MINUTES OF JULY 16, 2014

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: G. Scharff

STAFF PRESENT: J. Averill, T. Bartholomew, A. Chan, C. Harvey, A. Maguigad

The meeting convened at 5:49.

SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (TA) MEASURE A STRATEGIC PLAN – April Chan

April Chan, Executive Officer, Planning and Development, presented:

- The Original Measure A Program was from 1998 through 2008, the New Measure A Program is from 2009 to 2033. This program was approved by voters.
- Measure A requires a strategic plan be updated every five years to set project selection and ranking processes.
- The purpose of the Strategic Plan Update is to review and modify as needed the policy framework for guiding programming and allocation decisions, including:
  - Funding prioritization and evaluation criteria for the selection of candidate projects
  - Procedures for sponsors to initiate projects
- The Expenditure Plan collects one-half cent sales tax from San Mateo County. This money is to be allocated by percentages to various categories:
  - Transit – 30 percent
  - Highways – 27.5 percent
  - Local Streets and Transportation – 22.5 percent
  - Grade Separations – 15 percent
  - Pedestrian and Bicycles – 3 percent
  - Administration – 1 percent
  - Alternative Congestion Relief – 1 percent
- 2014 Plan Update Schedule:
  - June/July: Analyze existing process and conduct financial review
  - July/August: Stakeholder meetings and public surveys
  - August: Review findings and draft plan with TA Board subcommittee
  - September: Review draft plan with Board
  - October: Public outreach
  - November: Board adoption of final plan
- Expenditure Plan Goals – voter-approved goals for use of the sales tax funds:
  - Reduce commute corridor congestion
    - Improve mass transit
- Construct key highway projects
- Fund supplemental highway projects
- Implement information technologies
- Provide employer incentives for commute alternatives
  - Make regional connections
    - Improve Caltrain
    - Support Dumbarton Rail
    - Fund San Francisco International Airport Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) extension
    - Support ferry service
  - Enhance safety
    - Construct grade separations
    - Provide pedestrian/bicycle paths
    - Improve and maintain local streets
  - Meet local mobility needs
    - Provide paratransit service
    - Improve shuttle services
    - Provide funding to cities for streets and roads
- A 25 percent increase in population and 34 percent increase in jobs is projected by 2040.
- Maps were shown to illustrate where the major changes in population and jobs are expected to occur.
- Caltrain Funding and Status:
  - Original Measure A – More than $260 million to help fund right of way acquisition, operational and station improvements including Baby Bullet and maintenance facility.
  - New Measure A – 16 percent of the measure (approximately $11 million per year) to improve Caltrain service through a combination of capital investments and operational expenditures. Approximately $5.5 million is eligible to be used for Caltrain Operating Budget. Eligible sponsors are San Mateo County Transit District and the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board.
- The Fiscal Year (FY) 2014 Operating Budget was $120 million, Measure A covered $5.4 million.
- The FY2014 Capital Budget was $259 million, Measure A covered $29.4 million.
- Critical ongoing capital needs:
  - State of Good Repair
  - Track, signal, communications and rolling stock require consistent, ongoing maintenance
  - Deferral of regular maintenance causes system delays, decreased service levels leading to ridership declines
- Caltrain Status
  - Ridership up 110 percent since FY2004
  - Farebox recovery (64 percent) is up 38 percent since FY2008
  - Peak-period service is at or near capacity
  - Operating and capital budget structural deficits persist
- Questions
  - How effective has the TA been at delivering on Measure A promises?
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- Are the Expenditure Plan goals properly aligned with current/future transportation needs?

Adina Levin arrived at 6:08 p.m.

- Should the TA put more emphasis on any one goal over the others?
- What is the best way to ensure efficient delivery of the Measure A funded Caltrain projects?
- People can participate the following ways:
  - Complete the stakeholder questionnaire
  - Attend a public meeting
  - Visit the project website at www.smcta.com/strategicplan
  - Send a message to tastrategicplan@samtrans.com

Chair Tucker asked if there are restrictions with how Measure A funds are used. Ms. Chan said the restrictions are based on the program categories that were approved by the voters. Funds cannot be transferred from one category to another. Within the limits of how much money is available per category, the Strategic Plan sets up an evaluation process to rank the projects and how to allocate funding to them.

