



## **TRANSIT PLANNING & OPERATIONS COMMITTEE**

Thursday, September 18, 2003

### **MEETING RECORD**

#### **1. CALL TO ORDER**

The Regular Meeting of the Transit Planning and Operations (TP&O) Committee was called to order at 4:34 p.m. by Chairperson Valerio in Room 106, San Jose City Hall, 801 North First Street, San Jose, California.

#### **ROLL CALL**

##### **Members Present**

David Cortese, Vice Chairperson  
Dena Mossar  
Manuel Valerio, Chairperson  
Ken Yeager

##### **Members Absent**

Ron Gonzales  
Francis LaPoll

**A quorum was present.**

#### **2. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS**

There were no Public Presentations.

#### **3. ORDERS OF THE DAY**

There were no Orders of the Day.

### **CONSENT AGENDA**

#### **4. Minutes of August 21, 2003**

M/S/C (Mossar/Yeager) to approve the Minutes of August 21, 2003.

**NOTE:** M/S/C MEANS MOTION SECONDED AND CARRIED AND, UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED, THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

#### **5. T-Signal Replacement Project Award for the Tasman Light Rail Corridor**

M/S/C (Mossar/Yeager) to approve submitting a recommendation to the Board of Directors to authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Republic Electric, the lowest responsible bidder, in an amount of \$369,525 for furnishing and installation of new light emitting diode (LED) LRT signal modules assemblies with lens and train approaching symbol signs. This project is 80 percent federally funded.

**6. Parking Lot Power Sweeping Services**

M/S/C (Mossar/Yeager) to approve submitting a recommendation to the Board of Directors to authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Universal Sweeping Services, Inc., the lowest responsible and responsive bidder, for parking lot power sweeping services of VTA-owned parking lots in Santa Clara County for \$116,197 for a three-year term with two one-year extension options for \$40,685 in option year four and \$41,703 in option year five.

**7. Community Oriented Design Enhancements (CODE) Program Update – August - September 2003**

M/S/C (Mossar/Yeager) to receive and file the Community Oriented Design Enhancements (CODE) Program Update - August – September 2003.

**8. Report on the Capitol Light Rail Project for the Month of August 2003**

M/S/C (Mossar/Yeager) to receive and file the Report on the Capitol Light Rail Project for the Month of August 2003.

**9. Report on the Tasman East Light Rail Project for the Month of August 2003**

M/S/C (Mossar/Yeager) to receive and file the Report on the Tasman East Light Rail Project for the Month of August 2003.

**10. Report on the Vasona Light Rail Project for the Month of August 2003**

M/S/C (Mossar/Yeager) to receive and file the Report on the Vasona Light Rail Project for the Month of August 2003.

**11. Joint Powers Board Monthly Status Report**

M/S/C (Mossar/Yeager) to receive and file the Joint Powers Board Monthly Status Report.

**12. Committee for Transit Accessibility Report**

M/S/C (Mossar/Yeager) to receive and file the Committee for Transit Accessibility Report.

**13. Monthly Legislative Report**

M/S/C (Mossar/Yeager) to receive and file the Monthly Legislative Report.

**REGULAR AGENDA**

**14. Value Engineering and Technical Review Board Services for the Silicon Valley Rapid Transit (SVRT) Project**

Jack Collins, Chief Construction Officer, reported to move the BART to Silicon Valley Project forward, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) requires grantees to do formal Value Engineering (VE) at the end of conceptual and preliminary engineering.

Mr. Collins referred to the first phase of the contract and reported that VTA went through a consultant selection process. The consultants would be given the conceptual engineering documents prepared as part of the environmental process for the project and would do a formal review of the documents. The team usually consists of a variety of specialists in the transit industry, from civil engineering, electrical engineering, systems, etc. The team would look at the plans and would try to identify items where they think the project staff should further investigate for potential savings and in terms of cost reductions on the project.

Mr. Collins reported if the item is approved at the October 2, 2003 Board of Directors' Meeting, the team would start their formal review on conceptual engineering for the project in late October 2003, early November 2003 and submit a formal report to VTA around January 2004. VTA would then give the report to the preliminary engineering consultants on the project and the preliminary engineering consultants would start evaluating some of the recommendations submitted by the team.

Mr. Collins referred to the second phase of the contract and noted at the end of preliminary engineering, which would be approximately 18 to 24 months, the team would conduct another round of formal VE on the preliminary engineering product to see if there would be additional savings that VTA might investigate for the project.

Mr. Collins noted that the team would act as a peer-review team in terms of doing technical reviews on VTA's design concepts to make sure that the design concepts are sound as the project progresses.

Upon query of Vice Chairperson Cortese, Peter M. Cipolla, General Manager, noted that there is no timing conflict with the Minimum Operating Segment (MOS) exercise required by the FTA.

