August 17, 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 June 15, 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. Caltrain Fare Policy Study Overview (Sebastian Petty) (6:15 p.m.)
8. Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project Quarterly Update (Casey Fromson) (6:35 p.m.)
9. Staff Report (Michelle Bouchard) (6:55 p.m.)
   a) Customer Experience Taskforce Update
   b) JPB CAC Work Plan Update
10. Date, Time and Place of Next Meeting
    September 21, 2016 at 5:40 p.m., San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building, 2nd Floor Bacciocco Auditorium, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA
11. 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), 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 JUNE 15, 2016

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: Y. Mills, C. Tucker

STAFF PRESENT: J. Averill, C. David, C. Kwok, S. Petty, D. Stewart

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MAY 18, 2016
Motion/Second: Shaw/Berk
Ayes: Berk, Cabansagan, Berk, Levin, Shaw, Cobey
Absent: Mills, Scharff, Tucker

PUBLIC COMMENT
None

CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT
Chair Cobey said Jonathan Berk gave the CAC report to the Board. There have no responses on a proposal to skip a July or August CAC meeting.

COMMITTEE COMMENTS
Annie Lee said the Caltrain and San Francisco Muni monthly pass bundle discount was discontinued. Now there is a Clipper transfer discount that automatically applies when the customer tags on and off Caltrain. After that customers get a 50-cent discount on San Francisco Muni, but that is only if the customers tag on and tag off even if they have a monthly pass. This is very unclear. No one with a monthly pass tags on and off. It is worth putting up information at San Francisco stations noting this and that there are discounts available. Interagency transfers should be improved with future versions of Clipper.

Adina Levin said San Francisco is considering a ballot measure for transportation. A couple weeks ago Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) approved allocation for a transportation measure for November, which includes funding for Caltrain capacity improvements such as longer platforms and longer trains. Longer platforms and longer trains can only be delivered if all three counties are covering their cost for it. It would be logical for San Francisco to consider taking up this expense as
part of their ballot measure. There is nothing official about it and when San Mateo County would do a similar ballot measure.

Jonathan Berk said last month he asked why speed restrictions are in place over construction areas when construction is not occurring at that moment. He would like someone to get back to him with an answer. Overall, Caltrain is running more efficiently. There are fewer breakdowns and trains are running more on time than they used to. The train he was on had to wait at a few stations so it would not leave early. Instead of running efficiently the schedule was changed to account for inefficiency.

Chair Cobey said some parking spaces in the San Jose parking lot do not have numbers, which makes it hard to identify the space when paying for parking. These spaces are on the east side of the north and south parking lots. He heard a complaint from someone who experienced a bus bridge on a northbound morning train during a fatality. This person was concerned about the fact that two buses showed up to empty the train, which was not enough to handle capacity.

Public Comment
Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said the San Francisco tax measure is being discussed at the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA) CAC. Longer platforms will not happen until San Mateo County participates. The only longer platform will be at Diridon.

ANNUAL PASSENGER COUNTS
Catherine David, Senior Planner, presented:
- **Purpose**
  - Provide a measurement relative to previous years
  - Data for evaluating service changes
  - Allocate resources to address capacity issues
  - Validate revenue-based ridership estimates
- **Data collection methodology**
  - Headcount on every weekday train averaged over five weekdays
  - Headcount on every weekend train for one weekend
  - Differs from monthly revenue-based average weekday ridership (AWR) calculations
  - Fifth year for “bikes denied boarding” count
- **Challenges**
  - Surveys suspended during special events and construction activities
  - Surveys extended into mid-March
  - More rain in 2016 than in past several years
- **AWR is 62,416, a 7.2 percent increase from last year**
- **Riders by time period 2015 versus 2016**
  - Traditional peak difference is 2,805 riders or an increase of 9.6 percent
  - Midday is 556 riders or an increase of 8 percent
  - Reverse peak is 722 or an increase of 3.8 percent
  - Night is 88 riders or an increase of 2.7 percent
- **Most stations are seeing ridership growth**
- **County-by-county 2015 versus 2016**
- San Francisco: 1,283 additional riders or 8.3 percent increase
- San Mateo: 1,208 additional riders or 6.7 percent increase
- Santa Clara: 1,679 additional riders or 6.8 percent increase
- Gilroy extension ridership increased 12.7 percent since last year
- Riders per train type 2015 versus 2016
  - Baby Bullet increased 9 percent
  - Limited increased 6.7 percent
  - Local increased 2.8 percent
- Average trip length
  - Weekday: 22.8 miles
  - Baby Bullet: 27.7 miles
  - Peak non-Baby Bullet: 20.5 miles
  - Off peak: 21.1 miles
  - All locals: 20.8 miles
- Average weekday bike ridership decreased 11.1 percent to 5,520 bikes per day, which may be a reflection of the rainy counting season
- Bikes: Denied boarding
  - Fifth year counted with annual count
  - 118 bikes were denied boarding from the 528 trains counted
  - Carried approximately 29,130 bikes on the trains counted
  - Denied boardings were observed at 16 stations
  - Denials on 15 northbound trains and 8 southbound trains
- Summary
  - Passenger ridership is at an all-time height: 83 percent increase since 2010
  - Caltrain has a strong reverse-peak ridership
  - The majority of stations saw growth
  - All three counties saw increases
  - Overall weekend ridership increased
- Next steps
  - Review allocation of six-car trains
  - Fiscal Year (FY) 2017 Operating and Capital budgets must support the required resources to meet demand
  - Increasing capacity FY2017 – FY2020 is essential to continue ridership/revenue growth
  - Future service planning requires use of ridership data to develop potential service scenarios to improve capacity pre-/post-electrification

Mr. Berk said he is interested in the capacity of local trains around rush hour. He said he guesses the southbound trains from San Francisco at 9 a.m. and 10 a.m. are the fullest. He asked for the detailed data on each train. Baby Bullets are the most used. If Caltrain adds more Baby Bullets, people would move to those trains reducing the amount of people on local trains. The 8 p.m. northbound out of Palo Alto is packed. It seems like the JPB should attempt to introduce express service at 8 p.m. and 8:30 p.m. He asked why every single train does not stop at Palo Alto when it is the second busiest station. He asked for staff to get back to him with an answer on this question.

Ms. Levin asked out of the trains with denied bike boarding if any were six-car trains. This will tell staff if the six-car trains eliminated bike bumps and if there are any better
places to use the six-car trains. She asked for an update when the rest of the new cars will be put into service.

Chair Cobey asked why Atherton had a 45 percent increase over one year. Ms. David said the count was conducted on one Saturday and one Sunday. She said there has been a tremendous amount of development and new jobs near the Redwood City station, which can explain why that increase occurred.

Public Comment
Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said hopefully the Electric Multiple Unit (EMU) procurement will include automatic passenger counters. He said the consultants already decided to buy Swiss trains with only 600 seats, before ripping seats out for bikes, plus two sets of doors. The report states the most important amenity for EMUs is seating. He said the six-car train sets were paid for twice. The JPB bought 16, deployed five, and 11 were never deployed. The JPB ripped out 24 seats out of five of the cars and swapped them with the five that were deployed before, which are now parked back in Diridon. The JPB needs to buy one more Bombardier to have 12 spares and then make two more Bombardier train sets. Then two Gallery train sets can be broken down and one more car can be added to 10 Gallery train sets to make six-car trains.

Jeff Carter, Millbrae, said he suggested the JPB look at automatic passenger counters, which would get better data. Doing this count requires putting people to count passengers on the trains. The JPB had to adjust the counting schedule because of the Super Bowl, so the numbers might be skewed. The train data should be posted online. Caltrain needs more than six trains per hour per direction. Ms. David said staff is hoping automatic counters can be added to the EMUs. The key findings reports are posted online. She is planning to include the counts for each train in this year’s report when she posts it. This data is used to identify maximum loads at various times.

Mr. Berk said the Excel file of the raw should be posted. Ms. David said she will post it.

Andy Chow, Redwood City, said reasons the maximum bike capacity is over 80 are because some people bring folding bikes onboard but are still counted as a bike even though they are not using bike spaces, some bicyclists cram on and add more bikes than what is allowed by Caltrain, and some people get off mid-line and others come on.

Ms. Levin asked if Mr. Lebrun’s suggestion makes sense and if staff is working on it. Ms. David said the next steps are to make sure the current trains are being maximized with the 2016 count data.

Ms. Levin said the question was if there are ways to put existing cars in service and shuffle the trains around to have more six-car trains. Ms. David said they’re being analyzed and it is being considered.

Danielle Stewart, Acting Director, Rail Transportation, said some of the cars are still in the process of being rehabilitated. No target service date is known.
CUSTOMER EXPERIENCE SURVEY RESULTS
Christiane Kwok, Manager, Market Research and Development, presented:

- Objectives
  - Guide the Customer Experience Taskforce in choosing the priorities for future investments
  - Narrow the questions to be used in the upcoming Annual Customer Satisfaction Survey

- Methodology
  - Online survey
    - February 28 to March 20
    - Opt-in, not statistically valid
    - Various outreach methods
  - Response
    - 2,956
    - 92 percent completed the entire survey

- Service ratings (five-point scale: five = very important, one = not at all important)
  - More frequent service: 4.2
  - Trains with shorter commute times: 4.18
  - More shoulder peak service: 3.89
  - More frequent weekend or mid-day service: 3.33
  - Expanded service after 10:30 p.m.: 2.94
  - Expanded service between San Jose and Gilroy: 1.92

- Service Rankings
  - Top three priorities identified
    - More frequent service
    - Trains with shorter commute times
    - More shoulder peak service

- Communications ratings
  - Improved real-time updates onboard or at stations: 4.34
  - Schedule and real-time information on a smartphone application: 4.33
  - Better directional signage at stations: 2.99

- Customer comfort/enjoyment ratings
  - Allowing food and drinks onboard: 3.3
  - Quiet car: 3.24
  - Increased bike storage and bike share facilities: 2.97
  - Pay as you go Wi-Fi: 2.68
  - Access to concessions at stations: 2.6

- Payment ratings
  - Improved ticket machines with Clipper integration: 3.82
  - A smartphone application with mobile ticketing: 3.65
  - Ability to pay for parking using mobile application: 3.27

- Rankings
  - Top priorities identified
    - Improved real-time updates
    - Schedule and real-time information available on a smartphone application
    - Improved ticket machines with Clipper integration
    - A smartphone application with mobile ticketing
• Value of service relative to the cost to customer
  o Ranked 5: 14 percent
  o Ranked 4: 28 percent
  o Ranked 3: 33 percent
  o Ranked 2: 12 percent
  o Ranked 1: 6 percent
  o Mean: 3.35

• Use of Transportation Network Company (TNC)
  o Yes: 43 percent
  o No: 55 percent
  o Not sure: 2 percent

Chair Cobey asked if bikes are included in TNCs. Ms. Kwok said no.

