

Congestion Management Program & Planning Committee

Thursday, October 16, 2008
10:30 AM

Conference Room 157
County Government Center
70 West Hedding Street
San Jose, CA

AGENDA

Call to Order

1. Roll Call

2. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS:

This portion of the agenda is reserved for persons desiring to address the Committee on any matter not on the agenda. Speakers are limited to 2 minutes. The law does not permit Committee action or extended discussion on any item not on the agenda except under special circumstances. If Committee action is requested, the matter can be placed on a subsequent agenda. All statements that require a response will be referred to staff for reply in writing.

3. ORDERS OF THE DAY

CONSENT AGENDA

- 4.** Approve the Minutes of September 18, 2008.

REGULAR AGENDA

- 5.** ACTION ITEM - Approve the programming of FY 2009/2011 Lifeline Transportation Program funds as described in the memorandum.
- 6.** ACTION ITEM - Adopt the revised Bicycle Expenditure Plan (BEP) Evaluation Criteria.
- 7.** INFORMATION ITEM - Receive a report on the Joint Development Policy-Discuss Conceptual Modifications

8. ACTION ITEM - Authorize the General Manager to: (1) negotiate and amend Contract S07065 with URS Corporation to provide Phase II, final plans, specifications, and estimates (PS&E) services for the US 101 Auxiliary Lanes Project - State Route 85 to Embarcadero Road, and increase the value of the original \$2,500,000 contract ceiling by \$6,350,000 for a new total contract value \$8,850,000, and, (2) extend the contract term by 24 months.
9. INFORMATION ITEM - Receive an update on the recent activities and the findings related to the public outreach that has been conducted for the High Occupancy Toll (HOT) Lanes Project.

OTHER

10. Items of Concern and Referral to Administration.
11. Review Committee Work Plan. (Ristow)
12. Committee Staff Report (Ristow)
13. Chairperson's Report (Campos)
14. Determine Consent Agenda for November 6, 2008 Board of Directors Meeting.
15. Announcements
16. **ADJOURN**

NOTE COMMITTEE MEMBERS: In order to establish a quorum for this meeting, members are asked to call the Board Secretary's Office at (408) 321-5680 or E-mail: board.secretary@vta.org before 5:00 p.m. on the day prior to the meeting. Thank you for your cooperation.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), those requiring accommodations or accessible media for this meeting should notify the Board Secretary's Office 48 hours prior to the meeting at (408) 321-5680 or e-mail: board.secretary@vta.org, TDD (408) 321-2330. VTA's Homepage is located on the Web at: <http://www.vta.org/>.

All reports for items on the open meeting agenda are available for review in the Board Secretary's Office, 3331 North First Street, San Jose, California, (408) 321-5680, the Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday prior to the meeting. This information is available on VTA's website at <http://www.vta.org/> and also at the meeting.

**NOTE: THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS MAY ACCEPT, REJECT OR MODIFY
ANY ACTION RECOMMENDED ON THIS AGENDA.**



Date: October 8, 2008
 Current Meeting: October 16, 2008
 Board Meeting: November 6, 2008

BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
 Congestion Management Program & Planning Committee

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief CMA Officer, John Ristow

SUBJECT: Lifeline Transportation Program -- Cycle 2

Policy-Related Action: No

Government Code Section 84308 Applies: No

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve the programming of FY 2009/2011 Lifeline Transportation Program funds as described in the memorandum.

BACKGROUND:

In 2005, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) established the interim Lifeline Transportation Program to fund projects that result in improved mobility for low-income residents of the nine San Francisco Bay Area counties.

On January 5, 2006, the VTA Board of Directors authorized the General Manager to execute a Cooperative Agreement with the County of Santa Clara to develop and administer the Lifeline Transportation Program in Santa Clara County. This agreement established a Joint Lifeline Transportation Committee (JLTC) to review and recommend projects to the VTA Board and the County Board of Supervisors.

In June 2008, MTC evaluated the interim Lifeline Program and resolved to continue the program. For the second cycle Call for Projects, the Lifeline Transportation Program is funded through the federal Job Access & Reverse Commute (JARC), State Transit Assistance (STA) and Proposition 1B sources. Approximately \$15,800,000 is available for funding projects in Santa Clara County for the 3-year period 2009-2011. Of that amount, \$57,977 was approved by the Board of Directors on September 4, 2008 for the Small Urbanized Area from the JARC funds.

DISCUSSION:

VTA and the County of Santa Clara issued the Lifeline Transportation Program Cycle 2 General

Call for Projects on July 28, 2008. The Santa Clara County Department of Social Services hosted a bidder's workshop on August 15, 2008. The deadline for submitting applications was September 5, 2008.

Project sponsors submitted eight projects with a total grant request of \$8,647,140. County and VTA staff determined two proposals, from the Emergency Housing Consortium (EHC Lifebuilders) and the Society of St. Vincent de Paul respectively, did not meet the program criteria for minimum project size. The sponsors were notified in writing and the proposals removed from further consideration. The remaining six proposals were provided to the JLTC for review and evaluation on the guidelines in MTC Resolution 3860.

On September 24, 2008, JLTC met to review and score the projects. Four projects are recommended for funding. The recommendations are shown in Attachment A. A brief description of each project recommended for full or partial funding is shown in Attachment B. The remaining two projects, submitted by VTA, did not receive the minimum score of 73.5 points out of a possible 105 and are not recommended at this time. VTA submitted the proposals in anticipation of needs being identified by the East San Jose Community Transportation Plan which is currently under development. When the plan is complete, VTA will refine these proposals and resubmit them under a future funding cycle.

