JPB Board of Directors
Meeting of June 4, 2026

Correspondence as of May 8, 2026

#	Subject
1.	Re: Complaint and concern by daily commuter between San Jose and San Francisco – *Staff Response*
2.	Re: Frequent 511 Braking & Delays – *Staff Response*
3.	FW: WORLD biggest fandom BTS ARMY
4.	Improving Caltrain crew labor efficiency for significant cost savings
5.	Caltrain Safety Procedures

From: Caltrain BOD Public Support
To: itsontime@gmail.com
Cc: Board (@caltrain.com)
Subject: Re: Complaint and concern by daily commuter between San Jose and San Francisco
Date: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 3:01:15 PM

Dear Marvin Florentino,

Thank you for contacting us and for sharing your experience on the northbound Train 511 Express.

We're sorry to hear about the repeated disruptions you experienced, including the two unexpected stops and the delayed arrival into San Francisco 4th and King Station at 9:52am.

We understand how frustrating and disruptive this is for a daily commute from San Jose Diridon, especially when delays feel recurring. Your report has been documented and forwarded to our operations and maintenance teams for review and investigation into the cause of these service interruptions.

We appreciate you taking the time to share this, and we value your continued ridership.

Sincerely,
Your Caltrain BOD Public Support Team

From: Board (@caltrain.com) <BoardCaltrain@samtrans.com>
Sent: Friday, May 1, 2026 11:48 AM
To: Caltrain BOD Public Support <CaltrainBODPublicSupport@caltrain.com>
Subject: FW: Complaint and concern by daily commuter between San Jose and San Francisco

-----Original Message-----
From: Marvin Ruiz Florentino <itsontime@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, May 1, 2026 10:13 AM
To: Board (@caltrain.com) <BoardCaltrain@samtrans.com>
Cc: Public Comment <PublicComment@samtrans.com>
Subject: Complaint and concern by daily commuter between San Jose and San Francisco

Some people who received this message don't often get email from itsontime@gmail.com. Learn why this is important <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>

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: Caltrain BOD Public Support
To: ryanglobus@gmail.com
Cc: Board (@caltrain.com)
Subject: Re: Frequent 511 Braking & Delays
Date: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 3:12:18 PM

Dear Ryan Globus,

Thank you for taking the time to share your concerns regarding Train 511 and the repeated braking and delay events between San Jose Diridon Station and Sunnyvale Station.

We're very sorry to hear about the impact these delays have had on your commute and your husband's appointment. We understand how frustrating and disruptive it is when service reliability affects time-sensitive plans.

Your concerns about frequency, service reliability, and overall system readiness have been documented and will be shared with the appropriate technical and planning teams for investigation.

We appreciate your long-standing ridership and your willingness to share this detailed feedback.

Sincerely,

Your Caltrain BOD Public Support Team

From: Board (@caltrain.com) <board@caltrain.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 11:27 AM
To: Caltrain BOD Public Support <CaltrainBODPublicSupport@caltrain.com>
Subject: FW: Frequent 511 Braking & Delays

From: Ryan Globus <ryanglobus@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 6:27:24 PM (UTC+00:00) Monrovia, Reykjavik
To: Board (@caltrain.com) <board@caltrain.com>
Subject: Frequent 511 Braking & Delays

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: Jason Dayvault
To: Board (@caltrain.com)
Subject: FW: WORLD biggest fandom BTS ARMY
Date: Thursday, May 7, 2026 7:44:11 AM

Recovered from Board@ Junk – DSO, please process. Thanks --JJD

From: MIl _Bochinche <mf17182772@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 7, 2026 1:32 AM
To: Board (@caltrain.com) <BoardCaltrain@samtrans.com>
Subject: WORLD biggest fandom BTS ARMY

Hello
We BTS ARMY kindly asking in many ways possible some cahave called some ha email asking for Caltrain to add the Caltrain Stop to Stanford stadium for concert days May 16-17 and 19
Please do your research this is the biggest fandom in the WORLD there it not only locals but international fans coming to the bay some asking about transportation be aware of it and help Bay Area good representation in transport thank you BTS ARMY

From: Adrian Brandt
To: Board (@caltrain.com)
Subject: Improving Caltrain crew labor efficiency for significant cost savings
Date: Thursday, May 7, 2026 9:04:44 AM

Caltrain currently uses 3-man crews: 1 engineer and 2 conductors.

