BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

Thursday, February 5, 2015

5:30 PM

Board of Supervisors’ Chambers
County Government Center
70 West Hedding Street
San Jose, CA 95110

AGENDA

To help you better understand, follow, and participate in the meeting, the following information is provided:

- Persons wishing to address the Board of Directors on any item on the agenda or not on the agenda should complete a blue card located at the public information table and hand it to the Board Secretary staff prior to the meeting or before the item is heard.

- Speakers will be called to address the Board when their agenda item(s) arise during the meeting and are asked to limit their comments to 2 minutes. The amount of time allocated to speakers may vary at the Chairperson's discretion depending on the number of speakers and length of the agenda. If presenting handout materials, please provide 25 copies to the Board Secretary for distribution to the Board of Directors.

- The Consent Agenda items may be voted on in one motion at the beginning of the meeting under Orders of the Day. If you wish to discuss any of these items, please request the item be removed from the Consent Agenda by completing a blue card at the public information table and handing it to the Board Secretary staff prior to Orders of the Day, Agenda Item #1.2.
• Disclosure of Campaign Contributions to Board Members (Government Code Section 84308)

In accordance with Government Code Section 84308, no VTA Board Member shall accept, solicit, or direct a contribution of more than $250 from any party, or his or her agent, or from any participant, or his or her agent, while a proceeding involving a license, permit, or other entitlement for use is pending before the agency. Any Board Member who has received a contribution within the preceding 12 months in an amount of more than $250 from a party or from any agent or participant shall disclose that fact on the record of the proceeding and shall not make, participate in making, or in any way attempt to use his or her official position to influence the decision.

A party to a proceeding before VTA shall disclose on the record of the proceeding any contribution in an amount of more than $250 made within the preceding 12 months by the party, or his or her agent, to any Board Member. No party, or his or her agent, shall make a contribution of more than $250 to any Board Member during the proceeding and for three months following the date a final decision is rendered by the agency in the proceeding. The foregoing statements are limited in their entirety by the provisions of Section 84308 and parties are urged to consult with their own legal counsel regarding the requirements of the law.

• 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 our website, www.vta.org, and also at the meeting. Any document distributed less than 72-hours prior to the meeting will also be made available to the public at the time of distribution. Copies of items provided by members of the public at the meeting will be made available following the meeting upon request.

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, VTA will make reasonable arrangements to ensure meaningful access to its meetings for persons who have disabilities and for persons with limited English proficiency who need translation and interpretation services. Individuals requiring ADA accommodations should notify the Board Secretary’s Office at least 48-hours prior to the meeting. Individuals requiring language assistance should notify the Board Secretary’s Office at least 72-hours prior to the meeting. The Board Secretary may be contacted at (408) 321-5680 or e-mail: board.secretary@vta.org or (408) 321-2330 (TTY only). VTA’s home page is on the web at: www.vta.org or visit us on Facebook at: www.facebook.com/scvta. (408) 321-2300: 中文 / Español / 日本語 / 한국어 / tiếng Việt / Tagalog.

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

70 West Hedding St., San Jose, California is served by bus lines *61, 62, 66, 181, and Light Rail. (*61 Southbound last trip is at 8:55 pm for this location.)

For trip planning information, contact our Customer Service Department at (408) 321-2300 between the hours of 6:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and 7:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. on Saturday. Schedule information is also available on our website, www.vta.org.
1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

1.1. ROLL CALL

1.2. Orders of the Day - approve Consent Agenda (Item #6)

2. AWARDS AND COMMENDATION

2.1. ACTION ITEM - Adopt a Resolution of Appreciation for outgoing 2014 VTA Board Member Donald Rocha.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

This portion of the meeting is reserved for persons desiring to address the Board of Directors on any item within the Board's jurisdiction. Speakers are limited to 2 minutes. The law does not permit Board action or extended discussion of any item not on the agenda except under special circumstances. If Board 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.

4. PUBLIC HEARINGS

4.1. HEARING - NOTICE OF INTENTION TO ADOPT RESOLUTION OF NECESSITY

ACTION ITEM - Close Hearing and adopt a Resolution of Necessity determining that the public interest and necessity require the acquisition of property interests in property owned by Jack C. Cox and Marie I. Cox, as Co-Trustees udt dated February 11, 1988, and Jackie L. Irwin, and located in Milpitas, California, for the BART Silicon Valley Berryessa Extension (SVBX) Project.

**Property ID/Assessor's Parcel Number/Owner**

B2257 (APN 092-08-084) owned by Jack C. Cox and Marie I. Cox, as Co-Trustees udt dated February 11, 1988 and Jackie L. Irwin, a married woman as her sole and separate property.

**Note:** Motion must be approved by at least 2/3 of the Board (8 members).

5. REPORTS


5.3. General Manager Report. (Verbal Report)
5.3.A. Receive updates regarding Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and California Transportation Commission (CTC) activities.

5.4. Chairperson's Report. (Verbal Report)

6. CONSENT AGENDA

6.1. Approve the Board of Directors Regular Meeting Minutes of January 8, 2015.

6.2. ACTION ITEM - Ratify the appointment of Lucas Ramirez to the Citizens Advisory Committee position representing the South Bay Labor Council.

6.3. ACTION ITEM - Authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Balfour Beatty Rail in the amount of $2,700,000 for the procurement and installation of Traction Power Substation (TPSS) 17A in Mountain View and amend the FY14-15 VTA Transit Fund Capital Budget to add $3,000,000 for this project.

Note: Motion must be approved by at least 2/3 of the Board (8 members).

6.4. ACTION ITEM - Authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Ghilotti Construction, the lowest responsible and responsive bidder, in the amount of $5,357,786.50 for the construction of Milpitas Station Surface Parking Lot and Roadway.

6.5. ACTION ITEM - Adopt a Resolution of Local Support authorizing the General Manager to file and execute a grant application and agreement with California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle), for $350,000-$750,000 in funding from the FY14-15 Tire-Derived Aggregate (TDA) Grant Program to reimburse the cost of aggregate material needed for noise and vibration mitigation of eligible projects.

6.6. ACTION ITEM - Adopt a Resolution of Local Support authorizing the General Manager to execute a grant agreement with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for $500,000 in funding from the Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) allocated through the Regional Strategic Investment (RSI) for the Interstate 280/Winchester Boulevard Improvement Study.

6.7. ACTION ITEM - Approve reallocation of Local Program Reserve (LPR) savings of $700,000 to the I-280/I-880 Stevens Creek Interchange Project.


6.9. INFORMATION ITEM - Review the Legislative Update Matrix.

6.10. INFORMATION ITEM - Receive update on Light Rail Enhancement Program.
6.11. INFORMATION ITEM - Receive a report on three California State Transportation Agency: California Transportation Infrastructure Priorities Workgroup Draft White Papers.

6.12. INFORMATION ITEM - Receive an update on the SR 82 (El Camino Real) Relinquishment Exploration Study.

6.13. INFORMATION ITEM - Receive information on the Great Streets Corridor Study proposal.


7. REGULAR AGENDA

Administration and Finance Committee – Ash Kalra (Committee Chairperson)

7.1. INFORMATION ITEM - Review the Fiscal Year 2016 & Fiscal Year 2017 Biennial Budget Assumptions.

Transit Planning and Operations Committee – Rich Larsen (Committee Chairperson)

7.2. INFORMATION ITEM - Receive a report on Bus Priority Seating.

SVRT Program Working Committee – Sam Liccardo (Committee Chairperson)

7.3. INFORMATION ITEM - Receive Silicon Valley Rapid Transit (SVRT) Program Update.

8. OTHER ITEMS

8.1. ITEMS OF CONCERN AND REFERRAL TO ADMINISTRATION

8.2. Reports from VTA Committees, Joint Powers Boards (JPB), and Regional Commissions

8.2.A. VTA Standing Committees

8.2.B. VTA Advisory Committees

8.2.C. VTA Policy Advisory Boards (PAB)

8.2.D. Joint Powers Boards and Regional Commissions

8.3. Announcements
9.  CLOSED SESSION

9.1.  Recess to Closed Session

A.  Existing Litigation - Conference with Legal Counsel
    [Government Code Section 54956.9(d)(1)]

Name of Case:  San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District v. PPF Industrial Whipple Road/Bowman Place, LP, a Delaware Limited Partnership

(Alameda County Superior Court Case No.: RG 13708269)

B.  Existing Litigation - Conference with Legal Counsel
    [Government Code Section 54956.9(d)(1)]

Name of Case:  Sabouri v. Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA)

(Santa Clara County Case No.: 1-13-CV-250895)

C.  Conference with Real Property Negotiators
    [Government Code Section 54956.8]

Property: Portion of Newhall Yard located at Newhall Street near Coleman Avenue in San Jose, California (APNs: 230-46-035 and 052)

Agency Negotiator: Bijal Patel, Deputy Director, Property Development & Management

Negotiating Parties: David Kaval, San Jose Earthquakes

Under Negotiation: Price and terms

D.  Security of Public Building
    [Government Code Section 54957(a)]

Consultation with: Santa Clara County Sheriff's Department

9.2.  Reconvene to Open Session

9.3.  Closed Session Report

10.  ADJOURN
Resolution

By the Board of Directors of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) a Special District of the State of California relative to commending the

Honorable Donald Rocha

Whereas, Donald Rocha is completing his term on the VTA Board of Directors after two years of dedicated service, representing the City of San José; and

Whereas, He consistently demonstrated a distinctly thoughtful and collegial style when engaging in transportation policy debates during VTA Board of Directors meetings; and

Whereas, He served on the County Expressways Policy Advisory Committee from 2013 through 2014; and

Whereas, He worked to improve VTA operations while serving as a member of the Transit Planning & Operations Committee in 2013, and as chair of this committee in 2014; and

Whereas, He championed efforts to improve the multi-modal transportation system in Silicon Valley, including programs that would enhance the ability of students to walk and bike to school; and

Whereas, He was a strong supporter of projects that would provide access to public transit opportunities for the residents of Silicon Valley, such as the Santa Clara/Alum Rock Bus Rapid Transit Project.

Now therefore be it resolved, that the VTA Board of Directors hereby commends and expresses its sincere appreciation to Donald Rocha for his exemplary service; and

Be it further resolved, that this resolution is presented with the thanks and good wishes of the VTA.

Adopted by the VTA Board of Directors this 5th day of February 2015.

_____________________________
Perry Woodward, Chairperson
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
Resolution

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt one (1) Resolution of Necessity determining that the public interest and necessity require the acquisition of one property for the BART Silicon Valley Berryessa Extension (SVBX) Project.

BACKGROUND:

The BART Silicon Valley Program is an extension of the existing BART regional heavy rail system to Milpitas, San Jose and Santa Clara, which will be delivered through a phased approach. The first phase is the Silicon Valley Berryessa Extension (SVBX) Project, a 10-mile, two-station project, which will extend the existing BART system and provide service to the Cities of Milpitas and San Jose in Santa Clara County.

The SVBX Project will begin south of the future BART Warm Springs Station in Fremont and proceed on the WP Milpitas Corridor purchased by VTA from the Union Pacific Railroad in 2002, through Milpitas, and end in the Berryessa area of north San Jose at Las Plumas Avenue (See Project Map attached hereto). Engineering on the SVBX Project is advancing, and major utility relocations and full construction activities have begun. Full and partial property acquisitions are required from approximately 102 property owners in order to construct the SVBX Project.
These acquisitions are being pursued in accordance with state and federal law, and diligent efforts are being made to acquire them through negotiated settlements. However, negotiated settlements may not be achievable in all instances and some of the acquisitions may need to be acquired through a timely condemnation process, particularly to ensure that the Project can stay on schedule.

A prerequisite to commencement of eminent domain proceedings by a public entity is adoption of a Resolution of Necessity (California Code Civil Procedure section 1245.220). As discussed below, staff is recommending the Board to adopt 2 Resolutions of Necessity to enable commencement of eminent domain proceedings.

DISCUSSION:

Among the approximately 102 property acquisitions required for the Project, staff is recommending that a Resolution of Necessity be adopted for the following property:

Jack C. Cox and Marie I. Cox, as Co-Trustees udt dated February 11, 1988

This property is located at 1550 Gladding Court in the City of Milpitas. The larger parcel consists of approximately 3.47 acres, and is improved with a 25,000 sq. ft. industrial building and a 27,700 sq.ft. industrial building.

The proposed acquisition consists of:

(1) a 44,494 sq.ft Fee interest (B2257-01) to construct the future South Milpitas Boulevard extension;
(2) the 27,700 sq.ft. industrial building located primarily within B2257-01;
(3) a 5,509 sq.ft. Public Service Easement (B2257-02) for construction, installation and maintenance of a sidewalk and other public utilities supporting the new roadway;
(4) a 1,845 sq.ft. Temporary Construction Easement (B2257-05) for work space necessary for demolition of the 27,700 sq. ft. building;
(5) a 5,509 sq.ft. Temporary Construction Easement (B2257-06) for staging, storage and work space necessary to construct the new roadway;
(6) a 1,169 sq.ft. Emergency Vehicle Access Easement (B2257-07) to provide emergency access to the remainder property; and
(7) a 559 sq. ft. Temporary Construction Easement (B2257-08) for work space needed to construct the Emergency Access Easement.

The above interests are collectively referred to as the “Required Project Property”.

VTA also seeks to acquire a 12,222 sq.ft. Fee (B2257-09) (“Uneconomic Remnant”) pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 1240.410 et.seq., which authorizes public agencies to acquire a portion of remainder property when, following an acquisition, it is left in such size, shape or condition as to be of little market value. An independent appraiser determined that after the acquisition of the Required Project Property, the area identified as the Uneconomic Remnant
will be of little market value. VTA staff seeks to acquire the **Uneconomic Remnant** in lieu of acquiring a 3,471 sq. ft. Public Utility Easement (B2257-3) and a 3,344 sq.ft. Storm Drainage Easement (B2257-03), which are necessary to construct the Project, because said easements are located entirely within the **Uneconomic Remnant** and therefore separate acquisitions of those easements are unnecessary.

The subject property was appraised and reviewed by a review appraiser, and VTA staff set just compensation. An offer based on the recommended appraisal, which included the Required Project Property and the Uneconomic Remnant, was made on or about October 31, 2014. To date, negotiations with the owner to acquire the property have been unsuccessful even though the real estate team has diligently worked to acquire the property through negotiated settlement with the property owner. The team will continue to work with the property owner to reach a negotiated settlement even after adoption of a Resolution of Necessity. VTA must take action to acquire the above-referenced property through eminent domain proceedings in order to ensure that construction can timely begin and the construction schedule remains intact.

As noted above, a prerequisite to commencement of eminent domain proceedings by a public entity is adoption of a Resolution of Necessity. This statutory requirement is designed to ensure that public entities verify and confirm the validity of their intended use of the power of eminent domain. A resolution of necessity must contain a general statement of the public use for which the property is taken, a reference to the authorizing statutes, a description of property, and a declaration stating that each of the following has been found and determined to be true:

1. The public interest and necessity require the proposed project;
2. The proposed project is planned or located in the manner that will be most compatible with the greatest public good and the least private injury;
3. The property described in the resolution is necessary for the proposed project; and
4. The offer required by Section 7267.2 of the Government Code, together with the accompanying statement of the amount established as just compensation, has been made to the owner or owners of record, which offer and statement were in a format and contained the information required by Government Code Section 7267.2, or the offer has not been made because the owner cannot be located with reasonable diligence.

In addition, the Board must authorize VTA to acquire B2257-09, the Uneconomic Remnant, pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 1240.410, in that it will be left in such a size, shape, or condition as to be of little market value.

Further information addressing each of these items and any additional findings that must be made are included in a staff report attached hereto. The staff report also contains specific information on the properties being impacted.

**ALTERNATIVES:**
The property that is subject to the Resolution of Necessity before the Board is necessary for the Project and a condemnation action must be initiated in order to obtain possession of this parcel if the Project schedule is to be maintained. The Board may, in its discretion, decide not to adopt the Resolution of Necessity. However, this would necessitate either some delay and/or a possible redesign, which could impact the schedule and, most likely, increase the costs of the Project.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

Appropriation for the costs associated with acquisition of this property is included in the FY13 Adopted 2000 Measure A Transit Improvement Program Fund Capital Budget.

Prepared by: Bijal Patel
Memo No. 4891
RESOLUTION OF NECESSITY DETERMINING THAT THE PUBLIC INTEREST AND NECESSITY REQUIRE THE ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN LAND AND DIRECTING THE FILING OF EMINENT DOMAIN PROCEEDINGS

WHEREAS, the BART Silicon Valley Berryessa Extension Project (the “Project”) is being undertaken for the purpose of easing traffic congestion, improving area-wide mobility, and otherwise furthering the public health, safety and welfare; and

WHEREAS, it is desirable and necessary for the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (“VTA”) to acquire a Partial Fee interest as described in Exhibit “A” (B2257-01), attached hereto and made a part hereof by this reference, including an industrial building located primarily within said Fee; a Public Service Easement described in Exhibit “B”(B2257-02), attached hereto and made a part hereof by this reference; three Temporary Construction Easements described in Exhibits “C”, “D” and “E” (B2257-05, B2257-06 and B2257-08), attached hereto and made a part hereof by this reference; and an Emergency Vehicle Access Easement as described in Exhibit “F” (B2257-07), attached hereto and made a part hereof by this reference (collectively, “the Required Project Property”), as right of way for the Project and the construction thereof; and

WHEREAS, as a result of the proposed acquisitions of the Required Project Property, the property described in Exhibit “G” (B2257-09), attached hereto and made a part hereof by this reference (“Remnant Property”), will be left in such size, shape or condition as to be of little market value and, accordingly, VTA is authorized to acquire the Remnant Property by eminent domain pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1240.410 et.seq..

WHEREAS, VTA is authorized to acquire both the Required Project Property and the Remnant Property and exercise the power of eminent domain pursuant to and in accordance with Article 1, Section 19 of the California Constitution, the California Eminent Domain Law, Code of Civil Procedure Sections 1230.010 et seq., 1240.410 et.seq., and Sections 100130 and 100131 of the Public Utilities Code; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the provisions of Section 1245.235 of the Code of Civil Procedure of the State of California, notice has been duly given to the owner(s) of the property herein, all of whom have been given a reasonable opportunity to appear and be heard before the Board of Directors of VTA at the time and place set forth in said notice, regarding the matters specified therein.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS FOUND, DETERMINED AND ORDERED as follows:

1. The recitals contained herein are true and correct.

2. Upon examination of the alternatives, VTA requires the Required Project Property for the Project.

3. The Required Project Property is necessary for the Project.

4. VTA is authorized to acquire the Remnant Property pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 1240.410 et.seq. in that it will be left in such size, shape and condition as to be of little market value.
5. VTA is authorized to acquire both the Required Project Property and the Remnant Property and exercise the power of eminent domain pursuant to and in accordance with Article 1, Section 19 of the California Constitution, the California Eminent Domain Law, Code of Civil Procedure Sections 1230.010 et seq., 1240.410 et seq., and Sections 100130 and 100131 of the Public Utilities Code.

6. The public interest and necessity require the Project.

7. The Project is planned or located in the manner that will be most compatible with the greatest public good and the least private injury.

8. The offer required by Section 7267.2 of the Government Code, together with the accompanying statement of the amount established as just compensation, for the acquisition of both the Required Project Property and the Remnant Property has been made to the owner or owners of record, which offer and statement were in a format and contained the information required by Government Code Section 7267.2, or the offer has not been made because the owner cannot be located with reasonable diligence.

9. VTA has complied with all conditions and statutory requirements, including those prescribed by CEQA, NEPA, and that are necessary for approval and adoption of the Project.

10. All conditions and statutory requirements necessary to exercise the power of eminent domain ("the right to take") to acquire the Entire Property have been complied with by VTA.

11. Insofar as the property or the larger parcel of which it is a part has heretofore been appropriated for public use, the proposed use set forth herein will not unreasonably interfere with or impair the continuation of the public use as it exists or may reasonably be expected to exist in the future, and is therefore a compatible public use pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 1240.510, or, as applicable, constitutes a more necessary public use to which the property is appropriated pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 1240.610.

12. General Counsel or General Counsel’s duly authorized designee is hereby authorized and directed to institute and conduct to conclusion eminent domain proceedings to acquire the Required Project Property and the Remnant Property, and to take such actions that counsel deems advisable or necessary in connection therewith, and may deposit the probable amount of compensation and obtain an order for prejudgment possession of the subject property.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Board of Directors on February 5, 2015, by the following vote:

AYES: DIRECTORS:

NOES: DIRECTORS:

ABSENT: DIRECTORS:

__________________________________________
PERRY WOODWARD, Chairperson
Board of Directors
I HEREBY CERTIFY AND ATTEST that the foregoing resolution was duly and regularly introduced, passed and adopted by the vote of two-thirds or more of the Board of Directors of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, California, at a meeting of said Board of Directors on the date indicated, as set forth above.

Dated: ______________________

ELAINE BALTAO, Secretary
Board of Directors

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

____________________________

ROBERT FABELA
General Counsel
EXHIBIT “A”

LEGAL DESCRIPTION
APN 092-08-084

All that certain real property situated in the City of Milpitas, County of Santa Clara, State of California, described as follows:

Being a portion of that certain parcel of land designated as Parcel 1, as said parcel is shown upon that certain Parcel Map recorded April 11, 2000 in Book 726 of Maps, pages 24 and 25, Official Records of said County, being more particularly described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the northeasterly line of Gladding Court, distant South 20°13'49" East 17.96 feet from the west corner of said Parcel 1; thence

1. North 69°46'11" East 4.38 feet; thence
2. South 20°13'49" East 4.47 feet; thence
3. South 65°13'49" East 21.96 feet; thence
4. North 69°46'11" East 228.67 feet to the beginning of a curve to the left with radius of 194.50 feet; thence
5. Northeasterly 123.68 feet along said curve through a central angle of 36°26'00" to the northwesterly line of said Parcel 1; thence along said northwesterly line
6. North 69°45'40" East 136.32 feet to the beginning of a non-tangent curve to the right, the center of which bears North 78°22'47" West 296.50 feet; thence
7. Southwesterly 300.92 feet along said curve through a central angle of 59°08'58"; thence
8. South 69°46'11" West 235.47 feet to the beginning of a non-tangent curve to the left, the center of which bears North 60°58'33" West 66.00 feet and being on the easterly line of Gladding Court; thence
9. Northerly 119.46 feet along said curve through a central angle of 103°42'20" to the beginning of a reverse curve with a radius of 20.00 feet; thence
10. Northwesterly 19.01 feet along said curve through a central angle of 54°27'04"; thence
11. North 20°13'49" West 2.03 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING.

Containing 44,494 square feet more or less.

This description was prepared by me or under my direction in conformance with the Professional Land Surveyors Act. All bearings and distances are based on the North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Zone III, epoch 1996.5. All distances are grid distances. To convert grid distances to ground distances, multiply expressed distances by 1.00005333.

John W. Pettley, PLS 6202
My License Expires on 03/31/2014
PUBLIC SERVICE EASEMENT

A permanent, non-exclusive public service easement (the “Public Service Easement”) and incidents thereto, for the installation, operation, maintenance and repair of any and all public service facilities including roadways, sidewalks, poles, wires and conduits for electrical, telephone, television, gas, storm, water mains, sanitary and water pipelines and services, fiber optic lines, and all appurtenances thereto, under, upon, above or across a portion of the property described in the deed recorded November 8, 1994 in Book N663, Page 113, Doc. No. 12717429, situated in the City of Milpitas, County of Santa Clara, State of California, said Public Service Easement being described and depicted as Parcel B2257-02 on Exhibit “1” attached hereto and made a part hereof.

The herein described easement shall remain open and be kept free and clear from buildings and structures of any kind, except public service and public utility structures and their appurtenances, lawful landscape and irrigation systems, pavement and fences that don’t impair the intended purpose of the easement, lawful unsupported roof overhangs, and obstructions that impair the intended use of or are inconsistent with the purposes of the easement. Unobstructed continuous access shall be maintained at all times.

The provisions hereof shall inure to the benefit of and bind the successors and assigns of the respective parties hereto, and all covenants shall apply to and run with the land.
Exhibit “1”

Parcel B2257-02
5/16/2013
PSE

LEGAL DESCRIPTION
APN 092-08-084

All that certain real property situated in the City of Milpitas, County of Santa Clara, State of California, described as follows:

Being a portion of that certain parcel of land designated as Parcel 1, as said parcel is shown upon that certain Parcel Map recorded April 11, 2000 in Book 726 of Maps, pages 24 and 25, Official Records of said County, being more particularly described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the northwesterly line of said Parcel 1, distant North 69°45′40″ East 500.40 feet from the west corner of said Parcel 1; thence continuing along said northwesterly line

1. North 69°45′40″ East 11.70 feet to the beginning of a non-tangent curve to the right, the center of which bears North 79°32′04″ West 306.50 feet; thence

2. Southwesterly 317.24 feet along said curve through a central angle of 59°18′15″; thence

3. South 69°46′11″ West 244.87 feet to the southwesterly line of said Parcel 1; thence along said southwesterly line

4. North 69°20′03″ West 3.00 feet to a point of cusp and the beginning of a non-tangent curve to the left, the center of which bears North 48°39′27″ West 66.00 feet; thence

5. Northeasterly 14.19 feet along said curve through a central angle of 12°19′06″; thence

6. North 69°46′11″ East 235.47 feet to the beginning of a curve to the left with radius of 296.50 feet; thence

7. Northeasterly 300.92 feet along said curve through a central angle of 58°08′58″ to the POINT OF BEGINNING.

Containing 5,509 square feet more or less.

This description was prepared by me or under my direction in conformance with the Professional Land Surveyors Act. All bearings and distances are based on the North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Zone III, epoch 1998.5. All distances are grid distances. To convert grid distances to ground distances, multiply expressed distances by 1.00005333.

John W. Pettley, PLS 6202
My License Expires on 03/31/2014
EXHIBIT “C”

TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT

A Temporary Construction Easement for the construction (and other related activities incidental to construction) of the Silicon Valley Berryessa Extension Project (SVBX), under, upon, over and across a portion of the Grantor’s property described in the deed recorded November 8, 1994 in Book N663, Page 113, Doc. No. 12717429, situated in the City of Milpitas, County of Santa Clara, State of California, said Temporary Construction Easement being described and depicted as Parcel B2257-05 on Exhibit “2” attached hereto and made a part hereof.

See Exhibit “2” attached hereto and made a part hereof.

This Temporary Construction Easement will begin on or after July 1, 2015, when the property is first occupied for use for SVBX civil construction, and will continue for a duration of four continuous months, ending no later than December 31, 2015.

The provisions hereof shall inure to the benefit of and bind the successors and assigns of the respective parties hereto, and all covenants shall apply to and run with the land.
LEGAL DESCRIPTION
TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT
APN: 092-08-084

REAL PROPERTY situated in the City of Milpitas, County of Santa Clara, State of California, being a portion of Parcel 1 as shown on that certain Parcel Map filed April 11, 2000, in Book 726 of Maps at Pages 24 and 25, Santa Clara County Records, also being a portion of Parcel One, as described in the Grant Deed recorded November 8, 1994, in Book N663, Page 0113, as Document No. 12717429, Santa Clara County Official Records, more particularly described as follows:

COMMENCING at the most westerly corner of Parcel 1 of said Parcel Map, being on the easterly line of Gladding Court (60 feet wide);

Thence along the northerly line of Parcel 1 of said Parcel Map, North 69°45'40" East, 512.10 feet to the beginning of a non-tangent curve to the right;

Thence southerly, along said non-tangent curve, having a radius of 306.50 feet, the radial line of which bears South 79°32'04" East, through a central angle of 15°26'08", for an arc length of 82.57 feet to the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING;

Thence South 20°21'54" East, 20.23 feet;

Thence South 24°45'48" West, 63.81 feet;

Thence South 70°00'26" West, 57.34 feet, to the beginning of a non-tangent curve to the left;

Thence northeasterly, along said non-tangent curve, having a radius of 306.50 feet, the radial line of which bears South 41°15'44" East, through a central angle of 22°50'11", for an arc length of 122.16 feet, to the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING.

Containing an area of 1,845 square feet, more or less.

Plat Exhibit attached and by this reference made of part thereof.
This description was prepared by me or under my direction in conformance with the Professional Land Surveyors Act. All bearings and distances are based on the North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Zone III, epoch 1998.5. All distances are grid distances. To convert grid distances to ground distances, multiply expressed distances by 1.00005333.

Feb 4, 2014
Date

Julia MacRory, LS 7871
Survey and Mapping Manager
A Temporary Construction Easement for the construction (and other related activities incidental to construction) of the Silicon Valley Berryessa Extension Project (SVBX), under, upon, over and across a portion of the Grantor’s property described in the deed recorded November 8, 1994 in Book N663, Page 113, Doc. No. 12717429, situated in the City of Milpitas, County of Santa Clara, State of California, said Temporary Construction Easement being described and depicted as Parcel B2257-06 on Exhibit “3” attached hereto and made a part hereof.

See Exhibit “3” attached hereto and made a part hereof.

This Temporary Construction Easement will begin on or after July 1, 2015, when the property is first occupied for use for SVBX civil construction, and will continue for a duration of nine continuous months, ending no later than December 31, 2016.

The provisions hereof shall inure to the benefit of and bind the successors and assigns of the respective parties hereto, and all covenants shall apply to and run with the land.
REAL PROPERTY situated in the City of Milpitas, County of Santa Clara, State of California, being a portion of Parcel 1 as shown on that certain Parcel Map filed April 11, 2000, in Book 726 of Maps at Pages 24 and 25, Santa Clara County Records, also being a portion of Parcel One, as described in the Grant Deed recorded November 8, 1994, in Book N663, Page 0113, as Document No. 12717429, Santa Clara County Official Records, more particularly described as follows:

COMMENCING at the most westerly corner of Parcel 1 of said Parcel Map, being on the easterly line of Gladding Court (60 feet wide);

Thence along the northerly line of Parcel 1 of said Parcel Map, North 69°45'40" East, 500.40 feet to the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING;

Thence continuing along said northerly line, North 69°45'40" East, 11.70 feet, to the beginning of a non-tangent curve to the right;

Thence southerly, along said non-tangent curve, having a radius of 306.50 feet, the radial line of which bears South 79°32'04" East, through a central angle of 59°18'14", for an arc length of 317.24 feet;

Thence South 69°46'11" West, 244.87 feet, to the general southerly line of Parcel 1 of said Parcel Map;

Thence along said general southerly line, North 69°20'03" West, 3.00 feet, to the easterly line of Gladding Court, being the beginning of a non-tangent curve to the left;

Thence northerly along said easterly line, along said non-tangent curve, having a radius of 66.00 feet, the radial line of which bears South 48°39'27" East, through a central angle of 12°19'06", for an arc length of 14.19 feet;

Thence North 69°46'11" East, 235.47 feet, to the beginning of a tangent curve to the left;
Thence along said curve, having a radius of 296.50 feet, through a central angle of 58°08'58'', for an arc length of 300.92 feet, to the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING.

Containing an area of 5,509 square feet, more or less.

Plat Exhibit attached and by this reference made of part thereof.

This description was prepared by me or under my direction in conformance with the Professional Land Surveyors Act. All bearings and distances are based on the North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Zone III, epoch 1998.5. All distances are grid distances. To convert grid distances to ground distances, multiply expressed distances by 1.00005333.

Feb 11, 2014
Date

Julia MacRory, LS 7871
Survey and Mapping Manager
B2257-06 TCE
AREA = 5,509± SQFT.

ALL BEARINGS AND DISTANCES SHOWN HERE ARE GRID AND ARE BASED ON THE NORTH AMERICAN DATUM OF 1983 (NAD83), ZONE 3, EPOCH 1998.5. MULTIPLY GRID DISTANCES BY 1.00005333 TO OBTAIN GROUND LEVEL DISTANCES.

SEE SHEET 2 OF 2 FOR LINE, CURVE AND RADIAL BEARING TABLES.

LICENSED LAND SURVEYOR
PLS 7871

PLAT TO ACCOMPANY LEGAL DESCRIPTION
B2257-06 TCE
APN 092-08-084
CITY OF MILPITAS,
COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
**Line Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Bearing</th>
<th>Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>N69°45'40&quot;E</td>
<td>11.70'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>S69°46'11&quot;W</td>
<td>244.87'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>N69°20'03&quot;W</td>
<td>3.00'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4</td>
<td>N69°46'11&quot;E</td>
<td>235.47'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Curve Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curve</th>
<th>Radius</th>
<th>Delta</th>
<th>Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>66.00'</td>
<td>12°19'06&quot;</td>
<td>14.19'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Radial Bearing Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Bearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RB1</td>
<td>S79°32'04&quot;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB2</td>
<td>S48°39'27&quot;E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXHIBIT “E”

A Temporary Construction Easement for the construction (and other related activities incidental to construction) of the Silicon Valley Berryessa Extension Project (SVBX), under, upon, over and across a portion of property described in the deed recorded November 8, 1994 in Book N663, Page 113, Doc. No. 12717429, situated in the City of Milpitas, County of Santa Clara, State of California, said Temporary Construction Easement being described and depicted as Parcel B2257-08 on Exhibit “4” attached hereto and made a part hereof.

See Exhibit “4” attached hereto and made a part hereof.

This Temporary Construction Easement will begin on or after July 1, 2015, when the property is first occupied for use for SVBX civil construction, and will continue for a duration of one month, ending no later than December 31, 2016.

The provisions hereof shall inure to the benefit of and bind the successors and assigns of the respective parties hereto, and all covenants shall apply to and run with the land.
LEGAL DESCRIPTION
TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT
APN: 092-08-084

REAL PROPERTY situated in the City of Milpitas, County of Santa Clara, State of California, being a portion of Parcel 1 as shown on that certain Parcel Map filed April 11, 2000, in Book 726 of Maps at Pages 24 and 25, Santa Clara County Records, also being a portion of Parcel One, as described in the Grant Deed recorded November 8, 1994, in Book N663, Page 0113, as Document No. 12717429, Santa Clara County Official Records, more particularly described as follows:

COMMENCING at the westerly terminus of that certain course, shown on said Parcel Map, as “North 69°19'43" West, 77.86 feet”, in the general southerly line of said Parcel 1, being on the southerly line of Gladding Court;

Thence along the general southerly line of said Parcel 1, South 69°20'03" East, 70.59 feet, to the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING;

Thence North 19°36'05" West, 26.21 feet, to a line parallel with and 20.00 feet northerly of said general southerly line;

Thence along said parallel line, North 69°20'03" West, 27.56 feet;

Thence North 69°46'11" East, 15.27 feet, to a line parallel with and 30.00 feet northerly of said general southerly line;

Thence along said parallel line, South 69°20'03" East, 20.37 feet;

Thence South 20°13'52" East, 35.68 feet, to the general southerly line of said Parcel 1, the following two courses:

1. South 69°45'45" West, 4.63 feet;
2. North 69°20'03" West, 7.27 feet, to the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING.

Containing an area of 559 square feet, more or less.
A Plat Map is attached hereto and made of part hereof.

This description was prepared by me or under my direction in conformance with the Professional Land Surveyors Act. All bearings and distances are based on the North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Zone III, epoch 1998.5. All distances are grid distances. To convert grid distances to ground distances, multiply expressed distances by 1.00005333.

Date
July 21, 2014

Julia MacRory, LS 7871
Survey and Mapping Manager
ALL BEARINGS AND DISTANCES SHOWN ON THIS EXHIBIT ARE BASED UPON THE NORTH AMERICAN DATUM OF 1983 (NA83), ZONE III, EPOCH 1995.5. ALL DISTANCES SHOWN ON THIS EXHIBIT ARE GRID DISTANCES. TO CONVERT GRID DISTANCES TO GROUND DISTANCES, MULTIPLY EXPRESSED DISTANCES BY 1.00000333.

GLADDING COURT

B2257
092-08-084
JACK C. & MARIE I.
COX &
JACKIE L. IRWIN
PARCEL 1
726-M-24

B2257-08 TCE
AREA = 559 ± SQFT.

B2253
092-08-003
STANLEY HERZSTEIN
TRUSTEE

B2084
092-08-077
S & B MILPITAS LLC,
& SEMIN VALANI
PARCEL A
518 PM 23

LINE TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINE</th>
<th>BEARING</th>
<th>LENGTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>N19°36'05&quot;W</td>
<td>26.21'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>N69°46'11&quot;E</td>
<td>15.27'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>S69°45'45&quot;W</td>
<td>4.63'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4</td>
<td>N69°20'03&quot;W</td>
<td>7.27'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEGEND:
TCE = TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT
POC = POINT OF COMMENCEMENT
TPOB = TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING
SQFT. = SQUARE FEET

PLAT TO ACCOMPANY LEGAL DESCRIPTION
B2257-08 TCE
APN: 092-08-084
CITY OF MILPITAS
COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SCALE: 1"=50'
DATE: 07-18-14

DRAWN BY: L. Boroumand
CHECKED BY: J. MacRory
SHEET: 1 OF 1
EXHIBIT “F”

An Emergency Access Easement for the purpose of emergency ingress and egress of pedestrians and vehicles in the event of a fire or other emergency occurring on property described in the deed recorded November 8, 1994 in Book N663, Page 113, Doc. No. 12717429, situated in the City of Milpitas, County of Santa Clara, State of California (“Property”), said Emergency Access Easement being described and depicted as Parcel B2257-07 on Exhibit “5” attached hereto and made a part hereof.

Ingress/egress to/from the Property shall be provided by means of a driveway reserved strictly for emergency use and marked per City of Milpitas specifications as a designated fire lane. The driveway and pavement markings shall be maintained by the owner of the Property, and shall be kept free and clear of all structures, except lawful unsupported roof overhangs, and obstructions that impair the intended use of or are inconsistent with the purposes of the easement. This easement shall carry with it the right to construct and maintain a drivable surface for the access way, which may include removal and/or modification to existing landscape, utilities and appurtenances and concrete curbs, and pavement markings per City of Milpitas specifications. The easement also shall include the right to use existing roads or other practical route(s) to reach the easement to carry out the rights granted hereunder.

This easement agreement may not be modified, amended or terminated without the prior written consent of the City of Milpitas.

The covenants set forth herein shall run with the land and be binding upon and inure to the benefit of the parties hereto and their respective heirs, legal representatives, successors and assigns.
LEGAL DESCRIPTION
EMERGENCY VEHICLE ACCESS EASEMENT
APN: 092-08-084

REAL PROPERTY situated in the City of Milpitas, County of Santa Clara, State of California, being a portion of Parcel 1 as shown on that certain Parcel Map filed April 11, 2000, in Book 726 of Maps at Pages 24 and 25, Santa Clara County Records, also being a portion of Parcel One, as described in the Grant Deed recorded November 8, 1994, in Book N663, Page 0113, as Document No. 12717429, Santa Clara County Official Records, more particularly described as follows:

BEGINNING at the westerly terminus of that certain course, shown on said Parcel Map, as “North 69°19′43″ West, 77.86 feet”, in the general southerly line of said Parcel 1, being on the southerly line of Gladding Court;

Thence along the general southerly line of said Parcel 1, South 69°20′03″ East, 70.59 feet;

Thence North 19°36′05″ West, 26.21 feet, to a line parallel with and 20.00 feet northerly of said general southerly line;

Thence along said parallel line, North 69°20′03″ West, 42.84 feet;

Thence South 69°46′11″ West, 9.61 feet, to the easterly line of Gladding Court and the beginning of a non-tangent curve to the right;

Thence southwesterly along said curve and along said easterly line, having a radius of 66.00 feet, the radial line of which bears South 60°58′33″ East, through a central angle of 12°19′06″, for an arc length of 14.19 feet, to the POINT OF BEGINNING.

Containing an area of 1,169 square feet, more or less.

A Plat Map is attached hereto and made of part hereof.
This description was prepared by me or under my direction in conformance with the Professional Land Surveyors Act. All bearings and distances are based on the North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Zone III, epoch 1998.5. All distances are grid distances. To convert grid distances to ground distances, multiply expressed distances by 1.00005333.

Date
July 21, 2014

Julia MacRory, LS 7871
Survey and Mapping Manager
REAL PROPERTY situated in the City of Milpitas, County of Santa Clara, State of California, being a portion of Parcel 1 as shown on that certain Parcel Map filed April 11, 2000, in Book 726 of Maps at Pages 24 and 25, Santa Clara County Records, also being a portion of Parcel One, as described in the Grant Deed recorded November 8, 1994, in Book N663, Page 0113, as Document No. 12717429, Santa Clara County Official Records, more particularly described as follows:

BEGINNING at the most westerly corner of Parcel 1 of said Parcel Map, being on the easterly line of Gladding Court (60 feet wide);

Thence along said easterly line, South 20°13'49" East, 17.96 feet;

Thence North 69°46'11" East, 4.38 feet, to a line parallel with said easterly line;

Thence along said parallel line, South 20°13'49" East, 4.47 feet;

Thence South 65°13'49" East, 21.96 feet;

Thence North 69°46'11" East, 228.67 feet, to the beginning of a tangent curve to the left;

Thence along said curve, having a radius of 194.50 feet, through a central angle of 36°26'00", for an arc length of 123.68 feet, to the northwesterly line of said Parcel 1;

Thence along said northwesterly line, South 69°45'40" West, 364.09 feet, to the POINT OF BEGINNING.

