

Bicycle Advisory Committee

CORRESPONDENCE

as of

January 17, 2017

From: Scott Yarbrough
To: [Board \(@caltrain.com\)](mailto:Board@caltrain.com); [Caltrain, Bac \(@caltrain.com\)](mailto:Caltrain_Bac@caltrain.com)
Subject: Another early departure...192 this time
Date: Wednesday, January 04, 2017 9:48:17 PM

Just watched the 192 leave the southbound Palo Alto platform early, too. Stopped for under 30 seconds, and not really possible for your conductors to even recognize if potential passengers were attempting to board ON TIME before the early departure. Still raining, still a mostly empty train, still not apparent to me why the train did not wait another minute when the 3 passengers who I see arrived after the train left but before the 9:40 posted departure time could have boarded and gotten to their destinations an hour earlier.

Can you tell I'm a bit more upset tonight than when I typically get left by an impatient conductor of one of your trains?

On Jan 4, 2017 9:27 PM, "Board (@caltrain.com)" <BoardCaltrain@samtrans.com> wrote:

We have received your message to the Joint Powers Board of Directors. Staff will research your comments and respond to you. Correspondence, including any personal information such as names and e-mail addresses, submitted to this agency will become disclosable public records.

Please note: If your message is received by 10 a.m. the day before the meeting, it will be included in the public correspondence file on the day of the Board meeting. Messages received after that time will be sent to the Board at a later date. -JPB Secretary

From: Scott Yarbrough
To: [Board \(@caltrain.com\)](mailto:Board@caltrain.com); [Caltrain, Bac \(@caltrain.com\)](mailto:Caltrain.Bac@caltrain.com)
Subject: Early train departures
Date: Wednesday, January 04, 2017 9:38:32 PM

Now I not only received the stink eye from the colleagues who I left to try to catch the 195 train, I'm standing around, waiting in the rain to catch the 10:04 train. By the time I get home, I'll have fewer than 7 hours to eat dinner, shower, sleep, eat breakfast, and get back to work using Caltrain. Sure as hell hope the conductors on the 210 tomorrow morning wait to leave the platform at the actual posted departure time and not whatever time they think everyone has been able to board the train who they are looking for

From: Scott Yarbrough
To: [Board \(@caltrain.com\)](mailto:Board@caltrain.com); [Caltrain, Bac \(@caltrain.com\)](mailto:Caltrain_Bac@caltrain.com)
Subject: Train 195
Date: Wednesday, January 04, 2017 9:31:34 PM

I left my meeting early tonight so that I could catch the 9:04 train. I was at the platform before the 9:04 departure time, but the 195 was unfortunately even earlier than I was

From: Scott Yarbrough
To: [Board \(@caltrain.com\)](mailto:Board@caltrain.com); [Caltrain, Bac \(@caltrain.com\)](mailto:Caltrain_Bac (@caltrain.com))
Subject: Another early departure
Date: Wednesday, January 04, 2017 9:30:19 PM

I take Caltrain daily and have had the problem of conductors leaving the platform early repeatedly. It is way more of a problem when your conductors tell the engineers to leave the platform prior to the posted departure time.

From: Scott Yarbrough
To: [Caltrain.Bac \(@caltrain.com\)](mailto:Caltrain.Bac@caltrain.com); [Board \(@caltrain.com\)](mailto:Board@caltrain.com)
Subject: Another early departure
Date: Wednesday, January 04, 2017 9:27:32 PM

The 195 left Palo Alto early tonight

From: pat giorni
To: [Caltrain_Bac \(@caltrain.com\): Tietjen, Brent; Board \(@caltrain.com\): SF Bicycle Coalition Janice Li; Catherine Young; Steve Vanderlip; BIKES.ONboard; cacsecretary \(@caltrain.com\): Simon, Mark; Peter Colijn](mailto:Caltrain_Bac (@caltrain.com): Tietjen, Brent; Board (@caltrain.com): SF Bicycle Coalition Janice Li; Catherine Young; Steve Vanderlip; BIKES.ONboard; cacsecretary (@caltrain.com): Simon, Mark; Peter Colijn)
Subject: Fw: [SVBC general] Missing Bike Lockers at San Carlos Station
Date: Wednesday, January 04, 2017 12:47:56 PM

This has become a matter worth paying utmost attention to, especially when Bicycle Parking and Access Plan is constantly on the BAC agenda and ridership is at an all-time high.....

