individual project is scored and ranked. The most critical projects or the most impactful projects in terms of the quality of service ranked at the top. The bottom four or five projects were deferred. Station painting projects are an example of deferred projects.

Ms. Stewart said the JPB is able to fund everything needed for the maintenance of rolling stock. Staff asked for enough money to procure the 15 separate head end power units that are needed, but only have enough funding for the labor to do 10. Should funding become available to do the labor, the material will be available. Every request on mechanical front has been addressed.

Ms. Tucker asked if funding for Wi-Fi is included in this budget. Ms. Fromson said someone will get back to the CAC.

Public Comment
Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said no one knows what the JPB is going to do with the $207.2 million for CalMod. He said the JPB never saw any of the $600 million from Proposition 1A funds back when the nine-party memorandum of understanding (MOU) was signed, and the JPB will not see it this time with the seven-party MOU either because the JPB cannot legally use Proposition 1A funds to electrify a 79-mile-per-hour system. There has been $440 million in Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funds sitting around and in the 2012 agreement the JPB used it as matching funds for the Proposition 1A funds, but it never went anywhere. Two years ago the Executive Director tried to take $15 million out of that fund but the MTC told him that money is only for the new train sets. Now the total cost for modernization is over $2.2 billion. He said staff believes they will get another $647 million of FTA funds after the election, so the JPB intends to borrow $125 million out of the $440 million pot of FTA and hope things work out after the election. If things don’t work out, that $125 million that could be used to buy five eight-car electric train sets will be blown on rebuilding Gallery train sets and fixing the locomotives.

PENINSULA CORRIDOR ELECTRIFICATION PROJECT QUARTERLY UPDATE (PENINSULA CORRIDOR ELECTRIFICATION PROJECT CONTRACT STATUS AND ELECTRIC VEHICLE CONSIDERATIONS INCLUDING BATHROOMS)
Ms. Fromson presented:
- Electrification Infrastructure Contract
  - 2014: June: Pre-qualification process (six firms)
• 2015:
  ▪ February: Request for Proposals (RFP) issued
  ▪ August: Proposals received (four firms)
  ▪ October: Shortlisted (three firms)
  ▪ December: Best and Final Offer (BAFO) issued

• 2016:
  ▪ February: BAFO proposal received
  ▪ March: Apparent best value proposal

• BAFO Process
  ▪ Competition between three shortlisted firms
  ▪ Goal to improve initial proposals received
    ▪ Modified work windows to allow more access
    ▪ Strategic weekend closure in tunnels allowed
    ▪ Utilization of current signal houses with existing capacity
  ▪ BAFO proposal results
    ▪ Seven-month reduction in schedule
    ▪ Significant cost savings
    ▪ Best value proposal with highest technical score and lowest cost

• Electric Multiple Unit (EMU) Contract
  ▪ 2014: May: Request for Information (six firms)
  ▪ 2015:
    ▪ January – June: Compatible boarding heights discussion (two – four firms)
    ▪ July: RFP issued based on JPB direction
  ▪ 2016: February: Proposal received

• Contract Next Steps
  ▪ For both infrastructure and EMUs
  ▪ Continue negotiation on price
  ▪ Discuss/finalize policy decisions
  ▪ Contract award
    ▪ Limited Notice to Proceed for six months
    ▪ Full Notice to Proceed in 2017

• Funding Update
  ▪ May: Regional seven-party supplemental memorandum of understanding (MOU)
  ▪ June/July: State/California High-Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) agreement
  ▪ August: Cap and Trade grant award
  ▪ End of 2016: FTA Core Capacity award

• EMU Policy Discussion

• Board Action (July 2015)
  ▪ RFP for EMUs
    ▪ Design vehicle with one bathroom per train
    ▪ Option for no bathrooms
  ▪ Consider additional bathrooms at stations

• Public Feedback EMUs
  ▪ Sources
    ▪ Rider surveys in 2014, 2015, and 2016 (approximately 10,000 responses)
• Public meetings (18)
  • E-mail, website, social media
    o Priority: #1 more seats; #2 more standing space
    o Support for bathroom dips when capacity tradeoffs explained
    o Majority desire at least one bathroom onboard (especially for special events and unexpected incidents)

• Technical Information
  o One bathroom per train, cost for fleet
    • $2.8 million (proposal)
    • Annual operation and maintenance costs
  o Capacity
    • One bathroom eliminates approximately 12 seats of 24 standees (proposal)

• Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Considerations
  o Current law
    • Does not require any bathrooms or any specific number per train
    • If one is included, both bathroom and car must be ADA accessible and clearly marked
  o Bathrooms would likely be in the second car and all passengers expecting to need it would be encouraged to use this car
  o One bathroom per train is acceptable to FTA

• Bathrooms at Stations
  o Public bathrooms at San Francisco and Diridon Caltrain stations
  o Private bathrooms at several stations for patrons of a private business
  o Costs for a standalone facility
    • $134,000 capital cost per unit (Portland Loo estimate for installation in Portland)
    • Additional hookup costs
    • Annual operation and maintenance costs
  o Other condensations such as security

• Bicycle Elements
  o July Board action
    • EMUs must have an 8:1 ratio of seats to bikes
    • $3 million capital commitment to bike parking at stations
  o Bike parking management plan
    • Ongoing, kickoff March 2016
    • Will identify needs and implementation approach
  o Additional public involvement on onboard bike configuration post-award

• Additional Doors
  o Off-the-shelf option with low-level doors only
  o Dual doors option with upper doors sealed initially with seats in front

• Dual Doors
  o Context
    • Requested by stakeholders
    • Not to preclude future CHSRA boarding decisions
    • Customized vehicle
  o Technical information
    • Requires internal lift if upper doors opened
Cost of upper doors plus lift: $30 million (proposal)

Timeline
- May: solicit public feedback
- June: JPB bathroom policy decision
- July: award contract

Ms. Tucker asked if the $30 million proposal for the lift is for the whole fleet. Because of high-speed rail, there is also the cost of possibly raising the platforms. She asked if anyone has taken into account these extra costs to make sure there is enough money for the high-speed rail project. Ms. Fromson said the JPB is not committing to making any changes to the platforms, and the new trains will be able to operate with the platforms and stations as they exist today.

