

-  

---

**From:** Frank Koppelman [fkoppel@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 20, 2011 7:43 AM  
**To:** Roelof van Ark; 'Gregg Albright'  
**Cc:** Rick Donnelly  
**Subject:** Peer Review Report

Roeloff,

This is just a heads up that we are unlikely to meet the Friday (tomorrow) target deadline for the draft report. We will have it to you early next week.

A subset of the panel had a phone meeting with key CS representatives (with Gregg participating for part of the meeting) so they have a good sense of our general response. No major problems were identified during that meeting.

Frank

Frank S. Koppelman  
1122 Hinman Ave.  
Evanston, IL 60202

---

**From:** Frank Koppelman [mailto:fkoppel@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 20, 2011 9:37 AM  
**To:** (fsk.mss@comcast.net); Billy Charlton (billy@sfcta.org); Eric Miller (miller@civ.utoronto.ca); Kay Axhausen (axhausen@ivt.baug.ethz.ch); Ken Small (ksmall@uci.edu); Rick Donnelly (DonnellyR@pbworld.com)  
**Subject:** FW: No brains, no headaches

I just scanned the work by Rick and the revisions by Ken. Unfortunately, my day today is heavily scheduled so I will probably not go into detailed commenting until tomorrow. I will reserve much of tomorrow (and as much of Saturday as needed) for this task. This is likely to break the targeted schedule of completion by Friday. However, it is more important that we have a strong and clear report that we all stand behind than that we save a few days in getting back to Roeloff. I will give him a heads up.

Frank

Frank S. Koppelman  
1122 Hinman Ave.  
Evanston, IL 60202

-

---

**From:** Roelof Van Ark [rvanark@hsr.ca.gov]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 26, 2011 7:54 PM  
**To:** Frank Koppelman  
**Subject:** RE: Initial Review Meeting

Frank,

Can we chat tomorrow. Rather complicated. Need to spend some time with you to understand. Hope you are getting better. Are you able to accommodate a phone call?

Roelof

Sent from my Verizon Wireless Phone

---

**From:** Frank Koppelman <fkoppel@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 26, 2011 10:28 AM  
**To:** Roelof Van Ark <rvanark@hsr.ca.gov>  
**Cc:** Billy Charlton <billy@sfcta.org>; Eric Miller <miller@civ.utoronto.ca>; Frani Koppelman <fkoppel@comcast.net>; Kay Axhausen <axhausen@ivt.baug.ethz.ch>; Ken Small <ksmall@uci.edu>; Rick Donnelly <DonnellyR@pbworld.com>  
**Subject:** Initial Review Meeting

Dear Roeloff,

The panel is working on completing the 1<sup>st</sup> draft report of our meeting. It is proving to be a challenge as we recognize some serious inconsistencies in our detailed comments and conclusions, we need some additional clarification on scope not included explicitly in the contract, three of the members are working full time and currently at TRB and I have been ill and only partially functional during much of this time. I will address each in turn:

- Serious inconsistencies in our detailed comments and conclusions
  - We have important concerns about the model formulation, primarily to do with specification, that I think should have been taken into account during the work previously done.
  - We did not fully appreciate the importance of some of these concerns during the meeting or the briefing to you and Gregg.
  - The panel has to discuss these by phone meeting and come to some consensus on these issues.
  - Possibly or likely, these will lead to work that should be done before the EIR/EIS studies. We recognize that this will impact the work schedule but believe that our mission is to give the you an honest appraisal so that you can make the appropriate adjustments.
- We need some additional clarification on scope not explicitly included in the contract (different panel members have somewhat different interpretations)
  - I have interpreted the forecasting needs of HSRA to be differentiated across two (or three) levels of specificity.
    - Those required for EIR/EIS studies
    - Those required for decisions with respect to the Minimum Operating Segment (I think the requirements here may be identical to those in the next item) and
    - Those required for investment/risk analysis
  - There is some lack of agreement as to whether we should limit our analysis to the model development and precision or include forecast precision, as well. That is, address the issue of reasonability of assumptions about .
  - It would help us substantially if you or someone on your extended staff could provide us with an explicit statement in this regard rather than for us to try come to agreement on what you need.