When an assistant conductor is unavailable, trains already are run with only 1 conductor — but without cost savings, because the solo conductor receives the missing assistant conductor's pay in addition to their own.

Due to the projected $75m (average) annual budget shortfall Caltrain faces, it is time for a serious examination of transitioning Caltrain to European-style train 2-man crew labor efficiency such as UTA's FrontRunner commuter rail system in Utah uses.

What would it take to transition to 2-man crews augmented by dedicated roving fare enforcement teams to possibly save as much as $10 million in annual operating cost?

Under current FRA rules, Caltrain would *not* need special FRA permission to go from today's typical 3-person crews (1 engineer + 1 conductor + 1 assistant conductor) down to 2-person crews (1 engineer + 1 conductor), because FRA's current minimum is generally just two certified operating crewmembers.

So the main barriers are not federal crew-size regulations. They are mostly:

1. collective bargaining agreements,
2. operating practices,
3. platform/door procedures,
4. and emergency-response staffing assumptions.

The key issue is that Caltrain's current staffing model is heavily influenced by labor agreements and legacy operating practices. A commonly cited crew-consist rule has historically required:

- 1 engineer,
- 1 conductor,
- plus 1 assistant conductor for shorter trains,
  with additional assistant conductors for longer consists.

By contrast, systems like Utah's FrontRunner commonly operate with:

- 1 engineer,
- 1 conductor,
  with the conductor handling:
- door control,
- fare inspection,
- ADA assistance,

- train protection duties,
- and passenger management.

For Caltrain to move to that model, the biggest required changes would likely be:

1. Renegotiate union crew-consist agreements

This is probably the single biggest hurdle.

The assistant-conductor position is generally protected by collective bargaining agreements between the operator and the train-service unions. The FRA does not require assistant conductors on commuter trains; those positions are typically contractual.

Caltrain (through its operator) would need to negotiate:

- elimination or reduction of assistant-conductor minimums,
- revised work rules,
- reassignment or attrition plans,
- compensation adjustments,
- and likely productivity tradeoffs.

Historically in U.S. railroading, crew reductions almost always happen through bargaining, buyouts, attrition, or arbitration — not unilateral management action.

2. Redesign door-operation procedures

This is operationally significant.

On Caltrain today, conductors are distributed through the train partly because:

- platforms vary in length,
- passenger loads are uneven,
- bicycles require supervision,
- and selective door opening sometimes occurs.

A 2-person crew likely would require:

- centralized door controls,
- more platform CCTV coverage,
- improved mirrors/monitors,
- stricter stopping precision,
- and procedures allowing one conductor to visually verify safe boarding/alighting for the whole train.

Electrification and the new Stadler KISS EMUs help here because:

- visibility is better,
- diagnostics are better,
- doors are more automated,
- and the trains are designed for more modern commuter operations.

3. Change fare enforcement philosophy

Caltrain still relies heavily on onboard inspection.

With only one conductor aboard:

- full-train fare checking becomes harder,
- especially on crowded peak runs.

Many lower-staffed systems compensate by shifting toward:

- proof-of-payment enforcement,
- roving inspection teams,
- or station-based inspection.

That exact debate has already appeared in Caltrain discussions around electrification and operating-cost reduction.

4. Rework emergency-response assumptions

A second onboard train-service employee is valuable during:

- medical emergencies,
- evacuations,
- disabled trains,
- grade-crossing strikes,
- passenger disturbances,
- fires/smoke events,
- and ADA assistance.

