

**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC)
PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD (JPB)
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT ADMINISTRATIVE BUILDING
Bacciocco Auditorium, 2nd Floor
1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos CA 94070**

MINUTES OF JANUARY 20, 2021

MEMBERS PRESENT: A. Brandt (Vice Chair), A. Dagum, P. Flautt, R. Kutler, P. Leung, N. Mathur (Alternate), K. Maxwell (Alternate), D. Tuzman, B. Shaw (Chair)

MEMBERS ABSENT: L. Klein, M. Romo

STAFF PRESENT: B. Fitzpatrick, J. Navarrete, J. Navarro, D. Provence, B. Zhang

Due to COVID-19, this meeting was conducted as a teleconference pursuant to the provisions of the Governor's Executive Orders N-25-20 and N-29-20, which suspends certain requirements of the Ralph M. Brown Act.

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF DECEMBER 16, 2020

Motion/Second: Flautt / Leung

Ayes: Brandt, Dagum, Shaw, Tuzman

Absent: Klein, Kutler, Romo

R. Kutler joined at 5:54 p.m.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, via Zoom Q&A, mentioned that the TASI contract that was approved by the Board is basically an evergreen bundled contract that essentially allocated 100% of Measure RR for the next six years. He stated that there was no need to renew the contract because it was not up for renewal for another 18 months. He stated that it is a shame because Stadler will maintain, not just the EMUs, but diesel trains as well. He stated that he has made discoveries regarding Constant Time Warning and advised the committee that he would be sending correspondence on that matter. Roland also stated that Dual Speed Check is the solution, and it appears to be on track. Lastly, he mentioned that it concerns him that staff continues to pursue an item on the CBOSS contract, trains telling the gates what speed is approaching via radio and advised that it needs to stop.

Aleta Dupree, via Zoom Q&A, asked the Committee for their advocacy in engaging with this new administration to keep this railroad running. She mentioned that the

electrification project is essential, however is concerned with the low productions of foundations. She then stated that during COVID era, fare collection should receive attention with greater outreach of Clipper and Clipper Start. She also mentioned with upgrading vending machines and moving toward a paperless system of managing fare. She is looking forward to a big and productive year for Caltrain and to always be relevant to the future.

CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT

Chair Brian Shaw shared his hope, with the new administration, to see things happen for Transit in America that have been long overdue and hopes that Caltrain and the region is positioned to make use of that opportunity.

Public Comments:

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, via Zoom Q&A, advised the committee that the VTA General Manager turned in her resignation effective the day prior as she has been asked to join the Biden administration as be the Director of the Federal Transit Administration. He stated that her new position may be favorable to Caltrain as the federal money would not be sent only to BART and hopefully would send some of it Caltrain's direction.

COMMITTEE COMMENTS

Member Patrick Flautt provided an update about the website development for Caltrain. He stated that he was pleased with the direction the team is heading. He then advised the committee that a full presentation from the development team would be presented soon with further details. Chair Shaw thanked Member Flautt for investing his expertise to Caltrain.

Member David Tuzman made an informal request for a presentation compiling what type of funding sources and mechanisms would Caltrain pursue. He stated that he would follow-up with an email to staff with further details to Agendize for a future meeting. Member Tuzman then stated that MTC is in the early stages of a fare integration study. He stated that it is important keep focus on the experience of riders, the convenience, equity and affordability as well as having a system that is nice and attractive to riders where ridership can increase. Lastly, he stated that he has heard talks of Caltrain governance and hopes that it does not get in the way of finding a good solution for fare integration. Chair Shaw mentioned that staff provided the Committee with their Government Legislative Agenda and can be found in the December or November meeting minutes, however if Member Tuzman would like specific information, to provide staff an understanding of what is being asked so that they may provide feedback and information in that regard.

Member Rosalind Kutler thanked Patrick for working on the website and hopes that the committee will have a chance to provide input as the process moves along.

Vice Chair Adrian Brandt expressed the importance Air Quality control on the train. He shared that the Washington Post reported that Germany decided to make it mandatory for people riding on transit to use medical style masks. Member Brandt

stated that with the building of the new trains, air filtration needs to be a priority. He then shared that Redwood City is doing a major Grade Separation study and Transit District study and that the city council will be having a presentation and taking public comment on the ongoing alternative analysis at their next meeting agenda Monday, January 25th. He stated that it is a really important issue, because it will be the passing track central hub as Redwood City is the approximate midpoint of the Caltrain service and it will be the key to making the business plan work well.