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

Ms. Levin said last time this issue came up the CAC was in favor of keeping bathrooms on the train.

Ms. Tucker said her opinion is to have at least one on each train, maybe two. Since all this money is being spent, it might as well be done right the first time. She said since another bathroom cannot be added in the future, she is in favor of two bathrooms.

Chair Cobey said he is in favor of at least one bathroom per train.

Ms. Levin said she is in favor of at least one bathroom per train.

Ms. Lee said she is in favor of one bathroom per train. Based on the distance the train travels and the frequency of the trains, having none onboard will not work.

Ms. Cabansagan said there should be at least one bathroom. If customers’ trips are longer it might merit a second bathroom in some trains. Ms. Levin said people who have longer commutes and people on special trains and when there are breakdowns have a higher need for onboard bathrooms.

Ms. Cabansagan said with the tradeoff between bathrooms and capacity, it is a hard sell to get two bathrooms per train.

Public Comment
Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said trains with 650 seats have 2 bathrooms and trains with 762 seats have six bathrooms. The JPB forgot the capacity analysis they did four years ago. To get 110,000 people in and out of Transbay, they needed a minimum of 950 seats per train. With that number of people per train, the train needs a minimum of two bathrooms per train. If anything happens to that bathroom, there needs to be a backup. When the train is so packed it is physically impossible to walk from one end of the train to the other to get to a different bathroom. Something is wrong with the EMU procurement if it is saying a bathroom takes up 12 seats. The person that wants to run trains is going to have bathrooms. Different platform heights will never happen.
Jeff Carter, Millbrae, said the Caltrain service plan is to have six trains per hour per
direction. That is what constraining capacity. The JPB is using this excuse to not put
bathrooms on the trains. He said he does not know how accurate 12 seats per
bathroom really is. There should be at least one bathroom for every two cars. He said
to look at the big picture and think of higher capacity through longer trains and more
trains per hour. CHSRA should not dictate platform heights to Caltrain.

DATE, TIME AND LOCATION OF NEXT REGULAR MEETING:
June 15, 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 7:26 p.m.
PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD
STAFF REPORT

TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
Executive Director

FROM: Michelle Bouchard
Chief Operating Officer, Rail

SUBJECT: 2016 CALTRAIN ANNUAL COUNT PRESENTATION

ACTION
This report is for information only. No Board action is required.

SIGNIFICANCE
The presentation of the results of the 2016 Caltrain Annual Counts demonstrates the passenger ridership growth that Caltrain is experiencing. Analysis of the ridership numbers and passenger use of the stations and trains will guide decisions made regarding the Fiscal Year 2017 Operating and Capital budgets.

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no impact on the budget.

BACKGROUND
The Annual Counts are conducted every year in the early calendar months. This year counts were performed in January, February, and March as a result of suspending the counts during large special events that would skew ridership including the 10 days during Super Bowl 50 week. The counts provide detailed ridership data for planning purposes. Boardings and alightings are counted on each train and at each station. Results and analysis will be delivered in the presentation and further detailed in the Key Findings Report, which will be posted on the Caltrain website in late spring.

The presentation is available at this link:

Prepared by: Catherine David, Senior Planner 650.508.6471
TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
Executive Director

FROM: Seamus Murphy
Chief Communications Officer

SUBJECT: CUSTOMER EXPERIENCE SURVEY

ACTION
This report is for information only. No board action is required.

SIGNIFICANCE
The Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) conducted an online Customer Experience Survey between February 28 and March 20 to help identify areas for potential improvements to the Caltrain customer experience. The results of this survey have been used to inform development of the 2016 Customer Satisfaction Survey, which will refine and prioritize opportunities for service improvements.

The survey was administered using Survey Monkey. 2,956 responses were received, and 2,396 respondents completed the full questionnaire. Although the survey was opt-in and therefore does not statistically reflect Caltrain ridership, it does provide important customer feedback that can be used to guide and inform development of potential improvements.

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no impact on the budget.

BACKGROUND
During the survey period, various methods were utilized to reach riders and encourage their participation, including online advertising and outreach, print advertising, and onboard materials. The JPB also promoted the survey through its electronic newsletter, Peninsula Moves, and reached out to stakeholders including Go Pass companies.

