



JPB Board of Directors
Meeting of May 7, 2026

Correspondence as of April 3, 2026

Subject

1. Public Comment: Public comment on agenda item 8C for April 2 board meeting
2. April 2nd , Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board, Meeting Caltrain
3. Re: Administrative Review Status, Velzy

From: [Bill Hough](#)
To: [Public Comment](#)
Subject: Public comment on agenda item 8C for April 2 board meeting
Date: Wednesday, April 1, 2026 5:51:10 PM

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

I am writing as a resident and taxpayer in Santa Clara County.

We don't need another regressive transportation funding measure. Our taxes are already too high.

Vote NO.

Over the last several elections, voters in Santa Clara County have passed multiple tax and fee increases including gas taxes, the Caltrain Measure RR tax, two bridge toll increases, three VTA sales taxes, Santa Clara County's Measure A 1/8 cent sales tax, the state prop 30 1/4 cent sales tax and the 2010 Measure B Vehicle Registration Fee of \$10, and most recently a Santa Clara County "stealth sales tax." Additionally, we're on the hook to pay back numerous state bond issues including high-speed rail, the Proposition 1 water bond and the infrastructure bonds of 2006.

All this nickel and diming contributes into making the Bay Area a horribly expensive place to live; especially for people of modest means, who must pay the greatest percentage of their income in these regressive taxes and fees. Each increase by itself does not amount to much, but the cumulative effect is to add to the unaffordability of the region.

Before increasing taxes YET AGAIN, waste needs to be removed from transportation projects. VTA needs to "value engineer" the BART to San Jose project, going with a twin bore tunnel and eliminating the redundant BART extension between the San Jose and Santa Clara Caltrain stations. The BART segment from these stations would duplicate both the existing Caltrain line and VTA's 22 and 522 buses.

Why don't the wealthy high rollers at MTC suggest taxing rich tech companies and leave the little guy alone for a change?

From: [John Melnychuk](#)
To: [Public Comment](#)
Cc: [Melinda McGee](#); [Adrian Brandt](#); [City.Council@cityofpaloalto.org](#); [Burt, Pat \[Pat.burt@cityofpaloalto.org\]](#); [Stone, Greer](#); [Vicki.Veenker@paloalto.gov](#); [Lu, George](#); [lythcott-Haims Julie](#); [Reckdahl, Keith](#); [Lauing, Ed](#)
Subject: April 2nd , Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board, Meeting Caltrain
Date: Thursday, April 2, 2026 1:25:51 AM
Attachments: [Caltrain Executive Summary Final v6 fixed.pdf](#)

You don't often get email from jdmelnichuk@icloud.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.

Dear PCJP Board,

Thank you for working to improve public transportation and Caltrain operations.

Caltrain remains an essential resource for the traveling public, but it's in trouble because ridership now can't sustain the operational costs; Caltrain is overbuilt now and it is expecting a rescue from taxpayers. That rescue should be very limited and subject to improvements in defined and measurable operational improvements for safety and much lower subsidies than it currently is demanding. PCJB can't devise a plan based on the reality of 2018, ridership won't return to those levels without better safety and connectivity. The strategy to pursue frequency and to not elevate safety to a top priority doesn't deserve public support.

Perhaps a 5 year tax increase will be more suitable and allow for accountability regarding Board and Caltrain Performance. The present plan should be rejected; the Board hasn't organized any benchmarks to perform to, and it hasn't properly prioritized safety, fiscal prudence, or operational improvements as to connectivity.

I attach an analysis and plan for action below. It will take 60 seconds to grasp.

With respect,

John

John Melnychuk
3707 Lindero Dr
Palo Alto, CA 94306

(650) 906-5656
jdmelnichuk@icloud.com

Caltrain Funding: Executive Summary

\$10 Fare → ~\$30 Cost → ~\$20 Taxpayer Subsidy (~70%)

If taxpayers fund 70% of each ride, they deserve 100% accountability.

Why Challenge the Board's Proposal

Caltrain remains vital, but its current model is not sustainable. Ridership has not recovered to the pre-COVID growth assumptions that supported major capital plans. The system now operates with roughly 70% subsidy per rider, after a period of expensive capital programs, delays, disputes, and weak integration with other transit providers. The Board's 14-year tax proposal should be replaced with a **5-year funding measure** tied to measurable improvements in safety, fiscal performance, and regional connectivity.