Mr. Berk asked if shuttles are included in the TNCs. Ms. Kwok said no.

• Electric train amenity ratings
  o Seating: 4.43
  o Standing/leaning room: 3.34
  o Onboard bathroom: 3.01
  o Bike storage: 3.01
  o Maximum seating (bathrooms at stations only): 2.81
  o Luggage storage: 2.36

• Electric train amenity rankings
  o Top priorities identified
    ▪ Seating
    ▪ Standing/leaning room
    ▪ Bike storage
    ▪ Onboard bathroom

• What customers like about diesel cars and want to keep on electric trains
  o 52 percent of respondents answered this question
  o 49 percent of comments related to seating
    ▪ 15 percent single seats on second level, 9 percent seating with tables, 8 percent comfortable seats
  o 32 percent of comments were about onboard amenities
    ▪ 12 percent about having onboard bathrooms
  o 27 percent of comments were about train design/features
    ▪ 12 percent about having two levels

• What customers dislike about diesel cars and want to change on electric trains
  o 57 percent of respondents answered this question
  o 20 percent of comments related to seating
  o 18 percent of comments related to capacity
    ▪ 7 percent not enough seats or cars, 6 percent too crowded, 5 percent not enough standing room
  o 17 percent of comments were about amenities
    ▪ 7 percent no Wi-Fi, 5 percent lack of outlets, 4 percent air conditioning
• Rider characteristics
  o 50 percent riding for four years or more, 34 percent for one to three years
  o 59 percent ride at least four days a week
  o 32 percent Go Pass users, 31 percent Caltrain Monthly Pass users
  o 82 percent traveling to or from work

• Demographics
  o 53 percent male
  o 71 percent between 25 and 54
  o 53 annual incomes of $100,000 or more
  o 61 percent white, 20 percent Asian

• Additional comments
  o 1,182 respondents provided comments
  o 46 percent related to service
    ▪ 20 percent more frequent trains or expanded service
  o 11 percent were positive comments
  o 9 percent were communications related
    ▪ 8 percent were about announcements/messages/updates

• Next steps
  o Used Customer Experience Survey data to develop additional questions for the Customer Satisfaction Survey (June 2016)
  o Develop customer experience focus group

Ms. Levin said TNC numbers are striking. She asked if there will be more data gathered about it. She asked if people use TNCs during peak hour or when no other options are available, if they use them frequently, daily, or just occasionally, where people take the TNCs to, and which stations from, and if it is for the first mile or last mile. Ms. Kwok said she can bring the issue up with the taskforce to see where they want to go with it.

Ms. Levin asked if the data is available in Excel format. Ms. Kwok said she could probably post it.

Clarrissa Cabansagan said the TNC data could be used for managing parking or the cost of parking.

Brian Shaw said this is not the survey to do an analysis on TNC use by Caltrain riders. A different survey would need to be done for that specific purpose.

Ms. Kwok said in October there will be the Triennial Customer Survey. One of the questions is about access and egress from stations. Staff could consider including this question.

Public Comment
Doug DeLong, Mountain View, said easiest way to find out about TNCs is to ask TNCs for their data. In the olden days, when the front cover of the Caltrain timetable was right side up and then it was opened, the print was also right side up. Now when it is open the customer has to rotate the timetable to see right-side-up print.
Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said free Wi-Fi service was not offered as a rating option on the survey because of the unlikeliness of it being an option for Caltrain to offer. There is an easy fix: a different managing agency should run Caltrain. Capitol Corridor, Altamont Corridor Express, Amtrak, and VTA provide Wi-Fi. The question about value of service was asked before the fare increase. The top priority should be seating. He said Chuck Harvey, Deputy CEO, Organizational Support/Special Projects, came up with the idea to take apart train sets to make six-car trains.

Jeff Carter, Millbrae, said he is bothered by the demographics showing Caltrain riders have high income. People see that and think fares are too low. The problem is fares are too high, which prevents low-income people to ride Caltrain. Other surveys showed having bathrooms onboard was a higher priority. Gallery car seats used to flip, but when the California State Department of Transportation operated the train they locked the seats in place in their current configuration. Seating versus bathrooms versus bikes goes back to shortsighted service projections. More cars per train and more trains per hour are needed.

BIKE PARKING MANAGEMENT PLAN
Sebastian Petty, Principal Planner, presented:
• Capacity and access challenges
  o Between 11 percent and 19 percent of customers make “bike-based” trips to and/or from system
  o Majority (approximately 90 percent) involve taking a bike onboard the train
  o Peak load trains often over capacity for bikes and people
  o Bike riders sometimes “bumped” or denied boarding due to capacity limits
• Caltrain electrification
  o Increase in service levels, capacity and performance
  o Six peak-hour trains
  o 8:1 seats to bikes ratio on new trains (versus existing 9:1)
  o Future blended system with California High-Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) and service to Transbay Terminal
• Growing bike-based trips on Caltrain
  o Caltrain ridership projected to double by 2040
  o Caltrain wants to grow both the number and share of bike-based trips to the system
  o Expansion of onboard bike capacity included in electrification, but must be balanced against overall capacity needs
  o 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
  o 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 versus which ones might choose to park a bike if better facilities were available?
  - How can Caltrain deliver high-quality bike parking?
    - What goals and standards should apply to Caltrain’s bike parking system?
    - What is the best model for managing and operating a bike parking system? What resources may be needed?
    - How should investments be focused and phased in the bike parking system?

Cordelia Crockett, Senior Transit Planner, Stantec, presented:
- General schedule
  - Data collection and customer research:
    - Start: Now
    - Duration: five months
  - Performance goals and targets
    - Start: August 2016
    - Duration: 5 months
  - Management and implementation recommendations:
    - Start: December 2016
    - Duration: 4 months
- Key activities
  - Data collection
    - Analysis of Metropolitan Transportation Commission (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 Bicycle Advisory Committee and CAC
    - Study Technical Advisory Committee
    - Project website/comment form
    - Additional public meetings as requested by stakeholders
- Existing bike parking system
  - There are currently 660 racks, over 1,000 mechanical keyed lockers, 60 e-lockers, and 380 bike stations
- 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 onboard
• Additional data collection
  o Observe midday bike rack usage at top stations
  o Collect data on usage of keyed, e-locker and shared bike facilities
  o Observe “efficiency” of keyed locker usage at top stations
• Intercept survey
  o Collect 320+ completed surveys by interviewing passengers in the bike cars during July
  o Focus will be customers who currently bring their bike onboard
  o Intercept methodology used to insure representative sample
  o 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 onboard
• Questionnaire – keyed locker users
  o Collect 20+ completed surveys from the users of keyed lockers though an e-mail/mail back questionnaire
  o Questions will aim to explain observed usage of these lockers and identify positives and shortcomings of current parking system
• Web-based survey
  o Open to everyone
  o Will occur after onboard survey
  o Will provide more general format for input
  o Questions related to trip patterns, bike parking needs and options
  o Not a representative sample
• Focus groups
  o Three focus group meetings planned for early fall
  o Will be held along the Caltrain corridor, likely in the afternoon/evening commute period
  o Focus group participants will be selected through respondents to the intercept survey who provide their contact information
  o Focus groups will be used to explore ideas and concepts for bike parking
  o improvements

Mr. Berk said the presentation never mentions bike share. It should be an important consideration as an alternative to bike lockers.

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

Mr. Shaw said Caltrain does not own many of the stations and bike parking is at the stations themselves. He asked if there will be discussion with the municipalities involved to find out what they will allow Caltrain to do at those stations. Mr. Petty said a technical advisory committee will be formed with representatives from all three counties and municipalities with the highest bike ridership, Stanford, and Facebook. That group can serve as a basis for having those discussions.

Ms. Levin asked if theft and theft statistics will be look into. Mr. Petty said it will be looked into. The multijurisdictional nature about who a person calls when their bike is stolen creates a challenge.
Ms. Levin said customers should be asked what viable choices they have, what their tradeoffs are and what drives their behavior. Some people use more than one station depending on their needs each day.

Ms. Lee said bike share is critical. As it get ramped up it is important to see how it affects Caltrain’s projections. People might not use some services because bikes might get stolen. Cost could be a factor. Caltrain is not charging to bring bikes on trains but will charge to use these facilities. She asked if these issues are related to full sized bikes not foldable bikes or scooters. Mr. Petty said those issues are things that would be asked about in a focus group scenario.

Ms. Cabansagan said Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) has a bike station plan and when they were determining the new cars and configuration for bikes they only had space onboard for three bikes. They are planning to make sure there is secure bike parking. The presentation did not show average distance per station for the last mile. There is a tradeoff between bringing a bike onboard, having a seat on the train or what to do at the end of the trip. Mr. Petty said those types of issues like how to manage bike parking could change over time as ridership grows, as bike share expands, and as TNCs become more common in some areas. Staff will look at how to make the system flexible and create a system that is equitable for users and cost efficient for Caltrain.

Mr. Shaw said at the end of the focus group staff should find out what ability Caltrain has to influence bikes onboard. He asked what all the things are that have to be in place to make it so people don’t need a bike on the train. It might be shuttles, bike share, storage, folding bikes. This is how Caltrain is beginning to manage this issue. Staff needs to think about ongoing data sets, evaluation and the things Caltrain can influence.

Public Comment
Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said there is a monetary incentive to bring a bike onboard versus leaving it at a station. He said people with monthly parking passes do not get dedicated parking spots for their cars, so there should not be dedicated spaces for bikes. Electronic lockers should be Clipper based where customers get the first 12 hours free. If the bike is still in the locker after 12 hours, customers should get charged $1 per hour. It should be first come first served. Right now trains have 762 seats and room for 80 bikes, so the ratio is 9.5:1. Staff will rip out 120 seats, going from 762 to 480 seats and from 80 bikes to 60, and this will provide the 8:1 ratio. New EMUs will each have capacity of 1,000 standees.

Greg Scharff arrived at 7:33 p.m.

Doug DeLong, Mountain View, said he was shocked to learn how few bike parking places there are on the Caltrain line. Three million dollars was provided by the Board to address this problem, but the need is more like $10 million. There are some stations where the existing bike racks are over 100 percent utilized, so people lock their bikes to fences and poles. If there is no place to park a bike, customers will bring bikes onboard.
Jeff Carter, Millbrae, said it is great Caltrain is looking into this. Staff is asking for stakeholder input on bike parking. Caltrain is also doing a fare study, but there has been no customer outreach and no focus groups and staff hasn’t presented anything to the CAC. It would be great if Caltrain could have more wayside parking. Caltrain does not have enough parking capacity for cars and bikes.

Andy Chow, Redwood City, said Caltrain has plenty of shared bike parking. Menlo Park, Palo Alto, and Mountain View have shared bike storage facilities. They don’t work together. They are all separate programs and require different fees and keys. There are better examples with BART. Their shared facilities and lockers work as a single system. This is an opportunity for Caltrain to join the program and use the same system as BART.