Proposal #3, OUTREACH's Family Transportation Services program, is only recommended for partial funding. The project has significant merit. However, some elements of it are only eligible for JARC funding. Some \$1,003,122 in eligible JARC funding requests were received. Unfortunately only \$574,299 in JARC funds are available. Proposal #3 was the lowest ranked of the JARC requests and could only be partially covered. The project is still viable at the reduced amount.

Staff requests that the VTA Board of Directors approve the funding for these projects. Project submittals are due to MTC on November 30, 2008.

Staff's recommendation leaves a significant amount of money unprogrammed. While the funds are in no immediate danger of being lost to Santa Clara County, the JLTC has recommended that VTA and the County proceed immediately with a supplemental call for projects for the remaining funds. All eligible proposals resulting from the supplemental call will be brought to the VTA Board at its' December meeting.

ALTERNATIVES:

The VTA Board may request other programming alternatives. Any change in programming alternatives requires the County Board of Supervisors also approve the alternatives.

FISCAL IMPACT:

This action will make \$4,558,299 in grant funds available to four projects. VTA is the sponsor of one of these projects.

Prepared by: Celeste Fiore

**Attachment A
2009-2011 Lifeline Transportation Program Recommendations**

Proposal # Proposer Program Name	Program Description	Grant Request	Local Match	TOTAL SCORE (Max 105 Points)	Recommended JARC	Recommended STA	Recommended Prop 1B	Total Grant Recommendation
Proposal #2: Family & Children Services Ways to Work Family Loan Program	Proposal provides auto loans to low-income families, along with financial education and comprehensive case management.	\$370,846 (JARC)	\$370,846	104	\$ 370,846	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 370,846
Proposal #3: Outreach Family Transportation Services Program	Program offers individualized transportation plans with flexibility to offer rides for entire family (Guaranteed Ride and LIFT), repair of personal vehicles (JumpStart), and Reach Out.	\$632,276 (JARC) \$1,200,000 (STA)	\$1,453,796	101.5	\$ 203,453	\$ 1,200,000	\$ -	\$ 1,403,453
Proposal #4: Outreach Senior Transportation Program	Program provides older, minority seniors with a menu of transportation options such as demand-response rides, individualized transportation plans, volunteer driver program.	\$1,600,000 (STA)	\$798,000	102.5	\$ -	\$ 1,600,000	\$ -	\$ 1,600,000
Proposal #8: Santa Clara VTA Gilroy Community Bus Routes	Improve Community Bus Service on Lines 14 & 17 in Gilroy by operating as two-way routes.	\$1,184,000 (STA)	\$296,000	94.75	\$ -	\$ 1,184,000	\$ -	\$ 1,184,000
<i>Not Recommended</i>								\$ -
Proposal #6: Santa Clara VTA ADA improved bus stop amenities	Identify, repair and upgrade bus stops, pedestrian and ADA access to improve their transit experience.	\$1,756,000 (STA)	\$439,000	54.25	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Proposal #7: Santa Clara VTA East San Jose improved Community bus service	Implement improved Communit Bus Service in East San Jose, a Community of Concern.	\$1,904,018 (STA)	\$476,004	57.5	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Proposal #5: Society of St.Vincent de Paul SVDP Transit Passes	Program to provide transit passes to homeless & low-income of the San Jose Parish.	\$40,000 (JARC)	\$40,000	N/A	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Proposal #1: EHC LifeBuilders Suttle Service to One-Stop Prevention Center	Purchase two passenger vans for shuttle service among Gilroy's Cold Weather Shelter, Sunnyvale Armories and One-Stop Homeless Prevention Center	\$56,000 (JARC)	\$14,000	N/A	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total		\$8,647,140.00	\$530,004	N/A	\$ 574,299	\$ 3,984,000	\$ -	\$ 4,558,299

Attachment B

Description of Lifeline Transportation Program Projects Recommended for Full or Partial Funding

Proposal # 2: Family & Children Services Ways to Work Family Loan Program

This is a continuation of the program funded during the interim Lifeline Transportation Program. It funds auto purchase and repair loans for qualified low-income individuals supporting at least one dependent child. The program is available to families throughout the county with increased outreach and services for targeted “Communities of Concern”. In addition to low-interest loans, the program offers financial education, lender services to help repair problematic credit histories and access to Family & Children Services’ broad range of health and human services programs.

Proposal # 3: Outreach Family Transportation Services Program

This is a continuation of the program funded during the interim Lifeline Transportation Program. The program addresses the transportation needs for CalWORKs and other low-income families that have been identified in the County’s Welfare-to-Work Transportation Planning Project. It provides a comprehensive, no-cost menu of transportation solutions including short-term, door-to-door rides to work, training, school and/or support services; preparation of individualized transportation plans that utilize public transit; repair of personal vehicles.

Proposal # 4: Outreach Senior Transportation Program

This is a continuation of the program funded during the interim Lifeline Transportation Program. The program addresses the issues of affordability and availability of transportation for County seniors. It provides door-to-door taxi/non-taxi rides; subsidized ADA paratransit service rider’s fares; individualized transportation plans; financial and technical support for Volunteer Driver Programs serving seniors. The program targets low-income seniors, but all residents age 65 and older are eligible to receive program benefits.

