BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

Thursday, August 28, 2014

5:30 PM

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

AGENDA

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

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

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

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

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

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

All reports for items on the open meeting agenda are available for review in the Board Secretary’s Office, 3331 North First Street, San Jose, California, (408) 321-5680, the Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday prior to the meeting. This information is available on our website, www.vta.org, and also at the meeting. Any document distributed less than 72-hours prior to the meeting will also be made available to the public at the time of distribution. Copies of items provided by members of the public at the meeting will be made available following the meeting upon request.

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

NOTE: THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS MAY ACCEPT, REJECT OR MODIFY ANY ACTION RECOMMENDED ON THIS AGENDA.
1. **CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

1.1. **ROLL CALL**

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

2. **AWARDS AND COMMENDATION**

2.1. INFORMATION ITEM - Recognize Kevin Kuhlmann, Bus Maintenance Instructor, Chaboya Bus Maintenance Training Center; Diana Sotelo, Coach Operator, Chaboya Operations; and Jean Pierre Graveline, Transit Mechanic, Chaboya Maintenance, as Employees of the Month for September 2014.

2.2. INFORMATION ITEM - Recognize VTA Operator Janell Rubbo.

3. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

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

4. **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

4.1. **HEARING - NOTICE OF INTENTION TO ADOPT 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 two properties owned by: (1) BA Partners LLC, a California limited liability company, located in Fremont, California; and (2) Mission Court Properties, Inc., a California corporation, located in Fremont, 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**

B2007 (APN 519-1688-008) owned by BA Partners LLC, a California limited liability company

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

B2008 (APN 519-0850-008-08) owned by Mission Court Properties, Inc., a California corporation
5. REPORTS


5.3. General Manager Report. (Verbal Report)

5.3.A. INFORMATION ITEM - Receive an update on Procurement Program evaluation.

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

5.4. Chairperson's Report. (Verbal Report)

5.4.A. Receive a report regarding the Levi's Stadium Transit Program Committee.

5.4.B. DISCUSSION - Rename the “Ad Hoc Governance Committee,” which was approved on August 7, 2014, to “Ad Hoc Committee on Envisioning Silicon Valley.” Discuss membership and composition of the renamed Committee, and appoint members based on that discussion. Said committee to examine the transportation needs of Silicon Valley and explore various potential funding sources with the intention of informing a potential ballot measure in the future.

6. CONSENT AGENDA

6.1. Approve the Board of Directors Regular Meeting Minutes of August 7, 2014.

6.2. ACTION ITEM - Ratify the appointments to the Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee for the two-year term ending June 30, 2016 of: (1) David Simons, representing the City of Sunnyvale; (2) Dale Schouten, representing the City of Santa Clara; (3) Wes Brinsfield, representing the City of Los Altos; (4) Melanie Hanssen, representing the Town of Los Gatos; and (5) Corinne Winter, ex-officio member, and Colin Heyne, ex-officio alternate member, representing the Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition.

6.3. ACTION ITEM - Approve the allocation of $2.803 million to the VTA Transit Fund Operating Reserve in order to maintain a reserve equal to 15% of the annual operating budget.
6.4. **ACTION ITEM** - Authorize the General Manager to execute a Facility Use Agreement between the County of Santa Clara and VTA for continued use of critical communications equipment at 2700 Carol Drive in San Jose for 10 years with two, five-year renewal options.

6.5. **ACTION ITEM** - Adopt a support position for AB 1193 (Ting), which provides cities and counties with more flexibility when it comes to design standards used to plan and construct bikeway facilities on local streets and roads. In addition, adopt a support position for SB 1368 (Wolk), which adds joint powers authorities and transit districts to the list of public agencies to which the California Transportation Commission (CTC) may relinquish park-and-ride lots owned and operated by Caltrans.

6.6. **ACTION ITEM** - Authorize the General Manager to execute an Amendment to perform additional Engineering Support for traffic signal and street light design for $1,000,000 with the City of San Jose for the Santa Clara/Alum Rock Bus Rapid Transit Project for a new contract amount of $1,580,000.