Customers were asked to rate the importance of various aspects of the service, potential amenities and other issues on a scale of one to five, with five being very important. In addition, respondents were asked to rank priorities issues, initiatives and improvements by selecting their top priorities and ranking them against one another.
Key findings include:

- More frequent service and shorter commute times received the highest service-related ratings.
- The most important amenities identified by customers included improved schedule and real-time updates, improved ticket machines with Clipper integration, and a smartphone app with real-time information and mobile ticketing functionality.
- Respondents were generally positive about the value of service provided by Caltrain, rating it at 3.35 out of five points.
- 43 percent of respondents use Transportation Network Companies (TNC) (such as Lyft or Uber) to connect with Caltrain. According to the survey, among adults, use of TNCs increases as age decreases. Also, respondents with incomes of $50,000 or more are more likely to use TNCs than respondents with lower incomes.
- The most important amenity for the new electric trains is seating, rated highest among all options at 4.43. In addition to the demand for seating, there is notable interest in standing room/leaning room (3.34 rating), onboard bathrooms (3.01 rating), and bike storage (3.01 rating). These ratings are consistent with prior surveys on this topic.
- 74 percent of respondents have been riding Caltrain at least one year
- 82 percent of respondents mainly use Caltrain to commute to and from work

The survey introduction, executive summary and findings are attached. The full report is available online at www.caltrain.com/surveys.

Prepared By: Christiane Kwok, Manager, Market Research and Development 650.508.7926
Project Manager: Patrick Thompson, Market Research Specialist 650.508.6245
Caltrain Customer Experience Survey

Market Research & Development

March 2016
The Caltrain Customer Experience Program was recently implemented to identify short-, mid- and long- range improvements in collaboration with the Citizens Advisory Committee. Part of this initiative also includes seeking input from the frequent, infrequent and non-riders through online, intercept and focus group studies that will guide Caltrain efforts in providing the ultimate customer experience.

In this first online survey, Caltrain asked the general public to rate and identify priorities, and provide ridership and demographic information. This is not a statistically valid study but it’s the first step to help Caltrain’s improvement process. The results of this survey will inform the questions on the next statistically valid Customer Satisfaction Survey in June. The last study of this series will be a focus group in which Caltrain will test some of the possible improvements and ensure they make a positive impact on riders’ daily use of the system.
The Customer Experience Survey was conducted as an opt-in, online survey and even though the response rate was high, it does not represent the entire Caltrain customer base or the general population of the counties which Caltrain serves.

As an example, when compared to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission’s 2014 Origin & Destination Survey, respondents differ in terms of ridership and demographic characteristics including:

- More likely to be a Go Pass user than in O&D study (32% vs. 18%) and less likely to be a Caltrain Monthly Pass user (31% vs. 41%)
- Twice as likely to be riding Caltrain for four years or more (50% vs. 25%), while less likely to be riding Caltrain for less than a year (15% vs. 37%)
- Less likely to ride Caltrain at least five days per week (46% vs. 52%)
- More likely to be White (61% vs. 54%) and less likely to be Asian (20% vs. 28%) or Black (2% vs. 8%)
- Less likely to be between the ages of 25 and 54 (71% vs. 75%)
- More likely to have annual household incomes of $100,000 (53% vs. 47%)
- Less likely to be male (53% vs. 56%)
Ridership Characteristics

- Half of respondents (50%) have been riding Caltrain for four years or more. Another third (34%) have been riding for one to three years.

- Nearly six in ten respondents (59%) ride Caltrain at least 4 days a week.

- About one-third each of respondents use Go Pass (32%) or Caltrain Monthly Pass (31%).

- The majority of respondents (82%) report traveling with Caltrain to get to work.

- About one-quarter of respondents board Caltrain at San Jose Diridon or San Francisco station (12% each). One-third (35%) exit at San Francisco station, while another 17 percent exit at Palo Alto.

Service Measurements

Respondents were asked about several aspects of service and asked to rate them on a 5-point scale where 5 is very important and 1 is not at all important, as well as rank them in terms of priority. Respondents are most interested in more frequent service in general, trains with shorter commute times, and more shoulder peak service as these received the highest ratings. Independent of the actual rankings, these themes appeared more frequently among the ranked items as well.
Other Measurements

Respondents were also asked about several aspects of communication, customer comfort/enjoyment, and payment and asked to rate them on a 5-point scale where 5 is very important and 1 is not at all important, as well as rank them in terms of priority.

Real-time information was rated very highly by respondents, including improved real-time updates (onboard or at stations) at 4.34, and schedule and real-time information available on a smartphone app at 4.33. Better directional signage at stations was rated a 2.99.

Respondents did not rate any items related to customer comfort/enjoyment very highly but allowing food and drinks onboard at 3.30, a quiet car at 3.24, and increased bike storage and bike share facilities at 2.97 were among the highest rated. Pay as you go Wi-fi and access to concession at stations were rated a 2.68 and 2.60, respectively. Free Wi-fi service was not offered as a rating option on this survey because of the unlikelihood of this being an option for Caltrain to offer.

In terms of payment options, respondents are most interested in improved ticket machines with Clipper integration (3.82 rating), followed by a smartphone app with mobile ticketing (3.65 rating), and the ability to pay for parking with a mobile app (3.27 rating).

Independent of the actual rankings, the most important themes identified by customers are improved real-time updates, schedule and real-time information available on a
Executive Summary

smartphone app, improved ticket machines with Clipper integration, and a smartphone app with mobile ticketing.

Value of Service

Respondents were generally positive about the value of Caltrain giving it a mean of 3.35 on a 5-point scale.

Use of Transportation Network Companies

Forty-three percent of respondents use Transportation Network Companies (such as Lyft or Uber) to connect with Caltrain. Among adults, use of TNCs increases as age decreases. Also, respondents with incomes of $50,000 or more are more likely to use TNCs than respondents with lower incomes.