Proposal # 8: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Gilroy Community Bus Routes

This program will provide shuttle service from existing fixed-route bus service to specific medical/healthcare, shopping, residential and social services facilities in Gilroy. Although the services focus on serving low-income residents in Gilroy, it will be available to the entire community. The existing service operates a large one-way loop resulting in inconvenient and infrequent service to most social services. The program proposes to provide two-way service, operating every 30 minutes for line 17 and every 20 minutes for line 14.



Date: October 6, 2008
 Current Meeting: October 16, 2008
 Board Meeting: November 6, 2008

BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
 Congestion Management Program & Planning Committee

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief CMA Officer, John Ristow

SUBJECT: Adopt Bicycle Expenditure Plan (BEP) Evaluation Criteria

Policy-Related Action: Yes

Government Code Section 84308 Applies: No

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt the revised Bicycle Expenditure Plan (BEP) Evaluation Criteria.

BACKGROUND:

The long range transportation plan for Santa Clara County, Valley Transportation Plan (VTP) 2035, is currently being updated and is scheduled for adoption in December, 2008. At its August 2008 meeting the VTA Board of Directors adopted an update to the Santa Clara Countywide Bicycle Plan (CBP). The CBP identifies approximately \$800 million of potential bicycle projects, and provides the basis for moving projects into the Bicycle Expenditure Plan (BEP).

The BEP is the funding mechanism for planned bicycle projects. It is expected that the BEP will have capacity to add new projects as part of the VTP 2035 scheduled for adoption in December 2008, and the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) scheduled for adoption in March 2009. The BEP is governed by a set of policies adopted by the VTA Board of Directors (BOD), including criteria for evaluating and scoring potential bicycle projects to include in the BEP. The current BEP Evaluation Criteria were last adopted/revised by the BOD in December 2004.

At its May meeting, the BPAC received a presentation of the current BEP Evaluation Criteria to re-acquaint them with the BEP project evaluation process. At its July meeting, the BPAC was presented with an analysis of the existing criteria and staff received comment on a proposed approach to revise the criteria. In August and September, this approach was then presented to the Technical Advisory Committee subcommittee, which concurred with staff recommendations.

DISCUSSION

The existing BEP Evaluation Criteria are in need of revision in order to be consistent with the 2008 Countywide Bicycle Plan; the Bicycle Technical Guidelines (BTG) adopted by the Board in December 2007; and with other changed background conditions.

The proposed new BEP Evaluation Criteria are presented in Attachment A. The existing BEP Evaluation Criteria are presented in Attachment B. The existing Evaluation Criteria are composed of three “screens”; four major criteria worth 10 points each; and four minor criteria, which collectively total 10 points. The current maximum total is 50 points and staff is recommending an increase to a total of 100 points. The changes between the proposed and existing criteria are described below.

Existing and Proposed Evaluation Criteria

Screening Criteria

The existing BEP Evaluation Criteria have three initial screening criteria, for which up to three points may be deducted. Staff recommends eliminating the point-deduction method and instead using these criteria to establish either eligibility criteria for BEP funds, or be incorporated into criteria that receive points, as described below.

Existing Screen 1 - County / Regional Network- Is the project included in at least one of the following: Regional Bicycle Network or Plan; Cross-County Bicycle Corridors (CCBC); Santa Clara County Parks Trails Master Plan; Bay Trail; or Short Range Transit Plan?

Evaluation and Recommendation - The Regional Bicycle Plan contains a subset of the Countywide Bicycle Plan which now renders these screening criteria redundant. The 2008 Santa Clara Countywide Bicycle Plan includes the Bay Trail, as well as all regional and sub regional trails from the SCC Parks Trails Master Plan. Staff recommends that this screen be replaced with a pre-qualification criterion that all BEP projects be included in the CBP 2008 (all projects in the CBP are by definition considered to have countywide significance) or otherwise be shown to have regional or countywide significance.

Existing Screen 2 - Governing Board Resolution- Is there a Governing Board resolution authorizing the project application with a commitment to a 20% minimum local matching (non-BEP) funds? A “no” response is a three point deduction.

Evaluation and Recommendation - Comments received suggested this was premature for projects in a 30-year expenditure plan and this requirement is considered more a measure of project readiness. Therefore it is recommended that this be added to the project readiness criterion.

Existing Screen 3 - Standards- Will the project conform to VTA Bicycle Technical Standards; Caltrans Highway Design Manual Chapter 1000; Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD); Santa Clara County Parks Uniform Inter-jurisdictional Trail Design; Use and Management Guidelines; or other state/national guidelines as appropriate? A “no” response is a three point deduction.

Evaluation and Recommendation - All projects must conform to state and federal standards to receive state and federal funds, so it is better as an eligibility criterion. Staff recommendation is to eliminate Screen 3 and create:

- a) One eligibility criterion, that references only federal and state standards; and
- b) Two bonus-points criteria that reference only the VTA BTG, and use adherence to BTG as incentives whereby projects receive more points if they adhere to BTG optimal criteria.

New Recommendation Bonus points criteria (10 points each):

- a) For bike lanes, shoulders, bike paths, bike bridge and tunnel projects, will the width meet the optimal widths of the VTA BTG?
- b) Will the project be open for transportation purposes 24 hours a day?

Project Evaluation Criteria

The existing BEP Evaluation Criteria have eight criteria; the maximum each criterion can earn varies from one to ten points. Staff recommends revising and consolidating these into six criteria, as described below.

Existing Criterion 1 (10 points): *Gap closures in sidewalk or regional bicycle network serving mobility needs; addresses barrier to completing trip, increases convenience.*

Evaluation and Recommendation - Retain this criterion but provide more guidance and definition of a “gap” and the way it is measured (see Attachment A). Increase maximum number of points to 20 so that it remains 20% of total points: 20 out of 100, compared to 10 out of 50.

