



**JPB Citizens Advisory Committee  
1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070  
Bacciocco Auditorium, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor**

BOARD OF DIRECTORS 2016

PERRY WOODWARD, CHAIR  
 JOSÉ CISNEROS, VICE CHAIR  
 MALIA COHEN  
 JEFF GEE  
 ROSE GUILBAULT  
 RAUL PERALEZ  
 JOEL RAMOS  
 ADRIENNE TISSIER  
 KEN YEAGER

JIM HARTNETT  
 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

**January 20, 2016 – Wednesday**

**5:40 p.m.**

Times noted are estimated.

Items in bold are CAC member-requested presentations.

1. Pledge of Allegiance
2. Roll Call
3. Report of Nominating Committee (Jonathan Berk, Adina Levin, Cat Tucker) (5:40 p.m.)
  - a) Election of 2016 Officers MOTION
4. Approval of Meeting Minutes of December 16, 2015 (5:50 p.m.) MOTION
5. Public Comment (5:50 p.m.)  
Public testimony by each individual speaker shall be limited to three minutes
6. Committee Comments (6:00 p.m.)  
Committee members may make brief statements regarding CAC-related areas of concern, ideas for improvement, or other items that will benefit or impact Caltrain service or the CAC, or request future agenda topics
7. Chairperson's Report (6:10 p.m.)
  - a) Certificate of Appreciation to Outgoing CAC Member Alex Sweet
  - b) Follow up on Report of Customer Service Concerns to the Board
8. Draft 2016 JPB Legislative Program (Casey Fromson) (6:20 p.m.) INFORMATIONAL
9. **Overview of Caltrain Survey Process** (Patrick Thompson) (6:25 p.m.) INFORMATIONAL
10. **2015 Customer Satisfaction Survey Results** (Patrick Thompson) (6:45 p.m.) INFORMATIONAL
11. Staff Report (Danielle Stewart) (7:05 p.m.) INFORMATIONAL
  - a) **JPB CAC Work Plan**
12. Date, Time and Place of Next Meeting  
February 17, 2016 at 5:40 p.m., San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Bacciocco Auditorium, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA
13. Adjournment

**CAC MEMBERS:** **San Francisco City & County:** Jonathan Berk, Brian Shaw, Alex Sweet  
**San Mateo County:** Chris Cobey, Annie Lee, Adina Levin  
**Santa Clara County:** Yvonne Mills, Greg Scharff, Cat Tucker

## **INFORMATION TO THE PUBLIC**

If you have questions on the agenda, please contact the Assistant District Secretary at 650.508.6223 or [cacsecretary@caltrain.com](mailto:cacsecretary@caltrain.com). Agendas are available on the Caltrain Web site at <http://www.caltrain.com>.

JPB and Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) meeting schedules are available on the Caltrain Web site.

### Location, Date and Time of Regular Meetings

Regular meetings are held at the San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building located at 1250 San Carlos Ave., San Carlos, CA, which is located one block west of the San Carlos Caltrain Station on El Camino Real. The office is also accessible by SamTrans bus routes ECR, FLX, 260, 295 and 398. Additional transit information can be obtained by calling 1.800.660.4287 (TTY 650.508.6448) or 511.

The JPB Citizens Advisory Committee meets regularly on the third Wednesday of the month at 5:40 p.m. at the same location. Date, time and place may change as necessary.

### Public Comment

If you wish to address the Committee, please fill out a speaker's card located on the agenda table and hand it to the Assistant District Secretary. If you have anything that you wish distributed to the Committee and included for the official record, please hand it to the Assistant District Secretary, who will distribute the information to the Committee members and staff.

Members of the public may address the Committee on non-agendized items under the Public Comment item on the agenda. Public testimony by each individual speaker shall be limited to three minutes and items raised that require a response will be deferred for staff reply.

### Accessibility for Individuals with Disabilities

Upon request, the JPB will provide for written agenda materials in appropriate alternative formats, or disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, to enable individuals with disabilities to participate in public meetings. Please send a written request, including your name, mailing address, phone number and brief description of the requested materials and a preferred alternative format or auxiliary aid or service at least two days before the meeting. Requests should be mailed to Assistant District Secretary at Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070-1306; or emailed to [cacsecretary@caltrain.com](mailto:cacsecretary@caltrain.com); or by phone at 650.508.6279, or TTY 650.508.6448.

### Availability of Public Records

All public records relating to an open session item on this agenda, which are not exempt from disclosure pursuant to the California Public Records Act, that are distributed to a majority of the legislative body will be available for public inspection at 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070-1306, at the same time that public records are distributed or made available to the legislative body.

**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC)  
PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD (JPB)  
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT ADMINISTRATIVE BUILDING  
Bacciocco Auditorium, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos CA 94070**

**MINUTES OF DECEMBER 16, 2015**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** J. Berk, A. Lee, A. Levin, Y. Mills, G. Scharff, B. Shaw, A. Sweet, C. Tucker

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** C. Cobey (Chair)

**STAFF PRESENT:** J. Averill, M. Bouchard, J. Castaneda, C. Fromson, M. Martinez, D. Stewart

Vice Chair Alex Sweet called the meeting to order at 5:41 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 18, 2015**

Adina Levin said on page 6 where she said Caltrain should have inter-county buses should be inter-county express buses. She said on page 10 she requested to add "because they may be priced out of rail" to the end of her statement that the study may not address Caltrain because most low-income people use bus service.

Brian Shaw said on page 8 there is a typo that reads "Ms. Shaw" and should read "Mr. Shaw."

Yvonne Mills arrived at 5:44 p.m.

Motion to approve the minutes of November 18, 2015 as amended.

Motion/Second: Shaw/Lee

Ayes: Berk, Lee, Levin, Mills, Scharff, Shaw, Sweet

Absent: Tucker, Cobey

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Doug DeLong, Mountain View, said when it comes to the fare changes, a way to look at it is that some of the customers don't have transit options. He said if the price of the Go Pass was raised to \$2,000 a year, just from Stanford alone the JPB would get enough money to eliminate the subsidy from the partners.

Jeff Carter, Millbrae, said last week there was a report on television about a grandfather who rides Caltrain and purchased a Clipper Monthly Pass online, and because of the way Clipper works, the card was not valid until five days after. The man was riding the train and the conductor issued a citation. The man went to court and the judge was sympathetic and told the man to report the issue to Channel 7. The Caltrain spokesperson said the website mentions the delay in buying Clipper tickets

online and the passenger should have known and did not have valid fare. Mr. Carter said on December 7 several people were stranded at 22<sup>nd</sup> Street because Caltrain was single tracking and the customers were directed to the northbound platform by the employee in charge. The train did not wait for the customers to wait to get to the other platform and they had to wait 90 minutes for the next train. He said when Caltrain does the fare study he hopes they take an objective look and solicit customer input.

Cat Tucker arrived at 5:48 p.m.