Member Kutler mentioned that Redwood City did a nice job of using untraditional and not just social media for getting out the word about the information. They used an empty storefront and did a four-panel layout of what the issues are and what community input they needed. She stated that, that type of walk-by marketing and outreach is very effective in addition to social media and hopes Caltrain will think about doing those kinds of events.

Vice Chair Brandt requested staff to consider rethinking and repricing the monthly pass to lure ridership back as many riders are now telecommuting.

Public Comments:

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, via Zoom Q&A, asked whether the new EMU's will have bike counters. He then stated that regarding the rebranding of Caltrain, a private sector can be more innovative than a Transit Agency. He then addressed Member Brandt's comment and stated that N95 masks are not available to the general public in the United States. He then stated that the trains being tested in Pueblo at TTCL, the same location where the EMU's will be tested are revising the ventilation flow and are changing it from horizontal ventilation, to vertical just like in an aircraft. Roland then stated that there will be no way to ever get four tracks in downtown Redwood City or High-Speed Rail platforms. Lastly, regarding ridership, he stated that the last time table update was no use to anybody and hopes that staff reports good news about the ridership since the update in December.

Aleta Dupree, via Zoom Q&A, stated that website improvements should be mobile focused. She then mentioned that the way to solve the fare problem, passes versus single rides, is fare capping because there are some people that will use the system frequently and some people that will telecommute forever. Regarding population on train cars, she mentioned that it is possible to show how crowded a train is as the technology exists in Las Vegas. Lastly, she stated that wearing a mask is essential.

Jeff Carter, Millbrae, via Zoom Q&A, mentioned regarding the website and mobile devices, not everyone has a mobile device. He then stated that Caltrain should consider bringing back the 20- ride ticket or x-ride ticket for people that do not ride the train as frequently and to continue to provide the monthly pass at a reasonable discount.

ELECTRONIC BICYCLE LOCKER UPDATE

Dan Provence, Principal Planner, provided the Electronic Bicycle Locker Update.

The full Power Point presentation can be found on caltrain.com

Committee Comments:

Member Flautt asked who the vendor is providing the bike lockers, and who is in charge of the pricing per locker. Dan Provence responded that eLock Technologies is the vendor and operate BikeLink so cards are available at bikelink.org. and that Caltrain sets the pricing. Member Flautt mentioned that the pricing seems low and Mr. Provence responded that staff is trying to encourage use of the lockers and that it is the standard pricing.

Member Kutler asked Mr. Provence for literature or his contact information to share. Mr. Provence stated that his team is working on doing outreach and have mailed letters to current key locker customers. He also stated that they have talked to the vendor about doing some in-person promotion at the stations and looking for other creative ways to touch base with people.

Vice Chair Brandt stated that according to the presentation the first funded batch of 632 eLockers would be installed by the end of 2023, he said that it would be nice to see numbers and more visibility to the rollout schedule. He then asked what the numbers are at the various stations. He then suggested that since the eLockers are internet connected devices, the vendor should implement a feature whereby customers could go online and check locker availability and the ability to rent the locker online. Mr. Provence stated the vendor is looking to rollout an app that deals with those concerns, checking availability in advance and reserving the space.

Member Tuzman asked about the user experience, if they are not yet signed up or connected to Clipper is there a way to sign-up for an eLocker at the station, in the moment. He also asked whether staff has the flexibility to move and redistribute eLockers if it is determined that there are too many at one station. Lastly, he asked what the time limit is and whether there is a point at which the eLocker company would take the locker into long term storage for pick-up, if customers were abusing the system. Mr. Provence responded that if the customer has mobile capability, they can go online and set up an account link to their Clipper. He also mentioned that there are vendors that sell bike link cards that are pre-loaded cards, for example the coffee shop around the corner from the 22nd Street station sells them. This is also a cash option for those that are unbanked. Lastly, he stated that yes there will be flexibility to move the lockers around.

Alternate Member Kathleen Maxwell asked whether all sides, including the top, of the lockers are perforated and if so, was that to decrease their appeal to perhaps homeless population. Mr. Provence responded that they are not perforated on top, they have a solid roof, but yes, the sides have perforations and helps Security look in and see what is going on in there.

Member Patricia Leung asked whether there are any plans to acquire more casual users for the system. Mr. Provence stated that his team is still developing ways to rollout

the program and looking at ideas for outreach via social media and perhaps station events and is open to suggestions.

Member Tuzman stated that there is potentially a lot of customer who are not aware that they can leave their bikes parked at the station and besides the bike coalitions, whether staff has a list of local organizations like that. Mr. Provence stated that staff is open to hearing from customers who have ideas. He stated that staff will be working with the San Francisco Bike Coalition and the Silicon Valley Bike Coalition and is open to touch base with all those types of groups.