Existing Criterion 2 (10 points): *Access to schools, regional transit, lifeline transit or to/within regional activity center.*

Evaluation and Recommendation - Retain as is.

Existing Criterion 3 (10 points): *Safety*

Evaluation and Recommendation - Retain as is, but increase maximum number of points to 20 so it remains 20% of total points: 20 out of 100, compared to 10 out of 50.

Existing Criterion 4 (10 points): *Community Support*

Evaluation - The existing high, medium and low ratings all include the concept of being in a local community-based plan, which does not distinguish between the three levels. This criterion also focuses on established agency efforts but does not incorporate grass roots support as well as communities of concern.

Recommendation - Break this into two criteria with 10 points each:

- a) *Revised Criterion 4A (10 points): Community / Grassroots Support: Is the project supported or sponsored by a grassroots or a Non-Government Organization (NGO) as expressed by letters of support or other signs, and/or is it in a Community of Concern?*
- b) *Revised Criterion 4B (10 points): Local Agency Support: Is the project in a local, county or*

community-based plan, such as adopted Bicycle Plans, General Plans, Capital Improvement programs, Specific Plans, Park/Trail Master Plans, and/ or does it have the Local BAC endorsement?

Existing Criterion 5 (4 points): *Project Readiness*

Evaluation and Recommendation - The BEP has funded projects at all project phases from feasibility studies to environmental clearance to design and construction. It is recommended to consolidate Existing Criterion 5 with Existing Criterion 6 and use “Local Match” as a measure of “project readiness”.

Existing Criterion 6 (3 points): *Local Match (% of project cost) Project can commit over x% of the total project cost.*

Evaluation and Recommendation - Consolidate with old Screen 2 and Criterion 5, re-title to Local Match/Project Readiness and set maximum points to 15.

New Criterion 5 (15 Points): *Local Match/Project Readiness*
Keep same text as Existing Criterion 6.

Existing Criterion 7 (2 points): *Regional Significance: Demonstrates multi-jurisdictional cooperation; project is innovative; has potential to be replicated elsewhere; demonstrates regional significance.*

Evaluation and Recommendation - “Regional significance” is now covered under the pre-qualification criterion. It is recommended that the last three words be deleted from this criterion, and it be re-titled “Cooperation and Innovation”, and be worth 5 points.

Existing Criterion 8 (1 point): *Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) Endorsement*

Evaluation and Recommendation - Delete this criterion since it has been incorporated into the revised Criterion 4B.

ALTERNATIVES:

The Board may choose to revise some or all of the criteria.

FISCAL IMPACT:

There is no fiscal impact as a result of this action.

Prepared by: Michelle DeRobertis

BEP Evaluation Criteria - VTP 2035

Proposed New Criteria	Ranking and Description	Points
Eligibility Criteria: Regional or Countywide significance?	Is project in the 2008 Countywide Bicycle Plan? If not explain its regional or countywide significance.	na
Eligibility Criteria: State and Federal Standards?	Will the project conform to state and federal standards for bikeways, i.e. HDM Chapter 1000?	na
1. Gap Closure	Compare distance using nearest alternate route of similar type with distance with project. Score 1 point for each 0.25 additional distance up to a maximum of 20 pts.	0-20
2. Access to schools, regional transit**, lifeline transit** or to/within regional activity center***	<i>High: Project is specifically designed to significantly improve access to a destination. Project will be within 1/2 mile in actual walking/biking distance from destination.</i>	8- 10pts
	<i>Medium: Project will generally enhance access to a destination. Project will be within 1 mile in actual walking/biking distance from destination.</i>	4-7 pts
	<i>Low: Project improves upon limited existing access. Project will be beyond 1 mile in actual walking/biking distance from destination.</i>	0-3 pts
3. Safety	<i>High: Project will address a demonstrated safety issue (e.g. collision statistics are high). Project will address safety concern with a proven or demonstrated countermeasure. Project will help bicyclists (i) cross a road with high ADT/high traffic speeds, and/or (ii) provide bicyclists a parallel route to a road with high ADT/high traffic speeds.</i>	13- 20pts
	<i>Med: Project will improve a situation with some safety issues (e.g. some reported collisions, conflicts, near-misses, or evidence of high vehicle traffic volume or speed). Project will help bicyclists (i) cross a road with medium ADT/high traffic speeds, and/or (ii) provide bicyclists a parallel route to a road with medium ADT/medium traffic speeds.</i>	7-12 pts
	<i>Low: Project will generally improve safety, even though there are no known problems. Project will reduce exposure/risk of conflicts between motor-vehicles and bike/pedestrians.</i>	0-6 pts
4A. Community / Grassroots Support	Is the project supported or sponsored by a grassroots or a Non-Government Organization (NGO) as expressed by letters of support or other signs, and/or is it in a Community of Concern?	0-10
4B. Local Agency Support and Planning	Is the project in a local, county or community-based plan, such as adopted Bicycle Plans, General Plans, Capital Improvement programs, Specific Plans, Park/Trail Master Plans, and/ or does it have the Local BAC endorsement?	0-10
5. Local Match / Project Readiness	Project can commit over 60% of the total project cost from non-BEP sources; 15 pts.	0-15
	Project can commit between 41-60% of total project cost from non-BEP sources. 10 pts.	
	Project can commit betw. 21% -40% of total project cost from non-BEP sources 5 pts.	
6. Cooperation, Innovation	Demonstrates multi-jurisdictional cooperation****; project is innovative; has potential to be replicated elsewhere;	0-5
BONUS		
7. BTG	For Bike lane, bike path, bike bridge and /or shoulder projects, will the width meet the optimal widths of the BTG	0-10
8. BTG	Will the project be open for transportation purposes 24 hours a day?	0-10
TOTAL		100
* Barriers include major arterials, freeways, major transit facilities, railroad tracks, creek/streams, etc. .		
** Regional transit is transit serving a regional activity center. Lifeline transit serves low-income, transit-dependent communities.		
*** Regional activity centers include universities, hospitals, major commercial districts, major employment centers, central business districts and major public venues..		
**** Jurisdictions/agencies include public agencies, special districts, non-government organizations, non-profit organizations, transit, etc.		

