

JPB CAC

CORRESPONDENCE
AS OF

February 17, 2026

From: [Roland Lebrun](#)
To: [Board \(@caltrain.com\)](#)
Cc: [cacsecretary \(@caltrain.com\)](#)
Subject: Item 5 Public comment: Board supplemental reading file
Date: Wednesday, February 4, 2026 4:58:22 PM
Attachments: [image.png](#)
[image.png](#)
[On-call consultant contracts.pdf](#)
[On-call consultant contracts.pdf](#)

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

Dear Chair Medina,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the supplemental reading file [20260205 JPB Board of Directors Supplemental Reading File \(PDF, 4.52 MB\)](#)

1) I am pleased to report that on-call services contracts (total \$361,478,400) did not show an increase in the last 3 months but it is unclear why the transfer from on-call consultants to in-house staff did not result in a decrease in contract capacity (example: corridor crossing strategy on today's agenda)

2) The BEMU contract is trending at least six months late.

3) The Allocation for Diridon environmental clearance shows an allocation of \$41M (\$35M RM3 + \$6M VTA 2016 Measure B) but the budget for environmental clearance is only \$21.1M so the question is what happened to the "missing" \$19.9M?

The answer is located in the January 22 2026 VTA Finance, Audit & Administration

8. [Diridon Station Redevelopment Project - Capital Project Augmentation and grant award acceptance](#)

which reads as follows:

The environmental phase of the Diridon Station Redevelopment Project is estimated to cost \$41 million. Of this amount, \$6 million from 2016 Measure B is already appropriated in VTA's FY26 and FY27 budgets. The remaining \$35 million is expected to be funded by RM3.

To fully fund the environmental phase and accept the RM3 contribution, the VTA Board must approve a \$41 million increase to the Diridon Station Redevelopment Project (P-0989) appropriation. Because RM3 funds from MTC are provided on a reimbursement basis, VTA did not have an appropriation in its capital budget when MTC approved the allocation. This action is needed to formally appropriate the RM3 funds.

The additional funding will support the full environmental clearance effort. A portion will reimburse Caltrain for environmental consulting, staffing, and related costs. **The remainder will be used by VTA to advance funding, coordination, and advocacy activities necessary for the environmental phase.**

The current budget for Project P-0989 is \$17,848,580. With the proposed \$41,000,000 increase, the total project budget would become \$58,848,580.

May 2025 Steering Committee Approval



- FY2025-2028 project budget (\$41M)
- State and Federal environmental review of Diridon Program
- Caltrain as owner of station serve as local lead agency for environmental review
- Discussion to expedite estimated 3 - 4 year timeframe

Parameters



- Process CEQA/NEPA combined
- Environmentally clear all projects in the Diridon Program
- Three-year contract plus two 1-year extensions
- Budget: \$21.1M

	25-06	25-09
On-call Project Delivery Negotiation Support Services Contract	\$4,150,000	
On-call Alternative Project Delivery Negotiation Support Services Contract		\$4,150,000
On-call Alternative Project Delivery Support Services Contract		\$6,228,400
On-call Communication and Signal Services Contract	\$18,000,000	\$18,000,000
On-call Construction Management Services Contract	\$40,000,000	\$40,000,000
On-Call Design Review Services Contract	\$8,000,000	\$8,000,000
On-Call General Engineering Consultant Design Services Contract	\$50,000,000	\$50,000,000
On-Call Management of Soil, Hazardous Waste, and Other Environmental Compliance Services Contract	\$5,600,000	\$5,600,000
On-Call Professional Support Services Contract	\$42,000,000	\$42,000,000
On-Call Program Management Oversight Services Contract	\$55,000,000	\$55,000,000
On-Call Transportation Planning and Consultant Support Services Contract	\$52,500,000	
On-Call Transportation Planning and Consultant Support Services Contract 20-J-P-006		\$52,500,000
On-Call Transportation Planning and Consultant Support Services Contract 24-J-P-098		\$80,000,000
Total	\$275,250,000	\$361,478,400