### **COMMITTEE COMMENTS**

Ms. Levin asked if the agenda can have a standing topic to get regular staff reports that address the capacity constraints. There are things Caltrain is working on to alleviate constraints such as putting into service additional cars, services for customers who use bikes and get bumped, Caltrain Modernization Phase 2 and other things. Danielle Stewart, Acting Director, Rail Operations, said she will be making updates in her staff report unless there is something specific that needs to be agendized.

Chair Sweet said January will probably be her last meeting. She said she works in Oakland and coming to this meeting is a challenge.

### **CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT**

Ms. Levin said she reported to the Board the CAC's concerns about the fare proposal and that it was not sufficiently supported to get the CAC's endorsement. The Board approved the fare increase for budgetary purposes. The Board made many comments picking up on the CAC's ideas on studying the fare structure including corporate pricing, the Go Pass, student fares, distance-based fares, parking, peak-hour pricing, and a robust set of issues.

Casey Fromson, Government Relations Officer, said there is a new planner who is part of the Caltrain planning team and she will be working on the fare study. It is a priority in the new year and staff will report back to the CAC when the scope is outlined a bit more.

Jonathan Berk said there must be a clearly defined objective. It would then be easier to understand why the fares are set the way they are if a clear objective is defined.

### **Appointment of 2016 Officer Nominating Committee**

Chair Sweet appointed Mr. Berk, Ms. Levin, and Ms. Tucker to the nominating committee.

### **ADVISE THE BOARD TO TAKE ACTION TO IMPROVE CUSTOMER SERVICE**

Mr. Berk said this is an advisory committee and has no formal power. He sits on another advisory committee at work, but their advice is always taken and they are basically the decision makers. He said the CAC does not have much influence or power and the reason is because they are not fulfilling their role as advisors. He said the CAC has expertise in identifying problems but not in fixing them. He said he wants the CAC to focus on identifying problems, advising the Board that the problems exist, and then letting the Board decide how to address the problems. The CAC has identified

customer service and the issues he has outlined in his memo as problems. The memo has one motion: The current level of customer service on Caltrain is unacceptable. He showed a picture of Train 69 at a station at 5:15 p.m. The Predictive Arrival/Departure System sign does not have Train 69 on it. The sign listed Train 69 before it arrived, said it was arriving, and disappeared off the sign before the train got to the station. There is enough space on the sign to list the stops that the train is making. Some other deficiencies are: there is no evidence to deal with capacity over the next five years; when an incident occurs on Caltrain there is no formal response plan; trains are not adequately labeled; the information system is inadequate; there are no quiet cars; there is no Wi-Fi service; the on-time performance (OTP) is inadequate. This is not an exhaustive list of the concerns with customer service. He said he was heartened by the response from Michelle Bouchard, Chief Operating Officer, Rail, who submitted a staff report that agrees with the CAC proposal. He said it is not the CAC's job to tell Caltrain how to fix the problems. He said Caltrain needs a vice president of customer service whose job is to represent the customers.

Greg Scharff said he would second the motion, but he would like to amend the motion to state, "for example but not limited to" and then the list of problems. Mr. Berk said he assumes his memo would go to the Board and he volunteered to represent the CAC at the next Board meeting.

Ms. Mills said a motion should have an action attached to it, and this is just a statement. Mr. Berk said the CAC is just giving the Board advice in an advisory capacity.

Ms. Mills asked how much the Board listens to the CAC. Ms. Tucker said the Board members are approachable and she thinks they do listen, but they have to operate under their own constraints.

Mr. Scharff said he would like Mr. Berk to present this to the Board. Mr. Berk said he plans to do that.

Mr. Scharff asked if this issue can be put on the Board agenda so the Board could discuss it at the meeting.

Ms. Levin said at the last Board meeting she presented to the Board the CAC's "no" vote on the fare policy. That prompted the Board to discuss the CAC's concerns. There was a relation in the Board's discussion between what should be looked at in the fare study and the issues and concerns that were raised by the CAC. She said one thing that was different in the report to the Board was that the CAC took a vote. She said the next chair should work with staff to have more votes on the CAC agenda to provide recommendations to the Board.

Chair Sweet asked if the issue can be put on the Board's agenda. Martha Martinez, Executive Officer, District Secretary/Executive Administration, said staff will agendaize the issue on the Board agenda and will include the CAC memo to give the Board advanced notice so they can give the CAC some feedback.

Ms. Bouchard said when staff read through the CAC memo it struck home that the CAC thought customer service had declined and staff was not listening. Staff agrees that the level of customer service is unacceptable. A transition is occurring within the organization. The communications office has been reorganized. Staff is committed to understanding the issues better and being more responsive because staff relies on the CAC to represent the customers. In view of this transition, she asked to reset the relationship between the CAC and staff support. There has been a breakdown in communication and respectful discourse. She would like to bring it back to a place where staff is responding in meaningful way, and if there is something that can be done, staff will do it. Staff couldn't deny most of the issues identified in the memo and would like to do the work and come back to the CAC with actionable suggestions. She said staff would like the respect of the CAC understanding that there are some things that staff are not going to be able to do, but staff will provide transparency and the information the CAC needs to understand the decision.

Ms. Mills asked Ms. Bouchard if she would like the CAC not to report this to the Board. Ms. Bouchard said the CAC should do whatever it feels it needs to do, but if the memo is in repose to non-responsiveness from a previous group of people, she would like the opportunity to work with the CAC and be responsive. She said staff feels strongly about customer service and if the CAC wants to elevate this to the Board level, it is the CAC's prerogative.

Ms. Fromson said the customer service issues that the CAC have raised are important and should be addressed by staff. Moving forward, it would be helpful to think about a solution-oriented process to address these issues. She said it could be a good idea to let the new staff team address the concerns that have been raised so far and create a format for consistent updates on other issues going forward.

Ms. Sweet there are two suggestions, one is the motion to take this to the Board advising them to take action, and the other is to set up a methodology to address the specific issues and work internally to find some solutions and create recommendations of advice to bring to the Board.

Ms. Levin asked if it makes sense to pause this motion and ask the new communications chief to come address the set of issues and discuss what Caltrain is doing specifically and organizationally to be more responsive on customer issues.

Ms. Tucker said it wouldn't hurt for this to go to the Board as long as there are no demands being made and staff would get full support from the Board to take action.

Mr. Berk said there is an opportunity here to change. Staff could always say the CAC's suggestions are not in the budget. He wants someone in Caltrain whose job is to care about customers, hear from the CAC, and figure out how to get things done for customer service. That person should then report back to the CAC with actions that were taken, constraints, compromises, and other information. Ms. Bouchard said staff feels strongly about customer service issues and will bring solutions into fruition if possible.

Mr. Berk said these are endemic issues within Caltrain and something should have been done about them by now.

Mr. Shaw said the CAC has an obligation to report this issue to the Board. This is a major problem and Caltrain needs to function at a level that the region and the employers in it deserve. He said he has ridden trains in other places that don't have the problems Caltrain has.

Ms. Sweet said motion is to advise Caltrain that the current level of customer service is unacceptable. Mr. Berk said he is happy to make the amendment if that is what the CAC wants to do.