Evaluation Criteria for Bicycle Projects

VTA Board Adopted 12/9/04

<i>Focus Area</i>	<i>Ranking and Description</i>	<i>Points</i>
A SCREEN: County/ Regional Network	Is the project included in at least one of the following: Regional Bicycle Network or Plan, Cross-County Bicycle Corridors, Santa Clara County Parks Trails Master Plan, Bay Trail, Short Range Transit Plan?	(A "no" answer will be a 3 pt deduction)
B SCREEN: Governing Board Resolution	Is there a Governing Board resolution authorizing the project application with a committed or commitment to a minimum 20% local matching (non-BEP) funds?	
C SCREEN: Standards	Will the project conform to VTA Bicycle Technical Standards, Caltrans Highway Design Manual Chapter 1000, MUTCD, Santa Clara County Parks Uniform Interjurisdictional Trail Design, Use and Management Guidelines, or other state/national guidelines as appropriate?	
1 Gap closures in sidewalk or regional bicycle network serving mobility needs. Addresses barrier* to completing trip. Increases convenience.	High: Project provides means to overcome a barrier e.g. bridge over freeway, expressway, waterway or rail line) or eliminates a gap (e.g. a new bike lane or a new sidewalk in a corridor without facilities) where no nearby facility exists.	8-10
	Med: Project reduces consequences of an existing barrier or gap to provide more direct non-motorized travel where limited or inferior alternatives exist.	4-7
	Low: Project extends an existing pedestrian facility or regional bicycle route (e.g. bike lane or sidewalk), working towards a gap closure, but not eliminating it.	0-3
2 Access to schools, regional transit**, lifeline transit** or to/within regional activity center***	High: Project is specifically designed to significantly improve access to a destination. Project will be within 1/2 mile in actual walking/biking distance from destination.	8-10
	Medium: Project will generally enhance access to a destination. Project will be within 1 mile in actual walking/biking distance from destination.	4-7
	Low: Project improves upon limited existing access. Project will be beyond 1 mile in actual walking/biking distance from destination.	0-3
<p>* Barriers include major arterials, freeways, major transit facilities, railroad tracks, creek/streams, etc. A substandard or deficient facility is generally considered a "medium" gap.</p> <p>** Regional transit is transit serving a regional activity center. Lifeline transit serves low-income, transit-dependent communities.</p> <p>*** Regional activity centers include universities, hospitals, major commercial districts, major employment centers, central business districts and major public venues. Priority should be given to projects serving utilitarian trip purposes when possible. Pedestrian access to or within a regional activity center will be eligible for funding. Bicycle access to or within a regional activity center is only eligible if it is included on the regional bicycle network.</p>		

Evaluation Criteria for Bicycle Projects

VTA Board Adopted 12/9/04

<i>Focus Area</i>	<i>Ranking and Description</i>	<i>Points</i>
3 Safety	High: Project will address a demonstrated safety issue (e.g. collision statistics are high). Project will address safety concern with a proven or demonstrated countermeasure. Project will help bicyclists (i) cross a road with high ADT/high traffic speeds, and/or (ii) provide bicyclists a parallel route to a road with high ADT/high traffic speeds.	8-10
	Med: Project will improve a situation with some safety issues (e.g. some reported collisions, conflicts, near-misses, or evidence of high vehicle traffic volume or speed). Project will help bicyclists (i) cross a road with medium ADT/high traffic speeds, and/or (ii) provide bicyclists a parallel route to a road with medium ADT/medium traffic speeds.	4-7
	Low: Project will generally improve safety, even though there are no known problems. Project will reduce exposure/risk of conflicts between motor-vehicles and bike/pedestrians.	0-3
4 Community Support	High: Project has strong documented community and neighborhood support. Letters of support OR minutes indicating actions taken in support of project provided. Projects are included in a local, county or community-based plan, such as adopted Bicycle Plans, General Plans, Capital Improvement programs, Specific Plans, Park/Trail Master Plans, etc.	8-10
	Med: Project has some community & neighborhood support. Projects are included in a local, county or community-based plan, such as adopted Bicycle Plans, General Plans, Capital Improvement programs, Specific Plans, Park/Trail Master Plans, etc.	4-7
	Low: Community outreach will be completed as part of the project, but little or none done to date. Projects are included in a local, county or community-based plan, such as adopted Bicycle Plans, General Plans, Capital Improvement programs, Specific Plans, Park/Trail Master Plans, etc.	0-3
5 Project readiness		
(a) PLANNING	A feasibility study, alternatives analysis, project study report, or master plan (a) has not been started: 0 pts., (b) is underway: 0.5 pts., (c) completed: 1 pt.	0-1
(b) ENVIRONMENT	The environmental document (NEPA/CEQA) for the project (a) has not been started: 0 pts., (b) is underway: 0.5 pts., (c) has been completed: 1 pt.	0-1
(c) DESIGN	Design work (a) has not been started: 0 pts., (b) is underway: 0.5 pts., (c) is at or beyond 65% PSE: 1 pt.	0-1
(d) ROW	ROW process has not been started: 0 pts; ROW process has not started, but is all under public ownership: 0.5 pts; ROW has been secured: 1 pt.	0-1

