From: Board.Secretary
Sent: Monday, June 29, 2015 5:40 PM
To: VTA Board of Directors
Subject: VTA's Meetings at a Glance Calendar for July 2015

VTA Board of Directors:

Attached is VTA’s Meetings at a Glance Calendar for July 2015. 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 PUBLIC MEETINGS AT-A-GLANCE
JULY 2015

BOARD ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETINGS:
VTA River Oaks Campus, 3331 North First Street, San Jose

Committee for Transit
Accessibility
(NO MEETING SCHEDULED)
(MEETS QUARTERLY - Next Meeting October 7, 2015)

Citizens Advisory Committee and 2000 Measure A Citizens Watchdog Committee
Wednesday, July 8, 2015  4:00 p.m.  Conference Room B-104

Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee
Wednesday, July 8, 2015  6:30 p.m.  Conference Room B-104

Technical Advisory Committee
Thursday, July 9, 2015  1:30 p.m.  Conference Room B-104

Policy Advisory Committee
Thursday, July 9, 2015  4:00 p.m.  Conference Room B-104

MEETING CANCELLED

ENVISION SILICON VALLEY MEETINGS:
VTA River Oaks Campus, 3331 North First Street, San Jose

Transportation Advocates Stakeholder Meeting
Tuesday, July 21, 2015  1:30 p.m.  Auditorium

REGIONAL JOINT POWERS BOARD (JPB) MEETING:

Caltrain
Thursday, July 2, 2015  10:00 a.m.  SamTrans Office 2nd Floor Auditorium 1250 San Carlos Avenue San Carlos

I-680 Sunol SMART Carpool Lane Joint Powers Authority (I-680 JPA)
Monday, July 13, 2015  9:30 a.m.  Alameda CTC Office Board Room 1111 Broadway, Suite 800 Oakland

MARKETING AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS OPEN HOUSE / PRESENTATION / PUBLIC MEETINGS:

Summer Reading Challenge  June 1, 2015 – July 31, 2015  San Jose Public Library’s VTA Promotional Partnership

Meetings at a Glance is a list of scheduled VTA public meetings. Meeting schedules are subject to change. Please call Board Secretary’s Office at (408) 321-5680 and/or the VTA Community Outreach Hotline at (408) 321-7575 to confirm meeting dates and locations. In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; VTA will make reasonable arrangements to ensure meaningful access to its meetings for persons who have disabilities and for persons with limited English proficiency who need translation and interpretation services. Individuals requiring ADA accommodations should notify the Board Secretary’s Office at least 48-hours prior to the meeting. Individuals requiring language assistance should notify the Board Secretary’s Office at least 72-hours prior to the meeting. The Board Secretary December be contacted at (408) 321-5680 or e-mail: board.secretary@vta.org or (408) 321-2330 (TTY only). VTA’s home page is on the web at: www.vta.org or visit us on Facebook at: www.facebook.com/scvta. *(408) 321-2300: 中文 / Español / 日本語 / 한국어 / tiếng Việt / Tagalog.*
VTA Board of Directors:

The Board is copied on the following correspondence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Addressed to</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 30, 2015</td>
<td>Honorable Jim Beall, Chairperson Senate Transportation &amp; Housing Committee</td>
<td>Support for AB 194 (Frazier)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1, 2015</td>
<td>Honorable Jim Beall, Chairperson Senate Transportation &amp; Housing Committee</td>
<td>Support for AB 516 (Mullin)</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
June 30, 2015

The Honorable Jim Beall, Chairperson
Senate Transportation & Housing Committee
State Capitol, Room 2209
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Chairperson Beall:

The Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) respectfully requests your support for AB 194 (Frazier) when this bill comes before the Senate Transportation & Housing Committee for a vote. AB 194 calls for putting in place a process that would allow VTA and other regional transportation agencies, as defined, to submit applications for constructing and operating express lanes and other toll facilities on the state highway system within our respective jurisdictions to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) for approval. A similar process for express lane facilities was initially established on a temporary basis through the enactment of legislation in 2006, but it expired at the end of 2011.

