

**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 MARCH 16, 2016

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: A. Lee, B. Shaw

STAFF PRESENT: J. Ackemann, J. Averill, D. Chow, M. Martinez, N. McKenna,
D. Stewart, S. van Hoften

Chair Chris Cobey called the meeting to order at 5:43 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 17, 2016

Motion/Second: Tucker/Levin

Ayes: Berk, Levin, Scharff, Tucker, Cobey

Absent: Lee, Mills, Shaw

PUBLIC COMMENT

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said there were two engine failures last month and a third one tonight. Table 1.2 on page 18 of the Short Range Transit Plan tells what the problem is. He said 20 of 29 locomotives were supposed to be replaced between 2012 and 2015. Maintenance won't make a difference, they're shot. The court ruling came through and all the funding for electrification is blocked. Proposition 1A funds can't be used to electrify the tracks. The opportunity now is to put electrification to the side and buy new trains. The JPB should also focus on signaling and use a third party to do it. He said Caltrain won't get capacity out of electrification, it would get more capacity out of signaling and track work.

Jeff Carter, Millbrae, said the new schedule is on the website and was advertised as making a few minor tweaks to make the schedule more realistic. He said significant tweaks were made moving Train 156 from 3:07 p.m. to 3 p.m. That makes that train useless for people who work in the city and get off work at 3 pm. He gets on at 22nd Street and the next train is not for 90 minutes. This was done without any discussion or public input. This is not a minor adjustment and will cause a great deal of inconvenience. All the trains that leave seven minutes past the hour will now be leaving on the hour. This affects people who get off work on the hour. It would make more sense to move the train to 10 or 15 minutes after the hour. Now people have to make huge changes to their schedules. There is no valid reason to make these changes. This new schedule should be stopped and trains should go back to normal schedule. Sometimes the doors at 4th and King Caltrain Station are closed prior to train departure time.

Danielle Stewart, Acting Director, Rail Transportation, said Train 156 was adjusted to allow passengers to make the meet for the Altamont Corridor Express (ACE) train. Staff did a number of field studies and took the high ridership, dwell times, and construction activities into account to make the timetable more realistic.

Adina Levin asked if it is true that Caltrain cannot use the bond funds.

Yvonne Mills arrived at 5:52 p.m.

Ms. Levin asked if staff can check if the new schedule will affect a significant amount of riders and if the reaction to the schedule changes will be taken into account.

COMMITTEE COMMENTS

Chair Cobey said the customer experience survey ends on March 20 and he is looking forward to seeing results. One question referred to diesel cars and was not sure if that meant locomotives or passenger cars. He asked the CAC members to identify the priority of work plan items. He asked why a new timetable was printed, because the times are changing in five weeks and customers will need a new timetable.

Jonathan Berk said the trains at 9 p.m. are fuller than the trains at 8 p.m., and the 9 p.m. trains are very slow. Caltrain should experiment with express trains at 9 p.m. He said public comment took up half the Board of Directors (Board) meeting. Public comment can hamper the ability of the committee to do their job. Often members of the public repeat the same issues meeting after meeting. There is a tendency to report on trivial things. He asked members of the public to think if their comment is something that could just be e-mailed instead of brought up at the meetings, and to not be repetitive.

Greg Scharff said Stanford University has to run their shuttles to University Avenue station because there are not enough trains at California Avenue station. When staff looks at ridership numbers to see where trains should be, they should see that a huge number of employees go to University Avenue instead of California Avenue. Caltrain ridership would be much higher if it didn't take so long to get from the Research Park to the University Avenue station.

Ms. Levin said transportation management agencies are looking to provide transit pass benefits for downtown Palo Alto employees to reduce traffic and parking demand. A larger company can get in bulk Go Passes for their employees, but if the transportation management association could act as a purchasing agent for a consortium of smaller businesses, it would help alleviate Caltrain's administrative burden and would get Go Passes to employees of smaller companies and lower-wage workers.

Mr. Scharff said it is also an equity issue. Low-wage workers don't get the benefit of Go Passes because they don't work for large companies.