Containing an area of 12,222 square feet, more or less.

Plat Exhibit attached and by this reference made a part hereof.
This description was prepared by me or under my direction in conformance with the Professional Land Surveyors Act. All bearings and distances are based on the North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Zone III, epoch 1998.5. All distances are grid distances. To convert grid distances to ground distances, multiply expressed distances by 1.00005333.

Date

2014-10-22

Julia MacRory, LS 7871
Survey and Mapping Manager
SVBX Property Acquisition Staff Report

INTRODUCTION

This staff report is submitted for review by the Board of Directors prior to the recommended adoption of a resolution of necessity for the acquisition of property for the BART Silicon Valley Berryessa Extension (SVBX) Project.

For each property interest to be acquired, a resolution of necessity must be adopted prior to the commencement of eminent domain proceedings (Code of Civil Procedure Section 1245.220.). The statutory requirement that a public entity adopt a resolution of necessity before initiating a condemnation action “is designed to ensure that public entities will verify and confirm the validity of their intended use of the power of eminent domain prior to the application of that power in any one particular instance.” San Bernardino County Flood Control Dist. v. Grabowski (1988) 205 Cal.App.3d 885, 897.

Thus, a resolution of necessity must contain a general statement of the public use for which the property is to be taken, a reference to the statute authorizing the exercise of eminent domain, a description of the property, and a declaration stating that each of the following have been found and determined by the Board to be the case:

1. The public interest and necessity require the proposed project;
2. The proposed project is planned or located in the manner that will be most compatible with the greatest public good and the least private injury;
3. The property described in the resolution is necessary for the proposed project; and,
4. That either the offer required by Section 7267.2 of the Government Code has been made to the owner or owners of record, or the offer has not been made because the owner cannot be located with reasonable diligence.

(Code of Civil Procedure Section 1245.230.)

Also, for those parcels to be acquired as public service public utility easements, the resolution of necessity will state that such property is being acquired pursuant to the provisions of Code of Civil Procedure Sections 1240.320, 1240.330, and 1240.350, as substitute property necessary for acquisition or exchange with regard to affected public utilities, for relocation of such utilities, or to provide utility service to the remaining property, as the case may be. For such property, the Board will be further finding and determining that the taking of said substitute property is necessary for each of the purposes specified in Sections 1240.320, 1240.330, and 1240.350.

Additionally, for the parcel in which a remnant is being acquired, the resolution of necessity will state that VTA is authorized to acquire the remnant property pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 1240.410 et.seq., in that it will be left in such a size, shape, or condition as to be of little market value.
Further, insofar as any of the property to be acquired has heretofore been dedicated to public use, the resolution of necessity will find that the acquisition of such property by VTA for the Project is for a more necessary public use to which the property has already been appropriated or is a compatible public use pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Sections 1240.510 and 1240.610. This report provides data and information addressing each of these items. Section 1 generally describes the public use for which the property is to be taken and sets forth the statutory authority for VTA’s exercise of eminent domain. Sections 3, 4, and 5 provide facts pertinent to public interest and necessity (Finding #1) and the planning and location of the SVBX Project (Finding #2). Section 6 also contains a property data sheet and other material discussing the necessity for acquiring the specific property interests that are the subject of the resolutions of necessity (Finding #3). Section 2 provides information concerning the offers made to the property owners pursuant to Government Code Section 7267.2 (Finding #4).

This evidentiary factual record will assist the Board in determining whether the requirements of Section 1245.230 have been met, and whether the other findings specified above, as applicable, can be made. If the Board determines that all requirements have been met, and that all findings can be made, it is recommended that the Board adopt resolutions of necessity for each of the parcels listed on the Board Meeting Agenda. The resolutions of necessity scheduled to be heard by the Board are attached to this staff report.

SECTION 1

GENERAL STATEMENT OF PUBLIC USE

Each of the parcels of property that are the subject of the recommended resolutions of necessity are to be acquired for the construction of the SVBX Project, a 10-mile, two-station, first phase of the 16-mile BART Silicon Valley Program.

STATUTORY AUTHORIZATION FOR EXERCISE OF EMINENT DOMAIN

Under its enabling legislation, VTA is authorized to acquire property for mass transit purposes by eminent domain. Public Utilities Code Section 100130, which sets forth the general powers of VTA, provides in pertinent part that: “The district may take by grant, purchase, devise, or lease, or condemn in proceedings under eminent domain, or otherwise acquire, and hold and enjoy, real and personal property of every kind within or without the district necessary to the full or convenient exercise of its powers.” One of the main functions of VTA is to provide transit service. (Public Utilities Code Sections 100160, 100161.)

Public Utilities Code Section 100131 provides further authority for the taking of property by VTA through eminent domain. It states in pertinent part that: “The district may exercise the right of eminent domain to take any property necessary or convenient to the exercise of the powers granted in this part.”
In addition, the Eminent Domain Law, Code of Civil Procedure Sections 1230.010 et seq., gives entities authorized by statute the right to use eminent domain to acquire property for public use, and specifies the procedures for the exercise of that right.

SECTION 2

GOVERNMENT CODE OFFERS

The owners of the properties that are the subject of the resolutions were made an offer by VTA for the purchase of the properties unless they could not be located with reasonable diligence as required by Government Code Section 7267.2. Sections 7267.2(a), (b) and (c) state that:

(a) (1) Prior to adopting a resolution of necessity pursuant to Section 1245.230 of the Code of Civil Procedure and initiating negotiations for the acquisition of real property, the public entity shall establish an amount that it believes to be just compensation therefor, and shall made an offer to the owner or owners of record to acquire the property for the full amount so established, unless the owner cannot be located with reasonable diligence. The offer may be conditioned upon the legislative body’s ratification of the offer by execution of a contract of acquisition or adoption of a resolution of necessity or both. The amount shall not be less than the public entity’s approved appraisal of the fair market value of the property. Any increase or decrease in the fair market value of real property to be acquired prior to the date of valuation caused by the public improvement for which the property is acquired, or by the likelihood that the property would be acquired for the improvement, other than that due to physical deterioration within the reasonable control of the owner or occupant, shall be disregarded in determining the compensation for the real property.

(2) At the time of making the offer described in paragraph (1), the public entity shall provide the property owner with an informational pamphlet detailing the process of eminent domain and the property owner’s rights under the Eminent Domain Law.

(b) The public entity shall provide the owner of real property to be acquired with a written statement of, and summary of the basis for, the amount it established as just compensation. The written statement summary shall contain detail sufficient to indicate clearly the basis for the offer, including, but not limited to, all of the following information:

(1) The date of valuation, highest and best use, and applicable zoning of property.
(2) The principal transactions, reproduction or replacement cost analysis, or capitalization analysis, supporting the determination of value.

(3) If appropriate, the just compensation for the real property acquired and for damages to remaining real property shall be separately stated and shall include the calculations and narrative explanation supporting the compensation, including any offsetting benefits.

(c) Where the property involved is owner-occupied residential property and contains no more than four residential units, the homeowner shall, upon request, be allowed to review a copy of the appraisal upon which the offer is based. The public entity may, but is not required to, satisfy the written statement, summary, and review requirements of this section by providing the owner a copy of the appraisal on which the offer is based.

Each property owner was presented with a written offer in an amount not less than the approved appraisal for the property, and a statement and summary of the basis of the offer, comprised of an Appraisal Summary Statement. The Appraisal Summary Statement provided the following information: name of owner; property address; parcel and APN number; locale; applicable zoning; date of valuation, present use; highest and best use; total property area; area to be acquired; type of interest to be acquired; improvements and access impacted; damages incurred and, as appropriate, separately stated with calculations and narrative explanation; total payment; and a description of the market value, reproduction or replacement cost analysis, or capitalization analysis, used to determine just compensation; and a summary of comparable sales, including the location, date of sale and sales price of properties used in the appraisal process. The date that the offer was made to each of the property owner is specified on the Property Fact Sheets contained in Section 6 of this report.

SECTION 3

SVBX PROJECT OVERVIEW, PURPOSE AND NEED

Project Description

BART Silicon Valley is an extension of the existing BART regional heavy rail system to Milpitas, San Jose and Santa Clara. The 16-mile BART Silicon Valley Program will be delivered through a phased approach.
The Silicon Valley Berryessa Extension (SVBX) Project is a 10-mile, two-station, first phase of BART Silicon Valley. SVBX is being implemented in cooperation with the Federal Transit Administration’s (FTA) New Starts Program, and will be a fully operable extension of the existing BART system with service to the cities of Milpitas and San Jose in Santa Clara County.

This extension of the BART system will begin south of the future BART Warm Springs Station in Fremont and proceed on the WP Milpitas Corridor purchased by VTA from the Union Pacific Railroad in 2002, through Milpitas, and end in the Berryessa area of north San Jose at Las Plumas Avenue. Engineering on the project is advancing, construction activities have commenced.

The two SVBX stations will feature:

- Parking structures
- Bus transit centers
- Bike and pedestrian connections
- Convenient access to BART System:
  - Half-mile walk for nearly 30,000 residents
  - Less than 12-minute bike ride for 260,000
  - 15-minutes via public transit or automobiles for more than 1,007,000 local residents

**Purpose of the Project**

The project is intended to achieve the following objectives:

- Improve public transit service and increase ridership in this severely, and ever-increasing, congested corridor by providing expanded transit capacity and faster, convenient access to and from major Santa Clara County employment and activity centers for corridor residents and residents from throughout the Bay Area and portions of the Central Valley of California.

- Enhance regional connectivity by expanding and interconnecting BART rapid transit service with VTA light rail, Amtrak, ACE, Caltrain, and VTA bus services in Santa Clara County; improve intermodal transit hubs where rail, bus, auto, bicycle and pedestrian links meet.

- Expand transportation solutions that will be instrumental in maintaining the economic vitality and continuing development of Silicon Valley.

- Improve mobility options to employment, education, medical, and retail centers for corridor residents, in particular low-income, youth, elderly, disabled, and ethnic minority populations.
• Improve regional air quality by reducing auto emissions.

• Support local and regional land use plans and facilitate corridor cities’ efforts to direct business and residential investments in transit oriented development. More efficient growth and sustainable development patterns are necessary to reduce impacts to the local and global environmental, such as adverse climate change.

Improved transit in the BART Silicon Valley Corridor is consistent with the goals established in prior corridor studies and responds to the long-range Valley Transportation Plan 2035 (VTP 2035), adopted by VTA in January 2009. The primary goal of the long-range plan is to provide transportation facilities and services that support and enhance Santa Clara County’s high quality of life and vibrant economy.

Need for the Project

The SVBX Project is critical to improving mobility between the East Bay and South Bay regions of the San Francisco Bay Area, as well as between eastern Santa Clara County and San Francisco. The project corridor, including the 1-880 and 1-680 freeways, is already very congested, with roadway conditions projected to steadily worsen as Santa Clara County and the greater Bay Area continue to grow. Travelers on the roadway network experience excessive delays currently and can expect delays on the typical weekday to increase in the absence of the proposed improvements.

SVBX is the initial segment of a planned BART extension to downtown San Jose and Santa Clara. The full extension will complete a major link in a regional high-speed, high capacity transit network that will circle lower San Francisco Bay. Regional connectivity is important to the future of Silicon Valley, the high-technology and venture capital center of the nation and a major provider of biotechnology products and services.

BART is the only modal alternative that produces a better balance between transit and auto modes; significantly facilitates transit-oriented development; and moves large numbers of commuters and discretionary travelers alike quickly and reliably. Other transportation improvement alternatives to the proposed project are not adequate for addressing current and future needs. Transportation system management/baseline improvements in the form of expanded express bus services and preferential treatments for transit do not reduce travel time delays significantly. Although increased higher density, mixed-use developments around light rail stations would increase the viability of a light rail option, it is oriented to intra-county travel. Frequent station stops and at-grade running tend to slow travel speeds, and train capacity will become constrained by the maximum allowable three-car train consists. Existing commuter rail services in the corridor are also capacity constrained due to the limited service frequencies that remain when sharing trackage with freight trains. No other transit modes can match the regional
connectivity provided by a BART extension and therefore they perform poorly in accommodating the rapid growth of regional travel in the San Francisco Bay Area.

SECTION 4
PROJECT PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION

Alternatives Analysis

A BART extension was selected as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) following completion of the Major Investment Study (MIS)/Alternatives Analysis (MIS/AA) in November 2001. The study evaluated 11 alternatives for the Silicon Valley Rapid Transit Corridor, representing various modes of travel including express bus, bus rapid transit, commuter rail, diesel and electric light rail, and BART. The LPA was chosen after an extensive review process, including technical analysis, 12 public meetings, and more than 15 Community Working Group meetings.

In October 2001, the Policy Advisory Board (PAB) voted unanimously to recommend to the VTA Board that the BART on the UPRR Alignment alternative be carried forward into the EIS/EIR phase along with the FTA-required Baseline Alternative. Since the VTA-BART property negotiations were still unresolved at the time, the PAB also recommended carrying forward a BART-Compatible alternative.

On November 9, 2001, the VTA Board unanimously selected BART on the UPRR Alignment as the Preferred Investment Strategy for the Silicon Valley Rapid Transit Corridor, citing its overall ranking of “High” in comparison to the other alternatives. The Board instructed that, in addition to the BART Alternative, the Baseline (Expanded Bus) Alternative be carried forward into the environmental compliance phase to fulfill FTA project development guidelines. The Board also approved an agreement with BART to identify the terms and conditions for implementing the Preferred Investment Strategy in concert with BART. On November 12, 2001, the BART Board also adopted the terms and conditions for the agreement.

When compared with the other alternatives, the BART Alternative offered:

- Fastest travel times to passenger destinations
- Highest ridership projections
- Greatest congestion relief
- Best access to jobs, education, medical, retail and entertainment centers throughout the Bay Area
- Regional connectivity with no transfers to the BART system
• Opportunities for transit-oriented development in conjunction with local land use planning efforts.

Station Area Planning

Station area planning for the new BART stations is an important element of the SVBX Project. VTA is working with the cities and stakeholders to develop transit-supportive station campuses, access, circulation, and land uses in the station areas that would increase transit ridership, create vibrant communities, ease the housing shortage, and promote multi-modal access to and from the stations.

The City of Milpitas has adopted a specific plan for the area surrounding the proposed BART Milpitas Station. The Milpitas Transit Sub Area Specific Plan, as adopted by the Milpitas City Council, would create mixed land uses near two VTA LRT stations and the future Milpitas BART station at Montague Expressway and Piper Drive.

Station area land use plans are guided, in part, by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Regional Transit Expansion Program policy, Resolution 3434, which includes provisions for transit-oriented development within a half-mile radius of transit stations.

Project Funding

The total SVBX Project cost is estimated at approximately $2.1 billion based on most current engineering cost estimates for project construction. Funding for the SVBX Project will come through multiple revenue streams including the 2000 Measure A, 1/2 cent sales tax and other local sources, the State of California and its Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP), and federal grants including the New Starts Program. VTA requested $900 million in FTA New Starts funding, which it secured through execution of a full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA) in March, 2012. The FFGA is a multi-year contractual agreement between the FTA and VTA that formally defines the project scope, cost and schedule, and establishes the terms of the $900 million in federal financial assistance.

Engineering design

The engineering and design of BART Silicon Valley is developed in various phases of project development in conjunction with the environmental process. Engineering phases include Conceptual Engineering (10% design), Preliminary Engineering (35% design), 65% design, and Final Engineering (100% design). These design phases represent a progression of engineering throughout project development.

Conceptual Engineering and Preliminary Engineering (PE) phases occur during the development of draft and final environmental documents, and together are generally referred to as the PE
phase. The 65% design phase allows for a further refinement to project definition and the design of the facilities and systems.

In December 2006, the technical PE phase was completed. The 65% engineering phase was completed in December 2008. Said engineering designs are hereby incorporated herein by reference. Final design will advance the project development to 100% completion following the selection of a Design-Build contractor as discussed in the section below.

*Design-Build Contract Procurement*

In May 2010, the VTA Board of Directors authorized VTA’s General Manager to pursue Design-Build as the delivery method for SVBX. The Design-Build method of project delivery involves selecting a contractor to perform both final design and construction under a single contract. Analysis of Design-Build as the delivery method for the project versus the traditional design, bid, build showed potential cost savings of $75 million, a 6 month acceleration of project delivery and reduced risks to VTA. This is VTA’s first Design-Build contract.

VTA issued the Request for Proposals (RFP) for the C700 Line, Track, Stations, and Systems (LTSS) contract in March 2011 to pre-qualified teams. The pre-qualified teams are KSG Constructors, Skanska-Shimmick-Herzog, Tutor Perini and Parsons SVBX, and Walsh/Flatiron/Comstock. On December 8, 2011, the Board awarded the C700 contract to Skanska-Shimmick-Herzog.

**SECTION 5**

**ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE AND REVIEW**

*Environmental Clearance*

The Berryessa Extension Project is defined in the BART Silicon Valley Final Environmental Impact Statement (2010). FTA, in coordination with VTA, circulated an Environmental Impact Statement in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in 2009. The Final Environmental Impact Statement was released in March 2010. A Record of Decision was issued in June 2010.

VTA released a Draft Second Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) in November 2010 to address proposed project changes since the certification of the last environmental document in 2007 under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Final Second SEIR was circulated to the public in February 2011 and certified at the March 2011 VTA Board of Directors meeting.
Environmental Review Summary

Environmental impacts were discussed in detail in the following California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents prepared during the planning and environmental review phases of the Project. Said documents are available for the Board's review & consideration and are incorporated by reference herein. Many of these documents, and other information concerning the Project, are available through the VTA website, vta.org.

- Major Investment Study Final Report, November 2001 (NEPA)
- 2004 Final Environmental Impact Report (CEQA)
- 2007 Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (CEQA)
- 2007 Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (CEQA)
- 2009 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (NEPA)
- 2010 Final Environmental Impact Statement (NEPA)
- 2010 Addendum to the 2007 FSEIR (CEQA)
- 2010 Environmental Determination – Addenda to the Final EIS (NEPA)
- 2010 Draft Second Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (CEQA)
- 2011 Final Second Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (CEQA)
- 2011 Addendum to the 2nd Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (CEQA)
- 2011 Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (CEQA)
- 2012 Addendum No. 2 to the 2nd Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (CEQA)
- 2012 Addendum No. 3 to the 2nd Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (CEQA)
- 2013 Addendum No. 4 to the 2nd Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (CEQA)
- 2013 Categorical Exemption (CEQA)
• 2014 Addendum No. 5 to the 2nd Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (CEQA)

• 2014 Environmental Re-evaluation (NEPA)

• 2014 Addendum to Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (CEQA)

• 2014 Categorical Exemption (CEQA)

SECTION 6

SPECIFIC PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS

A detailed property fact sheet and aerial photographs of the parcels required for this Project, and subject to the Resolution of Necessity follows. Overall property requirements and project related costs have been minimized as much as possible. An offer, which included the Required Project Property and the Uneconomic Remnant, was made to Jack C. Cox and Marie I. Cox, as Co-Trustees udt dated February 11, 1988, the owners of the property, on or about October 31, 2014. The offer package is incorporated herein by reference. A Notice of Intention to Adopt Resolution of Necessity, which is incorporated herein by reference, was sent to the owners of the property via first class and overnight mail on January 20, 2015 and was also hand delivered at the owner’s residence on January 21, 2015.
BART SILICON VALLEY BERRYESSA EXTENSION PROJECT

PROPERTY FACT SHEET – B2257

Owner: Jack C. Cox and Marie I. Cox, as Co-Trustees udt dated February 11, 1988

Property Address: 1550 Gladding Court

Locale: Milpitas, CA

Present Use: Improved with 2 industrial building

Total Property Area: 3.47 acres

Areas to be Acquired:

1. Fee (B2257-01) - 44,494 sq.ft
2. Public Service Easement (B2257-02) - 5,509 sq.ft
3. Temporary Construction Easement (B2257-05) - 1,845 sq.ft
4. Temporary Construction Easement (B2257-06) - 5,509 sq.ft
5. Emergency Vehicle Access Easement (B2257-07) - 1,169 sq.ft
6. Temporary Construction Easement (B2257-08) - 559 sq.ft
7. Fee (B2257-09) - 12,222 sq.ft (Uneconomic Remnant)

Building to be acquired: 27,700 sq.ft. industrial building located primarily within B2257-01

Date of Offer: October 31, 2014

The subject property is currently owned by Jack C. Cox and Marie I. Cox, as Co-Trustees udt dated February 11, 1988, and is located at 1550 Gladding Court in the City of Milpitas. The larger parcel consists of approximately 3.47 acres and is improved with a 27,700 sq. ft industrial building and a 25,000 sq.ft. industrial building.

The proposed acquisition consists of: (1) a 44,494 sq.ft Fee (B2257-01) to construct the future South Milpitas Boulevard extension; (2) the 27,700 sq.ft. industrial building located primarily within B2257-01; (3) a 5,509 sq.ft. Public Service Easement (B2257-02) for construction, installation and maintenance of a sidewalk and other public utilities supporting the new roadway; (4) a 1,845 sq.ft. Temporary Construction Easement (B2257-05) for work space necessary for demolition of the 27,700 sq. ft. building; (5) a 5,509 sq.ft. Temporary Construction Easement (B2257-06) for staging, storage and work space necessary to construct the new roadway; (6) a
1,169 sq.ft. Emergency Vehicle Access Easement (B2257-07) to provide emergency access to the remainder property; and (7) a Temporary Construction Easement (B2257-08) for work space needed to construct the Emergency Access Easement (collectively “Required Project Property”).

VTA also seeks to acquire a 12,222 sq.ft. Fee interest (B2257-09) (“Uneconomic Remnant”) pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 1240.410 et seq., which authorizes public agencies to acquire a portion of remainder property when, following an acquisition, it is left in such size, shape or condition as to be of little market value. An independent appraiser determined that after the acquisition of the Required Project Property, the area identified as the Uneconomic Remnant will be of little market value. VTA staff seeks to acquire the Uneconomic Remnant in lieu of acquiring a 3,471 sq. ft. Public Utility Easement (B2257-3) and a 3,344 sq.ft. Storm Drainage Easement (B2257-03) (collectively “Additional Easements”), which are necessary to construct the Project, because the Additional Easements are located entirely within the Uneconomic Remnant and therefore separate acquisitions of those easements are unnecessary. See the following Exhibits: Exhibit A-1- Aerial Exhibit of Required Project Property and Uneconomic Remnant; Exhibit A-2- Aerial Exhibit of Required Project Property and Additional Easements; and Exhibit A-3- Legals/Plats of Additional Easements.
Exhibit A-3

PUBLIC SERVICE EASEMENT

A permanent, non-exclusive public service easement (the “Public Service Easement”) and incidents thereto, for the installation, operation, maintenance and repair of any and all public service facilities including roadways, sidewalks, poles, wires and conduits for electrical, telephone, television, gas, storm, water mains, sanitary and water pipelines and services, fiber optic lines, and all appurtenances thereto, under, upon, above or across a portion of the property described in the deed recorded November 8, 1994 in Book N663, Page 113, Doc. No. 12717429, situated in the City of Milpitas, County of Santa Clara, State of California, said Public Service Easement being described and depicted as Parcel B2257-02 on Exhibit “1” attached hereto and made a part hereof.

The herein described easement shall remain open and be kept free and clear from buildings and structures of any kind, except public service and public utility structures and their appurtenances, lawful landscape and irrigation systems, pavement and fences that don’t impair the intended purpose of the easement, lawful unsupported roof overhangs, and obstructions that impair the intended use of or are inconsistent with the purposes of the easement. Unobstructed continuous access shall be maintained at all times.

The provisions hereof shall inure to the benefit of and bind the successors and assigns of the respective parties hereto, and all covenants shall apply to and run with the land.
Exhibit “1”

Parcel B2257-03
5/16/2013
PSE

LEGAL DESCRIPTION
APN 092-08-084

All that certain real property situated in the City of Milpitas, County of Santa Clara, State of California, described as follows:

Being a portion of that certain parcel of land designated as Parcel 1, as said parcel is shown upon that certain Parcel Map recorded April 11, 2000 in Book 726 of Maps, pages 24 and 25, Official Records of said County, being more particularly described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the northwesterly line of said Parcel 1, distant North 69°45'40" East 346.31 feet from the west corner of said Parcel 1; thence continuing along said northwesterly line

1. North 69°45'40" East 17.78 feet to the beginning of a non-tangent curve to the right, the center of which bears North 56°39'49" West 194.50 feet; thence
2. Southwesterly 123.68 feet along said curve through a central angle of 36°26'00"; thence
3. South 69°46'11" West 228.67 feet; thence
4. North 65°13'49" West 14.14 feet; thence
5. North 69°46'11" East 238.67 feet to the beginning of a curve to the left with radius of 184.50 feet; thence
6. Northeasterly 103.00 feet along said curve through a central angle of 31°59'13" to the POINT OF BEGINNING.

Containing 3,471 square feet more or less.

This description was prepared by me or under my direction in conformance with the Professional Land Surveyors Act. All bearings and distances are based on the North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Zone III, epoch 1998.5. All distances are grid distances. To convert grid distances to ground distances, multiply expressed distances by 1.00005333.

John W. Pettley, PLS 6202
My License Expires on 03/31/2014

LICENSED LAND SURVEYOR
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
STORM DRAIN EASEMENT

A Storm Drain Easement for the purpose of installation, maintenance, repair and replacement of the initial or any other size of water pipe lines and storm drain pipelines and any and all appurtenances thereto, including but not limited to, valves, meters and manholes under, upon, above or across a portion of the Grantor’s property described in the deed recorded November 8, 1994 in Book N663, Page 113, Doc. No. 12717429, situated in the City of Milpitas, County of Santa Clara, State of California, said Storm Drain Easement being described and depicted as Parcel B2257-04 on Exhibit “2” attached hereto and made a part hereof.

The herein described easement shall remain open and be kept free and clear from buildings and structures of any kind, except lawful unsupported roof overhangs, and obstructions that impair the intended use of or are inconsistent with the purposes of the easement. Unobstructed continuous access shall be maintained at all times.

The provisions hereof shall inure to the benefit of and bind the successors and assigns of the respective parties hereto, and all covenants shall apply to and run with the land.
Exhibit “2”

LEGAL DESCRIPTION
APN 092-08-084

All that certain real property situated in the City of Milpitas, County of Santa Clara, State of California, described as follows:

Being a portion of that certain parcel of land designated as Parcel 1, as said parcel is shown upon that certain Parcel Map recorded April 11, 2000 in Book 725 of Maps, pages 24 and 25, Official Records of said County, being more particularly described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the northwesterly line of said Parcel 1, distant North 69°45'40" East 325.78 feet from the west corner of said Parcel 1; thence continuing along said northwesterly line

1. North 69°45'40" East 20.53 feet to the beginning of a non-tangent curve to the right, the center of which bears North 52°13'02" West 184.50 feet; thence

2. Southwesterly 103.00 feet along said curve through a central angle of 31°59'13"; thence

3. South 69°46'11" West 238.67 feet; thence

4. North 65°13'49" West 7.82 feet; thence

5. North 20°13'49" West 4.47 feet; thence

6. North 69°46'11" East 244.20 feet to the beginning of a curve to the left with radius of 174.50 feet; thence

7. Northeasterly 79.98 feet along said curve through a central angle of 26°15'37" to the POINT OF BEGINNING.

Containing 3,344 square feet more or less.

This description was prepared by me or under my direction in conformance with the Professional Land Surveyors Act. All bearings and distances are based on the North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Zone III, epoch 1998.5. All distances are grid distances. To convert grid distances to ground distances, multiply expressed distances by 1.00005333.

John W. Pettley, PLS 6202
My License Expires on 03/31/2014
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BART Silicon Valley Berryessa Extension Project

Resolution of Necessity Hearing

February 5, 2015
Resolution of Necessity Hearing

- Board has full discretion as to whether or not to adopt a recommended Resolution of Necessity.

- Amount of compensation is NOT a consideration in this hearing.

- Board must make each of the findings contained in the respective Resolution of Necessity prior to their adoption.
Resolution of Necessity Property

Jack C. Cox and Marie I. Cox, as Co-Trustees udt dated February 11, 1988

(1) a 44,494 sq.ft Fee, including a 27,700 sq.ft. industrial building located primarily within Fee
(2) a 5,509 sq.ft. Public Service Easement
(3) a 1,845 sq.ft. Temporary Construction Easement
(4) a 5,509 sq.ft. Temporary Construction Easement
(5) a 1,169 sq.ft. Emergency Vehicle Access Easement
(6) a 559 sq. ft. Temporary Construction Easement
(7) a 12,222 sq.ft. Fee (Uneconomic Remnant)
Owner: Jack C. Cox and Marie I. Cox, as Co-Trustees udt dated February 11, 1988

Location: 1550 Gladding Court, Milpitas

Present Use: Improved with an industrial building

Property Size: Approximately 3.47 acres

Acquisitions:
(1) Fee (B2257-01) - 44,494 sq.ft
(2) Public Service Easement (B2257-02) - 5,509 sq.ft.
(3) Temporary Construction Easement (B2257-05) - 1,845 sq.ft.
(4) Temporary Construction Easement (B2257-06) - 5,509 sq.ft.
(5) Emergency Vehicle Access Easement (B2257-07) - 1,169 sq.ft.
(6) Temporary Construction Easement (B2257-08) - 559 sq.ft.
(7) Fee (B2257-09) - 12,222 sq.ft. (Uneconomic Remnant)

**Building to be acquired:** 27,700 sq.ft. industrial building located primarily within B2257-01

**Date of Offer:** October 31, 2014
Project Need:

(1) a 44,494 sq.ft Fee (B2257-01), including a 27,700 sq. foot industrial building is required to construct the future South Milpitas Boulevard extension;

(2) a 5,509 sq.ft. Public Service Easement (B2257-02) is needed for construction, installation and maintenance of a sidewalk and other public utilities supporting the new roadway;
(3) a 1,845 sq.ft. Temporary Construction Easement (B2257-05) is required for work space necessary for demolition of the 27,700 sq. ft. building;

(4) a 5,509 sq.ft. Temporary Construction Easement (B2257-06) is required for staging, storage and work space necessary to construct the new roadway;

(5) a 1,169 sq.ft. Emergency Vehicle Access Easement (B2257-07) is needed to provide emergency access to the remainder property;

(6) a Temporary Construction Easement (B2257-08) for work space needed to construct the Emergency Access Easement
Uneconomic Remnant:

A 12,222 sq.ft. Fee interest (B2257-09) is being acquired as a result of an independent appraiser’s determination that, after the acquisitions of the properties required for the Project, it will be left in such size, shape or condition as to be of little market value. (California Code of Civil Procedure section 1240.410 et seq.)
Jack C. Cox and Marie I. Cox, Co-Trustees udt dated February 11, 1988

BART Silicon Valley Berryessa Extension Project
1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The Regular Meeting of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority’s (VTA) Board of Directors was called to order by Chairperson Woodward at 5:32 p.m. in the Board of Supervisors’ Chambers, County Government Center, 70 West Hedding Street, San José, California.

Chairperson Woodward welcomed newly appointed Regular Board Member Magdalena Carrasco, representing Group 1, San Jose; returning Regular Board Member Rich Larsen, representing Group 2, North West Cities, who previously served as an alternate; and, Raul Peralez, Alternate, representing Group 1, San Jose, who was not in attendance.

1.1 ADMINISTER OATH OF OFFICE

Elaine Baltalo, Board Secretary, administered the Oath of Office to newly appointed Board Member Magdalena Carrasco.

1.2. ROLL CALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jason Baker</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeannie Bruins</td>
<td>Alternate Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Carr</td>
<td>Alternate Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magdalena Carrasco</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Chavez</td>
<td>Vice Chairperson</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Cortese</td>
<td>Alternate Board Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jose Esteves</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Herrera</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash Kalra</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnny Khamis</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Larsen</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Liccardo</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie Matthews</td>
<td>Alternate Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Miller</td>
<td>Alternate Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raul Peralez</td>
<td>Alternate Board Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Whittum</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry Woodward</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Yeager</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Alternates do not serve unless participating as a Member.

A quorum was present.
1.3 Orders of the Day and Approval of the Consent Agenda

Chairperson Woodward noted staff’s request to move the following items to the Consent Agenda: 1) Agenda Item # 7.4, Auxiliary Power Supply (APSE) Procurement contract, and; 2) Agenda Item # 7.5, LRT Efficiency Project – Mountain View Double Track Phase II Construction Contract Award.

Chairperson Woodward also noted staff’s request to remove Agenda Item # 4.2, Light Rail Efficiency Program (LREP) Resolution of Necessity for the Mountain View Double Tract Project, as an agreement was reached with the property owners.

M/S/C (Chavez/Baker) to approve the Orders of the Day and the Consent Agenda.

RESULT: ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS] (Orders of the Day, Consent Agenda Items #: 6.1 - 6.6 and 7.4 - 7.5)

MOVER: Chavez
SECONDER: Baker
AYES: Baker, Carrasco, Chavez, Esteves, Kalra, Khamis, Larsen, Whittum, Yeager, Woodward
ABSENT: Liccardo, Herrera

Board Member Liccardo arrived at the meeting and took his seat at 5:38 p.m.

2. AWARDS AND COMMENDATION

2.1 Employees of the Month for December 2014; and Employees and Supervisor of the First Quarter of 2015

Chairperson Woodward recognized Christina Jaworski, Sr. Environmental Planner, River Oaks; Vance Gwinn, Bus Dispatcher, Chaboya Operations; Jonathan Swage, Transit Mechanic, Cerone Maintenance, as Employees of the Month for December 2014.

Chairperson Woodward recognized Brent Burgos, Accountant III, River Oaks; Susan Yates, Coach Operator, Chaboya Division; Jamal Gettone, Service Worker, Chaboya Maintenance, as Employees of the Quarter for the first (1) quarter of 2015; and Sergio Pina, Transit Maintenance Supervisor; Cerone Maintenance, for Supervisor of the Quarter for the first (1) quarter of 2015.

Board Member Herrera arrived at the meeting and took her seat at 5:40 p.m.
2.2 **Board Resolution of Appreciation**

Vice Chairperson Chavez presented the Resolution of Appreciation to outgoing Board Chairperson Ash Kalra.

**M/S/C (Larsen/Herrera)** to adopt Resolution of Appreciation No. 2015.01.01 for outgoing Board Chairperson Kalra.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULT: ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOVER: Larsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDER: Herrera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYES: Baker, Carrasco, Chavez, Esteves, Herrera, Kalra, Khamis, Larsen, Liccardo, Whittum, Yeager, Woodward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSENT: None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Board Member Kalra expressed his appreciation to the VTA Board and staff for the great honor and privilege of serving as Chairperson.

Alternate Board Member Bruins arrived at the meeting and took her seat at 5:46 p.m.

Chairperson Woodward welcomed newly appointed Alternate Board Member Jeannie Bruins, representing Group 2, North West Cities.

Elaine Baltao, Board Secretary, administered the Oath of Office to newly appointed Alternate Board Member Jeannie Bruins.

Chairperson Woodward welcomed newly appointed Regular Board Member Sam Liccardo, Group 1, San Jose, who previously served as Ex-Officio Board Member.

3. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Fred Newman, Interested Citizen, noted his frustration with early morning riders who lie down and utilize more than one seat.

John Rainville, Interested Citizen, noted the insufficient space for bicycles on VTA light rail and suggested VTA follow Caltrain’s dedicated bike car to increase bicycle capacity in light rail.

Trish, Interested Citizen, commented on the following: 1) Oath of Office; 2) include minutes in the board packet, and; 3) discussed toll lane revenue graph.

James Wightman, Interested Citizen, expressed concern with hearing offensive language on VTA Light Rail and suggested signage be posted to discourage such behavior. Mr. Wightman queried about the reason for the four month closure of the Montague Light Rail station in Milpitas.

Gary Jones, Interested Citizen, expressed excitement for Cupertino’s General Plan and revitalization. He suggested a VTA Transit Center be built at Stevens Creek Boulevard and Wolfe Road to help relieve traffic congestion.
Ross Signnorino, Interested Citizen, suggested the VTA Board of Directors’ Minutes Roll Call be modified to add a column indicating the city grouping being represented to display the balance of representation.

The following members of the public expressed concern about express lane plans on SR 85 noting the following: 1) allow more hybrids; 2) address pinch points along the corridor, and; 3) add light rail in the corridor.

- Cheriel Jensen
- Paul Krug

4. PUBLIC HEARINGS

4.1 HEARING - NOTICE OF INTENTION TO ADOPT RESOLUTION OF NECESSITY

Bijal Patel, Deputy Director, Real Estate, provided a brief presentation, highlighting: 1) Project map; 2) Resolution of Necessity hearing; 3) Resolution of Necessity property; and 4) S&B, LLC, a California limited liability company.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

M/S/C (Liccardo/Kalra) to close the Public Hearing.

RESULT: ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: Liccardo
SECONDER: Kalra
AYES: Baker, Carrasco, Chavez, Esteves, Herrera, Kalra, Khamis, Larsen, Liccardo, Whittum, Yeager, Woodward
ABSENT: None

M/S/C (Liccardo/Kalra) to adopt Resolution of Necessity No. 2015.01.02 determining that the public interest and necessity require the acquisition of a property interest in property owned by S&B Milpitas, LLC and located in Milpitas, California, for the BART Silicon Valley Berryessa Extension (SVBX) Project.

Property ID/Assessor's Parcel Number/Owner

B2084 (APN 092-08-077) owned by S & B Milpitas, LLC, a California limited liability company

RESULT: ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: Liccardo
SECONDER: Kalra
AYES: Baker, Carrasco, Chavez, Esteves, Herrera, Kalra, Khamis, Larsen, Liccardo, Whittum, Yeager, Woodward
ABSENT: None
4.2 (Removed from the Agenda)

Close Hearing and adopt a Resolution of Necessity determining that the public interest and necessity require the acquisition of property interests in property owned by DuJuan E. Green and Christina Green, Trustees or their successors in trust, under the DuJuan & Christina Green Living Trust, dated October 08, 2009 and located in Mountain View, California, for the Mountain View Double Track Project.

**Property ID/Assessor's Parcel Number/Owner**

LREP003 (APN 160-73-014) owned by DuJuan E. Green and Christina Green, Trustees or their successors in trust, under the DuJuan & Christina Green Living Trust, dated October 08, 2009.

5. REPORTS

5.1. **Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) Chairperson's Report**

There was no Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) Chairperson’s report.

5.2. **Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) Chairperson's Report**

There was no Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) Chairperson’s report.

5.3. **General Manager's Report**

Nuria I. Fernandez, General Manager, provided a report, highlighting:

- Ridership Report for November, 2014 noting, bus ridership decreased by 1.6% while light rail increased by 5.9% as compared to November, 2013. Calendar year to date system ridership is up 1%.

- VTA Events in December, 2014, noting: 1) Light Rail and Bus Holiday Wrap; 2) Stuff the Bus Toys for Tots Holiday Toy Drive; 3) VTA employees annual participation in the annual Family Giving Tree Holiday Wish Drive 4) VTA Holly Trolley, and; 5) New Year’s Eve Service.

- Announced January 2015 is Human Trafficking Awareness Month.

- Introduced Captain David Lera, Santa Clara County Sheriff’s Department, who reported on Security and Public Safety, highlighting the following: 1) November and December, 2014, statistics for the Sheriff Transit Patrol and citations from the VTA Fare Inspectors; and 2) discussed Proposition 47 reclassification of crimes which affects the number of arrests. Captain Lera noted he will be adding a line to report out misdemeanor cite and releases.

5.3.A. **Silicon Valley Rapid Transit (SVRT) Program Update**

Carolyn Gonot, Director of Engineering and Transportation Infrastructure and SVRT Program, provided a presentation, highlighting: 1) current project activities - Milpitas; 2) current project activities - San Jose; 3) Sierra/Lundy Trench Construction; 4) SVBX Project Integrated Summary Schedule; 5) SVBX Cost Summary, and; 6) Phase II Activities.
On order of Chairperson Woodward and there being no objection, the Committee received the Silicon Valley Rapid Transit program update.

5.3.B. **Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and California Transportation Commission (CTC) activities**

Aaron Quigley, Senior Policy Advisor, provided a brief report, highlighting the Caltrain modernization funding plan challenges.

The Board expressed concern about the funding challenges.

**Public Comment**

Eugene Bradley, Interested Citizen, suggested VTA increase the on-time percentage for bus and light rail.