Chair Tucker asked how much of Measure A can be used for Caltrain. Ms. Chan said 16 percent of the funding received from Measure A is for Caltrain, and up to 8 percent can be used to operate Caltrain and the other 8 percent can be used for capital improvements.

Yvonne Mills asked if grade separation is part of the 16 percent Ms. Chan just mentioned. Ms. Chan said no, it is a separate category because a grade separation has benefits for both the city and for Caltrain.

Adina Levin said the City/County Association of Governments active transportation coordinator made a presentation showing data about how much peak-hour congestion is related to non-employment trips and asked if that would be a good strategic focus to relieve congestion. Ms. Chan said that suggestion would not be related to the Caltrain category, it would go under the 1 percent Alternative Congestion Relief category.

Ms. Levin said in the Santa Clara County proposed ballot measure that is being deferred, it mentioned a complete streets condition on the spending for local streets and roads and the expressway interchanges. Ms. Chan said staff is going to have to figure out how to incorporate complete streets requirements into the update.

Ms. Levin said it would be good to include a comment about Caltrain capacity improvements in the plan.

Ms. Levin said there have been changes in mode shift and travel patterns since voters approved these buckets of funding and there may be an appetite for changes to Measure A. Ms. Chan said any changes would have to go back to the voters. She said staff has looked at trends to see if there has been a huge shift that would require a
change to the percentages in the program categories, but staff is not seeing that yet. These are the constraints staff is working with.

Ms. Levin said Dumbarton Rail is not going forward to cross the bay, but there is a lot of development in Menlo Park and Redwood City in the connection on the Dumbarton route and in the planning for North Fair Oaks. She asked if activating the rail line for the peninsula section might be thought of. Ms. Chan said the Dumbarton Rail Policy Advisory Committee is looking at other transportation options to address those issues. She said $30 million was set aside for Dumbarton Rail station improvements. Since it is not going through, the region has to look at what other improvements can be done with the available money.

Ms. Mills asked if the funds set aside for the Dumbarton Rail Project are being used elsewhere. Ms. Chan said that project has multiple funding sources. Some funding has been redirected to purchase buses for the Dumbarton bus service to connect the East Bay and West Bay, and $20 million was redirected to the electrification project. Staff doesn’t want the Measure A funding to just sit there, so funding is being redirected for other usage. That is in accordance with the intent of the voters.

Chair Tucker asked if this funding is only for San Mateo County. Ms. Chan said generally speaking, yes, but if it is being used for Caltrain system-wide improvements, Santa Clara County and San Francisco County contribute their equal share, and staff takes that pool of money to make those improvements. Station improvements are for San Mateo County only.

Chair Tucker said it seems like there will be an abundance of money in certain categories and there should be a contingency plan that allows the funding to cross categories where it is needed. Ms. Chan said Caltrain prepares a Capital Improvement Program (CIP) to prioritize its needs, and the TA relies on Caltrain to tell the TA where those investments need to go. The needs in the CIP are greater than the amount of money that will be available.

Ms. Levin asked if there is a program to sync the three funding partners to show categories of investment such as level boarding where Caltrain will need more than one county promising to support it. Ms. Chan said the CIP is being updated, system-wide needs, how they are prioritized, and the funding needs, then staff works with each of the partners to make sure they can come up with the funding to fund the list of prioritized projects. There are more needs than money available.