On Wednesday, January 4, 2017 8:28 AM, Elaine <lavendula6654@gmail.com> wrote:

I'm posting this for a friend, Nick Pilch, so please reply-all with any response.

I'm very unhappy about the project at the San Carlos Caltrain station parking lot. Googling around I found these links about the project:

http://www.samtrans.com/Planning/Real_Estate_and_Property_Development/SanCarlosMulti-ModalTransitCenter.html
http://cityofsancarlos.org/planning/projects/san_carlos_transit_village/default.asp
http://www.samtrans.com/Assets/_Public+Affairs/Government+Affairs/pdf/SCTC+SC+Planning+Commission+1.19.16+Presentation.pdf
<http://www.cityofsancarlos.org/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=9647>

As part of the project, they are at least temporarily removing the long-term lockers there. I am getting conflicting messages about whether they will be put back. In some of the information above, I see bike lockers in the project drawings. And I had a phone conversation with a project manager who seemed to indicate that they would be back after construction.

I am a commuter from Albany who uses BART and Caltrain to get to my job on Skyway Rd. in San Carlos. Being able to keep a bicycle at the train station made this pretty pleasant for me as taking a bike on a train can be a pain, and taking it on two different train systems in the same direction of the commute is a bummer.

This project is called a "multi-modal transit center". If anything, the bike lockers should be temporarily relocated and more lockers and racks put back as part of the project. Some project information claims that they will be increasing the number of automobile parking spaces. First, I never saw this station lot filled up. Second, it is outrageous that they are increasing motor vehicle parking while removing bike parking, or at least keeping bike parking the same. They ought to introduce BikeLink lockers as well, BTW. I was told that there wasn't an opening at a locker at the Belmont station, and that really takes that cake. As the train rolls by that station, I see what seem like acres and acres of empty car parking there!

Here's what one rep had to say:

"...The bike lockers are being removed from the San Carlos Caltrain station and there are no plans to have them reinstalled at this time. I have asked our Stations Manager about the reasoning behind this decision. He is currently out of the office but I will respond with more information next week once he returns.

I apologize for the inconvenience this will cause you during your commute.

Best,

Brent Tietjen, Government and Community Relations Officer

SamTrans | Caltrain | TA

1250 San Carlos Ave.

San Carlos, CA 94070-1306

650-508-6495

tietjenb@samtrans.com"

Any help or info or advocacy you could give in this matter would be greatly appreciated. I work full-time, and, as you will see in the P.S., I have other commitments as well. I have not ruled out attending a City Council meeting and/or other hearing, however.

P.S. I am the co-founder of our local bicyclist and pedestrian advocacy group, Albany Strollers & Rollers, and Vice-Mayor of Albany.

--

Topics posted to this list are visible to the public.

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "SVBC general discussion list" group.

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to svbcbikes+unsubscribe@bikesiliconvalley.org.

To post to this group, send email to svbcbikes@bikesiliconvalley.org.

Visit this group at <https://groups.google.com/a/bikesiliconvalley.org/group/svbcbikes/>.

From: Roland Lebrun
To: [Supervisor Aaron Peskin](#)
Cc: [SFCTA Board Secretary](#); [VTA Board Secretary](#); [MTC Commission](#); [CHSRA Board](#); [Board \(@caltrain.com\)](#); [cacsecretary \(@caltrain.com\)](#); [Caltrain, Bac \(@caltrain.com\)](#); [Nila Gonzales](#)
Subject: SFCTA 1/5 Board Meeting Item #3 Commit Up to \$50 Million in additional funding to Caltrain
Date: Tuesday, January 03, 2017 5:20:17 AM
Attachments: [January 5th 2017 Item #3 Commit to Fund Up to \\$50 Million for Caltrain.pdf](#)

Dear Supervisor Peskin and members of the SFCTA Board of Directors,

Please find attached issues and recommendations re this item for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Roland Lebrun