To justify fewer onboard crew, Caltrain would likely need:

- revised emergency procedures,
- faster supervisor response capability,
- improved communications,
- and confidence that one conductor can manage a full 7-car EMU train while the engineer remains in the cab.

5. Possibly change state or agency policy

Even if federally legal and contractually negotiated, there may still be:

- board policy issues,
- political resistance,
- public concerns,
- or state-level labor pressure.

California transit politics are generally less favorable to labor reductions than in some other states.

So in practical terms:

Requirement	Needed to reach 2-person crews?
FRA waiver	No, generally not
PTC installed	Already yes
Union agreement changes	Yes, likely essential
New operating procedures	Yes
Door-monitoring modernization	Probably
Reduced onboard fare-check expectations	Likely
Emergency-plan revisions	Yes
New rolling stock	Already mostly achieved via electrification

What are best train crewing practices to minimize labor cost and maximize labor efficiency on proof-of-payment systems in Europe? How are dedicated roving fare inspector teams used to facilitate this?

The dominant European "best practice" for regional rail labor efficiency is generally:

- 1 driver (engineer),
- zero or one onboard train manager/conductor depending on service type,
- proof-of-payment (POP) fare collection,
- and separate mobile fare-inspection teams that are not assigned permanently to specific trains.

The key idea is that fare inspection becomes a *network-wide random enforcement function* instead of a train-by-train onboard staffing function.

That fundamentally changes labor productivity.

On many European regional rail systems, the onboard crew's primary role is operations and passenger safety — not universal ticket checking. Instead, roving inspection teams create uncertainty about inspection probability across the network.

Typical European regional rail staffing patterns look roughly like this:

Operating model	Typical crew
Legacy/conventional commuter rail	Driver + onboard conductor
Modern regional rail (medium ridership)	Driver only or driver + train manager

High-frequency S-Bahn/RER style	Driver only
Intercity/high-speed	Driver + train manager/service staff

The labor-efficiency advantage comes from three major changes.

1. Fare inspection is decoupled from train staffing

North American commuter railroads often staff each train for:

- ticket checking,
- door operation,
- passenger supervision,
- and revenue protection.

European POP systems instead separate:

- operations staff,
- revenue enforcement staff,
- and station/customer-service staff.

That means:

- a fare inspector may inspect 10–20 trains per shift,
- instead of being tied to a single train all day.

This dramatically improves labor utilization.

The academic literature on POP systems specifically emphasizes optimizing:

- “how many inspectors,”
- “how to distribute inspectors,”
- and inspection scheduling efficiency.

The economic principle is that:

- full onboard checking everywhere is expensive,
- but fully random inspection with meaningful penalties can achieve nearly comparable compliance at much lower labor cost.

2. Roving inspection teams are highly mobile and unpredictable

European systems typically use inspectors in:

- pairs,
- small squads,
- or mixed security/revenue teams.

These teams:

- board trains at random,
- inspect several cars,
- then disembark and transfer to another train.

Inspection locations and timing are intentionally unpredictable.

The goal is maximizing *perceived inspection probability* rather than physically checking every passenger.

Common practices include:

- hotspot deployment at known evasion corridors,
- surge inspections after major events,
- station exit inspections,
- plainclothes inspectors,
- algorithmic/randomized scheduling,
- and coordinated inspections with transit police.

German S-Bahn systems, Dutch regional rail, Swiss regional rail, Austrian regional trains, and many French TER systems all use variations of this model.

Reddit discussions from European riders also note that:

- conductors may be absent or rarely visible,
- while separate “security and service” or inspection teams move network-wide between trains.

3. Door operations are automated or driver-controlled

A major labor saving in Europe comes from eliminating conductor-based dispatch.

Common European practices:

- driver-controlled doors,
- platform mirrors or CCTV,
- automatic selective door opening,
- standardized platforms,
- and centralized dispatch systems.

This allows:

- “driver-only operation” (DOO),
- or “one-person operation” (OPO).

On regional rail, some systems still carry a train manager for:

- accessibility assistance,
- disruptions,
- security presence,

- and occasional ticket inspection.

