BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

Thursday, January 31, 2013
5:30 PM

PLEASE NOTE MEETING DATE

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 #7)

2. AWARDS AND COMMENDATION

2.1. INFORMATION ITEM - Recognize Dan Pornel, Associate Transportation Engineer, River Oaks Administration; Dave Adamson, Coach Operator, North Division; and Duane Garza, Light Rail Maintenance Worker, Guadalupe Maintenance Division, as Employees of the Month for February 2013.

3. CLOSED SESSION

3.1. Recess to Closed Session

A. Conference with Labor Negotiators
   [Government Code Section 54957.6]
   
   VTA Designated Representatives
   Bill Lopez, Chief Administrative Officer
   Robert L. Escobar, Manager, Employee Relations
   Joseph Smith, Chief Financial Officer

   Employee Organization
   American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), Local 101

B. PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT
   [Pursuant to Government Code Section 54957]
   
   Title of position to be filled: Assistant General Manager

C. Conference with Real Property Negotiators
   [Government Code Section 54956.8]
   
   Property: Sale of property located at near the intersections of Sunol and West San Carlos Streets in San Jose, California (APNs: 264-14-69, 90, 122, 130 and 131)
   
   Agency Negotiator: Bijal Patel, Deputy Director, Property Development & Management

   Negotiating Parties: Michael Van Every, Green Republic, LLLP, Michael Black, Barry Swenson Builder

   Under Negotiation: Price and terms of payment

3.2. Reconvene to Open Session

3.3. Closed Session Report
4. **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.

5. **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

HEARING – NOTICE OF INTENTION TO ADOPT RESOLUTIONS OF NECESSITY

ACTION ITEM - Close Hearing and adopt Resolutions of Necessity determining that the public interest and necessity requires the acquisition of property interests from four properties owned by: (1) R.W.L. Investment, Inc., a Corporation, located in Milpitas, California; (2) Dieter Schmidt and Simin F. Schmidt, or their successors as co-trustees of the Schmidt 1980 trust dated May 5, 1980, located in San Jose, California; (3) Tuan Q. Phan and Genevieve A. Nguyen, husband and wife as joint tenants, located in San Jose, California; and (4) Hertz Realty Inc., a California Corporation, located in San Jose, California, for the BART Silicon Valley Berryessa Extension (SVBX) Project.

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

**Property ID/Assessor's Parcel Number/Owner**
B3620 (APNs’ 086-37-015 and 086-37-026) owned by R.W.L. Investment, Inc., a Corporation

**Property ID/Assessor's Parcel Number/Owner**
B2098 (APN 244-01-003) owned by Dieter Schmidt and Simin F. Schmidt, or their successors as co-trustees of the Schmidt 1980 trust dated May 5, 1980

**Property ID/Assessor's Parcel Number/Owner**
B2172 (APN 245-27-075) owned by Tuan Q. Phan and Genevieve A. Nguyen, husband and wife as joint tenants

**Property ID/Assessor's Parcel Number/Owner**
B2147 (APN 254-02-044) owned by Hertz Realty Inc., a California Corporation

6. **REPORTS**


6.3. General Manager Report. (Verbal Report)

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

6.3.B. Receive updates regarding Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and California Transportation Commission (CTC) activities.


7. CONSENT AGENDA

7.1. Approve the Board of Directors Regular Meeting Minutes of January 10, 2013.

7.2. ACTION ITEM - Authorize the General Manager to execute interagency fund agreements with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for federal funds which support VTA Congestion Management Agency (CMA) planning and programming activities.

7.3. ACTION ITEM - Reprogram $326,700 in CMAQ funds from the City of San Jose's completed Jackson St. Pedestrian Improvements project to the City of San Jose's West San Carlos St. Phase II Sidewalk project.

7.4. ACTION ITEM - Authorize the General Manager to commence utility relocation construction activities for the rearrangement of facilities determined to be in conflict with the Santa Clara - Alum Rock Bus Rapid Transit Project improvements. The utility owners include Pacific Gas & Electric Company, San Jose Water Company, AT&T, and others. The estimated cost for such rearrangements is $4.9 million.

7.5. ACTION ITEM - Authorize the General Manager to execute the quitclaim of an existing Easement for a bus shelter and bus stop which have been relocated and now lie within public right-of-way.

7.6. ACTION ITEM - Authorize the General Manager to negotiate and execute a cooperative agreement with the County of Santa Clara (County) regarding the reimbursement of County’s staff costs to assist VTA with design coordination, construction document development, and construction coordination in support of the BART Silicon Valley Berryessa Extension (SVBX) Project in an amount up to $985,000.

7.7. INFORMATION ITEM - Review the Monthly Legislative History Matrix.

7.8. INFORMATION ITEM - Review the Fiscal Year 2014 & Fiscal Year 2015 Biennial Budget Assumptions.

7.9. INFORMATION ITEM - Review the draft of Chapters 2 and 3 of the Valley Transportation Plan (VTP) 2040.

7.11. INFORMATION ITEM - Receive an update on the Light Rail Efficiency Program.

7.12. INFORMATION ITEM - Receive an update on the Real Time Information (RTI) project.

8. REGULAR AGENDA

Transit Planning and Operations Committee

8.1. ACTION ITEM - Authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with New Flyer of America Inc. (New Flyer) in the amount of $32,987,101 for the purchase of 29 sixty foot articulated Hybrid Diesel-Electric Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) buses and related equipment, training and support, along with the option to purchase an additional 20 buses for future BRT fleet requirements in an amount up to approximately $20,658,567 plus the Producer Price Index (PPI). The execution of the contract will be subject to compliance with the FTA pre-award requirements and the satisfactory clearance of any protests.

8.2. ACTION ITEM - Authorize the General Manager to negotiate and execute a 20-year Power Purchase Agreement with Bloom Energy Corporation and project financier Alternative Energy Development Group for an electricity-generating fuel cell technology and maintenance contract to be installed at VTA’s Guadalupe Division.

Audit Committee

8.3. ACTION ITEM - Authorize the General Manager to execute a task order contract with McGladrey LLP for Auditor General services in an amount not to exceed $800,000 for the base term of twenty-seven months (through June 30, 2015). In addition, the contract also includes four optional one-year contract extensions at a maximum of $250,000 per year; execution of the one-year extensions is subject to approval by the Audit Committee.

9. OTHER ITEMS

9.1. ITEMS OF CONCERN AND REFERRAL TO ADMINISTRATION

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

9.2.A. VTA Standing Committees

9.2.B. VTA Advisory Committees

9.2.C. VTA Policy Advisory Boards (PAB)
9.2.D. Joint Powers Boards and Regional Commissions

9.3. Announcements

10. ADJOURN in memory of Sandy Eakins, former VTA Board Member, Palo Alto Mayor and Civic Activist.
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief Administrative Officer, Bill Lopez

SUBJECT: Employees of the Month for February 2013

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

Dan Pornel, Associate Transportation Engineer in the Engineering & Construction Division is VTA’s Administration Employee of the Month. Dan joined VTA in 2000 and is recognized by his fellow workers for his diligence and ability to follow through on any issue he is assigned. In his role as Associate Transportation Engineer, he supports his colleagues by moving VTA construction projects through the regulatory process and into construction. Dan has consistently demonstrated his strong organizational skills through his work with designers and field construction crews and his ability to get the job done. Congratulations to Dan Pornel, Administration Employee of the Month for February!

Dave Adamson, North Division Coach Operator, is the Operations Employee of the Month. Dave has been with VTA for over 24 years, and throughout his service has performed his duties as Coach Operator with the highest professional standards and care. Dave has an excellent attendance record, regularly receives passenger compliments and has been recognized for his kindness to the elderly. He demonstrates an exceptionally strong work ethic and is well-respected by his peers and supervisors. Dave is a tremendous asset to VTA and offers our customers the highest level of care. Congratulations to Dave Adamson, Operations Employee of the Month for February!

Duane Garza, Light Rail Maintenance Worker at Guadalupe, is our Maintenance Employee of the Month. Duane joined VTA in 1997 and performs his assignments maintaining VTA equipment with a high level of professionalism. He is very prepared and meticulous in his work and always contributes his best effort. Duane is proactive and regularly makes positive suggestions for improvement. He takes pride in his work and makes sure that his Light Rail Stations are well-maintained to provide the public with a pleasant experience. Duane is always willing to lend a hand, and his co-workers enjoy working with him. Congratulations to Duane Garza, Maintenance Employee of the Month for February!
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief SVRT Program Officer, Carolyn M. Gonot

SUBJECT: SVBX Resolution of Necessity

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

Resolution

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt Resolutions of Necessity determining that the public interest and necessity require the acquisition of properties 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 settlement. 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 Resolutions of Necessity for 4 property acquisitions to enable commencement of eminent domain proceedings.

DISCUSSION:

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

1. Property owned by R.W.L. Investment, Inc., a corporation (B3620):

This property is located at 730 E. Capitol Avenue in the City of Milpitas. The larger parcel consists of approximately 4.17 acres and is currently improved with a truck dock terminal.

A utility easement on the subject property (B3620-02 - 51,834 sq. ft.) is required in order to relocate three existing PG&E gas transmission pipelines currently located within the VTA corridor. The relocation of these pipelines is necessary to allow for the construction of the underground guideway structure and the Milpitas Station.

The property was appraised and reviewed by a review appraiser, and VTA staff set just compensation. An offer based on the recommended appraisal was made on December 12, 2012. 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.

2. Property owned by Dieter Schmidt and Simin F. Schmidt, or their successors as co-trustees of the Schmidt 1980 trust dated May 5, 1980 (B2098):

This property is located at 2301 Trade Zone Boulevard in the City of San Jose. The larger parcel consists of approximately 26,572 sq. ft. and is currently improved with an industrial building.

A partial fee interest (B2098-01 - 1,656 sq. ft) and a one month temporary construction easement (B2098-03 - 310 sq. ft.) are required on the property. The partial fee interest is required to construct a new pump station to provide drainage for the BART corridor and the temporary construction easement is required to construct a wall around the pump station.

The property was appraised and reviewed by a review appraiser, and VTA staff set just compensation. An offer based on the recommended appraisal was made on June 28, 2012, and updated on December 21, 2012. The update to the offer was made because the areas of the takes were reduced in order to accommodate the property owner’s concerns.
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.

3. Property owned by Tuan Q. Phan and Genevieve A. Nguyen, husband and wife as joint tenants (B2172):

This property is located at 1385 Prelude Drive in the City of San Jose. The larger parcel consists of approximately 19,273 sq. ft. and is currently improved with a single family residence.

A partial fee interest (B2172-01 - 1,691 sq. ft) and a thirty (30) month temporary construction easement (B2172-02 - 135 sq. ft.) are required on the subject property. The partial fee interest is required to construct a new pump station to provide drainage for the BART corridor and the temporary construction easement is required to construct the new pump station. The proposed acquisitions do not impact the residential building, the fee area is located outside the fenced backyard and the temporary construction easement is located in a small corner of the backyard.

The property was appraised and reviewed by a review appraiser, and VTA staff set just compensation. An offer based on the recommended appraisal was made on October 28, 2011. VTA and the owners reached an agreement to acquire the property on December 2, 2011, and the transaction proceeded to escrow. However, during the escrow period, it became apparent that the owners would not be able to successfully remove the necessary encumbrances on their property in order to close escrow on the transaction, which left the parties with no choice but to proceed to the Board, seeking adoption of a Resolution of Necessity.

4. Property owned by Hertz Realty Inc., a California Corporation (B2147):

This property is located at 1460 Mabury Road in the City of San Jose. The larger parcel consists of approximately 3.522 acres and is currently improved with a warehouse building.

A thirty (30) month temporary construction easement (B2147-02 - 10,672 sq. ft.) is required on the property to construct the supporting walls for the guideway structure, and will include such uses as a construction work area, construction access, and delivery and storage of materials and equipment.

The property was appraised and reviewed by a review appraiser, and VTA staff set just compensation. An offer based on the recommended appraisal was made on October 11, 2011. VTA and the owner reached an agreement to acquire the property on June 22, 2012, and the transaction proceeded to escrow. However, during the escrow period, it became apparent that the owner would not be able to successfully remove the necessary encumbrances from its property in order to close escrow on the transaction, which left the parties with no choice but to proceed to the Board, seeking adoption of a Resolution of Necessity.
VTA must take action to acquire the above-referenced properties 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 have 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.

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 properties that are subject to the Resolutions of Necessity before the Board are necessary for the Project and a condemnation action must be initiated in order to obtain possession of the parcels if the Project schedule is to be maintained. The Board may, in its discretion, decide not to adopt the Resolutions 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 these properties is included in the FY13 Adopted 2000 Measure A Transit Improvement Program Fund Capital Budget.

Prepared by: Bijal Patel
Memo No. 3883
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.

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.
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; anda 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 Draft Second Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (CEQA)
• 2011 Final Second Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (CEQA)
• 2011 Addendum to the 2011 FSEIR (CEQA)
• 2012 Addendum No. 2 to the 2011 FSEIR (CEQA)
• 2012 Addendum No. 3 to the 2011 FSEIR (CEQA)

SECTION 6

SPECIFIC PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS

Detailed property fact sheets and aerial photographsof the parcelsrequired for this Project, and subject to the Resolutions of Necessityfollow. Overall property requirements and project related costs have been minimized as much as possible. Offers were made to the owners of property as follows: (1) B3620 -- on or about December 12, 2012; (2) B2098 -- on or about June 28, 2012, (subsequently updated on December 21, 2012); (3) B2172 -- on or about October 28, 2011; and (4) B2147 -- on or about October 11, 2011, said offer packages incorporated herein by reference. Notices of Intention to Adopt Resolution of Necessity, incorporated herein by reference, were sent to each of the property owners on January 11, 2013.
The subject property is owned by R.W.L. Investment, Inc., a corporation, and is located at 730 E. Capitol Avenue in the City of Milpitas. The larger parcel consists of approximately 4.17 acres and is currently improved with a Truck Dock Terminal.

A 51,834 square foot utility easement on the subject property (B3620-02) is required in order to relocate three existing PG&E gas transmission pipelines currently located within the VTA corridor. The relocation of these pipelines is necessary to allow for the construction of the underground guideway structure and the Milpitas Station.
BART SILICON VALLEY BERRYESSA EXTENSION PROJECT

PROPERTY FACT SHEET – B2098

Owner: Dieter Schmidt and Simin F. Schmidt, or their successors as co-trustees of the Schmidt 1980 trust dated May 5, 1980

Property Address: 2301 Trade Zone Boulevard

Locale: San Jose, CA

Present Use: Industrial Building

Total Property Area: 26,572 sq. ft.

Area to be Acquired: Partial fee interest (B2098-01) – 1,656 sq. ft. Temporary construction easement (B2098-03) - 310 sq. ft. for one (1) month

Date of Offer: December 21, 2012

The subject property is owned by Dieter Schmidt and Simin F. Schmidt, or their successors as co-trustees of the Schmidt 1980 trust dated May 5, 1980, and is located at 2301 Trade Zone Boulevard in the City of San Jose. The larger parcel consists of approximately 26,572 sq. ft. and is currently improved with an industrial building.

A 1,656 square foot partial fee interest (B2098–01) is required to construct a new pump station to provide drainage for the BART corridor. A one month 310 square foot temporary construction easement (B2098–03) is required to construct a wall around the pump station.
BART SILICON VALLEY BERRYESSA EXTENSION PROJECT

PROPERTY FACT SHEET – B2172

Owner: Tuan Q. Phan and Genevieve A. Nguyen, husband and wife as joint tenants

Property Address: 1385 Prelude Drive

Locale: San Jose, CA

Present Use: Single family residence

Total Property Area: 19,273 sq. ft.

Area to be Acquired: Partial fee interest (B2172-01) – 1,691 sq. ft.
Temporary construction easement (B2172-02) - 135 sq. ft. for thirty (30) months

Date of Offer: October 28, 2011

The subject property is owned by Tuan Q. Phan and Genevieve A. Nguyen, husband and wife as joint tenants, and is located at 1385 Prelude Drive in the City of San Jose. The larger parcel consists of approximately 19,273 sq. ft. and is currently improved with a single family residence.

A 1,691 square foot partial fee interest (B2172–01) is required to construct a new pump station to provide drainage for the BART corridor. A thirty (30) month, 135 square foot, temporary construction easement (B2172–02) is required to construct the new pump station. The proposed acquisitions do not impact the residential building. The fee area is located outside the fenced backyard and the temporary construction easement is located in a small corner of the backyard.
BART SILICON VALLEY BERRYESSA EXTENSION PROJECT

PROPERTY FACT SHEET – B2147

Owner: Hertz Realty Inc., a California Corporation

Property Address: 1460 Mabury Road

Locale: San Jose, CA

Present Use: Warehouse building

Total Property Area: 3.522 acres

Area to be Acquired: Temporary Construction Easement (B2147-02) – 10,672 sq. ft. for 30 months

Date of Offer: October 11, 2011

The subject property is owned by Hertz Realty Inc., a California Corporation, and is located at 1460 Mabury Road in the City of San Jose. The larger parcel consists of approximately 3.522 acres and is currently improved with a warehouse building.

A thirty (30) month, 10,672 square foot temporary construction easement (B2147-02) is required on the property to construct the supporting walls for the guideway structure, and will include such uses as a construction work area, construction access, and delivery and storage of materials and equipment.
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 utility easement interest in certain property more particularly described in Exhibit “A” (B3620-02), attached hereto and made a part hereof by this reference, as right of way for the Project and the construction thereof; and

WHEREAS, VTA is authorized to acquire the subject 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., 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 property for the Project.

3. VTA is authorized to acquire the 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., and Sections 100130 and 100131 of the Public Utilities Code.

4. The public interest and necessity require the Project.

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

6. A utility easement interest in property described in Exhibit “A” is necessary for the Project.
7. 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.

8. 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.

9. All conditions and statutory requirements necessary to exercise the power of eminent domain (“the right to take”) to acquire the property described herein have been complied with by VTA.

10. 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.

11. The parcel described in Exhibit “A” is being acquired in whole or in part pursuant to the provisions of Code of Civil Procedure Sections 1240.320, 1240.330 and 1240.350, as the case may be, as substitute property necessary for a public use, for the relocation of public utility facilities, or to provide utility service to the remainder property. It is further found and determined that the taking of said substitute property is necessary for the purpose specified in Sections 1240.320, 1240.330 and/or 1240.350.

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 a utility easement interest in property described in Exhibit “A”, 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 January 31, 2013, by the following vote:

AYES: DIRECTORS:

NOES: DIRECTORS:

ABSENT: DIRECTORS:

__________________________________________
JOE PIRZYNSKI, 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: _____________________

SANDRA WEYMOUTH, Secretary
Board of Directors

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

__________________________________________
ROBERT FABELA
General Counsel
EXHIBIT “A”

TRANSMISSION PIPELINE EASEMENT

A nonexclusive easement, in perpetuity, over, under and through certain land, situated in the County of Santa Clara, State of California, with said easement described more particularly in EXHIBIT "1" which is attached hereto ("Easement") and as follows:

Easement Rights. Grantee shall have the right at any time and from time to time to excavate for, install, replace (of the initial or any other size), maintain and use such pipe lines as Grantee shall from time to time elect for conveying gas, with necessary and proper valves and other appliances and fittings, and devices for controlling electrolysis for use in connection with said pipe lines, and such underground wires, cables, conduits, appliances, fixtures, and appurtenances, as Grantee shall from time to time elect for communication purposes, together with adequate protection therefore, hereinafter collectively referred to as “Pipeline Facilities”, within the attached Easement area.

Said rights granted above shall not be deemed abandoned or forfeited by Grantee due to the temporary idling, nonuse, abandonment, or removal of any or all pipeline(s) or the nonuse of the rights granted herein for any period of time.

Grantee further shall have:

(a) the right of ingress to and egress from said easement areas and trees and brush requiring trimming or removal pursuant to the following paragraph, over and across said lands by means of roads and lanes thereon, if such there be, otherwise by such route or routes as shall occasion the least practicable damage and inconvenience to Grantor, provided, that such right of ingress and egress shall not extend to any portion of said lands which is isolated from said easement areas by any public road or highway, now crossing or hereafter crossing said lands;

(b) the right, from time to time, to trim or to cut down any and all trees and brush now or hereafter within said easement areas, and shall have the further right, from time to time, to trim and cut down trees and brush outside said easement areas which now or hereafter in the opinion of Grantee may interfere with or be a hazard to the Pipeline facilities installed hereunder, or as Grantee deems necessary to comply with applicable state or federal regulations, or as Grantee deems necessary for construction purposes;

(c) the right to use such portion of said lands contiguous to said easement areas as may be reasonably necessary in connection with the installation and replacement of said Pipeline facilities;

(d) the right to install, maintain and use gates in all fences which now cross or shall hereafter cross said easement areas;

5.1.c
(e) the right to mark the location of said easement areas by suitable markers set in the ground; provided that said markers shall be placed in fences or other locations which will not interfere with any reasonable use Grantor shall make of said easement areas; and

(f) the right to assign to Pacific Gas and Electric Company, a California corporation, all right, title and interest in and to the transmission pipeline easement acquired by Grantee hereunder.

Grantee shall not fence said easement areas and shall promptly backfill any excavations made by it on said easement areas and repair any damage it shall do to Grantor's private roads or lanes on said lands;

Grantee shall indemnify Grantor against any loss and damage which shall be caused by any wrongful or negligent act or omission of Grantee or of its agents or employees in the course of their employment, provided, however, that this indemnity shall not extend to that portion of such loss or damage that shall have been caused by Grantor's comparative negligence or willful misconduct.

Grantor shall continue to have the right to use said easement areas for purposes which will not interfere with Grantee's full enjoyment of the rights hereby granted; provided that Grantor shall not erect or construct any building or other structure, or drill or operate any well, or construct any reservoir or other obstruction or plant any trees or vines, or construct associated supporting structures within said easement areas, or diminish or substantially add to the ground cover over said Pipeline facilities, or construct any fences that will interfere with the maintenance and operation of said Pipeline facilities.

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"

LEGAL DESCRIPTION

APN: 086-37-015
APN: 086-37-026

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 parcel of land as described in the Deed to R.W.L. Investment, Inc., recorded April 15, 1974 in Book 0848 Page 401, Official Records of said County, being more particularly described as follows:

BEGINNING at the most westerly corner of Parcel B, as said parcel is shown that Parcel Map filed July 10, 1978 in Book 422 of Maps, Page 9, lying also on the northeasterly line of that parcel conveyed to the Santa Clara Valley Water District, as filed in Book G348, Page 358, both of Official Records of said County; thence along the southwesterly line of Parcel A of said Parcel Map

1. North 69°37'01" West, a distance of 161.27 feet; thence leaving said southwesterly line

2. North 66°45'17" East, a distance of 118.80 feet; thence

3. North 31°47'15" East, a distance of 382.12 feet to the southwesterly line of that property conveyed to the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority by Grant Deed recorded August 12, 2002 as Instrument No. 16415211, Official Records of said County; thence along said southwesterly line

4. South 58°21'47" East, a distance of 90.00 feet; thence leaving said line

5. South 31°47'15" West, a distance of 342.79 feet; thence

6. South 69°36'30" East, a distance of 76.51 feet; thence

7. South 31°47'15" West, a distance of 105.02 feet to the southwesterly line of said Parcel B; thence along said southwesterly line

8. North 69°37'01" West, a distance of 76.51 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING.

Containing 51,834 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
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 in certain property more particularly described in Exhibit “A” (B2098-01) and a temporary construction easement interest in certain property more particularly described in Exhibit “B” (B2098-03), attached hereto and made a part hereof by this reference, as right of way for the Project and the construction thereof; and

WHEREAS, VTA is authorized to acquire the subject 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., 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 property for the Project.

3. VTA is authorized to acquire the 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., and Sections 100130 and 100131 of the Public Utilities Code.

4. The public interest and necessity require the Project.

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

6. A partial fee interest in property described in Exhibit “A” and a temporary construction easement interest in property described in Exhibit “B” are necessary for the Project.

7. 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.

8. 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.

9. All conditions and statutory requirements necessary to exercise the power of eminent domain ("the right to take") to acquire the property described herein have been complied with by VTA.

10. 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.

11. 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 a partial fee interest in property described in Exhibit “A” and a temporary construction easement interest in property described in Exhibit “B”, 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 January 31, 2013, by the following vote:

AYES: DIRECTORS:

NOES: DIRECTORS:

ABSENT: DIRECTORS:

____________________________
J O E  P I R Z Y N S K I ,  C h a i r p e r s o n
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: ______________________   ______________________________________
SANDRA WEYMOUTH, Secretary
Board of Directors

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

____________________________
ROBERT FABELA
General Counsel
EXHIBIT “A”
Property Description

LEGAL DESCRIPTION
APN 244-01-003

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

Being a portion of that certain parcel of land designated as Parcel 55, as said parcel is shown upon that certain Map entitled, "Parcel Map International Business Park being a part of Tract No. 1 of Pueblo Lands of San Jose and a portion of the Milpitas Rancho", recorded January 28, 1977 in Book 388 of Maps, pages 16 to 27, Official Records of said County, being more particularly described as follows:

BEGINNING at the southeast corner of said Parcel 55; thence along the southerly line of said parcel

1. North 83°20'46" West 44.73 feet; thence leaving said southerly line

2. North 35°43'41" East 12.35 feet; thence

3. North 23°01'33" West 21.29 feet; thence

4. North 65°28'49" East 18.13 feet; thence

5. North 23°02'05" West 39.11 feet; thence

6. North 66°57'55" East 10.19 feet to the westerly line of that certain parcel of land designated as Parcel 18, as said parcel is shown on that certain map entitled “RECORD OF SURVEY VTA-BART EXTENSION” filed December 7, 2007 in Book 821 of Maps, at Page 1 through 51 inclusive, Official Records of said County; thence

7. South 23°01'35" East 89.43 feet along said westerly line to the POINT OF BEGINNING.

Containing 1,556 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 1.00000333.

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

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 that certain real property, situated in the City of San Jose, County of Santa Clara, State of California, and more particularly described in Exhibit “1” attached hereto and made a part hereof.

This Temporary Construction Easement will begin on or after September 30, 2012, when the property is first occupied for use for SVBX civil construction, and will continue for a duration of one (1) month, ending no later than June 30, 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
APN 244-01-003

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

Being a portion of that certain parcel of land designated as Parcel 55, as said parcel is shown upon that certain Map entitled, "Parcel Map International Business Park being a part of Tract No. 1 of Pueblo Lands of San Jose and a portion of the Milpitas Rancho", recorded January 28, 1977 in Book 388 of Maps, pages 16 to 27, Official Records of said County, being more particularly described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the southerly line of said Parcel 55, distant North 83°20'46" West 44.73 feet from the southeast corner thereof, thence along the southerly line of said parcel

1. North 83°20'46" West 3.43 feet; thence leaving said southerly line
2. North 35°43'41" East 12.33 feet; thence
3. North 23°01'33" West 22.52 feet; thence
4. North 65°28'49" East 18.13 feet; thence
5. North 23°02'05" West 39.19 feet; thence
6. North 66°57'55" East 13.19 feet to the westerly line of that certain parcel of land designated as Parcel 18, as said parcel is shown on that certain map entitled "RECORD OF SURVEY VTA-BART EXTENSION" filed December 7, 2007 in Book 621 of Maps, at Page 1 through 51 inclusive, Official Records of said County; thence
7. South 23°01'35" East 3.00 feet along said westerly line; thence leaving said line
8. South 66°57'55" West 10.19 feet; thence
9. South 23°02'05" East 39.11 feet; thence
10. South 65°28'49" West 18.13 feet; thence
11. South 23°01'33" East 21.29 feet; thence
12. South 35°43'41" West 12.35 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING.

Containing 310 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. Pettrey, PLS 6202
My License Expires on 03/31/2014
**LINE TABLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINE</th>
<th>LENGTH</th>
<th>BEARING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>21.29</td>
<td>S23°01'33&quot;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>12.35</td>
<td>S35°43'41&quot;W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**244-01-003**

DIETER & SIMIN F. SCHMIDT
DOC No. 8497582

PARCEL 55
388 MAPS 16-27

**244-01-023**

2334 LUNDY LLC

PARCEL ONE
535 M 22

**LEGEND**

POB = POINT OF BEGINNING
SCVTA = SANTA CLARA VALLEY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

ALL BEARINGS AND DISTANCES SHOWN ON THIS EXHIBIT ARE BASED UPON THE NORTH AMERICAN DATUM OF 1983 (NAD83).

ZONE III, EPOCH 1998.5. ALL DISTANCES SHOWN ON THIS EXHIBIT ARE GRID DISTANCES. TO CONVERT GRID DISTANCES TO GROUND DISTANCES, MULTIPLY EXPRESSED DISTANCES BY 1.00000533.

**Scale:** 1" = 30'

**Plat to Accompany Legal Description**

CITY OF SAN JOSE, COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

**APN:** 244-01-003

**Date:** DEC. 14, 2012

**B2098-03 TCE**
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 in certain property more particularly described in Exhibit “A” (B2172-01) and a temporary construction easement interest in certain property more particularly described in Exhibit “B” (B2172-02), attached hereto and made a part hereof by this reference, as right of way for the Project and the construction thereof; and

WHEREAS, VTA is authorized to acquire the subject 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., 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 property for the Project.

3. VTA is authorized to acquire the 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., and Sections 100130 and 100131 of the Public Utilities Code.

4. The public interest and necessity require the Project.

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

6. A partial fee interest in property described in Exhibit “A” and a temporary construction easement interest in property described in Exhibit “B” are necessary for the Project.

7. 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

1
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.

8. 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.

9. All conditions and statutory requirements necessary to exercise the power of eminent domain ("the right to take") to acquire the property described herein have been complied with by VTA.

10. 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.

11. 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 a partial fee interest in property described in Exhibit “A” and a temporary construction easement interest in property described in Exhibit “B”, 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 January 31, 2013, by the following vote:

AYES: DIRECTORS:

NOES: DIRECTORS:

ABSENT: DIRECTORS:

JOE PIRZYNSKI, 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: ______________________

SANDRA WEYMOUTH, Secretary
Board of Directors

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

ROBERT FABELA
General Counsel
EXHIBIT “A”
Property Description

LEGAL DESCRIPTION
APN 245-27-075

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

Being a portion of that certain parcel of land described in the Grant Deed to Tuan Q. Phan and Genevieve A. Nguyen recorded December 27, 2007 under Recorder’s Series Number 19695503, Official Records of said County, being more particularly described as follows:

BEGINNING at the most southerly corner of that certain parcel of land designated as Lot 13, as said lot is shown on that certain map entitled “Tract No. 8235” filed August 4, 1989 in Book 604 of Maps, at Page 3, Official Records of said County; thence

1. North 39°52’15” West 92.67 feet along the westerly line of said Lot 13; thence leaving last said line

2. North 75°30’48” East 40.38 feet to the easterly line of said Lot 13, said point also being coincident with the westerly line of that certain parcel of land designated as Parcel 35, as said parcel is shown on that certain map entitled “RECORD OF SURVEY VTA-BART EXTENSION” filed December 7, 2007 in Book 821 of Maps at Pages 1 through 51 inclusive, Official Records of said County; thence

3. South 14°02’15” East 83.73 feet along said common boundary line to the POINT OF BEGINNING;

Containing 1,691 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 1.00000333.

JOHN W. PETTLE, PLS #6202
My License Expires on 03/31/2012

LICENSED LAND SURVEYOR
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
EXHIBIT “B”

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 that certain real property, situated in the City of San Jose, County of Santa Clara, State of California, and more particularly described in Exhibit “1” attached hereto and made a part hereof.

This Temporary Construction Easement will begin on or after September 30, 2012, when the property is first occupied for use for SVBX civil construction, and will continue for a duration of thirty continuous months, ending no later than June 30, 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.
EXHIBIT “1”

LEGAL DESCRIPTION
APN 245-27-075

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

Being a portion of that certain parcel of land described in the Grant Deed to Tuan Q. Phan and Genevieve A. Nguyen recorded December 27, 2007 under Recorder’s Series Number 19695503, Official Records of said County, being more particularly described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the easterly line of that certain parcel of land designated as Lot 13, as said lot is shown on that certain map entitled “Tract No. 8235” filed August 4, 1989 in Book 604 of Maps, at Page 3, Official Records of said County from which the most southerly corner thereof bears South 14°02'15” East 63.73 feet; thence leaving last said line

1. South 75°30'48” West 14.85 feet; thence
2. North 14°08'24 West 9.15 feet; thence
3. North 75°57'57” East 14.87 feet to said easterly line of Lot 13, said point also being coincident with the westerly line of that certain parcel of land designated as Parcel 35, as said parcel is shown on that certain map entitled “RECORD OF SURVEY VTA-BART EXTENSION” filed December 7, 2007 in Book 821 of Maps at Pages 1 through 51 inclusive, Official Records of said County; thence
4. South 14°02'15” East 9.03 feet along said common boundary line to the POINT OF BEGINNING;

Containing 135 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 1999.5. All distances are grid distances. To convert grid distances to ground distances, multiply expressed distances by 1.00005333.
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 temporary construction easement interest in certain property more particularly described in Exhibit “A” (B2147-02), attached hereto and made a part hereof by this reference, as right of way for the Project and the construction thereof; and

WHEREAS, VTA is authorized to acquire the subject 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., 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 public interest and necessity require the Project.

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

3. A temporary construction easement interest in property described in Exhibit “A” is necessary for the Project.

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.

5. All conditions and statutory requirements necessary to exercise the power of eminent domain (“the right to take”) to acquire the property described herein have been complied with by VTA.
6. 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.

7. 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 a temporary construction easement interest in property described in Exhibit “A”, 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 January 31, 2013, by the following vote:

AYES: DIRECTORS:

NOES: DIRECTORS:

ABSENT: DIRECTORS:

________________________________________
JOE PIRZYNSKI, 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: ______________________   ______________________________________
SANDRA WEYMOUTH, Secretary
Board of Directors

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

________________________________________
ROBERT FABELA
General Counsel
EXHIBIT “A”

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 that certain real property, situated in the City of San Jose, County of Santa Clara, State of California, and more particularly described in Exhibit “1” attached hereto and made a part hereof.

This Temporary Construction Easement will begin on or after June 30, 2012, when the property is first occupied for use for SVBX civil construction, and will continue for a duration of thirty (30) continuous months. Grantee shall notify Grantor in writing no fewer than fifteen (15) calendar days prior to commencement of its occupation of this Temporary Construction Easement for the purposes set forth herein and the term of the Temporary Construction Easement shall be deemed to commence on the date set forth in that written notice. Notwithstanding the foregoing, in no event shall this Temporary Construction Easement be deemed to encumber the underlying real property after June 30, 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
APN 254-02-044

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

Being a portion of that certain parcel of land designated as Parcel A, as said Parcel is shown on that certain map entitled "PARCEL MAP FOR WESTERN PACIFIC RAILROAD ON MABURY ROAD" filed September 16, 1970 in Book 273 of Maps at Page 16, Official Records of said County, being more particularly described as follows:

BEGINNING at the northwesterly corner of said Parcel A;

1. Thence North 51°41'00" East 18.38 feet along the northerly line thereof;
2. Thence leaving last said line, South 14°02'51" East 625.74 feet to the southerly line thereof and the beginning of a non-tangent curve concave easterly and having a radius of 483.59 feet (a radial line of said curve through said point bearing North 79°23'28" West);
3. Thence southerly 35.03 feet along said curve and said southerly line through a central angle of 04°09'01" to the westerly line thereof;
4. Thence North 14°02'51" West 648.94 feet along last said line to the POINT OF BEGINNING.

Containing 10,672 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.

Stan Heffner, PLS 5991
My License Expires on 09/30/2012
FOR INFORMATION ONLY

Significant BART Silicon Valley activities and progress during January 2012 include:

**Berryessa Extension Project Construction Activities**

Skanska, Shimmick & Herzog (SSH), VTA’s Design-Build contractor, continued to work in the future Berryessa Station area on the roadway bridge. In February, installation of bridge beams is anticipated to occur at the location where the roadway will intersect with Berryessa Road. Installation activities will occur for approximately one week, and include nighttime full closures of Berryessa Road, with some daytime lane closures or lane reconfigurations. Additionally, demolition activities of the US Reif business park are anticipated to begin in late January or early February.

In the Milpitas Station area, utility relocation activities continued in the Piper Dr. area. SSH is relocating sewer, storm and water lines. PG&E is also relocating overhead electric lines in the Piper Dr. area. As with the Berryessa Station area, demolition activities for the remaining buildings within the future Milpitas Station area are scheduled to begin in February with installation of a sound barrier being a first order of work.

**Corridor Preparation Activities**

Kato Road Grade Separation work is progressing. Sidewalks on both north and south side are almost complete, completion of the new BART bridge is expected at the end of January, and private driveways are expected to be completed in early February. With the roadbed being prepared for paving, it is still anticipated that the roadway will reopen in March.

Recent work in the Mission/Warren area included the installation of piles at Warren Ave., which will support future rail bridge structures. Four weekend roadway closures were scheduled during the month of January to complete these activities. A UPRR shoofly at Warren Ave. will be in place by the end of January to allow for construction of the new UPRR bridge over the roadway. Deep Soil Mix (DSM) wall activities are now in full production. The contractor has started at the...
northeast quadrant of the area and will work clockwise.

The contractor has begun constructing embankment walls along Mission Blvd as part of the roadway widening. In early February, night work will occur for lane reconfigurations.

**Residential Noise Insulation Program (RNIP)**

The RNIP Program continues to move toward completion of architectural design packages for eligible residences. VTA is preparing to advertise the construction bid package for installation of noise mitigation materials for residences included in the initial group. The initial group includes homes located closest to the first major construction activities that will take place near the future Berryessa Station. This first bid package is anticipated to be advertised in early February, with a staff recommendation for award of contract in April. Based on this schedule, the initial installation is anticipated to begin in early summer 2013.

In April, staff also anticipates bringing to the Board a contract amendment for CSDA, the RNIP architectural design firm, which will provide construction administration services during the installation of materials for all eligible residences. Services included in the amendment scope of work include tasks to ensure construction is completed per design plans and specifications, maintain homeowner satisfaction, minimize contractor and homeowner claims, and expedite resolution of unforeseen field conditions that could cause project delays.

**BART Silicon Valley Phase 2 - Environmental Services Request for Proposal (RFP)**

With construction activities underway on Phase 1 of BART Silicon Valley, preliminary project development activities are beginning for Phase 2 of the extension. An Environmental Services RFP was advertised on October 31, 2012. Proposals were submitted on January 7, 2013 and the evaluation process is underway, with interviews to be held on January 23, 2013. The selected team will provide services to produce a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report for the full BART extension into Santa Clara County. A staff recommendation for award of contract is anticipated in April 2013.

**One Bay Area Grant**

Through the One Bay Area Grant Program, BART Silicon Valley staff is working with staffs from the cities of Milpitas and San Jose to submit applications for projects that would provide additional bicycle and pedestrian access to the future Milpitas and Berryessa BART stations.

In coordination with the City of Milpitas, staff is preparing an application for Final Engineering and environmental clearance activities of a pedestrian overcrossing that would provide improved access between the BART Station, Great Mall, and future residential development north of Montague Expressway. The City of Milpitas will be the project sponsor and provide the minimum local match.

Staffs from VTA and the City of San Jose are preparing an application to complete the design of an Upper Penitencia Creek trail connection through the future Berryessa Station campus. Project elements include design of a shared-use trail through the campus on VTA and City of San Jose property, a full traffic signal on King Road, trailhead gateways, and interpretive signs for the Upper Penitencia Creek mitigation site. The City of San Jose and VTA will be co-project...
sponsors.

Parking Revenue and Technology Study
Staff has initiated this study to develop a parking technology and revenue collection plan for the Berryessa Extension Project to ensure that campus and garage designs and procurement documents support the identified technologies and strategies that best support the extension from an operational, financial, and passenger experience perspective.

An internal Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) has been formed to develop and review the study’s goals and guiding principles. The TAC is made up of staff from VTA’s Fiscal Resources, Information Technology, Operations, CMA, Construction & Engineering and BART Silicon Valley Program Office divisions. A Board workshop has been scheduled for April 19, 2013 to discuss the study’s findings and recommendations of the TAC and project team.

Communications and Outreach
Media distribution of traffic advisories related to the BART Silicon Valley Project garnered nearly a dozen print articles in publications including the San Jose Mercury News, the Fremont Patch, the Tri-City Voice, Contra Costa Times and Fremont Argus, and 14 radio broadcast mentions. BART Silicon Valley made significant updates to collateral and the website including improvements to the Project Activities Map, the Berryessa Station Frequently Asked Questions document and the BART Silicon Valley Program Progress Report. Additional website enhancements included a BART Silicon Valley mobile friendly site for those accessing from smart phone devices and a customized QR Code to easily visit the project website. Recent or near-term presentations and events include the following:

- Citizen Advisory Committee/Committee for Transit Accessibility Project Update (January 16, 2013)
- Milpitas Senior Center Meet and Greet (January 16, 2013)
- Policy Advisory Committee Project Update (January 17, 2013)
- Berryessa Business Association Meeting (January 17, 2013)
- BART Silicon Valley Phase 2 Update to City of Santa Clara staff (January 23, 2013)
- Fremont Chamber of Commerce Career and Community Resource Fair (scheduled for February 1, 2013)
- TET Festival (scheduled for February 2, 2013)
- VTA/BART Silicon Valley Business to Business, Skanska, Shimmick & Herzog Joint Venture (scheduled for February 7, 2013)
- Berryessa Citizens Advisory Council Presentation (scheduled for February 11, 2013)

Prepared By: Kevin Kurimoto
Memo No. 3959
The Regular Meeting of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority’s (VTA) Board of Directors was called to order by Chairperson Pirzynski at 4:02 p.m. in the Board of Supervisors’ Chambers, County Government Center, 70 West Hedding Street, San José, California.

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

1.1. ADMINISTER OATHS OF OFFIC

Sandra A. Weymouth, VTA Board Secretary, administered the Oath of Office to newly appointed Board Member Jose Esteves, representing the City of Milpitas; Board Member Donald Rocha, representing the City of San Jose; and Alternate Board Member Johnny Khamis, representing the City of San Jose.

1.2. ROLL CALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Abe-Koga</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xavier Campos</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Carr</td>
<td>Alternate Board Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Cortese</td>
<td>Ex-Officio Board Member</td>
<td>Present</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>Alternate Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Liccardo</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evan Low</td>
<td>Alternate Board Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie Matthews</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Pirzynski</td>
<td>Vice Chairperson</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail A. Price</td>
<td>Alternate Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Rocha</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Shirakawa</td>
<td>Alternate Board Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Whittum</td>
<td>Alternate Board Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry Woodward</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Yeager</td>
<td>Chairperson</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**

Chairperson Pirzynski noted there was an addendum to the Agenda: **Item #3.1.X.** Existing Litigation - Conference with Legal Counsel [Government Code Section 54956.9(a)], Name of Case: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority v. MVFT, LLC, et al. [Santa Clara Superior Court Case No. 1-10-CV-182138].

Chairperson Pirzynski indicated staff requested **Agenda Item # 3.1** Conference with Labor Negotiators [Government Code Section 54957.6], be removed from the Agenda. He noted **Agenda Item #7.1**, Minutes from the December 2012 Board meeting, were placed in the Board Members’ reading folders and on the public table.

M/S/C (Herrera/Matthews) to accept the Orders of the Day and approve the Consent Agenda.

2. **AWARDS AND COMMENDATION**

2.1. **Employees of the Month for December 2012**

Chairperson Pirzynski recognized Michelle Garza, Board Assistant, River Oaks Administration; and James Azucena, Service Worker, Cerone Division (Maintenance) as Employees of the Month for December 2012; and, Steve Johnstone, Policy and Administrative Manager, Operations as Supervisor of the Quarter for the fourth quarter 2012. Sing Vong, Coach Operator, Chaboya Division was unable to attend.

Member Abe-Koga took her seat at 4:12 p.m.

**Employees of the Month for January 2013**

Chairperson Pirzynski recognized Linda Wilson, Human Resources Analyst, River Oaks Administration; Robert “Bob” Mizerak, Coach Operator, North Division; and Rely Villanueva, Transit Foreperson at Cerone (Maintenance) Division, as Employees of the Month for January 2013; and, Cecilia Moreno, Transit Division Supervisor, Chaboya Division as Supervisor of the Quarter for the first quarter 2013.

2.2 **Resolution of appreciation for 2012 VTA Board Chairperson Ken Yeager**

M/S/C (Kalra/Herrera) to adopt **Resolution of Appreciation # 2013.01.68** for 2012 VTA Board Chairperson Ken Yeager.

**NOTE:** M/S/C MEANS MOTION SECONDED AND CARRIED AND, UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED, THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.
2.3 Remarks from outgoing 2012 Chairperson Ken Yeager

Board Member Yeager provided highlighted the many accomplishments of VTA during 2012, including: 1) Groundbreaking on BART project; 2) 101/Yerba Buena improvements; 3) One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) funding; and 4) 280/880 project groundbreaking. He thanked VTA staff for their work and for providing the best service possible.

3. CLOSED SESSION

3.1. Recessed to Closed Session at: 4:23 p.m.

Conference with Labor Negotiators
[Government Code Section 54957.6]

(Item Removed from Closed Session)

VTA Designated Representatives
Bill Lopez, Chief Administrative Officer
Robert L. Escobar, Manager, Employee Relations

Employee Organization
Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 265

3.1.X. Existing Litigation - Conference with Legal Counsel
[Government Code Section 54956.9(a)]

Name of Case: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority v. MVFT, LLC, et al.
[Santa Clara Superior Court Case No. 1-10-CV-182138]

3.2. Reconvened to Open Session at: 4:35 p.m.

3.3. Closed Session Report

Conference with Labor Negotiators
[Government Code Section 54957.6]

VTA Designated Representatives
Bill Lopez, Chief Administrative Officer
Robert L. Escobar, Manager, Employee Relations

Employee Organization
Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 265

This item was removed from Closed Session.

Existing Litigation - Conference with Legal Counsel
[Government Code Section 54956.9(a)]

Name of Case: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority v. MVFT, LLC, et al.
[Santa Clara Superior Court Case No. 1-10-CV-182138]

Rob Fabela, General Counsel, reported there was no reportable action taken in Closed Session.
4. PUBLIC COMMENT

Pat Plant, People Acting in Community Together (PACT), thanked the Board and VTA Staff for committing to low-income pass pilot program.

Sandy Hietala, PACT Member, expressed appreciation to VTA staff for the low-income pass program noting she is hopeful that it will grow and expand beyond a pilot project.

James Wightman, Interested Citizen, questioned if the Downtown Customer Service center is moving and, provided suggested routes for light rail shuttle to 49ers stadium.

Michael Ludwig, Interested Citizen, submitted suggestions for bus bridges when light rail system is down and expressed concern with the announcement system on bus line 323.

Edward Mason, Interested Citizen, expressed concern with the OBAG program, and suggested sponsors should have the financial responsibility for maintaining street trees and not property owners.

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS

HEARING - NOTICE OF INTENTION TO ADOPT RESOLUTIONS OF NECESSITY

Bijal Patel, Deputy Director Property Development and Management, provided a presentation, highlighting: 1) Status of acquisition activities; 2) Key board findings; and, 3) RON hearing property.

M/S/C (Abe-Koga/Matthews) to Close Hearing.

M/S/C (Matthews/Abe-Koga) to adopt Resolutions of Necessity No. 2013.01.69 determining that the public interest and necessity requires the acquisition of property interest from one property owned by: (1) YRC, Inc., a Delaware Corporation, f/k/a Yellow Roadway Corp., a Delaware Corporation, f/k/a Roadway Express, Inc., a Delaware Corporation, located in Milpitas, California, for the BART Silicon Valley Berryessa Extension (SVBX) Project. Motion approved by 11 members.

Property ID/Assessor’s Parcel Number/Owner


6. REPORTS

6.1. Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) Chairperson's Report

There was no report

6.2. Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) Chairperson's Report

There was no PAC Chairperson’s report.
6.3. **General Manager’s Report**

Michael T. Burns, General Manager, provided a report, highlighting:

- 2012 Ridership numbers for bus, light rail, express service, Clipper, Holiday Trolley service, and Global Winter Wonderland service.

