



JPB Board of Directors
Meeting of August 6, 2020

Correspondence as of August 5, 2020

Subject

- 1 Close Atherton Station
- 2 Caltrain Customer Treatment
- 3 Support for Caltrain 1/8-Cent Sales Tax Measure on the November 2020 Ballot
- 4 Skeptical About Increased Service Bringing More Riders
- 5 Excessive Idling as a Significant Fraction of Social Media Contact
- 6 Item 5f Balfour Beatty Breach of Contract

From: [Nerissa Dexter](#)
To: changes@caltrain.com
Cc: boardsecretary@caltrain.com; [Board \(@caltrain.com\)](#)
Subject: CLOSE ATHERTON STATION; JPB Correspondence
Date: Sunday, August 2, 2020 7:29:29 PM
Importance: High

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the San Mateo County Transit District. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board, Honorable Chair and Board of Directors:

We support Caltrain's proposal to close the Station in Atherton for the following reasons.

It would be irresponsible to spend an estimated \$30 Million dollars, plus – which is necessary to upgrade this little-used station for electrification (to eliminate the "Hold-Out-Rule") -- given the severe constraint of having only 33 parking spaces to accommodate passengers. (Note: 33 is Caltrain's official number, as reported to the MTC.) Keeping this station open will result in squandering Caltrain's limited financial resources and, ultimately, taxpayers' money.

It would be significantly more beneficial to the transportation system, to invest this \$30+ Million, and savings in operating expenses, to improve nearby, viable, commuter stations, like Menlo Park & Redwood City, which could have the critical mass in service frequency, and express train availability, sufficient to attract 300-500 additional passengers to Caltrain.

But, providing the desirable level of service frequency will be compromised if station stops are taken away from Menlo Park / Redwood City, in order to create the stops necessary to re-introduce week-day service to Atherton station (after 15 years).

I encourage Caltrain to close Atherton Station as soon as feasible, because it poses a public safety hazard: anyone can wander onto the middle of the tracks from grade-level pathways, over the southbound track, which were paved to provide boarding access to trains stopped on the northbound track, at this antiquated Station.

Since there are ZERO dollars budgeted through 2027 in Caltrain's 10 Year Capital Improvement Plan (officially recorded with the MTC), the Atherton Station will have to close anyway, in order NOT to undermine electrification's commitment to increased throughput.

Let's invest taxpayer money in creating a better rail service for the entire community – a service that Atherton residents can easily use. (Indeed, in parts of Atherton, the Menlo Park station is physically closer than the Atherton station.)

Thank you,
Neil and Nerissa Dexter, Atherton, CA, 8/2/20

From: Brandon Clark <brandonclark2@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 3, 2020 10:18 PM
To: Board (@caltrain.com) <BoardCaltrain@samtrans.com>
Subject: Disappointed & Treated Like Trash By Your Staff

I ride Caltrain Regularly and pay for my tickets everytime I get on. I forgot to tag on and was kicked off of the train when I had plenty of money on my Clipper Card. I tagged on at Burlingame and they would not let me back on the train when there was about 7 individuals who were smoking drugs at milbrae and didnt have tickets yet I was kicked off. The others just didnt get off and they get to ride for fre? The staff was rude and treated me like I was dirt despite the fact I work and pay for my housing and consistently pay for my transportation costs.

I guess next time to ensure I get to stay on I just wont pay for the ticket and when asked bitch and complain and yell like the others did who ended up staying on the train when I had to get off, doesn't seem fair to me. Your staff is rude, angry and completely disrespectful and now after actually paying for a ticket have to wait in burlingame an hour at night when I work the next day.

Thanks a lot! No wonder everyone speaks so slowly of caltrain these days. I think I'll start taking the bus instead

From: Rios, Rona <riosr@samtrans.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 8:15 AM
To: brandonclark2@gmail.com
Cc: Board (@caltrain.com) <BoardCaltrain@samtrans.com>
Subject: Consumer Report #755888

Dear Mr. Clark,

Thank you for submitting your comments to Caltrain. Your email sent to the Caltrain Board was sent to me for response and they will receive a copy of our correspondence.

First I want to sincerely apologize for the rude treatment while on board Caltrain.

It is unsettling to hear that some non-paying passengers were allowed to stay on the train because all passengers are required to be in possession of valid fare. Passengers without valid fare should be cited under our new zero tolerance policy. Additionally, we do expect our crew members to be professional at all times, including during the course of fare enforcement. We sincerely apologize that you were addressed in another manner. We would like to follow up with the train crew regarding your comments however I need some additional information. When possible, may I ask you to please provide me with additional information such as the train number you were on, the direction you were heading and a description of the crew member.

We appreciate your feedback and we look forward to providing you with improved customer service on your future commutes.