**STAFF REPORT**

Ms. Stewart said:
- Joseph Navarro will be starting June 20 as the Director, Rail Operations.
- Ms. Stewart researched the question about reporting late trains at one minute late versus five minutes late. This is an industry standard. Long Island Railroad, New Jersey Transit, Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority, and Capital Metro all follow that standard.
- The stations manager went to look at the wayfinding concerns at the 22nd Street Caltrain Station. An ambassador was there at the time and there was adequate signage.
- Last month there were questions related to the operating and capital budgets and partner contributions. Staff will try to send out update over e-mail or will address it at the next meeting.

**Customer Experience Taskforce**

Ms. Stewart said:
- Staff will consider CAC comments on the Playbook on Service Interruptions before publishing it.
- A month ago the JPB hired a contractor who has been instrumental in the Railroad Operation Control System and Predictive Arrival/Departure System (PADS) and pushing limits of what the systems can do. This person has looked into advanced technology. The weekend of June 25 staff will be displaying nomenclature related to the trains associated with the Pride Parade and baseball service to test out the technology.

Ms. Levin said the northbound train she was on today was early into Palo Alto and some other trains show up early. She asked if that is being looked at to see if the new times are right. Ms. Stewart said staff is still monitoring the timetable revisions.

Ms. Levin asked if the PADS plan includes making an application programming interface available to the public. She asked if Caltrain will provide access to real-time data. Ms. Stewart said the system is not at that point yet.

Mr. Shaw said trains have had to slow down through San Mateo because of the rehabilitation work. It looks like it is getting closer to done. He asked what the plan is to
return speed on bullet trains through San Mateo and if it will require a schedule change. This is slowing trains down by two or three minutes. Ms. Stewart said the timetable change took into account the slow speed orders. Staff continually monitors train service as it relates to construction. Future timetables will take project completion into account.

Annie Lee asked for an update on the mobile ticketing pilot program. This may be a replacement for Clipper. Ms. Stewart said she does not have an update at this time but it is on the work plan for a future presentation.

Mr. Shaw asked for an update on the additional Bombardier cars and the ability to use them to increase the length of trains. There is not a lot of room in the schedule because of construction, but if trains can be made longer it should be done. He would like to get an update in August or September.

**Work Plan and Discussion of Possible Bye Month**

Ms. Stewart said she would like to move incident management and recovery to September so Mr. Navarro will have time to address the issue and potentially make some changes. The two other items slated for July, the MTC fare study and the Caltrain fare study scope will not be ready for the July meeting.

Chair Cobey said it looks like the July meeting might be the bye meeting.

Mr. Shaw said the CAC owes it to the public to meet and they have a right to be heard, and there are issues that he would like to get updates on.

Mr. Scharff said he does not understand how there could be a meeting if there is nothing on the agenda. It seems silly to meet just for public comment. He would not vote to have a meeting.

Chair Cobey said he could just make a decision. Josh Averill, Assistant District Secretary, said the CAC rules say a bye month has to be voted on by the CAC. He asked if the CAC feels comfortable delegating the authority to the chair to make the decision. There were no objections.

**Caltrain Electrification Update**

Ms. Stewart said:

- In June the Board directed staff to include one restroom on each six-car EMU train consist.
- Several parties have committed to provide additional funding sources to the Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project associated with the 2014 cost estimate. The agreement was approved at the May JPB meeting.
  - $28.4 million from the MTC
  - $9 million from the JPB California’s low-carbon transit operations program
  - $20 million each from VTA, the San Mateo County Transportation Authority, and the SFCTA/city and county of San Francisco
  - $113 million from CHSRA
Public Comment
Andy Chow, Redwood City, said one reason for development in San Jose is the Greyhound station was moved the train station because the city wanted to redevelop the old station. The Amtrak ticket counter extended its hours to 1 a.m. because of the late-night Greyhounds. This means the bathrooms will be open longer.

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said he strongly advises against canceling the July meeting because of what is happening at the Board. If there is nothing to present, he is happy to present something. The staff memorandum recommending one bathroom per EMU was posted one day before the Local Policy Makers Group met, and they voted to have two bathrooms per train. The JBP has no plans to increase capacity for the next six years. If one extra Gallery car is added per train, dwell times will decrease by 20 percent due to the additional door. He said PADS has never worked. It does not show trains at the correct time and it shows non-existent trains. He said mobile ticketing won’t work because people will just wait for the conductor to start checking tickets before they purchase a ticket.

Jeff Carter, Millbrae, said there will always be public comment, a chairperson’s report and committee comments, so there should not be a bye month. He said San Francisco has something against onboard bathrooms.

DATE, TIME AND LOCATION OF NEXT REGULAR MEETING:
Date to be determined 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 8:04 p.m.
TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
          Executive Director

FROM: Seamus Murphy  Eli Kay
       Chief Communications Officer  Chief Financial Officer

SUBJECT: CALTRAIN FARE POLICY STUDY

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

SIGNIFICANCE
In late 2015, the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) requested that staff review and study the Caltrain Fare policies and structure to identify potential opportunities to maximize revenue, enhance ridership and safeguard social and geographic equity. Staff will present an overview of the Caltrain Fare Policy Study, including the draft Scope of Work and key issues to be explored over the course of the Study.

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no impact on the budget.

BACKGROUND
The last system-wide Caltrain fare study was conducted in 2001, when fare elasticity was determined to represent a significant deterrent to fare increases. The elasticity measured at that time indicated that ridership was highly influenced by price, resulting in a high anticipated elasticity (meaning that any fare increase would be expected to generate a corresponding ridership decline). Since 2001, however, onboard surveys of Caltrain customers reveal that many riders along the corridor have high relative incomes and may not be as price sensitive as riders during the early 2000s. Additionally, Caltrain ridership has continued to climb rapidly, signaling that there may be missed opportunities to improve farebox recovery ratios.

Caltrain continues to lack a dedicated source of funding and struggles every year to balance its operating budget. To plan effectively for long-range service changes and expansions, Caltrain needs to have the right technical inputs and policy framework in place to equitably maximize farebox revenues. To achieve this, Caltrain intends to conduct a phased fare policy study. It is anticipated that the fare study process will fully engage Caltrain’s riders as well as the JPB’s funding partners.
The Caltrain Fare Study will explore various questions regarding the potential for the fare structure, and supporting policy including:

1. **How much revenue can and should Caltrain generate from fares? What should the “domain” of a Caltrain fare policy be?**
   - What is the fare elasticity of Caltrain’s ridership? How does this vary between different rider groups?
   - Should Caltrain explore developing an explicit fare box recovery goal for policy documentation?
   - Should the Caltrain fare policy include specific fare increase indexing? Should the Caltrain fare policy contemplate regular fare increase timeframes?
   - Pricing of trips includes access by other modes such as parking. Are Caltrain parking prices reasonable? Too high/low? What is the elasticity of the parking costs? How does/doesn’t this affect ridership?

2. **Is the current Fare and pass structure the right fit for Caltrain?**
   - Should congestion pricing in the peak hour be explored?
   - Does the Zone based fare structure optimize fare revenue and ease of use for Caltrain riders?
   - Should Caltrain charge surcharges? If so, applicable to what services?
   - Other related fare pricing?
   - Is the pricing of Caltrain’s monthly pass appropriate relative to single-ride pricing?
   - Is the Go Pass financially optimal and equitably priced?
   - Should Caltrain offer a Student Pass or other product similar to San Francisco Muni’s free youth pass?
   - What types of passes could Caltrain offer that are more financially viable?
   - What are the overall revenue impacts of various pass programs/structure?

3. **How should Caltrain phase and implement changes to its fare system?**
   - What are the operational impacts of adopting a new fare program?
   - What agency equipment, departments and processes will be impacted?
   - What are the costs and trade-offs associated with implementing fare policy changes?

Phase 1 will comprise a technical investigation to determine the correct fare elasticity to apply to any potential changes to the Caltrain fare structure. Developing this information will allow Caltrain to craft a more nuanced fare policy and make an informed assessment of how changes to the fare structure may impact ridership and revenue.

Phase 2 will use the technical information developed in Phase 1 as the basis for drafting and evaluating options for a full Caltrain fare policy. The full scope of Phase 2 will be developed during Phase 1, along with refining the data collection efforts that support the Phase 2 analysis, such as rider surveys. At a minimum, Phase 2 will combine the technical information developed in Phase 1 with a substantial public outreach component and equity analysis to yield a formal fare policy for JPB consideration.
Considerations during Phase 2 will include potential implementation strategies dependent on the Policy adopted, interfaces with fare media tools, and timing relative to Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project.

Prepared By: Elizabeth Scanlon, Manager, Caltrain Planning 650.295.6867
Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board  
Draft Document – August 4, 2016  
Caltrain Fare Policy Study

Purpose:
The purpose of the Caltrain Fare Study is to develop a Caltrain Fare Policy that allows the agency to maximize revenue while substantially preserving ridership and safeguarding social and geographic equity.

Background:
The last system-wide Caltrain fare study was conducted in 2001, when fare elasticity was determined to represent a significant deterrent to fare increases. The elasticity measured at that time indicated that ridership was very influenced by price, resulting in a high anticipated elasticity (meaning that any fare increase would be expected to generate a significant ridership decline). Since 2001, however, on-board surveys of Caltrain customers reveal that many riders along the corridor have high relative incomes and may not be as price sensitive as riders during the early 2000s. Additionally, Caltrain ridership has continued to climb rapidly, signaling that there may be missed opportunities to increase farebox revenue and improve farebox recovery ratios.

Looking forward, Caltrain still lacks a dedicated source of funding and must struggle every year to balance its operating budget. To plan effectively for any long range service changes and expansions, Caltrain needs to have the right technical inputs and policy framework in place to equitably maximize farebox revenues. To achieve this, Caltrain intends to conduct the phased fare study described below. It is anticipated that the fare study process will fully engage Caltrain’s riders as well as the JPB’s funding partners.

The Caltrain Fare Policy Study will ensure it is consistent with the principals and objectives of the Caltrain FY2015-2024 Strategic Plan. The Caltrain Strategic Plan includes an objective to establish financial stability, minimize the operating subsidy and fund system improvements. Further, the Strategic Plan includes goals and objectives to maximize revenues by developing strategies to increase returns from existing revenue streams including fares, as well as to explore new funding streams. The Caltrain Strategic Plan also includes a goal conduct business in a socially responsible way, including providing an inclusive and equitable system.

This study will also be closely coordinated with other related planning studies including the Station Management Toolbox.