- Three of the panel members are working full time and currently at TRB as you know. They all have substantially responsibilities and this week, especially, are difficult to reach.
- I have been ill and only partially functional during much of this time. I am making every attempt to meet my commitment to HSRA (I have made this is my highest professional priority), but there may be some inevitable disruption.
  - Nevertheless, we will complete our first draft well before I leave on vacation and I will make every attempt to be somewhat available during that time (assuming I am able to travel)
  - I do not expect this to impair my ability to lead the panel into the next stages of this work.

On a separate point, I am trying to work with Jeff Mikles on the continuing scope of the panel. Due to the above situations, I have had to put that on a back burner. I have received input from Jeff Buxbaum on the CS Tasks 16 and 17 scopes with which we should mesh our schedule. However, I note that our scope includes

- An assessment of the scope of work for Cambridge Systematics work (sic) and recommendations for modification of that scope of work.

Thus, it is not possible to refine our scope for the balance of the review until we finish and you accept our current report.

Best regards,

Frank

Frank S. Koppelman  
1122 Hinman Ave.  
Evanston, IL 60202

-

---

**From:** Frank Koppelman [fkoppel@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, February 07, 2011 1:41 PM  
**To:** Roelof van Ark  
**Cc:** Billy Charlton; Eric Miller; Frank Koppelman; Kay Axhausen; Ken Small; 'Rick Donnelly'  
**Subject:** Draft Report of Peer Review Panel Meeting  
**Attachments:** Draft Peer Review 110207.pdf

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Roelof,

I am attaching our Draft Report of the Peer Review Panel Meeting. The panel regrets that we had to break the very optimistic schedule we had suggested at the end of the meeting. We determined that the importance of the report was such that we needed to take additional time to cover issues thoroughly and express our thoughts carefully.

As you know, I will be away from this Wednesday, February 9<sup>th</sup>, through Wednesday, March 2<sup>nd</sup>. If you wish to discuss the report with me tomorrow, I expect to be available at the number below most of the afternoon. Once I am established at my destination, I will send you and Rick Donnelly my contact information. I believe I will have reasonable phone and internet connections but I cannot verify that from here.

Frank

Frank S. Koppelman  
1122 Hinman Ave.  
Evanston, IL 60202

-

---

**From:** Jeff Mikles [jlmikles@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 08, 2011 3:06 PM  
**To:** Frank Koppelman  
**Cc:** Shahin Pourvahidi; Vickie Janek  
**Subject:** Re: Status on final report and SOW for next contract

Thanks, Frank. This will take some pressure off the contracting process.

Jeff

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

**From:** Frank Koppelman  
**To:** 'Jeff Mikles'  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 08, 2011 2:47 PM  
**Subject:** RE: Status on final report and SOW for next contract

Jeff,

I sent the draft final report to Roelof yesterday. It has already been sent on to CSI.

Since I will be away for the next three weeks, I asked Rick Donnelly, who is working with the Peer Review Panel and has other roles in the PMG, to be in touch with you about our schedule once we have an estimate of how long it will take CSI to respond to our recommendations. I doubt if there will be a meeting in April.

Frank

Frank S. Koppelman  
1122 Hinman Ave.  
Evanston, IL 60202

---

**From:** Jeff Mikles [mailto:jlmikles@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 08, 2011 10:22 AM  
**To:** Frank Koppelman  
**Cc:** Vickie Janek  
**Subject:** Status on final report and SOW for next contract

Hi Frank,

Hope you're doing well and your team won last weekend.

Please give me a status report on when you think you will complete and submit the final report for the first contract, and when we can expect the completed scope of work and budget for the second contract.

If you plan to have an April meeting, we need to get the next contract processed soon.

Thanks,  
Jeff Mikles

**om:** Roelof Van Ark [<mailto:rvanark@hsr.ca.gov>]  
**Sent:** Friday, March 11, 2011 12:03 PM  
**To:** Elizabeth Stone; Vickie Janek; Jeff Mikles  
**Cc:** Gregg Albright; Carrie Pourvahidi  
**Subject:** FW: Progress on Peer Review Panel Work

Jeff,

Can you please explain what we require as state, for this next phase of the contract. Not sure what Frank is saying when he writes "Second, I now understand that state contracting rules require (or make it desirable) that the PRP work for the balance of the year be included in a single contract. It is unclear to me whether it is possible to complete, obtain approval for and execute the PRP contracts by end-March or even by early-April".