Cc

SFCTA Board of Directors

VTA Board of Directors

MTC Board of Directors

TJPA Board of Directors

High Speed Rail Authority Board of Directors

Caltrain Board

Caltrain CAC

Caltrain BAC

VTA CAC

SFCTA CAC

TJPA CAC

FTA regional director

SFCTA Board of Directors
 January 5th Board Meeting
Item #3 Commit Up to \$50 Million in additional funding to Caltrain

Dear Chair Peskin and members of the SFCTA Board of Directors,

Please consider the following issues and recommendations prior to approving any additional funding for the Caltrain electrification project:

Issues

1) **\$2.5B investment will result in a 10% loss of capacity AFTER adding a 6th train** (“Calmod II” will require additional funding for longer trains & platform at a later date)

2016 Top 10 Trains: Maximum Load

Northbound				
Train No.	Depart SJ	Max Load	Train Seating Capacity	Percent of Seated Capacity
319	7:03 AM	951	762	125%
323	7:45 AM	950	762	125%
329	8:03 AM	882	762	116%
375	5:23 PM	841	762	110%
217	6:57 AM	818	650	126%
225	7:50 AM	764	762	100%
269	4:39 PM	756	762	99%
313	6:45 AM	747	762	98%
233	8:40 AM	722	650	111%
215	6:50 AM	719	650	111%

Caltrain’s proposed EMU replacement trains

Parameter	Car 1	Car 2	Car 3	Car 4	Car 5	Car 6	Total
Car type	Cab	Middle	Middle	Middle	Middle	Cab	-
Number of powered axles	2	4	0	4	0	2	12
Seats, lower level	38	23	6	38	6	38	149
Seats, upper level	52	52	60	52	60	52	328
Seats, intermediate level	10+2	10	10+16	10	10+16	10+2	96
Seats, total	102	85	92	100	92	102	573
Bike spaces	-	-	40	-	40	-	80
Bathroom	-	1	-	-	-	-	1

5 trains x 762 seats (3,810 seats) - 6 trains x 573 seats (3,438 seats) = **372 seats lost**

2) System is not ready for electrification

- a. **New CBOSS signalling system is not “electrification ready”**
*“It seems, from the scope of work for the electrification contractor that it will be responsible for testing these links after its work on track circuits is finished. **This is a high risk safety area. In our experience, any work requiring safety related technical interfaces with signaling already installed on an existing system is high risk in terms of interface management, approvals for designs by the operator and regulators and in the installation by the electrification contractor for intrusive access to a new and complex system like CBOSS is bound to cause some delay to the project completion date, particularly if the alteration (e.g. track circuit replacement) involves interfaces with other operators like the UPRR.**”*
http://www.hsr.ca.gov/docs/brdmeetings/2016/brdmtg_121316_item3_ATTA_CHMENT_Ind_Consult_Report_SF_SJ_Peninsula_Corridor_Funding_Plan.pdf (Section 4.5 on page 35)
- b. **Unknown impacts of High Speed Rail modifications to the corridor**
“PFAL did not review future improvements to the Corridor which may be required to operate at speeds above the current imposed speed in the Peninsula Corridor because they are not included in the Funding Plan.”
http://www.hsr.ca.gov/docs/brdmeetings/2016/brdmtg_121316_item3_ATTA_CHMENT_Ind_Consult_Report_SF_SJ_Peninsula_Corridor_Funding_Plan.pdf (Page 3)
- c. **Many stations and grade crossings require reconstruction/relocation**
*“Though the track improvements compatibility risk described here mainly poses a risk to the PCEP schedule for the purposes of this review, a secondary issue is the **potential for throw away costs due to the possibility of replacing electrification infrastructure.**”*
http://www.hsr.ca.gov/docs/brdmeetings/2016/brdmtg_121316_item3_ATTA_CHMENT_Ind_Consult_Report_SF_SJ_Peninsula_Corridor_Funding_Plan.pdf (page 27)
- d. **Caltrain electrification design does not follow best practices and could result in (potentially spectacular) catenary failures at high speeds.**
*“NB noted that back to back cantilevers were not to be used on the high speed line but were likely to be used by Caltrain. **Such cantilevers did not provide for mechanical independence necessary for reliable performance.**”*
http://www.hsr.ca.gov/docs/brdmeetings/2016/brdmtg_121316_item3_ATTA_CHMENT_Ind_Consult_Report_SF_SJ_Peninsula_Corridor_Funding_Plan.pdf (PDF page 54).
- e. Caltrain ridership has been dropping off for the last 6 months and the revised schedule is likely to result in further decreases in ridership.