Omar Chatty, Interested Citizen, thanked the Board for supporting Pacheco Pass Funding in 2014, and advocated for BART around the Bay.

Roland Lebrun, Interested Citizen, expressed concern about Caltrain funding issues.

5.4. **Chairperson's Report**

Chairperson Woodward provided a brief report highlighting: 1) 2015 Committee appointments; 2) moving the responsibilities of the Ad-Hoc Levi’s Stadium Transit Program Committee to the Transit Planning & Operations (TP&O) Committee; 3) Audit Committee functions will become part of the newly constituted Governance and Audit Committee.

5.4.A. **2015 Appointments to Board Standing Committees, Joint Powers Boards, Policy Advisory Boards, and Ad Hoc Committees**

M/S/C (Herrera/Larsen) to approve appointments to the Board Standing Committees, Joint Powers Boards, Policy Advisory Boards, and Ad Hoc Committees.

RESULT: ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]

MOVER: Herrera
SECONDER: Larsen
AYES: Baker, Carrasco, Chavez, Esteves, Herrera, Kalra, Khamis, Larsen, Liccardo, Whittum, Yeager, Woodward
ABSENT: None

5.4.B. **Receive Remarks from Incoming 2015 Chairperson Perry Woodward**

Chairperson Woodward thanked the Committee for their confidence and stated he looks forward to working together.

Chairperson Woodward noted his vision for VTA in 2015, highlighting the following five priorities: 1) Bus Rapid Transit (BRT); 2) Super Bowl 50; 3) Earthquakes Stadium service; 4) Envision Silicon Valley (ESV) process, and; 5) BART (Bay Area Rapid Transit) Phase II.
Ms. Fernandez expounded on the plans and efforts for each of the priorities.

Chairperson Woodward noted his vision for VTA includes restructuring the process slightly by requesting the Committee Chairs provide a brief introduction at the Board Meeting to those items their committee has considered. After the introduction staff will give a brief description of the major points and answer any questions the Board may have.

5.4.C. Report Regarding the Levi’s Stadium Transit Program Committee

George Tacke, Levi’s Stadium and Special Events Manager, provided a brief report, highlighting: 1) VTA has managed 50 events at Levi’s Stadium with success; 2) there have been no significant operational or customer service challenges during the last several events; 3) planning for the upcoming 2015 WrestleMania and Super Bowl 2016, and; 4) staff will focus on proposed strategies to fund VTA service to Levi’s Stadium in upcoming months.

Public Comment

Mr. Lebrun requested information items be provided to the public in the agenda packet prior to the Board meeting, if available. He also commented about Levi’s Stadium surplus funds.

6. CONSENT AGENDA

6.1. Board of Directors Regular Meeting Minutes of December 11, 2014
M/S/C (Chavez/Baker) to approve the Board of Directors Regular Meeting Minutes of December 11, 2014.

6.2. Amended and Restated Regulation 98.11.2 Use, Traffic and Vehicles Operated or Parked on VTA Facilities
M/S/C (Chavez/Baker) to adopt the Amended and Restated Regulation 98.11.2, entitled Use, Traffic and Vehicles Operated or Parked on VTA Facilities, which updates the rules and regulations for use, traffic and vehicles operated or parked on all property owned, leased or controlled by VTA.

6.3. Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee Appointment
M/S/C (Chavez/Baker) to ratify the appointment to the Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee of David Almeida, representing the City of Gilroy, for the two-year term ending June 30, 2016.

6.4. Programmed Project Monitoring – Quarterly Report
M/S/C (Chavez/Baker) to receive the Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report for July-September 2014.

6.6. **Transit Service Changes – January 2015**

M/S/C (Chavez/Baker) to receive a report on the January 2015 Transit Service Changes.

7.4. **Auxiliary Power Supply (APSE) Procurement**

M/S/C (Chavez/Baker) to authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Alstom, Inc., in an amount up to $1,944,926 to procure five (5) Auxiliary Power Supply Equipment (APSE) units and associated support parts for VTA’s light rail vehicles.

7.5. **LRT Efficiency Project – Mountain View Double Track Phase II Construction Contract Award**

M/S/C (Chavez/Baker) to authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with B&C Transit, the lowest responsible and responsive bidder for construction of the LRT Efficiency Project - Mountain View Double Track Phase II Project for an amount not to exceed $11,706,985.

7. **REGULAR AGENDA**

7.1. **Amended and Restated Ordinance 98.1 - Vehicles and Facilities – Second Reading and Adoption**

Ms. Patel provided a brief overview of the report highlighting: 1) background; 2) Reason for the amendment; 3) Summary of changes, and; 4) Committee review process.

**Public Comment**

The following members of the public made the following comments: 1) thanked VTA for rewriting the ordinance; 2) noted the ordinance refers only to “inspectors” and leaves out “fare inspector” 3) expressed concern about the safety of Google buses using VTA bus stops; 4) the importance of preventing environmental pollution; 5) 49 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Section 120, Substance Abuse monitoring for operators, and; 6) maintenance cost sharing.

- Diana Hermone, Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU) Local 265
- Satnam Gill, ATU Local 265

Board Member Kalra thanked the public speakers and noted that the specifics of Third Party Use Policy will be discussed and considered at a future meeting.

Ms. Patel noted VTA has multiple categories of inspectors and the ordinance was intended to cover all potential categories. She stated Section 6 of the ordinance lays out who has delegated authority to enforce and says “inspectors as well as officers” and is meant to be inclusive of all categories of inspectors including fare inspectors.

Robert Fabela, General Counsel, noted the language was modified to be more specific.
Vice Chairperson Chavez requested a discussion be held with VTA employee bargaining units prior to returning to the Board to work together to develop a shared understanding around next steps and intent.

**M/S/C (Chavez/Herrera)** to consider and adopt the Amended and Restated Ordinance 98.1, Vehicles and Facilities, in the form attached hereto as Attachment A, which updates references to relevant California statutes, adds restrictions that align with current issues faced by the VTA, updates references to the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority’s name, updates provisions regulating the conduct of passengers on transit vehicles and facilities, and clarifies the conditions by which third parties may enter and use parking lots, stations and other VTA facilities.

**RESULT:** APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
**MOVER:** Chavez
**SECONDER:** Herrera
**AYES:** Baker, Carrasco, Chavez, Esteves, Herrera, Kalra, Khamis, Larsen, Liccardo, Whittum, Yeager, Woodward
**ABSENT:** None

Board Member Kalra left the meeting at 7:18 p.m.

7.2. **Tamien Negative Declaration**

Tom Fitzwater, Transportation Planning Manager, provided a brief overview of the report and a presentation, highlighting: 1) Project Purpose and Description; 2) Project View; 3) Public Comments on Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration; 4) Bicycle Access and Facilities, and; 5) Alternative Designs.

**Public Comment**

Mr. Lebrun made the following comments: 1) commended VTA on the alternative design; 2) suggested VTA consider putting gravel down on the east side where people are currently parking in the dirt, and 3) suggested VTA use Clipper Card access to track facility use.

Vice Chairperson Chavez queried whether an exterior treatment was planned for the parking structure, and highlighted the importance of clearly defining what the public can expect as well as the investment VTA is making.

Ms. Fernandez indicated if federal funds are involved in the project then a percentage of that funding can be allocated toward “art transit.”

Vice Chairperson Chavez requested staff provide Board Members with the project cite history to familiarize them with the project.

Board Member Liccardo queried about possible retail opportunities such as building parking areas on top of retail buildings to generate revenue to VTA. Staff noted development is not allowed on the west side, and a new amendment for private use would be required.

Board Member Herrera seconded Board Member Liccardo’s suggestion to consider retail opportunities on the site, and thanked staff for listening to the community and providing an alternative design.
RESULT: APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: Chavez
SECONDER: Herrera
AYES: Baker, Carrasco, Chavez, Esteves, Herrera, Khamis, Larsen, Liccardo, Whittum, Yeager, Woodward
ABSENT: Kalra

M/S/C (Chavez/Herrera) to approve the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) for the Tamien Station Parking Structure Project; 2. Adopt the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program; and 3. Adopt the Recommended Project Description.

Administration and Finance Committee

7.3. 2000 Measure A Sales Tax Revenue Refunding Bonds, 2015 Series A

Raj Srinath, Chief Financial Officer, provided a brief overview of the report and a presentation, highlighting: 1) refunding bonds - Series 2015 - A & B; 2) Comparison of Debt Service, and; 3) Next Steps.

Board Member Khamis thanked VTA for protecting taxpayers, and requested staff provide a list where the onetime tax savings could be allocated. Mr. Srinath responded budgetary savings from Measure A funds can only be allocated to Measure A projects.

RESULT: APPROVED
MOVER: Larsen
SECONDER: Herrera
AYES: Baker, Carrasco, Chavez, Esteves, Herrera, Larsen, Liccardo, Whittum, Yeager, Woodward
NOES: Khamis
ABSENT: Kalra

M/S/C (Larsen/Herrera) on a vote of 10 ayes to 1 no to 0 abstentions, to adopt Resolution No. 2015.01.03 that approves the transaction documents (on file with the Board Secretary) and authorizes the General Manager and Chief Financial Officer to take all necessary actions to issue the 2000 Measure A Sales Tax Revenue Refunding Bonds, 2015 Series A (the “2015 Bonds”), in order to effect an advance refunding of up to all the outstanding 2000 Measure A Sales Tax Revenue Refunding Bonds, 2007 Series A Bonds (the “2007 Bonds”) and to pay the costs of issuance. Board Member Khamis opposed.

7.4. (Removed from the Regular Agenda and placed on the Consent Agenda.)

Authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Alstom, Inc., in an amount up to $1,944,926 to procure five (5) Auxiliary Power Supply Equipment (APSE) units and associated support parts for VTA’s light rail vehicles.

7.5. (Removed from the Regular Agenda and placed on the Consent Agenda.)

Authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with B&C Transit, the lowest responsible and responsive bidder for construction of the LRT Efficiency
Project - Mountain View Double Track Phase II Project for an amount not to exceed $11,706,985.

8. **OTHER ITEMS**

8.1. **ITEMS OF CONCERN AND REFERRAL TO ADMINISTRATION**

There were no Items of Concern and Referral to Administration.

8.2. **Reports from VTA Committees, Joint Powers Boards (JPB), and Regional Commissions**

8.2.A. **VTA Standing Committees**

- Silicon Valley Rapid Transit Program Working (SVRT) Committee – December 1, 2014, Notice of Cancellation was accepted as contained in the Agenda Packet.
- Congestion Management Program & Planning (CMPP) Committee – December 18, 2014, Minutes, were accepted as contained in the Agenda Packet.
- Administration & Finance (A&F) Committee – December 18, 2014, Minutes, were accepted as contained in the Agenda Packet.
- Transit Planning & Operations (TP&O) Committee – December 18, 2014, Notice of Cancellation was accepted as contained in the Agenda Packet.

8.2.B. **VTA Advisory Committees**

- Committee for Transit Accessibility (CTA) – There was no report.
- Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) and 2000 Measure A Citizens Watchdog Committee (CWC) – December 10, 2014, Notice of Cancellation was accepted as contained in the Agenda Packet.
- Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) – There was no report.
- Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) – December 11, 2014, Notice of Cancellation was accepted as contained in the Agenda Packet.
- Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) – December 11, 2014, Notice of Cancellation was accepted as contained in the Agenda Packet.

8.2.C. **VTA Policy Advisory Boards (PAB)**

- Downtown East Valley Policy Advisory Board (DTEV) – There was no report.
- Diridon Station Joint Policy Advisory Board - There was no report.
- El Camino Real Rapid Transit PAB – There was no report.

8.2.D. **Joint Powers Boards and Regional Commissions**
• Peninsula Corridor JPB – January 8, 2015, Summary Notes were accepted as contained on the dais.
• Capitol Corridor JPB – There was no report.
• Dumbarton Rail Corridor Policy Committee – There was no report.
• Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) – December 17, 2014, Summary Notes were accepted as contained on the dais.
• Sunol Smart Carpool Lane Joint Powers Authority – There was no report.
• SR 152 Mobility Partnership – There was no report.

8.3. ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no Announcements.

9. CLOSED SESSION

9.1. Recessed to Closed Session at 7:34 p.m.

A. Existing Litigation - Conference with Legal Counsel
   [Government Code Section 54956.9(d)(1)]


   (Santa Clara County Superior Court Case No.: 1-13-CV-257814)

B. Existing Litigation - Conference with Legal Counsel
   [Government Code Section 54956.9(d)(1)]

   Name of Case: San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District v. PPF Industrial Whipple Road/Bowman Place, LP, a Delaware Limited Partnership

   (Alameda County Superior Court Case No.: RG 13708269)

C. Anticipated Litigation - Conference with Legal Counsel
   [Government Code Section 54956.9(d)(4) - Initiation of Litigation]

   Number of Potential Cases: 1 (Union Pacific)

D. Public Employee Performance Evaluation
   (Pursuant to Government Code Section 54957)

   Title: General Manager

E. Conference with Labor Negotiator
   [Government Code Section 54957.6]
9.2. **Reconvened to Open Session at 8:39 p.m.**

9.3. **Closed Session Report**

A. **Existing Litigation - Conference with Legal Counsel**  
[Government Code Section 54956.9(d)(1)]

(Santa Clara County Superior Court Case No.: 1-13-CV-257814)  
Mr. Fabela reported there was no reportable action taken in Closed Session.

B. **Existing Litigation - Conference with Legal Counsel**  
[Government Code Section 54956.9(d)(1)]

Name of Case: San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District v. PPF Industrial Whipple Road/Bowman Place, LP, a Delaware Limited Partnership  
(Alameda County Superior Court Case No.: RG 13708269)  
Mr. Fabela reported there was no reportable action taken in Closed Session.

C. **Anticipated Litigation - Conference with Legal Counsel**  
[Government Code Section 54956.9(d)(4) - Initiation of Litigation]

Number of Potential Cases: 1 (Union Pacific)  
Mr. Fabela reported there was no reportable action taken in Closed Session.

D. **Public Employee Performance Evaluation**  
(Pursuant to Government Code Section 54957)

Title: General Manager  
Mr. Fabela reported there was no reportable action taken in Closed Session.

E. **Conference with Labor Negotiator**
[Government Code Section 54957.6]

VTA Designated Representative
Bill Lopez, Director of Business Services

Employment Contract
General Counsel

Chairperson Woodward reported there was no reportable action taken in Closed Session.

9.4. Extension and Amendment to Employment Contract for General Counsel

Bill Lopez, Director of Business Services, provided a brief overview of the report.

RESULT: APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: Chavez
SECONDER: Herrera
AYES: Baker, Carrasco, Chavez, Esteves, Herrera, Khamis, Larsen, Liccardo, Whittum, Yeager, Woodward
ABSENT: Kalra

M/S/C (Larsen/Herrera) to approve the recommendation of the current and immediate-past Board of Directors Chairperson, serving as the Evaluation Committee for the General Counsel, to adopt a Second Amendment to the Employment Agreement between Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) and General Counsel Robert Fabela. The Second Amendment revises the General Counsel’s compensation as detailed below, and extends the contract term for an additional five years.

The Evaluation Committee has recommended that General Counsel Robert Fabela’s base salary be increased, upon the beginning of the term of the contract extension, by 9%, from $206,000 per year to $224,540 per year; and that VTA increase the employer-paid contribution to his 457(b) Deferred Compensation account to the maximum allowed by IRS limits based on age and circumstance. The proposed contract term is for five years, and there are no other contractually guaranteed salary increases during this term.

10. ADJOURNMENT

On order of Chairperson Woodward and there being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Anita McGraw, Board Assistant
VTA Office of the Board Secretary
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Nuria I. Fernandez

FROM: Board Secretary, Elaine F. Baltao

SUBJECT: Citizens Advisory Committee Appointment: South Bay Labor Council

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Ratify the appointment of Lucas Ramirez to the Citizens Advisory Committee position representing the South Bay Labor Council.

BACKGROUND:

The Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) is a 17-member committee representing the residents of the various city/county groupings of the VTA Board of Directors, as well as specified community stakeholder groups with an interest in transportation. The CAC advises the Board and VTA administration on issues impacting the communities and organizations they represent. It also serves in two other functions: (1) as the ballot-specified Citizens Watchdog Committee for the 2000 Measure A Transit Improvement Program; and (2) as the 2008 Measure D ballot-specified advisory body that reviews and comments on VTA’s comprehensive transit program as part of the countywide transportation plan.

The CAC bylaws require that a committee member must be a resident of Santa Clara County while on the committee and cannot concurrently hold elected public office. Committee members cannot be VTA staff or employed by a city they represent. The committee membership term is indefinite, with CAC members serving until resignation or replacement by their appointing organization or the VTA Board.

The process to fill CAC vacancies, as defined by the bylaws, is that member agencies, specified business and labor groups, and specified Community Interests positions nominate representatives for their respective membership positions. For select Community Interests positions, VTA’s Administration & Finance Committee appoints one member per position from nominations...
submitted by advocacy groups or received at-large. In all cases, the VTA Board must ratify the appointment.

**DISCUSSION:**

The VTA Administrative Code establishes the membership of the CAC. One of the six positions in the Business & Labor section represents, and the representative for this position is appointed by, the South Bay Labor Council (SBLC).

The SBLC has appointed Lucas Ramirez as its new representative on the CAC, replacing its previous representative, Jeremy Barousse, who resigned due to changed work location and schedule.

Mr. Ramirez, a Mountain View resident, has lived in Santa Clara County for almost 25 years. His civic and community involvement is extensive, including in a number of organizations that engage in educational, transportation, environmental, land use and affordable housing advocacy.

Mr. Ramirez serves as the Vice Chair of the City of Mountain View’s Human Relations Commission. He also serves three other community advocacy organizations: (1) Los Altos - League of Women Voters, which advocates for good transit/housing/land use policy; (2) Mountain View Coalition for Sustainable Planning, a group that promotes good transit, land-use, housing and environmental policy; and (3) Friends of Caltrain, a transit advocacy non-profit organization. He is also a member of the Mountain View Historical Association.

Based on his position and qualifications, staff recommends that the Board ratify the South Bay Labor Council’s appointment of Mr. Ramirez to this position.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The Board could choose to not ratify the nomination of this individual and instead ask the South Bay Labor Council to nominate another individual to represent it.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

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

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

The Administration & Finance Committee considered this item at its January 22, 2015 meeting as part of its Consent Agenda and without comment unanimously recommended both its approval and placement on the Board’s Consent Agenda.

Prepared by: Stephen Flynn, Advisory Committee Coordinator
Memo No. 4821
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Nuria I. Fernandez

FROM: Director of Engr. & Trans. Infrastructure Dev., Carolyn M. Gonot

SUBJECT: Contract for Procurement and Installation of Traction Power Substation 17A in Mountain View

Policy-Related Action: No
Government Code Section 84308 Applies: Yes

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Balfour Beatty Rail in the amount of $2,700,000 for the procurement and installation of Traction Power Substation (TPSS) 17A in Mountain View and amend the FY14-15 VTA Transit Fund Capital Budget to add $3,000,000 for this project.

BACKGROUND:

VTA is currently operating trains through single track territory in the City of Mountain View. To expand system capacity and improve light rail efficiency, VTA is in the process of adding a second track at the end-of-the-line at Mountain View. Once completed, VTA will have the ability to run additional service necessary when BART service begins in Santa Clara County. This work is scheduled for completion in December 2015 to accommodate the projected demands due to the future connection to BART and Super Bowl 50 in February 2016.

In consideration of the planned service improvements, VTA commissioned an electrical traction power study. This study revealed that under current operating conditions, when the end-of-the-line Mountain View Traction Power Substation (TPSS 17 at Evelyn Avenue) is shut down due to a power failure or light rail maintenance work, the line voltage drops into unacceptable ranges. The voltage drop creates a degradation of light rail operations with the primary cause of the low voltage being the considerable distance (1.8 miles) between TPSS 17 and TPSS 18 near Middlefield Road. The study indicates that with the expanded service, the additional load that will be placed on the power system presents a considerable risk to systems operations.
To address the additional loads that the expanded operation will place on the system, a second substation is proposed to be placed next to the existing substation 17 on Evelyn Avenue (Exhibit A). The new substation will be connected to a PG&E feed that is independent from the existing substation thereby assuring continuity of LRT operations if one of the end-of-the-line substations is shut down due to a power failure or maintenance.

**DISCUSSION:**

Two options were explored for the procurement and installation of TPSS 17A. The first option considered a new contract package where design would be completed in June 2015, advertised in July 2015, and awarded in November 2015. Utilizing standard VTA contracting practice, procurement and installation is projected to be completed November 2016. Based on the current schedule for the Mountain View double-track completion, option 1 is not a viable alternative to have TPSS 17A operational in December 2015.

The second option investigated a sole source design, with procurement and installation of TPSS 17A by Balfour Beatty Rail. This option would expedite the completion by December 2015 in time for the Super Bowl event. Balfour Beatty Rail is already procuring and installing substations for VTA through two other contracts and are familiar with VTA procedures and substation requirements. In addition, there will be a time and cost savings in the utilization of turnkey delivery wherein Balfour Beatty will be designing, procuring and installing the substation. The procurement of the TPSS unit will be similar to the other units installed on VTA system which will facilitate maintenance and spare parts procurement.

VTA staff met with Balfour Beatty and negotiated the cost of $2,700,000 for the new substation. The cost proposed was based on competitive bid prices on previous VTA contracts for substations.

The addition of a new Traction Power Substation in Mountain View is estimated to cost a total of $3,500,000. In December 2014, the General Manager authorized the release of $500,000 from the Capital Contingency Fund to start the procurement effort for the additional substation. Staff requests augmentation of VTA Transit Capital Budget for the remaining $3,000,000 needed to complete the project.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The Board may choose not to approve the budget augmentation and not authorize the execution of a contract with Balfour Beatty Rail. However, the additional load that will be placed on the power system in the City of Mountain View when light rail service expands would present a considerable risk to systems operations if TPSS 17A is not installed.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

This action will authorize $2,700,000 for the procurement and installation of Traction Power Substation 17A. In addition, this action will add $3,000,000 to the FY15 VTA Transit Fund Capital Budget. This additional appropriation is funded 100% by local funding currently available in the VTA Debt Reduction Fund.
SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISE (SBE) PARTICIPATION:
This is a sole source procurement and no specific Small Business Enterprise goal has been established.

STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:
The Administration & Finance Committee considered this item on January 22, 2015 and commented that the benefits of adding the new substation extended beyond that of just events at Levi’s Stadium, it is critical for the efficiency of light rail and operations once BART is in service. There was a question about site security, and staff responded that the site is secured by a fence and intrusion system. Staff pointed out that the new substation will be connected to an independent PG&E feed to provide continuous operation during a power outage, which alleviated any concerns about a potential loss of operations during a power failure.

Questions were raised about the scope of work for Balfour Beatty and if the substation can be consolidated with Caltrain. Staff responded that Balfour Beatty is responsible for all work related to the procurement and installation of the substation and that because Caltrain and the light rail run on different systems, the systems cannot be combined.

Prepared by: Ven Prasad, Engineering Group Manager
Memo No. 4839

ATTACHMENTS:
- 4839 Exhibit A_PE_SUBSTATION 17 (PDF)
- 4839 - Exhibit B Consultant List (PDF)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balfour Beatty Rail</td>
<td>Roger D. Wilson</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>512 So. Airport Blvd., So. San Francisco, CA 94080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Nuria I. Fernandez

FROM: Director of Engr. & Trans. Infrastructure Dev., Carolyn M. Gonot

SUBJECT: SVBX Milpitas Campus Surface Parking and Roadway Improvements

Policy-Related Action: No  Government Code Section 84308 Applies: No

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Ghilotti Construction, the lowest responsible and responsive bidder, in the amount of $5,357,786.50 for the construction of Milpitas Station Surface Parking Lot and Roadway.

BACKGROUND:

The Milpitas Station campus is part of VTA’s BART Silicon Valley Berryessa Extension (SVBX). The Surface Parking and Roadway Contract at the Milpitas Station Campus is a construction contract that includes a surface parking lot with approximately 425 spaces and approximately 500 linear feet segment of South Milpitas Boulevard extension. Attachment A shows the location of the contract within the Milpitas Station Campus.

The Milpitas Station Surface Parking and Roadway Contract includes the following work scope:

- Utility installation including water, storm, sanitary sewer, and recycled water;
- Civil site work and roadway construction including grading, asphalt concrete paving, concrete curb and gutter, bio-retention basins, sidewalks, etc.;
- Signing and pavement markings;
- New traffic signals on South Milpitas Boulevard;
- Roadway and surface parking lighting;
- Communications systems elements including CCTV cameras, emergency call boxes, conduits, cabling, etc.
DISCUSSION:
The Milpitas Station Surface Parking and Roadway contract was advertised on October 14, 2014. Contractor pre-qualification was required for this contract. Six bids were submitted on December 19, 2014 with the following results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>Bid Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RGW Construction, Inc.</td>
<td>$5,232,464.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galeb Paving, Inc.</td>
<td>$5,352,006.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghilotti Construction</td>
<td>$5,357,786.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granite Rock Company</td>
<td>$5,548,489.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.C. Jones &amp; Sons, Inc.</td>
<td>$5,695,517.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granite Construction Company</td>
<td>$6,091,386.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Engineer’s Estimate $5,548,635.00

VTA staff has completed the bid review process and has determined that Ghilotti Construction is the lowest responsible and responsive bidder. The bid, 3.4% below the Engineer’s Estimate, is fair and reasonable. The other two low bidders, RGW Construction and Galeb Paving, both failed to meet the DBE goal established for this contract and did not demonstrate good faith efforts to achieve the DBE goal. Based on the Good Faith Effort Committee meeting on January 5, 2015, staff recommends award of this contract to the third lowest bidder, Ghilotti Construction. A list of named subcontractors for Ghilotti Construction is included in Attachment B.

Notice of Recommended Award to Ghilotti Construction has been issued to the six bidders on January 6, 2015.

Construction is anticipated to begin in March 2015 with completion by December 2015.

ALTERNATIVES:
The Board could choose to reject all bids and request staff to readvertise. This action would delay the completion of the Milpitas Station Surface Parking and Roadway project, which would negatively affect SVBX’s delivery schedule.

FISCAL IMPACT:
This action will authorize $5,357,786.50 for construction of Milpitas Station Surface Parking and Roadway. Appropriation for this expenditure is included in the FY2015 Adopted 2000 Measure A Transit Improvement Program Fund Capital Budget. This contract is funded by a combination of Federal, State of California, and 2000 Measure A funds.

DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS ENTERPRISE (DBE) PARTICIPATION:
Based on identifiable subcontracting opportunities, a Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) goal of 16.58% has been established for this contract. Ghilotti Construction has committed to 17.33% DBE participation on this contract.
STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:

The Administration & Finance Committee reviewed this item on January 22, 2015. The Committee unanimously recommended approval and placed it on the Board’s consent agenda for February 5, 2015.

Prepared by: Margaret Simmons-Cross
Memo No. 4867

ATTACHMENTS:
- 4867 - Milpitas Campus Plan Attachment A pdf - Adobe Acrobat Professional (PDF)
- 4867 C740 Board Memo Attachment B (PDF)
C740 Limits of Work
Attachment B - Subcontractor Listing for Ghilotti Construction Company.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor Firm</th>
<th>Contractor Role</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ghilotti Construction Company</td>
<td>Prime Contractor</td>
<td>Santa Rosa, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitta Erosion Control</td>
<td>Erosion Control</td>
<td>Loomis, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Francis Electric</td>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>San Leandro, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliveira Fence</td>
<td>Temporary Fencing</td>
<td>Santa Clara, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone Star Landscape</td>
<td>Irrigation Sleeves</td>
<td>San Martin, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrisp Company</td>
<td>Striping</td>
<td>Fremont, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D&amp;S Trucking</td>
<td>Trucking</td>
<td>Castro Valley, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistical Enterprises</td>
<td>Electrical Supplier</td>
<td>Fresno, CA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Nuria I. Fernandez

FROM: Director of Planning and Program Development, John Ristow

SUBJECT: FY 14-15 Tire-Derived Aggregate Grant Application

Resolution

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt a Resolution of Local Support authorizing the General Manager to file and execute a grant application and agreement with California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle), for $350,000-$750,000 in funding from the FY14-15 Tire-Derived Aggregate (TDA) Grant Program to reimburse the cost of aggregate material needed for noise and vibration mitigation of eligible projects.

BACKGROUND:

The California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle), is the state’s leading authority on recycling, waste reduction, and product reuse. Directed by state enacted legislation in 2012, the agency has a commitment to achieve the new 75% recycling goal for the state by 2020. CalRecycle is elevating efforts to divert waste of organic materials, beverage containers, used oil, electronic waste, and tires from landfills and find new innovative uses for them. CalRecycle is also supporting projects through its newly established greenhouse gas reduction grants. In all, $19.5 million has been earmarked for various programs.

A Notice of Funding Availability for the FY14-15 Tire-Derived Aggregate (TDA) Grant Program was announced on November 25, 2014, with a total of $1,600,000 available for this grant cycle. Revenue for this grant is generated directly from a tire fee collected on each new tire sold in California. The fundamental goal of CalRecycle’s TDA Program is to promote the development of long-term sustainable and diversified markets for California’s tire-derived...
products. TDA is the second largest use of recycled tires in the United States and provides cost-effective alternative to conventional aggregate for use in various civil engineering projects.

In order for VTA to be eligible for the TDA Grant funds, it must submit a resolution of Local Support to CalRecycle with the filing of the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

This TDA Grant Program provides opportunities to divert waste tires from landfill disposal, prevent illegal tire dumping, and promote markets for recycled-content tire products. TDA, which is produced from shredded tires, is lightweight, free-draining, and a less expensive alternative to conventional lightweight aggregates.

Eligible projects under this program include:

- Lightweight fill (slope stabilization, embankment fill, and landslide repair)
- Retaining wall backfill (where lightweight material is required)
- Vibration mitigation (under rail lines)
- Landfill application

VTA staff is particularly interested in utilizing TDA materials to reduce noise and vibration along new and existing rail lines and therefore improve the quality of life of communities residing along our corridors. TDA installation on the VTA Vasona Line has demonstrated vibration attenuation characteristics in mid-frequency vibration range. In addition, TDA is cost-effective since it performs the same function as the more expensive floating track slabs. Projects eligible for these funds include the: A) Silicon Valley Berryessa Extension (SVBX) Project, and B) Various Rail Rehabilitation and Improvement Projects. A brief description of each project is listed below:

**Project A:** The SVBX is an approximately 10-mile extension of BART service from the planned Warm Springs Station in the City of Fremont that proceeds on the former Union Pacific Railroad right-of-way and ends near Las Plumas Avenue in the City of San Jose. The SVBX includes one station in retained-cut (Milpitas Station) and one above-grade station (Berryessa Station). Construction is already underway and project management has identified a need for approximately 4,100 tons of TDA material to be placed under the new heavy rail corridor to mitigate excessive noise and vibration.

**Project B:** VTA performs an annual rail grinding and measurement program to refine wear trends along its existing corridor. This requires special track work replacement and improvements at various locations for wear and tear including embedded crossovers, tie replacement cycles and other track components, ballast replacement concurrent with tie replacement, crossing replacements where concrete breaks are visible as well as TDA installation.

CalRecycle’s FY14/15 TDA Grant Program range from $350,000 to $750,000 for individual grant awards, each award is free of matching requirements. VTA wants to take advantage of this funding availability and should the Board of Directors approve it, VTA staff will request the maximum allowable amount under this grant cycle.
ALTERNATIVES:

The Board of Directors could choose not to approve the resolution, and VTA would not be eligible to submit Tire-Derived Aggregate application and compete for funds.

FISCAL IMPACT:

This action will make $350,000-$750,000 in Tire-Derived Aggregate funds available to VTA for eligible projects.

STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:

The Congestion Management Program & Planning Committee considered this item as part of its January 22, 2015 Consent Agenda. The Committee unanimously recommended approval of the item and placed it on the consent agenda for the February 5, 2015 Board of Directors’ meeting.

Prepared by: Lorena Bernal-Vidal
Memo No. 4824
Resolution of Local Support

Resolution No.

Authorizing Submittal of Application(S) For CalRecycle Tire-Derived Aggregate Grant
For Which Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) Is Eligible

WHEREAS, Public Resources Code sections 40000 et seq. authorize the Department of
Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle) to administer various grant programs (grants)
in furtherance of the State of California’s (state) efforts to reduce, recycle and reuse solid waste
generated in the state thereby preserving landfill capacity and protecting public health and safety
and the environment; and

WHEREAS, in furtherance of this authority CalRecycle is required to establish procedures
governing the application, awarding, and management of the grants; and

WHEREAS, CalRecycle grant application procedures require, among other things, an applicant’s
governing body to declare by resolution certain authorizations related to the administration of
CalRecycle grants.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Santa Clara Valley Transportation
Authority’s Board of Directors authorizes the submittal of application(s) to CalRecycle for the
Tire-Derived Aggregate Grant Program; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Nuria I. Fernandez, VTA’s General Manager or her
designee is hereby authorized and empowered to execute in the name of the Santa Clara Valley
Transportation Authority all grant documents, including but not limited to, applications,
agreements, amendments and requests for payment, necessary to secure grant funds and
implement the approved grant project; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that these authorizations are effective for five (5) years from the
date of adoption of this resolution.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Board of
directors on ______________________ by the following vote:

AYES:   DIRECTORS: ________________________________________
NOES:   DIRECTORS: __________________________
ABSENT: DIRECTORS: __________________________

______________________________
Perry Woodward, Chairperson
Board of Directors
I HEREBY CERTIFY AND ATTEST that the foregoing resolution was duly and regularly introduced, passed and adopted by the vote of the Board of Directors of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, California, at a meeting of said Board of directors on the indicated, as set forth above.

Date:____________________

Elaine Baltao, Board Secretary

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Nuria I. Fernandez

FROM: Director of Planning and Program Development, John Ristow

SUBJECT: STP-CMAQ Regional Strategic Investment Resolution of Local Support

Policy-Related Action: No  Government Code Section 84308 Applies: No

Resolution

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt a Resolution of Local Support authorizing the General Manager to execute a grant agreement with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for $500,000 in funding from the Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) allocated through the Regional Strategic Investment (RSI) for the Interstate 280/Winchester Boulevard Improvement Study.

BACKGROUND:

In 1991, Congress adopted the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA). This law authorized the creation of the CMAQ program and provided $6 billion in funding for surface transportation and other related projects that contribute to air quality improvements and reduce congestion. In 2005, the CMAQ program continued under the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU). The CMAQ program under SAFETEA-LU received over $8.6 billion dollars in funds to provide to various State Departments of Transportation and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) to invest in projects that reduce air pollutants regulated from transportation-related sources over a period of five years.

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), as the Bay Area's MPO, received a share of this federal funding for local programming. Among the various transportation programs MTC established with this funding is the Surface Transportation Authorization Act Cycle 1
STP/CMAQ Project Selection Criteria and Programming Policy. This policy outlines how the region proposes to use these funds for transportation needs in the region and implements the necessary strategies and objectives of the Regional Transportation Plan over a period of 25 years. One allocation category under the Regional Transportation Plan is the Regional Strategic Investments (RSI), which included an earmark towards corridor mobility improvements in Santa Clara County’s Interstate 280 to improve traffic operations, safety and access.

In order for VTA to access these federal funds, it must comply with MTC’s Commission Approval of Programs and Projects, which requires a resolution from the local agency to update the region's Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP).

**DISCUSSION:**

The I-280/Winchester Boulevard Improvement Study is a response to continued operational deficiencies along I-280 in San Jose. The project objective is to produce a study, which 1) identifies key deficiencies and 2) proposes alternatives that would improve operations and reduce congestion on the vicinity of I-280/Winchester Interchange Ramp. The estimated cost of this phase of the project is $1,000,000. The alternatives analysis will identify a recommended project scope to move into environmental analysis, project development and construction as funding is identified.

VTA took incremental steps to secure funding for this project. First, in November 2013, the VTA Board of Directors approved the allocation of $250,000 towards this project from its local program reserve. Then, VTA staff partnered with the City of San Jose to secure an additional $250,000 of local share. Finally, should the VTA Board adopt this resolution, VTA staff will pursue the remainder $500,000 from MTC to implement this project. Please see Table 1 with the Estimated Project Cost Breakdown by Agency.

| Table 1: I-280/Winchester Blvd. Planning Study’s Estimated Cost Breakdown by Agency |
|-----------------|---------|
| Agency          | Amount  |
| VTA             | $250,000|
| City of San Jose| $250,000|
| MTC             | $500,000|
| TOTAL           | $1,000,000|

Once the approved resolution is submitted, VTA expects this project to be included in the TIP. At that point, staff will work with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) to secure an additional E-76 documentation for development and approval of the project.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The Board of Directors could choose not to approve the resolution and VTA would not be
eligible to receive $500,000 in funds.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

This action will make $500,000 in STP CMAQ Regional Strategic Investment (RSI) funds available to VTA for the I-280/Winchester Boulevard Improvement Study.

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

The Congestion Management Program & Planning Committee considered this item as part of its January 22, 2015 Consent Agenda and recommended that the Board of Directors approve this item. The Committee placed this item on the consent agenda for the February 5, 2015 Board of Directors’ meeting.