Electric Train Amenities

Respondents were asked about potential amenities on the new electric trains and asked to rate them on a 5-point scale where 5 is very important and 1 is not at all important, as well as rank them in terms of priority. By far the most important amenity for the new electric trains is seating, rated highest among all options at 4.43. In addition to the demand for seating, there is notable interest in standing room/leaning room (3.34 rating), onboard bathrooms (3.01 rating), and bike storage (3.01 rating), as well as lesser interest in maximum seating with bathrooms at stations only (2.81 rating), and luggage storage (2.36 rating). Even though forgoing bathrooms on board received a lower average rating than having bathrooms onboard (2.81 vs. 3.01), the share of
respondents indicating the importance of bathrooms onboard vs. at stations only is very similar. Thirty-six percent rated onboard bathrooms a 4 or 5, while nearly as many respondents (34%) rated having bathrooms at stations only a 4 or 5.

When asked to rank the various electric train amenities in terms of their priorities, seating was by far the top priority. Standing/leaning room was a distant second, while the rest were ranked much lower.
**Service Ratings**

Respondents indicate that in general they would like more frequent service and trains with shorter commute times. On a scale of 1-5 these rated a 4.20 and 4.18, respectively, in terms of importance. More shoulder peak service was rated nearly as high with a mean of 3.89.

*Please indicate how important each of the following is to you on a scale of 1-5 where 5 is very important and 1 is not at all important. If the question does not apply please select N/A.*

![Bar chart showing service ratings](chart.png)
Service Rankings

Independent of the actual rankings, the most common themes identified by customers are more frequent service in general, trains with shorter commute times, and more shoulder peak service.

Note that respondents were only asked to rank their top 3 priorities so some items were only ranked by a small number of respondents. Therefore, rather than using the mean scores to determine the top priorities, the most common themes are presented in terms of the percent of total respondents who ranked the service item as a priority.

Now please rank the importance of each of the following items by indicating which is your first priority, second, and third priority?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>% of Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In general, more frequent service</td>
<td>948 804 514</td>
<td>2,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, trains with shorter commute times</td>
<td>982 696 436</td>
<td>2,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More shoulder peak service (just past rush hour)</td>
<td>387 612 697</td>
<td>1,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More frequent weekend or mid-day service</td>
<td>230 453 659</td>
<td>1,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded service after 10:30 pm</td>
<td>173 249 410</td>
<td>832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded service between San Jose &amp; Gilroy</td>
<td>149 55 153</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Communications Ratings

Real-time updates and information available on smartphone app were rated very highly by respondents. Improved real-time updates (onboard or at stations) received a mean rating of 4.34 on a 5-point scale, while schedule and real-time information available on a smartphone app received a mean rating of 4.33.

Please indicate how important each of the following is to you on a scale of 1-5 where 5 is very important and 1 is not at all important. If the question does not apply please select N/A.

![Bar chart showing ratings](chart.png)
Survey Findings

Customer Comfort / Enjoyment Ratings

Respondents did not rate any items related to customer comfort /enjoyment very highly but allowing food and drinks onboard (3.30 mean), a quiet car (3.24 mean), and increased bike storage and bike share facilities (2.97 mean) were among the highest rated.

Please indicate how important each of the following is to you on a scale of 1-5 where 5 is very important and 1 is not at all important. If the question does not apply please select N/A.

[Bar chart showing ratings for various amenities with n=2,907]
Survey Findings

Payment Ratings

In terms of payment options, respondents are most interested in improved ticket machines with Clipper integration (3.82 mean), followed by a smartphone app with mobile ticketing (3.65 mean).

Please indicate how important each of the following is to you on a scale of 1-5 where 5 is very important and 1 is not at all important. If the question does not apply please select N/A.

![Bar Chart]

n=2,897
Survey Findings

**Rankings** (Communications, Customer Comfort/Enjoyment, Payment)

Independent of the actual rankings, the most important themes identified by customers are improved real-time updates, schedule and real-time information available on a smartphone app, improved ticket machines with Clipper integration, and a smartphone app with mobile ticketing.

Note that respondents were only asked to rank their top 3 priorities so some items were only ranked by a small number of respondents. Therefore, rather than using the mean scores to determine the top priorities, the most common themes are presented in terms of the percent of total respondents who ranked the item as a priority.

*Again, please rank the importance of each of the following items by indicating which is your first priority, second, and third priority?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rankings</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>% of Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved real-time updates (onboard or at station)</td>
<td>652 633 433</td>
<td>1,718 61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule and real-time information available on a smartphone app</td>
<td>609 604 398</td>
<td>1,611 57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved ticket machines with Clipper integration</td>
<td>251 272 294</td>
<td>817 29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A smartphone app with mobile ticketing</td>
<td>243 271 301</td>
<td>815 29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet car</td>
<td>249 209 257</td>
<td>715 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased bike storage and bike share facilities</td>
<td>304 179 192</td>
<td>675 24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowing food and drinks onboard</td>
<td>204 190 248</td>
<td>642 23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay as you go Wi-Fi</td>
<td>181 154 192</td>
<td>527 19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to pay for parking using a mobile app</td>
<td>78 160 244</td>
<td>482 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better directional signage at stations</td>
<td>48 82 116</td>
<td>246 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to concession (food/drink) at stations</td>
<td>19 84 163</td>
<td>266 9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Value of Service**

Respondents were generally positive about the value of Caltrain. Using a scale of 1-5 where 5 is great value for the money and 1 is poor value for the money, 42 percent gave a rating of 4 or 5, while one-third had neutral feelings. The mean was 3.35.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value of Service (n=2,826)</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate the value of Caltrain's service relative to the amount you pay on a scale of 1-5 where 5 is great value for the money and 1 is poor value for the money</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Use of TNCs

Forty-three percent of respondents use Transportation Network Companies (such as Lyft or Uber) to connect with Caltrain. Among adults, use of TNCs increases as age decreases. Respondents with incomes of $50,000 or more are more likely to use TNCs than respondents with lower incomes.

