JPB Board of Directors
Meeting of February 4, 2021

Correspondence as of January 8, 2021

#	Subject
1	TASI Incidents Request
2	University Ave Beige Pole Color

From:	Roland Lebrun
To:	Board (@caltrain.com)
Cc:	SFCTA Board Secretary; VTA Board Secretary; MTC Info; CHSRA Board; cacsecretary [@caltrain.com]; Caltrain, Bac (@caltrain.com); SFCTA CAC; PRA
Subject:	Re: Caltrain Board meeting item 12.a 5-year TASI contract extension
Date:	Thursday, January 7, 2021 4:36:08 PM

Dear Chair Davis,

Pursuant to Government Code §6250 et seq, please provide a comprehensive list of incidents involving TASI employees and passengers since the first (2011) contract award categorized as follows:

- Assault
- Sexual encounter (whether consensual or not)
- Substance abuse (alcohol/drugs)
- Breach of safety protocols

For each incident, please provide the following information:

1) Date of the incident
2) Brief description
3) TASI corrective action
4) JPB response

Thank you in advance for your prompt attention to this request.

Roland Lebrun

CC

SFCTA Commissioners

VTA Board of Directors

MTC Commissioners

CHSRA Board of Directors

Caltrain CAC

Caltrain BAC

SFCTA CAC

VTA CAC

From: Roland Lebrun <ccss@msn.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 6, 2021 5:31 PM
To: Caltrain Board <board@caltrain.com>
Cc: SFCTA Board Secretary <clerk@sfcta.org>; VTA Board Secretary <board.secretary@vta.org>; MTC Info <info@bayareametro.gov>; CHSRA Board <boardmembers@hsr.ca.gov>; Caltrain CAC Secretary <cacsecretary@caltrain.com>; Caltrain BAC <bac@caltrain.com>; SFCTA CAC <cac@sfcta.org>
Subject: Re: Caltrain Board meeting item 12.a 5-year TASI contract extension

Dear Chair Pine,

Please accept my apologies for attaching the wrong document to my earlier email.
The attached document is the Stadler price proposal for maintaining the EMUs and the remaining diesel trainsets.

Sincerely,

Roland Lebrun

From: Roland Lebrun
Sent: Wednesday, January 6, 2021 5:11 AM
To: Caltrain Board <board@caltrain.com>
Cc: SFCTA Board Secretary <clerk@sfcta.org>; VTA Board Secretary <board.secretary@vta.org>; MTC Info <info@bayareametro.gov>; CHSRA Board <boardmembers@hsr.ca.gov>; Caltrain CAC Secretary <cacsecretary@caltrain.com>; Caltrain BAC <bac@caltrain.com>; SFCTA CAC <cac@sfcta.org>
Subject: Caltrain Board meeting item 12.a 5-year TASI contract extension

Dear Chair Pine and Board members,

Further to Ms. Bouchard's March 2017 letter to TASI (attached) which ignored the September 1 2011 Board resolution to award a 5-year contract followed by five one-year extensions, please modify the current staff recommendation for a third 5-year contract extension to five one-year extensions for the following reasons:

1) It is unclear why SamTrans are proposing a $1/2B+ 5-year (100% of Measure RR!) **single-source bundled evergreen contract** extension to 2027 given that the JPB is currently engaging Howard Permutt on recommendations for a new governance structure.

2) **The execution of this contract extension should be the responsibility of the new administration, not SamTrans**.

3) **The next administration's top priority should be to unbundle this evergreen contract**, starting with establishing specific cost ranges for the following categories:

- Administration/Safety

Why should Caltrain have to pay for Administration twice (SamTrans and TASI)? What are the opportunities for streamlining/consolidation including bringing this function in-house under the new administration?

- **Operations**

Why is SamTrans proposing to bundle rail and train operations?
While there is sufficient overlap between rail operations and Maintenance of Way to justify awarding a bundled rail O&M contract to TASI or some other entity, it is unclear why train operations should be bundled with the same contract when ACE, Capitol Corridor and Metrolink operate primarily as UPRR and/or BNSF tenants (they do not own the rails they operate on).
Of more serious concern, **train operations should be a net source of revenue** (trackage rights, rolling stock availability payments/leasing to a Train Operating Company (TOC), etc.) **not an operating expense**.

As an example, the JPB was approached by a private company in 2015 but **this unsolicited proposal was never referred to the Board for consideration:**

. Verbal presentation to the LPMG: "***Finance and operate trains at a significantly lower cost***": https://www.youtube.com/watch?t=5463&v=3TNFWZrzUw4

. Promotional video: https://youtu.be/BTYUBsu6KQg

. CNBC interview: "***We can bring new trains in two years (2018) to run on freight infrastructure or public railroads***" https://www.cnbc.com/video/2015/06/03/czech-company-to-bring-euro-style-trains-to-us.html

. Testimonials (**Stanford and others**):
https://leoexpress-california.herokuapp.com/#testimonials.

Last but not least, **private operators are always incentivized to increase revenues (profits) through increased ridership, not increased fares** and could provide valuable input on schedules and train configurations (Leo Express' fleet includes five Stadler FLIRT EMUs financed with private capital). **A private operator would also never settle for a less than a 100% ticket checking target** vs the SamTrans/TASI 50% proposal.

- **Maintenance of Equipment**

Once again, why is rolling stock maintenance bundled into a single contract when the optimal solution is to entrust maintenance to the manufacturer (**superior service AT A LOWER COST**)? Specifically, **why did SamTrans staff ignore the Stadler proposal included with their response to the EMU RFP** (attached)?

Please refer the above proposals to Howard Permutt for further analysis and eventual recommendation to the Board on how to proceed with this contract.

Thank You.

Roland Lebrun.

CC

SFCTA Commissioners

VTA Board of Directors

MTC Commissioners

CHSRA Board of Directors

Caltrain CAC

Caltrain BAC

SFCTA CAC

VTA CAC

From: martin@sommer.net [mailto:martin@sommer.net]
Sent: Thursday, January 7, 2021 11:49 AM
To: CalMod@caltrain.com
Cc: Board (@caltrain.com) <BoardCaltrain@samtrans.com>; city.council@cityofpaloalto.org; Pat Burt <pat@patburt.org>
Subject: Re: University Ave Beige Pole Color

Thanks Brent, tomorrow (Friday) afternoon would work. Is there a number to reach you, and a best time to call?

Just to be clear, you state "the pole cannot be repainted a different color". I disagree, it's just a matter of cost. Sure you could estimate some extraordinary amount, but I could counter that with my own sub-contractor.

You also sated, "we worked with the City through both the Historic Resources Board(HRB) and Architectural Review Board (ARB) in January 2019". Clearly, a wrong decision was made. If your power line was the wrong voltage, or your tracks were pointed in the wrong direction, would you not fix it?

Martin

--
Martin Sommer
650-346-5307
martin@sommer.net
http://www.linkedin.com/in/martinsommer

"Turn technical vision into reality."

From: CalMod@caltrain.com <CalMod@caltrain.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 7, 2021 2:03 PM
To: martin@sommer.net; CalMod@caltrain.com
Cc: Board (@caltrain.com) <BoardCaltrain@samtrans.com>; city.council@cityofpaloalto.org; Pat Burt <pat@patburt.org>
Subject: RE: University Ave Beige Pole Color

Hi Martin,

I'm free anytime between 9a-12p tomorrow (1/8). You can reach me at [redacted].

I look forward to speaking with you.

Brent