Key Issues to Explore:
There are a number of key issues related to the area of fares for Caltrain. These fall into three main areas;
  1. How much revenue can and should Caltrain generate from fares? What should the “domain” of a Caltrain fare policy be?
     o What is the fare elasticity of Caltrain’s ridership? How does this vary between different rider groups?
o Should Caltrain explore developing an explicit fare box recovery goal for policy documentation?

o Should the Caltrain fare policy include specific fare increase indexing? Should the Caltrain fare policy contemplate regular fare increase timeframes?

o Pricing of trips includes access by other modes such as parking. Are Caltrain parking prices reasonable? Too high/low? What is the elasticity of the parking costs? How does/doesn’t this affect ridership?

2. Is the current Fare and pass structure the right fit for Caltrain?
   o Should congestion pricing in the peak hour be explored?
   o Does the Zone based fare structure optimize the fare revenue?
   o Should Caltrain charge surcharges? If so, applicable to what services?
   o Other related fare pricing?
   o Is the pricing of Caltrain’s monthly pass appropriate relative to single-ride pricing?
   o Is the Go Pass financially optimal?
   o Should Caltrain offer a Student Pass similar to MUNI’s free youth pass?
   o What types of passes could Caltrain offer that are more financially viable
   o What are the overall revenue impacts of

3. How should Caltrain phase and implement changes to its fare system
   o What are the operational impacts of adopting a new fare program?
   o What agency equipment, departments and processes will be impacted?
   o What are the costs associated with implementing fare policy changes?

**Scope of Work:**
The scope has been broken into two phases.

1. Phase 1 will comprise a technical investigation to determine the correct fare elasticity to apply to any potential changes to the Caltrain fare structure. Developing this information will allow Caltrain to craft a more nuanced fare policy and make an informed assessment of how changes to the fare structure may impact ridership and revenue.

2. Phase 2 will use the technical information developed in Phase 1 as the basis for drafting and evaluating a full Caltrain fare policy. The full scope of Phase 2 will be developed during Phase 1, along with refining the data collection efforts that support the Phase 2 analysis. Minimally, however, Phase 2 will combine the technical information developed in Phase 1 with a substantial public outreach component and equity analysis to yield a formal fare policy for JPB adoption. Considerations during Phase 2 will include potential implementation strategies dependent on the Policy adopted, interfaces with fare media tools, and timing relative to Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project.

**Phase 1: Tasks**
The primary purpose of Phase 1 is to conduct and study fare elasticity modeling in order to inform the development of Fare Policy. Primarily, Phase 1 will collect existing conditions by understanding the current Caltrain fare products and structure; collect information from peer agencies as well as agencies such as APTA; determine the correct fare elasticity rate to use when suggesting fare changes; evaluate influencing factors related to the fare elasticity; and fully develop the scope and schedule for Phase 2
work. Phase I work will also establish several working groups to assist staff/consultant in the technical work:

- Executive Steering Committee; and
- An external technical advisory committee including core staff from Samtrans, VTA and CCSF (to be expanded during Phase 2 of the study)

**Task 1) Refine Purpose and Need**

Working with the TAC, the study team will review the goals for the fare study that will inform the process for determining the appropriate Fare Elasticity level. This task will also lay out the decision processes and refine the schedule, along with comparative agencies that should be considered.

*Deliverable:* Refined scope and schedule

*Time Frame:* 3 months from Notice to Proceed (concurrent with Task 2)

**Task 2) Existing Conditions and Background**

The study team will develop existing conditions documentation with background information including, existing Caltrain fare products and structure, historical fare revenue and ridership, and other service and/or fare metrics to provide a better understanding of the historical fare changes and their influence upon new fare levels.

*Deliverable:* Caltrain Existing Conditions Report

*Time Frame:* 3 months from Notice to Proceed

**Task 3) Rider Survey Scope Development and Timeline**

In Phase I, the study team will prepare the scope of work for survey of Caltrain passengers regarding potential changes to the fare policy and structure. This task will assess the data points desired, and the methods of data collection that will efficiently yield valid results.

*Deliverable:* Data collection scope and schedule

*Time Frame:* 3 months from Notice to Proceed (concurrent with Task 1 and 2)

**Task 4) Research and Peer Review Findings**

Using recent literature and/or peer studies, the study team will compile agency profile information, as well as other relevant studies or findings that can influence the fare elasticity determination. Even though comparable agencies may prove difficult, a variety of rail operations will be considered for their similarities and differences to provide a wide view of comparable data.

Information gathered will include documentation regarding service type, fare structure, farebox ratio, parking provision and cost, ethnicity and income of ridership, pass programs (such as Ecopass or other pass programs) and other conditions that may influence their elasticity projections. Additionally, other information will be considered, including studies that review the impact of income or service availability on elasticity such as those developed by the Transportation Research Board (TRB) and/or the American Public Transportation Association (APTA). Information will be provided in a tabular format to facilitate comparison.
These review findings will inform the selection of the values to use for the elasticity modeling and may be used in the future to help right-price pass programs.

Results will be presented to the internal JPB team as well as the TAC for review and comments. If findings are strong enough to suggest fare elasticity based on operators with similar ridership profiles, recommendations will be crafted and reviewed by the JPB Team and the TAC.

**Deliverable:** 1) Research Findings  
2) Peer Review Comparison  
3) Draft Fare Elasticity Recommendations for Analysis

**Time Frame:** 4 months occurring after completion of Task 1 and 2

**Task 5) Fare Elasticity Modeling**

Based on the results of Task 4, a proposed series of fare elasticity scenarios will be studied. This may involve regression analysis, or other statistical analyses, if it’s determined to be required in order to increase confidence with the fare elasticity levels being developed. Fare elasticity modeling should also consider different segments of Caltrain’s ridership including analysis of the sensitivity of different demographic groups as well as geographic markets.

Modeling is assumed to review several elasticity scenarios and their performance against stated goals. Results will be presented internally to JPB as well as TAC for review and input.

As a result of the modeling exercise and TAC review, it is anticipated that preferred fare elasticity level(s) will be selected to be used in Phase 2 of the study.

**Deliverable:** Fare Elasticity Scenarios Modeling Results

**Time Frame:** 4-5 months occurring after completion of Task 4

**Task 6) Phase 2 Work Scope Development**

The purpose of this task is to develop the work scope that will be undertaken during Phase 2 of the fare study. The work scope will minimally describe:

- The framework for developing fare policy goals with the stakeholders that would include ridership, revenue, and social equity outcomes.
- The extent of fare structure changes contemplated and the areas of agency activity impacted.
- An agency engagement and public outreach plan.

**Deliverable:** Work scope and schedule for Phase 2

**Time Frame:** 2-3 months occurring after completion of Task 5
Caltrain Modernization Program
Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project
(PCEP)

4th Quarter FY 2016
Progress Report

April 1, 2016 to June 30, 2016
Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project
4th Quarter FY 2016 Progress Report

Funding Partners

FTA Core Capacity
FTA Section 5307/5337 (Environmental / Pre Development only)
FTA Section 5307/5337 (EMU only)
Prop 1B (Public Transportation Modernization & Improvement Account)
Caltrain Low Carbon Transit Operations Cap and Trade

Prop 1A
High Speed Rail Cap and Trade

Carl Moyer Fund
RM2
RM1
Bridge Tolls

SFCTA
San Mateo (SMCTA) Contribution
SMCTA Measure A

VTA Measure A
Santa Clara (VTA) Contribution

San Francisco Contribution
# Table of Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>PREFACE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>ELECTRIFICATION</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>ELECTRIC MULTIPLE UNITS</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>QUALITY</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>SCHEDULE</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>FUNDING</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>RISK MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>UTILITY RELOCATION</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>REAL ESTATE</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>THIRD-PARTY AGREEMENT</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>COMMUNITY RELATIONS AND OUTREACH</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>DBE PARTICIPATION AND LABOR STATISTICS</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Tables

Page
Table 6-1 Quality Assurance Audit Summary ................................................................. 8
Table 7-1 Schedule Status .................................................................................................10
Table 8-1 Electrification Budget & Expenditure Status .....................................................11
Table 8-2 EMU Budget & Expenditure Status .................................................................12
Table 8-3 PCEP Budget & Expenditure Status .................................................................12
Table 10-1 Summary of Risks .........................................................................................15
Table 13-1 Overview Real Estate Status .........................................................................17
Table 14-1 Third-Party Agreement Status .....................................................................18

List of Figures

Page
Figure 9-1 Funding Plan .................................................................................................13

List of Appendices

Page
Appendix A – Acronyms .............................................................................................24
Appendix B – Schedule ..............................................................................................27
1.0 PREFACE

Over the last decade, Caltrain has experienced a substantial increase in ridership and anticipates further increases in ridership demand as the San Francisco Bay Area's population grows. The Caltrain Modernization (CalMod) Program, scheduled to be implemented by 2020, will electrify and upgrade the performance, operating efficiency, capacity, safety, and reliability of Caltrain’s commuter rail service.

The Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project (PCEP) is a key component of the CalMod Program and consists of converting Caltrain from diesel-hauled to Electric Multiple Unit (EMU) trains for service between San Francisco Station (at the intersection of Fourth and King Streets in San Francisco) and Tamien Station in San Jose. The project will entail the installation of new electrical infrastructure and the purchase of electrified vehicles. Caltrain will continue Gilroy service and support existing tenants.

An electrified Caltrain will better address Peninsula commuters’ vision of an environmentally friendly, fast, reliable service. Electrification will modernize Caltrain and make it possible to increase service while offering several advantages in comparison with existing diesel power use, including:

**Improved Train Performance, Increased Ridership Capacity and Increased Service:** Electrified trains can accelerate and decelerate more quickly than diesel-powered trains, allowing Caltrain to run more efficiently. In addition, because of their performance advantages, electrified trains will enable more frequent and/or faster train service to more riders.

**Increased Revenue and Reduced Fuel Cost:** An electrified Caltrain will increase ridership and fare revenues while decreasing fuel costs.

**Reduced Engine Noise Emanating from Trains:** Noise from electrified train engines is measurably less than noise from diesel train engines. Train horns will continue to be required at grade crossings, adhering to current safety regulations.

**Improved Regional Air Quality and Reduced Greenhouse Gas Emissions:** Electrified trains will produce substantially less corridor air pollution compared with diesel trains, even when the indirect emissions from electrical power generation are included. Increased ridership will reduce automobile usage, resulting in additional air quality benefits. In addition, the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions is not only good for our regional air quality, but will also help meet the State’s emission reduction goals.

An electrified Caltrain system would set the stage for an enhanced, modern commuter rail service and for future blended California High-Speed Rail (CHSR) service. While this project will not include or study all infrastructure necessary to implement high-speed rail service on the corridor (such as CHSR maintenance facilities, station improvements, or passing tracks), the electrical infrastructure (such as overhead wire systems) will be compatible with later blended service.
2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

During the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2016, the PCEP team continued to progress the project. As planned in the procurement process for the Electrification contract, an apparent best value proposer was selected and negotiations were initiated in April. The project team worked extensively to negotiate technical and commercial sections with the apparent best value proposer. The negotiations were successfully completed at the end of June. Staff will recommend that the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) award the Electrification contract to Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. at the JPB Board meeting on July 7, 2016.

