

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

MINUTES OF MAY 20, 2015

MEMBERS PRESENT: J. Berk, C. Cobey (Chair), A. Levin, B. Shaw, A. Sweet, G. Scharff

MEMBERS ABSENT: A. Lee, Y. Mills, C. Tucker

STAFF PRESENT: J. Averill, D. Couch, C. Fromson, A. Ly, A. Maguigad

Chair Chris Cobey called the meeting to order at 5:42 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF APRIL 15, 2015

Motion/Second: Shaw/Sweet

Ayes: Berk, Cobey, Levin, Shaw, Sweet, Scharff

Absent: Lee, Mills, Tucker

PUBLIC COMMENT

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said the new Metrolink cars are on the trains. Now capacity is met, but capacity will continue to grow, and bicyclists will want more bike space. He suggested gutting the seats out of the bike cars to provide 80 bike spaces on trains, and if people want to watch their bikes, they should stand.

Doug DeLong, Mountain View, congratulated the JPB and Transit America Services, Inc. for getting the new Metrolink cars into service. He said this just buys time between now and electrification because demand will continue to grow. The schedule is being stressed by the passenger loads. Capacity can be created by eliminating stops on average, and the schedule should be redesigned to spread out the stops and create similar speed for all trains. Caltrain could run a group of three trains every 30 minutes. This could provide more seat miles per hour, seat more customers and make the schedule more reliable.

Jeff Carter, Millbrae, said he does not agree to eliminate stops because it is a deterrent to using Caltrain and is an inconvenience to station pairs.

COMMITTEE COMMENTS

Brian Shaw thanked the JPB for the new cars and said they are a good stopgap measure for the meantime. He said trains should be better labeled on the sides with their train number and perhaps the stops they make.

Jonathan Berk said the design of the schedule should be an absolute focus that requires analysis. He said it requires a serious investment because the trains are full. He

said the customers being served come in late and work late. He said the optimal train service that can be provided given the constraints Caltrain has should be determined. The objective should be defined, which could be to get the most cars off the road, increase the revenue, or increase customers.

Adina Levin asked if schedule refinements are in the work plan and if Caltrain is planning to change the schedule between now and electrification. April Maguigad, Manager, Rail Operations, said how service levels are decided, when changes are made, and what factors are involved are in the work plan. She said there will be changes between now and 2020 but none are planned at this time.

Greg Scharff said the schedule issue is very important. He said it is important to know how much it costs to run more express trains, and to know what is feasible and what can be accomplished given the limited resources.

Alex Sweet said Bike Share is proposing to remove all bike share systems on the Peninsula except for San Jose. She said this is a terrible idea given the goals Caltrain has to move people, accommodate people with bikes and reduce demand for bikes onboard. She encouraged Caltrain to reach out to cities on the Peninsula to voice support for continuing Bike Share and expanding the program.

Mr. Scharff encouraged Caltrain to reach out to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), because they will be making the decision. It is critical for cities to have the Bike Share Program.

Public Comment

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said he found \$10 million to \$16 million of pork in the operating budget. He said he wants to use that money to have one Baby Bullet Train every hour in the off peak.

CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT

Chair Cobey said:

- He would like the CAC members to come up with two or three ideas of priorities for the CAC to address the rest of the year.
- He thinks Caltrain's annual customer satisfaction survey should include topics that have been discussed at the CAC, such as quiet cars, Wi-Fi, level boarding, and fares based on income.
- He wants a searchable database of CAC minutes to find out what the CAC has done over time.
- He would like to know if there is another tool besides the survey to gain an understanding of customers' interest on issues that come before the committee.

ELECTRIC MULTIPLE UNIT (EMU) REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL POLICY DISCUSSION RELATED TO EMU PROCUREMENT AND RELATED DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

Casey Fromson, Government Relations Officer, presented:

- Need to Maximize Capacity
 - Add cars to diesel trains now
 - Caltrain Electrification (2020)

- More trains/serve more riders
 - Increase station stops and/or reduced travel times
 - Level boarding and longer trains
- Key Regional Benefits:
 - Decreases in greenhouse gases, daily traffic congestion, engine noise
 - Improvements in clean air quality and increases in daily ridership, improved frequency and quicker trips
- Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project (PCEP) Service Benefits
 - Today
 - There are five trains that carry 5,100 passengers per hour per direction
 - A Baby Bullet train takes 60 minutes and makes six stops between San Francisco and San Jose
 - After PCEP
 - There will be six trains that carry 6,300 passengers per hour per direction
 - A Baby Bullet train could take 45 minutes to travel from San Francisco to San Jose, or at 60 minutes could make 13 stops

Dave Couch, Project Delivery Director, presented:

- Timeline for 2020 Revenue Service
 - Design Build contractors were prequalified summer 2014
 - The Request for Proposals (RFP) has been issued
 - The Design Build contract will be awarded in fall 2015
 - The EMU RFP will be issued in July
 - The EMU contract will be awarded winter 2015
- Request for Information from car builders – summer 2014
 - To maximize seats would require bi-level vehicles
 - Use currently available makes of cars, which are service-proven and saves costs and time
 - Comply with U.S. regulations
 - Two double doors per car at 22 inches to 25 inches
- Recommended EMU
 - Two double doors located at 25 inches
 - One to two steps up from platform
 - Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) passengers and bikes located at 25-inch level
 - ADA would use mini highs and wayside lifts
 - Similar to today's Bombardier cars
- Level Boarding is Important for
 - Safety enhancements
 - Operating efficiencies
 - Passenger convenience
 - ADA compliance
- Level Boarding Challenges
 - Lengthy construction period with revenue service
 - California Public Utilities Commission waiver needed for freight corridor
 - Tenants with different boarding heights

- Station area impacts (e.g. ramps, circulation)
- Stakeholder Request for EMU Modification
 - California High-speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) vehicles will require high door boarding
 - Caltrain EMUs be modified to support high door boarding
 - Enables common platforms in future
 - Provides system operational flexibility
- Explore Modification Options
 - December 2014 to May 2015
 - Car builder interviews
 - Technical analysis
 - Caltrain operational assessment
 - May 2015 – July 2015
 - Policy discussion/decisions
 - Updates to Boards and stakeholders
- Car Builder Interviews
 - Seven car builders participated and proposed
 - Cars with more doors – possible seat loss
 - Cars with traps – possible reliability concerns
 - Could redesign existing vehicles to save money and time
- Analysis
 - Two modification options
 - Two timeframes
 - 2020 electrified service without high-speed rail (HSR)
 - Future blended service with HSR
 - Focus areas
 - Boarding for passengers with and without bikes, ADA
 - Passenger circulation within the cars
 - Operational challenges
- Terminology
 - Caltrain EMU floor above top of rail (ATOR): 22 inches to 25 inches
 - CHSRA floor ATOR: 48 inches to 51 inches
 - Current platforms ATOR: eight inches
- Timeframe: 2020 electrified service
 - Modification A – Cars with more doors
 - Two double doors at 25-inch and 50-inch height for a total of four double doors
 - Passengers and bikes use 25-inch doors with one to two steps
 - ADA location to be determined
 - Modification B – Cars with traps
 - Two single doors with traps, two single doors with no traps, all doors to 50-inch floor. Single door access means longer dwell time
 - Passengers and bikes would use the two single doors with traps and step up three to five steps
 - ADA location at 50-inch level
- Timeframe: future blended system with level boarding
 - Scenario 1
 - Shared platforms at two to three CHSRA/Caltrain stations

- Shared platforms at 50-inch height
- Caltrain stations have level boarding at 25 inches
- Modification A – Cars with more doors
 - Continue using both doors
 - Seats cannot be restored
 - Interior lift needed for ADA
 - Potential mitigation by car reconfiguration
- Modification B – Cars with traps
 - Continue using traps
 - Interior circulation challenges
- Scenario 2
 - Shared platforms at all 27 stations at 50 inches
 - Modification A – Cars with more doors
 - Seal low doors and use high doors only
 - Interior reconfiguration/restore seats
 - Bike circulation and storage challenge
 - Interior lift needed for ADA
 - Potential mitigation by car reconfiguration
 - Modification B – Cars with traps
 - Seal traps
 - Single door (dwell impacts)
 - Bike circulation and storage challenge

Ms. Fromson presented:

- Potential Path Forward – Framework
 - Blended system partnership
 - Blended system is not yet defined
 - Early investment program
 - Need to make EMU design decision now to not preclude common platforms with CHSRA in the future
- Potential Path Forward – Cars with More Doors Option
 - Challenges
 - Seat loss/passenger circulation inside car
 - Short-term solution
 - Design car with two sets of doors
 - Keep high doors sealed/use low doors
 - Car configured similar to original EMUs
 - Request CHSRA to fund modification costs
 - Future blended system
 - Evaluate use of high doors
 - Associated car interior reconfiguration
- Future Blended Service
 - Additional work needed
 - Community planning/environmental review
 - Blended system definition
- Next Steps
 - June
 - Update JPB on proposed path forward

- Seats/bikes/bathroom balance
- July Board action
 - Release EMU RFP
 - Updated funding plan/CHSRA additional funding commitment

Mr. Berk said there must be a more effective way to put a bike on the train. He said 50 inches does not seem like the right height for Caltrain. He asked why the focus is not on the stations where a center platform is at 50 inches for HSR and the side platforms are at 25 inches for Caltrain. He said the shared stations should be cleverly designed to accommodate both types of trains. Ms. Fromson said the original staff recommendation was a scenario with separate dedicated platforms that could accommodate both types of trains. That recommendation has evolved based on stakeholder requests for Caltrain to procure a vehicle that could be used at a common platform with CHSRA.