Member Flautt offered his help to connect with the Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition and many other Regional Associations of bikers, if help with outreach is needed. Mr. Provence thanks Member Flautt.

Chair Shaw suggested looking at charging a premium for the online reservations versus the walk ups. Mr. Provence thanked Chair Shaw.

Vice Chair Brandt asked whether there is a maximum time limit and what will be done if someone leaves their bike in the locker. He then asked how many lockers each of the stations are getting initially. Mr. Provence responded that they usually allow seven to ten days, however it will be up to Caltrain to figure out the maximum length and that the language will be in the user agreement. He then stated that the vendor would deal with items left in the locker and place the unclaimed bike in storage and work with the customer to retrieve it. He then stated that as far as the numbers of lockers, staff is looking at 16 spaces at most stations to start with. At Diridon, looking to start with 32 and then 16 at the other four stations that were listed. He stated that ridership will be considered.

Chair Shaw asked whether the eLockers can be stacked and Mr. Provence confirmed that there are stackable models and are being looked at.

Member Leung suggested outreach to monthly parking passengers as they may want to change the mode of transportation and utilize their bike. She also suggested with charging premium, perhaps following the Clipper way of charging the full fare for a 24-hour reservation then credit back the unused time upon return.

Public Comments:

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, via Zoom Q&A, shared his appreciation for the two-phase approach where the data from the first phase will drive the second phase. He then suggested to create an app that combines both the onboard train capacity and the eLocker availability so that passengers can make their whether to bring their bike onboard or leave it parked at the station. He then asked again whether there will be bike counters onboard. He then requested staff to confirm whether these lockers 100% funded by a grant, and if not, asked where the money is coming from. He then stated that the incentive is wrong because Caltrain is charging to leave bikes in a locker and not charging to ride the train. Roland suggested an alternative, that if the passenger uses Clipper to pay for the eLocker and then boards the train, the passenger will

receive a discount for using the locker. This may be applied for those that qualify for the means-based fare. Lastly, Roland suggested outreaching out to Google for the Diridon station.

Jeff Carter, Millbrae, via Zoom Q&A, asked thanked Mr. Provence for the presentation and for implementing a better bike locker program than what currently exists and providing more alternatives for bike storage.

TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT POLICY

Brian Fitzpatrick, Director, Real Estate and Property Development, presented the Transit Oriented Development Policy

The full Power Point presentation can be found on caltrain.com

Committee Comments:

Member Leung referred to the AMI targets and mentioned that they are aggressive and asked whether it is per site or overall, for all properties. Mr. Fitzpatrick responded that the Board adopted a policy and wants to try to go for 30% per site. Member Leung then asked how much influence can the Caltrain policies have over the other agencies and municipalities on how to develop and help encourage growth for Caltrain and facility development. Mr. Fitzpatrick responded that when Caltrain owns property in a specific city and that property is going to be used for development, Caltrain is subject to the Land Use Authority of the city. Additionally, Caltrain works very closely with VTA and have extremely sophisticated Transit Oriented Development both policy and staff and says that both agencies share the vision for what should happen around transit stations.

Member Kutler asked whether Caltrain has influence with the stalled project at Bayshore. Mr. Fitzpatrick responded that even though Caltrain is a regional authority, Caltrain does not have the ability to usurp land use authority from cities when it is Caltrain property. In the case of Bayshore, where it is not Caltrain property, in terms of local city development, Caltrain encourage and help provide expertise, but cannot tell a local city what to do or how to do it.

Vice Chair Brandt asked Mr. Fitzpatrick to talk about air rights both below and above the tracks. Mr. Fitzpatrick responded that in a dynamic railroad like Caltrain, Caltrain will not be developing under, over, or around the right of way independently, and most likely would happen in conjunction with a capital project and capital projects are done in conjunction with the cities. Caltrain did not want to take away the creativity by constraining them in a policy that is development focused. He said that, not only do you create development opportunities on the area where the tracks are in, on and under them, but might better activate some of the property next to the tracks by having those more open options.