6.7. **ACTION ITEM** - Review and receive the Auditor General's report on the VTA Extension of BART to Silicon Valley Project Construction Schedule Assessment.


6.9. **INFORMATION ITEM** - Review the Monthly Legislative Update Matrix.

6.10. **INFORMATION ITEM** - Receive a report on Cap and Trade Funds for Transportation.


7. REGULAR AGENDA

Administration and Finance Committee

7.1. ACTION ITEM - Adopt the 2014 Short Range Transit Plan.

7.2. ACTION ITEM - Adopt the Minority and Women-Owned Business Enterprise Program (MWBE Program) in effort to increase minority and women-owned business participation for locally funded contracts and to ensure that these businesses are afforded an equitable opportunity to compete.

7.3. ACTION ITEM - Adopt the following Resolutions for CalPERS Medical Plans for employees and retirees represented by American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), Local 101, effective January 1, 2015:

1. AFSCME (CalPERS) Resolution.
2. AFSCME Survivor Resolution (CalPERS) - for Surviving Spouses of AFSCME retirees.
3. AFSCME (non-CalPERS) Resolution - for AFSCME employees who do not have five years of CalPERS service time but qualify for retiree medical based on VTA/ATU retirement service and total VTA years of service.
4. AFSCME Survivor resolution (non-CalPERS) - for Surviving Spouses of AFSCME employees who did not have five years of CalPERS service time but qualified for retiree medical based on VTA/ATU Pension retirement and total agency time.

7.4. ACTION ITEM - Adopt the following Resolutions for CalPERS Medical Plans for Non-Represented employees and retirees, effective January 1, 2015:

1. Non-Represented Resolution (CalPERS).
2. Non-Represented Survivor Resolution (CalPERS) - for Surviving Spouses of deceased Non-Represented retirees.
3. Non-Represented (non-CalPERS) Resolution - for Non-Represented retirees who do not have five years of CalPERS service time but qualify for retiree medical based on VTA/ATU Retirement service and total VTA years of service.
4. Non-Represented Survivor Resolution (non-CalPERS) - for Surviving Spouses of deceased Non-Represented retirees who did not have five years of CalPERS service time when they retired, but qualified for retiree medical based on VTA/ATU Retirement service and total VTA years of service.
7.5. ACTION ITEM - Approve the following actions:

1. Rescind the ICMA Retirement Health Savings (RHS) Plan Number 803302 for Non-Represented employee groups who are converting to CalPERS Medical plans effective January 1, 2015. (Resolution No. 2012.01.09)

2. Rescind the ICMA Retirement Health Savings (RHS) Plan Number 803313 for employees represented by AFSMCE, Local 101, who are converting to CalPERS Medical plans, effective January 1, 2015. (Resolution No. 2012.01.10)

Such approval is conditioned on the Board’s approval of the CalPERS Medical Plans Resolutions for AFSCME and Non-Represented employees.

7.6. ACTION ITEM - Authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Granite Rock Company, the lowest responsible bidder, in an amount of $1,170,202 for the construction of the Passenger Safety Improvements Project.

7.7. ACTION ITEM - Authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Rail Surveyors and Engineers, Inc. to perform engineering design services for the Light Rail Special Trackwork contract. The contract shall be for a three-year period for a total value not to exceed $1,200,000.

7.8. ACTION ITEM - Authorize the General Manager to amend the Mission Boulevard/Warren Avenue/Freight Railroad Relocation construction contract with RGW Construction, Inc. to accommodate scope additions in the amount of $2,200,000 for a new contract amount of $56,746,318.

7.9. ACTION ITEM - Authorize the General Manager to execute an Agreement with the City of San Jose and Merge Conceptual Design, LLC for $1,000,000 to finalize design, fabricate and deliver art elements for the Santa Clara/Alum Rock Bus Rapid Transit Project.

**Congestion Management Program and Planning Committee**

7.10. ACTION ITEM - Approve State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) program amendments that exchange funds between two Palo Alto and San Jose projects.

