

CENDA

CAPITOL CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Wednesday February 18, 2015

10:00 a.m.

City Council Chambers Suisun City Hall 701 Civic Center Blvd., Suisun City, CA (see attached map) A simultaneous teleconference call will take place at:

Santa Clara Valley Transportation Agency 3331 North First Street, Conference Room C-118 San Jose, CA

AG	ENDA	
I.	Call to Order	
II.	Roll Call and Pledge of Allegiance	
III.	Report of the Chair	
IV.	Minutes of the November 19, 2014 Meeting	Action
V.	Consent Calendar	Action
	1. CalEOS FY 14-15 Safety/Security Project Program	
	2. Budget Update: Oleum Tunnel Safety Improvement Project	
	3. CCJPA Operations Database Business Intelligence Project	
VI.	Action and Discussion Items	
	1. Business Plan Update (FY 2015/16 – FY 2016/17)	Action*
	2. Legislative Matters/Governor's Draft FY 15/16 Budget	Action
	3. Capitol Corridor Project List: FY 14/15-FY15/16 Cap and Trade Transit/Intercity Rail Program	Action
	4. On-Board Information System Project Implementation Agreement	Action
	5. Vision Plan Implementation Program	Action
	6. Capitol Corridor Station Bicycle eLocker Project	Action
	7. Managing Director's Report	Info
	8. Work Completed	Info
	a. Capitol Corridor Annual Performance Report (FY 2014)	
	b. CCJPA Annual Independent Audit (FY14)	
	c. CCJPA/BART Administrative Services Agreement (February 2015 – February 2020)	
	d. Marketing Activities (November 2014 – January 2015)	T C
	9. Work in Progress	Info
	a. Oakland – San Jose Phase 2 Project	
	b. Sacramento-Roseville 3 rd Track Environmental Review/Preliminary Engineering	
	c. Positive Train Control Update	
	d. Station and Platform Safety Upgrades	
	e. Proposition 1B Transit Safety/Security Improvement Projects	
	f. Proposed Extension of Capitol Corridor Trains to Salinas	

- g. Upcoming Marketing Activities
- VII. Board Member Reports
- VIII. Public Comments
- IX. Adjournment. Next Meeting Date: 10:00 a.m., April 15, 2015, at City Council Chambers, Suisun City Hall, 701 Civic Center Blvd., City of Suisun City, CA

Notes:

Members of the public may address the Board regarding any item on this agenda. Please complete a "Request to Address the Board" form (available at the entrance of the Boardroom and at a teleconference location, if applicable) and hand it to the Secretary or designated staff member before the item is considered by the Board. If you wish to discuss a matter that is not on the agenda during a regular meeting, you may do so under Public Comment. Speakers are limited to three (3) minutes for any item or matter. The CCJPA Board reserves the right to take action on any agenda item.

Consent calendar items are considered routine and will be enacted, approved or adopted by one motion unless a request for discussion or explanation is received from a CCJPA Board Director or from a member of the audience.

* Approval of the business plan requires an affirmative vote of at least two-thirds (11) of the appointed members.

The CCJPA Board provides services/accommodations upon request to persons with disabilities who wish to address Board matters. A request must be made within one and five days in advance of a Board meeting, depending on the service requested. Call (510) 464-6085 for information.

MAP DIRECTIONS TO SUISUN CITY HALL



Regular Board Meeting

Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority Board of Directors Minutes of the 95th Meeting November 19, 2014

The 95th meeting of the Board of Directors of the Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority (CCJPA) was held at 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, November 19, 2014, via simultaneous teleconference at City Council Chambers, Suisun City Hall, 701 Civic Center Blvd., Suisun City, California; and San Jose City Hall, 200 East Santa Clara Street, Room T1853, San Jose, California. Vice Chair Gail Murray presided; Kenneth A. Duron, Recording Secretary.

I. <u>Call to Order</u>. Vice Chair Murray called the meeting to order at 9:31 a.m.

II. <u>Roll Call and Pledge of Allegiance</u>. Directors present in Suisun City: Vice Chair Gail Murray, San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART); Steve Cohn, Sacramento Regional Transit District (SRTD); Jim Holmes, Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA); Robert Davis, Yolo County Transportation District (YCTD); Lucas Frerichs, YCTD; Robert Raburn, BART; Rebecca Saltzman, BART; and Harry Price, Solano Transportation Authority (STA) (Alternate for Director Batchelor).

Zakhary Mallett, BART, entered the meeting later.

Directors present in San Jose: None.

Absent: Directors James Spering, STA; Steve Hansen, SRTD; Susan Rohan, PCTPA; Rose Herrera, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (SCVTA); Xavier Campos, SCVTA; James Fang, BART; Tom Radulovich, BART; and Jack Batchelor, Jr., STA (Alternate in stead).

Vice Chair Murray noted there was not a quorum of the Board present and led the Board in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Director Mallett entered the meeting in Suisun City, establishing a quorum.

III. Report of the Chair.

1. Election of Chair and Vice Chair (2-Year Term: 2015-16). Vice Chair Murray brought the matter of the Election of the Chair and Vice Chair before the Board for consideration. Director Holmes read remarks by Chair Spering describing the process for nomination and the recommendation of the Nominating Committee.

Director Holmes moved the election of Vice Chair Gail Murray to be the Chair of the Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Board and Director Lucas Frerichs to be the Vice Chair for the 2015 through 2016 two-year term. Director Cohn seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous roll call vote. Ayes: 9 – Directors Murray, Cohn, Holmes, Davis, Frerichs, Mallett, Raburn, Saltzman, and Price. Noes: 0. Absent: 7 – Directors Spering, Hansen, Rohan, Herrera, Campos, Fang, and Radulovich.

Vice Chair Murray thanked the Board for her election as Chair and shared goals for the coming term. Vice Chair Murray referred the Board to the prepared Report of the Chair in their handouts.

2. Committee for Proposed Updates to CCJPA Interagency Transfer Agreement. Vice Chair Murray shared Chair Spering's memorandum of November 19, 2014 describing the appointment of a committee to protect the interests of the CCJPA, the committee's duties and responsibilities for the Capitol Corridor service under its Interagency Transfer Agreement with the California State Transportation Agency, and the recommended members.

Director Holmes moved the ratification of the CCJPA Interagency Transfer Agreement Committee with Directors Murray, Frerichs, Raburn and Spering as its members. Director Cohn seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous roll call vote. Ayes: 9 – Directors Murray, Cohn, Holmes, Davis, Frerichs, Mallett, Raburn, Saltzman, and Price. Noes: 0. Absent: 7 – Directors Spering, Hansen, Rohan, Herrera, Campos, Fang, and Radulovich.

IV. <u>Consent Calendar</u>. Vice Chair Murray brought forward the Consent Calendar. Director Mallett moved adoption of Item IV.1. Minutes of the September 14, 2014 Board Meeting; Item IV.2. 2015 Meeting Schedule for the CCJPA Board of Directors; Item IV.3. Resolution 14-12, In the Matter of Approving the State Transportation Improvement Program – Interregional Improvement Program (STIP-ITIP) Funds to the Capitol Corridor 2015 Capitalized Maintenance Track Improvement Program. Director Price seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous roll call vote. Ayes: 9 – Directors Murray, Cohn, Holmes, Davis, Frerichs, Mallett, Raburn, Saltzman, and Price. Noes: 0. Absent: 7 – Directors Spering, Hansen, Rohan, Herrera, Campos, Fang, and Radulovich.

V. Action and Discussion Items.

1. Capitol Corridor Annual Performance Report (FY2013-14). Mr. David Kutrosky, Managing Director, presented the proposed Capitol Corridor Annual Performance Report (FY2013-14) for review, comment and adoption by the Board of Directors.

Director Holmes moved adoption of Resolution No. 14-13, In the Matter of Approving the Capitol Corridor Annual Performance Report (FY2013-14). Director Saltzman seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous roll call vote. Ayes: 9 – Directors Murray, Cohn, Holmes, Davis, Frerichs, Mallett, Raburn, Saltzman, and Price. Noes: 0. Absent: 7 – Directors Spering, Hansen, Rohan, Herrera, Campos, Fang, and Radulovich.

2. Vision Plan Update (November 2014) – Capitol Corridor Strategic Service Plan. Mr. Kutrosky reviewed the proposed Vision Plan Update and recommended adoption. Mr. Kutrosky included discussion of Agenda Item V.6. Sea Level Rise Adaptation – Capitol Corridor Route.

Ms. Sherry McCoy, Vice Mayor, City of Hercules, addressed the Board.

Director Cohn moved adoption of Resolution No. 14-14, In the Matter of Providing Authorization for the Adoption of the Capitol Corridor Vision Plan Update (November 2014). Director Raburn seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous roll call vote. Ayes: 9 – Directors Murray, Cohn, Holmes, Davis, Frerichs, Mallett, Raburn, Saltzman, and Price. Noes: 0. Absent: 7 – Directors Spering, Hansen, Rohan, Herrera, Campos, Fang, and Radulovich.

3. Legislative Matters. Mr. Kutrosky provided an overview of proposed legislative matters affecting Capitol Corridor Service. The item was discussed. Mr. Kutrosky advised no action was required.

4. CCJPA Administrative Services Agreement (February 2015 – February 2020). Mr. Kutrosky introduced Ms. Celia McAdam, Placer County Transportation Planning Agency and CCJPA Staff Coordinating Group member. Ms. McAdam presented the recommendation of the Staff Coordinating Group for the selection of the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District as the

Managing Agency for the CCJPA and to extend the Administrative Support Agreement for a five year term.

Director Mallett moved adoption of Resolution No. 14-15, In the Matter of Extending the Administrative Services between the Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority and the Managing Agency for Five Years (February 2015 - February 2020). Director Holmes seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous roll call vote. Ayes: 9 – Directors Murray, Cohn, Holmes, Davis, Frerichs, Mallett, Raburn, Saltzman, and Price. Noes: 0. Absent: 7 – Directors Spering, Hansen, Rohan, Herrera, Campos, Fang, and Radulovich.

5. Fiscal Year 2015 Advertising Contract. Mr. Kutrosky introduced Ms. Priscilla Kalugdan, Manager of Marketing, who requested the Board authorize staff to enter into the agreements necessary to implement the Capitol Corridor advertising plan for FY2015.

Director Holmes moved adoption of Resolution No. 14-16, In the Matter of Authorizing Staff to Enter into Contracts for Advertising Services to Support the FY15 Advertising Campaign. Director Price seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous roll call vote. Ayes: 9 – Directors Murray, Cohn, Holmes, Davis, Frerichs, Mallett, Raburn, Saltzman, and Price. Noes: 0. Absent: 7 – Directors Spering, Hansen, Rohan, Herrera, Campos, Fang, and Radulovich.

6. Sea Level Rise Adaptation – Capitol Corridor Route. Mr. Kutrosky noted a discussion of the topic was included in Item V.2.

7. Managing Director's Report. Mr. Kutrosky reported on on-time performance, recent mechanical issues and resulting delays, and progress of safety projects. Mr. Kutrosky commented that the Wednesday before Thanksgiving was the highest ridership day of the year. The item was discussed.

8. Work Completed and 9. Work in Progress. Vice Chair Murray invited questions or comments from the Board on Items 8 and 9. No comments were received.

Ms. Patricia G. Haman and Mr. Roger C. Haman addressed the Board under Item 9.d. Station Platform Safety Upgrades.

VI. <u>Board Member Reports</u>. Vice Chair Murray invited Board member reports. Director Frerichs read remarks commending Director Steve Cohn on his 16 years of service to the CCJPA on the occasion of his last meeting as a member of the Board of Directors. Director Cohn shared his thoughts on his tenure and the progress of the service. Vice Chair Murray offered congratulations on behalf of the Board of Directors.

VII. <u>Public Comments</u>. Vice Chair Murray invited comment from the public. No comment was received.

VIII. <u>Adjournment</u>. The Meeting adjourned at 11:19 a.m. Next Meeting Date: 10:00 a.m., February 18, 2015 at the City Council Chambers, Suisun City Hall, 701 Civic Center Blvd., Suisun City, California.

Motion: CCJPA Board adopts the minutes of the November 19, 2014 Board Meeting.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Board

DATE: February 11, 2015

FROM: David B. Kutrosky Managing Director, CCJPA

SUBJECT: CalEOS FY 14-15 TRANSIT SAFETY/SECURITY PROJECT PROGRAM

PURPOSE

For the CCJPA Board to adopt the recommended CCJPA project list for the CalEOS FY 14-15 Transit Safety/Security Project Program and provide the flexibility to adjust the allocation of such funding among the approved projects in order to meet CalOES fund expenditure requirements.

BACKGROUND

Each year for the 10-year term of the Proposition 1B, bond funds are administered by the California Office of Emergency Services (CalOES) for the Transit Safety/Security program. The CCJPA is an eligible agency to receive an annual program of \$1.934 million for the duration of Prop 1B. The CCJPA is required to propose the projects to CalOES to receive these funds for the fiscal year for which funds are programmed. For FY 14-15, the CCJPA is nominating the following two projects to be funded using the \$1,934,422 available:

- Project 1:Facility and Wayside/Operational Safety Improvement Projects (\$934,422)
- Project 2: On-Board Information System (\$1,000,000)

Project 1 will enhance station safety/security through better visual signage and platform demarcation improvements, and other related station safety improvements. The wayside/operational safety will be enhanced by reducing intrusion into the right-of-way through the use of fencing as well as shoring up physically vulnerable portions of the track right-of-way to improve the safety of train operations.

Project 2, the on-board information system, will replace non-ADA compliant on-train signage with compliant on-train coordinated audio and video messaging. Such messages will include station arrival information and safety/security customer service messages which are automated by geo-location and can be modified real time as circumstances require. Initial investments will be in system design and function followed by installation all done in coordination with Amtrak and Caltrans Division of Rail and Mass Transit.

The timeframe for using these annual Prop 1B funds has been a very narrow window. Often times, the CCJPA and its project partners have difficulties meeting this restricted CalOES timelines. To prevent a lapse of these funds, staff is seeking the flexibility starting with the current CalOES FY 13-14 projects approved by the CCJPA Board to allow project funding shares to shift between the adopted projects in each fiscal year beginning with the FY 13-14 project list.

RECOMMENDATION

The SCG recommends that the CCJPA Board adopt the list of projects for inclusion in the CalEOS FY 14-15 Transit Safety/Security Project Program and authorizes the flexibility to adjust the allocation of such funding among the approved projects in order to meet CalOES fund expenditure requirements.

Motion: The CCJPB adopts the attached resolution.

In the Matter of Providing Authorization to Obtain FY 14-15 Funds From the State of California Office of Emergency Management Services

Resolution No. 15-01

WHEREAS, Proposition 1B ("Prop 1B"), titled *the "Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, and Port Security Bond Act of 2006,"* was passed by the state's voters on November 7, 2006 and provides \$19.925B in general obligation bonds that will become available through annual enactment by the Legislature for improvements to the state's transportation network; and

WHEREAS, one of those funding accounts established in Proposition 1B was \$1 billion from the Transit Security and Safety Account, of which, \$150 million was set aside for the state's intercity passenger rail system and Metrolink commuter trains in Southern California and Altamont Corridor Express and San Joaquin trains in Northern California; and

WHEREAS, these Prop 1B transit safety and security funds for intercity passenger and commuter rail trains have been named "California Transit Security Grant Program - Intercity Passenger/Commuter Rail" ("CTSGP-IPCR") and are to be allocated by California Office of Emergency Services ("CalOES"); and

WHEREAS, CCJPA has developed a list of eligible projects for the Capitol Corridor for its share of FY 14-15 State appropriations of \$1,934,422 from CalOES listed below:

- Facility and Wayside/Operational Safety Improvement Project (\$934,422) and
- On-Board Information System (\$1,000,000)

WHEREAS, CalOES requires that the governing body of each recipient agency adopt a resolution authorizing the person or persons who may enter into agreements with CalOES on behalf of the governing body; and

WHEREAS, in order to meet the expenditure timelines stipulated by CalOES for the allocation of annual funds, the CCJPA seeks to achieve the flexibility to adjust the allocation of such CalOES funding among the approved projects; and

RESOLVED, that the Board of Directors of the Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority provides that the Executive Director or Managing Director are hereby authorized to execute for and on behalf of the Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority, a public entity established under the laws of the State of California, any actions necessary for the purpose of obtaining financial assistance provided by CalOES, including adjustment of such funding between adopted CTSGP-IPCR Projects starting with the allocated CalOES FY 14-15 funds.

Certification

I, Kenneth A. Duron, duly appointed and Secretary of the Board of Directors do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of a resolution passed and approved by the Board of Directors of the Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority on the _____ day of _____, 2015.

Signature

Date

Item V.2 (Consent) CAPITOL CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY

MEMORANDUM

TO: Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Board

DATE: February 11, 2015

FROM: David B. Kutrosky Managing Director

SUBJECT: BUDGET UPDATE: OLEUM TUNNEL SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS

PURPOSE

For the CCJPA Board to approve an updated budget for the implementation of a safety/security improvement project to reinforce the tunnel at Oleum along the Capitol Corridor route.

BACKGROUND

At its September 17, 2014 meeting, the CCJPA Board adopted Resolution 14-07, which authorizes the CCJPA to contribute \$550,000 for a project to be performed by Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) at natural rock tunnel between the Richmond and Martinez stations, referred to as the "Oleum Tunnel." The original budget was estimated at \$1.6M; however, through further study, UPRR has projected that the total cost for the Project would increase to \$2.0M.

Combining the original CCJPA contribution (\$550,000; Resolution 14-07) with the Caltrans amount, the total public agency contribution of \$930,000 represents approximately 60% of the original project estimate. To keep the public agency contribution to this project at approximately 60% of the revised project cost, with understanding that Caltrans does not plan to increase its contribution, staff is proposing to increase its contribution to this project to \$800,000 through a mix of the annual allocation of state funds to the CCJPA: (1) Capitalized Maintenance funds and (2) Proposition 1B Transit Safety/Security funds.

Funding Partner	Original Budget [Sept. 2014]	Revised Budget [Feb. 2015]	Difference
Union Pacific Railroad	\$670,000	\$820,000	+\$150,000
Caltrans/San Joaquin	\$380,000	\$380,000	\$0
ССЈРА	\$550,000	\$800,000	+\$250,000
TOTAL	\$1,600,000	\$2,000,000	+\$400,000

This contribution by the CCJPA to the Oleum Tunnel Safety Improvement Project will maintain the expected high level of safety and reliability (on-time performance) of the Capitol Corridor trains with the intent to prevent and avoid at some point in the future a rock fall inside the tunnel could cause significant disruption to the Capitol Corridor and other rail services and result in damage to the train equipment and injuries to employees and passengers.

RECOMMENDATION

The SCG recommends that the CCJPA Board approve an updated contribution from the CCJPA for an amount not-to-exceed \$800,000 to the Union Pacific Railroad Oleum Tunnel Safety Improvement Project and authorize the CCJPA Executive Director or her designee to enter into agreements for the implementation of the Project.

Motion: The CCJPB adopts the attached resolution.

In the Matter of Providing Approving an Updated Budget Authorization Of CCJPA Funds for the Union Pacific Railroad Oleum Tunnel Safety Improvement Project

Resolution No. 15-02

WHEREAS, the Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority Board of Directors adopted Resolution 14-07 at its September 17, 2014 meeting that authorizes the CCJPA to contribute \$550,000 for the Union Pacific Railroad ("UPRR") Oleum Tunnel Safety Improvement Project ("Project");

WHEREAS, per Resolution 14-07, the original budget was estimated at \$1,600,000; yet based upon further study, UPRR has projected that the total cost would increase to \$2,000,000; and

WHEREAS, based on discussions with UPRR, staff is seeking to increase the CCJPA's contribution to \$800,000 to help fill the funding gap for the Project; and

WHEREAS, staff believes that it is important for the CCJPA to contribute to the Project as this critical tunnel infrastructure between Martinez and Richmond is used by the Capitol Corridor trains and would avoid the chance of a future a rock fall inside the tunnel that could cause significant disruption to the Capitol Corridor and other rail services and result in damage to the train equipment and injuries to employees and passengers; and

WHEREAS, the CCJPA has secured \$800,000 in Proposition 1B Transit Safety/Security funds provided through a mix of the California Office of Emergency Services (CalOES) and Capitalized Maintenance funds as the CCJPA contribution to the overall project; and

RESOLVED, that the CCJPB does hereby approve an updated budget of \$800,000 for the CCJPA's share of Oleum Tunnel Safety Improvement Project and authorize the CCJPA Executive Director or her designee to enter into the necessary funding and development agreements for the implementation of such safety and security measures.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the CCJPA forthwith transmit a copy of this resolution to Amtrak, Caltrans Division of Rail, and the Union Pacific Railroad.