Ben Tripousis, Northern California Regional Director, CHSRA, said a 46- to 51-inch platform is the international standard in order to operate at 220 miles per hour. It allows CHSRA to maximize competition for the procurement, and a service-proven design is needed. There are no operating high-speed trains that have a 30-inch boarding level that meet these criteria. The equipment necessary to operate at high speed is under the floor of the train. The advantages of a common-level boarding solution are: improving operations at common stations, improving passenger circulation, which includes reduced dwell time, improving safety and ADA facilities, improving reliability, allowing the ability to move trains to any platform when there is a disabled train on the line or medical emergency, significantly reducing overall infrastructure costs, improving overall system operations and throughput, maximizing interoperability, and achieving service readiness sooner.

Mr. Berk said none of this negates the solution he proposed. Mr. Tripousis said at most of the stations in the Caltrain corridor, the platform size would result in challenging circulation and the need for high-blocks and other platform furniture. The platform width at many stations is not sufficient to accommodate that type of circulation.

Ms. Levin asked when mockups will be reviewed to help design the most efficient passenger flow. Ms. Fromson said there will be mockups when a car builder is onboard.

Mr. Berk left at 7:15 p.m.

Ms. Levin asked if environmental approval is needed to raise platform heights or if it is California Environmental Quality Act exempt. Ms. Fromson said it depends on how big and what type the change is, the size of the platform, and the station site. Changes could impact the footprint, historic stations, road crossings, pedestrian crossings, or other buildings.

Mr. Scharff asked how these issues are being handled in Southern California. Mr. Tripousis said they are looking to Caltrain on how to handle it. This area is further ahead in the electrification process.

Mr. Scharff asked when Caltrain will get to the Transbay Terminal. Mr. Tripousis said the Transbay Joint Powers Authority (TJPA) is building the terminal. It will be complete by the end of 2017. The TJPA is in midst of formulating a funding plan for the construction of the Downtown Extension Project, but there is no firm schedule.

Mr. Shaw asked how the metrics are going to be determined that come up with a balance for the bikes/bathrooms/seats/standees. He said he hopes this committee has ability to influence the metrics. He said he is concerned that Caltrain might be compromised because of CHSRA. Ms. Fromson said staff is meeting with the public at several venues to get feedback and be transparent.

Ms. Levin said metrics could include capacity, passengers per peak hour per direction, service to Transbay, dwell time, and the customer experience at shared stations.

Public Comment

Doug DeLong, Mountain View, said the high-speed alignment is not going to be along the Caltrain service alignment on the Union Pacific tracks at the Gilroy Caltrain Station, so that is not a common station. The tracks at Diridon are going to be up in the air for CHSRA, so that is not a common platform. The only relevant stations for common platforms are Millbrae and the Transbay Terminal. He said the tracks or platforms could be raised and lowered by hydraulic jacks so both trains could use the same platform face. He said CHSRA is bribing Caltrain with money, but it will result in messing up the service.

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said the Federal Railroad Administration believes the CHSRA equipment height and width must be compatible with North American equipment to be able to share tracks. He said the French have ordered 840 trains for \$10 billion that have a two-plus-two configuration. He presented his ideas on a modified EMU, which was provided in the correspondence packet.

Ms. Levin asked if the Diridon Caltrain Station track alignment will be elevated. Mr. Tripousis said that is not set in stone. An analysis completed about four years ago included that option and another option was at-grade. As the environmental review goes through, those options will be reviewed, and he believes having an at-grade solution may be more workable. He said he is working with Union Pacific at Gilroy to operate adjacent to the corridor and he expects to serve the downtown Gilroy station. He said CHSRA has contributed money to Gilroy to assist in the planning process for their area master plan.

Jeff Carter, Millbrae, said CHSRA should not dictate to Caltrain how to set up the platforms. He asked how 50-inch platforms will work with freight and other tenants. The priority of this body is Caltrain and increasing efficiency and capacity of Caltrain. Trains with trap doors are too old school and should be put to rest. Double doors are worthy of study. Caltrain should not be limited to six-car trains. Increasing platforms and the length of trains and more than six trains per hour to get more capacity should be discussed.