- Downtown Customer Service center moving to 55-A W Santa Clara Street.

- Status of Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU)/VTA negotiations.

- Governor’s FY 2014 budget announced with positive news for transportation.

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

Dennis Radcliffe, Deputy Director, SVRT, provided a PowerPoint presentation, highlighting: 1) Milpitas area activities; 2) Upper Penitencia Creek mitigation; 3) Montague Expressway Reconstruction Project; 4) Kato Road grade separation; and 5) Mission Warren area activities.

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

Scott Haywood, Policy and Community Relations Manager, provided an MTC report highlighting; 1) approval of 1.3 million to help VTA develop a low-income ridership program. 2) Caltrain electrification project solution for funding; 3) two new members on the Caltrain Board.

Mr. Burns indicated San Francisco has come forward pressing for changes in the electrification project that could impact the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and will result in significant project delay.

John Ristow, Chief CMA Officer, provided a presentation on the Innovative Team District (iTEAM) highlighting: 1) Caltrans District 4; 2) iTEAM update; 3) next steps for iTEAM implementation.

Public Comments

Roland Lebrun, Interested Citizen, provided comment on a new funding method he shared with San Francisco.

6.4. **Chairperson's Report**

Chairperson Pirzynski announced the February Board meeting will be held on January 31, 2013, and the April workshop has been rescheduled to April 19, 2013 at 9:00 a.m.
6.4. A. **Board Committee Appointments**

M/S/C (Yeager/Matthews) to approve appointments to Board Standing Committees, Joint Powers Boards, Policy Advisory Boards, and Ad Hoc Committees for 2013.

6.4.B. **Incoming Remarks from Chairperson Joe Pyrzinski**

Chairperson Pyrzinski thanked former Board Chairperson Yeager for his leadership in 2012. He commented on the year ahead for VTA noting a number of projects and opportunities being taken on to help streamline transportation and provide economic and environmental benefits in Santa Clara County.

Chairperson Pirzynski commented specifically on the following 2013 initiatives/projects: 1) FY 2014 and FY 2015 budget; 2) Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) projects; 3) BART project; 5) Successful Collective Bargaining; 6) iTEAM; and, 7) Webcasting.

Chairperson Pirzynski noted he is looking forward to working with the Board and VTA staff to provide the best service to those traveling into and throughout the County.

7. **CONSENT AGENDA**

7.1. **Board of Directors Regular Meeting Minutes of December 13, 2012**

M/S/C (Herrera/Matthews) to approve the Minutes of December 13, 2012.

7.2. **Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee Reappointment – Mountain View**

M/S/C (Herrera/Matthews) to ratify the re-appointment of Marc Roddin to the Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee representing the City of Mountain View for the remainder of the two-year term ending June 30, 2014.

7.3 **Citizens Advisory Committee bylaws - Council on Aging Silicon Valley**

M/S/C (Herrera/Matthews) to adopt Resolution No. 2013.01.70 amending the Citizens Advisory Committee bylaws to establish the Council on Aging Silicon Valley as the defined appointing authority for the existing position representing Seniors, and also amending the VTA Administrative Code to be consistent therewith.

7.4. **Citizens Advisory Committee Appointment - Council on Aging Silicon Valley**

M/S/C (Herrera/Matthews) to ratify the appointment by the Council on Aging Silicon Valley (COASV) of Mike Torres to the Citizens Advisory Committee representing senior citizens. This appointment is conditional on Board of Directors prior approval of establishment of the COASV as the defined appointing authority for the existing CAC membership position representing seniors.
7.5. **CAC Appointment - Building Owners and Managers Association**

M/S/C (Herrera/Matthews) to ratify the appointment by the Building Owners & Managers Association Silicon Valley (BOMA SV) of Sharon Fredlund to the Citizens Advisory Committee.

7.6. **Committee for Transit Accessibility Appointments**

M/S/C (Herrera/Matthews) for the Committee for Transit Accessibility, to approve the following for the two-year term ending December 31, 2014:

- Reapppointment of current members Aaron Morrow, Troy Hernandez, and Jeffrey Jokinen to represent persons with disabilities.
- Reapppointment of the Silicon Valley Independent Living Center as a human services agencies/business representative.
- Appointment of Chaitanya Vaidya to represent persons with disabilities.

7.7. **Measure B Vehicle Registration Fee**

M/S/C (Herrera/Matthews) to approve the programming of 2010 Measure B Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) funds to Intelligent Transportation System projects.

7.8. **Moffett Park Station Easements**

M/S/C (Herrera/Matthews) to authorize the General Manager to execute the Grant of Easement and the Quitclaim of Easement for Ingress and Egress rights at Moffett Park Station.

7.9. **Transit Performance Initiative (TPI) Incentive Grant**

M/S/C (Herrera/Matthews) to adopt Resolution No. 2013.01.71 a project sponsor resolution of support for a Transit Performance Initiative (TPI) Incentive grant

7.10. **Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report**

M/S/C (Herrera/Matthews) to receive the Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report for July-September 2012.

7.11. **Service Changes for January 2013**

M/S/C (Herrera/Matthews) to receive information on Service Changes for January 2013.
8. REGULAR AGENDA

8.1. Community Bus and Express Bus Procurements

Michael Hursh, Chief Operations Officer, provided an overview of the VTA bus fleet and a presentation entitled, "New Bus Procurements" highlighting: 1) current revenue bus fleet; 2) new bus procurement plan for the different bus types; 3) purchase status; 4) comparison between the existing bus fleet and the new buses that will be purchased; and 5) procurement schedule and budget.

Public Comments

Michael Ludwig, Interested Citizen, expressed concern with the number of new buses being able to fulfill future needs for Express Bus service ridership.

Board Members discussed negotiation techniques and factors included in cost of buses.

M/S/C (Campos/Herrera) to amend the FY 2013 VTA Transit Fund Capital Budget to add $17,609,759 to facilitate Community Bus and Express Bus procurements.

Board Member Campos left his seat at 5:47 p.m.

8.2. Pre-Screening OBAG Requirements: Member Agency Status

John Ristow, Chief CMA Officer provided a brief overview of the staff report

On order of Chairperson Pirzynski and there being no objections, the Committee received the Pre-Screening OBAG Requirements: Member Agency Status report.

9. OTHER ITEMS

9.1. ITEMS OF CONCERN AND REFERRAL TO ADMINISTRATION

There were no items of Concern and Referral to Administration.

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

9.2.A. VTA Standing Committees

- Administration & Finance Committee (A&F) – The December 20, 2012 Cancellation notice was accepted as contained in the packet.

- Congestion Management Program & Planning (CMPP) The December 20, 2012 Cancellation notice was accepted as contained in the packet.
• Transit Planning & Operations Committee (TP&O) - The December 20, 2012 Cancellation notice was accepted as contained in the packet.

9.2.B. VTA Advisory Committees

• Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) and 2000 Measure A Citizens Watchdog Committee (CWC) – The December 12, 2012 Meeting Minutes were accepted as contained on the dais.
• Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) – The December 13, 2012 Cancellation notice was accepted as contained in the packet.
• Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) – The December 13, 2012, Minutes were accepted as contained on the dais.

9.2.C. VTA Policy Advisory Boards (PAB)

• Downtown East Valley PAB (DTEV) – December 6, 2012 Minutes were accepted as contained in the packet.
• El Camino Real Rapid Transit – December 14, 2012 minutes were accepted as contained on the dais.

9.2.D. Joint Powers Boards and Regional Commissions

• Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board Caltrain – January 3, 2013 Summary Notes were accepted as contained on the dais.
• Metropolitan Transportation Commission Meeting – December 19, 2012 Summary Notes were accepted as contained on the dais.

9.3. Announcements

There were no announcements.

10. ADJOURN

On order of Chairperson Pirzynski and there being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 5:49 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Menominee L. McCarter, Board Assistant
VTA Office of the Board Secretary
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief CMA Officer, John Ristow

SUBJECT: Fund Agreements with MTC for CMA Planning & Programming Funds

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the General Manager to execute interagency fund agreements with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for federal funds which support VTA Congestion Management Agency (CMA) planning and programming activities.

BACKGROUND:

MTC is the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the San Francisco Bay Area and the recipient of federal funding administered by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). Federal funding is made available for capital projects through a number of federal programs including the Surface Transportation Program (STP). STP funds can also be used to support transportation planning and fund programming activities. As the eligible recipient of federal planning funds, MTC allocates these federal planning funds to county Congestion Management Agencies (CMA) to assist local transportation planning projects as the necessary components of the urban transportation planning process required under 23 CFR 450.100 et seq. As the Santa Clara County CMA, VTA’s federally funded planning efforts include county-wide planning, programming and outreach activities such as solicitation of projects.

DISCUSSION:

The intent of this board action is to authorize the General Manager to enter into fund agreements with MTC to access all federal CMA planning and programming funds allocated to VTA by MTC. VTA is required to execute interagency fund agreements with MTC in order to receive these funds. These funds will be included in the VTA CMA Budget.
**ALTERNATIVES:**

There are no practical alternatives if VTA is to receive these funds.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

If approved, federal STP Planning funds will be available to fund VTA CMA planning and programming activities.

Prepared by: Celeste Fiore  
Memo No. 3906
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief CMA Officer, John Ristow

SUBJECT: Reprogram $326,700 in CMAQ Funds from Jackson St. Pedestrian Improvements to the West San Carlos St. Phase II Sidewalk Project

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Reprogram $326,700 in CMAQ funds from the City of San Jose's completed Jackson St. Pedestrian Improvements project to the City of San Jose's West San Carlos St. Phase II Sidewalk project.

BACKGROUND:

The VTA Board of Directors programmed $865,500 in Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) funds to the City of San Jose for the City's Jackson Street Pedestrian Improvements (1st - 4th Streets) at its' August 30, 2007 meeting. The City has completed the project under budget, with grant savings of $326,700.

The City of San Jose received $2,024,000 in Federal grant funding for the West San Carlos St. Phase II Sidewalk (2nd - Market St.) project from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) in 2010. The project is currently in design, and will proceed to construction in the summer of 2013. The project has encountered unanticipated delivery challenges which have increased the cost. These challenges include the relocation of critical VTA light rail system infrastructure. The City is petitioning to reprogram the grant savings and associated local match from the Jackson Street project to West San Carlos Phase II to cover a portion of these increased costs.
**DISCUSSION:**

MTC's programming and project delivery policy directs grant savings from the Jackson Street Pedestrian Improvement project back to MTC. However, since these funds were programmed to the project by VTA, MTC is willing to consider reprogramming them to another San Jose project at its' February 2013 meeting. To consider this, MTC requires that (1) The VTA Board of Directors takes formal action to approve the reprogramming prior to the MTC Commission action, and (2) the City of San Jose obligates the funds within federal fiscal year 2013.

VTA staff is working closely with City staff to ensure that the project proceeds into construction in Fiscal 2013, and recommends that the VTA Board of Directors approve the reprogramming of funds as requested at its January 31, 2013 meeting. VTA staff would note that the timing of the VTA Board's approval is critical. If the funds are not reprogrammed by MTC in February 2013, they will not be available to San Jose in time to fulfill the fiscal 2013 delivery requirement.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The VTA Board may consider rejecting the request. The VTA Board may consider alternative projects.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

There is no Fiscal Impact to VTA as a result of this action.

Prepared by: Marcella Rensi
Memo No. 3963
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

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


Policy-Related Action: No

Government Code Section 84308 Applies: No

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the General Manager to commence utility relocation construction activities for the rearrangement of facilities determined to be in conflict with the Santa Clara - Alum Rock Bus Rapid Transit Project improvements. The utility owners include Pacific Gas & Electric Company, San Jose Water Company, AT&T, and others. The estimated cost for such rearrangements is $4.9 million.

BACKGROUND:

In order to advance preliminary utility relocation design, and ultimately relocate existing utility facilities to clear planned Santa Clara - Alum Rock Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Project improvements in a timely manner, VTA executed utility relocation agreements with Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E), San Jose Water Company (SJWC), and AT&T (see Attachment A). Since working with these utility owners and developing preliminary utility relocation plans, VTA and the utility owners have determined that the cost to VTA to relocate facilities of the three utility relocation companies will be in excess of $1 million each. The total cost to VTA for relocation of all utility facilities is estimated to be $4.9 million.

DISCUSSION:

Before the BRT Project can be constructed, VTA must request utility owners to complete their final designs and rearrange communication facilities, waterlines, electric facilities, gas facilities,
and other utility facilities that are determined to be in conflict with project improvements. VTA’s final cost for these utility rearrangements are dependent upon the extent of the actual utility conflicts and upon VTA’s final cost share obligation as defined in the executed Project Master Agreements between VTA and the utility owners. This Board authorization will allow the General Manager to direct utility owners to commence with construction work for the rearrangement of utility facilities determined to be in conflict with planned project improvements. Table 1 shows the estimated VTA cost by utility.

Table 1 Estimated Utility Rearrangement Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCAR BRT Project</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Gas &amp; Electric Company</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Water Company</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$4,900,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Board approval of this recommendation would facilitate VTA’s effort to more effectively manage the utility rearrangement work and clear utility conflicts in a timely manner in advance of the civil improvements, thereby avoiding costly BRT Project delays.

ALTERNATIVES:

There are no practical alternatives to the recommended action if VTA is to clear utility conflicts in a timely manner and make way for BRT Project improvements. In lieu of approving this recommendation, project staff would be required to request separate Board spending authorizations for utility rearrangements as the utility conflicts are further identified, designs are completed and costs are estimated based on the utility owners’ designs. However, this would create schedule and coordination problems that would result in untimely utility rearrangements, costly project delays, and increased administrative effort.

FISCAL IMPACT:

This action will authorize $4.9 million for utility owner reimbursements. Appropriation for these expenditures is included in the FY13 Adopted 2000 Measure A Transit Improvement Program Fund Capital Budget.

Prepared by: Ken Ronsse, Deputy Director
Memo No. 3946
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief CMA Officer, John Ristow

SUBJECT: Quitclaim Deed for Bus Stop and Shelter Easement

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the General Manager to execute the quitclaim of an existing Easement for a bus shelter and bus stop which have been relocated and now lie within public right-of-way.

BACKGROUND:

VTA previously has had a bus shelter and bus stop in the Northbound direction on San Antonio Road near El Camino Real in Mountain View, CA, as illustrated in Exhibit A. Although the bus stop was located on private property, VTA had procured an easement for the bus shelter and bus stop in 1979 from the former private property owner. The current developer of the property, MGP IX Properties, LLC, subsequently purchased the private property and proposed a development that directly impacts the VTA easement.

VTA Real Estate and Operations staff have been working with the developer to address the bus service and real property concerns while the development is under construction. Since the proposed project impacts the VTA easement, it was necessary to temporarily terminate bus service and abandon the existing bus shelter and stop. Since that time, the developer and VTA staff have been working to relocate the bus shelter and stop to a new location that is acceptable to VTA.

DISCUSSION:

The developer is in the process of obtaining the necessary City approvals and permits for the proposed development. As a condition of approval for the project, the developer was required to dedicate 2,227 square feet of the private property to the City of Mountain View. The developer
proposed to relocate the bus shelter and stop to the dedicated property as illustrated on Exhibit A. Under the administrative code, VTA has the right to operate transit facilities in public rights-of-way without obtaining property rights. Both parties agreed that the proposed relocation was viable for the development, VTA bus operations and VTA real estate interests. The easement language includes a provision for termination the requires 90-days notice following an initial 5-year period during which the easement was irrevocable. We are now well outside the 5-year period and ample notice was provided for termination; therefore, there is no fee or compensation associated with the quitclaim of the easement.

Merlone Geier Management, LLC, the managing agent for MGP IX Properties, Inc. has recorded the Dedication Grant Deed to the City of Mountain View, and now requests that the VTA Easement for the bus shelter be quitclaimed to the City of Mountain View. The proposed quitclaim of the existing easement will have no impact to VTA as the bus shelter and bus stop now lie within the public right-of-way.

VTA Bus service at this location has been terminated since April 2, 2012 to accommodate the development while it is under construction and is scheduled to be restored on January 8, 2013. The remaining construction of the development should not impact VTA operations.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The Board may choose not to authorize the execution and recordation of the proposed quitclaim of the existing easement, which would impose a significant impediment to the development project.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

There is no fee associated with the Quitclaim of the existing Easement. In accordance with a provision of the Easement, the Developer provided VTA ample notice for termination.

Prepared by: Jennifer Rocci
Memo No. 3931
Exhibit A - VTA Bus on NB San Antonio
### Quitclaim Deed for Bus Stop and Shelter Easement
#### List of Consultants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MGP DX Properties, LLC</td>
<td>Glenn Goodman</td>
<td>Direct Design and Construction</td>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Managed by Merlone Greier Partners)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief SVRT Program Officer, Carolyn M. Gonot

SUBJECT: Agreement for Reimbursement of County of Santa Clara’s Costs for SVBX Project Support

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the General Manager to negotiate and execute a cooperative agreement with the County of Santa Clara (County) regarding the reimbursement of County’s staff costs to assist VTA with design coordination, construction document development, and construction coordination in support of the BART Silicon Valley Berryessa Extension (SVBX) Project in an amount up to $985,000.

BACKGROUND:

Montague Expressway is owned and operated by the County of Santa Clara. The SVBX guideway alignment crosses Montague Expressway in a below-grade (trench) configuration, which will require SVBX to construct an overpass to carry the Expressway across the BART tracks.

In addition, the Milpitas Station is located immediately south of Montague Expressway. The station access includes a direct access road leading into the parking garage and station drop-off from the eastbound lanes of Montague Expressway. New dual left turn lanes will be constructed by SVBX at the intersection of South Milpitas Blvd. to allow westbound Expressway traffic to access the station.

VTA entered into a Master Agreement with the County for the SVBX project on October 8, 2012. The Master Agreement provided a framework for cooperative efforts between the two agencies to advance the works required for the project within County right-of-way. The Master Agreement stated that VTA would reimburse the internal staff costs of the County related to the
project, but did not provide a specific budget for the reimbursements. This Agreement provides more detail about how the reimbursements will be handled, and establishes a budget for the County’s services.

**DISCUSSION:**

The County Department of Roads and Airports has been working cooperatively with VTA for more than a year, assisting with technical issues, planning activities, and plan reviews for portions of the project within County right-of-way as described above. In addition, the County has already issued permits for construction of early utility relocations, several of which cross the Expressway in the area of Milpitas station.

The County Department of Roads and Airports has provided an estimate to VTA of their anticipated staff time for SVBX support through the period of intensive project support activities, which is expected to extend through approximately 2013. The estimate also provides a schedule of hourly rates and total anticipated staff costs. VTA staff has reviewed the estimate provided by the County Department of Roads and Airports and has developed a budget based on the estimate that would cover their project support activities through the construction that impacts Montague Expressway. The estimated cost for the support activities is $985,000. With the Board’s approval, this Agreement will provide funding for those anticipated costs, as well as retroactive funding approval to reimburse the County for services already provided, as described above. The agreement is specific to SVBX and contains language providing that it is not precedent-setting for other VTA projects.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

Because VTA has already agreed, through the existing Master Agreement, to reimburse the County’s internal costs related to SVBX, there is no practical alternative to providing funding for this support.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

This agreement provides an authorization of up to $985,000 for the above-described County services. Appropriation for this expenditure is included in the FY13 Adopted 2000 Measure A Transit Improvement Program Fund Capital Budget and would be paid from a combination of 2000 Measure A and grant funds.

Prepared by: John Morris
Memo No. 3948
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief External Affairs Officer, Greta Helm

SUBJECT: Monthly Legislative History Matrix

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

The attached Monthly Legislative History Matrix describes the key transportation-related bills that are being considered by the California State Legislature during the 2013-2014 regular session. The matrix indicates the status of these measures and any adopted VTA positions with regard to them.

DISCUSSION:

The California State Legislature convened the 2013-14 regular session on December 3 with historic Democratic supermajorities -- 29 of 40 seats in the Senate and 55 of 80 in the Assembly. However, Democrats will lose their two-thirds majority in the Assembly in late April and will not be able to get it back until August due to a number of vacancies and special elections.

Senate Democrats will retain their supermajority even after Sens. Juan Vargas of San Diego and Gloria Negrete-McLeod of Chino leave for Congress in early January. But Assembly Democrats could lose their two-thirds majority in late April because two of their members -- Ben Hueso of Chula Vista and Norma Torres of Pomona -- are expected to win special elections for those vacant Senate seats. If that occurs, Democrats would be left with 53 Assembly members -- one short of a two-thirds majority -- until August special elections are held to replace both Hueso and Torres.

The Democratic supermajorities mark a dramatic shift in the balance of power in the Capitol, where GOP lawmakers have aggressively used their ability to block budget plans and prevent revenue increases in order to scale back the scope of state government. With two-thirds majorities in both the Senate and Assembly, Democratic legislators would be empowered to raise revenues, and bring constitutional changes and other measures to the voters without GOP support. Democrats also would be able to override gubernatorial vetoes, though such moves
would risk undermining Gov. Jerry Brown, the leader of their own party.

The pressure on Democrats to restore funding for many services that were cut to balance the General Fund in recent years will be intense. However, Senate President Pro Tempore Darrell Steinberg (D-Sacramento) and Assembly Speaker John Perez (D-Los Angeles) are emphasizing restraint, primarily with an eye toward maintaining their tenuous supermajorities. How party leaders use their new powers could affect the outcome of the upcoming special elections, as well as the future prospects of moderate Democrats who eked out unexpected victories in GOP-rich areas in the Central Valley and Southern California.

Both Steinberg and Perez have acknowledged that Democrats could risk a backlash if they overreach, particularly on fiscal matters. Given that Democratic Party leaders and Gov. Brown were successful in persuading Californians to approve billions of dollars in new taxes on the November ballot to help balance the General Fund, Steinberg and Perez have promised that there would not be a frenzy of tax increases. Instead, they appear to be inclined to limit the use of their supermajorities in the near term to exploring revisions to the state’s tax structure, initiative system and political reform act, as well as considering whether to provide local governments with the ability to impose certain special taxes with a 55 percent vote of the electorate, rather than the current two-thirds majority. But for the most part, they seem intent on devoting the bulk of 2013 to laying the groundwork for significant changes in 2014.

Party leaders already have reined in one lawmaker who wanted to move forward immediately. Shortly after the election, Sen. Ted Lieu (D-Torrance) announced plans to seek voter approval of a constitutional amendment to increase the state’s vehicle license fee from .65 percent to 2 percent, the rate that was in effect until 2004 when it was reduced to its current level by former Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger, in order to generate roughly $4 billion a year in new revenues for California’s transportation infrastructure. He called the proposal “a test to see what the two-thirds majority Legislature means.” But after facing pressure from within and outside the Democratic Party, Lieu backtracked, saying “it’s clear to me that we need to demonstrate that we can responsibly work with the new revenue from Proposition 30 and not go right back to the voters and ask for more.”

Gov. Brown also is preaching restraint. “Voters have trusted the elected representatives, maybe even trusted me to some extent, and now we’ve got to meet that trust,” he recently commented. “We’ve got to make sure over the next few years that we pay our bills, we invest in the right programs, but we don’t go on any spending binges.” He is hoping that the passage of Proposition 30 will provide him with some breathing room to turn his attention to legacy-building pursuits. Up until now, he has been preoccupied with trying to resolve the state’s persistent budget challenges. His top priorities include aggressively implementing the federal health care reform law, overhauling California’s water system, amending the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to encourage economic growth, and promoting the state’s high-speed rail project.

Besides the Democratic supermajorities, other milestones were marked as lawmakers opened the 2013-14 session. Term limits for the incoming class of legislators will be a total of 12 years in either chamber, not a maximum of six years in the Assembly and eight in the Senate. The new
Legislature also has the largest freshman class since 1966. Nearly half of the Assembly’s seats -- 38 of 80 -- are filled with freshmen. The Senate is replacing nine of its 40 members, but only one freshman has never been a legislator.

Prepared By: Kurt Evans, Government Affairs Manager
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## LEGISLATIVE HISTORY
### 2013 – 2014 State Legislative Session
#### January 4, 2013

### 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>
</table>
| **AB 14** (B. Lowenthal)  
State Freight Plan | Requires the Business, Transportation & Housing Agency to prepare a state freight plan to govern the immediate and long-range planning activities and capital investments of the state with respect to the movement of freight. At a minimum, requires the plan to include all of the following: (1) an identification of significant freight system trends, needs and issues; (2) a description of the freight policies, strategies and performance measures that will guide freight-related transportation investment decisions; (3) a description of how the state freight plan will improve the ability of California to meet the national freight goals established under the federal Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21); (4) evidence of consideration of innovative technologies and operational strategies that will improve the safety and efficiency of freight movement; (5) in the case of routes on which travel by heavy vehicles is projected to substantially deteriorate the condition of roadways, a description of improvements that may be required to reduce or impede the deterioration; and (6) an inventory of facilities with freight mobility issues and a description of the strategies that California is employing to address those issues. | As Introduced | Assembly Desk |
| **AB 37** (Perea)  
CEQA: Record of Proceedings | At the request of a project applicant and subject to the project applicant’s agreeing to bear the costs incurred by the lead agency, requires the lead agency for California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) purposes to prepare a record of proceedings concurrently with the preparation, adoption or certification of an environmental document for a project, as specified. Sunsets the provisions of the bill on January 1, 2017. | 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>SB 1 (Steinberg) Sustainable Communities Investment Authorities</td>
<td>Allows a city, county or special district to form a Sustainable Communities Investment Authority for a designated Sustainable Communities Investment Area. Requires a Sustainable Communities Investment Area to include only the following: (1) transit priority project areas; and (2) areas that are small walkable communities. Provides that a taxing agency participating in or approving the formation of a Sustainable Communities Investment Authority, or appointing governing board members to the authority may authorize an allocation to the authority of all or part of the tax increment revenues that otherwise would be paid to that taxing agency. Excludes school districts from participating in a Sustainable Communities Investment Authority. Allows an authority to adopt a plan for a Sustainable Communities Investment Area, which may include a provision for the receipt of tax increment funds, if the local government with land-use jurisdiction has adopted all of the following: (1) a sustainable parking standards ordinance that restricts parking in transit priority project areas to encourage public transit use to the greatest extent feasible; (2) an ordinance creating a jobs plan; (3) for transit priority project areas and small walkable communities within a metropolitan planning organization (MPO), a plan consistent with the use designation, density, building intensity, and applicable policies specified for the Sustainable Communities Investment Area in the sustainable communities strategy; and (4) within small walkable communities outside an MPO, a plan that provides a density of at least 20 dwelling units per net acre for new residential construction and a minimum floor area ratio of 0.75 for non-residential uses. If a Sustainable Communities Investment Authority includes a provision for the receipt of tax increment revenues in its plan, requires the authority to dedicate no less than 20 percent of these revenues for affordable housing purposes. Allows a state or local pension fund system to invest capital in the public infrastructure projects, and private commercial and residential developments undertaken by an authority. Allows a Sustainable Communities Investment Authority to implement a local transactions and use tax, and to issue bonds. Prohibits pledging school district property tax revenues for the repayment of bonds issued by a Sustainable Communities Investment Authority.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Senate Rules Committee</td>
<td></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 33</td>
<td>Eliminates the requirement for voter approval for the creation of an infrastructure financing district, adoption of an infrastructure financing plan, and the issuance of bonds for implementing an infrastructure financing plan. Instead, provides that the legislative body of a city, at the conclusion of a public hearing, may adopt a resolution establishing an infrastructure financing district based upon a finding that: (1) the goals of the district are consistent with the city’s General Plan; and (2) the financing programs undertaken by the district are an efficient means of implementing the goals of the district. Requires a public financing authority to be created to serve as the legislative body of an infrastructure financing district. Requires the public financing authority to be comprised of five people, three of whom must be members of the city council or board of supervisors that established the district and two of whom must be public members. Allows for the public financing authority to adopt the infrastructure financing plan and to issue bonds by a majority vote of the authority. If an infrastructure financing plan provides for the division of taxes of any affected taxing entity, requires a public accountability committee to be created to review the actions of the public financing authority. Requires the committee to be comprised of a representative from each affected taxing entity that has agreed to the division of its taxes, a representative of the public financing authority, and one or more public members. Generally prohibits an infrastructure financing district from paying for: (1) routine maintenance; (2) repair work; (3) the costs of ongoing operations; or (4) providing services of any kind. Clarifies that an infrastructure financing district shall finance only structural and non-structural public capital facilities of communitywide significance. Allows an infrastructure financing district to finance any project that implements a transit priority project regional transportation plan (RTP), or other projects that are consistent with the general use designation, density, building intensity, and applicable policies specified for the project area in a sustainable communities strategy. Prohibits an infrastructure financing district from providing any form of financial assistance to: (1) a vehicle dealer; (2) a big box retailer; or (3) a business entity that sells or leases land to a vehicle dealer or big box retailer that is relocating from the territorial jurisdiction of one local agency to the territorial jurisdiction of another local agency but within the same market area. Specifies that the date on which an infrastructure financing district would cease to exist would not be more than 40 years from the date the public financing authority adopted the infrastructure financing plan. Requires an infrastructure financing district to distribute an annual report to each owner of land within the district and each affected taxing entity. Requires the report to contain all of the following: (1) a summary of the district’s expenditures; (2) a description of the progress made toward the district’s adopted goals; and (3) an assessment of the status regarding completion of the district’s public works projects.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Senate Rules Committee</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA 4</td>
<td>Calls for placing before the voters an amendment to the California Constitution to allow a local agency to impose, extend or increase a special tax for the purpose of providing funding for local transportation projects, if approved by a 55 percent majority vote. Requires the Legislature to define “local transportation projects” for purposes of this constitutional amendment.</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>SCA 8 (Corbett) Local Government Transportation Projects</td>
<td>Calls for placing before the voters an amendment to the California Constitution to allow a local agency to impose, extend or increase a special tax for the purpose of providing funding for local transportation projects, if approved by a 55 percent majority vote. Requires the Legislature to define “local transportation projects” for purposes of this constitutional amendment.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Senate Rules Committee</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY</td>
<td>JANUARY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Statutes signed into law in 2012 take effect.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Legislature reconvenes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Last day to submit bill requests to the Legislative Counsel’s Office.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>FEBRUARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Last day for new bills to be introduced.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>MARCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Spring Recess begins upon adjournment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>APRIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</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>3</td>
<td>Last day for policy committees to hear and report fiscal bills introduced in their house of origin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</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>24</td>
<td>Last day for fiscal committees to hear and report to the floor bills introduced in their house of origin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Last day for bills to be passed out of their house of origin.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>JUNE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Budget must be passed by midnight.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>JULY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</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>AUGUST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Legislature reconvenes from Summer Recess.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</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>SEPTEMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Last day to amend bills on the Assembly and Senate floors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</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>13</td>
<td>Last day for the Governor to sign or veto bills passed by the Legislature before September 13, and in his possession after September 13.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>JANUARY 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Statutes signed into law in 2013 take effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Legislature reconvenes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief Financial Officer, Joseph T. Smith

SUBJECT: FY 2014 & FY 2015 Biennial Budget Assumptions

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

In order to facilitate the preparation of the FY 2014 and FY 2015 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 2014 and FY 2015 Recommended Budget will be published and distributed in April 2013 with Board of Directors’ action scheduled for June 2013.

DISCUSSION:

Staff will use these working budget assumptions as guidelines to develop the Recommended FY 2014 and FY 2015 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 2014 and FY 2015 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 2014      AFSCME-April 2013
   SEIU-May 2013          TAEA-June 2013

3331 North First Street · San Jose, CA  95134-1927 · Administration 408.321.5555 · Customer Service 408.321.2300
- Reflect no wage increase for negotiated contracts at this time. Budgeting of additional costs, if any, for new contracts will be addressed upon contract ratification by the Board.

- Funding for merit increases for non-represented employees, if any, will be managed through vacancy savings.

- Projected health insurance premium increase of 10% for FY 2014 and 10% for FY 2015 based on employee benefits broker’s estimate.

- Pension and Retiree Health contributions as a percentage of wages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATU Pension</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalPERS-Employer portion</td>
<td>14.025%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalPERS-Employee portion (paid by VTA)¹</td>
<td>0%-4%</td>
<td>0%-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirees’ Other Post Employment Benefits (OPEB) Trust</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>11.0%</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>FY14</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Sales tax growth:

Based on the most recent information, including FY 2013 1st QTR actual sales tax data received December 14th; projected growth rates for sales tax revenue have been updated as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Recommended Growth Assumption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY13</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY14</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The FY 2013-FY 2015 recommended growth assumptions are based on projections from Beacon Economics provided in September 2012, adjusted for actual first quarter FY 2013 receipts.

¹ Varies by hire date
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 2014 and FY 2015 Recommended Budget.

4. **Measure A Operating Assistance:**
   18.45% of Measure A Sales Tax Revenues.

5. **Low sulfur diesel fuel price:**
   While diesel prices are highly unpredictable, they have been fairly stable over the last two years compared to the wild fluctuations experienced from 2008-2010. The average price per gallon paid (including taxes) in FY 2012 was $3.43. Current year-to-date FY 2013 average through 12/10/12 is $3.47. Due to the volatility of the item, the price per gallon assumption for FY 2014 and FY 2015 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 current service plan calls for an additional 2.4% or 31,600 hours of bus service in FY 2014 from extended hours, improved frequency, and increased service reliability on various routes.

   For FY 2015 the service plan includes an increase of 1.4% or 18,800 hours of bus service and 1.1% or 1,700 hours of light rail service. These increases are primarily related to the implementation of Bus Rapid Transit service on the Santa Clara-Alum Rock corridor, introduction of Express vehicles on additional routes, increased service reliability on various routes, and new service to 49er games.

8. **Bus and Light Rail Ridership:**
   Based on the service level assumptions above, current projected growth rates for ridership are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Ridership Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY13</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY14</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. **State Transit Assistance (STA) funding level:**
   Beginning in FY 2012, the state diesel sales tax rate was increased to 6.75% in conjunction with a corresponding drop in the per-gallon diesel fuel excise tax to ensure that consumers felt no impact at the pump. High-speed rail/transit bond debt service has
first call on the revenues generated by the diesel sales tax. Any remaining revenues are split 75% to STA and 25% to intercity rail and other miscellaneous state transit programs. The intent is to ensure, at minimum, an annual STA Program of $350 million. VTA’s share of a $350 million program is approximately $13.6 million per year.

10. Federal Operating Grants Preventative Maintenance funding level:

Although the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5307 grant program is designed primarily to fund capital acquisitions, funds can also be awarded for preventive maintenance activities in support of operations. Due to the economic downturn, VTA used 100% of available Section 5307 funds for preventive maintenance from FY 2009 to FY 2011 to partially offset the loss of Sales Tax Revenues and STA funding. Beginning in FY 2012 VTA began a gradual reduction of this practice towards the goal of reaching historical levels (35%). The proposed Section 5307 funding split for operations support and capital replacement is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>% Operations Support</th>
<th>% Capital Replacement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY14</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Capital Program:

As in previous years, the FY 2014 and FY 2015 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.

12. 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 received this item as part of its January 16, 2013 meeting. A member of the committee expressed concern that the STA projection seemed optimistic. Another member of the committee questioned whether the projected growth in health insurance premiums was high in light of recent health care reform legislation.

The Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) received this item as part of its January 16, 2013 meeting. A member of the committee inquired if job growth was considered in the assumptions and if an increase in CPI would require reconsideration of no fare increase.
The Policy Advisory Committee received this item as part of its January 17, 2013 meeting. A member of the committee requested clarification on the total cost of pension and retiree medical contributions and inquired if there were any two-tier plans in place.

Prepared By: Carol Lawson, Fiscal Resources Manager, Budget
Memo No. 3766
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief CMA Officer, John Ristow

SUBJECT: Valley Transportation Plan 2040 - Chapters Two & Three

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

Staff is in the process of developing the Valley Transportation Plan (VTP) 2040, the update to VTA's long-range transportation plan for Santa Clara County. As part the development process, staff will bring draft sections of the report to the Committees for review. In September, staff presented the VTP themes and Plan vision; in October, staff presented a draft of Chapter 1, which introduced the framework of the Plan and discussed the current setting and relevant new trends in transportation policy and funding. This month's update is the draft of Chapters 2 and 3 which are provided to the Committees for review and comment.

DISCUSSION:

Chapter 2 is the core of VTP 2040, providing a comprehensive look at VTA's capital investment plan for transportation projects in Santa Clara County. This chapter covers the fiscal setting underlying the development of the Plan, the fund sources and flow of money, the capital investments for each program area, the planning initiatives and studies which support these investments, and the operation and maintenance needs for VTA's transit fleet and local roadway system.

This chapter is organized into four sections:

2a. Fiscal Setting and Financial Plan: Presents an overview of the current economic conditions and funding challenges underlying the development of the Plan and discusses the various sources of funding available for transportation projects in Santa Clara County.

2b. Capital Investment Program: Presents the capital investment plan for transportation-related projects and actions which cover the multiple modes of travel. These projects include but are not limited to: improved interchanges and Express Lanes for roadways, system efficiency and station improvements for transit, expanded multimodal network and improved infrastructure for both bicycle and pedestrian-related projects.
2c. Planning & Project Development Program: Discusses VTA's ongoing and future planning initiatives that serve to support and complement each of the Capital Investment Program areas, as well as address the Plan's overall vision for supporting Santa Clara County's continued economic health and livability.

2d. Operating & Maintenance Program: Presents the operation and maintenance funding needs for VTA's transit fleet which includes fixed route transit service and rail, as well as identifies needs for maintenance and repair of local systems which includes pavement management and traffic operating systems.

Chapter 3 is the final chapter of VTP 2040 providing a summary of the overall framework and the investment program. The chapter highlights key themes which contribute to achieving the overall Plan vision and concludes with a discussion of opportunities and challenges facing Santa Clara County in the future.

VTP 2040 is scheduled to complete in April 2013. Staff will incorporate comments received from the Committees in subsequent updates to the draft chapters. The text version of Chapters 2 and 3 are included as Attachment A. Below is a brief schedule of events that highlight the document development.

VTP Schedule
January 2013 - Review Draft Chapters 2 and 3
February 2013 - VTA to hold VTP 2040 Public Meetings
March 2013 - VTA takes Draft Plan to Committees
April 2013 - VTA Board adopts VTP 2040

ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:

The Technical Advisory Committee received the report at their meeting. Member Collen had a few comments related to the document that he would like Staff to consider. He questioned why there was Express Lane revenue in the Expressway program, and requested staff to clarify that there is flexibility for projects in the plan to access Federal and State funds when they are available. Staff responded that the chart can be adjusted and will follow up with County Staff.

Member Collen also noted that San Tomas and Lawrence Expressway were identified as “in-lieu” freeways in the Countywide Expressway Study. The reason being that these expressways carry a vehicle load that resembles a freeway and that these expressways would be eligible to receive State and Regional Funds under MAP-21. Member Collen requested Staff to consider discussion of this in Chapter Two. Staff would consider this request to be included in the report.

Member Collen also noted that in the Express Lane Program there is little mention in the development of the Express Lane Program of those interchange projects that should be considered. He named the interchanges at Lawrence and I-280 and Almaden and SR 85. Staff responded that when there comes time to develop the projects based on the Express Lane Program that it will include the noted projects.

Member Collen also asked if the VTA was looking at a Pedestrian Expenditure Program for the
future. Staff responded that there was consideration of a Pedestrian Master Plan to be done by VTA Staff, however at this point it is only noted in the CMP Work Plan. Member Collen then voiced support for Staff to develop a Pedestrian Master Plan.

Member Servine asked if VTA was looking at further work outside of the iTeam development related to Caltrans assistance in local projects. Staff responded that at this time the iTeam development was only the first step and would like to see how this effort progresses.

The Policy Advisory Committee received the report at their meeting. Member Wasserman questioned staff regarding Express Lane revenue in the Expressway program since there were possible legal ramifications regarding the spending of Express Lane dollars. He reiterated County staff’s request for confirmation from Staff that the projections are not indicative of programming decisions to be made in the future. Staff responded that they responded to TAC Member Collen that they would work with County Staff to discuss changes in the Expressway Revenue.

Member Wasserman also commented on the Interchanges at Lawrence and I-280 and Almaden and SR 85, stating that as the Express Lane Program move forward, that there be consideration for these interchanges in the development of the program. Staff responded that this issue came up at TAC and that they would work with Staff to discuss these two interchanges during the development of the Express Lane Program.

Vice Chair Price had an inquiry about Chapter 2a, especially the Transit Special District funds and if Staff knew of any Local Agency enacting special transit districts. Staff responded that it was noted in the document merely for discussion as concepts that would help VTA fund all of these projects in VTP. Vice Chair Price also asked how the ITS Strategic Plan played a role in the VTP document. Staff responded that the projects identified within the ITS Strategic Plan were included in the VTP document.

Prepared By: John Sighamony
Memo No. 3899
CHAPTER 2A. Financial Plan

Fiscal Setting

The economy of Santa Clara County, the heart of Silicon Valley, is rooted in technological innovation and development. The high-tech industry, while prone to boom and bust cycles, remains a major driving force behind the region’s economic prosperity and enviable standing in the global economy. The Valley’s continued ability to foster talent, develop and fund innovation, and cultivate a vibrant community has allowed our region to weather the peaks and valleys of the economic cycles, including the most recent downturn that began in 2007. The last plan, VTP 2035, adopted in 2009, was developed in the midst of the financial turmoil.

The development of VTP 2040 features a much different economic climate than the one from which VTP 2035 was developed. Compared with the economic conditions in 2009, the current economy is improving, albeit slowly, and signs of positive growth are evident. Locally, sales tax receipts, which VTA relies heavily on, are showing modest increases following a decline of almost 16 percent in FY09. In FY10, sales tax receipts increased by 1.7 percent. Year-to-date growth in FY11 has been tempered but quarterly year-over-year increases remain strong. VTA’s biennial budget projects sales tax revenue to continue to increase by 3.5 and 5.8 percent for FY12 and FY13, respectively, reflecting a rebound in taxable sales since the recession.

At the federal level, a new surface transportation authorization bill called Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) was approved on July 6, 2012 after three years of short-term extensions. MAP-21 covers two fiscal years, FY13 and FY14, and will run through September 30, 2014. The bill includes several key changes such as the consolidation of almost 100 separate funding programs, elimination of earmarks and establishing performance-based planning requirements that align Federal funding with key goals. More importantly, the bill maintains surface transportation programs at current funding levels, with a small adjustment for inflation, for a two-year total of $105 billion. This means for federal-aid highway programs, the bill provides $39.6 billion in FY13 and $40.2 billion in FY14. For public transit, this means $10.5 billion in FY13 and $10.6 billion in FY14. While MAP-21 is only a two-year bill, it
provides stability in terms of revenue sources with steady and predictable funding for federal highway and transit programs in the short term.

**Funding Challenges**
A significant challenge for VTA and other public transportation agencies is to find sufficient and reliable funding sources in the midst of continuing decline in Federal and State funding. The gasoline sales tax is the primary source of Federal and State transportation revenue but with the gas tax remaining fixed at 1993 levels, it has failed to keep up with current costs and inflation, resulting in a chronically underfunded transportation program. In addition, efforts to improve gas mileage through fuel-efficient vehicles have yielded unforeseen consequences – with better gas mileage comes lower gasoline sales, which means less revenue from the per gallon taxes levied at the federal and state levels. Along with improved fuel efficiency, the use of alternative transportation options such as transit, walking and biking are on the rise. With increased investments to make alternative transportation viable as well as cost-adverse consumers who want to avoid increasing fuel prices, more and more people are driving less. With these factors combined, gas taxes are increasingly becoming less reliable as a transportation revenue source.

Some states have managed to increase the state gas taxes, but many others, including local government agencies such as VTA, have had to increase reliance on other revenue sources such as vehicle registration fees and self-imposed sales tax measures to compensate for declining Federal and State funding- and this trend continues. In the 1970s, Federal and State funding accounted for approximately 80% of all transportation funds, while local funds counted for approximately 20%. By the 2000s, this ratio flipped with almost 60% coming from local sources and 40% from State and Federal sources.

Locally generated transportation revenue also has its challenges. A prime example is the volatility of sales tax-based revenues, which makes up a large portion of VTA’s revenue. Approximately 71 percent of VTA’s Transit Fund operating revenues are generated from sales tax sources, which include the 1976 half-cent local sales tax, a quarter-cent sales tax from Transportation Development Act (TDA), and 2000 Measure A half-cent sales tax revenue. Sales tax-based revenues are driven by the health of the local economy and therefore subject to the fluctuations of economic cycles, which directly and immediately affects transportation revenue. This unpredictability in sales tax revenue makes planning for long-term future revenue challenging.
In 2012, VTA established the VTA Transit Sales Tax Stabilization Fund, a designated surplus reserve, in order to mitigate the impact of sales tax receipts volatility on service levels and the VTA Transit Fund Operating Budget. Funds accumulated in the VTA Transit Sales Tax Stabilization Fund may be used to supplement budgeted declines in sales tax based revenues or offset declines in actual sales tax based revenue receipts. The VTA Transit Sales Tax Stabilization Fund supports VTA policy of maintaining a prudent level of surplus reserves to ensure sufficient funds are available in the event of either unavoidable expenditure needs or unanticipated revenue shortfalls.

Even with myriad challenges of predicting future funding levels VTA can develop a feasible long-range plan. The long-range plan does not guarantee funding for projects - it provides the most appropriate funding forecast for the programs and projects within the timeframe of the plan.

**VTP 2040 Financial Plan**

Funding for the projects, programs and services identified in VTP 2040 comes from a number of local, State and Federal sources. Generally, the plan focuses on larger sources that provide flexibility in programming and that are expected to provide significant revenues for transportation projects in Santa Clara County over the life of the plan.

Fund estimates provided by MTC are used as the starting point to develop the fund estimates for VTP2040. VTA adjusts these estimates using local sources that staff reasonably believes will be available over the life of the plan. Revenue from all fund sources for transportation projects and programs in Santa Clara County is estimated to be roughly $13 billion ($2013) from 2013 to 2040 (Table 2.1). This fund estimate provides the basis of the financially constrained project lists.

The revenue sources include base sources such as existing State and Federal discretionary grants, and our current locally generated funding such as Santa Clara County’s existing sales taxes, city transportation improvement funds (“developer fees”) and the new 2010 Vehicle Registration Fee. Augmented revenue sources include revenue from future Express Lanes, future tolls from the State Route 152 Corridor, and future Federal participation in the BART Silicon Valley and Bus Rapid Transit projects.
Table 2.1 VTP 2040 Program Area Allocations (2013 dollars, in millions during the life of the VTP 2040 plan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSIT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$3,713</td>
<td>$649</td>
<td>$119</td>
<td>$247</td>
<td>$89</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain/ACE/HSR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$3,713</td>
<td>$680</td>
<td>$145</td>
<td>$969</td>
<td>$89</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIGHWAYS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express Lanes/Toll Roads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highway Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$588</td>
<td>$341</td>
<td>$1,951</td>
<td>$144</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$3,124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCAL SYSTEM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Expressways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Street &amp; Roads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimodal Transportation Investments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local System Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$387</td>
<td>$252</td>
<td>$259</td>
<td>$306</td>
<td>$535</td>
<td>$247</td>
<td>$2,048</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$3,713</td>
<td>$680</td>
<td>$145</td>
<td>$969</td>
<td>$1,064</td>
<td>$341</td>
<td>$252</td>
<td>$259</td>
<td>$2,607</td>
<td>$714</td>
<td>$62</td>
<td>$347</td>
<td>$13,303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The revenue sources include base sources such as existing State and Federal discretionary grants, and our current locally generated funding such as Santa Clara County’s existing sales taxes, city transportation improvement funds (“developer fees”) and the new 2010 Vehicle Registration Fee. Augmented revenue sources include revenue from future Express Lanes, future tolls from the State Route 152 Corridor, and future Federal participation in the BART Silicon Valley and Bus Rapid Transit projects.

**Transportation Capital Funding Sources for VTP 2040**
Locally generated funds are normally governed by local initiatives or policies. Federal funds flow into the State and are divided up based on both Federal and State statutes and guidelines. State funds are essentially moved to the regional and local level through the State Transportation Improvement Planning (STIP) process, and allocated for specific purposes in accordance with the statutes and guidelines governing the STIP process.