- f. UK's Network Rail recently cancelled an electrification contract with Caltrain's contractor
"It was concluded that the proposed alliance was unlikely to meet its stated objectives of delivering the scope of the work on time and to budget"
<http://www.railtechnologymagazine.com/Rail-News/balfour-beatty-dropped-from-north-west-electrification>

3) Caltrain Management issues

- a. "A May 2016 APTA Peer Review Panel of the CBOSS project raised serious questions about Caltrain's project management capabilities and JPB oversight that have similar implications to PCEP. These include:
- **"The panel notes that the PTC CBOSS project is just one of several complex infrastructure projects that will require Caltrain to take a serious look at in-house technical management resources."**
 - **"Caltrain needs to directly hire a project manager with requisite technical experience and provide that person with the authority to manage the interests of Caltrain."**
 - **"...this has consequently led to unresolved technical and contractual issues. Despite the recent partnering session, there continues to be a lack of commitment to resolving contractual issues such as scheduling and cost."**
- "The agency's Executive Director and the Mod Squad will need sufficient time and understanding of project technical and management issues in order to provide the necessary oversight and authority for effective program delivery"**
- http://www.hsr.ca.gov/docs/brdmeetings/2016/brdmtg_121316_item3_ATTACHMENT_Ind_Consult_Report_SF_SJ_Peninsula_Corridor_Funding_Plan.pdf (page 24)
- b. Current Caltrain job openings:
- i. Chief Financial Officer (the last CFO quit after 10 months)
 - ii. Director, Engineering & Maintenance
 - iii. Deputy Director, Railroad Systems Engineering
 - iv. Director, Contracts and Procurement
 - v. Director, Safety and Security
- <http://www.smctd.com/jobs.html>

4) Funding issues

a. **Misappropriation of \$125M FTA Formula Funds dedicated to EMU procurement**

“WHEREAS, \$125 million in FTA funds identified in the 2012 Early Investment Strategy funding plan included in the 2012 Nine-Party MOU is needed by the PCJPB to advance critical state of good repair improvements necessary to maintain existing Caltrain operations, and the PCJPB has requested to remove these funds from the early investment funding strategy, which would create a \$125 million funding gap”

<http://www.caltrain.com/Assets/Caltrain+Modernization+Program/Documents/7-Party+MOU.pdf> (SEVEN PARTY SUPPLEMENT TO 2012 MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU) Page 2)

b. **Misappropriation of \$28M FTA Formula Funds dedicated to EMU procurement by the San Mateo County Transit District WITHOUT JPB APPROVAL.**

“In its role as the metropolitan planning organization for the San Francisco Bay Area, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) programmed \$27,854,836 of Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5337 State of Good Repair grant funds for the PCEP.

Recently, the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) and MTC were informed by the FTA that the PCEP is not eligible to receive the programmed Section 5337 funds, which would create a corresponding funding gap in the PCEP budget.

JPB staff has coordinated with the FTA and MTC, and MTC has concluded that it will redirect the Section 5337 funds to the SSF Caltrain Station Improvement Project. Therefore, these funds will replace the TA funds proposed for re-programming.”

http://www.smcta.com/Assets/_Agendas+and+Minutes/TA/Board+of+Directors/Agendas/2016/2016-12-01+TA+BOD+Agenda+Packet.pdf (AGENDA ITEM # 9 (a))

c. **\$600M Prop1A funding issue (PCEP does not go to Transbay)**

““Section 2704.04, subdivision (b)(2) provides that “Phase 1 of the high-speed train project is the corridor of the high-speed train system between San Francisco Transbay Terminal and Los Angeles Union Station and Anaheim.” Subdivision (b)(3) identifies specific high-speed train corridors, and lists, “(B) San Francisco Transbay Terminal to San Jose to Fresno.” Subdivision (a) identifies that the purpose behind the Bond Act is “construction of a high-speed train system that connects the San Francisco Transbay Terminal to Los Angeles Union Station and Anaheim...”