PRESENTATION ON THE FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2016 OPERATING AND CAPITAL BUDGET PROCESS

Aandy Ly, Manager, Budgets, presented:

- Operating Budget
 - Farebox revenue will go over \$80 million in FY2015
 - The farebox recovery budget for FY2016 is 60 percent
 - A fare increase will be proposed, including the Go Pass, in January 2016
 - Fare increases are anticipated to be made every other year. Staff will be proposing to use one-time funds
 - Total preliminary revenue is \$139.1 million, an increase of \$8.4 million
 - Total preliminary expenses are \$139.1 million, an increase of \$11.6 million
 - The budget is balanced
 - Member Contributions
 - San Mateo: \$6,080,000
 - Santa Clara: \$8,413,758
 - San Francisco: \$5,233,692
 - Total: \$19,727,450
 - Caltrain's Structural Deficit
 - Need dedicated permanent funding source
 - Using one-time funding sources to balance the budget
 - Continuing to explore a full range of options
 - Need continued support from partner agencies, businesses, labor, environmental and community-based organizations and elected officials
 - Next Step: Long-term focus on funding options
- Capital Budget Development
 - Call for Projects – January 5
 - Project managers prepare budget requests – February 3
 - Budget and Grants review requests – February 13
 - Peer Review Committee reviews projects – March 6
 - Executive Team reviews proposals – April 24
 - Board sees preliminary budget – May 7
 - Board adopts budget – June 4
- Deliverables
 - Work Plan
 - Project Evaluation Form
 - Project Justification Form
- Review Capital Budget Goals
 - Invest in infrastructure and equipment improvements to maintain system in a state of good repair
 - Invest in the rehabilitation and replacement of components for the rail vehicles to ensure fleet availability
 - Continue system safety improvements
 - Begin delivery of the Caltrain Modernization (CalMod) Program, and continue planning with CHSRA
- FY2016 Capital Budget total: \$200.8 million
- Capital Projects Highlights
 - State of good repair - \$70.4 million

- Station and intermodal access
- Right of way/signal and communications
- Rolling stock
- CalMod - \$122.5 million
 - Rolling stock replacement
 - Electrification
- Legal mandates and required enhancements - \$1.9 million
 - Railroad bridge load ratings
 - Santa Clara County grade crossing medians
- Operational improvements/enhancements - \$2.9 million
 - Right of way fencing
 - Train departure monitors at terminal stations
- Planning/studies - \$3.1 million
- FY2016 Capital Funding Sources
 - Federal grants - \$21.1 million
 - State and regional grants - \$1.5 million
 - Other (CalMod Early Investment Program) - \$163.2 million
 - JPB member agency contribution - \$15 million
- Next Steps
 - Negotiate Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funds on hold with MTC.
 - Present balanced budget in June.

Public Comment

Roland Lebrun, San Jose, said fuel is listed at \$18.5 million, but the actual number should be \$12.6 million. Staff overestimated the amount of fuel Caltrain uses. They estimated the cost per gallon at \$3.40, but the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority estimates \$2.75 per gallon. When the farebox jumped 100 percent, the Administrative Expenses went up from \$10 million to \$20 million, so that \$10 million is not needed. The Managing Agency Administrative Overhead is \$5.8 million. The San Mateo County Transit District contribution to the operating budget is \$6.1 million, so that leaves \$300,000. He said all this money can be used to run Baby Bullet trains every hour. He said the "Other" funding source of \$163 million is the FTA funding for new trains.

Mr. Ly said the \$12 million fuel cost Mr. Lebrun is referring to is a year-to-date expense, not the full annual expense. He said staff takes a conservative approach to the fuel budget since oil prices are very volatile. He said about 4.6 million gallons of fuel are budgeted for the year. Even a one-cent increase equates to \$46,000, and a 10-cent increase equates to \$460,000. If the budgeted money is not spent, then there will be budget savings. He said the "Other" funding is from the Early Investment Program, and staff is not using that money for other purposes; it is strictly for the CalMod Program.

Mr. Scharff asked where the shuttles go and what they do. Ms. Maguigad said some shuttles are pass-through costs, some the JPB pays for. There are 30 different shuttle services that help with Caltrain stations and the last mile.

Ms. Levin asked for ridership figures and costs on Santa Clara County partners.

Mr. Scharff asked what drove administrative cost increase. Mr. Ly said there was an increase of \$2.3 million, and the major drive is coming from consultant services needed for operations, engineering and construction.

Mr. Scharff asked why there is an increase in fuel costs. Mr. Ly said the majority of that increase is from the greenhouse gas tax of 13 cents per gallon, and there is a small increase in volume due in part to the new railcars that were added to trains.

Ms. Levin asked why costs to run trains goes up if Positive Train Control adds automation. Ms. Maguigad said it is not automation, it is there as a safety net. The engineers will still be operating the train. Additional costs are due to training and implementation. Mr. Ly said additional employees are needed for the extra train that was added.

Mr. Scharff left at 8:06. Due to a loss of a quorum, the meeting adjourned.

DATE, TIME AND LOCATION OF NEXT MEETING:

June 17, 2015 at 5:40 p.m., San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building, 2nd Floor Bacciocco Auditorium, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA.

Meeting adjourned at 8:06 p.m.