VTA Board of Directors:

We are forwarding you the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson Cindy Chavez</td>
<td>Support Letters for AB 1746 (Stone) and AB 2374 (Chiu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roland Lebrun, Member of the Public</td>
<td>Caltrain EMU Specification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you.

Office of the Board Secretary
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
3331 N. First Street
San Jose, CA 95134
408.321.5680
board.secretary@vta.org
MEMORANDUM

TO:        Members of the California State Assembly

FROM:      Cindy Chavez, Chairperson
            Board of Directors
            Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority

DATE:      April 8, 2016

RE:        Support for AB 1746 (Stone)

The Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) respectfully requests your support for AB 1746 (Stone) when this bill comes before the Assembly for a vote. In 2013, legislation was enacted to authorize the Monterey-Salinas Transit District and the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District to operate public transit buses on the shoulders of segments of the state highway system within their respective service areas, subject to the approval of Caltrans and the California Highway Patrol (CHP). AB 1746 extends this authority to VTA and six other agencies.

Operating public transit buses on the shoulders of state highways is a low-cost strategy for enhancing the reliability of public transit by minimizing congestion-related interruptions of service, while preserving the safety and structural integrity of the highway system. It also improves travel times for public transit relative to driving, thereby making public transit a more attractive mobility option. Numerous cities in the United States currently are utilizing the shoulders of state highways for operating public transit buses with positive results. Similarly, a recent bus-on-shoulders demonstration effort in San Diego was considered to be a success.

AB 1746 would provide VTA and several other agencies in California with the opportunity to work in collaboration with Caltrans and the CHP to determine whether operating their buses on the shoulders of certain segments of the state highway system would be an effective and safe strategy for enhancing public transit for the communities that they serve. For this reason, we respectfully seek your support for AB 1746. Thank you for your consideration of our request.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Members of the California State Assembly

FROM: Cindy Chavez, Chairperson
Board of Directors
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority

DATE: April 8, 2016

RE: Support for AB 2374 (Chiu)

The Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) respectfully requests your support for AB 2374 (Chiu) when this bill comes before the Assembly for a vote. AB 2374 authorizes VTA and other regional transportation agencies, as defined, to use the Construction Manager/General Contractor (CMGC) delivery method to design and construct projects on roadway ramps that are not on the state highway system. In addition, this legislation deletes provisions in current law that limit the use of CMCG for expressway projects to only those included in a voter-approved expenditure plan, thereby allowing a regional transportation agency to use CMGC for any expressway project, as long as it is not on the state highway system.

CMCG is an emerging procurement tool that combines elements of both design-bid-build and design-build to enhance project delivery. Under CMGC, a public agency engages a construction management firm to act as its consultant during pre-construction work and as the general contractor during construction. During the pre-construction phase, the construction management firm serves in an advisory role, providing constructability reviews, value engineering suggestions, construction cost estimates, and other construction-related recommendations. When project design has progressed to a sufficient point that construction may begin, the public agency and the construction management firm work out mutually agreeable terms and conditions for the construction contract. If the price and other terms of the contract are acceptable to both parties, the construction management firm then becomes the general contractor, and construction of the project commences before design is entirely completed.

There are a number of benefits to CMGC. For instance, it allows for continuity and collaboration between the design and construction phases of the project, provides earlier cost certainty and ensures project constructability. Moreover, under CMGC, the public agency does not sacrifice control over the design of the project. Finally, during the construction phase, the general contractor is very familiar with the project design, resulting in fewer disputes over design issues.

VTA is very interested in having the ability to take advantage of as many different and innovative tools as possible for delivering transportation projects. CMGC is one such tool that we believe has merit in terms of helping transportation agencies deliver their projects in a cost-effective and expeditious manner. Therefore, we respectfully seek your support for AB 2374 because it would allow regional transportation agencies to use CMGC for more types of projects. Thank you for your consideration of our request.
Dear Mr Murphy,

Thank you for your April 1st 2016 response to my April 25 2015 EMU proposal (attached).

I was encouraged to learn that the SamTrans consultants will soon provide a status update on this multi-year EMU procurement effort (the $42,371,750 contract was awarded to LTK Engineering at the March 2014 Board meeting).

