
From: Luu, Catherine <FTA>
To: Fisher, Ronald <FTA>; Matley, Ted <FTA>; Barr, James <FTA>; Sukys, Raymond <FTA>; Marler, Renee <FTA>; Nguyen, Kim <FTA>
CC: Rogers, Leslie <FTA>; Tahir, Nadeem <FTA>; Carranza, Edward <FTA>
Sent: 9/17/2008 6:39:01 AM
Subject: RE: Schedule for comments on Honolulu ADEIS

I tried to catch up with all my emails.... I saw Ron's 2nd comment and per my reading (C5010) I cut and pasted below, I don't think 20% for rail is required per the circular:

" Spare Ratio. Because rail transit operations tend to be highly individualized, FTA has not established a specific number to serve as an acceptable spare ratio for rail transit operations. Nevertheless, rail operators should be aware that the grant applicant's rail vehicle spare ratio and the rationale underlying that spare ratio will be examined as part of the grant application review whenever FTA assistance is requested to purchase rail vehicles, and during the triennial review. A fleet status report must be submitted with any grant application for assistance to acquire rolling stock. As in the calculation of spare ratio for bus fleets, scheduled standby fixed guideway vehicles are permitted to be included as "vehicles operated in maximum service."

The following guidance should be used to support an operator's proposed spare ratio when the spare ratio is under review by FTA:

An operator of a rail system must have in its file available upon request by FTA a fleet management plan that addresses operating policies (level of service requirements, train failure definitions and actions); peak vehicle requirements (service period and make-up, e.g., standby trains); maintenance and overhaul program (schedules, unscheduled, and overhaul); system and service expansions; rail car procurements and related schedules; and spare ratio justification.

Spare ratio justification should consider: average number of cars out of service for scheduled maintenance, unscheduled maintenance and overhaul program; allowance for ridership variation (historical data); ridership changes that affect car needs caused by expansion of system or services; contingency for destroyed cars; and car procurements for replacements and system expansions.

Cars delivered for future expansion and cars that have been replaced, but are in the process of being disposed of, should be identified and separated from other spares because they unfairly inflate the spare ratio.

Peak Vehicle Requirement includes "standby" trains that are scheduled, ready for service, and have a designated crew.

Factors that may influence spare ratio are: equipment make-up (locomotive hauled trains; married pair units or single cars; equipment design, reliability and age); environmental conditions (weather, above ground or underground operation, loading and track layout); operational policies (standby trains, load factors, headways); maintenance policies (conditions for removing cars from service, maintenance during nights and weekends, and labor agreement conditions; and maintenance facilities and staff capabilities. "

-----Original Message-----

From: Fisher, Ronald <FTA>
Sent: Friday, September 12, 2008 10:55 AM
To: Carranza, Edward <FTA>; Matley, Ted <FTA>; Barr, James <FTA>; Sukys, Raymond <FTA>; Marler, Renee <FTA>; Luu, Catherine <FTA>
Cc: Rogers, Leslie <FTA>; Tahir, Nadeem <FTA>
Subject: RE: Schedule for comments on Honolulu ADEIS

I will have all my comments to you by COB today as I leave for two weeks of vacation tomorrow. I'd like to share two with you that may have been caught by our PMOCs:

Pg. 3-26: second paragraph: a 2-hr max peak load of 11,950 is cited along with a reference to the system design capacity of 18,000. The capacity cited is the potential capacity with expansion beyond what the project would have. The relevant capacity is 6,000/hr per direction as that is what the Project will have. Because peak-hour loadings are greater than 50% of the two-hour loadings, it appears that the projected loadings exceed project capacity. This should be explained.

Pg. 2-13, Table 2-4: the 20% spare ratio for buses is consistent with industry practice. However the figure for rail cars is 10%. This should be changed to 20% consistent with industry practice.

Any comments on those?

-----Original Message-----

From: Carranza, Edward <FTA>
Sent: Friday, September 12, 2008 1:18 PM
To: Matley, Ted <FTA>; Barr, James <FTA>; Fisher, Ronald <FTA>; Sukys, Raymond <FTA>; Marler, Renee <FTA>; Luu, Catherine <FTA>
Cc: Rogers, Leslie <FTA>; Tahir, Nadeem <FTA>
Subject: Re: Schedule for comments on Honolulu ADEIS

Hi Group. I'm here on the islands and ready to soon board the plane back to SF, but the Honolulu folks are anxious to hear back from us with any more comments. With that said, I'm sure Ted if you gave Toru and Steve a call advising them you'd complete our inputs by sometime next week, they'd be fine with it. The initial comments you gave them are keeping them busy enough, and this weeks action items from the Risk Assessment effort will keep them from waiting too intensely. I will pass onto to Cathy the need to expedite anything from BAH, and in fact, I can also if you wish touch base with Jacobs who is finishing their initial RA inputs as we speak, and did also review the draft as a prep action for their RA work - they may offer some thoughts for you. I can't believe it would be major work to share what they saw as they read the document. If you need something from me within the next couple of hours before I leave here, please advise.

----- Original Message -----

From: Matley, Ted <FTA>
To: Barr, James <FTA>; Fisher, Ronald <FTA>; Sukys, Raymond <FTA>; Marler, Renee <FTA>; Carranza, Edward <FTA>; Luu, Catherine <FTA>
Cc: Rogers, Leslie <FTA>; Tahir, Nadeem <FTA>
Sent: Fri Sep 12 13:03:46 2008
Subject: Schedule for comments on Honolulu ADEIS

Hello all,

How is everyone doing on their review of the Honolulu ADEIS? Frankly I wouldn't mind a little more time, and I also haven't gotten anything from the PMOC, I think Cathy had directed them to send me their comments to me directly.

Should we send comments Monday as they requested, or set a new target date? If we set a new target date, do we want to communicate it to Honolulu?

Any thoughts?

Thanks,

Ted

Ted M Matley

FTA Region IX

201 Mission Street, Suite 1650

San Francisco, CA 94105

AR00143870

(415) 744-2590

fax (415) 744-2726

ted.matley@dot.gov