Public Comment

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said the new timetables are useless and stupid. They don't fit in customers' pockets. In the old timetable, the northbound was on top and the

southbound was on bottom, but now they are all over the place. When the times are changed the timetables should go back to old format. If staff had listened to the members of the public, they would not have had to change the timetables. He said 16 additional train cars were purchased last year and 11 are unaccounted for.

CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT

Mr. Berk said he made the report to the Board and emphasized the importance of customer service. He offered to help the Board to interview candidates to fill the vacancy on the CAC. He spoke to the Staff Coordinating Council member who said she would work on filling the vacancy.

Chair Cobey said he encourages members of the CAC to keep their comments productive and constructive.

STAFF REPORT

Ms. Stewart said:

- January 2016 on-time performance (OTP) was 93.3 percent compared to 91.6 percent in January 2015.
- There was a trespasser fatality in February. February 2016 OTP was 90.5 percent compared to 88.1 percent in February 2015.
- The new timetable will be rolled out with the third bike car on April 4. There will be an event related to the rolling out of the third bike car.

Mr. Berk asked what "on time" means. Ms. Stewart said it is within five minutes of the scheduled arrival.

Mr. Berk asked if trains can be reported late if they are more than one minute late. Ms. Stewart said that is not how the contract is structured and reporting is compatible with that.

Customer Experience Taskforce Update

Ms. Stewart said:

- Incident management protocol has been added.
- Developing the passenger survey has been added. The survey is out now and is closing on March 20. This item will be moved to the May CAC meeting on the work plan.
- Clipper Card issues will be discussed today to gather information from the CAC.
- Investigating the potential for quiet cars has been added.
- There is no order of priority for this list.

Mr. Berk said the CAC has emphasized some of the items on the list above others and the list should be prioritized. Expansion of express service is a very important issue to the CAC and it should be at the top of the list.

Ms. Stewart said this list is not prioritized and the Customer Experience Taskforce is an umbrella taskforce to a number of subcommittees in the agency. Some of these items are being looked at by different committees.

Chair Cobey asked what subcommittees exist. Ms. Stewart said staff is working on establishing the structure to the subcommittees that already exist to make sure staff knows how all the decisions are made and carried through.

Mr. Berk said staff should take a fresh look at the issues on the list. The Wi-Fi presentation went badly because staff said they can't do anything unless they have the best Wi-Fi service in the world. Staff should take a step back and find solutions between all and nothing. Caltrain should experiment with express trains.

Chair Cobey said he would like a report on the idea of express trains. There are probably economic and structural and temporal challenges to doing it, but he would like that to be communicated to the committee, perhaps in a staff report.

Cat Tucker asked if the idea about standing versus sitting versus bikes will be part of the customer experience taskforce. Ms. Stewart said she will add it to the list.

Mr. Berk said "improve and define incident management protocol" is very broad. Communication is easy to deal with. Communication on Caltrain is a joke. Customers can't understand a word of what is being said on the public address system and no one has any idea what was going on. That should be an easy thing to address. Automatic responses are complicated and might require an investment. If tracks get blocked at a specific time and specific place, there should be an automatic response and everyone would know what to do. This would transform the customer experience. Ms. Stewart said staff is working towards a communication to the public that defines basic incidents that are seen on the railroad and a behind-the-scenes look at what the customer may experience if they were on the incident train, on a different train, or on the platform.

Mr. Berk said he hopes staff will have a better response in the future. The response now should be different, so staff might want to wait to publish that communication. If there is an incident now, all trains go local, which is not an optimal response.

Ms. Tucker said she hopes Caltrain staff is following along and getting lessons learned from the ACE derailment and will implement those lessons if it happens on Caltrain.

Chair Cobey asked if there is a written protocol for incident management. Ms. Stewart said yes.

Ms. Levin said she agrees with the potential service expansion that would include different express trains, later trains from San Jose, and other possible solutions such as different stopping patterns.

Yvonne Mills said she disagrees with Mr. Berk about interim solutions or band aids to problems. If something is being considered she hopes it is the best possible solution than can be done, but if something can't be done well it should be explained why. Sometimes nothing should be done until it can be done right, because interim solutions and band aids can make it seem worse.