25-12
\$4,150,000
\$6,228,400
\$18,000,000
\$40,000,000
\$8,000,000
\$50,000,000
\$5,600,000
\$42,000,000
\$55,000,000
\$52,500,000
\$80,000,000
\$361,478,400

From: [Roland Lebrun](#)
To: [Board \(@caltrain.com\)](#)
Cc: [cacsecretary \[@caltrain.com\]](#)
Subject: Transport for London did NOT fire Cubic
Date: Thursday, February 5, 2026 11:43:49 AM

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

Question to Gemini: "did tfl fire Cubic?"

Answer:

No, **Transport for London (TfL)** did not "fire" **Cubic Transportation Systems** in the sense of an immediate termination for cause. Instead, Cubic lost the bidding process for a massive new **£1.5 billion (\$2 billion)** revenue-collection contract, known as **Project Proteus**, to the Spanish firm **Indra Group**.

Here are the key details of the transition:

Contract Loss: In late 2025, TfL selected **Indra Group** over Cubic (the long-term incumbent) to manage London's fare collection systems, including **Oyster** and **contactless payments**.

Legal Battle: Cubic filed a lawsuit to challenge the decision, claiming the bidding process was unfair and that they had actually submitted a lower bid.

Court Ruling: On **January 15, 2026**, the **High Court** lifted a suspension that had been blocking the new deal, allowing TfL to officially sign the contract with Indra.

Transition Period: While Indra has been awarded the new seven-year contract, Cubic's current service agreement was previously extended and is expected to continue until the new systems are fully operational, likely through **August 2026**.

Cubic has been TfL's primary ticketing partner since the introduction of the Oyster card in 2003. Their loss of this contract is considered a major shift for London's transit infrastructure.

From: [Adrian Brandt](#)
To: [Roland Lebrun](#)
Cc: [Board \(@caltrain.com\)](#); [cacsecretary \[@caltrain.com\]](#)
Subject: Re: Transport for London did NOT fire Cubic
Date: Thursday, February 5, 2026 11:55:59 AM

You don't often get email from adrian.brandt@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Question for ChatGPT: “Was Transport for London, aka TfL, in any way unsatisfied with Cubic as its contactless ticketing provider?”

Response:

https://chatgpt.com/s/t_6984f537b61481918a7b03e8ef4f7eb0

Yes — Transport for London (TfL) did have significant issues with Cubic as its contactless and Oyster ticketing provider, and those problems appear to have contributed to TfL’s decision not to continue with Cubic for the next contract. Here’s a clear summary based on the latest reporting:

1. Contract Replacement After Long Partnership

TfL recently awarded its revenue-collection and ticketing contract — covering Oyster and contactless payments — to Indra Group, replacing Cubic Transportation Systems after more than two decades of Cubic managing the system.

2. Tender Performance Issues Highlighted by TfL

In legal proceedings related to Cubic’s challenge of the contract award, TfL strongly criticized Cubic’s bid performance. Official court filings (reported in industry press) reveal that:

- TfL contended Cubic failed key technical requirements in the tender process.
- TfL argued it could have rejected Cubic’s bid on multiple grounds even without the formal technical failure.

This response from TfL suggests dissatisfaction with Cubic’s ability to meet the requirements for the next-generation system.

3. Underlying Industry Context

TfL invited new bids partly because its existing contract with Cubic (extended due to supply-chain delays) was approaching expiry and the authority wanted a more modern back-office billing and revenue system capable of evolving with digital and account-based ticketing trends.

4. Cyberattack & Operational Challenges

While not directly attributed to Cubic's fault, TfL's contactless system was affected by a major cyberattack in 2024, and such events likely added to pressure to modernize and rethink contract arrangements.

Bottom Line

- TfL's public statements on Cubic have remained courteous about past service.
- However, behind the scenes, the authority clearly believed Cubic was not the best fit for its future ticketing ambitions.
- This is evidenced by TfL's criticisms in contract litigation and by choosing a different provider for the next long-term contract.