Member Mossar queried if the Board of Directors were to change direction or reprioritize projects in the upcoming planning process, would these dollars still be valuable dollars spent. She asked what if the Board of Directors voted to delay the BART Project and made some other project a higher priority. Mr. Collins noted if the project were delayed, the work product, which is to identify how you can save money in terms of the overall capital costs, is still a valuable product.

**M/S/C (Yeager/Cortese)** to approve on a vote of 3 ayes to 1 noe to 0 abstentions to submit a recommendation to the Board of Directors to authorize the General Manager to execute a three-year contract with Value Management Strategies, Inc. (VMS) for Value Engineering and Technical Review Board Services related to the SVRT Project in an amount not to exceed \$2,600,000. (Member Mossar opposed.)

**15. Bus Signal Priority Equipment Purchase Contract**

James R. Lightbody, Transit Planning & Development Deputy Director, reported that the item is to award a contract for bus signal priority equipment that would be installed in the traffic signal controllers along El Camino. He reported that VTA worked with Caltrans in terms of the design and implementation and noted that Caltrans would be installing the equipment.

Mr. Lightbody reported that the bids would be received the week of September 22, 2003, and a revised Board Memorandum would be forwarded to the Board of Directors. Mr. Cipolla noted that there would be no action taken on the item and the item would be forwarded to the Board of Directors at their October 2, 2003 Meeting.

Member Mossar queried about the expectation once the signals are in place and what is Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) going to look like on El Camino in Mountain View and Palo Alto. Mr. Lightbody noted the nature of the BRT Project is one of incremental improvements as funding allows and would be the next phase, which would allow the priority given to the signal. VTA would be able to move the buses through faster, because of special priority. Future phases that are not yet funded could allow for additional upgrades, improving the bus stops and shelters and information signs informing people when the bus would be arriving.

Member Mossar queried about funding for the renovation of the Palo Alto University Avenue Bus Transit Center. Mr. Collins reported that VTA went originally to the Historical Review Board and Architectural Review Board in Palo Alto and noted that

Stanford did not like the layout concept. VTA went back to the drawing boards and Stanford has now approved the concept designs on the Palo Alto Transit Center. Mr. Collins reported that VTA would be going back to the Historical Review Board and

Architectural Review Board the week of September 24, 2003 to get final approval. If approved, VTA would finish the final design and begin construction by next summer.

Upon query of Chairperson Valerio, Mr. Lightbody noted that the project time savings would be about 15 percent.

Upon query of Chairperson Valerio, Mr. Lightbody noted that the times savings would be about 15 percent.

**On order of Chairperson Valerio**, there being no objection, the Committee submitted without a recommendation to the Board of Directors to authorize the General Manager to execute a contract for supply and delivery of bus signal priority equipment for use in the Line 22 Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project.

#### **16. January 2004 Transit Service Reduction Plan**

Frank T. Martin, Chief Operating Officer, reported that in June 2003, the Board of Directors approved a two-year budget for FY 2003-2004 and 2004-2005 and it called for a 21 percent reduction in transit services to be implemented in October 2003. After deliberation of the Board of Directors the final decision was made to shift the 21 percent reduction in transit services from October 2003 to January 2004.

Mr. Martin reported that the Board of Directors directed staff to explore feasibility of limited or temporary use of future Measure A revenues to fund most, if not all the bus and light rail service reductions contained in the two-year budget. He reported that staff was further directed to return this time to the Board for review and action, in conformance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requirements, no later than September 2003.

Mr. Martin reported that VTA conducted a number of public hearings throughout the County of Santa Clara in June 2003 and a number of CEQA hearings were also conducted over the last 30 days.

Mr. Martin noted that the January 2004 Transit Service Reduction Plan was forwarded to the Administration and Finance Committee and Congestion Management Program & Planning Committee for discussion.

Mr. Martin reported that depending on the validation action by the courts, VTA would either be reducing transit services by 21 percent or by 3 percent.

Mr. Martin directed attention to Attachment C – Changes to Original Proposal and noted the document shows specific changes that were made to the original proposal that VTA took out to the public for public comment. As a result of the specific comments that were made during the public hearing process, VTA made modifications and/or changes.

Suzanne Gifford, General Counsel, reported that VTA received a court date of Wednesday, September 24, 2003, and noted that no one responded to the complaint.

Mr. Martin noted if VTA is successful and is able to use Measure A funds, VTA would be recommending a 3 percent reduction in service. If VTA is not successful, VTA would be recommending a 21 percent reduction in service.

Member Mossar expressed concern about the proposed 3 percent service reduction in bus and light rail service. She referred to the bond measure and the \$80 million to keep service at the level it was after the prior two service reductions and asked why VTA is talking about additional cuts. Mr. Cipolla noted that the proposed 3 percent service reduction is housekeeping cuts in service that VTA would normally reinvest into the system. He noted it is service that is not meeting standards.