The fund sources described below provide the revenue for capital transportation projects in Santa Clara County. Following, is a general description of each fund source, and 28-year estimates for each fund source is provided in Table 2.1. More detailed descriptions of these can be found in Appendix ____.

**Federal Funds**

**Federal New Starts (Section 5309 – New Starts)**
The Federal New Starts program is one of the Federal transit funding programs created in 1991 as part of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA). Eligible projects include light rail, rapid rail (heavy rail/BART), commuter rail (Caltrain), monorail, automated fixed guideway system (such as a “people mover”), or a bus way/high occupancy vehicle (HOV) facility, or an extension of any of these. Congress distributes these funds to projects based on project evaluations by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA).

**Federal Small Starts**
The Small Starts program provides funds for smaller, low-cost capital projects that qualify for a highly simplified project evaluation and rating process by FTA. To qualify as a Small Starts project, the total project cost must be less than $250 million, with no greater than $75 million in requested Capital Investment Grant funding. In addition, the project must either (a) meet the definition of a fixed guideway for at least 50 percent of the project length in the peak period and/or (b) be a new fixed guideway project, or (c) be a new corridor-based bus project.

With the passage of the newly authorized transportation bill MAP-21, several changes were introduced to the FTA Major Capital Investment Program which includes the Small Starts program. MAP-21 maintains the Small Starts eligibility definition but provides expanded clarification on how Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) projects are defined; these changes are favorable to VTA BRT projects. Similar to New Starts, this program is competitive where projects from around the country are evaluated based on a set of criteria established by the FTA.

**Federal Surface Transportation Program/Congestion Mitigation Air Quality Program (STP/CMAQ)**

STP and CMAQ are often called “flexible funds.” STP funds can be used for virtually all transportation maintenance projects and will be shown later in the chapter under Maintenance. CMAQ funds are limited to implementing the transportation provisions of the 1990 Federal Clean Air Act in Air Quality Non-Attainment areas. The Bay Area is currently a non-attainment area. The current estimate for CMAQ funds for Santa Clara County is $252 million over the life of the plan.

**Transportation Alternatives (TA)**

Transportation Alternatives Program is a new program under MAP-21. It consolidates Transportation Enhancements (TE), Safe Routes to School, Recreational Trails, and Scenic Byways into a new Transportation Alternatives Program. The TA estimate for Santa Clara County is $173 million.

**State and Regional Funds**

**Traffic Congestion Relief Program**
The Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP) enacted in 2000, directed revenues generated by the State sales tax on gas and diesel fuel from the State general fund to transportation. The transfer was to occur for fiscal years 2003/04 through 2007/08, then end. However, in 2002, California voters passed State Proposition 42, which made the sales tax on gasoline a permanent funding source for transportation.

The TCRP established a list of 149 specific congestion relieving transit and highway projects designated to receive funds. Approximately $680 million was designated for projects in Santa Clara County. The CTC adopted a statewide TCRP allocation plan on September 24, 2008 that specifies a six-year payment schedule for the remaining $239 million, starting in fiscal year 2009. VTA expects the final two payments for the remaining $89 million in fiscal years 2014 and 2015.

**State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)**

The State Highway Account (SHA) is divided into two programs: a Regional Improvement Program (RIP) and an Interregional Improvement Program (IIP). Together, these programs form the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). STIP funds may be used for road rehabilitation and capacity expanding capital transportation projects.

The current total STIP projection, in year of expenditure dollars, for Santa Clara County is $2.118 billion, consisting of $1.603 billion in Regional funds and $515 million in Interregional funds for projects nominated by Caltrans.

**Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA)**

Funds generated by this State fee on motor vehicles are placed in the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) account to be used for implementing projects and programs that reduce air pollution from motor vehicles. Expenditure of these funds is limited to specified eligible transportation control measures (TCMs) that are included in Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD)’s 1991 Clean Air Plan, developed and adopted pursuant to the requirements of the California Clean Air Act of 1988. The BAAQMD administers 60 percent of these funds and 40 percent is administered by TFCA Program Managers such as VTA. The current TFCA 40 percent estimate for Santa Clara County is $49 million over the life of the plan.
Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3

TDA Article 3 funds are a portion of the sales tax on gasoline and diesel fuel, which is returned by the State of California to the county in which it was collected. TDA Article 3 funds are for use on bicycle and pedestrian projects.

MTC programs these funds in the nine Bay Area counties. Each year, VTA coordinates and submits countywide project priorities for this fund source. The VTA Board has set aside 25 percent of the annual allocation for the Countywide Bicycle Expenditure Program, less $150,000 per year for pedestrian improvements on County Expressways. The remainder distributed among the cities/towns and county by formula. The current 28-year estimate for TDA Article 3 funds is $56 million in the year of expenditure.

Freeway Performance Initiative (FPI)

The FPI program is a traffic management program developed by MTC to address deficiencies within the transportation system such as signal timing, synchronization, ramp metering, and other technological improvements. In addition to freeways, these improvements may also be on the major corridors within cities.

In Santa Clara County, FPI funding will be directed to projects in VTA’s Systems Operations and Management Program and Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Strategic Plan. For VTP 2040 VTA assumes it will receive almost $347 million in FPI funding for the next 28 years.

High Speed Rail (HSR)

In the Bay Area, a memorandum of understanding (MOU) that was executed by MTC in 2012; five Bay Area transportation agencies, including VTA; two municipalities, including the city of San Jose; and the High-Speed Rail Authority sets up a framework for early investment in the Peninsula Corridor. The MOU includes a comprehensive financial strategy that contemplates investing a total of $1.456 billion to modernize and electrify the Peninsula Corridor. This investment will significantly improve Caltrain service in the near term, as well as prepare the corridor for the implementation of “blended” Caltrain
and high-speed rail operations in the future. The financial strategy in the MOU identifies $106 million in Proposition 1A connectivity funds from the formula shares for VTA, Caltrain and BART, and calls for the High-Speed Authority to contribute $600 million of its Proposition 1A money. The VTP projects $969 million from HSR towards Caltrain electrification, BART Silicon Valley Phase II and station improvements.

Local Funds

2000 Measure A Sales Tax

On November 2, 2000, the voters of Santa Clara County voted to approve Measure A Sales Tax for 30 years to fund a specified package of transit projects and programs. The new 2000 ½ cent Measure A began on April 1, 2006, and ends on March 31, 2036. Eighteen and a half percent of Measure A funds are set aside for operating purposes and the remaining is for transit capital projects. In addition, the Plan assumes the renewal of the sales tax in similar terms starting 2036. Table 2.1 shows the remaining $3.712 billion available for capital between 2013 and 2040.

Express Lane/Toll Revenue

Tolling directly charges a user for the use of a facility at the time that the facility is in use. Such user fees address the market side of the equation by considering the interaction between demand for transportation services and the available supply. This results in a direct cost for the good—or service—being consumed. VTA’s Express Lane Program is expected to generate $4.114 billion (in YOE dollars) during the plan time period. Approximately $2.398 billion will be needed to finance, construct, operate and maintain the Express Lane system over the plan period. The express lanes will generate an additional $1.716 billion that will be used for transit services and other transportation improvements in the Express Lane corridors. The State Route 152 new alignment is planned to be a toll road. The Plan includes $917 million in year of expenditure dollars from future toll revenue from the new facilities to be used for the capital phase.

SB 83 Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF)

Senate Bill 83 (Hancock) was signed into law in 2009, authorizing countywide transportation agencies such as VTA to implement a vehicle registration fee of up to $10 on motor vehicles registered within the
county for transportation projects and programs. The statute requires that the fees collected be used only to pay for programs and projects that have a relationship or benefit the owners of motor vehicles paying the fee. The projects and programs must be consistent with the regional transportation plan and requires the agency’s board to make a specific finding of fact in that regard.

In June 2010, the VTA Board adopted a resolution placing 2010 Santa Clara Measure B before the voters of Santa Clara County. In November 2010 Santa Clara County voters authorized a $10 increase in the fees of motor vehicle registration for transportation-related projects and programs. Subsequently, the VTA Board adopted an expenditure plan for transportation-related projects and programs allocating 80% of the VRF revenue to the local road improvement and repair, and 15% for

- Intelligent Transportation System Technologies
- Countywide Environmental Mitigation
- Matching funds for Federal/state/regional transportation grants

The remaining 5% goes toward Program Administration. In the Capital Program, there is approximately $95 million YOE for countywide projects.

**Impact and Mitigation Fees**

Development projects often contribute funding to transportation system improvements, as a way of mitigating transportation project impacts, enhancing project access, or providing benefits to the community. These fees and contributions currently provide an important source of local funding for transportation projects, and this funding role is expected to continue over the life of this Plan. Development-related fees and contributions may occur in a number of ways:

- As mitigation measures for impacts identified through the environmental review of a project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); a development project may entirely fund a transportation improvement project, or may contribute a portion of the funding;
• Through local agency policies and programs, such as a citywide or specific area Transportation Impact Fee (TIF); these are typically one-time fees levied on a new development at the rate proportional to its demand for transportation capital improvements;
• Through a Development Agreement negotiated between a developer and a City, or a voluntary developer contribution to provide a community benefit;
• Through the Congestion Management Program (CMP) Deficiency Planning Process. The CMP statute requires Member Agencies to prepare Deficiency Plans for CMP system facilities located within their jurisdictions that exceed the CMP Traffic Level-of-Service (LOS) standard; Santa Clara County’s CMP traffic LOS standard is LOS E. A Deficiency Plan includes an a list of actions that will improve multimodal transportation performance and air quality, as well as an Action Plan for how and when it will be implemented.

There are many local examples of transportation improvements being funded as mitigation measures for impacts through the CEQA review process, and a number of examples of such projects being funded through Development Agreements. A number of cities in Santa Clara County currently have Transportation Impact Fee programs in place, either citywide or in specific areas. There are currently two CMP Deficiency Plans in place in Santa Clara County – an area wide plan in North San José and a citywide plan in Sunnyvale. Collectively, these development-related funding sources provide revenue for many specific transit, highway, expressway, and local road, bicycle, and TDM projects around the county. A total of $714 million for transit, roadway and multimodal improvements is estimated over the life of this Plan.

Additional Funding Strategies

VTP 2040 provides a structure for discussing and exploring strategies for seeking additional funding that VTA will explore during the timeframe of the plan. A description of these potential fund sources are summarized below.

New Local Sales Tax

Santa Clara County is the first “self-help” county in California to vote in sales taxes for transportation programs and projects. Since the first vote in 1984 Santa Clara County has approved four measures for a range of transportation projects and programs that include bikes, transit, roadways and highways. As a
self-help leader within the State and region, it is reasonable to believe that voters may approve additional sales tax measures within the life of the plan.

**Transit Special District**

Jurisdictions around the nation and in other counties are exploring and implementing Transit Special Districts (TSD) to generate funds to support new or expanded transit service and/or transit-related capital improvements in specific areas or corridors. The concept is that assessments would be levied to businesses, property owners, other special districts such as schools, or jurisdictions in general that request new transit service and that would benefit from those service improvements. The fees would support expanded transit operations that support new development or community specific services such as community bus. This may also be a mechanism that would allow VTA to implement transit service improvements in advance of the land use in areas where VTA’s Transit Sustainability Policy and Service Design Guidelines are not met. Several cities are in the process of preparing comprehensive General Plan updates and VTA will be working over the next few years with these jurisdictions to further explore this option in conjunction with these processes.

**Joint Development Program**

VTA has implemented a Joint Development/Land Development Program. This program responds to the Board’s 2003 Ad Hoc Financial Committee Recommendations to pursue opportunities to provide VTA with a diverse revenue stream. VTA has a large portfolio of land assets that if developed, leased or sold and the revenues properly invested can generate a significant ongoing revenue stream for VTA.

**Gas Taxes**

Federal and State funds consist primarily of excise taxes on gasoline and diesel fuels. The federal Highway Trust Fund (HTF), which funds various programs for both highways and transit, is currently supported by an 18.4 cent per gallon motor vehicle gas tax which was last increased in 1993. With the gas tax remaining fixed for nearly two decades, it has failed to keep up with the rising costs in highway construction and repair. It also fails to account for improved fuel efficiency from hybrid and electric vehicles, which mean more vehicle miles, will not necessarily match higher gasoline sales. As revenue from gas taxes continue to decline, it has become apparent that gas taxes either need to be raised, fixed
or replaced by an alternative tax that can adequately provide a reliable source of funding for transportation projects. A five cent per gallon local tax on gasoline/diesel fuel sales in Santa Clara County would generate about $40 million annually.

**Consumption or Use Taxes**

An alternative to or supplement to gas taxes are consumption or “user fee” taxes, such as a vehicle-miles-traveled (VMT) tax. A VMT tax charges a small fee for every mile a motorists drives. This approach may also be favorable to increasing the gas tax since the tax is derived from those who use the road the most and can be adjusted as needed to discourage motorists from using congested roads during peak travel times.

**Other Impact Fees**

In addition to the current development-related transportation impact and mitigation fees described earlier in this section, there is the possibility that other impact fees may be established in Santa Clara County in the future. These revenue sources could originate from individual agencies, or could potentially occur at a multi-jurisdictional or countywide level.

In 2008, VTA investigated the option of impact fees to fund transportation improvements across Santa Clara County. The product of this research is VTA’s *Traffic Impact Fee White Paper*, which summarizes findings of existing practices, methods of fee collections and the benefits and challenges of implementing a countywide impact fee program. The white paper is intended to identify best practices in implementing fee programs rather than provide recommendations on an impact fee scenario for Santa Clara County. Should VTA and its Member Agencies decide to pursue a countywide impact fee program, the fee program could have the following aspects:

- Fees charged directly to developers seeking permits to build within the county.
- Fees charged proportional to the impact (i.e., vehicle trip generation) of the specific land use type. Thus, the fee could be scaled according to the burden new development places on congested transportation infrastructure. The traditional approach to instituting a fee of this type is for all local jurisdictions to adopt the plan by a majority vote of their city council or board. Although no legal precedent has been established, an alternative strategy may be for VTA to
institute a 50 percent matching requirement and give each jurisdiction the option of adopting the countywide fee as a means of generating its local match.

VTA Member Agencies may in the future develop their own Transportation Impact Fees or Citywide Deficiency Plans to implement transportation improvements as new development occurs.

**Other Funding Opportunities**

Local revenues can offer greater reliability and flexibility than State or Federal sources, and may be used strategically to leverage other funds. Forecasting the amount of revenue that many of these sources might generate is a difficult and inexact process over the long term. Potential local sources include, but are not limited to:

- City or county general funds
- Business tax and/or license fees
- Transient Occupancy taxes
- Local assessment districts
- Right-of-way dedication
- California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) mitigation
- Redevelopment tax increment financing
- Parking charges and taxes
- VMT tax
- Payroll tax
- Parcel tax
- Roadway pricing
- Other user fees
2B. Capital Investment Program

The CIP sets forth a comprehensive set of transportation projects and programs that carry out a vision for an integrated, more efficient and sustainable multimodal transportation system serving all socio-economic groups, supporting existing and new development, and embracing the future potential of Santa Clara County. This is reflected in an increased emphasis on complete streets principles, interconnectivity, and bicycle and pedestrian projects that augment other modes of travel, firmly establishing walking and cycling as viable forms of transportation. The projects and programs listed in the CIP serve as the basis for Santa Clara County’s project submittals to the 2013 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

Many of the projects are location-specific improvements while others are listed as a subcategory, such as the Community Design and Transportation. In addition, VTP 2040 Program Areas diverge from the format of previous VTPs to more simplified format. In VTP 2040 projects are assigned to one of three general program areas: Transit System, Highway System, and Local System as follows:

1. Transit System
   - VTA
   - Caltrain / High Speed Rail
   - ACE

2. Highway System
   - Express Lanes
   - Highways

3. Local System
   - County Expressways
   - Local Streets and Roads
   - Multimodal Transportation Improvements (ITS, bikes/pedestrian, CDT/livable communities)

Each program area is presented and discussed further in the following sections.

Program Area Definitions

Transit System
This program area includes transit expansion and improvement projects that VTA leads, such as BART to Silicon Valley, light rail improvements and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT). It also includes the projects for which VTA provides capital funding or in which VTA is a partner such as developing rail corridor and station improvements for specific rail projects. The most expensive projects in this program area are BART Silicon Valley and the California High Speed Rail project.

Highway System
This program area includes highway expansion, interchanges, on/off ramps, and operational efficiency projects. A major component of the Highway System Program Area is the development of Express Lanes throughout most of the freeway corridors within the County.

Local System
This program area encompasses improvements on the local facilities, such as County Expressways, local streets and County roads, Traffic Operating System, and bike and pedestrian facilities.
- County Expressway system – encompasses improvements generated by the Countywide Expressway Study, including a variety of bike and pedestrian improvements.
- Local Streets and County Roads – contains projects focused on major improvements to the roadway system, such as reconstruction or, in certain cases, expansion.
- Multimodal Transportation Investments (MTI) – includes improvements that focus on complete streets elements, bicycle and pedestrian access through the VTA Bicycle program, Traffic Operating System (TOS) elements, and projects that utilize the CDT program guidance.

Development of the Constrained Project Lists
VTA develops financially constrained project lists to guide local investments and for submittal to MTC for inclusion in the financially constrained portion of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Funding for the financially constrained projects comes from a variety of sources that are reasonably expected to be available during the life of the plan (See Chapter 2A and Appendix X for more information on funding and fund sources.)

The development of VTP 2040 project lists includes outreach to VTA Member Agencies, community organizations, public officials, and the general public to help determine which projects should move
forward to the constrained project list. Project lists are initially developed from existing lists and priorities set by VTA Member Agencies. Initial lists are refined through a review process involving VTA committees and Board as well as public meetings and workshops. Project list development is an iterative process that evolves over a period or 18-24 months. {Insert public meeting photo somewhere in the upper/lower paragraph and have the text wrap around it}

In January 2012, the VTA Board of Directors approved a financially constrained list of projects to be submitted to MTC and included in the RTP. Further details on VTA’s outreach efforts may be found in the VTP 2040 Community Outreach Implementation Plan. Complete details about the VTP Development Process are available in Appendix D.

The Programming Process

VTP 2040 is a long-range transportation planning document, and neither it nor the RTP set priorities or schedules for when projects are to be implemented. VTA works with MTC to ensure projects appearing in VTP 2040’s Investment Program are included in the financially constrained portion of the RTP. Projects that want to seek State or Federal funds, and/or want to certify environmental clearances and move into final design/constriction phases must appear in the RTP. Projects that require funding are then determined by using a set of Board adopted criteria that is focused on elements of project readiness. Following VTA Board approval to program funds to specific projects from specific sources, MTC places those projects in its Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP). Funds from State and Federal sources are released for obligation to these projects. Finally, the sponsors of the projects obligate the funds in order to finance construction.

Transit System Program Development

The Capital Investment Program identifies specific transit capital projects to be implemented during the timeframe of the plan. These projects include Santa Clara Valley Rapid Transit (SVRT/BART) extensions, light rail system improvements and extensions, bus rapid transit corridors, regional rail services, and enhanced commuter rail service. This section discusses VTA’s plans to enhance and expand current services, descriptions of capital projects, and funding challenges to fully implement the Transit Program of projects. {Insert transit photo (T1) somewhere in this section}
Transit Capital Program
The VTP 2040 Transit Program is based on the currently adopted Measure A Expenditure Plan and planning work conducted since 2008. The Measure A sales tax is the most significant and reliable source of funds for major transit improvements in Santa Clara County. Eighteen projects, representing an eight billion dollar investment, are included in the financially constrained Transit project list (Table 2.2, Figure 2.2). In addition to the Measure A sales tax measure, a wide range of fund sources must be pursued to fully implement the Transit Program (Table 2.1). These funds include Federal New and Small Starts, Santa Clara County Express Lane Program net revenues, TCRP, and other Federal and State funds.

Table 2.2 Financially Constrained Transit Projects in Santa Clara County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VTP ID</th>
<th>Transit Project Title and Description</th>
<th>Cost (2013 $M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>BART Silicon Valley - The Berryessa Extension</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project connects the existing BART system from the Warm Springs Station in Southern Fremont through Milpitas to the Berryessa District of San Jose. It includes two new BART stations and facility modifications to the existing BART Hayward Yard for maintenance of BART vehicles. The official project ground-breaking occurred on April 12, 2012 and passenger service is expected to begin in 2018.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>BART Silicon Valley - The Santa Clara Extension</td>
<td>$3,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project continues the BART extension in a tunnel under downtown San Jose ending near the Santa Clara Caltrain Station and builds four new stations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>El Camino Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)</td>
<td>$230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project upgrades the current Line 522 service along El Camino Real and The Alameda between the Palo Alto Transit Center and Downtown San Jose. The project is projected to decrease transit travel times, lower operating costs, increase ridership and increase farebox revenue. Anticipated service date beginning 2016.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>Stevens Creek Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)</td>
<td>$151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project implements BRT on Stevens Creek Boulevard and West San Carlos Street, crossing I-880 and Winchester with other segments of dedicated lane operations. Corridor improvements include segments of dedicated bus lane, special branded shelters, off-board fare collection, and other streetscape and urban design amenities. The anticipated service date is 2017.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>Santa Clara/Alum Rock Transit Improvement (SCAR) (BRT)</td>
<td>$128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project constructs enhancement in the County's highest ridership corridor, including 2 miles of dedicated lanes on the eastern half of the corridor and mixed flow operations in the western segments. Construction to begin in early 2013 and revenue service to begin in late 2014.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>BART Berryessa Connector</td>
<td>$60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The BART Berryessa Connector will link BART riders to their ultimate destination as well as provide a premium service for Santa Clara County residents destined for the Berryessa BART station. The service will likely utilize distinctive vehicles similar to those anticipated for VTA’s Express Bus and Bus Rapid Transit services. Capital improvements that will facilitate the service could be developed in multiple corridors to facilitate premium service levels and enhanced passenger environments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T7</th>
<th>Capitol Expressway Light Rail Pedestrian and Bus Stop Improvements</th>
<th>$53</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian and bus improvements along Capitol Expressway to accommodate pedestrian access and to improve safety, including new sidewalks, pedestrian and street lights, and a landscaping buffer between the sidewalk and roadway from Capitol Avenue to Quimby Road. During this phase, reconstruction of the Eastridge Transit Center will also take place. Under construction with an anticipated completion date in 2013.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T8</th>
<th>Capitol Expressway Light Rail Extension</th>
<th>$276</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project would extend the light rail system 2.6 miles from the current terminus at Alum Rock Avenue to Eastridge Transit Center in San Jose. Light rail will operate primarily in the center of Capitol Expressway, with elevated track structures. The Eastridge extension will include three light rail stations: Story Road, Ocala Avenue, and Eastridge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T9</th>
<th>Vasona Light Rail Extension</th>
<th>$176</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project would build the Vasona Light Rail Extension, consisting of extending VTA’s light rail system 1.5 miles from the current terminus at Winchester Avenue in Campbell to Vasona Junction in Los Gatos (Netflix campus).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T10</th>
<th>Guadalupe Express Light Rail Improvement Project</th>
<th>$22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project reconfigures the southern half of the Light Rail System’s operations to provide express trains along the Santa Teresa line and interline the Almaden spur with the Tasman West line to Mountain View and create an independent Winchester line. Requires modest track and signal improvements between Downtown San Jose and Civic Center.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T11</th>
<th>Tasman Express Light Rail Improvement Project (Long T)</th>
<th>$49</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project provides infrastructure needed to Introduce a new light rail line linking Mountain View to Alum Rock in time for the opening of the critical Light Rail/BART connection at Montague station in late 2016. The new service will feature peak period express trains between Mountain View and Santa Clara that will expedite access to and from the BART station while improving service to existing and future land uses along the Tasman corridor. The project requires track improvements and signal upgrades at several key points along the Tasman corridor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T12</th>
<th>North First Speed Improvements</th>
<th>$9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project provides several speed improvements for the North First Street corridor – roughly between Tasman and the Metro/Airport stations to allow Light Rail speeds to improve from 35 to 45 miles per hour. A key element of these improvements will be fencing along the Light Rail right-of-way.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T13</th>
<th>Caltrain Electrification Tamien to San Francisco</th>
<th>$608</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Project provides Improvements to support a blended HSR/Electrified Caltrain rail system from the Transbay Transit Center to the Tamien station. The blended system coordinates the development and operation of high speed rail with Caltrain passenger service on the existing two track configuration. These investments will realize early implementation of modernized electrified Caltrain service by 2019, reduce noise and air pollution, minimize impacts on surrounding communities, reduce project costs, and expedite the implementation of high speed rail in 2029.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T14 Caltrain - South County</td>
<td>$31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double track segments on the Caltrain line between San Jose and Gilroy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T15 Caltrain / HSR Station Improvements: San Jose Diridon and Gilroy Stations</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide station improvements needed to accommodate and support the High Speed Rail service.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T16 ACE Upgrade</td>
<td>$16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This program will upgrade service by providing VTA's share of funds for rolling stock and track improvements. VTA will work with San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission staff to implement this program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T17 North San Jose Transit Improvements</td>
<td>$35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit improvements projects included in the North San Jose Development Area Deficiency Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T18 Mineta San Jose International Airport APM Connector</td>
<td>$81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project would provide transit link to San Jose International Airport from VTA's Guadalupe Light Rail Transit (LRT) Line, and from Caltrain and future BART in Santa Clara, using automated People Mover (APM) technology. The environmental phase is included.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Constrained Transit Projects $8,131

Highway System Program Development

The VTP 2040 Highway Program includes ongoing efforts to expand the Express Lanes network, improvements to system operations, increased efficiency in key corridors, and enhancements that relieve congestion, alleviate bottlenecks, and increase safety. Capacity increasing projects are pursued if no other feasible alternative is found.

Highway Capital Program

Seventy-six projects, representing approximately $5.6 billion in costs were evaluated using the Board adopted Highway Project Prioritization criteria, which are designed to allot fair consideration to the full range of low-cost, high utility improvements as well as higher cost mainline capacity and systems enhancements. Out of this unconstrained list the financially constrained project were derived. The financially constrained project list consists of fifty-two projects totaling $3.1 billion dollars of
improvements (Tables 2.3a and 2.3b), including $2.3 billion for the comprehensive Silicon Valley Express Lane (SVEL) network in Santa Clara County. Revenues from the Express Lane Program will fund both operations and capital improvements.

VTA has legislative authority to implement and operate Express Lanes in the SR 237 and SR 85/US 101 corridors, and they are considered the highest priority Express Lanes projects in Santa Clara County.

Table 2.3a Financially Constrained Express Lanes Projects in Santa Clara County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VTP ID</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Express Lanes / Toll Facilities Project Title and Description</th>
<th>Cost (2013 $M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>SR 85</td>
<td>SR 85 Express Lanes: US 101 (South San Jose to Mountain View)</td>
<td>$181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Converts 24 miles of the existing high-occupancy vehicle (HOV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lanes along SR 85 to Express Lanes. The proposed facility will</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>allow single occupancy vehicles access to the express lanes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>by paying a toll. An additional express lane will be added</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to create two-lane express lanes along a portion of the corridor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The project will also include the continuation of the Express</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lanes for 3 miles to US 101 in South San Jose, through the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SR 85/US 101 Interchange, for a total of 27 miles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>US 101</td>
<td>Convert existing HOV lanes to express lanes on US 101 from</td>
<td>$465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Whipple Avenue in San Mateo County to Cochrane Road in Morgan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Convert 34 miles of the existing HOV lane on US 101 between</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cochrane Road and the San Mateo County line to express</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lane operation. The proposed facility will implement two</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lanes of express lanes within the existing footprint to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>accommodate the projected travel demand for US 101.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>SR 237</td>
<td>SR 237 Express Lanes: North First Street to Mathilda Avenue</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Convert HOV Lanes to Express Lanes on SR 237 between North</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>First Street and Mathilda Avenue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>SR 87</td>
<td>SR 87 Express Lanes: SR 85 to US 101</td>
<td>$35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Convert HOV Lanes to Express Lanes on SR 87.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>SR 237</td>
<td>SR 237 Express Lanes: Mathilda Avenue to SR 85</td>
<td>$81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Build new Express Lanes on SR 237 between Mathilda Avenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and SR 85.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>I-680</td>
<td>I-680 NB Express Lane: Calaveras Boulevard to Alameda County</td>
<td>$36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Widen to add an Express Lane on I-680 northbound between</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Calaveras Boulevard and the Alameda County Line.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td>I-880</td>
<td>I-880 Express Lanes: Alameda County line to US 101</td>
<td>$23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Convert existing HOV lanes to Express Lanes on I-880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>between the Alameda County line and US 101.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8</td>
<td>US 101</td>
<td>US 101 Express Lanes: Cochrane Road to Masten Avenue</td>
<td>$107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Build new Express Lanes on US 101 between Cochrane Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and Masten Avenue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9</td>
<td>US 101</td>
<td>US 101 Express Lanes: Masten Avenue to 10th Street</td>
<td>$68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Build new Express Lanes on US 101 between Masten Avenue and 10th Street.

| H10 | US 101 | US 101 Express Lanes: 10th Street to SR 25 | $50 |

Build new Express Lanes on US 101 between 10th Street and SR 25.

| H11 | I-280 | I-280 Express Lanes: Leland to Magdalena | $58 |

Convert existing HOV lanes to Express Lanes on I-280 between Leland Avenue and Magdalena Avenue.

| H12 | I-280 | I-280 Express Lanes: US 101 to Leland | $25 |

Convert 1 general purpose lane to Express Lanes in each direction on I-280 between US 101 and Leland Avenue.

| H13 | I-280 | I-280 Express Lanes: SB El Monte to Magdalena | $14 |

Build new Express Lanes on I-280 southbound from El Monte Avenue to Magdalena Avenue.

| H14 | I-680 | I-680 Express Lanes: Calaveras Boulevard to Montague Expressway | $20 |

Convert 1 general purpose lane to Express Lanes in each direction on I-680 between Calaveras Boulevard and Montague Expressway.

| H15 | I-880 | I-880 Express Lanes: US 101 to I-280 | $186 |

Build new express lane on I-880 between US 101 and I-280.

| H16 | SR 17 | SR 17 Express Lanes | $30 |

Convert one lane to express lanes between I-280 to SR 85.

| H17 | I-680 | I-680 Express Lanes: Montague Expressway to US 101 | $35 |

Convert one lane to express lanes between I-280 to SR 85.

| H18 | SR 152 | New SR 152 Alignment: SR 156 to US 101 | $848 |

Project includes US 101 Widening from Monterey Street to the SR 25/US 101 Interchange; New interchange at SR 25/US 101; And a new SR 152 alignment that will be operated as a toll facility from US 101 to SR 156; SR152 Improvements include; roadway and access control improvements between SR156 and the County Line, and new east bound truck climbing lanes over Pacheco Pass.

**Express Lanes Projects Total** $2,282

Over the last several years, VTA and Caltrans have conducted highway planning studies to identify projects for development and that have been included in the VTP planning process. The highway projects in VTP 2040 focus on improving the existing highway network and were chosen because they address congestion, improve efficiency, and reduce commute times, all of which help to reduce greenhouse gases, vehicle miles travelled, and enhance the highway experience for travelers.
### Table 2.3b Financially Constrained Highway Projects in Santa Clara County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VTP ID</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Highways Project Title and Description</th>
<th>Cost (2013 $M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H19</td>
<td>US 101</td>
<td>Double Lane SB US 101 off-ramp to SB SR 87</td>
<td>$1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Widen the existing ramp by providing a secondary lane on the off-ramp at SR 87.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H20</td>
<td>SR 17</td>
<td>SR 17 SB/Hamilton Avenue Off-ramp Widening</td>
<td>$1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Widen off-ramp to improve operations on Southbound Route 17 at Hamilton Avenue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H21</td>
<td>SR 85</td>
<td>SR 85 Northbound to Eastbound SR 237 Connector Ramp and NB SR 85 Aux Lane</td>
<td>$30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Widen off-ramp from NB SR 85 to SR 237 EB to 2 lanes; Construct auxiliary lane on EB SR 237 between SR 85 onramp to Middlefield Road; Construct braid off-ramp on EB SR 237 between SR 85 and Dana Street. These improvements will address the current congestion that extends from SR 237 to SR 85 El Camino Real interchange during the AM peak period. In addition, it would also remove the weave between traffic on EB SR 237 exiting to Dana Street with traffic from NB SR 85.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H22</td>
<td>SR 85</td>
<td>SR 85/Cottle Rd Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>$6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reconfigure ramp Interchange with minor improvements at SR 85 and Cottle Road.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H23</td>
<td>SR 87</td>
<td>SR 87/Capitol/Narvaez Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>$12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reconfigure the SR 87 interchange, with possible adjustment at Narvaez Avenue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H24</td>
<td>US 101</td>
<td>Montague Expressway &amp; US 101 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>$17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct partial interchange at US 101 and Montague Expressway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H25</td>
<td>US 101</td>
<td>US 101 SB/Trimble Road/De La Cruz Boulevard/Central Expressway Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>$39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Modify existing loop cloverleaf ramp from SB US 101 to Trimble Road into a partial cloverleaf ramp (diagonal ramp with signalized intersection). Modify the SB US 101 onramp from De La Cruz Boulevard/Central Expressway to 1 mixed flow lane, 1 HOV lane with ramp metering equipment. The onramp will be modified to improve merging onto SB US 101. The De La Cruz Boulevard bridge across US 101 will be widened from 4 lanes to 6 lanes. The segment between De La Cruz Boulevard/Trimble Road intersections to bridge overcrossing will be widened by an additional lane.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H26</td>
<td>US 101</td>
<td>US 101/Blossom Hill Road Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>$23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reconfigure interchange at US 101/Blossom Hill Road in San Jose; Modifications are on the local roadway system, including widening of Blossom Hill Road over US 101.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H27</td>
<td>US 101</td>
<td>US 101/Mabury Road/Taylor Street Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>$57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct a new interchange with full access to the US 101 freeway. The project will provide access to US 101 for the heavy local commuter traffic that currently are forced to use the congested Old Oakland Road interchange (north of Mabury Road). The interchange would also act as the primary access to the future Berryessa BART station.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H28</td>
<td>US 101</td>
<td>US 101/Old Oakland Road Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>$23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interchange improvements at US 101 and Old Oakland Road and possible widening on Old Oakland Road.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H29</td>
<td>US 101</td>
<td>US 101/Hellyer Avenue Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>$16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Widening the overcrossing from 2 to 4 lanes and installing traffic signals at each of the two off-ramp intersections. Widen the intersection with the southbound on and off-ramps to include a second eastbound through lane and a separate left turn pocket. Widen the southbound off ramp will be widened to provide 2 left turn lanes. At the intersection of the Northbound off ramp, widen Hellyer from 1 to 2 lanes in the eastbound direction and the westbound left turn pocket.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H30</td>
<td>US 101</td>
<td>US 101/Zanker Road/Skyport Drive/Fourth Street Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>$104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Constructs a new interchange connecting Zanker Road, an Old Bayshore Highway, with North Fourth Street and Skyport Drive at US 101. The interchange will provide an overcrossing across US 101 to improve limited existing connectivity across US 101 to the North San Jose employment centers. In addition, the interchange would improve access to Mineta International Airport (San Jose) from US 101. The existing intersection at North First Street and Skyport Drive, North Fourth Street and Old Bayshore Highway, northbound US 101 on and off-ramp, northbound US 101 off-ramp to Brokaw Road will be modified to construct this interchange.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H31</td>
<td>US 101</td>
<td>US 101/Buena Vista Avenue Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>$31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Constructs a full interchange at US 101 and Buena Vista Avenue. The interchange includes a flyover southbound onramp to braid with the existing truck exit at the CHP Inspection Station. Off-ramp diagonal ramps will be constructed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H32</td>
<td>SR 237</td>
<td>SR 237 Westbound On-ramp at Middlefield Road</td>
<td>$13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct WB loop onramp from NB Middlefield Road to WB SR 237; Eliminates signalized intersection at Middlefield Road/WB SR 237 diagonal onramp; And realigns frontage road to form a new intersection at Middlefield Road/Ferguson Drive. The existing signalized intersections between Middlefield Road/WB SR 237 diagonal onramp and Middlefield Road/Ferguson Drive are closely spaced and are experiencing several broadside accidents. These improvements will reduce one signalized intersection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H33</td>
<td>SR 237</td>
<td>SR 237/Mathilda Avenue &amp; US 101/Mathilda Avenue Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>$17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Modify US 101/ Mathilda and SR 237/Mathilda interchanges, reducing to one signalized intersection and increasing intersection spacing in the Mathilda Avenue/SR 237 Interchange Area. Project to include ramp improvements, addition of auxiliary lanes, and construction of new ramp configurations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H34</td>
<td>SR 237</td>
<td>SR 237/North First Street Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>$2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interchange improvements at SR 237 and N 1st Street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H35</td>
<td>I-280</td>
<td>I-280 Northbound - Second Exit Lane to Foothill Expressway</td>
<td>$2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct a second exit lane from northbound I-280 to Foothill Expressway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H36</td>
<td>I-880</td>
<td>I-880/Montague Expressway Interchange Improvement</td>
<td>$14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct partial interchange at I-880 and Montague Expressway, including improvements on Montague.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H37</td>
<td>SR 152</td>
<td>SR 152 Ramp/Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Construct EB right turn lane at the intersection of SR 152 and Frazier Lake Road; Widen SR 152 at the intersection of Bloomfield Road; and additional turn lanes at SR 152 and Watsonville Road; Signalize and widen SR 152 south leg and Ferguson Road from 2 to 4 lanes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H38</th>
<th>SR 237</th>
<th>SR 237/El Camino Real/Grant Road Intersection Improvements</th>
<th>$5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Widening WB SR 237 within the existing median to extend both of the left turn lanes; Lengthening the NB El Camino Real right turn lane onto SR 237 starting the lane at Yuba Drive; Widening the SB El Camino Real left turn lane within the existing median; and constructing a right turn lane on SB El Camino Real for traffic accessing WB Grant Road.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reconstruct the existing I-280 northbound off-ramp at 7th Street to connect directly to 3rd Street and the I-280 northbound onramp from 4th Street will be reconstructed to cross over the new off-ramp. The existing off-ramp connection to 5th Street will be eliminated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H40</th>
<th>SR 85</th>
<th>SR 85/ El Camino Real I/C Improvements</th>
<th>$23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct SR 85 auxiliary lanes between El Camino Real and SR 237, and SR 85/El Camino Real interchange improvements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Construct partial interchange at I-680 and Montague Expressway including improvements on Montague Expressway.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H41</th>
<th>I-680</th>
<th>I-680/Montague Expressway Interchange Improvement</th>
<th>$26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Construct southbound improvements on US 101 from San Antonio Road to Charleston Road/ Rengstorff Avenue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H42</th>
<th>US 101</th>
<th>US 101 Southbound Improvements: San Antonio Road to Charleston Road/Rengstorff Avenue</th>
<th>$22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Construct improvements to US 101/Oregon Expressway/Embarcadero Road Interchange.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H44</th>
<th>SR 237</th>
<th>SR 237 WB to SB SR 85 Connector Ramp Improvements (including SR 85 auxiliary lanes between El Camino Real &amp; SR 237)</th>
<th>$40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct a collector/distributor road in the westbound direction on SR 237 from the Central Expressway overcrossing to SR 85. Widen off-ramp from westbound SR 237 to southbound SR 85 to two lanes. Add auxiliary lane in the southbound direction between SR 237 and the El Camino Real interchange on SR 85.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conduct preliminary engineering, environmental studies and design widen the existing off-ramp to Foothill Expressway from northbound I-280 from a single-lane exit to a two-lane exit opening at I-280. This solution is expected to improve the existing weaving traffic through this area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H45</th>
<th>I-280</th>
<th>I-280 Northbound Braided Ramps between Foothill Expressway and SR 85</th>
<th>$44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Extend Senter Road and construct new on/off ramps and modify existing on/off ramps into a collector/distributor ramp system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H46</th>
<th>I-280</th>
<th>I-280/Senter Road Interchange</th>
<th>$50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Construct SR 237 eastbound, build auxiliary lanes between Mathilda Avenue to Fair Oaks Avenue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H48</th>
<th>US 101</th>
<th>US 101 Southbound Auxiliary Lane: Great America Pkwy to Lawrence</th>
<th>$3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**Expressway**

Construct auxiliary lanes on US 101 from Great America Parkway to Lawrence Expressway.

**H49  US 101  Southbound Auxiliary Lane Improvement Between Ellis Street and SR 237  $4**

Construct a US 101 southbound (SB) auxiliary lane from Ellis Street interchange to eastbound (EB) Route 237. The project will reduce queue backup onto SB US 101 mainline during the AM peak period by providing additional storage. The project may also include Traffic Operation Systems (TOS) elements.

**H50  All  Sound walls  $15**

Construct soundwalls on major highways. Projects to be determined through Soundwall Study.

**H51  All  Highway TOS  $100**

Transportation Operations Systems installation and maintenance for metering ramps and other ramp improvements.

**Total Highway Projects  $842**

---

**Local System Program Development**

The Local System Program area is a new organizational structure in the VTP document and encompasses a range of projects, carried out by Member Agencies. The project in this new Program Area have in the past been included in other VTP Program Areas, and are now consolidated into three primary categories:

- County Expressways
- Local Streets and County Roads
- Multimodal Transportation Investments (MTI)

The Local System Program Area is intended to maximize funding flexibility and opportunities, and create a planning framework that encourages VTA and Member Agencies to look for project synergies – with the ultimate goals of improved project scope, cost savings, and increased administrative efficiency. Local System projects are largely generated by VTA’s Member Agencies, with input from the communities, and address deficiencies within the local street and county road system. The Local System Program areas are each discussed in more detail below.
**County Expressways**
Santa Clara County is the only county in California operating a comprehensive expressway system within urban areas. In 2008, the County of Santa Clara adopted its Comprehensive County Expressway Planning Study which provides a long-term plan for the improvement and maintenance of the expressway system. In 2012, the County initiated a comprehensive update to this plan, reflecting new conditions and opportunities, and addressing unresolved issues identified in the 2008 Study. This new plan; however, is not expected to change the County’s expressway project VTP 2040 submittals.

The County placed expressway projects into five tiers based on criteria approved by the Expressway Study Policy Advisory Board. The top Tier was submitted by the County for inclusion in VTP 2040. All projects from the top Tier are included in the financially constrained project list (Table 2.4, Figure 2.4) with a proposed VTP 2040 allocation of $267 Million. That includes approximately $148 million in state and federal sources and $119 million from local development fees.

**Table 2.4 Financially Constrained Expressway Projects in Santa Clara County**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VTP ID</th>
<th>Expressways Project Title and Description</th>
<th>Cost (2013 $M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1</td>
<td>Almaden Expressway – Widen Coleman to Blossom Hill</td>
<td>$12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widen Almaden Expressway to eight lanes between Coleman Avenue and Blossom Hill Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2</td>
<td>Central Expressway – Auxiliary lanes between Mary Ave and Lawrence Expressway</td>
<td>$19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct auxiliary acceleration and/or deceleration lanes along the grade-separated segment on Central Expressway between Lawrence Expressway and Mary Avenue to improve ramp operations and safety.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3</td>
<td>Central Expressway – Convert Measure B HOV lane between De La Cruz Blvd and San Tomas Expressway</td>
<td>$0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Convert Measure B HOV lane on Central Expressway between San Tomas Expressway and De La Cruz Boulevard to mixed-flow in order to more fully utilize available system capacity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X4</td>
<td>Central Expressway – Six lanes from Lawrence Expressway to San Tomas Expressway</td>
<td>$15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widen Central Expressway between Lawrence Expressway and San Tomas Expressway from four to six through lanes to reduce delay and improve level of service by providing a consistent roadway width on Central Expressway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X5</td>
<td>Foothill Expressway – Extend deceleration lane at San Antonio Rd</td>
<td>$0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project extends the existing westbound deceleration lane of Foothill Expressway at San Antonio Road by 250 feet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X6</td>
<td><strong>Foothill Expressway – Loyola Bridge</strong></td>
<td>$8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widen Loyola Bridge over Foothill Expressway to add left turn lanes, six-foot shoulders for bicycle use, and five-foot sidewalks with pedestrian ramps. This project also includes circulation improvements for Loyola Drive on both sides of the bridge to calm traffic and improve bicycle/pedestrian access.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X7</th>
<th><strong>Lawrence Expressway – Additional left turn lane at Prospect</strong></th>
<th>$3.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct a second left turn lane from eastbound Prospect Road to northbound Lawrence Expressway and modify existing traffic signals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X8</th>
<th><strong>Lawrence Expressway – Close median, right in/out</strong></th>
<th>$1.7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project closes the median at Lochinvar Avenue and right-in-and-out access at DeSoto Avenue, Golden State Drive, Granada Avenue, Lillick, Buckley Street, and Lawrence Expressway/Lawrence Station on-ramp to improve operations by limiting access to this high-volume expressway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X9</th>
<th><strong>Lawrence Expressway – Arques Square Loop Grade Separation</strong></th>
<th>$52.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct an interchange at the intersection of Lawrence Expressway and Arques Avenue with square loops on Kern Avenue and Titan Way.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X10</th>
<th><strong>Lawrence Expressway – Expand to eight lanes from Moorpark Ave to south of Calvert Drive</strong></th>
<th>$6.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widen Lawrence Expressway from six to eight lanes between Moorpark Avenue/Bollinger Road and south of Calvert Drive, with additional westbound through lane at Moorpark Avenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X11</th>
<th><strong>Montague Expressway – Eight lanes from Lick Mill Blvd to Trade Zone Blvd</strong></th>
<th>$13.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widen Montague Expressway to eight lanes between Lick Mill and Trade Zone Boulevards including widening of Guadalupe River Bridge. Operate the new lanes as HOV lanes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X12</th>
<th><strong>Montague Expressway – Trimble Road Flyover</strong></th>
<th>$37.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct a new flyover ramp at Trimble Road and Montague Expressway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X13</th>
<th><strong>Montague Expressway – Eight lanes from Trade Zone Blvd to I-680</strong></th>
<th>$15.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widen Montague Expressway to eight lanes between Trade Zone Boulevard and I-680; designate new lanes as HOV lanes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X14</th>
<th><strong>Montague Expressway – Mission College Blvd At-Grade Improvements</strong></th>
<th>$5.7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project provides intersection improvements by enhancing and modifying the operational characteristics of the intersection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X15</th>
<th><strong>Oregon Expressway/Page Mill Road – I-280 Page Mill Road Modification</strong></th>
<th>$7.7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project modifies the I-280 freeway connections to enhance safety and improve operations for motor vehicles and bicyclists traveling on Page Mill Road through the interchange area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X16</th>
<th><strong>San Tomas Expressway – SR 17/San Tomas Expressway Improvements</strong></th>
<th>$3.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project creates at-grade improvements at SR 17/San Tomas Expressway that include: re-stripping the eastbound through lane on White Oaks Road to provide an optional left as third left turn lane; provide second right-turn lane on southbound off-ramp; and study potential operational &amp; safety improvements in the interchange area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X17</th>
<th><strong>San Tomas Expressway – Box Culvert</strong></th>
<th>$15.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rebuild 3.9 miles of box culvert under San Tomas Expressway which has serious erosion and a deteriorating structure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X18</th>
<th><strong>San Tomas Expressway – Eight lanes between Williams Road and El Camino Real</strong></th>
<th>$47.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Widen San Tomas Expressway to eight lanes between Williams Road and El Camino Real (SR 82) with additional left turn lane from eastbound and westbound El Camino Real to San Tomas Expressway. Project includes maintaining operations of existing HOV lane; Adding a Class I bike/ped path alongside a segment of the project; Adding sidewalks along all other segments of project; And maintaining bicycle accommodations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X19</th>
<th>Lawrence Expressway - Ramp Improvements at SR 237</th>
<th>$2.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct an auxiliary lane on Southbound Lawrence Expressway, between the SR 237 Loop ramps, that will improve merging on Lawrence Expressway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Constrained Expressway Projects $267.2

**Local Streets and County Roads**

The Local Streets and County Roads Program Area include:

- New street connections and extensions, local road crossings of freeways and expressways
- Reconstruction of streets
- Roadway operational improvements including new lanes, intersection turn lanes, and roundabouts
- New grade separations at railroads and roadways

The VTP 2040 Program Area Allocation (Table 2.1) identifies up to $781 million for local streets and county roads (LS&CR) on the financially constrained project list (Table 2.5, Figure 2.5). Working through the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Working Group of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), VTA developed this list of projects using program eligibility and scoring criteria adopted by the VTA Board. The criteria are based on street connectivity, congestion relief, safety, and support for land use. The following descriptions are representative of projects included in LS&CR.