7.11. DISCUSSION - Receive and discuss a report on Opportunities to Enhance the Relationship of Land Use and Transportation.
Transit Planning and Operations Committee

7.12. ACTION ITEM -Authorize the General Manager to negotiate and execute an amendment to the existing cooperative agreement with the Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD) regarding the reimbursement of SCVWD’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 to increase the authorization by $550,000, from an existing amount of $1,723,000 to $2,273,000.

7.13. INFORMATION ITEM -Receive update on first year of 2-year Transit Assistance Program (TAP), a low-income fare pilot program.

8. OTHER ITEMS

8.1. ITEMS OF CONCERN AND REFERRAL TO ADMINISTRATION

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

8.2.A. VTA Standing Committees

8.2.B. VTA Advisory Committees

8.2.C. VTA Policy Advisory Boards (PAB)

8.2.D. Joint Powers Boards and Regional Commissions

8.3. Announcements

9. CLOSED SESSION

9.1. Recess to Closed Session

A. Conference with Labor Negotiators
   [Government Code Section 54957.6]

   VTA Designated Representatives:
   Bill Lopez, Chief Administrative Officer
   Robert L. Escobar, Deputy Director, Labor Relations
   Ali Hudda, Acting Chief Financial Officer

   Employee Organizations:
   Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 265

B. Public Employee Performance Evaluation
   [Government Code Section 54957]

   Title: General Counsel
9.2. Reconvene to Open Session

9.3. Closed Session Report

10. ADJOURN
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Nuria I. Fernandez

FROM: Director of Business Services, Bill Lopez

SUBJECT: September 2014 Employees of the Month

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

Kevin Kuhlmann, a Bus Maintenance Instructor at the Chaboya Bus Maintenance Training Center, is the Administrative Award winner for September. Kevin joined VTA in 2008 has been a valued member of the Maintenance team ever since. In his current role Kevin makes quality his number one priority, utilizing his extensive knowledge and solid technical skills to teach classes for Maintenance training and certification. He is a strong leader, a proven problem solver, and an excellent communicator who is deserving of this award. Congratulations to Kevin Kuhlmann, Administrative Employee of the Month for September!

Diana Sotelo, Coach Operator from Chaboya Operations, is the Operations Award winner for September. Diana has been with VTA for over 27 years and performs her job with high standards and great enthusiasm, setting a positive example for her fellow employees. In addition to her regular duties, Diana serves as a Line Instructor, coaching Operator trainees on safe bus operations and on learning VTA bus routes. Diana has volunteered to take the lead on many projects including the creation of a Vehicle Inspection DVD that students can utilize at home. Congratulations to Diana Sotelo, Operations Employee of the Month for September!

Jean Pierre Graveline, Transit Mechanic at Chaboya Maintenance, is the Maintenance Award winner for September. Jean Pierre has over six years of dedicated service with VTA. In his current assignment as a Road Call Mechanic, Jean Pierre performs skilled mechanical work with professionalism and pride when assisting drivers and passengers to get to their destination on time. He has been recognized by his supervisors for his strong work ethic, and as an employee who exemplifies VTA’s values, which promote safety and quality job performance. Congratulations to Jean Pierre Graveline, Maintenance Employee of the Month for September!

Prepared By: Employee Relations
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Nuria I. Fernandez

FROM: Director of SVRT Program, Carolyn M. Gonot

SUBJECT: SVBX Resolution of Necessity

Policy-Related Action: No

Government Code Section 84308 Applies: No

Resolution

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt two (2) Resolutions of Necessity determining that the public interest and necessity require the acquisitions of each of the 2 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 settlements. However, negotiated settlements may not be achievable in all instances and some of the acquisitions may need to be acquired through a timely condemnation process, particularly to ensure that the Project can stay on schedule.

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

**DISCUSSION:**

Among the approximately 102 property acquisitions required for the Project, staff is recommending that a Resolution of Necessity be adopted for the following 2 properties:

1. **Property owned by BA Partners LLC, a California limited liability company (B2007)**

   This property is located at 1500 Fulton Place in the City of Fremont. The larger parcel consists of approximately .835 acres and is currently improved with a tilt-up industrial building. The proposed acquisition consists of a 460 sq.ft. partial fee interest (B2007-01). The partial fee interest is needed for a storm drain and access road to inspect and maintain utilities and facilities within the corridor.