Thanks,

Roelof

---

**From:** Frank Koppelman [<mailto:fkoppel@comcast.net>]  
**Sent:** Friday, March 11, 2011 11:51 AM  
**To:** Roelof Van Ark; Gregg Albright  
**Cc:** Nick Brand;  
**Subject:** Progress on Peer Review Panel Work

Roelof,

It appears to me that there is a disjoint between the objective of moving the Peer Review process along that Rick Donnelly and I discussed with you and Gregg and the realities of project performance and contracting. I am including all the copyees as each has important involvement in some aspect of clarifying and scheduling the next stage of the Peer Review Panel's work.

I have two concerns about our ability to proceed in accordance with the currently planned timing of the next phase of the Peer Review Panel (PRP) work. Both the CS response to our first report and state contracting rules raise questions about scheduling the next Peer Review Panel meeting for April 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> as previously planned.

First, I list below the sections of the PRP report on which we expect responses from CS and my understanding of the status of each of them. We expect that the responses to the first three items would be a substantively complete report and on the second three items would be a plan to complete the work.

- 3.1 Inputs to model application. Delivered, not yet reviewed.
- 3.2 Validation and documentation. Expected by end-March.
4. Short term issues. No information on a response or plan for a response.
5. Long term issues. No information on a response or plan for a response.
6. Econometric Issues. No information on a response or plan for a response.
7. Data Requirements for Data Enhancement. No information on a response or plan for a response.

As discussed, our next meeting should include two major elements. First is a review of responses to all six items listed above. The second is our review of the CS Scope. This will require our having access to an updated statement of the CS scope of work and schedule for that work. The current document we have was drafted in late December. I do not have any documentation as to what work has been authorized to proceed, other than responses to our report, or what the schedule is for completion of additional work.

An effective PRP meeting requires that we have either a substantive response or a plan for preparing a response from CS on each for each of the six items listed above. It appears that we must consider re-scheduling our next PRP meeting until a date two weeks after all of those responses are in our hands.

Second, I now understand that state contracting rules require (or make it desirable) that the PRP work for the balance of the year be included in a single contract. It is unclear to me whether it is possible to complete, obtain approval for and execute the PRP contracts by end-March or even by early-April.

I need clear and integrated guidance from you and your staff about how both of these issues will be addressed so that I can inform the rest of the panel about likely scheduling and the Ridership and Revenue work can proceed in an expeditious manner. Also, it is important that our contracts have the flexibility to adjust to changes in the CS work schedule and delivery.

Sincerely,

Frank

Frank S. Koppelman  
1122 Hinman Ave.  
Evanston, IL 60202



-

---

**From:** Roelof Van Ark [rvanark@hsr.ca.gov]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 22, 2011 3:51 PM  
**To:** Frank Koppelman  
**Cc:** Hans Van Winkle; Gregg Albright; Nick Brand; 'Jeff Mikles'; Billy Charlton; Eric Miller; Kay Axhausen; Ken Small; 'Rick Donnelly'; mcutler@camsys.com; jbuxbaum@camsys.com; dkurth@camsys.com; Kimon Proussaloglou  
**Subject:** RE: Approach to Accelerating CS and Panel Interchange and Work

Thanks Frank,

Based on the discussions we had with Kimon and the team from CS this morning, this is in line with my expectations. I look forward to keeping the process going and together with Gregg Albright, we will be keeping the management level contact with the Peer Review Panel.

Regards,

Roelof

---

**From:** Frank Koppelman [<mailto:fkoppel@comcast.net>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 22, 2011 1:48 PM  
**To:** Roelof Van Ark  
**Cc:** Hans Van Winkle; Gregg Albright; Nick Brand; 'Jeff Mikles'; Billy Charlton; Eric Miller; Frank Koppelman; Kay Axhausen; Ken Small; 'Rick Donnelly'; [mcutler@camsys.com](mailto:mcutler@camsys.com); [jbuxbaum@camsys.com](mailto:jbuxbaum@camsys.com); [dkurth@camsys.com](mailto:dkurth@camsys.com); Kimon Proussaloglou  
**Subject:** Approach to Accelerating CS and Panel Interchange and Work

Roelof,

Kimon Proussaloglou contacted me at your suggestion to work out an approach to accelerating the model development and review process; particularly with respect to Item 4, Short Term Issues, in our recommended actions from the first Peer Review Panel Meeting. We had a productive conversation and I am sending you and, I hope, all interested parties at HSRA, PB, CS and the Panel my criteria for this plan and an outline of the approach.