As you know, an express lane is a carpool lane that permits solo drivers to use the carpool lane for a fee, which typically fluctuates by time of day and level of congestion. The fee is set at a level to ensure that the lane never becomes too congested in order to provide a time-savings benefit to carpoolers, public transit passengers and toll-paying solo drivers. Carpoolers continue to use the lanes for free. The revenues generated by the fee are typically used to operate, maintain and provide enforcement for the express lanes, improve the transportation corridor where the express lanes are located, and increase public transit service in the corridor. Experience with express lanes in Santa Clara County, in other parts of California and across the country has shown that these lanes can provide more air quality and congestion relief benefits than a simple carpool lane.

In California, a number of agencies, including VTA, have existing statutory authority to implement express lanes on the state highway system, but the number of corridors that we can pursue is capped. Given the success of the express lanes that are currently in operation in Santa Clara County and in California, as well as the growing interest on the part of our communities to build out full express lane networks, it makes sense to put in place a way for VTA and other regional agencies to pursue express lanes without having to seek specific authorization through the Legislature on a corridor-by-corridor basis. We also appreciate that AB 194 applies not only to express lanes, but also to other toll facilities, so that VTA would not have to seek separate legislation each time we decide to pursue a toll facility project on the state highway system within Santa Clara County.

For these reasons, we respectfully seek your support for AB 194. Thank you for your consideration of our request.

Sincerely,

Perry Woodward, Chairperson
Board of Directors
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
July 1, 2015

The Honorable Jim Beall, Chairperson  
Senate Transportation & Housing Committee  
State Capitol, Room 2209  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Chairperson Beall:

The Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) respectfully requests your support for AB 516 (Mullin) when this bill comes before the Senate Transportation & Housing Committee for a vote. AB 516 calls for developing a statewide temporary license plate system to ensure that purchased vehicles are identifiable to law enforcement and agencies that operate toll facilities during the period between the point-of-sale and when permanent plates are received by the buyer. Specifically, this legislation requires: (1) the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to develop the system; (2) auto dealers to affix temporary license plates to a vehicle at the point-of-sale; and (3) buyers to remove the temporary plates and affix permanent ones upon receipt.

Each year, approximately 1.9 million new vehicles are purchased in California and driven off the lot of a dealership without license plates. More than 100,000 used vehicles are sold by independent dealers without plates. While permanent license plates are legally required to be installed upon receipt or within 90 days, whichever is sooner, many individuals drive their vehicles without plates for many months. Furthermore, law enforcement cannot tell when plates are required to be on a vehicle, making enforcement extremely difficult. This situation undermines public safety by allowing motorists to avoid detection in traffic violations, hit-and-run accidents and criminal activity. Moreover, FasTrak, California’s electronic toll collection system, relies on a photo of a vehicle’s license plate for enforcement. According to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), drivers evaded a total of approximately $9 million in tolls on the Bay Area’s state-owned toll bridges and the Golden Gate Bridge in FY 2014. Southern California toll roads and express lanes lost roughly $6 million, for a statewide total of $15 million.

AB 516 provides a mechanism for the DMV and California’s auto dealers to adopt the practice of affixing a temporary license plate to a vehicle at the point-of-sale and before it is driven off the lot. This practice, which is in use in more than a dozen other states, will improve public safety by enabling vehicles involved in traffic violations, accidents and criminal activity to be more easily identified. It also will help prevent drivers of vehicles without plates from evading tolls on express lanes and other toll facilities. For these reasons, we respectfully seek your support for AB 516. Thank you for your consideration of our request.

Sincerely,

Perry Woodward, Chairperson  
Board of Directors  
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
VTA Board of Directors and VTA Advisory Committee Members:

Here are the latest updates to VTA’s BART Silicon Valley Extension:


Please see the general update below to see project-related videos.

![Milpitas Station Area - Summer 2015](https://via.placeholder.com/150)

After three years of digging and working underground, the Milpitas BART Station has finally started to rise up. This video captures the activities that were implemented in order to get to this level of construction and showcases some of the efforts to come. The onsite project work includes the extension of South Milpitas Boulevard through the station campus and the construction of the future pedestrian bridge that will provide a direct connection between the future BART station and VTA’s Montague Light Rail Station.