Work Plan Update

Ms. Stewart said:

- April
 - Social Media Update
- May
 - Caltrain Modernization Quarterly Update
 - Preliminary Fiscal Year (FY) 2017 Operating and Capital Budget
 - Customer Experience Survey Results
- June
 - Bike Parking Management Plan
 - Annual Passenger Counts

Chair Cobey asked what else would be in April. Ms. Stewart said it is open right now.

Ms. Levin said the topic of bathrooms/bikes/seats is integral to the Electric Multiple Unit purchasing process. The CAC does not want to weigh-in after the Board has made its decision. Ms. Stewart said it will be brought to the CAC before a decision is made.

Ms. Levin said bike parking management and station parking are two common methods for getting to Caltrain. She asked if one of the items could be generalized to station access because there are other ways people get to stations, such as Uber and Lyft, and there are other station access topics that should be rolled into one of these presentations.

Mr. Berk said presentations and reports should be sent ahead of time and the reports at the meeting should be summaries.

Ms. Mills said quiet car should be more a family car and a way to get away from drunk and obnoxious people. It is a misnomer to call it a quiet car. Families don't want to bring kids onboard around drunken people and people who swear.

Ms. Levin asked if the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Means-Based Fare Pricing Study could be broadened to Fare Equity including the MTC study so the CAC could make other related comments to fare equity that are not specific to the MTC study.

Public Comment

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said staff is not adding a third bike car, they are taking 24 seats out of the passenger cars that were added last year. He said he wrote a letter to the Board about bullet trains. The budget is still there. He could add 20 bullets a day without any impact to the budget. Another alternative is the private sector, which is willing to pay \$3 million a year for using the tracks. He wrote to the CAC and included train configuration specifications. These trains fit within the existing platforms. ACE and Capitol Corridor have quiet cars and Wi-Fi on their trains.

BROWN ACT WORKSHOP

Shayna van Hoften, Legal Counsel, said she is an attorney at Hanson Bridgett, which is the general counsel to the San Mateo County Transit District (District), the JPB, and the

San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA). She has practiced local government law for 12 years.

Ms. van Hoften presented:

- Who's Who and Why
 - Committee Membership
 - Appointed to represent communities by county.
 - Not appointed to represent subgroups of communities; CAC members represent Caltrain riders as a whole.
 - Advisory role to the JPB on policy impacts felt by customers; policy decisions are not made by the CAC.
 - Express views of passengers – good and bad; when CAC members report to the Board, they are to represent the CAC as a whole and should state majority views and minority views or consensus views.
 - Staff
 - Caltrain has no employees. Employees here are employees of the District. All employees report to the District general manager. The general manager reports to the three boards. The District is the managing agency of SamTrans, the JPB, and the TA. When staff responds to requests from the Boards, those requests take priority. Staff is not the CAC's staff to direct to do things.

Ms. Tucker asked if it is not in the CAC's purview to direct staff, if it is in staff's purview to tell the CAC they can or cannot write a letter of recommendation to the Board.

Ms. van Hoften said the CAC is an advisory body to provide input to the Board and the CAC can do it verbally or in writing. It would not be appropriate for the CAC to get together on the side to write a letter and circulate it because that would violate the Brown Act, but the group can provide feedback and recommendations to the Board in writing.

Ms. Mills asked if the only exposure the Board gets about what happens at the CAC meetings is from the CAC report at the Board meeting. She asked if the Board reads the minutes. Martha Martinez, Executive Officer, District Secretary/Executive Administration, said the Board receives the CAC agenda packets that include the minutes.

Mr. Berk said he does not think the Board reads the minutes.

Ms. van Hoften continued:

- There are numerous committees and the agency has not opted to have an attorney attend the many committee meetings. Costs would add up. Staff is to perform a role to provide information and to facilitate meeting the CAC's needs, and to police the CAC's compliance with the Brown Act. There are many interpretations about the Brown Act and nuances that apply differently in different contexts. Staff is does not try to stop the CAC from having their meetings. It would be helpful to reset any understanding on how

the Brown Act applies so staff and the CAC can work together to accomplish their goals.

