



JPB Board of Directors
Meeting of April 2, 2020

Correspondence as of April 3, 2020

Subject

- 1 Masks Question
- 2 Shut Down Suggestion
- 3 No More Sales Tax Increases
- 4 CalTrain Conductors Closing Cars
- 5 Public Comment Emailed In for 4/2 Meeting
- 6 Q&A Read During 4/2 Meeting

From: [Ryan K. Snow](#)
To: [Public Comment](#)
Subject: MASKS
Date: Wednesday, April 1, 2020 8:35:53 PM

Are there any plans to supply Operating Crews with Masks to limit exposure to themselves and the General Public?

Ryan K. Snow, State Chairman
California State Legislative Board
Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers & Trainmen
Teamsters Rail Conference
1207 Front Street # 20
Sacramento Ca. 95814
530-823-7510 Office
530-823-7215 Fax
661-319-0824 Cell

D.V.

This message is covered by the Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. §§ 2510-2521, and is legally privileged. This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient or the person responsible for delivering the email to the intended recipient, please be advised that you have received this email in error and that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing, or copying of this email and any file attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please immediately notify us by reply email to the sender. Please delete this email and its attachments from your system and do not retain any copies.

From: [Kevin Burke](#)
To: [Board \(@caltrain.com\)](#); [adina.levin@friendsofcaltrain.com](#); [sebastian.petty@caltrain.com](#); [BusinessPlan@caltrain.com](#)
Subject: Consider shutting everything down and building every grade separation
Date: Thursday, April 2, 2020 12:04:05 PM

Hi,

A vaccine for coronavirus is still over a year away, and Caltrain ridership is at record lows. It is not clear when we will be able to let things go back to normal; I don't think they will for another year. Unemployment claims are also at a record high.

I think now would be a good time to consider shutting down Caltrain for three to six months and building ten to twelve grade separations, in parallel.

Building grade separations with the rail line shut down is a lot cheaper than building them with the train line active - you can work around the clock. It will also help put people back to work. Cities could build them for a fraction of the cost.

This would require a bus bridge for 3-6 months. However, car volumes on ECR are also down. SamTrans is hitting record on time performance. This is the best possible time for a bus bridge.

Freight volumes are also probably down. You could consider buying out Union Pacific's track rights. Without Union Pacific, you could build the grade separation at Broadway or through Redwood City at a 3-5% grade, instead of at a 1% grade. This would also help reduce the amount of elevated track section, and costs to construct the project.

Kevin

From: [Bill Hough](#)
To: [Public Comment](#)
Cc: board.secretary@vta.org; BoardOperations@cob.sccgov.org
Subject: NO more sales tax increases
Date: Thursday, April 2, 2020 12:07:20 PM

I am writing in my capacity as a voter and taxpayer residing in Santa Clara County. I was shocked to read in the *San Francisco Chronicle* that Caltrain, the agency with an overpaid CEO, is proposing ANOTHER sales tax increase. Vote NO. Over the last several elections, voters in Santa Clara County have passed multiple tax and fee increases including gas taxes, 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. 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.

It is time to reconsider transportation finance. The last thing we need right now is another bump in the sales tax. When the virus scare began, the congestion problem went away when companies began encouraging staff to work from home at least part of the time. Let's encourage more working at home when the virus scare is over. This tax would not be necessary if there were not as much demand.

From: [D.Franke](#)
To: [Board \(@caltrain.com\)](mailto:Board (@caltrain.com))
Subject: Caltrain Conductors Closing Cars During COVID-19
Date: Thursday, April 2, 2020 4:37:40 PM

My name is Bernard Franke. I am a reporter for KIQI here in San Francisco. I have recorded several conductors, on several trains, closing off cars to passengers; thereby, constricting passengers' available, physical space.

When approached, the conductors have become aggressive, lied, or evasive.

What is Caltrain's position on this?

I look forward to your response.

Thank you.