Hybrid capability
Moving on to the specifics of your email, you have correctly identified the Bombardier Omneo train which was developed jointly with SNCF as the Regio2N. Bombardier was the first company to deliver a hybrid train (AGC BiBi) in 2007 but there is currently no commercially available hybrid version of the Omneo so my recommendation would be to engage MTU in the development of a roof-mounted hybrid version of the 12V 1600 R80LP 700KW powerpack for the Omneo.

Location of equipment
With regards to the location of the traction converters(s), a likely location would be in the roof immediately behind the driver's cabins in the cab cars (see page 3 in the letter) while the fuel tanks would be mounted below the floor in the hybrid single-level motor cars (see page 4).

Bike capacity
I was surprised to learn that you did not notice the bike accommodation (80 bikes) in the original proposal which was the primary reason for suggesting the deletion of seats ("Remove 34 seats (for bikes") in the cab cars. Please refer to column #4 (Bicycles) in the Summary spreadsheet on page 6. This seat/bike configuration (961 seats/ 80 bikes) was subsequently revised to 893 seats and 112 bikes to deliver the 8/1 seat to bike ratio adopted by the Caltrain Board at the June 2015 Board meeting (please refer to sheet #2 in the attached spreadsheet).

Modifications
The proposal to remove the front stairs in the cab cars is intended to increase seat and bike capacity while improving flow because bikes would be able to board and alight simultaneously without being constrained by the stairs. There would also be no conflicts between bikes and foot passengers who would be boarding and alighting the train via the sets of doors in the adjacent single-level module (identical access configuration to the bi-level passenger cars).

Competition
I have made a conscious effort over the last year not to identify this train manufacturer and model and have repeatedly stated in public that "the only problem with this train is that it does not have any competition" but I believe that, at the end of the day, our top priority should be to identify and deliver the best solution for our Caltrain customers. On a related note, I would
encourage you to consider increasing competition when issuing RFPs for consultant contracts (LTK Engineering were the sole respondent to the EMU procurement RFP).

**Consist length**
Please refer to the attached spreadsheets and note that these trains are 8-car EMUs fitting comfortably within the existing 700-foot Caltrain platforms (no need for platform lengthening in "Calmod 2.0").

**Economies of scale**
I strongly encourage you to reach out to ACE, Capitol Corridor, Amtrak, Metrolink, LOSSAN, NCTD and any other agency currently operating bilevel trains in California and ask them if they would be interested in a joint procurement similar to the 15 French regions who ordered Bombardier Omneos.

**Schedule**
The Prop1A bonds earmarked for Caltrain electrification are currently on hold until the California High Speed Rail Authority submits a funding plan that complies with the Bond Act, specifically:
- Diridon to Transbay in 30 minutes
- 12 trains/hour(direction)

Given the current state of the Caltrain rolling stock (4 engine failures in the last 6 weeks), I encourage you to consider an EDMU procurement timeline similar to the one being proposed by Leo Express (hybrid EMUs by 2018) which parallels the timeline outlined in my attached July 1st 2015 letter to the Caltrain Board: "Staff refused to consider an EDMU (hybrid) option which would have allowed testing and commissioning upon delivery starting in winter 2018 instead of having to store new EMUs for up to 3 years until electrification is complete in 2021."

I hope you find this information useful. Please don’t hesitate to email or call if you need further clarification.

Sincerely,

Roland Lebrun.

CC:
Caltrain Board of directors
VTA Board of Directors
SFCTA Board of Directors
MTC Commissioners
Steve Heminger
Caltrain CAC
Caltrain BAC
SFCTA CAC
Hi Roland,

Thank you for your March 14, 2016 note sharing your suggestions for the EMU procurement and configurations.

As you know, Caltrain has been engaged in a two year process with various car builders to procure a vehicle that would meet the needs of the corridor today and in the future. In August 2015, Caltrain issued a request for proposals for the EMUs. The proposals were due in March and the board and public will be updated on the process in the coming weeks.

It appears that the model you have suggested Caltrain procure is the Bombardier Omneo. Caltrain staff has been in contact with Bombardier about this model and currently, they only offer the Omneo as a standard EMU model, not a DMU or hybrid version. It also appears that your seat calculations do not account for some design components and parameters such as main transformers, a large fuel tank (if pursuing the hybrid option), and onboard bike space.