Prepared by: Lorena Bernal-Vidal
Memo No. 4823
Resolution of Local Support

Resolution No. _____

Authorizing the filing of an application for funding assigned to MTC and committing any necessary matching funds and stating the assurance to complete the project

WHEREAS, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (herein referred to as APPLICANT) is submitting an application to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for $500,000 in funding assigned to MTC for programming discretion, which includes federal funding administered by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and federal or state funding administered by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) such as Surface Transportation Program (STP) funding, Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) funding, Transportation Alternatives (TA)/Active Transportation Program (ATP) funding, and Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) funding (herein collectively referred to as REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING) for the I 280/ Winchester Corridor Study (herein referred to as PROJECT) for the Cycle 1 STP/CMAQ-Regional Strategic Investment (herein referred to as PROGRAM); and

WHEREAS, the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (Public Law 112-141, July 6, 2012) and any extensions or successor legislation for continued funding (collectively, MAP 21) authorize various federal funding programs including, but not limited to the Surface Transportation Program (STP) (23 U.S.C. § 133), the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) (23 U.S.C. § 149) and the Transportation Alternatives Program (TA) (23 U.S.C. § 213); and

WHEREAS, state statutes, including California Streets and Highways Code §182.6, §182.7, and §2381(a)(1), and California Government Code §14527, provide various funding programs for the programming discretion of the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to MAP-21, and any regulations promulgated thereunder, eligible project sponsors wishing to receive federal or state funds for a regionally-significant project shall submit an application first with the appropriate MPO, or RTPA, as applicable, for review and inclusion in the federal Transportation Improvement Program (TIP); and

WHEREAS, MTC is the MPO and RTPA for the nine counties of the San Francisco Bay region; and

WHEREAS, MTC has adopted a Regional Project Funding Delivery Policy (MTC Resolution No. 3606, revised) that sets out procedures governing the application and use of REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING; and

WHEREAS, APPLICANT is an eligible sponsor for REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING; and

WHEREAS, as part of the application for REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING, MTC requires a resolution adopted by the responsible implementing agency stating the following:

- the commitment of any required matching funds; and

- that the sponsor understands that the REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING is fixed at the programmed amount, and therefore any cost increase cannot be expected
to be funded with additional REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING; and

- that the PROJECT will comply with the procedures, delivery milestones and funding deadlines specified in the Regional Project Funding Delivery Policy (MTC Resolution No. 3606, revised); and

- the assurance of the sponsor to complete the PROJECT as described in the application, subject to environmental clearance, and if approved, as included in MTC’s federal Transportation Improvement Program (TIP); and

- that the PROJECT will have adequate staffing resources to deliver and complete the PROJECT within the schedule submitted with the project application; and

- that the PROJECT will comply with all project-specific requirements as set forth in the PROGRAM; and

- that APPLICANT has assigned, and will maintain a single point of contact for all FHWA- and CTC-funded transportation projects to coordinate within the agency and with the respective Congestion Management Agency (CMA), MTC, Caltrans, FHWA, and CTC on all communications, inquiries or issues that may arise during the federal programming and delivery process for all FHWA- and CTC-funded transportation and transit projects implemented by APPLICANT; and

- in the case of a transit project, the PROJECT will comply with MTC Resolution No. 3866, revised, which sets forth the requirements of MTC’s Transit Coordination Implementation Plan to more efficiently deliver transit projects in the region; and

- in the case of a highway project, the PROJECT will comply with MTC Resolution No. 4104, which sets forth MTC’s Traffic Operations System (TOS) Policy to install and activate TOS elements on new major freeway projects; and

- in the case of an RTIP project, state law requires PROJECT be included in a local congestion management plan, or be consistent with the capital improvement program adopted pursuant to MTC’s funding agreement with the countywide transportation agency; and

WHEREAS, that APPLICANT is authorized to submit an application for REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING for the PROJECT; and

WHEREAS, there is no legal impediment to APPLICANT making applications for the funds; and

WHEREAS, there is no pending or threatened litigation that might in any way adversely affect the proposed PROJECT, or the ability of APPLICANT to deliver such PROJECT; and
WHEREAS, APPLICANT authorizes its Executive Director, General Manager, or
designee to execute and file an application with MTC for REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY
FUNDING for the PROJECT as referenced in this resolution; and

WHEREAS, MTC requires that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the MTC in
conjunction with the filing of the application.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the APPLICANT is authorized to
execute and file an application for funding for the PROJECT for REGIONAL
DISCRETIONARY FUNDING under MAP-21 or continued funding; and be it further
RESOLVED that APPLICANT will provide any required matching funds; and be it further
RESOLVED that APPLICANT understands that the REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY
FUNDING for the project is fixed at the MTC approved programmed amount, and that any cost
increases must be funded by the APPLICANT from other funds, and that APPLICANT does not
expect any cost increases to be funded with additional REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY
FUNDING; and be it further
RESOLVED that APPLICANT understands the funding deadlines associated with these
funds and will comply with the provisions and requirements of the Regional Project Funding
Delivery Policy (MTC Resolution No. 3606, revised) and APPLICANT has, and will retain the
expertise, knowledge and resources necessary to deliver federally-funded transportation and
transit projects, and has assigned, and will maintain a single point of contact for all FHWA- and
CTC-funded transportation projects to coordinate within the agency and with the respective
Congestion Management Agency (CMA), MTC, Caltrans. FHWA, and CTC on all
communications, inquires or issues that may arise during the federal programming and delivery
process for all FHWA- and CTC-funded transportation and transit projects implemented by
APPLICANT; and be it further
RESOLVED that PROJECT will be implemented as described in the complete
application and in this resolution, subject to environmental clearance, and, if approved, for the
amount approved by MTC and programmed in the federal TIP; and be it further
RESOLVED that APPLICANT has reviewed the PROJECT and has adequate staffing
resources to deliver and complete the PROJECT within the schedule submitted with the project
application; and be it further
RESOLVED that PROJECT will comply with the requirements as set forth in MTC
programming guidelines and project selection procedures for the PROGRAM; and be it further
RESOLVED that, in the case of a transit project, APPLICANT agrees to comply with
the requirements of MTC’s Transit Coordination Implementation Plan as set forth in MTC
Resolution No. 3866, revised; and be it further
RESOLVED that, in the case of a highway project, APPLICANT agrees to comply with
the requirements of MTC’s Traffic Operations System (TOS) Policy as set forth in MTC
Resolution No. 4104; and be it further
RESOLVED that, in the case of an RTIP project, PROJECT is included in a local
congestion management plan, or is consistent with the capital improvement program adopted
pursuant to MTC’s funding agreement with the countywide transportation agency; and be it
further
RESOLVED that APPLICANT is an eligible sponsor of REGIONAL
DISCRETIONARY FUNDING funded projects; and be it further
RESOLVED that APPLICANT is authorized to submit an application for REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING for the PROJECT; and be it further
RESOLVED that there is no legal impediment to APPLICANT making applications for the funds; and be it further
RESOLVED that there is no pending or threatened litigation that might in any way adversely affect the proposed PROJECT, or the ability of APPLICANT to deliver such PROJECT; and be it further
RESOLVED that APPLICANT authorizes its General Manager, or designee to execute and file an application with MTC for REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING for the PROJECT as referenced in this resolution; and be it further
RESOLVED that a copy of this resolution will be transmitted to the MTC in conjunction with the filing of the application; and be it further
RESOLVED that the MTC is requested to support the application for the PROJECT described in the resolution, and if approved, to include the PROJECT in MTC’s federal TIP upon submittal by the project sponsor for TIP programming.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Board of directors on ______________________ by the following vote:

AYES: DIRECTORS:
NOES: DIRECTORS:
ABSENT: DIRECTORS

_________________________________
Perry Woodward, Chairperson
Board of Directors

I HEREBY CERTIFY AND ATTEST that the foregoing resolution was duly and regularly introduced, passed an adopted by the vote of the Board of Directors of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, California, at a meeting of said Board of directors on the indicated, as set forth above.

Date: ______________________

_________________________________
Elaine Baltao, Board Secretary

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

_________________________________
Robert Fabela, General Counsel
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Nuria I. Fernandez

FROM: Director of Planning and Program Development, John Ristow

SUBJECT: Local Program Reserve Reallocation

Policy-Related Action: No
Government Code Section 84308 Applies: No

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve reallocation of Local Program Reserve (LPR) savings of $700,000 to the I-280/I-880 Stevens Creek Interchange Project.

BACKGROUND:

The VTA Board of Directors approved Local Program Reserve funds for the following four projects as shown on Table 1 at various meetings in prior years. These projects are all completed or nearing completion with projected savings. The combined savings from the projects is $700,000.

TABLE 1: LOCAL PROGRAM RESERVE SAVINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Savings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SR 152/SR 156 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>$7,667,500</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US101 Improvements I-280 to Yerba Buena</td>
<td>$6,020,126</td>
<td>$356,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 87 Highway Planting</td>
<td>$2,205,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-880 HOV Widening SR 237 to US 101</td>
<td>$18,185,000</td>
<td>$144,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Savings</td>
<td></td>
<td>$700,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The VTA Board of Directors approved LPR funds of $2.52 million for the I-280/I-880 Stevens Creek Interchange Project at various meetings. The California Transportation Commission
(CTC) also approved approximately $38.8 million from the Proposition 1B Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) funds for this project. Exhibit A illustrates this project.

**DISCUSSION:**

The I-280/I-880 Stevens Creek Interchange Project is scheduled for completion in spring 2015. The project had an aggressive schedule to avoid impacts to the Westfield Mall and Santana Row during the 2014 year-end holiday period. However, because rain impacted controlling construction activities (including earth embankment construction) and unforeseen field conditions were discovered, the construction has taken longer than anticipated and additional funds are necessary to complete the work.

VTA staff recommends transferring the $700,000 of LPR savings to this project to complete the construction.

The construction cost of the project is estimated to be $36.5 million at the time of completion and the current budget for construction administration is $3.7 million. The current recommendation of $700,000 would bring the total construction administration budget to $4.4 million. Any savings would revert back to the LPR funds.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The VTA Board of Directors may choose not to reprogram the LPR savings for use in supporting the construction phase of the I-280/I-880 Stevens Creek Interchange project. There are no other choices to pay for this cost.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

There is no fiscal impact because the funds to be reprogrammed are savings of LPR funds previously allocated to projects by the VTA Board of Directors.

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

The Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC), Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) reviewed this item at their respective January 14, and 15 2015 meetings and unanimously recommended approval of the staff recommendation to the VTA Board of the Directors.

The CAC additionally recommended that a more complete explanation of how the cost overruns on the I-280/I-880/Stevens Creek project occurred be provided to the Board of Directors.

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

The Congestion Management Planning & Programming Committee (CMPP) reviewed this item at its January 22, 2015 meeting and unanimously recommended approval of the staff recommendation to the VTA Board of the Directors.

Prepared by: Amin Surani
Memo No. 4843

ATTACHMENTS:

- Exhibit A (PDF)
EXHIBIT A

I-280/I-880/Stevens Creek Improvements Project

LEGEND
- Blue: New Improvements
- Green: New Structure
- Dashed: Bridge Widening
- Red: Remove Existing
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BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Nuria I. Fernandez

FROM: Chief Financial Officer, Raj Srinath

SUBJECT: Monthly Investment Report - November 2014

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

The investment activities of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority are in compliance with the VTA Restricted/Unrestricted Investment Policy Statement, the VTA Retirees’ Other Post Employment Benefits Trust Investment Policy Statement and the ATU, Local 265 Pension’s Investment Policy Statement.

DISCUSSION:

Economic Watch

Real gross domestic product (GDP) increased 5.0 percent in the third quarter of 2014, according to the “third” estimate released by the Bureau of Economic Analysis. The second-quarter growth rate was unchanged at 4.6%. Both personal consumption expenditures (PCE) and nonresidential fixed investment increased more than previously estimated.

Headline consumer prices, as measured by the consumer price index (CPI), increased at a rate of 1.3% year over year as of November 2014, a notable decline from the 1.7% figure from the 12 months ending in October. Core CPI, which excludes volatile food and energy prices increased at a rate of 1.7% year over year as of November 2014. The Federal Reserve continues to target an inflation rate of 2.0%.

The unemployment rate in Santa Clara County was 5.2% for November 2014, below the year-ago estimate of 6.3%. This compares with an unadjusted unemployment rate of 7.1% for California and 5.5% for the nation during the same period.
Market Watch

The S&P 500 Index returned 2.69% in November 2014. Large cap stocks returned 2.62% and small cap stocks returned 0.09%. Within the large cap space, growth stocks outperformed value stocks, returning 3.17% and 2.05% respectively. The top-performing sectors were consumer discretionary, technology and consumer staples. The worst-performing sectors were materials and processing, utilities and energy.

The Barclays Aggregate index returned 0.70% in November 2014. The government related sector returned 0.63% and the treasury sector returned 0.81% for the month. The investment grade corporate bond sector returned 0.63% for the month.

VTA Enterprise Funds

VTA Enterprise Funds are invested in portfolios managed by Payden & Rygel and in the LAIF investment account or an interest bearing checking account. Investment performance for the Payden & Rygel managed accounts is included in the table below.

The Payden & Rygel composite portfolio matched its policy benchmark in the current month, but outperformed its policy benchmark by 0.10% calendar year-to-date. The current yield for the Payden long-term portfolio is 1.35%, the mid-term portfolio is 0.82%, and the short-term portfolio is 0.43%.

The current yield for funds invested in LAIF is 0.26% and VTA’s checking accounts is 0.01%.

Market performance for each Payden & Rygel account is summarized in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Class</th>
<th>Fund Manager</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>3 Mo</th>
<th>Y-T-D</th>
<th>1 Yr</th>
<th>3 Yr</th>
<th>5 Yr</th>
<th>10 Yr</th>
<th>I-T-D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long-Term Fixed Income</td>
<td>Payden &amp; Rygel</td>
<td>0.47%</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>2.62%</td>
<td>1.90%</td>
<td>1.74%</td>
<td>2.61%</td>
<td>3.81%</td>
<td>4.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barclays Cap US Govt. Intermediate Index</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>0.86%</td>
<td>2.77%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>2.47%</td>
<td>3.83%</td>
<td>4.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Term Fixed Income 1</td>
<td>Payden &amp; Rygel</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
<td>0.89%</td>
<td>0.89%</td>
<td>1.19%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill Lynch 1 to 3 Year Treasury Index</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.14%</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
<td>0.86%</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
<td>0.95%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-Term Fixed Income 2</td>
<td>Payden &amp; Rygel</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
<td>0.34%</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
<td>1.93%</td>
<td>1.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iMoneyNet Money Market Index</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>1.51%</td>
<td>1.41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composite Portfolio Returns</th>
<th>Policy Benchmark Returns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.36%</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.35%</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.05%</td>
<td>0.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.14%</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.68%</td>
<td>1.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.86%</td>
<td>2.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.78%</td>
<td>3.63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Implemented February 11, 2009  
2 Implemented February 14, 2003
VTA Retirees’ Other Post Employment Benefits (OPEB) Trust

The VTA Retirees’ OPEB Trust Investment Policy requires the following asset allocation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Allocation</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Fixed Income</td>
<td>35-70%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Large Cap Index</td>
<td>25-60%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>0-5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Retirees’ OPEB composite portfolio outperformed its policy benchmark by 0.19% in the current month, and by 1.05% calendar year-to-date. The current yield for the fixed income portfolio is 3.70%.

Market performance for each money manager is summarized in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Performance as of November 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asset Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barclays Cap US Aggregate Bond Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Cap Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S&amp;P 500 Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Portfolio Returns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Benchmark Returns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DODGE & COX - The Fixed Income portfolio manager underperformed its benchmark in November 2014 by 0.14%, but outperformed its policy benchmark by 0.10% calendar year-to-date. The main detractors from relative performance included the portfolios’ shorter relative duration and the portfolios’ overweight to corporate bonds.

A 7.00% rate of return assumption is used in the annual actuarial analysis for the Retirees’ OPEB. The results of the actuarial analysis determine VTA’s annual contribution rates. Any difference between actual investment returns and the 7.00% assumed annual return is recognized in the same year. The annual returns for the Retirees’ OPEB portfolio have been equivalent to or exceeded the 7.00% assumed rate of return in 7 out of 12 years.

Historic Portfolio Performance for the last six calendar years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>-21.0%</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCVTA-ATU, Local 265 Pension Plan Assets

It is the policy of the SCVTA-ATU Board of Pensions to have a well-managed investment program that provides for the financial needs of the pension plan and allows the investments to be appropriately diversified and prudently invested to protect the safety of the principal while maintaining a reasonable return. Assets are invested within the following investment guidelines:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Allocation</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Fixed Income</td>
<td>28-38%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Large-Cap Value</td>
<td>12-22%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Large-Cap Index</td>
<td>8-18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Small-Cap Value</td>
<td>2-12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int’l Equity Developed Markets</td>
<td>9-19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int’l Equity Emerging Markets</td>
<td>2-10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Core Real Estate</td>
<td>5-15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>0-5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The SCVTA-ATU Pension Plan composite portfolio outperformed its policy benchmark in November 2014 by 0.19%, and by 0.03% calendar year-to-date. The current yield of the Dodge & Cox Fixed Income portfolio is 4.20%.

Market performance for each money manager is summarized in the following table:
## Investment Performance as of November 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Class</th>
<th>Fund Manager</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>3 Mo</th>
<th>Y-T-D</th>
<th>1 Yr</th>
<th>3 Yr</th>
<th>5 Yr</th>
<th>10 Yr</th>
<th>I-T-D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Income</td>
<td>Dodge &amp; Cox</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>5.80%</td>
<td>4.95%</td>
<td>4.99%</td>
<td>5.60%</td>
<td>6.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barclays Cap US Aggregate Bond Index</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>5.85%</td>
<td>5.24%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>4.11%</td>
<td>4.80%</td>
<td>5.25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large-Cap Value Stocks</td>
<td>Boston Partners</td>
<td>2.86%</td>
<td>3.18%</td>
<td>11.49%</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
<td>23.38%</td>
<td>16.77%</td>
<td>10.25%</td>
<td>9.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell 1000 Value Index</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.05%</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td>12.77%</td>
<td>15.63%</td>
<td>21.46%</td>
<td>15.69%</td>
<td>7.40%</td>
<td>6.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large-Cap Index</td>
<td>State Street</td>
<td>2.69%</td>
<td>3.73%</td>
<td>13.93%</td>
<td>16.81%</td>
<td>20.85%</td>
<td>15.92%</td>
<td>8.08%</td>
<td>6.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S&amp;P 500 Index</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.69%</td>
<td>3.72%</td>
<td>13.97%</td>
<td>16.86%</td>
<td>20.92%</td>
<td>15.95%</td>
<td>8.06%</td>
<td>6.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-Cap Value Stocks</td>
<td>Wedge</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td>6.01%</td>
<td>8.78%</td>
<td>19.96%</td>
<td>17.18%</td>
<td>6.78%</td>
<td>10.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell 2000 Value Index</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.46%</td>
<td>-0.69%</td>
<td>1.45%</td>
<td>3.35%</td>
<td>17.83%</td>
<td>15.31%</td>
<td>6.85%</td>
<td>9.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int’l Equity Dev. Markets Growth</td>
<td>MFS 5</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
<td>-2.99%</td>
<td>-1.26%</td>
<td>-0.11%</td>
<td>10.27%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSCI AC World ex-US Growth Index</td>
<td>1.46%</td>
<td>-3.29%</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
<td>1.79%</td>
<td>10.12%</td>
<td>6.44%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Core Real Estate</td>
<td>UBS 6</td>
<td>3.19%</td>
<td>8.42%</td>
<td>10.89%</td>
<td>10.50%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12.16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCREIF NFI-ODCE</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.24%</td>
<td>8.95%</td>
<td>12.43%</td>
<td>12.35%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14.36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging Market</td>
<td>ROBECO E. M. 7</td>
<td>-0.66%</td>
<td>-7.86%</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
<td>5.43%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCSI World Emerging Market</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.06%</td>
<td>-7.31%</td>
<td>2.53%</td>
<td>1.05%</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.78%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Portfolio Returns</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>7.21%</td>
<td>8.60%</td>
<td>12.90%</td>
<td>10.96%</td>
<td>8.36%</td>
<td>8.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Benchmark Returns</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.06%</td>
<td>0.44%</td>
<td>7.18%</td>
<td>8.25%</td>
<td>11.47%</td>
<td>9.64%</td>
<td>6.39%</td>
<td>6.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Funded April 1, 2009. Prior manager is Brandywine with the same benchmark.
5 Funded December 14, 2007. Prior managers were Putnam and Fidelity with MSCI EAFE as their benchmark.
6 Initially funded July 1, 2010. UBS Realty Investors LLC with NCREIF NFI-ODCE as their benchmark. Performance report 45 days after quarter ended.
7 Initially funded December 1, 2010
8 Investment performances by prior managers are included in composite returns and historical policy benchmark returns.

**DODGE & COX** - The Fixed Income portfolio manager underperformed its benchmark in November 2014 by 0.10%, but outperformed its policy benchmark by 0.15% calendar year-to-date. The main detractors from relative performance included the portfolios’ shorter relative duration and the portfolios’ overweight to corporate bonds.

**BOSTON PARTNERS** - The Domestic Large Cap Value Equity manager outperformed its policy benchmark in November 2014 by 0.81%, but underperformed its policy benchmark by 1.28% calendar year-to-date. An overweight position in the technology sector together with better stock selection in the energy, healthcare and transportation sectors contributed to the relative performance this month.
WEDGE - The Domestic Small Cap Value Equity manager outperformed its policy benchmark in November 2014 by 1.16%, and by 4.56% calendar year-to-date. Performance was positively impacted by an underweight in position in the energy sector and stock selection in the technology and financial sectors.

MFS - The International Equity manager underperformed its policy benchmark in November 2014 by 0.37%, and by 2.01% calendar year-to-date. Stock selection in basic materials and financial services contributed to relative performance; stock selection in energy, autos and housing detracted from relative performance.

ROBECO - The Emerging Markets Equity manager outperformed its policy benchmark in November 2014 by 0.40%, but underperformed its policy benchmark by 0.33% calendar year-to-date. The fund’s overweight allocations to India and China and underweight allocations to Mexico and Columbia contributed to relative performance during the month.

A 7.50% rate of return assumption is used in the annual actuarial analysis for the ATU Pension Plan. The results of the actuarial analysis determine VTA’s annual contribution rates. The annual returns for the ATU Pension Plan portfolio have been equivalent to or exceeded the 7.50% assumed rate of return 7 out of 13 years.

Historic Portfolio Performance (calendar year) for the last six calendar years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>-19.8%</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATU Spousal Medical Trust Fund, Dental, and Vision Plan

Asset allocation for the ATU Spousal Medical Trust Fund (including funds for dental and vision plans) is provided for in the SCVTA-ATU Pension Plan Investment Policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Allocation</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Fixed Income</td>
<td>30-50%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Large Cap Index</td>
<td>50-70%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>0-5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ATU Spousal Medical Trust Fund composite portfolio underperformed its policy benchmark in the current month by 0.03%, but outperformed its policy benchmark by 0.10% calendar year-to-date. The current yield for the fixed income portfolio is 4.20%

Market performance for each money manager is summarized in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Class</th>
<th>Fund Manager</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>3 Mo</th>
<th>Y-T-D</th>
<th>1 Yr</th>
<th>3 Yr</th>
<th>5 Yr</th>
<th>10 Yr</th>
<th>I-T-D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Income</td>
<td>Dodge &amp; Cox</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
<td>5.73%</td>
<td>5.68%</td>
<td>5.23%</td>
<td>5.21%</td>
<td>5.43%</td>
<td>5.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barclays Cap US Aggregate Bond Index</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>5.85%</td>
<td>5.24%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>4.11%</td>
<td>4.80%</td>
<td>4.71%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large-Cap Index</td>
<td>State Street</td>
<td>2.69%</td>
<td>3.73%</td>
<td>13.93%</td>
<td>16.81%</td>
<td>20.85%</td>
<td>15.92%</td>
<td>8.08%</td>
<td>8.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S&amp;P 500 Index</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.69%</td>
<td>3.72%</td>
<td>13.97%</td>
<td>16.86%</td>
<td>20.92%</td>
<td>15.95%</td>
<td>8.06%</td>
<td>8.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Portfolio Returns</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.86%</td>
<td>2.51%</td>
<td>10.83%</td>
<td>12.54%</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
<td>12.15%</td>
<td>7.78%</td>
<td>7.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Benchmark Returns</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.89%</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
<td>10.73%</td>
<td>12.16%</td>
<td>13.51%</td>
<td>11.30%</td>
<td>7.02%</td>
<td>7.26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DODGE & COX - The Fixed Income portfolio manager underperformed its benchmark in November 2014 by 0.20%, and by 0.12% calendar year-to-date. The main detractors from relative performance included the portfolios’ shorter relative duration and the portfolios’ overweight to corporate bonds.

Other Data

The valuation of VTA’s securities is provided by Interactive Data Corporation (IDC), Merrill Lynch Securities Pricing Service and Bloomberg Generic Pricing Service. These firms are the leading providers of global securities data. They offer the largest information databases with current and historical prices on securities traded in all major markets.

This report complies with VTA’s adopted investment policies. Based on budgeted revenues and expenditures as well as actual transfers to/from reserves, there are sufficient funds available to meet expenditure requirements for the six months ending May 31, 2015.

Prepared By: Sean Bill, Investment Program Manager
Memo No. 4854
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Nuria I. Fernandez

FROM: Director of Government Affairs, Jim Lawson

SUBJECT: Legislative Update Matrix

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

The Legislative Update Matrix describes key transportation-related bills and other measures of interest that are being considered by the California State Legislature during the 2015-2016 regular session. The matrix indicates the status of these bills and any adopted VTA positions with regard to them.

DISCUSSION:

The Legislature officially convened the 2015-2016 regular session on December 1, 2014. While Democrats lost their supermajorities in both the Assembly and Senate during the November general elections, they are still firmly in control of both chambers.

So far, roughly 100 new bills have been introduced. In the case of transportation, there are the usual measures authored by Republican lawmakers that would prohibit the further issuance of general obligation bonds for construction of the state’s proposed high-speed rail system, and that would either delay or prohibit the inclusion of transportation fuels under the state’s cap-and-trade system. Similar to past years, these bills are not expected to make it through the legislative process. Other transportation-related measures of note that have been introduced are as follows:

**AB 4 (Linder):** This legislation seeks to recapture vehicle weight fee revenues for transportation purposes until January 1, 2020. Currently, these revenues are being transferred to the General Fund to pay debt service for transportation-related general obligation bonds.

**AB 21 (Perea) and SB 32 (Pavley):** Under the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, the state is required to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. Both AB 21 and SB 32 set emissions reduction targets to be achieved after 2020. Specifically, AB 21
requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to recommend to the Governor and the Legislature a specific target for reductions in statewide greenhouse gas emissions for 2030 that could be accomplished in a cost-effective manner. Meanwhile, SB 32 requires CARB to approve a statewide greenhouse gas emissions limit to be achieved by 2050 that is equivalent to 80 percent below the 1990 level. This bill also authorizes CARB to adopt interim targets to be achieved by 2030 and 2040.

**AB 61 (Allen):** This measure authorizes a public transit agency to adopt an ordinance or resolution to allow private shuttle providers to use its bus stops to load and unload passengers. AB 61 was introduced to ensure that state law does not inhibit the ability of a public transit agency to regulate the use of its facilities by commuter shuttles being operated by private-sector employers.

**SB 9 (Beall):** Enacted as part of the FY 2015 budget package, SB 862 calls for setting aside 10 percent of all future cap-and-trade auction proceeds, beginning in FY 2016, for a new Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program. This competitive grant program is intended to fund capital improvements and operational investments that would reduce greenhouse gas emissions, as well as modernize intercity, commuter and urban transit systems. Under the provisions of SB 862, CalSTA will be responsible for developing and adopting guidelines for the Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program, evaluating grants applications based on those guidelines, and submitting a list of projects to be funded to the California Transportation Commission (CTC), which will administer the grants. SB 9 targets Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program funding to large, “transformative” capital projects costing in excess of $100 million that will achieve significant reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. It also structures the program in a way that would allow CalSTA and the CTC to develop a multi-year program of projects; make multi-year funding commitments; enter into multi-year grant agreements with project sponsors; and make use of Letters of No Prejudice (LONPs). Since SB 9 is consistent with the principles included in the 2015 Legislative Program adopted by the Board of Directors, VTA will be supporting this legislation.

Prepared By: Kurt Evans, Government Affairs Manager
Memo No. 4344
# LEGISLATIVE UPDATE
## 2015 - 2016 State Legislative Session
### January 2, 2015

## 2015 Regular Session Calendar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>JANUARY</th>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>JUNE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Statutes signed into law in 2014 take effect.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Last day for bills to be passed out of their house of origin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Legislature reconvenes.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Budget must be passed by midnight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Budget must be submitted by the Governor to the Legislature on or before this date.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Last day to submit bill requests to the Legislative Counsel’s Office.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>FEBRUARY</th>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>JULY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Last day for new bills to be introduced.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Last day for policy committees to hear and report bills introduced in the other house. Summer Recess begins upon adjournment, provided that the Budget Bill has been enacted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>MARCH</th>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>AUGUST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Spring Recess begins upon adjournment.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Last day for fiscal committees to hear and report to the floor bills introduced in the other house.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>APRIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Legislature reconvenes from Spring Recess.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>MAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Last day for policy committees to hear and report fiscal bills introduced in their house of origin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Last day for policy committees to hear and report to the floor non-fiscal bills introduced in their house of origin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Last day for fiscal committees to hear and report to the floor bills introduced in their house of origin.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>SEPTEMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Last day to amend bills on the Assembly and Senate floors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Last day for each house to pass bills. Interim Study Recess begins at the end of this day’s session.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>OCTOBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Last day for the Governor to sign or veto bills passed by the Legislature before September 11, and in his possession after September 11.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>JANUARY 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Statutes signed into law in 2015 take effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Legislature reconvenes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### State Assembly Bills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Assembly Bills</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Last Amended</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>VTA Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 2</strong> (Alejo) Community Revitalization Authorities</td>
<td>States the intent of the Legislature to enact a bill to allow certain local agencies to form a community revitalization authority within a community revitalization and investment area for purposes related to infrastructure, affordable housing and economic revitalization.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Desk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 4</strong> (Linder) Vehicle Weight Fee Revenues</td>
<td>Until January 1, 2020, prohibits vehicle weight fee revenues from being used to pay debt service for transportation-related, general obligation bonds or from being loaned to the General Fund.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Desk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 6</strong> (Wilk) High-Speed Rail: Bond Funding</td>
<td>Specifies that no further bonds shall be sold for high-speed rail purposes pursuant to the Safe, Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the 21st Century (Proposition 1A), except as specifically provided with respect to an existing appropriation for early improvement projects related to the Phase I blended system. Upon appropriation by the Legislature, requires the unspent proceeds received from outstanding bonds issued and sold for high-speed rail purposes prior to the effective date of the provisions of this bill to be redirected to retiring the debt incurred from the issuance and sale of those outstanding bonds. Allows the remaining unissued bonds, as of the effective date of the provisions of this bill, that were authorized for high-speed rail purposes to be issued and sold. Upon appropriation by the Legislature, requires the net proceeds from the sale of these remaining unissued bonds to be made available to fund the construction of school facilities for K-12 and higher education. Makes no changes to the authorization under Proposition 1A for the issuance of $950 in bonds for rail purposes other than high-speed rail.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Desk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 12</strong> (Cooley) State Agency Regulations</td>
<td>By January 1, 2018, requires each state agency to do all of the following: (1) review all provisions of the California Code of Regulations applicable to, and adopted by, that state agency; (2) identify any regulations that are duplicative, overlapping, inconsistent, or out-of-date; and (3) adopt, amend or repeal regulations to reconcile or eliminate any duplication, overlap, inconsistencies, or out-of-date provisions. By January 1, 2017, requires each state agency to compile an overview of the statutory law that it oversees or administers. Requires this overview to include the following: (1) a synopsis of the state agency’s key programs; (2) when each program was authorized or instituted; (3) when any statute authorizing a program was significantly revised to alter, redirect or extend the original program, as well as the reason for the revision, if known; and (4) an identification of any emerging challenges that the state agency is encountering with respect to its programs.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Desk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 21</strong> (Perea) Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reductions: 2030 Target</td>
<td>By January 1, 2018, requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to recommend to the Governor and the Legislature a specific target for reductions in statewide greenhouse gas emissions for 2030 to be accomplished in a cost-effective manner.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Desk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assembly Bills</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Last Amended</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>VTA Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **AB 23** (Patterson)  
Cap-and-Trade: Transportation Fuels | Prohibits the inclusion of suppliers of transportation fuels in the cap-and-trade system administered by the California Air Resources Board (CARB). Applies the provisions of the bill retroactively from January 1, 2015. | As Introduced | Assembly Desk | |
| **AB 28** (Chu)  
Bicycle Safety: Rear White Flashing Light | Requires a bicycle operated during darkness upon a highway, sidewalk or bikeway to be equipped with a rear white flashing light, rather than a red reflector, that is visible from a distance of 500 feet to the rear when the bicycle is directly in front of lawful upper beams of headlamps on a motor vehicle. In lieu of a white flashing light, requires the bicyclist to wear reflective gear. | As Introduced | Assembly Desk | |
| **AB 33** (Quirk)  
Global Warming Solutions Act: Scoping Plan | For purposes of advising the update of its next scoping plan, requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB), by July 1, 2016, to develop a proposed goal for further reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 2030 that includes all of the following: (1) an evaluation of the 2030 goal based on what policies and technologies can be scaled to the rest of the country and the world; (2) an economic assessment using the best available models and data of the various greenhouse gas emissions reduction strategies required to achieve the 2030 goal; (3) an analysis of the benefits to the health, safety and welfare of California residents, as well as to worker safety, the state’s environment and quality of life, and any other benefits associated with the various greenhouse gas emissions reduction strategies required to achieve the 2030 goal; and (4) the establishment of consistent metrics to accurately quantify reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, quantify public health benefits, and measure the cost-effectiveness of various policies and technologies. In addition, requires CARB, for purposes of the next scoping plan update, to develop: (1) a proposed goal that further reduces greenhouse gas emissions by 2040; and (2) a proposed goal that further reduces greenhouse gas emissions beyond the 2040 goal by 2050. | As Introduced | Assembly Desk | |
| **AB 40** (Ting)  
Golden Gate Bridge: Sidewalk Fees | Prohibits the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District from fixing or collecting any tolls or access fees for pedestrian and bicyclist use of the Golden Gate Bridge sidewalks. | As Introduced | Assembly Desk | |
| **AB 51** (Quirk)  
Motorcycles: Lane Splitting | Allows a motorcycle to be driven between rows of stopped or moving vehicles in the same lane, including both divided and undivided streets, roads or highways, if both of the following conditions are present: (1) the speed of traffic moving in the same direction is 35 miles per hour or less; and (2) the motorcycle is not driven more than 10 miles per hour faster than the speed of traffic moving in the same direction. Specifies that the provisions of the bill do not authorize a motorcycle to be driven in contravention of other laws relating to the safe operation of a vehicle. | As Introduced | Assembly Desk | |
| **AB 61** (Allen)  
Private Shuttles | Allows a public transit agency, by ordinance or resolution, to permit the vehicles of a private shuttle service provider to stop for the loading or unloading of its passengers alongside any or all curb spaces designated for the passengers of the public transit agency’s buses. | As Introduced | Assembly Desk | |
### State Senate Bills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Senate Bills</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Last Amended</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>VTA Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 1</strong> (Gaines) Cap-and-Trade: Transportation Fuels</td>
<td>Delays the inclusion of suppliers of transportation fuels in the cap-and-trade system administered by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) from January 1, 2015, to January 1, 2025.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Senate Rules Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 3</strong> (Leno) Minimum Wage</td>
<td>Increases the minimum wage for all industries as follows: (1) to $11 per hour beginning January 1, 2016; and (2) to $13 per hour beginning July 1, 2017. Commencing on January 1, 2019, requires the Industrial Welfare Commission to automatically adjust the minimum wage each year to maintain employee purchasing power diminished by the rate of inflation that occurred during the previous year. Requires the automatic adjustment to be calculated using the California Consumer Price Index. Prohibits the Industrial Welfare Commission from adjusting the minimum wage if the average percentage of inflation for the previous year was negative. Specifies that the provisions of the bill apply to all industries, including public and private employment.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Senate Rules Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 5</strong> (Vidak) Cap-and-Trade: Transportation Fuels</td>
<td>Delays the inclusion of suppliers of transportation fuels in the cap-and-trade system administered by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) from January 1, 2015, to January 1, 2020. Applies the provisions of the bill retroactively from January 1, 2015.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Senate Rules Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 9</strong> (Beall) Cap-and-Trade: Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program</td>
<td>Clarifies that the Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program funded with cap-and-trade auction proceeds will be used for large, transformative capital improvements with a total cost exceeding $100 million that will reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and modernize California’s intercity, commuter and urban rail systems. In prioritizing and selecting projects for funding under this program, requires the California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA) to consider the extent to which a project reduces greenhouse gas emissions. In addition, requires CalSTA to consider whether a project: (1) reduces the number of auto trips; (2) improves connectivity, integration and coordination of the state’s various regional and local public transit systems; (3) provides a direct connection to high-speed rail; (4) has supplemental funding committed to it from non-state sources; and (5) increases public transit ridership. By July 1, 2016, requires CalSTA to develop an initial five-year estimate of revenues reasonably expected to be available for the Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program, with subsequent estimates to be made every other year for additional five-year periods. Requires CalSTA to adopt five-year programs of projects consistent with those fund estimates. Requires CalSTA to enter into and execute a multi-year agreement with an eligible applicant for a project that is proposed to be funded from the Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program over a period of more than one fiscal year. Allows this agreement to be for a period that extends beyond the five fiscal years covered by the program of projects. Allows for the use of Letters of No Prejudice (LONPs), so that project sponsors can advance their projects with local money and then get reimbursed with Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program dollars when they become available.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Senate Rules Committee</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senate Bills</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Last Amended</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>VTA Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 16 (Beall) Road Repair and Litter Clean-up</td>
<td>States the intent of the Legislature to enact a bill that would require Caltrans to identify savings from implementing efficiencies in its existing programs, and direct those resources into expanded activities for road repair and litter clean-up.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Senate Rules Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 32 (Pavley) Greenhouse Gas Emissions Limit</td>
<td>Requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to approve a statewide greenhouse gas emissions limit that is equivalent to 80 percent below the 1990 level to be achieved by 2050. Authorizes CARB to adopt interim greenhouse gas emissions level targets to be achieved by 2030 and 2040. Provides that the Legislature and appropriate state agencies should adopt complementary policies ensuring that long-term emissions reductions advance all of the following: (1) job growth and local economic benefits in California; (2) public health benefits for California residents, particularly in disadvantaged communities; (3) innovation in technology, as well as in energy, water and resources management practices; and (4) regional and international collaboration to adopt similar greenhouse gas emissions reduction policies.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Senate Rules Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 34 (Hill) Automated License Plate Recognition Systems</td>
<td>Requires an operator of an automated license plate recognition (ALPR) system to do all of the following: (1) make sure that ALPR information is protected with reasonable operational, administrative, technical, and physical safeguards to ensure its confidentiality and integrity; (2) implement and maintain reasonable security procedures and practices in order to protect ALPR information from unauthorized access, destruction, use, modification, or disclosure; and (3) implement and maintain a usage and privacy policy in order to ensure that the collection of ALPR information is consistent with respect for individuals’ privacy and civil liberties. If an ALRP operator accesses or provides access to ALPR information, requires the operator to maintain a record of that access. Requires an end-user of ALPR information to implement and maintain a usage and privacy policy in order to ensure that the access and use of ALPR information is consistent with respect for individuals’ privacy and civil liberties. In addition to any other sanctions, penalties or remedies provided under current law, allows an individual who has been harmed by a violation under the provisions of this bill to bring a civil action in any court of competent jurisdiction against a person who knowingly caused that violation. Includes in the definition of “personal information” data collected through the use or operation of an ALPR system, when that information is not encrypted and is used in combination with an individual’s name.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Senate Rules Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 39 (Pavley) HOV Lanes: Low-Emission and Fuel-Efficient Vehicles</td>
<td>Increases the number of green stickers that can be issued by the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to allow certain low-emission and fuel-efficient vehicles to use high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes regardless of the number of occupants from 70,000 to an unspecified amount.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Senate Rules Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Nuria I. Fernandez

FROM: Director of Planning and Program Development, John Ristow

SUBJECT: Light Rail Enhancement Program

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

VTA is preparing to initiate planning and engineering for a number of light rail projects aimed at improving system speed and reliability. The Light Rail Enhancement Program includes a combination of projects recommended from the 2010 Light Rail Systems Analysis and other projects initiated by staff between 2010 and today. The projects focus on speeding up the entire system by analyzing slow speed zones as well as implementing specific capital projects designed to speed up the service and increase ridership.

The 2010 Light Rail Systems Analysis was a comprehensive study of the light rail system and analyzed existing operations and system constraints. At the conclusion of that study, numerous capital projects and operational improvements were recommended to alleviate many existing problems and improve overall light rail operations.

In October 2010, VTA launched the Light Rail Commuter Express service during peak hours on the Santa Theresa-Alum Rock line between Ohlone/Chynoweth and Convention Center Stations. This service added six additional trips per day and did not require any capital construction. The Express service reduces travel time by 4 minutes between the Ohlone/Chynoweth and Convention Center Stations. In FY2014, the three A.M. trips averaged approximately 550 daily boardings. Riders surveyed were very happy with the new service.

In 2014, VTA began light rail construction projects on the Tasman West corridor, the Santa Clara Pocket Track and the Mountain View Double Track. The Santa Clara Pocket Track was operationally complete in September of 2014 and allows for VTA to hold up to three 3-car trains in the vicinity of Levi’s Stadium and for much greater flexibility for pre and post-game operations. The Mountain View Double Track project began construction in November of 2014. The project, when complete, will double track the existing .083 mile single tracked segment
between the Whisman and Downtown Mountain View Stations. This project will also close the
Evelyn Station in Mountain View. The project will be complete before the end of 2015.

Upcoming capital improvements will focus on increasing speed and will support operating
changes planned with the implementation of the VTA's BART Extension to Silicon Valley
Phase I Project in 2017. While the scope of some of the projects may change depending on
reconfigured service in 2017, many of the projects will have significant benefits for any
operating plan that is chosen.

**DISCUSSION:**

An upcoming milestone for the light rail system is the opening of the VTA's BART Extension to
Silicon Valley Phase I in late 2017. There will be an opportunity to reconfigure the light rail
operating plan to capture the ridership potential resulting from the BART connection and to
improve overall service. To augment the benefits of this major service change, staff is in the
process of beginning planning and engineering for capital projects which will have tangible
speed and operating flexibility benefits throughout the light rail system. More details on all of
these capital projects can be found in Attachment A.

These projects are not currently fully funded and are going through the budget approval process.
The schedule for planning, engineering, and construction will depend on when each project is
approved in the VTA capital budget process.

**New Service Plan**

Staff is currently evaluating options for a major service change to reconfigure the current routing
of the system. Many service change proposals, including the service plan recommended in the
2010 Study, are being evaluated for cost implications and projected ridership. Generally they all
have two main changes from today's existing service: (1) A new line of service will be added
along Tasman which will connect the BART connection at the Montague Light Rail Station to
the job centers on West Tasman; (2) The current commuter express service will be expanded.
The new service will be implemented in 2017, when BART to Milpitas and Berryessa opens.

**Speed Zone Analysis**

Staff is aware of many slow speeds zones in the light rail system. There is a need to better
understand the specifics of these areas and what could potentially be done to increase speeds and
improve reliability through those areas. This task will coincide with a separate project which will
improve Light Rail signal priority throughout Santa Clara Valley. Both projects will require
significant coordination between VTA and individual cities within the county.

**North First Street Speed Improvements**

The North First Street corridor is an area where VTA has identified a potential for increasing the
existing maximum operating speeds. Light rail currently operates at 35 miles per hour (mph) in
the median of North First Street. In order to increase speeds up to 45 mph (the posted vehicular
speed limit) VTA needs to comply with California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) General
Order 143-B, which generally states that VTA will need to install fencing and intersection gates in order to allow trains to travel at the same maximum speeds with adjacent traffic. The analysis will require an intersection-by-intersection analysis for this corridor.