For more information, visit [http://vta.org/bart/milpitasconstruction](http://vta.org/bart/milpitasconstruction)
VTA's BART Silicon Valley Extension

VTA's Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) Silicon Valley Extension Project is a 16-mile extension of the existing BART system to San Jose, Milpitas and Santa Clara, which will be delivered through a phased approach. The first phase, the Berryessa Extension, is a 10-mile, two-station extension, beginning in Fremont south of the future BART Warm Springs Station and proceeding in the former Union Pacific Railroad right-of-way through Milpitas, the location of the first station, and then to the Berryessa area of north San Jose, at the second station. VTA continues project development activities for the second 6-mile phase of the project that includes a 5.1 mile-long subway tunnel through downtown San Jose, and ends at grade in Santa Clara near the Caltrain Station. Construction on the second phase of the project will commence as additional funding is secured.

About VTA

Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) is an independent special district that provides sustainable, accessible, community-focused transportation options that are innovative, environmentally responsible, and promote the vitality of our region. VTA is responsible for bus, light rail and paratransit operations and also serves as the county's congestion management agency. As such, VTA is responsible for...
countywide transportation planning, including congestion management issues, specific highway improvement projects, pedestrian and bicycle improvement projects, and provides these services throughout the county, including the municipalities of Campbell, Cupertino, Gilroy, Los Altos, Los Altos Hills, Los Gatos, Milpitas, Monte Sereno, Morgan Hill, Mountain View, Palo Alto, San Jose, Santa Clara, Saratoga and Sunnyvale. VTA continually builds partnerships to deliver transportation solutions that meet the evolving mobility needs of Santa Clara County.

For more information about the project, please visit: [http://www.vta.org/bart/](http://www.vta.org/bart/).

If you have any questions, please reply to this email.

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: Board.Secretary  
Sent: Thursday, July 02, 2015 4:02 PM  
To: VTA Board of Directors  
Subject: VTA Correspondence - SEIU Concerns and Staff Response; Congresswoman Eshoo letter; Comments on Caltrain

VTA Board of Directors:

We are forwarding to you the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>Staff response to Ms. Kerianne Steele re: SEIU at 060415 Board Meeting; Letter from SEIU member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorable Congresswoman</td>
<td>Letter of Support for light rail upgrades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Eshoo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roland Lebrun</td>
<td>Caltrain</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
Via Facsimile & U.S. Mail

June 23, 2015

Kerianne R. Steele
Weinberg, Roger & Rosenfeld
1001 Marina Village Parkway, Suite 200
Alameda, California 94501
Facsimile No.: (510) 337-1023

Dear Ms. Steele:

This responds to your letter to Chairperson Perry Woodward dated June 16, 2015, relating to your client Ms. Tammy Dhanota’s inability to stay long enough at the VTA Board meeting on June 4, 2015 to make a verbal presentation regarding the Service Employees International Union, Local 521 (“SEIU”).

It is unfortunate that Ms. Dhanota had to leave the meeting before the Board reached Item 9.1.G on the Agenda, the closed session item relating to SEIU. We can assure you that the Board Chair’s decision to have public presentations heard before the actual agenda item was consistent with prior practice, as well as Brown Act and First Amendment principles. It is also generally the practice to limit presentations in the “Public Comment” portion of the meeting to items within VTA’s jurisdiction that are not already on the Agenda. The Agenda for this particular meeting happened to cover many topics that generated a lot of interest and public participation, and Chair Woodward, in the interest of fairness and efficiency, deemed it important not to expand the Public Comment portion of the meeting to those subjects on the Agenda that would have opportunities for public comment later in the meeting. This was true for all matters raised, not just those related to the SEIU item.