The criteria are straightforward:

- To facilitate the most effective interaction between CS and the PRP with respect to addressing the concerns stated in the Panel's Recommendation from its first meeting and produce the best model reasonably possible under the existing time constraints.
- Schedule the next Panel Meeting on April 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> as previously envisioned with a further meeting in June or July (I will attempt to schedule my trip to Israel and Europe to allow for a meeting in early June or mid-July).
- Obtain substantial results from CS between meetings so that the Panel's time is well used.

The plan will proceed as follows:

- HSRA will complete the contracts with the Panel Members early enough to begin review of materials responding to Recommendation 3.1, 3.2 and 4 by April 4<sup>th</sup> and the next Panel meeting will be held on April 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup>.
- CS has delivered their response to recommendation 3.1 already, will deliver their response to 3.2 next week and will deliver working documents as part of their response to 4 by April 4<sup>th</sup> with additional material delivered by April 8<sup>th</sup>.
- Kimon will send me draft model estimation worksheets for questions and comments as they become available. I will provide suggestions to facilitate the review by the full panel and CS will respond to those suggestions as appropriate. If any other member(s) of the panel wishes to review these intermediate products, they will also receive these intermediate products.

- The panel will prepare technical comments on each of the CS submissions as soon after the PRP meeting as possible and CS will refine/revise submissions as appropriate.
- This cyclical process will carry over into the next quarter with a focus on Recommendations 5, 6 and 7.

If anyone has further suggestions to keep the process moving, please let me know.

Frank

Frank S. Koppelman  
1122 Hinman Ave.  
Evanston, IL 60202



-

---

**From:** Frank Koppelman [fkoppel@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, March 21, 2011 8:11 PM  
**To:** 'Jeff Mikles'; 'Brand, Nicholas'  
**Cc:** 'Van Winkle, Hans'; 'Albright, R. Gregg'; '13259 CAHSR - Program Mgmt Project Email'; 'Vickie Janek'  
**Subject:** RE: DRAFT scope of work for the Ridership Panel  
**Attachments:** CS-Scope\_Task 16-17\_PRPEdits-Comments.docx

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Jeff and Nick,

I am attaching the Panel's DRAFT revision to the CS SOW for Tasks 16 and 17. This is designed primarily to incorporate the items recommended in the Panel's report.

If we are to make the April 11-12 dates or some reasonable April dates, we will need to get the full responses to Items 3.1, 3.2 and 4 completed one week before and it would be desirable to have a plan for their response to items 5, 6 and 7. [7 actually precedes 5 and 6].

Frank

Frank S. Koppelman  
1122 Hinman Ave.  
Evanston, IL 60202

---

**From:** Jeff Mikles [mailto:jlmikles@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, March 21, 2011 4:35 PM  
**To:** 'Frank Koppelman'; 'Brand, Nicholas'  
**Cc:** 'Van Winkle, Hans'; 'Albright, R. Gregg'; '13259 CAHSR - Program Mgmt Project Email'; Vickie Janek  
**Subject:** RE: DRAFT scope of work for the Ridership Panel

Hi Frank,

If we can get the SOW by Wed we might be able to make the April 11 date but it could be pushing it. We have been able to get most consulting contracts through DGS in about two weeks, but they have been difficult lately. We'll do our best to accommodate your meeting plans.

Thanks for staying on top of this matter,  
Jeff

---

**From:** Frank Koppelman [mailto:fkoppel@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, March 21, 2011 1:54 PM  
**To:** 'Brand, Nicholas'; 'Jeff Mikles'  
**Cc:** 'Van Winkle, Hans'; 'Albright, R. Gregg'; '13259 CAHSR - Program Mgmt Project Email'  
**Subject:** RE: DRAFT scope of work for the Ridership Panel

Nick and Jeff,

I assume the scope is as detailed below; that may need to be filled in with more detail to be useful. As I promised, I will get you a revised CS scope tomorrow (Wednesday at the latest) which may influence the panel scope. I think my time commitment is probably on the order of 66 to 70 hours per meeting and 12 hours per month; 50 hours per meeting and 2 hours per month probably works for the panel members. I overran substantially my first contract due to post meeting report preparation and discussions as well as CS scope discussions. Experience indicates that these require considerable hours of my time and moderate hours of the panelist's time.