If you'd like, I can also pull specific language from TfL's contract procurement documents or the legal filings to show exactly what performance or capability concerns were cited.

On Thu, Feb 5, 2026 at 11:43 Roland Lebrun <cess@msn.com> wrote:

Question to Gemini: "did tfl fire Cubic?"

Answer:

No, **Transport for London (TfL)** did not "fire" **Cubic Transportation Systems** in the sense of an immediate termination for cause. Instead, Cubic lost the bidding process for a massive new **£1.5 billion (\$2 billion)** revenue-collection contract, known as **Project Proteus**, to the Spanish firm **Indra Group**.

Here are the key details of the transition:

- **Contract Loss:** In late 2025, TfL selected **Indra Group** over Cubic (the long-term incumbent) to manage London's fare collection systems, including **Oyster** and **contactless payments**.
- **Legal Battle:** Cubic filed a lawsuit to challenge the decision, claiming the bidding process was unfair and that they had actually submitted a lower bid.
- **Court Ruling:** On **January 15, 2026**, the **High Court** lifted a suspension that had been blocking the new deal, allowing TfL to officially sign the contract with Indra.
- **Transition Period:** While Indra has been awarded the new seven-year contract, Cubic's current service agreement was previously extended and is expected to continue until the new systems are fully operational, likely through **August 2026**.

Cubic has been TfL's primary ticketing partner since the introduction of the Oyster card in 2003. Their loss of this contract is considered a major shift for London's transit infrastructure.

From: [Roland Lebrun](#)
To: [cacsecretary \[@caltrain.com\]](mailto:cacsecretary [@caltrain.com])
Cc: [Board \(@caltrain.com\)](mailto:Board (@caltrain.com))
Subject: Using Zoom's AI Companion to generate a summarized CAC meeting report
Date: Thursday, February 5, 2026 3:03:16 PM

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

Dear Chair Leung,

Please consider directing staff to enable Zoom's AI companion to automatically generate a summarized CAC meeting report at the end of future CAC meetings.

https://support.zoom.com/hc/en/article?id=zm_kb&sysparm_article=KB0058013

Please note that this feature can be automatically enabled as follows:

https://support.zoom.com/hc/en/article?id=zm_kb&sysparm_article=KB0057960

Thank you for your consideration

Roland Lebrun

From: [Adrian Brandt](#)
To: [Roland Lebrun](#)
Cc: [Patricia Leung](#); [cacsecretary \[mailto:cacsecretary@caltrain.com\]](mailto:cacsecretary@caltrain.com)
Subject: Re: Using Zoom's AI Companion to generate a summarized CAC meeting report
Date: Friday, February 6, 2026 3:28:48 AM

You don't often get email from adrian.brandt@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Thanks for the good suggestion, Roland.

Don't you also think it'd be good/better for Caltrain meeting videos to be posted to YouTube?

I've noticed many city councils and other public agencies & bodies have switched to doing this instead, and I find watching meetings on YouTube with variable playback speed, scrubbing, and other playback features including automatically generated subtitles and indexed transcripts soooooo much nicer than Granicus or whatever cruddy & primitive playback user interface Caltrain meeting videos are limited to now.

I'm unfamiliar with the details, but have heard it's quite easy for Zoom recordings to be uploaded to YouTube.

Adrian

On Thu, Feb 5, 2026 at 15:03 Roland Lebrun <ccss@msn.com> wrote:

Dear Chair Leung,

Please consider directing staff to enable Zoom's AI companion to automatically generate a summarized CAC meeting report at the end of future CAC meetings.

https://support.zoom.com/hc/en/article?id=zm_kb&sysparm_article=KB0058013

Please note that this feature can be automatically enabled as follows:

https://support.zoom.com/hc/en/article?id=zm_kb&sysparm_article=KB0057960

Thank you for your consideration

Roland Lebrun