Consequently, it appears that the intent of the Bond Act was for the system to extend, in San Francisco, to the Transbay Terminal, not stop 1.3 miles short at a 4th and King Caltrain Station.

This specific language and indication of intent does not conflict with a general referral to “San Francisco” in section 2704.09 subdivision (b)(1) and (3). It is reasonable to interpret this reference to “San Francisco” as indicating the Transbay Terminal identified as the intended San Francisco location in section 2704.04.

It appears, at this time, that the Authority does not have sufficient evidence to prove the blended system can currently comply with all of the Bond Act requirements, as they have not provided analysis of trip time to the San Francisco Transbay Terminal, and cannot yet achieve five-minute headways (even allowing for the definition of “train” to include non-HSR trains).

However, as Plaintiffs acknowledged during oral argument, the Authority may be able to accomplish these objectives at some point in the future. This project is an ongoing, dynamic, changing project. As the Court of Appeal noted, “because there is no formal funding plan and the design of the system remains in flux.. .we simply cannot determine whether the project will comply with the specific requirements of the Bond Act...” (California High-Speed Rail Authority, 228 Cal.App.4th at 703.)

*There is no evidence currently before the Court that the blended system will not comply with the Bond Act system requirements. **Although Plaintiffs have raised compelling questions about potential future compliance, the Authority has not yet submitted a funding plan pursuant to section 2704.08, subdivisions (c) and (d), seeking to expend Bond Act funds.** Thus, the issue of the project’s compliance with the Bond Act is not ripe for review.*

Currently, all that is before the Court is conjecture as to what system the Authority will present in its request for Bond Act funds.

This is insufficient for the requested relief.”

<http://www.thehamiltonreport.com/downloads/TOS-RULING-KENNY-3-4-2016.PDF>(pp15-16).

Recommendations

- 1) Commit to fund up to \$50 Million in Additional State Regional Improvement Program Funds to the Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project subject to JPB Board approval to terminate SamTrans' contract and initiate search for new agency responsible for Caltrain administration (VTA, MUNI, ACE or BART).
- 2) Consider requesting an Independent Financial Advisor Report to the 7-party MOU partners regarding the Caltrain EMU procurement and CBOSS projects.

Respectfully presented for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Roland Lebrun.

Cc

SFCTA Board of Directors

VTA Board of Directors

MTC Board of Directors

High Speed Rail Authority Board of Directors

Caltrain CAC

Caltrain BAC

VTA CAC

SFCTA CAC

RAB CAC

FTA regional director

From: Roland Lebrun
To: [MTC Commission](#)
Cc: [Board \(@caltrain.com\)](#); [VTA Board Secretary](#); [SFCTA Board Secretary](#); [Nila Gonzales](#); [cacsecretary \(@caltrain.com\)](#); [Caltrain_Bac \(@caltrain.com\)](#); [SFCTA CAC](#); [Edward Phillips](#)
Subject: Programming & Allocations item 2.c
Date: Tuesday, December 13, 2016 1:03:13 AM
Attachments: [Dec 14 2016 Programming & Allocations item 2.pdf](#)

Dear Chair Cortese and MTC Commissioners,

Please find attached my comments for the Wednesday December 14th Programming & Allocations Committee meeting item 2.c Revised Caltrain Programming.

Sincerely,

Roland Lebrun

Cc

Caltrain Board of Directors
VTA Board of Directors
SFCTA Board of Supervisors
TJPA Board of Directors
Caltrain CAC
Caltrain BPAC
SFCTA CAC
TJPA CAC

Roland Lebrun
ccss@msn.com
December 12th 2016

MTC Commission
December 14th 2016 Programming & Allocations Committee meeting
item 2.c Revised Caltrain Programming

Dear Honorable Chair Cortese and MTC Commissioners,

Please be aware of serious issues with the staff memo for item 2.c

- “Caltrain has requested that \$28 million in FY2014-15 and FY2015-16 funding for their railcar replacement project be shifted to the South San Francisco Station project.”

This is false. The memo is from SMCTA, not from the Caltrain JPB which never did and never would approve shifting railcar replacement funds to this project without public input followed by Board approval.