Do you ever use a Transportation Network Company (e.g., Lyft, Uber) to connect with Caltrain?

![Pie chart showing usage of TNCs]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>12 or younger</th>
<th>13-17</th>
<th>18-24</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55-64</th>
<th>65 or older</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use TNC</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Less than $30,000</th>
<th>$30,000-$49,999</th>
<th>$50,000-$74,999</th>
<th>$75,000-$99,999</th>
<th>$100,000-$149,999</th>
<th>$150,000-$199,999</th>
<th>$200,000 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use TNC</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Electric Train Amenity Ratings**

By far the most important amenity for the new electric trains is seating (mean rating of 4.43 on a 5-point scale). In addition to the demand for seating there is notable interest in standing room/leaning room (3.34), as well as onboard bathrooms and bike storage (each receiving a mean of 3.01).

Even though forgoing bathrooms on board received a lower average rating than having bathrooms onboard (2.81 vs. 3.01), the share of respondents indicating the importance of bathrooms onboard vs. at stations only is very similar. Thirty-six percent rated onboard bathrooms a 4 or 5, while nearly as many respondents (34%) rated having bathrooms at stations only a 4 or 5.

*In order to meet Caltrain’s growing demand for service, new electric trains will be configured to maximize customer capacity. Some space allocated for seating could be used for standing room, bike storage, luggage and bathrooms, or a combination of these. Please indicate how important each of the following is to you on a scale of 1-5 where 5 is Very Important and 1 is Not at all Important. If the question does not apply please select N/A.*


Electric Train Amenity Rankings

When asked to rank the various electric train amenities in terms of their priorities, seating was by far the top priority. Standing/leaning room was a distant second, while the rest were ranked much lower.

Note that for electric train amenities respondents were asked to prioritize each amenity, not just the top 3. The mean score, therefore, is presented to illustrate the top priorities. The lower the mean score the more highly the amenity was ranked.

Now please rank the importance of each of the following items on new electric trains by indicating which is your first priority, second priority, third priority and so on.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electric Train Rankings (n=2,747)</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
<th>5th</th>
<th>6th</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seating</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,528</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing room/leaning room</td>
<td></td>
<td>166</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike storage</td>
<td></td>
<td>458</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathroom</td>
<td></td>
<td>308</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum seating (bathrooms at stations only)</td>
<td></td>
<td>259</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luggage storage</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ridership

Longevity of Use

Half of respondents have been riding Caltrain for four years or more. Another third (34%) have been riding for one to three years.
Survey Findings

Ridership

Frequency of Use

Nearly six in ten respondents (59%) ride Caltrain at least 4 days a week.
Ridership

Fare Category

About one-third each of respondents to this survey use Go Pass (32%) or Caltrain Monthly Pass (31%).

How do you typically pay for your trip when taking Caltrain?

- One-way ticket: 3%
- Day Pass: 4%
- Go Pass: 6%
- Clipper cash value: 31%
- Clipper 8-ride Ticket: 32%
- Clipper Caltrain Monthly Pass: 19%
- Other (please specify): 5%

n=2,701
Ridership

Main Trip Purpose

The majority of respondents (82%) report traveling with Caltrain to get to work.
Ridership

Stations Used

About one-quarter of respondents board Caltrain at San Jose Diridon or San Francisco station (12% each). One-third (35%) exit at San Francisco station, while another 17 percent exit at Palo Alto.

*At what station do you typically board and exit Caltrain?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Caltrain</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
<th>Exit Caltrain</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Diridon</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Millbrae</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22nd Street</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>San Jose Diridon</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamien</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>California Avenue</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menlo Park</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>So. San Francisco</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsdale</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millbrae</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=2,694
Demographics

Gender

More than half of respondents (53%) are males.

Do you identify as:

- Male: 53%
- Female: 41%
- Prefer not to answer: 6%

n=2,705
Demographics

Age

Nearly three-quarters of respondents (71%) are between the ages of 25 and 54.
Survey Findings

Demographics

Ethnicity

The majority of respondents (61%) are white, followed by Asian (20%).

Which of the following best describes your ethnic background?

- Asian: 20%
- Am Indian/AK Native: 1%
- Black/Af-Am: 2%
- Hisp/Lat: 5%
- Nat Haw/Pac Is: 1%
- White: 61%
- Prefer not to answer: 14%
- Other: 2%

n=2,701
Survey Findings

Demographics

Household Income

More than half of respondents (53%) have annual household incomes of $100,000 or more. Nearly a quarter (24%) chose not to respond.

What is your household’s total yearly income (before taxes)?

- Less than $30,000: 2%
- $30,000-$49,999: 8%
- $50,000-$74,999: 10%
- $75,000-$99,999: 19%
- $100,000-$149,999: 13%
- $150,000-$199,999: 21%
- $200,000 or more: 24%
- Prefer not to answer: 3%

n=2,701
Demographics

Country of Origin

Nearly three-quarters of respondents (71%) were born in the US.

Were you born in the US?