The procurement process also continued for the Electric Multiple Units (EMU) manufacturer. Staff began negotiations in late-April with Stadler US, Inc. Negotiation discussions focused on technical exceptions and contractual / legal exceptions. The project team issued a letter to Stadler on May 20, 2016 to request a proposal in response to negotiations. Stadler submitted a revised proposal on June 17, 2016 after which negotiations were successfully completed. Staff will recommend that the JPB award the EMU Vehicle contract to Stadler US, Inc. at the JPB Board meeting on July 7, 2016.

The Tunnel Modification project completed the preliminary design phase and will enter into final design in Fiscal Year 2017.

The Central Equipment and Maintenance Operations Facility (CEMOF) modifications design effort is on hold at this time. The preliminary design effort has proceeded to a stage where detailed information from the EMU manufacturer is required to finalize the design. It is anticipated that the modification design efforts will resume in August.

The PCEP team is in the process of evaluating the Master Program Schedule (MPS) in conjunction with responses to the Electrification and EMU RFPs. The team anticipates issuing a revised baseline schedule in the next quarter.

The PCEP team meets monthly with members of the Peninsula Corridor Working Group (PCWG), which is comprised of staff from the agencies that signed the 2012 9-Party Funding MOU. In April members of the PCWG agreed to the 7-Party Regional Funding Supplement. Between May and June the JPB, San Mateo County Transportation Authority (SMCTA), Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA) voted unanimously to approve the 7-Party Regional Funding Supplement. The San Francisco Board of Supervisors and California High-Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) are expected to vote on the 7-Party Regional Funding Supplement in July and August.

In addition the team continues to work towards receipt of a Core Capacity Grant from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). The team has had positive interactions with the FTA and meets with the FTA's appointed Project Management Oversight Contractor (PMOC) on a monthly basis. The team continues to work with the funding partners to secure commitments to fund the entire program.
Board Actions

There were no PCEP Board items in April.

On May 5, 2016 the JPB Board received the 6th Quarterly Update on the PCEP. The quarterly update highlights PCEP activities on the major contracts, funding updates, and key policy issues regarding the new electric trains.

Also at the May meeting the JPB Board approved two items related to the PCEP:

- Adopted an agreement that invests an additional $211 million in the Caltrain Modernization Program. The 7-Party Regional Funding Supplement to the 2012 9-Party MOU increases funding commitments from Caltrain’s state and local partners, including an additional $113 million commitment from the (CHSRA).

- Adopted granting the Executive Director authority to execute a Comprehensive Agreement with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) for the PCEP. The Comprehensive Agreement memorializes the parties’ consultation and cooperation, designates their respective rights and obligations, and ensures cooperation between the JPB and Caltrans in connection with the design and construction of the PCEP.

A copy of the May board packet can be found here:

At the June 2, 2016 meeting, the JPB Board authorized finalization of contract negotiations for the procurement of EMUs with one restroom for each bi-level trainset. A copy of the June board packet can be found here:
3.0 ELECTRIFICATION

The PCEP team continued to work through the procurement steps as a result of the February 2016 responses to the BAFO Electrification RFP. Staff began negotiations with the shortlisted best value proposer in April 2016. The team worked extensively to negotiate technical and commercial sections with the apparent best value proposer. Staff successfully completed negotiations at the end of June. The team issued a staff report and resolution to recommend award of the Electrification contract to Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc. at the July 2016 Board meeting. After the award of the contract a Limited Notice to Proceed (LNTP) is anticipated to be issued to the contractor. The LNTP will allow the contractor to begin design as well as limited procurement of long lead material. Construction effort is not included within the scope of the LNTP.

A Master Agreement was signed and executed with Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) in April 2016 for continued coordination and support for the implementation of electrification. The PCEP team continues coordination with PG&E on a Power Quality study to finalize scope and necessary infrastructure to support Caltrain loads required for electrification. PG&E facilities studies are scheduled to be completed by July 2016 and design of necessary infrastructures will continue through the remainder of 2016.

The PCEP team continued to provide technical support for ongoing coordination efforts with third party jurisdictions such as California Public Utility Commission (CPUC) as well as the local cities and counties.

Tunnel Modification

Tunnel modifications will be required on the four tunnels located in San Francisco. This effort is required to accommodate the required clearance for the overhead catenary system (OCS) to support electrification of the corridor. Work was completed on the preliminary design for the Tunnel Modification including 65% design plans and specification, construction schedule, construction cost estimate and overall constructability of the project. Comments for preliminary cost estimate and construction schedules were reviewed by staff and will be incorporated in the next technical deliverables. The PCEP team will start final design for the Tunnel Modifications in July 2016 with a target completion of the end of 2016.

Central Equipment Maintenance and Operations Facility Modifications for EMUs

The CEMOF Modifications project will provide safe work areas for performing maintenance on the new EMUs. The schematic design for CEMOF modifications is complete. Preliminary design efforts remain on hold until the Stadler vehicle design is available. Selection of a car body is necessary to complete design of maintenance platforms.
4.0 ELECTRIC MULTIPLE UNITS

Negotiations began with Stadler in San Mateo the week of May 2 – 6, 2016. Discussions focused on technical exceptions, contractual and legal exceptions. The PCEP team issued a letter to Stadler on May 20, 2016 to request a proposal in response to negotiations. Stadler submitted a revised proposal on June 17, 2016 after which negotiations were successfully completed in late June. The team issued a staff report and resolution to recommend award of the EMU contract to Stadler US, Inc. in July 2016. Discussion regarding issuance of a Limited Notice to Proceed (LNTP) is underway. The LNTP will allow Stadler to prepare and submit milestone deliverables and begin their design efforts sooner rather than waiting for a Full NTP.

The Buy America Pre-Award Audit and Certification was conducted on May 25 – 27, 2016 at Stadler’s Manufacturing and Assembly Facility in Salt Lake City, UT. A report was issued on June 24, 2016. Based on the data reviewed during the audit, the Audit Team is satisfied that the rail vehicles to be purchased meet the requirements of Section 165(b)(3) of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982, as amended, and as required under the Terms and Conditions of the proposed contract between Stadler and Caltrain.

The JPB reviewed the Maintenance Services Agreement approach in which Stadler would provide the maintenance work for the existing Caltrain diesel fleet in addition to the new EMUs under their named subcontractor. A method will need to be determined with Rail Operations and Maintenance staff to compare the Stadler proposal to the current contract and make sure the decision to exercise the option is made on an equal footing basis.

EMU and overall systems integration efforts continued. The predominant method of controlling the interfaces will be to create an interface control document (ICD) to define the interfaces and allow the parties to agree to the specific details as they evolve. A System Interface Matrix is reviewed at regularly scheduled meetings and updated as items are closed or added. Correspondence will be exchanged to advance the level of detail in each ICD. System integration efforts involve coordinating the following disciplines (as well as others not mentioned here): EMU with wayside, electrification, CEMOF, testing/commissioning site, CBOSS PTC, CHSRA, EMU Testing/Commissioning Site and Track time availability, T/C site access, and schedule coordination with OCS project. A list of EMU tests that can be performed on the Santa Clara Drill Track as well as those that will need to be performed on the Main Line is being finalized.
5.0 SAFETY

The PCEP Safety team continues to develop and update the safety and security management processes as committed to within the scope of the project Safety and Security Management Plan (SSMP). The following highlights several areas of focus of the Safety team during the last quarter:

- The project Hazard Management Plan was finalized and approved by the JPB Safety and Security Director. The project team continues to work with the IndustrySafe Hazard Log application that will be utilized throughout the project life cycle as a tool to support the project hazard management program.

- As a means of continuous improvement, an internal audit of the SSMP was performed resulting in several suggestions that were incorporated within the document. In addition the PMOC also provided comments on the content of the SSMP following its detailed review of the document. These comments are in the process of being addressed within the next revision of the document.

- The project safety team is working closely with the JPB Safety and Security Office, Rail Operations, and Engineering and Construction to review and update the Caltrain Roadway Worker Protection (RWP) program as a means to ensure the ongoing priority to consistently support the highest level of on-track safety standards continues to be achieved.

- PCEP Safety staff continues to work closely with the JPB Safety and Security, Rail Operations, and Engineering and Construction in coordinating project requirements.
6.0 QUALITY

Quality Management continues to coordinate with the PCEP team via training, audits and technical support.

Activity This Quarter

- Continued to provide on-going quality-related assistance to the PCEP team
- Performed an audit of LTK (Systems Integration) on April 27, 2016. The audit resulted in no findings.
- Cost Estimating NCR 004 was closed on April 28, 2016. Corrective actions are in place.
- Investigating / lining up Independent Labs for Quality Assurance (QA) Oversight (Electrification / EMU)
- Reviewed the following Quality Control (QC) documents
  - PCEP Cost Estimate Rev 4
  - RFP ICE to Baseline – Rev 2 Report
  - DRAFT Schedule Basis for C14.02 Baseline Schedule
  - PHA / TVA comment incorporation & revision
- Performed an audit of GF Tunnel Design on May 4, 2016. The audit resulted in no findings.
- Developed and implemented a Quality Manager Transition Plan due to the resignation of the PCEP Quality Manager
- Performed an audit of B&G Transportation on June 7, 2016. The audit resulted in no findings.
- Performed an audit of LR Transit on June 8, 2016. The audit resulted in no findings.

The Table below provides details on the status of audits performed through the reporting period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Assurance Activity</th>
<th>This Reporting Period</th>
<th>Total to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal Audits Conducted</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Conformances Open</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Conformances Issued</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Conformances Closed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Activity Next Quarter

- Contribute to the preparation of the final submittal of FTA documents.
- Conduct visit to project office to coordinate and meet with Director of Program Management.
- No audits will be conducted in July. The AECOM Management audit scheduled for August may be pushed to September to allow for the replacement Quality Manager (QM) to participate, depending on the QM’s start date. In September an audit of Scheduling will be conducted. A compliance audit of AECOM Document Control is anticipated 60 - 90 days following implementation of the Document Control System on the Aconex platform.
- Continue implementation of Quality Manager Transition Plan until such time as replacement Quality Manager joins the project.
7.0 SCHEDULE

The Master Program Schedule (MPS) was updated in April 2016 to incorporate schedules prepared by the apparent best value Electrification proposer and selected EMU proposer. This update formed the basis of a revised baseline schedule.

The new schedule baseline contains two Revenue Service Dates (RSD). The first RSD represents a “soft opening” with six EMU trainsets providing revenue operations. This date is forecasted as December 2020. The second RSD represents “full service” with all 16 EMU trainsets providing revenue operations. This date without contingency is forecast as July 2021. With the addition of six months of contingency to account for potential risk to the project the Full Service RSD is anticipated as December 2021.