ACTION: Adopted	DATE: February 18, 2015	ATTEST:
Ayes: (10) Murray, Jer	nings, Miller, Holmes, Rohan,	
Davis, Frerichs, Mallett, I	Raburn, Saltzman,	
Noes: (0)		Kenneth A. Duron

#

Item V.3 (Consent) CAPITOL CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY

MEMORANDUM

TO: Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Board

DATE: February 11, 2015

FROM: David B. Kutrosky Managing Director

SUBJECT: CCJPA OPERATIONS DATABASE BUSINESS INTELLIGENCE PROJECT

PURPOSE

For the CCJPA Board to approve a budget not to exceed \$150,000 to develop business intelligence tools using operations data collected on the Capitol Corridor service.

BACKGROUND

Over the years, CCJPA has been receiving and utilizing data provided by Amtrak in formatted daily and monthly reports, which has been used by the CCJPA to illustrate the performance of the Capitol Corridor service and has been used to implement changes/improvements to the service. In late 2014, Amtrak who had already developed their own business intelligence tools was able to start sending filtered data (for Capitol Corridor service only) to CCJPA staff which is sent electronically and is in a raw, unformatted form. With this delivery of data, the CCJPA is seeking to take this data and use it to improve the CCJPA's management and business practices of the Capitol Corridor service (i.e., trend lines)..

This timing is concurrent with the application of business intelligence tools (database tools) across many industries to use data to improve management and business practices. BART, as the CCJPA Managing Agency, through its Office of Information Technology (IT), has been assisting CCJPA staff receive this flow of data from Amtrak and has offered its resources to assist the CCJPA with development of business intelligence tools.

The cost of these resources to develop the business intelligence tools is separate from the BART support/overhead fees and will be provided by external resources currently performing similar duties for BART. The estimated cost to develop business intelligence tools and supporting database(s) is \$150,000, which will be funded through FY14 Capitol Corridor Reinvestment Program (CCRP) funds, achieved through cost savings from the FY 14 operating contract.

RECOMMENDATION

The SCG recommends that the CCJPA Board authorize the CCJPA Executive Director or her designee to enter into agreements to develop business intelligence tools for CCJPA operations data analysis for an amount not-to-exceed \$150,000.

Motion: The CCJPB adopts the attached resolution.

In the Matter of Providing Authorizing CCJPA Funds for the Capitol Corridor Operations Database Business Intelligence Project/

Resolution No. 15-03

WHEREAS, the development of database analysis tools has advanced significantly such that the CCJPA is poised to progress with the CCJPA Operations Database Business Intelligence Project ("Project"); and

WHEREAS, Amtrak is providing data feeds that have been filtered to provide data files relating to the operation of the Capitol Corridor service; and

WHEREAS, the Project will develop data analysis tools to allow the CCJPA to analyze data in an efficient and flexible manner for trends and business analysis needs; and

WHEREAS, BART, as the CCJPA Managing Agency, through its Office of Information Technology (IT), has been assisting CCJPA staff receive this flow of data from Amtrak and has offered its resources to assist the CCJPA with development of business intelligence tools; and

WHEREAS, the cost of these resources to develop the business intelligence tools is separate from the BART support/overhead fees and will be provided by external resources currently performing similar duties for BART; and

WHEREAS, the estimated cost to develop business intelligence tools and supporting database(s) is \$150,000 and will be funded through FY14 Capitol Corridor Reinvestment Program (CCRP) funds; and

RESOLVED, that the CCJPB does hereby approve a budget for an amount not-to-exceed \$150,000 for the purposes of implementing the Capitol Corridor Operations Database Business Intelligence Project and authorize the CCJPA Executive Director or her designee to enter into the necessary funding and development agreements for the implementation of such security measures.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the CCJPA forthwith transmit a copy of this resolution to BART.

#

ACTION: Adopted DATE: February 18, 2015	ATTEST:
Ayes: (10) Murray, Jennings, Miller, Holmes, Rohan, Davis, Frerichs, Mallett, Raburn, Saltzman,	
Noes: (0)	Kenneth A. Duron Secretary
Abstain: (0)	

MEMORANDUM

TO: Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Board

DATE: February 11, 2014

FROM: David B. Kutrosky Managing Director, CCJPA

SUBJECT: CCJPA FY 2015-16 – FY 2016-17 BUSINESS PLAN UPDATE

PURPOSE

For the CCJPA Board to approve the CCJPA FY 2015-16 – FY 2016-17 Business Plan Update (February 2015).

BACKGROUND

The Draft FY 2015-16 – FY 2016-17 Business Plan Update was released for public review on January 15, 2015. Public workshops for the Business Plan Update were held January 20-23 and 26. Comments received during the public review process, and any input, as appropriate, has been incorporated in the document. (A compilation of comments from the public and from the workshops were sent under separate cover.) Upon approval by the CCJPA Board, the revised business plan update will be finalized and submitted to the Secretary of the California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA) by April 1, 2015, in accordance with the CCJPA's enabling legislation.

In summary, this Business Plan Update (sent under separate cover) calls for continuing the current service plan (30 weekday and 22 weekend trains); provides a capital program that is consistent with the CCJPA *Vision Plan* (November 2014) and conforms with the most recent guidelines from CalSTA for the receipt of Cap and Trade Transit/Intercity Rail Capital Grant Program that would support the CCJPA's service expansion plans to Roseville and San Jose/Salinas; and continues last year's technology-based marketing and communications program which focused on raising the awareness of the Capitol Corridor "brand" as a viable transport alternative in Northern California.

The CCJPA's funding request in the Business Plan for FY 15-16 increases by 1.6% [\$531,000] compared to the CCJPA's FY 14-15 budget due to:

- (1) increased net operating costs of \$356,000 (+1.1.%) due to increased labor expenses and equipment capital costs for the use of Amtrak locomotives [1.5 units] to support the Capitol Corridor service plan; and
- (2) increase of \$175,000 (+8.2%) in the administrative budget to support CCJPA's management duties and functions to (a) ensure Amtrak's pricing and the CCJPA operating contracts conform with the PRIIA Section 209 Policy and (b) provide staff resources to support the service planning and pursue capital programming from the CalSTA Cap and Trade Transit/Intercity Rail Capital Program.

The Business Plan Update focuses on (1) maintaining a high on-time performance for the Capitol Corridor trains through the reduction of en-route delay minutes by working with Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) and Amtrak and the development and execution of strategies to quickly recover from unanticipated, infrequent service incidents (i.e., trespasser incidents) and (2) introducing and monitoring passenger service amenities (such as improved bike access, website upgrades, and e-ticketing upgrades).

As presented in Section 3 of the Business Plan Update ("Operating Plan and Strategies"), the operating budgets for FY 15-16 and FY 16-17 should be considered draft and placeholders because the CCJPA is currently analyzing various service optimization options that could result in revenue and ridership increases and/or cost reductions. If cost savings are achievable, then the CCJPA Board will take action to modify the operating budget and implement such schedule changes as part of its adoption of the FY 2015-16 CCJPA/Amtrak operating contract (effective October 1, 2015).

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the CCJPA Board approve the CCJPA FY 2015-16 – FY 2016-17 Business Plan Update and submit a copy of the Business Plan Update to the Secretary of CalSTA. (Approval of the Business Plan Update requires an affirmative vote of at least two-thirds (11) of the appointed members.)

<u>Motion:</u> The CCJPA Board adopts the attached resolution. g:\CCJPA Board Meetings\2013\agenda15.feb final

In the Matter of Approving the State Fiscal Year 2015-16 – FY 2016-17 Business Plan Update for the Capitol Corridor Service For the Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority/

Resolution No. 15-04

WHEREAS, the CCJPA staff have prepared a Draft FY 2015-16 – FY 2016-17 Business Plan Update ("Business Plan Update"), held a series of public workshops between January 20 and 23 and 26, and received comments, which, as appropriate, were incorporated into the draft document; and

WHEREAS, the Business Plan Update reflects a weekday train schedule of 30 weekday trains and 22 weekend trains, and outlines a capital funding strategy to advance the CCJPA's Capital Improvement Program (CIP) that includes the CCJPA's pursuit of the Cap and Trade Transit/Intercity Rail Capital Program administered by the California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA), which will assist in financing the capital projects necessary to support the CCJPA's service expansion plans to Roseville and San Jose/Salinas, and builds upon the success of previous award-winning marketing campaigns/programs to raise the awareness of the Capitol Corridor "brand"; and

WHEREAS, the CCJPA Board acting for and on behalf of the Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority has prepared for the CalSTA a Business Plan Update for the Capitol Corridor Service for State FY 2015-16 – FY 2016-17 in the form appended hereto; and

WHEREAS, preparation and submission of the Business Plan Update to the Secretary of CalSTA by April 1 of each year is mandated pursuant to the provisions of California Government Code 14070.4(b);

RESOLVED, that the CCJPA Board does hereby approve and adopt the FY 2015-16 – FY 2016-17 Business Plan Update for the Capitol Corridor Service.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the CCJPA forthwith transmit a copy of this resolution to CalSTA and Caltrans.

#

ACTION: Adopted DATE: February 18, 2015	ATTEST:
Ayes: (12) Murray, Jennings, Miller, Holmes, Rohan,	
Davis, Frerichs, Mallett, Raburn, Saltzman, Spering,	
Batchelor	
Noes: (0)	Kenneth A. Duron
	Secretary
Abstain: (0)	

MEMORANDUM

TO: Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Board

DATE: February 12, 2014

- FROM: David B. Kutrosky Managing Director, CCJPA
- SUBJECT: LEGISLATIVE MATTERS

PURPOSE

To provide the CCJPA Board with an overview of the proposed legislative matters affecting Capitol Corridor Service.

BACKGROUND

State Legislative Matters FY 15-16 Draft State Budget

- CA Intercity Passenger Rail Operating Budget The Governor's Draft FY 15-16 Budget provides the same amount of funding (\$119 million) as the enacted FY 14-15 budget for the operating support of the operation on the three intercity passenger rail routes (San Joaquin, Pacific Surfliner and Capitol Corridor), which is equal to last year's FY 14-15 budget. The Governor's draft budget may be updated as part of the May Revise based on Amtrak's submittal of final FY 15-16 operating (and ridership and revenue) estimates which are expected from Amtrak in late March 2015.
- 2. Cap and Trade Auction Proceeds The Governor's Draft FY 14-15 Budget conforms with SB 862 (enacted in 2014) which stipulates the appropriation of the projected proceeds from the Cap and Trade auctions to various programs. Specifically, the draft budget supplements the \$25 million in the FY 14-15 budget for the Cap and Trade Transit/Intercity Rail Capital Program with an appropriation of \$100 million in FY 15-16 (based on 10% allocation from a projected \$1 billion total FY 15-16 Cap and Trade Program). The CCJPA plans to submit applications for a portion of the \$125 million FY 14-15 FY 15-16 Cap and Trade Transit/Intercity Rail Capital Program (see Agenda item VI.3).

State Legislation

Select Committee on Passenger Rail (Senate and Assembly)

Staff and other CIPR agencies are working with State Senator Jackson and the State Senate Rules Committee to reauthorize the Senate Select Committee on Passenger Rail, which was only originally authorized for one year [2014]. State Senator Jackson (D-Santa Barbara) will remain as Chair of the Select Committee in recognition of her leadership in forming the committee. Efforts are underway to secure other Senators to serve on the Select Committee. The intent is to capitalize on principles previously approved by Select Committee to promote the need for investment growth (from state and federal and local funds) to (1) maintain and continue the success of the state's IPR services and (2) ensure investment also supports an integrated network with the other passenger rail services in the state – commuter rail and the planned HST system.

A similar effort is underway to establish a select committee in the Assembly.

SB 9 (Beall) - Transit/Intercity Rail Capital Program

[CCJPA POSITION- WATCH]

SB 9 attempts to use the enactment of SB 862 (develops the fund programs for the Cap and Trade auction proceeds) and use the Cap and Trade Transit/Intercity Rail Capital Program to finance large, transformative

projects using multi-year programming allocations from this program to meet the goals and intent of AB 32 (clean air/Greenhouse reductions).

The CCJPA service expansions plans to Roseville and San Jose/Salinas stand to gain from this bill; however, no clear consensus has been developed with the CCJPA member agency staff nor with other transit and CIPR agencies.

Status: Introduced December 1, 2014. No actions taken by any committee(s) yet.

Federal Legislation

Obama 6-Year \$478 Billion Authorization Plan/FY2016 Appropriations Proposal

On February 2, 2015, President Obama released the Administration's \$478 billion proposed six-year surface transportation authorization bill, an updated version of last year's proposed four-year GROW AMERICA Act. The budget proposes to rename and restructure the Highway Trust Fund (HTF) as the Transportation Trust Fund and to add rail accounts that currently are not captured in the HTF, which would be administered by the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) as follows:

FRA Budget [Billion \$]	Current	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	FY21	Total
Current Passenger Rail Service	1,390	2,450	2,400	2,350	2,300	2,300	2,300	14,100
Rail Service Improvement Program	n 0	2,325	2,405	2,370	2,450	2,450	2,450	14,450
Total	1,390	4,775	4,805	4,720	4,750	4,750	4,750	28,550

State agencies that support intercity passenger rail (IPR) routes of 750 miles or less (currently operated by Amtrak) would be eligible for both programs. For the \$4.775 billion FRA FY 2016 budget, state IPR agencies, like the CCJPA, would be eligible for or benefit from the following:

- Current Passenger Rail Service [\$2.450B]:
 - FRA proposes providing grant assistance organized according to Amtrak's lines of business to improve transparency and cost management.
 - Specifically State Corridors could apply for \$225 million to replace obsolete equipment on State-supported routes and to help States pay for capital expenses as required by the existing statute.
- Rail Service Improvement Program [\$2.325B]:
 - Passenger Corridors: \$1.3 billion is requested to develop high-performance passenger rail networks through construction of new corridors, substantial improvements to existing corridors, and mitigation of passenger train congestion at critical chokepoints.
 - Commuter Railroads—PTC Compliance: \$825 million is requested to implement positive train control systems on commuter railroads, which will be phased out by FY 2018. CCJPA could be a joint applicant or supporter.

Amtrak Submittal of FY 2016 Grant Request to Congress

In conjunction with President Obama's expected to release of the Administration's FY2016 budget, staff and other state intercity passenger rail (IPR) staff are working with Amtrak in support of Amtrak's request to Congress for FY 2016 funds to support not only the Northeast Corridor (NEC) and long distance services but also the state-supported IPR corridors. Specifically, based on the implementation of the PRIIA Section 209 Policy, state IPR services that use Amtrak-owned rail vehicles are required to pay their fair share to keep these vehicles in a state of good repair. The CCJPA's support for this request is to ensure that federal/Congressional funds are provided for these equipment capital costs otherwise the states' share for these Amtrak equipment capital costs will likely increase.

Surface Transportation and Rail Safety Reauthorizations

The new Congress has many transportation funding matters to deal with at the beginning of the session. Namely, the short-term extension of MAP-21 in October 2014 expires in May 2015 with the pending bankruptcy of the Highway Trust Fund (highway and transit federal funding authority) and the need to reauthorize PRIIA (the railroad safety and national intercity rail program), that expired in October 2013.

On February 5, 2015, House Transportation and Infrastructure (T&I) Committee leaders introduced bipartisan legislation, The Passenger Rail Reform and Investment Act of 2015, or PRRIA (H.R. 749), that

seeks to improve the infrastructure, reduces costs, creates greater accountability and transparency for state-supported Amtrak-operated services, leverage private sector resources, and accelerate project delivery for Amtrak and the nation's passenger rail transportation system. The same legislation was introduced last year (HR 5449) in the House last Congress, and the Committee approved it unanimously.

Specific to the Capitol Corridor service, PRRIA proposes to reform the Amtrak accounting practices to increase transparency, reduce its costs to the CCJPA, and operate the Capitol Corridor in partnership with the CCJPA, It is unclear if PRRIA will provide any federal capital funds to state-supported Amtrak routes.

RECOMMENDATION

The SCG recommends that the CCJPA Board authorize the CCJPA Executive Director to submit a letter(s) of support or opposition for actions relating to the proposed legislative matters affecting Capitol Corridor Service, including modifications as provided by the CCJPA Board.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Board

DATE: February 11, 2015

- FROM: David B. Kutrosky CCJPA Managing Director
- **SUBJECT:** CAPITOL CORRIDOR PROJECT LIST: FY 14/15- FY15/16 CAP AND TRADE TRANSIT/INTERCITY RAIL PROGRAM

PURPOSE

For the CCJPA Board to authorize the submittal of FY 14/15- FY15/16 Cap and Trade Transit/Intercity Rail Program grant application(s) to CalSTA for capital projects that will expand and/or enhance the performance of the Capitol Corridor service.

BACKGROUND

CCJPA has been actively following and participating in the development of guidelines for the Cap and Trade Transit/Intercity Rail Capital Program, which will be administered by the California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA). As of this writing, the guidelines have not been finalized but draft versions have been released and discussed via workshops. In the guidelines, a schedule has been provided which states that a call for projects is set for February 9, 2015 with applications due by April 9, 2015. As presented in Agenda item VI.2, the Governor's draft FY 15/16 budget supplements the current FY 14/15 \$25 million in the Cap and Trade Transit/Intercity Rail Capital Program with an additional \$100 million for a total two-year program of \$125 million.

Using the draft guidelines, staff has been determining which projects to submit on April 9, 2015. Challenges to the CCJPA under the current version of the guidelines include: no ability to seek allocations over numerous years (due to the lack of a history from any auctions CalSTA cannot forecast Cap and Trade revenues); any one year allocation must generate immediate benefits (GHG reductions and improvements to disadvantaged communities); and specifically a lack of (or limited) local/state/federal matching funds for CCJPA projects. As well, the maximum number of projects is two that can be submitted at this time. Staff has been informed that there is a possibility that supplemental funds may increase the funds available in the Program from future auction revenues that may occur during FY 15/16, which could lead to a second call for projects in FY 15/16.

As such, staff has been meeting with Amtrak, UPRR and Caltrain to identify projects (including the possibility of phasing certain service expansion projects) that can achieve the requirements of the Program guidelines. Based on these meetings, staff has identified the following three (3) projects that should be considered for applications for funding from the FY 14/15 - FY 15/16 Cap and Trade Transit/Intercity Rail Capital Program:

1. <u>Travel Time Improvements</u>: There are two locations that have been identified that can increase speeds and reduce travel time times. First, the tracks along the winding alignment between Pinole and Martinez can be modified without extensive trackwork using recent federal regulations which allow for higher passenger train speeds on non-linear track. This upgrade may require a slight increase in annual track maintenance costs but can be absorbed in the current operating budget. The second section of track to be improved is located between Newark and Alviso/Santa Clara. This project would replace the single-track section operating through the wildlife refuge and the work can be accommodated within the existing right-of-way. The estimated travel time reductions are expected to be between 5-10 minutes which in turn would lead to increased ridership and thus meet the Program's requirement of GHG reductions through increased ridership. A better estimate for travel time reductions will be developed as part of the application process.

Staff estimates that the total cost will be \$5-\$7M with matching funds of \$1-\$2M, resulting in an application fund request of \$3-\$5M. These upgrades can be completed within two years of allocation and would likely be implemented by 2017.

2. <u>Oakland-San Jose Phase 2A Project</u>: This project assumes a phasing of the Oakland-San Jose Project which will allow for the incremental expansion of Capitol Corridor trains to/from San Jose. This assumption is subject to agreement by UPRR and Caltrain and is being discussed with these partners as of this writing. The intent would be advance and fund select sub-projects between Oakland and San Jose that in turn would allow for frequency increases for Capitol Corridor trains to/from San Jose thereby meeting the Program's requirement of GHG reductions through increased ridership.

Staff estimates that the total cost would be \$80M-\$100M with \$70M in matching funds (a mix of Prop 1A Connectivity funds, STIP-IIP funds, and local Alameda County Measure B3 funds), resulting in an application fund request of \$10M-\$30M. The matching funds and list of sub-projects are still subject to negotiation with the proposed completion within two years of allocation (likely late 2017/early 2018) in concert with the introduction of new locomotives and bi-level cars expected to arrive in 2018.