**Montague Expressway Grade Separation**

This project would grade separate the light rail tracks from the general travel lanes at North First Street and Montague Expressway. This intersection is a known problem area on the light rail system - 32% of trains get delayed at this intersection for an average of 44 seconds. It is anticipated that these delays will only continue to grow at this location as automobile traffic levels continue to increase. Thus grade separation is the most likely solution.

**Downtown San Jose Speed Improvements**

Downtown San Jose is known as one of the slowest portions of the VTA Light Rail System. The current maximum operating speed in Downtown San Jose is 10mph, which is a restriction self-imposed by VTA. According to CPUC standards, light rail could conceivably operate at 20mph. Staff plans to incorporate some design improvements to create a more distinct separation between pedestrian walkways and light rail tracks. This study will analyze downtown on a block-by-block basis and create specific recommendations for each intersection.

**Vasona Corridor Improvements**

This project would construct improvements along the light rail system between the Winchester and San Fernando stations, generally known as the Vasona corridor. There are currently two single tracked segments in this corridor and all of the platforms are sized for only two car trains (the rest of the system can accommodate 3 car trains). These limitations are major sources for operational flexibility and delays throughout the light rail system, and constructing these improvements would improve service reliability and increase overall light rail capacity.

**Siding at Ohlone-Chynoweth**

With the service changes planned in the near future, operations at the Ohlone-Chynoweth station will become more critical to overall system operations. Adding a siding track at this location could greatly improve operating flexibility for the express service.

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION**

This Item was on the January 2015 agenda for CTA, BPAC, and TAC.

At CTA, Member Romoser commented he was concerned about the service changes to service to the Winchester line and staff responded that VTA is in the process of re-evaluating the service plan changes recommended in 2010.

At BPAC, Member Wadler referenced Vasona corridor project presentation at an earlier date and commented on the high capital cost involved with that project. Staff responded that this project will begin with a re-evaluation of the original project scope and cost estimate.
At TAC, Member Collen commented that the County is also looking at a capital project to grade separate Montague Expressway and North First Street, and that the County and VTA should coordinate on this project. Staff will be setting up a meeting with the County to discuss this project very soon. Member Salvano asked if track construction projects in the St. James area were still being considered and commented on the need to coordinate with VTA concerning Downtown Speed improvement work. Staff responded that no track construction projects are planned for the St. James area and that VTA will work closely with San Jose City Staff concerning the Downtown Speed Improvement project.

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION**

Item was also presented as an Information Item at the Transportation, Planning, & Operations Committee on January, 22 2015. Members of the committee noted the following

- What opportunities are available to find other sources of funding for these projects?
- The estimated percentage ridership increase should also be noted in the presentation
- The fencing design for north first street should be coordinated with the City of San Jose
- These projects which are designed to speed up the system are very important to the light system, increasing Light Rail speed is necessary for improving light rail service
- This committee would like to continue receiving updates on the light rail program including capital cost estimates for the projects presented.

Prepared By: Jason Kim
Memo No. 4820
Light Rail Enhancement Project

Committees

January 2015
Presentation Outline

2017 Operating Plan
  • Long T
  • Southern Express
  • Other Potential Operating Changes

System Speed Improvements: Study and Design
  • North First Street Speed Improvements
  • Montague Grade Separation
  • Downtown San Jose Speed Improvements
  • Vasona Corridor Improvements
  • Chynoweth Siding
Status: Currently under evaluation along with other service proposals
Tasman Express (Long T)

New Service from Mountain View to Alum Rock

- Connects with BART Milpitas Station
- Express between Mountain View and Old Ironsides in peak
- Requires double tracking Mountain View and pocket track near Great America
Southern Express

- All-Day Express Service: Santa Teresa to Alum Rock
- Local service from Almaden to Mountain View
- Winchester Line loops through downtown and turns back

Current

Proposed

Non-stop Service
## Ridership Projections and Cost Estimates

### Long T Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2018 (BART Phase I)</th>
<th>2035 (BART Phase II)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Daily Ridership Increase</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>6,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional annual operating hours (% increase from existing)</td>
<td>31,000 hours (21%)</td>
<td>31,000 hours (21%)</td>
<td>31,000 hours (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Cost Required</td>
<td>$60M (Mountain View Double Tracking and Santa Clara Pocket Track)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Southern Express

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2018 (BART Phase I)</th>
<th>2035 (BART Phase II)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Daily Ridership Increase</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>4,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional annual operating hours (% increase from existing)</td>
<td>29,000 hours (20%)</td>
<td>29,000 hours (20%)</td>
<td>29,000 hours (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Cost Required</td>
<td>$0 ($10M Chynoweth Siding is an optional project)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Other Operating Concepts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Frequency changes (same service pattern)</th>
<th>Expand Existing Express Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Operations:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Current Operations:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 minute frequencies</td>
<td>Three Northbound and three southbound trips a day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential Changes:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Potential Changes:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 minute frequencies</td>
<td>Add more daily express trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 minute frequencies</td>
<td>Skip stop operations on North First Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Southern Express Alternatives</th>
<th>“Long T” Alternatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Plan:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Current Plan:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All day express service</td>
<td>Peak Period – Express from Mountain View to Old Ironsides (stop at Lockheed) all stop east of Old Ironsides to Alum Rock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between Ohlone-Chynoweth and</td>
<td>Off-peak – All stop Old Ironsides to Alum Rock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention Center, Direct</td>
<td><strong>Potential Changes:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almaden Service through</td>
<td>Different stops on express service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown San Jose,</td>
<td>No express service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasona Downtown Turnback</td>
<td>All day service express service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential Changes:</strong></td>
<td>Short turn non-Long T line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express service stops at Tamien then continues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express Almaden Trains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Express Service, All trains make all stops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester Trains to Younger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester Trains to Baypointe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skip stop operations on North First Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Near Term Focus: Its All About Speed

• VTA has established "increasing ridership" as one of its top five 2014 priorities

• Land use density continues to intensify along the light rail corridors

• VTA is becoming an urban light rail system where demand will increase along with traffic congestion levels along the light rail corridor

• In the future light rail will play a greater role in meeting the changing needs of Santa Clara Valley

• The system needs more flexibility to respond to different ridership demands

• Timing is a critical component when it comes the the potential success of capital improvements
Light Rail System Constraints

- Single Track Segments
- At-grade Intersections
- Merge Points
- Future Transit Connections
- Downtown Transit Mall
- Existing Transit Connections
### System Speed Improvements

**Draft List of Improvements – Pending VTA Budget Approval**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Station consolidation study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Operating Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRT Transit Signal Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRT Speed Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North First Street Speed Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montague Grade separation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown San Jose Speed Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siding at Chynoweth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasona Corridor Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRT Signage Replacement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**
- Planning Work Only
- New Capital Projects
- Existing Capital Projects
North First Street Speed Improvements

Current maximum speed – 35 mph

Maximum Speed after improvements – 45 mph
- Improvements include fencing and gates at select intersections
- Required by CPUC General Order 143-B
- Tasman Station and merge point
- VTA will conduct an intersection-by-intersection analysis

Example of Gated and Fenced Light Rail Intersection
Expo Line Los Angeles
Montague Grade Separation

- 32% of all trains delayed
- Average Delay of 44 seconds
- High automobile traffic volumes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delay (Sec/Veh)</th>
<th>PM LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>215.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Downtown San Jose – Phase 1

Downtown San Jose Transit Mall

- Maximum Speed 10mph (slowest system wide, see string chart below)
- Embedded track, hard to distinguish from sidewalk
- Multiple intersections and junctions

Phase 1 – Near term improvements

Phase 2 – Will coincide with BART to Silicon Valley

Phase II
Downtown San Jose

- Bollards or curbs can be used to create separation between tracks and sidewalk
- Also looking at using new technology applications

Bollard Examples
Edmonton and Minnesota

Curb Alternatives
Phoenix
Vasona Corridor

Vasona Corridor Improvements

- Vasona Corridor has two single tracked segments which contribute to delays systemwide
- VTA tracks are adjacent to Freight Rail tracks throughout corridor
  - Platforms only allow for two-car trains (rest of the system can accommodate three-car trains)
Chynoweth Siding

- Would construct a siding at the Ohlone/Chynoweth Station (exact configuration TBD)
- Would allow for greater flexibility with express/local operation in the future
- VTA and Public owned ROW
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Nuria I. Fernandez

FROM: Director of Planning and Program Development, John Ristow

SUBJECT: California State Transportation Agency: California Transportation Infrastructure Priorities Discussion Draft White Papers

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

In April 2013, the California State Transportation Agency established the California Transportation Infrastructure Priorities (CTIP) Workgroup to examine the current state of California's transportation infrastructure and discuss the challenges that lie ahead. The CTIP Workgroup released an interim report in February 2014 which articulated the vision of California's transportation system; provided short-term recommendations related to fiscal year 2015 budget; and identified areas for further consideration. In September 2014, three draft white papers discussing three areas of consideration identified in the interim report were released.

The draft white papers are on the following areas of consideration: Exploring a Road Usage Charge as a Potential Replacement for the Gasoline Tax; Tolling and Pricing for Congestion Management and Transportation Infrastructure Funding; and State Transportation Improvement Program - Performance Investment and Transparency.

The draft white paper on Exploring a Road Usage Charge as a Potential Replacement for the Gasoline Tax is especially timely, as Senate Bill 1077 (DeSaulnier) was approved in September 2014. Working through the California Transportation Commission, SB 1077 requires the implementation of a road usage charge pilot program by January 1, 2017 and the findings to be reported by June 30, 2018.

DISCUSSION:

Exploring a Road Usage Charge as a Potential Replacement for the Gasoline Tax

The California Transportation Infrastructure Priorities (CTIP) Workgroup acknowledges the deficiencies of relying on the current gas tax and its unsustainable future as a funding source for California’s transportation infrastructure needs. They see that a road usage charge is a real and
tangible funding alternative. With this, the CTIP Workgroup recommends moving ahead with a large-scale road usage charge demonstration program with the overall goal being:

"To advance the understanding and evaluate the viability of a road usage charge model in California, and to provide a sustainable and equitable source of revenue to maintain, operate, and improve California's state and local transportation infrastructure."

Thirteen policy principles were developed as a framework to guide future research and development in road usage charge. These principles are broad and are intended to reflect California's unique perspectives towards a road usage charge. With the approval of Senate Bill 1077 and as California moves ahead with exploration of a road usage charge, the Workgroup recommends that the principles be refined and operational concepts be developed as needed. This white paper and policy principles have become a road map for implementing SB 1077. The policy principles can be found on pages 7-8 of Attachment A

The importance of finding an alternative funding source for California infrastructure is not lost on the CTIP Workgroup. They recognize the viability of a road usage charge as funding source as well as the urgency to act due to the time required to implement and complete a demonstration program. In order for California to remain a leader in modern transportation practice and policy, the CTIP Workgroup recommends the Secretary of Transportation to take action.

Tolling and Pricing for Congestion Management and Transportation Infrastructure Funding

Per the CTIP Workgroup, California has moved from the traditional use of tolling to build infrastructure by leveraging the revenue stream. Tolling is now seen as a true “user fee” where the revenues are collected and reinvested into the corridor/system. Pricing, as a subset of tolling, has a primary focus of managing demand to reduce congestion, and revenue generation is a secondary objective.

The CTIP Workgroup recommends that a clear, statewide policy be developed to “clarify the process for determining the use of toll revenues, and streamlining the statutory process to use tolling and pricing where appropriate.” For tolling and pricing related to congestion management and funding transportation infrastructure, the policy will show that where appropriate, Caltrans will support the use of tolling on the State Highway System (SHS) to “optimize system performance and provide an alternative source of transportation funding to maintain and improve infrastructure.” The policy would have the following requirements:

1) Tolling would be considered during the planning and development of capacity improvements on the SHS; and

2) Congestion pricing and all-electronic tolling would be required for priced managed lanes and would need to be considered for other toll facilities where feasible.

For managed lanes, the policy would identify the types of operational strategies used on managed lanes, including pricing, as well as assert that Caltrans supports the use of managed lanes on the SHS as a sustainable transportation system management solution. The use of revenues generated from the managed lanes would be addressed under the statewide tolling policy.

The CTIP Workgroup recognizes that the current legislation limits the authority for Caltrans and regional transportation agencies to collect tolls. They propose new legislation that would expand
the authority for Caltrans and regional transportation agencies to collect tolls. The proposed legislation would permanently reinstate the process by which regional agencies could apply to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) to operate express lanes established under 2006 Assembly Bill 1467, which sunset in 2012; expand this authority to Caltrans; eliminate the cap on the number of projects that can be approved; and in addition to express lanes, include express toll lanes and toll roads as a qualifying project. Provisions of the proposed legislation are also identified by the CTIP Workgroup.

State Transportation Improvement Program - Performance Investment and Transparency

With the intention of having these recommendations inform the 2016 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) process, the CTIP Workgroup has developed five recommendations to assure the STIP investments align with State policy, perform well and are developed in a transparent manner. The recommendations of the CTIP Workgroup are as follows:

1) Do not change the current statute directing 75% of STIP dollars to the Regional Transportation Improvement Plan (RTIP) and 25% to the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP) as suggested by a State Smart Transportation Initiative review of Caltrans and voiced by critics of the 2014 STIP. Instead, focus state policy alignment on Regional Transportation Plans and the Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan (ITSP).

2) The CTC will adopt performance measures as part of the STIP process to improve transparency. The CTIP Workgroup recommends seven measures that should “apply to individual projects and relate back to the applicable overarching plan benefit, subject to any thresholds set by the CTC guidelines.” The recommended measures can be found on page 10 of Attachment C.

3) STIP should pursue multi-modal investments to support Sustainable Community Strategies and California Transportation Plan 2040 which define regional and statewide priorities and focus.

4) In cases where the most cost-effective use of STIP dollars is the preservation of existing multi-modal infrastructure and operational improvements, these expenditures should be encouraged. The CTIP Workgroup acknowledges that if in the long term, additional funding is not identified for preservation of highways, the STIP may need to be reduced and the State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP) increased.

5) Improve the transparency of the ITIP by increasing public participation and ensuring the updated ITSP and related STIP investments align with the State’s priorities as reflected in the California Transportation Plan 2040. Per the CTIP Workgroup, the ITSP should encompass the entire interregional system, including high-speed rail, intercity rail along with active transportation.

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION**

The Citizens Advisory Committee received the item on consent at their January 14, 2015 meeting.
The Technical Advisory Committee placed the item on consent at their January 15, 2015 meeting.

Due to time limitations, the Policy Advisory Committee deferred this item until the February 12, 2015 meeting.

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

The Congestion Management Program & Planning Committee considered this item as part of its January 22, 2015 Consent Agenda. The Committee placed this item on the consent agenda for the February 5, 2015 Board of Directors’ meeting.

Prepared By: Jane Shinn
Memo No. 4813
California State Transportation Agency

California Transportation Infrastructure Priorities Whitepaper:

Exploring a Road Usage Charge as a Potential Replacement for the Gasoline Tax

Recommendations to the Secretary of Transportation

September 12, 2014 Draft
Exploring a Road Usage Charge

This whitepaper provides background and recommendations from the California Transportation Infrastructure Priorities (CTIP) Workgroup on the establishment of a demonstration program to explore the feasibility of road usage charge as an alternative to the excise tax on gasoline. The California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA) established the CTIP Workgroup in April 2013, to examine the current status of the state’s transportation system and discuss the challenges that lie ahead. The workgroup includes a diverse group of transportation stakeholders. An Interim Recommendation Report was issued in February 2014 and posted on the CalSTA website. The CTIP Workgroup continues to meet on specific topics in 2014 – one of these being the feasibility of a road usage charge for addressing the state’s long-term funding challenge to preserve state and local transportation infrastructure.

Gas taxes pay for highways, local roads, bridges, busses, trains, and even active transportation. However, the current per-gallon tax structure is untenable in the long-term. Although total Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) are expected to increase over time, the projected sale of gasoline is expected to decrease dramatically due to increasing fuel efficiency of the vehicle fleet. One alternative funding approach to this problem is a Road Usage Charge, which is charged on the number of vehicle miles traveled. This may be a more logical and fairer method of paying for state highway needs in light of high fuel economy and electric drive vehicles – It is also a direct charge for usage of the transportation system with a clearer nexus between payment and use. As a new and widely untested alternative funding approach, many questions must be answered prior to any wide-scale changes. This whitepaper describes the need for a stable revenue source that will address the twin funding problems of inflation and increasing vehicle fuel economy, and some of the challenges therein.

1 Transportation Infrastructure Charges Relative to Other Services

With perhaps the notable exception of Warren Buffett, nobody publicly admits to wanting to pay more taxes. Nonetheless, the state’s transportation infrastructure represents an essential component of modern life, and its existence and function relies on some sort of user payment. The transport of people, food, and consumer goods - not to mention vital emergency services - would not be possible without the state’s integrated transportation system. Though no official number exists, it is roughly estimated that the transportation system in the state is valued in the neighborhood of several trillion dollars; yet users of the system generally pay far less for use of the system than for many daily luxuries. The average driver pays just $368

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Average Annual Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gas Taxes</td>
<td>$368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>$540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>$780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell Phone</td>
<td>$852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cable</td>
<td>$1,032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Annual Cost of Select Items
annually in gasoline taxes, including all state, local and federal taxes. Yet, consumers would likely be surprised to find that their annualized payments for use of highways and roads are only about one-third of the cost of their cable bill. This lack of perspective makes it very difficult to engage in any conversation about paying for infrastructure.

The current tax system is a consumption tax. It is constructed in such a way that leads consumers to think of the taxes on gasoline as a tax for the *purchase of gasoline, not on the usage of the roadway network*. This somewhat circular logic is perpetuated by the fact that the taxes on gasoline are just a proxy for a tax on the *use of the transportation system*. The direct link between use of the system and paying for that system does not exist. A useful means of guiding this discussion is to shift the focus from a tax, to a charge for use of a crucial utility, just as people think about their use of electricity, water and internet access.

### 2 Effects of Vehicle Fuel Economy

New Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) standards, alternative fuels, and the rise in the popularity of electric vehicles, combine to create a rapidly deteriorating funding situation. These are positive results from other statewide policy initiatives, but the primary state transportation revenue source for maintenance and operations has been the flat-rate excise tax of 18 cents placed on each gallon of gasoline sold. While sales tax (later replaced with a “price-based” excise tax) was shifted to transportation beginning in 2000, only the base 18 cents provides funding for “fix-it-first” activities including maintenance and rehabilitation of the state’s transportation system. The excise tax has long been used as a proxy for a user fee, but as vehicles become more efficient, this proxy is becoming less effective.

The emphasis on increased fuel economy is undeniably desirable. From an environmental and energy policy standpoint, decreased fuel consumption reduces greenhouse gasses and our dependence on a finite energy source. However, as we strive to reduce fuel consumption, we undercut the primary funding source for repair of the roads that *all* cars, trucks, and busses rely on - regardless of the energy source that they use, or how efficient the vehicle they drive is. There is no equitable means to mitigate these effects so long as we
continue to rely on the antiquated per-gallon excise tax.

By 2030, as much as half of the revenue that could have been collected will be lost to fuel efficiency. If that sounds farfetched, consider that 20 years ago in 1994, the average fuel economy of cars on the road in the United States was just around 20 miles per gallon (MPG); today the average efficiency of new cars sold exceeds 35 MPG. By comparison, 35 MPG was the average fuel economy of all passenger cars sold in the European Union (EU) in 2001, and by 2011 it had increased to 42 MPG, with average highway ratings exceeding 50 MPG. As new, more efficient, cars replace the older models, the effect on consumption and average fuel economy of the fleet will increase rapidly. On the other hand, revenue from the gas tax will decline dramatically. Estimates suggest that the decrease in revenue due to fuel efficiency will soon outpace even the negative impact of inflation.

Complicating the issue somewhat is the interaction of increased fuel economy with the use of diesel fuel that is taxed at a lower rate than gasoline. The market share of diesel passenger vehicles in the U.S. is currently around 1 percent. Based on experiences in the 1980s drivers in the U.S. have been soured on diesel cars, viewing them as noisy, dirty, and unreliable. But modern diesel systems are touted as clean, powerful, and fuel-efficient. In the EU, 55 percent of passenger cars sold in 2011 were diesel-powered. Because modern diesel cars are more fuel efficient than gasoline-powered equivalents, this move to diesel power has helped the EU to achieve outstanding average fuel efficiency and commensurate greenhouse gas reductions.

Recent years have seen the marginally successful re-entry of diesel passenger cars into the U.S. market, and estimates by some expert sources indicate that the market share of new diesel passenger cars sold could increase to 10 percent by 2020. But, because diesel excise tax was reduced to 10 cents per gallon (from 18), a shift in fuel source would negatively impact transportation revenues available under the existing tax structure.

3 Effects of Inflation
Even absent changes in tax revenue due to fuel efficiency, the state faces another losing proposition in the excise tax: inflation. The base excise tax, which provides the funding for the maintenance of our highways and local roads, has remained unchanged since 1994. This rate has been in place for 20 years, despite significant increases in project construction costs. Since that time, despite the economic crisis of 2008, the buying power of the tax has decreased about 42 percent in terms of construction costs. To flip that around, if the base 18 cents-per-gallon tax had been indexed to inflation back in 1994, it
would be about 31 cents-per-gallon today.

The chart above illustrates how inflation has reduced the purchasing power of 1994’s 18 cent gas excise tax to the equivalent of a 10.5 cent tax. A further adjustment for increased VMT would reduce the purchasing power to the equivalent of 9.0 cents per gallon (half the value).

The effects of inflation must be addressed if California is to be successful in both improving the condition of transportation infrastructure and maintaining the improved condition. The means of doing so is to tie the tax to an index that changes with the cost of goods and services. The Consumer Price Index may be the most well known, but the Producer Price Index, or even the California Highway Construction Cost Index, are more consistent with construction price changes.

The gasoline excise tax was raised multiple times between its initiation in 1923 and the last increase in 1994 to account for the effects of inflation. Indexing annually for inflation can alternatively be authorized and reduces the purchasing power erosion between longer-term adjustments. Regardless of the type of long-term solution implemented to provide appropriate funding for transportation, the effects of inflation must be surmounted and annual indexing considered.

4 The Benefit of Exploring the Road Usage Charge

The word “sustainability” generally evokes thoughts related to environmental quality. But sustainability is a much broader concept that includes, at its heart, a consideration for the long-term feasibility of any undertaking, including its financial feasibility. As currently structured and with advances in vehicle technologies, the current per-gallon tax on fuel is not sustainable as a long-term revenue source for transportation infrastructure funding. Therefore, California should consider the feasibility of other revenue sources.

The road usage charge is untested on a large scale in the United States, but may offer benefits as an alternative to the gasoline tax in terms of greater revenue sustainability to maintain bridges, roads, and other transportation infrastructure, and in terms of a closer nexus between the payer and the service being consumed. A closer nexus between a road usage charge and miles traveled on roads and highways may additionally improve traveler information about the relative costs of car travel compared to other modes. Better consumer information on the cost of car trips may increase car pools, transit, and active transportation modes; resulting in co-benefits to the environment and public health.

When the possible benefits of a road usage charge detailed in the prior paragraph are coupled with the need to consider various options for privacy protection, technology, and other detail of a road usage charge system, the merit of a demonstration program comes into focus. This whitepaper does not recommend implementation of a road usage charge – rather it recommends exploration, through a demonstration program, to better understand the possible benefits and costs. Through future efforts, the CTIP Workgroup will additionally be looking at other pay-as-you-go revenue options to maintain transportation infrastructure.
4.1 Other States are Exploring the Road Usage Charge

The state of Oregon has been a national leader in the drive towards a road usage charge. It is currently the only state in the nation that has a permanent, albeit limited, road usage charge. Oregon started on this path in 2001, when the Oregon Legislature created Oregon’s Road User Fee Task Force (Task Force). The Task Force was created to develop a revenue collection design funded through user pay methods, acceptable and visible to the public, that ensures a flow of revenue sufficient to annually maintain, preserve and improve Oregon’s state, county and city highway and road system.

The Task Force researched and investigated more than two-dozen revenue options. After the Task Force determined that a road user fee based on miles driven had the most promise, it spearheaded a successful pilot in the Portland area that concluded in 2007. That 2007 pilot proved the concept of a per-mile fee was feasible and pinpointed areas that needed more research and testing.

In 2012, the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) began a second road user fee pilot. The second pilot included new technologies that could report VMT without the use of a global positioning system (GPS), assuaging many privacy concerns. Notably, the second pilot gave volunteers several options, including the type of device used, and a choice of service provider. The pilot concluded in February 2013, and was the final proof of concept necessary to move forward into formal implementation.

A 2013 bill (Senate Bill 810) authorized the ODOT to set up a permanent road usage charge system for 5,000 volunteer motorists beginning July 1, 2015. ODOT may assess a charge of 1.5 cents per mile for up to 5,000 volunteer cars and light commercial vehicles and issue a gas tax refund to those participants.

Washington and other western states are exploring a road usage charge and have formed the Western Road Usage Charge Consortium to collaborate and pool valuable research and development dollars.

4.2 Explore a Tax Structure to Reflect Use of the System, Not Fuel Purchased

Implementation of a road usage charge to replace the antiquated per-gallon excise tax would help to preserve transportation revenues for state and local governments. However, as highlighted by the experience in Oregon, the process to implement a road usage charge is long and challenging. A demonstration program will provide data to inform the conversation regarding a road usage charge as a viable user fee option for California and test participant reactions to the concept. The state should pursue a demonstration program to understand the challenges and best practices associated with a road usage charge program.

A conversion from a gasoline excise tax to a road usage charge would be an extensive process that would take considerable time. Exploration of the issues discussed above would enable the state to explore an important option for transportation funding without necessitating a change to the current tax structure, or to current statute.

The list of areas that should be investigated is wide-ranging, but some of the most prominent include:
CTIP Recommendations – DRAFT for discussion purposes only

- Privacy
- Public Education
- Rural and Urban perceptions
- Environmental justice
- Technological hurdles
- Practicality
- Equity
- Interoperability

5 CTIP Workgroup Recommendations
Over the past several months, CalSTA and the CTIP Workgroup have convened to discuss policies and issues related to guiding the early stages of a road usage charge demonstration program in California. The discussions encompassed a wide-range of topics such as road usage charge history nationally and worldwide, policy issues, demonstration program characteristics, and others. Through these efforts, the CTIP Workgroup recommends moving forward on a road usage charge demonstration program, including the following overall goal for the demonstration:

To advance the understanding and evaluate the viability of a road usage charge model in California, and to provide a sustainable and equitable source of revenue to maintain, operate, and improve California’s state and local transportation infrastructure.

5.1 Guiding Policy Principles Framework
In order to achieve the overall goal, the CTIP Workgroup developed 13 policy principles that will help guide future road usage charge research and development in California. At a minimum, the process to develop a California road usage charge should:

1. Fully Engage the Public – A road usage charge demonstration program needs to be transparent and engage the traveling public.
2. Honor Personal Privacy – The right to privacy must be honored. The system should protect specific driver and other personally identifiable information.
3. Be Fair and Equitable – All Californians should pay their fair share for using the transportation system – just like they pay their fair share of use for water or electricity. A fair system may account for vehicle type and size (e.g., fuel efficiency and weight) and consider incentives for lower income and disadvantaged Californians.
4. Keep Pace with Change – The system should be open, adaptable, and expandable towards current and future technologies, and allow private sector participation.
5. Avoid Double Charging – The individual paying a road usage charge should not have to pay both the gas tax and the road usage charge.
6. Be Simple – The system should be uncomplicated, streamlined, and transparent.
7. Clearly Identify Responsibilities – Roles, responsibilities, administration, and oversight functions should be clearly identified.
8. **Be Enforceable** – The system should meet all security and compliance measures to detect and deter evasion and fraud.

9. **Integrate with Other Charges** – As a replacement to the gas tax, the charge should also be compatible with current and future transportation revenue streams in California, and with other state, national and international transportation systems.

10. **Reinvest in Transportation** – The use of road usage charge revenue must be used for transportation purposes.

11. **Allow User Choice** – Californians should have the ability to select a reporting option of choice based on multiple technology and non-technology options.

12. **Incorporate Cost Efficiencies** – The system should incorporate low capital and operating costs to ensure highest return on system investment.

13. **Integrate with Other State Policies** – The system should also align with California’s economic, energy, environmental, and congestion management goals.

The guiding policy framework is intended to be broad in nature and the principles reflect California’s unique perspectives toward a road usage charge. However, as California continues to explore a road usage charge through research and a possible demonstration, it will be prudent to further refine these guiding policy principles and develop operational concepts that reflect a clear nexus to them.

### 5.2 Large Road Usage Charge Demonstration Characteristics

The purpose of a road usage charge demonstration is to gain insights and discover information relevant to the viability of a road usage charge as a user fee option in California. In order to achieve the overall recommended goal, the CTIP Workgroup was provided with small, medium and large demonstration options, each having unique key parameters, including: sample size, geographic diversity, duration, and reporting options. Each option was discussed at length between CTIP Workgroup participants and the general consensus was to recommend a “Large” demonstration. The characteristics of a large road usage charge demonstration include:

- **Geographic Diversity** – A road usage charge demonstration in California should reflect the profile of drivers on the roads. This includes north/south, urban/rural, socioeconomic classes, ethnic groups, and others. A large demonstration consisting of statewide distribution is recommended, including multiple urban and rural areas throughout the state. Any reduction in geographic coverage may not provide a statistically valid representation of California’s geographic diversity.

- **Duration** – A road usage charge demonstration in California will take time and may take 12 months of live demonstration. Any reduction to this timeframe might reduce the confidence level and confidence interval of the demonstration results.

- **Reporting Options** – A road usage charge demonstration in California will need to explore both technology and non-technology options. A large demonstration will allow participants to choose from approximately six (6) different types of reporting options. Any reduction to the amount of options available to participants might limit California’s ability to address issues such as privacy, interoperability, user choice, and flexible technology.
Sample Size – A road usage charge demonstration in California should reflect the overall population. Based on the characteristics identified above, a large demonstration consisting of approximately 6,000 participants is recommended. Any reduction in sample size may not provide a statistically valid representation of California’s population when spread across the state’s geographic segments and multiple reporting options.

5.3 Call for Action
As recognized by the CTIP Workgroup, the need for a stable alternate funding source that will address the various transportation funding problems in California is real and tangible. The current transportation funding structure is broken, but a road usage charge is a promising funding alternative that merits further exploration. Furthermore, there is an urgency to act because even the most ambitious road usage charge demonstration schedule will take time to implement and complete. In order for California to remain a leader in modern transportation practice and policy, California should take action, demonstrate the viability of a road usage charge, and take the necessary steps towards addressing long-term transportation funding challenges.
California State Transportation Agency
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Tolling and Pricing on State Highways

This whitepaper provides background and recommendations from the California Transportation Investment Priorities (CTIP) Workgroup on the tolling and pricing highway assets for congestion management and revenue for transportation infrastructure. The California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA) established the CTIP workgroup in April 2013 to examine the current status of the state’s transportation system and discuss the challenges that lie ahead. The workgroup includes a diverse group of transportation stakeholders. An Interim Recommendation Report was issued in February 2014 and posted on the CalSTA website. The CTIP workgroup continues to meet on specific topics in 2014—one of these being the subject of tolling and pricing.

Tolls are fees that drivers pay to use specific transportation facilities; such as bridges, highways, or managed lanes. California has a total of 170 centerline miles of toll bridges, toll roads, and priced managed lanes (also known as express lanes). These facilities are located in the San Francisco Bay Area, Los Angeles County, Orange County, and San Diego County.

Traditionally, tolling has been seen as a means to get new bridges, tunnels, and roads built by leveraging the revenue stream from tolls over many years. Many states have expressed a growing interest in tolling as the introduction of more fuel-efficient vehicles and inflation have reduced the amount and buying power of fuel tax revenues, which historically have represented their largest source of transportation funding. Tolling is also seen as a true “user fee” in that the toll revenues collected from system users are reinvested back into the maintenance and improvement of the system. Toll revenues can also be leveraged to provide financing for other transportation improvements.

Beyond the motivation for funding, there also is a motivation to use pricing as a means of managing demand to reduce congestion. A subset of tolling, pricing focuses on the use of tolls to manage traffic demand, with revenue generation being a secondary objective. Various adjectives are sometimes used to modify the term pricing: variable-, congestion-, and value-. They all essentially mean the same thing: varying the toll charged based upon the time of day, day of week, and/or real-time traffic conditions in order to appropriately manage traffic. Pricing can be applied to traditional toll roads, bridges, tunnels, or designated highway lanes.

1 Background on Tolling and Pricing in California

California has long used tolling, albeit in a very limited way, to help pay for transportation infrastructure. For much of the 20th century, the focus was to charge tolls to finance large transportation projects, specifically bridges. The State built 9 toll bridges in the San Francisco Bay Area, Los Angeles, and San...
Diego, and a separate bridge district comprised of several counties built and continues to operate the Golden Gate Bridge.

In 1987, two joint powers authorities were authorized to charge tolls as well as development fees to finance a 67-mile network of highways in Orange County. This was followed two years later by the State’s first public-private partnership (P3) law in 1989, which authorized Caltrans to establish franchise agreements with private entities for up to four transportation facilities and mandated the use of tolls to help finance the projects. Two projects were built using this P3 provision. One of these projects, the State Route 91 Express Lanes, was the first priced managed lane facility in California, where a combination of tolling, access control, and vehicle occupancy were used in order to ensure that the facility operated at a high level of performance.

In 1993, Assembly Bill 713 was passed, implementing priced managed lanes (express lanes) on Interstate 15 in San Diego County. In this particular project, the San Diego Association of Governments was given authority to convert existing high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes to high-occupancy/toll (HOT) lanes. The success of this project led to subsequent legislation (Assembly Bill 2032) in 2003 that authorized other regional transportation agencies to operate a limited number of express lane projects elsewhere in San Diego County as well as in Alameda and Santa Clara Counties. This was later followed by legislation in 2006 (Assembly Bill 1467) that allowed regional transportation agencies to request approval from the California Transportation Commission to operate express lanes. The number of projects was limited to four - two in northern California and two in southern California. Projects were authorized in Los Angeles and Riverside Counties and the San Francisco Bay Area under this provision, which expired in 2012.

A new statute (Senate Bill X2 4) authorizing P3 projects became law in 2009. Under this statute, regional transportation agencies or Caltrans could enter into P3 agreements for projects, and tolling is an option to provide a source of financing for the projects. This law will sunset in 2017. In 2010, Assembly Bill 798 became law, establishing the California Transportation Finance Authority (CTFA). CTFA was granted the power to authorize Caltrans or other regional transportation agencies to use tolls as a means of financing a transportation facility. This authority through the CTFA has no sunset date.

2 Typical Uses of Toll Revenue

The primary intent of tolling on the bridges was for project financing purposes. That historic policy driver remains today, but tolls are now also being used to pay for the operations and maintenance costs of the bridges. State law initially required that tolls be removed from the State-owned toll bridges once the revenue bonds used to finance the facilities were paid off but in 1972 this requirement was removed and instead tolls were to be set to cover the costs of operating and maintaining the facilities as well as pay off project indebtedness. Tolls collected on the Golden Gate Bridge also subsidize transit service and ferry service. Tolls collected on the State-owned bridges in the San Francisco Bay Area not only cover the costs of operations and
maintenance but also the costs of replacing or retrofitting bridges for seismic safety, and expanding bridges to handle increased traffic. In addition, voters in the San Francisco Bay Area have twice approved specific bridge toll increases to finance freeway and transit improvements in the region and cover the costs of operating transit service. The most recent measure (Regional Measure 2) is expected to provide over $3 billion in toll revenues through the year 2040 to cover highway and transit improvements and subsidize transit operations in the region. (Tolls were removed from the bridges in southern California once the facilities were paid for and their seismic safety retrofits were completed.)

State laws require that tolls collected on P3 projects or authorized by CTFA could also be used to cover the costs of operating and maintaining the facility in addition to financing. Excess toll revenues from a P3 project may be repaid into the State Highway Account, while excess toll revenues from a project authorized by CTFA are to be used for HOV improvements or other transportation improvements in the corridor in which they were collected.

State laws require that toll revenues from express lanes are to be used to cover the capital, operations, and maintenance costs of the lanes. Any remaining revenues are to be used to fund improvements on the same freeway corridor, or operational subsidies for public transit operations. In some specific cases, these excess revenues can be dedicated to expansion and enhancements to the adjacent general purpose lanes in the corridor.

The revenue potential for express lanes can be high; the express lanes on State Route 91 generated $22.3 million in net revenues in 2013. In San Diego, the express lanes on I-15 were expected to generate over $5 million in toll revenue in fiscal year 2014. Approximately 18 percent of those revenues were dedicated to financing transit service in the I-15 corridor.

### 91 Express Lane Toll Revenue Generation (2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Revenues</td>
<td>$39.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>$17 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Revenue</td>
<td>$22.3 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The use of tolling and pricing has been increasingly supported by the federal government as a means to increase capacity and manage existing capacity. Since 2005, federal law has allowed states to convert HOV lanes to HOT lanes without federal approval. The Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21), which took effect in October 2012, further streamlined the use of tolling by eliminating federal approval and tolling agreement requirements to toll new capacity on existing freeways. Federal law also requires toll revenues to be used first to cover the costs of developing, operating, and maintaining the facility, and providing a return on investment to any private investment partner. Excess revenues may be used for any transportation purpose within the subject corridor for which Federal funds would normally be used.

## 3 Recommendations from the Tolling and Pricing Subgroup

Over the past several months, the California State Transportation Agency and the CTIP Workgroup have convened to discuss policies and issues related to developing a tolling and pricing policy for state highways. Through these efforts, the CTIP workgroup recommends moving forward on a clear policy that would clarify the process for determining use of toll revenues, and streamlining the statutory process to use tolling and pricing where appropriate. The following are suggested recommendations from the Tolling and Pricing subgroup:
3.1 Policy on Tolling and Pricing Related to Congestion Management and Funding Transportation Infrastructure

CalSTA or Caltrans should issue a high-level policy that provides general guidelines on the use of tolling on the State Highway System (SHS). The policy should state that Caltrans will support the use of tolling on the SHS, where appropriate, to optimize system performance and provide an alternative source of transportation funding to maintain and improve infrastructure. Caltrans or a regional transportation agency could have the authority to collect tolls.

The policy would require that tolling be considered during the planning and development of capacity improvements on the SHS. Tolling could be used on new SHS facilities, new capacity added to existing SHS facilities, and existing high-occupancy vehicle lanes. Congestion pricing and all-electronic tolling would be required for priced managed lanes and would need to be considered for other toll facilities where feasible. Incentives such as discounted tolls or toll-free passage could be granted to high-occupancy vehicles, transit vehicles, and zero- and low-emission vehicles, as appropriate.

The policy would require that whenever tolls are implemented on the SHS, Caltrans and regional transportation agencies would sign agreements that define overall roles, responsibilities and requirements related to maintenance, operations, data sharing, performance monitoring, and annual audits and reports. Regional transportation agencies that sponsor projects would be required to reimburse Caltrans for costs incurred relative to the development, operation, and maintenance of the facility as part of these agreements.

Toll revenues would be used first be used for direct expenses of the toll facility, including:

- Debt service, if any.
- Administration.
- Operations and maintenance.
- Capital improvements.
- Reimbursement to the California Highway Patrol for enforcement services.
- Appropriate reserves for the above items.

Unless otherwise specified by project financing requirements, excess toll revenues, if any, would need to be used for projects that improve travel reliability, provide travel options, or improve the safety and operations of the transportation corridor in which the tolls were collected. These improvements could include, but not be limited to:

- Transit service
- Active transportation projects.
- Operational improvements.
- Augmentation to existing maintenance and operation expenses on adjacent lanes.
- Completion of regional managed lane networks.
- An expenditure plan for the use of excess revenues would be developed collaboratively by project stakeholders on an annual basis. The plan and each annual update would be made available for public review and comment for not less than 30 days prior to adoption by the governing board of the project operator. For projects operated by the department, the plan shall be adopted by the commission. The plan would take into account the financial contributions and roles and responsibilities of all project stakeholders.
3.2 Policy on Managed Lanes

Caltrans has been in the process of updating its existing policy on HOV lanes on the SHS to address managed lanes - HOV lanes and express lanes. The policy has been vetted with regional stakeholders and should be finalized to reflect the comments received from stakeholders and the requirements of the statewide tolling policy.

The policy would state that Caltrans supports the use of managed lanes on the SHS as a sustainable transportation system management solution. Managed lanes will be used to promote carpoolsing and transit ridership, improve travel time reliability, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and maximize the efficiency of the freeway system by increasing person and vehicle throughput while reducing congestion and delay. Caltrans will partner with regional transportation agencies to develop plans for managed lanes on the SHS in each of the State’s large urban areas.