Mr. Scharff said as many CAC members that can should go present this to the Board.

Ms. Sweet said the memo should list more specifically why things such as Wi-Fi are so critical to customer service. Mr. Berk said he could have gone on a lot more but these issues identified were obvious enough for anyone to see there is a problem. He could have listed the Clipper issue. He said he originally had bikes on the memo but he took it out because there is a Bicycle Advisory Committee.

Ms. Mills said she does not like bringing up a problem without a proposed solution. She proposed amending the motion to say the CAC understand staff is committed to address these problems and the CAC would like the Board to support staff in working towards addressing these issues. Dropping a problem with no solution is not productive.

Mr. Berk said the CAC has no expertise on how to fix the problems. He expects the Board to direct staff to fix the problems.

Ms. Bouchard requested the CAC figure out how to establish a meaningful feedback loop and relationship between the CAC and staff, because that is how things will get done.

Mr. Scharff said he agrees a feedback loop is important and he thinks the CAC should take this to the Board.

Mr. Berk said it would be great if staff could develop a strategy on how to tackle these problems and report that at the Board meeting. Ms. Bouchard said staff has already had that conversation and part of it was developing feedback from the CAC. Staff takes this very seriously and are committed to doing the work.

Mr. Scharff said the thing that would heal the relationship the most is not having the CAC feel like they can't make motions. He said he is an attorney and he knows what he is doing with the Brown Act. The interpretation of the Brown Act makes it really difficult for the CAC to take a position and advise the Board. Ms. Martinez said she will send the CAC a note on the process of creating agendas and setting items as informational or action. The Brown Act is the floor of how the agency needs to be transparent and how it provides information to the public, and the agency's process is to have enough information for the public before a meeting so they know what action

will be taken so they have the opportunity to provide public comment or to attend the meeting. Staff is not saying the CAC can't take a motion on something, but there needs to be a conversation and direction to know what the motion is going to be so it can be agendized for the next CAC meeting.

Mr. Scharff said he has served on many public bodies and he has been mayor. The Brown Act requires that the body not know how the motion is going to be, and that the topic needs to be discussed in public. He said agendas need a broad topic to be agendized. Ms. Martinez said the conversation is done ahead of the action when the motion gets developed. The motion can evolve but there needs to be a sense of what type of action is going to be taken so if a public comment changes the opinion the motion can be amended. She said everyone does it differently and she will share the process with the CAC in a memo. This is done the same with the Board and the CACs.

Mr. Berk said the CAC is being held to a higher standard. He asked Ms. Bouchard to help with this disagreement. Ms. Martinez said she will share the process with the CAC and if the CAC has any concerns with it, she will be happy to discuss it and Ms. Bouchard can be included in the conversation.

Ms. Tucker said this CAC is stricter than the city council that she is on. She said if an item is agendized as action, the CAC should be able to vote on it. Ms. Martinez said if the agenda reads "Update on Customer Service," the public will not be able to know what action the CAC would take.

Mr. Berk said "Update on Customer Service" is enough information for the public. Ms. Martinez said she would be happy to discuss this offline.

Ms. Levin said of all the customer service issues listed in the memo there was not consensus among the CAC about the quiet car as a solution. There is an issue with rowdy passengers, but the CAC did not agree that the quiet car was the solution.

Mr. Berk said the CAC could not vote on it so there is no record on how the CAC felt. He said there was a wide majority on the CAC that wanted quiet cars. Assuming that is the case, he would leave it in.

Ms. Sweet said she would keep the comment about Giants baseball trains in the memo and say there is an issue with that, and that quiet cars might be a way to address the problem.

Ms. Fromson said there needs to be a better feedback loop with the CAC. With the merger between customer service, public affairs and marketing, there is a new team that will be more united and responsive to concerns from customers and advisory groups like the CAC. Staff is committed to come back to the CAC to address the issues they have raised at this meeting.

#### Public Comment

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said at the Board meeting Supervisor Malia Cohen voted against the fare increases and there was no representation from Santa Clara County.



Customers are the permanent funding source for Caltrain and are contributing over \$90 million a year. The San Mateo County Transit District (District) is in charge of Caltrain administration. Operations and maintenance is done by Transit America Services, Inc. (TASI) and the contract is close to \$100 million a year. It is physically impossible with the existing rolling stock to provide the service that customers expect. Gallery cars have four steps and only one door per car. TASI should not be expected to provide the service because it is impossible. The District came up with a Short-Range Transit Plan to spend \$50 million a year to tear down and refurbish old garbage. The new trains should be brought in and then TASI can provide the service people expect.

Jeff Carter, Millbrae, said he agrees that Mr. Berk should go to the Board with the memo. The status quo of the existing schedule is not acceptable. Caltrain can't survive on this schedule. Caltrain service needs more trains and a revamp of the schedule should be done. He said during the incident where the train hit a vehicle in Burlingame and lost power and left 900 people without air conditioning or lights there was no customer service. It is understandable it was traumatizing for the train crew, but it was also traumatizing for the 900 customers on the train. These are people who are paying for the service. Caltrain needs to address customer service.

Mr. Scharff left at 6:55 p.m.

Doug DeLong, Mountain View, said going forward with this action is a constructive step. He said his personal priorities are different than the author of the motion. Having a seat on the train is the most central customer service issue, and concierge services are down on his list. He said there have been five years of 10 percent annual growth. He said a way to make this effective and constructive is to have members of the employer community express their concerns. That would be impactful. He said there needs to be more seats on the line. A wholesale schedule redesign is an extremely complicated problem and involves a huge amount of outreach. It is a humongous undertaking and costs millions to do. A short-term schedule adjustment to recognize the reality of ridership, realistic to what Caltrain can perform to is needed.

Ms. Levin made a motion to amend the motion to refer to the problems with Giants and event trains, but take out quiet cars as the obvious solution.

There was no second to the motion.

Motion to advise the Board that the current level of customer service on Caltrain is unacceptable.

Motion/Second: Berk/Shaw

Ayes: Berk, Lee, Levin, Mills, Shaw, Tucker, Sweet

Absent: Cobey, Scharff

### **Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project Quarterly Update**

Ms. Fromson said the revenue service date for the new Communications-based Overlay Signal System (CBOSS)/Positive Train Control is the first quarter of 2016. She presented:

- Project Delivery Efforts
  - Environmental consultation and permits

- Federal Transit Administration (FTA) oversight
  - Project management oversight consultant assigned
- City/county agreements
  - Millbrae approved
  - Other cities/counties to be approved
- Real estate
  - Santa Clara County properties appraisal complete
  - Other segments of corridor to follow
- Pacific Gas and Electric
  - Power study complete
  - Scoping and design started
- Utilities
  - Potholing in progress for critical locations
  - Coordinating relocation of utilities crossing the right of way
- Central Equipment Maintenance and Operations
  - Completed conceptual design
  - Coordination of final design pending Electric Multiple Unit (EMU) selection
- Tunnel
  - Review of 65 percent design completed
- Funding Update
  - More funds needed by partners to move forward with the project and award contracts.
  - Bay Area Air Quality Management District approved \$20 million
  - Working on getting FTA Core Capacity funding
  - Finalizing funding agreements with the California High-Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) and funding partners
- Procurement
  - Three proposals left and staff is going through a best and final offer process
  - Complicated considerations with active railroad
  - Revised contract award date to summer/fall 2016
- EMU
  - Request for Proposals issued in August
  - Proposals expected in February 2016
- 2020 Revenue Service

Mr. Shaw asked where Atherton is with the agreement. Ms. Fromson said staff is working with every city, and staff provided them with the template that staff is trying to enact with all the cities. There has not been an agreement yet, so it is too early to tell.