Kind Regards,

Rona Rios
Director, Customer Experience
Caltrain

City of Palo Alto

Office of the Mayor and City Council

August 4, 2020

President Cindy Chavez
Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors
70 West Hedding Street East Wing, 10th Floor
San Jose, CA 95110

RE: Placing a Caltrain 1/8-cent sales tax measure on the November 2020 ballot

Dear President Chavez,

On behalf of the City of Palo Alto, I am writing to express strong support for placing a one-eighth cent sales tax on the November 2020 ballot in the counties of San Francisco, San Mateo, and Santa Clara so that voters have an opportunity to weigh in on this important topic facing our region.

Caltrain is a vital link in the region's transit network, which provides critical alternatives to single-occupancy vehicle travel. Thousands of essential workers and transit-dependent riders continue to use the service.

Improving Caltrain service was always dependent on dedicated funding and discussions with regional partners have continued for several years, with a 1/8-cent sales tax measure as one option to consider. Before the pandemic, Caltrain's member agencies signaled that they could not afford to increase their contributions, and now their financial situation is even more precarious.

Caltrain is likely to run out of operating funds before the end of the year and they project a \$71 million deficit over the next financial year. As a result of this projected deficit Caltrain is preparing to stop providing service for several years. Voters must have the opportunity to weigh in on imposing a 1/8-cent sales tax measure and as a regional partner, we urge the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors to let voters decide whether to financially support Caltrain service through this long-term financial option.

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:

289F2F8A691E446...

Adrian Fine
Mayor
City of Palo Alto

Cc:

Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board
San Francisco Mayor London Breed
San Jose Mayor Sam Liccardo
San Mateo County Board of Supervisors
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors
San Mateo County Transit District Board of Directors
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Agency Board of Directors

From: [Chad Hedstrom](#)
To: [Public Comment](#)
Subject: Skeptical about increased service bringing more riders
Date: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 12:10:57 AM

On page 1 of your "Key Caltrain Performance Statistics" you cite that Average Weekday Ridership (AWR) is down NINETY-SIX PERCENT YoY year over year.

Attributing a single percentage increase being down 97% vs being down 96% YoY and then attributing this 1% increase in ridership as 54%(!!) and then using those lies to justify running a full, pre-pandemic schedule is both absurd and questionable use of funds.

Please return to a 42 train schedule in the future, and consider dropping weekend service altogether for the foreseeable future. This would allow for electrification to happen 2 days a week and Caltrain to actually get back on track with their modernization program.

Thank you

Chad Hedstrom

From: [Chad Hedstrom](#)
To: [Public Comment](#)
Subject: Excessive idling as a significant fraction of social media contact
Date: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 12:19:41 AM

I find it interesting that on page 8 of your "Key Caltrain Performance Statistics" includes "Caltrain Digital Metrics".

Top Tagged issues:

1. Covid (99 issues)
2. Idling (59 issues)
3. Electrification (28 issues)

I find it curious that EXCESSIVE is the NUMBER TWO issue for digital metrics, after COVID, and more than double that of the third item, electrification. Both covid (#1) and electrification (#3) are discussed at length in agenda minutes, but idling has never been addressed in these minutes.

Please consider doing zero cost improvements, like not idling trains on platform #11 and platform #12 after 8pm. Please consider not "high idling" trains after 8pm, especially on platforms #11 and #12. Platforms #11 and #12 at the 4th and King station are DIRECTLY ACROSS THE STREET from multiple apartment buildings, and resonates down King Street into adjacent residential areas. Idling on platforms #1-10, facing empty office buildings and retail that is closed after 6pm, would be far preferable.

I encourage the Caltrain Digital Team to highlight the excessive idling issue as something to address.

Thank you

Chad Hedstrom

From: [Roland Lebrun](#)
To: [Board \(@caltrain.com\)](#)
Cc: [SFCTA Board Secretary](#); [MTC Info](#); [cacsecretary \[@caltrain.com\]](#); [SFCTA CAC](#)
Subject: Item 5f Balfour Beatty breach of contract
Date: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 2:34:40 AM
Attachments: [Item 5f Electrification RFP.pdf](#)

Dear Chair Pine and Board members,

Please be aware of serious issues with the staff report which states that "*shunt wires are required to protect the safety of the public and rail or utility facilities in case the utility lines crossing the Overhead Contact System (OCS) should fall and make contact with the OCS*", when the real reason for this \$9.5M change order is a **flagrant breach of contract by Balfour Beatty**, not new CPUC safety requirements.

Background

Utility clearances are covered in Section 9.6 of Volume III of the RFP (attached).

Section 9.6.4 deals with overhead utilities and specifies the following:

"Where electrical lines with voltage less than 30 kV and communication lines cannot be accommodated in an overpass structure, they shall be relocated underground"

Recommendation

Please consider initiating a full investigation into how overhead utilities ended up getting raised instead of undergrounded and make the responsible parties accountable for their actions as continued mismanagement of this project will result in cost escalations into the **hundreds of millions of dollars in excess of remaining contingency**.