How much time is typically needed to obtain approval of these contracts? Is it realistic to get approved and signed contracts by mid-April?

The panelists reserved April 11-12 for the first panel meeting but the reasonableness of that depends on what we cover. I recommend that the mission for that meeting include items 3.1, 3.2 and 4 from the DRAFT Report of the first panel meeting. [We can translate that to the modified CS Tasks when their revised scope is approved]. I doubt if CS will have a response to item 4 ready early enough to review for an April date. In any case, panel scheduling is likely to be a problem in April-May. Also, I will be away much of June and part of July (dates to be finalized soon) so we may have to make some schedule adjustments to accommodate my travel plan [redacted].

Let's get a schedule from CS on delivery. I will contact the panelists to get a general idea of availability.

Frank

Frank S. Koppelman  
1122 Hinman Ave.  
Evanston, IL 60202



---

**From:** Brand, Nicholas [mailto:Brand@pbworld.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 20, 2011 12:51 PM  
**To:** Jeff Mikles; Frank Koppelman  
**Cc:** Van Winkle, Hans; Albright, R. Gregg; 13259 CAHSR - Program Mgmt Project Email  
**Subject:** RE: DRAFT scope of work for the Ridership Panel

Thanks for the review, Jeff.

Frank, our next steps were to get the actual rates on Monday, calculate a draft budget, and see with Roelof whether the amounts, scope, and level of effort were realistic, and then get it to you. But since you have it in its current form, could you please let me know whether the time commitment is in line with what you and the panel members might provide, and of course I'd appreciate any suggestions on the tech scope, which I've tried to write very broadly.

Thanks, Nick

---

**From:** Jeff Mikles [mailto:jlmikles@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 20, 2011 12:07 PM  
**To:** Brand, Nicholas  
**Cc:** Frank Koppelman; Van Winkle, Hans; Albright, R. Gregg; 13259 CAHSR - Program Mgmt Project Email  
**Subject:** Re: DRAFT scope of work for the Ridership Panel

Hi Nick,

The following format looks good, please run it by Frank also for content.

The contract requirements call for a scope of work with detailed tasks, deliverables, schedule with milestone dates, budget, and resumes. Looks like you have it pretty well covered. This information will be used to generate separate contracts for each panel member. The only variances will be their respective budgets and resumes.

Thanks,  
Jeff Mikles

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

**From:** Brand, Nicholas

**To:** jlmikles@gmail.com

**Cc:** 13259 CAHSR - Program Mgmt Project Email ; Albright, R. Gregg ; Van Winkle, Hans

**Sent:** Saturday, March 19, 2011 12:08 PM

**Subject:** RE: DRAFT scope of work for the Ridership Panel

Hi Jeff, Gregg has looked at scope below for substance, and we want Hans to discuss w/ Roelof on Monday as to the appropriateness of the tasks and level of effort. Could you please review it and see if it fits the form requirements....I realize we need a \$\$ value, but don't have info on their rates, and penciled in hours of work. That can be added in after.... The form is a general statement of work for 3 fiscal years ending June 2013, with a requirement for an annual work plan negotiation, and specific scope and deliverables for FY10/11, plus 11/12 and 12/13 work that might be adjusted during the AWP negotiation.

Assuming \$250/hr for each of them, the cost would be

\$131,600 for 10/11

\$460,600 for all three years...

Thanks, Nick.

---

**From:** Brand, Nicholas

**Sent:** Wednesday, March 16, 2011 1:05 PM

**To:** Van Winkle, Hans; Albright, R. Gregg

**Cc:** 13259 CAHSR - Program Mgmt Project Email

**Subject:** RE: Who provided the scope of work for the Ridership Panel?

Hi Gregg, Hans, here's a first cut at a multi-year scope of work (such as PB has), which for the out years would have an annual work plan prepared to update the assumptions made in this. That way we don't have to know every detail of the CS plan now, and can move the contract through to get the panel back on board for the duration. The FY 11/12 AWP and budget would be hammered out in detail by end May, as with ours. Next step after your review would be review by Jeff Mikles to make sure it has all that the contracting folks at CA DGS need. Then review with Roelof for budget..... Nick

Re: desire to get Bill Davidson's input, he has auto reply turned on: *I will be on vacation the week of March 14th with only limited access to email.*

Proposed Scope for Koppelman and other panelists. [Items in brackets are for Frank's only].

