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

MEMBERS ABSENT: A. Sweet, C. Tucker

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Andy Chow, Redwood City, said one way to address capacity is to use the bus option. In Seattle, buses runs between train stations during off-peak times. SamTrans already operates the KX, which goes to San Francisco from Redwood City. It would be a good idea for Caltrain passes that are good to San Francisco to be valid on that bus.

Ms. Maguigad said if a customer has a monthly ticket that has two or more zones on it, the customer can use SamTrans buses.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ms. Levin said MTC’s study may not address Caltrain because most low-income people use bus service because they may be priced out of rail.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**DATE, TIME AND LOCATION OF NEXT MEETING:**
December 16, 2015 at 5:40 p.m., San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building, 2nd Floor Bacciocco Auditorium, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA.

Meeting adjourned at 8:23 p.m.