The policy would identify the types of operational strategies used on managed lanes, including pricing. Caltrans or a regional transportation agency could have the authority to collect tolls on priced managed lanes. Operational strategies (and any changes in those strategies) for managed lanes would be determined by Caltrans in cooperation with regional transportation agencies and the California Highway Patrol, and in consultation with other affected stakeholders. Operational strategies would be determined based on factors such as safety and mobility considerations, regional consistency, traffic forecasts, life cycle costs, revenue potential, enforcement needs, environmental considerations, and community support.

The use of toll revenues from managed lanes would be addressed under the statewide tolling policy.

3.3 Legislation to Expand the Use of Tolling and Pricing in California

There is currently very limited authority for Caltrans and regional transportation agencies to collect tolls on the SHS. The CTIP Workgroup recommends this authority should be expanded through legislation. The proposed legislation should permanently reinstate the process established under Assembly Bill 1467 in 2006, in which regional agencies could apply to the California Transportation Commission to operate express lanes. The proposed legislation would expand this authority to Caltrans, eliminate the cap on the number of projects that could be approved, and would also include express toll lanes and toll roads as a qualifying project, in addition to express lanes. Provisions of the legislation would be as follows:

- Caltrans and regional transportation agencies could enter into agreements to develop and operate high-occupancy toll lanes, express toll lanes, toll roads, or a network comprised of two or more such facilities.
- Caltrans could operate the facility and collect the tolls, or could authorize the regional transportation agency to operate the facility and collect the tolls.
- The California Transportation Commission would be required to approve the agreements, and develop eligibility criteria.
- Toll revenues would need to be used for direct expenses related to the development, maintenance, administration, and operation, including collection and enforcement, of the facilities or network, and reserves for these purposes.
• Unless required by any project financing agreements, any remaining revenue would be used for projects that improve travel reliability, provide travel options, or improve the safety and operations of the State highway corridor in which the tolls were collected. An expenditure plan for the use of excess toll revenues, if any, shall be developed by the department and the regional transportation agency and updated annually. The plan and each annual update would be made available for public review and comment for not less than 30 days prior to adoption by the governing board of the project operator. For projects operated by the department, the plan shall be adopted by the commission.

• Regional transportation agencies and Caltrans would have the ability to issue toll revenue bonds to finance projects.

• A regional transportation agency would be defined as a regional transportation planning agency, a county transportation commission, any other local or regional transportation entity that is designated by statute as a regional transportation agency, or a joint exercise of powers authority.

4 Definitions

Below are definitions for several terms used throughout this white paper.

**Tolling:** Charging a price to motorists to use a transportation facility, such as a bridge, tunnel, or road. Revenues are typically used to pay for the costs of building, operating and maintaining the facility.

**Pricing:** Tolls that vary based on the level of vehicle demand on a highway facility. Tolls may vary by time of day (static) or according to real-time conditions on the facility. Also known as congestion pricing, value pricing, or variable pricing.

**Managed Lanes:** A set of exclusive or preferential use lanes on a freeway that are proactively managed in response to changing conditions using strategies such as access control, vehicle eligibility, pricing, or a combination thereof.

**High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Lane:** A type of managed lane that may be used by vehicles carrying a minimum number of occupants.

**High Occupancy/Toll (HOT) Lane:** An HOV lane that lower occupancy vehicles may access by paying a toll.

**Express Toll Lane:** A managed lane on which all users pay a toll; vehicles carrying a minimum number of occupants may pay a discounted toll to use the lane.

**Express Lanes:** A blanket term for HOT lanes or express toll lanes.

**Electronic Toll Collection (ETC):** A method of collecting tolls using a transponder (associated with a pre-paid account) mounted in a vehicle and overhead antennas that read the transponder. An ETC system may utilize an automated license plate reader to assist in identifying vehicles not equipped with a transponder.

**All-Electronic Tolling:** The collection of tolls on toll facilities using only ETC. Also known as cashless tolling.
**Regional Transportation Agency:** A regional transportation planning agency, a county transportation commission, any other local or regional transportation entity that is designated by statute as a regional transportation agency, or a joint exercise of powers authority.
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This whitepaper provides background and recommendations from the California Transportation Investment Priorities (CTIP) Workgroup on the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA) established the CTIP workgroup in April 2013 to examine the current status of the state’s transportation system and discuss the challenges that lie ahead. The workgroup includes a diverse group of transportation stakeholders. An Interim Recommendation Report was issued in February 2014 and posted on the CalSTA website centered around the concepts of: preservation, innovation, integration, reform, and funding. The CTIP workgroup continues to meet on specific topics in 2014 – including this review of the STIP. The intention of this effort is to ensure STIP alignment with the priorities identified in the February Report and with current state and federal laws, policies, and priorities.

1 Introduction

The STIP is the State’s multimodal funding program – it provides funding for highways, local roads, rail and transit, and bicycling and pedestrian improvements. The STIP is the sole ongoing State program that provides funds for highway expansion, and historically, most STIP funds have been directed to highway projects. Non-highway modes of transportation have existing or new ongoing State funding programs that focus on individual modes, such as the: Active Transportation Program for bike and walk projects; Cap-and-Trade-funded Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program and High-Speed Rail Program for intercity, commuter, and urban rail; State Transit Assistance Program and the Low Carbon Transit Operations Program for transit operators; and “Shared Revenue” apportionment of gasoline tax for local streets and roads. Highway maintenance and highway preservation, likewise have separate funding programs, within the Caltrans Maintenance Program and the State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP).

There are a number of other state and non state fund sources used for capital projects for transportation, as shown in the chart below. The chart represents programmed funds for the 2014-15 fiscal year and does not include some potential program fund sources such as toll and developer fees where data is not readily available. The amount of funds for given programs vary slightly by year but the overall relative percentage of each program will likely not vary substantially by year. The distinction between the State and Local projects below is a distinction between local versus state nominated projects. In some cases, such as a portion of Active Transportation Program funds, the locals nominate projects and the state chooses the projects through a competitive grant process. The funds sources listed in the chart below can be used for multiple types of investments as outlined in the table below.
Funds Available for Transportation Capital Projects in FY 14-15

- **STIP**, 4.4% of total. **ITIP**, 1.1%, primarily for freight.
- **Local Measure Funds**, 23.2%
- **Local Transportation Fund (State TDA)**, 8.6%
- **Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax to Locals**, 17.3%
- **Cap and Trade Rail & Transit**, 0.2%
- **High Speed Rail**, 8.8%
- **STIP (ITIP)**, 1.1%
- **Highway Maintenance (SHOPP)**, 15.3%
- **Cap and Trade Local**
- **P1B Transit**, 5.3%
- **FTA 5307 & 5340**, 5.1%
- **Federal CMAQ, RSTP, Loc Br., etc.**, 8.5%
- **Local Measure Funds**
- **Local Choice - 74%**
- **State - 26%**

For deliberative purposes only.
## Transportation Fund Source Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Program</th>
<th>Mass Transportation Infrastructure</th>
<th>Automobile Infrastructure</th>
<th>Pedestrian and Bicycle Infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STIP (RTIP and ITIP)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Transit</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal CMAQ, RSTP, Local bridge, Etc.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop 1B Transit and IC Rail</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Transportation Fund</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Measure</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Transportation Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STIP funds are often combined with local revenues to fund projects and in many counties, the local sales-tax measure funds exceed the STIP funds used for new infrastructure projects. The annual funding for STIP is about $675 million, and local measure fund revenue sums to approximately $4 billion per year. Local sales-tax measures typically support multi-modal investment and include transit, and active transportation projects, in addition to highway projects.

A recent review of Caltrans by the State Smart Transportation Initiative (SSTI) and some critics of the 2014 STIP have raised questions about the appropriateness of the STIP structure and projects, relative to statewide policy objectives for sustainability and the statutory priority for preservation of existing transportation infrastructure.

The SSTI review opines that the STIP, combined with local sales-tax measure funding, has resulted in a disproportionately high investment in new highway capacity:

> Despite decades-long calls for a pivot toward system preservation, nearly all STIP funding, whether administered by state or local governments, goes to highway-capacity projects, even though state law allows for STIP-funded preservation projects as well. Coupled with self-help county funding and other sources, such as recent bonding, the STIP helps to generate substantial new highway capacity.

Some critics of the 2014 STIP pointed to the number of highway capacity expansion projects included in the Regional Transportation Improvement Programs and the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program and suggested the proportion directed to highways was too large, and that new highway
capacity would increase vehicle miles-traveled on the corridors negatively impacting greenhouse gas emissions.

While the STIP is a small fraction of all federal, state, and local transportation spending in California—less than 5 percent—it is the responsibility of the State and its partners to ensure these public dollars are well-spent and consistent with state policy. Further, the CTIP February interim report identified preservation, innovation, integration, reform, and funding as top priorities for infrastructure investment. This whitepaper provides STIP background, provides related information, and makes recommendations for better alignment.

2 Background on the STIP

The basic structure of today’s STIP goes back to Senate Bill 45 of 1997. The STIP is a five-year program of projects that is updated every two years. The most recent STIP—the 2014 STIP—was adopted by the California Transportation Commission in March 2014. State statute directs: 75 percent of STIP dollars to the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), which is subdivided by formula into county shares, with projects to be nominated by each regional agency; and 25 percent to the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP), which are projects nominated by Caltrans. The purpose of the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP) is to fund projects that improve interregional mobility for people and goods across the State of California on highway and rail corridors of strategic importance. State law further requires that a minimum of 60 percent of the ITIP be directed to highway projects that are outside the boundaries of an urbanized area with a population of more than 50,000 and intercity rail projects, with a minimum of 15 percent of that 60 percent directed to the intercity rail projects.

The chart to the left illustrates how the statutory distribution of funding between the interregional and regional programs functions. Within the regional program, funding is further split between the north and south county groups, 40 percent and 60 percent respectively. Lastly funding is then distributed with each county group to each county on a formula basis that weighs population and centerline mileage.

The chart to the right illustrates the regional funding split between the largely urbanized areas and non-urbanized areas of the state.

The process of adopting the STIP is a multi-step effort. Caltrans updates the Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan and each region updates its regional transportation plan. The regional
transportation plans also include the sustainable community strategies for the 18 metropolitan planning organizations. The CTC adopts STIP guidelines that describe the policy, standards, criteria and procedures for the development, adoption and management of the STIP. The CTC guidelines are updated as needed during each STIP adoption cycle. Not later than August 15 of each odd-numbered year, the CTC adopts an estimate of available revenues for the STIP. Nominations from regions and Caltrans are due by December 15 of each odd-numbered year. The CTC must adopt the STIP by April 1 of each even-numbered year.

CTC guidelines for the 2014 STIP included performance measures of safety, operational efficiency, travel time and reliability, greenhouse gas benefits, rail ridership, and vehicle miles traveled. Additionally, each region with an adopted sustainable communities strategy was required for the first time to include a discussion of how the program of projects relates to that strategy. Historically the submitted performance measures have not been aggregated across the entire Program nor reported by the Commission.

Eligible uses of the STIP are dependent on fund source. Most STIP funds today are from the State Highway Account (SHA), which is restricted in expenditure by Article XIX of the State Constitution. The Constitution permits the use of SHA revenue for State highways, local roads, active transportation facilities, environmental mitigation, and exclusive public mass transit guideways. SHA funds in the STIP can be used for highway or road expansion and preservation, but not for highway or road maintenance. Additionally, the SHA in the STIP can be used for rail track and grade separations, but not for purchasing rail cars or buses. Some types of federal funds in the STIP are more flexible and can be used for expenditures such as bus or rail car purchase. The availability of Public Transportation Account (PTA) funding in the STIP has diminished in recent years due to tax law changes and the fact that more of the existing funds are being allocated directly to transit operators by formula rather than through the STIP. While the PTA was a bigger share of the STIP in past years, and directed to transit investments, some transit investments can still be made from SHA.

The funding level in the STIP is set by a combination of state law and the annual budget process. Currently, STIP funding is set at the level set by statute as a minimum – receiving 44 percent of the “priced-based excise tax” on gasoline, which is expected to generate about $675 million annually. The budget process can increase or decrease this funding level. Street and Highway Code Section 167 defines preservation and rehabilitation as a higher priority than new capacity, and that is generally reflected in the state budget, with the SHOPP program expected to receive about $2.3 billion annually, and the Maintenance Division at Caltrans funded at about $1.4 billion annually. Between the 2012 STIP and the 2014 STIP, the STIP funding was largely unchanged, however, the SHOPP programming capacity grew $1.1 billion over the four year period.

3 Typical Uses of STIP Dollars

The 2014 STIP added two new years of programming, 2017-18 and 2018-19, and also reflected the elimination of the federal Transportation Enhancement (TE) program, which had been previously programmed in the STIP. With the elimination of the TE and the establishment of the new federal
Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP), California decided to use TAP funds and State funds to create the Active Transportation Program as a separate program for funding bicycling and pedestrian projects. The net new programming capacity for the STIP five-year program was $1.3 billion mostly in the two final years. The regions and Caltrans nominated new projects that were split 83 percent for road and highway, and 17 percent for rail and transit. As is typical, the requests for new programming in the early years of the STIP exceeded capacity and the CTC needed to determine which projects to program early and which to program late. Generally, the CTC favored rail, transit, bike and pedestrian projects in the earlier STIP years and highway and road projects were programmed in later years.

4 Impact of AB 32, SB 375, SB 391, and SB 743 on Project Selection

Through the passage of AB 32 (Nunez, 2006), SB 375 (Steinberg, 2008), and SB 391 (Liu, 2009), the State is leading the nation in aggressively reducing greenhouse gas emissions. These bills do not require any specific changes to the STIP, or to broader transportation funding, but in order to achieve the greenhouse gas reduction goals of that legislation, a greater focus on multi-modal investments and infill development is required. Assembly Bill 32 requires that the state reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 and maintain those reductions – the bill also authorizes the establishment of a market-based “Cap-and-Trade” auction program to reduce emissions. The Governor has set an additional greenhouse gas target by Executive Order (S-3-05) of a further 80 percent reduction by 2050. Senate Bill 375 requires the California Air Resources Board to set greenhouse-gas reduction targets for the state’s Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and that the MPOs include Sustainable Community Strategies in their Regional Transportation Plans. Senate Bill 391 requires that the California Transportation Plan incorporate the regional Sustainable Community Strategies and identify the statewide integrated multimodal transportation system needed to achieve maximum feasible emissions reductions. The California Transportation Plan 2040, which is due in final form by December 2015, is the first statewide plan developed under the requirements of SB 391.

Most MPOs have released their first Sustainable Community Strategies, and these have generally been favorably received in terms of support for multimodalism and infill development. These plans include specific projects and all funding sources available to the regions – federal, state and local funds. As one illustration of the new plans, Plan Bay Area directs 87 percent of all funds to maintaining existing infrastructure, and 62 percent of all funds to transit investments. Where Plan Bay Area directs funds to highway capacity, it is focused primarily on completion of a high-occupancy toll network and traffic management systems. In conformance with these plans and in response to voter demographic shifts in mobility demand, new regional sales tax measures are shifting their emphasis toward multimodal investments and fix-it-first preservation. Recent sales tax measures proposed by Alameda and Los Angeles do reflect this shift with significantly reduced highway capacity investments compared to past measures. For example, the Alameda measure on the November 2014 ballot would direct 9 percent to highways, 8 percent to bicycle and pedestrian projects, 30 percent to local street and road repair, and most of the remainder to transit.
Legislation adopted with the 2014 State Budget, Senate Bill 862, established an expenditure program for Cap-and-Trade auction proceeds. A large portion of the 2014-15 spending plan – over $600 million – is directed to Transportation and Sustainable Communities. In 2015-16 and thereafter, a minimum of 60 percent of annual auction proceeds are directed to these purposes, meaning that projects that reduce transportation emissions – through both cleaner vehicles and through mode shift away from auto trips to transit and active transportation – will enjoy new funding at a level equal to or possibly exceeding the baseline STIP program.

Caltrans is developing the first “SB 391” California Transportation Plan (The CTP2040) through an open public process. Through that process, a vision, goals and policies have been established with the active participation of a broad stakeholdership in the policy advisory committee that guides the effort. The vision of the plan is as follows:

*California’s transportation system is safe, sustainable, and globally competitive. It provides reliable and efficient mobility and accessibility for people, goods, and services while meeting our greenhouse gas emission reduction goals and preserving community character. This integrated, connected, and resilient multimodal system supports a prosperous economy, human and environmental health, and social equity.*

The CTP 2040 is intended to guide the project selection for projects in the Interregional Transportation Investment Plan and in the regional transportation plans.

Governor Brown signed Senate Bill SB 743 (Steinberg, 2013), which created a process to change the way that transportation impacts are analyzed under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Specifically, SB 743 requires amending the CEQA Guidelines to provide an alternative to Level of Service (LOS) for evaluating transportation impacts. Particularly within areas served by transit, those alternative criteria must “promote the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, the development of multimodal transportation networks, and a diversity of land uses.” This new analysis will likely reprioritize new solutions to mobility challenges as part of the environmental review process required for transportation projects.

5 Role for Highway Capacity Expansion

As indicated above, recent state law and funding programs have emphasized multi-modal investments, fix-it-first preservation, and operational improvements over adding lanes to address increasing transportation demand needs. These policies and programs have reduced the overall proportion of funding available for highway capacity, but not eliminated it. It is important to recognize that some highway expansion projects are good policy – for example capacity projects on key corridors for goods movement, HOT and HOV lanes, and safety projects may warrant inclusion in spending plans.

Highway expansion that adds new mixed-flow lanes to major urban commute corridors creates a risk of inducing more vehicle miles traveled and sprawl – perhaps improving mobility in the short term, but at a cost to greenhouse reduction goals. The SB 375 approach does allow regions to manage to a greenhouse reduction target and balance multiple objectives – so priority highway expansion can be
consistent with SB 375 in urban areas if balanced with transit, active transportation and infill development sufficient to achieve greenhouse gas reduction targets. In rural areas, there are few or limited multimodal options and that is recognized as an important consideration in the rural transportation investment choices. The diversity of California’s regions should be considered as part of acknowledging equity for all users. It should also be noted that with the Caltrans complete streets policy, most road projects include elements that benefit all system users.

Recent state and regional plans have increased the focus on trade corridors and various congestion management practices to prioritize highway investments that best grow the economy and reduce highway congestion in major corridors through pricing and traffic management systems. For example, a major focus of highway expansion in the Southern California Association of Government is moving freight from the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach efficiently through the region. The Bay Area has a focus on completing a network of high-occupancy toll (HOT) lanes to improve travel-time reliability and more effectively manage congestion. Caltrans has in the past year increased its emphasis on maintaining and improving traffic management systems and is developing a pricing policy to implement additional HOT lanes where appropriate. Additionally, the state is seeking strategies to move more freight on rail and marine transport to help relieve pressure on highways.

6 CTIP workgroup STIP Alignment Recommendations

After much discussion with stakeholders in the Workgroup, the group is recommending the following to assure the STIP investments are aligned with state policy, perform well and are developed in a transparent manner. These recommendations are intended to inform the 2016 STIP process, and the Transportation Agency should stay engaged with stakeholders through the upcoming STIP cycle, with additional deliberations on further steps to take after the adoption of the 2016 STIP.

6.1 Focus on the Regional Transportation Plans and the Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan to direct project selection.

One of the recommendations of the State Smart Transportation Initiative (SSTI) review of Caltrans was that the State pursue legislation to allow the California Transportation Commission to reject individual projects in the STIP, if they are not aligned with state policy goals. The Workgroup recommends against this change in statute at this time, and instead recommends that the focus for state policy alignment should be on Regional Transportation Plans and the Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan. Focusing on plans addresses project selection at the earlier planning stage rather than in isolation when the project may already have pre-construction expenditures. Both the Regional and Interregional plans are developed in a transparent public process so that priorities are discussed and understood by all interested stakeholders.
6.2 Strong performance measures and reporting are needed for the STIP, because the public should know their tax dollars are well-spent.

STIP performance measures should be based on state goals and priorities and provide transparency on program effectiveness. The California Transportation Commission will adopt performance measures as part of STIP guideline process. The CTIP Workgroup recommends the measures be:

- Focused and well-defined;
- Consistent with CTP 2040;
- Consistent with MAP-21 and SB 375 / SB 391;
- Developed with commonly-used data when possible;
- Communicated to the public and easily understood;
- Cognizant of the diversity of California’s regions as reflected in the regional plans; and
- Allow for qualitative and quantitative measures.

The reported performance measures should apply to individual projects and relate back to the applicable overarching plan benefit, subject to any thresholds set by the CTC guidelines.

Associated with this recommendation, the Regional Transportation Planning Agencies are developing a template for the submittal of the regional and interregional improvement programs. The intention of the template is as a communication tool concerning the STIP investments. The template is expected to include:

- How the STIP project funding fits into the meet the vision of both the Regional, Interregional, and California Transportation Plans and the Sustainable Community Strategies including a link to the pertinent plan;
- Regional and statewide project benefits for the projects and program;
- Reporting on benefits of previous STIP funded projects that are complete; and a
- A write-up of overall qualitative and quantitative performance measures as applicable;

For further transparency, it is recommended that the STIP funded regional programs and the STIP funded ITIP are made available electronically on the CTC website.

6.3 This effort is encouraged by the CTIP Workgroup to provide further input to the CTC as guidelines are developed. Pursue multi-modal investments in the STIP, while recognizing the STIP as the only State program for regional and interregional highway capacity improvements.

The STIP is defined as a multi-modal transportation program in current state statute. Given SB 375 and SB 391 direction, it is likely overall federal, state, and local transportation dollars will be spent in higher proportions on preservation, rail, transit, and active transportation, with a
decreased portion spent on highway expansion – both the 2014-15 State Budget and recent Regional Transportation Plans reflect this shift. The STIP will likely experience a similar shift, but will also continue to direct a portion to highway capacity focused on major trade corridors, safety, and traffic management systems improvements. As Sustainable Community Strategies and the California Transportation Plan 2040 define regional and statewide priorities and focus, the STIP should support, and be fully consistent with, those comprehensive plans and policy directions. The performance reporting above should help evaluate attainment of this goal.

6.4 While not having any preservation mandates, the STIP should be clearly eligible for fix-it-first preservation and operational improvements of existing multi-modal infrastructure.

The CTIP Workgroup notes that the SHOPP is the primary state funding program for highway preservation and operations improvements, but also points out the operations investments have decreased over time. Over the last year, Caltrans increased its focus on operations improvements in the SHOPP, such as traffic management systems rehabilitation and upgrades. The Workgroup recommends against any regional or interregional STIP preservation and operations mandates, but agrees preservation and operations uses are allowable and appropriate in some circumstances. With the limited SHOPP funding, in some areas of the state, preservation of existing multi-modal infrastructure and operations improvements may be the most cost-effective expenditure of STIP dollars, and where that is the case, such expenditures should be encouraged. Additionally, where regional share dollars are directed to such purposes, partnership funding in the SHOPP should be considered. Longer term, it is acknowledged that if additional pay-as-you go revenue is not identified for preservation of highways, that the STIP may need to be reduced and the SHOPP augmented.

6.5 Improve the transparency of the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program, starting with the 2016 plan, to demonstrate its alignment with state policies and expand the public participation process.

Ensure the updated Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan (ITSP) and related STIP investments align with the California Transportation Plan 2040 vision and goals, which reflect the state’s priorities. Already Caltrans has designated the CTP 2040 Policy Advisory Committee to serve as the ITSP Advisory Committee. Further public participation should be accomplished by holding public workshops and seeking input through various advisory groups and committees such as California Freight Advisory Group, Active Transportation and Livable Communities group, RTPA meetings, Cal COG, Rural County Task Force meetings, Native American Advisory Committee meetings, and the CTC meeting process. The ITSP should include the entire interregional system including high-speed rail, intercity rail along with active transportation. Recognize that ITIP projects that leverage regional funds also go through an extensive regional public involvement process.
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Nuria I. Fernandez

FROM: Director of Planning and Program Development, John Ristow

SUBJECT: State Route 82 Relinquishment Exploration Study

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

The Grand Boulevard Initiative (GBI) is a collaborative planning effort of local and regional agencies, including Santa Clara County representatives from Palo Alto, Mountain View, Los Altos, Sunnyvale, Santa Clara, Santa Clara County, San Jose and Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) as well as representatives from private businesses and non-profit organizations, to improve the performance, safety and aesthetics of El Camino Real. This effort is funded by various federal, state, local and private grant programs and foundations.

The vision of the Grand Boulevard Initiative as established by its committee and task force is to see the El Camino Real corridor “achieve its full potential as a place for residents to work, live, shop and play, creating links between communities that promote walking and transit and an improved and meaningful quality of life.” This vision also includes guiding principles that support and encourage compact mixed-use development, multimodal complete streets elements, managed parking and attractive public spaces along El Camino Real. Additional information can be found on their website at www.grandboulevard.net/ <http://www.grandboulevard.net/>.

At its March 27, 2013 meeting, the GBI Task Force expressed interest in moving forward with the conceptual work scope and requested VTA and City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) staff to inquire if their respective local agencies would also be interested in the relinquishment study with the understanding that the funding would be sought from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC).

DISCUSSION:

On June 6, 2013, the VTA Board approved participation in the SR 82 (El Camino Real) Relinquishment Exploration Study at part of the GBI effort. Since then, MTC approved the funding for this study in September 2014, with work on the study already underway.
Nelson\Nygaard Consulting Associates was selected to lead this effort along with their team members Sherwood Design Engineers, Strategic Economics, and Remy Moose Manley, firms in civil engineering, economic analysis and land use law.

The limits for the SR 82 Relinquishment Exploration Study extend 20 miles along SR 82 (El Camino Real) from the I-880 Interchange in San Jose to SR 84 (Woodside Road) in Redwood City (see Attachment A). The purpose of this study is to provide communities and stakeholders in Santa Clara and San Mateo counties, as well as other cities in the Bay Area, with information to help make informed decisions about relinquishment of state highways to local jurisdictions such as the following:

- An understanding of Caltrans relinquishment polices and process;
- Case studies of recent highway relinquishments including schedules, budgets and staffing resources; and
- An assessment of existing conditions and public infrastructure along El Camino Real (a State urban highway facility) including estimated costs of relinquishment, annual maintenance costs and discussion on potential funding sources.

The study is anticipated to take approximately ten to twelve months to complete with VTA as the lead agency. The team is working on the data collection tasks, including literature review, case study research and existing conditions analysis. The first stakeholder meeting is tentatively planned for the January/February 2015 time frame, with the first deliverable draft report on data collection findings anticipated to be completed in March/April 2015 and shared with VTA committees.

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION**

The Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) received an update on January 14, 2015 and had the following comments: 1) inquired who will be working with the consultants; 2) the study should also look at the pros and cons of relinquishment including the lack of continuity if the corridor is relinquished to individual cities; 3) inquired if all the cities along the corridor need to agree on relinquishment; 4) cautioned on the impacts of relinquishments to local cities, specifically on maintenance issues and funding; and 5) inquired if cities are supportive of relinquishment and if the study will include a recommendation that can be presented at a future BPAC meeting.

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) received an update on this item on January 15, 2015 and requested staff to return with periodic updates.

The Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) received an update on this item on January 15, 2015 and had the following comments: 1) inquired about Caltrans’ relinquishment process and the level of support from cities along the corridor within the study area limits; 2) inquired about recent highway relinquishments; 3) described the current arrangement that City of Gilroy has with Caltrans for maintenance of traffic signals along Monterey Highway.
STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:

The Congestion Management Program & Planning Committee considered this item on January 22, 2015 and commented that the study should include estimated costs for relinquishment for each city along the corridor and a discussion on the pros and cons of relinquishment. The Committee also requested staff to provide an update on the status of the Grand Boulevard Initiative at a future meeting. The Committee recommended that this item be placed on the consent agenda for the February 2015 Board of Directors’ meeting.

Prepared By: Eugene Maeda
Memo No. 4798
Study Area
- I-880 Interchange, San Jose to SR 84, Redwood City
- Approx. 20 miles in length
- 6-8 Lanes, 35-40 mph posted speed limit
- San Mateo County – 3 cities
- Santa Clara County – 6 cities
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Nuria I. Fernandez

FROM: Director of Planning and Program Development, John Ristow

SUBJECT: Great Streets: Complete Street Corridor Study

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

The Complete Streets concept calls for public roads to be designed and built for the mobility and safety of all roadway users. Motorists, transit riders, bicyclists, and pedestrians of all ages and abilities must be able to move safely along and across our streets. VTA has long promoted elements of the multimodal, complete streets concept through its Community Design and Transportation Program, countywide plans, technical guidelines, and funding programs to support incremental improvements for bicycle, pedestrian and public transit along existing roadways.

In line with these efforts, VTA is proposing to conduct a series of corridor studies to implement the complete streets concept along select transportation roadways in Santa Clara County. This major planning effort, called the Great Streets Corridor Study, is a partnership between VTA and Member Agencies to transform select transportation roadways into high-quality, multimodal streets that prioritize bicycle, pedestrian and transit travel while still serving motorists. VTA is proposing to lead this collaborative planning process to better coordinate localized planning efforts on corridors that cross multiple jurisdictions. Each corridor study will include planning and conceptual design work to improve one or more of the preferred alternative modes along the corridor (i.e. bicycle, pedestrian, and/or transit), and may result in a number of recommended improvements for transit operations, pedestrian and bicycle safety and connectivity, transit travel time, transit rider amenities, and/or traffic calming measures. The expected outcome of this planning effort is to provide Member Agencies with a completed plan that can be implemented as capital funding becomes available or as redevelopment occurs and cities are able to condition these improvements as part of approval.
DISCUSSION:

VTA has identified a preliminary list of potential corridors to study (Table 1 and Attachment A). These candidate corridors were identified based on factors including geographic and demographic equity; regional significance; connections to major destinations such as shopping, employment and school centers; core transit routes; and major bike corridors.

Table 1 - Candidate Corridors to Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Rough Extents</th>
<th>Length (Mile)</th>
<th>Transit Route(s)</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tasman</td>
<td>N. Fair Oaks to Main Street</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>200, 55, 321, 121, 902, 901, 58, 140, 330, 825, Great America Transit Center</td>
<td>Sunnyvale, Santa Clara, San Jose, Milpitas,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bascom</td>
<td>Santa Clara to Campbell (880 to 85)</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>61, 62, 26, 49, 25</td>
<td>San Jose, Campbell, County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Keyes/Story</td>
<td>1st Street to E Capitol Expwy</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>25, 73</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Middlefield</td>
<td>Whisman to County line in Palo Alto</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>32, Middlefield LRT station</td>
<td>Mountain View, Palo Alto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Los Gatos Blvd</td>
<td>SR 85 to Main Street</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Los Gatos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1st Street (Gilroy)</td>
<td>Santa Teresa Blvd to Monterey St.</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Berryessa Rd.</td>
<td>US 101 to I-680</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>62, 65, 66, 61, Berryessa BART</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Winchester Blvd</td>
<td>Winchester Transit Center to Moorpark</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>60, 48, 101</td>
<td>San Jose, Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Rengstorff</td>
<td>Central Expwy to US 101</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>34, 40</td>
<td>Mountain View</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Scott/Arques</td>
<td>N Fair Oaks to Walsh</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>304, 822, 58, 827, 60</td>
<td>Santa Clara, Sunnyvale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Coleman</td>
<td>Guadalupe River Trail to Brokaw</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>10, 304, 61, 62, Santa Clara Caltrain station, Future BART station</td>
<td>San Jose, Santa Clara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Saratoga Avenue</td>
<td>280 to San Jose city limit (Prospect)</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>57, 58</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VTA presented the concept of the Great Streets Corridor Study at the October 28th CIP Working Group and November 13th Technical Advisory Committee meetings. VTA also met with individual city staff to request feedback on the 12 preliminary corridors identified for potential analysis and to understand the cities’ planning priorities and level of interest in partnering with VTA in this effort. Based on input received from these meetings, three corridors were selected to move forward for potential funding through available planning grant programs: Story/Keyes, Bascom and Tasman.

In October 2014, VTA worked with City of San Jose to submit the Story/Keyes Corridor Study for the Caltrans Planning Grant opportunity, highlighting benefits of complete streets improvements in a corridor located in an environmental justice community. The funding recommendations for this grant are expected to be announced in January 2015. In December 2014, the Priority Development Area (PDA) planning grant call-for-projects was released. VTA
is planning to submit both the Bascom and Tasman corridors for this funding opportunity in partnership with the cities of San Jose and Campbell and the County, and the cities of Sunnyvale, Santa Clara, San Jose and Milpitas, respectively.

**NEXT STEPS:**

As more funding opportunities become available in the future, VTA will work with the cities to determine which corridor from the candidate list to move forward based on the timing and relevancy of the grant program, availability of staff resources, and level of interest from participating Member Agencies.

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION:**

The Committee for Transit Accessibility (CTA) deferred this item at the January 14, 2015 meeting.

The Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) received this information item at the January 14, 2015 meeting and provided no comments.

The Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) received this information item at the January 14, 2015 meeting. The Committee members inquired if Hale/Santa Teresa corridor and Homestead Road were considered for potential analysis. Staff responded that the list of candidate corridors is preliminary and can be modified over time.

Members of the Committee noted the following: 1) corridors #8 and #12 should be extended further; 2) candidate corridors do not connect with one another; 3) asked what factors were considered in the corridor selection; 4) queried why El Camino Real was not in the list of potential corridors; and 5) requested staff to provide another update in a few months. Staff responded that the corridor selection is based on land use and transportation factors including core bike and transit routes and major land use attractors. Staff added significant investments have been made along the El Camino Real corridor and this study will focus on other opportunity areas.

The Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) deferred this item at the January 15, 2015 meeting.

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION:**

The Congestion Management Program & Planning Committee (CMPP) received this information item at their January 22, 2015 meeting. Committee Members noted the following: 1) City of Sunnyvale is appreciative of a study focused on the Tasman corridor due to the density around the light rail stations, access needs to 49er stadium, incomplete sidewalks and pedestrian conflict in an already constrained corridor; 2) asked what criteria is used to determine how locations are selected in terms of geographic balance and needs in other areas; 3) inquired why Alum Rock corridor was not included on the list; and 4) requested the Story/Keyes corridor to be extended further east. Staff responded that the list can be modified to add new or revise existing corridors. Corridor selection is based on the suitability of the corridor to compete for available grant funds and consideration of VTA and the cities' planning priorities. Staff will continue to look for
available grant funding to move other corridors forward and position these plans for future
capital funding. The Committee recommended placing this item on the Board’s consent agenda
for February 5, 2015.

Prepared By: Aiko Cuenco
Memo No. 4826
Complete Street Demonstration Corridor Study

Corridors, Primary Selection

Priority Development Area

Service Layer Credits: ESRI
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Nuria I. Fernandez

FROM: Director of Planning and Program Development, John Ristow

SUBJECT: Land Use and Transportation Integration (LUTI) Partnerships

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

This item is a follow-up from a Discussion item at the August 28, 2014 VTA Board of Directors meeting. In response to an earlier request from the Congestion Management Program & Planning Committee (CMPP), VTA developed a summary of VTA’s roles in land use and transportation integration, and areas where the process could be improved. After discussing these ideas, the Committee requested VTA to further develop and outline a concrete approach for how VTA and local agencies can work together to improve the process. This report builds on the previous discussion item to initiate the Land Use and Transportation Integration (LUTI) Partnerships Program and identify specific implementation actions for VTA and local agencies.

This item also ties into the SPUR report on VTA, Freedom to Move, which was received by the Board of Directors on October 2, 2014. The LUTI Partnerships program addresses several of SPUR’s recommendations, including #4, “Shape Communities Around Transit,” #5, “Set clear sustainable transportation goals and align resources to meet them,” and #6, “Increase public engagement and innovation.”

DISCUSSION:

As the Congestion Management Agency (CMA) and transit authority for Santa Clara County, VTA has always had a role in integrating land use and transportation planning. State legislation requires CMAs to establish “A program to analyze the impacts of land use decisions made by local jurisdictions on the regional transportation system.” (Government Code 65089 (b) (4)). In addition, transit agencies typically work with local jurisdictions to review and provide comments on development proposals near transit routes and facilities. However, VTA does not have land use decision-making authority, and it is therefore essential for VTA and Member Agencies to work hand-in-hand to achieve an integrated and thriving land use and transportation system.
The core goal of VTA’s land use activities is to strengthen the connection between land use decisions and transportation investments in order to increase walking, biking and transit ridership, manage congestion and improve the livability and economic vitality of Silicon Valley. With this in mind, VTA has developed several programs and initiatives to coordinate local land use decision-making with countywide transportation planning. These existing efforts are included for review in Attachment A.

The purpose of the LUTI Partnerships Program is to build on existing VTA initiatives to improve land use decision-making. A key objective is to create opportunities for VTA and Member Agencies to work together earlier in the process of planning and development to produce more effective and beneficial outcomes. VTA’s transportation investments greatly influence many aspects of city livability and sustainability, and the local land use decisions influence the effectiveness of the various types of travel (e.g., car, walk, bike, and transit). Both efforts attain greater value working together through each phase of development to the benefit of the traveling public.

VTA staff offers three broad categories of outreach and assistance to Member Agencies:
- Knowledge-building: trainings, new blog series, policy discussions;
- Research: reporting on trends and our development tracking;
- Technical assistance: providing project-based best practice on land use, urban design, and transportation issues.

VTA has identified 16 initial implementation actions for the LUTI Partnerships Program, organized into three tiers: **Tier 1** actions which can be implemented immediately by VTA in the near-term; **Tier 2** actions for which VTA is ready to provide assistance to Member Agencies or other parties; and **Tier 3** actions which can be implemented by VTA in the medium to long-term and would require Member Agency support. These actions are described in Attachment B.

The following implementation timeline has been developed for the LUTI Partnerships Program:

- **Early 2015 - Program Initiation**
  - Present LUTI Partnerships to Committees (Jan. 2015)
  - Begin blog posts on land use and development
  - Present Annual Development Review Program Report to Committees (Feb. 2015)
  - Create web homes for VTA land use/transportation-related programs
  - Initiate other Tier 1 Actions
  - Make VTA staff available to assist Member Agencies (Tier 2 Actions)
  - Begin implementation of Tier 3 Actions, based on available staff resources

- **Early 2016 - Check-in Point - Return to Committees**
  - Assess effectiveness of program
  - Decide which actions to continue to pursue
  - Highlight successes and missed opportunities
ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:

This item was on the regular agenda at the January 2015 meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). A Member of the Committee requested clarification on the recommendation in Attachment B for VTA staff to monitor Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs. Staff responded that this ties back to the updated Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Guidelines which were adopted by the Board in October 2014 and provide improved guidance for projects that take a "target-based" approach to auto trip reductions. VTA will begin to collect data on projects that use this trip reduction approach and would welcome any other data on existing TDM programs that Cities choose to provide to help develop a data clearinghouse on TDM measures and programs.

STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:

The Congestion Management Program & Policy Committee (CMPP) considered this item on January 22, 2015 and made the following comments:

- It is helpful for decision-makers to have examples of best practices of land use and transportation integration when approving major development projects.
- VTA are subject matter experts on issues of concern to local agencies, and could act as a consultant and reach out to other audiences such as the development community.
- VTA should craft policies for local agencies to adopt, and highlight examples of successful collaboration between cities and transportation agencies in other parts of the country.
- Staff provided a brief update on VTA’s Community Design and Transportation Program and noted that it could be a tool to help local agencies update their policies, and a Member of the Committee requested that VTA start this process of collaboration as soon as possible in the City of Milpitas.

Prepared By: Robert Cunningham
Memo No. 4804
VTA Involvement in Land Use & Development – Existing Programs and Initiatives

Direct Influence

Valley Transportation Plan (VTP) – County-wide planning and policy framework for developing and delivering future transportation projects

Transit Service Plan – Evaluates existing service and recommends improvements

Congestion Management Program (CMP) Auto LOS Standard – Used as a threshold of significance for CMP and CEQA analysis of CMP intersections and freeways

Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Guidelines – Provides framework of required and recommended transportation analysis

Joint Development – Develop transit-supportive land use, subject to market demand and City regulations.

Indirect Influence

VTA Land Use/Transportation Integration Efforts – Includes proactive efforts to work with Member Agencies to establish transit-supportive land use policies, input on General/Specific Plans, etc.

Community Design and Transportation (CDT) Program – Identifies best practices for transportation and development design

Proactive CMP/Development Review – Process through which VTA reviews and comments on projects throughout the County

VTA Monitoring Activities – Includes regular assessments of land use, congestion, and transit ridership in the County.