- Brown Act Overview
 - State law (California Government Code §§54950, et seq.).
 - Applies to local legislative bodies and their meetings.
 - Requires meetings to be open, public, and accessible.
 - Requires published agendas that provide notice of the meeting, when, where, and what will be discussed. Typically agenda items should be described in no more than 20 words to give the public a sense of what is happening so they can look at the agenda and know if they have an interest in the discussion that is going to happen or any potential outcomes of that discussion.
 - Requires availability of materials, opportunity for public comment before actions taken.
 - Provides for limited closed session.
- Why Another Brown Act Training
 - Typically done every two years.
 - Responding to CAC request.
 - Members of CAC with various backgrounds.
 - Some new members.
 - Some disagreements regarding Brown Act application in past few years.
 - All play a role in compliance, but on-the-spot analysis can be hard and views can vary.
- What is a Meeting
 - Majority of members of legislative body together at the same place and time to hear, discuss, deliberate or take action on any item within the subject matter jurisdiction of the body.
- What is not a Meeting
 - Contact between less than a majority.
 - Contact between a member and non-member.
 - Ad hoc advisory committee discussions.
 - Conferences, other agencies' meetings that are open to the public
 - No caucusing or discussion among members about business within the body's subject matter jurisdiction.
 - Exceptions for scheduled/agendized sessions/discussions.
- Danger Zone: Quorums Outside of Noticed Meetings
 - A majority of a legislative body shall not, outside a meeting, use a series of communications of any kind, directly or through intermediaries, to discuss, deliberate, or take action on any item of business that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the legislative body.
 - Any communication of any kind can turn into a Brown Act meeting.
 - Serial communications.
 - E-mail, social media sites, blogs, other technology.
 - Social engagements.
 - Parking lot/hallway discussions.
- Observations from the Outside
 - Sources: Conversations with several members of staff and the chair, review of several years' worth of CAC minutes, observation at February

- CAC meeting, and 12 years of experiences with other boards and committees.
- Some level of disagreement is inherent and expected.
 - Different perspectives and approaches in different environments.
 - Different levels of experience, risk-tolerance, and commitment to Brown Act ideals.
 - The law doesn't look so hard, but applications requires nuance.
- JPB CAC: Disagreement appears to be broader, more transparent, more frequently approached in public realm over a longer period of time.

Mr. Scharff said the other bodies he sits on, staff agendizes items in a broadly enough way that allows the committee to discuss it. Here, it feels like staff wants to shut the conversation down. Staff has the attitude to take the most conservative approach possible, so if something is not right in view of the agenda, it may not be discussed or voted on. Staff is not doing an appropriate job to write the agenda items broadly enough to deal with the anticipated discussion. Ms. van Hoften said she will work with the CAC and staff to fix this concern and will apply it to the next agenda.

Ms. van Hoften continued:

- Three Main Areas of Concern
 - Interpretation of notice provided on agenda.
 - Subject matter.
 - Ability to take action.
 - Form of discussion, involvement of public speakers.
 - Responses to committee comments, public comments, or chairperson's report.
 - Questions regarding basis of limitations.
 - No, the JPB has not adopted heightened rules.
 - However, the agency boards and committees do not meet when there is no quorum.
 - Results in concern over time lag before next meeting and lack of trust/confidence in staff.
 - Purpose of the CAC is to talk about things that concern the CAC about the customer experience based on the policy decision coming from the Board.
 - The Brown Act needs to be layered on top of that, which is to allow the public to voice their opinions.
 - When items are on the agenda, the CAC cannot discuss beyond what is written on the agenda because then the public loses their opportunity to contribute before the CAC reports their opinions to the Board.
- Room to work on establishing unified approach.
 - Common goals.
 - Staff wants to know what the CAC thinks.
 - The Board wants to know what the CAC thinks.
 - The CAC wants to share what they think.
 - Staff's concern has been making a mistake in allowing conversations that should not be allowed, which is fair and

appropriate. Legal, staff, and the CAC will work out some ways to make it clear how far the CAC discussions can go before there is a problem.