Member Tuzman asked whether there is a particular metric or goal for how much income benefit that Caltrain would get through the development. He then asked

whether it was considered that having an increase in housing close to transit will naturally bring more customers to Caltrain which also is a revenue stream itself. He then asked who the partners are, Caltrain is working with, to understand how the constraints around the affordability requirements verse the ground lease rate that are put on the developers. Lastly, Member Tuzman mentioned that the presentation is not on the website. Mr. Fitzpatrick responded that every development is very unique for a number of reasons and every site is done on an individual level, so Caltrain does not have a metric in gross because we have to really get into the details to get there. The specifics of the site are going to drive the revenue of the site. Mr. Fitzpatrick then stated that on every transaction staff brings in an independent economist firm and a land economy firm and have a transparent process with the developers that staff works with. Typically, an economic model is built to push and pull on different levers that will accommodate different business terms. Staff works to get the most benefits for the public agency, while still allowing the transaction to be financially viable to the developer. Lastly, Brian stated that he would forward the presentation to staff so that it may be uploaded to the website and apologized for not sending it sooner. Member Tuzman then asked how staff ensures that the housing units are attractive, and people want to live in them, but not an excessive rental rate to make up for the bending that happened in that negotiation. Mr. Fitzpatrick responded that the bottom line is, in any development that is mixed income with affordable units and other units, all units need to be the same. Those other units, in theory, the developer is able to rent them at market rates.

Member Anna Dagum asked whether staff looks at the actual train stations for development. Mr. Fitzpatrick responded staff keeps the railroad's future vision in mind when developing property.

Public Comments:

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, via Zoom Q&A, stated that these problems have been going on for long enough and is borderline Brown Act violation and that he will make sure this one of the first governance issues that will be addressed with the transition to the new administration. Roland then thanked Mr. Fitzpatrick for the presentation. He asked why do TOD's need to be on Caltrain property and asked whether the building built across the road on San Carlos from the Transit District building and whether it counts as a TOD. There are two-story buildings where there could be passing tracks. Roland then suggested potentially demolishing the Transit District and start building TODs at least 10-stories high. Then Roland mentioned that the BART parking at the Millbrae station is gone due to TOD just as in Tamien and does not know how ridership will recover there when the pandemic is over. Roland also stated that Caltrain needs to focus on other project other than High Speed Rail. He stated that Google is willing to lease Caltrain's land on all the surface parking and move the parking underground on their own dollar. Lastly, Roland said that he requested the Board create a policy whereby Caltrain no longer sells or negotiate any Caltrain land and only buys land until the new administration is in place.

Jeff Carter, Millbrae, via Zoom Q&A, shared his concerns regarding some outline structures in San Carlos that are quite close to the track that might prevent Caltrain from expanding to four tracks. He stated that some of this development can hinder

expansion of four tracks and hopefully there is a way to plan for four tracks through San Carlos.

CALTRAIN ENGINEERING STANDARDS UPDATE

Bin Zhang, Manager, Engineering, presented the Caltrain Engineering Standards Update.

The full Power Point presentation can be found on caltrain.com

Committee Comments:

Adrian Brandt asked about the maximum grade standard and stated that today in the engineering standards, many grade separation design alternatives are either precluded or grossly more expensive than they need to be. He asked what is going on with relaxing the needlessly expensive limitation that he believes is a concession to UP. He also asked whether the new standards would be published on the Caltrain website for public inspection. Bin responded that regarding the 1% grade, there will be no changes to the 2011 standard because Caltrain is a shared corridor with Union Pacific. Joe Navarro, Deputy Chief, Rail Operations stated that staff will take concerns into consideration. Additionally, Mr. Navarro stated that once the standards have been updated, they will be available on the website. Mr. Zhang stated that they should be published on the website by the end of summer. Vice Chair Brandt requested an update regarding Caltrain buying out or taking over the UP-freight franchise. Mr. Navarro thanked Vice Chair Brandt for his comments.

Member Kutler stated it would be great to invest in Standards for Pedestrian Access specifically standards for station entries and signage, because new users may be confused especially during construction projects. An engineering standard during construction for example a modified pedestrian access, would be so helpful to the public. Mr. Zhang thanked Member Kutler for her recommendations and stated that it is the next item to incorporate in the standard for construction purposes.

Vice Chair Brandt requested a response to his previous question other than thank you. Mr. Navarro stated that staff will get back to him with further information at a later time.

Public Comments:

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, via Zoom Q&A, thanked Mr. Zhang for the presentation and posting it to the website. He then asked where the engineering standards for tunnels are. He asked why you can't have tracks leaving two tracks at grade and then have the passing tracks in the tunnel. Roland then address 870 ft. platforms, he said that if you start doing this, you will never ever be able to use these platforms until every single platform is 8700 ft. long. Then regarding Transbay, he stated that the only way twelve trains can be stored before the tunnel open is by stacking them and asked how this will work. He then advised that he will send a letter to staff explaining how what Balfour Beatty is building will not work with High Speed Rail. He addressed the Hillsdale center boarding and said that it is beautiful; however that is where the four tracks will be. He

then addressed the 1% grade and said that Diridon needs a minimum of 1.5 % and that Caltrain will need potentially 3% to get into the Transbay terminal.