Ms. Levin said she heard the last budget for electrification presented to the Board was \$1.5 billion and there has been an increase and asked if there is public information about it. Ms. Fromson said the last public update was in November of last year, and staff said they were going to revise costs from the 2008 estimate. Staff identified \$300 million plus \$125 million from the previous Memorandum of Understanding that was used for other sources to find funding for the gap. As bids and different proposals

come in staff needs to evaluate the costs to build the project, and that could be the next step of resetting the costs of the project.

Mr. Berk said he has to leave, but on the Lost and Found topic that is coming up he wants his personal experience addressed. He lost his wallet, had to go to the Lost and Found website to register, there is no one to call, and staff never looked at the form he filled out and sent a letter to the address on his driver's license. He wants to know how the policy is being enforced that the people working in Lost and Found check the computer forms they receive against the items that get turned in.

Mr. Berk left at 7:12 p.m.

### Public Comment

Jeff Carter, Millbrae, said CHSRA is trying to dictate that Caltrain go to 50-inch platforms for the EMUs. CHSRA should not dictate to Caltrain what platforms to use. Having two sets of doors means less room for seats, bikes or bathrooms. The EMUs should have a fair number of restrooms because it has to do with customer service.

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said CBOSS is going to be late, but it doesn't do anything so it is okay. The line was supposed to be electrified by 2012, and the Gallery cars were supposed to be replaced in 2012. The Gallery cars are shot now because of this. With electrification, Caltrain will have less capacity than what it has now. A downtown extension is going to be built, a new station at South San Francisco will be built, a new Hillsdale Station will be built, Palo Alto wants grade separations, and the Diridon Station has to be rebuilt to fit Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) in. He asked why the line is being electrified now. Caltrain is going to buy EMUs, trains that run on electricity, but if there is no electricity there will be no trains. In 10 years Caltrain will still be running the Gallery cars that are falling apart today. The only solution is to tell the Board to get rid of the District and hire someone who knows how to run and plan a railway.

### **SUPPORT ADOPTION OF UPDATED BICYCLE PARKING RULES AND REGULATIONS**

Jim Castaneda, Director, Safety, said this is an update to the rules and regulations. Sometimes the Transit Police notice bicycles chained to areas where they are not supposed to be, abandoned or vandalized, and they stay there for weeks. This is a vehicle to remedy that. With this change, those bikes will be tagged with a warning tag and a photographed. After 72 hours, staff goes back and removes the bike.

Ms. Tucker asked what happens if a person goes away for a weekend. Mr. Castaneda said if the bike is in a proper bike parking space it will be fine, this is for areas that are not for bike parking or for bikes that have been abandoned. Staff will hold the bike for 90 days, and if it is not claimed, it goes through the lost and found process. It will cost the bicyclist \$120 for handling if they pick it up before the 90 days. After 90 days, the bikes are assessed by a bike company and if the bikes are valued over \$100 they go to auction, if under \$100 they can be donated to a nonprofit.

Ms. Mills asked why staff would wait 72 hours for bikes that violate laws and regulations or that create unsafe conditions. Mr. Castaneda said if there is an immediate hazard

there are other codes that staff can use to remove those bikes immediately. This is for bikes that are improperly stored.

Annie Lee asked if a notice will be put up that tells people that fences are not designated bike parking areas. Mr. Castaneda said it will be noticed and this will give riders the opportunity to remove their bikes.

Ms. Levin urged Caltrain to move forward on bike storage strategies. Before there are reliable, secure bike parking Caltrain should not be punitive. Mr. Castaneda said this is a 72-hour notice.

#### Public Comment

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said when someone rides a bike and chains it to a bike rack where they are supposed to and the bike gets stolen they should get a better response from customer service than just being told it happens all the time and they should call the police.

Motion: Tucker/Shaw

Ayes: Lee, Levin, Mills, Shaw, Tucker, Sweet

Absent: Berk, Cobey, Scharff

#### **LOST AND FOUND POLICY AND PROGRAM**

Mr. Castaneda presented:

- Lost and Unclaimed Property
  - Definition – Personal items, except when prohibited by law
  - Care and Restitution – central repository; no storage charges
  - Period to be Held – three-month period by State law
  - Disposal – auction, unsold or items under \$100,000
- Lost and Found Process
  - Item is left on Train or station
    - Day 1: Train crew sweeps train at terminus or item turned in by other customer
    - Day 1: Item held in secure location overnight, logged into chain of custody
    - Day 2: Item transferred by courier to San Carlos lost and found, arrives after mid-day
    - Day 2: Item logged, tagged, and categorized
  - Process flow
    - Day 2: Manifest is checked against electronic submittal log for item description/match
    - Day 2: Items with identification (address, telephone number, e-mail) are contacted via phone, e-mail or post card
    - Day 7 and Day 14: check updated log for lost item
  - Returning items
    - Staff contacts via phone, e-mail or post card and provides item number with location, hours of service and identification tag number

- Walk ins are assisted if they come in during service hours
  - If staff does not have the lost item, customer's contact information is recorded to compare with manifests
- October 2015 Activity
  - 237 unclaimed items
  - 106 claimed items
  - 31 percent return
- October 2015 Returned Items by Category
  - Wallets/purses: 30.2 percent
  - Other: 19.8 percent
  - Cellphones: 15.1 percent
  - Keys: 9.4 percent
  - Backpacks/suitcases: 8.5 percent
  - Miscellaneous electronics: 5.7 percent
  - Identification cards/badges: 3.8 percent
  - Bikes/bike equipment: 2.8 percent
  - Clothing: 2.8 percent
  - Clipper cards: 0.9 percent
  - Credit cards: 0.9 percent
- Nonprofits (partial list)
  - Clothing, books, etcetera
    - Next Step Veterans Resource Center
    - Blue Star Moms, Veterans of Foreign Wars
    - Samaritan House
    - Saint Vincent De Paul
    - Puente Del Costa Sur
  - Bicycles
    - Veterans Mobility Corp
    - The Bike Kitchen
    - Operation Elf
    - Puente del la Costa Sur
    - SFBC Community Bike Builds

Mr. Shaw asked if a lost item was turned into train personnel if the person could not retrieve the item for two or three days. Mr. Castaneda said would take 48 hours.