Public Comment
Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said the San Mateo Bridges Rehabilitation Project cost $12 million, and Caltrain is blowing everything up and starting over again because they are raising the tracks. He said when it comes to grade separations, Caltrain should look at where there the most congestion is, like at Broadway, and do that separation first, but they don’t. He said Caltrain is going to do a grade separation at 25th Avenue, and there are very few cars using that area. He said the reason Caltrain is doing that separation is because they really want to open up new grade separations at 28th and 31st avenues to get access to Bay Meadows. He asked why grade separation funds
should be used for that. He said if four tracks were put in at Hillsdale, it would be a massive system-wide improvement because more Baby Bullets would be able to be run.

Doug DeLong, Mountain View, said Mr. Lebrun mischaracterized the San Mateo Bridges Project because the rehab was done to the foundation structure of the bridges, and the new project is to replace the bridges that sit on that foundation structure. He said grade separations allow for more capacity on the roads and on the railroad. He said it would be useful if some crude numbers were brought forward to give an idea of how much more capacity comes with grade separations so people could compare a grade separation to adding a lane to a highway, for example. He said Ms. Levin was not asking for a transbay service of the Dumbarton Rail line, but if it would make sense to run a high-capacity shuttle service over the corridor to connect the East Bay with the Caltrain network. He said that is a lot less expensive than making the rail tracks work.

STAFF REPORT – April Maguigad
Caltrain Service for Levi’s Stadium Events
April Maguigad, Manager, Rail Operations, said the 49ers are moving to Santa Clara. Staff has been working with Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) on connecting service at Mountain View. Staff had a dry run on July 1 to figure out how to keep people from crossing tracks when they don’t need to. It was successful and helpful. Another dry run will be done on July 25. She said on weekends, staff is planning to have two local trains leaving San Francisco and making all local stops until Mountain View and terminate there. The idea is to get people to the stadium at least one and one-half hours early. A matrix was built in five-minute increments to give staff a response plan for whenever the events end and it includes revenue service trains into the schedule. She said the first official game is a San Jose Earthquakes game on August 2. She said there will be signage pointing the way to VTA and the lines, there will be fare checking, and a joint day pass has been developed with VTA so passengers will not have to buy another pass at Mountain View. VTA has portable clipper units to help with the crowds who need to tag onto the system. Staff will be at the station helping customers find their way. Caltrain allows food, drinks, and alcohol, VTA does not. Bike capacity is another challenge because VTA does not have the capacity Caltrain does. Bicyclists could take a regularly scheduled train to Santa Clara and bike from there if they want to bike to the stadium. There will be bike parking in some of the parking lots at Levi’s Stadium.

Ms. Mills asked if Caltrain will create a video on how to go to Levi’s Stadium. Ms. Maguigad said a communications plan is being worked on but there is no plan for a video at this time.

Alex Sweet asked if staff has worked with Mountain View to increase bike parking at that station. Ms. Maguigad said no, but staff is looking at what the bike options are, and Levi’s Stadium will offer valet bike parking, which may be a better, safer option.

Ms. Levin asked what percentage of people who go to Levi’s Stadium will be taking transit and what percentage will be taking Caltrain. Ms. Maguigad said she doesn’t know. She said staff estimates are 3,000 to 4,000 people, but it’s a new location, a new service, it includes a transfer, so there will be a learning curve.
Ms. Levin said Mountain View has a policy to match Caltrain’s parking prices during events. She said this will be a challenge for Mountain View residents who want to go to San Francisco. She asked if there has been any thought to serve those residents.

Ms. Maguigad said no decisions have been made yet but discussions have taken place.

Public Comment
Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said a lot of San Francisco residents have told him they won’t take Caltrain to go to Levi’s Stadium. He said people are looking at chartering buses, going to Oakland to take Capitol Corridor, or taking BART and then buses.

Caltrain Schedule Change
Ms. Maguigad said staff is working through a schedule change on October 5. She said the San Mateo Bridges Project is going to raise the tracks approaching the bridges. Anytime there is a change to the track, a temporary speed restriction is imposed for safety. This will be a long-term temporary speed restriction, so it is being built into the schedule. There will be an additional minute for most local limited trains and an additional two minutes for bullets trains. She said staff is also working on some shifts in mid-day trains to change where trains meet up with each other to support single tracking to support construction in the area so there will be no construction-related delays. Staff is putting considerable thought into this and will provide more information at the next meeting.