3. <u>Sacramento-Roseville Third Project</u>: Staff is also seeking the opportunity to submit an application for another service expansion project - Sacramento-Roseville Third Track Project. The challenge with this project is that while this project is well-suited for these Cap and Trade funds due to the expected reduction in GHG emissions (gained through service frequency increases which in turn drive ridership increases), the application request exceeds the current cap of \$30M per project. That being said, staff is seeking to advance of section of the 3rd track project that will incrementally increase Capitol Corridor trains to/from Roseville. This assumption is subject to agreement by UPRR and is being discussed as of this writing. The intent would be to advance and fund select sub-projects between Sacramento and Roseville that in turn would allow for frequency increases for Capitol Corridor trains to/from Roseville through increased ridership.

Staff estimates that the total cost of this initial phase would be \$110M-\$125M with only \$28M in matching funds (a mix of Prop 1A Connectivity funds and STIP-RTIP funds), resulting in an application fund request of \$88M-\$93M, which exceeds the \$30M cap. Staff will work with the project partners to determine if other matching funds can be secured in the near-term to bring the application request to \$30M or under. The list of sub-projects are still subject to negotiation with the proposed completion within two years of allocation (likely late 2017/early 2018) in concert with the introduction of new locomotives and bi-level cars expected to arrive in 2018.

Due to the short turnaround time to get applications, staff is seeking authorization from the CCJPA Board to submit applications for one or all three of these projects. Using this authorization, staff will perform the necessary analyses, secure approval from the various project partners, and complete and submit the application(s). Staff will keep the Board informed of any developments of this process.

RECOMMENDATION

The SCG recommends that the CCJPA Board hereby authorizes the CCJPA Executive Director or her designee to submit grant applications to the California State Transportation Agency for funds from the FY 14/15 – FY 15/16 Cap and Trade Transit/Intercity Rail Capital Program that would support improvements to the Capitol Corridor service.

Motion: The CCJPA Board adopts the attached resolution.

In the Matter of Authorizing the Submittal of Grant Applications For the FY 14-15 – FY 15-16 Cap and Trade Transit/Intercity Rail Capital Program For Projects to Improve the Capitol Corridor Service / Resolution No. <u>15-05</u>

WHEREAS, Senate Bill 862 was enacted in June 2014, which among other things, established the Cap and Trade Transit/Intercity Rail Capital Program ("Program"), which will be administered by the California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA); and

WHEREAS, the Governor's draft FY 15-16 budget supplements the current \$25 million from the FY 14-15 State Budget the with an additional \$100 million for a total two-year (FY 14-15 – FY 15-16) program of \$125 million; and

WHEREAS, Guidelines are currently under development and yet not finalized; however draft versions have been released which identifies the requirements to receive such Program funds and the criteria used in evaluating applications for Program funds; and

WHEREAS, the Guidelines set forth a schedule with the call for projects set for February 9, 2015 with applications due by April 9, 2015 and selection of projects by June 30, 2015; and

WHEREAS, staff is evaluating which projects meet the Program requirements in order to submit application(s) by April 9, 2015; and

WHEREAS, based on initial discussions with project partners, staff has identified the following three (3) projects that should be submitted for funding from the Program:

- Travel Time Improvements
- Oakland-San Jose Phase 2A Project
- Sacramento-Roseville Third Project

RESOLVED, that the CCJPA Board does hereby authorize the CCJPA Executive Director or her designee to submit grant applications to the California State Transportation Agency for funds from the FY 14-15 – FY 15-16 Cap and Trade Transit/Intercity Rail Capital Program that would support improvements to the Capitol Corridor service.

#

ACTION: Adopted DATE: February 18, 2015	ATTEST:
Ayes: (12) Murray, Jennings, Miller, Holmes, Rohan, Davis, Frerichs, Mallett, Raburn, Saltzman, Spering, Batchelor	
Noes: (0)	Kenneth A. Duron Secretary
Abstain: (0)	

MEMORANDUM

TO: Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Board

DATE: February 11, 2015

- FROM: David Kutrosky CCJPA Managing Director
- **SUBJECT:** ON-BOARD INFORMATION SYSTEM (OBIS) PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AGREEMENT

PURPOSE

For the CCJPA Board to authorize execution of a funding agreement with Amtrak for a project partnership to implement the On-Board Information System (OBIS) Project for the Capitol Corridor service in an amount not to exceed \$4,000,000.

BACKGROUND

The CCJPA has been working with the Caltrans Rail Division and Amtrak in various stages since 2009 to implement an on-board information system which would ensure all elements of Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Compliance are met on the train with regarding to audio and visual information. It will provide station arrival information on both via synched audio loudspeakers and video screens in the train. Additional service and even advertising or marketing partnerships are also permitted using the video screens (audio would be too intrusive).

Using base information developed by Caltrans Rail Division staff, the CCJPA included OBIS elements in an unsuccessful procurement in 2009 which focused on WiFi on Capitol Corridor trains, with OBIS as a follow-up application running over the network. Subsequently, after WiFi was installed through a partnership with Amtrak, in 2012 CCJPA and Caltrans wrote the OBIS specifications into the new bilevel car specifications in parallel with a request for proposal (RFP) that Amtrak would lead for a national procurement of OBIS. This coordinated effort ensured that the key performance specifications for OBIS were aligned between retrofitting the existing rolling stock as well as installing it on the new rolling stock. At this time, after lengthy procurement and contract negotiations between Amtrak and the selected OBIS vendor team and also between Caltrans and Amtrak the scope of work and terms and conditions with a contract for Caltrans as a lead funding agency with Amtrak are expected to be complete by this CCJPA Board meeting. Because there is also a new bi-level car order with Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) they will also be a partner in OBIS. Total cost for deployment in California is estimated to be approximately \$25 million but that includes the design/development and testing period of which IDOT is a funding partner. CCJPA is the other partner in supporting OBIS implementation.

With Caltrans being the lead for California, the CCJPA has indicated to the project partners that it can utilize Proposition 1B Safety/Security funding from CalOES as the funding source over time. For FY 14, the CCJPA had up to \$400,000 from the CalOES for OBIS supported by the annual CCJPA Board Resolution approving the use of CalOES administered Proposition 1B Safety/Security funds, and that work is supported now by CCJPA signing a contract with Amtrak for a "limited notice to proceed" (LNTP) which will advance the detailed design of OBIS along with other OBIS planning and procurement expenses which occurred during this CalOES funding period. As related to the Agenda item V.1, in this next year another \$1,000,000 is identified for OBIS and then in future years, using this future fiscal year CalOES Proposition 1B funding, up to \$4,000,000 in total will be CCJPA's partnership

contribution for this system. In order to capitalize on this opportunity, staff is seeking authorization from the CCJPA Board to execute a funding agreement contract with Amtrak for OBIS implementation.

OBIS will be in a design and back office testing phase until approximately March/April 2016, then move to a live install and testing phase for another six months, and then, provided the live test is successful, begin the commissioning of OBIS equipment by mid-2017 for both the new bi-level cars and existing bi-level cars used in Capitol Corridor operations.

RECOMMENDATION

The SCG recommends that the CCJPA Board authorize the CCJPA Executive Director or her designee to execute a funding agreement with Amtrak for an amount up to \$4,000,000 to test and implement the OBIS project.

Motion: The CCJPA Board adopts the attached resolution.

In the Matter of On-Board Information System (OBIS) Project Funding Agreement with Amtrak For the Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority / Resol

Resolution No. 15-06

WHEREAS, the CCJPA, along with the Caltrans Division of Rail has actively participated in the development of the On-Board Information System (OBIS) system specifications since 2009; and

WHEREAS, the CCJPA Board has supported prior OBIS funding steps using CalOES administered Proposition 1B Safety/Security funds; and

WHEREAS, staff, working in partnership with Amtrak, Caltrans Division of Rail, and the Illinois Department of Transportation, has identified the need for the CCJPA to contribute up to \$4,000,000 for the development and installation of OBIS; and,

WHEREAS, such funding commitment will require the CCJPA to enter into a funding agreement with Amtrak to support the development of OBIS;

RESOLVED, that the CCJPA Board does hereby approve the CCJPA Executive Director or designee to enter into a contract with Amtrak up to \$4,000,000 for the purposes of implementing OBIS on the Capitol Corridor service.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the CCJPA forthwith transmit a copy of this resolution to Caltrans, Illinois Department of Transportation, and Amtrak.

#

ACTION: Adopted	DATE: February 18, 2015	ATTEST:
	ngs, Miller, Holmes, Rohan,	
Davis, Frerichs, Mallett, H	Raburn, Saltzman, Spering,	
Batchelor		
Noes: (0)		Kenneth A. Duron
		Secretary
Abstain: (0)		

MEMORANDUM

TO: Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Board

DATE: February 11, 2015

FROM: David Kutrosky CCJPA Managing Director

SUBJECT: VISION PLAN IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM

PURPOSE

For the CCJPA Board to authorize the execution of funding and related agreements to advance the next phase of the Vision Plan Update, the Vision Implementation Plan, for an amount not to exceed \$400,000.

BACKGROUND

At the November 2014 CCJPA Board meeting the CCJPA Board adopted the first of three anticipated work products – the Vision Plan Update (VPU). At that Board meeting the concepts for the next two follow-up work products were introduced and those were the Vision Implementation Plan (VIP) and the Vision Communications Plan (VCP). The VPU presented the short, medium, and long term vision for Capitol Corridor service with heavy emphasis on the long-term plan since the short and medium term plans are conceptually developed in terms of the existing rolling stock type and type of operations (79 mph maximum with allowances for up to 90 mph or 110 mph service with certain right of way improvements). The long term vision looked at an entirely different type of passenger rail service – electrified, 150 mph and 90 trains per day, likely on a right of way owned by the state, as opposed to the 30 trains per day being the core service frequency allowance at this time under UPRR ownership.

The VIP promises to be the most complex element of the three work products because the VIP will be developed to document the phased capital investment plan while trying to minimize any capital throwaway costs in the short and medium term. Since the CCJPA Board initiated the VPU process, with the guidance of the CCJPA Board Ad Hoc Vision Plan Subcommittee , it became clear that follow up work would be required which could answer the public policy and funding implications of achieving far faster and more frequent train service.

Staff has developed a scope, schedule and estimated budget of \$400,000 to complete the VIP by May 2016. The scope includes a strong focus on capital construction phasing and railroad engineering design. Staff has secured \$400,000 in FY14 Capitol Corridor Reinvestment Program (CCRP) funds, achieved through cost savings from the FY 14 operating contract.

Staff will schedule a meeting(s) with the Subcommittee once a vendor is selected and the necessary agreements are executed.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the CCJPA Board authorize the CCJPA Executive Director or her designee to execute the necessary funding and related agreements to advance the next phase of the Vision Plan Update, the Vision Implementation Plan for an amount not to exceed \$400,000.

Motion: The CCJPA Board adopts the attached resolution.

In the Matter of Developing the Vision Plan Implementation Program For the Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority /

Resolution No. 15-07

WHEREAS, the CCJPA Board adopted the Vision Plan Update (VPU) in November 2014 which included direction to develop the Vision Implementation Plan (VIP) as a work product working with the CCJPA Board Ad Hoc Vision Plan Subcommittee ("Subcommittee"); and

WHEREAS, the VIP is intended to strategically analyze and document the development and phasing of long-term projects with the intended goal of presenting a cost effective capital implementation plan to achieve the service objectives developed in the VPU process; and

WHEREAS, staff has developed a scope, schedule and estimated budget of \$400,000 to complete the VIP by May 2016 whereby the VIP will evaluate capital construction phasing and railroad engineering design.

WHEREAS, staff has secured \$400,000 in FY14 Capitol Corridor Reinvestment Program (CCRP) funds, achieved through cost savings from the FY 14 operating contract.

RESOLVED, that the CCJPA Board authorizes the CCJPA Executive Director or her designee to execute the necessary funding and related agreements to advance the next phase of the Vision Plan Update, the Vision Implementation Plan for an amount not to exceed \$400,000.

#

ACTION: Adopted DATE: February 18, 2015	ATTEST:
Ayes: (12) Murray, Jennings, Miller, Holmes, Rohan,	
Davis, Frerichs, Mallett, Raburn, Saltzman, Spering,	
Batchelor	
Noes: (0)	Kenneth A. Duron
	Secretary
Abstain: (0)	

MEMORANDUM

TO: Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Board

DATE: February 11, 2015

FROM: David Kutrosky CCJPA Managing Director

SUBJECT: CAPITOL CORRIDOR STATION BICYCLE ELOCKERS PROJECT

PURPOSE

For the CCJPA Board to approve the procurement and installation of Capitol Corridor station bicycle electronic lockers from eLock Technologies, LLC in an amount not to exceed \$1,000,000.

BACKGROUND

The CCJPA Bicycle Access Plan, adopted in February 2013, laid out plans to provide electronically accessed secure bicycle storage facilities at all Capitol Corridor stations to facilitate the option to <u>not</u> take a bicycle on the train. The Plan identified several options for electronic bicycle lockers (eLockers), and the BikeLink system that is currently used across the Bay Area (e.g. BART stations) was especially highlighted for its great rate-of-return for public investment, flexibility in installation and accommodating different models of bicycles, and most importantly, system continuity for those who already use the card-activated BikeLink eLockers across the Bay Area. There are already city-owned BikeLink eLockers at two Capitol Corridor stations (Suisun/Fairfield and Berkeley) and BART-owned BikeLink eLockers are available for Capitol Corridor riders to use at the two BART connection stations (Richmond and Oakland Coliseum).

For the above mentioned reasons, CCJPA planning staff recommends that BikeLink electronic bicycle lockers be installed at Capitol Corridor stations with eLock Technologies as the provider. As the managing agency of CCJPA, BART has already performed a competitive bid solicitation and evaluation process in 2010 according to California Public Contract Code for station electric bicycle lockers and selected eLock Technologies, LLC as the provider.

Consistent with CCJPA Board Resolution No. 13-16, adopted on November20, 2013, which authorized CCJPA up to \$1,000,000 for the purposes of installing eLockers and folding bicycle rentals, the CCJPA has secured \$556,000 in funding from the California Department of Transportation for the procurement and marketing of electronic bicycle lockers at 13 Capitol Corridor stations, and CCJPA staff have applied for an additional grant from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District Transportation Fund for Clean Air Regional Fund for the procurement of electronic bicycle lockers for Capitol Corridor stations in the Bay Area.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the CCJPA Board approve authorize the CCJPA Executive Director or her designee to enter into agreements for the procurement of station electronic bicycle lockers with eLock Technologies, LLC for an amount not-to-exceed \$1,000,000.

Motion: The CCJPA Board adopts the attached resolution.

In the Matter of Approving the Procurement of Station Electronic Bicycle Lockers To eLock Technologies, LLC For Installation at Select Capitol Corridor Train Stations /

Resolution No. 15-08

WHEREAS, the CCJPA Board has adopted the Bicycle Access Plan in February 2013 which included the plan to place eLockers at various Capitol Corridor stations, like those used at BART stations; and,

WHEREAS, BART is the managing agency of CCJPA and BART has performed a competitive bid solicitation and evaluation process for station electronic bicycle lockers and has selected eLock Technologies, LLC as the vendor; and,

WHEREAS, with CCJPA Board Resolution No. 13-16, adopted on 11/20/13, authorized up to \$1,000,000 to be approved for the installation of eLockers and a folding bicycle rental program; and,

WHEREAS, the CCJPA has secured \$556,000 in funding from the California Department of Transportation partially which is partially for the procurement and marketing of electronic bicycle lockers at thirteen (13) Capitol Corridor stations; and

WHEREAS, CCJPA staff have applied for an additional grant from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District Transportation Fund for Clean Air Regional Fund to complete the funding plan for the procurement of electronic bicycle lockers for Capitol Corridor stations in the Bay Area.; and

WHEREAS, CCJPA staff have determined that BikeLink electronic bicycle lockers are the best option for Capitol Corridor stations to maintain consistency in user experience, given that BART stations and some Capitol Corridor stations (Berkeley and Suisun/Fairfield) already have BikeLink eLockers; and

RESOLVED, that the CCJPA Board does hereby authorize the CCJPA Executive Director or her designee to enter into agreements for the procurement of station electronic bicycle lockers with eLock Technologies, LLC for an amount not-to-exceed actual secured funding up to \$1,000,000.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the CCJPA forthwith transmit a copy of this resolution to BART, Amtrak, and affected station project partners for the eLocker project.

ACTION: Adopted DATE: February 18, 2015	ATTEST:
Ayes: (12) Murray, Jennings, Miller, Holmes, Rohan,	
Davis, Frerichs, Mallett, Raburn, Saltzman, Spering,	
Batchelor	
Noes: (0)	Kenneth A. Duron
	Secretary
Abstain: (0)	



Service Performance Overview

The January 2015 performance results for the Capitol Corridor represent the 10th consecutive month of growth. A total of 112,362 passengers rode Capitol Corridor trains in January 2015, a 2.0% increase versus January 2014. January 2015 revenues were up by 3.7% compared to January 2014, and set a record for the month of January. With year to-date (YTD) revenue 5.9% above projections, and expenses 2% below budget (fuel prices are 15% below budget), the YTD Operating Ratio currently is at 53% compared to 51% at this time last year.

Standard	Standard Jan. 2015		YTD	vs. Prior YTD	vs. FY15 Plan		
Ridership	112,362	2.0%	484,922	4.2%	3.1%		
Revenue	\$2,281,169	3.7%	\$2,530,845	5.9%	4.8%		
Operating Ratio	46%	48%	53%	2.3%	11.5%		
OTP	OTP 98% 97% 93% -3.3% 3.6%						
increases for the passengers in Jar revenue increase which remains at continue to be be	Capitol Corrido nuary 2015, a 2 d 3.7% versus bove the 47% a elow budget pr	or. The Capitol .0% increase vo January 2014. s revenues are ojections. On-t	Consecutive month Corridor trains carr ersus January Dece The year to-date (Y 5.9% above budget ime Performance (O ns and a severe drop	ied a total of 11 mber 2014. Jan TD) Operating projections an TP) for January	2,362 uary 2015 Ratio is 53%, d fuel costs v 2015 was a		

On-Time Performance (OTP) for January 2015 bounced back to a stellar 98% after dropping to 90% in December 2014. Third party delays (i.e., trespasser incidents, bridge lifts) and mechanical malfunctions were nearly absent in January 2015. The one constant factor that carried over from December 2014 and prior months is the excellent dispatching by Union Pacific Railroad and its state of good repair program for the route. YTD OTP for the Capitol Corridor is 93%, keeping the Capitol Corridor as #1 for reliability in the Amtrak national system.

Using the most recent monthly report provided by Amtrak (December 2014), the following data is available for train and station segments:

- For January 2015, ridership for weekday trains was up 7%, with continued growth to and from the Silicon Valley/San Jose and weekend ridership was up 3%, despite no home games for the Raiders nor 49ers.
- For December 2014, there was an increase in boardings at the Davis and Sacramento stations. See the attached tables below for station city-pairs and station activity.
- The embedded table below shows the drop in OTP to 90% for the Capitol Corridor trains in December 2014. This drop in OTP is primarily attributed to service disruptions from (1) protestors trespassing onto the tracks, resulting in the termination of train services and (2) severe weather in late December.

FY 15-16 Draft State Budget (released by Governor Brown on January 9, 2015)

3. CA Intercity Passenger Rail Operating Budget - The Governor's Draft FY 15-16 Budget provides the same amount of funding (\$119 million) as the enacted FY 14-15 budget for the operating support of the operation on the three intercity passenger rail routes (San Joaquin, Pacific Surfliner and Capitol Corridor), which is equal to last year's FY 14-15 budget. The Governor's draft budget may be updated as part of the May Revise based on Amtrak's submittal of final FY 15-16 operating (and ridership and revenue) estimates which are expected from Amtrak in late March 2015.

4. Cap and Trade Auction Proceeds – The Governor's Draft FY 14-15 Budget conforms with SB 862 (enacted in 2014) which stipulates the appropriation of the projected proceeds from the Cap and Trade auctions to various programs. Specifically, the draft budget supplements the \$25 million in the FY 14-15 budget for the Cap and Trade Transit/Intercity Rail Capital Program with an appropriation of \$100 million in FY 15-16 (based on 10% allocation from a projected \$1 billion total FY 15-16 Cap and Trade Program). The CCJPA plans to submit applications for a portion of the \$125 million FY 14-15 – FY 15-16 Cap and Trade Transit/Intercity Rail Capital Program (see Agenda item VI.3).

Select Committee on Passenger Rail (Senate and Assembly)

Staff and other CIPR agencies are working with State Senator Jackson and the State Senate Rules Committee to reauthorize the Senate Select Committee on Passenger Rail, which was only originally authorized for one year [2014]. State Senator Jackson (D-Santa Barbara) will remain as Chair of the Select Committee in recognition of her leadership in forming the committee. Efforts are underway to secure other Senators to serve on the Select Committee. The intent is to capitalize on principles previously approved by Select Committee to promote the need for investment growth (from state and federal and local funds) to (1) maintain and continue the success of the state's IPR services and (2) ensure investment also supports an integrated network with the other passenger rail services in the state – commuter rail and the planned HST system.