Mr. Shaw said that needs to be understood by the public because customers would be mad if they found out it takes two days to get a lost item back. Mr. Castaneda said the website says it takes 48 hours and there is an explanation why.

Mr. Shaw said the process is thorough and fair and demonstrates competency and capability of getting things back to people, but people have no patience for process. People have to understand the reality of the situation. If it takes 48 hours, there needs to be an education process all the way through the organization from train engineers to conductors to workers at San Francisco, San Jose, and San Carlos, so expectations can be managed properly.

Mr. Castaneda said staff will take special accommodations for lost medication and other issues to help the customer get their medication back.

Ms. Mills said she lost her wallet and got great service getting it back. She got it back the same day. She went to San Jose to retrieve it. Mr. Castaneda said the process changed seven months ago when he came onboard. He said that in order to take custody of property there has to be a chain of custody and accountability of everything left on the train.

Ms. Mills asked if she left her wallet on the street and a conductor picks it up if the conductor is allowed to hand it back to her. Mr. Castaneda said yes, but once an item is left behind, there is a standard process in place.

Ms. Lee asked what is done for out-of-town visitors who need to fly somewhere. Mr. Castaneda said staff will mail items to other states or countries or make special provisions for people who are in the area to meet them before they leave the area.

Ms. Levin said she once heard BART use the Public Announcement System to announce lost objects. Many customer service organizations use online chat as a contact mechanism, and this is a way to flexibly utilize the customer service representative's time.

Ms. Sweet said the lost and found webpage can't have too much information. When someone loses something they feel out of control and helpless. The website has a vague statement, but the explanation Mr. Castaneda gave made a lot of sense. It would be worth putting a summary of these steps online. She said if the lost and found web form had categories it would help refine and make the process easier for the customer service agent on the other end. When the form is submitted, the e-mail they get back with the identification tag number should tell the customer the next steps and explanations.

Mr. Shaw said the data in the presentation is interesting and would help people understand the capability to get their stuff back. It would help manage people's understanding if the data from the presentation was on the website.

#### Public Comment

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said there should be an article in the monthly newsletter and on the social media page about the lost and found process and this data. He has heard a Caltrain conductor make an announcement about a lost item over the Public Announcement System. The Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority lost and found page states where lost property goes and that persons claiming lost property must present proper identification and sign for returned items, and most items will be kept for 90 days.

Jeff Carter, Millbrae, said he lost a wallet on SamTrans and he did not get it back. He also lost a wallet on a San Francisco Municipal Transportation bus and did not get it back. He also lost a cell phone on Caltrain. He called his cell phone, the station master

in San Francisco answered the phone, and he picked up his phone from the Stationmaster. This process may not work under the new policy.

## **STAFF REPORT**

Ms. Stewart said:

- The Tilton Avenue Bridge was replaced November 7.
- The next bus bridge will be December 19 for the replacement of the Monte Diablo Bridge. Ten minutes have been added to the bus bridge schedule in both directions, and staff will be providing more assistance to customers.
- The Holiday Train ran over the weekend of December 5, and 2,500 toys were collected.
- October OTP was 86.9 percent, and nearly 55 percent of delayed trains arrived within 10 minutes. When trains that arrived within 10 minutes are included, the OTP goes up to 94.2 percent.
- Average weekday ridership was down over last October, but last year Caltrain transportation was involved with the World Series and victory parade.
- Staff is in process of finalizing the Super Bowl Sunday schedule and it will be published soon. There will be extra service for pre-Super Bowl events.
- Staff is working on the revised timetable which will be rolled out around April.
- Phase 1 of the Generation 2 Bombardier cars was implemented, which was adding the sixth car to five of the Bombardier trainsets with two bike cars per consist. Phase 2 will be rolled out in March and will include running the five six-car Bombardier trainsets with three bike cars.
- Last month Ms. Levin raised a concern about an experience a customer had calling into the emergency dispatch center. Mr. Castaneda had reached out to the dispatch center and told them this agency does not tolerate impolite acts. The dispatchers go through training, and they randomly go over call recording as part of their protocol. There may have been other things going on at the time that could have played into the dispatcher's attitude.
- A comment was made last month regarding the OTP statistics and off-peak versus on-peak data. The OTP statistics take into account all weekdays and weekend service.

Ms. Lee said a lot of the delays are probably during the peak hours due to increased ridership and dwell times. She said staff might want to of another metric where it is normalized by the number of people it is affecting. The numbers may look good because of all the trains in the middle of the day.

Ms. Levin said the CAC received a presentation a year ago on mobile ticketing as an initiative for Caltrain. She asked for an update on the timeline or the project.

Ms. Lee said the train identification and schedule communication ad hoc committee should meet again and perhaps regroup and reframe the questions for Ms. Stewart.

## **Work Plan**

Ms. Stewart said a discussion on wayside bike facilities and the Brown Act will be added in February.

Ms. Tucker said the interpretation from the JPB is very different than other cities. She would like the focus of this Brown Act presentation to be why the interpretation is taken the way it is.

### **Caltrain Corridor Tenants**

Ms. Stewart said at a previous meeting there were questions about how Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) and Caltrain operate together. There is a trackage rights agreement between the JPB and UPRR that was entered into in December of 1991 that governs how the JPB operates with UPRR. The agreement states, "Where JPB grants the UPRR and its successors the perpetual and exclusive right to operate freight service and intercity passenger service on the JPB property."

Ms. Tucker said Caltrain modernization gets stopped at Diridon and does not go to Gilroy because UPRR owns the tracks in that area. She asked if there will be any kind of renegotiation with UPRR and if there will be a chance to benefit from modernization in the future. Ms. Fromson said it is likely to remain as is.

### Public Comment

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said he has asked the Board to have an attorney present at the CAC meetings. He said TASI can't provide the service customers want because of the equipment. The response is to change the timetable. He said Google trip planner has given up on Diridon. If customers want to go from Diridon to downtown San Jose, Google tells customers to get off Caltrain at Santa Clara.

### **DATE, TIME AND LOCATION OF NEXT REGULAR MEETING:**

January 20, 2016 at 5:40 p.m., San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Bacciocco Auditorium, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA.

Meeting adjourned at 8:05 p.m.



**PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD  
STAFF REPORT**

TO: Joint Powers Board

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett  
Executive Director

FROM: Seamus Murphy  
Chief Communications Officer

SUBJECT: **2016 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM**

**ACTION**

This report is for information only. No Board action is required.

**SIGNIFICANCE**

The 2016 Legislative Program (Program) establishes the principles that will guide Caltrain's legislative and regulatory advocacy efforts through the 2016 calendar year, including the second half of the State legislative session and the second session of the 114<sup>th</sup> Congress. The Program is intended to be broad enough to cover the wide variety of issues that are likely to be considered during that time and flexible enough to allow Caltrain to respond swiftly and effectively to unanticipated developments. Adoption of the Program provides our legislative delegation and our transportation partners with a clear statement of Caltrain's priorities.

