



JPB Board of Directors
Meeting of January 8, 2026

Correspondence as of January 7, 2026

Subject

1. RE: CalTrain Complaint
2. January 8 Item #7 Public Comment (South County Connector Caltrain Service)
3. New Clipper and Monthly pass feedback

From: Fried, Kevin
To: Caltrain BOD Public Support
Cc: Board (@caltrain.com)
Subject: RE: CalTrain Complaint
Date: Friday, January 2, 2026 7:31:24 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from kefried@deloitte.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

ATTENTION: This email came from an external source. Do not open attachments or click

Hello Caltrain BOD Public Support Team,

Happy New Year! Thanks for the update and clarifications, and I appreciate the additional information.

I look forward to an update from your claim team on my request for a refund.

Take care,
Kevin

From: Caltrain BOD Public Support <CaltrainBODPublicSupport@caltrain.com>
Sent: Monday, December 29, 2025 3:36 PM
To: Fried, Kevin <kefried@deloitte.com>
Cc: Board (@caltrain.com) <board@caltrain.com>
Subject: [EXT] Re: CalTrain Complaint

You don't often get email from caltrainbodpublicsupport@caltrain.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Kevin Fried,

Thank you for your follow-up and for sharing your additional concerns.

To clarify the situation involving our employees: Garret does not have the authority to deny passengers boarding based on violations of laws outside of railroad operations. This matter has been reviewed internally, and Garret has been addressed through our disciplinary process and provided coaching to ensure proper handling of similar situations in the future.

Maria was following direction provided by Garret at the time and offered the option to board the next train as an alternative. She does not have the authority to override instructions given by a conductor, even if those instructions are later determined to be incorrect.

We understand how confusing and frustrating this experience must have been, particularly given the mixed messaging you received. Your feedback has been important in helping us identify where clearer guidance and consistency are needed.

Thank you again for your patience and for taking the time to share your experience.

Sincerely,

Your Caltrain BOD Public Support Team

From: Fried, Kevin <kefried@deloitte.com>
Sent: Monday, December 22, 2025 10:14 AM
To: Caltrain BOD Public Support <CaltrainBODPublicSupport@caltrain.com>
Cc: Board (@caltrain.com) <board@caltrain.com>
Subject: RE: CalTrain Complaint

ATTENTION: This email came from an external source. Do not open attachments or click on links from unknown senders.

Hello Caltrain BOD Public Support Team,

Thanks for the update and response. I very much appreciate the information you have shared on my situation. I think we are great making progress, but I have a few additional comments / questions. Please see below...

1. I am requesting that any of my Personally Identifiable Information (PII) be redacted from any public records and/or any communications that may be accessible to Caltrain employees (specifically Garret and Maria). This includes my full name, contact information, email address, physical address, employers information, etc.
2. While the explanation below is helpful, I would still like to understand whether or not the employee in question (Garret), had the authority to deny us access to the train (thus all my questions related to your policies, training, and ability to enforce laws of San Francisco or other public transit providers)? As you might imagine, we were dumbfounded when we were told that we were being denied entry to the train. And to add insult to injury, we were told by Maria that we could **“board the next train”** immediately after Garret’s train left the station. So which is it... were we being denied entry for one train ride because we broke a rule of another city or public transit system, or were we being punished because Garret wanted to prove who had “authority”?? Clearly Maria is following a different set of rules, or perhaps employees are making up as they go??
3. Thanks for the update on the expense reimbursement claim we have filed. While it is a small amount, it is a matter of principle. It is my sincere hope that we are reimbursed for the additional, unnecessary, expense. If not, I’d like this to be on the Board agenda for February 6th.

Thanks again. Have a great holiday.

Take care,
Kevin

From: Caltrain BOD Public Support <CaltrainBODPublicSupport@caltrain.com>
Sent: Monday, December 22, 2025 8:08 AM
To: Fried, Kevin <kefried@deloitte.com>
Cc: Board (@caltrain.com) <board@caltrain.com>
Subject: [EXT] Re: CalTrain Complaint

You don't often get email from caltrainbodpublicsupport@caltrain.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Kevin Fried,

Your message to the Caltrain Board of Directors was forwarded to me for response. A copy of this correspondence will also be shared with the Board. Thank you for your detailed message. We want to confirm that your feedback has been received and has been shared with Caltrain Customer Service leadership as well as the appropriate Caltrain management teams for review. Regarding the response Todd referenced from 12/12, we would like to clarify that this communication was sent from Operations to Customer Service for internal awareness and was not addressed directly to you. We apologize for any confusion or miscommunication this may have caused.

