



JPB Board of Directors
Meeting of May 7, 2026

Correspondence as of May 6, 2026

Subject

1. Re: Board Correspondence - Orlando Nell - Re: Formal Complaint Regarding Fare Enforcement Inconsistencies, Clipper Card System Malfunction, and Refusal of Federally Issued Identification – *Staff Response*
2. Public Comment: Complaint and concern by daily commuter between San Jose and San Francisco
3. Request for clarification regarding Work Directive structure and oversight
4. May 7 Item #16 Public Comment (South County Connector Caltrain Service)
5. Frequent 511 Braking & Delays
6. Re: Public Comment - Bullet Trains after the Giants Games– *Staff Response*



BOARD OF DIRECTORS 2026

RICO E. MEDINA, CHAIR
PAT BURT, VICE CHAIR
MARGARET ABE-KOGA
DAVID CANEPA
DAVID COHEN
JEFF GEE
STEVE HEMINGER
GREG WAGNER
SHAMANN WALTON

MICHELLE BOUCHARD
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

April 27, 2026

Orlando Nell
10 Martin Ln
Woodside CA 94062-366

Subject: Formal Complaint Regarding Fare Enforcement Inconsistencies, Clipper Card System Malfunction, and Refusal of Federally Issued Identification

Dear Mr. Nell

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 letter regarding your recent experience on Caltrain. We appreciate you taking the time to share your concerns.

We are sorry to hear about the interaction you described with onboard staff. Caltrain expects all employees to conduct fare inspections professionally and respectfully. Your feedback has been forwarded to our operations and management teams for review.

We also understand your frustration regarding the Clipper card issue and the resulting citation. Equipment reliability is critical, and instances where devices malfunction can create unnecessary stress for riders. Your comments regarding the handling of malfunction claims and the burden placed on customers have been shared with the appropriate departments for evaluation, including fare policy and customer service procedures.

Regarding your concerns about identification requirements, Caltrain's policies are intended to support fare enforcement while respecting customer rights. We acknowledge your perspective and will include your feedback as part of ongoing internal discussions about policy clarity, consistency, and customer experience.

PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD
1250 San Carlos Avenue
San Carlos, CA 94070-1306 (650) 508-6200

April 27, 2026

Page 2 of 2

While we are unable to reverse citations through this correspondence, we encourage you to continue working through the formal appeals process if you have not already done so. Your broader concerns, however, have been documented and elevated for internal review.

Thank you again for bringing these matters to our attention. We value your feedback and are committed to improving both our service and our customer interactions.

Sincerely,

Your Caltrain BOD Public Support Team

From: [Marvin Ruiz Florentino](#)
To: [Board \(@caltrain.com\)](#)
Cc: [Public Comment](#)
Subject: Complaint and concern by daily commuter between San Jose and San Francisco
Date: Friday, May 1, 2026 10:12:50 AM

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

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to express my frustration regarding the consistent service issues with the 511 Express northbound train from San Jose to San Francisco.

As a daily commuter, I have frequently experienced abrupt shutdowns and persistent delays on this route. For instance, today we had two abrupt stops along the way and we arrived in San Francisco at 9:52 am (30 minutes late).

For the sake of passenger safety and customer satisfaction, I request that this train be removed from service for necessary repairs and replaced with a reliable substitute until these issues are resolved.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Best regards,

Marvin Florentino

-Marvin

From: [Chrissy Field](#)
To: [Board \(@caltrain.com\)](#)
Subject: Request for clarification regarding Work Directive structure and oversight
Date: Sunday, May 3, 2026 5:02:44 PM
Attachments: [publickey - chrissyfield@protonmail.com - 0x739DB4CF.asc](#)
[signature.asc](#)

Dear Members of the Board,

As Caltrain has been seeking additional funding to address a projected operating shortfall of approximately \$75 million beginning in fiscal year 2027, as discussed at the April 2, 2026 Board meeting, I took a closer look at publicly available contract records to better understand how certain consulting engagements are structured within the agency.

In doing so, I came across a recent consulting Work Directive (WDPR 12198) that appears to allocate approximately \$1.4 million over a period of about six months (April–September 2026) for a role described as a full-time (1.0 FTE) position associated with design and construction leadership functions.

This Work Directive appears to follow a series of prior Work Directives involving the same individual, spanning multiple years and including roles with similar program management and capital delivery responsibilities. Several of these prior directives appear to have been active during overlapping periods and to involve related or evolving scopes of work.

Available records raise two additional concerns: (1) that this more recent Work Directive may be supported through remaining or reallocated funds associated with previously approved budgets, including contingency allocations tied to earlier and, in some cases, different scopes of work; and (2) that services associated with capital program functions may be funded, at least in part, through operating budget sources.

In light of the agency's projected operating deficit beginning in fiscal year 2027, it may be helpful to understand how such funding decisions are made and how they are evaluated within the agency's broader financial planning and resource allocation processes.

Given the scale and structure of this most recent directive, I respectfully request clarification on the following:

- How a single full-time role is structured across multiple Work Directives over time, particularly where prior directives may overlap in scope and duration
- How scope changes and extensions are evaluated and approved when drawing from previously authorized funding or contingency allocations
- How total compensation and level of effort are assessed across multiple

directives associated with a single role

- How funding sources (including operating versus capital budgets) are determined for roles performing capital program functions
- How these practices align with the agency's overall financial planning, particularly in light of the projected operating deficit beginning in fiscal year 2027

Finally, given the magnitude of the most recent Work Directive relative to its duration, it may also be helpful to understand how such consulting arrangements are evaluated in comparison to alternative staffing approaches and how these decisions are reviewed from a cost-effectiveness and oversight perspective.