Scope of Work

- 1) The consultant will participate in [serve as chair of] the Ridership & Revenue Peer Review Panel (Panel) established by the Authority to advise them and their Program Management Team (PMT) on the process for developing ridership and revenue forecasts and on the resulting forecasts and associated information.
- 2) The Panel's advice may be sought on a wide range of matters related to project ridership and revenue forecasts, to which the consultant will bring his/her own expertise and knowledge as applicable, including but not limited to:
  - a) collection and organization of data relevant to forecasting travel by mode including travel surveys, expansion of survey information to larger populations, socioeconomic data collection and organization, construction of zonal structures, assembly of current and future travel networks, times and costs, possibilities of uncertainty in future forecasts of these elements;
  - b) appropriateness and stability of input assumptions into travel models including service frequency, fare levels, competitive air reactions, costs of travel, on-time performance, service quality;

- c) model structure and development including structure of model and sub-models, appropriateness of sub-models for different travel markets and activity patterns; incremental improvement vs cost/schedule of additional sub-models; model testing protocols, statistical validity, and evaluation of strength of alternative model formulations; validity of constraints on model components;
- d) organization and execution of probability-based risk analyses, including the development of alternate scenarios of competitive response, transportation cost, technology change, demographic evolution, and other issues;
- e) experience with ridership and revenue modelling for and operations of high-speed and intercity rail systems outside of California, and extent to which applicable to the project, including peak period pricing, yield management, effect of transfers to feeder services, classes of service, and other issues;
- f) results of the forecast including market share, distribution of trips during a day, seasonality, parking and other access requirements at stations, and other issues as needed;
- g) use of the forecasts in financial forecasting, including the creation of reasonable ranges of outcomes, application of contingencies, growth over time, and other issues as requested.

3) The Panel's primary focus will be to review and advise on forecasting upgrades and updates to be conducted by the Program Management Team (PMT) and its sub-consultant Cambridge Systematics (CS). The consultant will participate in person and/or by teleconference at periodic meetings to discuss proposed scope, methodologies, and other activities, to review results of key work effort, and to review the reasonableness of results with the Authority, PMT, and CS.

4) The consultant will participate in two such meetings in FY 10/11, three in FY 11/12, and two in FY 12/13. [Ten days after the conclusion of the meeting, the chair will provide a summary memorandum on the key issues, recommendations, and action items, with assistance in drafting and production from the PMT.] The specific schedule of meetings and level of budget will be set to coincide with milestones established in an Annual Work Program to be negotiated between the Panel chair and the Authority prior to the start of work in each State fiscal year.

5) The consultant and Panel will also provide advice from time to time on issues that may arise from the forecasts and model development as requested by the Authority in coordination with the chair of the Panel, and within the limits of the budget and schedule.

[6) The chair will prepare tri-annual report summarizing the Panel's activities in prior months by the end of October, February, and June, with assistance in drafting and production from the PMT. ]

Deliverables and Schedule FY 10/11

- 10-1) Meeting to review modelling documentation and planning for upgrades/updating of model & forecasts;  
April 15, 2011
- 10-2) Report on April 2011 meeting;  
April 25, 2011
- 10-3) Meeting to review further documentation, and detailed planning for upgrades/updates;  
June 15, 2011
- 10-4) Report on June 2011 meeting;  
June 25, 2011
- 10-5) Responses to questions arising from forecasts;  
as needed through June 30, 2011
- 10-6) Tri-annual report on April-June activities  
June 30, 2011

Budget FY 10/11

Koppelman      Meetings, preparation, and reports: 56 hours each - 108 hours total  
                          Responses to questions:                      8 hours/month - 24 hours total