A similar effort is underway to establish a select committee in the Assembly.

Reauthorization of PRIIA and Amtrak

On February 5, 2015, House Transportation and Infrastructure (T&I) Committee leaders introduced bipartisan legislation - The Passenger Rail Reform and Investment Act of 2015, or PRRIA (H.R. 749) – which seeks to improve the infrastructure, reduces costs, creates greater accountability and transparency for state-supported Amtrak-operated services, leverage private sector resources, and accelerate project delivery for Amtrak and the nation's passenger rail transportation system. The same legislation was introduced last year (HR 5449) in the House last Congress, and the Committee approved it unanimously.

CCJPA/BART Administrative Services Agreement (February 2015 - February 2020)

At its November 19, 2014 meeting, the CCJPA Board approved the extension of the Administrative Services Agreement (ASA) with BART for another five-year term (effective February 20, 2015). The ASA identifies the duties and responsibilities to be provided by the Managing Agency to the CCJPA Board, which includes administrative support of the Board and management oversight of the Capitol Corridor service. The BART Board, in turn, is scheduled to authorize the execution of the ASA at its February 12, 2015 meeting.

Customer Service Program Upgrades:

- <u>Bicycle Access Program</u>: CCJPA, working with Amtrak, is now able to provide two cars with extra bicycle capacity on selected trainsets (in the cab car, opposite the locomotive and in the car # 2 positions). To supplement this on-train initiative, the CCJPA is now moving ahead to install bicycle eLockers at 13 of the 17 Capitol Corridor stations. (Exceptions being those joint Capitol Corridor/BART stations and Caltrain stations, which already have bike lockers.) The eLocker installation will take approximately one year. Once eLockers gain momentum, the CCJPA will begin implementing a folding bicycle lease program to further reduce on-train bicycle crowding and/or induce more convenient and safe Capitol Corridor travel with bicycle access as the first/last-mile portion of the trip.
- <u>Improvements to CCJPA Train Status Feature on Website</u>: A vendor is now under contract to implement upgrades to the train status feature on the CCJPA website and via mobile app. CCJPA staff is awaiting Amtrak resources to establish a data stream to CCJPA website. Testing will be underway in late Spring, and it is anticipated that implementation will happen by June 2015.
- <u>New Passenger Fare Discounts</u>: In February/March 2015, Capitol Corridor will introduce three fare discounts aimed at increasing off-peak ridership. The fare discounts are as follows: Take 5 for weekend and holiday weekend travel, Friends & Family small group discount available every day, and a senior Midweek discount. Marketing for these discounts will begin in late February/early March 2015.

Safety Initiatives

- 5. <u>Security Cameras at Capitol Corridor Stations</u>: Funding is currently being secured to install cameras and surveillance equipment at the Auburn, Rocklin, Roseville, Suisun, Martinez, Emeryville, Oakland Jack London, and Fremont stations.
- 6. <u>Positive Train Control Update</u>: Installation of the PTC equipment on the state-owned equipment is currently complete for the Northern California intercity rail fleet (supporting the Capitol Corridor and San Joaquin trains) with all locomotives and cab cars equipped except for the installation of PTC radios on the locomotives. Once the state-owned equipment is fully equipped, Capitol Corridor trainsets will be tested for interoperability with Caltrain's PTC system, which is expected to be installed and ready for testing in mid- to late-2015.
- <u>Station and Platform Safety Upgrades</u>. The CCJPA staff will have Amtrak survey stations along the Capitol Corridor route and identify those stations requiring safety upgrades at the platforms. The improvements include: replacing broken platform tactile edges, repainting tactile edges, restriping yellow safety lines along the main platform, repainting safety text along main platform, and installing safety signs. Work has been completed at a number of stations; the similar safety upgrades are underway at: Santa Clara/Great America, Hayward, Oakland Coliseum, Richmond, Suisun-Fairfield, Roseville and Auburn stations. Work at these stations will be completed in spring 2015. In addition, staff is scheduled to meet with City of Davis staff in mid-March 2015 to determine what additional safety improvements can be implemented at this station.

Project Updates

- <u>CCJPA Oakland-San Jose Phase 2 Project</u>: The engineering and environmental consultants working for CCJPA on this project have completed initial survey data gathering and are in the process of assembling the base maps for use in the design process. CCJPA have also consulted with UPRR regarding upgrades to the track infrastructure adjacent to and serving the Great America/Santa Clara station that can be completed in time to serve the Levi's Stadium for Super Bowl 50 (February 6, 2016).
- <u>Sacramento to Roseville 3rd Track Environmental Review/Preliminary Engineering</u>: The CCJPA is on target for a November 2015 adoption of the required California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) adoption of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for this project which will add capacity to allow up to ten round trips per day to/from Roseville. The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) environmental documentation is required to be completed by the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA). Between November and the present, the draft version of these two environmental documents will be circulated for public review and comment as per the requirements. In addition, there will be at least two public sessions to receive comments on the draft documents.

Outlook – Closing

Performance for the Capitol Corridor continues its positive trends through the first four months of FY 2015. Actual results exceed all performance standards (ridership, system operating ratio and OTP) for and the CCJPA will carry this momentum forward in the state budget planning season with the adoption of the FY 2015-16 - FY 2016-17 Business Plan Update and in application(s) to secure Cap and Trade revenues dedicated to state transit/intercity passenger rail services.

As mentioned in previous reports, the CCJPA and various passenger rail organizations are partnering to host the 3rd annual California Passenger Rail Summit. In 2015, the events for this Summit will be held in Sacramento with an evening welcoming reception on Tuesday April 28 and a full-day program on Wednesday, April 29. Please see link [http://californiapassengerrailsummit.com/] for details.