A summary of the overall schedule status for the PCEP is provided in Table 7-1.

Table 7-1 Schedule Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MILESTONES</th>
<th>PROGRAM PLAN</th>
<th>LAST QUARTER*</th>
<th>THIS QUARTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electrification Contract NTP</td>
<td>08/01/2016</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>08/01/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMU Contract NTP</td>
<td>08/01/2016</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>08/01/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start of Electrification Construction</td>
<td>03/20/2017</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>03/20/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start Pre-Revenue Operations</td>
<td>09/08/2020</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>09/08/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSD Soft Opening (w/ Risk Contingency)</td>
<td>12/31/2020</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>12/31/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSD Full Service (w/o Risk Contingency)</td>
<td>07/12/2021</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>07/12/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSD Full Service (w/ Risk Contingency)</td>
<td>12/30/2021</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>12/30/2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The MPS was under reevaluation last quarter, thus the post contract award schedule was still in development.
8.0 BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES

The budget was updated to reflect final negotiations with the Electrification Design Build contractor and the EMU Manufacturer. The negotiations resulted in a reduction in the amount for each contract. The budget was also modified to capture revised cost estimates for private utilities, management oversight costs, TASI support and insurance.

The overall program budget remains unchanged.

A summary of the overall budget and expenditure status for the PCEP is shown in the following tables. Table 8-1 reflects the Electrification budget, Table 8-2 reflects the EMU budget, and Table 8-3 reflects the overall project budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Work</th>
<th>Budget (A)</th>
<th>Actual This Quarter (B)</th>
<th>Accrued To Date (C)</th>
<th>Estimate To Complete (D)</th>
<th>Estimate At Completion (E) = (C) + (D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electrification</td>
<td>$696,610,558</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$696,610,558</td>
<td>$696,610,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunnel Notching</td>
<td>$11,029,649</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$11,029,649</td>
<td>$11,029,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>$28,385,456</td>
<td>$674,185</td>
<td>$4,319,739</td>
<td>$24,065,717</td>
<td>$28,385,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Utilities</td>
<td>$66,526,406</td>
<td>$66,300</td>
<td>$1,714,683</td>
<td>$64,811,723</td>
<td>$66,526,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Oversight</td>
<td>$142,814,887</td>
<td>$3,027,504</td>
<td>$57,264,144</td>
<td>$85,550,843</td>
<td>$142,814,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Management</td>
<td>$7,494,952</td>
<td>$167,506</td>
<td>$2,031,842</td>
<td>$5,463,110</td>
<td>$7,494,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$7,235,808</td>
<td>$47,286</td>
<td>$3,960,334</td>
<td>$3,275,474</td>
<td>$7,235,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>$2,826,960</td>
<td>$27,660</td>
<td>$754,901</td>
<td>$2,072,059</td>
<td>$2,826,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Security</td>
<td>$2,350,737</td>
<td>$38,266</td>
<td>$441,523</td>
<td>$1,909,214</td>
<td>$2,350,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management Services</td>
<td>$20,905,616</td>
<td>$929,874</td>
<td>$5,732,467</td>
<td>$15,173,149</td>
<td>$20,905,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Construction</td>
<td>$11,934,024</td>
<td>$51,097</td>
<td>$1,705,799</td>
<td>$10,228,225</td>
<td>$11,934,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrification Engineering &amp; Management</td>
<td>$49,093,647</td>
<td>$1,064,515</td>
<td>$13,300,202</td>
<td>$35,793,445</td>
<td>$49,093,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Support</td>
<td>$818,790</td>
<td>$43,362</td>
<td>$297,719</td>
<td>$521,071</td>
<td>$818,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Support</td>
<td>$1,423,335</td>
<td>$483,560</td>
<td>$2,996,623</td>
<td>$1,126,371</td>
<td>$1,423,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Support</td>
<td>$8,859,806</td>
<td>$1,000,107</td>
<td>$2,859,699</td>
<td>$3,859,806</td>
<td>$8,859,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget / Grants / Finance</td>
<td>$1,268,408</td>
<td>$1,715</td>
<td>$80,663</td>
<td>$1,187,745</td>
<td>$1,268,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>$2,480,274</td>
<td>$379,636</td>
<td>$1,404,869</td>
<td>$1,075,405</td>
<td>$2,480,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Direct Costs</td>
<td>$5,583,917</td>
<td>$221,878</td>
<td>$1,134,750</td>
<td>$4,449,167</td>
<td>$5,583,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Costs 2002 - 2013</td>
<td>$25,336,712</td>
<td>$1,359</td>
<td>$25,122,004</td>
<td>$416,708</td>
<td>$25,336,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASI Support</td>
<td>$53,063,531</td>
<td>$124,767</td>
<td>$254,845</td>
<td>$52,808,686</td>
<td>$53,063,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRP Insurance</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigations</td>
<td>$17,685,498</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$17,685,498</td>
<td>$17,685,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Projects</td>
<td>$17,337,378</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$497,318</td>
<td>$16,840,060</td>
<td>$17,337,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Training</td>
<td>$1,021,808</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$1,021,808</td>
<td>$1,021,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Changes</td>
<td>$3,168,200</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$3,168,200</td>
<td>$3,168,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$276,970,649</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$276,970,649</td>
<td>$276,970,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner’s Reserve</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELECTRIFICATION SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,318,114,119</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,892,756</strong></td>
<td><strong>$64,050,729</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,254,063,390</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,318,114,119</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8-2 EMU Budget & Expenditure Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Work</th>
<th>Budget (A)</th>
<th>Actual This Quarter (B)</th>
<th>Accrued To Date (C)</th>
<th>Estimate To Complete (D)</th>
<th>Estimate At Completion (E) = (C) + (D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EMU</td>
<td>$550,899,459</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$550,899,459</td>
<td>$550,899,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEMOF Modifications</td>
<td>$1,344,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$1,344,000</td>
<td>$1,344,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Oversight</td>
<td>$62,150,192</td>
<td>$1,527,460</td>
<td>$12,791,844</td>
<td>$49,358,348</td>
<td>$62,150,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Management</td>
<td>$4,715,388</td>
<td>$102,786</td>
<td>$1,278,990</td>
<td>$3,436,398</td>
<td>$4,715,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>$1,631,907</td>
<td>$12,479</td>
<td>$184,358</td>
<td>$1,447,549</td>
<td>$1,631,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Security</td>
<td>$570,000</td>
<td>$23,728</td>
<td>$109,268</td>
<td>$460,732</td>
<td>$570,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management Services</td>
<td>$11,713,423</td>
<td>$766,609</td>
<td>$3,763,096</td>
<td>$7,950,327</td>
<td>$11,713,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Construction</td>
<td>$89,113</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$89,113</td>
<td>$89,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMU Engineering &amp; Management</td>
<td>$33,083,374</td>
<td>$406,849</td>
<td>$5,686,034</td>
<td>$27,397,340</td>
<td>$33,083,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Support</td>
<td>$501,839</td>
<td>$27,290</td>
<td>$173,034</td>
<td>$328,805</td>
<td>$501,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Support</td>
<td>$1,879,350</td>
<td>$9,857</td>
<td>$235,998</td>
<td>$1,643,398</td>
<td>$1,879,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Support</td>
<td>$2,737,849</td>
<td>$27,385</td>
<td>$213,512</td>
<td>$2,160,337</td>
<td>$2,737,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget / Grants / Finance</td>
<td>$600,103</td>
<td>$1,524</td>
<td>$167,208</td>
<td>$435,893</td>
<td>$600,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>$1,258,753</td>
<td>$80,854</td>
<td>$331,690</td>
<td>$927,063</td>
<td>$1,258,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Direct Costs</td>
<td>$3,730,996</td>
<td>$68,099</td>
<td>$648,656</td>
<td>$3,081,440</td>
<td>$3,730,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASI Support</td>
<td>$2,740,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$2,740,000</td>
<td>$2,740,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Projects</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Charges</td>
<td>$1,914,800</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$1,914,800</td>
<td>$1,914,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$38,526,962</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$38,526,962</td>
<td>$38,526,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner's Reserve</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMU SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$662,138,414</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,527,460</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,791,544</strong></td>
<td><strong>$649,346,570</strong></td>
<td><strong>$662,138,414</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8-3 PCEP Budget & Expenditure Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Work</th>
<th>Budget (A)</th>
<th>Actual This Quarter (B)</th>
<th>Accrued To Date (C)</th>
<th>Estimate To Complete (D)</th>
<th>Estimate At Completion (E) = (C) + (D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELECTRIFICATION SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,318,114,119</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,892,756</strong></td>
<td><strong>$64,050,729</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,254,063,390</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,318,114,119</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMU SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$662,138,414</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,527,460</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,791,544</strong></td>
<td><strong>$649,346,570</strong></td>
<td><strong>$662,138,414</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PCEP TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,980,252,533</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,420,216</strong></td>
<td><strong>$76,842,573</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,903,409,960</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,980,252,533</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes regarding tables above:

1. A revised baseline budget was established on April 14, 2015 at the time of the Core Capacity Grant, Entry into Engineering application.
2. Based on the status of the PeopleSoft 9.1 data available, the above table is an estimate of the incurred costs and Estimate to Complete.
3. During the Entry into Engineering estimate update costs and budget were reassigned under different headers to better align with the Scope of Services.
4. Accrued To Date is the combination of invoices received and accrued costs.
9.0 FUNDING

The PCEP has been working with FTA staff as well as the FTA’s appointed Project Management Oversight Contractor (PMOC) to provide needed documentation required to achieve the Entry into Engineering milestone for the $647M Core Capacity grant. This includes an update to the 20-Year Financial plan reflecting changes in the project cost estimate and project funding.

Negotiations continue with California High-Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) regarding oversight and technical issues. These negotiations are in support of finalizing the CHSRA’s $600M grant which is included in the 9-Party Funding Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) as well as the additional $113M included in the 7-Party Regional Funding Supplement.

The JPB is also in the process of working with the funding partners to execute the 7-Party Regional Funding Supplement to provide the additional project funding. The JPB Board approved the funding supplement at the May 2016 Board meeting.

Figure 8-1 shows the percentage of contributions from the various sources that comprise the total $1.980B funding plan.

![Figure 9-1 Funding Plan](image)
10.0 RISK MANAGEMENT

Risk Management continues to actively monitor the Risk Register originally produced in 2014. This active monitoring consists of updating risk descriptions, effects, and mitigations based upon weekly input from risk owners and through a monthly cycle of risk updating per the process established in the Risk Identification and Mitigation Plan. An updated Risk Register is based on decisions made at Risk Assessment Committee meetings. Selected risks are forwarded to risk owners for grading and planning of mitigation measures.

