



Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project Delivery Quarterly Update

Citizen Advisory Committee
2/18/15



Design Build Electrification RFP

- Review
 - Prequalified firms
 - SFMTA, VTA, CAHSR, SFCTA, MTC
- February
 - RFP complete (includes comments round I)
 - JPB action to release RFP to 6 prequalified firms
- March – April
 - Develop PLA
 - Comments round II complete / issue amendments
- Anticipate contract award in fall 2015



EMU RFP

- Current
 - Technical analysis with CHSRA on compatible boarding heights
 - Monthly update of progress to funding partners
 - Technical feasibility with vehicle manufacturers
- JPB action July to release RFP
- Anticipate contract award in winter 2015/2016

3



Vehicle Compatibility Analysis

- December 2014
 - Key criteria analysis
 - Fatal flaw analysis
- January – February 2015
 - Trade off assessment
- March – May 2015
 - Policy discussion / decisions
 - Updated funding commitment

4



EMU Outreach Phase I

- Public input on capacity
 - Focus: seats/standees, bathrooms, and bikes onboard
 - 4,196 survey responses
 - 1,200+ individual comments
- Public priority and use combine with technical/operational considerations

5



Survey Methodology

- “Opt-in” Survey
 - *Not statistically valid*
 - Highlight interests
- Input received Sept. 5 to Oct. 17
- Available in Spanish, Vietnamese, Chinese
- Outreach
 - In-person (tabling at stations), onboard, VMS messages
 - Social media, news release, e-newsletter, email, website
 - Meetings elected officials, advisory, advocacy groups
 - Dissemination by various partner agencies and organizations to their membership

6



Survey: Participant Overview

Description	EMU Survey
Time Riding Caltrain	45% more than 4 years
Trip Purpose	73% work; 19% social
Type trip	94% round trip
Access to Car	83% yes
Gender	68% male
Age	38% between 25 – 34 years
Income (household)	36% income \$100,000 – \$199,999

7



Survey: Station Access / Egress

Description	EMU Survey
Top Origin Stations	SF; San Jose; Mountain View; Hillsdale; Palo Alto
Top Destination Stations	SF; Palo Alto; Mountain View; San Jose
Distance (Origin to Station)	53% from 1 – 5 miles; 33% up to 1 mile
Distance (Station to Destination)	56% from 1 – 5 miles; 33% up to 1 mile
Access Mode (Origin to Station)	29% bike; 27% walk; 26% car; 10% transit
Departure Mode (Station to Destination)	38% walk; 27% bike; 16% shuttle; 13% transit

8



Survey: Seats / Standee Related

Description	EMU Survey
Average Trip Onboard Caltrain (Time)	28% from 31 – 45 min; 26% from 46 – 60 min
Seat Availability (Destination trip)	64% always; 17% standing up to 10 min; 7% standing more than 20 min
Seat Availability (Return trip)	57% always; 19% standing up to 10 min; 8% standing up more than 20 min

9



Survey: Bike Related

Description	EMU Survey
Brought bike onboard	44%
Bumped in last year	46% never; 13% once; 30% twice – 12 times
Would a staffed bike facility be an alternative to bringing a bike onboard?	52% yes
Are additional bike lockers an option for use?	49% yes
Would bike sharing be an alternative to bringing a bike on board?	39% yes
Could the addition of shuttles provide an alternative to bringing a bike on board?	47% yes

10

Survey: Bathroom Related

Description	EMU Survey
Use of bathroom	53% yes
How often utilized	2% never 23% once a year 60% twice – 12 times 13% multiple times per month 3% multiple times per week

11

Summary Results

<i>Prioritize what is most important to your riding experience (weighted average from ranking scale of 1 to 5)</i>	
Seating	4.5
Standing Room / Leaning Area	3.26
Bike Storage	3.11
Bathroom	2.18
Luggage Storage	1.95

12

Level of Importance

Rate on a sliding scale the importance of these features		
Feature	Very Important	Unimportant
Increase seating capacity	56%	2%
Increase onboard bike capacity	38%	10%
Increase standing capacity	22%	5%
Increase bike storage at stations	22%	13%
Include bathroom onboard	17%	14%
Increase bike sharing kiosks at stations	16%	17%
Increase luggage storage	3%	24%

13

Technical/Operational Considerations Seats / Standees

- Current provision
 - Bi-level
 - 2 / 2 configuration
 - 620 – 670 seats
 - Standee space limited
- Seating important (20+ mile average trip)
- Circulations space for conductor
- ADA compliance for space and accessibility
- Seat pitch between rows
- Aisle widths

14



Technical / Operational Considerations Bikes on Trains

- Current provision
 - 48 to 80 bikes per train (5 trains / peak hour)
 - 1 bike and customer take up 2 seats
 - Two bike cars per train
 - Bike bumps occurring
 - Wayside bike parking facilities improvement opportunities
- Dedicated bike cars more efficient and safer than bikes onboard throughout train
- Additional bike cars may require crew changes driving operational costs

15



Technical / Operational Considerations Bathroom

- Current provision
 - Portion of fleet have 2 to 5 bathrooms per train
 - Not all ADA compliant
 - 2 terminal stations have bathroom
- Multiple configurations available
- 1 ADA compliant bathroom equals 8 seats
- Additional utility during delays
- O/M implications of 2 versus 6 bathrooms

16



Next Steps

- Outreach Phase I
 - Survey complete (report at www.caltrain.com/emu)
 - February - March public discussion
 - April staff recommendation (seats / bikes / bathrooms)
 - Inform vehicle RFP
- Outreach Phase II (after Vehicle Contract Award)
 - Interior configuration seating, standee, bikes (design)
 - Interior style and colors
 - Exterior appearance

17



Questions

18