2 Richmond - Sacramento 9,240 8,872 ++ 3 Martinez - Sacramento 9,131 9,571 4 Oakland - Sacramento 6,422 6,842 5 Sacramento - San Jose 5,498 5,550 6 Davis - Emeryville 5,268 5,550 7 Davis - Sacramento 3,928 3,207 +2 9 Sacramento - Suisun City 3,730 +1 10 Berkeley - Sacramento 2,965 2,980 -C 11 Berkeley - Davis 2,965 2,980 -C 12 Davis - Martinez 2,867 2,362 +2 13 Emeryville - Suisun City 2,684 2,339 +1 14 Oakland - San Jose 2,176 2,067 +4 15 Davis - Oakland 1,988 1,839 +4 16 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) - Oakland 1,980 1,431 +3 19 Emeryville - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 1,966 +3 22 12 Davis -	1	v Deir Diderekin			0/ -1
2 Richmond - Sacramento 9,240 8,872 ++ 3 Martinez - Sacramento 9,131 9,571 4 Oakland - Sacramento 6,422 6,842 5 Sacramento - San Jose 5,498 5,550 6 Davis - Emeryville 5,268 5,550 7 Davis - Sacramento 3,928 3,207 +2 9 Sacramento - Suisun City 3,759 3,730 +1 10 Berkeley - Davis 2,965 2,980 -C 11 Berkeley - Davis 2,867 2,362 +2 12 Davis - Martinez 2,867 2,362 +2 13 Emeryville - Saisun City 2,867 2,339 +1 14 Oakland - San Jose 2,176 2,067 +4 15 Davis - Oakland 1,988 1,839 +4 16 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) - Oakland 1,980 1,431 +3 17 Oakland Coliseum - Sacramento 1,981 1,461 +3 12 <					
3 Martinez - Sacramento 9,131 9,571 -4 4 Qakland - Sacramento 6,422 6,842 -6 5 Sacramento - San Jose 5,498 5,550 -7 6 Davis - Emeryville 5,268 5,550 -7 9 Sacramento - Suisun City 3,759 3,730 +4 10 Berkeley - Sacramento 2,965 2,980 -C 11 Berkeley - Sacramento 2,968 2,022 +1 12 Davis - Martinez 2,867 2,362 +2 13 Emeryville - Suisun City 2,684 2,339 +1 14 Oakland - San Jose 2,176 2,067 +1 15 Davis - Oakland 1,988 1,839 +4 16 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) - Sacramento 1,906 1,923 -C 17 Oakland Coliseum - Sacramento 1,906 1,433 +3 18 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) -Adkand 1,890 1,431 +3 20 Davis - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 1,28 973 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>+0.2</td></t<>					+0.2
4 Oakland - Sacramento 6,422 6,422 6,422 6 5 Sacramento - San Jose 5,488 5,559 -7 6 Davis - Emeryville 5,268 5,550 -5 7 Davis - Richmond 4,437 4,416 1,461 4,339 4,416 4,437 4,417 4,437 4,416 4,437 4,417 4,437 4,417 4,437 4,417 4,437 4,417 4,437 4,417 4,417 4,417 4,417 4,417 4,417 4,417 4,418 4,418 <	_				
5 Sacramento - San Jose 5,498 5,959 -7 6 Davis - Emeryville 5,268 5,550 -5 7 Davis - Richmond 4,437 4,196 +4 8 Davis - Sacramento 3,928 3,207 +2 9 Sacramento - Suisun City 3,759 3,730 +4 10 Berkeley - Davis 2,965 2,980 -C 11 Berkeley - Davis 2,965 2,980 -C 12 Davis - Martinez 2,867 2,362 +2 13 Emeryville - Suisun City 2,684 2,339 +1 14 Oakland - San Jose 2,176 2,067 +4 15 Davis - Oakland 1,988 1,433 +3 19 Emeryville - San Jose 1,515 1,469 +2 20 Davis - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 1,099 1,057 +4 21 Emeryville - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 724 569 +2 22				,	
6 Davis - Emeryville 5,268 5,550 -5 7 Davis - Richmond 4,437 4,196 +4 8 Davis - Sacramento 3,028 3,207 +2 9 Sacramento - Suisun City 3,759 3,730 +4 10 Berkeley - Sacramento 2,965 2,980 -0 11 Berkeley - Sacramento 2,965 2,980 -0 12 Davis - Martinez 2,667 2,362 +2 12 Davis - Martinez 2,664 2,339 +1 14 Oakland - San Jose 2,176 2,067 +4 15 Davis - Oakland 1,988 1,839 +4 16 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) - Sacramento 1,906 1,433 +3 19 Emeryville - San Jose 1,515 1,469 +2 20 Davis - Sant A Clara (Great Amer.) 1,168 837 973 -2 21 Emeryville - Sacramento 1,099 1,057 +2					
7 Davis - Richmond 4,437 4,196 44 8 Davis - Sacramento 3,928 3,207 42 9 Sacramento - Suisun City 3,759 3,730 44 10 Berkeley - Sacramento 2,965 2,980 -C 11 Berkeley - Davis 2,958 2,902 +1 12 Davis - Martinez 2,867 2,362 +2 13 Emeryville - Suisun City 2,684 2,339 +1 14 Oakland - San Jose 2,176 2,067 +3 15 Davis - Oakland 1,988 1,839 +4 16 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) - Sacrament 1,981 1,461 +3 17 Oakland Coliseum - Sacramento 1,906 1,923 -C 18 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) - Oakland 1,880 1,433 +3 19 Emeryville - Sand Dave 1,166 837 +3 22 Davis - Sand Clara (Great Amer.) 1,099 1,057 +4 23 Hayward - Sacramento 887 973 +2 <					
8 Davis - Sacramento 3,928 3,207 +2 9 Sacramento - Suisun City 3,759 3,730 +1 10 Berkeley - Sacramento 2,965 2,980 -2 11 Berkeley - Davis 2,967 2,962 +2 12 Davis - Martinez 2,867 2,362 +2 13 Emeryville - Suisun City 2,684 2,339 +1 14 Oakland - San Jose 2,176 2,067 +4 15 Davis - Oakland 1,981 1,461 +3 17 Oakland Coliseum - Sacramento 1,906 1,923 -C 18 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) - Oakland 1,880 1,4433 +3 20 Davis - San Jose 1,515 1,469 +1 21 Emeryville - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 1,166 837 +3 22 Fremont - Sacramento 887 973 -5 23 Hayward - Sacramento 887 9773 -5 2					-5.1
9 Sacramento - Suisun City 3,759 3,730 +4 10 Berkeley - Sacramento 2,965 2,980 -C 11 Berkeley - Davis 2,967 2,962 +2 12 Davis - Martinez 2,867 2,362 +2 13 Emeryville - Suisun City 2,684 2,339 +1 14 Oakland - San Jose 2,176 2,067 +4 15 Davis - Oakland 1,988 1,839 +4 16 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) - Sacramento 1,906 1,923 -7 18 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) - Oakland 1,890 1,433 +3 19 Emeryville - San Jose 1,515 1,469 +5 20 Davis - San Jose 1,388 1,370 +7 21 Emeryville - Sacramento 887 973 -5 24 Davis - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 724 569 +2 25 Sacramento - Santa Clara 612 5077 +2					+5.7
10 Berkeley - Sacramento 2,965 2,980 -C 11 Berkeley - Davis 2,958 2,902 + 12 Davis - Martinez 2,867 2,362 +2 13 Emeryville - Suisun City 2,684 2,339 +1 14 Oakland - San Jose 2,176 2,067 +4 15 Davis - Oakland 1,988 1,839 +4 16 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) - Sacrament 1,981 1,461 +3 17 Oakland Coliseum - Sacramento 1,906 1,923 -C 18 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) - Oakland 1,890 1,433 +3 19 Emeryville - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 1,166 837 +3 22 Davis - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 724 569 +2 24 Davis - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 724 569 +2 25 Sacramento - Sacramento 887 973 +2 41 Davis - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 724 507					+22.5
11 Berkeley - Davis 2,958 2,902 + 12 Davis - Martinez 2,867 2,362 +2 13 Emeryville - Suisun City 2,684 2,339 +1 14 Dakland - San Jose 2,176 2,067 +4 15 Davis - Oakland 1,988 1,839 +4 16 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) - Sacrament 1,981 1,461 +3 17 Oakland Coliseum - Sacramento 1,906 1,923 -0 18 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) - Oakland 1,890 1,433 +3 19 Emeryville - San Jose 1,515 1,469 +4 20 Davis - San Jose 1,515 1,469 +4 21 Emeryville - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 1,166 837 +3 22 Fremont - Sacramento 887 973 -5 23 Bayward - Sacramento 887 973 -5 24 Davis - Santa Clara 612 507 +2 25 Sacramento - Santa Clara 612 507 +2					+0.8
12 Davis - Martinez 2,867 2,362 +2 13 Emeryville - Suisun City 2,684 2,339 +1 14 Oakland - San Jose 2,176 2,067 +1 15 Davis - Oakland 1,988 1,839 +1 15 Davis - Oakland 1,988 1,839 +1 16 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) - Sacramento 1,906 1,923 -0 18 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) - Oakland 1,890 1,433 +3 19 Emeryville - San Jose 1,515 1,469 +2 20 Davis - San Jose 1,388 1,370 +2 21 Emeryville - Sacramento 1,099 1,057 +2 23 Hayward - Sacramento 1,099 1,057 +2 24 Davis - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 724 569 +2 25 Sacramento - Santa Clara 612 507 +2 All other markets 24,272 22,239 +4 1 Emeryville - Sacramento 27,548 28,160 -2 1 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>-0.5</td>					-0.5
13 Emeryville - Suisun City 2,684 2,339 +1 14 Oakland - San Jose 2,176 2,067 +4 15 Davis - Oakland 1,988 1,839 +4 16 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) - Sacramento 1,906 1,923 -0 17 Oakland Coliseum - Sacramento 1,906 1,923 -0 18 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) - Oakland 1,890 1,433 +3 19 Emeryville - San Jose 1,515 1,469 +3 20 Davis - San Jose 1,388 1,370 + 21 Emeryville - Sarta Clara (Great Amer.) 1,166 837 +3 22 Fremont - Sacramento 1,099 1,057 +4 23 Hayward - Sacramento 887 973 -6 24 Davis - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 724 569 +2 25 Sacramento - Santa Clara 612 507 +2 41 Ither markets 24,272 22,239 +5 14 Oakland - Sacramento 27,548 28,160 -2 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>+1.9</td>					+1.9
14 Oakland - San Jose 2,176 2,067 +4 15 Davis - Oakland 1,988 1,839 +4 16 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) Sacrament 1,981 1,461 +3 17 Oakland Coliseum - Sacramento 1,906 1,923 -0 18 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) - Oakland 1,890 1,433 +3 19 Emeryville - San Jose 1,515 1,469 +7 20 Davis - San Jose 1,515 1,469 +7 21 Emeryville - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 1,166 837 +3 22 Fremont - Sacramento 1,099 1,057 +4 23 Hayward - Sacramento 887 973 -5 24 Davis - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 724 569 +2 25 Sacramento - Sacramento 887 973 -5 24 Davis - Santa Clara 612 507 +2 41 Oakland - Sacramento 887 973 -6 2 Martinez Total 1116,309 111,772 +					+21.4
15 Davis - Oakland 1,988 1,839 +4 16 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) Sacrament 1,981 1,461 +3 17 Oakland Coliseum - Sacramento 1,906 1,923 -0 18 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) - Oakland 1,890 1,433 +3 19 Emeryville - San Jose 1,515 1,469 +4 20 Davis - San Jose 1,388 1,370 +4 21 Emeryville - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 1,166 837 +3 22 Fremont - Sacramento 887 973 -6 24 Davis - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 724 569 +2 25 Sacramento - Santa Clara 612 507 +2 All other markets 24,272 22,239 +4 V Total 116,309 111,772 +4 2 Martinez - Sacramento 46,181 44,467 +5 2 Martinez 19,525 19,759 -1 3 Richmond - Sacramento 27,548 28,160 -2 3<					
16 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) Sacrament 1,981 1,461 +3 17 Oakland Coliseum - Sacramento 1,906 1,923 -0 18 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) - Oakland 1,890 1,433 +3 19 Emeryville - San Jose 1,515 1,469 +5 20 Davis - San Jose 1,388 1,370 + 21 Emeryville - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 1,166 837 +3 22 Fremont - Sacramento 887 973 -5 24 Davis - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 724 569 +2 25 Sacramento - Santa Clara 612 507 +2 All other markets 24,272 22,239 +5 Total 116,309 111,772 +4 2 Martinez - Sacramento 46,181 44,467 +5 2 Martinez - Sacramento 27,548 28,160 -2 3 Richmond - Sacramento 19,525 19,759 -1 5 Davis - Sacramento 13,676 12,607 +4					+5.3
17 Oakland Coliseum - Sacramento 1,906 1,923 -C 18 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) - Oakland 1,890 1,433 +3 19 Emeryville - San Jose 1,515 1,469 + 20 Davis - San Jose 1,388 1,370 + 21 Emeryville - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 1,166 837 +3 22 Fremont - Sacramento 887 973 -6 24 Davis - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 724 569 +2 25 Sacramento - Santa Clara 612 507 +2 25 Sacramento - Santa Clara 612 507 +2 26 All other markets 24,272 22,239 +2 27 All other markets 24,272 22,239 +2 28 Action - Sacramento 46,181 44,467 +5 2 Martinez - Sacramento 27,548 28,160 -2 3 Richmond - Sacramento 27,479 26,247 +4 4 Oakland - Sacramento 19,555 19,759 -1 <					
18 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) - Oakland 1,890 1,433 +3 19 Emeryville - San Jose 1,515 1,469 +3 20 Davis - San Jose 1,388 1,370 +7 21 Emeryville - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 1,166 837 +3 22 Fremont - Sacramento 1,099 1,057 +4 23 Hayward - Sacramento 887 973 -5 24 Davis - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 724 569 +2 25 Sacramento - Santa Clara 612 507 +2 All other markets 24,272 22,239 +4 Total 116,309 111,772 +4 City Pair Ridership FY15 TD FY14 TD % colspan="2">% colspan="2" Colspan="2" FY15 TD <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>+35.6</td></t<>					+35.6
19 Emeryville - San Jose 1,515 1,469 4:3 20 Davis - San Jose 1,388 1,370 4:4 21 Emeryville - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 1,166 837 4:3 22 Fremont - Sacramento 1,099 1,057 4:4 23 Hayward - Sacramento 887 973 -5 24 Davis - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 724 569 +2 25 Sacramento - Santa Clara 612 507 +2 All other markets 24,272 22,239 +4 Total 116,309 111,772 +4 All other markets 24,272 22,239 +4 City Pair Ridership FY15 TD FY14 TD % of 1 Emeryville - Sacramento 27,548 28,160 -2 3 Richmond - Sacramento 27,479 26,247 +4 4 Oakland - Sacramento 19,525 19,759 -1 5 Davis - Emeryville 17,661 18,524 -4 6 Sacramento - San Jo					
20 Davis - San Jose 1,388 1,370 + 21 Emeryville - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 1,166 837 +3 22 Fremont - Sacramento 1,099 1,057 +4 23 Hayward - Sacramento 887 973 -6 24 Davis - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 724 569 +2 25 Sacramento - Santa Clara 612 507 +2 All other markets 24,272 22,239 +4 Total 116,309 111,772 +4 City Pair Ridership FY15 TD FY14 TD % c 1 Emeryville - Sacramento 46,181 44,467 +2 2 Martinez - Sacramento 27,548 28,160 -2 3 Richmond - Sacramento 27,479 26,247 +4 4 Oakian - Sacramento 19,525 19,759 -1 5 Davis - Emeryville 17,661 18,524 -4 6 Sacramento - San Jose 15,553 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>+31.9</td>					+31.9
21 Emeryville - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 1,166 837 +3 22 Fremont - Sacramento 1,099 1,057 +4 23 Hayward - Sacramento 887 973 -5 24 Davis - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 724 569 +2 25 Sacramento - Santa Clara 612 507 +2 All other markets 24,272 22,239 +5 Total 116,309 111,772 +4 2 Martinez - Sacramento 46,181 44,467 +3 2 Martinez - Sacramento 27,548 28,160 -2 3 Richmond - Sacramento 27,479 26,247 +4 4 Oakland - Sacramento 19,525 19,759 -1 5 Davis - Emeryville 17,661 18,524 -2 6 Sacramento - San Jose 15,553 16,365 -5 7 Davis - Sacramento 13,772 11,457 -1 8 Davis - Sacram			1,515	1,469	
22 Fremont - Sacramento 1,099 1,057 +4 23 Hayward - Sacramento 887 973 -6 24 Davis - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 724 569 +2 25 Sacramento - Santa Clara 612 507 +2 All other markets 24,272 22,239 +5 Total 116,309 111,772 +4 1 Emeryville - Sacramento 46,181 44,467 +5 2 Martinez - Sacramento 27,548 28,160 -2 3 Richmond - Sacramento 27,479 26,247 +4 4 Oakland - Sacramento 19,525 19,759 -1 5 Davis - Emeryville 17,661 18,524 -4 6 Sacramento - San Jose 15,553 16,365 -5 7 Davis - Sacramento 13,772 11,505 +1 8 Davis - Richmond 13,676 12,607 +4 9 Sacramento - Suisun City			1,388	1,370	+1.3
23 Hayward - Sacramento 887 973 -E 24 Davis - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 724 569 +2 25 Sacramento - Santa Clara 612 507 +2 All other markets 24,272 22,239 +9 Total 116,309 111,772 +4 City Pair Ridership FY15 TD FY14 TD % of 1 Emeryville - Sacramento 46,181 44,467 +2 3 Richmond - Sacramento 27,548 28,160 -2 3 Richmond - Sacramento 19,525 19,759 -1 5 Davis - Sacramento 19,525 19,759 -1 5 Davis - Sacramento 13,772 11,505 +1 8 Davis - Sacramento 13,676 12,607 +4 9 Sacramento - Suisun City 12,268 11,930 +2 10 Berkeley - Davis 11,327 11,457 -1 11 Davis - Martinez 10,284 <	21	Emeryville - Santa Clara (Great Amer.)	1,166	837	+39.3
24 Davis - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 724 569 +22 25 Sacramento - Santa Clara 612 507 +2 All other markets 24,272 22,239 +4 City Pair Ridership FY15 TD FY14 TD % of 1 Emeryville - Sacramento 46,181 44,467 +4 2 Martinez - Sacramento 27,548 28,160 +2 3 Richmond - Sacramento 27,479 26,247 +4 4 Oakland - Sacramento 19,525 19,759 -1 5 Davis - Emeryville 17,661 18,524 -4 6 Sacramento - San Jose 15,553 16,365 -5 7 Davis - Sacramento 13,772 11,457 -1 8 Davis - Richmond 13,676 12,607 +4 9 Sacramento - Suisun City 12,268 11,930 +2 10 Berkeley - Davis 11,327 11,457 -1 11 Davis - Martinez </td <td>22</td> <td>Fremont - Sacrmnto</td> <td>1,099</td> <td>1,057</td> <td>+4.0</td>	22	Fremont - Sacrmnto	1,099	1,057	+4.0
25 Sacramento - Santa Clara 612 507 +2 All other markets 24,272 22,239 +4 Total 116,309 111,772 +4 City Pair Ridership FY15 TD FY14 TD % c 1 Emeryville - Sacramento 46,181 44,467 +2 2 Martinez - Sacramento 27,548 28,160 -2 3 Richmond - Sacramento 27,479 26,247 +4 4 Oakland - Sacramento 19,525 19,759 -1 5 Davis - Emeryville 17,661 18,524 -4 6 Sacramento - San Jose 15,553 16,365 -5 7 Davis - Sacramento 13,772 11,505 +1 8 Davis - Richmond 13,676 12,607 +4 9 Sacramento - Suisun City 12,268 11,930 +2 10 Berkeley - Davis 11,327 11,457 -1 11 Davis - Martinez 10,284 9,	23	Hayward - Sacramento	887	973	-8.8
All other markets 24,272 22,239 +4 Total 116,309 111,772 +4 City Pair Ridership FY15 TD FY14 TD % c 1 Emeryville - Sacramento 46,181 44,467 +2 2 Martinez - Sacramento 27,548 28,160 -2 3 Richmond - Sacramento 27,479 26,247 +4 4 Oakland - Sacramento 19,525 19,759 -1 5 Davis - Emeryville 17,661 18,524 -4 6 Sacramento - San Jose 15,553 16,365 -5 7 Davis - Sacramento 13,772 11,505 +1 8 Davis - Richmond 13,676 12,607 +4 9 Sacramento - Suisun City 12,268 11,930 +2 10 Berkeley - Davis 11,327 11,457 -1 11 Davis - Martinez 10,284 9,448 +4 12 Berkeley - Sacramento 9,964 9,688 +2 13 Emeryville - Suisun City 8,806	24	Davis - Santa Clara (Great Amer.)	724	569	+27.2
Total 116,309 111,772 +4 City Pair Ridership FY15 TD FY14 TD % of 1 Emeryville - Sacramento 46,181 44,467 +4 2 Martinez - Sacramento 27,548 28,160 -2 3 Richmond - Sacramento 27,479 26,247 +4 4 Oakland - Sacramento 19,525 19,759 -1 5 Davis - Emeryville 17,661 18,524 -4 6 Sacramento - San Jose 15,553 16,365 -5 7 Davis - Sacramento 13,772 11,505 +1 8 Davis - Sacramento 13,676 12,607 +4 9 Sacramento - Suisun City 12,268 11,930 +2 10 Berkeley - Davis 11,327 11,457 -1 11 Davis - Martinez 10,284 9,448 +4 12 Berkeley - Sacramento 9,964 9,688 +2 13 Emeryville - Suisun City	25	Sacramento - Santa Clara	612	507	+20.7
City Pair Ridership FY15 TD FY14 TD % c 1 Emeryville - Sacramento 46,181 44,467 +.5 2 Martinez - Sacramento 27,548 28,160 -2 3 Richmond - Sacramento 27,479 26,247 +.4 4 Oakland - Sacramento 19,525 19,759 -1 5 Davis - Emeryville 17,661 18,524 -4 6 Sacramento - San Jose 15,553 16,365 -5 7 Davis - Sacramento 13,772 11,505 +1 8 Davis - Richmond 13,676 12,607 +4 9 Sacramento - Suisun City 12,268 11,930 +2 10 Berkeley - Davis 11,327 11,457 -1 11 Davis - Martinez 10,284 9,448 +4 12 Berkeley - Sacramento 9,964 9,688 +2 13 Emeryville - Suisun City 8,806 8,030 +3 14 Oakl		All other markets	24,272	22,239	+9.1
1 Emeryville - Sacramento 46,181 44,467 +: 2 Martinez - Sacramento 27,548 28,160 -: 3 Richmond - Sacramento 27,479 26,247 +: 4 Oakland - Sacramento 19,525 19,759 -: 5 Davis - Emeryville 17,661 18,524 -: 6 Sacramento - San Jose 15,553 16,365 -: 7 Davis - Sacramento 13,772 11,505 +1 8 Davis - Richmond 13,676 12,607 +8 9 Sacramento - Suisun City 12,268 11,930 +2 10 Berkeley - Davis 11,327 11,457 -1 11 Davis - Martinez 10,284 9,448 +8 12 Berkeley - Sacramento 9,964 9,688 +2 13 Emeryville - Suisun City 8,806 8,030 +5 14 Oakland - San Jose 7,180 6,619 +5 15 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) - Oakland 6,601 5,763 +1		Total	116,309	111,772	+4.1
1 Emeryville - Sacramento 46,181 44,467 +: 2 Martinez - Sacramento 27,548 28,160 -: 3 Richmond - Sacramento 27,479 26,247 +: 4 Oakland - Sacramento 19,525 19,759 -: 5 Davis - Emeryville 17,661 18,524 -: 6 Sacramento - San Jose 15,553 16,365 -: 7 Davis - Sacramento 13,772 11,505 +1 8 Davis - Sacramento 13,676 12,607 +8 9 Sacramento - Suisun City 12,268 11,930 +2 10 Berkeley - Davis 11,327 11,457 -1 11 Davis - Martinez 10,284 9,448 +8 12 Berkeley - Sacramento 9,964 9,688 +2 13 Emeryville - Suisun City 8,806 8,030 +5 14 Oakland - San Jose 7,180 6,619 +5 15 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) Sacrament 7,070 4,907 +4					
2 Martinez - Sacramento 27,548 28,160 -2 3 Richmond - Sacramento 19,525 19,759 -1 4 Oakland - Sacramento 19,525 19,759 -1 5 Davis - Emeryville 17,661 18,524 -4 6 Sacramento - San Jose 15,553 16,365 -5 7 Davis - Sacramento 13,772 11,505 +1 8 Davis - Richmond 13,676 12,607 +8 9 Sacramento - Suisun City 12,268 11,930 +2 10 Berkeley - Davis 11,327 11,457 -1 11 Davis - Martinez 10,284 9,448 +4 12 Berkeley - Sacramento 9,964 9,688 +2 13 Emeryville - Suisun City 8,806 8,030 +4 14 Oakland - San Jose 7,180 6,619 +4 15 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) Sacrament 7,070 4,907 +4 16 Davis - San Jose 5,142 4,808 +6 1					% chg.
3 Richmond - Sacramento 27,479 26,247 +4 4 Oakland - Sacramento 19,525 19,759 -1 5 Davis - Emeryville 17,661 18,524 -4 6 Sacramento - San Jose 15,553 16,365 -5 7 Davis - Sacramento 13,772 11,505 +1 8 Davis - Richmond 13,676 12,607 +4 9 Sacramento - Suisun City 12,268 11,930 +2 10 Berkeley - Davis 11,327 11,457 -1 11 Davis - Martinez 10,284 9,448 +4 12 Berkeley - Sacramento 9,964 9,688 +2 13 Emeryville - Suisun City 8,806 8,030 +4 14 Oakland - San Jose 7,180 6,619 +4 15 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) Sacrament 7,070 4,907 +4 16 Davis - Oakland 6,601 5,763 +1 18 Oakland Coliseum - Sacramento 5,623 5,571 +0			46,181	11 167	
4 Oakland - Sacramento 19,525 19,759 -1 5 Davis - Emeryville 17,661 18,524 -4 6 Sacramento - San Jose 15,553 16,365 -5 7 Davis - Sacramento 13,772 11,505 +1 8 Davis - Richmond 13,676 12,607 +8 9 Sacramento - Suisun City 12,268 11,930 +2 10 Berkeley - Davis 11,327 11,457 -1 11 Davis - Martinez 10,284 9,448 +8 12 Berkeley - Sacramento 9,964 9,688 +2 13 Emeryville - Suisun City 8,806 8,030 +4 14 Oakland - San Jose 7,180 6,619 +4 15 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) Sacrament 7,070 4,907 +4 16 Davis - Oakland 6,601 5,763 +1 18 Oakland Coliseum - Sacramento 5,623 5,571 +0 19 Davis - San Jose 5,142 4,808 +0 2					+3.9
5 Davis - Emeryville 17,661 18,524 -4 6 Sacramento - San Jose 15,553 16,365 -5 7 Davis - Sacramento 13,772 11,505 +1 8 Davis - Richmond 13,676 12,607 +8 9 Sacramento - Suisun City 12,268 11,930 +2 10 Berkeley - Davis 11,327 11,457 -1 11 Davis - Martinez 10,284 9,448 +8 12 Berkeley - Davis 11,327 11,457 -1 11 Davis - Martinez 10,284 9,448 +8 12 Berkeley - Sacramento 9,964 9,688 +2 13 Emeryville - Suisun City 8,806 8,030 +5 14 Oakland - San Jose 7,180 6,619 +8 15 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) Sacrament 7,070 4,907 +4 16 Davis - Oakland 6,601 5,763 +1 18 Oakland Coliseum - Sacramento 5,623 5,571 +0 19<	3			28,160	-2.2
6 Sacramento - San Jose 15,553 16,365 -5 7 Davis - Sacramento 13,772 11,505 +1 8 Davis - Richmond 13,676 12,607 +8 9 Sacramento - Suisun City 12,268 11,930 +2 10 Berkeley - Davis 11,327 11,457 -1 11 Davis - Martinez 10,284 9,448 +8 12 Berkeley - Davis 11,327 11,457 -1 11 Davis - Martinez 10,284 9,448 +8 12 Berkeley - Sacramento 9,964 9,688 +2 13 Emeryville - Suisun City 8,806 8,030 +5 14 Oakland - San Jose 7,180 6,619 +8 15 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) Sacrament 7,070 4,907 +4 16 Davis - Oakland 6,601 5,763 +1 18 Oakland Coliseum - Sacramento 5,623 5,571 +0 19<		Richmond - Sacramento	27,479	28,160 26,247	-2.2 +4.7
7 Davis - Sacramento 13,772 11,505 +1 8 Davis - Richmond 13,676 12,607 +8 9 Sacramento - Suisun City 12,268 11,930 +2 10 Berkeley - Davis 11,327 11,457 -1 11 Davis - Martinez 10,284 9,448 +8 12 Berkeley - Sacramento 9,964 9,688 +2 13 Emeryville - Suisun City 8,806 8,030 +5 14 Oakland - San Jose 7,180 6,619 +6 15 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) Sacrament 7,070 4,907 +4 16 Davis - Oakland 6,601 5,763 +1 18 Oakland Coliseum - Sacramento 5,623 5,571 +0 19 Davis - San Jose 5,142 4,808 +0 20 Emeryville - Sant Clara (Great Amer.) 4,224 3,134 +3 21 Emeryville - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 4,224 3,134 +3 22 Fremont - Sacramto 3,213 3,107 +5	4	Richmond - Sacramento Oakland - Sacramento	27,479 19,525	28,160 26,247 19,759	-2.2 +4.7 -1.2
8 Davis - Richmond 13,676 12,607 +4 9 Sacramento - Suisun City 12,268 11,930 +2 10 Berkeley - Davis 11,327 11,457 -1 11 Davis - Martinez 10,284 9,448 +4 12 Berkeley - Sacramento 9,964 9,688 +2 13 Emeryville - Suisun City 8,806 8,030 +5 14 Oakland - San Jose 7,180 6,619 +4 15 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) Sacrament 7,070 4,907 +4 16 Davis - Oakland 6,601 5,763 +1 18 Oakland Coliseum - Sacramento 5,623 5,571 +0 19 Davis - San Jose 5,142 4,808 +0 20 Emeryville - San Jose 4,950 4,782 +3 21 Emeryville - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 4,224 3,134 +3 22 Fremont - Sacramto 3,213 3,107 +3 23 Hayward - Sacramento 2,822 2,882 -2 </td <td>4 5</td> <td>Richmond - Sacramento Oakland - Sacramento Davis - Emeryville</td> <td>27,479 19,525 17,661</td> <td>28,160 26,247 19,759 18,524</td> <td>-2.2 +4.7 -1.2 -4.7</td>	4 5	Richmond - Sacramento Oakland - Sacramento Davis - Emeryville	27,479 19,525 17,661	28,160 26,247 19,759 18,524	-2.2 +4.7 -1.2 -4.7
9 Sacramento - Suisun City 12,268 11,930 +2 10 Berkeley - Davis 11,327 11,457 -1 11 Davis - Martinez 10,284 9,448 +4 12 Berkeley - Sacramento 9,964 9,688 +2 13 Emeryville - Suisun City 8,806 8,030 +4 14 Oakland - San Jose 7,180 6,619 +4 15 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) Sacrament 7,070 4,907 +4 16 Davis - Oakland 6,638 6,614 +4 17 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) - Oakland 6,601 5,763 +1 18 Oakland Coliseum - Sacramento 5,623 5,571 +0 19 Davis - San Jose 5,142 4,808 +0 20 Emeryville - San Jose 4,950 4,782 +3 21 Emeryville - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 4,224 3,134 +3 22 Fremont - Sacramto 3,213 3,107 +3 23 Hayward - Sacramento 2,822 2,882 -2 </td <td>4 5 6</td> <td>Richmond - Sacramento Oakland - Sacramento Davis - Emeryville Sacramento - San Jose</td> <td>27,479 19,525 17,661 15,553</td> <td>28,160 26,247 19,759 18,524 16,365</td> <td>-2.2 +4.7 -1.2 -4.7 -5.0</td>	4 5 6	Richmond - Sacramento Oakland - Sacramento Davis - Emeryville Sacramento - San Jose	27,479 19,525 17,661 15,553	28,160 26,247 19,759 18,524 16,365	-2.2 +4.7 -1.2 -4.7 -5.0
10 Berkeley - Davis 11,327 11,457 -1 11 Davis - Martinez 10,284 9,448 +8 12 Berkeley - Sacramento 9,964 9,688 +2 13 Emeryville - Suisun City 8,806 8,030 +5 14 Oakland - San Jose 7,180 6,619 +4 15 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) Sacrament 7,070 4,907 +4 16 Davis - Oakland 6,638 6,614 +4 17 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) Oakland 6,601 5,763 +1 18 Oakland Coliseum - Sacramento 5,623 5,571 +0 19 Davis - San Jose 5,142 4,808 +0 20 Emeryville - San Jose 4,950 4,782 +3 21 Emeryville - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 4,224 3,134 +3 22 Fremont - Sacramto 3,213 3,107 +3 23 Hayward - Sacramento 2,822 2,882 -2	4 5 6 7	Richmond - Sacramento Oakland - Sacramento Davis - Emeryville Sacramento - San Jose Davis - Sacramento	27,479 19,525 17,661 15,553 13,772	28,160 26,247 19,759 18,524 16,365 11,505	-2.2 +4.7 -1.2 -4.7 -5.0 +19.7
11 Davis - Martinez 10,284 9,448 +4 12 Berkeley - Sacramento 9,964 9,688 +2 13 Emeryville - Suisun City 8,806 8,030 +5 14 Oakland - San Jose 7,180 6,619 +5 15 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) Sacrament 7,070 4,907 +4 16 Davis - Oakland 6,638 6,614 +4 17 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) - Oakland 6,601 5,763 +1 18 Oakland Coliseum - Sacramento 5,623 5,571 +6 19 Davis - San Jose 5,142 4,808 +6 20 Emeryville - San Jose 4,950 4,782 +3 21 Emeryville - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 4,224 3,134 +3 22 Fremont - Sacramto 3,213 3,107 +5 23 Hayward - Sacramento 2,822 2,882 -2	4 5 6 7 8	Richmond - Sacramento Oakland - Sacramento Davis - Emeryville Sacramento - San Jose Davis - Sacramento Davis - Richmond	27,479 19,525 17,661 15,553 13,772 13,676	28,160 26,247 19,759 18,524 16,365 11,505 12,607	-2.2 +4.7 -1.2 -4.7 -5.0 +19.7 +8.5
12 Berkeley - Sacramento 9,964 9,688 +2 13 Emeryville - Suisun City 8,806 8,030 +9 14 Oakland - San Jose 7,180 6,619 +8 15 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) Sacrament 7,070 4,907 +4 16 Davis - Oakland 6,638 6,614 +4 17 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) - Oakland 6,601 5,763 +1 18 Oakland Coliseum - Sacramento 5,623 5,571 +0 19 Davis - San Jose 5,142 4,808 +0 20 Emeryville - San Jose 4,950 4,782 +3 21 Emeryville - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 4,224 3,134 +3 22 Fremont - Sacramto 3,213 3,107 +3 23 Hayward - Sacramento 2,822 2,882 -2	4 5 6 7 8 9	Richmond - Sacramento Oakland - Sacramento Davis - Emeryville Sacramento - San Jose Davis - Sacramento Davis - Richmond Sacramento - Suisun City	27,479 19,525 17,661 15,553 13,772 13,676 12,268	28,160 26,247 19,759 18,524 16,365 11,505 12,607 11,930	-2.2 +4.7 -1.2 -4.7 -5.0 +19.7 +8.5 +2.8
13 Emeryville - Suisun City 8,806 8,030 +9 14 Oakland - San Jose 7,180 6,619 +8 15 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) Sacrament 7,070 4,907 +4 16 Davis - Oakland 6,938 6,614 +4 17 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) - Oakland 6,601 5,763 +1 18 Oakland Coliseum - Sacramento 5,623 5,571 +0 19 Davis - San Jose 5,142 4,808 +6 20 Emeryville - San Jose 4,950 4,782 +5 21 Emeryville - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 4,224 3,134 +3 22 Fremont - Sacramto 3,213 3,107 +5 23 Hayward - Sacramento 2,822 2,882 -2	4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Richmond - Sacramento Oakland - Sacramento Davis - Emeryville Sacramento - San Jose Davis - Sacramento Davis - Richmond Sacramento - Suisun City Berkeley - Davis	27,479 19,525 17,661 15,553 13,772 13,676 12,268 11,327	28,160 26,247 19,759 18,524 16,365 11,505 12,607 11,930 11,457	-2.2 +4.7 -1.2 -4.7 -5.0 +19.7 +8.5 +2.8 -1.1
14 Oakland - San Jose 7,180 6,619 +8 15 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) Sacrament 7,070 4,907 +4 16 Davis - Oakland 6,938 6,614 +4 17 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) - Oakland 6,601 5,763 +1 18 Oakland Coliseum - Sacramento 5,623 5,571 +0 19 Davis - San Jose 5,142 4,808 +0 20 Emeryville - San Jose 4,950 4,782 +3 21 Emeryville - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 4,224 3,134 +3 22 Fremont - Sacramto 3,213 3,107 +3 23 Hayward - Sacramento 2,822 2,882 -2	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Richmond - Sacramento Oakland - Sacramento Davis - Emeryville Sacramento - San Jose Davis - Sacramento Davis - Richmond Sacramento - Suisun City Berkeley - Davis Davis - Martinez	27,479 19,525 17,661 15,553 13,772 13,676 12,268 11,327 10,284	28,160 26,247 19,759 18,524 16,365 11,505 12,607 11,930 11,457 9,448	-2.2 +4.7 -1.2 -4.7 -5.0 +19.7 +8.5 +2.8 -1.1 +8.8
15 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) Sacrament 7,070 4,907 +4 16 Davis - Oakland 6,938 6,614 +4 17 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) - Oakland 6,601 5,763 +1 18 Oakland Coliseum - Sacramento 5,623 5,571 +0 19 Davis - San Jose 5,142 4,808 +0 20 Emeryville - San Jose 4,950 4,782 +3 21 Emeryville - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 4,224 3,134 +3 22 Fremont - Sacramto 3,213 3,107 +3 23 Hayward - Sacramento 2,822 2,882 -2	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Richmond - Sacramento Oakland - Sacramento Davis - Emeryville Sacramento - San Jose Davis - Sacramento Davis - Richmond Sacramento - Suisun City Berkeley - Davis Davis - Martinez Berkeley - Sacramento	27,479 19,525 17,661 15,553 13,772 13,676 12,268 11,327 10,284 9,964	28,160 26,247 19,759 18,524 16,365 11,505 12,607 11,930 11,457 9,448 9,688	-2.2 +4.7 -1.2 -4.7 -5.0 +19.7 +8.5 +2.8 -1.1 +8.8 +2.8
16 Davis - Oakland 6,938 6,614 +4 17 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) - Oakland 6,601 5,763 +1 18 Oakland Coliseum - Sacramento 5,623 5,571 +0 19 Davis - San Jose 5,142 4,808 +0 20 Emeryville - San Jose 4,950 4,782 +3 21 Emeryville - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 4,224 3,134 +3 22 Fremont - Sacramento 3,213 3,107 +3 23 Hayward - Sacramento 2,822 2,882 -2	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Richmond - Sacramento Oakland - Sacramento Davis - Emeryville Sacramento - San Jose Davis - Sacramento Davis - Richmond Sacramento - Suisun City Berkeley - Davis Davis - Martinez Berkeley - Sacramento Emeryville - Suisun City	27,479 19,525 17,661 15,553 13,772 13,676 12,268 11,327 10,284 9,964 8,806	28,160 26,247 19,759 18,524 16,365 11,505 12,607 11,930 11,457 9,448 9,688 8,030	-2.2 +4.7 -1.2 -4.7 -5.0 +19.7 +8.5 +2.8 -1.1 +8.8 +2.8 +9.7
17 Santa Clara (Great Amer.) - Oakland 6,601 5,763 +1 18 Oakland Coliseum - Sacramento 5,623 5,571 +0 19 Davis - San Jose 5,142 4,808 +0 20 Emeryville - San Jose 4,950 4,782 +3 21 Emeryville - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 4,224 3,134 +3 22 Fremont - Sacrmnto 3,213 3,107 +3 23 Hayward - Sacramento 2,822 2,882 -2	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Richmond - Sacramento Oakland - Sacramento Davis - Emeryville Sacramento - San Jose Davis - Sacramento Davis - Richmond Sacramento - Suisun City Berkeley - Davis Davis - Martinez Berkeley - Sacramento Emeryville - Suisun City Oakland - San Jose	27,479 19,525 17,661 15,553 13,772 13,676 12,268 11,327 10,284 9,964 8,806 7,180	28,160 26,247 19,759 18,524 16,365 11,505 12,607 11,930 11,457 9,448 9,688 8,030 6,619	-2.2 +4.7 -1.2 -4.7 -5.0 +19.7 +8.5 +2.8 -1.1 +8.8 +2.8 +9.7 +8.5
18 Oakland Coliseum - Sacramento 5,623 5,571 +0 19 Davis - San Jose 5,142 4,808 +0 20 Emeryville - San Jose 4,950 4,782 +3 21 Emeryville - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 4,224 3,134 +3 22 Fremont - Sacrmnto 3,213 3,107 +3 23 Hayward - Sacramento 2,822 2,882 -2	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Richmond - Sacramento Oakland - Sacramento Davis - Emeryville Sacramento - San Jose Davis - Sacramento Davis - Richmond Sacramento - Suisun City Berkeley - Davis Davis - Martinez Berkeley - Sacramento Emeryville - Suisun City Oakland - San Jose Santa Clara (Great Amer.) Sacrament	27,479 19,525 17,661 15,553 13,772 13,676 12,268 11,327 10,284 9,964 8,806 7,180	28,160 26,247 19,759 18,524 16,365 11,505 12,607 11,930 11,457 9,448 9,688 8,030 6,619	-2.2 +4.7 -1.2 -4.7 -5.0 +19.7 +8.5 +2.8 -1.1 +8.8 +2.8 +9.7
19 Davis - San Jose 5,142 4,808 +6 20 Emeryville - San Jose 4,950 4,782 +5 21 Emeryville - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 4,224 3,134 +3 22 Fremont - Sacrmnto 3,213 3,107 +5 23 Hayward - Sacramento 2,822 2,882 -2	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Richmond - Sacramento Oakland - Sacramento Davis - Emeryville Sacramento - San Jose Davis - Sacramento Davis - Richmond Sacramento - Suisun City Berkeley - Davis Davis - Martinez Berkeley - Sacramento Emeryville - Suisun City Oakland - San Jose Santa Clara (Great Amer.) Sacrament Davis - Oakland	27,479 19,525 17,661 15,553 13,772 13,676 12,268 11,327 10,284 9,964 8,806 7,180 7,070	28,160 26,247 19,759 18,524 16,365 11,505 12,607 11,930 11,457 9,448 9,688 8,030 6,619 4,907	-2.2 +4.7 -1.2 -4.7 -5.0 +19.7 +8.5 +2.8 -1.1 +8.8 +2.8 +9.7 +8.5
20 Emeryville - San Jose 4,950 4,782 + 21 Emeryville - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 4,224 3,134 +3 22 Fremont - Sacrmnto 3,213 3,107 +3 23 Hayward - Sacramento 2,822 2,882 -2	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Richmond - Sacramento Oakland - Sacramento Davis - Emeryville Sacramento - San Jose Davis - Sacramento Davis - Sacramento Davis - Richmond Sacramento - Suisun City Berkeley - Davis Davis - Martinez Berkeley - Sacramento Emeryville - Suisun City Oakland - San Jose Santa Clara (Great Amer.) Sacrament Davis - Oakland Santa Clara (Great Amer.) - Oakland	27,479 19,525 17,661 15,553 13,772 13,676 12,268 11,327 10,284 9,964 8,806 7,180 7,070 6,938	28,160 26,247 19,759 18,524 16,365 11,505 12,607 11,930 11,457 9,448 9,688 8,030 6,619 4,907 6,614	-2.2 +4.7 -1.2 -4.7 -5.0 +19.7 +8.5 +2.8 -1.1 +8.8 +2.8 +9.7 +8.5 +44.1
21 Emeryville - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) 4,224 3,134 +3 22 Fremont - Sacrmnto 3,213 3,107 +3 23 Hayward - Sacramento 2,822 2,882 -2	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Richmond - Sacramento Oakland - Sacramento Davis - Emeryville Sacramento - San Jose Davis - Sacramento Davis - Sacramento Davis - Richmond Sacramento - Suisun City Berkeley - Davis Davis - Martinez Berkeley - Sacramento Emeryville - Suisun City Oakland - San Jose Santa Clara (Great Amer.) Sacrament Davis - Oakland Santa Clara (Great Amer.) - Oakland	27,479 19,525 17,661 15,553 13,772 13,676 12,268 11,327 10,284 9,964 8,806 7,180 7,070 6,938 6,601	28,160 26,247 19,759 18,524 16,365 11,505 12,607 11,930 11,457 9,448 9,688 8,030 6,619 4,907 6,614 5,763	-2.2 +4.7 -1.2 -4.7 -5.0 +19.7 +8.5 +2.8 -1.1 +8.8 +2.8 +9.7 +8.5 +44.1 +4.9
22 Fremont - Sacrmnto 3,213 3,107 +5 23 Hayward - Sacramento 2,822 2,882 -2	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Richmond - Sacramento Oakland - Sacramento Davis - Emeryville Sacramento - San Jose Davis - Sacramento Davis - Sacramento Davis - Richmond Sacramento - Suisun City Berkeley - Davis Davis - Martinez Berkeley - Sacramento Emeryville - Suisun City Oakland - San Jose Santa Clara (Great Amer.) Sacrament Davis - Oakland Santa Clara (Great Amer.) - Oakland Oakland Coliseum - Sacramento	27,479 19,525 17,661 15,553 13,772 13,676 12,268 11,327 10,284 9,964 8,806 7,180 7,070 6,938 6,601 5,623	28,160 26,247 19,759 18,524 16,365 11,505 12,607 11,930 11,457 9,448 9,688 8,030 6,619 4,907 6,614 5,763 5,571	-2.2 +4.7 -1.2 -4.7 -5.0 +19.7 +8.5 +2.8 -1.1 +8.8 +2.8 +9.7 +8.5 +44.1 +4.9 +14.5
23 Hayward - Sacramento 2,822 2,882 -2	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Richmond - Sacramento Oakland - Sacramento Davis - Emeryville Sacramento - San Jose Davis - Sacramento Davis - Sacramento Davis - Richmond Sacramento - Suisun City Berkeley - Davis Davis - Martinez Berkeley - Sacramento Emeryville - Suisun City Oakland - San Jose Santa Clara (Great Amer.) - Sacrament Davis - Oakland Santa Clara (Great Amer.) - Oakland Oakland Coliseum - Sacramento Davis - San Jose	27,479 19,525 17,661 15,553 13,772 13,676 12,268 11,327 10,284 9,964 8,806 7,180 7,070 6,938 6,601 5,623 5,142	28,160 26,247 19,759 18,524 16,365 11,505 12,607 11,930 11,457 9,448 9,688 8,030 6,619 4,907 6,614 5,763 5,571 4,808	-2.2 +4.7 -1.2 -4.7 +5.0 +19.7 +8.5 +2.8 -1.1 +8.8 +2.8 +9.7 +8.5 +44.1 +4.9 +14.5 +0.9
23 Hayward - Sacramento 2,822 2,882 -2	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Richmond - Sacramento Oakland - Sacramento Davis - Emeryville Sacramento - San Jose Davis - Sacramento Davis - Sacramento Davis - Richmond Sacramento - Suisun City Berkeley - Davis Davis - Martinez Berkeley - Sacramento Emeryville - Suisun City Oakland - San Jose Santa Clara (Great Amer.) Sacrament Davis - Oakland Santa Clara (Great Amer.) - Oakland Oakland Coliseum - Sacramento Davis - San Jose Emeryville - San Jose	27,479 19,525 17,661 15,553 13,772 13,676 12,268 11,327 10,284 9,964 8,806 7,180 7,070 6,938 6,601 5,623 5,142 4,950	28,160 26,247 19,759 18,524 16,365 11,505 12,607 11,930 11,457 9,448 9,688 8,030 6,619 4,907 6,614 5,763 5,571 4,808 4,782	-2.2 +4.7 -1.2 -4.7 -5.0 +19.7 +8.5 +2.8 -1.1 +8.8 +2.8 +9.7 +8.5 +9.7 +8.5 +44.1 +4.9 +14.5 +0.9 +6.9
	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Richmond - Sacramento Oakland - Sacramento Davis - Emeryville Sacramento - San Jose Davis - Sacramento Davis - Sacramento Davis - Richmond Sacramento - Suisun City Berkeley - Davis Davis - Martinez Berkeley - Sacramento Emeryville - Suisun City Oakland - San Jose Santa Clara (Great Amer.) Sacrament Davis - Oakland Santa Clara (Great Amer.) - Oakland Oakland Coliseum - Sacramento Davis - San Jose Emeryville - San Jose Emeryville - Santa Clara (Great Amer.)	27,479 19,525 17,661 15,553 13,772 13,676 12,268 11,327 10,284 9,964 8,806 7,180 7,070 6,938 6,601 5,623 5,142 4,950 4,224	28,160 26,247 19,759 18,524 16,365 11,505 12,607 11,930 11,457 9,448 9,688 8,030 6,619 4,907 6,614 5,763 5,571 4,808 4,782 3,134	$\begin{array}{r} -2.2 \\ +4.7 \\ -1.2 \\ -4.7 \\ -5.0 \\ +19.7 \\ +8.5 \\ +2.8 \\ -1.1 \\ +8.8 \\ +2.8 \\ +9.7 \\ +8.5 \\ +9.7 \\ +8.5 \\ +44.1 \\ +4.9 \\ +14.5 \\ +0.9 \\ +6.9 \\ +3.5 \end{array}$
24 Davis - Santa Giala (Great Amer.) 2,000 2,007 +2	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Richmond - Sacramento Oakland - Sacramento Davis - Emeryville Sacramento - San Jose Davis - Sacramento Davis - Sacramento Davis - Richmond Sacramento - Suisun City Berkeley - Davis Davis - Martinez Berkeley - Sacramento Emeryville - Suisun City Oakland - San Jose Santa Clara (Great Amer.) Sacrament Davis - Oakland Santa Clara (Great Amer.) Oakland Oakland Coliseum - Sacramento Davis - San Jose Emeryville - San Jose Emeryville - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) Fremont - Sacrmnto	27,479 19,525 17,661 15,553 13,772 13,676 12,268 11,327 10,284 9,964 8,806 7,180 7,070 6,938 6,601 5,623 5,142 4,950 4,224 3,213	28,160 26,247 19,759 18,524 16,365 11,505 12,607 11,930 11,457 9,448 9,688 8,030 6,619 4,907 6,614 5,763 5,571 4,808 4,782 3,134 3,107	$\begin{array}{r} -2.2 \\ +4.7 \\ -1.2 \\ -4.7 \\ -5.0 \\ +19.7 \\ +8.5 \\ +2.8 \\ -1.1 \\ +8.8 \\ +2.8 \\ +9.7 \\ +8.5 \\ +44.1 \\ +4.9 \\ +14.5 \\ +0.9 \\ +14.5 \\ +0.9 \\ +6.9 \\ +3.5 \\ +34.8 \end{array}$
	$\begin{array}{c} 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	Richmond - Sacramento Oakland - Sacramento Davis - Emeryville Sacramento - San Jose Davis - Sacramento Davis - Sacramento Davis - Richmond Sacramento - Suisun City Berkeley - Davis Davis - Martinez Berkeley - Sacramento Emeryville - Suisun City Oakland - San Jose Santa Clara (Great Amer.) Sacrament Davis - Oakland Santa Clara (Great Amer.) Oakland Oakland Coliseum - Sacramento Davis - San Jose Emeryville - San Jose Emeryville - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) Fremont - Sacrmnto	27,479 19,525 17,661 15,553 13,772 13,676 12,268 11,327 10,284 9,964 8,806 7,180 7,070 6,938 6,601 5,623 5,142 4,950 4,224 3,213 2,822	28,160 26,247 19,759 18,524 16,365 11,505 12,607 11,930 11,457 9,448 9,688 8,030 6,619 4,907 6,614 5,763 5,571 4,808 4,782 3,134 3,107 2,882	$\begin{array}{r} -2.2 \\ +4.7 \\ -1.2 \\ -4.7 \\ -5.0 \\ +19.7 \\ +8.5 \\ +2.8 \\ -1.1 \\ +8.8 \\ +2.8 \\ +9.7 \\ +8.5 \\ +44.1 \\ +4.9 \\ +14.5 \\ +0.9 \\ +14.5 \\ +0.9 \\ +3.5 \\ +34.8 \\ +3.4 \\ -2.1 \end{array}$
	$\begin{array}{c} 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	Richmond - Sacramento Oakland - Sacramento Davis - Emeryville Sacramento - San Jose Davis - Sacramento Davis - Sacramento Davis - Richmond Sacramento - Suisun City Berkeley - Davis Davis - Martinez Berkeley - Davis Davis - Martinez Berkeley - Sacramento Emeryville - Suisun City Oakland - San Jose Santa Clara (Great Amer.) Sacrament Davis - Oakland Santa Clara (Great Amer.) - Oakland Oakland Coliseum - Sacramento Davis - San Jose Emeryville - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) Fremont - Sacramento Hayward - Sacramento Davis - Santa Clara (Great Amer.)	27,479 19,525 17,661 15,553 13,772 13,676 12,268 11,327 10,284 9,964 8,806 7,180 7,070 6,938 6,601 5,623 5,142 4,950 4,224 3,213 2,822 2,568	28,160 26,247 19,759 18,524 16,365 11,505 12,607 11,930 11,457 9,448 9,688 8,030 6,619 4,907 6,614 5,763 5,571 4,808 4,782 3,134 3,107 2,882 2,087	-2.2 +4.7 -1.2 -4.7 -5.0 +19.7 +8.5 +2.8 -1.1 +8.8 +2.8 +9.7 +8.5 +44.1 +4.9 +14.5 +0.9 +14.5 +0.9 +14.5 +0.9 +3.5 +34.8 +3.4 -2.1 +23.0
Total 372,560 355,470 +4	$\begin{array}{c} 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	Richmond - Sacramento Oakland - Sacramento Davis - Emeryville Sacramento - San Jose Davis - Sacramento Davis - Sacramento Davis - Richmond Sacramento - Suisun City Berkeley - Davis Davis - Martinez Berkeley - Sacramento Emeryville - Suisun City Oakland - San Jose Santa Clara (Great Amer.) Sacrament Davis - Oakland Santa Clara (Great Amer.) - Oakland Oakland Coliseum - Sacramento Davis - San Jose Emeryville - San Jose Emeryville - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) Fremont - Sacramento Davis - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) Fremont - Sacramento Davis - Santa Clara (Great Amer.) Sacramento - Santa Clara	27,479 19,525 17,661 15,553 13,772 13,676 12,268 11,327 10,284 9,964 8,806 7,180 7,070 6,938 6,601 5,623 5,142 4,950 4,224 3,213 2,822 2,568 1,811	28,160 26,247 19,759 18,524 16,365 11,505 12,607 11,930 11,457 9,448 9,688 8,030 6,619 4,907 6,614 5,763 5,571 4,808 4,782 3,134 3,107 2,882 2,087 1,554	$\begin{array}{r} -2.2 \\ +4.7 \\ -1.2 \\ -4.7 \\ -5.0 \\ +19.7 \\ +8.5 \\ +2.8 \\ +2.8 \\ +2.8 \\ +9.7 \\ +8.5 \\ +44.1 \\ +4.9 \\ +14.5 \\ +0.9 \\ +14.5 \\ +0.9 \\ +6.9 \\ +3.5 \\ +3.4 \\ +3.4 \\ +2.1 \\ +23.0 \\ +16.5 \end{array}$