- “With the railcar funds being replaced by SMCTA local sales tax funds transferred from the station project, due to fund eligibility issues”

This is false: the real issue is lack of funds, not “fund eligibility issues”.

- “The programming continues to count toward meeting MTC's commitment of \$315 million for the railcars.”

Please remember that this \$315M is what is left of the \$440M FTA formula funds earmarked for Caltrain replacement vehicles after SamTrans “borrowed” \$125M for so-called “State Of Good Repair” projects which are nothing more than San Mateo County pet projects which have nothing to do with SOGR focused on improving Caltrain capacity and safety.

Recommendation

This is the latest episode in a long list of Caltrain fund misallocations by the SMCTA and I am requesting that MTC entertain a motion directing the JPB to transfer responsibility for Caltrain administration from SamTrans to the VTA subject to section 6.b (Managing Agency; Delegation of Authority) of the 1996 agreement:

http://www.caltrain.com/Assets/Public/JPA_Agreement_and_Amendment_10-03-1996.pdf

Respectfully submitted for your consideration

Roland Lebrun

Cc

Caltrain Board of Directors

VTA Board of Directors

SFCTA Board of Supervisors

TJPA Board of Directors

Caltrain CAC

Caltrain BPAC

SFCTA CAC

TJPA CAC

From: Rios, Rona
Sent: Monday, December 05, 2016 10:31 AM
To: 'sarah.s.husain@gmail.com'
Cc: Board (@caltrain.com)
Subject: Consumer Report File #110179

Dear Ms. Husain,

Your message to the Caltrain Board of Directors was referred to me for response. The group will receive a copy of our correspondence.

First, thank you for contacting Caltrain with your suggestions and comments regarding bike boarding and space in the train. We are sincerely sorry and understand your frustration with being bumped to another train with your bicycle. Unfortunately, if the bike capacity is full on a particular train, the only option is to board the following train which may have capacity. While we try to accommodate as many bicycles as possible, on occasion the bicycle racks may get out of balance and the appearance of space is not necessarily the case. One duty of our conductors is to count bicycles that are on board (and boarding) the train and cutting them off once the bike capacity reaches its limit.

Additionally, as a general courtesy to the bike riders, the crew members do occasionally make announcements for those travelling without a bike to not sit in the bike car. However, there is no rule to enforce as we cannot force people to not sit where they choose. Our vestibules may become crowded depending on the trains current capacity. The conductors working the bike cars do ask passengers to clear the vestibules so bike riders can get on if there seems to be congestion building up.

Again, we appreciate your feedback and thank you for your patronage.

Best Regards,

Rona Rios

From: Sarah Husain
To: [Caltrain.Bac \(@caltrain.com\)](mailto:Caltrain.Bac@caltrain.com); [Board \(@caltrain.com\)](mailto:Board@caltrain.com)
Subject: suggestion for managing bike car capacity on Caltrain
Date: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 9:28:09 AM

Good morning—

My name is Sarah Husain and I commute on Caltrain with my bike from San Bruno to 4th and King every day. I'd like to applaud Caltrain for offering robust bike storage on the trains for those of us who bike both our first and last miles, as well as the bike parking study that is currently underway.

While that effort is currently in progress, I have a simple suggestion for more efficiently using bike car space. Conductors seem overwhelmed by passengers who crowd near the door. I get bumped sometimes and near-bumped regularly when I can *see* space for my bike. It's frustrating because I while I'm standing on the platform, I can see swaths of empty spaces on the train, just not where I need to board with my bike.

Often the operators on BART will make announcements for passengers to move to the center of the car to make space for passengers to get on. Making a similar announcement (at *multiple* stops) would greatly help nudge passengers toward the center of the car and make space for other passengers and bicycles. Nearly all of the passengers on my NB train are getting off at 4th and King and don't need to hover near the door for the entire trip.

Making another announcement to request passengers to reserve space in the bike car for people with bikes would also be great (I know there are some issues around this but I assume you have some language that accommodates the limitations to which Caltrain can request this from passengers).

Thanks so much. It's extremely frustrating to be bumped from my train, but even more so when I can see space but am denied because there isn't the space for me *where* I need it.

Sincerely,
Sarah Husain