The following are the top risks at the end of the quarter:

- If overhead utilities are not relocated on time the Electrification contractor may incur delays.
- Upgrades to the electrical service needed for the electrification project are dependent upon final agreement with PG&E for which technical and contractual issues must first be resolved.
- Modifications to proposed catenary pole locations may need to be revised to avoid sight distance problems.
- TASI may not be able to deliver sufficient staff resources to support the construction and testing of the electrification system.
- Existing Caltrain processes for reviewing and approving site specific work plans (SSWP) are not sufficiently flexible to allow the design-build contractor to maximize efficiencies in the construction of the electrification system.
- JPB’s current system integration and configuration program will require additional staff expertise and systems improvements to accommodate proposed electrification improvements.
- The final configuration of the electrification system requires the installation of a duct bank under UPRR tracks requiring coordination with UPRR the negotiation of a broad range of issues that may not be completed in a timely manner.
- All funding for the electrification program is not in place and will require agreements with all parties to the 9-Party MOU and FTA and may be affected by legal challenges associated with the CHSRA project.
- Delays in locating and relocating underground utilities may result in delays to the installation of the electrification system.

Table 10-1 provides insight into the number of risks in each classification and the changes for the previous quarter.
Table 10-1 Summary of Risks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Classification</th>
<th>Original (August 2014)</th>
<th>Last Quarter (ending 3/31/16)</th>
<th>This Quarter (ending 6/30/16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant Risks</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risks</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Risks</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>164</strong></td>
<td><strong>129</strong></td>
<td><strong>126</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired Risks</td>
<td>35*</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Risks</strong></td>
<td><strong>199</strong></td>
<td><strong>221</strong></td>
<td><strong>223</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*After initial identification 35 risks were deemed to be a duplication of other existing risks and were either retired or combined to add additional context.*
11.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) environmental clearance for the PCEP scope to date has been completed.

Permit Activity:

- Section 106 National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) process has concluded.
- Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) process has concluded.
- The target completion date for completing the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board (SFRWQCB), California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and the San Francisco Bay Conservation Development Commission (SF BCDC) is 2016.

PCEP Mitigation Program: The JPB has prepared a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) to ensure that mitigation measures identified in the PCEP EIR are fully implemented during project implementation. The JPB will implement the mitigation measures through its own actions, those of the Electrification contractor and actions taken in cooperation with other agencies and entities.

12.0 UTILITY RELOCATION

Monthly Utility Coordination meetings continued during the quarter with all Telecom and power carriers within the JPB Right of Way (ROW). Discussions have been focused on the utility relocation timeline as it relates to the overall project schedule, responsibilities of relocation, applicable design standards of relocation, and reconciliation of agreements and records.

Final verification requests were submitted to utility companies during the quarter for final concurrence of existing utility conditions and records. Field verifications will be performed during the next quarter prior to the issuance of final relocation notices.

Utility companies began submission of relocation schedules and the PCEP team will continue to work with all utility companies to refine relocation schedules and relocation criteria in the 1st quarter of Fiscal Year 2017.
13.0 REAL ESTATE

Preparation of appraisal maps, plats and legal descriptions have continued for all segments throughout the project corridor. Appraisal packages contain preliminary title reports, plat maps and the proposed acquisition appraisal map. The initial appraisal packages required for appraisal work have been completed for all segments (1 – 4).

Segment 4 (Santa Clara – San Jose) Offer presentation packages have been completed. Offer presentation meetings have begun with property owners on Segment 4 and will continue through the 1st quarter of FY2017.

Segment 2 (South San Francisco – Atherton) Offer presentation packages will be complete in 1st quarter of FY2017. Fee simple purchase acquisitions in Segment 2 offer packages are currently complete and offers will begin in 1st quarter FY2017.

The PCEP team will seek JPB Board approval in July for the acquisition of six fee acquisition parcels in Segment 2 and one parcel in Segment 4 to be used for the construction of Paralleling Station 7 (PS-7).

Table 13-1 provides an overview of property status.

Table 13-1 Overview Real Estate Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Appraisal Packages*</th>
<th>Appraisals Completed</th>
<th>Acquisition Offers</th>
<th>Acquisition Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Escrow Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Value Litigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parcel Possession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment 4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment 2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment 1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment 3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Appraisal Packages include Plat Map, Legal Description and Appraisal Map. Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) packages include Appraisal Maps only.
14.0 THIRD-PARTY AGREEMENTS

Third-party coordination is necessary for work impacting public infrastructure, utilities, ROW acquisitions, and others. The table below outlines the status of necessary agreements for the PCEP.

Table 14-1 Third-Party Agreement Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Third-Party</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governmental Jurisdictions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction &amp; Maintenance¹</td>
<td>City and County of San Francisco</td>
<td>In Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Brisbane</td>
<td>In Process²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of South San Francisco</td>
<td>In Process²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of San Bruno</td>
<td>In Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Millbrae</td>
<td>Executed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Burlingame</td>
<td>In Process²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of San Mateo</td>
<td>Executed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Belmont</td>
<td>In Process²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of San Carlos</td>
<td>Executed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Redwood City</td>
<td>In Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Atherton</td>
<td>In Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County of San Mateo</td>
<td>In Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Menlo Park</td>
<td>In Process²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Palo Alto</td>
<td>In Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Mountain View</td>
<td>In Process²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Sunnyvale</td>
<td>In Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Santa Clara</td>
<td>In Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County of Santa Clara</td>
<td>In Process²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of San Jose</td>
<td>In Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Condemnation Authority</strong></td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>In Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>Executed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>Executed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utilities</strong></td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Pacific Gas &amp; Electric (PG&amp;E)</td>
<td>Executed³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating Rules</td>
<td>California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)</td>
<td>In Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation &amp; Railroad</strong></td>
<td>Construction &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART)</td>
<td>Executed⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)</td>
<td>In Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trackage Rights</td>
<td>Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR)</td>
<td>Executed⁴</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes regarding table above:

1 Agreements memorialize the parties’ consultation and cooperation, designate respective rights and obligations and ensure cooperation between the JPB and the cities and counties in connection with the design and construction of the PCEP. A comprehensive agreement is planned for each of the 17 cities and three counties along the Caltrain ROW and within the PCEP limits.

2 Approved by City Council and awaiting signature for execution.

3 Master agreement and two supplemental agreements.

4 Utilizing existing agreements.
15.0 COMMUNITY RELATIONS AND OUTREACH

The following PCEP related community meetings and briefings took place in the last quarter:

- Testimony at Senate Transportation and Housing Subcommittee Hearing
- Testimony at Assembly Budget Subcommittee Hearing
- Meeting with Peninsula Corridor Working Group (3)
- Meeting with Diridon Station Working Group
- Presentation at the City / County Staff Coordination Group (3)
- Meeting with Caltrain Commuter Coalition Steering Committee
- Presentation at the Menlo Park Chamber Transportation Committee
- Presentation at Local Policy Maker Group (3)
- Presentation at San Carlos City Council
- Presentation at Belmont City Council
- Presentation at SAMCEDA (2)
- Presentation at South San Francisco City Council
- Presentation at the VTA Citizen Advisory Committee
- Presentation at the VTA Policy Advisory Committee
- Presentation at the Brokers North Tour Group
- Tabled at HSR Open House Meeting in San Jose
- Presentation at the JPB Citizen Advisory Committee
- Quarterly Call with State and Federal Staff
- Presentation at the JPB Bicycle Advisory Committee
- Tabled at HSR Scoping Meeting in San Francisco
- Meeting at Menlo Park City Council (2)
- Tabled HSR Scoping Meeting in Mountain View
- Presentation at the SFCTA Citizen Advisory Committee
- Presentation at the Menlo Park Chamber
- Presentation at the Caltrain Accessibility Advisory Committee
- Presentation at the Local Policy Maker Group (special meeting)
- Presentation at the Caltrain Commuter Coalition
- Presentation at the SMCTA Citizen Advisory Committee
- Unanimous support VTA Board of Directors on the 7-party Regional Funding Supplement
- Tabled HSR Community Meeting in San Jose
- Unanimous support MTC Programming and Allocations Subcommittee on the 7-party Regional Funding Supplement
- Unanimous support Brisbane City Council on the PCEP Agreement
- Presentation at the Diridon Station Joint Policy Advisory Board
• Presentation / Action by the SFCTA Plans and Program Subcommittee
• Unanimous support Mountain View Council on the PCEP Agreement
• Unanimous support MTC Commission on the 7-party Regional Funding Supplement
• Unanimous support from the SFCTA Board on the 7-party Regional Funding Supplement
• Quarterly meeting with Silicon Valley and SF Bicycle Coalitions
• Presentation at the Mineta Transportation Institute

Press Release on 7-Party Regional Funding Supplement:
http://www.caltrain.com/about/MediaRelations/news/Caltrain_s_Board_Approves_Multi-party_Caltrain_Modernization_Funding_Agreement__High_Speed_Rail_Commits_Additional__113_Million.html

The PCEP received the WTS Innovative Transportation Solutions Award. Link to the press release:
http://www.caltrain.com/about/MediaRelations/news/San_Francisco_Women_s_Transportation_Seminar_to_Honor_Transit_District_Employee__Caltrain_Electrification_Project.html
16.0 DBE PARTICIPATION AND LABOR STATISTICS

Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) and labor statistics will be reported after construction has commenced.
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Appendix A – Acronyms
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIM</td>
<td>Advanced Information Management</td>
<td>FEIR Final Environmental Impact Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARINC</td>
<td>Aeronautical Radio, Inc.</td>
<td>FONSI Finding of No Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAAQMD</td>
<td>Bay Area Air Quality Management District</td>
<td>FRA Federal Railway Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAFO</td>
<td>Best and Final Offer</td>
<td>GO-26D General Order 26D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalMod</td>
<td>Caltrain Modernization Program</td>
<td>ICD Internal Control Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>California Department of Transportation</td>
<td>ITS Intelligent Transportation System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDFW</td>
<td>California Department of Fish and Wildlife</td>
<td>JPB Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEMOF</td>
<td>Centralized Equipment Maintenance and Operations Facility</td>
<td>LNTP Limited Notice to Proceed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA</td>
<td>California Environmental Quality Act (State)</td>
<td>MMRP Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHSRA</td>
<td>California High-Speed Rail Authority</td>
<td>MOU Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP</td>
<td>Capital Improvement Plan</td>
<td>MPS Master Program Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPUC</td>
<td>California Public Utilities Commission</td>
<td>NCR Non Conformance Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-B</td>
<td>Design-Build</td>
<td>NEPA National Environmental Policy Act (Federal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>Disadvantaged Business Enterprise</td>
<td>NHPA National Historic Preservation Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMP</td>
<td>Design, Engineering, and Management Planning</td>
<td>NMFS National Marine Fisheries Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Environmental Assessment</td>
<td>NTE Not to Exceed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAC</td>
<td>Expenditure at Completion</td>
<td>NTP Notice to Proceed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIR</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Report</td>
<td>OCS Overhead Contact System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMU</td>
<td>Electric Multiple Unit</td>
<td>PCEP Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESA</td>
<td>Endangered Species Act</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
<td>Acronym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG&amp;E</td>
<td>Pacific Gas and Electric</td>
<td>SFMTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHA</td>
<td>Preliminary Hazard Analysis</td>
<td>SFRWQCB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMOC</td>
<td>Project Management Oversight Contractor</td>
<td>SOGR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA</td>
<td>Quality Assurance</td>
<td>SSMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC</td>
<td>Quality Control</td>
<td>TASI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMP</td>
<td>Quality Management Plan</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMS</td>
<td>Quality Management System</td>
<td>UPRR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAMP</td>
<td>Real Estate Acquisition Management Plan</td>
<td>USACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>USFWS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP</td>
<td>Request for Proposals</td>
<td>VTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFQ</td>
<td>Request for Qualifications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCS</td>
<td>Rail Operations Center System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRP</td>
<td>Railroad Protective Liability Insurance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSD</td>
<td>Revenue Service Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWP</td>
<td>Roadway Worker Protection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SamTrans</td>
<td>San Mateo County Transit District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCADA</td>
<td>Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>Standard Cost Categories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFBCDC</td>
<td>San Francisco Bay Conservation Development Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFCTA</td>
<td>San Francisco County Transportation Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B – Schedule
TO: JPB CAC