Thank you in advance for your consideration

Roland Lebrun

CC

SFCTA Commissioners

MTC Commissioners

VTA Board of Directors

Caltrain CAC

SFCTA CAC

A level of service equivalent to the existing service shall be maintained for adjacent properties, residents, and businesses throughout construction by supporting utilities in place, diverting if necessary, interruption of existing utilities service shall be minimized. Service shall not be interrupted without the prior written consent of utility owners.

9.6 Utility Clearances

The minimum requirements for utility clearances shall be as defined by the CPUC GOs as applicable, Caltrans HDM and PDPM, AREMA, utility owner's requirements, and these Design Criteria. The Design-Builder shall use the most stringent and conservative clearance requirements as determined from these documents. These requirements apply to Caltrain Systems related facilities as well as those owned by others. In addition, High Risk and Low Risk utilities shall comply with the following requirements:

9.6.1 High Risk and Low Risk Utilities

High-risk utilities include: fiber optic cable, utilities conducting toxic or flammable gases or liquids, pressurized greater than 60 psi normal operating pressure or in pipelines greater than 6 inches in diameter, and underground electrical supply lines that have potential to ground more than 300 volts, either directly buried or in a duct bank or conduit which do not have concentric grounded or effectively grounded metal shields or sheath.

All other utilities are considered Low Risk utilities.

9.6.2 High Risk Utilities

- Maintain 5 feet minimum horizontal separation from other Low Risk utilities
- Maintain 5 feet minimum horizontal separation from non-load carrying and load carrying structural elements, including OCS pole foundations and down guys

9.6.3 Low Risk Utilities

- Maintain 3 feet minimum horizontal separation from other Low Risk utilities
- Maintain 5 feet minimum horizontal separation from load carrying structural elements, including OCS pole foundations and down guys, and 3-foot minimum horizontal separation from other structures
- Maintain 3 feet minimum vertical separation from drainage pipes
- The above clearances are minimum requirements. Where such condition is impractical, a design variance shall be submitted to the Authority.

Electrical and communication lines within the Authority's right-of-way must comply with the above requirements except that a concrete encased duct bank can be used in lieu of steel casing pipe. All underground electrical utilities and supporting facilities within the planned construction area must meet the minimum clearance requirements as defined in CPUC GOs.

9.6.4 Overhead Utilities

Overhead utilities shall cross the tracks at local, street, or highway overpasses. Such utilities shall either be contained within the overpass structure, or if attached to the outside of the overpass

structure, shall be encased in a steel casing sleeve, which shall be grounded and bonded in accordance with the Grounding and Bonding Requirements chapter. Where electrical lines with voltage less than 30 kV and communication lines cannot be accommodated in an overpass structure, they shall be relocated underground per clearance requirements established in this chapter. Clearances for overhead electrical lines with voltage higher than 30 kV shall be governed by CPUC GO No. 95 or wire to wire clearance requirements, whichever is more stringent, and shall be modified to a higher class of construction.

9.7 Miscellaneous Utilities and Supporting Facilities

9.7.1 Railroad Utilities

Signals and communication lines belonging to railroad companies may be affected by construction of the Caltrain Electrification Project. The design and rearrangement of such utilities and supporting facilities that conflict with Caltrain Electrifications Project may be performed by the Design-Builder or by the facility owner in accordance with owner's standards.

Where Caltrain utilities and supporting facilities impact railroad utility facilities or where rearrangement of other utility facilities will impact or potentially affect the operation of railroad utility facilities, the Design-Builder shall coordinate its work with the Authority so that adequate data can be furnished to the railroad to complete its work. The Design-Builder shall include the rearrangement of railroad utilities in the utilities plan.

9.7.2 Street Lights and Traffic Control Devices

Traffic control devices and street lighting facilities belonging to municipal agencies may be affected by construction. Any facility affected or impacted by the construction shall be replaced in-kind, unless otherwise indicated in the agreement between the Authority and the affected agencies.

9.7.3 Fire Alarm and Police Communication Systems

Protection, relocation, and support-in-place of the fire alarm and police communication systems within construction limits shall be in strict conformance with the current standards of the governing agency or municipality.

The Design-Builder shall indicate which emergency communication lines is to be maintained complete in-place, removed, protected and supported, temporarily relocated and replaced after construction is complete. The lines to be abandoned or are already abandoned shall also be indicated.

9.7.4 Vaults

Private vaults surrounding the project area that do not conflict with the proposed shall be protected in place. Vaults that are found to be in conflict with the proposed construction shall be subject to demolition and/ or relocation.

END OF CHAPTER