Regarding your questions about Garrett's role, Caltrain uses both Caltrain employees and contracted staff to support operations. We are reviewing the circumstances you described, including staff roles and actions taken, as part of this process.

We have also notified our Claims team regarding your request for reimbursement of expenses. They will review the information provided and follow up as appropriate.

With respect to disciplinary actions, training, and other personnel-related matters, while we are unable to discuss specific personnel issues due to confidentiality, please know that Caltrain takes all complaints seriously. The concerns you raised have been forwarded to the appropriate management teams for review and consideration.

We appreciate you taking the time to document your experience and clearly outline your concerns. Your feedback is important and will be considered as part of our ongoing efforts to ensure consistent policy enforcement and respectful customer interactions.

Thank you for bringing this matter to our attention.

Best regards,
Your Caltrain BOD Public Support Team

From: Fried, Kevin <kefried@deloitte.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 17, 2025 10:08:52 PM (UTC+00:00) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Todd Douglas <DouglasT@samtrans.com>; Board (@caltrain.com) <board@caltrain.com>
Cc: pra@samtrans.com <messages@nextrequest.com>; Fried, Kevin <kefried@deloitte.com>
Subject: RE: CalTrain Complaint

Some people who received this message don't often get email from kefried@deloitte.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

ATTENTION: This email came from an external source. Do not open attachments or click on links from unknown senders.

Caltrain Board, Todd,

Thanks for the note below and assistance. I am filing this **second FORMAL COMPLAINT** that I request is brought to the attention of the Full Board of Directors.

First, I have double and triple checked in all of my folders (Inbox, Spam, Junk, etc.,) and I never received the response below (that you indicated was sent on 12/12).

Second, while I very much appreciate the thoughtful and articulate response below, it falls short of my requested resolution and expectations. For your reference, I have attached the original complaint that was filed on 11/29. In that complaint you would have seen the requests outlined below. I understand that your public records department is searching for any relevant records as requested below. I will wait for their response. In the meantime, can you please provide a response to the items highlighted in yellow below?

Questions, resolution, and requested actions of the Caltrain Board and Management:

1. I am requesting this message be shared with Customer Service and appropriate Caltrain Management. (HAS THIS BEEN DONE??)
2. I would like to understand Garret's role, level of authority, and whether or not he is a "supervisor", or if he misrepresented his title and authority?
3. I am requesting a copy of ALL Caltrain rules, regulations, and policies that reference the use of crosswalks, including the following:
 1. Caltrain's policies related to the use of crosswalks that cross Caltrain tracks.

2. Caltrain's policies related to crosswalks that DO NOT CROSS Caltrain tracks.
3. Caltrain's authority to enforce traffic laws of the City of San Francisco.
4. Caltrain's approach to enforcement of any crosswalk violations, including specific explanations of Caltrain's enforcement of San Francisco traffic laws OUTSIDE the train station.
5. All recent examples of enforcement actions taken against Caltrain riders related to potential violations of crosswalk rules in San Francisco (specifically, riders who have been prohibited from riding the train as a result of violating San Francisco's traffic rules).
4. I am requesting a written apology from Garret, including a reference to the rules that allowed him to deny us access to ride the train.
5. I am requesting a written response from the board that outlines:
 1. Actions that will be taken in the next 60 days to reinforce the limits of conductor's authority to enforce SF traffic laws
 2. Steps taken to train or retrain Garret and other conductors
 3. Steps taken to train and/or retrain Maria on customer interaction and approach to resolving customer concerns/issues
6. A payment of \$34.14 (the difference between the cost of our Uber ride (details below) and the cost of the train ride from SF to Hayward Park).

Uber Receipt Details:

Nov 29, 2025 - 9:29 PM

Total \$62.64

Payments: American Express26 \$62.64

11/30/25 8:31 AM

Third, with respect to your response below (see highlighted in yellow), your Conductor did indeed speak with us about his observation that 3 individuals in our group crossed 4th Street directly across the Muni tracks. This is the crux of my complaint and is at the heart of my questions above, i.e., "what authority does your Conductor at Caltrain have to deny access to the Caltrain system based upon an observation that a group failed to use a crosswalk and walked across a Muni track"?? Muni and Caltrain are separate public and legal entities, and I find it difficult to believe that an employee of Caltrain can legally or by policy deny service to the public based upon a claim that it is their **responsibility to report and enforce violations of another public entity**. Can you please assist in shedding light on this issue?