**Table 2.5 Financially Constrained Local Streets and County Roads Projects in Santa Clara County**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VTP ID</th>
<th>Sponsor / Local Agency</th>
<th>Local Streets and County Roads Project Title and Description</th>
<th>Cost (2013 $M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>Hacienda Avenue Improvements</td>
<td>$3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reconstruct and reconfigure Hacienda Avenue between Winchester Boulevard and San Tomas Aquino Road by narrowing the roadway width and improving connectivity for bicycles to Winchester Boulevard and the future Vasona Light Rail Station.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>Cupertino</td>
<td>McClellan Road Widening</td>
<td>$2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>Gilroy Orbital Concept (NW Quad)</td>
<td>$9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>Tenth Street Bridge Project</td>
<td>$16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>Los Gatos</td>
<td>Los Gatos Boulevard Widening</td>
<td>$6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>Milpitas</td>
<td>Calaveras Boulevard Widening</td>
<td>$81.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7</td>
<td>Milpitas</td>
<td>Dixon Landing Rd./North Milpitas Boulevard Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>$3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>Butterfield Boulevard Extension</td>
<td>$1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R9</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>Butterfield Boulevard South Extension</td>
<td>$21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R10</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>Santa Teresa Boulevard Improvements</td>
<td>$11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11</td>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>Rengstorff Avenue Grade Separation</td>
<td>$71.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **R3 Gilroy**: Gilroy Orbital Concept (NW Quad) - Construct a new four lane arterial that extends Buena Vista Avenue from Santa Teresa Boulevard to Monterey Road.
- **R4 Gilroy**: Tenth Street Bridge Project - Construct a new four lane bridge (twelve-foot Lanes, six-foot bikeways, eight-foot sidewalks and a fourteen-foot median) across Uvas Creek to allow the extension of Tenth Street to Santa Teresa Boulevard (Glen Loma Development).
- **R5 Los Gatos**: Los Gatos Boulevard Widening - Widen Los Gatos Boulevard from Camino Del Cerro to Samaritan Drive to relieve traffic congestion in the area.
- **R6 Milpitas**: Calaveras Boulevard Widening - Replace the four lane bridge, which has a single sidewalk and no bicycle lane, over the Union Pacific (UP) Railroad tracks with a six-lane bridge. Operational improvements include ten foot wide sidewalks, bicycle lanes in both directions and auxiliary lanes between Abel Street and Abbott Avenue.
- **R7 Milpitas**: Dixon Landing Rd./North Milpitas Boulevard Intersection Improvements - Construct an additional northbound left-turn lane with bicycle detectors, a southbound right-turn lane and the addition of an eastbound left and right-turn lane.
- **R8 Morgan Hill**: Butterfield Boulevard Extension - Construct Butterfield Boulevard North Road improvements that include four-lane arterial, bike lanes, sidewalks, lighting and signal modification.
- **R9 Morgan Hill**: Butterfield Boulevard South Extension - Construct new roadway segment by extending Butterfield Boulevard between Tennant Avenue and Watsonville Road. Work will include UPRR overpass structure, drainage channel, traffic signal upgrades, striping, median and landscaping, street lights, bike lanes and sidewalks.
- **R10 Morgan Hill**: Santa Teresa Boulevard Improvements - Project improves the roadway between Main Avenue and DeWitt Avenue. The Roadway section will encompass one lane of traffic and bike lanes in both directions. The project scope also includes sidewalks, street lights, overhead utility relocations, and traffic signals at three intersections: Main Avenue, West Dunne Avenue, and DeWitt Avenue.
- **R11 Mountain View**: Rengstorff Avenue Grade Separation - Project constructs a grade separation, depressing Rengstorff Avenue under the Caltrain tracks and reconnecting the roadway to a new at-grade Rengstorff Avenue and Central Expressway intersection.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R12</th>
<th>Mountain View</th>
<th>Miramonte Avenue/Park Drive &amp; Gladys Drive/Easy St. Intersection Improvements</th>
<th>$0.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Realign Miramonte Avenue to eliminate the existing “exit lane.” from northbound Miramonte Avenue to Park Drive. Reconfigure the Park Drive and Miramonte Avenue intersection and reconfigure the Easy Street/Gladys Avenue intersection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R13</td>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
<td>El Camino Real Regional Corridor Improvements: PAMF to Churchill Avenue</td>
<td>$4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reconfigure El Camino Real between Palo Alto Medical Foundation and Churchill Avenue. Improvements focus on utility undergrounding, new median islands and streetscape focused improvements, and operational enhancements along adjacent streets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R14</td>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
<td>Middlefield Road - Midtown Corridor Improvements</td>
<td>$2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project includes sidewalk enhancements, transit stop improvements, lighting improvements, and traffic signal improvements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R15</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Autumn Parkway Improvement from Union Pacific Rail Road to San Carlos Street</td>
<td>$38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extend new four-lane. multimodal street from UPRR crossing to San Carlos Street and improve existing Autumn Street from Julian Street to San Carlos Street. Project improves multimodal access and circulation to support planned transit oriented development near Diridon Transit Center.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R16</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>North First Street Core Area Grid Streets</td>
<td>$70.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project facilitates the efficient circulation of traffic within North San Jose by constructing several new local streets to form a grid. The new two-lane streets connect to major roadways within North San Jose such as Montague Expressway, Trimble Road, North First Street, and Zanker Road. Included within the system are the extensions of Zanker Road to Skyport Drive, Component Drive to Orchard Parkway, and the connection of Orchard Parkway to Trimble Rd. and Atmel Way.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R17</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Chynoweth/Thornwood Avenue Extension from Almaden Expressway to Winfield Boulevard</td>
<td>$16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct a new two or four-lane connection between Almaden Expressway and Winfield Boulevard with the construction of a new connector, bike lanes, and sidewalks on Chynoweth Avenue or Thornwood bridge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R18</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Charcot Avenue Extension Over I-880</td>
<td>$30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extend new two-lane roadway with bike lanes and sidewalks that provide a new multimodal connection to North San Jose employment centers, improve bicycle/pedestrian access across freeway corridor, and reduce traffic congestion at I-880/Brokaw Road and I-880/Montague Expressway interchanges.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R19</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Coleman Avenue Widening from I-880 to Taylor Street</td>
<td>$15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Widen Coleman Avenue from four to six lanes as part of an enhanced highway gateway to serve planned expansion of Downtown San Jose.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R20</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Downtown Couplet Conversions</td>
<td>$25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Convert one-way couplets to two-way streets, reduce vehicle lanes and add bike lanes along 10th and 11th Streets, Almaden Avenue, Vine St., and 2nd and 3rd Sts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R21</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Zanker Road Widening</td>
<td>$62.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Widen Zanker Road from four to six lanes to support traffic circulation in the North San Jose area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R22</th>
<th>San Jose</th>
<th>Branham Lane/Monterey Hwy Grade Crossing Project</th>
<th>$34.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reconstruct the Branham lane intersection at Monterey Highway, below the Caltrain and UPRR corridor to improve safety and accommodate California High Speed Rail.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R23</th>
<th>San Jose</th>
<th>North San Jose Miscellaneous Intersection Improvements</th>
<th>$33.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project provides various intersection improvements throughout North San Jose.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R24</th>
<th>San Jose</th>
<th>Oakland Road Improvements from 101 to Montague</th>
<th>$11.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide median island landscaping and operational improvements in the roadway corridor between North San Jose and Downtown San Jose area. Widens Oakland Road from four to six lanes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R25</th>
<th>San Jose</th>
<th>Caltrain Grade Separation at Skyway Drive</th>
<th>$35.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct roadway underpass grade separation at Caltrain railroad tracks and future High Speed Rail. Include significant safety and multimodal access improvements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R26</th>
<th>San Jose</th>
<th>San Carlos Street Bridge Replacement and Widening at Caltrain/ Vasona Light Rail</th>
<th>$10.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Replace structurally deficient bridge with improved facilities for biking and walking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R27</th>
<th>San Jose</th>
<th>Brokaw Bridge Widening Over Coyote Creek</th>
<th>$23.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Widen north side of the bridge to add an additional through traffic lane on westbound Brokaw Road.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R28</th>
<th>Santa Clara</th>
<th>Great America Parkway/Mission College Boulevard Intersection Improvements</th>
<th>$7.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project provides improvements at the intersection of Great American Parkway and Mission College Boulevard, which include widening and capacity improvements to add triple left-turns in two directions, and traffic signal upgrades.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R29</th>
<th>Santa Clara</th>
<th>El Camino Real/Lafayette Street Improvements</th>
<th>$1.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project includes widening and capacity improvements, and signal systems upgrades at the intersection of El Camino Real and Lafayette Street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R30</th>
<th>Saratoga</th>
<th>Prospect Road Median Project</th>
<th>$2.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct new medians with landscaping along Prospect Road between Saratoga Avenue and Saratoga-Sunnyvale Road.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R31</th>
<th>Sunnyvale</th>
<th>Mary Avenue Extension</th>
<th>$67.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extend Mary Avenue north across SR-237, reconfiguring the Mathilda Avenue/US101 interchange, rerouting Moffett Park Drive and modifying the eastbound SR 237/Northbound Mathilda Avenue flyover to create an alternative north/south route.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R32</th>
<th>Sunnyvale</th>
<th>Lawrence Expressway/Wildwood Avenue Realignment &amp; Signalization</th>
<th>$5.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Realign Wildwood Avenue to connect directly with Lawrence Expressway and create a new signalized intersection at Lawrence Expressway and Wildwood Avenue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R33</td>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>Sunnyvale Local Street Improvements</td>
<td>$17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Widen intersections and upgrade sidewalks at various locations citywide.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R34</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Center Avenue and Marcella Avenue 2 Lane Connection</td>
<td>$3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project extends Center Avenue approximately 0.2 miles as a two-lane roadway, which connects to Marcella Avenue, and includes constructing a bridge over Llagas Creek.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R35</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>DeWitt Avenue/Sunnyside Avenue Realignment at Edmunsen Avenue</td>
<td>$7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Align DeWitt Avenue with Sunnyside Avenue to eliminate the existing offset intersection and introduce shoulder treatments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R36</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Hill Road Extension from East Main Avenue to Peet Road</td>
<td>$9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extend a two-lane alignment for Hill Road, from East Main Avenue to Half Road and connect to Peet Avenue. Project includes realignment of the existing Peet Road approach to Half Road in order to line up and connect with Hill Road.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R37</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Marcella Avenue Two-Lane Realignment</td>
<td>$7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Realign existing two-lane Marcella Avenue to eliminate 90-degree zigzag along the alignment. This will improve line of sight and operations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R38</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Watsonville Road Center Turn Lane</td>
<td>$8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct center turn lane and right-turn improvements to serve driveways/cross streets. This will stop drivers, waiting to turn, from blocking traffic and drivers passing waiting vehicles from intruding on bicyclists in the shoulders. Project also improves paved shoulders for bicycle use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Constrained Local Streets and County Roads</strong></td>
<td><strong>$781.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>Multimodal Transportation Investments (MTI)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This new section of VTP consolidates projects from Intelligent Transportation System (ITS), Bicycle Expenditure Program (BEP), streetscape components; and the Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Program.

The MTI category is designed to provide funding for projects that have Complete Streets elements and enhance the quality of the roadway for all users of the system. Grouping these types of projects into one program area offers VTA and Member Agencies greater funding flexibility, fosters project bundling to increase cost-effectiveness and implementation efficiency, and helps to craft a framework for local and countywide Complete Streets Programs. By moving from individual project categories to a broader program, VTA intends to encourage and incentivize projects that integrate multiple components and serve multiple modes.

All MTI projects are exempt from regional air quality conformity as they do not add capacity for automobile travel or expand the transportation network. MTI projects may also support Complete...
Street elements. Many General Plans within Santa Clara County have circulation elements that reflect the requirements of the State’s 2008 Complete Streets Act. The MTI program will be funded primarily by Congestion Management and Air Quality (CMAQ), Transportation Enhancement (TE), Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA), and the Santa Clara County's vehicle registration fees (VRF).

A total of $1 billion is assigned to this category that is comprised of projects and program areas that will enhance quality of life and contribute to VTA’s vision for a complete multimodal transportation network (Table 2.6).

Table 2.6 Financially Constrained MTI Project Categories in Santa Clara County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MTI Category Name</th>
<th>Cost ($2013)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Improvements (Bicycle Expenditure Program)</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Environment Improvements</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Systems Operations and Management Program</td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDT, Streetscapes, and Complete Streets</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Constrained MTI Projects</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bicycle Expenditure Program (BEP)

The Bicycle Expenditure Program (BEP) is the funding mechanism for planned bicycle projects in Santa Clara County. It is developed in conjunction with the VTP update. The bicycle network is an essential component of a fully integrated, multimodal, countywide transportation system, and VTA is committed to improving bicycling conditions that will benefit all users 7 days per week and 24 hours per day, enabling people of all ages to bike to work, school, errands, and for recreation.

The BEP was first adopted by the VTA Board of Directors (BOD) in 2000 as a financially constrained list of projects with a ten-year funding horizon. BEP projects are solicited from Member Agencies and evaluated by a committee consisting of BPAC members and VTA staff. The development of the BEP is guided by the Board-adopted policies and Evaluation Criteria. Some changes to the BEP policies are

---

1 Assembly Bill (AB) 1358, Leno
being developed as part of the VTP update.

The funding for the BEP comes from several sources, including:

- Congestion Management Air Quality (CMAQ) through the One-Bay-Area Grant (OBAG) Program
- Transportation Funds for Clean Air, funded through the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD)
- Transportation Development Act Article 3 funds
- Local Matching Funds

VTA administers and distributes funds from these sources to Member Agencies, matching appropriate project types and funding amounts with the requirements of each fund source. VTA assists Member Agencies as necessary to comply with the various regional, state and federal procedural rules of each fund source. Project Sponsors/Member Agencies are required to provide a local match to receive BEP funding. As part of the VTP update, the BEP projects list (Table 2.7a, Figure 2.7a) is reviewed and re-adopted approximately every four years as part of the VTP process.

Table 2.7a Financially Constrained Bicycle Expenditure Plan Projects in Santa Clara County (to be provided after the BEP list is completed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VTP 2040 ID</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Bicycle Expenditure Plan Project Name</th>
<th>Cost (2013 $M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Constrained BEP Projects**

**Pedestrian Environment Improvements**

Pedestrian projects have traditionally been difficult to define and fund. Pedestrian elements are often included in bike or street projects, and within traditional funding programs pedestrian projects have either been excluded or found it difficult to compete with criteria that favored other modes. Nevertheless, VTA has found, and continues to look for, opportunities to meet pedestrian project needs. As part of the VTP outreach process desire to find funding for pedestrian access and safety projects, especially the ones that improve safety for people with mobility limitations, was expressed. Many of
these types of improvements have been indentified and studied in the Community-Based Transportation Plans and other VTA plans. VTA and interested parties all recognize the crucial role that pedestrian improvements play in the County’s multimodal transportation network. Potential pedestrian-specific projects include:

- Transit access improvements, including first- and last-mile connections and shorten pedestrian path
- Safe Routes to Schools projects
- Sidewalk gap closures, and improvements and upgrades
- Removal of safety and access barriers
- Pedestrian / Urban Design amenities such as signage, street lighting and buffer from automobile traffic

In coming years VTA will begin a planning process to determine the best way to develop a pedestrian program and identify capital projects.

**Expressway Pedestrian Funding Program**

The County Expressway Study identifies numerous pedestrian improvements throughout the expressway network. However, funding availability, coordination challenges and sometimes competing priorities have made project implementation sluggish and sporadic. In order to provide a relatively secure and steady source of funds for pedestrian and bicycle improvements on the Expressways that are neither part of the Bicycle Expenditure Program (BEP) nor Community Design and Transportation (CDT) eligible, in 2009 VTA established the Expressway Pedestrian Funding Program that would direct up to $150,000 per year from the TDA Article 3 30% funding, and make them available to fund these projects.

In order to receive these funds, the County and the respective City(s) where the project is located would be required to jointly sponsor the project, coordinate planning, and commit equal amounts of matching funds which would be matched by VTA on equal one-third shares. VTA’s one-third share would be from the TDA funding noted above. VTP 2040 proposes the continuation of this program.

**Transportation Systems Operations and Management Program (TSO&M)**

The Transportation Systems Operations and Management (TSO&M) Program includes projects that use technology to improve the operation and management of the overall transportation system (Table 2.7b,
The new technologies are collectively referred to as Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), and include electronics, computer, and communications infrastructure.

Development of the TSO&M Capital Program for VTP 2040 built on work conducted for the Santa Clara County ITS Plan, as part of VTP 2035. The VTP 2040 TSO&M Capital Program is built off the development of an implementation plan lead by an ITS task force consisting of staff from VTA’s Member Agencies, regional agencies, and Caltrans.

Table 2.7b Financially Constrained Transportation Systems Operations and Management Projects in Santa Clara County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VTP ID</th>
<th>Project Sponsor / Location</th>
<th>Transportation Systems Operations and Management Project Title and Description</th>
<th>Cost (2013 $M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>Hamilton Avenue Intelligent Transportation Systems</td>
<td>$0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project expands on the existing ITS infrastructure on Hamilton Avenue by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>retiming and linking three signals, via wireless interconnect, to the Smart</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Corridor signals to the east.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>Citywide Traffic Signal System Upgrade</td>
<td>$0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project replaces older traffic signal controllers with new controllers and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>signal system software that is compatible with NTCIP and Silicon Valley-ITS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Data Exchange Network Software protocols.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>Winchester Boulevard Intelligent Transportation System</td>
<td>$0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project expands upon existing ITS equipment on Winchester Boulevard by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>installing new conduit, fiber, and fiber equipment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>Reactivation of Traffic Count Stations</td>
<td>$0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reactivate traffic count stations in Campbell along arterials such as Hamilton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Avenue, Winchester Boulevard, and Campbell Avenue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>Cupertino</td>
<td>Stevens Creek Blvd CCTV Cameras</td>
<td>$0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project includes engineering and installing communication equipment and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cameras. The existing fiber optic infrastructure will be utilized to bring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>data from the cameras back to the Cupertino Traffic Operations Center.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The locations are at the intersections of Stevens Creek Blvd with the SB-85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ramp, Stelling, Blaney, Wolfe, and Tantau.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>City of Gilroy Adaptive Traffic Control System</td>
<td>$1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project installs and implements adaptive traffic signal timing on various</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>commute corridors through the City of Gilroy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>City of Gilroy Event Management System</td>
<td>$1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project develops and implements changeable message signs, highway advisory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>radio (HAR), information kiosk, and traveler information system for special</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>events and incident management in the Gilroy area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>City of Gilroy Traffic Signal System Upgrade</td>
<td>$4.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Upgrade traffic signal controller and communications systems with the current technology, including Interconnect to replace outdated equipment and provide city with centralized traffic management system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>City of Gilroy Flood Watch Camera Installations</td>
<td>$0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>ITS Enhancements on Santa Teresa Boulevard</td>
<td>$2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>10th St. and Downtown Signals Upgrade</td>
<td>$1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>SR 152 Signal System Upgrade</td>
<td>$2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>Gilroy Community Bus Signal Priority</td>
<td>$0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>Gilroy Other Signal Upgrade</td>
<td>$1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>Gilroy Downtown Parking Management System</td>
<td>$0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S16</td>
<td>Los Gatos</td>
<td>Town of Los Gatos Traffic Signal System Upgrade</td>
<td>$0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S17</td>
<td>Milpitas</td>
<td>South Milpitas Boulevard SMART Corridor</td>
<td>$0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S18</td>
<td>Milpitas</td>
<td>Citywide Adaptive Bicycle and Pedestrian Timing</td>
<td>$0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S19</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>Citywide Traffic Signal Operation Center</td>
<td>$1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S20</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>Citywide Wireless Vehicle Detection System Installation</td>
<td>$1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S21</td>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>Citywide Traffic Signal Upgrade and IP Traffic Signal Access</td>
<td>$3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Install new traffic signal controllers, software and Internet accessible traffic signal communications to upgrade the City’s existing traffic system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S22</td>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td><strong>Shoreline Boulevard Adaptive Traffic Signals</strong></td>
<td>$2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S23</td>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td><strong>Rengstorff Avenue Traffic Signal Improvements</strong></td>
<td>$1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S24</td>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
<td><strong>Citywide Traffic Signal System Upgrade</strong></td>
<td>$2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S25</td>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
<td><strong>Citywide Traffic Signal CCTV/Emergency Vehicle Preemption Project</strong></td>
<td>$1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S26</td>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
<td><strong>Citywide Traffic Signal Retiming &amp; Pedestrian Facility Upgrades</strong></td>
<td>$1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S27</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td><strong>San Jose Proactive Signal Retiming Program</strong></td>
<td>$30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S28</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td><strong>San Jose Transportation Communications Network Enhancements</strong></td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S29</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td><strong>San Jose Traffic Signal System Upgrades</strong></td>
<td>$15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S30</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td><strong>Downtown San Jose Area Freeway Management System</strong></td>
<td>$2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S31</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td><strong>Downtown San Jose Local Street Advanced Traffic Management System</strong></td>
<td>$3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S32</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td><strong>Downtown San Jose CMS Upgrades</strong></td>
<td>$1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S33</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td><strong>King Road/Story Road Area Advanced Traffic Management System</strong></td>
<td>$3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S34</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td><strong>Silicon Valley ITS Program Upgrades</strong></td>
<td>$32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S35</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td><strong>Silicon Valley TiMC - San Jose Police Department Integration</strong></td>
<td>$2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S36</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td><strong>City of San Jose Red Light Running Enforcement Program</strong></td>
<td>$0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Install cameras at various intersections to capture red light runner incidents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S37</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td><strong>San Jose Traffic Signal Interconnect</strong></td>
<td>$4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Install surveillance cameras at various intersections, install new fiber-optic cable, and replace citywide signal controllers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S38</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td><strong>SVITS Hybrid Analog/Digital Video System</strong></td>
<td>$0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project provides the video component of a greater traffic management system.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S39</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td><strong>Silicon Valley TiMC - Ramp Metering Integration</strong></td>
<td>$9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Install and upgrade new technology for ramp metering at the traffic management center.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S40</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td><strong>Monterey Highway Intelligent Transportation System</strong></td>
<td>$5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Install a system of signal upgrades, interconnect, and CCTV cameras throughout in the Monterey Highway area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S41</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td><strong>San Jose Emergency Vehicle Preemption System</strong></td>
<td>$8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Install an emergency vehicle traffic light preemption system for preemption of traffic lights at intersections to allow safe passage of emergency vehicles. The system includes a real-time status monitor of an intersection which is relayed to a control module for transmission to emergency vehicles as well as to a central dispatch office.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S42</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td><strong>SVITS Connection to Sunnyvale</strong></td>
<td>$4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project encompasses a system of CCTV, signage, and the development of a traffic management center.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S43</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td><strong>Winchester/Stevens Creek Area Advanced Traffic Management System</strong></td>
<td>$2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Install a system of traffic cameras, signal timing upgrades, and other traffic management tools.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S44</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td><strong>Eastridge/Evergreen Area Advanced Traffic Management System</strong></td>
<td>$4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Install a system of traffic cameras, signal timing upgrades, and other traffic management tools.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S45</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td><strong>Almaden/Blossom Hill Area Advanced Traffic Management System</strong></td>
<td>$2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Install a system of traffic cameras, signal timing upgrades, and other traffic management tools.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S46</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td><strong>Saratoga/Moorpark Advanced Traffic Management System</strong></td>
<td>$2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project provides improved monitoring and management tools to better manage the congestion within I-280/Saratoga Avenue interchange and adjacent near Saratoga Avenue/Moorpark Avenue intersection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S47</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td><strong>Brokaw-Airport Area Advanced Traffic Management System</strong></td>
<td>$2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project provides improved monitoring and management tools to better manage the congestion around the roadways surrounding San Jose Airport.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S48</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td><strong>San Jose Citywide Count and Speed Monitoring System</strong></td>
<td>$8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project deploys count and monitoring stations at key locations around the City to provide up to date traffic data for real time traffic management and for investment decisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S49</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td><strong>Santa Clara Communications Network Upgrade</strong></td>
<td>$6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project upgrades infrastructure for existing countywide ITS system.
Convert City's existing copper twisted wire pair (TWP) communication infrastructure to new fiber optic cable network.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>City/County</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S50</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>Santa Clara Traffic Signals Upgrade</td>
<td>$5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S51</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>Santa Clara Traffic Management Center Upgrade</td>
<td>$1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S52</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>Citywide Traffic Monitoring Cameras</td>
<td>$2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S53</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>Citywide Traffic Count and Travel time Monitoring System</td>
<td>$1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S54</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>Citywide Emergency Vehicle Preemption for Traffic Signals</td>
<td>$2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S55</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>Citywide Bicycle Detection</td>
<td>$4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S56</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>Citywide Pedestrian Signal Upgrades</td>
<td>$3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S57</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>Santa Clara Adaptive Traffic Signal System</td>
<td>$6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S58</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>Lafayette Street Reversible Lane Control Upgrade</td>
<td>$3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S59</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>North Santa Clara Event Management System</td>
<td>$8.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S60</td>
<td>Saratoga</td>
<td>Citywide Signal Upgrade Project Phase II</td>
<td>$0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S61</td>
<td>Saratoga</td>
<td>Herriman Avenue/Saratoga Avenue Traffic Signal</td>
<td>$0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S62</td>
<td>Saratoga</td>
<td>Verde Vista Lane Traffic Signal</td>
<td>$0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S63</td>
<td>Saratoga</td>
<td>City of Saratoga Citywide Signal Upgrade Project- Phase II</td>
<td>$0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S64</td>
<td>Saratoga</td>
<td>Citywide Accessible Pedestrian Signals</td>
<td>$0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Code</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S65</td>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>Installation of Pedestrian Countdown Signals</td>
<td>$0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S66</td>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>Traffic Adaptive Signal Controller Update</td>
<td>$4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S67</td>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>Citywide CCTV Camera Deployment</td>
<td>$1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S68</td>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>Citywide Traffic Signal Controller Update</td>
<td>$0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S69</td>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>Citywide Count and Speed Monitoring Stations</td>
<td>$1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S70</td>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>Citywide Intelligent Transportation System Communications Infrastructure</td>
<td>$2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S71</td>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>Traffic Management Center Integration</td>
<td>$0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S72</td>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>Emergency Preemption Receiver Installation</td>
<td>$1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S73</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Santa Teresa Boulevard &amp; Tilton Avenue Traffic Signal Improvements</td>
<td>$0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S74</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Santa Teresa Boulevard &amp; San Martin Avenue Traffic Signal Improvements</td>
<td>$0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S75</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Capitol Expressway – Traffic Operations Systems Infrastructure</td>
<td>$5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S76</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Santa Teresa Blvd/Hale Ave Corridor - Traffic Operations Systems Infrastructure Improvements</td>
<td>$5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S77</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>SCC Motorist Traffic Information &amp; Advisory Systems</td>
<td>$5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Install traffic information outlets such as electronic information changeable message signs along expressways, advisory radio, cable TV feeds and web page to provide real time traffic information to expressway users.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S78</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Signal Coordination/Interconnect with Cross Streets</th>
<th>$5.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Project implements signal coordination/interconnection between expressway signals and major cross street signals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S79</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Traffic Operations Systems Infrastructure Improvements</th>
<th>$11.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Project enhances expressway traffic operations systems components and functions, and provides connectivity between Santa Clara County and cities for sharing of ITS data/communications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S80</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Expressway Adaptive Pedestrian Timing Project</th>
<th>$2.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Project includes adaptive pedestrian timing-dynamic FDW by detecting pedestrians in crosswalk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S81</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Expressway and Santa Teresa Corridor Bike Detection</th>
<th>$2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Install bicycle detection on expressway shoulders close to stop bar at all signalized intersections in both directions of the expressway approach to the intersections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S82</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Magdalena at Country Club Intersection Signal</th>
<th>$0.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Project replaces stop sign with traffic signal at intersection of Magdalena and Country Club.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S83</th>
<th>VTA</th>
<th>Countywide Freeway Traffic Operation System and Ramp Metering Improvements</th>
<th>$30.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Project fills in gaps in both ramp metering and traffic operations systems throughout freeway corridors in Santa Clara County. This also includes improvements to meter on-ramps to add additional storage for queued vehicles waiting at the meters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S84</th>
<th>VTA</th>
<th>Regional Transportation Operations Personnel Service</th>
<th>$6.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Project encompasses a transportation and traffic engineering program that provides staff service to Local Agencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S85</th>
<th>VTA</th>
<th>Regional ITS Maintenance Service</th>
<th>$2.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Project includes an operations and maintenance capital program to upgrade and replace ITS infrastructure.

Total TSO&M Projects Cost $319.8

**Community Design and Transportation Program, Streetscapes, and Complete Streets**

The Community Design and Transportation Program, Streetscapes, and Complete Streets category of the MTI category does not currently have a constrained project list. VTA will evaluate the best way to integrate the CDT Program with new policies developed by MTC to support implementation of SB 375. However, over the life of the plan VTA expects to allocate funds to these programs and projects as shown in table 2.6.
The financially constrained projects included in the Capital Investment Program are representative of VTA’s vision for a livable, mobile, efficient Santa Clara County. The projects are intended to help meet state mandates for greenhouse gas reduction, increase mobility throughout the county, and contribute to a comprehensive multimodal transportation system. The next section, Planning and Project Development, discusses near and long-term planning initiatives, which includes many of the projects in the previous lists, in greater detail.
2C. Planning and Project Development

We plan because we believe our actions today will have a positive outcome in the future. A large part of VTP 2040 centers on this belief through its planning and development programs. Planning and project development activities provide the incremental steps necessary to achieve the long-range goals of the plan. VTA’s investments are supported and complemented by an array of ongoing and future planning initiatives. These efforts take the form of research policies, plans and studies that range in application from specific projects to how VTA functions as an agency. They address key goals such as improving the efficiency of the system, developing new sources of funding, and improving our model of growth to embrace shorter trips and multiple travel modes. Taken as a whole, these initiatives support the mission and vision of VTA and form a roadmap for meeting the challenges Santa Clara County faces over the next 28 years.

While VTP 2040 includes a range of traditional transportation modes – bus and rail transit, and highways and local roads - it has increasing focus on multimodal transportation projects. These are programs and projects seek to find synergies between modes and maximize benefits to everyone who utilizes the transportation system – whether you’re walking, biking, riding transit or driving. VTP Planning and Project Development activities are organized in the same structure as the Capital Investment Program: Transit Program, Highways Program, and Local Systems Program. This section discusses the breadth of planning initiatives and capital project development within the program areas.

Transit Program
VTA plans for, builds and operates a full range of transit services – from local community bus lines to inter-regional heavy rail services such as Caltrain and BART. VTA is committed to continually improving its services through planning, project, and policy development. In 2007 VTA adopted its Transit Sustainability Policy (TSP) and accompanying Service Design Guidelines (SDG). The policy framework and performance standards provided by the TSP/SDG guide the development of new transit capital projects and transit services through standards and metrics for the range of VTA transit service types.
This innovative approach has resulted in the development and implementation of a new model for delivering transit service. More information about the TSP and SDG are available in appendix __.

These projects and other planning initiatives are guided by the Goals and Core Principles adopted as part of the Transit Sustainability Policy. The Transit Sustainability Policy (TSP), and accompanying Service Design Guidelines (SDG), adopted by the VTA Board in 2007, will guide the development of new transit capital projects through standards and metrics for the range of VTA transit service types. The primary metric for transit projects is ridership. The TSP also establishes a program for continual monitoring and evaluation of VTA services that in turn inform service changes through the Annual Service Planning Process.

**Strategies for Service Improvements**

VTA develops strategies for service improvements that increase ridership and improve efficiency of the transit system. The goal is to operate full vehicles to make the most efficient use of the system. This means planning for market needs and optimizing operations, both of which are described below.

**Planning for Market Needs.** VTA’s transit planning program begins with an understanding of Market Needs – much like Ford or Proctor and Gamble seek to understand what their customers want and need, VTA applies the same approach to transit service delivery: understanding what will make people ride transit in Santa Clara County, and how to plan for those needs. Using information from Market-segmentation studies, surveys and other plans and studies VTA will [is in a constant state of] design and re-design its existing transit system to better serve existing and capture new high-ridership markets. A market-based approach is designed to match basic elements such as travel, attitudes, desired amenities, environment and services in a way that VTA can prioritize the deployment of its resources and maximize its market share. Another dimension to this study will be identifying the origins and destinations of these markets.

**Innovation and Evolution.** As the transportation organization for Silicon Valley, VTA is seeking to change its corporate culture by embracing a philosophy of one of Silicon Valley’s pioneers. As Apple, Inc. co-founder Steve Jobs said “People don’t know what they want until you show it to them.” VTA has the
opportunity to innovate and evolve transportation and show the people of Santa Clara Valley what is possible in this area, but to do so, we will need to take an occasional risk.

**Operating Optimization and Effectiveness.** Ongoing efforts, informed by VTA’s many system studies, will allow VTA to explore options for improving operational efficiency and flexibility to offer premium services such as faster transit speeds and express (skip stop) trains on the LRT system.

**Annual Transit Service Planning Process**
VTA continually monitors use of its transit network to determine where and when service improvements and expansions may be needed, and this process is now guided by the TSP/SDG mentioned above. This information is considered as VTA develops its biennial ten-year Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP), and its Annual Transit Service Plans. These plans are used to implement detailed transit service improvements, route changes and refinements, and improve productivity. Until new sources of additional funding can be secured for operations, VTA will work within the existing resources it has for operations, and will to continue to improve services to its current and potential new customers.

VTA has made a commitment to continually evaluate the system based on performance standards established in the Service Design Guidelines. The Quarterly Service Performance Report provides a report card on the performance of every line in the system. Based on these quarterly updates, the Annual Service Management Plan will modify bus and rail service through measures such as increases or decreases in service hours or frequency, marketing and promotion or routing changes.

**Transit Projects**
**BART Silicon Valley, Berryessa Extension (T1) and Santa Clara Extension (T2)**
The [planning] work that began in 2001 to bring BART from Alameda County into Silicon Valley took a giant leap forward in 2011 with the recite of a $900m grant from the Federal Government and the signing of a Full Funding Agreement, and the 2012 ground-breaking of the first phase from Warm Springs to Berryessa in San Jose. The proposed 16.1 mile extension of the BART system is planned to operate along the existing railroad alignment south of the planned BART Warm Springs Station in Fremont and extend along the previous Union Pacific Railroad Corridor to US 101. It would continue in a tunnel under downtown San
Jose and end near the Santa Clara Caltrain Station. The grade-separated project includes six stations: one in Milpitas, four in San Jose, and one in Santa Clara. {Insert BART ground breaking picture}

Near-term BART Silicon Valley activities include the continued construction of the Phase I Berryessa Extension, and Phase 2 Project Definition activities, such as project refinement development, phase 2 funding plan development, environmental clearance activities, and analysis of delivery strategies. Planning Studies include:

**Berryessa Transit Connector Study (T6)**

The Berryessa Transit Connector Study will investigate the most effective ways to serve the future Berryessa BART station by transit. The Transit service options for the station could include Bus Rapid Transit, Express Bus, Local Bus or a specially-branded BART bus service that links BART riders to destinations and origins in close proximity to the station. The feasibility study will develop alternatives and recommend a service profile prior to the larger BART Transit Integration Planning effort (see below).

**BART Transit Integration Study**

With the opening of the Berryessa BART extension in late 2016, VTA will evaluate transit service to the two new BART stations in Santa Clara County. The Transit Integration Study will survey transit customers and potential riders, conduct analysis of current and future travel patterns, and develop a service plan that integrates existing bus and light rail service to complement future BART service, and possibly new lines or routes.

**Warm Springs BART Express Bus Business Plan Addendum**

The VTA Board adopted Express Bus Business Plan (2010) introduced a new vehicle and new brand on half of VTA’s Express Bus lines. With the opening of Warm Springs BART in 2015, the Express Bus connection to BART will be 15-minutes shorter and a new Express Bus market opens. The Express Bus Business Plan Addendum will revisit some of the recommendations in the 2010 study and evaluate the possibility of introducing the new vehicle and brand to the remaining half of the Express Bus services.
Bus Rapid Transit Program

The Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Strategic Plan – adopted by the VTA Board in 2009 – established a design and service basis for future VTA BRT service and identified three primary corridors for immediate implementation. A fourth corridor will be re-evaluated based on its connection to the Berryessa BART station. Planning, design and implementation work is ongoing in the three primary corridors. Detail about each corridor follows:

Santa Clara Alum Rock Transit Improvement Project (T5)

The Santa Clara Alum Rock BRT project is in the Final Design phase, fully funded, and is anticipated to open in late fall 2014. The project is a 7-mile corridor linking residential areas of East San Jose with Downtown. The corridor features two miles of dedicated lanes and 13 stations that feature uniquely branded shelters, enhanced corridor lighting, public art, real-time information, and off board fare collection.

El Camino Real Bus Rapid Transit (T3)

The El Camino Real BRT project is in the conceptual engineering (CE) phase. Future planning and design work will take the project through preliminary engineering (PE), final design (FD) and CEQA/NEPA Clearances, with construction projected to begin in 2014 and an anticipated opening in 2016. The Project qualifies for Federal New/Small Starts funding, and VTA will see funding through these programs.

The project will serve 16 BRT stations over the 17 mile corridor and will use two street configurations: mixed flow – where the bus operates in the right lane, with cars – and dedicated lane – where one travel lane in each direction is converted to a bus-only lane and stations are located in the median. BRT Stations will feature uniquely branded shelters, real time information and off-board fare collection, which will allow for fast all-door boarding and lighting.
The El Camino Real corridor traverses six cities between Downtown San Jose and Downtown Palo Alto. The cities and VTA have partnered with San Mateo cities to establish a vision for El Camino Real as a multimodal boulevard in the Grand Boulevard Initiative. El Camino Real is a state-owned facility between Santa Clara and Palo Alto meaning that any change to the roadway must be approved and accepted by Caltrans. In addition, VTA is pursuing Federal Small Starts funding for the project and is also subject to the requirements of that program. Ultimately, the project is a partnership between VTA, the corridor cities, the State and the Federal government.

**Stevens Creek Bus Rapid Transit (T4)**

The Stevens Creek BRT project began Conceptual Engineering activities in the summer of 2012. The corridor extends for eight miles from De Anza College, on Stevens Creek Boulevard, to Downtown San Jose, on West San Carlos Street, linking the cities of Cupertino, Santa Clara and San Jose. The corridor is currently is served by Local Bus 23. Key destinations in the corridor include Downtown San Jose, the San Jose Convention Center, Valley Fair, Santana Row and Vallco Shopping centers and De Anza College.

Stevens Creek Bus Rapid Transit facilities will include a dedicated lane crossing I-880 and Winchester with other segments of dedicated lane operations. A new transit center at De Anza College is necessary to serve as the western anchor to the line. Stations and vehicles will feature passenger amenities such as real-time information, uniquely branded shelters, and off-board fare collection. Planning and design work will continue through conceptual engineering, preliminary engineering, final design, and environmental clearance. The anticipated operational date is 2017.

This project is eligible for federal funding through the Small Starts or New Starts programs. Stevens Creek is the second highest bus ridership corridor in the VTA system and experiences severe crowding and travel delays in both directions throughout the day.

**Stevens Creek Transit Signal Priority**

Using funds from the region’s Transit Performance Initiative program, implement transit signal priority along VTA’s 23/323 route in advance of BRT improvements as an interim improvement
for service on the corridor. The project will be closely coordinated with the cities of Cupertino, Santa Clara and San Jose.

**Light Rail Efficiency Program**

The Light Rail System Analysis – adopted by the VTA Board in 2010 – recommended immediate development of several capital projects to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of VTA’s Light Rail System. These projects, summarized below, will transition through design and implementation phases through 2017:

**Guadalupe Express Light Rail Improvement Project (T10)**

The Guadalupe Express Project will reconfigure the southern half of the Light Rail System’s operations to provide express trains along the Santa Teresa line, interline the Almaden spur line with the Tasman West to Mountain View line and create an independent Winchester line. This reconfiguration requires modest track and signal improvements between Downtown San Jose and the Civic Center Station. The project work includes both feasibility analysis and initial designs with the goal of the revised service being in operation by 2017.

**Tasman Express Light Rail Improvement Project (Long T) (T11)**

The Tasman Express Project will introduce new light rail service linking Mountain View and Alum Rock in time for the opening of the critical Light Rail/BART connection at Montague station in late 2016. The new service will feature peak period express trains between Mountain View and Santa Clara that will expedite access to and from the BART station while improving service to existing and future land uses along the Tasman corridor. The project requires track improvements and signal upgrades at several key points along the Tasman corridor.

**North First Speed Improvements (T12)**

Several improvements for the North First Street corridor – roughly between Tasman and the Metro/Airport stations – are envisioned to allow Light Rail speeds to improve from 35 to 45 miles per hour. A key element of these improvements will be fencing along the Light Rail right-of-way.
Light Rail System Transit Signal Priority Project

Using a grant from MTC’s Transit Performance Initiative program, VTA will be upgrading and installing Transit Signal Priority at traffic signals throughout the Light Rail network. This project will speed operations for Light Rail trains, improving operating efficiency and customer travel times.

Light Rail Station Access Plans

In an effort to increase ridership and access to transit the VTA will develop Light Rail Station Access Plans for key stations in the system. The plans will focus on improving multimodal connections to light rail stations within a “catchment” area, identifying areas for improvement to increase access to transit.

Capitol Expressway Light Rail Pedestrian and Bus Stop Improvements (T7)

The first phase of the Capitol Expressway Light Rail Project includes pedestrian and bus stop improvements along the Capitol Expressway corridor from Capitol Avenue to Tully Road. Pedestrian improvements include continuous sidewalk/multiuse path, landscape buffer and lighting. Bus stop improvements include bus stops at Ocala Avenue and at Story Road intersections with bus pads to accommodate future Santa Clara Alum Rock BRT. Construction of this phase is anticipated in October 2012.

The next phase of the project will reconstruct of the Eastridge Transit Center to meet current transit demands and future BRT lines serving the transit center. The upgraded transit center will include additional bus bays and layover areas for operational flexibility, and new pedestrian connections to Capitol Expressway, Quimby Road and Eastridge Mall.

Capitol Expressway Light Rail Extension (T8)

The Capitol Expressway Light Rail Extension Project extends Silicon Valley’s light rail system 2.6 miles from the current Tasman line terminus at Alum Rock Avenue in San Jose to Eastridge Transit Center in San Jose. The light rail will operate primarily in the center of Capitol
Expressway, with elevated, double track structures. The Eastridge extension will include three LRT stations: Story Road, Ocala Avenue, and Eastridge Transit Center.

The extension completes the corridor by providing a regional rail connection by directly connecting downtown San Jose and the future Milpitas BART station to Eastridge Mall, one of VTA’s busiest destinations and transfer points, and high density residential areas.

**Vasona Light Rail Extension (T9)**
Light rail from downtown San Jose to Winchester Station in Campbell was completed in 2005. Phase II of the Vasona Light Rail Extension project would extend VTA’s light rail system 1.5 miles from the current terminus at Winchester Avenue in Campbell to Vasona Junction in Los Gatos.

**Mineta San Jose International Airport People Mover Connector (APM) (T18)**
An automated people mover system connecting San Jose International Airport with nearby transit hubs was included in 2000’s voter-approved Measure A sales tax initiative. Since then, Airport expansion plans have changed. The City of San Jose recently evaluated the possibility of developing an airport “pod car / personal rapid transit (PRT)” system using a public-private partnership funding arrangement. The evaluation found that pod/PRT technology is not sufficiently developed for a public transit application and would present more risk than is appropriate for a public agency to assume. In addition, pod/PRT technology was originally more attractive than traditional APM technology because it was reportedly less expensive to construct and operate, but the study found its costs are far higher, coming in above even light rail construction. Future planning efforts may include study of applying more proven mass transportation technologies to provide better transit connections to the airport – especially through public / private partnerships.

**Transit Planning Studies**
The VTP 2040 vision for improving transit service focuses on key high-demand/ridership corridors, system refinements, and improved operating efficiency. To get more from existing and future investments, take advantage of “green / sustainable” transportation opportunities, and address specific
community needs, VTA will use new technologies, innovative planning and marketing strategies and smaller-sized vehicles where appropriate. The vision for these improvements is to develop an expanding ridership base by providing higher-quality, market-oriented service.

VTP 2040 outlines several planning initiatives and studies to be conducted to prepare for transit delivery, refinement and expansion. These studies, outlined below, are designed and deliver more effective and productive service.

**Transit Sustainability Policy, Service Design Guidelines Updates**

The Transit Sustainability Policy (TSP) and accompanying Service Design Guidelines (SDG), adopted by the VTA Board in 2007, provide policy and technical guidance for the development of new transit capital projects using standards and metrics for the range of VTA transit service types. The document also establishes a program for continual monitoring and evaluation of VTA services that in turn inform service changes through the Annual Service Planning Process. Upon adoption, VTA committed to evaluating and updating the performance and efficiency measures that form the basis of the SDG on a periodic basis. The updating process occurs on a regular basis, generally every two years or as needed.

**First and Last Mile Connections Study**

Providing efficient transit services, which rely on density and concentrated job centers, is difficult and costly because of Santa Clara County's many-to-many travel patterns. The benefits of offering high frequency transportation services represented by commuter rail, light rail or bus rapid transit – or even conventional bus lines - are often lost at either the origin or destination where potential transit riders are confronted by long walks over difficult terrain or unfriendly environments. Providing efficient and attractive options for the “first and last mile” connection is the focus of this study, which will explore shuttles and other innovative approaches to connecting riders to home, work place and major activity centers.

**New Transit Corridors Program**
The New Transit Corridors Program consists of a series of studies intended to establish a rational planning framework for future transit capital expansion. While each study investigates a different aspect of the transit capital program, the studies are linked by policy and program objectives established by the VTA Board of Directors.

**Transit Corridor Improvement Plans**

Transit Corridor Improvement Plans are defined in VTA’s TSP and Service Design Guidelines as an option for cities or communities that are seeking transit enhancements in a corridor but do not reach the minimum thresholds for upgrades to higher levels of service. VTA will work with cities and communities as needed to develop Transit Corridor Improvement Plans that will identify future transit upgrades. This process will have special importance with the comprehensive General Plan updates recently completed or currently underway in many Santa Clara County cities. Moreover, based on the evaluation contained in the Bus Rapid Transit Strategic Plan and Light Rail Systems Analysis, corridors identified for potential future upgrades to Bus Rapid Transit or Light Rail may require or benefit from Corridor Improvement Plans. Additional corridors that are identified for further analysis in other studies and other forums such as Board Workshops will also be subject to these plans.

**Transit Waiting Improvement Program**

Transit waiting environments, commonly known as bus or light rail stops or stations, will continue to take on greater importance as transit ridership grows throughout Santa Clara County. These areas, which are the interface between the public realm and transit, are the most notable feature of the system and often set public perception about transit. The level of design, upkeep, and care of transit waiting areas influences first impressions of a neighborhood or city, communicates the quality of public transportation services, and reflects the value placed on the needs of the passengers. As a visible component of a community, the waiting area also contributes to the image of the transit operator. Improving these locations is a challenge as existing facilities age and new service is introduced.

Transit Waiting Environments Capital Plan
The Transit Waiting Environments Study will develop concepts and standards for stop and station design and facilities and seek innovative ways to finance their improvement and construction over the next 20 years.

Transit Waiting Environments Handbook

The Transit Waiting Environments Handbook will establish design and development criteria for VTA’s 4,000 plus stops and stations throughout the system. The Handbook will inventory and categorize the existing stop locations by volume and surrounding environment. Design standards for required bus stop elements will be established with recommendations given to stop location, context and utilization. The Handbook, which will complement and enhance the CDT Manual, is intended to be used not just by VTA staff but by cities, developers and communities interested in improving or upgrading bus stops.