Evaluation Criteria for Bicycle Projects

VTA Board Adopted 12/9/04

<i>Focus Area</i>	<i>Ranking and Description</i>	<i>Points</i>
6 Local match	Project can commit over 60% of the total project cost (including the 11.47% required match for federal BEP funds) from non-BEP sources	3
	Project can commit between >40% and 60% of the total project cost (including the 11.47% required match for federal BEP funds) from non-BEP sources	2
	Project can commit between > 20% and 40% of the total project cost (including the 11.47% required match for federal BEP funds) from non-BEP sources	1
7 Regional Significance Bonus	Demonstrates multi-jurisdictional cooperation****; project is innovative; has potential to be replicated elsewhere; demonstrates regional significance	0-2
8 BAC endorsement	The local Bicycle Advisory Committee has endorsed the project for submittal to the Countywide Bicycle Program	0-1
Maximum Total:		50
**** Jurisdictions include city/county public agencies, special districts, non-profit organizations, transit, etc.		



Date: October 6, 2008
 Current Meeting: October 16, 2008
 Board Meeting: N/A

BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
 Congestion Management Program & Planning Committee

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief CMA Officer, John Ristow

SUBJECT: Joint Development Policy - Discuss Conceptual Modifications

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

The Board of Directors approved the Joint Development Policy (JDP) and Developer Selection Process at its January 2005 meeting. Subsequently, a Board workshop on Joint Development was held in January 2007, and the JDP was amended at the Board's May 2007 meeting based on input from this workshop.

Over the past few years, VTA has pursued joint development on several agency-owned properties, including most recently the West San Carlos (WSC) site in San Jose, which is advancing with the Board's approval of a sale agreement at its May 2008 meeting. The WSC site was the first to be approved under the JDP procedures. Approval of the WSC site offered valuable insight about the existing JDP and revealed several areas where the framework may be improved. As joint development revenues are included in VTA's long-range financial assumptions, the JDP must set forth a realistic and practical framework that maximizes the long-term utility and financial success of VTA's real estate assets.

DISCUSSION:

At the October meeting staff will revisit the existing JDP framework with committee members. In particular, staff will discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the existing JDP and review conceptual modifications to the JDP where necessary. Staff will also highlight the concurrent tasks being undertaken to assess the joint development potential of VTA's real estate assets and set them on a consensus-driven development path. To facilitate the discussion on this item, staff will provide a presentation to committee members at the meeting.

Prepared By: Bijal Patel



Date: October 7, 2008
 Current Meeting: October 16, 2008
 Board Meeting: November 6, 2008

BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
 Congestion Management Program & Planning Committee

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Acting Chief Engineering & Construction Officer, Mark S. Robinson

SUBJECT: Amendment to Contract S07065 with URS Corporation for Phase II, Final Plans, Specifications, and Estimates for the US 101 Auxiliary Lanes Project – SR 85 to Embarcadero Road

Policy-Related Action: No

Government Code Section 84308 Applies: Yes

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the General Manager to: (1) negotiate and amend Contract S07065 with URS Corporation to provide Phase II, final plans, specifications, and estimates (PS&E) services for the US 101 Auxiliary Lanes Project - State Route 85 to Embarcadero Road, and increase the value of the original \$2,500,000 contract ceiling by \$6,350,000 for a new total contract value \$8,850,000, and, (2) extend the contract term by 24 months.

BACKGROUND:

On November 6, 2006 California voters approved Proposition 1B, a bond measure which will provide \$19.9 billion for transportation improvements in California through 12 programs. One of the programs is the Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA), which makes \$4.5 billion available to roadway projects on a competitive basis to expand roadways, enhance operations, and improve travel times in high-congestion travel corridors.

On February 28, 2007, the California Transportation Commission (CTC) selected three projects in Santa Clara County and provided approximately \$187 million in CMIA grant funds, including \$84.9 million to the US 101 Auxiliary Lanes Project from State Route 85 to Embarcadero Road. The CMIA Program has imposed required project delivery milestone dates for sponsors, with July 2009 as the date established for this project to complete the environmental phase, February 2011 for right of way acquisition and June 2011 for final design. The purpose of the project is to improve the overall operations on US 101 over an approximately 3.2-mile segment, adding

auxiliary lanes in each direction along US 101 from State Route 85 to Embarcadero Road in Santa Clara County. This project complements the adjoining project in San Mateo County, adding auxiliary lanes between the Embarcadero Road and March Road. The estimated total cost of the project is \$102.3 million. Attachment A provides an overview map of the project area.

On June 7, 2007, based on the previously approved list of VTA Highway Program Planning and Engineering Consultants, the VTA Board of Directors approved and authorized the General Manager to negotiate and execute a contract with URS Corporation to provide Phase I, preliminary engineering and environmental planning services for the US 101 Auxiliary Lanes Project - State Route 85 to Embarcadero Road, for a total contract value not to exceed \$2,500,000, and an initial contract term through December 31, 2009. Contract No. S07065 was subsequently issued to URS Corporation on September 6, 2007 as a firm fixed price agreement in the amount of \$2,492,189. Phase I design work on Contract No. S07065 is currently proceeding and anticipated to be complete by Summer 2009. With the scope of work defined, the project is prepared to move into the final design and right of way concurrent phases of work.