Station / Ridership	Dec 2014	Dec 2013	% Change
Auburn, CA	648	786	-16.9
Berkeley, CA	4,940	4,577	+4.6
Davis, CA	13,856	12,660	+7.7
Emeryville, CA	14,630	14,099	+3.1
Fremont, CA	1,204	1,119	+7.4
Santa Clara (Great Amer),	4,882	3,537	+37.6
Hayward, CA	1,395	1,372	+0.3
Martinez, CA	8,234	7,984	+4.6
Oakland, CA	2,064	1,958	+12.7
Oakland, CA	7,800	7,684	+1.7
Richmond, CA	8,083	7,626	+3.7
Rocklin, CA	608	694	-7.7
Roseville, CA	950	853	+13.2
Sacramento, CA	32,848	32,910	+0.4
Santa Clara, CA	970	716	+33.7
San Jose, CA	6,949	7,406	-4.4
Suisun City, CA	6,248	5,791	+7.6
Total	116,309	111,772	+4.1
Station / Ridership	FY15 TD	FY14 TD	% Change
Station / Ridership Auburn, CA	1,942	2,360	-17.2
Auburn, CA Berkeley, CA	1,942 17,376	2,360 16,971	-17.2 +2.3
Auburn, CA Berkeley, CA Davis, CA	1,942	2,360	-17.2 +2.3
Auburn, CA Berkeley, CA Davis, CA Emeryville, CA	1,942 17,376	2,360 16,971	-17.2 +2.3 +6.0 +4.7
Auburn, CA Berkeley, CA Davis, CA	1,942 17,376 47,390	2,360 16,971 44,580	-17.2 +2.3 +6.0
Auburn, CA Berkeley, CA Davis, CA Emeryville, CA	1,942 17,376 47,390 46,070	2,360 16,971 44,580 44,116	-17.2 +2.3 +6.0 +4.7
Auburn, CA Berkeley, CA Davis, CA Emeryville, CA Fremont, CA	1,942 17,376 47,390 46,070 4,006	2,360 16,971 44,580 44,116 4,061 13,178 4,572	-17.2 +2.3 +6.0 +4.7 -1.7
Auburn, CA Berkeley, CA Davis, CA Emeryville, CA Fremont, CA Santa Clara (Great Amer), Hayward, CA Martinez, CA	1,942 17,376 47,390 46,070 4,006 17,360 4,841 26,060	2,360 16,971 44,580 44,116 4,061 13,178	-17.2 +2.3 +6.0 +4.7 -1.7 +30.6
Auburn, CA Berkeley, CA Davis, CA Emeryville, CA Fremont, CA Santa Clara (Great Amer), Hayward, CA	1,942 17,376 47,390 46,070 4,006 17,360 4,841 26,060 6,477	2,360 16,971 44,580 44,116 4,061 13,178 4,572 25,307 6,001	-17.2 +2.3 +6.0 +4.7 -1.7 +30.6 +4.1
Auburn, CA Berkeley, CA Davis, CA Emeryville, CA Fremont, CA Santa Clara (Great Amer), Hayward, CA Martinez, CA	1,942 17,376 47,390 46,070 4,006 17,360 4,841 26,060	2,360 16,971 44,580 44,116 4,061 13,178 4,572 25,307	-17.2 +2.3 +6.0 +4.7 -1.7 +30.6 +4.1 +3.0
Auburn, CA Berkeley, CA Davis, CA Emeryville, CA Fremont, CA Santa Clara (Great Amer), Hayward, CA Martinez, CA Oakland, CA	1,942 17,376 47,390 46,070 4,006 17,360 4,841 26,060 6,477	2,360 16,971 44,580 44,116 4,061 13,178 4,572 25,307 6,001	-17.2 +2.3 +6.0 +4.7 -1.7 +30.6 +4.1 +3.0 +11.5
Auburn, CA Berkeley, CA Davis, CA Emeryville, CA Fremont, CA Santa Clara (Great Amer), Hayward, CA Martinez, CA Oakland, CA Oakland, CA Richmond, CA Rocklin, CA	1,942 17,376 47,390 46,070 4,006 17,360 4,841 26,060 6,477 24,948	2,360 16,971 44,580 44,116 4,061 13,178 4,572 25,307 6,001 24,648	$\begin{array}{r} -17.2 \\ +2.3 \\ +6.0 \\ +4.7 \\ -1.7 \\ +30.6 \\ +4.1 \\ +3.0 \\ +11.5 \\ +1.3 \end{array}$
Auburn, CA Berkeley, CA Davis, CA Emeryville, CA Fremont, CA Santa Clara (Great Amer), Hayward, CA Martinez, CA Oakland, CA Oakland, CA Richmond, CA Rocklin, CA Roseville, CA	1,942 17,376 47,390 46,070 4,006 17,360 4,841 26,060 6,477 24,948 24,460 1,974 3,051	2,360 16,971 44,580 44,116 4,061 13,178 4,572 25,307 6,001 24,648 23,171	$\begin{array}{r} -17.2 \\ +2.3 \\ +6.0 \\ +4.7 \\ -1.7 \\ +30.6 \\ +4.1 \\ +3.0 \\ +11.5 \\ +1.3 \\ +6.1 \\ -7.0 \\ +11.3 \end{array}$
Auburn, CA Berkeley, CA Davis, CA Emeryville, CA Fremont, CA Santa Clara (Great Amer), Hayward, CA Martinez, CA Oakland, CA Oakland, CA Richmond, CA Rocklin, CA	1,942 17,376 47,390 46,070 4,006 17,360 4,841 26,060 6,477 24,948 24,948 24,460 1,974	2,360 16,971 44,580 44,116 4,061 13,178 4,572 25,307 6,001 24,648 23,171 2,162	$\begin{array}{r} -17.2 \\ +2.3 \\ +6.0 \\ +4.7 \\ -1.7 \\ +30.6 \\ +4.1 \\ +3.0 \\ +11.5 \\ +1.3 \\ +6.1 \\ -7.0 \end{array}$
Auburn, CA Berkeley, CA Davis, CA Emeryville, CA Fremont, CA Santa Clara (Great Amer), Hayward, CA Martinez, CA Oakland, CA Oakland, CA Richmond, CA Rocklin, CA Roseville, CA	1,942 17,376 47,390 46,070 4,006 17,360 4,841 26,060 6,477 24,948 24,460 1,974 3,051	2,360 16,971 44,580 44,116 4,061 13,178 4,572 25,307 6,001 24,648 23,171 2,162 2,754	$\begin{array}{r} -17.2 \\ +2.3 \\ +6.0 \\ +4.7 \\ -1.7 \\ +30.6 \\ +4.1 \\ +3.0 \\ +11.5 \\ +1.3 \\ +6.1 \\ -7.0 \\ +11.3 \end{array}$
Auburn, CA Berkeley, CA Davis, CA Emeryville, CA Fremont, CA Santa Clara (Great Amer), Hayward, CA Martinez, CA Oakland, CA Oakland, CA Richmond, CA Rocklin, CA Roseville, CA Sacramento, CA	1,942 17,376 47,390 46,070 4,006 17,360 4,841 26,060 6,477 24,948 24,460 1,974 3,051 101,578	2,360 16,971 44,580 44,116 13,178 4,572 25,307 6,001 24,648 23,171 2,162 2,754 97,366	$\begin{array}{r} -17.2 \\ +2.3 \\ +6.0 \\ +4.7 \\ -1.7 \\ +30.6 \\ +4.1 \\ +3.0 \\ +11.5 \\ +1.3 \\ +6.1 \\ -7.0 \\ +11.3 \\ +3.6 \\ +41.1 \end{array}$
Auburn, CA Berkeley, CA Davis, CA Emeryville, CA Fremont, CA Santa Clara (Great Amer), Hayward, CA Martinez, CA Oakland, CA Oakland, CA Richmond, CA Rocklin, CA Roseville, CA Sacramento, CA Santa Clara, CA	1,942 17,376 47,390 46,070 4,006 17,360 4,841 26,060 6,477 24,948 24,460 1,974 3,051 101,578 3,487	2,360 16,971 44,580 44,116 4,061 13,178 4,572 25,307 6,001 24,648 23,171 2,162 2,754 97,366 2,490	$\begin{array}{r} -17.2 \\ +2.3 \\ +6.0 \\ +4.7 \\ -1.7 \\ +30.6 \\ +4.1 \\ +3.0 \\ +11.5 \\ +1.3 \\ +6.1 \\ -7.0 \\ +11.3 \\ +6.1 \\ -7.0 \\ +11.3 \\ +3.6 \\ +41.1 \\ -1.9 \\ +3.8 \end{array}$