I am raising this for the Board's awareness and would appreciate any clarification or information you are able to provide regarding these practices.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Best,

A concerned Caltrain rider and San Mateo County taxpayer

From: [Council Member Zachary Hilton](#)
To: [Public Comment](#)
Cc: [Board \(@caltrain.com\)](#)
Subject: May 7 Item #16 Public Comment (South County Connector Caltrain Service)
Date: Tuesday, May 5, 2026 10:03:13 AM
Attachments: [CM Zach Hilton South County Caltrain Service-9.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 sender. Do not open attachments or click on links from unknown senders.
Caltrain Board,

Public Comment Letter attached for May 7 Item #16 Public Comment **(South County Connector Caltrain Service)**

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



ZACH HILTON

Gilroy City Council Member

Livable Gilroy for All

May 5, 2026

Caltrain South County Connector

I've seen the **March Caltrain South County Connector** ridership numbers (**Monday-Friday 4 Trains North in morning and 4 Trains South in evening**) Gilroy 115 riders/day, San Martin 46 riders/day, Morgan Hill 154 riders/day, Blossom Hill 95 riders/day, Capitol 50 riders/day. It's not fiscally responsible to fund Caltrain South County Connector at **\$15 million for 460 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 (~\$75 million annual structural deficit) that can only be solved by taking a State Loan. 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 2025 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. **South County Connector riders don't relieve traffic congestion as they represent 0.3% of the 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 460 riders/day M-F. I am proud to represent Gilroy on the Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) and Caltrain Local Policy Maker Group (Alternate) (LPMG) in 2026.

Sincerely,



Zach Hilton

Gilroy City Council Member

www.zachhilton.com

#HiltonForCouncil @zachhilton_ca

From: [Ryan Globus](#)
To: [Board \(@caltrain.com\)](#)
Subject: Frequent 511 Braking & Delays
Date: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 11:27:41 AM

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

To the Caltrain Board of Directors,

I take Caltrain 511 several days a week to commute to work. Over the past several weeks, Caltrain 511 has hit the brakes and stopped for a long time between San Jose and Sunnyvale. These delays put me at risk of being late to work. Today, my husband joined me on 511 and is now at risk of being late to his doctor's appointment.

I've been a regular Caltrain rider for over 15 years, but if these delays continue, I may have to start driving to work to ensure I arrive on time.

What is Caltrain doing to fix these PTC issues? When can riders expect this issue to be fixed? This is unacceptable given EMUs have been in service for over a year and Caltrain is asking taxpayers for more money this fall.

Thanks,
Ryan Globus
San Jose resident

From: [Caltrain BOD Public Support](#)
To: mguiney@stgregs-sanmateo.org
Cc: [Public Comment](#)
Subject: Re: Public Comment - Bullet Trains after the Giants Games
Date: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 11:49:50 AM

Dear Melissa Guiney,

Thank you for your feedback regarding post-game service.

We would like to share the following information from our operations team regarding the current Giants post-game train service:

“This season Caltrain is providing an additional train after all Giants games except weekday afternoon games (pre 4pm). When deciding how best to serve the Giants post-game riders, the two priorities were travel time and access. During last season, a larger than expected proportion of riders alighted at South San Francisco and San Bruno stations, meaning that returning to an express format would prevent these riders from taking the train. Staff conducted a travel time evaluation and found that a local EMU reaches Millbrae only three minutes behind the old Diesel Millbrae express. By San Mateo the travel time is equal at 28 minutes, and by Sunnyvale the local EMU would be 11 minutes ahead. An EMU Millbrae express would be about 5 minutes quicker than a local, but as mentioned, would prevent a sizeable portion of riders from taking advantage of the extra train. Staff are actively monitoring the service, and your feedback is greatly appreciated as we work to improve in the future.”

We appreciate you taking the time to share your perspective, and we will continue to monitor ridership patterns and service performance to ensure we are balancing travel time and access effectively.

Sincerely,

Your Caltrain BOD Public Support Team

From: Melissa Guiney <mguiney@stgregs-sanmateo.org>
Sent: Wednesday, April 22, 2026 10:39 AM
To: Public Comment <publiccomment@caltrain.com>
Subject: Public Comment - Bullet Trains after the Giants Games

You don't often get email from mguiney@stgregs-sanmateo.org. [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 Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board,
How come now that we have electric trains, we have fewer trains bringing people home after a Giants Game.

You want people to use Public Transportation, but make it so long for people to get home. I live in San Mateo and feel the pain. I can't imagine living in Sunnyvale or farther south, trying to get home at a decent time after a game.

My family has season tickets, and the cost of a round-trip train ticket is expensive enough for us to go, and then we have really long, unpleasant rides home. The faster you can get me off a rowdy train, the better for my safety and peace of mind.

We used to drive to San Carlos to park and take the bullet train home. Then there was a first stop in San Bruno. Now there are no options. All Trains and "special trains" make all stops.

Thanks for considering my comment,

--

Melissa Guiney