<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>University Ave Beige Pole Color</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Progress Status Fence Work (FAR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>VTA Draft Biennial Budget FY22-FY23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hi Martin,

The joint ARB/HRB meeting was held on January 10th, 2019. The City of Palo Alto records and uploads videos of these Board meetings for review. The full video of the presentation, including photo simulations shown to the Board, and the ARB/HRB member discussion and decision can be seen on this page [https://midpenmedia.org/architectural-review-board-74-1102019/](https://midpenmedia.org/architectural-review-board-74-1102019/).

Thanks,
Brent

---

Thanks Brent, looks like "bait and switch" to me.

Can you please send me the photos presented to the Palo Alto ARB? You mentioned them in the prior email, but they were not included with the ARB report.

We need to get this issue resolved.

Thank you,
Martin

On 4/13/21 9:16 AM, Tietjen, Brent wrote:

   Hi Martin,

   Thanks for your patience. I believe your questions are related and hope the below information below is helpful.

   The image you are referencing was a rendering that was created before the final design of the pole and foundation locations was complete. This rendering was also complete prior to the ARB/HRB decision on pole colors for the station area.
There are three main types of poles used along the corridor, single side poles, two track cantilevers (on one side), and center poles. The use of each pole is dependent on the site conditions, including utilities and the clearance between the tracks. Where feasible, center poles were chosen in order to reduce the number trees pruned or removed required to provide clearance for the electrical safety zone (ESZ). The ESZ is typically 10 feet from the farthest electrified element in most cases. A center pole has the ESZ set by the train pantograph as that is the electrified element that is farthest out. With single side poles, the electrical safety zone is set by the pole location which supports an electrified wire.

Thanks,
Brent

From: Martin J Sommer [mailto:martin@sommer.net]
Sent: Monday, March 29, 2021 9:28 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, appreciate you staying on this issue.

In addition, please see the attached photo. This vision of Caltrain rolling into the University Ave station in Palo Alto, is one of the most widely distributed photos of the Caltrain Electrification Project. Notice: a) short poles, b) back color, and c) symmetric north and south cantilevers. What we received in Palo Alto, bears no resemblance to this?

What went wrong, and can we please fix it?

Martin

On 3/27/21 6:22 PM, CalMod@caltrain.com wrote:

Hi Martin,

Yes, I will work to get this information from the project team.

Best,
Hi Brent,

I am still working on this issue. When we talked via phone, you offered to look into why the tall single poles were used at the University Ave station, vs two shorter poles on the side, with or without a crossbar. The Cal Ave station, uses two shorter poles, placed right on the platform.

Can you please answer that for me?

Thanks,
Martin

On 1/13/21 9:58 AM, Martin J Sommer wrote:
    Hi Brent,

    Thanks for talking this morning. Yes, please try to put a number on repainting the top half of one or more poles at the University Ave station. Once we have this number, I will reach out to the City Of Palo Alto, for potential funding sources.

    Best regards,
    Martin

On 12/22/20 7:49 PM, Martin J Sommer wrote:
    +cc: Pat Bert
Brent, please take a look at the attached photo. I don't think this is what the City, nor the design engineers, had in mind.

Please tell me, how I can help correct this situation.

Thank you,
Martin
ATTENTION: This email came from an external source. Do not open attachments or click on links from unknown senders.

Dale,

I appreciate your response. Please note the timeline since Toure's submittal of Invoices for payment to include FAR and BBII review process has become extremely excessive. All of this could have been avoided if Toure's earlier invoicing and emails regarding project concerns would have been addressed by BBII more timely and appropriately. As a DBE Firm these delays are jeopardizing our company. Toure conducted the work required within the presence and also direction when given by BBII field superintendent and project team. As a result, Toure has incurred an extreme amount of debt. Toure is not a large enough company to continue to absorb such a loss. We request receipt of some form of payment. We have four FAR payment requests of which none have been paid. The work we are requesting payment for dates back to August 2000. BBII has only reimbursed Toure for the material on-hand and issued base contract payments. The remaining funds are due and each delay places Toure in greater debt with our overall business affairs. I realize this may not be a high priority to BBII and the overall project goal. However this is why such disparity occurs across the board for African-American businesses attempting to actively participate in the construction industry.

We request equity and the resolution of FAR payment.

Respectfully,
T'Shaka Toure, MS
Toure Environmental Engineering
415.716.8434 (office)
559.470.5586 (mobile)

website: www.toureassociates.com

On Wed, Apr 14, 2021 at 9:29 AM Sangria, Dale <dsangria@balfourbeattyus.com> wrote:

T'Shaka,

There are some final details we are going through to try to close out the remaining items. I will follow up with our team to get a status update. I will keep you updated.

Thanks,
Hi Dale,

Just checking in with you to see where we stand on getting all items and concerns closed out.

Thanks,

T'Shaka Toure, MS
Toure Environmental Engineering

415.716.8434 (office)
559.470.5586 (mobile)

website: www.toureassociates.com
Dear Commissioner Papan,

Further to my comments during today's MTC Programming & Allocations meeting, here is the information you requested:

**Caltrain**

In prior years, VTA contributed to Caltrain’s operating budget based on a ridership formula agreed to by the partner agencies. In FY 2020 and 2021, that contribution totaled $10.8 million annually. The FY 2022 and FY 2023 Proposed Biennial Budget no longer includes a contribution to Caltrain because of the passage of Measure RR in November 2020. Measure RR implemented a 30-year one-eighth cent sales tax in San Francisco, San Mateo, and Santa Clara counties to fund Caltrain operations and capital improvements. Caltrain is projected to receive about $57 million in FY 2022 from this tax generated in Santa Clara County.


Sincerely,

Roland Lebrun

CC

VTA Board of Directors
Caltrain Board
SFCTA Commissioners
VTA PAC
SFCTA CAC
Caltrain CAC
VTA CAC