If there are significant modifications to the stairs and upper deck, as described in your proposal, those changes must be examined by the Federal Railroad Administration and American Public Transportation Association emergency access / egress requirements. The modification of circulation paths may also have an impact on passenger boarding time. Finally, we want to encourage competition on the EMU proposals and if the specifications are too specific, that could lead to an individual proposer/supplier.

We appreciate your interest and suggestions. If you have any questions about the information above, please don’t hesitate to email or call.

Your email, along with this response will be part of the April JPB Directors reading file.

Thanks,

Seamus P. Murphy | Caltrain, SamTrans, SMCTA
Chief Communications Officer
1250 San Carlos Avenue | San Carlos, CA 94070
650.508.6388 | murphys@samtrans.com
Alternate Caltrain EMU specification proposal

Background

The intent of this presentation is to introduce an alternative to SamTrans’ proposal for dual-height Caltrain EMUs with two sets of doors and the potential loss of over 200 seats per train.

Objectives

- Increase current seated/standing capacity and number of wheelchairs and ADA toilets by >50%
- Maintain existing bike capacity (80 bikes)
- **Limit train length to current platform standard (700 feet)**
- Enable boarding from existing platform height (8 inches) and future level boarding (22-24 inches)
- Compatibility with existing Caltrain infrastructure (tracks & tunnels) and fleet (25-inch boarding height)
- Off-the shelf specification capable of delivering trains by 2018
- Capability to extend operating range beyond electrified territory (hybrid power)
- US manufacturing capability

Deliverable

A revised train specification for the consideration of the Caltrain Board of Directors as follows:
1) Off the shelf capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacité</th>
<th>Confort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Capacity 2+3 ✓</td>
<td>1ère ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban/Regional 2+2 ✓</td>
<td>2nde ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length</th>
<th>High Capacity 2+</th>
<th>Urban/Regional 2+</th>
<th>Intercity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71 feet</td>
<td>Courte 2 82695</td>
<td>Moyenne 54995</td>
<td>Longue 109010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 feet</td>
<td>Courte 2 8695</td>
<td>Moyenne 34940</td>
<td>Longue 109010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 feet</td>
<td>Courte 2 10295</td>
<td>Moyenne 4200</td>
<td>Longue 109010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Seats</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71 feet</td>
<td>400-420</td>
<td>690-720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 feet</td>
<td>485-505</td>
<td>810-840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 feet</td>
<td>580-600</td>
<td>975-1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Seats</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71 feet</td>
<td>350-365</td>
<td>660-690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 feet</td>
<td>425-440</td>
<td>780-810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 feet</td>
<td>505-520</td>
<td>930-960</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2) Front and rear bi-level cab cars

Lower deck modifications
- Remove 34 seats (for bikes)
- 8 seats (2+2) behind driver’s cab
- Remove front stairs to upper deck
- Add two (total 8) flip-up seats
- Remove luggage rack
- Raise floor (eliminate step)

Modified lower deck capacity
- 40 bikes
- 12 seats (2+2 configuration)
- 8 flip-ups

Upper deck modifications
- Remove front stairs to upper deck
- 2+2 seating
- Remove luggage rack
- Remove tables

Modified upper deck capacity
- 38 seats (2+2 configuration)
- 1 middle front bulkhead seat
3) Single level motor cars

- Powered Bogie
- Toilet
- Wheelchair

MITRAC Hybrid Components

- 16 seats (2+2 configuration)
- 17 tip-ups
- 1 wheelchair
- 1 toilet

Six interior layouts

- Roof-mounted traction converter
- Hybrid powerpack
4) Passenger cars

No change in off-the-shelf 2+2 configuration
- 56 seats on the lower deck
- 46 seats on the upper deck
Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle type</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th># Seats</th>
<th># Bicycles</th>
<th># Toilets</th>
<th># Wheelchairs</th>
<th>Power (MW)</th>
<th>Hybrid (MW)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cab car</td>
<td>63.04</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single deck</td>
<td>32.87</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double deck</td>
<td>50.67</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Powerpack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single deck</td>
<td>32.87</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Powerpack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double deck</td>
<td>50.67</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Powerpack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single deck</td>
<td>32.87</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Powerpack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double deck</td>
<td>50.67</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Powerpack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single deck</td>
<td>32.87</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Powerpack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double deck</td>
<td>50.67</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Powerpack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single deck</td>
<td>32.87</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Powerpack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cab car</td>
<td>63.04</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>660.19</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation

The Caltrain Board of directors should consider an alternative EMU specification that includes:
- **No infrastructure modifications** (existing tunnels, tracks and platform lengths & heights)
- **Minimum 950 seats, 80 bicycles, 6 toilets and 6 wheelchairs**
- **Hybrid capability** (Facebook, Gilroy and Great America extensions)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle type</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th># Seats</th>
<th># Bicycles</th>
<th># Toilets</th>
<th># Wheelchairs</th>
<th>Power (MW)</th>
<th>Hybrid (MW)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cab car</td>
<td>63.04</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single deck</td>
<td>32.87</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double deck</td>
<td>50.67</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Converter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single deck</td>
<td>32.87</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>Powerpack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double deck</td>
<td>50.67</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single deck</td>
<td>32.87</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>Powerpack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double deck</td>
<td>50.67</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single deck</td>
<td>32.87</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Powerpack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double deck</td>
<td>50.67</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single deck</td>
<td>32.87</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Powerpack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cab car</td>
<td>63.04</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length</th>
<th># Seats</th>
<th># Bicycles</th>
<th># Toilets</th>
<th># Wheelchairs</th>
<th>Power (MW)</th>
<th>Hybrid (MW)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>660.19</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Seat/bike ratio**  

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.0125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle type</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th># Seats</th>
<th># Bicycles</th>
<th># Toilets</th>
<th># Wheelchairs</th>
<th>Power (MW)</th>
<th>Hybrid (MW)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cab car</td>
<td>63.04</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single deck</td>
<td>32.87</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Converter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double deck</td>
<td>50.67</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single deck</td>
<td>32.87</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>Powerpack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double deck</td>
<td>50.67</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single deck</td>
<td>32.87</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double deck</td>
<td>50.67</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single deck</td>
<td>32.87</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>Powerpack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double deck</td>
<td>50.67</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single deck</td>
<td>32.87</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cab car</td>
<td>63.04</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length</th>
<th># Seats</th>
<th># Bicycles</th>
<th># Toilets</th>
<th># Wheelchairs</th>
<th>Power (MW)</th>
<th>Hybrid (MW)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>660.19</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Seat/bike ratio**  

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.973214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Chair Tissier and Members of the Caltrain Board Directors,

Further to my letter of April 26th (attached), I am writing to express serious concerns about the Caltrain EMU Request For Proposals (RFP) as drafted by SamTrans staff and consultants.

1) Staff inexplicably ignored the option of an articulated EMU design with separate single-level motorized modules consisting of a dual set of level-boarding doors, toilets and wheelchair and/or bicycle accommodation, including a solution whereby additional modules could be ordered off-the-shelf with a 50” boarding height at a later date and alternated with 25” modules in the unlikely event of a requirement to accommodate dual platform heights.

2) **Staff refused to consider an EDMU (hybrid) option** which would have allowed testing and commissioning upon delivery starting in winter 2018 instead of having to store new EMUs for up to 3 years until electrification is complete in 2021.

3) Staff are recommending a 9 to 1 seat to bicycle ratio but **the RFP completely lacks any specification for seats/bikes/wheelchairs per foot of platform**, As an example, the train configuration in the attached letter is capable of carrying 900 seated passengers and 100 bicycles within 660 feet.
4) The current bathroom capacity on 5-car Gallery train sets (one ADA, one non-ADA) has proved to be wholly inadequate on a number of occasions. In contrast, 1st class High Speed coaches have 2 bathrooms so that if one is occupied, first class passengers have access to a spare 1st class bathroom and do not have to use a bathroom in 2nd class.

**Staff’s recommendation to have a single bathroom on trains which are expected to have 50% more passenger capacity than the existing 6-bathroom Bombardier trainsets is despicable** and I urge the Board to give direction to staff to adhere to a civilized country’s bathroom ratio of approximately 1 bathroom for every 150 passenger seats.

On a related note, it should be noted from the diagrams on the previous page that **a properly designed ADA bathroom occupies the same amount of space as 4 seats, not 8** as claimed on page 3 of the staff memo.