DISCUSSION:

The VTA staff recommendation is to authorize the General Manager to negotiate and amend Contract S07065 with URS Corporation to begin the right of way engineering and final design, including development of plans, specifications, and estimates for the project. The services include completion of final design, preparation of permits and right of way certification documents and preparation of the construction bid package, conforming to the milestone dates noted in the signed project agreement. VTA staff recommends amending the existing contract with URS, based on the quality of the work performed to date for the Phase I project scope of work.

The requested budget increase of \$6,350,000, which includes \$150,000 of budget for additional scope of work necessary to complete Phase I of the efforts, as well as \$6,200,000 of budget for Phase 2 final design and right of way scope, will result in a revised firm fixed price contract amount of \$8,850,000. The contract scope of services for this phase provides over 52,000 hours of design service from the consultant team. The recommended contract amendment will extend the term 24 months.

ALTERNATIVES:

The VTA Board could choose not to move forward with this amended contract at this time. However, this could cause a delay in the CMIA project schedule and milestone delivery dates stated in the Agreement, and potentially jeopardize the State CMIA funding.

As an alternative, the VTA Board could direct staff to select another design firm to fulfill the services needed to complete the project. The selection of another firm would result in delays in the completion of the project which could jeopardize the schedule and milestone delivery dates, and potentially the funding.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Budget appropriation for this project is included in the VTA Highway Improvements Fund Capital Budget adopted by the Board of Directors on June 7, 2007. Funding for this contract is included in the 2008 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) approved by the Board of Directors on December 13, 2007 and adopted by CTC on March 15, 2007. All Project funding is derived from local, state and federal grant funds previously dedicated and made available to the project.

SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISE (SBE) PARTICIPATION:

Based on limited subcontracting opportunities, a Small Business Enterprise (SBE) goal of 15% has been established for this contract. The contractor has committed to 15% SBE participation on this contract which is recommended to remain in effect for the amendment.

Prepared by: Lam Trinh, Project Manager

ATTACHMENT B**Listing of Recommended Prime and Sub-Consultants****US 101 Auxiliary Lanes Project (SR 85 to Embarcadero) PS&E Phase**

	Consultant Firm	Contact Person	Location
Prime	URS Corporation	Ramsey Hissen	San Jose
Sub-Consultant	WRECO, Inc.	Han-Bin Liang	Walnut Creek
	Haygood and Associates	Leah Haygood	Albany
	Y&C Transportation	Kin Chan	Sacramento
	V&A Consulting	Glenn Willson	Oakland

Other Vendors (TBD)

Geotechnical drilling vendor

Hazardous waste drilling vendor

Geotechnical lab test vendor

Utility potholing vendor



Date: October 7, 2008

Current Meeting: October 16, 2008

Board Meeting: November 6, 2008

BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
Congestion Management Program & Planning Committee

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief CMA Officer, John Ristow

SUBJECT: High Occupancy Toll (HOT) Lanes - Public Outreach

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

The Silicon Valley High Occupancy Toll (HOT) Lanes Program (referred to as the Express Lanes Program) has been under development since 2003 when the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) Board of Directors' Ad Hoc Financial Stability Committee requested a presentation from staff on HOT lanes and their potential benefits and opportunities in Santa Clara County.

The Silicon Valley Express Lanes Program (Program) has been undertaken to provide long-term mobility benefits and to provide another funding stream for transportation improvements. Specifically, the primary objectives of the Program are the following:

1. Provide congestion relief through more effective use of existing roadways;
2. Provide commuters with a new mobility option; and
3. Provide a new funding source for transportation improvements including public transit.

DISCUSSION:

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide an update on the most recent activities of the Program relating to public education and outreach. This memorandum is a continuation of the project team's efforts to keep the VTA Board updated on the Program's progress. At the December 2008 Board meeting, the project team will be seeking approval from Board on an implementation plan for the Express Lanes Program.

Update on Express Lanes Program Outreach

The objectives for the Program outreach and opinion research are as follows:

1. To give the general public, potential Express Lanes users and key community and project stakeholders an opportunity to provide comments on the Program.
2. To explore how public opinion toward HOV and HOT lanes affects the proposed Program.
3. To determine the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats facing the Program.
4. To determine how best to educate the general public about the Program while formulating an outreach plan that best addresses the areas of interest to the public, project stakeholders and elected officials.

Among the work completed to date are as follows:

- Interviews with project stakeholders
- Focus Groups with 42 carpoolers and solo drivers
- Presentations to the VTA Advisory and Standing Committees
- Presentation to VTA and City staff, and professional organizations

There are several other outreach efforts that are planned and ongoing to provide information and get feedback. This includes:

- A public opinion survey with 500 SR 85 and US 101 users
- Public open houses
- Presentation to business communities and environmental groups
- Provide information materials at public events (Fact sheet and FAQ's)
- Interactive website providing program information, on-line survey and program update database
- Project video for SR 85 and US 101

This planned and ongoing outreach will be used to verify the initial findings from interviews and focus group survey. These results will help further shape the education and outreach programs to obtain greater general acceptance for the Program. This will form the basis for the Outreach Plan that will be used throughout the course of the implementation of the Program.