Transit Waiting Environments Demonstration Project

Utilizing funds from a federal earmark for bus stop improvements, VTA will select bus stops or a single corridor and modify and upgrade the stops to be consistent with its new Transit Waiting Environments Handbook. The Handbook effort will identify candidate stops for the project. The demonstration project is intended to be a showcase for how bus stops can fit into their surrounding neighborhoods and enhanced the attractiveness of transit and alternative modes.

EcoPass Evaluation Study

VTA introduced its EcoPass program in the mid 1990s and has never performed a full scale evaluation of the program to determine its effectiveness in meeting program goals. The EcoPass Evaluation Study is scheduled to be complete in 2013 after 20 months of study and input from EcoPass stakeholders. The study is revisiting the program goals of increasing ridership while remaining revenue neutral. The study also explores eligibility and categories of users to determine the optimal program design given customer needs in VTA’s service area. The results of this study will guide future changes to the EcoPass Program.

Annual Transit Service Plans
The Transit Sustainability Policy, adopted by VTA Board of Directors in February 2007, requires an annual review of transit services called the Annual Transit Service Plan. It includes an evaluation of existing services as compared to the performance standards contained in the Service Design Guidelines, review of potential new services, assessment of opportunities for service refinement and resource reallocation, route specific service changes and recommendations for further analysis and study. Results from other studies and plans are incorporated into the Annual Service Planning process.

**Short Range Transit Plans**

The Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP) is required by federal, state and regional funding agencies and is a 10-year forecast of a transit agency’s capital and operating needs together with revenue expectations. In addition, the SRTP presents an agency’s transit products, funding partnerships, marketing plan and an evaluation of its services. VTA produces an SRTP a minimum of every two years and it serves as context and a precursor to the development of its two-year budget.

**Proof-of-Payment Peer Review**

VTA operates Light Rail, and will operate BRT, on a proof-of-payment system where passengers must be prepared to show a ticket or pass at all times. Many other agencies operate rail with this system and some are even starting to deploy proof-of-payment for buses as well. The Proof-of-Payment Peer Review will survey systems in the United States that offer a variety of different service types – Light Rail, Bus, BRT – and how each system differs in proof-of-payment operations. This will be instructive as VTA introduces BRT and other changes such as wider spread use of Clipper occur.

**Caltrain Electrification and High Speed Rail Blended System Study (T3 and T15)**

The California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) is responsible to plan, construct, operate, and maintain a safe, clean and reliable statewide high speed rail system. The high speed train network will connect major metropolitan areas via corridors in northern, southern, and central California in anticipation increased travel demand between the Bay Area and Southern California. The initial phase calls for concurrent improvements in the Central Valley, the Los Angeles Basin, and the Caltrain Peninsula Corridor. Future planning work will support the pursuit of a Blended Rail System (ex. Caltrain and HSR operating in the same corridor). Investments include projects to modernize and electrify Caltrain, and prepare the corridor for HSP service in 2029.
**Caltrain Capital Needs Study and Caltrain Station Access Study**

This update to the 2007 Capital needs study examines needs in Santa Clara County in context with the new “blended system” approach. As the scope of this study develops, it may be combined with a Caltrain Station Access Study. Products of the studies may include a plan, programs, and capital projects.

**Community-Based Transportation Plans**

In partnership with MTC, VTA will conduct Community-Based Transportation Plans (CBTP) in areas defined by MTC. The goal of the CBTP process is to advance the findings from MTC’s Lifeline Transportation Network Report adopted by the Commission. The Lifeline Transportation Network Report identified transit needs in economically disadvantaged communities throughout the San Francisco Bay Area region, and recommended local transportation studies to further efforts to address them. Each community-based transportation study will involve a collaborative approach that includes residents and community-based organizations (CBOs) that provide services within minority and low-income neighborhoods. VTA has completed CBTP’s for Gilroy, East San Jose and Milpitas. The Community-Based Transportation Plan for Alviso has begun with an anticipated completion date of December 2012. Future study areas include Sunnyvale, South San Jose, San Martin and Palo Alto.

**Bus Service Expansion Study**

This study will explore options for funding future expansion of bus service, and prepare short and long-range integration plans with regard to Caltrain, LRT and BRT. The study may be separated into funding and service pieces – and/or arranged in phases to coincide with VTA’s Annual Service Planning Process.

**Bus Stop Improvement Program**

This effort will evolve VTA’s current program to actively study, identify, select, and develop capital improvements for key bus stops. The Bus Stop is the most predominant public icon of the transit system, but they are usually overlooked. VTA has over 4,000 bus stops and each one represents an opportunity to establish a sense of place for transit, a community identity, and work long-term towards making the transit system – as system – truly integrated and embraced by the community at-large.
study would also include an examination of funding opportunities ranging from minimal within current expected budgets to maximum with the injection of funding from outside sources (cities, assessment districts, private/individual donors and other sources). Subsequent maintenance and funding needs will also be examined.

Transit Center & Park and Ride Lot Evaluation Study

This study will examine the operations, safety and security concerns, market demands, and aesthetic needs of VTA Transit Centers and Park & Ride Lots. Potential study area include transit center expansion and/or circulation requirements, urban design enhancements, safety improvements, methods to attract more riders, and ways to better integrate with the surrounding environment. Potential for on-site retail services, bike storage facilities or other active uses, and ways to make Park and Ride safer are also potential study topics.

Accessible Transportation Services and Programs for People with Disabilities and Senior Citizens

Almost 10 percent of the nation’s drivers are older than 65, and that percentage could increase rapidly in the next decade as the post-World War II “baby boom” generation begins to reach that milestone. By 2030, projections suggest one in five Americans will be 65 or older, and the number of people aged 85 and older—currently the fastest growing segment of the older population—could exceed 10 million. Driving cessation has been found to peak at about age 85; suggesting more of the oldest old may be dependent on other forms of transportation in the future (National Institutes of Health, 2002, http://www.nih.gov/news/pr/jul2002/nia-29.htm).

To meet the expected increase in demand for alternative modes of non-automobile transportation, VTA is continuing to plan for accessible fixed-route bus, light rail and paratransit services during the next 30 years. These efforts include a fleet of accessible bus and light rail vehicles, ensuring adequate operating and capital funds to address demand for paratransit services, meeting and exceeding accessibility standards at transit facilities, developing new technologies to improve access to transit information, and provide training and educational opportunities for seniors and persons with disabilities about their mobility options.
**Fixed Route Bus and Rail Service**

To ensure that seniors and customers with disabilities have access to work, school, medical care and recreational activities, all of VTA’s buses, light rail vehicles, and transit facilities are 100% accessible. Bus and light rail operators receive comprehensive training in providing service to seniors and persons with disabilities.

Persons with disabilities may apply for a Regional Transit Connection (RTC) Discount Clipper Card to obtain transit fare discounts that are mandated by state and federal law for eligible individuals. With a RTC Discount Clipper Card, persons with qualifying disabilities are entitled to reduced fares on fixed-route bus, rail and ferry systems throughout the San Francisco Bay Area. The card makes it easier for qualified persons to demonstrate eligibility for the reduced fares.

Senior citizens (65 or over) may obtain transit fare discounts on VTA buses and light rail trains and on the region’s other transit services through the use of the Senior fare payment Clipper Card. Seniors may apply for a Senior Clipper Card with identification that shows that they are 65 years old or older.

Customers who are found eligible for paratransit have the option to use their paratransit photo identification cards to ride VTA bus and light rail services at no cost when they are able to.

VTA’s plans for new or improved transit services also increase the access and mobility for our customers. Newer services such the Community Bus and Limited Line 323 are prime examples. Recent improvements to VTA’s Express bus service with new vehicles, more trips and wifi has proven very popular increasing ridership over 20%. Current studies of our light rail system, Bus Rapid Transit and connecting transit services to the BART to Berryessa extension will also enhance future mobility options.

**Paratransit Services**

Customers who cannot independently use VTA’s fixed route service for some or all trips can apply to use VTA’s ADA paratransit service. Paratransit service is provided within the VTA service area and is available on the same days per week and during the same hours of the day as bus and light rail service. Total VTA
paratransit ridership, which includes customers as well as their personal care attendants and companions, has declined 27% since FY 2009 (Table 2.8).

**Table 2.8 Paratransit Ridership Trends**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit Ridership</td>
<td>1,055,429</td>
<td>1,067,115</td>
<td>930,156</td>
<td>824,813</td>
<td>775,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Change</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>-12.8%</td>
<td>-11.3%</td>
<td>-6.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VTA’s on-going planning for paratransit seeks to continually refine and improve the service, from both cost efficiency and quality of service perspectives. The key focus of VTA’s paratransit planning will be to continue to provide the operating and capital funds necessary to meet the ever growing demand. VTA has contained operating costs by purchasing high mileage eco-friendly Toyota Prius sedans. Costs have also been reduced by entering into fuel purchasing and maintenance agreements with the County and relocating the vendor’s operating yard to two VTA owned facilities.

Long term funding and vehicle procurement strategies are part of VTA’s ongoing paratransit planning process. At the start of Calendar Year 2013, with the deployment of a new paratransit fleet, there are 233 vehicles that are used exclusively for VTA’s paratransit service. Of these vehicles, 187 are funded by VTA. OUTREACH anticipates receiving an additional 24 vehicles from the Federal Section 5310 Capital Equipment Program for seniors and persons with disabilities by the end of June 2013. This will increase the number of vehicles in VTA’s paratransit fleet to 257; 70 of the vehicles will have been procured and funded by OUTREACH. VTA and OUTREACH (as a non-profit operator) are eligible to procure vehicles using federal grants, with only a 10% or 20% local match depending on the grant source. The primary paratransit service provider currently uses two VTA controlled sites for daily operations and dispatching and vehicle storage. Modular buildings and sites with limited improvements are being used.

On the operational side, OUTREACH receives and schedules trip requests, builds daily vehicle schedules, handles daily service changes, and subcontracts and monitors the daily service. They also manage the paratransit eligibility and appeals process, simplifying the process and providing a single point of contact for customers needing paratransit services. OUTREACH contracts with two types of vendors to provide paratransit services. The primary service provider is MV Transportation, a nationwide transit provider.
MV Transportation operates sedans and accessible vans (both minivans and larger vans) to deliver a dedicated paratransit service to customers who are ambulatory and who use mobility devices.

Service is also provided by local taxi companies for persons with disabilities who do not lift-equipped vehicle (persons with visual impairments or cognitive disabilities are two examples). In FY 2012, taxi service accounted for 14% of paratransit trips taken by eligible customers. Most taxis used for this service also provide will-call general public transportation when they are not performing paratransit trip assignments. OUTREACH also contracts with the County of Santa Clara to perform vehicle maintenance and fueling.

**Transit Facilities**

VTA’s transit facility projects are completed within ADA accessibility standards and provide improvements that benefit both seniors and persons with disabilities. VTA has also worked with our local disabled advisory committee, the Committee for Transit Accessibility (CTA) to implement features that exceed ADA accessibility such as the guide tiles that are installed at transit centers. Some current and upcoming facility projects include VTA’s ongoing bus stop improvement program. This program constructs improvements at bus stops throughout the county to meet ADA accessibility guidelines, improve the overall pedestrian environments and build a safe operating area for buses. This program is annually funded, often using federal grants. The CTA reviews the priorities for these bus stop improvements.

**Highways Program**

The planning and development of highways in Santa Clara County since the mid-1980s has been due to sales tax measures, when Santa Clara County became the first county in the state to implement a local sales tax to fund transportation improvements. VTP 2020 (December 2000) first articulated that it would become more difficult to build our way out of congestion; VTP 2030 (February 2005) continued this theme and coupled it with the idea of building roadway improvements that generated revenues through roadway pricing; and VTP 2035, for the first time, included a highway plan that included a specific listing of the development of a network of express lanes in Santa Clara County and declared the US 101/SR 85 and the SR 237/I-880 corridors as the first two corridors for near-term implementation. Although the concept of having drivers pay for using the roadways has existed for decades as cited in
VTP 2030, the scarcity of transportation funding now is drawing even more attention to roadway pricing as a viable way to help pay for the capital, maintenance and operations costs of roadways.

In addition to the need to continue to find new ways to pay for improving highways, there is a need to continue to apply technological solutions to get maximum throughput from existing highway infrastructure while controlling costs through streamlined methods for project delivery, and developing a system that caters to a wide range of travelers.

US cities have evolved through several generations of Highway Programs—Generation 1.0—began in the 1950s with the construction of the national Interstate Highway System. Generation 2.0, completion of the highway system, came during the 1980s and 1990s with many local jurisdictions implementing self-help measures to fund projects to complete the network, as was the case in Santa Clara County. And Generation 3.0, which concentrates on pricing and improving efficiency, begins in Santa Clara County with VTP 2035. We’re now moving toward Gen3a, which brings viable new technologies into play that promise an evolution to true smart roads system. New materials, such as silicon rich roadway surface materials could bring not only more durable, longer lasting roadway surfaces but also a means to generate electricity and provide vehicle communications. This next generation will evolve first through demonstration / proof of concept projects, and VTA as the Silicon Valley’s transportation agency, intends to pursue these projects in partnership.

Streamlined Project Delivery Practices
With funds available to transportation declining, attention has been turned to improving how projects are delivered. Such streamlining of project delivery practices factors would improve efficiency and directly result in lower project costs. With the backdrop of national efforts by the Bipartisan Policy Center, the Eno Center and others to study how the environmental review process can be accelerated while maintaining strong environmental protections, VTA has initiated an effort to examine the project delivery process related to work with the State Department of Transportation (Caltrans). Streamlining of project delivery practices is expected to yield shorter durations to deliver projects which in turn means lower costs to deliver projects.

iDelivery Demonstration Program (IDD)
The iDelivery Demonstration Program is a new partnership model between VTA and Caltrans that is designed to strengthen transportation project delivery in Santa Clara County. Working together, the team will develop and implement improved and creative methods to deliver transportation projects and services that will save time, reduce costs, and provide the much needed focus on Santa Clara County’s significant project work. Ultimately, the iDD program may lead to a new and innovative project delivery structure by Caltrans.

A Master Agreement between VTA and Caltrans is in development to lay the groundwork for the demonstration program. It is anticipated that the agreement will be executed in early 2013 and program staff will be located in Santa Clara County by mid 2013. The program will commence with focus on three specific areas: Capital Project Delivery, Traffic Operations, and Local Assistance. The following activities are anticipated to be addressed by the iDD:

- Delivery of CMIA-funded improvement projects
- Delivery of SR 152 Trade Corridor Project
- Delivery of Silicon Valley Express Lanes projects
- Delivery of Freeway Performance Initiative, Traffic Operations Systems and State arterial operations improvements
- Oversight on capital projects (BART Silicon Valley - Berryessa Extension, Bus Rapid Transit, US 101/Trimble/De La Cruz Blvd interchange improvement, and other PID work plan projects)
- Local Assistance Program tasks

**Multi-modal Design Practices and Principles**

An important aspect of the project planning and delivery process is how the different modes of travel are considered in the project development process including for the development of highway improvements. At the January 8, 2009 VTA Board of Directors meeting, VTA staff were directed to apply multi-modal design practices and principles on all future roadway improvement projects as feasible, including projects within the State right of way. The Board action noted the 2003 adoption of the Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Program and Manual to set the guidelines for the development and design of local transportation improvements.
In 2007 the California Transportation Commission granted Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) program funds to three highway improvement projects in Santa Clara County including the complete reconstruction of the US 101/Tully Road interchange in San Jose, California. On this project, VTA working with the City of San Jose and Caltrans implemented a design following not only the Caltrans Highway Design Manual but also principles from the CDT Manual, VTA Bicycle Technical Guidelines and VTA Pedestrian Technical Guidelines to develop an interchange with a multi-modal environment rather than one where the emphasis is on vehicular traffic.

If such multi-modal practices and principles are applied early in the project planning process, the cost for the development of the highway improvement should not be higher. In fact, there may be cost savings related to the reduced footprint for the improvement.

**Roadway Pricing**

The implementation of roadway pricing to highways in Santa Clara County has been part of the planning process since VTP 2030. The main form of pricing that has been planned and continues to be developed is express lanes, which are carpool lanes that allow solo drivers to gain access through the paying of a toll. Tolls change dynamically based on conditions in the express lane to ensure that the express lane is able to maintain a minimum speed of 45 miles per hour following federal standards.

Express lanes allow for the use of unused capacity in carpool lanes and have the added benefit of raising revenue for future corridor improvements including for public transportation. VTA joined the growing list of agencies operating express lanes with the opening of its SR 237/I-880 Express Lane facility on March 20, 2012.

**Technology**

The application of technology to transportation is often referred to as Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS). This includes systems to assist operations (such as ramp metering and dynamic message signs) and to help the traveling public (such as real-time information systems). Ramp metering offers the ability to control the flow of traffic onto a highway to prevent the highway from breaking down due to
overloading. Dynamic message signs and real-time information systems help to get the needed information into the hands of travelers to make more informed travel decisions. ITS is also listed under the Transportation Systems Operations and Management Program in this document.

**Highway Planning Studies and Projects**

Over the last several years, VTA and Caltrans have conducted highway planning studies to identify projects for development and that have been included in the VTP planning process. These studies have led to implementation projects such as the US 101/Tully Road interchange reconstruction where a ribbon cutting was held on June 15, 2012, the I-880 HOV Lanes project that is expected to be opened for service in 2013, the US 101 Auxiliary Lanes project that is expected to be opened for service in 2013, the US 101/Capitol Expressway/Yerba Buena Road interchange project which is set to get under construction in late 2012, and the I-280/I-880/Stevens Creek Boulevard improvements that is also set to get under construction in late 2012. [Picture of US 101/Tully Road ribbon cutting in this section]

VTA working with Caltrans and local agencies is currently engaged in highway planning studies to inform the next generation of highway projects. A major shift in the development of highway projects is that highway projects in Santa Clara County no longer have access to locally generated sales tax measure funding, with the existing sales tax funds going entirely to public transit projects. This means that moving forward there will be greater focus on projects such as express lanes and toll roadway projects that have the potential to generate revenue, on lower cost technology-based enhancements that work to squeeze even more throughput carrying ability out of the existing highway system, and on lower cost projects that provide focused operational benefits. The following are a few projects representative of the development efforts that are underway as part of the highway program.

**SR 85/US 101 Express Lanes**

These projects include the preliminary engineering and environmental studies required to develop express lanes for the SR 85/US 101 corridor. Completion is expected for 2013 with the design and construction efforts slated to follow shortly after and targeted for completion in the 2015 to 2016 timeframe. As part of this effort, the application of innovative project delivery approaches continues to be studied. This includes both innovative approaches to project delivery and project funding.
State Route 85 Express Lanes (Phase I): From US 101 in South San Jose to US 101 in Mountain View (H1)

The conversion of 23.7 miles of the existing high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes along SR 85 to combination HOV/Express Lanes. The proposed facility will allow single occupancy vehicles access to the combination HOV/express lanes by paying a toll. An additional express lane will be added to create a double express lane along a portion of the corridor to provide congestion relief and operational benefits. The project will also include the continuation of the Express Lanes for 3.3 miles to US 101 in South San Jose, through the SR 85/US 101 Interchange, for a total of 27 miles.

Traffic data collection, traffic validation, and traffic forecasting are underway for the Project Approval (PA)/Environmental Document (ED) phase. Preliminary conceptual engineering drawings are also under development to identify design exceptions to be approved by Caltrans. The Draft Environmental Document is scheduled to be completed by late 2012, with the PA/ED phase expected to be completed in spring 2013.

U.S. 101 Express Lanes: Convert existing HOV lanes to express lanes on US 101 from Whipple Avenue in San Mateo County to Cochrane Road in Morgan Hill (H3)

Convert 34 miles of the existing carpool network on US 101 between Dunne Avenue in Morgan Hill and the San Mateo County line to express lane operation. The current recommendation is to implement two lanes of express lanes within the existing footprint to accommodate the projected travel demand for US 101.

In December 2010, VTA began work on the initial phase of the PA/ED for the project and submitted a Project Study Report/Preliminary Development Study (PSR/PDS) for Caltrans review in March 2012, prior to producing a PA/ED. A cooperative agreement to reimburse Caltrans in reviewing the PSR/PDS has been executed. The Draft ED is scheduled to be completed by early 2013, with the PA/ED phase expected to be completed by mid 2013.

SR 237 Express Lanes
The 237 Express Lanes projects include the preliminary engineering and environmental studies necessary to extend the express lanes that were opened for service on March 20, 2012 at the SR 237/I-880 interchange. (Picture of Express Lanes. Wrap Text) The project is expected to be completed in 2014 with the design and construction efforts slated to follow. As part of this effort, the application of innovative project delivery approaches continues to be studied. This includes both innovative approaches to project delivery and project funding.

State Route 237 Express lanes (Phase II): North First Street in San Jose to Mathilda Ave in Sunnyvale (H4)

Utilize the available capacity in the existing SR 237 High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes to provide relief to the traffic congestion on the corridor. The project is an extension of the SR 237/I-880 Express Connectors project that became operational in March 2012. SR 237 is a six-lane facility with two general purpose lanes and a HOV lane in each travel direction in the segment under consideration for pricing. In the westbound direction, the SR 237/I-880 Express Connectors project extends to the Lawrence Expressway interchange, with the zone between North First Street and Lawrence Expressway, a distance of approximately two miles, serving as a transition zone. From this point to the west is a designated HOV lane to just east of the Fair Oaks Avenue overcrossing, a distance of less than one mile. The proposal is to extend express lanes operations as far to the west on SR 237 as is practical.

In the eastbound direction, the existing SR 237 HOV lane begins approximately one-half mile east of the Mathilda overcrossing and extends approximately four miles to the start of the SR 237/I-880 Express Connectors project that begins at the Zanker Road overcrossing. This project would convert the eastbound HOV lane to an express lane with the limits of work potential extending back to US 101 to accommodate the needed advance signing. The Project proposes to convert the HOV lanes to express lanes within the existing freeway footprint within the existing Caltrans right of way. This approach ensures that the existing corridor is fully utilized, while not environmentally affecting the adjacent right of way.

VTA staff released a Request for Proposal (RFP) for the project. The RFP includes the development of a Project Study Report (PSR) and environmental analyses. It is expected that
the PSR, along with preliminary engineering and cost analysis will be completed by September 2013. The engineering package for Caltrans should be ready for release in 2014.

State Route 237 Express lanes (Phase III): Mathilda Avenue to SR 85 (H5)

Build new express lanes on State Route 237 between Mathilda Avenue and State Route 85.

SR 152 Trade Corridor Project: SR 156 to US 101 (H18)

Santa Clara and San Benito counties along with Caltrans are working together to develop and deliver infrastructure improvements for SR 152 between U.S. 101 and the Santa Clara/Merced county line. The improvements will accommodate the long-term travel needs of commercial, commuter, and recreational traffic by enhancing travel safety and improving traffic operations. Additionally, these improvements would enhance the quality of life for the local communities and economic vitality of the region.

The project includes four major components;

1) New SR 152 Alignment - Construct a new 4- to 6-lane freeway between the U.S. 101/ Monterey Road Interchange in Santa Clara County and just east of the SR 152 / SR 156 interchange in San Benito County, a distance of approximately 12 miles.

2) Reconstruction of a full interchange at the intersection of US 101 and SR 25, including an extension to Santa Teresa Boulevard and improvements on SR 25 from the new SR 25/US 101 interchange to the Santa Clara County line.

3) Eastbound SR 152 Climbing Lane at Pacheco Pass - Widen SR 152 to construct an approximately 4-mile long, climbing lane on the eastbound ascent to Pacheco Pass together.

4) Access Control Improvements - close uncontrolled private and local road access points to SR 152. New frontage roads, shared private driveways, standard right-in and right-out only driveway access, new interchanges and overcrossings will be included as needed.
VTA, in coordination with Caltrans is the leading development of this project. The study, including preliminary engineering, environmental studies and public outreach, would wrap up with environmental documentation of the selected improvements in 2015.

**US 101 Widening Project (Monterey Road to SR 129) – Environmental Phase Only**

Extend US 101 as a six-lane facility to SR 129 in Santa Clara and San Benito Counties to meet future traffic demands and provide access control. The project also entails widening and replacing bridge structures, correcting existing horizontal curves, constructing a new interchange at the intersection of US 101 and SR 25, and adding additional ramp lanes at State Route 129. The extent of the project is approximately 2.6 miles in San Benito County and approximately 4.1 miles in Santa Clara County. The portion of US 101 from Monterey Road to SR 25 would overlap with the planned work for the SR 152 Trade Corridor project. Currently, this project is in the Preliminary Engineering and draft Environmental phase, which will be completed in mid-2013.

**US 101 Southbound/Trimble Road/De La Cruz Boulevard/ Central Expressway Interchange Improvements (H25)**

VTA and the City of San Jose propose to make the following key improvements to relieve existing and future traffic congestion at the US 101/De La Cruz Boulevard/Trimble Road interchange: replace existing 101 overcrossing, reconstructing the southbound three quadrant cloverleaf interchange to a partial cloverleaf and incorporating a new intersection on De La Cruz Blvd; widening the De La Cruz/Trimble Road overcrossing structure from four lanes to six lanes; realigning the southbound off- and on-ramps from and to US 101/De La Cruz Boulevard to facilitate a bike and pedestrian friendly design; realigning the northbound on-ramps from US101/De La Cruz Boulevard to facilitate a bike and pedestrian friendly design; adding a new southbound US 101 auxiliary lane from De La Cruz Blvd to the SR 87 Exit ramp; and constructing improvements at adjacent intersections on Trimble Road and De La Cruz Boulevard. These interchange improvements have been developed applying multi-modal design practices and principles. Currently the project is in the PSR phase. It is expected to go into construction in 2014.

**I-280/Foothill Expressway Improvements (H45)**
This project includes the preliminary engineering, environmental studies and design to modify the exit ramp to Foothill Expressway from northbound I-280 from a single-lane exit opening to a two-lane exit opening at I-280. The existing situation has a large volume of traffic from northbound SR 85 attempting to enter onto northbound I-280 while another stream of traffic from I-280 is attempting to exit to Foothill Expressway. This low-cost, near-term modification is expected to improve the existing weaving traffic through this area. The project is proposed to be completed as an encroachment permit project. Currently the project will be funded through savings in the CMIA program for VTA. Construction is anticipated to begin in 2013 and end in 2014.

**US 101/SR 237/Mathilda Avenue Interchange Improvements (H33)**

Interchange improvements include modifications to both the US 101/Mathilda Avenue and SR 237/Mathilda Avenue interchanges, as well as the widening the NB direction of Mathilda Avenue. The modifications to the US 101/Mathilda Avenue interchange include the following: removing the NB US 101 to SB Mathilda Avenue loop ramp and adding left turn lanes at the US 101 off-ramp at SB Mathilda Avenue with traffic signals; extending the NB US 101 deceleration lane to Mathilda Avenue off-ramp to accommodate the additional traffic from NB US 101 to SB Mathilda Avenue; constructing a diagonal ramp for SB Mathilda Avenue to NB US 101 traffic in the northwest of the interchange; and constructing an auxiliary lane along NB US 101 from the Mathilda Avenue interchange to the US 101/SR 237 interchange.

The modifications to the SR 237/Mathilda Avenue interchange will include the following: realigning the WB SR 237 off-ramp to Mathilda Avenue; removing Moffett Park Drive between Mathilda Avenue and Bordeaux Drive; and removing the existing on-ramp to WB 237 in conjunction with the termination of Moffett Park Drive east of Mathilda Avenue and Bordeaux Drive. VTA will work with the City of Sunnyvale to develop a Project Initiation Document (PID). It is anticipated that the VTA and City staff will begin work on the PID in mid 2013.

**Freeway Performance Initiative (FPI)**

The Freeway Performance Initiative (FPI) is an effort by MTC to improve the operations, safety, and management of the Bay Area’s freeway system through the application of technology-related enhancements (also referred to as Intelligent Transportation Systems or ITS) to squeeze more throughput carrying ability out of the existing transportation systems. According to MTC, “the program
targets predictable congestion caused by the onslaught of commuters using the freeways during rush hours as well as non-recurrent congestion resulting from unanticipated incidents.” The majority of the existing 620 center-line miles of freeways in the Bay Area does not have a complete installation of the transportation technologies that could be installed to aid motorists and those operators responsible for maintaining and operating the freeway system.

Substantial progress has been made in the implementation of additional freeway ITS in Santa Clara County through FPI.

The effort has been a collaborative process involving Caltrans, MTC, VTA and local agencies with the technical discussions being led by local agency staff represented on the Systems Operations & Management Working Group (SOMWG) of VTA’s Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). New ramp metering was implemented on SR 87, SR 85, and US 101 in 2009 through FPI funding. In 2011, new ramp metering was implemented for I-880. By the end of 2012, new ramp metering will be completed for I-280.

At the same time, FPI efforts to design additional freeway Traffic Operations System (TOS) and ramp metering improvements by Caltrans and VTA are underway for various locations along SR 9, SR 17, SR 85, SR 87, US 101, SR 237, I-280, I-680 and I-880. A key improvement under design is the conversion of the southbound US 101 to southbound SR 87 ramp from a single-lane connector to a two-lane connector. The existing single lane design results in routine traffic back-ups from SR 87 onto the US 101 mainline that also results in back-ups that extend back onto the adjacent De La Cruz Boulevard/Trimble Road local roadway and Central Expressway.

The current MTC effort to update the regional transportation plan, Plan Bay Area, has widened the reach of FPI to also include arterials with the premise being that maximizing the efficiency of the freeway system requires coordination with and optimization of the major parallel and freeway intersecting arterials. The application of FPI to arterials will provide opportunities to modernize and synchronize traffic signal systems along major arterials.

Innovative Technology Projects
In the pipeline are other technology-based initiatives related to the highway system. These include the following:

- Adaptive Ramp Metering Systems
- Express Lanes Occupancy Detection System
- Remote Monitoring Ramp Metering System
- Transit Credit-Based Congestion Pricing System

These are potential new technology applications that could work to enhance already existing systems. The adaptive ramp metering system would allow better coordination between groups of metered ramps. The occupancy detection system would provide for technology to help with the determination of the number of occupants in a vehicle for managing and operating express lanes. The current method for determining occupancy purely based on visual observation by CHP officers. The remote monitoring ramp metering system would place ramp metering operations capabilities directly into the hands of Caltrans staff responsible for the operation of the meters. The current practice requires field staff to interact directly through the controller cabinets housing the metering equipment roadside. The transit credit-based congestion pricing would provide a way to link Clipper accounts with FasTrak accounts and perhaps incentive for increase use of public transit.

**System Efficiency Projects**

System efficiency projects are designed to improve the efficiency of the existing highway system, including interchanges and ramp improvements. The projects include auxiliary lanes in select areas, ramp improvements focusing on the additional capacity, and lane extensions to address merge frictions. MTC’s has shown recent interest in system efficiency projects by allowing the FPI to assist with project implementation. It is expected that MTC will consider several VTP 2040 projects as system efficiency projects and potentially provide funding for these projects to VTA. The revenue may offset expenses and allow for additional projects to be added to the highway constrained project list.

**Santa Clara County Goods Movement Study**
An examination of truck, freight rail and air cargo infrastructure and services to ensure our connections to gateway facilities, such as ports and airports, remain economically competitive and major goods movements’ transportation corridors remain efficient and vital links of the system. The study would require development of databases to track shipping and trip movements through the region /county and make projections of how goods movements will change over time. Resulting products may include Goods Movements programs and capital projects.

Local System

County Expressways
Santa Clara County’s expressway system is owned and operated by the County Roads and Airport Department. Expressway planning is guided by the Comprehensive County Expressway Planning Study (CCEPS), which was approved in November of 2008. The study provides a long-term plan for the improvement and maintenance of the expressway system. It includes capacity, operational, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements as well as an analysis of ongoing operating and maintenance needs. Since adoption of the CCEPS, the County has actively worked with VTA and the cities to secure funding and develop projects. The County will begin developing a new CCEPS, to be known as Expressway Study 2040, in 2013.

Local Streets and County Roads
VTA’s Board of Directors created the Local Street and County Roads (LS&CR) Program to address the difficulties faced by Member Agencies to raise revenues for LS&CR projects not connected to new development projects. Member Agencies are lead sponsors for most projects in this program area. They are responsible for project design and implementation but the projects are closely coordinated with, and receive input from, VTA staff to ensure the projects meet the long range vision for the county and contain desirable features such as Complete Streets principles. Projects that are planned for under LS&CR program area encompass local issues such as new street connections, crossing freeways and expressways, reconstructing streets, turn lanes, traffic circles, and grade separations.
Multimodal Transportation Investments (MTI)
The MTI planning area encompasses non-capacity enhancing projects in the areas of bicycle and pedestrian planning, Intelligent Transportation System Projects, Streetscape improvements and the Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Program.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Programs
The past few decades have seen an increase in the number of bicycle trails, paths, lanes and facilities in Santa Clara County. VTA’s bicycle program aims to continue this trend by expanding the number of bicycle facilities and bicycle-friendly thoroughfares and by promoting bicycle-friendly design.

As the countywide planning agency for bicycle projects, VTA plays a lead role in the advancement of bicycling as a significant mode of travel in Santa Clara County. Some of the initiatives being led by VTA are the development and implementation of the Countywide Bicycle Plan and the creation of the Bicycle technical guidelines (BTG). VTA also manages the Bicycle Expenditure Program (BEP) in the Bicycle Element of the VTP; BEP is the funding mechanism for countywide bicycle projects, utilizing several fund sources. Finally, VTA is one of several agencies working to bring bike share to Santa Clara County and the rest of the Bay Area. Details about all of these programs are discussed below.

Countywide Bicycle Plan
In August 2008, VTA adopted the Santa Clara Countywide Bicycle Plan (CBP). The CBP complements Member Agencies’ bicycle plans, which are more focused on improvements serving local needs. The CBP contains policies and actions designed to improve bicycle facilities and inter-agency coordination, and promote bicycling and bicycle safety in Santa Clara County. The CBP guides the development of major bicycle facilities by identifying regional needs and new capital projects including a financially unconstrained master list of bicycle infrastructure projects. These projects are eligible for consideration for inclusion in the future Bicycle Expenditure Program updates. This list is useful in other VTA and local agency activities such as development review, transit planning, highway projects review, prioritizing local streets and roads projects, and collision monitoring. Lastly, by including these projects in the CBP, Member Agencies may apply for outside (non-BEP) funds. The three major categories of projects that the CBP addresses are:
• **Cross-County Bicycle Corridors (CCBCs):** Twenty-four on-street bicycle routes and 17 trail networks (figure 2.X). The corridors are in various stages of completion with existing, planned, and undeveloped segments. When completed, the CCBCs will be the most direct and convenient routes for bike trips to local and regional destinations across city or county boundaries.

• **Across Barrier Connections (ABC):** A list of locations of freeways, creeks, rivers and active rail lines in the county present impenetrable barriers to bicycle circulation. Although the county has over 90 pedestrian/bicycle crossings, approximately 100 more are needed to provide a basic level of connectivity across these barriers (figure 2.XX).

{Insert figure 2.X CCBC map as close to the above section as possible}

{Insert figure 2.XX ABC map as close to the abc section as }

**Bicycle Technical Guidelines**

The Bicycle Technical Guidelines (BTG) is a manual that contains optimum standards and best practices for roadway and bikeway design. It is intended to help Member Agencies to plan, design, and provide optimal bicycle facilities in their jurisdictions, while ensuring that bicycle and roadway planning remains consistent countywide.

The BTG complements the Countywide Bicycle Plan (CBP) and the Bicycle Expenditure Program (BEP) and should be used as a resource by both roadway and bikeway planners and designers. First adopted by VTA in 1999, the BTG has undergone two revisions, the most recent of which includes newly adopted State standards for, and new technical developments in, bicycle planning. The latest BTG was adopted by the Board of Directors in December 2012.

**Bicycle Expenditure Program**

The 1996 Measure B sales tax dedicated $12 million to bicycle projects. Subsequently, in 2000 the VTA Board of Directors adopted the Bicycle Expenditure Program (BEP) as the funding mechanism for countywide bicycle projects, utilizing several fund sources.

**Bike Share**

In 2009, VTA began work to develop, fund and implement a Bike Sharing program in Santa Clara County, the first of its kind in the Bay Area and second in the West Coast following Anaheim. Santa Clara County
will join the select few U.S. cities to provide bike sharing as an alternative transportation option to make short trips, connect to transit and improve access to transit services. VTA worked in partnership with Silicon Valley Bike Coalition (SVBC), local employers and cities, to develop a Feasibility Study to test a 100-bike pilot program in one or more cities in Santa Clara County. Following the successful completion of the study, VTA merged efforts with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District and other local agencies to launch bike share as part of a region-wide program. The Bike Share Pilot Program is expected to begin service in Spring/Summer 2013 with 1,000 bicycles in San Jose, Mountain View, Palo Alto, Redwood City and San Francisco. The goal of the program is to continue program operations and expansion following the pilot period.

**Pedestrian Program**

Walking is one of the most sustainable forms of transportation—there are zero emissions while very little resources are consumed. People use sidewalks, crosswalks, paths and trails every day, alone or as a part of longer trips connecting with other modes. Most trips, especially longer ones, involve relying on more than one mode of transportation to reach a destination. For shorter local trips, walking often becomes the primary transportation mode, yielding greater importance to having comprehensive pedestrian facilities. In this context, all places are universally linked through walking or using mobility aids on sidewalks, crosswalks, and other public spaces. A well-connected pedestrian network encourages short trips to be taken by foot, and effectively reduces traffic congestion by eliminating local car trips.

Well-designed paths and amenities maintain safety as the paramount feature for pedestrians of all ages and abilities. One major area of focus is to improve safety in the design of all pedestrian facilities and connections, especially for people with limited mobility. Pedestrian paths and public spaces contribute to vibrant and livable communities, and help establish a sense-of-place. Combining unique, visually striking design with practical amenities for pedestrians helps strengthen the emotional bond between people and the cities built around them. The pedestrian network contributes to healthy communities and active lifestyles.
These ingredients for a robust, enjoyable, and safe walking experience lie in vigilant planning and engineering. VTA has proudly been an advocate for progressive transportation design in the Santa Clara Valley for many years. The creation of a Countywide Pedestrian Plan aims to place a greater level of importance on pedestrian improvements in our region.

**Countywide Pedestrian Plan**

Starting in Fiscal Year 2013, VTA will begin the development of a Countywide pedestrian plan. The plan would be similar in nature to the Countywide Bike Plan in that it would establish a pedestrian network that links together destinations in a geographic framework such as a conglomeration of employment sites within reasonable proximity of a rail or BRT station. The network will connect pedestrian pathways to transit and bicycle trails as well as identify opportunities for expansion, connection gaps, and barriers. The initial study will examine opportunities to help foster a sense-of-place and establish an easily recognizable and intuitive corridor structure throughout the county. This will be accomplished through good urban design, streetscape projects, and capital investments. The Plan will build on and leverage with the existing efforts carried out by VTA and its Member Agencies, such as the bus stop improvement program, Cities’ pedestrian plans and their Capital Improvement Programs, and grass root efforts.

Similar to the Bicycle Program, the Pedestrian Program will encompass its own programs, capital projects, and a subset of plans such as Local Area Pedestrian Plans that are more attuned to partnerships with local jurisdictions.

**Transportation Systems Operation and Management Program**

The Transportation Systems Operations and Management (TSO&M) Program seeks to improve the operation and management of Santa Clara County’s transportation system through the use of new technologies, including electronics, computers, and communication infrastructure.

**Smart Streets Study**

This exploratory study examines new technologies and applications, and their suitability for implementation in Santa Clara County. It is the first step towards developing a smart streets plan,
programs, and capital projects. This study may also position Santa Clara County to receive federal grants for proof of concept projects or programs and engage Silicon Valley Hi-Tech firms to enter public/private partnerships with VTA and other local government agencies. Possible concepts for examination are:

- **Smart Road Intersections.** These fully-instrumented signalized intersections are dynamically reconfigurable (e.g., turning lanes and crosswalks can be added as needed) for all approaches and are outfitted with customized controllers, vehicle presence sensors, and wireless communications.

- **A system of Smart Roads** to cost-effectively improve traffic flow by installing sensors, cameras and automatic toll readers that are integrated with vehicles and other systems.

- **New materials and technologies** such as high tech road surfaces, which offer such features as durability, renewable materials, permeability, or the ability to generate solar power.

**Silicon Valley Intelligent Transportation Systems (SV-ITS) Program Enhancements**

Through a partnership of local, regional and State agencies, work will continue on the integration of technology-based systems to provide improved operations of the transportation system. The program has four projects underway or near completion that expand camera surveillance, coordinate traffic signal operations, and share traffic information in areas covering Los Gatos north to Fremont in Alameda County, around the San Jose Mineta International Airport, and westward from downtown San Jose to Cupertino. The SV-ITS program has plans to upgrade its existing Wide Area Network (WAN) to current networking standards and to interface with the Caltrans – District 4 Traffic Operations Center (TOC) in Oakland, CA.

**Transit Signal Priority Implementations for BRT**

VTA’s BRT program includes the deployment of priority treatment at traffic signals for buses. Bus signal priority (BSP) has been in operation since 2005 along VTA’s Route 522 corridor as a result of traffic signal software updates, new traffic signal hardware, and the installation of BSP transmitters on buses. VTA has an upcoming effort to expand Transit Signal Priority along Stevens Creek Boulevard for a new rapid bus service to provide an east-west direction rapid transit connection where none existed before.

**Santa Clara County TSO&M Projects from the Freeway Performance Initiative**
MTC’s FPI program aims to make improvements to ramps through technology improvements and greening existing ramp meters. In Santa Clara County, the VTA will manage a set of projects. All of these projects will be implemented beginning in mid 2013, with completion of these sets of projects to occur in 2015.

**Ramp Metering Implementation**

This project will implement ramp metering along southbound US 101 between Embarcadero Road and De La Cruz Boulevard, the entire length of SR 87, and southbound SR 85 between Almaden Expressway and Cottle Road during the AM and PM peak periods. Ramp metering improvements to the I-880 corridor between SR 237 and I-280 were subsequently added and implemented. Caltrans has recently requested assistance with similar ramp metering improvements on the I-280 corridor between US 101 and I-880. Overall, the project will be implemented in mid 2013.

**Regional Transportation Operations Personal Service (RTOPS) and Regional Intelligent Transportation Systems Maintenance Service (RITSMS)**

VTA and its Member Agencies are interested in using these systems to fullest potential and developing these programs to meet a regional need to management, maintain, and operate existing traffic operations systems (e.g. traffic signals, traffic surveillance cameras, traffic data collection, and communication peripherals). Current, some of these systems are not staffed or funded with appropriate levels. These programs will develop, enhance or augment existing management, maintenance, and operations staff/programs for these systems to ultimately move traffic more efficiently in the region. Both RTOPS and RITSMS in near future will be funded through regional portion of the Santa Clara County Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) funds.

**Traffic Signal Communication and Synchronization Project**

In 2008, the California Transportation Commission approved a grant through the Traffic Light Synchronization Project (TLSP) to the City of San Jose for $15 million to upgrade aging 785 traffic signal controllers, install 36 miles of Fiber of Optic communications to support real time traffic management, and install 141 traffic surveillance cameras to support real time traffic management, implementation of
traffic responsive corridors in seven key business and commercial districts in the City of San Jose, and synchronize the traffic signals. This project will be completed by late 2013.

County Expressway Traffic Operations System

The County of Santa Clara Roads and Airports Department has on-going effort to implement the deployment of fiber-optic communications, traffic signal system improvements and surveillance cameras along all eight expressways. Much of this improvement project was funded by the 1996 Measure B sales tax; however, in 2008, the California Transportation Commission approved a grant through the Traffic Light Synchronization Project (TLSP) to the County for $4.4 million to enhance its existing data collection systems. The enhancement would be used by the County TOC staff and the centralize traffic signal control systems to optimize traffic signal timing to meet changes in demand.

Real-Time Transit Information Project (Formerly Dynamic Passenger Information Project)

The Real-Time Transit Information (RTI) project incorporates various state-of-the-art Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) technologies at light rail/bus transit centers and park and ride lots. This project includes Internet-based information, real-time electronic transit schedules linking to Automated Vehicle Location (AVL) on buses and light rail, transit information signs, and other on-site transit user amenities. The project is expected to be completed and being used in revenue operations before 2014.

Transportation Operations Strategic Plan for Santa Clara County (TOSP)

The TOSP, previously referred to as the ITS Implementation Plan, is derived from the 2008 Transportation Operations Strategic Plan for Santa Clara County. It describes a strategy for making better use of real-time actions to enhance the operation of public surface transportation facilities in Santa Clara County, California, and provides input to the VTP. The facilities of interest are all publicly owned major roads and transit systems in the urban portion of the county. The real-time actions of interest are those taken minute-by-minute by personnel or automated systems to monitor system information and make changes as needed.
This strategy is intended to help refocus Santa Clara County agencies on effective and cooperative transportation operations. This is especially important now that travel demand is growing again after a downturn following the recent technology-industry recession.

The strategic ITS planning effort generated a list of projects and initiatives and revealed a shift in the original fund allocation recommendations, where operations, management and maintenance needs have become the greatest need in the region. The greatest needs in order of greatest frequency are as follows:

1. Operations, management, and maintenance programs.
2. Traffic flow improvement project for all users such as traffic signal timing; improve access for pedestrians and bicycles; improve transit operations; and safety.
3. Traffic Signal Systems projects
4. Traffic Operations Center (TOC) projects
5. Traffic Surveillance projects such as cameras and in pavement loops
6. Communications between traffic signals, TOC, and other traffic operations systems (TOS)
7. Emergency Response System projects
8. Other projects that do not fall under any of the above listed project types

MTC’s FPI program is expected to contribute to funding these elements since there are no dedicated sources of funding to address Santa Clara County’s needs.

Community Design and Transportation Program, Streetscapes, and Complete Streets

Community Design and Transportation Program

In the late 1990’s VTA recognized the disconnect between transportation and land use planning in Santa Clara County and set forth to develop the Community Design and Transportation (CDT) Manual of best practices for land use integration. Adopted in 2002, the CDT Program is VTA’s primary method for aligning transportation with development and services, as well as defining principles, practices, and actions that lead to more inviting and vibrant places throughout the County. As the first of its kind in the Bay Area, the CDT program presented a new paradigm for growth and development in Santa Clara
County by intensifying land use and transportation alternatives around cores, corridors and station areas (CCSA) (appendix F).

Ten years later, the concepts presented in the CDT have integrated into local and regional planning practice by agencies throughout the Bay Area. VTA member agencies have adopted the CDT manual and implemented its tenets. One example is the redevelopment of Murphy Avenue in Sunnyvale from an underutilized main street to an active hub of pedestrian activity [Insert Murphy Ave Pic]. At VTA, the Pedestrian Technical Guidelines are a direct result of the CDT Program, as are several of VTA’s grant programs. Regionally, the CDT principles and practices are incorporated into the 2013 RTP due to the transportation and land use mandates of SB 375. MTC and ABAG designated many CCSA’s as PDA’s, which has blurred the lines between the CCSA concept of the CDT and the PDA concept of the RTP.

Unlike the PDA concept, however, the CDT considers that, although focused growth around transit and activity nodes is vital to the long term success of the County, the areas that do not fall within a CCSA/PDA are important and should be enhanced and revitalized with treatment appropriate for those neighborhoods. The CDT program is designed to consider these non-PDA areas and committed to making them inviting and connected places that draw people by non-automobile modes of travel.

The CDT program is evolving from a foundation for transportation and land use integration to an innovative leader in multimodal community development in the Bay Area. Opportunities exist to revise the program to reflect lessons learned and redefine suburban communities. This means updating the CCSA with PDA boundaries and supporting intensified growth in those areas. It also means incorporating best practices to increase livability in traditional car-oriented suburban housing developments that are not within the CCSA/PDA boundaries. This may be accomplished by developing guidelines for VMT reduction measures specific to these suburban areas, such as pedestrian cut throughs, across barrier connections, and separated bike lanes connected to vibrant pockets of local services. These types of updates will continue to keep the CDT program at the forefront of good planning practice in the Bay Area.
Other Planning Initiatives

Land Use and Transportation Integration

Coordinating land use and transportation planning is one of the fundamental ways to ensure that transportation investments are used effectively and land uses are supported by the appropriate transportation infrastructure and services. VTA has an extensive history of working closely with Member Agencies on land use and transportation integration, while balancing regional planning principles with the integrity of local planning initiatives and plans. Maintaining this balance will help us achieve SB 375 requirements, meet the goals of the RTP, and strive for our collective vision for a vibrant Santa Clara County.