Fourth, it is my understanding that CalTrain holds public board meetings. If the requested information above and/or payment/refund requested is not received, I intend to participate in the Board meeting on February 6, 2025 to further discuss this situation.

Again, please feel free to reach out to me with any questions. I look forward to your response.

Respectfully,

Kevin

Kevin Fried

Principal | Deloitte Consulting
Deloitte & Touche LLP
225 West Santa Clara Street, San Jose, CA 95113
Office: +1 408 704 2786 – Mobile: +1 415 609 1443

kefried@deloitte.com | www.deloitte.com

From: Todd Douglas <DouglasT@samtrans.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 17, 2025 11:04 AM
To: Fried, Kevin <kefried@deloitte.com>
Cc: Todd Douglas <DouglasT@samtrans.com>
Subject: [EXT] Re: CalTrain Complaint

You don't often get email from doulast@samtrans.com. [Learn why this is important](#)
Hello Mr. Fried,

Per our conversation, please see the escalation response to your complaint to Caltrain.

Thank you for bringing this to our attention. We sincerely apologize for the experience you and your family had on November 29, 2025, while attempting to board Train 656. We understand how upsetting this situation must have been, and we truly regret that your interaction with our staff did not reflect the level of professionalism and respect you deserve.

After carefully reviewing the video footage, we confirmed that the conductor escalated the situation and used his arms to block your family from boarding. Although the conductor initially reported that a member of your group had blocked the doors and prevented others from boarding, the footage clearly shows that it was the conductor himself who was obstructing the doorway. This discrepancy is deeply concerning, and we take it very seriously.

When interviewed, the conductor stated that he intended to speak with your group about what he believed he observed as you crossed the street and the MUNI tracks. However, regardless of his intentions, the conduct displayed was inappropriate and unacceptable. Both conductors assigned to Train 656 have been coached and will receive disciplinary action for their actions and for their handling of this situation.

We also spoke with the Customer Service Agent who attempted to step in and deescalate the interaction. Please note that this employee is not a manager and does not have any authority to override the decisions made by the train crew, though we appreciate their attempt to calm the situation.

Once again, we sincerely apologize for the distress this incident caused. We appreciate you bringing this matter to us, and we are taking the appropriate steps to ensure this type of interaction does not occur again.

Todd Douglas

San Mateo County Transit District

Customer Service Dept.

1250 San Carlos Avenue

San Carlos, CA 95070-1306

1-800-660-4287

www.smctd.com

This message (including any attachments) contains confidential information intended for a specific individual and purpose, and is protected by law. If you are not the intended recipient, you should delete this message and any disclosure, copying, or distribution of this message, or the taking of any action based on it, by you is strictly prohibited.

Deloitte refers to a Deloitte member firm, one of its related entities, or Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited ("DTTL"). Each Deloitte member firm is a separate legal entity and a member of DTTL. DTTL does not provide services to clients. Please see www.deloitte.com/about to learn more.

v.E.1

From: [Council Member Zachary Hilton](#)
To: [Board \(@caltrain.com\)](#)
Cc: [Public Comment](#)
Subject: January 8 Item #7 Public Comment (South County Connector Caltrain Service)
Date: Tuesday, January 6, 2026 10:01:39 AM
Attachments: [CM Zach Hilton South County Caltrain Service-7.pdf](#)

Some people who received this message don't often get email from zachary.hilton@cityofgilroy.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

ATTENTION: This email came from an external source. Do not open attachments or click links from unknown senders.

Caltrain Board,

Public comment letter attached for January 8 Item #7 Public Comment **(South County Connector Caltrain Service)**

Thank you.

