

**SAMTRANS**  
**CORRESPONDENCE**  
**as of 4-16-2021**

**From:** vaughnwolffe@netscape.net  
**To:** [Board \(@samtrans.com\)](mailto:Board@samtrans.com); [cmau@samtrans.com](mailto:cmau@samtrans.com); [Bouchard, Michelle](mailto:Bouchard.Michelle)  
**Subject:** Comments on Dumbarton Interregional Rail Corridor Analysis  
**Date:** Thursday, April 15, 2021 1:37:28 PM

---

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

The following remarks are related to the Dumbarton Interregional Rail Corridor Analysis that was presented virtually on March 15. This analysis does not treat all modes equitably. As was stated in the presentation it was intentionally given to show the advantages of the AVT option. Unfortunately the array of slides provide confusing and contradicting information, or lack thereof, for the other mode options. AVT is presented with the highest frequency and express(flex) service along with a grade separated route.

All 3 other modes are equally capable of express service with higher frequency at higher capacity and speeds. Plus, all 3 modes could be automated. Notably, this unbalanced analysis does not provide the policy makers with a proper or complete description of the potential modes from which they could make the best judgement for transit options in the Dumbarton Corridor. This distorted view is even less helpful in showing performance for an option that combines modes. One such combination would be a bus from Ardenwood to Newark(1 mile) and from Willow to University(less than a mile) both with minimal rail ridership to allow the MRT(Modern Rail,not Commuter) to skip 2 short distance stops and decrease travel times. Modern Rail Transit is electrified doubled deck trains that are capable traveling at 110 mph or above. The projected ridership comparisons appear to be purely a matter of predicated frequency rather than any valid attributes by mode or expense.

This analysis limits MRT by excluding consideration of modern passenger rail's(MRT) superior capacity, speed and range. It appears to include all the advantages of multiple additional boarding locations(9 vs 8 for MRT) and presumably higher frequency to accommodate shorter trips by slower lower capacity vehicles within a small service area for the AVT mode. Limiting consideration of one mode does not, in reality, make the other superior.

Since both Caltrain and BART seek to provide for 10 minute frequency(six trains per hour), MRT's 20 minute frequency appears to be arbitrary or intentionally selected to put passenger rail at a disadvantage by avoiding any intent to coordinate their ridership by having a shuttle meet every train. The same holds true for coordination with the Capitol Corridor's intent to shift to the coast line which passes through Ardenwood as was mentioned in the presentation.

Additionally, there are several considerations that should be looked at with respect to coordinating with ACE from San

Joaquin County and the Tri-Valley. A significant amount of the traffic over the San Mateo and Dumbarton bridges is from San Joaquin and Tri-Valley. The initial stage could be to allow a branch ACE line to use Dumbarton to reach Redwood City directly with stops at Centerville, Newark, and transfers from Capitol Corridor and Willow. Or this could be in addition to the Dumbarton shuttles which, unless there is some grand plan with Fremont to greatly expanded parking, would allow the shuttle to skip a Centerville stop and either make a Ardenwood stop or reduce the total travel time from Union City.

Or it could replace the shuttle altogether with accompanying rapid bus service from Union City to Newark. ACE train arrivals in either case would facilitate cross platform transfers at Redwood city in both directions. At later stages ACE trains could go inline with one of Caltrains slots to take passengers north to SF and south to the Silicon Valley stops. ACE could either haul Caltrain double length EMUs to Redwood City where they could split up and assume a time slot in each direction. Or, as the 2018 State Rail Plan described electrified 125 mph ACE trains every half hour from Stockton to San Jose. Some of those trains could come to Redwood City and provide Mid-Peninsula residents direct access to Sacramento and Stockton/Tri-Valley. The Altamont Vision, available at the ACE website, indicates a 1 hour travel time from Stockton to Oakland, Redwood City and or San Jose.

Commuters on both sides could retain their homes and not be forced to move when they change jobs. Single seat rides from San Joaquin to the Mid-Peninsula and Silicon Valley would go a big way in removing the overwhelming number of cars and GHGs coming into the Peninsula from the East Bay and beyond. Removing 50% or more of the cars coming over bridges into San Mateo would actually allow the people living in the Dumbarton Corridor to breathe better and have an ease of mobility not seen in their neighborhoods for 60 years.

It does seem a bit curious for this analysis to put so much emphasis on a technology under development and with such limited benefit, AVT, vs modern passenger rail that has evolved over time and demonstrated its capabilities in multiple venues. It is even more suspicious with the current emphasis on equity and jobs when AVs would eliminate jobs for the 60% of non-college educated adults whose job is to drive a vehicle of some sort. There is not currently enough clean electrical power available to power the necessary server farms, which are not currently available, that would be needed to supply the AI needed for AVs to prevail.

With regard to staging this project, I suggest that consideration be given to building the rail bridge regardless of the mode.

Once the rail bridge is built any of the other modes would still be possible. The same cannot be said of a bridge built for the other modes.

This project reminds me of National City Lines in the 1950s and 60s when private corporations like Mac

Truck,  
Standard Oil, Goodyear tires and others private companies that stood to profit from the tearing up of rail lines  
were able to convince elected officials to do so on the promise of more modern transportation. Now again  
years later  
later and billions of dollars gone we have another road proponent trying to push out rail service.

The following are questions I have for the study providers. The first 4 questions I submitted last month  
with  
a reply indicating answers would be forthcoming. Nothing yet. Will answers be provided individually or are  
being  
posted someplace.

Thank You  
Vaughn Wolffe 925-461-2880

This letter along with a list of more specific questions has been sent to [dumbartonrail@samtrans.com](mailto:dumbartonrail@samtrans.com)