As the modeling results in Chapter 1 showed, reaching the greenhouse gas reduction targets set forth by SB375 will require us to intensify housing and job production around transportation nodes. We cannot do this without the express help of local jurisdictions, who have land use decision-making authority. To elicit the highest and best use from transportation investments, and deliver a world-class multimodal transportation system, VTA must rely on the concerted efforts of its Member Agencies. Land use policies and commitments by Member Agencies are important factors in VTA’s decision making process for transportation improvements because opportunities to add capacity to roadways and expand fixed-rail transit are limited and expensive. VTA expects to see its commitments of billions of dollars, in capital and on-going operating funds to Member Agencies, work in concert with coordinated land use and policy decisions that focus development along major transportation corridors or around transportation nodes.

VTA works with its Member Agencies to promote land use and transportation integration through several efforts. These include policy-level coordination when Member Agencies update their General Plans; project-level coordination through VTA’s Proactive Congestion Management Program (CMP) and Development Review Program; and ongoing information-sharing and discussion at the agency staff level through VTA’s Land Use/Transportation Integration (LUTI) Working Group.

Policy-Level Coordination - General Plan Updates
Local agency General Plans are the fundamental policy documents that guide land use change, define the local transportation system, and determine the vision for other elements such as parks, public facilities, and infrastructure. In the past few years, several cities in Santa Clara County have completed updates to their General Plans, including San José, Santa Clara, Mountain View, and Los Gatos. Other cities, such as Sunnyvale, Palo Alto, and Milpitas are in the process of updating portions of their General Plans. VTA often provides input to its Member Agencies on these policy updates in an effort to promote a coordinated land use and transportation system. VTA also works closely with Member Agencies that have recently updated their General Plans, to help with General Plan implementation and to integrate the land use patterns envisioned in those General Plans with the plans, projects and services provided by VTA.

Proactive Congestion Management Program (CMP) and Development Review Program

VTA also coordinates with its Member Agencies to promote land use and transportation integration at the project level. As the Congestion Management Agency for Santa Clara County, VTA is charged with monitoring a network of regional roadways for congestion, encouraging the use of alternatives to the single-occupant automobile and promoting land use/transportation integration strategies. VTA reviews development proposals circulated by Member Agencies to ensure that transportation impacts are minimized, to facilitate use of alternative transportation modes, and to encourage a balanced approach to addressing congestion. The CDT program is a fundamental component of this review process. The Proactive CMP process coordinates two project review processes engaged in by VTA staff:

1. Review of environmental documents, site plans and related documents as part of VTA’s Development Review Program
2. Review of Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) reports of proposed projects meeting the Congestion Management Program TIA Guidelines requirements

VTA is currently enhancing its efforts in the Proactive CMP Program and Development Review Program. VTA is identifying ways to better follow up on VTA staff comments over the life of projects. In addition, VTA is improving its tracking of development activities early in the planning process, and assisting Member Agencies through the CDT program with the early review of development proposals, General
Plans, and areas plans. All of these efforts are intended to forge a stronger partnership between VTA, its Member Agencies and the development community to promote stronger, more transit-supportive and livable communities.

VTA Land Use / Transportation Integration (LUTI) Working Group

As a part of its land use-related activities, VTA has recently introduced a new Land Use / Transportation Integration (LUTI) Working Group of its Technical Advisory Committee. This Working Group is composed of Member Agency and VTA planning staff and provides a forum for information-sharing and discussion of topics with transportation and land use implications. The LUTI Working Group has also helped VTA in its role as a liaison between the regional agencies and Member Agencies in the development of the Sustainable Communities Strategy under SB 375, and will continue to play a role through the adoption and implementation of the SCS.

Congestion Management Program (CMP) Update

In accordance with California law, Santa Clara County has established a Congestion Management Program (CMP). The intent of the CMP legislation is to develop a comprehensive transportation improvement program among local jurisdictions that will reduce traffic congestion and improve land use decision-making and air quality. VTA administers the CMP and serves as the Congestion Management Agency for Santa Clara County. As a part of its CMA role, VTA maintains the technical guidelines and standards for the transportation analysis of development projects and plans in Santa Clara County. VTA is continually looking to improve its CMP policies, standards, and technical documents. Santa Clara County / Silicon Valley is a unique region within the San Francisco Bay Area, and the State, and VTA recognizes that its CMP should adapt to the changing landscape and emerging trends in Santa Clara County, the Bay Area, and beyond.

TIA Guidelines Update

As the Congestion Management Agency for Santa Clara County, VTA is charged with maintaining the county’s Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Guidelines that Member Agencies use when analyzing the transportation impacts of land use and development projects on the CMP transportation system. A number of recent trends have occurred since the TIA Guidelines were last updated in 2009, which
provide an impetus for updates and improvements. These trends include progress on the implementation of SB 375 and the emphasis on reductions in auto trips and Vehicle-Miles-Traveled; the 2010 updates to the CEQA Transportation checklist which allowed Lead Agencies more flexibility in determining how to perform transportation analysis; the release of the 2010 Highway Capacity Manual including new Multimodal Level of Service measures; and additional emphasis on Complete Streets policies.

An update to the TIA Guidelines focusing on the improvements described above will occur in 2013-2014, and will involve consultation with the VTA Technical Advisory Committee and its Working Groups, other VTA Board Committees, and other stakeholders.

**Multimodal Level of Service**

In December 2010, the Transportation Research Board (TRB) released an updated version of the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM 2010) which includes new methodologies for measuring Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Transit Level of Service (LOS) on urban streets. Since 2011, VTA has been making efforts to educate its own staff as well as Member Agency staff on the new Multimodal LOS methodologies, and to encourage discussions about how these may be applied in Santa Clara County.

VTA will be working with its Member Agencies over the next few years to determine the best way to incorporate multimodal performance measures and methodologies in the Congestion Management Program.

**CMP Technical Studies Program**

This ongoing Program is designed to improve VTA’s CMP through the application of new academic and industry research, real world experiences of other agencies, and original research conducted by VTA. Original research may include but not be limited to parking demand, management, and design; multimodal streets; modal level-of-service standards (i.e., bicycles, pedestrians and vehicles), and trip generation / trip reduction rates and strategies. VTA may partner with other institutions such as nearby universities to conduct research, and may pursue grant funding for some of these efforts. This work is
intended to provide specific, local information to help update VTA’s CMP guidelines and standards, with the ultimate goal of incentivizing better development and transportation projects.

**Joint Development Program**

VTA’s Joint Development Program furthers the VTP 2035 land use goal and objectives and supports VTA’s strategic and fiscal goals. To govern the activities of the Joint Development Program, the VTA Board of Directors approved a comprehensive policy framework in 2009 that significantly improves upon VTA’s previous Joint Development Policy, originally adopted in January 2005. The policy framework provides the principle concepts behind the Joint Development Program, and the Implementation Plan lays out a consistent process to advance Joint Development opportunities. As reflected in these documents, the program identifies the most suitable private and public sector development opportunities from VTA’s extensive portfolio of VTA-owned property at, and adjacent to, transit stations and corridors. VTA envisions its station areas and transit corridors as vibrant, prosperous community assets that create a strong sense of place for transit, pedestrians, and the surrounding community, and which are destinations in their own right.

The mission of the Joint Development Program is to be accomplished through the pursuit of the following three goals, in priority order:

A. **Revenue.** To provide a long-term, stable source of revenue for VTA by obtaining fair market value on the sale or lease of its real property assets through an open and competitive development process;

B. **Transit Oriented Development (TOD).** To carry out TOD, where appropriate, that provides the highest and best use of each site, conforms to the regulations of the affected jurisdiction in which the site is located, and achieves the goals set forth in VTA’s Community Design and Transportation Manual for high quality design and community benefits; and

C. **Transit Operations.** To create development that results in ridership growth on multi-modal transit systems and/or enhances VTA’s operational infrastructure.
All of these goals are to be accomplished through a consensus-driven, site-appropriate development process, which includes both comprehensive intra-agency coordination and extensive collaboration with external stakeholders, both interested in and affected by VTA’s Program. As a whole, the approach outlined in VTA policy framework is intended to be clear and uniform for all projects; to involve close communication and collaboration with affected jurisdictions; to follow a competitive developer selection process; to include best practices in the public-private contracting arena; and to be fair and transparent to developers, jurisdictions, real estate markets, and the public.

Of the three goals, determining the appropriate level of parking for TOD poses one of the major obstacles to the Joint Development Program. As a transit agency, VTA is obligated to provide ample parking for transit patrons, but as a requirement for a potential development, project parking must also be satisfied based on local land use regulations and zoning requirements. In early 2011, through a grant issued by MTC, VTA conducted a Replacement Parking Study for a subset of station areas to ascertain the appropriate approach to Transit-Oriented Development Parking. The results of the study were finalized in March 2012 and concluded that the replacement parking should be determined on a project by project basis. The project-specific replacement parking will vary depending on myriad factors, such as parking demand, potential to implement traffic demand management practices, access improvements, and potential for the ridership levels to increase as a result of the transit-oriented development. VTA will continue to evaluate station-specific replacement parking and seek shared-parking opportunities were applicable.

A station-specific Joint Development opportunity is located at Tamien Station in San Jose. VTA has engaged Dahlin Group to advance the project with the ultimate goal of obtaining entitlements for a high-density housing project. Phase I of the analysis will kick off in December and will include feasibility and site planning studies. The first Phase will also include preliminary analysis for the opportunities and constraints for development and will require extensive coordination between Dahlin Group, VTA and the City of San Jose.

Policy Initiatives

Congestion Pricing
Congestion pricing seeks to maintain a constant acceptable level of operation by charging users a fee. As applied to Santa Clara County, congestion pricing would first take the form of express lanes on highways. Express lanes are modified HOV lanes that allow non-carpool drivers to use the lane for a fee that varies depending on traffic conditions. The cost of entry would vary to maintain a minimum speed of 55 miles per hour and HOV users will remain able to use the facility at no cost.

This strategy takes advantage of excess capacity in HOV lanes and has the added benefit of raising revenue for future corridor improvements including express or freeway-based BRT services operating in the lanes. By allowing non-carpool drivers to use express lanes, the burden on mixed-flow lanes is reduced. Legislation is in place that allows the development of two express lane corridors. US 101 and SR 85 are the top corridors for near-term implementation. VTA will seek authority to complete the entire network. VTA has recently completed and opened the SR 237 Express Connector project this past March and work will commence to work on the remaining sections of SR 237.

**Fees**

Dwindling transportation funds at the state and federal level require VTA to explore innovative funding strategies that use old, new, or non-traditional financing techniques to raise the funds necessary to deliver transportation projects efficiently and cost-effectively. The use of fees to supplement traditional funding sources is an important strategy for managing demand and meeting operations and maintenance needs, while also enhancing and expanding Santa Clara County’s multimodal transportation system. This broad planning area includes many strategies that align real costs with the users who benefit from the transportation product. Aligning users and costs creates a natural progression where demand for some projects will decrease while revenues from other projects will increase.

VTA is committed to working with member agencies, regional authorities, and the public to transparently develop and implement fee programs, which will be multimodal in focus and protect the public interest in the transportation system. The following list contains potential fees or fee-based partnerships that may be implemented during the life of the plan. Some of these strategies are explained in detail starting on page 10 of section A while others are newer opportunities that warrant further exploration by VTA, and may be found in the glossary.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gas Taxes</th>
<th>Tax Increment Financing (ex. Special Transit District)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Activity Fees</td>
<td>Countywide TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Fees (ex. Toll roads)</td>
<td>VMT Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable Parking Fees</td>
<td>Countywide Deficiency Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay as You Drive Car Insurance</td>
<td>Public Private Partnerships. (ex. Asset Leases)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Registration Fees</td>
<td>Impact Mitigation Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City or County General Funds</td>
<td>Business Tax/license Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient Occupancy Tax</td>
<td>Local Assessment Districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way dedication</td>
<td>VMT Tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Charges and Taxes</td>
<td>Parcel Tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Tax</td>
<td>California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion Pricing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 2D: Operations and Maintenance Program

Purpose

In the coming years, the transportation system will need significant maintenance to handle the amount of users on the system. While the VTP document is a 28-year outlook on the capital expansion investment, it also illustrates the need for revenue to maintain the existing and expanded systems in the future. This element takes into account the different program areas of the VTP and determines the necessary funding required addressing these needs. When comparing the need of the system to the expected revenue, it results in a revenue shortfall. This shortfall is what is required to keep the system maintained and operated at an acceptable level.

Table 2.X shows the operations and maintenance needs in the same three Program Areas as in the Capital Improvement Program, Transit, Highway, and Local System. The table also describes the need versus the expected revenue and the shortfall expected through the timeframe. All costs and revenues are in 2013 dollars.

<<Insert O&M Table>>

VTA Transit Operations and Maintenance

Operations and Maintenance are an essential element that defines how the VTA operates its existing fleet of transit as well as provide funding to help repair and maintain the local roadway system. As the congestion management agency for Santa Clara County, one of the responsibilities of VTA is to be the Countywide Transit Planning, Development, and Operations agency. VTA plans, designs, and builds new bus and rail projects, and facilities. It also operates, maintains, and improves bus, rail and paratransit service within the county. VTA is also responsible for overseeing the ½ cent sales tax established by Santa Clara County voters in 2000 to implement the Measure A Transit Program. With the implementation of the sales tax program, VTA has funded projects related to pavement management and also intends to use revenue to maintain and operate the fleet as well as the light rail network.
VTA operates bus and light rail systems and maintains its fleet. VTA also supports and contributes other transit services within our jurisdiction such as Caltrain, BART, and ACE. VTA updates a Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP) that describes in detail the 10-year forecast VTA’s system and a funding outlook that is likely. VTA’s core system is guided by our Transit Sustainability Policy (TSP). The TSP is a process to evaluate performance of the transit system using Board adopted standards for productivity. The goals of the TSP are to: (a) Improve system ridership, productivity, and efficiency; (b) Improve farebox recovery; (c) Improve transit’s role as a viable alternative mode; and (d) Use transit investments and resources more effectively.

VTA’s O&M costs are driven by the level of service and the unit cost associated with each level of service driving variable. The variables include items such as facilities, replacement of bus or light rail, stations, etc. VTA is planning to realign its service to provide BRT services in two corridors (in the Santa Clara-Alum Rock corridor to El Camino Real and West San Carlos/Stevens Creek Corridor in FY15 and FY18, respectively); to implement the improvements outlined in the Light Rail System Analysis; and to serve the extension of BART into the county in 2019. Bus and light rail service levels throughout the plan are consistent with existing VTA bus service.

When the most recent SRTP was completed in 2010, it was assumed that the economic downturn would reduce the service level in the bus fleet. It was taken into account that while service will be lower than average for 2010, it would recover to regular levels by the end of the SRTP period, which was about 2019. The Santa Clara Alum Rock and the El Camino Bus Rapid Transit projects are two new BRT projects that will have an impact on the operations of the systems, especially with the costs of the new buses that will be used for the projects. Light Rail is also reduced in the first fiscal year of the SRTP, but will also recover by 2019. Both bus and light rail would be accommodated through the addition of articulated buses and longer trains.

The SRTP also takes into account the BART project until first year of service. In 2001, a comprehensive agreement between VTA and BART requests BART to operate the Berryessa Extension and to credit VTA for a portion of the fare revenue collected. VTA will pay the operating subsidy and capital costs associated with BART through a subsidy payment to BART. For the other services operated in Santa Clara County, such as ACE and Caltrain, VTA will continue to be a funding partner for those services.
Sources of Operating and Maintenance Funds
In the past few years, VTA has seen an increase in the ridership both in light rail and bus service. VTA also anticipates growth due to BART and the introduction of BRT service in the County. A portion of the maintenance funding comes through farebox recovery; however there are other sources that the VTA relies on.

VTA heavily relies on Sales tax based revenues for the VTA Transit Fund, including the 1976 half-cent local sales tax and the 2000 Measure A Sales Tax-Operating Assistance which is derived from 18.5% of 2000 Measure A half-cent sales tax revenues. Most recently in 2008, Santa Clara County voters passed Measure B, a 1/8 cent sales tax dedicated to the operations of the BART Silicon Valley operations. The sales tax increase did not take effect until after state and federal matching funds were secured, which occurred in mid 2012.

Federal 5307 Preventive Maintenance grants are another source of the funding for maintenance of the transit system. The federal SAFETEA-LU program’s Section 5307 Large Urban Cities grant program and Section 5309 Rail and Fixed Guideway Modernization programs are major sources of capital funding for VTA. Federal formula funds are awarded to the San Jose urbanized area based on demographics, ridership, levels of service, and operating measures. Funding for this region, which includes several urbanized areas, is allocated to individual transit operators by MTC.

The Transportation Development Act (TDA) of 1971 provides state funding allocated to transit properties complying with regional plans. The program provides two funding sources: the Local Transportation Fund (LTF) is derived from a ¼ cent statewide sales tax, and the State Transportation Assistance (STA) is derived from the statewide sales tax on gasoline and diesel fuel. LTF revenues are returned to their originating county, while STA revenues are allocated based on population transit revenues from the prior years.

Another source of funding for future operations will be the Silicon Valley Express Lanes Revenue. A portion of these revenues would go towards operations and maintenance based on approvals by the VTA Board of Directors. VTA anticipates that the application of a portion of these revenues to provide funding for eligible transportation improvements and transit services in the County. The specific projects have not been identified, however once the funding comes in, VTA will develop a process to apportion the funds to projects.
Need
For the entire transit system, the need is based on the variety of services that VTA provides. There are also the subsidies that VTA pays to other operators, including Caltrain and the Altamont Commuter Express (ACE). The VTA also maintains the bus and light rail fleet and facilities in a state of good repair, which many of the funds go towards but is a separate cost versus the need. VTA’s need for the entire transit system for the next 28 years is approximately $18 Billion with the costs to keep the system in a state of good repair is $3.1 Billion.

HIGHWAYS
Caltrans is responsible for the maintenance of the State Highway System. Many of the maintenance associated with the State Highway System revolves around a few categories. The most visible maintenance of the freeway comes in the form of litter removal and landscape maintenance. Another maintenance feature deals with the upkeep of the pavement on the freeways and ongoing technological maintenance related to ramp meters. For State Highways not on the freeways system, pavement is done primarily by Caltrans; however, there are instances where the Local Agency agrees to maintain the project through a cooperative agreement. For example, a local agency may take charge of the litter removal for a specific interchange with permission from Caltrans.

Sources of Operating and Maintenance Funds
A majority of the funding for operations and maintenance is derived from the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP). This includes three separate categories: Preservation, Operations, and Mobility. Preservation includes the rehabilitation of the mainline freeways, pavement maintenance, and any improvements related to bridges. Operations include the installation and maintenance of both signals and signage. It is basically inclusive of traffic management systems. Mobility is inclusive of all miscellaneous improvements such as roadside assistance, collision reduction improvements, damage restoration projects, and other facility improvements.

Funding for litter and landscape maintenance usually comes from the Caltrans overall budget. A variety of efforts and resources are used to maintain the aesthetic appearance of freeways for travelers and local communities. Caltrans classifies its maintenance activities into three family/problem categories. The three categories are: Litter and Debris; Landscaping Maintenance; and Vegetation Control. VTA initiated the VTA Litter and Landscape Study that investigated the freeway litter and landscape
conditions in 2005. The study estimated the average yearly cost of $4.6 million for maintaining the freeway system in Santa Clara County. This optimal cost to perform landscape maintenance and graffiti cleanup was based on a visual standard, of which the highest was a no litter scenario.

**Need**

In the next 28 years, there is about $2.1 Billion in SHOPP funds for the purpose of maintaining the system within Santa Clara County. In the SHOPP program, the three elements mentioned above were calculated based on the number of freeway miles within Santa Clara County versus the amount of freeway mileage in the entire Caltrans District 4. The overall necessary need for Santa Clara County revolve around the availability of SHOPP Funds. For the purposes of the long range planning document, we are showing the overall need for the highway system in Santa Clara County to be approximately $5.6 Billion. This leaves a shortfall of approximately $3.5 Billion.

In the Express Lane program, VTA estimates the cost needed to maintain and operate the system would be approximately $562 Million over 28-years that would be covered entirely by the toll collected. This leaves no shortfall. The litter and landscaping program is estimated to have a 28-year need of $129 Million. Calculating the amount in the Caltrans budget leaves approximately $84 Million coming in that timeframe. This leaves a shortfall of approximately $45 Million.

**LOCAL SYSTEM**

The Local System consists of pavement management and non-pavement needs for the local roadways that the Cities and the County maintain. The local system also includes improvements to the Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) equipment and management of traffic. Pavement conditions are maintained by MTC's Pavement Management Program (PMP) StreetSaver, a computer-assisted decision-making process designed to help cities and counties prevent pavement problems through judicious maintenance, and to diagnose and repair those that exist in a timely, cost-effective manner. Pavement Management projects are intended to repair or replace existing roadway pavement from outside edge of curb and gutter to opposite outside edge of curb and gutter. The following types of improvements occur with Pavement Management: Roadway reconstruction; Overlays; Pavement maintenance treatments; Spot repairs; Curb and gutter repair; replacing pavement markings and striping; and Fiber-optic cable installation. They may also include bicycle striping if it is feasible.
Another set of maintenance needs revolves around the upkeep of traffic signals and traffic operating systems (TOS). These features have long been in need of maintenance. Most Member Agencies we consulted with have stated that the biggest need in terms of funding deals with the maintenance of the system.

**Sources of Funding for the Local System**
For road rehabilitation and reconstruction, the preliminary source of funding comes from the Surface Transportation Program (STP). STP funds strictly go towards pavement maintenance and other indirect associated costs. For example, if a paving project includes the addition of sidewalks or bicycle lanes, a portion of STP funds may be used to implements some of these. Local funding is also used in many cases to maintain pavement within a particular City or the County. For the purposes of the plan, it is assumed that STP funding is the primary source for pavement maintenance in Santa Clara County. It is anticipated that a portion of the funding from the Freeway Performance Initiative (FPI) and the Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) would be available to fund TOS projects. However, the majority of the funds generally will go to actual projects needed, rather than the maintenance.

**Need**
The identified need was based on three categories: Local Streets and Roads maintenance, ITS maintenance, and Expressway system maintenance. The need for Local Streets and Roads maintenance is heavily revolved around pavement maintenance. Through MTC’s Pavement Management Program, the need for the County is determined by the Pavement Management System (PMS) program, which calculates the need for both actual pavement and associated non-pavement costs such as sidewalks, curb and gutter, etc. The total pavement need for Santa Clara County is estimated to be $10.9 billion. The total revenue expected to flow in the next 28 years is estimated to be approximately $6.2 billion, leaving a shortfall of $4.7 billion for the County.

The ITS maintenance need for Santa Clara County was based on the information based in the ITS Strategic Plan. The ITS Strategic Plan identified a 28-year list of improvements that are necessary to improve movement in the County on local streets as well as freeway on-ramps. The expected need for the ITS program is approximately $501 Million over 28 years. Most of the maintenance of the system is expected over the next 28 years would be estimated at $200 Million in revenue coming from MTC’s
Freeway Performance Initiative and local Vehicle Registration Fees. The need would then be approximately $300 Million.

The Expressway system is managed by the County of Santa Clara. The Countywide Expressway Study of 2008 detailed the needs and resources available to maintain the system. It outlined an annual cost to maintain the Expressways. The total maintenance need for the Expressways was approximately $563 Million over the 28-year period. This need did not account for pavement improvements, since it was included as part of overall pavement. Revenue for Expressways is usually done through local funding, STP funding, or other initiatives such as Sales Tax set-asides. Over the 28-year period of the plan, it is estimated that funding would be roughly $150 Million, leaving an overall need of $413 Million.

**IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE FUNDING STRATEGIES**

The long range planning process identifies funding for capital projects. While these capital projects are important to enhancing the transportation system, many times the need to fund the operations of the transit system or the maintenance of the transportation system gets neglected. The information and the discussion earlier in the section, were meant to highlight the overwhelming need to address these shortfalls in the system.

In terms of Local Streets and Roads pavement maintenance, most paving projects usually are done when there is a definite need to repair and rehabilitate the street. Transit maintenance involves fleet, stations, and facilities. In the 2035 RTP, MTC designated roughly 80 percent of revenues be allotted to the maintenance of the transportation system. While the amount of funding is large, the need still is great. Even in the 2040 RTP, approximately 88% of funding will go towards Operations and Maintenance. The approach that MTC takes in the development of the RTP is threefold. MTC will (1) maintain existing pavement/bridge structural conditions, (2) fully fund revenue vehicles and 70% of other fixed assets for transit, and (3) fully fund operating needs for existing transit services.

The basic concern comes back to securing sufficient funding for operations and maintenance to ensure the high performance of the transportation system. Generally, it is more likely to secure fund sources for newer projects and implementation of existing capital needs. It is more of a challenge to pursue new fund sources for operations and maintenance, with a few exceptions.

Looking into the future, the VTP is calling for several strategies for operations and maintenance funds.
• **Creative Finance for Capital Projects and O&M** – One of the current programs that VTA is implementing is the Express Lanes Network for Santa Clara County. The revenue is generated by use fees, toll revenue in this case. A portion of the revenue generated by Express Lanes would go toward the maintenance of the Express Lanes, as well as possible infrastructure maintenance of our local roadways and highways. The VTA is also considering using this fund source to implement transit improvements. The finance for the Express Lanes Network will set an example to inspire more creative ways to fund projects and connect project finance with users.

• **Create New Fund Sources** Another example can be the implementation of a Vehicle Registration fee that would apportion funding for maintenance related to ITS and pavement rehabilitation. We should also look at using existing fund sources and apportioning out segments to fund operations and maintenance.

• **Implement Self-Help Measures** – In the past 15 years, Santa Clara County has implemented Sales Tax Measures to help fund both projects and system maintenance. The 1996 Measure B Program went a long way in providing road maintenance funding to our Member Agencies. Although it did not entirely meet the need, it provided a source of funding that did not require Federal Approval for the implementation of projects. In addition, there are three sales tax measures go into transit operations as discussed previously. VTA has established policies for the prudent management of the transit operations funds to ensure that sufficient funds are always available in the event of either unanticipated revenue shortfalls or unavoidable expenditure needs.
CHAPTER 3

“The future depends on what you do today.” – Mahatma Gandhi

Conclusions

The future success and vitality of our County will depend on how we grow, develop and evolve in the years to come. VTP 2040 presents a vision for the future that is based on a broad set of goals and objectives that can respond to the many challenges we face – how to grow efficiently, preserve the health of the environment and maintain sufficient funding resources, while providing all socio-economic groups access to transportation and opportunity. Developing a long range vision is an iterative process, one which requires us to revisit our goals and make adjustments to our assumptions to better respond to new opportunities and challenges in the future. It also requires that we embrace both a visionary and practical approach to plan for outcomes we want to achieve but also recognize that the outcomes we desire from this Plan will not be the result of any one project, decision, or jurisdiction. It will be based on the cumulative impact of the choices and investments we make over time. VTP 2040 embodies these principles and reflects our intent to support a more efficient and sustainable transportation system.

Challenges Ahead

Looking toward the future, we are faced with complex challenges that have real economic, social and environmental impacts – a growing population, increasing congestion, changing climate, fluctuating gas prices, and declining financial resources among many others. Our ability to maintain and improve the quality of our transportation system over the next 28 years will be challenged by a combination of these factors, many of which relate to the physical landscape of Santa Clara County and some which are external forces outside of our direct control. Nevertheless, achieving much of this shared vision requires a concerted effort between VTA and its partner agencies to find common ground in aligning local and regional interests in transportation, land use, air quality and environmental concerns.

Past experience has shown us that Santa Clara County is responsive to innovative solutions to address the growing demand for transportation mobility. As a “self-help county,” Santa Clara County residents have demonstrated support for implementing programs and projects that improves transportation services throughout the years. As a result, VTA has and will continue to roll out innovative
transportation solutions like congestion pricing, better information technology, and offer faster, and more customer-focused transit service. VTA will work with its Member Agencies to gather the political will and support necessary to further advance similar innovative strategies contained in VTP 2040.

The recommendations outlined in this Plan are not exceptional or unattainable – they describe what we can do given the available resources and what we can accomplish if we plan strategically. However, implementing this shared vision will require many years and significant resources to accomplish. The County has already taken great strides in creating our own funding opportunities by generating local revenue through sales tax measures. We must continue to stretch our local revenue dollars and seek additional resources that can help fund investment priorities now and anticipated project needs in the future. This will require innovative financing with the revenue we know that we can expect in combination with other approaches.

Opportunities for Change
Challenges which may seem daunting often present tremendous opportunity for meaningful change and chance to demonstrate leadership. We are fortunate to have in place the key elements essential to make meaningful change in the future: 1) an informed and engaged community, 2) forward-thinking partners dedicated to creating strong communities and 3) a proactive government and local agencies working together to seize opportunities in providing high quality transportation programs and services.

In an effort to respond to a range of challenges, make the most of our regional assets and realize our Plan vision, VTP 2040 outlines a menu of transportation investments designed to help meet the needs of Santa Clara County in the next 28 years. The Plan also includes a fresh assessment of opportunity areas that will help broaden the range of transportation options available.

*Tie land use and transportation with funding* – The passage of SB 375 is the beginning of what could potentially be a transformative change in better integration of land use and transportation decisions in Santa Clara County. A critical component to encouraging focused growth and strategic growth is to tie funding to projects near transit. VTP 2040 supports the regional strategy of incentivizing focused growth to support the Priority Development Areas (PDA’s) with One Bay Area Grant Program (OBAG) funding.
**Sensible Growth** – Even though VTA supports focused growth in PDAs; we must also consider local land use policies and local initiatives that support smart growth. We must think of growth that does not just focus on housing, but also employment. The health of the economy affects this County as well and we must not lose sight of that. At the same time, we cannot use that as an excuse that prohibits VTA and its partners from our efforts. This simply is a call for us to use our resources wisely in our PDAs and also continue our focus outside of those areas that play a role in change.

**Make the most of what we have** – While we actively pursue innovative solutions that can address traffic congestion and efficiency in travel time, we can also improve existing transportation system through better system management. We must take advantage of the intelligent transportation tools that help keep traffic flowing, improve bottlenecks, and enhance public transit. VTA is actively pursuing efforts to increase mobility through the advocacy of multimodal level of service which will encourage complete design and multimodal planning.

**Invest in public transit** – VTA is actively pursuing efforts to invest in significant transportation improvements. To increase speed and service levels on our light rail system calls for an intensive investment in capital transit projects. The VTA also envisions increased light rail connections to new destinations and Bus Rapid Transit projects that will improve ridership and increase express service along major corridors. Improvements to our active bus fleet will also ensure high quality vehicles that reduce the impact in the environment.

**Offer more travel choices** – Projects which would increase bicycling and walking mode shares are a significant component of the Bicycle Expenditure Program. VTA and its Member Agencies are driving the change towards making bicycling and walking viable transportation modes by investing in well-maintained bicycle and pedestrian facilities, improved access to transit facilities, and enhanced safety features though better street design. In addition, the County is demonstrating its strong commitment towards non-motorized transportation systems by rolling out new programs like bike sharing and introducing treatments such as protected bike lanes and “green lanes.”

**Build partnerships** – VTA, working in partnership with its Member Agencies, take an active role in planning for improvements that benefit mobility and air quality. Currently, through the development review process, VTA has been able to advocate for best practices in new developments around the County. Member Agencies have also begun the process to address climate change through General Plan
updates. As General Plans are updated, there is a movement to implement complete street practices, consider land use changes, and develop Climate Action Plans.

**What Lies Ahead**

The Plan calls for us to look deeply into the future and anticipate changes in the planning horizon which can affect our quality of life. The Plan indicates a number of trends which will likely continue into the future with investments in multimodal transportation services, system refinements, demand management and maintenance of existing infrastructure. However, transportation improvements will only take us so far. Changes in land use pattern must also evolve to support existing and future transportation investments. By integrating these two policy objectives, we can succeed in maximizing limited transportation dollars while advancing the goals of VTP 2040.

Technology will undoubtedly play a key role in future transportation strategies. Just as technological developments have improved fuel efficiency and introduced greater efficiencies in energy consumption, emerging technologies will be a critical component to address new challenges in transportation and energy use in the years to come. As one of the objectives in VTP 2040, the application of new technology will be embraced as a strategy for its potential to further reduce vehicle emissions, improve system operations, increase roadway safety and harness energy sources.

The pursuit of new fund sources will continue to be an ongoing effort. More financial resources are needed in order to accomplish the County’s goals of operating and maintaining high quality transit services, maintaining the existing roadways and improved operational efficiency, expanding bicycle and pedestrian improvements and strengthening ties between land use and transportation. It is important to explore possible sources of new funds which may include express lane net revenue, local gasoline tax, or countywide impact fees in the future.

We have accomplished a lot since the adoption of the last VTP document and we continue this momentum in VTP 2040 by refining our vision and enhancing our implementation strategies to pursue the next phase of investment priorities. Our shared success moving forward will require that we continue an open dialogue within our community and with other partners throughout the region to develop innovative, collaborative solutions that will help maximize limited resources and deliver quality transportation projects and programs. VTP 2040 seek to guide the County toward a more sustainable
future by integrating transportation, land use and funding opportunities to create communities that are a great place to live, work and play.
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief Engineering & Construction Officer, Robinson, Chief CMA Officer, Ristow

SUBJECT: October 2012 VTP Highway Program Semi-Annual Report

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

Please find attached the Semi-Annual Report for the VTP Highway Program for the period ending October 31, 2012. Highlights for this reporting period include the following accomplishments:

- Started construction on the I-280/I-880/Stevens Creek Boulevard Interchange Improvement Project in October 2012.
- Approved the Implementation Plan for VTP 2040 Highway Projects in Santa Clara County in June 2012.
- In May 2012, the Board approved allocating $700,000 for preparation of environmental clearance and engineering documents for I-280/Foothill Expressway Ramp Improvements project to be ready for available construction funding.

The goal of this report is to communicate overall progress in a simple yet informative manner. We look forward to your continued feedback on this report as the VTP Highway Program moves forward.

Prepared By: Adolf Daaboul, Sr. Transportation Engineer
Memo No. 3703
Semi-Annual Report
October 2012
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SECTION 1

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
SECTION 1 – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A. BACKGROUND

The VTP Highway Program includes projects from the currently approved long range countywide transportation plan, Valley Transportation Plan 2035 (VTP), for Santa Clara County. The VTP is developed by VTA, and projects must be included in the VTP as a prerequisite for eligibility to receive Federal, State, regional and local discretionary fund programming. One hundred percent of VTP Highway Program expenditures are funded by grants (Federal, State, regional or local) or other local funding. No VTA funds are required for these projects, except where noted.
B. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Valley Transportation Plan (VTP) Highway Program consists of potentially over $1 billion of highway improvement projects currently in various phases from conceptual study to construction. The projects are located throughout Santa Clara County (and adjoining areas) and seek to improve key elements of the highway transportation system, utilizing a variety of funding sources.

Funding is a key issue for many of the highway projects. VTA, acting as the CMA for Santa Clara County, assembles funding from a variety of sources as needed in order to advance each project through its various phases to completion. As a consequence, in this report there are references to several terms associated with a project’s funding level. These terms, arranged in order of increasing certainty of funding availability, are as follows:

1. **Estimated Cost** – An estimate of the total cost of a project given the currently known scope and configuration of the project. For early stage projects, this estimate may be based on very conceptual information and, therefore, has associated with it a high level of uncertainty and a correspondingly low level of accuracy. In the individual project information sheets, we have included the “Estimate Class” in order to give an idea of the level of uncertainty associated with the estimated cost. A more detailed discussion of this topic is included in the appendix.

2. **Identified Funding** – Funding identified as being ultimately available from project funding agencies to complete the work, as of the writing of this report. Depending on the stage of the project, the identified funding may be less than the estimated cost of a project. In such cases, we use the term “To Be Determined” (TBD) funding to describe the difference between the estimated cost and identified funding.

3. **Appropriation** - The most recent Adopted Budget includes appropriations, based on an estimate of expenditures during fiscal years 2012 and 2013, for various VTP Highway Program projects. Since these projects can run beyond FY13, the appropriation amount is only a time-constrained slice of total estimated expenditures.

4. **Secured Funding** – Funding that has been committed by funding agencies and is now available to VTA for project expenditures. In many cases, secured funding is at a lower level than the appropriation in the Adopted Budget. For these projects, it is anticipated that additional funding may be secured during the FY12/13 period. It is important to note that, regardless of the level of appropriation, actual expenditures will not exceed secured funding at any time.
Figure 1.1 shows the total estimated cost of all projects contained in this report, broken down by the currently identified funding sources.

![Figure 1.1](image)

**Figure 1.1**

VTP Highway Program Identified Funding Sources

Local: 5%
State: 8%
Federal: 1%
To Be Determined: 89%

Note the large proportion of funding shown in Figure 1.1 that is designated as “To Be Determined.” Clearly, significant sources of federal, state, and/or local funding will be required to complete many of these projects. VTA’s strategy continues to be to advance a number of projects through the early (and relatively low-cost) stages of project development so that they will be ready to take advantage of funding that may become available in the future.

Figure 1.2, on the next page, shows the projects categorized by phase of development, and shows what portion of the estimated cost has been identified for each project.
**Figure 1.2**  
**VTP Highway Projects Identified Funding Levels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Portion of Estimated Cost For Which Funding Has Been Identified**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Conceptual Study Projects</strong>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>El Camino Real/Route 85/237/Middlefield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Environmental/Preliminary Engineering</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freeway Performance Initiative (Design only)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Route 152 Trade Corridor</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US 101 Widening - Monterey Road to Route 129</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US 101 De La Cruz Boulevard/Trimble Road</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Route 85 Express Lanes</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US 101 Express Lanes</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Projects in Final Design (PS&amp;E)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Route 237 Planting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-280/Foothill Expressway Ramp Improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Projects Under Construction</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US 101 Aux Lanes – Embarcadero to Route 85 (CMIA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-880 HOV Widening (CMIA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US 101 Improvements - I-280 to Yerba Buena (CMIA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Route 87 Planting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ramp Metering Implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Route 237/I-880 Express Connectors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US 101 Capitol Expwy – Yerba Buena Int. (CMIA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-880/I-280/Stevens Creek Improvements (CMIA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**  
*Estimated cost for projects in the Conceptual Study category includes only the conceptual study. Estimated cost for projects in other categories covers entire scope through construction, except where noted.  
** (Identified Funding) / (Estimated Cost) x 100%  
See page 1-3 for definitions of Identified Funding and Estimated Cost.
By way of a brief progress report, during the six month period covered by this report:

a. On the **SR85 Express Lanes** project, the contract with URS Corporation was revised in October 2012 in the amount of $800,000 to a not-to-exceed total contract value of $9.1 million to accommodate additional services to complete the Project Approval/Environmental Document (PA/ED) phase for both SR 85 and US 101 Express Lanes projects.

b. On the **I-280/I-880/Stevens Creek Boulevard Interchange Improvement** project, a construction contract with DeSilva Gates Construction was executed in the amount of $33,582,063. Construction began in October 2012 and is expected to be completed by March 2015. A groundbreaking event was held on November 9, 2012.

c. On the **US 101/Capitol Expressway - Yerba Buena Road Interchange Improvements** project, a construction contract with Granite Rock Co. dba Pavex Construction was executed in the amount of $19,523,851. Construction began in September 2012 and is expected to be completed by early 2014.

d. In September 2012, the Board received an update regarding the **SR 237 Express Lanes** program for FY 2012. During FY 2012, the express lanes served a total of over 700,000 vehicles including both carpoolers or High Occupancy Vehicles (HOVs) and solo drivers or Single Occupant Vehicles (SOVs). It was reported that about 141,000 SOVs (20%) of the total express lanes traffic volumes chose to pay a fee to gain travel time reliability.

e. In August 2012, the Board approved the allocation of up to $2.5 million Local Program Reserve (LPR) to the **SR 237 Express Lanes** project’s Approval and Environmental Document Phase (PA/ED); $1.175 million LPR and/or Transportation Enhancement (TE) Funds to Palo Alto's California Avenue Transit Hub project; and deprogrammed $1.2 million from the **US 101/Trimble Road/De La Cruz Blvd/Central Expressway Interchange Improvements** project.

f. In July 2012, VTA’s participation in a four-county working group, the “Mobility Partnership”, previously formed to study a program of infrastructure improvements along the east-west **State Route 152 corridor**, was terminated. Together, the Counties of Santa Clara, San Benito, Merced and Madera had worked collaboratively to support the development of congestion and safety enhancements along the heavily traveled trade corridor between US 101 and SR 99 in the Central Valley. The four counties believe the partnership had been productive, however, given their varying stages of progress in environmental review and project study, they agreed to terminate the working group. This decision will allow VTA to focus its efforts on advancing project development in Santa Clara and San Benito Counties.

g. In June 2012, the Board approved the Implementation Plan for **VTP 2040 Highway Projects** in Santa Clara County.

h. In May 2012, the Board approved allocating $700,000 for preparation of environmental clearance and engineering documents for the **I-280/Foothill Expressway Ramp Improvements** project to be ready for available construction funding.
C. SECURED FUNDING

Figure 1.3 shows the prior and current period appropriations for the VTP Highway projects. Secured funding increased by a net $1.4 million during the report period, as discussed below:

Changes in Secured Funding

1. Conceptual Study Projects
   
   Secured funding remains unchanged at $0.8 million.

2. Projects in the Environmental/Preliminary Engineering Phase
   
   Secured funding increased by $0.4 million to a new total of $18.6 million due to the addition of Local Program Reserve funds to the US 101 Widening - Monterey Rd to Route 129 project.

3. Projects in Final Design (PS&E)
   
   Secured funding increased by $0.7 million to a new total of $2.0 million. The I-280/Foothill Expressway Ramp Improvements project was added to this category. The following projects were moved to the Projects Under Construction category:
   a. US 101 Capitol Expressway – Yerba Buena Interchange project.
   b. I-880/I-280/Stevens Creek Improvements project.

4. Projects Under Construction
   
   The US 101 Capitol Expressway – Yerba Buena Interchange project and the I-880/I-280/Stevens Creek Improvements project were moved under this category. Secured funding increased by $0.3 million to a new total of $254.7 million.

5. Silicon Valley Express Lanes
   
   Secured funding remains unchanged at $25.4 million.
## VTP Highway Program Secured Funding

### $’s in millions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/Category</th>
<th>Apr-12</th>
<th>Oct-12</th>
<th>(b - a)</th>
<th>Text Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conceptual Study Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Camino Real/Route 85/237/Middlefield</td>
<td>$0.8</td>
<td>$0.8</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$0.8</td>
<td>$0.8</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projects in the Environmental/Preliminary Engineering Phase</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Performance Initiative</td>
<td>$1.6</td>
<td>$1.6</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 152 Trade Corridor</td>
<td>$10.2</td>
<td>$10.2</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 101 Widening - Monterey Rd to Route 129</td>
<td>$5.5</td>
<td>$5.9</td>
<td>$0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US101 De La Cruz Blvd/Trimble Rd</td>
<td>$0.9</td>
<td>$0.9</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$18.2</td>
<td>$18.6</td>
<td>$0.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projects In Final Design (PS&amp;E)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 237 Planting</td>
<td>$1.3</td>
<td>$1.3</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-280/Foothill Expressway Ramp Improvements</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.7</td>
<td>$0.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$1.3</td>
<td>$2.0</td>
<td>$0.7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projects Under Construction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 101 Auxiliary Lanes - Embarcadero to Rt. 85 (CMIA)*</td>
<td>$72.0</td>
<td>$72.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-880 HOV Widening (CMIA)*</td>
<td>$67.4</td>
<td>$67.4</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 101 Improvements I-280 to Yerba Buena (CMIA)</td>
<td>$10.2</td>
<td>$14.2</td>
<td>$4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 87 Planting</td>
<td>$5.0</td>
<td>$5.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramp Metering Implementation</td>
<td>$2.6</td>
<td>$2.6</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 101 Capitol Expressway-Yerba Buena Interchange*</td>
<td>$32.6</td>
<td>$30.5</td>
<td>($2.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-880/I-280/Stevens Creek Improvements (CMIA)*</td>
<td>$64.7</td>
<td>$63.0</td>
<td>($1.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$254.4</td>
<td>$254.7</td>
<td>$0.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Silicon Valley Express Lanes Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVEL Program Development</td>
<td>$3.0</td>
<td>$2.9</td>
<td>($0.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR237/I-880 Express Connectors</td>
<td>$11.8</td>
<td>$11.8</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rt 85 Express Lanes</td>
<td>$4.9</td>
<td>$4.9</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 101 Express Lanes</td>
<td>$5.7</td>
<td>$5.7</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$25.4</td>
<td>$25.4</td>
<td>($0.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$300.1</td>
<td>$301.5</td>
<td>$1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Current Secured Funding shown here and in Section 2, and Appropriation shown in Section 2, include adjustments made after 10/31/2012, to better reflect project status at the time of report publication.
D. INCURRED COSTS

Figure 1.4 below shows the incurred costs for the VTP Highway Program at the beginning and end of the period as well as the percent of the project appropriation incurred as of October 31, 2012.

Figure 1.4

VTP Highway Program Incurred Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/Category</th>
<th>a Incurred Costs Through Apr-12</th>
<th>b Incurred Costs Through Oct-12</th>
<th>c = (b - a) Incurred Costs This Period</th>
<th>d Percent of Secured Funding Incurred Oct-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conceptual Study Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Camino Real/Route 85/237/Middlefield</td>
<td>$0.7</td>
<td>$0.8</td>
<td>$0.1</td>
<td>97.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$0.7</td>
<td>$0.8</td>
<td>$0.1</td>
<td>97.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projects in the Environmental/Preliminary Engineering Phase</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Performance Initiative</td>
<td>$0.3</td>
<td>$0.8</td>
<td>$0.5</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 152 Trade Corridor</td>
<td>$6.5</td>
<td>$7.0</td>
<td>$0.5</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 101 Widening - Monterey Rd to Route 129</td>
<td>$5.4</td>
<td>$5.4</td>
<td>($0.0)</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US101 De La Cruz Blvd/Trimble Rd</td>
<td>$0.6</td>
<td>$0.8</td>
<td>$0.2</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$12.8</td>
<td>$14.0</td>
<td>$1.1</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projects In Final Design (PS&amp;E)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 237 Planting</td>
<td>$0.7</td>
<td>$0.7</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-280/Foothill Expressway Ramp Improvements</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.3</td>
<td>$0.3</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$0.7</td>
<td>$1.0</td>
<td>$0.3</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projects Under Construction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 101 Auxiliary Lanes - Embarcadero to Rt. 85 (CMIA)</td>
<td>$14.6</td>
<td>$15.1</td>
<td>$0.5</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-880 HOV Widening (CMIA)</td>
<td>$15.5</td>
<td>$15.6</td>
<td>$0.1</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 101 Improvements I-280 to Yerba Buena (CMIA)</td>
<td>$9.0</td>
<td>$9.3</td>
<td>$0.3</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 87 Planting</td>
<td>$4.7</td>
<td>$4.8</td>
<td>$0.1</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramp Metering Implementation</td>
<td>$2.3</td>
<td>$2.3</td>
<td>$0.1</td>
<td>91.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 101 Capitol Expressway - Yerba Buena Int. (CMIA)</td>
<td>$3.3</td>
<td>$4.2</td>
<td>$0.9</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-880/I-280/Stevens Creek Improvements (CMIA)</td>
<td>$11.8</td>
<td>$13.0</td>
<td>$1.2</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$61.2</td>
<td>$64.3</td>
<td>$3.1</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Silicon Valley Express Lanes Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVEL Program Development</td>
<td>$2.9</td>
<td>$2.9</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR237/I-880 Express Connectors</td>
<td>$9.9</td>
<td>$11.0</td>
<td>$1.1</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rt 85 Express Lanes</td>
<td>$2.9</td>
<td>$3.6</td>
<td>$0.7</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 101 Express Lanes</td>
<td>$0.8</td>
<td>$2.4</td>
<td>$1.6</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$16.5</td>
<td>$20.4</td>
<td>$3.4</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$91.9</td>
<td>$100.1</td>
<td>$8.0</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1.5 - VTP Highway Program Overview Map
SECTION 2

PROJECT SUMMARY REPORTS
VTP HIGHWAY PROJECT SUMMARY REPORTS

A. CONCEPTUAL STUDY PROJECTS
   1. El Camino Real/Route 85/237/Middlefield

B. PROJECTS IN THE ENVIRONMENTAL/PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING PHASE
   1. Freeway Performance Initiative
   2. Route 152 Trade Corridor
   3. US 101 Widening - Monterey Road to Route 129
   4. US 101 De La Cruz Boulevard/Trimble Road Interchange

C. PROJECTS IN FINAL DESIGN (PS&E)
   1. Route 237 Planting
   2. I-280/Foothill Expressway Ramp Improvements

D. PROJECTS UNDER CONSTRUCTION
   1. US 101 Auxiliary Lanes – Embarcadero to Route 85 (CMIA)
   2. I-880 HOV Widening (CMIA)
   3. US 101 Improvements - I-280 to Yerba Buena Road (CMIA)
   4. Route 87 Planting
   5. Ramp Metering Implementation
   6. US 101 Capitol Expressway – Yerba Buena Interchange (CMIA)
   7. I-880/I-280/Stevens Creek Improvements (CMIA)

E. SILICON VALLEY EXPRESS LANES PROGRAM
   1. Program Overview
   2. Route 237/I-880 Express Connectors
   3. Route 85 Express Lanes
   4. US 101 Express Lanes
VTP Highway Projects

El Camino Real/Route 85/237/Middlefield

**Estimated Cost:**
$0.8 million (Conceptual Study)

Estimate Class 2 (see appendix)

**Appropriation through FY 13:**
$2.0 million

**Secured Funding to Date:**
$0.8 million

**Year of Completion:** 2012
(Conceptual Study)

**Project Manager:** Darrell Vice

**Designer:** Nolte Associates

**Project Description:**

Note: The description and funding indicated are solely for the production of a Project Study Report/Project Development Support (PSR/PDS). Any project arising from the Project Study Report will be defined and scoped separately.