- Respectful discourse.
 - Engenders cooperation between the CAC and staff.
 - Let the chair do his job: lead the meeting and set the agenda.
 - Recommend changes to the bylaws.
- Minimize time lost to Brown Act debates.
 - Fact: public governance structures are not the most nimble.
 - Lengthy/repetitive process debates exacerbate the downsides of this reality.
 - Options for addressing them when they arise.
- Words to use on the Agenda
 - Discussion, informal consensus clearly indicated:
 - Update
 - Report
 - Discuss
 - Presentation
 - Consider
 - Grey space:
 - Seek input from CAC
 - Receive
 - Clear action words:
 - Approve
 - Receive and file
 - Accept
 - Recommend
 - Support
 - Oppose
 - Vote
 - Whether
- May 2012 JPB CAC Agenda
 - Pledge of Allegiance
 - Pledge itself, not a discussion on whether to say it.

Chair Cobey asked if the CAC is required to recite the Pledge of Allegiance. Ms. van Hoften said no.

Ms. Tucker asked if the Board does it. Ms. van Hoften said yes.

Mr. Scharff said Palo Alto does not do it.

Mr. Berk said he would vote to get rid of it. Mr. Scharff said he would, too.

Ms. van Hoften continued:

- Roll Call
 - Only action is to take roll, not the time to take up topics like a change to the quorum rule.

- Approval of Meeting Minutes of April 18, 2012
 - Clear action: approval. The minutes could be revised, corrected, or adopted.
- Public Comment
 - The chair can limit the time given to each public member, but every member of the public must be allowed to speak.
 - The CAC can briefly respond to public comment, or ask the staff to briefly respond, or ask to agendize the topic for a future meeting. Not the place for a new discussion or action.
- Chairperson's Report
 - One-sided report. The chair can ask staff for a response. Not the place for discussion.
- There was a line on the agenda that read, "All items on this agenda are subject to action." This line tells the public there is going to be room for actions even if action is not clear on the agenda line. This line meets the needs of the public under the Brown Act. This line will be going back on the CAC agendas.

Mr. Berk left at 7:17 p.m.

- Support of JPB Resolution...
 - Staff was seeking action, which could be amended or reversed.
- Fiscal Year 2013 Budget
 - Not clearly an action item, but the line "All items on this agenda are subject to action" allowed for action to be taken.
- Staff Report
 - No way to take action on subjects of reports because no indication of what will be discussed so impossible to have provided sufficient notice.
- Committee Comments
 - Brief response, ask for staff to respond or agendize for future meeting. Not the place for discussion or actions.
 - Treated just like public comment.
- Today's Agenda:
 - Has "Motion" or "Informational" written down the side.
 - The "All items on this agenda are subject to action" line was removed.
 - The "Motion" or "Informational" will be removed from future agendas and the "All items on this agenda are subject to action" line will be put on future agendas. These two statements would be in conflict with one another if both were on the agenda.

Mr. Scharff said he thinks this solves his concern.

Chair Cobey asked where the CAC can comment on correspondence. Ms. van Hoften said "Correspondence" is an agenda item on the Board agendas, and usually the Board chair tells the Board that correspondence is in their packet and they move on to the next item. She said correspondence is treated like public comment because the CAC does not get it until the meeting.

Chair Cobey said he gets correspondence for a city council he sat on a week before the meeting.

Ms. Levin said she sits on other bodies and they get correspondence ahead of time. Mr. Scharff said he does, too.

Ms. Tucker said she thought the CAC could comment on it under Committee Comments. Ms. van Hoften said the agenda says, "Committee members may make brief statements regarding CAC-related areas of concern, ideas for improvement, or other items that will benefit or impact Caltrain service or the CAC, or request future agenda topics."

Ms. Mills said it might be helpful to add it as a discussion item. Chair Cobey asked to include the word "correspondence" in the description on the agenda of Committee Comments.

Chair Cobey asked if the chair can allow specific speakers to talk longer than the three minutes allowed if no one objects. Ms. van Hoften said yes.

Mr. Scharff said if the public brings up items that are not agendized, the CAC should not engage with the public member except to ask clarifying questions, but if it is on an agenda topic and the CAC wants to ask the public member questions, they should go through the chair. That is a meeting management issue.