Zach Hilton
Gilroy City Council Member
www.zachhilton.com
#HiltonForCouncil @zachhilton_ca



ZACH HILTON

Gilroy City Council Member

Livable Gilroy for All

January 4, 2026

Caltrain South County Connector

I've seen the **November South County Connector** ridership numbers (**Monday-Friday 4 Trains North in morning and 4 Trains South in evening**) Gilroy 133 riders/day, San Martin 34 riders/day, Morgan Hill 136 riders/day, Blossom Hill 76 riders/day, Capitol 49 riders/day. It's not fiscally responsible to fund Caltrain South County Connector at **\$15 million for 428 riders/day M-F** when they aren't serving the current commute travel patterns and while VTA is facing a fiscally constrained FY26 and FY27 Transit Operating Budget. Caltrain is heading into a deficit for FY27 too. These five stations south of Tamien are not electrified and Caltrain doesn't own the tracks, Union Pacific Railroad does. South County Caltrain service doesn't have the impact needed to relieve congestion on U.S. Route 101 today or historically.

Although VTA Staff has stated they will not cut frequent/daily Gilroy VTA bus service in order to keep Caltrain service, I remain concerned that Caltrain Staff will still try and pursue this option. All while VTA is facing a fiscally constrained FY26 and FY27 Transit Operating Budget and Caltrain is heading into a deficit for FY27 too. The demographic of riders I am currently hearing from that use VTA vs South County Caltrain are contrasted between those whose incomes need frequent/daily public transportation on VTA for their jobs, groceries, healthcare, and aging in place, may be sacrificed for those with significantly more means that are attending private prep-schools and commuting an average of 3 days a week on Caltrain.

We continue to talk about this at our South County VTA agenda preparation meetings with VTA staff and Caltrain staff. Caltrain and VTA aren't focused just on Gilroy and Morgan Hill. We are focused on moving the most people on mass transit from Gilroy to Diridon. We track and budget the ridership/cost from both agencies and have been comparing them for a long time. When ridership is low, services get cut, that's a given.

Seated capacity for each of the 4 diesel trains that make up the **South County Connector** as configured currently (3 cars, including 1 bike car) is 394-415, with space for 24 bikes. Each car has between 114 and 144 seated capacities and the standing room capacity ranges from 472-498. **Total max seated capacity of the South County Connector service is 1,660.** Standing room max capacity 1,992. Caltrain FY26 cost of South County Connector from a calculation in April is \$14,451,619. More trains or increased frequency will increase that cost. That's

not worth it for the current or future budget cycle. Caltrain operations should not be funded from VTA Transit funds, 2000 Measure A funds, or 2016 Measure B Caltrain Corridor Capacity. There are no grants that would be beneficial in funding this current level of service and ridership. Caltrain is currently using Federal funds to operate the South County Connector and that is about to run out.

Gilroy isn't the starting point for traffic any longer. San Benito County and Monterey County drivers contribute to it as well. In 2023 **Caltrans Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) at Cochrane in Morgan Hill was 142,000 vehicles per day** and in 2019 Caltrans Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) at Cochrane in Morgan Hill was 148,000 vehicles per day.

Per the [1996 Restated Joint Powers Agreement](#) (JPA Sections A and B) make VTA "responsible for all net operating costs of the Gilroy service" and "obtaining all Gilroy Service capital projects". It does not obligate Caltrain or VTA to operate service to Gilroy, though it assumed there would always be a market.

The State provided funding for one battery powered train (not four) which will serve as a pilot and it is supposed to run on the electrified system from Diridon to SF. The last update I received is this is not going to happen in FY26 or FY27.

VTA, Caltrain, and South County communities do minimal to increase Caltrain South County Connector ridership, so the expectation that ridership on Caltrain will increase is not a reality today. It's not fiscally responsible to fund \$15 million for 428 riders/day M-F.

Sincerely,



Zach Hilton
Gilroy City Council Member
www.zachhilton.com
#HiltonForCouncil @zachhilton_ca

From: [Juan Enrique Muñoz Zolotoochin](#)
To: [Public Comment](#)
Subject: New Clipper and Monthly pass feedback
Date: Tuesday, January 6, 2026 1:35:48 PM

You don't often get email from juanique@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

ATTENTION: This email came from an external source. Do not open attachments or click links from unknown senders.

Hi,

I just want to communicate my discontent with the changes on the Clipper card and the requirements that are going to be imposed to tap on every ride. After multiple issues with Caltrain in the past few months (ParkMobile not working as expected, inability to get historical activity on my clipper card online, etc, etc.) I feel like public transit is just hopeless in California. The past few months have been particularly disappointing.