Perform Conceptual Studies and prepare a PSR/PDS for improvements on Route 85 and Route 237. Possible alternatives include operational improvements to the El Camino Real/Route 85 Interchange, auxiliary lanes on Route 85 from El Camino Real to the Route 85 / Route 237 Interchange, and operational improvements at the Middlefield Road / Route 237 Interchange.

**Project Status:**

A Cooperative Agreement was executed with Caltrans in February 2012 to facilitate the completion of the Project Initiation Document. A Final Project Study Report/Project Development Support – PSR/PDS – was submitted to Caltrans in Fall 2012 for approval.

**Project Schedule:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>06</th>
<th>07</th>
<th>08</th>
<th>09</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental PS&amp;E</td>
<td>Mid 2006</td>
<td>Mid 2015*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid 2015*</td>
<td>Mid 2016*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Funding not identified schedule is tentative
Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding</th>
<th>Oct-12 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Oct-12 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Secured Funding Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>796</strong></td>
<td><strong>796</strong></td>
<td><strong>777</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred 98%
Secured Funding Committed 100%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

Funding (millions):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Identified</th>
<th>Secured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meas B Swap</td>
<td>$0.55</td>
<td>$0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (Mountain View)</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.80</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.80</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Portion of Estimated Cost for which funding has been identified 100%
VTP Highway Projects

Freeway Performance Initiative

Estimated Cost: $1.6 million

Appropriation through FY 13:
$1.6 million

Secured Funding to Date:
$1.6 million

Year of Completion:
2013 (PS&E)

Project Manager:
David Kobayashi

Designers:
URS Corporation
BKF Engineers

Project Description:
As part of MTC’s Freeway Performance Initiative, this program will include a variety of projects to improve highway operations along six freeway corridors within Santa Clara County: Routes 87, 17, 237, I-280, I-880, and US 101.

VTA, at the request of MTC and Caltrans, will act as the project manager to design proposed freeway improvements including on- and off-ramp widening, additional on- and off-ramp metering, and other Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) to gain additional throughput on the existing freeway systems.

Project Status:
The project is funded through the environmental and design phases, with construction funding to be identified in the future.

The URS Corporation and BKF Engineers teams continue environmental, data collection, and preliminary design efforts. Partial completion anticipated by Winter 2012. Balance by mid 2013.

Project Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Mid 2011</td>
<td>Late 2011</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design (PS&amp;E)</td>
<td>Early 2012</td>
<td>Mid 2013</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Mid 2013*</td>
<td>Mid 2014*</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open to Traffic</td>
<td>Mid 2014*</td>
<td>Late 2014*</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td>Mid 2014*</td>
<td></td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Funding not identified
schedule is tentative
## Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding (a)</th>
<th>Oct-12 Committed Costs (b)</th>
<th>Oct-12 Incurred Costs (c)</th>
<th>Secured Funding Balance (d = (a-c))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>1,526</td>
<td>1,325</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,563</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,325</strong></td>
<td><strong>822</strong></td>
<td><strong>741</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred 53%
Secured Funding Committed 85%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

## Funding (millions):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Identified</th>
<th>Secured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$1.6</td>
<td>$1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Typical Configuration of Freeway On-ramp Layout with Ramp Metering
**VTP Highway Projects**

**Route 152 Trade Corridor**

**Estimated Cost:** $1.0 billion  
Estimate Class 5 (see appendix)

**Appropriation through FY 13:**  
$25.15 million

**Secured Funding to Date:**  
$10.15 million

**Year of Completion:**  
2015 (PA/ED)

**Project Manager:** Darrell Vice

**Designer:** HDR

**Project Description:**

VTA is studying the development of an east-west trade and mobility corridor on Route 152 between US 101 and I-5. This study was requested by CTC.

The study will evaluate highway improvements and financing strategies that could benefit the movement of goods throughout the corridor and the mobility of commuters. It includes evaluation of Route 152 realignment alternatives between US 101 and Route 156 to enhance travel safety and improve travel times while upgrading to expressway standards.

Major improvements within Santa Clara County include: New Alignment of Route 152 from US 101 to Route 156, including the Route 25/US 101 interchange, safety and operational improvements from Route 156 to Pacheco Pass, and new Eastbound Pacheco Pass climbing lanes.

Major improvements outside Santa Clara County may include: improvements to the Route 152/I-5 interchange and other safety and operational improvements along the corridor.

**Project Status:**

**Major accomplishments** to date include:

- Prepared Preliminary Traffic and Revenue (T&R) Study
- Prepared Trade Corridor Summary Report
- Drafted Project Study Report/Project Development Support
- Initiated Environmental and Engineering Technical Studies
- Developed a range of Corridor Improvements
- Prepared preliminary financial model
- The four-county “Mobility Partnership” was terminated in July 2012.

The **Next Steps** are to:

- Secure Funding to Complete PA/ED
- Develop and Execute Necessary Agreements
- Continue Engineering and Environmental Studies
- Develop Project Business Case

**Project Schedule:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start Year</th>
<th>End Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA/ED</td>
<td>Early 2011</td>
<td>Late 2014*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Alloc.</td>
<td>Early 2013*</td>
<td>Early 2014*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td>Late 2013*</td>
<td>Early 2015*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>Early 2015*</td>
<td>Late 2016*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design-Build</td>
<td>Early 2015*</td>
<td>Early 2020*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Funding not identified, schedule is tentative.
Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding</th>
<th>Oct-12 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Oct-12 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Secured Funding Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>9,737</td>
<td>7,593</td>
<td>6,969</td>
<td>2,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10,150</td>
<td>7,593</td>
<td>6,969</td>
<td>3,181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred: 69%
Secured Funding Committed: 75%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

Funding (millions):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Identified</th>
<th>Secured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local (Other)</td>
<td>$0.15</td>
<td>$0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure A/STIP Swap</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State - STIP</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$10.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local 0.3%  State 0.3%  TBD 99.4%

Portion of Estimated Cost for which funding has been identified: 100%
**US 101 Widening - Monterey Road to Route 129**

**Estimated Cost:** $450 million  
  Estimate Class 4 (see appendix)

**Appropriation through FY 13:** $11.1 million

**Secured Funding to Date:** $5.9 million

**Year of Completion:** TBD

**Project Manager:** Darrell Vice

**Designer:** URS Corporation

**Project Description:**
The project proposes to widen US 101 from four to six lanes in Santa Clara and San Benito Counties to meet future traffic demands and to provide access control. The project also includes constructing a new interchange at the intersection of US 101 and Route 25, extending Santa Teresa Boulevard to connect to Route 25 at the Route 25/US 101 Interchange, and improvements on Route 25 required for the operation of the Route 25/US 101 interchange.

The project extends approximately 2.6 miles into San Benito County and approximately 4.1 miles into Santa Clara County. VTA is in partnership with San Benito Council of Government, Caltrans District 4, Caltrans District 5, local agencies and developers to deliver the project.

The project is contemplated to be delivered in two segments after completion of the environmental/PE phase. The first segment extends from the northern limit of the project to the US 101/Route 25 interchange. The second segment extends from just south of the US 101/Route 25 interchange to the US 101/Route 129 interchange.

The Route 25/US 101 Interchange reconstruction is a central element to both the US 101 Widening Project and the Route 152 Trade Corridor Project. The interchange construction is included in the description of both VTP Highway Project Descriptions as it is crucial to improve operations of both of the proposed projects. Budget for the northern limit segment is also included in the Route 152 Trade Corridor Project estimated cost in the amount of $225 million.

**Project Status:**

**Environmental/Preliminary Engineering:** The Administrative Draft EIR and Draft Project Report were submitted to Caltrans in October 2011. FEIR scheduled for Spring 2013 approval.

Additional funding of $0.4 million was approved by the Board in May 2012 to finalize the Environmental Document.


**Project Schedule:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft Env./PE</td>
<td>Early 2007</td>
<td>Mid 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Doc.</td>
<td>Early 2013*</td>
<td>Mid 2013*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design (PS&amp;E)</td>
<td>Mid 2013*</td>
<td>Late 2014*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>Mid 2013*</td>
<td>Late 2014*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Early 2015*</td>
<td>Late 2016*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open to Traffic</td>
<td>Early 2017*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td>Early 2017*</td>
<td>Mid 2017*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Funding not identified, schedule is tentative.
### Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding</th>
<th>Oct-12 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Oct-12 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Secured Funding Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td>d = (a-c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>5,832</td>
<td>5,832</td>
<td>5,371</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,900</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,900</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,439</strong></td>
<td><strong>461</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred 92%
Secured Funding Committed 100%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

### Funding (millions):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Identified</th>
<th>Secured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meas A/STIP Swap</td>
<td>$4.4</td>
<td>$4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meas B Swap</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>444.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$449.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Portion of Estimated Cost for which funding has been identified

100%
US 101 De La Cruz Boulevard/Trimble Road Interchange Improvements

**Estimated Cost:** $27 million

  Estimate Class 4 (see appendix)

**Appropriation through FY 13:**

$4.9 million

**Secured Funding to Date:**

$0.9 million

**Year of Completion:** 2013 (PA/ED)

**Project Manager:**

David Kobayashi

**Designer:** Rajappan & Meyer Consulting Engineers, Inc.

**Project Description:**

The project evaluates improvements to the US 101-De La Cruz Boulevard/Trimble Road interchange, including:

- Replacing the existing US 101 overcrossing
- Widening De La Cruz Blvd/Trimble Road to six travel lanes through the interchange limits
- Reconstructing the southbound exit loop to a partial cloverleaf design and incorporating a new intersection on De La Cruz Boulevard
- Configuring interchange and surface street improvements for multi-modal uses, including pedestrian and bicycle users.

**Project Status:**

A Cooperative Agreement was executed with Caltrans in February 2012 to facilitate the completion of the Project Initiation Document. A Draft Project Study Report/Project Development Support – PSR/PDS – was submitted to Caltrans in Spring 2012. Final PSR/PDS expected by end of 2012.

With VTA as the Environmental Lead Agency, the project will produce a Project Report and Environmental Document (State-CEQA only) for the interchange improvements in the City of San Jose by early 2013.

**Project Schedule:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental/PE</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design PS&amp;E</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding a</th>
<th>Oct-12 Committed Costs b</th>
<th>Oct-12 Incurred Costs c</th>
<th>Secured Funding Balance d = (a-c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>904</strong></td>
<td><strong>862</strong></td>
<td><strong>768</strong></td>
<td><strong>136</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred 85%
Secured Funding Committed 95%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

### Funding (millions):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Identified</th>
<th>Secured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local (San Jose)</td>
<td>$4.8</td>
<td>$0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Portion of Estimated Cost for which funding has been identified:
- Local 18%
- TBD 82%

Rendering of Proposed Overcrossing
Aerial Photo of US 101/De La Cruz Blvd Interchange
Route 237 Planting

Estimated Cost: $3.3 million

Estimate Class 1 (see appendix)

Appropriation through FY 13: $3.3 million

Secured Funding to Date: $1.29 million

Year of Completion:
2014 (Construction)
2016 (Plant Establishment)

Project Managers:
Stuart Bussian

Designers:
Parsons Transportation
Orsee Design

Project Description:
The project consists of landscape improvements in the City of Milpitas at Route 237 and McCarthy Boulevard Medians. Work will include tree planting, a recycled-water automatic irrigation system, and a 1-year plant establishment maintenance period.

It has not been determined whether a follow-on 2-year plant establishment period will be required.

Project Status:

Final Design (PS&E): Design is bid-ready. The project will become part of a new combined landscape maintenance project.

The project will be phased to coordinate with the I-880 HOV Widening project limits in the same corridor.

Project Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rescope and Final Design (PS&amp;E)</td>
<td>Mid 2012</td>
<td>Early 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction-Planting</td>
<td>Mid 2014</td>
<td>Late 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Establishment</td>
<td>Mid 2014</td>
<td>Late 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding (a)</th>
<th>Oct-12 Committed Costs (b)</th>
<th>Oct-12 Incurred Costs (c)</th>
<th>Secured Funding Balance (d = (a-c))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,285</strong></td>
<td><strong>744</strong></td>
<td><strong>741</strong></td>
<td><strong>544</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Secured Funding Incurred: 58%
- Secured Funding Committed: 58%

**NOTE:** All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000’s

## Funding (millions):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Identified</th>
<th>Secured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local (Milpitas)</td>
<td>$3.30</td>
<td>$1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3.30</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1.29</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Portion of Estimated Cost for which funding has been identified

---

**I-880/Route 237 Interchange**

**Typical Landscaping**
### Estimated Cost:
$0.7 million (Conceptual Study)
- Estimate Class 5 *(see appendix)*

### Appropriation through FY 13:
$0.7 million

### Secured Funding to Date:
$0.7 million

### Year of Completion:
2013 (PS&E)

### Project Manager:
Michelle Jiang

### Designer:
Transportation Infrastructure Group

#### Project Description:
Prepare environmental studies and develop PS&E for ramp improvements on I-280/Foothill Expressway. Scope includes widening the existing northbound I-280 exit to Foothill Expressway from one lane to two lanes and constructing a 4ft-wide shoulder with retaining wall and concrete barrier. The project area extends from the SR 85 connector ramp to NB I-280 and to Foothill Expressway.

---

#### Project Status:
Completed Geometric Approval Drawings (GAD), 35% PS&E, environmental studies, and provided to Caltrans for review. 100% Design is anticipated to be complete by December 2012 with Caltrans review to follow.

Funding for construction to be determined at a future stage.

#### Project Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design (PS&amp;E)</td>
<td>Early 2012</td>
<td>Early 2013</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding a</th>
<th>Oct-12 Committed Costs b</th>
<th>Oct-12 Incurred Costs c</th>
<th>Secured Funding Balance d = (a-c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>700</strong></td>
<td><strong>535</strong></td>
<td><strong>224</strong></td>
<td><strong>476</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred 32%
Secured Funding Committed 76%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

Funding (millions):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Identified</th>
<th>Secured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$0.70</td>
<td>$0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.70</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.70</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Portion of Estimated Cost for which funding has been identified

I-280 Northbound, approaching Foothill Expressway

Aerial View of I-280/Foothill Expressway Project Location
**US 101 Auxiliary Lanes – Embarcadero Rd to Route 85**

**Estimated Cost:** $72.0 million  
Estimate Class 1 (see appendix)

**Appropriation through FY 13:**  
$100.9 million

**Secured Funding to Date:**  
$72.0 million

**Year of Completion:** 2013

**Project Manager:** Lam Trinh

**Designer:** URS Corporation

**Project Description:**
Construct auxiliary lanes and extended dual HOV lanes in each direction of a 3.2 mile segment of US 101 between Route 85 in Mountain View and Embarcadero Road in Palo Alto.

This project has been selected by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) for construction funding through the Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) Proposition 1B Funding Program.

**Project Status:**

**Environmental/Preliminary Engineering:** The Environmental Document and Project Study Report/Project Report were approved in July 2009.

**Final Design:** The final engineering design – Plans, Specifications, and Estimate (PS&E) – work was completed in July 2011.

**Construction and Right-of-Way:** Right-of-way certification was achieved in May 2011. Utility relocations were completed in late 2011.

Bid opening occurred on October 25, 2011 with contract approval (O.C. Jones and Sons, Inc.) on December 13, 2011. Construction began on February 27, 2012 and continues with civil construction expected to be completed by mid 2013.

**Project Schedule:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental/PE</td>
<td>Mid 2007</td>
<td>Mid 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design (PS&amp;E)</td>
<td>Mid 2009</td>
<td>Mid 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>Mid 2009</td>
<td>Early 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Certification</td>
<td>4/19/2011</td>
<td>Early 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans Bidding Process</td>
<td>Mid 2011</td>
<td>Mid 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Early 2012</td>
<td>Mid 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open to Traffic</td>
<td>Mid 2013</td>
<td>Mid 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td>Mid 2013</td>
<td>Mid 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding</th>
<th>Oct-12 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Oct-12 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Secured Funding Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>56,881</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>55,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>1,644</td>
<td>1,460</td>
<td>1,459</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>13,475</td>
<td>13,174</td>
<td>12,628</td>
<td>847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>72,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,634</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,060</strong></td>
<td><strong>56,940</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred 21%
Secured Funding Committed 22%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000’s

### Funding (millions):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Identified</th>
<th>VTA Administered</th>
<th>Administered By Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meas A/STIP Swap</td>
<td>$15.7</td>
<td>$15.7</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (CMIA)</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$71.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>$17.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>$54.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>$71.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local 22%
State 78%

Portion of Estimated Cost for which funding has been identified

---

Double HOV lanes south of Old Middlefield Way

US 101 – Route 85 Interchange
I-880 HOV Widening

**Estimated Cost:** $67.4 million

Estimate Class 1 (see appendix)

**Appropriation through FY 13:**

$90.0 million

**Secured Funding to Date:** $67.4 million

**Year of Completion:** 2013

**Project Manager:** Lam Trinh

**Designer:** Mark Thomas & Company, Inc.

**Project Description:**

This project will add a High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lane in each direction of 4.6 miles of Interstate 880 between US 101 in San Jose and Route 237 in the City of Milpitas.

This project has been selected by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) for construction funding through the Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) Proposition 1B Funding Program.

**Project Status:**

**Environmental/Preliminary Engineering:** The Environmental Document and Project Study Report/Project Report were approved in June 2009.

**Final Design:** The final engineering design – Plans, Specifications, and Estimate (PS&E) – work was completed in July 2011.

**Construction and Right-of-Way:** Right-of-way certification was achieved in May 2011. VTA completed early utility relocations in October 2011.

Bid opening occurred on October 25, 2011 with contract approval (Bay Cities Paving & Grading, Inc.) on January 5, 2012. Construction began on April 2, 2012 and continues with civil construction expected to be completed by mid 2013.

**Project Schedule:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental/PE</td>
<td>Mid 2007</td>
<td>Mid 2009</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design (PS&amp;E)</td>
<td>Mid 2009</td>
<td>Mid 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>Mid 2009</td>
<td>Mid 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans Bidding Process</td>
<td>Mid 2011</td>
<td>Mid 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
<td>Mid 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Red</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open to Traffic</td>
<td>Mid 2013</td>
<td>Mid 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Purple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td>Mid 2013</td>
<td>Mid 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding</th>
<th>Oct-12 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Oct-12 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Secured Funding Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>51,654</td>
<td>3,284</td>
<td>1,124</td>
<td>50,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>4,080</td>
<td>3,834</td>
<td>3,756</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>11,604</td>
<td>11,063</td>
<td>10,758</td>
<td>846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67,400</td>
<td>18,181</td>
<td>15,638</td>
<td>51,762</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred 23%
Secured Funding Committed 27%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

### Funding (millions)*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Identified</th>
<th>VTA Administered</th>
<th>Administered By Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meas A/STIP Swap</td>
<td>$19.1</td>
<td>$19.1</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (CMIA)</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$67.4</td>
<td>$20.0</td>
<td>$47.4</td>
<td>$67.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Meas A/STIP Swap participation subject to change pending negotiations with Caltrans

**Portion of Estimated Cost for which funding has been identified**

- Local 28%
- State 72%

I-880/Brokaw Road Interchange

I-880/Route 237 Interchange
October 2012

VTP Highway Projects

US 101 Improvements - I-280 to Yerba Buena Road

Estimated Cost: $42.4 million
Appropriation through FY 13: $50.9 million
Secured Funding to Date: $14.2 million
Year of Completion: 2012
Project Manager: Ven Prasad
Designer: HMH Engineers

Project Description:

Improve operation on US 101 in east San Jose by adding a lane in the southbound direction from south of Story Road to north of Capitol Expressway and reconfigure the US 101/Tully Road interchange from the existing full cloverleaf to a partial cloverleaf interchange.

The balance of the operational improvements between Capital Expressway and Yerba Buena Road covered in the Environmental Document will be addressed in a separate project.

Additionally, the project replaces the Tully Road Overcrossing. The project fully accommodates bicyclists and pedestrians with a bike lane and sidewalk on both sides along the full length of Tully Road.

This project has been selected by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) for partial funding through the Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) Proposition 1B Funding Program.

Project Status:

Construction: The contract was awarded in late 2010 to RGW Construction, Inc. Construction was completed in October 2012.

Construction was administered by Caltrans.

Project Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental/PE</td>
<td>Mid 2007</td>
<td>Early 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design (PS&amp;E)</td>
<td>Early 2008</td>
<td>Early 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Mid 2010</td>
<td>Mid 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open to Traffic</td>
<td>Mid 2012</td>
<td>Mid 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding</th>
<th>Oct-12 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Oct-12 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Secured Funding Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>5,535</td>
<td>3,396</td>
<td>1,328</td>
<td>4,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>8,249</td>
<td>7,791</td>
<td>7,530</td>
<td>719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,230</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,632</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,303</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,927</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Secured Funding Incurred: 65%
- Secured Funding Committed: 82%

**NOTE:** All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

### Funding (millions):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Identified</th>
<th>VTA Administered</th>
<th>Administered By Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meas A/STIP Swap</td>
<td>$6.0</td>
<td>$6.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meas B Swap</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (CSJ)</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (Other)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (CMIA)</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (SHOPP)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal (ARRA)</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal (Earmark)</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$42.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>$14.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>$28.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>$42.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Secured Funding: 43%
- Federal: 26%
- Local: 31%

**Portion of Estimated Cost for which funding has been identified:**

![Tully Road Overcrossing](image1)

![Detail of Fencing](image2)
**Estimated Cost:** $5.0 million

Estimate Class 1 *(see appendix)*

**Appropriation through FY 13:**
$5.0 million

**Secured Funding to Date:**
$5.0 million

**Year of Completion:**
2009 (Construction)
2012 (Plant Establishment)

**Project Manager:** Ven Prasad

**Designer:** BKF Engineers, Sugimura & Assoc.

**Contractor:** McGuire and Hester

**Project Description:**
The project consists of landscape improvements including replacement planting, automatic irrigation system, and erosion control work, with a 3-year plant establishment and maintenance period. The project extends from Capitol Expressway to Julian Street in Downtown San Jose, and includes four major interchanges: Capital Expressway, Curtner Avenue, Almaden Expressway, and Julian Street.

**Project Status:**

**Construction:** Construction started in August 2008 and was completed in October 2009, two months ahead of schedule.

The three-year Plant Establishment Phase runs from October 2009 through October 2012. Construction contract closeout is underway.

**Project Schedule:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route 87 Planting</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final Design (PS&amp;E)</td>
<td>Mid 2006</td>
<td>Late 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planting</td>
<td>Late 2008</td>
<td>Late 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Establishment</td>
<td>Late 2009</td>
<td>Late 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding a</th>
<th>Oct-12 Committed Costs b</th>
<th>Oct-12 Incurred Costs c</th>
<th>Secured Funding Balance [d = (a-c)]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>3,385</td>
<td>3,285</td>
<td>3,266</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>1,590</td>
<td>1,574</td>
<td>1,546</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,975</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,860</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,812</strong></td>
<td><strong>163</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred: 97%
Secured Funding Committed: 98%

**NOTE:** All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

### Funding (millions):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Identified</th>
<th>Secured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meas A Swap</td>
<td>$0.1</td>
<td>$0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meas B Swap</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal (STP Funds)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal (GARVEE)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Portion of Estimated Cost for which funding has been identified:

- Local 44%
- Federal 56%
- 100%
**Estimated Cost:**
$2.6 million
  Estimate Class 1  
  *(see appendix)*

**Appropriation through FY 13:**
$11.8 million

**Secured Funding to Date:**
$2.6 million

**Year of Completion:**
2013

**Project Manager:**
David Kobayashi

**Designer:**
Mark Thomas & Company

**Project Description:**
Implement ramp metering along Southbound US 101 between Embarcadero Road and De La Cruz Boulevard, the entire length of Route 87, and southbound Route 85 between Almaden Expressway and Cottle Road during the AM and PM peak periods. Ramp metering improvements to the I-880 corridor between Route 237 and Interstate 280 were subsequently added and implemented. Caltrans has recently requested assistance with similar ramp metering improvements on the I-280 corridor between US 101 and I-880.

The goals of the project are to minimize overall corridor delay by managing access at on-ramps during peak commute periods, and to minimize the impact on local street traffic resulting from the implementation of ramp metering.

**Project Status:**
Ramp metering plans have been developed for southbound I-280 corridor and a public informational meeting was held in late April 2012. Metering on southbound I-280 corridor was implemented in late May 2012 and an evaluation of the metering effectiveness will be conducted in early 2013.

Metering plans are currently being developed in the opposite direction (northbound) of I-280 corridor and will be finalized in late 2012. Another public informational meeting will be held in late 2012 and will be implemented before the end of 2012. An evaluation of the metering effectiveness is planned to be conducted by Spring 2013.

**Project Schedule:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US 101, Route 87, I-880, and Route 85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Early 2008</td>
<td>Late 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Late 2008</td>
<td>Early 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Mid 2010</td>
<td>Late 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-280 Corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Mid 2011</td>
<td>Late 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Early 2012</td>
<td>Mid 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Mid 2013</td>
<td>Late 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td>Late 2013</td>
<td>Early 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding</th>
<th>Oct-12 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Oct-12 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Secured Funding Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>2,356</td>
<td>2,325</td>
<td>2,145</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,561</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,517</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,337</strong></td>
<td><strong>224</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Secured Funding Incurred**: 91%
- **Secured Funding Committed**: 98%

**NOTE**: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

### Funding (millions):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Identified</th>
<th>Secured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal (CMAQ)</td>
<td>$2.6</td>
<td>$2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Federal 100%**

**100%**

**Portion of Estimated Cost for which funding has been identified**

---

**Ramp Metering Schematic**

**Ramp Metering Hardware Example**

*(Typical One Lane On-Ramp)*

- Freeway Mainline
  - On Ramp
  - Off Ramp
- Ramp Metering Equipment
  - In-pavement Loops
  - Roadside Equipment
  - Advance Warning Device
  - Metering Signal Device
  - Traffic Sign
- Queue Loop
  - Demand Loop
  - Lane Out

---

**Metered Onramp**
**US 101 Capitol Expwy – Yerba Buena Interchange**

**Estimated Cost:** $34.1 million  
*Estimate Class 1 (see appendix)*

**Appropriation through FY 13:**  
$34.1 million  

**Secured Funding to Date:** $31.0 million  

**Year of Completion:** 2014  

**Project Manager:** Ven Prasad  

**Designer:** HMH Engineers  

**Contractor:** Granite Rock dba Pavex  

**Project Description:**  
This project complements the US 101 Improvements – I-280 to Yerba Buena Road project (see page 2-23), and its environmental clearance was approved in the same environmental document as US 101 Improvements – I-280 to Yerba Buena Road.  

This project will improve highway operations along US 101 by reducing congestion at the Capitol Expressway and Yerba Buena Road Interchanges. The anticipated improvements include:

- Modifying the Capitol Expressway Interchange from full cloverleaf to partial cloverleaf  
- Extending the fifth southbound lane on US 101 from north of Capitol Expressway to Yerba Buena Road  
- Modifying the northbound US 101 on-ramp from Yerba Buena Road  
- Constructing a northbound US 101 slip on-ramp from the northbound collector distributor road  
- Adding a southbound US 101 auxiliary lane between Capitol Expressway and Yerba Buena Road  
- Constructing a two-lane southbound US 101 off-ramp to Yerba Buena Road  
- Landscaping extending from Tully Road to Yerba Buena Road  

**Project Status:**  
The construction contract was awarded to Granite Rock Co. dba Pavex Construction for $19.5 million in August 2012. Construction began in September 2012 and is expected to be completed by end of 2014 including a 1-year Plant Establishment Period. VTA is administering the construction contract.

**Project Schedule:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Early 2010</td>
<td>Early 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design PS&amp;E</td>
<td>Early 2011</td>
<td>Early 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>Early 2011</td>
<td>Mid 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Mid 2012</td>
<td>Late 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open to Traffic</td>
<td>Late 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Establish</td>
<td>Late 2013</td>
<td>Late 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td>Early 2015</td>
<td>Mid 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding</th>
<th>Oct-12 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Oct-12 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Secured Funding Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>23,242</td>
<td>19,711</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>22,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>6,880</td>
<td>4,646</td>
<td>3,865</td>
<td>3,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,523</strong></td>
<td><strong>24,356</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,190</strong></td>
<td><strong>26,333</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred 14%
Secured Funding Committed 80%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

Funding (millions):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Identified</th>
<th>Secured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meas A/STIP Swap</td>
<td>$9.0</td>
<td>$7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (CMIA)</td>
<td>$24.0</td>
<td>$22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal - Others</td>
<td>$1.1</td>
<td>$1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$34.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>$31.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current US 101-Capitol Expressway Interchange

Portion of Estimated Cost for which funding has been identified

Local 26%
Federal 3%
State 71%

100%
I-880/I-280/Stevens Creek Improvements

**Estimated Cost:** $63.0 million  
**Estimate Class 1 (see appendix)**

**Apropriation through FY 13:** $66.0 million  
**Secured Funding to Date:** $63.0 million  
**Year of Completion:** 2015  
**Project Manager:** Ven Prasad  
**Designer:** Mark Thomas & Company, Inc.  
**Contractor:** DeSilva Gates Construction

**Project Description:**
The project improves traffic operations, enhances safety, and improves access between the I-880 and I-280 freeway corridors, including modifications to the Route 17/I-280/I-880 freeway-to-freeway interchange itself, as well as to the two adjacent interchanges at I-880/Stevens Creek Boulevard. Specific improvements include:

- Reconfiguring the existing full cloverleaf I-880/Stevens Creek Boulevard Interchange to improve traffic flow in the interchange area by widening and realigning ramps, widening the overcrossing structure at Stevens Creek Boulevard over I-880, improving intersections, and providing enhanced access to pedestrians and bicyclists.
- Separating freeway-to-freeway traffic from local traffic by constructing a new direct connector from northbound I-280 to northbound I-880.

**Project Status:**
The construction contract was awarded to DeSilva Gates Construction for $33.5 million in September 2012. Construction began in October 2012 and is expected to be completed by early 2015.

VTA is administering the construction contract.

**Project Schedule:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental/PE</td>
<td>Early 2007</td>
<td>Mid 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design PS&amp;E</td>
<td>Early 2009</td>
<td>Mid 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>Early 2011</td>
<td>Mid 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Oct-12</td>
<td>Mar-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open to Traffic</td>
<td>Mar-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td>Mid 2015</td>
<td>Early 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding</th>
<th>Oct-12 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Oct-12 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Secured Funding Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>42,953</td>
<td>34,255</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>42,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>2,254</td>
<td>2,192</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>16,227</td>
<td>11,867</td>
<td>10,647</td>
<td>5,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>1,142</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>63,022</strong></td>
<td><strong>48,376</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,003</strong></td>
<td><strong>50,019</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred 21%
Secured Funding Committed 77%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

### Funding (millions):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Identified</th>
<th>Secured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meas A/STIP Swap</td>
<td>$1.0</td>
<td>$1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meas B/STIP Swap</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (San Jose)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (CMIA)</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal (Earmark, STP)</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$66.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$63.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Federal 31%
Local 6%
State 63%

Portion of Estimated Cost for which funding has been identified

---

Northbound I-280 at Northbound I-880 Junction

Arial View of Project Area
Estimated Cost:
Initial Study - $3 million, Estimate Class 1
237/880 Express Connector - $12 million, Estimate Class 1
Route 85 Express Lanes - $200 million, Estimate Class 4
US 101 Express Lanes - $425 million, Estimate Class 4
See appendix for description of estimate classes

Appropriation through FY 13:
$47 million

Secured Funding to Date:
$25 million

Year of Completion / Target Opening Year:
237/880 Express Connectors - 2012
Route 85 Express Lanes – 2016
US 101 Express Lanes - 2018

Program Overview:
The benefits of the Silicon Valley Express Lanes program include:

- Increased efficiency of existing roadway - Carpool lanes are underutilized and have the capacity to accommodate more vehicles. By encouraging transit and carpools, and allowing solo drivers to pay a fee to access the lanes, we can make more efficient use of existing roadways.
- Option for reliable travel - Through the use of dynamic pricing, VTA can manage the amount of traffic in the express lanes and maintain free-flowing speeds even when the general purpose lanes are congested. Motorists who choose to use the Express Lanes can count on reliable travel times.
- Revenue reinvested in the corridor - Tolls collected will be used to operate the lanes and for other transportation improvements in the Express Lanes corridors including transit.

Tolls for solo drivers will vary based on the level of congestion in the lanes, and will be adjusted to maintain a minimum speed of 45 miles per hour in the lanes. When traffic is light, toll prices are low. When congestion increases, toll prices go up to regulate the number of drivers entering the express lanes. The California Highway Patrol (CHP) will provide enforcement of express lanes using a combination of new technologies and visual checks for occupancy (as with HOV lanes).
Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding</th>
<th>Oct-12 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Oct-12 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Secured Funding Balance $d = (a-c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>5,729</td>
<td>5,727</td>
<td>5,427</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>18,652</td>
<td>16,898</td>
<td>14,303</td>
<td>4,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations (P-0694 Only)</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>25,288</strong></td>
<td><strong>23,093</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,969</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,319</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred 79%
Secured Funding Committed 91%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $,000's

Funding (millions):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Identified</th>
<th>Secured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US 101 Express Lanes</td>
<td>Route 85 Express Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3</strong></td>
<td><strong>$425</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VTA Express Lanes provide improved access and reliable travel for everyone.

- Solo drivers with a prepaid FasTrak transponder can choose to pay a toll and use the Express Lanes.
- Transit vehicles, carpools, vanpools, motorcycles, and eligible hybrids can use the Express Lanes at no charge.
Estimated Cost: $11.8 Million, Estimate Class 1

Appropriation through FY 13:
$11.8 Million

Secured Funding to Date: $11.8 Million

Year of Completion: 2012

Project Manager: Jane Yu

Designer: PB Americas

System Integrator: Transcore

Project Description:
The Route 237/I-880 Express Connectors project will convert the direct carpool lane to carpool lane connector ramps at the Route 237/I-880 interchange to Express Lanes operation. This project is funded through local and federal funds, including the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), and the Value Pricing Pilot Program.

Project Status:
VTA successfully initiated operations of the Express Connector System in March 2012. Daily usage and revenue of Express Connector Lanes has been trending upwards during initial operations.

System warranty period will conclude in March 2013, followed by Final System Acceptance.

Project Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>Early 2007</td>
<td>Late 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Early 2009</td>
<td>Mid 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Mid 2011</td>
<td>March 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolling Operational</td>
<td>March 2012</td>
<td>March 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Closeout</td>
<td>March 2012</td>
<td>March 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding</th>
<th>Oct-12 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Oct-12 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Secured Funding Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>5,729</td>
<td>5,727</td>
<td>5,427</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>5,381</td>
<td>5,379</td>
<td>5,305</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,760</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,574</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,971</strong></td>
<td><strong>789</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Secured Funding Incurred: 93%
- Secured Funding Committed: 98%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

### Funding (millions):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Identified</th>
<th>Secured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$4.3</td>
<td>$4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11.8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local 37%
Fed 63%

Portion of Estimated Cost for which funding has been identified

Aerial Photograph of Route 237/I-880 Express Connectors Project Area
VTP Highway – Silicon Valley Express Lanes

Route 85 Express Lanes

Estimated Cost: $200 Million
Estimate Class 5

Appropriation through FY 13:
$12.3 million

Secured Funding to Date:
$4.9 Million

Year of Completion: 2016
Project Manager: Darrell Vice
Designer: URS Corporation

Project Description:
This project includes conversion of 23.7 miles of the existing high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes along SR 85 to combination HOV/Express Lanes. The proposed facility will allow single occupancy vehicles to gain access to the combination HOV/express lanes by paying a toll. A second Express Lane will also be added to create a double Express Lane along a portion of the corridor to provide added congestion relief and operational benefits to users. The project will also include the continuation of the Express Lanes for 3.3 miles to US 101 in South San Jose, through the SR85/US101 Interchange, for a total of 27 miles.

The project is a recipient of federal ARRA and earmark funds that will be used for the preliminary engineering and environmental clearance.

Project Status:

Environmental/Preliminary Engineering: Work on traffic data collection, traffic validation, and traffic forecasting as required for the PA/ED phase are underway. Conceptual engineering drawings are also under development to identify design exceptions to be approved by Caltrans. The Draft Environmental Document is scheduled to be completed by late 2012, with the PA/ED phase expected to be completed in Spring 2013.

VTA is looking for supplemental funding for an initial phase of design and construction through grants and bonding opportunities.

Project Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental/PE Design (PS&amp;E)</td>
<td>Late 2010</td>
<td>Mid 2013 *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETS Design</td>
<td>Mid 2013 *</td>
<td>Late 2015 *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Construction</td>
<td>Mid 2013 *</td>
<td>Mid 2015 *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open to Traffic</td>
<td>Mid 2016 *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td>Mid 2016 *</td>
<td>Early 2017 *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Cost:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding</th>
<th>Oct-12 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Oct-12 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Secured Funding Balance d = (a-c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>4,940</td>
<td>4,268</td>
<td>3,627</td>
<td>1,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,940</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,268</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,627</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,313</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred: 73%
Secured Funding Committed: 86%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

**Funding (millions):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Identified</th>
<th>Secured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$1.2</td>
<td>$1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>195.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$200.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Portion of Estimated Cost for which funding has been identified: 97%

Aerial view of Route 85 - US 101 Interchange in South San Jose
Estimated Cost: $425 Million
  Estimate Class 5
Appropriation through FY 13:
  $19.9 million
Secured Funding to Date:
  $5.7 million
Year of Completion: 2018
Project Manager: Lam Trinh
Designer: URS Corporation

Project Description:
The project involves converting 34 miles of the existing carpool network on US 101 between Dunne Avenue in Morgan Hill and the San Mateo County line to Express Lane operation.

The current recommendation is to implement two lanes of Express Lanes within the existing footprint to accommodate the projected travel demand for US 101.

Project Status:
In December 2010, work began on the initial phase of the Project Approval/Environmental Document (PA/ED) for the Project.

Environmental/Preliminary Engineering: Traffic validation, traffic forecasting, traffic operation analysis, and environmental studies are underway for the PA/ED phase. Conceptual engineering drawings are also under development to identify design exceptions to be approved by Caltrans. The Project Study Report/Preliminary Development Study (PSR/PDS) was approved by Caltrans in August 2012. The Draft ED is scheduled to be completed by early 2013, with the PA/ED phase expected to be completed by mid 2013.

Project Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental/PE Design (PS&amp;E)</td>
<td>Late 2010</td>
<td>Mid 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid 2013 *</td>
<td>Mid 2015 *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETS Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>Mid 2013 *</td>
<td>Early 2018 *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Construction</td>
<td>Mid 2013 *</td>
<td>Mid 2015 *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open to Traffic Closeout</td>
<td>Early 2018 *</td>
<td>Early 2018 *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Funding not identified, schedule is tentative
**Cost:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding</th>
<th>Oct-12 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Oct-12 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Secured Funding Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>5,398</td>
<td>4,318</td>
<td>2,438</td>
<td>2,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,655</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,318</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,438</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,217</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred: 43%
Secured Funding Committed: 76%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

**Funding (millions):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Identified</th>
<th>Secured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$5.7</td>
<td>$5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>419.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$425.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Northern US 101/Route 85 Interchange

Express Lanes Conceptual Rendering

Funding Source Identified: 1%
Funding Source Secured: 99%

Portion of Estimated Cost for which funding has been identified: TBD

TBD: To Be Determined

**7.10.a**
Figure 1.5 – Cost Estimate Classification Matrix  
(Adapted from AACE Skills & Knowledge of Cost Engineering, 4th ed., Chapter 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimate Class</th>
<th>Level of Project Definition</th>
<th>Expected Accuracy Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class 5</td>
<td>0% to 5%</td>
<td>-50% to +100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 4</td>
<td>5% to 25%</td>
<td>-30% to +50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 3</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>-20% to +30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 2</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>-15% to +20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 1</td>
<td>90% to 100%</td>
<td>-10% to +15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1.5 shows a mapping of Estimate Class to Level of Project Definition. Intuitively, estimates become more accurate and have less uncertainty as project definition increases. This table provides a rough framework to describe the accuracy of project estimated costs in this report. A discussion of cost estimate classes, in order of increasing accuracy, is presented below:

- **Class 5** (Order-of-Magnitude Estimates) – Order-of-magnitude estimates are sometimes referred to as “conceptual” or “ballpark” estimates. These estimates are made without detailed engineering data using only basic criteria such as area or distance. An estimate of this type would normally be expected to be accurate within +100 percent to -50 percent. Order-of-magnitude estimates are used to quickly screen several types of alternative designs.

- **Classes 4 and 3** (Preliminary Estimates) – Preliminary estimates are prepared once enough preliminary engineering has taken place to further define the project scope. An estimate of this type is normally expected to be accurate within +50 percent to -30 percent. Since the preliminary estimate is more definitive than the order-of-magnitude estimate, it is better suited for determining project feasibility.

- **Classes 2 and 1** (Final Estimates) – Final estimates are prepared from very defined engineering data. This data includes, as a minimum, fairly complete plans and specifications. An estimate of this type is usually expected to be accurate within +15 percent to -15 percent. The final estimate has a level of accuracy that is appropriate for setting project budgets.
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief CMA Officer, John Ristow

SUBJECT: Light Rail Efficiency Program Update

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

VTA is advancing capital improvements identified in its 2010 Light Rail System Analysis, to enhance the capacity, market-responsiveness, and efficiency of Light Rail Transit (LRT) operations. The improvements reconfigure LRT to respond to increasing population and employment and the extension of BART service to San José. The VTA Board of Directors adopted the LRT Improvement Plan in 2010, with the foresight and intent that, when the first segment of the Silicon Valley Berryessa Extension (SVBX) is completed in 2017, local transit services will enable connectivity from throughout VTA’s service area.

VTA’s light rail network has yet to deliver the ridership returns that are expected from infrastructure of its scale and investment cost. Attracting and sustaining strong transit ridership remains a challenging, yet principal goal. Modern light rail was introduced well after Santa Clara County had developed around an automobile-centric mobility network. Most residents live in low-density communities, and many employers occupy office parks set far back from the street with abundant surface parking. Walk times from transit are often not competitive with walk times from parking to destinations. These characteristics are the results of systemic policy and cultural conditioning, which must evolve as our communities develop and thrive. Transit becomes a competitive travel alternative when it is more abundant, more convenient, and less expensive than driving and parking.

By anticipating growth in the markets we serve and increasing regional connectivity, the new LRT network will attract more riders and generate greater return on investment than existing operations. To this end, VTA has defined the LRT Efficiency Program by the following capital and operating improvements:
The Southern Express will expand the pilot Commuter Express Service to an all-day schedule on the Santa Teresa to Alum Rock line, establish new service from Almaden to Mountain View, including direct service from Almaden to Downtown San José, and turn back Winchester service from Campbell in Downtown San José.

The Northern Express introduces a new service between Alum Rock and Mountain View, to increase ridership and efficiency, to effectively connect BART and the job centers in north San José, Santa Clara, Sunnyvale, and Mountain View, and to anticipate employment growth throughout the Tasman and North First Street corridors. This service will be introduced in 2017, commensurate with the opening of VTA’s Silicon Valley Rapid Transit - Berryessa Extension.

The First Street Speed Improvement project has potential to increase maximum LRT speeds on North First Street from 35 to 45 mph, via a combination of signal prioritization, fencing and safety enhancements along the LRT right-of-way. Speed improvements on the Downtown Transit Mall are also planned.

The Transit Signal Priority project will implement a system-wide real-time, reliable transit signal prioritization and light rail vehicle detection system that enables multiple city and county stakeholders to cooperate in providing live real-time train arrival management and prioritization to increase LRT operating speeds. This project is funded by a $1,587,176 Transit Performance Initiative grant from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission.

Current planning work has demonstrated that, by advancing several capital improvements planned for 2017 to 2014, VTA can gain system-wide operating and rider benefits well before BART service begins in 2017. Exhibits 1 and 2 illustrate the planned 2014 and 2017 LRT Service Expansion and Reconfiguration. This approach, called the BART - LRT Connection Strategy, will also accustom VTA riders to reconfigured LRT services anticipating the initiation of BART service to Berryessa. Under this strategy, following completion of the Phase I capital improvements described herein, three light rail services will operate with the following frequencies:

- **Almaden - Mountain View**: 15 minute headways with 30 minute midday headways from Tasman Station to Mountain View, 30 minute headways on weekends;
- **Santa Teresa - Alum Rock**: 15 minute headways all day; operate Express between Ohlone-Chynoweth and Downtown San José all day on weekdays, except after 8pm;
- **Winchester - Downtown San José**: 15 minute headways during peak, 30 minute headways midday and weekends.

The need for improved LRT services has accelerated since the adoption of the 2010 Light Rail Systems Analysis Improvement Plan (Exhibit 3: May 6, 2010 Board Action attached). The advent of a new, 68,500-seat stadium for the San Francisco 49ers in Santa Clara will place unprecedented demands upon the VTA LRT System. Scheduled to open for the 2014 NFL season, the new stadium will be located on Tasman Drive, adjacent to the Great America
amusement park, and served by VTA’s Great America LRT station. The complex’s convenience to transit and the projected ridership create both an opportunity, and an imperative to demonstrate the effectiveness of the Light Rail system.

VTA evaluated various stadium service alternatives that would be consistent with the 2017 SVBX opening and the ultimate build-out of the LRT Efficiency Projects. These alternatives were initially limited to operational strategies, exclusive of any capital improvements. The study analysis indicated that the BART - LRT Connection Strategy, anticipating the reconfiguration of VTA LRT services for the 2017 connection to BART, provides the best means of delivering maximum LRT capacity to the new stadium by 2014. To serve events at the stadium, VTA will supplement scheduled light rail services by operating three-car trains between Alum Rock and Mountain View and between Almaden and Mountain View. The supplemental service will increase service frequency to 7.5 minutes between Mountain View and Great America Stations.