- Yes 71%
- No 21%
- Prefer not to answer 8%

n=2,696
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**Demographics**

**Home Zip Code***

Respondents were asked to report their home Zip code. Based on this the top cities are San Francisco, San Jose, Mountain View, San Mateo, and Sunnyvale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th># of Respondents</th>
<th>City</th>
<th># of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Concord</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Daly City</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Emeryville</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Fairfax</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Hollister</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Hollywood, FL</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Los Altos</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Menlo Park</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Los Gatos</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Carlos</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Milpitas</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millbrae</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pacifica</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South San Francisco</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cupertino</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>San Bruno</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>San Ramon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Union City</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=292

*Note that the response to this question is low because the zip code question was added to the survey a few days after it launched and many chose not to answer this question even when it was available.*
Context
Capacity and Access Challenges

- Between 11% and 19% of customers make “bike-based” trips to and/or from system.
- Majority (~90%) involve taking a bike on-board the train.
- Peak load trains often over capacity for bikes and people.
- Bike riders sometimes “bumped” or denied boarding due to capacity limits.

Caltrain Electrification

- Increase in service levels, capacity and performance.
- 6 peak hour trains.
- 8:1 seats to bike ratio on new trains (vs existing 9:1).
- Future blended system with CAHSR and service to Transbay Terminal.
Growing bike-based trips on Caltrain

- Caltrain ridership projected to double by 2040
- Caltrain wants to grow both the number and share of bike-based trips to the system
- Expansion of on-board bike capacity included in electrification but must be balanced against overall capacity needs
- Long term growth in the number of bike-based trips to the system will also require increased utilization of wayside facilities (bike parking and bike share)

Key Questions

- What is the market for bike parking at Caltrain?
  - What will the future demand for bike-based trips to Caltrain be?
  - What mix of bike parking will best serve Caltrain customers?
  - Which customers will always choose to bring their bike on board vs. which ones might choose to park a bike if better facilities were available?
Key Questions Continued

• How can Caltrain deliver high-quality bike parking?
  – What goals and standards should apply to our bike parking system?
  – What is the best model for managing and operating a bike parking system? What resources may be needed?
  – How should we focus and phase investments in the bike parking system?

Scope & Schedule
General Schedule

• Data Collection and Customer Research:
  - Start: Now
  - Duration: 5 months

• Performance Goals and Targets:
  - Start: August 2016
  - Duration: 5 months

• Management & Implementation Recommendations:
  - Start: December 2016
  - Duration: 4 months

Scope Flow Chart
Data Collection and Customer Research and Outreach

Key Activities

- **Data Collection**
  - Analysis of MTC Survey Data
  - Parking occupancy and turnover data collection

- **Customer Research**
  - Intercept Survey of “Bikes on Board” users (Summer 2016)
  - Web-based Open Survey (Summer 2016)
  - Keyed Locker User Survey (Summer 2016)
  - Focus Groups (Fall 2016)

- **Outreach**
  - Caltrain BAC and CAC
  - Study Technical Advisory Committee
  - Project Website/Comment Form
  - Additional Public meetings as requested by stakeholders
Existing Bike Parking System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking Type</th>
<th>~Quantity</th>
<th>~Occupancy Levels</th>
<th>Ownership / Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Racks</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>Varies widely by station</td>
<td>Generally Caltrain, but variable by station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>1025</td>
<td>80% system wide</td>
<td>Caltrain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Lockers</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>TBD – but generally well utilized</td>
<td>Cities, other Transit operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike stations / shared facilities</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>TBD – but generally well utilized</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MTC Data

- Survey period: October/November/December 2014
- Sample size: 5,704 trips on Caltrain, including 1,094 bike-based trips
- Data types: Trip Type (Home to Work, Home to College/University, etc), Trip Origin, Access Mode, Origin Station, Access Mode, Egress Mode, Exit Station, Trip Destination, Socioeconomic Information
- Detailed information about bicycle access, including type of bike parking used at the entrance station and whether bike was brought on board
Bike Access Mode Share by Station

Bike Boarding/Alighting Volumes
Additional Data Collection

• Observe midday bike rack usage at top stations
• Collect data on usage of keyed, eLocker and shared bike facilities
• Observe “efficiency” of keyed locker usage at top stations

Intercept Survey

• Collect 320+ completed surveys by interviewing passengers in the bike cars during July
• Focus will be customers who currently bring their bike on board
• Intercept methodology used to insure representative sample
• Questions explore trip patterns observed in the MTC data and examine customers’ interest / ability to store bike at a Caltrain station rather than take it on board
Questionnaire – Keyed Locker Users

- Collect 20+ completed surveys from the users of keyed lockers though an email / mailback questionnaire
- Questions will aim to explain observed usage of these lockers and identify positives and shortcomings of current parking system

Web-Based Survey

- Open to everyone
- Will occur after onboard survey
- Will provide more general format for input
- Questions related to trip patterns, bike parking needs and options
- Not a representative sample
Focus Groups

- Three focus group meetings planned for early fall
- Will be held along the Caltrain corridor, likely in the afternoon / evening commute period
- Focus group participants will be selected through respondents to the intercept survey who provide their contact information
- Focus groups will be used to explore ideas and concepts for bike parking improvements

Imagining A Better Bike Parking System
Corrals / large-scale rack installations

San Francisco

UC Davis

Electronic Bike Lockers

San Francisco

UK
Civic Center BART

Berkeley BART
Washington, DC

Dorchester, MA
TO: JPB CAC

FROM: Danielle Stewart
Acting Director, Rail Transportation

SUBJECT: STAFF REPORT

Follow-Up Items –
- **Generation II Bombardier Railcar Rehabilitation Update:**
  Ten of the rehabilitated cars are in or are available for service. Six cars are still being rehabilitated.