Bernard Franke

From: [Board \(@caltrain.com\)](mailto:Board (@caltrain.com))
To: [Board \(@caltrain.com\)](mailto:Board (@caltrain.com))
Subject: RE: Response Caltrain Board email from a KIQI a reporter FW: Caltrain Conductors Closing Cars During COVID-19
Date: Friday, April 3, 2020 4:32:38 PM

Dear Mr. Franke,

This was an unauthorized activity. No direction has been given to train crews at this time to close off cars, unless there is a mechanical issue. The crews responsible will be disciplined, and it has been made clear that this is not to happen again. We apologize for the inconvenience, and I ask that you reach out to me directly with train number and station you boarded if you observe this happening again. Thanks for reaching out.

Dan Lieberman
Public Affairs Specialist
Caltrain/SamTrans/SMCTA
O: (650) 508-6385

From: D Frank <frankebernard@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 2, 2020 4:37 PM
To: Board (@caltrain.com) <BoardCaltrain@samtrans.com>
Subject: Caltrain Conductors Closing Cars During COVID-19

My name is Bernard Franke. I am a reporter for KIQI here in San Francisco. I have recorded several conductors, on several traons, closing off cars to passengers; thereby, constricting passengers' available, physical space.

When approached, the conductors have become aggressive, lied, or evasive.

What is Caltrain's position on this?

I look forward to your response.

Thank you.

Bernard Franke

From: [Roland Lebrun](#)
To: [Board \(@caltrain.com\)](#)
Cc: [Public Comment](#); [Steve Stamos, Clerk of the Board](#); [VTA Board Secretary](#); [SFCTA CAC](#); [cacsecretary \(@caltrain.com\)](#); [Caltrain, Bac \(@caltrain.com\)](#); [MTC-ABAG](#); [CHSRA Board](#)
Subject: Roland Lebrun public comments
Date: Thursday, April 2, 2020 1:32:57 AM

Dear Chair Pine and Board members,

Here are my comments for the April 2nd Board meeting.

I look forward to the opportunity to address the Board in person pursuant to Government Code Section 54954.3

https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=GOV§ionNum=54954.3.

Law section - California

54954.3. (a) Every agenda for regular meetings shall provide an opportunity for members of the public to directly address the legislative body on any item of interest to the public, before or during the legislative body's consideration of the item, that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the legislative body, provided that no action shall be taken on any item not appearing on the ...

leginfo.legislature.ca.gov

Item 3 General public comment

SB797 as currently written is inequitable. Specifically, Santa Clara County is expected to contribute approximately \$6M/year more than San Francisco and San Mateo counties combined but half of Santa Clara County does not get viable Caltrain service.

A more equitable solution could be to allocate a minimum percentage of tax revenues to the agency for Operations & Maintenance (O&M) and State Of Good Repair (SOGR) but each county's surplus would go back to the county for local capital projects such as the Downtown Extension (DTX) in San Francisco or Diridon and double-tracking to Gilroy in Santa Clara County.

This model follows AB1847 which proposes that 20% of revenues go the Regional Housing Agency and the remaining 80% go back to the originating counties.

Presentation: <https://mtc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=8195839&GUID=E62BC193-E3AA-4C1C-9754-2B73EA234EB6>

Video: http://baha.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=1&clip_id=6822&meta_id=158801

Please note that AB1847's legislative effort is driven by ABAG while Caltrain sales tax legislation should be driven by MTC whose Chair has indicated a preference for supporting transportation measures over housing measures.

Item 4 Consent

4.d Caltrain Business Plan

Slide 7 shows that 20 years and \$30B later an express train will take 5 minutes longer than a diesel baby bullet train did 10 years ago or more than twice as long as the 30-minute Prop1A mandate codified in Streets & Highways Code section 2704.09(b)(3)

https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=SHC§ionNum=2704.09

4.e Revenues and expenses

Shows expenses increasing at the same rate as revenues in February (\$6M over FY19). The question is whether expenses will decrease at the same rate as revenues in March and April and, if not, how we will fund the shortfall.

6 Report of the Executive Director

6.b PCEP Monthly Progress Report

The first EMU trainset was exempt from Buy America. It was scheduled to arrive at the JPB on 07/29/2019.

Revised schedule is 02/26/2021

“TASI may not have sufficient number of signal maintainers for testing”

Each grade crossing needs 2 flaggers (one on each side) x 42 grade crossings X 3 shifts (total 252 flaggers).

Are we seriously considering increasing the TASI headcount by 50%?