Risk Context: Everyday Vehicles vs. Caltrain

System	Weight	Speed	Controls
Cars / Trucks	3,000–5,000 lbs	20 mph in school zones	Traffic signals, roadway rules, enforcement
Caltrain	~1,000,000 lbs	Up to 79 mph	Incomplete systemwide physical protection

Safety Must Be Proactive, Not Reactive

Safety improvements have too often followed tragedies instead of preventing them. A corridor operating roughly 104 trains per day through cities needs a Board-led, corridor-wide safety agenda—not piecemeal responses after deaths or collisions.

Conditions for a 5-Year Ballot Measure

Category	Required measurable commitment
Funding compromise	Replace a 14-year tax increase with a 5-year ballot measure . Renewal should depend on published performance results.
Safety by FY2031	Upgrade all level crossings with quad gates and related protections by the close of FY2031. Start with the locations associated with the most deaths; prioritize remaining crossings by collision history.
Quiet Zones	Implement Quiet Zones and other enhanced protections first in the highest-risk locations, including communities affected by repeated tragic teen suicides.
Fiscal target	Improve fiscal performance so riders are subsidized at roughly 40% , not 70%, through better ridership capture, operating discipline, and stronger connections to other systems.
Integration	Publish measurable targets for easier transfers with BART, SamTrans, VTA, ACE, and Muni, plus a clear plan for simple airport access and employer partnerships.
Board accountability	Require annual public reporting. Missing agreed targets should trigger formal Board review, leadership evaluation, and suspension of executive performance bonuses tied to unmet goals.

Bottom Line: Don't grant a 14-year blank check. Approve a 5-year measure with measurable safety, integration, and fiscal targets—and hold the Board accountable for delivering them.

From: [James Velzy](#)
To: [Caltrain BOD Public Support](#)
Cc: [Board \(@caltrain.com\)](#)
Subject: Re: Administrative Review Status, Velzy
Date: Thursday, April 2, 2026 10:05:18 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from cowslikeus@gmail.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.

Thank you for your assistance.

-James Velzy

On Wed, Apr 1, 2026 at 10:56 AM Caltrain BOD Public Support <CaltrainBODPublicSupport@caltrain.com> wrote:

Dear James Velzy,

Thank you for your message regarding Citation #51000612. This citation has been dismissed in the interest of justice.

We apologize for the delay in resolution and appreciate your patience.

Sincerely,

Your Caltrain BOD Public Support Team

From: Board (@[caltrain.com](#)) <Board@caltrain.com>

Sent: Tuesday, March 31, 2026 11:27 AM

To: Caltrain BOD Public Support <CaltrainBODPublicSupport@caltrain.com>

Subject: FW: Administrative Review Status, Velzy

From: James Velzy <cowslikeus@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, March 31, 2026 6:26:29 PM (UTC+00:00) Monrovia, Reykjavik

To: Board (@[caltrain.com](#)) <Board@caltrain.com>

Subject: Administrative Review Status, Velzy

Some people who received this message don't often get email from cowslikeus@gmail.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.

I am writing to check the status of my Administrative Review Request. The status has not been updated since October 2025. Attached is a photo of the citation, my feedback submission and a screenshot of my Clipper card the day of the citation. See below:

===== PERSONAL INFORMATION =====

Date/Time : 10/13/2025 12:04:43 PM

Last Name : VELZY

First Name : JAMES

Home Address : [120 DIMOND ST](#)
[SANTA CRUZ CA 95060](#)
[US](#)

Phone : 279-300-6130 ext:

E-Mail: cowslikeus@gmail.com

===== CITATION INFORMATION =====

Citation/Ticket Number: 51000612

License/Vin: 91JVE216 CA

Issue date : 10/08/2025 13:10:00

Reason for contesting:

I loaded \$20 on my Clipper card app to ride from San Jose Diridon to Millbrae. I tapped my iPhone to a kiosk reader outside the train, it made a beep noise, and I did not see an error message on the screen. I tried to pay once the attendant told me I hadn't tapped on. I was not attempting to evade a fare; I am just unfamiliar with the use of these Clipper card readers, and I guess my tap didn't go through. I will be sure to double-check the app and the reader before entering the train going forward.