Planned Development Area (PDA) Planning Grants and other grant opportunities
# Land Use & Development Process and VTA Involvement

## EARLY PLANNING STAGE
- Land use, project size, location under consideration
- Transportation, economic, environmental policy and community issues under consideration

## APPLICATION FILED
- Land use, project size, location proposed

## CITY STAFF REVIEW
- Transportation, economic, environmental policy and community issues under review
- Public comment

## PUBLIC & AGENCY REVIEW
- Transportation, economic, environmental policy and community issues under review
- Mitigation measures, conditions determined

## PLANNING COMMISSION-COUNCIL PUBLIC HEARINGS/VOTE
- Public comment

## POST-APPROVAL /PROJECT BUILT
- Trip generation (auto, bike, ped, transit)

### Land Use Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEP 1</th>
<th>STEP 2</th>
<th>STEP 3</th>
<th>STEP 4</th>
<th>STEP 5</th>
<th>STEP 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EARLY PLANNING STAGE</td>
<td>APPLICATION FILED</td>
<td>CITY STAFF REVIEW</td>
<td>PUBLIC &amp; AGENCY REVIEW</td>
<td>PLANNING COMMISSION-COUNCIL PUBLIC HEARINGS/VOTE</td>
<td>POST-APPROVAL /PROJECT BUILT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VTA Involvement
- VTP
  - Transit Service Planning
- CDT Program

### Outreach / Discussions
- CMP Auto LOS Standards
  - TIA Guidelines
- Public Meetings

### Legend
- Process
- Direct
- Indirect

### Other Agencies
- City GPs/CIPs, County, Expressways, Caltrans
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Proposed Actions</th>
<th>Development/Planning Stage</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Prepare Annual Development Review Program Report to highlight trends</td>
<td>All Stages</td>
<td>Early 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Start series of blog posts related to land use and development</td>
<td>All Stages</td>
<td>Early 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Create Land Use/Transportation home on VTA's website, including:</td>
<td>All Stages, focusing on:</td>
<td>Early 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Community Design &amp; Transportation (CDT) Program</td>
<td>Early Planning,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Development Review Program</td>
<td>Public &amp; Agency Review,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Senate Bill (SB) 743 CEQA Reform Implementation</td>
<td>Post-Approval/Project Built</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Programs &amp; Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Land Use Data &amp; Trends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Get involved proactively in general/area planning efforts of key importance (e.g. San Jose Urban Village Plans)</td>
<td>Early Planning</td>
<td>Early 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Organize NACTO Complete Streets trainings; VTA/Member Agencies initiate Complete Streets Demonstration Corridors</td>
<td>Project Design</td>
<td>Early 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Award PDA Planning Grants to incentivize planning for focused growth</td>
<td>Early Planning, Project Design</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Continue to share information and act as a technical resource on SB 743</td>
<td>Public &amp; Agency Review</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Land Use & Transportation Integration (LUTI) Partnerships

### Proposed Implementation Actions

#### Tier 2 Actions: VTA Ready to Provide Assistance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Proposed Actions</th>
<th>Development/Planning Stage</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>VTA encourages invitations from cities to get involved in general/area plans</td>
<td>Early Planning</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>VTA encourages early consultation from cities for major development projects</td>
<td>Early Planning, City Staff Review</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>VTA encourages consultation from cities regarding Conditions of Approval</td>
<td>Commission/Council Hearings</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>VTA encourages additional data from cities - e.g., data not required under Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Guidelines</td>
<td>Post-Approval/Project Built</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>VTA encourages partnership opportunities for land use/transportation research</td>
<td>All Stages, focusing on Post-Approval/Project Built</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Tier 3 Actions: VTA-Led with Member Agency Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Proposed Actions</th>
<th>Development/Planning Stage</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Conduct &quot;Road show&quot; to offer VTA expertise in land use, urban design and transportation</td>
<td>All Stages</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Improve land use data collection to better assess transportation demand</td>
<td>Post-Approval/Project Built</td>
<td>2015-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Start monitoring TDM via TIAs and become TDM data clearinghouse</td>
<td>Post-Approval/Project Built</td>
<td>2015-ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Nuria I. Fernandez

FROM: Chief Financial Officer, Raj Srinath

SUBJECT: FY 2016 & FY 2017 Biennial Budget Assumptions

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

In order to facilitate the preparation of the FY 2016 and FY 2017 VTA Transit Fund Biennial Budget, several major assumptions relating to the economy, revenues, service levels, and other factors that affect costs are proposed. In addition to the general assumptions listed below, the biennial budget will be developed using the Expenditure Prioritization and Key Financial Principles as approved by the Board of Directors in December 2010.

The FY 2016 and FY 2017 Recommended Budget will be published and distributed in April 2015 with Board of Directors’ action scheduled for June 2015.

DISCUSSION:

Staff will use these working budget assumptions as guidelines to develop the Recommended FY 2016 and FY 2017 VTA Transit Fund Budgets. These assumptions also represent the financial constraints on VTA’s operations and the service and expenditure levels planned for these two years. The final assumptions used in the FY 2016 and FY 2017 Recommended Budget may change as additional information is received.

1. Wages and Benefits:
   - All negotiated contracts are currently scheduled to expire before or during the next biennial budget cycle.
     
     ATU-February 2015       AFSCME-April 2016
     SEIU-May 2015           TAEA-June 2016
Reflect no wage increase or reduction in health insurance premiums from potential transition to CalPERS Medical Plan pending outcome of contract negotiations.

Pension and Retiree Health contributions as a percentage of wages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATU Pension</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalPERS-Employer portion</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalPERS-Employee portion (paid by VTA)</td>
<td>0% - 2%</td>
<td>0% - 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirees’ Other Post Employment Benefits (OPEB) Trust</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All other benefits projected to increase at rate of inflation where appropriate.

2. VTA Investment Portfolio interest rate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Interest Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY16</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Sales tax growth:

Based on the most recent information, including FY 2015 1st QTR actual sales tax data received December 17th; projected growth rates for sales tax revenues have been updated as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Recommended Growth Assumption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY15</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The FY 2015-FY 2017 recommended growth assumptions are based on projections from Beacon Economics provided in September 2014. The FY 2015 growth assumption reflects actual first quarter receipts.

As updated information becomes available, including actual 2nd QTR sales tax receipts and updated forecasts from Beacon Economics, the projected growth rates for all three fiscal years will be finalized prior to distribution of the FY 2016 and FY 2017 Recommended Budget.

4. Measure A Operating Assistance:

18.45% of Measure A Sales Tax Revenues.
5. **Low sulfur diesel fuel price:**
   The average price per gallon paid (including taxes) in FY 2014 was $3.34. Current year-to-date FY 2015 average through 12/15/14 is $3.05. Due to the volatility of the item, the price per gallon assumption for FY 2016 and FY 2017 will be determined as close to the publication of the Recommended Budget as possible.

6. **Fares:**
   There are no plans to increase fares at this time.

7. **Bus & Light Rail Service Levels:**
   The service plan for FY 2016 and FY 2017 is still under development.

8. **Bus and Light Rail Ridership:**
   Growth rates for bus and light rail ridership will be determined at a later date based on the final proposed service levels and anticipated ridership gains from planned innovation and marketing initiatives.

9. **Capital Program:**
   As in previous years, the FY 2016 and FY 2017 VTA Transit Fund Capital Program will be structured to optimize the use of grant funds to the greatest extent possible. Debt Reduction Funds will be used to provide any required local matching funds for grants. Projects not eligible for grants will be prioritized based on pre-determined scoring criteria that give the greatest emphasis to transit system preservation, increased ridership, and cost impact. The selected high priority projects would be funded 100% by local dollars currently available in the Debt Reduction Fund.

10. **Operating Reserves funding level:**
    Operating Reserves will be designated at 15% of Recommended Budget expenditures. Any positive operating balance in excess of the 15% goal will be designated to the Debt Reduction Fund for use in funding the local portion of future year capital expenditures.

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE REVIEW/RECOMMENDATION:**

The Committee for Transit Accessibility, Citizens Advisory Committee, and Policy Advisory Committee received this item as part of their January 14 and 15, 2015 meetings.

**STANDING COMMITTEE REVIEW/RECOMMENDATION:**

The Administration and Finance Committee received this item as part of its January 21, 2015 meeting. The committee discussed the Ad Hoc Financial Recovery Committee Expenditure Prioritization and Key Financial Principles and how issues raised during that process and recent public input would be incorporated into the budget. Staff responded that the service plan will address some of the issues raised. Staff also reported that going forward, the newly created Governance and Audit Committee will provide the framework to guide the budget in meeting the agency’s strategic objectives.
Biennial Budget Guiding Framework

- Expenditure Prioritization & Key Financial Guiding Principles Adopted by the Board in December 2010
- Revised/New Strategic Priorities Established by the Board
- Additional Board & Stakeholder Input
FY16 & FY17 Biennial Budget Assumptions

• Service

  - Plan for FY16 & FY17 under development

  - No Fare Increase

  - Ridership Projections to be determined based on final proposed service levels and impact of other initiatives
FY16 & FY17 Budget Assumptions (cont.)

- Revenues
  - Sales Tax Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Recommended Growth Assumption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY15</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Measure A Operating Assistance—18.5%
FY16 & FY17 Budget Assumptions (cont.)

- Expense/Cost Drivers

  - All negotiated contracts currently scheduled to expire before or during the next biennial budget cycle.
FY16 & FY17 Budget Assumptions (cont.)

- Expense/Cost Drivers (cont.)
  - Reflect no wage increases or reduction in health insurance from potential full transition to CalPERS Medical pending outcome of contract negotiations.
  - Pension & Retiree Health Contribution (as % of wages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATU Pension</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalPERS-Employer portion</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalPERS-Employee portion (paid by VTA)(^1)</td>
<td>0-2%</td>
<td>0-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirees’ Other Post Employment Benefits (OPEB) Trust</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Varies by hire date
• **Capital Program**
  - Optimize use of grant funds
  - Use Debt Reduction Fund for local match and local funding for non-grant eligible projects

• **Operating Reserves**
  - Maintain at 15% level
Next Steps

- Board Workshop - April 24, 2015
- Community Meetings/Public Outreach - Early May
- Joint Advisory Committee Workshop - May 12, 2015
- Administration & Finance Committee - May 21, 2015
- Final Budget Presented for Adoption - June 4, 2015
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Nuria I. Fernandez

FROM: Director of Public Affairs and Marketing, Bernice Alaniz

SUBJECT: Bus Priority Seating

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) was implemented in 1990 and addresses accessibility for people with disabilities. VTA is required to provide accessible services to people with disabilities, including providing “Priority Seating” on buses and light rail trains. Under the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 49CFR37.167(j)(1), agencies are to request passengers to vacate priority seats for people with disabilities, unless passengers occupying the seats are people with disabilities or seniors.

DISCUSSION:

VTA educates passengers about priority seating through a number of communications and outreach channels, including:

- Current on-board signage for both bus and light rail
- We present to classes throughout the county to students from Kindergarten through middle school and teach students about using public transit. We emphasize rider etiquette, including vacating priority seats for seniors and people with disabilities.
- We distribute a Senior Factsheet that states all buses and light rail vehicles have designated seating for seniors and people with disabilities.
- We orient seniors to public transit use through our Daycation program, Train the Trainer Academy, and presentations for seniors/persons with disabilities. During presentations and trainings we introduce and educate participants about the availability of priority seating for seniors, persons with disabilities and passengers who use mobility devices. Participants learn how to ask passengers to give up seat, or ask the operator for assistance, and are reminded of the importance of giving up their seat for passengers who...
may need the seat more than they do.

- We run a series of “Travel Wise” Articles in our monthly newsletter, Take-One, covering issues important to senior riders. In the July and December 2013 issues we covered priority seating.

- Our Riders Tips webpage teaches, “The seats in front of the bus are designated for senior or disabled passengers.”

- Our Senior Amenities web page states, “Priority Seating: All buses and light rail have a designated seating area for seniors and people with disabilities. Please mention that you would like to use the priority seating if they are occupied, and the operator will ask passengers if they would move to make room. Operators cannot force passengers to move, even if they are not elderly nor have disabilities.”

- We have begun the process of changing our existing priority seating signage so that priority seating signs are more prominent, use visuals to be language independent, and give our operators authority to request people to move and make priority seats available to people with disabilities.

When requested, bus operators will ask passengers to vacate priority seats for seniors and people with disabilities. VTA can require passengers to move from the mobility device securement area when a device needs to be secured, but cannot require passengers to move for seniors or people with disabilities who are not in mobility devices. Even without the ability to compel people to move, passengers often move without being asked by VTA personnel and VTA is not aware of any issues where people refused to move for seniors when requested by an operator.

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

The Transit Planning & Operations Committee received this presentation at their January 2015 meeting. The Committee requested that this presentation be included in the February 5, 2015 Board of Directors’ agenda.

Prepared By: Patrick Griffin
Memo No. 4910
Upon the request of the driver or other authorized person, please vacate this seat to make room for the elderly or an individual with a disability.

A la solicitud pedida por el operador o otra persona autorizada, favor de ceder este asiento para personas mayores de edad o incapacitadas.

Nếu có sự yêu cầu của tài xế hoặc nhân viên có trách nhiệm, xin quý vị vui lòng nhường những ghế này cho người già hoặc tàn tật.
New Priority Seating Signage

FEDERAL LAW 49CFR37.167 REQUIRES

SEATS MUST BE VACATED FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH MOBILITY DEVICES

LA LEY FEDERAL 49CFR37.167 REQUIERE QUE LOS ASIENTOS SEAN CEDIDOS A LAS PERSONAS CON DISPOSITIVOS DE MOVILIDAD

LUẬT LIÊN BANG 49CFR37.167 YÊU CẦU CÁC GHẾ NGỒI NAY PHẢI DƯỢC NHƯỢNG LẠI CHO HÀNH KHÁCH SỨ DỤNG THIẾT BỊ DI CHUYỂN TỰ ĐỘNG

PRIORITY SEATING

ASIENTOS PRIORITARIOS

GHẾ NGỒI ƯU TIÊN
Communicating Priority Seating

- Travel Training
- Presentations
- Youth Outreach Program
- Videos
- VTA Communications
  - Take One
  - Senior Rider Fact Sheet
- Website
- Blogs
- Signage
- Do’s and Don’ts
FOR INFORMATION ONLY

Significant activities and progress on VTA’s BART Silicon Valley Berryessa Extension Project during January 2015 include:

**Key Milpitas Area Activities**
Skanska, Shimmick, Herzog (SSH) crews continued construction of the Milpitas Station, including substantial work on the concourse level where forms to pour concrete, rebar and utility conduit continue to be installed.

SSH continued trench construction activities near Dixon Landing Road and Montague Expressway. In the Dixon Landing area, crews continued to install materials to support trench excavation and relocate utilities north of the roadway. North of Montague Expressway, crews continued to pour concrete sections of the northernmost section trench wall, as well as the foundation for a traction power sub-station that will be situated above the trench.

At Capitol Avenue, SSH has initiated pre-construction activities for trench construction below the southbound portion of the roadway. Traffic has now been shifted off of the southbound lanes.

**Key San Jose Area Activities**
Construction activities continued on the Berryessa Aerial Structure and Berryessa Station. At the station area, crews continued construction of the elevator and escalator foundations, as well as the station platform. North of the station, crews continued to construct forms for concrete pours and install rebar.

South of Trade Zone Boulevard, materials to support trench excavation have been installed, and the bridge deck for the southern half of the roadway has been completed and opened to traffic. North of the roadway, utility relocation activities continue.
Trench construction activities continued within the project corridor around Hostetter Road. North of the roadway, the trench has been completed. South of the roadway, crews continued to install drainage and rebar materials in preparation for concrete pours.

The nine-month closure of the Sierra/Lundy intersection remains on track to begin in late January until fall 2015. All intersection improvements will be completed within the nine month period, including new traffic calming measures and traffic signals. Automobile traffic and VTA’s bus line 77 will be detoured onto Flickinger Avenue and emergency vehicle access will be provided. VTA’s BART Silicon Valley Community Outreach team has developed a comprehensive outreach plan, which included advance public meetings, mail and e-mail notifications, one-on-one outreach to area residences, changeable message signs, and coordination with San Jose City Council District 4 staff.

**Communications and Outreach**
In January, staff conducted intensive neighborhood outreach and inter-agency coordination in preparation for the Sierra Road/Lundy Avenue intersection full closure. A video was completed describing construction activities at the Sierra Road/Lundy Avenue intersection. Staff presented project updates to the Berryessa/North San Jose Democratic Club and the Berryessa Business Association. In the City of Milpitas, staff conducted door-to-door outreach (including language translation) and notification to residents and businesses regarding the installation of metal sheets to support trench excavation north of Dixon Landing Road. Staff also provided outreach to businesses along Capitol Avenue regarding the temporary disruption of water associated with the relocation of utilities.

**SVBX Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FFGA Date</th>
<th>Forecast Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Service</td>
<td>June 2018</td>
<td>August 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SVBX Budget**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Forecast at Completion</th>
<th>Incurred to Date (Through 12/31/14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SVBX New Starts Project</td>
<td>$2,330.0</td>
<td>$2,330.0</td>
<td>$916.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concurrent Non-Project Activities</td>
<td>$ 91.3</td>
<td>$ 91.3</td>
<td>$ 24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVBX Total</td>
<td>$2,421.3</td>
<td>$2,421.3</td>
<td>$940.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$Millions - Year of Expenditure

**Phase II Environmental Activities**
Initiation of the environmental study for the Phase II Extension will begin with the release of the Notice of Preparation on January 30, 2015. The study Scoping Period is from January 30, 2015 - March 2, 2015. The Scoping Period is the first step in the environmental process to narrow the focus of the draft document to significant environmental issues, eliminate insignificant impacts from detailed study, and identify alternatives to be analyzed. The Scoping Process also provides notice to the public and other agencies that the document is being prepared and initiates their involvement in the process. Public meetings will be held on the following dates:
February 12, 2015, 5:30 p.m. - 7:30 p.m.
City of Santa Clara Council Chambers

February 17, 2015, 5:30 p.m. - 7:30 p.m.
VTA Customer Service Center, Downtown San Jose

February 19, 2015, 5:30 p.m. - 7:30 p.m.
School of Arts and Culture at Mexican Heritage Plaza

Prepared By: Kevin Kurimoto
Memo No. 4897
VTA’s BART Silicon Valley Extension Update

Board of Directors Meeting

February 5, 2015
Current Project Activities - Milpitas

Crews installing conduit onto the newly constructed Dixon Landing bridge deck

January 2015
Current Project Activities - Milpitas

Bottom left - trench section under the traction power substation near Montague Expressway. Top right – trench section as it appeared in December.

January 2015

September 2014
Milpitas Station looking south - crews forming an area where a stairwell and escalator will take passengers to the train platforms.

January 2015
Current Project Activities – San Jose

Asphalt removal through the Sierra Road and Lundy Avenue intersection. The BART trench will be built diagonally through this intersection.

January 2015
Current Project Activities – San Jose

Preparing the foundations for an escalator and elevator at the Berryessa Station concourse.

January 2015
# SVBX Project Integrated Summary Schedule

## SVBX Summary Schedule - FFPA (Baseline) with Forecast (Progress through: December 26, 2014)

### Milestones
- **C101 Mission, Warren BART Bridges**
- **C222 Kate Rd BART Bridge**
- **C610 Piper Dr Utilities**
- **ROW Parcel Acquisition**
- **Longitudinal Utility Relocation**
- **C720 LTSS Design/Build**
  - **Design**
  - **Guideway Construction**
  - **Stations Construction**
  - **Systems Procurement & Construction**
  - **Systems Integration Testing**
- **Campus, Roadsides, & Parking**
  - **Design**
  - **Construction**
- **BART**
  - **BART provided Materials, Software and Equipment**
  - **Revenue Vehicles - Design**
  - **Manufacture & Delivery**
  - **Pilot & Production Vehicles**
  - **Hayward Yard Primary Shop Conversion**
  - **Pre-Revenue Operations Testing**

### Dates
- **December 26, 2014**

### Status Through December 2014

**VTA Forecast**
- 
**Actual Progress**
- 
**FFPA Baseline (Plan)**
- 
**BUFFER - 10 Mos**

**BEGIN REVENUE SERVICES**

**COMPLETE Dynamic Testing**

---

Through December 26, 2014
# SVBX Cost Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SVBX Project Element (FTA Standard Cost Category)</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Forecast at Completion</th>
<th>Incurred to date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SVBX – New Starts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Guideway and Track Elements</td>
<td>416.1</td>
<td>325.2</td>
<td>131.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Stations, Stops, Terminals &amp; Intermodal</td>
<td>250.3</td>
<td>269.9</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Support Facilities: Yards, Shops, Admin. Buildings</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Sitework and Special Conditions</td>
<td>220.1</td>
<td>238.4</td>
<td>113.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Systems</td>
<td>260.7</td>
<td>228.4</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 ROW, Land, and Existing Improvements</td>
<td>261.0</td>
<td>249.7</td>
<td>154.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 Vehicles</td>
<td>174.3</td>
<td>150.8</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 Professional Services</td>
<td>548.3</td>
<td>542.2</td>
<td>388.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 Unallocated Contingency</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>148.6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Finance Charges</td>
<td>112.5</td>
<td>112.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA New Starts Total</td>
<td>$2,330.0</td>
<td>$2,330.0</td>
<td>$916.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>999 Concurrent Non-project Activities</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVBX Project Total</td>
<td>$2,421.3</td>
<td>$2,421.3</td>
<td>$940.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In incurred through December 31, 2014.

$Millions – Year of Expenditure
Phase II Activities

- Released of Notice of Preparation January 30, 2015
- Direct Mailer, Gov.delivery notification, advertisements placed in Mercury News, community and ethnic newspapers
- Scoping period January 30, 2015 – March 2, 2015
- Environmental scoping meetings:
  - February 12, 2015, 5:30 p.m.– 7:30 p.m.
    City of Santa Clara Council Chambers
  - February 17, 2015, 5:30 p.m.– 7:30 p.m.
    VTA Customer Service Center, Downtown San Jose
  - February 19, 2015, 5:30 p.m.– 7:30 p.m.
    School of Arts and Culture at Mexican Heritage Plaza
End
Administration & Finance Committee

Regular Meeting Minutes of January 22, 2015

WILL BE FORWARDED UNDER SEPARATE COVER
Congestion Management Program and Planning Committee

Regular Meeting Minutes of January 22, 2015

WILL BE FORWARDED UNDER SEPARATE COVER
Transit Planning & Operations Committee

Regular Meeting Minutes of January 22, 2015

WILL BE FORWARDED UNDER SEPARATE COVER
CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Committee for Transit Accessibility (CTA) was called to order at 1:03 p.m. by Chairperson Morrow in the Auditorium, Building A, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), 3331 North First Street, San José, California.

1. ROLL CALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cam Acker</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseryn Bhudsabourg</td>
<td>Representative/ Board Member Kalra</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CTA Ex-Officio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Bonilla</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Heatley</td>
<td>Ex-Officio Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy Hernandez</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffery Jokinen</td>
<td>First Vice Chairperson</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupe Medrano</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Michels</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Morrow</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lechi Nguyen</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Robinson</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Romoser</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Saltman</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilip Shah</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Stahl</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaitanya Vaidya</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Williamson</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A quorum was not present and a Committee of the Whole was declared.

2. INTRODUCTION OF AUDIENCE MEMBERS

Patrick Griffin, Manager, Public Affairs and Customer Information; Astrid Canales, Customer Service Supervisor; David Ledwitz, Management Analyst; Christine Fitzgerald, Interested Citizen; Adam Burger, Transportation Planner III; David Sausjord, Revenue Services Manager; Carol Lawson, Fiscal Resources Manager; Warlito Sonico, Service and Operations Planning; and Lilia Scott, Senior Transportation Planner.
3. **PUBLIC PRESENTIONS**

Kathy Bonilla, CTA Member, expressed concern with scheduling displays on buses being inaccessible to persons in mobility devices.

**The Agenda was taken out of order.**

5. **Board of Directors Report**

Roseryn Bhudsabourg, representing Board Member Kalra, CTA Ex-Officio, introduced herself to the Committee. Chairperson Morrow welcomed Ms. Bhudsabourg and thanked her for attending.

4. **(Deferred to the April 8, 2015 meeting.)**

Election of Committee's chairperson, first vice chairperson and second vice chairperson for 2015

**CONSENT AGENDA**

7. **Regular Meeting Minutes of June 11, 2014**

On order of Chairperson Morrow and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole deferred the Regular Meeting Minutes of June 11, 2014.

8. **Regular Meeting Minutes of October 8, 2014**

On order of Chairperson Morrow and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole deferred the Regular Meeting Minutes of October 8, 2014.

9. **Chief Operating Officer's Report**

On order of Chairperson Morrow and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole received the Chief Operating Officer’s Report.


On order of Chairperson Morrow and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole received the FY 2015 First Quarter Transit Operations Performance Report.

11. **2014 Year-End Attendance Report**

On order of Chairperson Morrow and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole received the Committee for Transit Accessibility (CTA) 2014 Year-End Attendance Report.

**REGULAR AGENDA**

12. **Fiscal Year 2016 & Fiscal Year 2017 Biennial Budget Assumptions**

Carol Lawson, Fiscal Services Manager, provided a presentation highlighting: 1) Service; 2) Revenues; 3) Expense/cost drivers; 4) Capital program; 5) Operating reserves; and 6) Next steps.
Jim Unites, Deputy Director Operations and Committee Staff Liaison, requested Committee Members place the May 12, 2015, Joint Advisory Committee budget meeting on their calendars.

The Committee of the Whole discussed the following: 1) launching of the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) lines; 2) fuel assumptions; 3) increase in information going out as services are happening; and 4) scheduling labor contracts into the budget cycle.

**On order of Chairperson Morrow** and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole reviewed the Fiscal Year 2016 & Fiscal Year 2017 Biennial Budget Assumptions.

13. **Receive a report on the Regional Transit Connection (RTC) Clipper Card**
   
   Patrick Griffin, Manager, Public Affairs and Customer Information, provided a brief overview of the staff report.

   The Committee of the Whole expressed concern with several unpleasant experiences encountered while trying to obtain a Clipper Card and challenges related to communication, technical issues, and understanding how things work. They requested staff work with AC Transit to develop a smoother process.

   **On order of Chairperson Morrow** and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole received a report on the Regional Transit Connection (RTC) Clipper Card.

14. **Santa Clara County Fiscal Year 2013 and 2014 Section 5310 Scoring Report**

   David Ledwitz, Management Analyst, provided a brief overview of the report. He thanked the subcommittee for helping him and working together as a team.

   **On order of Chairperson Morrow** and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole received an update on the Santa Clara County fiscal Year 2013 and 2014 Section 5310 Scoring Report.

15. **FTA’s Draft Circular explaining ADA Regulations**

   Mr. Ledwitz provided a brief overview of the report.

   The Committee of the Whole expressed concern with new rules and the difficulty in understanding changes. Mr. Ledwitz encouraged Committee Members to provide comments noting their significance.

   **On order of Chairperson Morrow** and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole received a status update of FTA’s Draft Circular explaining ADA Regulations.

16. **Review the Levi’s Stadium Transit Service Ridership and Service Modifications**

   Mr. Unites provided a brief overview of the staff report and presentation.

   The Committee of the Whole discussed the following: 1) security concerns; 2) ridership; 3) development of the area surrounding employee parking north of the stadium and impacts to traffic and parking; 4) funding and costs of extra service to Levi's Stadium; and 5) budget monitoring.
On order of Chairperson Morrow and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole reviewed the Levi’s Stadium Transit Service Ridership and Service Modifications.

17. **BART Transit Integration Plan: Overview and Initial Findings**

Lilia Scott, Senior Transportation Planner, provided a presentation, highlighting: 1) VTA planning for BART; 2) VTA's BART Silicon Valley - Berryessa Extension; 3) BART Integration Plan; 4) Service included in study; 5) Berryessa connector service; 6) Light Rail – Tasman Express (Long T); 7) Initial analysis: income; 8) Initial Analysis: from Alameda to Santa Clara County; 9) Initial Analysis: planned development; 10) Initial Analysis: ridership; 11) Initial Analysis: ridership and productivity; 12) Fremont Express services: initial findings; 13) Fremont Express routes boardings; 14) Preliminary Service concepts - Milpitas and Berryessa; and 15) Project schedule.

The Committee of the Whole expressed concern with the following: 1) on-time performance; 2) better connections with BART; 3) extension of the Outreach area; 4) express buses and additional bus service; 5) working with AC Transit on all transportation; and 6) timeline.

On order of Chairperson Morrow and there being no objection the Committee of the Whole received a report of the progress of the BART Transit Integration Plan: overview and initial findings.

18. **North Central County Bus Improvement Plan**

Adam Burger, Transportation Planner III, provided an overview of the staff report, and a presentation, highlighting: 1) What is North Central County Bus Improvement Plan (NCCBIP); 2) NCCBIP work to date; 3) Service change concepts; 4) Near-term service change concept; 5) Mid to long-term service change concepts; 6) Long-term service change concepts; 7) Challenges with north-south auto traffic; and 8) Next Steps.

The Committee of the Whole discussed the following: 1) improvement of bus route 51 with service to El Camino Hospital on holidays and weekends; and 2) requested information on hospitals that do not have bus service.

Aaron Morrow, speaking as an Interested Citizen, stated VTA can only do so much as a transit agency and questioned when cities will provide transportation options for residents.

On order of Chairperson Morrow and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole received a presentation on the North Central County Bus Improvement Plan.

6. **Update on Envision Silicon Valley**

Scott Haywood, provided a brief report on meetings held with transportation advocates and community members highlighting the following goals and themes: 1) Maintaining existing transportation system; 2) improve the trip experience; 3) expand access to mobility choices; 4) develop an integrated, efficient, and sustainable system; 5) increase service in low-income areas; 6) improve connections to regional services; 7) improve frequency of services; 8) ensure service for all; 9) improve efficiency of last-mile service; 10) on-demand services; 11) service for workers; 12) zero emission fleet; 13) no
reduction in current service levels; 14) amenities for passengers; 15) more direct services; 16) transit in growth areas; and 17) affordable transit.

Mr. Haywood also provided a report from the Advisory Committee Chairpersons meeting highlighting the following goals and themes: 1) programs and services for the disabled community; 2) address bicycle projects; 3) helping transit dependent; 4) equity throughout the valley; 5) environmental impacts; 6) health impacts; 7) innovative using technological solutions; 8) more public/private partnerships and alliances; 9) sustainability; 10) projects that have financial support; 11) prioritize projects and funding sources; and 12) increasing ridership.

The Committee of the Whole discussed the following: 1) schedule of the stakeholder meetings with the Committee’s quarterly meetings and the ability to provide feedback before decisions are made; 2) the importance of discussing what has been successful and what is needed for seniors and people with disabilities; 3) suggested a workshop be held if needed; and 4) suggested staff explore programs for seniors and disabled communities that were a part of the transportation sales tax measure that recently passed in Alameda County.

Mr. Haywood indicated there are stakeholders representing both the senior and disabled communities and noted staff will come to the Committee meetings as often as possible.

On order of Chairperson Morrow and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole received a presentation on the North Central County Bus Improvement Plan.

19. (Deferred to the April 8, 2015 meeting.)

Receive information on the Great Streets Corridor Study Proposal.

20. **Light Rail Enhancement Program**

Jason Kim, Transportation Planner, provided a brief overview of the report and a presentation, highlighting: 1) Presentation outline; 2) Recommended operating plan; 3) Tasman Express (Long T); 4) Southern Express; 5) Ridership projections and cost estimates; 6) Other operating change ideas; 7) Near-term focus: It’s all about speed; 8) Light rail system constraints; 9) System speed improvement; 10) North First Street improvements; 11) Montague grade separation; 12) Downtown San Jose; 13) Vasona corridor; and 14) Chynoweth siding.

Member Shah left the meeting at 3:02 p.m.

The Committee of the Whole expressed concern with double tracking the Vasona line and potentially cutting trains off from various stops.

On order of Chairperson Morrow and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole received an update on Light Rail Enhancement Program.

21. **Work Plan Update**

On order of Chairperson Morrow and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole received the Work Plan update.
REPORTS

22. Committee Staff Report
   There was no Committee Staff Report.

23. Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)/Citizens Watchdog Committee (CWC) Report
   There was no Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)/Citizens Watchdog Committee (CWC) Report.

24. Chairperson’s Report
   Chairperson Morrow indicated he will work with staff on attendance issues and will report back to the Committee.

   Member Vaidya expressed concern with meetings where there is lack of a quorum.

   In reference to the 2014 Year-End Attendance Report, Member Nguyen indicated she was present at both the April and October Committee meetings and requested staff update the report.

OTHER

25. ANNOUNCEMENTS
   There were no Announcements.

26. ADJOURNMENT
   On order of Chairperson Morrow and there being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 3:12 p.m.

   Respectfully submitted,

   Menominee L. McCarter, Board Assistant
   VTA Office of the Board Secretary
CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) was called to order at 4:00 p.m. by Chairperson Hadaya, in Conference Room B-104, VTA River Oaks Campus, 3331 North First Street, San Jose, California.

1. ROLL CALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Blaylock</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton Brownley</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bena Chang</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Elias</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Fredlund</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Hadaya</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Hashimoto</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberta Hughan</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Morrow</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Powers</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie Rogers</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Schmoll</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Schulter</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noel Tebo</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herman Wadler</td>
<td>Vice Chairperson</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A quorum was present.

2. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

There were no Public Presentations.

3. ORDERS OF THE DAY

There were no Orders of the Day

4. Election Process for 2015 CAC Committee Leadership: Conduct Elections

Member Tebo provided a Subcommittee report and nominated William Hadaya Chairperson and Herman Wadler Vice Chairperson for a second term.

Member Chang arrived and took her seat at 4:04 p.m.
M/S/C (Powers/Rogers) to close nominations and elect William Hadaya as the Committee's Chairperson for 2015.

M/S/C (Powers/Rogers) to close nominations and elect Herman Wadler as the Committees Vice Chairperson.

5. **Committee Staff Report**

Scott Haywood, Policy and Community Relations Manager, introduced Nuria I. Fernandez, General Manager.

- **Report from the General Manager**

  Ms. Fernandez congratulated Chairperson Hadaya and Vice Chairperson Wadler on their elections.

  Ms. Fernandez reported about the accomplishments for 2014 and noted the 2014 Annual Report has been placed on the table for members.

  Member Schulter arrived and took his seat at 4:14 p.m.

  Member Brownley arrived and took his seat at 4:20 p.m.

  Ms. Fernandez provided a report highlighting:

  - The five priorities for 2015: 1) BART Phase II; 2) Bus Rapid Transit (BRT); 3) Super Bowl 50; 4) Earthquakes Stadium; and 5) Envision Silicon Valley.

  - Ridership increase, noting Levi’s Stadium events is contributing to the overall increase.

  - Noted VTA’s accomplishments during the holiday season, included: 1) the Holiday Wrap Light Rail Train; 2) operating the Holiday Trolley; and 3) VTA’s participation in the “Stuff the Bus” and the Family Giving Tree Holiday Wish Drive.

  - Announced January is Human Trafficking Awareness Prevention Month and reminded the Committee that VTA is a safe place.

  - Announced VTA’s new Governance and Audit Committee, noting the new Committee will provide an opportunity to address the needs of the agency.

  - Board of Directors elected new Chairperson Perry Woodward and Vice Chairperson Cindy Chavez for 2015.

**NOTE:** M/S/C MEANS MOTION SECONDED AND CARRIED AND, UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED, THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.
Members of the Committee made the following comments: 1) inquired about the planning process for the Earthquakes Stadium; 2) inquired about any assistance VTA can provide to coordinate with the Levi’s Stadium regarding pedestrian walkways/overpasses; 3) inquired about the environmental and community meetings regarding BART Phase II specifically the stations through downtown; 4) expressed concern regarding transportation to and from the Earthquakes Stadium; 5) expressed concern regarding parking in residential areas near the stadium; 6) noted that VTA is only providing extra service; and 7) inquired about any contributions to help with increased costs to provide extra service to and from the Levi’s and Earthquakes Stadium.

Ms. Fernandez noted the lack of pedestrian walkways is a safety issue. She further stated this is an opportunity for the City of Santa Clara to help build a pedestrian bridge.

Ms. Fernandez assured the Committee that VTA is currently in the process of creating a transportation plan for the Earthquakes Stadium. Ms. Fernandez noted that VTA can only enhance existing service and will not be creating a new bus line for the Earthquakes Stadium. Ms. Fernandez further noted that VTA is gathering all the data related to the Levi’s Stadium and will be presenting it to the Board of Directors.

Mr. Haywood announced the new and returning Board of Directors Members and Alternate Members for 2015, Magdalena Carrasco and Sam Liccardo representing Group 1, City of San Jose; Jeannie Bruins representing Group 2, North West Cities; Jason Baker representing Group 3, West Valley Cities; Rich Larsen representing Group 2, North West Cities; and Howard Miller representing Group 3, West Valley Cities.

7. Chairperson’s Report

There was no Chairperson’s report.

Member Elias arrived and took his seat at 4:35 p.m.

6. Envision Silicon Valley

Mr. Haywood provided a brief report, noting staff is gathering feedback from various community based organizations, cities, and VTA Advisory Committees. Mr. Haywood informed the Committee about the suggestions and concerns raised from the two stakeholder meetings. He noted that staff will create potential goals and priorities.

Upon inquiry of Chairperson Hadaya, Mr. Haywood commented that Members may call or email him with any feedback they have.

Members of Committee made the following comments: 1) inquired about the Ballot Tax Measure and expenditure plan; 2) requested that Mr. Haywood email the Envision Silicon Valley written report so members may respond in writing; 3) encouraged Members with different associations, organizations and groups to invite Mr. Haywood to provide a
presentation; and 4) inquired and commented about transit infrastructure and traffic congestion.

On order of Chairperson Hadaya and there being no objection, the Committee received the update on Envision Silicon Valley.

The Agenda was taken out of order.

8. Committee for Transit Accessibility (CTA) Report

Member Morrow noted his request to find ways for staff to improve communications with CTA regarding Envision Silicon Valley.

On order of Chairperson Hadaya and there being no objection, the Committee received the Committee for Transit Accessibility (CTA) Report.

Member Morrow left the meeting at 5:00 p.m.

9. Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) Report

Member Wadler noted he can provide flyers to anyone interested in attending a Bicycle training and safety class.

On order of Chairperson Hadaya and there being no objection, the Committee received the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) Report.

COMBINED CAC AND 2000 MEASURE A CITIZENS WATCHDOG COMMITTEE CONSENT AGENDAS

Member Rogers requested to have a brief discussion regarding Agenda Item. #11 California State Transportation Agency: California Transportation Infrastructure Priorities Discussion Draft White Papers.

Upon Member Rogers inquiry, Mr. Haywood commented he would need to verify if the Federal Legislative Program included anything on transportation infrastructure and noted if so, the Board has already taken action.


M/S/C (Chang/Powers) to approve the Regular Meeting Minutes of November 12, 2014.

11. California State Transportation Agency: California Transportation Infrastructure Priorities Discussion Draft White Papers

M/S/C (Chang/Powers) to receive a report on three California State Transportation Agency: California Transportation Infrastructure Priorities Workgroup Draft White Papers.
12. **CAC 2014 Year-End Attendance Report**

   M/S/C (Chang/Powers) to receive the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) 2014 Year-End Attendance Report.

13. **Legislative Update Matrix**

   M/S/C (Chang/Powers) to review the Legislative Update Matrix.

**2000 MEASURE A CITIZENS WATCHDOG COMMITTEE REGULAR AGENDA**

14. **Independent Auditor Initiation of Compliance Audit of FY14**

   Stephen Flynn, Senior Management Analyst, introduced Ben Lau, Director of Certified Public Accounting (CPA) firm of Macias, Gini and O’Connel, LLP (MGO), who provided an overview of the staff report.

   Mr. Lau directed the Committee to turn to attachment 14.a - Citizens Watchdog Committee of the 2000 Measure A Transit Improvement Program.

   **On order of Chairperson Hadaya** and there being no objection, the Committee received a briefing from the 2000 Measure A Citizens Watchdog Committee's independent compliance auditor on the draft audit plan and schedule for performing the compliance audit of FY14.

15. **(Deferred)**

   Receive the annual review of the Citizens Watchdog Committee's ballot-specified duties, responsibilities and limitations

**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE REGULAR AGENDA**

16. **Local Program Reserve Reallocation**

   Marcella Rensi, Transportation Planning Manager, provided a brief overview of the staff report.

   Members of the Committee made the following comments: 1) inquired about the cost overruns; 2) requested staff provide more information in the memo including project dates; 2) inquired about other projects needing funds from the reserve; 4) inquired about the completion time for the project; 5) commended staff about the four projects that are coming in under budget; 6) inquired about penalties and bench marks; 7) noted the importance of completing the I-280/I-880 Stevens Creek Interchange Project; and 8) inquired about the aggressive timeline for the project.
Ms. Rensi noted that staff would have to get back to the Committee regarding penalties and bench marks.