Capitol Corridor On Time Performance - December 2014							
WB Trair	Dec 2014	Dec 2013	% Diff	FY2015TD	FY2014TD	% Diff	
521	90.5%	100.0%	-9.5%	95.2%	98.4%	-3.2%	
523	95.2%	100.0%	-4.8%	93.6%	93.7%	-0.1%	
525	85.7%	100.0%	-14.3%	93.6%	96.8%	-3.2%	
527	95.2%	100.0%	-4.8%	95.2%	96.8%	-1.6%	
529	90.5%	100.0%	-9.5%	95.2%	100.0%	-4.8%	
531	66.7%	95.2%	-28.5%	87.1%	96.8%	-9.7%	
533	90.5%	100.0%	-9.5%	85.5%	95.2%	-9.7%	
535	81.0%	95.2%	-14.2%	88.7%	93.7%	-5.0%	
537	76.2%	100.0%	-23.8%	80.7%	98.4%	-17.7%	
541	100.0%	95.2%	4.8%	96.8%	95.2%	1.6%	
543	85.7%	100.0%	-14.3%	90.3%	96.8%	-6.5%	
545	90.5%	100.0%	-9.5%	93.6%	100.0%	-6.4%	
547	100.0%	95.2%	4.8%	96.8%	98.4%	-1.6%	
549	85.7%	100.0%	-14.3%	91.9%	93.7%	-1.8%	
551	90.5%	100.0%	-9.5%	95.2%	98.4%	-3.2%	
723	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	-3.2%	
723	100.0%	90.0%	10.0%	93.3%	96.6%	-3.3%	
727			10.0%			-3.3%	
729	100.0% 80.0%	90.0% 100.0%		83.3% 90.0%	92.9% 96.6%	-9.6%	
			-20.0%				
737	90.0%	100.0%	-10.0%	90.0%	96.6%	-6.6%	
741	80.0%	100.0%	-20.0%	90.0%	100.0%	-10.0%	
743	70.0%	90.0%	-20.0%	76.7%	96.6%	-19.9%	
745	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	86.7%	100.0%	-13.3%	
747	60.0%	100.0%	-40.0%	83.3%	96.6%	-13.3%	
749	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	89.7%	10.3%	
751	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	86.7%	93.1%	-6.4%	
	D 0044	D 0040	0/ 0166	DIODALTD	D/004 ATD	0/ 0166	
	Dec 2014		% Diff		FY2014TD	% Diff	
520	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	96.8%	100.0%	-3.2%	
520 522	100.0% 100.0%	100.0% 100.0%	0.0% 0.0%	96.8% 98.4%	100.0% 100.0%	-3.2% -1.6%	
520 522 524	100.0% 100.0% 85.7%	100.0% 100.0% 100.0%	0.0% 0.0% -14.3%	96.8% 98.4% 90.3%	100.0% 100.0% 98.4%	-3.2% -1.6% -8.1%	
520 522 524 526	100.0% 100.0% 85.7% 85.7%	100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 95.2%	0.0% 0.0% -14.3% -9.5%	96.8% 98.4% 90.3% 90.3%	100.0% 100.0% 98.4% 95.2%	-3.2% -1.6% -8.1% -4.9%	
520 522 524 526 528	100.0% 100.0% 85.7% 85.7% 100.0%	100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 95.2% 100.0%	0.0% 0.0% -14.3% -9.5% 0.0%	96.8% 98.4% 90.3% 90.3% 98.4%	100.0% 100.0% 98.4% 95.2% 95.2%	-3.2% -1.6% -8.1% -4.9% 3.2%	
520 522 524 526 528 530	100.0% 100.0% 85.7% 85.7% 100.0% 85.7%	100.0% 100.0% 95.2% 100.0% 100.0%	0.0% 0.0% -14.3% -9.5% 0.0% -14.3%	96.8% 98.4% 90.3% 90.3% 98.4% 91.9%	100.0% 100.0% 98.4% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2%	-3.2% -1.6% -8.1% -4.9% 3.2% -3.3%	
520 522 524 526 528 530	100.0% 100.0% 85.7% 85.7% 100.0%	100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 95.2% 100.0%	0.0% 0.0% -14.3% -9.5% 0.0%	96.8% 98.4% 90.3% 98.4% 91.9% 93.6%	100.0% 100.0% 98.4% 95.2% 95.2%	-3.2% -1.6% -8.1% -4.9% 3.2%	
520 522 524 526 528 530 532	100.0% 100.0% 85.7% 85.7% 100.0% 85.7%	100.0% 100.0% 95.2% 100.0% 100.0%	0.0% 0.0% -14.3% -9.5% 0.0% -14.3% -9.5% 0.0%	96.8% 98.4% 90.3% 90.3% 98.4% 91.9%	100.0% 100.0% 98.4% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2%	-3.2% -1.6% -8.1% -4.9% 3.2% -3.3%	
520 522 524 526 528 530 532 534	100.0% 100.0% 85.7% 85.7% 100.0% 85.7% 90.5%	100.0% 100.0% 95.2% 100.0% 100.0%	0.0% 0.0% -14.3% -9.5% 0.0% -14.3% -9.5%	96.8% 98.4% 90.3% 98.4% 91.9% 93.6%	100.0% 100.0% 98.4% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2%	-3.2% -1.6% -8.1% -4.9% 3.2% -3.3% -1.6%	
520 522 524 526 528 530 532 532 534 536	100.0% 100.0% 85.7% 85.7% 100.0% 85.7% 90.5% 100.0%	100.0% 100.0% 95.2% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0%	0.0% 0.0% -14.3% -9.5% 0.0% -14.3% -9.5% 0.0%	96.8% 98.4% 90.3% 90.3% 98.4% 91.9% 93.6% 98.4%	100.0% 100.0% 98.4% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 100.0%	-3.2% -1.6% -8.1% -4.9% 3.2% -3.3% -1.6%	
520 522 524 526 528 530 532 534 536 538	100.0% 100.0% 85.7% 100.0% 85.7% 90.5% 100.0% 90.5%	100.0% 100.0% 95.2% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 95.2%	0.0% 0.0% -14.3% -9.5% 0.0% -14.3% -9.5% 0.0% -4.7%	96.8% 98.4% 90.3% 90.3% 98.4% 91.9% 93.6% 98.4% 93.6%	100.0% 100.0% 98.4% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 100.0% 93.7%	-3.2% -1.6% -8.1% -4.9% 3.2% -3.3% -1.6% -1.6% -0.1%	
520 522 524 526 528 530 532 532 534 536 538 538	100.0% 100.0% 85.7% 100.0% 85.7% 90.5% 100.0% 90.5% 95.2%	100.0% 100.0% 95.2% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 95.2% 95.2%	0.0% 0.0% -14.3% -9.5% 0.0% -9.5% 0.0% -4.7% 0.0%	96.8% 98.4% 90.3% 90.3% 91.9% 93.6% 98.4% 93.6% 98.4%	100.0% 100.0% 98.4% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 100.0% 93.7% 98.4%	-3.2% -1.6% -8.1% -4.9% 3.2% -3.3% -1.6% -1.6% -0.1% 0.0%	
520 522 524 526 528 530 532 534 534 536 538 540 542	100.0% 100.0% 85.7% 100.0% 85.7% 90.5% 100.0% 95.2% 100.0%	100.0% 100.0% 95.2% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 95.2% 95.2%	0.0% 0.0% -14.3% -9.5% 0.0% -14.3% -9.5% 0.0% -4.7% 0.0% 4.8%	96.8% 98.4% 90.3% 90.3% 91.9% 93.6% 93.6% 98.4% 93.6% 98.4%	100.0% 100.0% 98.4% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 100.0% 93.7% 98.4%	-3.2% -1.6% -8.1% -4.9% 3.2% -3.3% -1.6% -0.1% 0.0% -1.6%	
520 522 524 526 530 532 534 536 538 540 542 544	100.0% 100.0% 85.7% 100.0% 85.7% 90.5% 90.5% 90.5% 90.5% 90.5%	100.0% 100.0% 95.2% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2%	0.0% 0.0% -14.3% -9.5% 0.0% -14.3% 0.0% -4.7% 0.0% 4.8% -4.7%	96.8% 98.4% 90.3% 90.3% 98.4% 93.6% 93.6% 98.4% 93.6% 98.4% 96.8% 91.9%	100.0% 100.0% 98.4% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 100.0% 93.7% 98.4% 98.4% 96.8%	-3.2% -1.6% -8.1% -4.9% 3.2% -3.3% -1.6% -0.1% 0.0% -1.6% -4.9% 1.5%	
520 522 524 526 530 532 534 536 538 540 542 544 544	100.0% 100.0% 85.7% 85.7% 90.5% 90.5% 90.5% 95.2% 100.0% 90.5% 95.2%	100.0% 100.0% 95.2% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2%	0.0% 0.0% -14.3% -9.5% 0.0% -14.3% 0.0% -4.7% 0.0% 4.8% -4.7% 0.0%	96.8% 98.4% 90.3% 90.3% 91.9% 93.6% 98.4% 93.6% 98.4% 96.8% 91.9% 95.2%	100.0% 100.0% 98.4% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 100.0% 93.7% 98.4% 98.4% 96.8% 93.7%	-3.2% -1.6% -8.1% -4.9% 3.2% -3.3% -1.6% -0.1% 0.0% -1.6% -4.9% 1.5%	
520 522 524 526 528 530 532 534 536 538 540 542 544 546 548	100.0% 100.0% 85.7% 85.7% 90.5% 100.0% 90.5% 95.2% 100.0% 95.2% 66.7%	100.0% 100.0% 95.2% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 100.0%	0.0% 0.0% -14.3% -9.5% 0.0% -14.3% 0.0% -4.7% 0.0% 4.8% -4.7% 0.0% -33.3%	96.8% 98.4% 90.3% 90.3% 98.4% 91.9% 93.6% 98.4% 93.6% 98.4% 96.8% 91.9% 95.2% 83.9%	100.0% 100.0% 98.4% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 100.0% 93.7% 98.4% 96.8% 93.7%	-3.2% -1.6% -8.1% -4.9% 3.2% -1.6% -1.6% -0.1% 0.0% -1.6% -4.9% 1.5% -12.9%	
520 522 524 526 528 530 532 534 536 538 538 540 542 544 546 548 720	100.0% 100.0% 85.7% 100.0% 85.7% 90.5% 100.0% 95.2% 100.0% 95.2% 66.7% 85.7%	100.0% 100.0% 95.2% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 100.0%	0.0% 0.0% -14.3% -9.5% 0.0% -14.3% -9.5% 0.0% -4.7% 0.0% -4.7% 0.0% -33.3% -14.3%	96.8% 98.4% 90.3% 91.9% 93.6% 93.6% 98.4% 93.6% 98.4% 96.8% 91.9% 95.2% 83.9% 88.7%	100.0% 100.0% 98.4% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 100.0% 93.7% 98.4% 98.4% 96.8% 93.7% 96.8%	-3.2% -1.6% -8.1% -4.9% 3.2% -3.3% -1.6% -1.6% -0.1% 0.0% -1.6% -4.9% 1.5% -12.9% -8.1%	
520 522 524 526 530 532 534 536 538 540 542 544 544 546 548 720 724	100.0% 100.0% 85.7% 100.0% 85.7% 90.5% 90.5% 95.2% 100.0% 95.2% 66.7% 85.7% 100.0%	100.0% 100.0% 95.2% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 100.0% 100.0%	0.0% 0.0% -14.3% -9.5% 0.0% -14.3% 0.0% -4.7% 0.0% -4.7% 0.0% -33.3% -14.3% 20.0%	96.8% 98.4% 90.3% 91.9% 93.6% 93.6% 98.4% 93.6% 98.4% 96.8% 91.9% 95.2% 83.9% 88.7% 96.7%	100.0% 100.0% 98.4% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 100.0% 93.7% 98.4% 98.4% 96.8% 93.7% 96.8% 93.1%	-3.2% -1.6% -8.1% -4.9% 3.2% -3.3% -1.6% -1.6% -1.6% -1.6% -1.6% -1.5% -12.9% -8.1% 3.6%	
520 522 524 526 530 532 534 536 538 540 542 544 546 544 546 548 720 724 728	100.0% 100.0% 85.7% 100.0% 85.7% 90.5% 90.5% 90.5% 90.5% 95.2% 66.7% 85.7% 100.0%	100.0% 100.0% 95.2% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 100.0% 100.0% 80.0%	0.0% 0.0% -14.3% -9.5% 0.0% -14.3% 0.0% -4.7% 0.0% -4.7% 0.0% -33.3% -14.3% 20.0% 10.0%	96.8% 98.4% 90.3% 90.3% 91.9% 93.6% 93.6% 98.4% 93.6% 98.4% 96.8% 91.9% 95.2% 83.9% 88.7% 96.7% 93.3%	100.0% 100.0% 98.4% 95.2% 95.2% 100.0% 93.7% 98.4% 98.4% 98.4% 96.8% 93.7% 96.8% 93.1% 893.1%	-3.2% -1.6% -8.1% -4.9% 3.2% -3.3% -1.6% -1.6% -1.6% -1.6% -1.6% -1.5% -12.9% -8.1% 3.6% 3.6% -6.4%	
520 522 524 526 530 532 534 536 538 540 542 544 544 544 546 548 720 724 728 732	100.0% 100.0% 85.7% 85.7% 90.5% 90.5% 90.5% 90.5% 90.5% 90.5% 95.2% 66.7% 85.7% 100.0% 100.0%	100.0% 100.0% 95.2% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 100.0% 100.0% 80.0% 90.0%	0.0% 0.0% -14.3% -9.5% 0.0% -14.3% 0.0% -4.7% 0.0% 4.8% -4.7% 0.0% -33.3% -14.3% 20.0% 10.0%	96.8% 98.4% 90.3% 90.3% 91.9% 93.6% 98.4% 93.6% 98.4% 96.8% 91.9% 95.2% 83.9% 88.7% 96.7% 93.3%	100.0% 100.0% 98.4% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 100.0% 93.7% 98.4% 98.4% 98.4% 96.8% 93.7% 96.8% 93.1% 89.7%	-3.2% -1.6% -8.1% -4.9% 3.2% -3.3% -1.6% -1.6% -1.6% -1.6% -1.6% -1.5% -12.9% -8.1% 3.6% 3.6% -6.4%	
520 522 524 526 530 532 534 536 538 540 542 544 544 544 544 720 724 728 732 734	100.0% 100.0% 85.7% 85.7% 90.5% 90.5% 90.5% 95.2% 100.0% 95.2% 66.7% 85.7% 100.0% 90.0% 90.0%	100.0% 100.0% 95.2% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 100.0% 100.0% 80.0% 90.0% 100.0%	0.0% 0.0% -14.3% -9.5% 0.0% -14.3% 0.0% -4.7% 0.0% 4.8% -4.7% 0.0% -33.3% -14.3% 20.0% 10.0% -10.0%	96.8% 98.4% 90.3% 90.3% 91.9% 93.6% 98.4% 93.6% 98.4% 96.8% 91.9% 95.2% 83.9% 88.7% 96.7% 93.3% 86.7% 86.7%	100.0% 100.0% 98.4% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 100.0% 93.7% 98.4% 98.4% 98.4% 96.8% 93.7% 96.8% 93.1% 89.7% 93.1% 100.0%	-3.2% -1.6% -8.1% -4.9% 3.2% -3.3% -1.6% -1.6% -1.6% -1.6% -4.9% 1.5% -12.9% -8.1% 3.6% 3.6% -6.4% -13.3%	
520 522 524 528 530 532 534 536 538 540 542 544 546 548 720 724 728 732 734 736	100.0% 100.0% 85.7% 85.7% 90.5% 90.5% 95.2% 100.0% 95.2% 66.7% 85.7% 100.0% 90.0% 90.0% 90.0%	100.0% 100.0% 95.2% 100.0% 100.0% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 100.0% 100.0% 80.0% 90.0%	0.0% 0.0% -14.3% -9.5% 0.0% -14.3% 0.0% -4.7% 0.0% 4.8% -4.7% 0.0% -33.3% -14.3% 20.0% 10.0% -10.0% -10.0%	96.8% 98.4% 90.3% 90.3% 91.9% 93.6% 93.6% 93.6% 98.4% 93.6% 98.4% 95.2% 83.9% 88.7% 96.7% 93.3% 86.7% 86.7%	100.0% 100.0% 98.4% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 100.0% 93.7% 98.4% 98.4% 96.8% 93.7% 96.8% 93.7% 96.8% 93.1% 100.0% 93.1%	-3.2% -1.6% -8.1% -4.9% 3.2% -1.6% -1.6% -0.1% 0.0% -1.6% -4.9% 1.5% -12.9% -8.1% 3.6% 3.6% -6.4% -13.3% -3.1%	
520 522 524 528 530 532 534 536 538 540 542 544 546 548 720 724 728 722 734 736 738	100.0% 100.0% 85.7% 100.0% 85.7% 90.5% 90.5% 95.2% 100.0% 95.2% 66.7% 85.7% 100.0% 90.0% 90.0% 90.0%	100.0% 100.0% 95.2% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 100.0% 80.0% 90.0% 100.0% 90.0% 90.0%	0.0% 0.0% -14.3% -9.5% 0.0% -14.3% 0.0% -4.7% 0.0% -4.7% 0.0% -33.3% -14.3% 20.0% 10.0% -10.0% 0.0% 0.0%	96.8% 98.4% 90.3% 91.9% 93.6% 93.6% 93.6% 98.4% 93.6% 98.4% 95.2% 83.9% 88.7% 95.2% 83.9% 88.7% 95.2% 83.9% 88.7% 90.0%	100.0% 100.0% 98.4% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 100.0% 93.7% 98.4% 98.4% 98.4% 96.8% 93.7% 96.8% 93.1% 89.7% 93.1% 100.0% 93.1%	-3.2% -1.6% -8.1% -3.3% -1.6% -1.6% -1.6% -1.6% -1.6% -1.5% -12.9% -8.1% 3.6% 3.6% -6.4% -13.3% -3.1%	
520 522 524 526 530 532 534 536 538 540 542 544 546 548 720 724 728 724 728 732 734 736 738 738	100.0% 100.0% 85.7% 100.0% 85.7% 100.0% 90.5% 90.5% 95.2% 100.0% 95.2% 66.7% 85.7% 100.0% 90.0% 90.0% 90.0%	100.0% 100.0% 95.2% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 100.0% 100.0% 80.0% 90.0% 100.0% 90.0%	0.0% 0.0% -14.3% -9.5% 0.0% -14.3% 0.0% -4.7% 0.0% -4.7% 0.0% -33.3% -14.3% 20.0% 10.0% -10.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	96.8% 98.4% 90.3% 91.9% 93.6% 93.6% 98.4% 93.6% 98.4% 95.2% 83.9% 88.7% 95.2% 83.9% 88.7% 95.2% 83.9% 88.7% 90.7% 90.0% 90.0%	100.0% 100.0% 98.4% 95.2% 95.2% 100.0% 93.7% 98.4% 98.4% 98.4% 93.7% 96.8% 93.7% 96.8% 93.1% 89.7% 93.1% 100.0% 93.1%	-3.2% -1.6% -8.1% -3.3% -1.6% -1.6% -1.6% -1.6% -1.6% -1.6% -1.5% -12.9% -8.1% 3.6% -6.4% -13.3% -3.1% -3.1%	
520 522 524 526 530 532 534 536 538 540 542 544 546 544 546 548 720 724 724 728 732 734 736 738 742 744	100.0% 100.0% 85.7% 85.7% 90.5% 90.5% 90.5% 90.5% 90.5% 90.5% 90.5% 90.5% 90.5% 90.0% 100.0% 90.0% 90.0% 90.0% 100.0%	100.0% 100.0% 95.2% 100.0% 100.0% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 100.0% 100.0% 80.0% 90.0% 100.0% 90.0% 100.0%	0.0% 0.0% -14.3% -9.5% 0.0% -14.3% 0.0% -4.7% 0.0% 4.8% -4.7% 0.0% -33.3% -14.3% 20.0% 10.0% -10.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	96.8% 98.4% 90.3% 91.9% 93.6% 93.6% 98.4% 93.6% 98.4% 95.2% 83.9% 88.7% 96.7% 93.3% 86.7% 96.7% 90.0% 90.0% 90.0%	100.0% 100.0% 98.4% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 100.0% 93.7% 98.4% 98.4% 98.4% 96.8% 93.7% 96.8% 93.1% 96.8% 93.1% 100.0% 93.1% 93.1% 93.1%	-3.2% -1.6% -8.1% -3.3% -1.6% -1.6% -0.1% 0.0% -1.6% -1.6% -1.6% -1.5% -12.9% -8.1% 3.6% -6.4% -13.3% -3.1% -3.1% -3.1% -3.1%	
520 522 524 526 530 532 534 536 538 540 542 544 546 544 546 548 720 724 724 728 732 734 736 738 742 744	100.0% 100.0% 85.7% 85.7% 90.5% 90.5% 90.5% 90.5% 90.5% 90.5% 90.5% 90.5% 90.0% 90.0% 90.0% 90.0% 90.0% 90.0% 100.0%	100.0% 100.0% 95.2% 100.0% 100.0% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 90.0% 100.0% 90.0% 100.0%	0.0% 0.0% -14.3% -9.5% 0.0% -14.3% 0.0% -4.7% 0.0% 4.8% -4.7% 0.0% -33.3% -14.3% 20.0% 10.0% -10.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	96.8% 98.4% 90.3% 90.3% 91.9% 93.6% 98.4% 93.6% 98.4% 96.8% 91.9% 95.2% 83.9% 88.7% 96.7% 93.3% 86.7% 86.7% 90.0% 90.0% 90.0% 76.7% 86.7%	100.0% 100.0% 98.4% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 100.0% 93.7% 98.4% 98.4% 98.4% 96.8% 93.7% 96.8% 93.1% 96.8% 93.1% 100.0% 93.1% 93.1% 93.1% 93.1%	-3.2% -1.6% -8.1% -4.9% 3.2% -1.6% -1.6% -0.1% 0.0% -1.6% -4.9% 1.5% -12.9% -8.1% 3.6% 3.6% 3.6% -3.1% -3.1% -3.1% -3.1% -19.9%	
520 522 524 526 530 532 534 536 538 540 542 544 544 544 720 724 728 732 734 736 738 738 742 744 746	100.0% 100.0% 85.7% 90.5% 90.5% 90.5% 95.2% 100.0% 95.2% 100.0% 90.5% 95.2% 100.0% 90.0% 90.0% 90.0% 90.0% 90.0% 100.0% 100.0%	100.0% 100.0% 95.2% 100.0% 100.0% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0%	0.0% 0.0% -14.3% -9.5% 0.0% -14.3% 0.0% -4.7% 0.0% 4.8% -4.7% 0.0% -33.3% -14.3% 20.0% 10.0% -10.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	96.8% 98.4% 90.3% 90.3% 91.9% 93.6% 93.6% 93.6% 93.6% 94.4% 95.2% 83.9% 88.7% 96.7% 96.7% 93.3% 86.7% 86.7% 90.0% 90.0% 90.0% 90.0% 86.7% 86.7%	100.0% 100.0% 98.4% 95.2% 95.2% 95.2% 100.0% 93.7% 98.4% 98.4% 98.4% 93.7% 96.8% 93.1% 96.8% 93.1% 100.0% 93.1% 93.1% 93.1% 93.1%	-3.2% -1.6% -8.1% -4.9% 3.2% -1.6% -1.6% -0.1% 0.0% -1.6% -4.9% 1.5% -4.9% 3.6% -6.4% -3.6% -3.1% -3.1% -3.1% -9.9%	