Ms. Maguigad reported:
- There are two vacancies on the CAC and hopefully will be filled by the next meeting.
- The capital budget hasn’t gone to the Board, but there is no danger of falling behind with the State of Good Repair Program.
- Interstate-280 closed over the Fourth of July weekend and there were two Giants games that weekend. Five trains were used for special service.
- There was a 6 percent decrease in ridership over Gay Pride weekend.
- Giants ridership was up 14 percent in June.
- Jay Z and Beyoncé will be at AT&T Park in August and extra service will be provided.
- The Bicycle Advisory Committee will meet tomorrow night.

Ms. Levin said she hears people would like to bring back 30-minute service and would like later trains departing from downtown San Jose.

Ms. Levin asked if staff does not expect to have problems in getting state of good repair funded in the upcoming year’s budget. Chuck Harvey, Deputy CEO, said FY2014 money is still available to continue work on the State of Good Repair Program. He said at some point, capital projects and state of good repair will have to be slowed down if Caltrain does not have a capital budget. It will not shut down the railroad or prevent Caltrain from operating, and it will not make the system unsafe. He said it is an ongoing, difficult discussion with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC).
Ms. Levin said a two-year operating budget and a five-year rolling capital budget would reduce the level of suspense.

Chair Tucker asked if the alcohol policy will be addressed with this committee and asked if the policy will be reworked. Ms. Maguigad said staff has been discussing the subject. She said staff was hoping to make updates by the Mountain View events with VTA because of the disparity between the services. She said the Alcohol Policy states whether passengers can drink onboard, but not being allowed to drink onboard is not going to stop people arriving drunk.

Chris Cobey asked if any other transit systems in the Bay Area allow drinking onboard. Ms. Maguigad said Capitol Corridor probably does because they fall under the Amtrak policy. She says there is no other system that allows eating and drinking onboard in the Bay Area.

Jonathan Berk said he rides Caltrain every day, and many of the trips are with Giants supporters who are just having a good time and they are not getting in the way, so he does not see an issue with alcohol on the train.

Ms. Mills said she has seen an issue with alcohol on the train and egregious behavior on the train.

Ms. Maguigad said the alcohol policy is not on the agenda. Chris Cobey said he would like to see this issue agendized for a future meeting.

Public Comment
Doug DeLong, Mountain View, said a drunken woman was swinging her purse with a bottle in it at conductors and one of the conductors got put on paid administrative leave pending investigation. He said there are some serious issues that happen in connection with alcohol consumption.

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said if alcohol is prohibited there will be a mass exodus off Caltrain. He said he would like to see off-peak bullet trains and local trains because in the off-peak, people would rather drive since the freeways will be clear, but a bullet-train would entice them to take the train. He said the train that leaves San Francisco at 2:07 p.m. does not go to Tamien, so people skip the train and wait for the 2:37 p.m. train that goes to Tamien. The only people on that train are the people who want to go to Tamien. He said if the 2:07 p.m. went to Tamien, the 2:37 p.m. train could be canceled and replace it with a bullet.

COMMITTEE COMMENTS
Mr. Berk said he has been on this committee for one year. It is a commitment and sacrifice to be here and he has not effected any change. He said he came onto the committee with two goals: get the trains to stop running early, and to see an official report from management on the emergency response and effect change on it. He said no changes have been made to trains running early and he hasn’t received a report on emergency response. He said all the problems at Caltrain are dealt with on an ad hoc basis. He said it is not difficult to solve a problem on a linear system to help
the customers get the best out of a bad situation. He said it is frustrating that after one year on the committee there has been no issue on that topic. He said when there is a problem on the line and all the trains are delayed, no one knows the number of a particular train or the number of the train they want to take. They just want to know where the train in the station is going. He asked how hard it is for every train to list the stops it is making. He said he brings these issues up on the committee and there is no change.