The 2016 Legislative Program is organized to guide Caltrain's actions and positions in support of three primary objectives:

1. Maintain and enhance funding opportunities to support Caltrain's programs, projects, and services.
2. Seek a regulatory environment that streamlines project delivery and maximizes Caltrain's ability to meet public transportation service demands.
3. Reinforce and expand programs that build and incentivize public transportation ridership.

The Program is structured to apply these core objectives to a series of issues detailed in the 2016 Legislative Program.

Should other issues surface that require Caltrain's attention, actions will be guided by the three policy objectives listed above. If needed, potential action on issues that are unrelated to these policy goals will be brought to Caltrain's Board of Directors for consideration.

Caltrain and its legislative consultants will employ a variety of engagement tools to support the 2016 Legislative Program, including:

1. Direct Engagement

Engage policymakers directly and sponsor legislation, submit correspondence and provide public testimony that communicates and advances Caltrain's legislative priorities and positions.

2. Coalition-based Engagement

Engage local and regional stakeholders to build awareness about specific issues and participate in local, regional, statewide and national coalitions organized to advance positions that are consistent with the 2016 Legislative Program.

3. Media Engagement

Build public awareness and communicate legislative priorities by issuing press releases, organizing media events, and through the use of social media and other electronic media.

**BUDGET IMPACT**

There is no impact on the budget.

**BACKGROUND**

Staff actively monitors legislative and regulatory activity and will seek Board positions on selected bills as appropriate to further Caltrain's legislative objectives and to provide support for our advocacy efforts. Staff will supply updated reports summarizing relevant legislative and regulatory activities, allowing the Board to track legislative developments and providing opportunities to take appropriate action on pending legislation.

Prepared By: Casey Fromson, Officer, Communications Division

650.508.6493

## **Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board 2016 Legislative Program**

### **Purpose**

Legislative and regulatory actions have the potential to significantly benefit Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) programs and services. They also have potential to present serious challenges that threaten JPB's ability to meet some of the region's most critical transportation demands.

The 2016 Legislative Program establishes the principles that will guide JPB's legislative and regulatory advocacy efforts through the 2016 calendar year, including the State legislative session and the second session of the 114<sup>th</sup> Congress. The program is intended to be broad enough to cover the wide variety of issues that are likely to be considered during that time and flexible enough to allow JPB to respond swiftly and effectively to unanticipated developments.

### **Objectives**

The 2016 Legislative Program is organized to guide JPB's actions and positions in support of three primary objectives:

- Maintain and enhance funding opportunities to support JPB programs and services.
- Seek a regulatory environment that streamlines project delivery and maximizes JPB's ability to meet transportation service demands.
- Reinforce and expand programs that build and incentivize public transportation ridership.

### **Issues**

The Legislative Program is structured to apply these core objectives to a series of State and Federal issues categories:

1. Budget and Transportation Funding Opportunities
2. Transportation Projects - Funding Requests and Needs
3. Regulatory and Administrative Issues

Within these major issue areas are a detailed list of specific legislative initiatives as well a corresponding set of policy strategies.

Should other issues surface that require JPB's attention, actions will be guided by the three policy objectives listed above. If needed, potential action on issues that are unrelated to these policy goals will be brought to the Board of Directors for consideration.

## **Advocacy Tactics**

JPB staff, led by the Communications Department and its legislative consultants, will employ a variety of advocacy tactics to support the 2016 Legislative Program, including:

**Direct Engagement:** Engage policymakers directly and sponsor legislation, submit correspondence and provide public testimony that communicates and advances JPB's legislative priorities and positions.

**Coalition-based Engagement:** Engage local and regional stakeholders to build awareness about specific issues and participate in local, regional, statewide and national coalitions organized to advance positions that are consistent with the 2016 Program.

**Media Engagement:** Build public awareness and communicate legislative priorities by issuing press releases, organizing media events, and through the use of social media and other electronic media.

DRAFT

# 2016 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

## STATE AND REGIONAL ISSUES

### 1. Budget and Transportation Funding Opportunities (State / Region)

Issues and Background	Strategies
<p><u>General:</u>            State investment in transportation operations and infrastructure continues to be underfunded despite a rebounding economy and the stabilization of the State budget. While some existing revenues have been protected from diversion, other funds remain vulnerable, and although some State bond revenues are still available to fund specified transportation projects, over \$200 billion in new revenue will be required to meet the State's infrastructure needs over the next six years. Since the gas tax has not been increased or adjusted for inflation since 1993, its buying power has been diminished, further depleting resources available to maintain, let alone expand or improve the State highway system or transit needs. A statewide advisory committee has been established to assess the implementation of pilot program for a mileage-based user fee as an alternative to the gas tax.</p> <p>In addition, Governor Brown has called for a Special Session on Transportation, which will last through the end of the legislative session, to find revenues for local streets and roads maintenance and rehabilitation, the State highway system, and funding for public transportation.</p> <p><u>Existing Revenues Formula</u>            After years of diversion to support the State's General Fund, funding for the State Transit Assistance (STA) program has remained stable over the last few budget cycles thanks to successful legal, legislative and political efforts on behalf of</p>	<p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protect against the elimination or diversion of any State or regional funds that support JPB's transportation needs.</li> <li>• Support State funding allocation requests for investments that benefit JPB's transportation programs and services.</li> <li>• Work with statewide transit coalitions to identify and advance opportunities for funding that would support JPB's transportation priorities.</li> <li>• Monitor recommendations of the Road Usage Charge (RUC) Technical advisory Committee and implementation of a RUC program by the California State Transportation Agency.</li> <li>• Monitor and support efforts to study Vehicle Miles Traveled tax as a potential revenue source.</li> <li>• Support a funding package that will include a significant and sustained investment in public transit that ensures transit systems are maintained in a State of good repair and able to support priority projects, such as transit capital, operations, and grade separations.</li> </ul> <p><u>Existing Revenues Formula</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the full funding of the STA program at levels called for in the 2011 reenactment of the 2010 gas-tax swap legislation.</li> <li>• Advocate for the regularly scheduled issuance of State</li> </ul>