MEMORANDUM

TO: Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Board

DATE: February 11, 2015

FROM: David B. Kutrosky Managing Director

SUBJECT: WORK COMPLETED (February 18, 2015 Meeting)

PURPOSE

To provide a report on work completed up to the February 18, 2015 CCJPA Board meeting.

BACKGROUND

The following is a report on recently completed work:

- a. <u>Annual Performance Report (FY2014)</u>. Pursuant to the Resolution 14-13, CCJPA Board provided comments and adopted the draft Performance Report covering the Fiscal Year 2013-14 (October 2013-September 2014). Staff continued with the condensed, leaner format that was implemented for last year's report with targeted text, charts, and photos. The final, finished report is expected to be released and available at the February 18, 2015 CCJPA Board of Directors meeting and be widely distributed the State Legislature and other interested agencies.
- b. <u>FY 14 CCJPA Independent Audit</u>. As stipulated in the Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement between the CCJPA member agencies, the Controller-Treasurer's Office of the CCJPA is required to conduct and prepare an annual independent audit of the CCJPA and submit the report of such audit by December 31 of each year. The financial report stating the findings of the independent audit for Fiscal Year 2013-14 (July 2013-June 2014) was prepared and submitted to the CCJPA member agency staff (Staff Coordinating Group [SCG]) for review. Comments were incorporated and the final report will be transmitted to the CCJPA Board Directors in February 2015.
- c. <u>CCJPA/BART Administrative Services Agreement (February 2015 February 2020)</u>. At its November 19, 2014 meeting, the CCJPA Board adopted Resolution 14-15 which approved the extension of the Administrative Services Agreement (ASA) with BART for another five-year term (effective February 20, 2015). The ASA identifies the duties and responsibilities to be provided by the Managing Agency to the CCJPA Board, which includes administrative support of the Board and management oversight of the Capitol Corridor service. The BART Board, in turn, approved the execution of the ASA at its February 12, 2015 meeting. The ASA is now being circulated for execution by the parties.
- d. <u>Marketing and Communications Activities (November 2014 January 2015)</u>: The following work has been completed as part of the CCJPA's FY2014-15 Marketing and Communications Programs:
 - Advertising:
 - Selected advertising agency to develop campaigns to support promotion of Take 5 on Weekends, Capitol Corridor Friends and Family 50% Off, and Seniors Ride Half Off Midweek Offer
 - Selected photographer to do photo shoot to grow library of images used for advertising and other marketing activities
 - Publications and Promotions

- o Ride/Policy Guide. Published and distributed on trains
- Annual Performance Report in production
- o San Jose Holiday Ice Rink and Downtown Sacramento Holiday Ice Rink partnerships
- Events/Media Relations/Customer Communications
 - Rider Appreciation Events evaluating results and determining dates for future "Cappy Hour" events
 - Train Status Web Site need to establish data stream with Amtrak for ETA data. Prototype web portal has been completed.
 - o Media Relations/Customer Communications: Tie Replacement project notices completed

RECOMMENDATION

For information only.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Board

DATE: February 11, 2015

FROM: David B. Kutrosky Managing Director

SUBJECT: WORK IN PROGRESS (February 18, 2015 Meeting)

PURPOSE

To provide an update on work in progress up to the February 18, 2015 CCJPA Board meeting.

BACKGROUND

The following is a report on work efforts currently underway:

- a. <u>Oakland-San Jose Phase 2 Track Project</u>. The engineering and environmental consultants working for CCJPA on this project have completed initial survey data gathering and are in the process of assembling the base maps for use in the design process. CCJPA have also consulted with UPRR regarding upgrades to the track infrastructure adjacent to and serving the Great America/Santa Clara station that can be completed in time to serve the Levi's Stadium for Super Bowl 50 (February 6, 2016).
- b. <u>Sacramento-Roseville 3rd Track Environmental Review/Preliminary Engineering</u>. The CCJPA is on target for a November 2015 adoption of the required California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) adoption of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for this project which will add capacity to allow up to ten round trips per day to/from Roseville. The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) environmental documentation is required to be completed by the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA). Between November and the present, the draft version of these two environmental documents will be circulated for public review and comment as per the requirements. In addition, there will be at least two public sessions to receive comments on the draft documents.
- c. <u>Positive Train Control Update</u>. The Union Pacific's plan for PTC implementation remains the same in that the Los Angeles basin will be first, with the Northern California area next. Initial reports are that the implementation of PTC in the LA Basin has been delayed to third quarter 2015, putting PTC installation on the Capitol Corridor route sometime after the fourth quarter of 2015 or perhaps later. The Union Pacific is also studying the possibility of beginning an initial phase where both PTC equipped and non-PTC equipped trains would operate over the Capitol Corridor route together, as a way of testing the system. Possible challenges to the overall implementation of PTC include expected action by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) regarding coordination of radio frequencies, and potential action by the US Congress to change the deadline date. A recent report by the Government Accounting Office has suggested that PTC installation could be delayed by a variety of technical and administrative challenges. However, the recent serious accident on the Metro North commuter railroad in New York has renewed the visibility of the PTC installation project.

Installation of the PTC equipment on the state-owned equipment is currently complete for the Northern California intercity rail fleet (supporting the Capitol Corridor and San Joaquin trains) with all locomotives and cab cars equipped except for the installation of PTC radios and antennas on the locomotives. Once the state-owned equipment is fully equipped, Capitol Corridor trainsets will be tested for interoperability with Caltrain's PTC system, which is expected to be installed and ready for testing in mid- to late-2015.

- d. <u>Station and Platform Safety Upgrades</u>. The CCJPA staff has been working with Amtrak to survey stations along the Capitol Corridor route and identify those stations for safety upgrades at the platforms. The improvements include: replacing broken platform tactile edges, repainting tactile edges, restriping yellow safety lines along the main platform, repainting safety text along main platform, and installing safety signs. Work has been completed at a number of stations; the similar safety upgrades are underway at: Santa Clara/Great America, Hayward, Oakland Coliseum, Richmond, Suisun-Fairfield, Roseville and Auburn stations. Work at these stations will be completed in spring 2015. In addition, staff is scheduled to meet with City of Davis staff in mid-March 2015 to determine what additional safety improvements can be implemented at this station.
- e. <u>Proposition 1B Transit Safety/Security Improvement Projects</u>. The CCJPA has been advancing work on the following CCJPA security projects: a number of Passenger Information Display System (PIDS) signs, made surplus by the construction of new boarding platforms at Sacramento, will be relocated to the bus bays at the Sacramento station; new safety/information display signs, based on the MTC Hub Signage program, are being designed and are planned to be implemented at all Capitol Corridor stations; additional security fencing to keep trespassers off the right-of-way will be constructed at various locations along the Capitol Corridor route; and design is underway for a project to improve security cameras, lighting and standby power at the Auburn station and layover facility.
- f. <u>Proposed Extension of Capitol Corridor Trains to Salinas</u>. Amtrak is conducting a revised ridership and revenue analysis for the Salinas rail service to now include the Watsonville/Pajaro Rail Station between Gilroy and Salinas. Currently TAMC staff is seeking \$18M in state funding through CTC for Salinas Station construction and a consultant has been retained by TAMC to work on the designs for the track and facilities associated with the Salinas Quick Start Rail project
- g. <u>Upcoming Marketing and Communications Activities</u> The following work is underway as part of the CCJPA's FY2014-15 Marketing Programs:
 - Advertising:
 - Advertising agency to develop multi-channel campaigns to support promotion of Take 5 on Weekends, Capitol Corridor Friends and Family 50% Off, and Seniors Ride Half Off Midweek Offer through June 2015
 - Publications:
 - Timetable production for March 1, 2015 in progress
 - Promotions:
 - o Oakland A's, Sacramento River Cats preparing for Spring promotion launches
 - o 49ers in discussions about cross-promotion for Levi's Stadium events
 - o Feld Entertainment Disney on Ice promotion launches in February
 - Group Travel bookings for spring increasing
 - o Collaborating with Davis Tour de Cluck coordinators to promote their event

• Employer Offers – developing an employer outreach program/offer to launch initially in the South Bay area. Program is estimated to launch in March and will be evaluated for possible expansion to other areas.

- Media Relations/Customer Communications:
 - o Developing new design for Capitol Corridor blogs to enhance social media engagement
 - o Planning Bike to Work Day efforts
- FAQs published online

RECOMMENDATION

For information only