	Travel ODCs - 2 trips, each, 2 days, 2 nights @ \$1,600 -- \$3,200 total (Air \$1,000; Ground \$200; hotel \$300; per diem, misc \$100)
Charlton	Meetings, preparation, and reports: 40 hours each - 80 hours total Responses to questions: 2 hours/month - 6 hours total Travel ODCs - 2 trips, each, 2 days, 1 night @\$500 -- \$1,000 total (Ground \$250; hotel \$150; per diem, misc \$100)
Small	Meetings, preparation, and reports: 40 hours each - 80 hours total Responses to questions: 2 hours/month - 6 hours total Travel ODCs - 2 trips, each, 2 days, 1 night @ \$850 -- \$1,700 total (Air, \$400; Ground \$200; hotel \$150; per diem, misc \$100)
Axhausen	Meetings, preparation, and reports: 40 hours each - 80 hours total Responses to questions: 2 hours/month - 6 hours total Travel ODCs - 1 trip, 2 days, 2 night @ \$850 -- \$3,100 total (Air, \$2,500; Ground \$200; hotel \$300; per diem, misc \$100)
Miller	Meetings, preparation, and reports: 40 hours each - 80 hours total Responses to questions: 2 hours/month - 6 hours total Travel ODCs - 2 trips, each 2 days, 2 nights @ \$1,800 -- \$3,600 total (Air, \$1,200; Ground \$200; hotel \$300; per diem, misc \$100)

Expected Deliverables and Schedule FY 11/12

- 11-1) Meeting to review progress and issues in data collection and model specification  
September 15, 2011
- 11-2) Report on September 2011 meeting  
September 25, 2011
- 11-3) Tri-annual report on July-October activities  
October 31, 2011
- 11-4) Meeting to review progress and issues in model specification  
January 15, 2012
- 11-5) Report on January 2012 meeting  
January 25, 2012
- 11-6) Tri-annual report on November-February activities  
February 29, 2012
- 11-7) Meeting to review progress and results of model specification and planning for risk analyses  
May 15, 2012
- 11-8) Report on May 2012 meeting  
May 25, 2012
- 11-9) Responses to questions arising from forecasts;  
as needed through June 30,2012
- 11-10) Tri-annual report on March-June activities  
June 30, 2012

Expected Budget FY 11/12

Set at 150% of FY10/11 for three meetings in lieu of two

Expected Deliverables and Schedule FY 12/13

- 12-1) Meeting to review progress in risk analyses  
September 15, 2012
- 12-2) Report on September 2012 meeting  
September 25, 2012

- 12-3) Tri-annual report on July-October activities  
October 31, 2012
- 12-4) Meeting to review results in risk analyses  
January 15, 2013
- 12-5) Report on January 2013 meeting  
January 25, 2013
- 12-6) Tri-annual report on November-February activities  
February 29, 2013
- 12-7) Responses to questions arising from forecasts;  
as needed through June 30,2013
- 12-10) Tri-annual report on March-June activities  
June 30, 2013

Expected Budget FY 12/13

Set at 100% of FY10/11 for three meetings in lieu of two

-#####-

---

**From:** Albright, R. Gregg  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 15, 2011 1:13 AM  
**To:** Brand, Nicholas; Van Winkle, Hans  
**Cc:** Donnelly, Rick; Davidson, William A.; '13259@pbworld.com'  
**Subject:** Re: Who provided the scope of work for the Ridership Panel?

Nick,  
Thanks for following up on this. I look forward to reviewing the draft and it would be good to get it to Roelof soon. I think we should also get Bill's input.

R. Gregg Albright  
Planning Director,  
CHSRA Program Management Team  
Parsons Brinckerhoff

(sent by BlackBerry)

---

**From:** Brand, Nicholas  
**To:** Albright, R. Gregg; Van Winkle, Hans  
**Cc:** Donnelly, Rick; Davidson, William A.; 13259 CAHSR - Program Mgmt Project Email  
**Sent:** Mon Mar 14 23:44:13 2011  
**Subject:** RE: Who provided the scope of work for the Ridership Panel?

Hi Greg, Hans,

I think Rick would agree, his formal role is to be the amenuensis/recorder for the panel, and it would not be right for him to help/set their scope of work. In any case the scope needs to be goals and policy related, more than technical, since they are to provide the experienced guidance and overview to the modelling team.

Am reaching out to Bill to see what input he might have. Hopefully the Authority would set a scope end of this week to set the framework within which they'd evaluate the CS material of the 22nd and 30th and advise on what further work CS should undertake.

Ready to take a cut at a first draft for tomorrow pm, so you and Roelof can review. It should not be very complicated, and once conceptually ok can send to Jeff Mikles.