# 2016 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

<p>the transportation community. Still, more revenue is needed in order to meet the demand of increased ridership, reduce congestion and adhere to the State's mandate of reducing greenhouse gas emissions, and creating livable communities.</p>	<p>infrastructure bonds from that support transportation services and programs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support legislation to maintain exemption for STA efficiency criteria.</li> <li>• Support legislation seeking to increase the sales tax on diesel, which serves as the primary source of funding for the STA program.</li> <li>• Advocate for the restoration of over \$1 billion in annual truck weight fee revenue and \$900 million in General Fund loan repayments, which can be used to support Measure A program priorities.</li> </ul>
<p><i>Cap-and-Trade Revenues</i>          In 2012, the State began implementing the cap-and-trade market-based compliance system approved as a part of the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32). The State estimates that the system may yield billions of dollars per year in revenues that will be allocated to various emissions-reducing projects and programs. In 2014, legislation was enacted creating a long-term funding plan for cap-and-trade which dedicates 60 percent of cap-and-trade revenues to transportation. The remaining 40 percent (~\$500 million) is subject to annual appropriation through the State budget process.</p> <p>Caltrain is eligible for funding through the Low Carbon Transit Operations Program, Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program, Affordable Housing Sustainable Communities and the HSR Program. The program requirements, oversight, and competitiveness vary.</p> <p>Some of the State's formula cap-and-trade programs for transit systems require a percent of the expended funding to be used in disadvantaged communities. This restriction can prove difficult in jurisdictions with a small number of "disadvantaged" communities, as currently defined by CalEnviro Screen.</p>	<p><i>Cap-and-Trade Revenues</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work with the Administration and like-minded coalitions to secure the appropriation of cap-and-trade revenues that will support JPB's transportation needs.</li> <li>• Support legislation and regional action makes a broad array of JPB's emissions-reducing transportation projects, programs and services eligible for investment.</li> <li>• Protect existing cap-and-trade appropriations for transit operations, capital projects, sustainable communities strategy, and HSR blended system implementation.</li> <li>• Work to direct additional revenues to transit-eligible programs, including efforts to secure funding from the remaining discretionary funds and revenues dedicated to the high-speed-rail project.</li> <li>• Support efforts to revise the definition of "disadvantaged communities" to include a larger proportion of disadvantaged communities on the Peninsula.</li> </ul>

# 2016 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

## Ballot Measure and Voter Threshold

With over \$200 billion in unfunded transportation needs and funding from existing infrastructure bond measures waning, proposals for new local, regional and statewide transportation revenues are being discussed.

Despite broad-based majority support for dedicating additional revenue to transportation services and programs, efforts to generate new revenues are often unsuccessful due to the requirement that certain measures receive two-thirds supermajority support from the Legislature and/or voters.

In 2016, legislation may be considered that provides a framework for lowering the thresholds for the State or a city, county, special district or regional public agency to impose a special tax.

## Other State or Local Funding Options

With the State's recent dissolution of redevelopment agencies, local, and regional governments continue to seek methods for funding new infrastructure, facility needs, and projects that will support ridership growth through a variety of methods.

Various local jurisdictions around the State are looking to expand managed lane programs as a way of generating additional funding for highway maintenance and operations, and, possibly to support alternatives to the auto in those lane corridors, such as public transit.

## Ballot Measure and Voter Threshold

- Support efforts to amend the State Constitution to reduce the voter threshold required for the State or a city, county, special district or regional transportation agency to impose a special tax for transportation projects or programs.
- Oppose efforts to add burdensome restrictions on the expenditure of these revenues, such as requiring payment for maintenance costs on the State highway system.
- Engage in efforts to generate new local, regional or statewide transportation funding and support proposals that adequately benefit JPB's transportation needs.

## Other State or Local Funding Options

- Advocate for legislation that would create new local funding tools to support transportation infrastructure and services.
- Support innovative local and regional funding options that will provide financial support for JPB.
- Support legislation that works to ensure revenues generated through managed lane projects remain in the County of origin.
- Advocate for funding sources that would assist transit agencies in obtaining funds for sustainability initiatives including water conservation, waste reduction, long-term resource efficiency of facilities and equipment, and greenhouse gas reductions.
- Support MTC's efforts to seeking authority for Bay Area voters to consider raising tolls on State- owned bridges to fund transportation improvements in bridge corridors (Regional Measure 3).

# 2016 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

## 2. Transportation Projects - Funding Requests and Needs (State / Region)

Issues and Background	Strategies
<p><u>Caltrain Modernization Program</u>            In 2012, the State Legislature appropriated \$705 million in Proposition 1A high-speed rail funds to modernize the Caltrain corridor and lay the foundation for future high-speed rail service. Under a multi-party regional funding agreement, this investment will be used to match a variety of local, regional, State and Federal funding sources to electrify the corridor, install an advanced signaling system and replace JPB's aging diesel trains with electric trains that will dramatically improve service between San Francisco and San Jose.</p> <p>In order to progress on the Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project, supplemental funding MOUs with State and local partners needs to be pursued and finalized.</p> <p><u>Other Projects</u>            Beyond the CalMod Program, JPB has identified capital projects such as a fully electrified 8-car EMU fleet with longer platforms that will provide additional capacity and service benefits to Caltrain commuters. The capital needs also include but are not limited to grade separations and station upgrades.</p> <p>First and last mile projects as well as transit oriented development projects are an important part of the broad transit ecosystem that will help support robust ridership in the corridor. JPB, as a key mobility agency, will continue to be engaged with projects focused on these issues.</p> <p>In 2016, a new round of HSR Blended System planning, outreach and environmental clearance work will kick-off in</p>	<p><u>Caltrain Modernization Program</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advocate for the sale and allocation of Proposition 1A funding to meet the commitments specified in SB 1029 with respect to the Caltrain corridor.</li> <li>• Support the allocation of cap-and-trade funding to advance implementation of the Caltrain Modernization Program.</li> <li>• Work with State, local and regional partners to advance policies and actions that will help secure funding needed to fulfill local and regional commitments to the Caltrain Modernization Program.</li> <li>• Work to address regulatory challenges that limit the implementation of solutions that will maximize JPB capacity and service benefits.</li> </ul> <p><u>Other Projects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the allocation of cap-and-trade or other State / regional funding to advance implementation of JPB projects.</li> <li>• Work to address regulatory actions or policies that negatively impact future capacity or service improvements.</li> <li>• Support efforts to provide commuters with easy and convenient options to travel to and from major transit centers to their final destination.</li> <li>• Advocate for policies that promote transit-oriented developments near major transit centers.</li> <li>• Consistent with existing agreements between JPB and CHSRA, support efforts to plan, engage stakeholders, and implement the Blended System project on the Caltrain corridor.</li> </ul>



# 2016 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

the corridor. While this project is not being led by JPB, the agency owns the right-of-way and has a significant interest in the process and success of the project that will “blended” with Caltrain service.

## 3. Regulatory and Administrative Issues (State / Region)

Issues and Background	Strategies
<p><u>General</u> Every year a variety of legislation or regulatory action is pursued that would affect regulations governing transportation-related service operations, administration, planning and project delivery. In addition, opportunities exist to reform or update existing regulations that are outdated, or can be improved to address potential burdens on transportation agencies without affecting regulatory goals.</p> <p><u>California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)</u> Several regional and statewide transportation organizations continue working to modernize CEQA and minimize unnecessary delays during the environmental review process.</p> <p><u>Sustainable Communities Strategies Implementation</u> In conjunction with AB 32 implementation, the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act (SB 375) requires regions to develop Sustainable Communities Strategies (SCS) with integrated housing, land-use and transportation policies that will accommodate population growth and reduce</p>	<p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support opportunities to remove barriers to, and improve the ability to conduct, efficient transportation operations, administration, planning and project delivery efforts, including alternative project delivery methods that provide flexibility to JPB.</li> <li>• Oppose efforts to impose unjustified and burdensome regulations or restrictions on JPB’s ability to conduct efficient transportation operations, administration, planning and project delivery efforts.</li> </ul> <p><u>California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Closely monitor efforts to modernize CEQA and support proposals that advantage transportation projects, including bicycle, pedestrian and transit-oriented development projects, without compromising CEQA’s effectiveness as an environmental protection policy.</li> <li>• Support efforts to streamline project delivery including expedited reviews and approvals for large transportation projects.</li> </ul> <p><u>Sustainable Communities Strategies Implementation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advocate for policies that provide adequate and equitable funding to support increased demand and dependence on JPB’s transportation services associated with the implementation of SB 375 and Plan Bay Area.</li> </ul>

# 2016 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

regional greenhouse gas emissions by specific amounts. In 2013, regional authorities in the Bay Area approved Plan Bay Area, which includes the region's SCS. Currently, work is underway to update Plan Bay Area.