   The subject 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 or about July 26, 2012 to Van Wey Die Casting, Inc. A conceptual settlement was reached following the death of the owner, and the parties thereafter actively worked on finalizing the language in the purchase and sale agreement. However, before the purchase and sale agreement could be finalized, the owner’s estate sold the property to BA Partners, LLC on or about April 7, 2014.

   Following the sale of the property, negotiations commenced with the new owner, and a similar settlement was reached. The parties are actively engaged in trying to finalize the settlement documents. VTA staff is optimistic that an agreement eventually will be finalized and executed, but must take action to acquire the above-referenced property through eminent domain proceedings in order to ensure that construction can timely begin and the construction schedule remains intact.

2. **Property owned by Mission Court Properties, Inc. (B2008)**

   This property is located at 440 -1055 Mission Court in the City of Fremont. The larger parcel consists of approximately 18.65 acres and is currently improved with six concrete multi-tenant industrial buildings. The proposed acquisition consists of an 807 sq.ft partial fee interest (B2008-1) and a 24,507 sq. foot ingress/egress easement (B2008-2). The partial fee interest is needed for a storm drain and for an access road to inspect and maintain utilities
and facilities within the corridor. The ingress/easement is needed to access the utilities and facilities within the corridor for inspection and maintenance purposes.

The subject 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 or about January 10, 2013 to Mission Court Properties, Inc. A settlement was reached as to just compensation, but the parties are still actively working on finalizing the purchase and sale agreement. VTA staff is optimistic that an agreement eventually will be finalized and executed, but must take action to acquire the above-referenced property through eminent domain proceedings in order to ensure that construction can timely begin and the construction schedule remains intact.

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

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

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

**ALTERNATIVES:**

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

Prepared by: Bijal Patel
Memo No. 4693
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” (B2007-01), attached hereto and made a part hereof by this reference (the “Property”), 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” 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 Partial Fee 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 August 28, 2014, by the following vote:

AYES: DIRECTORS:

NOES: DIRECTORS:

ABSENT: DIRECTORS:

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

Dated: ______________________  ______________________________________

ELAINE BALTAO, Secretary
Board of Directors

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

____________________________
ROBERT FABELA
General Counsel
EXHIBIT “A”

LEGAL DESCRIPTION
APN 519-1688-008

All that certain real property situated in the City of Fremont, County of Alameda, State of California, described as follows:

Being a portion of that certain parcel of land designated as Lot 8, as said lot is shown on that certain map entitled "TRACT 3981" filed May 27, 1981 in Book 127 of Maps at Page 53, Official Records of said County, being more particularly described as follows:

BEGINNING at the northwest corner of said Lot 8, said point being coincident with the easterly line of that certain parcel of land designated as Parcel 24, 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;

1. Thence North 67°31'40" East 2.21 feet along the northerly of said Lot 8;
2. Thence leaving last said line, South 22°21'43" East 231.93 feet to the southerly line of said Lot 8;
3. Thence South 74°30'18" West 1.77 feet along last said line to said easterly line of Parcel 24;
4. Thence North 22°28'20" West 231.72 feet along last said line to the POINT OF BEGINNING;

Containing 460 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.

Dan S. Scott III, PLS 7840
My License Expires on 12/31/2012
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” (B2008-01), and an Ingress/Egress Easement interest in certain property more particularly described in Exhibit “B” (B2008-02) attached hereto and made a part hereof by this reference (collectively, “the Property”), 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 an Ingress/Egress 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. The parcels described in Exhibits “A” and “B” are 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 Partial Fee 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 August 28, 2014, by the following vote:

AYES: DIRECTORS:

NOES: DIRECTORS:

ABSENT: DIRECTORS:

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

Dated: ______________________

ELAINE BALTAO, Secretary
Board of Directors

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

____________________________
ROBERT FABELA
General Counsel
LEGAL DESCRIPTION
APN 519-0850-008-08

All that certain real property situated in the City of Fremont, County of Alameda, State of California, described as follows:

Being a portion of those certain parcels of land designated as Parcel 1 and Parcel 2, as said parcels are described in the Grant Deed to Mission Court Properties, Inc., recorded August 27, 1996 under Recorder’s Series No. 96-212309, Official Records of said County, being more particularly described as follows:

BEGINNING at the northwest corner of said Parcel 1, said point being coincident with the easterly line of that certain parcel of land designated as Parcel 24, 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 Pages 1 through 51 inclusive, Official Records of said County;

1. Thence North 74°30’18” East 1.77 feet along the northerly line of said Parcel 1;
2. Thence leaving last said line, South 22°21’43” East 915.89 feet to said easterly line of Parcel 24;
3. Thence North 22°28’20” West 916.10 feet along last said line to the POINT OF BEGINNING;

Containing 807 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 express distances by 1.00005333.

John W. Pettrey, PLS No. 6202
My License Expires on 03/31/2014
EXHIBIT “B”

INGRESS EGRESS EASEMENT

A permanent non-exclusive ingress/egress easement (the “Access Easement”) and incidents thereto, for the purpose of vehicular and pedestrian ingress and egress on, over, across, and through the portion of Grantor’s property described in deed recorded on August 27, 1996, as Document No. 96-212309, said Access Easement being described and depicted as Parcel Number B2008-02 on Exhibit “1” attached hereto and made a part hereof, situated in the City of Fremont, County of Alameda, State of California.

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 519-0850-008-08

All that certain real property situated in the City of Fremont, County of Alameda, State of California, described as follows:

Being a portion of those certain parcels of land designated as Parcel 1 and Parcel 2, as said parcels are described in the Grant Deed to Mission Court Properties, Inc., recorded August 27, 1996 under Recorder’s Series No. 96-212309, Official Records of said County, being more particularly described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point lying on the westerly line of said Parcel 2 from which the northwest corner thereof bears North 22°28’20” West 339.06 feet, said point also being coincident with the easterly line of that certain parcel of land designated as Parcel 24, as said parcel is shown on that certain map entitled “RECORD OF SURVEY VTA-BART EXTENSION” filed December 7, 2007 in Book 021 of Maps, at Pages 1 through 51 inclusive, Official Records of said County;

1. Thence leaving last said line, North 68°09’55” East 18.85 feet;
2. Thence South 21°53’35” East 21.80 feet;
3. Thence North 68°27’00” East 18.52 feet;
4. Thence North 37°26’33” East 297.72 feet;
5. Thence North 36°56’22” East 170.02 feet;
6. Thence North 42°06’18” East 227.60 feet;
7. Thence North 37°14’42” West 340.34 feet;
8. Thence North 41°17’28” West 66.88 feet to the beginning of a curve concave easterly and having a radius of 40.00 feet;
9. Thence northwesterly and northerly 48.16 feet along said curve through a central angle of 68°58’53”;
10. Thence North 27°41’25” East 4.22 feet to the general southerly line of Mission Court, as said line is described in the Grant Deed to the City of Fremont, recorded December 6, 1984 under Recorder’s Series Number 84-241859, Official Records of said County, said point also being the beginning of a non-tangent curve concave northeasterly and having a radius of 75.00 feet (a radial line of said curve through said point bearing South 43°23’14” West);
11. Thence southeasterly 20.26 feet along said curve and said general southerly line through a central angle of 15°28’28”;
12. Thence leaving last said line, South 27°41’25” West 1.42 feet to the beginning of a curve concave easterly and having a radius of 20.00 feet;
13. Thence southerly and southeastally 24.08 feet along said curve through a central angle of 68°58’53”;
14. Thence South 41°17’28” East 67.57 feet;
15. Thence South 37°14’32” East 357.66 feet;
16. Thence South 42°06’18” West 243.27 feet;
17. Thence South 36°56’22” West 169.21 feet;
18. Thence South 37°26’33” West 303.36 feet;
19. Thence South 68°27’00” West 24.15 feet;
20. Thence South 21°18’51” East 6.09 feet;
21. Thence South 71°39'24" West 18.15 feet to said easterly line of Parcel 24;

22. Thence North 22°28'20" West 46.79 feet along last said line to the POINT OF BEGINNING;

Containing 24,507 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.
SEE SHEET 2