Public Comment

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said the point that no one works for Caltrain is true. Transit America Services, Inc. does the tracks and train operations, and the District is on a one-year automatic renewal for administration. Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) provides the administration for Capitol Corridor. Every year in June the JPB has the opportunity to tell the District their services are no longer required. The managing agency is the root cause of all the problems with Caltrain. He has requested many times an attorney be present for CAC meetings.

Jeff Carter, Millbrae, said sometimes when issues are controversial or staff does not want to discuss them staff claim it is a violation of the Brown Act. The CAC sees presentations after they are seen by the Board. It would be better if the CAC sees them first. He said Mr. Berk said there is too much public comment. These meetings are to hear public comment and concerns from the riders. He said there are different interpretations of fare equity. Some think fare equity is low income versus high income, or other issues. Fare equity to him is how zones work and how inequitable the trips are based on the zones.

Ms. Levin asked what is happening with train breakdowns and if the Proposition 1A funding cannot be used for electrification. Ms. Stewart said staff is looking more closely at maintenance procedures, but given the fleet is aging there are various ways that staff is handling the locomotives. Requests for capital funding have been made for FY2017. Staff is trying to maintain the fleet to the best of their abilities.

Ms. van Hoften said a press release came out about a recent decision that came out of the court regarding high-speed rail funding on the Peninsula. It is not correct that Caltrain cannot use the funding. She said staff will send the press release to the CAC.

UPDATE ON CLIPPER CUSTOMER EXPERIENCE

Jayme Ackemann, Director, Marketing and Communications, said staff looked at some of the issues raised by the CAC. Some relate to Clipper as it is today, some relate to business rules and issues that can be addressed with the Clipper 2.0, and some are fare policy questions. She said she will talk about issues that staff is trying to address in the short term before going to Clipper 2.0.

Ms. Ackemann said the areas where staff sees the greatest concern have to do with the way some policy is enacted in using Clipper Cards today. She sees complaints around the auto load delays of three to five days that result in funds not being available in timely fashion. Another issue is the minimum balance of \$1.25 in order to use fare instruments on the card. Staff knows there are questions about existing integration between Clipper and the Ticket Vending Machines (TVM) and what can be done to address those issues. Staff is proposing to do away with the minimum balance and will work with Clipper to address the three- to five-day delay, staff is looking for ways to improve customer education. Staff has developed some Frequently Asked Questions that will be used in a Caltrain brochure that conductors can use to help with educating customers who find themselves in violation of a policy they did not understand or know about, there will be some website changes that Clipper is looking at to help improve the customer experience, and staff is also looking at implementing a new generation of handheld readers that have greater functionality. This will be important when there are large events where lots of people will be loading on the train and conductors want to expedite the ticket checking or sales process.

David Chow, Project Manager, said he was on the Clipper Project back in 2001 before Clipper was rolled into place. The soft launch was in 2001 and it was several years later before the actual launch. He used to be the TVM Program Manager. The Clipper system is challenged. It is an old system based on equipment that was rolled out for the Sydney Olympics. It was very difficult to roll out equipment to six Phase 1 and Phase 2 agencies. Caltrain does about \$4 million a month in Clipper sales, which does not mean it is a good system, just that people use it. He was asked to participate with Clipper 2.0. He said he understands what happened with Clipper and it needs to be better. The Clipper contract ends in 2019, so all the agencies are speaking together to talk about what they learned from the roll out and peoples' behavior using Clipper. Every agency is a little different. With the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (MUNI), customers tag when they get on. With Caltrain customers tag on and off. Because Caltrain is a zone-based system, it is different than an average bus. Customers cannot get on BART without tagging on because it is a closed-gate system, and Caltrain is an open-gate system. On any given day, there are 100 to 200 new Clipper users and they don't understand what to do. Clipper is different from the TVMs. With Clipper 2.0, staff will endeavor to get the CAC up-to-date information with what they are working on. Caltrain participates in Clipper, but it is not the driving force for Clipper, BART and MUNI are. They move 700,000 people and collect tens of thousands