FROM: Joe Navarro
Director, Rail Transportation

SUBJECT: STAFF REPORT

Follow-Up Items –

- **San Jose Parking Lot (Spaces):**
  A work order has been issued to paint numbers on the parking spaces that have none.

- **Inter-Agency Transfers (SF Station):**
  Signage regarding the need for monthly pass holders to tag-off at Caltrain in order to receive $0.50 discount off Adult MUNI fare, is under review.

- **Train Speeds at Construction Zones:**
  The speed restriction through Quint St. Bridge has been removed. The restriction through San Mateo Bridge Project is scheduled to be removed on 8/28/2016.

On-time Performance (OTP) –

- **June:** The preliminary June 2016 OTP was 90.4 percent compared to 85.0 percent for June 2015. For trains within 10 minutes, the OTP was 95.2 percent.
  - **Trespasser Strike** – There was one trespasser strike on Wednesday, June 1, resulting in a fatality.

- **On-Time Performance Monitoring** –
  - Excluding the combined four days (June 1, 3, 4 and 6) with a trespasser strike and significant delays due to mechanical issues, OTP rises to 93.3 percent.

- **May:** The May 2016 OTP was 93.6 percent compared to 89.7 percent for May 2015. For trains within 10 minutes, the OTP was 97.0 percent.

ROCS 2 Implementation –

- Caltrain will implement an updated Rail Operation Control System (upgrade from ROCS 1 to ROCS 2) starting on Sunday, July 10, 2016 at 2 a.m.

Caltrain Consist Update -

- Caltrain will integrate a six-car Bombardier set with 3 bike cars (rehabilitated from the used Metrolink cars acquired in 2015) into the fleet and replace a five-car Gallery set. Equipment cycles will be adjusted to mitigate customer capacity
issues on Gilroy Trains 217 and 268. The five-car Gallery set will be pulled out for State of Good Repairs. The remaining used Metrolink cars are in the process of being rehabilitated.

**Special Event Train Service –**

- **Services performed:**
  - **Giants Baseball** – There were 13 Giants home games in June. Total additional ridership in June, alighting and boarding at San Francisco station, was 78,978, an average of 6,075 per game. Year-to-date additional ridership represents a 22 percent decrease compared to the same number of games in 2015.
  
  - **Copa America Centenario** – The 100th Anniversary of Copa America Centenario was held in the United States. Four International Soccer Tournament games were hosted at Levi’s Stadium in June and included:
    - **USA vs. Columbia, Friday, June 3, 6:30 p.m.**
      - Two post-event special trains operated
      - Total additional ridership alighting and boarding at Mountain View station was 5,103
      - There were 815 joint Caltrain/VTA passes sold
    
    - **Argentina vs. Chile, Monday, June 6, 7:00 p.m.**
      - Two post-event special trains operated
      - Total additional ridership alighting and boarding at Mountain View station was 5,103
      - There were 815 joint Caltrain/VTA passes sold
    
    - **Uruguay vs. Jamaica, Monday, June 13, 7:00 p.m.**
      - One post-event special train operated
      - Total additional ridership alighting and boarding at Mountain View station was 2,816
      - There were 151 joint Caltrain/VTA passes sold
    
    - **Quarter finals (Mexico vs. Chile), Saturday, June 18, 7:00 p.m.**
      - Two post-event special trains operated
      - Total additional ridership alighting and boarding at Mountain View station was 2,881
      - There were 256 joint Caltrain/VTA passes sold
  
  - **San Jose Earthquakes at Stanford Stadium** – On Saturday, June 25, at 7:30 p.m., the San Jose Earthquakes soccer team hosted the Los Angeles Galaxy at Stanford Stadium. Regular northbound and southbound service
stopped at Stanford Stadium (six pre-game and five post-game trains). Total riders alighting and boarding at Stanford Stadium station was 2,554, a 34 percent increase in ridership compared to 2015.

- **Gay Pride Weekend** – Large crowds flocked to San Francisco on Saturday, June 25 and Sunday, June 26, in celebration of Gay Pride. Five specials Northbound and Southbound operated on Sunday for the Gay Pride Parade in downtown San Francisco and same-day Giants game at 1:05 p.m. Total additional riders boarding and alighting at San Francisco station for both days was 12,528.

- **Opera at the Ballpark** – On Saturday, July 2, at 7:30 p.m. the San Francisco Opera returned to AT&T Park for a free performance of Carmen. Caltrain provided two extra post-event local trains. Total additional ridership alighting and boarding at San Francisco station was 4,393, a 156 percent increase compared to 2015 when the event was held on a Friday and the next day was July 4.

- **Independence Day Fireworks** – On Monday, July 4, Caltrain operated a Sunday schedule on the Independence Day holiday. Caltrain also provided three additional post-fireworks service from San Francisco to San Jose Diridon Station. Total additional ridership alighting and boarding at San Francisco station was 6,143, a 13 percent decrease compared to 2015 when July 4 was on a Saturday.

- **Services scheduled:**

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

  - **Liverpool FC vs. AC Milan at Levi’s Stadium** – On Saturday, July 30, at 7:00 p.m., International Soccer returns to Levi’s Stadium. Caltrain will coordinate post-event service with the VTA. Additional post-event service is still to be determined.

  - **Gilroy Garlic Festival** – On Saturday, July 30, and Sunday, July 31, Caltrain will provide roundtrip charter service from San Jose to Gilroy for the Gilroy Garlic Festival. On both days, the train will depart San Jose Diridon Station at 10:00 a.m. and will depart Gilroy Station at 5:00 p.m. Attendees will need to purchase a ticket for the charter trains separately. Tickets are being sold in advance at gilroygarlicfestival.com through Eventbrite. The charter train ticket includes shuttle service to and from the Gilroy station to the festival, and includes festival admission.
• **Capital Projects –**

  o **Quint Bridge Replacement Project:** The scope of this project is to replace the structurally deficient steel bridge with an earthen berm. The bridge replacement was completed at the end of April 2016. Final grading and paving, landscaping, clean-up activities and installation of right-of-way fencing continued in June. Project completion is expected by July 2016.

  o **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. The bridge replacements were completed in April 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 August 2016.

  o **San Francisco Highway Bridges:** Construction work for replacement of three overhead vehicular bridges located at 23rd Street (completed in April 2016), 22nd Street, and Paul Avenue in San Francisco, is ongoing. Utility relocations and temporary utility supports continue at 22nd Street location. The temporary pedestrian overpass across 22nd Street is forecasted to be in place by the end of July. At Paul Avenue, the installation of the bridge girders was completed in June and work is now progressing on the bridge deck. The Paul Avenue Bridge is forecasted to be completed by the fall of 2016. Due to unforeseen utility relocation issues, completion of the 22nd Street Bridge is now expected in the spring of 2017.

  o **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. 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 and to advertise the construction contract for bids in the winter of 2016.

  o **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 construction bid package was advertised for bids in June and two on-site pre-bid conferences were held to familiarize the potential contractors with the site conditions. Bids are due this summer and the award of the contract is expected by the fall of 2016. Coordination with the Union Pacific Railroad and affected utility companies continues. Due to environmental regulations, work within the creek’s waterways is restricted from mid-June to mid-October of 2017.
o **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. Finish room walls, wall painting, room doors, and installation of shower stalls were completed in June. Installation of plumbing fixtures, finished floors, completion of the ceiling, and installation of lockers and furnishings are upcoming activities. Completion of the project is expected in late 2016.

o **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. The contract was awarded in April and a Limited Notice to Proceed was issued to the contractor on June 20, 2016 to commence the Administrative period. Upon completion of administrative requirements, 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.

**CAC Appointments** – The SCC representatives are working on filling the CAC appointments for the September Board meeting. Until appointments are made, incumbent members whose terms have expired were asked to remain on the CAC.
TO: JPB CAC
FROM: Joe Navarro
Director, Rail Transportation

SUBJECT: Customer Experience Taskforce Update

The mission of the Customer Experience Taskforce (CETF) 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:

- Continue to monitor a new public timetable to improved service reliability (implemented April 4)
- Study potential service expansion
- On 7/25/2016, integrated a six-car Bombardier set with three bike cars (rehabilitated from the used Metrolink cars acquired in 2015) into the fleet and replaced a five-car Gallery.
Communications/Incident Management
In the short-term (six-18 months), the taskforce is spearheading efforts to:
- Continue to monitor the Predictive Arrival and Departure System and provide fixes to the system as identified
- Continue efforts to survey passengers
- Improved and defined incident management protocol (to be presented to CAC in September 2016)
- Finalized a public facing “playbook for service interruptions”
- Continue to 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:
- Developed a Language Assistance Plan and corresponding training for front-line Caltrain Rail Operations staff. Training in progress.

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:
- Continue to investigate Clipper Card issues
- Request for Proposal has been posted for 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

System Cleanliness
In the short-term (six-18 months), the taskforce is spearheading efforts to:
- Use the results from customer/passenger survey to enhance the customer experience
AGENDA ITEM # 9 (b)
AUGUST 17, 2016

JPB CAC Work Plan

August 17, 2016
- CalMod Quarterly Update
- Fare Policy Study Scope

September 21, 2016
- Incident management and recovery – requested by chair 3/2/16
- MTC means-based fare pricing study

October 19, 2016
- Short Range Transit Plan update

November 16, 2016
- CalMod Quarterly Update

December 21, 2016

January 18, 2017

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