Member Mossar asked what has happened that every time VTA implements a service reduction there is substandard service left to be cut. Member Mossar commented that it would be appropriate for the Board of Directors to have an answer to the question as to why after two rounds of service cuts, there still are under-performing bus routes.

Member Mossar expressed concern about additional service cuts even at the 3 percent level, particularly, when VTA is pursuing bonding against Measure A to support the operating deficit.

Vice Chairperson Cortese queried if the 3 percent was reinvested, so that VTA was not having a net reduction in service beyond any previous service cuts, what would it do to VTA financially. Mr. Cipolla reported that the year-end sales tax figures was \$800,000 less than projected and that sales tax is still not performing well. The Board of Directors adopted 19 proposals coming from the Ad-Hoc Financial Stability Committee to become a more cost effective operation. VTA is revisiting their operating standards and criteria and would be bringing it forward to the TP&O Committee for adoption in October 2003. Mr. Cipolla noted that the 3 percent service reductions are all substandard services.

Vice Chairperson Cortese queried if the 3 percent could be reinvested somewhere where VTA would be aligned with farebox recovery goals. Mr. Cipolla noted that he would not recommend reinvesting this in any service right now; not until this community is stabilized and not until there is at least some growth indicated.

Member Mossar commented that as things are changing the Board should have the opportunity to re-evaluate prior decisions or at least to understand prior decisions in the context of current events and projections. She commented that things are changing and yet some pieces of what the Board sees, like this, are changing with the changing

circumstances and other things that the Board sees, like the BART piece, are not changing at all and finds that of concern.

Chairperson Valerio requested that staff provide further clarification on the 3 percent service reduction. He noted that the Board passed a motion to seek the use of bond money in advance and get court validation to not make any further service cuts. Chairperson Valerio noted that there needs to be further clarification that says “but for the possibility of any routine review of substandard lines that would be under-performing anyway.

Mr. Martin noted that the Service Standards would be forwarded to the TP&O Committee in October 2003 for discussion, then forwarded to the Committee for approval in November 2003 and then forwarded to the Board of Directors for approval in December 2003.

James Wightman, Interested Citizen, addressed the Committee and expressed concern regarding the proposed service cuts.

**M/S/C (Cortese/Yeager)** to approve on a vote of 3 ayes to 1 noe to 0 abstentions to submit a recommendation to the Board of Directors to: 1) Receive staff responses to public comments made during the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) comment period for the January 2004 Transit Service Reduction Plan; 2) Adopt a finding that there is a fiscal emergency, as defined by Public Resources Code (P.R.C.) §21080.32(d)(2), caused by failure of VTA revenues to adequately fund VTA services, programs and facilities; 3) Invoke a Statutory Exemption under CEQA, P.R.C. §21080.32 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15285 (Transit Agency Responses to Revenue Shortfalls) for the purpose of implementing the January 2004 Transit Service Reduction Plan; and 4) Approve the service modifications included in the January 2004 Transit Service Reduction Plan, Alternatives A and B. Alternative A could potentially mean a combined reduction in bus and light rail services of approximately 21 percent. Alternative B will result in a combined reduction in bus and light rail service of approximately 3 percent. In addition, authorize staff to implement either Alternative A or Alternative B of the Plan in January 2004. Implementation of Alternative B is preferred, but would be contingent upon securing the authority to bond against Measure A funds. (Member Mossar opposed.)

## **OTHER ITEMS**

- 17. Report on the Zero Emission Bus (ZEB) Demonstration Program Second Quarter, 2003**

Chairperson Valerio directed attention to the Zero Emission Bus (ZEB) Program Project Photos being distributed, noting that the photos are in color.

Matthew Tucker, Transportation and Maintenance Director, reported that VTA and the San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans) have a regional joint demonstration project for the zero emission buses.

Mr. Tucker reported that in 2002, the Board of Directors took action to authorize VTA to purchase three buses to contract with a company called Air Products & Chemicals, Inc., as well as to make some construction modifications at the Cerone Division to support the implementation of the zero emission buses.

Mr. Tucker reported that in May 2004 VTA is anticipating receiving its first bus from Gillig. VTA is looking towards having the bus in revenue service some time in August 2004. He noted that there are projects internationally as well as nationally that are focusing on zero emission buses.

Mr. Tucker directed attention to the Project Photos showing the different features of the zero emission bus.

Mr. Martin noted the work in progress between VTA and the California Air Resources Board.

**On order of Chairperson Valerio**, there being no objection, the Report on the Zero Emission Bus (ZEB) Demonstration Program Second Quarter, 2003 was received and filed.