Doug DeLong via Zoom Q&A, stated that the issue regarding the grades and the freight railroad is really not just an engineering issue, but it is a real estate negotiation issue in terms of the Trackage Right Agreement and Union Pacific has the possessor interest in the real estate. Caltrain does not own all the right of way free and clear to do anything with it. It is not just a question of how steep a hill can the trains climb.

STAFF REPORT UPDATE

Joe Navarro, Deputy Chief, Rail Operations reported:
(The full report can be found on caltrain.com)

On-time Performance (OTP) –

- **December:** The December 2020 OTP was 95.3% compared to 92.5% for December 2019.
 - **Vehicle on Tracks** – There was one day, December 20, with a vehicle on the tracks that caused train delays.
 - **Mechanical Delays** – In December 2020 there were 308 minutes of delay due to mechanical issues compared to 860 minutes in December 2019.
 - **Trespasser Strikes** – There was one trespasser strike on December 8, resulting in a fatality.
- **November:** The November 2020 OTP was 96% compared to 93.4% for November 2019.

(The full report can be found on caltrain.com)

Mr. Navarro mentioned that when building on top and building below, you do not have to go very far, in New York City, they built the Barkley Center, which is a sporting arena over top of Long Island Railroad yard in Brooklyn. The developer paid for it in New York. At 31st and 11th where there was a cut section before you go into the North River tunnels, they built a deck and a 26-story high rise over that without shutting down the railroad. There are amazing things going on right here in the United States. At the Post Office between 8th and 31st, they used 70% of that for a new station and connected it with Penn Station. Then there is east side access that is tunneling underground to go to Grand Central Terminal from Long Island. There are a lot of examples we can learn from to utilize on Caltrain property. Mr. Navarro then shared that on December 14th, there was a service change made to the schedule, the same day Atherton station closed. Because of the higher restricted Stay at Home Orders and the Holidays, the data is affected and we will present data in March. If it is decided to change the

schedule, the update will be presented to this committee in February. Staff is working with BART as they are looking to change their schedule in March. Lastly, Mr. Navarro reported that the upgrades to the TVMs have been delayed by a month due to the Stay at Home orders and will have an update next month.

Committee Comments:

Vice Chair Brandt asked where the shoreline negotiations are. Mr. Navarro stated that since COVID negotiations have quieted down and does not know where it stands.

Public comments:

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, via Zoom Q&A, appreciated Joe's comment regarding ridership after the schedule change and is fair, however would like an update in February, if possible. He then mentioned the TASI contract and stated that they have lost a few minutes with mechanical failures, but how much service are they providing pre-COVID. Is there an improvement or the same as before? He then asked the same for On Time Performance, with the padding and less service with one train an hour, was there an improvement. He requested everything be on the same page, not just ridership and the other figures with Mechanical Failures and On Time Performance.

Doug DeLong via Zoom Q&A, said that regarding the freight operations, he believes Union Pacific hosted tours by several potential operators quite a while ago, a year or two ago. He stated as he understands the agreement between UP and Caltrain UP would have had to bring any potential operator to Caltrain to get their approval before they entered into a contract with them and no such action has appeared on a Board Agenda. He stated that if Caltrain took over freight operations, the downside of that to Caltrain is that they would be then taking over the common carrier freight obligation.

JPB CAC Work Plan

February 17, 2021

- San Francisco Downtown Extension update
- Grade Crossing Improvements
- Industry Safe Functionality
- Website Update

March 17, 2021

- Sales Tax Measure
-

April 21, 2021

- EMU Testing Update
- PCEP Update

May 19, 2021

- FY 2022 JPB Operating & Capital Budgets & TASI Budget
-

Suggested Items:

- Go Pass cost per ride factors – requested by Chair, Brian Shaw on 6/19/19
- San Mateo County Climate Action Plan – requested by Member Rosalind Kutler on 10/16/19
- MTC Means-Based Discount Fare program update
- Caltrain connections with other agencies – requested by Member Rosalind Kutler on 12/18/19
- Update on grade crossing pilot six months after installation – requested by Member, Patrick Flautt on 12/18/19
- Summary video of the CAC meetings by the Social Media Officer – requested by Chair, Brian Shaw on 12/18/19
- Operating Costs – requested by Member Adrian Brandt on 2/13/20
- Rail Corridor Use Policy – requested by Member Anna Dagum on 10/21/20
- South San Francisco
- Overview of COVID19 train schedule

DATE, TIME AND LOCATION OF NEXT REGULAR MEETING:

February 17, 2021 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 8:26 pm