Mr. Berk said when the CAC was discussing bike capacity on cars, he pointed out that the front bike car, one exit is not an emergency exit, which means the last set of seats could be removed and the car would not have human beings in the car and would not be subject to the regulation that a passageway is needed and the bikes on either side of the aisle could be increased. Mr. Harvey said that is not true. The regulation says an emergency exit must be maintained whether there are seats or not. Mr. Berk said he is okay with that, but he never got that response. He said responses to suggestions and comments should be brought up at the next meeting.

Mr. Berk said at the next meeting, he would like some response to the question of emergency response, and that Caltrain does not respond to everything by the seat of its pants. He said he needs to understand why he was told repeatedly that the policy is the trains do not run early when the trains do run early.

Mr. Berk said in the summer, the correspondence is very thick, and in the winter it is not as thick. He said when the surveys are conducted, bikes don’t come up as an issue so he thought they weren’t an issue. He said at the very least, the correspondence packet brings up an issue with conductors. He said he does not understand why conductors are not filling up the bike cars to capacity, as evidenced in the correspondence packet.

Mr. Berk said the CAC is for Caltrain to inform the citizens and for the citizens to inform Caltrain. He said his role is short changed. He said he would like on the next agenda a rule to be discussed that 50 percent of the time is Caltrain informing the committee and 50 percent of the time the committee informs Caltrain.

Ms. Sweet suggested the CAC keep a task list of questions that remain unanswered at the meetings and it could approved at the next meeting.

Ms. Sweet said she would like to discuss the opportunity for the CAC to have more interaction with the customers. She said the CAC is supposed to represent the customers but she has never heard from customers, and if they are looking for a way for their voice to be heard, there should be a better way for them to reach her as their representative.

Ms. Sweet said there have been more e-mail responses to customer complaints and it is good thing to help the customers feel less frustrated.

Ms. Sweet said a couple of items in the correspondence packet regarding bike queuing. She said if Caltrain just puts down tape to make queue lines, people will start
lining up. She said if there could be a day-, week-, or month-long trial, it would be a simple trial opportunity.

Ms. Mills said Mr. Harvey’s responses led her to believe that some discussions and questions were not appreciated. She asked if the committee is not supposed to be asking questions about budgets and other topics. Mr. Harvey said he was trying to make sure the CAC knew everything was fine and that the issue is a complex negotiation occurring between the MTC, which controls all Caltrain’s Federal money, and multiple agencies that all have capital needs that exceed how much the Federal program will pay out. He said it is hard to get this money and staff has to advocate and explain why the money is needed and it has to be managed politically. He said staff has been trying to get the Capital budget money for four months. It is a challenging situation. The Board passed a partial FY2015 Capital Budget to keep certain projects moving forward, so he is not concerned about the program today.

Mr. Cobey said some trains run early out of San Jose. He said he has never served on a committee where they don’t get materials ahead of the meeting. He said he would like to agendize a discussion about whether it is feasible to get a management report the Friday before the Wednesday meeting.

Ms. Levin said she has seen trains run early.

Chair Tucker said the items to add to future agendas are discussion of the alcohol issue, the 50/50 time between staff and committee members, a discussion about adding a task list to the end of the minutes with questions from the meeting, opportunities for the CAC to interact with customers, and possibly a discussion of the e-mail responses. She said she would like to add a discussion about the conductor turning people away when there is capacity. She said she would like to know about conductor training, how it is done, and why they have so much discretionary power. She would also add to an agenda an answer about queuing with tape, and a response to whether or not the CAC can get reports early.

Mr. Berk said these issues have more urgency than the strategic plan for some agency. He asked for agenda items to be prioritized.

Ms. Maguigad said she could work offline with Chair Tucker to create a work plan.

**DATE, TIME AND LOCATION OF NEXT MEETING:**
August 20, 2014 at 5:40 p.m., San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building, 2nd Floor Bacciocco Auditorium, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA.

Meeting adjourned at 7:21 p.m.