5) **Funding**

Caltrain initially had $440M in FTA funding for replacement rolling stock. This was subsequently reduced by $125M to pay for electrification leaving $315M for EMUs: [http://www.caltrain.com/Assets/Caltrain+Modernization+Program/Documents/Bay+Area+HSR+Early+Investment+MOU+JPB+Board+Resolution+2012.pdf](http://www.caltrain.com/Assets/Caltrain+Modernization+Program/Documents/Bay+Area+HSR+Early+Investment+MOU+JPB+Board+Resolution+2012.pdf) (note 5 on page 9). This amount was subsequently reduced by a further $42.3M allocated to the EMU Procurement Consultant contract awarded to the firm LTK Engineering Services who were the sole bidder for a contract whose RFP they allegedly drafted themselves: [http://www.caltrain.com/Assets/__Agendas+and+Minutes/JPB/Board+of+Directors/Agendas/2014/3-6-14+JPB+Agenda.pdf](http://www.caltrain.com/Assets/__Agendas+and+Minutes/JPB/Board+of+Directors/Agendas/2014/3-6-14+JPB+Agenda.pdf) Item #13. This EMU Procurement contract award was subsequently increased to $65M during the PCEP “cost/schedule update” on November 6th 2014 **leaving $250M or less than half the amount required for new trainsets**.

[http://www.caltrain.com/Assets/__Agendas+and+Minutes/JPB/Board+of+Directors/Presentations/2014/11-6-14+JPB+BOD+CalMod+Cost+and+Schedule+Update.pdf](http://www.caltrain.com/Assets/__Agendas+and+Minutes/JPB/Board+of+Directors/Presentations/2014/11-6-14+JPB+BOD+CalMod+Cost+and+Schedule+Update.pdf) slide 27.

**Recommendation:**

Staff should either return to the Board with a full funding plan for the EMUs or add a request for financing proposals to the RFP, including availability payments instead of outright purchase.

Sincerely,

Roland Lebrun.

Cc

SFCTA Board of Directors
VTA Board of Directors
Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Caltrain CAC
SFCTA CAC
VTA Board of Directors:

Based on the input received from the Board Ad-hoc Committee for Envision Silicon Valley, staff has made several modifications to the Envision report cards. The updated report cards can be found at www.vta.org/envision-silicon-valley/project-evaluation.

The Ad-hoc Committee also recommended that VTA staff meet with Board members who are interested in reviewing the report cards prior to the April 22 workshop.

Please reply to this email if you would like to schedule a meeting.

Thank you.

Office of the Board Secretary
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
3331 N. First Street
San Jose, CA 95134
408.321.5680
board.secretary@vta.org

VTA Website: www.vta.org
Find us on Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, YouTube and LinkedIn
From: Board.Secretary  
Sent: Wednesday, April 06, 2016 11:47 AM  
To: VTA Board of Directors  
Subject: VTA Correspondence: Comment on CCTV Policy

VTA Board of Directors:

Please see comments below from a member of the public on the Agenda Item #6.4: Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) Policy. A copy will be provided for you at the Board Meeting on April 7, 2016.

Thank you.

Office of the Board Secretary  
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority  
3331 N. First Street  
San Jose, CA 95134  
408.321.5680  
board.secretary@vta.org

------------------------------------------------------

From: D. Muirhead  
Sent: Wednesday, April 06, 2016 11:00 AM  
To: Board.Secretary  
Subject: VTA Board Meeting April 07, 2016 Item #6.4: CCTV Monitoring comment

Comments for the Public Record submitted by Doug Muirhead, a resident of Morgan Hill, for: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Board of Directors Meeting April 07, 2016  
Item #6.4: CCTV Monitoring & Preserved Footage Policy

---

This policy should be returned to Committee so that staff can be directed to
1) involve the public in creation and review of the policy
2) remove the enormous loopholes of "Any purpose that serves VTA's business needs" and "System Safety & Security management to make decisions regarding the CCTV technology and safeguards for handling of that technology" that essentially neuter the entire policy
3) have a discussion of Agency culture such that this policy was never intended to be seen by the Board and thus by the Public.

Only because Board Chair Chavez sits on the Administration and Finance Committee was staff's original intent to put this policy into effect without sunshining before the Board and thus the Public reversed.