The Caltrain CAC was supposed to have a robust discussion about grade crossing activation, including how the proposed so-called “two-speed check” (AKA “2SC”) “solution” will work at speeds in excess of 80 MPH. The question is why this meeting was canceled instead of being teleconferenced?

Why are we flying people to Salt Lake City for meetings instead of teleconferencing?

Why is the Salt Lake City 2/3rd of a mile “test track” being constructed after the first trainset?

Tunnel modifications are \$30M (300%) over budget

Anne Richman does not represent MTC (she retired from MTC 6 months ago)

7.A 25th Avenue Grade separation

Slide 7 in the Business Plan presentation shows passing tracks at Hillsdale and Hayward Park with a legend of “*Conceptual 4-track segment or station to be refined through further analysis and community engagement*” yet the additional two tracks are nowhere to be seen in the relocated Hillsdale station plan so the question is what is the Business “Plan”?

Are we seriously going to blow up the entire station after we are done blowing up \$200M on this project?

What about the new island (AKA “centerboard”) platform? How could a non-stopping train

possibly go through a station at more than 100 MPH with this kind of design?

12 Closed Session

This item is on the agenda because the PCEP is at least two years late. My only question, through the chair, is whether this cost overrun will be funded through PCEP contingency or some other source?

Sincerely,

Roland Lebrun

CC

MTC Commissioners

SFCTA Commissioners

VTA Board members

CHSRA Board members

SFCTA CAC

Caltrain CAC

Caltrain BAC

From: [Roland Lebrun](#)
To: [Board \(@caltrain.com\)](#)
Cc: [Public Comment](#); [Steve Stamos, Clerk of the Board](#); [VTA Board Secretary](#); [SFCTA CAC](#); [cacsecretary \(@caltrain.com\)](#); [Caltrain, Bac \(@caltrain.com\)](#); [MTC-ABAG](#); [CHSRA Board](#)
Subject: Roland Lebrun public comments
Date: Thursday, April 2, 2020 1:32:57 AM

Dear Chair Pine and Board members,

Here are my comments for the April 2nd Board meeting.

I look forward to the opportunity to address the Board in person pursuant to Government Code Section 54954.3

https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=GOV§ionNum=54954.3.

Law section - California

54954.3. (a) Every agenda for regular meetings shall provide an opportunity for members of the public to directly address the legislative body on any item of interest to the public, before or during the legislative body's consideration of the item, that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the legislative body, provided that no action shall be taken on any item not appearing on the ...

leginfo.legislature.ca.gov

Item 3 General public comment

SB797 as currently written is inequitable. Specifically, Santa Clara County is expected to contribute approximately \$6M/year more than San Francisco and San Mateo counties combined but half of Santa Clara County does not get viable Caltrain service.

A more equitable solution could be to allocate a minimum percentage of tax revenues to the agency for Operations & Maintenance (O&M) and State Of Good Repair (SOGR) but each county's surplus would go back to the county for local capital projects such as the Downtown Extension (DTX) in San Francisco or Diridon and double-tracking to Gilroy in Santa Clara County.

This model follows AB1847 which proposes that 20% of revenues go the Regional Housing Agency and the remaining 80% go back to the originating counties.

Presentation: <https://mtc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=8195839&GUID=E62BC193-E3AA-4C1C-9754-2B73EA234EB6>

Video: http://baha.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=1&clip_id=6822&meta_id=158801

Please note that AB1847's legislative effort is driven by ABAG while Caltrain sales tax legislation should be driven by MTC whose Chair has indicated a preference for supporting transportation measures over housing measures.

Item 4 Consent

4.d Caltrain Business Plan

Slide 7 shows that 20 years and \$30B later an express train will take 5 minutes longer than a diesel baby bullet train did 10 years ago or more than twice as long as the 30-minute Prop1A mandate codified in Streets & Highways Code section 2704.09(b)(3)
https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=SHC§ionNum=2704.09.

4.e Revenues and expenses

Shows expenses increasing at the same rate as revenues in February (\$6M over FY19). The question is whether expenses will decrease at the same rate as revenues in March and April and, if not, how we will fund the shortfall.

6 Report of the Executive Director

6.b PCEP Monthly Progress Report

The first EMU trainset was exempt from Buy America. It was scheduled to arrive at the JPB on 07/29/2019.