The time for the public to speak about the SEIU item was before item 9.1.G was discussed by the Board in closed session. If someone from SEIU including Ms. Dhanota, or anyone else for that matter, wished to address the Board about issues within the Board’s jurisdiction that were not on the Agenda, then he or she certainly could have notified the Board Secretary staff so that he or she could speak during the Public Comment period. As far as we know, that was not Ms. Dhanota’s intent and it certainly was not conveyed to staff.
The item relating to SEIU was properly on the closed session agenda. Over the last year and a half or so, all closed session agenda items have been placed at the end of the agenda. The fact that there may be fewer people in the audience at that time is immaterial: neither the Brown Act nor the First Amendment requires priority of any particular subject matter or viewpoint in order to allow the speaker to reach a bigger audience. (See, eg., Kindt v. Santa Monica Rent Control Board (9th Cir. 1995) 67 F.3d 266.) Any member of the public, however, is welcome to submit a statement in writing of any length at any time to the Board, a practice that many people have done in instances when they cannot stay for an entire meeting. It is our understanding that Ms. Dhanota was informed of this right, but chose not submit a written statement.

In summary, while it is regrettable that Ms. Dhanota was unable to stay for the entire meeting, her rights were not violated by the Chair’s decision to retain the structure and order of the Board Meeting.

Thank you and please let me know if you have any further questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Robert Fabela
General Counsel

RF/mm

cc: Nuria Fernandez
    Perry Woodward
Via Electronic Mail and U.S. Mail
(board.secretary@vta.org)

Mr. Perry Woodward, Chair Person of
Board of Directors
c/o Office of the Board Secretary
Santa Clara Valley Transit Authority
3331 North First Street
San Jose, CA 95134

Re: Denial of Right to Speak During Public Comment on June 4, 2015

Dear Mr. Woodward:

We represent the Service Employees International Union, Local 521 and write this letter on behalf of our client.

We are very concerned that the Board of Directors denied SEIU Local 521’s leader, Tammy Dhanota, the opportunity to speak during Public Comment at the Board of Directors meeting on June 4, 2015. The Board refused to allow Ms. Dhanota to speak during Public Comment (agenda item 3), and instead relegated her to speaking right before the Closed Session (agenda item 9). By delaying Ms. Dhanota’s right to speak until the very end of the meeting, the majority, if not all, of the audience members left and did not have an opportunity to hear her comments. We believe the Board treated Ms. Dhanota differently than other individuals who wished to speak during Public Comment due to the anticipated content of her speech. This amounts to a violation of the Ralph M. Brown Act, the Meyers-Milias-Brown Act, and quite possibly the California and federal constitutions as well.

If the Board denies or delays SEIU Local 521 representatives’ or its members’ right to speak in this manner again, SEIU Local 521 will likely pursue all legal remedies available to it including but not limited to the filing of an unfair labor practice charge or other litigation.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Kerianne R. Steele

KRS:sm
opeiu 3 afl-cio(1)
1816126
June 26, 2015

Dear VTA Board members:

I live in San Jose, having grown up in Los Altos Clara. I also work at VTA in a collective bargaining unit represented by SEIU Local 521. I am writing to share my thoughts on the ongoing contract negotiations.

First, I wish to express my displeasure at the treatment given to SEIU Local 521 leader Tammy Dhanota who attended the June 4, 2015 Board meeting in order to address the Board during the agendized public comment period. The Board refused to allow Ms. Dhanota to speak during public comment (agenda item 3), and instead relegated her to speaking at the end of the meeting right before the closed session (agenda item 9). I agree with SEIU’s attorney that this action is a violation of the Ralph M. Brown Act and the Meyers-Milias-Brown Act. Please refer to the attached letter.

Second, I would like to remind the Board that wages at VTA, according to management’s own numbers, are well below the average wages paid in the Bay Area for similar work. Additionally, with the transition to CalPERS health, employees will be negatively impacted by increased costs. Meanwhile, VTA has every contingency fund stuffed to the maximum limit and is attempting to pass yet another sales tax increase in 2016.

I am requesting that the board direct VTA management to come to the negotiations table with a fair and reasonable compensation package that not only keeps pace with inflation but also adjusts salaries so VTA workers are paid wages similar to those at other transit agencies and municipalities in the Bay Area.