LINE TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINE</th>
<th>BEARING</th>
<th>DISTANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>N68°27'00&quot;E</td>
<td>18.52'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>S68°27'00&quot;W</td>
<td>24.15'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>S21°18'51&quot;E</td>
<td>6.09'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4</td>
<td>S71°39'24&quot;W</td>
<td>18.15'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

519-0850-008-08
MISSION COURT PROPERTIES, INC
PARCEL 2
96-212309

NORTHWEST CORNER PARCEL 2

339.06'
N22°28'20"W 412.80'
519-0850-011
SCVTA, PARCEL 24
ROS No. 2076
821 M 1

LEGEND

- 1 = ACCESS CONTROLLED
- 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 1.000005333.

SHEET 1 OF 3

Scale: 1" = 60'
Plat to Accompany Legal Description
CITY OF FREMONT, COUNTY OF ALAMEDA
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Date: August 10, 2012
APN: 519-0850-008-08

B2008-02 IEE
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; and a summary of comparable sales, including the location, date of sale and sales price of properties used in the appraisal process. The date that the offer was made to each of the property owner is specified on the Property Fact Sheets contained in Section 6 of this report.
SECTION 3

SVBX PROJECT OVERVIEW, PURPOSE AND NEED

Project Description

BART Silicon Valley is an extension of the existing BART regional heavy rail system to Milpitas, San Jose and Santa Clara. The 16-mile BART Silicon Valley Program will be delivered through a phased approach.

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

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

The two SVBX stations will feature:

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

Purpose of the Project

The project is intended to achieve the following objectives:

- Improve public transit service and increase ridership in this severely, and ever-increasing, congested corridor by providing expanded transit capacity and faster, convenient access to and from major Santa Clara County employment and activity centers for corridor residents and residents from throughout the Bay Area and portions of the Central Valley of California.
• Enhance regional connectivity by expanding and interconnecting BART rapid transit service with VTA light rail, Amtrak, ACE, Caltrain, and VTA bus services in Santa Clara County; improve intermodal transit hubs where rail, bus, auto, bicycle and pedestrian links meet.

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

• Improve mobility options to employment, education, medical, and retail centers for corridor residents, in particular low-income, youth, elderly, disabled, and ethnic minority populations.

• Improve regional air quality by reducing auto emissions.

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

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

Need for the Project

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

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

SECTION 4
PROJECT PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION

Alternatives Analysis

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

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

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

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

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

Station Area Planning

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

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

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

Project Funding

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

*Engineering design*

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

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

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

*Design-Build Contract Procurement*

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

VTA issued the Request for Proposals (RFP) for the C700 Line, Track, Stations, and Systems (LTSS) contract in March 2011 to pre-qualified teams. The pre-qualified teams are KSG Constructors, Skanska-Shimmick-Herzog, Tutor Perini and Parsons SVBX, and Walsh/Flatiron/Comstock. On December 8, 2011, the Board awarded the C700 contract to Skanska-Shimmick-Herzog.
SECTION 5

ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE AND REVIEW

Environmental Clearance

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

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

Environmental Review Summary

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

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

SECTION 6

SPECIFIC PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS

Detailed property fact sheets and aerial photographs of the parcels required for this Project, and subject to the Resolutions of Necessity follow. 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) B2007 -- on or about July 26, 2012; (2) B2008-- on or about January 10, 2013 said offer packages incorporated herein by reference. Notices of Intention to Adopt Resolutions of Necessity, incorporated herein by reference, were sent to each of the property owners on August 7, 2014 (B2007) and August 8, 2014 (B2008).
The subject property is currently owned by BA Partners LLC, and is located at 1500 Fulton Place in the City of Fremont. The larger parcel consists of approximately .835 acres and is improved with an industrial building.

The proposed acquisition consists of a 460 square foot partial fee interest (B2007-1), which is needed for a storm drain and access road to inspect and maintain utilities and facilities within the corridor.
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BART SILICON VALLEY BERRYESSA EXTENSION PROJECT

PROPERTY FACT SHEET – B2008

Owner: Mission Court Properties, Inc.