- **Wi-Fi:**
  Not included in the Fiscal Year (FY) 2017 budget and will continue to be considered for future implementation.

On-time Performance (OTP) –
- **May:**
  - The preliminary May 2016 OTP was 93.6 percent compared to 89.6 percent for May 2015. For trains within 10 minutes, the OTP was 97.0 percent.
  - **Trespasser Strikes** – There were two trespasser strikes in May, with two fatalities, on Tuesday, May 3 and Monday, May 25.

- **Post-Timetable Implementation Monitoring** –
  - Excluding unforeseen service disruptions (trespasser strikes, mechanical and engineering issues) and Giants baseball extras, OTP is at 96.4 percent.

- **April:**
  - The April 2016 OTP 88.9 percent compared to 89.1 percent for April 2015. For trains within 10 minutes, the OTP was 94.9 percent.

Special Event Train Service –
- **Services performed:**
  - **San Jose Sharks** – There were six playoff home games in May. Total additional post-game riders boarding at San Jose Diridon station was 2,212, an average of 369 per game.
o **Giants Baseball** – There were 13 Giants home games in May. Total additional ridership in May, alighting and boarding at San Francisco station, was 79,983, an average of 6,153 per game. Year-to-date additional ridership represents an 18 percent decrease compared to the same number of games in 2015.

o **Bay to Breakers** – On Sunday, May 15, 2016 Caltrain provided four scheduled special pre-event trains and three extra post-event trains departing at 1:10 p.m., 2:10 p.m. and 3:10 p.m. that expressed from San Francisco to Belmont and made all local stops to San Jose Diridon for the Bay to Breakers Race which started at 8:00 a.m. in San Francisco. JPB/Transit America Services, Inc. (TASI) field staff and ambassadors assisted passengers at the San Jose Diridon and Palo Alto stations during pre-event service. Total northbound special train ridership was 5,579, an increase of 18 percent compared to 2015. Total southbound special train ridership was 2,644, an increase of 23 percent compared to 2015.

o **Beyoncé Concert at Levi’s Stadium** – On Monday May 16, 2016 at 7:30 p.m. Beyoncé performed the Formation World Tour concert at Levi’s Stadium. Caltrain provided one additional post-event train that departed from Mountain View Station after the concert. Total riders boarding and alighting at Mountain View Station was 1,999.

o **Out of the Darkness Overnight Walk (American Foundation for Suicide Prevention)** – On Saturday evening, May 21 from 8:30 p.m. through 1:00 a.m. Sunday morning May 22, the Caltrain San Francisco Station plaza was utilized as a Mid-Night Snack rest stop for Out of the Darkness participants during the 18-mile event walk. Caltrain staff coordinated with event organizers and recruited agency staff to participate in this event in support of the American Foundation for Suicide Prevention.

o **Memorial Day Holiday Service** – On Monday, May 30, 2016 Caltrain operated a Sunday schedule in observance of the Memorial Day holiday. The weekend Tamien-San Jose Diridon shuttle also operated that day.

• **Services scheduled:**

  o **San Jose Sharks** – The Sharks are currently in the Stanley Cup Finals vs. the Pittsburgh Penguins. Caltrain is continuing to track post-game service ridership and assess the need for Special trains during post-season.

  o **Giants Baseball** – Regular season continues through October. Caltrain will provide regular baseball service for all home games.

  o **Copa America Centenario** – Four International Soccer Tournament games will be hosted at Levi’s Stadium in June.
The tournament games include:
- USA vs. Columbia, Friday, June 3, 6:30 p.m.
- Argentina vs. Chile, Monday, June 6, 7:00 p.m.
- Uruguay vs. Jamaica, Monday, June 13, 7:00 p.m.
- Quarterfinal Match (Team TBD), Saturday, June 18, 7:00 p.m.

Caltrain will provide additional post-event service for the first two games and will monitor ridership to determine whether additional special service is warranted for the last two games. Caltrain will coordinate connecting service with VTA at the Mountain View Station.

- **San Jose Earthquakes at Stanford Stadium** – On Saturday June 25, at 7:30 p.m., the San Jose Earthquakes soccer team will be hosting the Los Angeles Galaxy at Stanford Stadium. Caltrain will make extra stops at Stanford Stadium before and after the game.

- **Gay Pride Parade** – On Sunday, June 26, Caltrain will be providing extra capacity to accommodate crowds headed to and from San Francisco for the Gay Pride parade down Market Street in downtown San Francisco.

- **Opera at the Ballpark** – On Saturday, July 2, at 7:30 p.m. the San Francisco Opera returns to AT&T Park for a free performance of Carmen. Caltrain will provide one extra post-event local train that will depart SF approximately 25 minutes after the event, or when full.

- **Independence Day Fireworks** – On Monday, July 4, Caltrain will operate a Sunday schedule on the Independence Day holiday. This will be supplemented by extra evening service to accommodate passengers after the fireworks display in the Fisherman’s Wharf area.

**Capital Projects** –

- **Quint Street 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 cross traffic has been detoured to Jerrold and Oakdale avenues. A future project by the city of San Francisco will construct a connector road adjacent to the Caltrain right of way from Jerrold to Newcomb avenues. Cutover to the new berm and removal of the existing bridge was completed during the weekend of April 29th to May 1st, 2016. Cleanup of the project site to remove the debris from the cutover and construction of trackwork improvements continued in May. Construction completion is expected by the end of June 2016.