M/S/C (Rogers/Chang) to recommend that the VTA Board of Directors approve reallocation of Local Program Reserve (LPR) savings of $700,000 to the I-280/I-880 Stevens Creek Interchange Project. Further requested the Board inquire about the reasons for the overruns and how to avoid cost increases it in the future.

17. **FY 2016 & FY 2017 Biennial Budget Assumptions**

Carol Lawson, Fiscal Resources Manager, provided the staff report and distributed a presentation entitled, “FY16 & FY17 Biennial Budget Assumptions,” highlighting: 1) Service; 2) Revenues; 3) Expense/Cost Drivers; 4) Capital Program; 5) Operating Reserves; and 6) Next Steps.

**On order of Chairperson Hadaya** and there being no objection, the Committee reviewed the Fiscal Year 2016 & Fiscal Year 2017 Biennial Budget Assumptions.

18. **BART Transit Integration Plan Progress Update**

Lilia Scott, Senior Transportation Planner, provided a brief overview of the staff report and distributed a presentation entitled "BART Transit Integration Plan," highlighting: 1) VTA Planning for BART; 2) VTA’s BART Silicon Valley-Berryessa Extension; 3) BART Transit Integration Plan; 4) Service Included in Study; 5) Berryessa Connector Service; 6) Light Rail – Tasman Express (Long T); 7) Initial Analysis; 8) Fremont Express Services: Initial Findings; 9) Fremont Express Routes boardings; 10) Preliminary Service Concepts – Milpitas and Berryessa; and 11) Project Schedule.

Upon inquiry of Member Chang, Ms. Scott noted that staff would be happy to present to various employer shuttles.

**On order of Chairperson Hadaya** and there being no objection, the Committee received a report of the progress of the BART Transit Integration Plan: overview and initial findings.

19. **North Central County Bus Improvement Plan**


Members of the Committee made the following comments: 1) noted the importance to increase public awareness through marketing; 2) commented about private shuttles that serve current areas; and 3) inquired if staff included the local Community colleges in the evaluation.
On order of Chairperson Hadaya and there being no objection, the Committee received a presentation on North Central County Bus Improvement Plan.

20. Great Streets: Complete Street Corridor Study

Aiko Cuenco, Transportation Planner III, provided a brief overview of the staff report.

On order of Chairperson Hadaya and there being no objection, the Committee received information on the Great Streets Corridor Study proposal.

COMBINED CAC AND CITIZENS WATCHDOG COMMITTEE ITEMS

21. Citizens Advisory Committee and Citizens Watchdog Committee Work Plans

Mr. Flynn commented on the new Building B lobby entrance and exits for the February meeting.

On order of Chairperson Hadaya and there being no objection, the Committee received the Citizens Advisory Committee and Citizens Watchdog Committee Work Plans.

OTHER

22. ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no Announcements.

23. ADJOURNMENT

On order of Chairperson Hadaya and there being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 6:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Theadora Travers, Board Assistant
VTA Office of the Board Secretary
CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Chairperson Brinsfield in Conference Room B-104, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), 3331 North First Street, San José, California.

1. ROLL CALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Herman Wadler</td>
<td>City of Campbell</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Wiant</td>
<td>City of Cupertino</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Almeida</td>
<td>City of Gilroy</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wes Brinsfield, Chairperson</td>
<td>City of Los Altos</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breene Kerr, Vice Chair</td>
<td>Town of Los Altos Hills</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACANT</td>
<td>Town of Los Gatos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristal Caidoy</td>
<td>City of Milpitas</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Chaffin</td>
<td>City of Monte Sereno</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Seehafer</td>
<td>City of Morgan Hill</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Purdon</td>
<td>City of Mountain View</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Goldstein</td>
<td>City of Palo Alto</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Bell</td>
<td>City of San José</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Schouten</td>
<td>City of Santa Clara</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus Gomez</td>
<td>County of Santa Clara</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Stallman</td>
<td>City of Saratoga</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Simons</td>
<td>City of Sunnyvale</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corinne Winter</td>
<td>Ex-Officio, SVBC</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin Heyne</td>
<td>Alternate Ex-Officio, SVBC</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A quorum was present.

2. ORDERS OF THE DAY

There were no Orders of the Day.

3. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

There were no Public Presentations.
4. **Election Process for 2015 Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee Leadership:**

Conduct Elections

Stephen Flynn, Advisory Committee Coordinator, provided a brief overview of the BPAC leadership election process.

Members of the Nomination Subcommittee provided a brief report, noting: 1) one nomination for Chair (Brinsfield) and four nominations for Vice Chair (Bell, Caidoy, Kerr, Stallman); 2) Member Hanssen resigned from the Committee and therefore ineligible for the vice chair position; 3) potential chairpersons are encouraged to consider serving additional years in the position; and 4) recommended that the Committee vice chair position be on a yearly rotation basis.

Vice Chairperson Kerr took his seat at 6:35 p.m.

Chairperson Brinsfield opened the floor for additional nominations for the position of 2015 BPAC Chairperson. Members of the Committee nominated Chairperson Brinsfield as the 2015 BPAC Chairperson.

**M/S/C (Stallman/Goldstein)** to close nominations and elect Wes Brinsfield as BPAC Chairperson for 2015.

Member Bell respectfully asked the Committee that his name be removed for consideration for the vice chair position.

Chairperson Brinsfield opened the floor for additional nominations for the position of 2015 BPAC Vice Chairperson.

Member Chaffin took his seat at 6:40 p.m.

**Chairperson Brinsfield** closed the nominations. The Committee elected Kristal Caidoy as BPAC Vice Chairperson for 2015.

5. **Update on Envision Silicon Valley**

Member Purdon took his seat at 6:42 p.m.

Scott Haywood, Policy and Community Relations Manager, provided a brief update on Envision Silicon Valley. He noted stakeholder meetings were held last year to ask for input regarding draft goals for Envision Silicon Valley. Common themes for the goals were evident, such as: increased service frequency and connectivity; ensure service options for all; and integrate local service with regional services. There were unique themes such as: efficiency of the first and last mile connections; improving infrastructure; exploration of on-demand services for workers in and outside of Santa Clara County; and moving to zero-emission fleet.

Mr. Haywood reviewed the following draft principles: 1) equity; 2) environmental impact; 3) innovation; 4) partnerships; and 5) sustainability. Staff is finalizing the Envision Silicon Valley goals, principles, potential criteria, and metrics for presentation to the stakeholder groups at a future meeting.

**Public Comment**

Doug Muirhead, Interested Citizen, queried if VTA’s minimum ridership requirements for bus service enhancement can be adjusted based on an area’s population/density, such as in Morgan Hill.
Members of the Committee and staff engaged in a discussion and offered the following comments: 1) ensure VTA follows through with projects from past tax measures; 2) consider gas prices and employment rates; 3) create alternatives to driving; 4) hybrid buses do not seem economically efficient at this time; 5) increase public awareness about the impacts of land use policies to traffic congestion levels; 6) VTA could lead an effort on a more comprehensive countywide bicycle infrastructure to include better east/west bike connectors; and 7) ensure that significant bike projects are included in the project list for the potential sales tax measure.

Lauren Ledbetter, Senior Transportation Planner and Staff Liaison, noted staff will present the scope of work of the Countywide Bicycle Plan update to the Committee at a future meeting. The key component of this plan will include identification of major bicycle corridors that could connect jobs and multi-jurisdictional east/west connections.

On order of Chairperson Brinsfield and there being no objection, the Committee received an update on Envision Silicon Valley.

CONSENT AGENDA

6. (Removed from the Consent Agenda and placed on the Regular Agenda.)

REGULAR AGENDA

6. Approve the Regular Meeting Minutes of November 12, 2014

Member Goldstein requested that Committee discussion on Agenda Item #10, Page 4 of the Regular Meeting Minutes of November 12, 2014, be clarified as follows: 1) consensus among Committee Members that bike racks reviewed had significant drawbacks and the Committee could not recommend it; and 2) expressed disappointment that there was not a better rack and asked staff to continue to look for ways to increase bike capacity on buses.

M/S/C (Stallman/Wiant) to approve the Regular Meeting Minutes of November 12, 2014, as amended.

7. Great Streets: Complete Street Corridor Study

Aiko Cuenco, Transportation Planner, provided a brief overview of the staff report.

Public Comment

Omar Chatty, Interested Citizen, asked staff that the “Great Streets” concept be beneficial to everyone, including motorists, to maximize safety and efficiency for all road users.

Members of the Committee provided the following comments: 1) the Winchester Boulevard and Saratoga Avenue corridors could be extended further north; 2) candidate corridors do not seem to be connected with one another; 3) suggested that Homestead Road be considered due to the development plans near the area and lack of robust transit service along the corridor; 4) requested staff to provide an update to the Committee on the status of grant applications and further information on criteria used to identify the final list of candidate corridors; and 5) urged staff to include motorists in the outreach process.
Upon query of Member Seehafer, Dawn Cameron, County Transportation Planner, noted that improvements to the Hale Avenue/Santa Teresa Boulevard corridor are being proposed through Santa Clara County’s Circulation and Mobility Element.

**On order of Chairperson Brinsfield** and there being no objection, the Committee received information on the Great Streets Corridor Study proposal.

8. **State Route 82 Relinquishment Exploration Study**

Eugene Maeda, Senior Transportation Planner, provided a summary and update of the report.

**Public Comment**

Mr. Chatty provided the following comments: 1) include costs associated with maintenance; 2) examine Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) efforts in Oakland and San Francisco; 3) examine relinquishment examples in the Cities of San Jose, Redondo Beach, and Carlsbad; and 4) requested a listing of non-profits and private groups funding the study.

Members of the Committee provided the following comments: 1) asked about the consultants in the study; 2) expressed concern on financial impacts of relinquishment to smaller cities, particularly for maintenance issues; 3) expressed concern that relinquishment could disrupt uniformity along the corridor; 4) inquired about funding for the San Tomas grade separation upon relinquishment; 5) suggested staff to focus efforts on Stevens Creek Boulevard and Monterey Road instead of El Camino Real; and 6) requested staff to present the study’s recommendations at a future BPAC meeting.

Member Almeida took his seat at 7:38 p.m.

**On order of Chairperson Brinsfield** and there being no objection, the Committee received an update on the SR 82 (El Camino Real) Relinquishment Exploration Study.

9. **Light Rail Enhancement Program**

Jason Kim, Sr. Transportation Planner, provided the staff report, highlighting:

1) overview of proposed operating plan for 2017/2018, including: a) proposed Tasman Express (Long T) service; b) proposed Southern Express service; c) ridership projections and cost estimates from the proposed service improvements; and d) other operating change ideas; and 2) overview of study and design of light rail system speed improvements, noting: a) current light rail system constraints; b) draft schedule of improvements; c) North First Street speed improvements; d) Montague Expressway grade separation; e) Downtown San Jose Transit mall improvements; f) Vasona light rail corridor improvements; and g) Ohlone/Chynoweth Station siding construction.

Ms. Cameron commented that, in conjunction with the Expressway Plan 2040 Study, VTA and the County should be coordinating on design concepts for light rail improvements on Montague Expressway and North First Street.

Members of the Committee offered the following comments: 1) expressed concern on the cost-benefit of the Vasona Corridor Double Tracking project; 2) suggested staff consider analysis of issues related to station access and bike capacity on light rail.

**On order of Chairperson Brinsfield** and there being no objection, the Committee received an update on the Light Rail Enhancement Program.
10. **Member Agency Success Stories and Priorities**

Chairperson Brinsfield provided a brief introduction and background of the item, noting the Committee could benefit from Members’ success stories and lessons learned from individual jurisdictions.

Chairperson Brinsfield proceeded with his report, titled “Completing a Pedestrian Master Plan for Los Altos: Lessons Learned, Success Stories, Epic Failures”, noting the following: 1) background and objectives of the Los Altos Pedestrian Master Plan (PMP); 2) key participants including the City of Los Altos’ Transportation Services Manager, the City’s Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission, consultants, and community members; 3) current status of the PMP; 4) areas of accomplishments; 5) management of public expectations and resulting increase in City staff resources to respond to public concerns and comments; 6) overview of next steps for the PMP; and 7) overview of lessons learned. Chairperson Brinsfield noted that recommendations from the PMP will consider potential impacts to adjacent neighborhoods and feedback from the community.

Members of the Committee engaged in a discussion covering: 1) “bicycle master plan” versus “bicycle and pedestrian master plan” approach; 2) budget for the plan; 3) potential for safe bike routes through parking policies and enforcement; and 4) coordination with appropriate city departments or staff in plan development and determining feasibility of proposed projects.

**Public Comment**

Mr. Chatty expressed concern on safety and vehicle traffic along Church Street in the City of Gilroy.

Member Stallman proceeded with his report, titled “Cross County Bike Plan Implementation”, noting the following: 1) overview of the bike gap, under the City of San Jose’s jurisdiction, along the De Anza Boulevard/Sunnyvale-Saratoga Road corridor; 2) coordination efforts between the Cities of San Jose and Cupertino; and 3) overview of lessons learned.

Members of the Committee engaged in a discussion regarding coordination experiences with other jurisdictions or agencies.

Chairperson Brinsfield noted that staff will follow up with Committee Members who may be interested in presenting relevant Member Agency success stories and priorities.

**On order of Chairperson Brinsfield** and there being no objection, the Committee heard success stories from selected BPAC members and discussed Member Agency priorities for bicycle and pedestrian transportation.

**OTHER**

11. **Committee Staff Report**

Ms. Ledbetter provided the staff report, highlighting: 1) the VTA Board of Directors’ five priorities for 2015; 2) new VTA Board Members and Board Alternates from Group 1 – San Jose and Group 2 – Northwest Cities; 3) National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) training workshop, on March 12 and 13, 2015, for elected officials and city staff respectively; 4) Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals (APBP) monthly webinar to be held on January 21, 2015, will cover Level of Service for Pedestrians and Cyclists; 5) end of comment period for the El Camino Real Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) on
January 14, 2015, noting VTA Board of Directors to select a preferred alternative in late Spring 2015; and 6) overview of the Traffic Safe Communities Network (TSCN) Steering Committee and its upcoming efforts on safe and active transportation and distracted walking, biking, and driving prevention.

On order of Chairperson Brinsfield and there being no objection, the Committee received the Committee Staff Report.

12. Santa Clara County Staff Report
Dawn Cameron, County Transportation Planner, provided the following report: 1) brief summary of community outreach efforts to date regarding the Expressway Plan 2040 Study; and 2) noted upcoming community meetings in the City of San Jose to discuss Lawrence Expressway, San Tomas Expressway, Capitol Expressway, and Almaden Expressway.

13. Chairperson’s Report
Chairperson Brinsfield expressed his appreciation to Member Kerr for highlighting the urgency of potentially including key bicycle projects on the Envision Silicon Valley initiative and noted the importance of coordination and cooperation between jurisdictions on countywide improvements.

14. Reports from BPAC Subcommittees
Chairperson Brinsfield noted that the Santa Clara County Housing, Land Use, Environment, and Transportation Committee (HLUET) is scheduled to receive a report from the Roads and Airports Department and Office of the County Counsel regarding the proposed Bicyclist Anti-Harassment Ordinance at their January 15, 2015 meeting.

There were no reports from the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Scoring Criteria Subcommittee.

15. Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) and 2000 Measure A Citizens Watchdog Committee (CWC) Report
Member Wadler provided a brief report, noting he was re-elected as the CAC Vice Chairperson for 2015.

16. BPAC Work Plan
Members of the Committee and staff noted the following additions to the work plan: 1) scope of work for the Countywide Bicycle Plan update; 2) discussion on Member Agency priorities; 3) Santa Clara County’s TDA-3 project list; and 4) discussion on changes to the criteria for the Bicycle Expenditure Plan (BEP), with a focus on prioritizing regional projects.

On order of Chairperson Brinsfield and there being no objection, the Committee reviewed the BPAC Work Plan.

17. ANNOUNCEMENTS
Member Wadler noted the Almaden Cycle Touring Club (ACTC) Academy six-week cycling instruction program beginning on February 28, 2015.

Alternate Ex-Officio Member Heyne noted the City of San Jose’s Parks, Recreation and Neighborhood Services Department efforts to implement an “Open Streets” event, tentatively scheduled for June 7, 2015.
Member Goldstein announced that the City of Palo Alto, in conjunction with the Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition (SVBC), has released educational materials for the public concerning bicycle lanes and crosswalks. The materials are available to interested communities and may be obtained by contacting SVBC through Alternate Ex-Officio Member Heyne.

Member Stallman made a comment about the forthcoming update to the countywide Trails Master Plan. Members of the Committee requested for more information on the document.

Chairperson Brinsfield made the following announcements: 1) advised the Committee of the Clipper Card survey that ends on January 15, 2015; 2) anticipated Caltrain vote next month on third bike car that could increase bike capacity; 3) the Loyola Bridge project in the City of Los Altos has been delayed; and 4) noted importance of educating the public on road safety improvements, such as green bicycle lanes and sharrows.

18. ADJOURNMENT

On order of Chairperson Brinsfield and there being no objection, the Committee meeting was adjourned at 8:59 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Michelle Oblena, Board Assistant
VTA Office of the Board Secretary
CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was called to order at 1:33 p.m. by Chairperson Capurso in Conference Room B-104, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), 3331 North First Street, San José, California.

1. ROLL CALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee Name</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rajeev Batra</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>City of Santa Clara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Riley</td>
<td>Alternate Member</td>
<td>City of Santa Clara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl Bjarke</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>City of Morgan Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Creer</td>
<td>Alternate Member</td>
<td>City of Morgan Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timm Borden</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>City of Cupertino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Stillman</td>
<td>Alternate Member</td>
<td>City of Cupertino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Capurso</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>City of Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cherbone</td>
<td>Vice Chairperson</td>
<td>City of Saratoga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Chiu</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Town of Los Altos Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina Tseng</td>
<td>Alternate Member</td>
<td>Town of Los Altos Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Collen</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>County of Santa Clara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Kim</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>City of Mountain View</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Chan</td>
<td>Alternate Member</td>
<td>City of Milpitas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Morley</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Town of Los Gatos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedric Novenario</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>City of Los Altos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Gustafson</td>
<td>Alternate Member</td>
<td>City of Los Altos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shahla Yazdy</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>City of Palo Alto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaime Rodriguez</td>
<td>Alternate Member</td>
<td>City of Palo Alto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Salvano</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>City of San José</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Servín</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>City of Gilroy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo Sharma</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>City of Monte Sereno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Saleh</td>
<td>Ex-Officio Alternate Member</td>
<td>California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Shariat</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>City of Sunnyvale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuel Pineda</td>
<td>Alternate Member</td>
<td>City of Sunnyvale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Alternates do not serve unless participating as a Member.

A quorum was present.
2. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

Roland Lebrun, Interested Citizen, suggested the meeting be held in the auditorium and stated conference room B-104 was too small for the public meeting.

3. ORDERS OF THE DAY

Chairperson Capurso noted a request to move Agenda Item # 17, Receive a report on three California State Transportation Agency: California Transportation Infrastructure Priorities Workgroup Draft White Papers, to the Consent Agenda.

M/S/C (Servin/Collen) to accept the Orders of the Day.

4. Conduct Voting to Determine the Committee's Chairperson and Vice Chairperson for 2015

Chairperson Capurso introduced and welcomed newly appointed Alternate Committee Members Tina Tseng, Town of Los Altos Hills; Manuel Pineda, City of Sunnyvale, and; Jim Ortbal, City of San Jose.

Stephen Flynn, Advisory Committee Coordinator, provided an overview of the election process.

Chairperson Capurso reported the subcommittee’s nomination of Member Servin as a candidate for the position of TAC Chairperson for 2015.

Chairperson Capurso opened the floor for additional nominations for the position of 2015 TAC Chairperson. Chairperson Capurso then noted there were no additional nominations for the position.

M/S/C (Salvano/Collen) to close nominations and elect Henry Servin as the TAC Chairperson for 2015.

Chairperson Capurso reported the subcommittee’s nomination of Member Cherbone as a candidate for the position of TAC Vice Chairperson for 2015.

Chairperson Capurso opened the floor for additional nominations for the position of 2015 TAC Vice Chairperson. Chairperson Capurso then noted there were no additional nominations for the position.

M/S/C (Salvano/Collen) to close nominations and elect John Cherbone as the TAC Vice Chairperson for 2015.

Chairperson Capurso relinquished his seat to newly elected TAC Chairperson Servin.

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

John Ristow, Director of Planning and Program Development and Staff Liaison, provided the staff report highlighting the five priorities VTA Board Chairperson Perry Woodward established at the January 2015 Board meeting: 1) VTA’s BART Silicon Valley Phase II; 2) Bus Rapid Transit; 3) Service to the new Earthquake’s stadium; 4) Service to Levi’s Stadium for Super Bowl 50, and; 5) Envision Silicon Valley.

Mr. Ristow noted the Board welcomed new members: Magdalena Carrasco (Regular Member) and Raul Peralez (Alternate Member) for Group 1 – City of San Jose; Jeannie Bruins (Alternate Member) for the City of Los Altos for Group 2 – North West cities; Sam Liccardo, having been an ex-officio member last year, returns as a regular member; Jason Baker and Rich Larsen return as regular members, and; Howard Miller as an Alternate for West Valley Cities.

Mr. Ristow provided a handout announcing the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) Training Seminar will be held March 12-13, 2015.

**On order of Chairperson Servin** and there being no objection, the Committee received the Committee Staff Report.

6. **Envision Silicon Valley Update**

Scott Haywood, Policy & Community Relations Manager, provided a brief update on the Envisioning Silicon Valley (ESV) effort that VTA is undertaking to look at a potential new sales tax measure in 2016 to fund transportation projects. He noted the following: 1) stakeholder groups; 2) draft goals discussion; 3) common themes; 4) unique themes; 5) advisory committee comments; and 6) next steps.

Member Collins provided a handout entitled “Envision Silicon Valley Concerns and Considerations,” and highlighted the following: 1) Why aren’t cities and county first stakeholders; 2) What is the rush to “finalize” the Goals and Principles; 3) Where is the word “commuter”; 4) Polling could help identify what the public wants; 5) Average voter sees some benefit; 6) Will the intent and spirit of 2002 Measure A (74% approval) get any attention, and 7) Revenue Results of Local Initiatives for Transportation. Staff indicated VTA will maintain balance between transit, roadways, bicycles, senior programs and disabled programs.

Members of the Committee discussed the following: 1) funding strategies; 2) noted all jurisdictions are invited to ESV meetings and encouraged representatives to participate in the development process, and 3) queried about ESV Committee dates. Staff indicated the finalized ESV meeting schedule will be sent to committee members.

**On order of Chairperson Servin** and there being no objection, the Committee received the Envision Silicon Valley Update.

7. **Chairperson’s Report**

Chairperson Servin reported that the TAC Subcommittee met prior to the Committee meeting to discuss and receive an update on present and future projects.

Chairperson Servin stated that 2015 is a year of preparation and urged committee members to attend meetings. He noted the committee will be more productive and will be able to by having a quorum, which will allow staff to prepare and work with the committee to fulfill the goal of better multi-modal transportation for the Santa Clara County residents.
8. **TAC Working Groups Report**

- **Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Working Group**

  Celeste Fiore, Transportation Planner III, provided a CIP Working Group 2014 year in review presentation, highlighting: 1) Pedestrian access to transit plan all the way through the existing conditions report; 2) 2014 Measure X Ballot; 3) Complete Streets Demonstration Corridor Scope; 4) hosted workshop for Project Delivery with the assistance of MTC staff; 5) hosted Caltrans Risk Based Invoicing Training; 6) review and score discretionary programs; 7) review grant opportunities; 8) elected 2015 Chairperson David Stillman, City of Cupertino, and Vice Chairperson David Gittleson, City of Morgan Hill.

  The next meeting of the CIP Working Group is scheduled for January 27, 2015.

- **Systems Operations & Management (SOM) Working Group**

  Eugene Maeda, Senior Transportation Planner, provided a SOM Working Group 2014 year in review presentation, highlighting their focus on the following topics: 1) asset management current practices; 2) ramp metering; 3) traffic (Level of Service) LOS software; 5) Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Guidelines update; 6) presentations on MTC Street Savers Asset Management Plus Software, Sunnyvale’s Pavement Management System Integration Project with GIS, Road Tech Safety portable ITS warning systems and Santa Clara County Roads and Airport Traffic Operation Center; 7) work products included Annual Congestion Management Program (CMP) Monitoring Conformance Report, collaboration with Caltrans to develop Transportation Concept Reports for State Route (SR) 237 and SR 9, 2014 Transportation Systems Monitoring Report, Caltrans Planning Grant for countywide signal correlation study. He also reported that the focus for 2015 for the Group would be traffic signal coordination and complete streets implementation.

  The next meeting of the SOM Working Group is tentatively scheduled for January 28, 2015.

- **Land Use/Transportation Integration (LUTI) Working Group**

  Robert Swierk, Senior Transportation Planner, provided a brief report on the Working Group’s activities in 2014, highlighting the following: 1) increased interest in using the group as information sharing and gathering input on city led plans; 2) supporting and sharing information on grant efforts, and 3) providing valuable planning perspective on the Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Guidelines Update.

  The next meeting of the LUTI Working Group is scheduled for February 11, 2015.

  **On order of Chairperson Servin** and there being no objection, the Committee received the TAC Working Group Reports.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

9. **Regular Meeting Minutes of November 13, 2014**

  M/S/C (Collen/Salvano) to approve the Regular Meeting Minutes of November 13, 2014.
10. **Review the Legislative Update Matrix**

   M/S/C (Collen/Salvano) to review the Legislative Update Matrix.

17. **California State Transportation Agency: California Transportation Infrastructure Priorities Discussion Draft White Pages**

   M/S/C (Collen/Salvano) to receive a report on three California State Transportation Agency: California Transportation Infrastructure Priorities Workgroup Draft White Papers.

**REGULAR AGENDA**

11. **Local Program Reserve Reallocation**

   Marcella Rensi, Transportation Planning Manager, provided an overview of the staff report.

   M/S/C (Salvano/Collen) to recommend that the VTA Board of Directors approve reallocation of Local Program Reserve (LPR) savings of $700,000 to the I-280/I-880 Stevens Creek Interchange Project.

12. **BART Transit Integration Plan Progress Update**


   Members of the Committee noted the following: 1) expressed concern about the proposed additional lines being added to current service between 10th Street and Diridon Station and requested further discussion; and 2) suggested VTA staff consult with City staff regarding service changes.

   **On order of Chairperson Servin** and there being no objection, the Committee received a report of the progress of the BART Transit Integration Plan: overview and initial findings.

13. **State Route 82 Relinquishment Exploration Study**

   Mr. Maeda provided the staff report, highlighting: 1) background; 2) purpose of study; 3) study is moving forward and the first stakeholder meeting is scheduled for February 19, 2015, and; 4) looking for participation from cities along the corridor.

   Members of the Committee requested staff to provide periodic updates to the Committee.
On order of Chairperson Servin and there being no objection, the Committee received an update on the SR 82 (El Camino Real) Relinquishment Exploration Study.

14. Land Use and Transportation Integration (LUTI) Partnerships

Robert Cunningham, Transportation Planner III, introduced Melissa Cerezo, Senior Planner.

Mr. Cunningham provided the staff report, highlighting: 1) VTA Involvement in Land Use & Development – Existing Programs and Initiatives; 2) Direct Influence; 3) Indirect Influence; 4) Land Use & Development Process & VTA Involvement, and; 5) Land Use & Transportation Integration (LUTI) Partnerships - Proposed Implementation Actions.

On order of Chairperson Servin and there being no objection, the Committee received a report on Land Use and Transportation Integration (LUTI) Partnerships.

15. North Central County Bus Improvement Plan


On order of Chairperson Servin and there being no objection, the Committee received a presentation on North Central County Bus Improvement Plan.

16. Light Rail Enhancement Program

Jason Kim, Transportation Planner, provided PowerPoint presentation entitled "Light Rail Enhancement Project," highlighting: 1) Presentation Outline; 2) Recommended Operating Plan; 3) Tasman Express (Long T); 4) Southern Express; 5) Ridership Projections and Cost Estimates; 6) Other operating change Ideas; 7) Near Term Focus: Its All About Speed; 8) Light Rail System Constraints; 9) System Speed Improvement; 10) North First Street Speed Improvements; 11) Montague Grade Separation; 12) Downtown San Jose; 13) Vasona Corridor; and 14) Chynoweth Siding.

Members of the Committee noted the following: 1) suggested VTA collaborate with Santa Clara County on the capital project to grade separate Montague Expressway; 2) noted the importance of coordination between San Jose City Staff and VTA concerning Downtown Speed improvement work.

Public Comment

Roland LeBrun, Interested Citizen, commented on the following: 1) the Southern Express breaks the Caltrain connection; 2) suggested increasing light rail speed to 65 mph between Ohlone Chynoweth and Virginia stations; 3) adding 300 parking spaces at Tamien, and 4) consider replacing the consultant.

Staff noted VTA is in the process of re-evaluating the plan and is considering the option of an intermediate stop on the express service at Tamien.
On order of Chairperson Servin and there being no objection, the Committee received an update on the Light Rail Enhancement Program.

17. (Removed from the Regular Agenda, and placed on the Consent Agenda.)

Received a report on three California State Transportation Agency: California Transportation Infrastructure Priorities Workgroup Draft White Papers.

OTHER

18. Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Activities and Initiatives

Therese M. Trivedi, MTC Senior Planner, reported on the Local Compliance Policies. She explained that in order to be eligible for the next cycle of funding, OBAG currently requires that jurisdictions update their general plans’ circulation elements and housing elements by January 31, 2015, to comply with the California Complete Streets Act of 2008 and to reflect the most recent Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) commitments. Staff recommends providing additional flexibility by extending the deadline for the circulation element update to January 31, 2016, and by extending the deadline for the housing element update to May 31, 2015.

Ms. Trivedi introduced Mike Reilly, MTC, and noted they would be attending committee meetings and working with committee members.

Chairperson Servin thanked Ms. Trivedi for the update and noted some cities have undertaken a general city plan update and due to transparency requirements will be hard pressed to meet a circulation element update.

On order of.....

19. Caltrans Activities and Initiatives

Nick Saleh, Caltrans Program District Division Chief – South Region, reported the following: 1) Caltrans is in the process of updating the resources for project initiation documents for the upcoming two years. The deadline to provide an updated list is February 12, 2015; 2) upcoming major project to replace selected overhead signs with a more reflective face structure; 3) activation of ramp metering on State Route (SR) 85. Testing will continue throughout the month of January, and 4) Caltrans is offering an Encroachment Permit Workshop to the region on March 19, 2015, hosted by VTA.

Chairperson Servin suggested Caltrans bring the retro-reflective signs before the SOM Working Group. Staff indicated the matter will be placed on the agenda.

On order of.....

20. TAC Committee Work Plan

Mr. Ristow provided a brief overview of the Committee Work Plan.

On order of Chairperson Servin, and there being no objection, the Committee reviewed the TAC Committee Work Plan.

21. ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no Announcements.
22. ADJOURNMENT
On order of Chairperson Servin, and there being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Anita McGraw, Board Assistant
VTA Office of the Board Secretary
POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Thursday, January 15, 2014

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) was called to order at 4:00 p.m. p.m. by Vice Chairperson Carr in Conference Room B-104, Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), 3331 North First Street, San Jose, California.

1. ROLL CALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paul Resnikoff</td>
<td>City of Campbell</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Kotowski (Alternate)</td>
<td>City of Campbell</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savita Vaidhyanathan</td>
<td>City of Cupertino</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Chang (Alternate)</td>
<td>City of Cupertino</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dion Bracco</td>
<td>City of Gilroy</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant (Alternate)</td>
<td>City of Gilroy</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeannie Bruins</td>
<td>City of Los Altos</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Prochnow (Alternate)</td>
<td>City of Los Altos</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Town of Los Altos Hills</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant (Alternate)</td>
<td>Town of Los Altos Hills</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcia Jensen</td>
<td>Town of Los Gatos</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Rennie (Alternate)</td>
<td>Town of Los Gatos</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmen Montano</td>
<td>City of Milpitas</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant (Alternate)</td>
<td>City of Milpitas</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lon Allan</td>
<td>City of Monte Sereno</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall Anstandig (Alternate)</td>
<td>City of Monte Sereno</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Carr</td>
<td>City of Morgan Hill</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Constantine (Alternate)</td>
<td>City of Morgan Hill</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John McAlister</td>
<td>City of Mountain View</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Clark (Alternate)</td>
<td>City of Mountain View</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz Kniss</td>
<td>City of Palo Alto</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Shepherd (Alternate)</td>
<td>City of Palo Alto</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles “Chappie” Jones</td>
<td>City of San Jose</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant (Alternate)</td>
<td>City of San Jose</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa O’Neill</td>
<td>City of Santa Clara</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Marsalli (Alternate)</td>
<td>City of Santa Clara</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Miller</td>
<td>City of Saratoga</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rishi Kumar (Alternate)</td>
<td>City of Saratoga</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Davis</td>
<td>City of Sunnyvale</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gustav Larsson (Alternate)</td>
<td>City of Sunnyvale</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Wasserman</td>
<td>SCC Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A quorum was present.
2. **PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS**

There were no Public Presentations.

3. **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

Vice Chairperson Carr noted staff’s request to defer Agenda Item #4. Election Process for 2015 PAC Committee Leadership: Conduct Elections.

4. **(Deferred)**

Conduct voting to determine the Committee's Chairperson and Vice Chairperson for 2015.

5. **Committee Staff Report**

Jim Lawson, Director of Government Affairs and Executive Policy Advisor and Staff Liaison, introduced Nuria I. Fernandez, General Manager.

- **Report from the General Manager**

Ms. Fernandez provided a report highlighting:

- The five priorities for 2015: 1) BART Phase II; 2) Bus Rapid Transit (BRT); 3) Super Bowl 50; 4) Earthquakes Stadium; and 5) Envision Silicon Valley.

- Ridership increase, noting Levi’s Stadium events is contributing to the overall increase.

- Noted VTA’s accomplishments during the holiday season, included: 1) the Holiday Wrap Light Rail Train; 2) operating the Holiday Trolley; and 3) VTA’s participation in the “Stuff the Bus” and the Family Giving Tree Holiday Wish Drive.

- Announced January is Human Trafficking Awareness Prevention Month and reminded the Committee that VTA is a safe place.

- Announced VTA’s new Governance and Audit Committee, noting the new Committee will provide an opportunity to address the needs of the agency.

- Board of Directors has elected new Chairperson Perry Woodward and Vice Chairperson Cindy Chavez for 2015.

Members of the Committee requested including a discussion regarding El Camino Real Bus Rapid Transit to a future meeting.

John Ristow, Director of Planning and Program Development, reported that VTA staff is currently reviewing the feedback from the cities along the El Camino Real corridor and added staff is scheduled to visit the City of Santa Clara and the City of Los Altos.

Ms. Fernandez noted that there will be opportunity for staff to work with various city councils.
Mr. Lawson provided a report highlighting the following: 1) the Board of Directors approved and adopted the following at the December 11, 2014 meeting: a) Santa Clara Caltrain Station Pedestrian/Bicycle Tunnel Extension Project; b) Amendments to the VTA Administrative Code and Board’s Rules of Procedure; c) 2015 Legislative Program; d) Proposed Fare Modifications; and e) Amended and Restated Ordinance 98.1, Vehicles and Facilities – First Reading; 2) the January 8, 2015 Board of Directors discussed the 5 priorities and received an update on the Levi’s Stadium at the January 8, 2015 meeting; 3) the Board of Directors approved and adopted the following at the January 8, 2015 meeting: a) Tamien Negative Declaration; b) Amended and Restated Ordinance 98.1, Vehicles and Facilities – Second Reading and Adoption; and c) 2000 Measure A Sales Tax Revenue Refunding Bonds, 2015 Series A; and 4) noted the NACTO Guidelines two-day training workshop flyer was placed on the table for members interested.

**On order of Vice Chairperson Carr** and there being no objection, the Committee received a report from the General Manager.

### 6. Envision Silicon Valley

Scott Haywood, Policy and Community Relations Manager, provided a brief report, noting staff is gathering feedback from various community based organizations, cities, and VTA Advisory Committees. Mr. Haywood informed the Committee about the suggestions and concerns raised from the two stakeholder meetings. He noted that staff will create potential goals and priorities.

Vice Chairperson Carr commented that Mr. Haywood will be providing regular updates to the Committee and to encourage a more in depth discussion.

Alternate Member Clark reported on the new Mountain View Community shuttle funded by Google.

Member of the Committee requested the following: 1) Envision Silicon Valley written reports; and 2) web link with information about the Mountain View shuttle.

**On order of Vice Chairperson Carr** and there being no objection, the Committee received an update on Envision Silicon Valley.

### 7. Chairperson’s Report

There was no Chairperson's report.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

### 8. Regular Meeting Minutes of November 13, 2014

M/S/C (Bruins/Davis) to approve the Regular Meeting Minutes of November 13, 2014.

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

M/S/C (Bruins/Davis) to review the Legislative Update Matrix.

Vice Chairperson Carr requested that the following items be deferred to a future meeting due to time constraints: **Agenda Item #13.** Great Streets: Complete Street Corridor Study; **Agenda Item #14.** California State Transportation Agency: California Transportation Infrastructure Priorities Discussion Draft White Papers; and **Agenda Item #15.** North Central County Bus Improvement Plan.

### REGULAR AGENDA

10. **Local Program Reserve Reallocation**

Marcella Rensi, Transportation Planning Manager, provided an overview of the staff report.

Members of the Committee inquired about potential projects that could benefit from the funds.

M/S/C (Bruins/Davis) to recommend that the VTA Board of Directors approve reallocation of Local Program Reserve (LPR) savings of $700,000 to the I-280/I-880 Stevens Creek Interchange Project.

11. **FY 2016 & FY 2017 Biennial Budget Assumptions**

Carol Lawson, Fiscal Resources Manager, provided the staff report and distributed a presentation entitled, “FY16 & FY17 Biennial Budget Assumptions,” highlighting: 1) Service; 2) Revenues; 3) Expense/Cost Drivers; 4) Capital Program; 5) Operating Reserves; and 6) Next Steps.

On order of Vice Chairperson Carr and there being no objection, the Committee reviewed the Fiscal Year 2016 & Fiscal Year 2017 Biennial Budget Assumptions.

Member Davis left his seat at 5:00 p.m. and a Committee of the Whole was declared.

12. **State Route 82 Relinquishment Exploration Study**

Eugene Maeda, Senior Transportation Planner, provided an overview of the staff report.

Member Jensen left her seat at 5:01 p.m.

Member Jones left his seat at 5:04 p.m.

Members of the Committee made the following comments: 1) inquired about the potential road conditions; 2) asked for more clarity regarding the relinquishment process and how it will impact the cities; 3) requested that information be brought to the city councils prior to the PAC Committee; and 4) noted that the relinquishment would allow each city to have more voice regarding the El Camino BRT.

Upon Member Bruins inquiry, Mr. Maeda noted the meeting will include members of the Grand Boulevard Initiative Task force and the various city staff.
Mr. Lawson reported on the specifics about relinquishment regarding the El Camino Real and the various cities along the corridor. He noted that the El Camino Real Relinquishment Exploration Study will help to determine the current and future conditions of the road.

Mr. Ristow recommended that the Committee Members and their city council attend the February 19, 2015 meeting with the stakeholders. Mr. Ristow commented that there will be handouts and more in-depth information that would help answer many questions.

**On order of Vice Chairperson Carr** and there being no objection, the Committee received an update on the SR 82 (El Camino Real) Relinquishment Exploration Study.

13. **(Deferred)**

Receive information on the Great Streets Corridor Study proposal.

14. **(Deferred)**

Receive a report on three California State Transportation Agency: California Transportation Infrastructure Priorities Workgroup Draft White Papers.

15. **(Deferred)**

Presentation on North Central County Bus Improvement Plan.

16. **Update on Regional Reports**

   A. **Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)**

   Aaron Quigley, Senior Policy Analyst, provided a brief report noting MTC deferred action to redirect 10.5 million dollars to Caltrain Vehicle replacement that was originally scheduled for the VTA operating budget.

   Mr. Lawson noted VTA’s concerns regarding redirecting funds from VTA’s operating budget and continued discussions will be held with MTC.

   B. **California Transportation Commission (CTC)**

   There was no California Transportation Commission (CTC) report.

**OTHER**

17. **Committee Work Plan**

   Upon Member Kniss’ inquiry, Mr. Lawson noted that VTA staff will look at the Biannual Budget workshop time and the Cities Council meetings times.

   **On order of Vice Chairperson Carr** and there being no objection, the Committee reviewed the Work Plan.

18. **Announcements**

   There were no Announcements.
19. ADJOURNMENT

On order of Vice Chairperson Carr and there being no objection, the Committee meeting was adjourned at 5:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Theadora Travers, Board Assistant
VTA Office of the Board Secretary