But critically:

- the train manager is *not required* for every train movement.

That flexibility allows staffing to scale with ridership and service type.

For example:

- busy airport or late-night trains may get onboard staff,
- while midday suburban trains operate driver-only.

Why this is much more labor-efficient than U.S. commuter rail

The North American commuter model evolved around:

- manual fare collection,
- conductors punching tickets,
- crew-based dispatch,
- and FRA operating traditions.

That creates poor labor productivity because:

- every train requires a full onboard revenue staff,
- regardless of passenger count.

European POP systems instead treat inspection statistically.

Instead of:

“Every rider must be checked”

the philosophy becomes:

“Enough riders must believe they *might* be checked.”

That allows:

- much smaller inspection workforces,
- fewer onboard staff,
- and higher passenger-to-employee ratios.

How inspection staffing is optimized

Research on POP systems focuses heavily on:

- optimal inspection probability,
- inspector allocation,

- and diminishing returns from excessive staffing.

A common finding is:

- once inspection rates reach a certain threshold,
- additional inspectors yield rapidly diminishing revenue benefit.

So efficient systems aim for:

- strategic randomness,
- high visibility,
- fast redeployment,
- and substantial penalties.

Large fines are essential to the model.

European POP systems often impose:

- immediate penalty fares,
- identity checks,
- escalating penalties,
- and occasionally police involvement.

What this would imply for Caltrain-type operations

A European-style labor-efficiency model for a regional railroad like Caltrain would likely involve:

Function	European-style approach
Train operation	1 engineer
Door control	Engineer-controlled
Fare checking	Separate mobile POP teams
Passenger assistance	Station staff + mobile supervisors
Security	Roving teams/transit police
Revenue enforcement	Dedicated inspectors
Routine onboard crew	Reduced or eliminated

That could theoretically reduce:

- onboard labor-hours per train-mile,
- especially on lightly loaded off-peak trains.

But there are major U.S.-specific obstacles:

- FRA two-person crew rules,
- union agreements,
- ADA expectations,
- liability concerns,
- platform geometry,
- long train lengths,
- and political resistance to reducing onboard staff.

So in practice, the most likely North American adaptation is:

- 2-person crews (engineer + conductor),
- with conductors focused on operations/safety,
- and fare enforcement shifted increasingly to mobile POP teams.

That is probably the closest realistic analogue to modern European regional rail practice under current U.S. regulatory conditions.

(Credit & thanks to ChatGPT for the foregoing overview)

From: CaltrainRider
To: Board (@caltrain.com)
Subject: Caltrain Safety Procedures
Date: Friday, May 8, 2026 10:32:25 AM

Caltrain Board,

I am reaching out to raise a concern regarding safety procedures on Caltrain.

I recently experienced a situation on Caltrain where I was followed by another passenger across multiple train cars and seat changes. I ultimately had to rely on another passenger that I approached while feeling unsafe to help me exit the train safely and without being followed. Together, we approached a Caltrain employee for assistance; however, I did not feel the urgency of the situation was fully understood, and there did not appear to be a clear safety protocol in place for this type of incident.

Proactive safety procedures and appropriate staff training can make a significant difference in preventing escalation. I urge Caltrain to consider implementing clearer rider safety protocols, including:

- training staff on how to respond to passenger safety concerns
- helping to coordinate a safe exit
- posting signage explaining what to do if a rider feels unsafe
- providing discreet ways for riders to contact staff or transit police (text lines instead of phone calls where the complaint can be overheard, QR codes, etc.)

I am submitting this feedback in hopes that future riders who encounter potentially threatening behavior will have a clearer understanding of their options for immediate support and will receive active assistance if they seek help. I believe BART has already implemented some of these measures such as the text message reporting of safety concerns. For example, see this link for BART's guidance and approach to this issue.

I'm happy to discuss this further. Since this correspondence may become public, I've omitted my full name from this email.

Thank you,

Brooke