- **San Mateo Bridges Replacement**: The scope of this project is to replace structurally deficient bridges in San Mateo at Tilton Avenue, Santa Inez Avenue, Monte Diablo Street, and Poplar Avenue that were approximately 100-years old. Construction work for the replacement of the
four bridges in San Mateo has been completed with the final bridge at Poplar Avenue replaced in mid-April 2016. Restoration of street sidewalks and pavement on Poplar Avenue was completed and the street was reopened to traffic on May 25, 2016. General clean-up items and construction of fencing, final trackwork, bridge, and street improvements throughout the project limits are ongoing with completion expected in July 2016.

- **San Francisco Highway Bridges:** Construction work for replacement of three overhead vehicular bridges located at 22nd Street, 23rd Street, and Paul Avenue in San Francisco is ongoing. The 23rd Street Bridge was completed in April 2016. Utility relocations and temporary utility supports continue at 22nd Street location. Pedestrians are temporarily crossing 22nd Street on the existing bridge. Due to unforeseen utility issues, the temporary pedestrian overpass across 22nd Street is now forecasted to be in place by the end of June. Currently, At the Paul Avenue Bridge, construction of support structures such as columns and bents are complete and the installation of the bridge girders is planned in June. Overall contract completion is expected in the winter of 2016.

- **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 schedule forecast is to complete the design by the fall 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 Station in San Jose. The new bridge is designed to meet current seismic standards in order to maintain safe railroad operations. The Issue For Bid design package was completed in May and is currently under legal review and preparations for Advertising. Coordination with the Union Pacific Railroad and affected utility companies continues. 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.

- **San Francisco Crew Facilities Rehabilitation:** The scope of this project is to renovate and rehabilitate the crew facility located at the San Francisco Yard. The crew facility is used by train engineers and conductors during shift layovers for rest breaks and sanitation. The existing crew facility is outdated and lacked proper circulation, security, and plumbing. The contract was awarded in December 2015 and the work began in February. Rough-in of plumbing and electrical systems and framing of walls and doors has been
completed. Architectural and plumbing finishes, such as room drywalls and shower stalls, are now in progress. Completion of the project is expected in late 2016.

- **Train Departure Monitors at 4th & King and San Jose Diridon Stations:** The scope of this project is to add electronic signage at the 4th and King and San Jose Diridon Stations that provide patrons with information that direct passengers to the proper platforms for designated trains. Currently patrons must rely on written signage or voice announcements to determine which platform to board the proper trains. This project will install large electronic signage that is easily visible at key locations throughout the stations, to guide patrons. The contract was awarded in April and a Limited Notice to Proceed will be issued to the contractor in June to commence the Administrative period. Upon completion of administrative requirements, such as safety training and approved health and safety programs, a Notice to Proceed will be issued to the contractor that allows field construction to commence. Completion of this project is expected in the winter of 2016.

**a) Customer Experience Taskforce Update (CETF)**

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 TASI 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. Policy decisions for the agency reside with the CETF for further consideration and potential approval. This includes such items as potential for Wi-Fi and implementation of quiet cars.
**Service Operations**
In the short-term (six-18 months), the taskforce is spearheading efforts to:
- Monitor a new public timetable to improve service reliability (implemented April 4)
- Study potential service expansion

**Communications/Incident Management**
In the short-term (six-18 months), the taskforce is spearheading efforts to:
- Monitor the Predictive Arrival and Departure System and provide fixes to the system as identified
- Completed a customer/passenger survey to identify the top priorities for short-, medium- and long-range improvements (presentation to CAC in June 2016)
- Improve and define incident management protocol (presentation to CAC in July 2016)
- Finalized a public facing “playbook for service interruptions"
- Identify ways to improve vehicle signage

In the medium term (18-24 months), the taskforce is spearheading efforts to:
- Investigate potential of a Global Positioning System application available for train tracking on website

**Conductor Training**
In the short-term (six-18 months), the taskforce is spearheading efforts to:
- Sensitivity Training enhanced and implemented finalized version as of May 19th, 2016.
- Developing a Language Assistance Plan and corresponding training for front-line Caltrain Rail Operations staff.

**Consumer Reports**
In the short-term (six-18 months), the taskforce is spearheading efforts to:
- Trend customer complaints to establish patterns for improvements

**Fare/Ticket Vending Machine (TVM)-Related Media**
In the short-term (six-18 months), the taskforce is spearheading efforts to:
- Investigate Clipper Card issues (presented to CAC March 16, 2016)
- Implement mobile ticketing

In the long term (24 months+), the taskforce is spearheading efforts to:
- Investigate potential of procurement of new TVMs
- Investigate and follow updates to Clipper Readers
JPB CAC Work Plan

June 15, 2016
- Annual Passenger Counts
- *Bike Parking Management Plan* – requested 11-18-15
- Results of the Customer Experience Survey
- Discussion of possible bye month

July 20, 2016
- Incident management and recovery – requested by chair 3/2/16
- MTC means-based fare pricing study
- Fare Policy Study Scope

August 17, 2016
- CalMod Quarterly Update

September 21, 2016

October 19, 2016
- Short Range Transit Plan update
- Operating and Maintenance Contract Status Update – requested 4/18/16

November 16, 2016
- CalMod Quarterly Update

Items to be scheduled
- Mobile ticketing – requested 12-16-15
- Station Access and Parking (getting to stations, capacity, usage, forecast, and planning) – requested by chair 3/2/16, modified 3/16/16 by Adina

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