of dollars per week, but Caltrain moves 60,000 people and is number three on revenue for Clipper. He will ask Clipper to provide TVMs that sell Clipper. He said Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority has TVMs that use Clipper, and to load a Clipper Card monthly pass customers would have to go to Mountain View. These issues were on the table with the roll out and he will work on them with Clipper 2.0. He said the three- to five-day delay is not really a delay, it is due to the design of a 15-year-old system and computers that don't talk to each other. If it was done on a mobile ticketing system it would be instant. The way Clipper does it is they get the six agencies doing 20 million transactions a month and they take the sales from Caltrain and hand type them in to a computer, which is what causes the delay. When he started Caltrain was moving 20,000 riders per day, but Caltrain carries three times that amount now. Clipper needs to grow. With Clipper 2.0 there will be a chance to make improvements. He will try to make sure Caltrain is represented with the other Bay Area agencies that use Clipper.

Ms. Tucker said the biggest complaint she hears is locations for loading up the cards. It is not easy to load up a card. Mr. Chow said the system needs to be improved today. Only 36 percent of Clipper users use auto load because people don't trust it. Any reload location such as Walgreens that has a person doing it, the value is available immediately. Clipper is trying to improve the website, which may bring the delay down to two or three days. That is high on the list of issues to bring up.

Ms. Mills said it is not easy to deal with Walgreens because there has to be a person who knows how to do it, if that person is there, and if the machine works. Another issue is if there is money on the card, it can't be converted to a monthly pass. It is a very clunky system. It is not easy to use. Mr. Chow said converting is not the issue, refunding is. Pretax dollars cannot be refunded, but money should be converted and that is one thing he will talk to Clipper about. He said Clipper can do it manually, but there are probably 5,000 people who want to do it every month because the money was loaded incorrectly. He said Walgreens is not a good place to be selling Clipper products, it should be done over the TVMs.

Ms. Mills said the last time she lost a card someone used it even though she reported it right away. Mr. Chow said she is not responsible for that usage. He asked what other transit agency allows customers to ride up to \$13 negative. He said he works in Safety and Security now and he gets about 150 to 200 cards a month in the trash. Smart cards are not smart anymore, especially considering mobile ticketing and other methods. The entire concept of fares has to change. People shouldn't be lining up at two TVMs. He said he will suggest some issues for the CAC to look at, such as communicating that triple beeps on the tag readers means the customer did not tag correctly.

Ms. Levin asked if zone upgrades are possible with Clipper. Mr. Chow said a zone upgrade will never be possible with Clipper 1.0 because it should be an e-cash ride at that point. It is not user friendly today. In the future it should be better managed.

Ms. Levin said if customers go from Caltrain to BART and they tag on at BART, the system should know the customer is tagged off of Caltrain. If the customer doesn't tag off Caltrain it will charge the customer to Gilroy even if the train is not running to Gilroy at that time. Mr. Chow said customers need to tag off so the system understands what to

charge the customer. Monthly Pass holders only need to tag the first time each month that they ride the system. The reason there is a problem with BART and Caltrain Clipper users is because customers go from an open-gate system to a closed-gate system. He hopes the new system will have more information on the rider and the back-end systems between BART and Clipper will marry each other. The system is based on old technology. Some "Add Value" machines use a modem to contact credit card companies, so they are very slow. He will also see if there is a way to move a machine closer to the gates at Millbrae.

Chair Cobey said Mr. Chow should look at the comments from the customer satisfaction survey for comments on Clipper.

Public Comment

Andy Chow, Redwood City, said Caltrain needs to get better technology from Clipper. There are a lot of problems with it. There are only so many Clipper readers at stations, and customers are not sure where readers are. JPB should put up signage to tell customers where Clipper readers are as they are exiting trains. He would like all rail systems to be Clipper only.

Jeff Carter, Millbrae, said the 8-Ride tickets should be available to be used by a group of people so it would be easier for a group of people to go out together. There should be a Regional Fare Program. There are over two dozen agencies and different fare systems, and it makes things difficult to travel from one agency to another.

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said Mountain View used to have a Clipper reader on the way out to the light rail. Customers have to be at the back of the train if they have any chance to make the connection.

DATE, TIME AND LOCATION OF NEXT REGULAR MEETING:

April 20, 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 8:15 p.m.