Revised schedule is 02/26/2021

“TASI may not have sufficient number of signal maintainers for testing”

Each grade crossing needs 2 flaggers (one on each side) x 42 grade crossings X 3 shifts (total 252 flaggers).

Are we seriously considering increasing the TASI headcount by 50%?

The Caltrain CAC was supposed to have a robust discussion about grade crossing activation, including how the proposed so-called “two-speed check” (AKA “2SC”) “solution” will work at speeds in excess of 80 MPH. The question is why this meeting was canceled instead of being teleconferenced?

Why are we flying people to Salt Lake City for meetings instead of teleconferencing?

Why is the Salt Lake City 2/3rd of a mile “test track” being constructed after the first trainset?

Tunnel modifications are \$30M (300%) over budget

Anne Richman does not represent MTC (she retired from MTC 6 months ago)

7.A 25th Avenue Grade separation

Slide 7 in the Business Plan presentation shows passing tracks at Hillsdale and Hayward Park with a legend of “*Conceptual 4-track segment or station to be refined through further analysis and community engagement*” yet the additional two tracks are nowhere to be seen in the relocated Hillsdale station plan so the question is what is the Business “Plan”?

Are we seriously going to blow up the entire station after we are done blowing up \$200M on this project?

What about the new island (AKA “centerboard”) platform? How could a non-stopping train

possibly go through a station at more than 100 MPH with this kind of design?

12 Closed Session

This item is on the agenda because the PCEP is at least two years late. My only question, through the chair, is whether this cost overrun will be funded through PCEP contingency or some other source?

Sincerely,

Roland Lebrun

CC

MTC Commissioners

SFCTA Commissioners

VTA Board members

CHSRA Board members

SFCTA CAC

Caltrain CAC

Caltrain BAC

From: [Adina Levin](#)
To: [Board \(@caltrain.com\)](#)
Cc: [Pine, Dave \[dpine@smcgov.org\]](#)
Subject: 4/3 Board Meeting - Public comment using Zoom
Date: Thursday, April 2, 2020 7:18:32 AM

Dear Caltrain board members and staff,

Thank you very much for hosting remote meetings and allowing public comment during this time of emergency.

In addition to taking written public comment, we are starting to see a number of jurisdictions use the features of Zoom for Public Comment.

Members of the public can be muted until the time comes for public comment, and can raise their hand using a Zoom feature. When called on, the clerk can unmute the speaker, and when their time is up they can be muted again.

Just yesterday, at the SamTrans board meeting, this method was used and worked every well

This has also worked well in jurisdictions including:

Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors
<https://www.sccgov.org/sites/bos/Pages/Meetings.aspx>

City of Milpitas
<https://twitter.com/StevenDLee/status/1242466290620461059/photo/1>

We would urge Caltrain to do the same to facilitate public input while meetings are being held remotely because of the Shelter In Place orders.

Thank you very much,

Adina
Adina Levin
Friends of Caltrain
<https://greencaltrain.com>
650-646-4344

From: [Andy Chow](#)
To: [Public Comment](#)
Subject: Agenda item 6a
Date: Thursday, April 2, 2020 8:56:12 AM

Unlike most disasters we faced in the region in the past, this pandemic has created damage and concern the impacts nearly everyone and every institutions. May be other than a labor strike, that there's an event would cause Caltrain ridership to drop probably around 90% and cause Caltrain to cut service (while very much justified) without having any formal planning procedures.

While CDC for a long time has recommend the use of face masks as a protective measure, there's growing sentiment that even use of cloth face masks would be better than none, given the risk of asymptomatic individuals unknowingly spreading the virus. In Asian countries, the wide spread use of face masks is collated with reduced growth of infection compared to US and European countries. I think that Caltrain should reconsider requiring/supplying face masks for front line workers, or at least not opposing front line workers wearing them (not sure whether it is a policy at Caltrain, but it is a policy at some other employers).

Andy Chow
Redwood City

From: [Adina Levin](#)
To: [Public Comment](#)
Subject: For General Public Comment
Date: Thursday, April 2, 2020 9:03:25 AM

This Adina Levin from Friends of Caltrain. As you may know, a key element of our mission is stable funding for Caltrain, as part of a regionally integrated public transportation system, accessible to all. While these are extremely uncertain times, it is good to see Caltrain's partners keep the option open for the SB787 ballot measure to provide stable funding for Caltrain and invest in increasing capacity, ridership, and traffic relief, with SamTrans as the first of the board members advancing it yesterday.