The following are key findings covering broad areas from the focus group surveys and the interviews with stakeholders:

What is the Congestion Level in Santa Clara County?

While residents have a good feel for where the traffic hot spots are in the county, views were mixed on the current state of the problem. There was skepticism about growth projections, however most agreed congestion would increase and a solution was needed.

Will Residents Accept Congestion Pricing?

Results from outreach show residents in this area are well prepared for congestion pricing and would easily understand the concept. Other key points include:

- The public is able to grasp a great deal of complicated and technical information in a relatively short period of time.
- A strong majority of carpool lane users stated they would likely use the Express lanes in the future.
- Successful examples from other areas are important to demonstrate how congestion

pricing works and can benefit commuters in Santa Clara County.

Where Does the Money Go?

This was the most important concern of both stakeholders and the public. Skepticism and distrust of government at all levels including VTA's ability to ensure the funds will remain and be reinvested within the corridor was generally raised. This concern remained despite the participants being told that the legislation bill stipulates the revenue to be reinvested within the corridor. The focus group participants highlighted that VTA can build support if the public is convinced that revenue:

- Are effectively spent on additional improvements in the corridor including public transit.
- Are overseen by a citizen's watchdog committee or independent auditing committee to ensure proper use of revenues.

What about Equity Implications?

Focus groups showed that concerns about equity could be mitigated through a policy that directs that revenues be spent on improving transit service in the corridor. This approach proved very successful in San Diego on the I-15 Express Lanes. Furthermore, experience shows people from all walks of life can obtain access to the lanes through ridesharing and improved transit.

Moderate and low-income solo drivers can choose to obtain a transponder and use the lanes when they need reliable travel (i.e., to pick-up a child at day care and avoid stiff overtime penalties that far exceed the toll). Surveys across the country have shown that all income levels support and use Express Lanes on an as-needed basis.

Are Express Lanes Double Taxation?

The initial outreach effort showed that as taxpayers, residents feel they have already paid for the use of highways. By having to pay to use the Express Lanes, it is perceived they are paying for the road twice. There is also a feeling of economic inequity in that only wealthier drivers will be able to afford to use the road. The overriding issue here is that the majority of the public interviewed do not fully understand where transportation funding comes from, what it is used for, and why there is a pressing need to raise more money.

There was general support when it was highlighted that:

- Solo commuters choosing to pay a toll can access the lanes, which they cannot do now.
- The benefits of toll revenues being reinvested in the corridor to provide greater transportation options for all commuters.
- This is a better use of existing roadways and the toll amount would be less than the increase in taxes necessary to build and maintain additional lanes.

How Will Express Lane User Access Be Enforced?

The focus group indicated enforcement is a key factor in the success of the lanes and one that needs to be clearly understood. Many drivers questioned the ability to prevent "cheaters" from using the lanes. Although there was general consensus that the use of revenue to have additional California Highway Patrol (CHP) presence is helpful, it was still not clear to the group if the "cheaters" can be enforced and what the level of disruption would be to general traffic related to enforcement activities.

Are Express Lanes Safe?

Safety was a key factor mentioned at the focus group surveys. Some focus group participants felt that merging in and out of Express Lanes at designated locations could be dangerous. On the contrary, there were others who were more positive towards the striped buffer separation between the general purpose lane and Express Lane. There were others that thought drivers on Express Lanes should be protected when moving faster than other traffic on the roadway using a physical barrier. With no barrier, there is some concern that safety will be jeopardized if people do move in and out of the lanes by crossing the striped buffer.

What Are Other Major Challenges?

As mentioned earlier, the public is able to grasp a great deal of complicated and technical information in a relatively short period of time. However, there is a need to “educate” drivers to the “new” way of using Express Lanes. This includes:

- Explanation of how dynamic pricing works so that prospective users understand and believe it is designed to reduce congestion in all lanes and perhaps more importantly will ensure a reliable trip on Express Lanes.
- Description of how entry and exit to/from Express Lanes work. Communications materials should include maps, diagrams and other illustrations that clearly define the Express Lane access points that will be guided by signage and striping.
- While the use of technology was well received, it is important to educate how to use the FasTrak transponder.

What Was The Preferred Name For HOT Lanes?

“Express Lanes” was the name favored by most focus group participants. It is also the name that is being used by other HOT Lanes projects in this region namely the I-680 and I-580 Express Lanes projects.

Who is VTA?

The public is not generally aware of what VTA does or the purpose of the organization. Consideration should be given to initiating a concerted effort to elevate VTA’s profile in order to build public trust and gain the public and leadership support the organization needs as it implements the Express Lanes project along with other major initiatives in the future.

Summary

Results from the various reports indicate that the public will not have difficulty understanding the project, and once provided with information, they quickly grasp the idea and tend to be open to its possibilities. It is important that motorists need to be informed about physical roadway changes and reassured of safety. Strong, consistent communication will be the key to gaining approval.

Many community leaders already support VTA’s leadership and feel the organization is on the right track. However, it is important to continue to communicate the specifics of the Express Lanes Program because the general awareness about the Express Lanes Program is still at its infancy stage. While there is general agreement, even among carpoolers, that the carpool lanes are underutilized, most people have only a general idea of what is being proposed. Hence there is a need to continue to do outreach at every stage of the Program implementation to ensure

successful implementation.

Next Steps

VTA staff will be incorporating the research findings to implement comprehensive education and outreach efforts moving forward. Planned activities include stakeholder presentations, public open houses, and extensive media relations.

Prepared By: Murali Ramanujam/Russell Bell/Brandi Childress