## Rail Safety

In the last year, there has been a spike in fatalities on the Caltrain corridor. Caltrain staff is already an active member of Operation Lifesaver and is always looking for additional actions / activities to make the railroad safer and change people's behavior around railroad tracks and crossings.

## Rail Safety

- Advocate for policies and resources that promote rail safety.

## FEDERAL ISSUES

### 1. Budget and Transportation Funding Opportunities (Federal)

#### Issues and Background

##### Federal Appropriations and Tax Extenders

Every year, Congress adopts several appropriations bills that cover 12 major issue areas, including the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development bill. These measures provide the authority for Federal agencies to spend money during the upcoming fiscal year for the programs they administer.

Congress also considers legislation that governs tax issues including benefits provided to transit commuters. In recent years, provisions that grant transit users with commute benefits equal to the benefit that drivers receive have been allowed to expire.

#### Strategies

##### Federal Appropriations and Tax Extenders

- Partner with local, regional, State and national coalitions to advocate appropriation of the maximum authorized amount for programs that benefit JPB's transportation services and needs.
- Work with local and regional coalitions to support JPB's requests for funding from discretionary programs.
- Advocate for the permanent extension of pre-tax transit commute benefits at a level equal to benefits that drivers receive.

# 2016 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

<p><u>Surface Transportation and Rail Authorization</u>          In 2015, Congress passed Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act, a five year bill that establishes funding levels and Federal policy for the nation's highways and public transit systems through Fiscal Year 2020. While FAST Act included significant benefits for transportation agencies, it did not address several critical issues including the long-term solvency of the Highway Trust Fund.</p>	<p><u>Surface Transportation and Rail Authorization</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advocate for a dedicated source of revenue that ensures long-term solvency of the Highway Trust fund; allows for the expansion of Federal transportation funding to cover transit State-of-good-repair and other transportation expansion needs.</li> </ul>
<p><b>2. Transportation Projects - Funding Requests and Needs (Federal)</b></p>	
<p>Issues and Background</p>	<p>Strategies</p>
<p><u>Caltrain Modernization Program</u>          The current Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project (PCEP) funding plan includes funding from several Federal funding sources including the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Core Capacity Program. In October 2015, the JPB submitted the PCEP for consideration in the President's FY17 budget under the FTA Core Capacity Program. To receive the funds, the JPB will need a Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA) with the FTA. The Core Capacity funding is an important part of the PCEP funding plan that will keep the project on track to award contracts in 2016.</p>	<p><u>Caltrain Modernization Program</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advocate for the PCEP to be included in the FY17 Core Capacity Program Presidential Budget and for a swift FFGA process with the FTA.</li> <li>• Work with Federal delegation members, as well as local, regional, and State coalitions to support the PCEP requests for funding.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Other Projects</u>          Beyond the CalMod Program, JPB has identified capital projects such as a fully electrified 8-car EMU fleet with longer platforms that will provide additional capacity and service benefits to Caltrain commuters. The capital needs also include but are not limited to grade separations, station upgrades, and supporting regional projects that will increase Caltrain ridership.</p>	<p><u>Other Projects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the allocation of Federal funding to advance implementation of JPB projects.</li> <li>• Work with Federal delegation members, as well as local, regional, and State coalitions to support requests for Federal funding that will benefit JPB service and transit ridership projects in the corridor.</li> </ul>

# 2016 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

<p>JPB is involved in several individual projects such as the South San Francisco Station Improvement project and projects with partner agencies that often seek Federal funds for activities that will enhance transit ridership.</p>	
<h3>3. Regulatory and Administrative Issues (Federal)</h3>	
<p>Issues and Background</p>	<p>Strategies</p>
<p><u>FAST Act and other Regulations</u>            Under FAST Act, the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) will issue guidance and conduct rulemaking to implement various regulatory changes.</p> <p>USDOT will also issue guidance, new rulemaking, and take action in response to executive orders on a variety of issues outside the scope of the FAST Act.</p> <p><u>Rail Safety</u>            In the last year, there has been a spike in fatalities on the Caltrain corridor. Caltrain staff is already an active member of Operation Lifesaver and is always looking for additional actions / activities to make the railroad safer and change people's behavior around railroad tracks and crossings.</p>	<p><u>FAST Act and other Regulations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitor and review guidance and rulemaking proposals affecting FAST Act implementation and other transportation issues.</li> <li>• Collaborate with local, regional, State and national transportation advocacy groups to coordinate comments and advocacy efforts that support regulation that maximizes benefits for transportation programs, services and users.</li> </ul> <p><u>Rail Safety</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advocate for policies and resources that promote rail safety.</li> </ul>

**AGENDA ITEM # 10  
JANUARY 20, 2016**

**PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD (JPB)  
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC)  
STAFF REPORT**

TO: Citizens Advisory Committee

FROM: Patrick Thompson  
Market Research Specialist

SUBJECT: **2015 CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY RESULTS**

Staff will be making a presentation at the CAC meeting of January 20, 2016.

The 2015 Customer Satisfaction Survey is available on the Caltrain website at the following address: <http://www.caltrain.com/about/statsandreports/Surveys.html>

To navigate to this page, go to: caltrain.com > About Caltrain > Statistics & Reports > Surveys.

Prepared by: Josh Averill, Assistant District Secretary

650.508.6223

## JPB CAC Work Plan – As of 1-20-16

### January 20, 2016

- \* Elections
- Legislative Program
- Overview on surveys
- 2015 Customer Survey results

### February 17, 2016

- \* Cal Mod qtly update
- Customer Service presentation – requested 10/21/15
- Brown Act Workshop – requested 11-18-15
- Bicycle Wayside Facilities – requested 11-18-15

### March 16, 2016

- 
- 
- 

### April 20, 2016

- 
- 
- 

### May 18, 2016

- \* Cal Mod qtly update
- 
- 

### June 15, 2016

- 
- 
- 

### Items to be scheduled

- MTC means-based fare pricing study
- Quiet cars
- Mobile ticketing – requested 12-16-15
- Social media update
- Wi-Fi update

\* Date certain (time sensitive item)