A number of you remember the very close vote with Measure W. As you know, we participated in a coalition of transit advocacy and environmental groups who provided input to shape the expenditure plan and then served as the grassroots arm of the campaign, marshalling over 100 volunteers to reach tens of thousands of voters through canvassing, phone and text-banking, as well as to decisively defeat Prop 6 in the Bay Area.

If SB797 moves forward, there is something that we would like to be able to support . The two things that we are looking for. First, equity in expenditures and policies. The resolution briefly mentions means-based fares as an equity measure, continuing Caltrain's participation in a regional means-based fare program. but Caltrain's equity study has more recommendations we would like to see incorporated.

Second, and not least, we see in the presentation on slide 17 that the measure is expected to transform the financial relationship of partners to Caltrain's budgets, eliminating contributions to annual operating/maintenance, and increasing contributions to major capital projects. However, these changes and the process to define them, are not mentioned in the resolution that the board is approving. We would want to see public recognition of these understandings and agreements, so that when we go out to engage voters, we're confident that the ballot measure will deliver the results that we're advertising, in terms of increased service, increased ridership, and reduced freeway congestion.

Q&A Read During April 2nd, 2020 JPB Board Meeting

aleta dupree 09:11 AM

Item 6, what is happening with the foundations?

boris 09:16 AM

so what is the total plan for responding to COVID-19

Roland 09:17 AM

I am also citing you with a violation of Executive Order N-35-20 which was issued on 3/21 precisely to stop the rampant Brown Act violations that followed Executive Order Executive Order N-29-20

Roland 09:34 AM

The ridership tanked right after you cancelled the Baby Bullets. Why did you cancel the only service that was still competitive with driving after freeway traffic volumes decreased?

Ryan 09:35 AM

what precautions if any are being taken to protect the crews and public?

Roland 09:39 AM

How about reducing operating expenses by \$8M/month?

Jeff Carter 09:39 AM

Why is current seemingly real time ridership data available for this meeting, yet when I make a PRA request, I am told it is not available? Ridership data has not been available since February 2019, recalibration of ridership.

Roland 09:42 AM

You are going to draw on the PCEP line of credit to support out of control operating expenses???????????????? Are you serious?????

Ryan 09:42 AM

Recovery will be based on publics perception of thier safety.

Roland 09:50 AM

Will all this funding go to Caltrain or its managing agency?

The ridership tanked right after you cancelled the Baby Bullets. Why did you cancel the only service that was still competitive with driving after freeway traffic volumes decreased?

How about closing down low ridership stations instead of high ridership service?

How about reducing operating expenses by \$8M/month?

You are going to draw on the PCEP line of credit to support out of control operating expenses???????????????? Are you serious?????

Roland 09:52 AM

Why is the PCEP ad hoc committe not open to the public????

Roland 10:01 AM

please submit your comments in writing via Q&A and they will be read by staff at the appropriate time.

Roland 10:18 AM

@John you need to type everything and paste it into Q&A when they open public comment

Roland 10:20 AM

How about being transparent about the "mixed results" experienced after the transmission gear teardown?

Roland 10:23 AM

The first trainset was supposed to be on JPB property on 7/29/19

Roland 10:29 AM

The first \$200M of the CBOSS fiasco will be written off

Abdulmajid Harb 09:14 AM

i have an important question about the corona

You 09:26 AM

type here, we will read it. thank you

Roland 09:23 AM

Why did you allow public comments at yesterday's SamTrans meeting?

You 09:25 AM

we had no Q&A yesterday, it was disabled
we have it now and must read. thank you for being flexible!

Roland 09:27 AM

Why are you violating social (AKA physical) distancing guidelines?

Roland 09:31 AM

Will all this funding go to Caltrain or its managing agency?
This question has been answered live

Roland 09:35 AM

How about closing down low ridership stations instead of high ridership service?

You 09:36 AM

Roland could you bulk your comments so they could be read at once, otherwise, we'll miss a comment as it is currently alternating between other comments