**18. FY 2003 Preliminary Annual Performance Report**

Mike Aro, Service & Operations Planning Deputy Director, provided a report, highlighting: 1) 13 percent decrease in bus ridership, 2) 22 percent decrease in light rail ridership, 3) 14 percent decrease in system combined bus and light rail ridership, 4) decrease in light rail shuttles ridership, 5) decrease in Altamont Commuter Express (ACE) shuttles ridership, 6) decrease in Caltrain ridership, and 7) decrease in Highway 17 Express.

Mr. Aro directed attention to the Annual Performance Report, Page 2, Light Rail Operations, and noted that the riders per revenue hour in FY 2002 was 59.0 and the riders per revenue hour in FY 2003 was 59.3. He noted that VTA has maintained its productivity level, even though there was a 22 percent decrease in ridership.

Mr. Aro reported that VTA's service quality has improved, miles between road calls have improved by 27 percent, and the accident rate has improved by 38 percent. He noted that this year VTA had a 1.7 percent increase in paratransit ridership.

Member Mossar queried if assumptions are being made about the bus and light rail system that service will return to the level it was or is VTA looking into the future, so that service will come back in some reorganized fashion. She queried about VTA's planning process. Mr. Cipolla noted part of it is about the land use and working with the cities. As the economy starts climbing back, VTA would be looking at doing a comprehensive operational analysis, that kind of gives VTA a very detailed type of a snapshot of where VTA would begin those types of growth in services and what services are appropriate for those types of communities or areas. He noted that he thinks you would see a different system than in 2001. VTA would be looking at more rail and more feeding into the rail systems.

Member Mossar noted as cities we go around doing our future land use planning based on our assumptions of transportation. She noted that communities such as hers where they are losing what they have and there is nothing visible on the horizon, it puts the communities in an incredibly difficult place, because you cannot do any planning. There is nothing to show the public that there is any transportation improvement in the pipeline that could possibly support any kind of growth or change. She expressed concern that this regional countywide agency is backing away from communities, such as hers, which need to change and grow every bit as much as the VTA needs to change and grow.

**On order of Chairperson Valerio**, there being no objection, the FY 2003 Preliminary Annual Performance Report was received and filed.

**19. Committee Work Plan**

Mr. Martin noted that the Updated Performance Measures and Service Standards would be forwarded to the TP&O Meeting of October 16, 2003 as a discussion item, then forwarded to the TP&O Meeting of November 20, 2003 as an action item, and then forwarded to the Board of Directors Meeting of December 4, 2003 for approval.

**On order of Chairperson Valerio**, there being no objection, the Committee Work Plan was reviewed and accepted.

**20. Committee Staff Report**

There was no Committee Staff Report.

**21. Chairperson's Report**

There was no Chairperson's Report.

**22. Determine the Consent Agenda for October 2, 2003 Board Meeting**

**CONSENT: Item #5.** Authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Republic Electric, the lowest responsible bidder, in an amount of \$369,525 for furnishing and installation of new light emitting diode (LED) LRT signal modules assemblies with lens and train approaching symbol signs. This project is 80 percent federally funded; and **Item #6.** Authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Universal Sweeping Services, Inc., the lowest responsible and responsive bidder, for parking lot power sweeping services of VTA-owned parking lots in Santa Clara County for \$116,197 for a three-year term with two one-year extension options for \$40,685 in option year four and \$41,703 in option year five;

**REGULAR: Item #14.** Authorize the General Manager to execute a three-year contract with Value Management Strategies, Inc. (VMS) for Value Engineering and Technical Review Board Services related to the SVRT Project in an amount not to exceed \$2,600,000; **Item #15.** Authorize the General Manager to execute a contract for supply and delivery of bus signal priority equipment for use in the Line 22 Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project; and **Item #16.** 1) Receive staff responses to public comments made during the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) comment period for the January 2004 Transit Service Reduction Plan; 2) Adopt a finding that there is a fiscal emergency, as defined by Public Resources Code (P.R.C.) §21080.32(d)(2), caused by failure of VTA revenues to adequately fund VTA services, programs and facilities; 3) Invoke a Statutory Exemption under CEQA, P.R.C. §21080.32 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15285 (Transit Agency Responses to Revenue Shortfalls) for the purpose of implementing the January 2004 Transit Service Reduction Plan; and 4) Approve the service modifications included in the January 2004 Transit Service Reduction Plan, Alternatives A and B. Alternative A could potentially mean a combined reduction in bus and light rail services of approximately 21%. Alternative B will result in a combined reduction in bus and light rail service of approximately 3%. In addition, authorize staff to implement either Alternative A or Alternative B of the Plan in January 2004. Implementation of Alternative B is preferred, but would be contingent upon securing the authority to bond against Measure A funds.

**23. Announcements**

There were no Announcements.

**24. Adjourn**

**On order of Chairperson Valerio**, there being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 5:36 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Tracene Y. Crenshaw, Board Assistant  
VTA Board of Directors