However, as the 2010 Light Rail Systems Analysis showed, operations under this reconfiguration can be delivered safely and efficiently only after three (3) essential capital improvements are made. Without these capital improvements, VTA would have to engage in exceptional operating practices to deliver both regular and stadium event services. Even if operated with extreme precision, without capital improvements, the system will be vulnerable to cascading delays, uncertain train arrivals, long passenger wait times, and overcrowded trains. This vulnerability stems from the inherent constraints of single-track segments and the lack of a by-pass track in Downtown San José. Furthermore, the frequency of service planned for 2017 to and from the Downtown Mountain View LRT station requires double-tracking the single-track segment between Mountain View and Whisman Stations, and adding storage capacity and a double crossover west of Old Ironsides LRT Station in the vicinity of the 49ers Stadium.

**DISCUSSION:**

VTA staff and consultants have developed concepts for Phase I Double Track of the Mountain View single-track segment, LRV storage in the vicinity of the 49ers Stadium in Santa Clara, and a By-Pass Track in the vicinity of Downtown San José, including implementation schedules and cost estimates.

The Mountain View Double Track Phase I (Figure 1) involves extending the existing LRT pocket track east of the Mountain View Station by approximately 1,400 feet, connecting with the existing single track near the Highway 85 overpass, and adding a special event platform across from the Caltrain Mountain View station platform. This track will be constructed entirely on Caltrain right-of-way, requiring additional Caltrain easement. Completion of the Phase I Double Track will enable VTA to reduce headways between Alum Rock and Mountain View on a limited basis, and will improve VTA’s ability to provide timed transfers with Caltrain and the future Milpitas BART connection at the Montague LRT Station. Implementation of the new Northern Express line is not possible until completion of the Phase II Double Track, anticipated in 2017. VTA and Caltrain staff have been working closely and are in agreement on the proposed Phase I improvement.

The Santa Clara Pocket Track (Figure 2) involves construction of a third track on Tasman Drive, north of the existing westbound track, between the Reamwood and Old Ironsides Stations and
east of Calabazas Creek. The additional storage capacity created by this improvement will enable flexibility and resiliency in VTA's service, supporting the 2017 BART LRT connection, and also stadium events, such as NFL football games and special events. VTA and City staff have been working closely and are in agreement on the proposed improvement.

The Downtown San José By-Pass Track is the cornerstone of increased and improved service from South San José, including All-Day Express Service from Santa Teresa and new, direct Local Service from Almaden to Mountain View. It will make Downtown San José the rail transit hub of VTA's service area, with direct service via one-seat rides from every station on the entire LRT network. VTA's Alternatives Study identified two By-Pass Track options as the most efficient operational and capital solutions; alternative options remain under evaluation (Figures 3 - 5). VTA and City staff have been working closely. After conducting early stakeholder meetings last fall, VTA has engaged the greater community in a public process that began in December 2012. The process is anticipated to conclude in March 2013 with selection of a preferred By-Pass Track option.

Besides securing acceptance of preferred designs by the host cities, by adjacent transit properties, and by the California Public Utilities Commission, VTA must additionally secure the appropriate environmental clearances and find expeditious means of funding and contracting final design, material procurement, right-of-way acquisition, and construction of these projects, to have them potentially ready for operation by August of 2014.

Prepared By: Sarah Syed
Memo No. 3708
Exhibit 1: 2014 “New Normal” LRT Map

2014 “New Normal” Service
Exhibit 2: 2017 LRT Map

2017 Basic Service
Figure 1: Mountain View Double Track Phase I, between Mountain View Station and Highway 85
Figure 2: Tasman Drive Pocket Track / LRV Storage, between Old Ironside Station and Patrick Henry Drive, Santa Clara

**11' TRAFFIC Lanes WITH BICYCLE LANE**

**NOTE:**
SEE FIGURE 4 THROUGH 6 FOR CROSS SECTIONS

**KEY:**
- Existing LRT Track
- Proposed LRT Track
- Curb
- Sidewalk
- Fence
- Bike Lane

**IMPACTS:**
- ROW acquisition (approx. 9,000 SF)
- Reduction of private property surface parking (20-25 spaces)
- Removal of mature trees and reduced landscaped areas
- Relocation of fire hydrants, street lights and traffic signal poles and cabinets
- Modification of storm drain system
- Relocation of miscellaneous utilities, including low and high voltage electrical, communication, and water (High Impact)
Figure 3: San José By-Pass Track Options Under Study

Not All Alternatives Are Equal

- Some are not constructable (7 & 8 on Devine St)
- Others do not serve transit need (11 & 12 south of Downtown Stations)
- Capital costs vary widely, from $6.0 to $25.0 M
- Two have significant operating cost impacts (13 & 14, 1.5 mile north of Downtown)
- Some introduce non-standard operations into the city’s densest blocks (5, 6, & 12)
- Two impact park land (3 & 4)
- Some have traffic impacts, change neighborhood circulation (9 & 10)
FIGURE 4: SAN JOSE BY-PASS TRACK OPTIONS IN BUS LANE ON N. FIRST STREET AND N. SECOND STREET BEST MEET TRANSIT OBJECTIVE

NEW CURB

NEW TRACK WILL BE THE ACTIVE LINE FOR SOUTHBOUND THROUGH TRAINS; WAITING TRAIN WILL HOLD ON THE EXISTING TRACK

ST JAMES STATION, SOUTH

TWO-CAR TRAIN

UTILITY IMPACTS

TWO-CAR TRAIN

ST JAMES STATION, NORTH

NEW TRACK WILL BE THE ACTIVE LINE FOR SOUTHBOUND THROUGH TRAINS; WAITING TRAIN WILL HOLD ON THE EXISTING TRACK

VTA LRT EFFICIENCY PROJECT

KEY:
- EXISTING LRT TRACK
- NEW LRT TRACK

OPTION 1: BY-PASS TRACK IN EXISTING BUS-ONLY LANE ON 1ST ST
OPTION 2: BY-PASS TRACK IN EXISTING BUS-ONLY LANE ON 2ND ST
Figure 5:
Photo Simulation of By-Pass Track on N. First Street

Proposed By-Pass Track on N. First, without trains

Proposed By-Pass Track in use on N. First St. Northbound train is passing train at St James Station in shared Bus/LRT lane
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief CMA Officer, John Ristow

SUBJECT: Light Rail Transit Systems Analysis - Final Plan Adoption

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:
Recommend the Board of Directors adopt the Light Rail System Analysis Improvement Plan.

BACKGROUND:
Santa Clara County’s Light Rail Transit (LRT) system has over the years grown as a series of extensions. The Light Rail Transit System Analysis is designed to provide the first comprehensive evaluation of the infrastructure and operational flexibility of the existing Light Rail lines as a system, and an evaluation of operational impacts created by population and employment growth along with planned Light Rail and BART extensions.

The Light Rail Transit System Analysis focuses on making the LRT system as productive and efficient as possible given existing and potential travel markets, and positioning the system to capture projected and latent passenger growth to the year 2035. The analysis represents the second phase of VTA’s Comprehensive Operations Analysis (COA) for the transit system. A COA for the VTA bus system was completed in 2007 and provided the framework for the redesign of the bus network introduced in January 2008.

DISCUSSION:
This memorandum provides a recommendation for an Improvement Plan for the LRT system over the next 25 years. The Improvement Plan will be revisited on a regular basis as part of VTA’s annual Service Management Planning process and will serve as a guide for funding and capital improvements to realize the potential of the system.

The recommendations in the Improvement Plan are the result of a 16-month study effort where a
project team consisting of VTA and consultant staff analyzed forecast system ridership growth and potential market opportunities in both the near- and long-term planning horizons. Additional analysis and research was performed in the area of rail operations through the use of rail simulation software and both capital and operating costs. The input of system stakeholders including VTA advisory committees and Board Members, affected city staff, and the public was gathered throughout the study.

**Recommended Light Rail Improvement Plan (2010 - 2018)**

This following describes the prioritization of different capital improvement projects, based in part on which changes generate the most effective improvements to travel times and ridership on the system between 2010 and 2018. Phase I of the plan contains recommended near-term operational changes. Phase II represents projects and operational changes that are likely to be beneficial after the extension of the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) system to Santa Clara County in 2018.

**Phase I: Near Term - Immediate Implementation**

The recommended near-term operational plan for the LRT system would be built around two main features:

- A Guadalupe Express service between Ohlone/Chynoweth and Convention Center, with local service provided by a through-routed Almaden line;
- An independent Vasona branch, operating between Campbell and Downtown San Jose, allowing three-car trains originating from the Almaden line to serve North First Street corridor and Mountain View.

**2018 LRT Ridership:** 2,800 additional daily riders compared to the Base Case

**Capital Cost:** No cost in the near term, however in order to achieve maximum operational flexibility a pocket track in downtown San Jose would be needed in the future. The pocket track is projected to cost $4 million.

**2018 LRT Operating Cost:** $2.5 to $3.5 million additional cost (in 2009 dollars) for increased service on the Guadalupe line.

**Phase II: LRT Service with the BART Extension to Berryessa**

The recommended operational plan for the LRT system when BART is extended to Berryessa, providing a transfer to Light Rail at the Montague Station, includes:

- Operating an additional line (the “Long T”) that would travel from Downtown Mountain View to Alum Rock during peak periods, with express service from Downtown Mountain View to Old Ironsides and an intermediate stop at Lockheed Martin. The off-peak service would operate from Old Ironsides to Alum Rock.

**2018 LRT Ridership:** 4,600 additional daily riders compared to the Base Case
Capital Cost: $33.4 million in 2018 (2009 dollar). The capital costs include double tracking the single track section of the Mountain View line and pocket tracks at Old Ironsides.

2018 LRT Operating Cost: $7.3 million additional cost (in 2009 dollars) for operating a new line between Alum Rock and Mountain View.

Independent System Improvements

Additional long term improvements are included in the final plan. These improvements represent areas where the system can further improve efficiency and speed prior to or after 2018, can be pursued independently, and are not prerequisites for the Phase I and II programs defined above. Costs and further description of the improvements can be found in Attachment A. These improvements are:

- Grade separation of North First Street and Montague Expressway
- Fencing along the North First Street Right-of-Way, allowing for higher speeds
- Pocket track at Ohlone/Chynoweth
- New Great America Station to serve increase in Commuter Rail service
- Hostetter Turnback Tracks
- Upgrade Train Control System
- Capital and operating improvements intended to improve train speeds at spot locations such as curves, corners, crossings and intersections.
- Intersection Traffic Control Signal Systems upgrades to improve overall corridor speed and efficiency

Light Rail System Constraints

The process to arrive at a recommended improvement plan for the Light Rail system started with an analysis that identified existing LRT system capital and operational constraints combined with a market analysis targeted toward the unmet market potential of both the existing system and the system with two extensions: Vasona Junction and Capitol Expressway. The constraints identified in the analysis represent potential limitations of VTA’s ability to operate the current system as fast and as efficiently as possible - and therefore its ability to offer competitive service that captures greater market share in transit competitive travel markets - and its ability to expand the system (in terms of both higher frequency and new extensions) to meet future demand. The primary constraints include:

- Single track segments
- Slow speeds in the downtown San Jose Transit Mall and Mountain View Line
- Platform length of Vasona branch only accommodates two-car trains
- Lack of adequate signal priority along North First Street and the Mountain View Line
- Current transit connections to Caltrain, Capitol Corridor and ACE
In addition, the analysis included the range of possible effects of future events on the existing system, and the possible physical and/or operational steps that might be desirable to meet potential operational challenges. The analysis looked at the capabilities of the existing system relative to:

- Handle anticipated system ridership growth driven by population and employment growth;
- Increases in ridership produced by the BART extension to Berryessa (2018) and the full extension to Santa Clara (2035);
- Ridership generated by the LRT extension projects (Capitol to Eastridge Mall and Vasona Junction)

The data from the growth forecast task shows that the largest contributor to ridership growth in year 2035 is anticipated population and employment increases, primarily resulting from large scale development along the North First Street corridor. Anticipated growth in the county alone is projected to increase ridership by 200 percent between 2005 and 2035. The second largest component is ridership related to the introduction of BART service to Santa Clara County (a 25 percent increase in LRT ridership).

**Development of Scenarios and Technical Analysis**

The project team developed 11 preliminary scenarios for the LRT system consisting of packages of operational changes, capital investments, responses to markets, and responses to external projects. The scenarios were designed to address the current LRT system constraints and the projected constraints in year 2035. The potential solutions incorporated into the scenarios for evaluation that address the constraints of travel speed, include:

- Implementation of different service options such as express trains from Santa Teresa and Mountain View and skip-stop operation on North First Street
- Tunnel segments through downtown San Jose and portions of North First Street
- Grade-separation of the LRT line at North First Street and Montague Expressway
- Adding a second set of tracks to the single track segments on the Mountain View and Vasona lines
- Temporary closure of poor performing stations to gain speed on the Mountain View Line
- Closure of the Almaden Line spur to gain operational flexibility for Santa Teresa Line trains

Other constraints identified relate to the system’s efficiency and flexibility. Potential solutions tested in the scenarios include the following:

- Provide infrastructure to support terminating trains in downtown San Jose and San Jose State University
- Lengthen all platforms on the Vasona Line to accommodate three car trains
- Identify alternatives for Almaden spur such as interlining it with the Mountain View line or full closure.
- Consolidate the Great America and Lick Mill stations to create a new Great America
station that provides a direct connection to ACE and Capitol Corridor trains

- Connect the Mountain View and Alum Rock lines through east-west operation on the Tasman line

These potential system enhancements were analyzed in 11 separate scenarios and refined through a series of VTA operational simulations and the VTA Travel Demand Model ridership projections. The technical assessment showed that some potential system enhancements had little or no impact on travel speeds and ridership. Potential changes such as skip stop service, tunnels and temporary station closures, were then eliminated from further analysis.

Costs and Ridership

The remaining components were integrated into six different sets of service packages which were then analyzed for performance in an interim year (2018) and a horizon year (2035). The key difference between these two analysis years is the build out of the BART system. In 2018, it was assumed that BART operates to Berryessa, providing a transfer to LRT at Montague Station, while by 2035 it was assumed that BART operates through Downtown San Jose, with a transfer at First Street and Santa Clara Street, the downtown Transit Mall, and the Diridon Station. The LRT system extensions analyzed include Vasona Junction and Capitol Expressway. These were considered as part of every service package to determine the impact of changing core system service on extension ridership and operations. Maps of the service packages are presented in Attachment B.

Ridership was estimated for each service package using VTA’s travel demand model. Model results indicate that system ridership will increase significantly between today, 2018, and 2035. Most of this increase is assumed to be due to land use changes and background growth in the county, specifically to areas along the North First Street corridor and downtown San Jose, accounting for approximately 40 and 45 percent of total system ridership in 2018 and 2035, respectively. In the base case scenario, overall system ridership is projected to grow to approximately 82,000 daily boardings by 2018 and to approximately 137,000 daily boardings in 2035.

Base Case Service Package

The base case service package assumes that the system will be configured with the same network as today (2010). The base service package would require capital projects to double track the single track segments of the Vasona branch and extend the Vasona platforms to accommodate three car trains by 2035. The cost to upgrade the Vasona branch totals $135 million, making the Base Case the most expensive of the service packages considered. Ridership was the lowest among the service packages with 81,900 average weekday boardings in 2018. The operating cost for the Base Case would be $53 million.

Tasman Corridor Service Packages

Two treatments are proposed for the Tasman Corridor, which is comprised of the Mountain View, Tasman West, Tasman East and Capital Avenue segments of the Light Rail system. Both packages are oriented towards a future BART connection at the Montague station in Milpitas. Other considerations for the corridor are the low ridership on the Tasman West segment and improving the commuter rail connection at the Great America station. A future 49ers Stadium in
Santa Clara was not considered as part of this analysis but will be analyzed as part of the development project should the stadium be approved.

The most expensive of the Tasman service packages, the “Long T” (shown in Attachment B) would operate at 15-minute headways in the peak with a fleet size of 93 cars, still within the total of the current fleet. The total annual LRT operating cost is estimated to be about $61.2 million or about $7.3 million annually more than the base scenario. Although the absolute value of annual operating expenses for the Long T is high, the additional service across the T creates strong user benefits and is a powerful attractor of ridership, leading to high rankings in the cost-benefit analysis.

Short “T” Service Package. The “Short T” service package takes the current system configuration and adds a new line that would directly connect the Tasman West and the Mountain View lines with the Tasman East and Alum Rock lines. This service package is designed to create a direct connection from job centers near the Champion and Old Ironsides stations to the BART connection at Montague station, adding a short line operating between Old Ironsides to Hostetter. Hostetter was chosen as a terminus instead of Montague because it is off the aerial structure and would better facilitate track modifications that allow trains to turnback. The Short T would require capital projects to modify both the Hostetter and Old Ironsides stations to allow for turning of trains. The estimated capital cost for the Short T is $13 million. Ridership above the Base Case totaled 2,200 boardings on an average weekday in 2018 and 3,700 in 2035.

“Long T” Service Package. The Long T would also directly connect the Mountain View line with the Alum Rock line. The Long T would operate a longer line between Downtown Mountain View and Alum Rock with peak-period express service from Downtown Mountain View to Old Ironsides and an intermediate stop at Lockheed Martin. The off-peak service would operate from Old Ironsides to Alum Rock. The Long T would require modifications to the Old Ironsides station to allow for trains to turn back during off-peak periods. The construction of a double track along the Mountain View line single track segment would be required to accommodate both lines. The estimated capital cost for the Long T is $33.4 million. Ridership above the Base Case totaled 4,600 boardings on an average weekday in 2018 and 6,700 in 2035.

Guadalupe Express and Vasona Service Packages

The study identified three service packages for the southern portion of the system. In all three service packages the Guadalupe Express and Almaden lines were combined with the Vasona branch. Terminating the Vasona line in Downtown San Jose has a number of systemwide benefits: it allows the major demand centers of downtown and North First Street to be served with 3-car Almaden trains rather than 2-car Vasona trains, it allows VTA to avoid undertaking the expensive capital improvement of double tracking and extending platforms on the Vasona branch, and finally it taps into an underserved market in Almaden by giving potential riders a one-seat ride to employment destinations in downtown and beyond. In two of the scenarios Vasona becomes an independent line that terminates in downtown San Jose and the Almaden line routed through to serve North First Street and the Mountain View branch.

The Guadalupe Express and Vasona to 2nd Street service package would operate at 15 minute headways in the peak with a fleet size of 77 cars. The current LRT fleet includes 100 cars. The total annual LRT operating cost is estimated to be within the range of $56.6 million to $57.6
million or about $2.5 to $3.5 million annually over the base scenario.

**Guadalupe Express, Vasona to Mountain View**

This service package retains the existing northern part of the system, but reroutes the southern half to create express service from Ohlone/Chynoweth to Convention Center on the Santa Teresa to Alum Rock line. The Almaden service would then extend north from its current terminus at Ohlone/Chynoweth to Downtown. The Vasona line would still be through-routed with the Mountain View line. Similar to the base service package, this service package would most likely require capital projects to double track the single track segments of the Vasona branch and extend the Vasona platforms to accommodate three car trains by 2035. No capital costs are required for this service package. Ridership above the Base Case totaled 2,400 boardings on an average weekday in 2018 and 4,000 in 2035.

**Guadalupe Express, Vasona to Downtown Loop**

This service package would uncouple Vasona from Mountain View, and instead loop back Vasona trains on the Downtown transit mall. The Almaden line would then be routed up the Guadalupe highway segment through Downtown and through-routed via North First Street with the Mountain View line. The Santa Teresa line would continue to be routed to Alum Rock, but it would operate as a non-stop express service from Ohlone/Chynoweth to Convention Center. There are no capital costs associated with this service package in the near term, however in order to achieve maximum operational flexibility a pocket track in downtown San Jose would be needed in the future. The pocket track is projected to cost $4 million. Ridership above the Base Case totaled 2,800 boardings on an average weekday in 2018 and 4,700 in 2035.

**Guadalupe Express, Vasona to 4th Street**

This service package is similar to the previous one except that the Vasona line would be routed to a new stub end terminal at Fourth Street and San Carlos, at the edge of San Jose State University (SJSU) and not use the Downtown transit mall. The Almaden line would be interlined with Mountain View, and Santa Teresa would be routed to Alum Rock, providing express service between Ohlone/Chynoweth and Convention Center. The estimated capital cost for the Guadalupe Express, Vasona to 4th Street is $20.6 million. Ridership above the Base Case totaled 1,400 boardings on an average weekday in 2018 and 2,300 in 2035.

**Light Rail Extensions**

Two extensions were analyzed as part of the Light Rail System Analysis, Vasona Junction and Capitol Expressway to Eastridge Mall. Both projects are currently undergoing environmental clearance to be eligible to compete for future federal funding. The two extensions were considered in the base case service package improvements to determine the operational and ridership impacts of changes to the core Light Rail system in 2035. Modifications to the extensions themselves, such as adding or deleting stations, were not considered as part of the study. The additional operating cost for both extensions is about $5 million annually.

Vasona Junction is a two-station, 1.5-mile extension that would add stations at Hacienda and Route 85. The cost of the Vasona extension is estimated to be $146 million in 2009 dollars. The
Vasona extension is not a Measure A project but is considered as one of several possible future Light Rail extensions, pending a study of candidate corridors. Ridership for the Vasona extension under the Base Case scenario is 1,700 in 2035. Ridership on the Vasona extension varies by service package with no ridership change with the Short T and Long T and a modest increase in the Guadalupe Express, Vasona to Mountain View service package (an additional 15 riders per day). Ridership on the extension would decrease in the service packages where Vasona terminates in downtown San Jose.

The Capitol Expressway extension is a 2.6-mile, three station extension adding stations at Story Road, Ocala Road and Eastridge Transit Center. The extension is estimated to cost $390 million in 2009 dollars. Phase I of the project, landscaping, pedestrian and Bus Rapid Transit improvements totaling $57 million is in final design and is expected to be complete by 2013. The Capitol Expressway extension is part of the Downtown East Valley Transit Improvement program and is mentioned in the 2000 Measure A ballot. Ridership for the Capitol extension under the Base Case scenario is 2,600 in 2035. Ridership on the extension does not change in the Short T and increases slightly in the Guadalupe Express service packages, however the Long T provides a 44% increase with a total of 3,800 average weekday riders in 2035.

**Stakeholder Input**

Throughout the course of the Light Rail Systems Analysis study, VTA staff sought the input of key stakeholders on VTA Advisory Committees, City staffs and individuals or organizations that have interest in the Light Rail System. Attachment C provides a list of the meetings and events attended by VTA staff throughout the study. The following is a brief summary of key suggestions and input received from these stakeholders.

- Initial suggestions for speeding service in Downtown San Jose were met with opposition from San Jose staff, which declared efforts to improve the service along the Transit Mall to 20 miles per hour a “non-starter”.
- The San Jose Downtown Association suggested that speeds through downtown could be achieved through better traffic signal coordination and traffic management. The Downtown Association also raised concerns over an extension to San Jose State, given the possible negative impact on San Carlos Street downtown. An alternate suggestion would be to improve the walking environment between the campus and Light Rail for students.
- San Jose State staff expressed enthusiasm for an extension to the gates of the campus.
- Members of the Citizens Advisory Committee felt strongly that Light Rail should go to more destinations and therefore massive expansion of the system was what was needed to improve transit service. Key destinations mentioned included those along El Camino Real and Stevens Creek Boulevard.
- The Policy Advisory Committee focused on capital costs and saw benefits in many of the Vasona and Express packages that could be achieved for minimal capital costs. There was also support expressed for the Vasona extension.
- The Technical Advisory Committee supports grade separation at North First and Montague and also suggested tunneling as a possible solution to downtown and other
areas of North First Street.

- Attendees of a public meeting in Mountain View expressed concern over the cost of planned extensions to Vasona and Eastridge Transit Center.

**NEXT STEPS:**

The Improvement Plan will serve as the basis for future planning and development around the Light Rail system for VTA and cities engaged in land use plans that emphasize transit service. The Improvement Plan will serve as a road map for funding and programming activities, enabling VTA staff and elected officials at the state and federal levels to understand VTA’s priorities for Light Rail system development along with their costs and benefits. However, the Improvement Plan will also serve as a living document by being integrated into the Service Management Planning process, where assumptions and measurements of performance will be revisited on an annual basis to allow for growth and flexibility as land use and other factors change over time.

Immediately, VTA is well positioned to advocate for improvements from several grant sources including the Climate Change Program recently created by MTC to encourage near-term transit improvements that reduce vehicle miles traveled. In addition, funding from the high speed rail authority intended to fund rail-serving transit to future high speed rail stations will also become available in the next 4-5 years. With VTA Board adoption of the Improvement Plan, VTA will pursue opportunities to realize a vision for a faster, more efficient Light Rail system well positioned for future growth in Santa Clara County.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The Board may elect to not adopt the Improvement Plan and direct staff to focus on other areas of VTA transit service.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

An estimated $10 million of additional operating costs would be incurred to support the increase in service hours associated with the Guadalupe Express and Long T improvements. In order to achieve this higher level of service, VTA would have to add $10 million to the operating budget or find equivalent savings in the existing transit system. A portion of the costs will be offset by additional fare revenue generated by the increase in ridership projected for the recommended Improvement Plan.

Prepared by: Andrew Ittigson
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Real-time information (RTI) uses VTA’s vehicle location data to let riders know how far away their bus or light rail vehicle is and its estimated time of arrival. When the project is complete, VTA riders will be able to access this information through a web site, electronic display boards at key transit locations, VTA customer service centers and MTC’s 511 system when and where they need it. This convenience will let riders more accurately plan their trips and will provide a better experience for VTA transit users.

VTA originally contracted with Xerox-ACS in 2009 to build and deliver RTI, which included software updates, deploying the SmartTraveler web site to provide customers with information on bus and train arrival times, installing signs displaying RTI information at bus shelters, and equipping the light rail system to provide RTI and location data.

VTA did receive the software updates, the SmartTraveler web site and the 511 interface from Xerox-ACS; however, VTA encountered considerable difficulty with the quality and timeliness of the products and services Xerox-ACS delivered. Despite efforts to remedy the quality and delay issues, the problems persisted, and in November 2012 VTA began taking steps to remove from the scope of the Xerox-ACS contract the services related to RTI sign installation at bus shelters and equipping the light rail system with RTI and location data. VTA has continued to work with Xerox-ACS to fix the remaining errors in their delivered products, and those errors are expected to be completely resolved in the First Quarter of 2013.

For the items removed from the Xerox-ACS contract, VTA has instead contracted with SinglePoint Communications, a provider of vehicle prediction software; and Auriga, a software developer, to complete the outstanding tasks for real time predictions on the light rail system. For the RTI bus signs, VTA will identify and contract with a new vendor.
What’s Next:

- In February 2013, VTA will test the light rail prediction web sites.
- In April 2013, VTA will test the bus SmartTraveler web sites.
- VTA is developing an Invitation for Bid for vendors to provide bus stop signs displaying RTI, and will release it in February 2013.
- Marketing is currently working on a customer roll-out campaign.
- Ultimately, staff expects to have the RTI web site and data feed to MTC’s 511 system in production this summer for both bus and light rail. The total project is expected to be completed by December 2013.
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BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief Operating Officer, Michael A. Hursh

SUBJECT: BRT Bus Procurement

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with New Flyer of America Inc. (New Flyer) in the amount of $32,987,101 for the purchase of 29 sixty foot articulated Hybrid Diesel-Electric Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) buses and related equipment, training and support, along with the option to purchase an additional 20 buses for future BRT fleet requirements in an amount up to approximately $20,658,567 plus the Producer Price Index (PPI). The execution of the contract will be subject to compliance with the FTA pre-award requirements and the satisfactory clearance of any protests.

BACKGROUND:

As part of the BRT program, VTA will be purchasing new 60' articulated BRT buses. In February 2012 the Board authorized the General Manager to proceed with the negotiated procurement of up to 46 low floor articulated Hybrid BRT buses for this program. Funding for these buses is from a combination of 2000 Measure A and State Prop 1B funds. The purchase of up to 49 buses will be done in two phases so that buses will arrive at the appropriate time:

Phase 1 of the procurement is for 29 buses which will replace the buses presently serving the Rapid 522 operation, and will cover the Santa Clara Alum Rock (SCAR) segment and the El Camino Real (ECR) segment of the BRT program.

Phase 2 of the procurement would be to purchase the buses necessary for future BRT services, such as the proposed Stevens Creek BRT corridor. Provision for this procurement is included in the contract as an option for up to 20 buses. The final number of buses for future BRT services is 8.1
still to be determined. Pricing for the option buses would be based on the price of the initial 29 buses plus an increase based on the Producer's Price Index (PPI) for the applicable category.

On April 23, 2012, VTA issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) to purchase the new articulated BRT buses.

Several strategic requirements were included in this RFP: (1) proposed bus must meet the unique needs of the BRT corridor, (2) must allow for additional bike carrying capacity, (3) must meet the requirements for accessibility; and, (4) must meet air quality and other environmental standards. It is also important to purchase buses with reliable mechanical components from a company that is financially strong, are reasonably priced, and fully meet "Buy America" and other federal purchase requirements. There are only a few suppliers who can meet these requirements.

The buses will be powered by hybrid diesel-electric technology, similar to what is available in the most modern hybrid automobiles. This diesel-electric hybrid technology is a responsible, energy-saving alternative to regular diesel buses and is more reliable and cost-effective than zero-emission buses. The new buses will have 95% lower Nitrogen Oxide (NOx) emissions and 80% lower Particulate Matter (PM) emissions as compared to older buses. Additionally, the new buses are anticipated to have a 25% better fuel economy and will also have significantly lower Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions compared to non-hybrid buses.

In addition to meeting all ADA accessibility requirements, VTA has specified features that will enhance accessibility of the buses. For example, high-visibility bright yellow pull cords.

With the success of WiFi on the light rail trains the new Express buses, these BRT buses will also be equipped with WiFi.

DISCUSSION:

The contract award culminates an intensive procurement process that began with the development of technical specifications describing in detail all the mechanical and design features VTA requires. Once the technical specification was completed, documents were prepared specifying quantities of buses, manufacturing and delivery schedules, and specific equipment and services (training, spare parts, security equipment) to be provided. VTA then advertised for proposals in trade journals such as APTA’s Passenger Transport.

The negotiated procurement process requires potential bidders to submit a proposal, including technical and price proposals delivered in separately sealed envelopes. The technical proposals were reviewed and evaluated to determine if the proposals met the technical requirements, while the price proposal remained sealed. VTA gave particular scrutiny to the mobility device ramp, rear door width and bike rack space. Each of the manufacturers who submitted proposals offered a two position rack on the exterior of the bus and allocated space for interior bike racks, a standard width exit door, and a high capacity ramp commercially available applicable to their bus design.

The technical proposal evaluation included the following criteria:
1. Technical Credibility based on:
   - Technical approach
   - System Integration
   - Quality Assurance
   - System Support

2. Schedule Credibility based on:
   - Management Plans
   - Past Performance

An evaluation team of VTA staff, including personnel from Maintenance Engineering, Quality Assurance, Operations, Mechanics, and Purchasing, conducted a detailed analysis of the technical proposals. Price proposals were opened by the selection team consisting of Purchasing, Operations Maintenance and Operations Planning, only after technical and schedule credibility was established. One supplier failed to meet the technical requirements and therefore their pricing was not opened. The final recommended award is based on completion of the full evaluation.

For this procurement, staff developed a plan that included a base bus purchase and an option to purchase additional buses when the need to implement additional BRT service and funding is available. The procurement schedule included the following:

April 23, 2012 --- The procurement was advertised in APTA's Passenger Transport and on the VTA’s website.
May 10, 2012 --- A pre-proposal meeting took place at VTA. Two bus manufacturers and one sub-supplier were present. One manufacturer attended through conference call.
June 22, 2012--- Initial Proposals were due for review and evaluation. VTA received initial proposals from two bus manufacturers. Based on the technical evaluations, VTA invited both bus manufacturers to present their proposals in detail and respond to technical questions raised by the technical evaluation committee.
September 27 and 28, 2012 --- The VTA selection team interviewed the bus manufacturers for clarifications and negotiation.

Based on the technical evaluations and interviews, VTA provided each proposer with the requirements for the final bus configuration and invited both bus manufacturers to provide a Best and Final Offer.
November 26, 2012--- Best and Final Offers were due
VTA received a Best and Final Offer for the bus procurement from the following bus manufacturers:
   - New Flyer of America Inc., Winnipeg, Canada
   - Nova Bus, St-Eustache, Canada

In their Best and Final Offer (BAFO), Nova Bus submitted documents which indicated that their bus would not meet the requirements of the technical specifications. In particular, the Nova Bus technical proposal did not meet the bus length required by the VTA specification and applicable
vehicle codes. Hence, their proposal was considered not compliant and their best and final price proposal was returned unopened. Based on this, New Flyer was the sole responsive proposer.

The best and final offers from each proposer were as follows:

- New Flyer
  29 Buses including related equipment, training and support $32,987,101
  Up to 20 buses under the option order pricing based on the PPI $20,658,567 (approx.)

- Nova Bus
  Returned unopened
  (proposed bus did not meet technical requirements)

- Engineer’s Estimate
  29 Buses including related equipment, training and support $30,794,048
  Up to 20 buses under the option order pricing based on the PPI $17,229,968

New Flyer has delivered over 500 hybrid drive buses. The buses meet federal buy America requirements and are scheduled to be built at New Flyer's manufacturing facility in St. Cloud, Minnesota. The hybrid system is state-of-the-art for environmentally friendly bus propulsion while still being a proven technology and in service in more than 3800 transit buses nationwide. VTA conducted reference checks with a number of properties that operate New Flyer hybrid buses including King County (Seattle), Omnitrans (San Bernardino) and Capital Area Transportation Authority (Lansing MI). All reported good performance from the hybrid system and overall satisfaction with New Flyer. VTA has done business with New Flyer since 2002 with the purchase of VTA's current fleet of articulated buses and has no reservations about continuing this relationship.

ALTERNATIVES:

There is no reasonable alternative to this action short of not procuring 60 foot articulated buses to meet the need of the BRT program.

DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS ENTERPRISE (DBE) PARTICIPATION:

Although this procurement does not include Federal funding at this time, VTA has elected to follow the Federal bus procurement guidelines for this procurement. This would allow Federal Funds to be used should such funds become available. The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) requires transit vehicle manufacturers, as a condition of being authorized to bid or propose on FTA-assisted transit vehicle procurements, to certify that they have an overall annual DBE goal approved by FTA. Pursuant to Federal regulation, VTA did not set a DBE goal on this procurement.

FISCAL IMPACT:

This action will authorize $32,987,101 for the purchase of 29 sixty-foot low-floor diesel-electric hybrid buses, related equipment, training and support and will retain an option to purchase up to
20 additional buses for future BRT Service. Appropriation for the initial 29 bus procurement is included in the FY13 Adopted 2000 Measure A Transit Improvement Program Fund Capital Budget. This procurement is funded by $10M in State Prop 1B funds with the remaining balance from 2000 Measure A funds.

Prepared by: Arthur Douwes
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## BRT Bus Procurement
### List of Contractor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Flyer of America</td>
<td>Paul Soubry</td>
<td>President/CEO</td>
<td>Winnipeg, Canada Minnesota Factory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief Operating Officer, Michael A. Hursh

SUBJECT: Guadalupe Fuel Cell Project

Policy-Related Action: No

Government Code Section 84308 Applies: Yes

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the General Manager to negotiate and execute a 20-year Power Purchase Agreement with Bloom Energy Corporation and project financier Alternative Energy Development Group for an electricity-generating fuel cell technology and maintenance contract to be installed at VTA’s Guadalupe Division.

BACKGROUND:

The Guadalupe Light Rail Maintenance Facility is located at 101 Younger Street in San Jose. The facility maintains and stores up to 99 light rail vehicles (LRV). Annual facility electricity usage averages approximately 400 kW not including traction power for the light rail vehicles. Use of alternative sources for traction power is a more complex issue that will continue to be reviewed.

In 2008, VTA prepared a solar assessment of several facilities, including the Guadalupe Division. This assessment concluded that solar panels could only offset about 3% of electrical usage because of limitations on space. Installation of the panels would also be complicated by the presence of overhead catenary lines.

As a result, VTA has chosen to explore fuel cell technology due to its unique ability to fulfill our needs effectively, efficiently, and sustainably. Fuel cell technologies work by converting the chemical energy of a fuel into electrical energy through a chemical reaction with oxygen. Types of fuel that can be used include natural gas, digester gas, and biogas. Fuel cells produce energy much more cleanly and efficiently than internal combustion engines and other types of fossil fuel generators, and as a result are less expensive to operate.
DISCUSSION:

VTA issued a RFP for a fuel cell technology on November 15, 2012. On December 3, 2012 VTA held a pre-proposal conference at the Guadalupe Division. Four firms attended the pre-proposal conference. Proposals were due on January 3, 2013. One firm, Bloom Energy Corporation, submitted a proposal. Salas O'brien sent an email on January 3, 2013 saying that they had decided not to submit a proposal on the project.

On January 11, 2013 VTA staff interviewed Bloom Energy Corporation and their project financier Alternative Energy Development Group. Bloom's product, called the Bloom Energy Server, provides 200kW of base load power, enough to meet the needs of 200 average homes. VTA estimates that two Servers (400 kW) would be required to power the Guadalupe Division's facility needs. Their proposal offered three options; power purchase agreement, bond financing, and capital purchase. With the power purchase agreement option, Bloom would finance, purchase materials, install and maintain the facility for 20 years. In return, VTA would agree to purchase the electricity at predetermined rates for 20 years. VTA will also need to contract with a natural gas supplier to operate the system. VTA has selected the Power Purchase Agreement option since it does not require any upfront cash outlay and minimizes the long term risk.

Execution of this agreement is contingent upon securing PG&E Self Generation Incentive Program (SGIP) funding and new market tax credits for the project financier or financing with a comparable financial benefit to VTA. Applications for SGIP funding are anticipated to be available the end of January. In addition, VTA has a federal Alternative Energy Facility grant that will be applied towards purchasing the electricity produced by the Bloom fuel cells.

VTA staff are negotiating with Bloom on the contractual terms. However, proceeding with the Bloom power purchase agreement will provide VTA with the highest efficiency fuel cells for electrical power generation only systems, a performance guarantee, and a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions along with a projected savings in electricity costs.

ALTERNATIVES:

VTA could continue to purchase electricity from PG&E based on an E-20 rate schedule. However, this option would likely result in progressively higher costs and a less sustainable operation. VTA could alternatively choose to fund the design, purchase of materials, installation, and maintenance of the fuel cell power generating facilities. However, this would involve a substantial initial expenditure of VTA funds.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Electricity purchased through this agreement is expected to generate savings over the 20-year term. Actual savings will depend on the negotiated Bloom electricity charges and the market rates for natural gas purchased by VTA to operate the facility as compared to the PG&E rates over the same time period. Conservatively, the net present value of savings in electricity costs over the 20 years is estimated at $675,000.

SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISE (SBE) PARTICIPATION:

SBE goals do not apply to Power Purchase Agreements.
Attachment A

Guadalupe Fuel Cell Project
List of Contractor(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AEDG</td>
<td>Chris Fraga</td>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>Radnor, PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloom Energy Corporation</td>
<td>KR Sridhard</td>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>Sunnyvale, CA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

FROM: Audit Committee Chairperson, Rose Herrera

SUBJECT: Contract Award for Auditor General Services

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the General Manager to execute a task order contract with McGladrey LLP for Auditor General services in an amount not to exceed $800,000 for the base term of twenty-seven months (through June 30, 2015). In addition, the contract also includes four optional one-year contract extensions at a maximum of $250,000 per year; execution of the one-year extensions is subject to approval by the Audit Committee.

BACKGROUND:

As recommended by the VTA Organizational & Financial Assessment, in 2008 VTA established the independent Auditor General function to assist the Board in fulfilling its fiduciary responsibilities of overseeing and managing risks and controls in financial reporting, financial integrity, program activities and brand and reputational integrity. As now established, VTA’s Auditor General’s Office is, among other duties, responsible for:

- Developing and recommending the Annual Internal Audit Work Plan.
- Assigning and managing the audit resources required to conduct each internal audit.
- Providing audit results and progress reports to the Audit Committee and Board.

The Auditor General has a direct reporting relationship to the Audit Committee and the Board of Directors and an administrative reporting relationship to the General Manager. The Audit Committee has direct responsibility for overseeing the activities of the Auditor General.

In January 2009, the Board of Directors awarded a task order contract to Deloitte & Touche LLP to provide Auditor General and internal audit services. The contract was for a two-year base
term with three additional one-year options. During the course of the contract, two of the three one-year extensions had been exercised.

In August 2012, the Board approved severing the contract with Deloitte & Touche LLP due to non-compliance with the requirement to file Form 700, the financial disclosure forms mandated by the Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC).

**DISCUSSION:**

To select a new Auditor General, VTA developed a Request for Proposals (RFP) for Auditor General Services utilizing the minimum qualifications and standards of work previously established by the Audit Committee but that were updated to reflect ensuing minor revisions to the process such as meeting schedules and workflow.

A Review Panel was convened that included voting members with the requisite financial and audit experience to appropriately assess the qualifications, credentials and relevant experience of firms proposing to serve as the VTA Auditor General. The voting members consisted of:

- VTA Chief Financial Officer
- SamTrans/Caltrain Deputy CEO/Chief Financial Officer
- VTA Deputy Director of SVRT Program
- Senior Program Performance Auditor, City of San Jose City Auditor's Office
- VTA Auditor General Program Administrator

The initial RFP was issued on August 24, 2012. Only one written proposal was received, which was from Crowe Horwath LLP (Crowe). Based on the evaluation of the Review Panel, Crowe was deemed to satisfy the minimum qualifications outlined in the RFP document and was invited for an oral interview. Based on the oral interview, and taking into account the importance of the Auditor General function and the associated need to ensure the most qualified candidate firm was selected, which is difficult to determine when only one proposal is received, the Review Panel felt it was in VTA’s best interest to re-issue the RFP in hopes of receiving additional proposals. Crowe was thanked for their interest and encouraged to resubmit for the second RFP.

The second RFP was issued on October 29, 2012. Three written proposals were received. The Review Panel was unanimous in its evaluation that two of the three proposals demonstrated a clear understanding of the requirements of the RFP, clearly met the minimum stated qualifications to perform the required scope of work, and demonstrated the required level of staff experience and expertise. Based on this evaluation, invitations for oral interviews were issued to two firms: (1) Crowe; and (2) McGladrey LLP.

The results of the oral interviews confirmed that VTA was fortunate to have two well qualified firms interested in serving as Auditor General. Both firm’s presentations and responses to Review Panel questions were professional, well organized and indicated a clear understanding of the Auditor General scope of work contained in the RFP. Both proved that they have professional, well-qualified staff and, if needed, can access a broad pool of staffing expertise from their firm’s satellite offices. Both firms demonstrated strong experience with risk assessment in a public sector environment as well as risk assessment experience in a number of important areas including transportation, Information Technology, Sarbanes-Oxley and
construction. In the case of the McGladrey team, it should be noted that Pat Hagan, Client Service Partner/National Government Industry Leader and the individual that would serve as VTA Auditor General, served as VTA’s first Auditor General when he was a partner with Deloitte & Touche LLP.

In the estimation of the Review Panel, both Crowe and McGladrey would serve well in the Auditor General function. However, in the final tally and by a significant margin, the Review Panel was unanimous in its recommendation that the Auditor General contract be awarded to McGladrey. The panel felt that McGladrey was a more qualified and experienced firm with a superior understanding of VTA’s organizational structure, responsibilities and associated risks, and that it is a better fit overall for VTA needs. This conclusion was based on several factors:

- The McGladrey team demonstrated a full understanding of VTA’s broad scope of responsibilities as both an accessible transit provider and multi-modal transportation planning and implementing organization involved with transit, highways and roadways, bikeways, and pedestrian facilities. Crowe demonstrated a significantly less complete or accurate understanding of VTA’s responsibilities and mission.
- McGladrey had significantly stronger demonstrated experience serving as an Auditor General or equivalent.
- Although both firms had very strong internal audit experience, McGladrey had broader and more extensive experience with both governmental entities and, more importantly, transportation. It was felt that that the McGladrey firm demonstrated a greater experience and understanding of transportation issues and risks.
- Pat Hagan is an experienced, proven Auditor General who demonstrates complete understanding of the VTA Auditor General function and mission, including providing risk assessment and management advice and counsel to the Audit Committee and Board. Very importantly, he not only referenced but emphasized the potential risk and damage to VTA brand reputation and public trust.
- McGladrey has a local office with significant workforce presence in San Jose, whereas Crowe’s closest office is in San Francisco. A large proportion McGladrey’s field work resources will be deployed out of the San Jose office, thus saving time and travel costs. Additional staffing resources or expertise can also be readily accessed from its San Francisco and Southern California offices.
- McGladrey’s construction specialist demonstrated more extensive knowledge and experience with various types of constructions and capital projects, including risks associated with design/build project delivery.

McGladrey LLP is national assurance, tax service and consulting provider. It was established in 1926 and is currently the fifth largest accounting firm in the U.S. with over 7,000 employees. It has 85 offices nationally, including ones in San Jose, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Irvine and San Diego. McGladrey has approximately 2,800 public sector clients and 30 large county and transit clients. Clients include the California cities of Burbank, Glendale, Inglewood and Fresno, Riverside and San Bernardino Counties, Riverside County Transportation Commission, Illinois Department of Transportation, Broward County (Fla.) Transit, Miami-Dade County Transit, and Fresno Area Express.

It should be noted that some, but not all, hourly rates for McGladrey staff, most prominently for
Pat Hagan as Auditor General, materially exceed those for Crowe and for VTA’s previous Audit General, Deloitte & Touche. However, McGladrey’s quoted labor rate for field work staff is on par, or in some cases, lower than that of Crowe and Deloitte. The overall labor rate schedule appears reasonable and competitive. Several Review Panel members noted the potential higher costs but thought that on the whole, and especially in the case of Pat Hagan as Auditor General, there would be additional benefit related to the potential additional cost and that overall, McGladrey is a good value.

The recommended Task Order contract establishes the maximum amount that can be spent with McGladrey; however, the specific funding level for each project is established in the Annual Internal Audit Work Plan reviewed by the Audit Committee and adopted by the Board. The contract is for a base term that includes the remainder of the current fiscal year (FY 2013, which ends June 30, 2013) plus two additional years, ending June 30, 2015. The contract also includes four additional one-year options at a maximum of $250,000 each to be executed at the sole discretion of VTA; the Board previously delegated sole discretion for exercising Auditor General contract option years to the Audit Committee. Compensation for each task will be on a firm fixed price basis and is based on the funding level previously established for each project in the Internal Audit Work Plan adopted by the Board annually.

Two additional financial factors should be noted. First, the average amount dedicated to Auditor General-related activities has increased since inception in 2009, and now averages approximately $250,000 - $300,000 annually. This primarily results from two factors: (1) expanded level of one-time projects and standing responsibilities and activities; and (2) regular inclusion of 2000 Measure A projects, primarily for the BART Silicon Valley Program.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The Board could reject the staff recommendation and direct staff to perform another RFP process. This option is only viable if there is a desire to revise the Auditor General scope of work and/or qualifications.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

This action will authorize a maximum expenditure with McGladrey LLP for Auditor General and internal audit services of $800,000 over the initial twenty-seven month base contract period and a maximum contract value of $1,800,000 if all four one-year extensions are exercised. Appropriation required for the work performed from February 2013 to June 2013 is available in the FY 2013 Adopted VTA Transit Fund and 2000 Measure A Transit Improvement Program Fund budgets. Appropriation for the remainder of the contract period will be included in subsequent Recommended Biennial Budgets.

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

The Audit Committee will consider this item at its January 31, 2013 meeting, which immediately precedes the Board of Directors meeting that day. Due to this, Audit Committee Chairperson Rose Herrera will provide a verbal report to the Board on the Audit Committee's discussion and recommendation for this item.
**Contract Award for VTA Auditor General Services with McGladrey LLP**

*January 31, 2013*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm &amp; Location</th>
<th>Contact Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McGladrey LLP</td>
<td>Patrick Hagan, CPA</td>
<td>National Managing Partner, State and Local Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One S. Wacker Drive, Suite 800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, Illinois  60606</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGladrey LLP</td>
<td>Corey Saunders, CPA</td>
<td>Director, Risk Advisory Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Union Square</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600 University Street, Suite 1100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle, WA  98101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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