Sincerely,

Bill Hough
June 18, 2015

The Honorable Ash Kalra, Board Chair
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
3331 North First Street
San Jose, California 95134

Dear Ash,

I’ve written to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) in support of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority’s grant request under the Transportation Security Grant Program to fund security upgrades on the VTA’s light rail system. A copy of my letter to Administrator Fugate is enclosed for you.

I hope this will be helpful to the VTA, and should you have any questions or comments, you can contact Paul Beck in my Washington, D.C. office at (202) 225-8104.

All my best,

Anna G. Eshoo
Member of Congress

Enclosure

cc: Members, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Board of Directors
Ms. Nuria Fernandez, General Manager, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
June 18, 2016

The Honorable W. Craig Fugate
Federal Emergency Management Agency
Federal Center Plaza
500 C Street S.W., Room 828
Washington, D.C. 20572

Dear Administrator Fugate,

I write in support of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority’s (VTA) request for $2.1 million under the Transit Security Grant Program (TSGP) to implement critical security enhancements in my Congressional District.

The VTA provides bus, light rail, and paratransit services for Santa Clara County, including the recently-opened Levi Stadium, home to the National Football League’s San Francisco 49ers. The VTA’s light rail tracks are approximately 90 feet from the Stadium, and the light rail typically carries between 8,000 and 16,000 to major stadium events. The Stadium will be the site of Super Bowl 50 on February 7, 2016. This event will generate thousands of additional visitors to the area, many of whom will ride public transit.

The requested TSGP funds will be used to implement critical security enhancements to the VTA’s light rail system. This will include the installation of surveillance cameras as well as state-of-the-art radiological and nuclear detection systems at 13 stations. This advanced security system along with other preventative measures will help keep VTA riders and Super Bowl attendees safe from potential security threats.

Thank you in advance for your high consideration of my request.

Most gratefully,

[Signature]

Anna G. Eshoo
Member of Congress
Dear Chair Tissier and Members of the Caltrain Board of Directors,

Please find attached my comments highlighting multiple issues with the issuance of the Caltrain EMU RFP as follows:

- Apparent disregard for off-the-shelf solutions for mixed platform heights with the potential to save $65M in EMU Procurement Consultant fees.

- No mention of DMU hybrids (EDMUs) resulting in the requirement to store new trains for 2-3 years while waiting for the completion of the Caltrain electrification.

- No specification for density requirement for seats, wheelchairs, bicycles etc. (e.g. 900 seats & 100 bicycles within a 700-foot platform).

- Inadequate number of bathrooms.

- Inadequate funding plan and lack of request for financing proposals in the RFP.

Sincerely,

Roland Lebrun.

cc

SFCTA Board of Directors
VTA Board of Directors
Metropolitan Transport Commission
Caltrain CAC
Caltrain BAC
SFCTA CAC
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
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

**High Capacity 2+3**
- Seats: 400-420
- Total: 690-720
- Length: 271 feet
- Length: 312 feet
- Length: 361 feet

**Urban/Regional 2+2**
- Seats: 350-365
- Total: 660-690
- Length: 271 feet
- Length: 312 feet
- Length: 361 feet

**Intercity**
- Seats: 485-505
- Total: 810-840
- Length: 361 feet
- Length: 425-440
- Length: 780-810
- Length: 361 feet
- Length: 505-520
- Length: 930-960
- Length: 361 feet
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

- Traction converter or generator
- Powered Bogie
- Toilet
- Wheelchair

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

- Six interior layouts

- Roof-mounted traction converter

- Hybrid powerpack
4) Passenger cars

Powered Bogie

Lower deck

Upper deck

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></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>0.8</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>0.7</td>
<td>Powerpack</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>Powerpack</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double deck</td>
<td>50.67</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>Powerpack</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>Powerpack</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double deck</td>
<td>50.67</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>Powerpack</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>Powerpack</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double deck</td>
<td>50.67</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>Powerpack</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>Powerpack</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double deck</td>
<td>50.67</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>Powerpack</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>Powerpack</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)
VTA Board of Directors and Advisory Committee Members:

The July 2015 Take-One is now available. Please click on the link below:

http://www.vta.org/sfc/servlet.shepherd/document/download/069A0000001ELoEIAW

Thank you.
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