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

INTRODUCTION OF NEW CAC MEMBER, CLARRISSA CABANSAGAN, REPRESENTING SAN FRANCISCO
Clarrissa Cabansagan said she is a transportation advocate at Transform. She grew up on the Peninsula and is now a resident of San Francisco. She is a regional transit user and cyclist.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF APRIL 20, 2016
Motion/Second: Tucker/Berk
Ayes: Berk, Cabansagan, Lee, Levin, Tucker, Cobey
Absent: Scharff, Shaw, Mills

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

PRELIMINARY FISCAL YEAR 2017 CAPITAL BUDGET
Aandy Ly, Manager, Budgets, presented:
- Preliminary FY2017 Capital Budget
  - Presented a preliminary constrained budget of $253.8 million
  - The preliminary budget included $19.5 million in local funds, or a funding request to each JPB member of $6.5 million
  - Reported that JPB members had committed to a contribution of $15 million ($5 million each)
  - Discussed the $25.5 million in deferred capital program and critical ongoing capital needs
- Changes since May 5, 2016
  - Deferred State of Good Repair in Grade Crossing, Rolling Stock and Station, and Operational Improvement projects in the amount of roughly $3 million
  - Increased Caltrain Modernization (CalMod) Program Budget by $100,000 due to revised cash flow
- The total Proposed FY2017 Capital Budget is $250.9 million
  - CalMod: 82.5 percent or $207.2 million
  - Legal mandates: 5.9 percent or $14.7 million
  - Operational improvements and enhancements: 1.9 percent or $4.7 million
  - Planning and studies: 0.8 percent or $2 million
  - Station and intermodal access: 0.6 percent or $1.4 million
Right of way/signals and communication: 5.5 percent or $13.9 million
Rolling stock: 2.8 percent or $7 million

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

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

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

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

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

PENINSULA CORRIDOR ELECTRIFICATION PROJECT QUARTERLY UPDATE (PENINSULA CORRIDOR ELECTRIFICATION PROJECT CONTRACT STATUS AND ELECTRIC VEHICLE CONSIDERATIONS INCLUDING BATHROOMS)
Ms. Fromson presented:
  • Electrification Infrastructure Contract
    o 2014: June: Pre-qualification process (six firms)
2015:
- February: Request for Proposals (RFP) issued
- August: Proposals received (four firms)
- October: Shortlisted (three firms)
- December: Best and Final Offer (BAFO) issued
2016:
- February: BAFO proposal received
- March: Apparent best value proposal

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

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

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

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

**EMU Policy Discussion**
- Board Action (July 2015)
  - RFP for EMUs
    - Design vehicle with one bathroom per train
    - Option for no bathrooms
- Consider additional bathrooms at stations

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

DATE, TIME AND LOCATION OF NEXT REGULAR MEETING:
June 15, 2016 at 5:40 p.m., San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building, 2nd Floor Bacciocco Auditorium, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA.

Adjourned at 7:26 p.m.