The Administration and Finance Committee on March 17, 2016 did make two improvements:
- Staff reference and attach the VTA records retention Policy.
- Staff provide an annual report to the Board of Directors in any calendar year that CCTV video is captured or used as outlined in CCTV Monitoring & Preservation Policy section 4.1 under the bullet point which reads: "Any purpose that serves VTA's business needs."
I see a significant difference between real-time observations using what I call "eyeballs on steroids" and recording for later data mining activities of people neither accused nor suspected of bad behavior. Just as was done by some anonymous State employee who decided to use FasTrak records to chart travel patterns without consent, "Any purpose that serves VTA's business needs" could be coupled with evolving video analytics to do the same for users of VTA services.

Thank you for your consideration,
Doug Muirhead
Morgan Hill, California
VTA Board of Directors:

Please see comments below from a member of the public on the Agenda Item #7: Transit Ridership Improvement Program Choices Report. A copy will be provided for you at the Board Meeting on April 7, 2016.

Thank you.

Office of the Board Secretary
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
3331 N. First Street
San Jose, CA 95134
408.321.5680
board.secretary@vta.org

---

The Transit Choices Report is extremely important in that it makes it very clear that VTA knows it has two conflicting goals:
- Ridership [70% of current resources] (routes that carry many riders and have higher farebox recovery rates)
- Coverage [30% of current resources] (services that exist to provide some level of transit access, but are not expected to have high farebox recovery rates) This is repeated in the staff report under the heading "Key Choices."

For two years of Envision meetings, I used the word "ridership", thinking it obviously meant "all riders on all services in all the County." But that is not the meaning within VTA.

So either the Agency should use a different word that is not easily confused with a more common meaning, or start qualifying it as follows: "ridership, in contrast to coverage,...."

When I look at the 31 proposed projects for Envision, I do not see any project that is Coverage.
What we probably need in South County, with lower densities and longer travel distances, is more emphasis on Coverage.

Thank you for your consideration,
Doug Muirhead
Morgan Hill, California
VTA Board of Directors and VTA Advisory Committee Members:
The information about VTA’s Try Transit Day Campaign is below. Try Transit Day will be held on April 22, 2016. Please help us promote this campaign by:
1. Sign up and pledge to ride VTA at www.vta.org/TryVTA.
2. Change your Facebook profile picture (see attached).
3. Promote the campaign to your constituents.
3. Share a selfie, photo or video on Facebook, Twitter or Instagram promoting VTA Transit Day, and tag with #TryVTA and #EarthDay.
4. Ride VTA on Earth Day!

-------------------------------------
Try VTA on Earth Day
Making a commitment to riding VTA, even twice per month, can have many environmental, health, and financial benefits. When you take transit, you are reducing greenhouse emissions, are 44 percent less likely to be overweight, 27 percent less likely to have high blood pressure, and 34 percent less likely to have diabetes. In addition, you’re taking one more car off of the road and potentially saving up to $6,251 per household annually.

Your Ride is FREE on Earth Day
On April 22, VTA will offer FREE rides on VTA Bus and Light Rail service for the entire day. VTA Travel Ambassadors will be available at select VTA transit centers handing out FREE Clipper Cards to those who don’t already have one, giving helpful advice, and spreading earthly minded cheer to all who make the commitment to try VTA transit on Earth Day.

Riding transit on Earth Day: Take the Pledge to ride, contact VTA to Plan your trip, Ride VTA transit on Earth Day, Repeat for your ride back, then repeat again and again for as many trips you can make transit a part of. VTA is offering a free VTA Transit Travel Toolkit for your convenience. Supplies are limited, so request yours now at customer.service@vta.org or call (408) 321-2300. You can also visit: http://www.vta.org/tryvta to take the pledge.

Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
3331 N. First Street
VTA Board of Directors:

Below is the link to the 2000 Measure A Status update as of March 1, 2016. This is also included in your meeting packet for the April 7 Board meeting.

www.vta.org/measureareportcard

Thank you.

Office of the Board Secretary
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
3331 N. First Street
San Jose, CA 95134
408.321.5680
board.secretary@vta.org

VTA Website: www.vta.org
Find us on Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, YouTube and LinkedIn