Property Address: 440-1055 Mission Court

Locale: City of Fremont, CA

Present Use: Improved with six multi-tenant industrial buildings

Total Property Area: 18.65 acres

Area to be Acquired: A partial fee interest (B2008-1) - 807 sq. ft.
Ingress/egress easement (B2008-02) – 24,507 sq. ft.

Date of Offer: January 10, 2013

The subject property is owned by Mission Court Properties, Inc, and is located at 440-1055 Mission Court in the City of Fremont. The larger parcel consists of approximately 18.65 acres and is currently improved with six multi-tenant industrial buildings.

The proposed acquisition consists of an 807 square foot partial fee interest (B2008-1) and a 24,507 square foot ingress/egress easement (B2008-02). The partial fee interest is needed for a storm drain and for an access road to inspect and maintain utilities and facilities within the corridor. The ingress/egress is needed to access the utilities and facilities within the corridor for inspection and maintenance purposes.
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Nuria I. Fernandez

FROM: Director of Business Services, Bill Lopez

SUBJECT: Auditor General, APTA Peer Group and FTA Triennial Audit Review & Recommendations-2014 Procurement Evaluations

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

VTA Auditor General & APTA Procurement Peer Review Findings & Recommendations:

In early January the Auditor General (AG) initiated an evaluation of the purchasing and contracting activities at VTA. The assessment of these two work units resulted in the Auditor General formulating a series of recommendations to enhance and facilitate the purchasing and contract functions.

The American Public Transportation Association (APTA) offers a service for its member agencies. The APTA Peer Review examined VTA’s procurement and contract business structure and processes with the intent to strengthen the organization’s management of its procurement and materials management function. In response to the General Manager's request, representatives from other transit properties spent nearly a week at VTA in June 2014. The properties represented were Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA), Dallas Area Rapid Transit (DART), Sound Transit, Seattle, and The Greater Cleveland Regional Transit Authority.

APTA recommendations for the most part are consistent and underscore those of the Auditor General. The recommendations are listed below. Item VIII Cultural Change, and item IX Department Restructuring are APTA recommendations above those offered by the Auditor General.

Federal Transit Agency Triennial Review:

The FTA Triennial Review is conducted as an audit exercise. During the three to five days on
the property they reviewed documentation relative to the procurement, contract administration and purchases using federal funds. The FTA once completing their assessment will provide a final written report discussing their findings and recommendations. That report is completed usually 30 to 60 days after the on-site review is conducted. However, during the exit interview on the last day of their review, the FTA Review Team provided preliminary findings and recommendations. Depending on the complexity of the findings, those preliminary findings mentioned at the Exit Interview may not be reported in the final written document when issued by the FTA. The preliminary findings and recommendations are as follows:

A brief summary of the findings and recommendations by the three review teams are as follows:

**Auditor General’s Findings & Recommendation**

I. **Automation** - the review teams determined that the current administration of the procurement process is to labor and paper intensive. The recommendation is to take advantage of the full SAP Procurement Module.

II. **Communication of Roles and Responsibilities** - it was determined there was a lack of clarity by user departments on how best to initiate a purchase. The recommendation is to conduct training to appropriate personnel on their respective roles and responsibilities.

III. **Review and Raise Purchase Limits** - current limits have been in place since 1994 and coupled with an increase level of activity, more agreements, current authorization limits require more review thus inhibiting the efficiency of completing the acquisition. The recommendation is to review the current limits with the anticipation of raising the authorization levels to streamline the purchasing process.

IV. **Create Customer Friendly Guides** - the review teams pointed out that the current policies and procedure are not easy to understand and as a consequence the user is not properly initiating the purchase. It is recommended that the contracts department review existing policies and procedures with the intent of consolidating and/or replacing them.

V. **Legal Review** - currently the legal department reviews all contracts that are excessive and time consuming. The recommendation is to develop a series of templates to standardize the process resulting in timely processing while insuring that “gate keeping” responsibilities are maintained.

VI. **Certified Purchasing Manager(s)** - the review team advised that VTA should consider personnel becoming certified through respected, established professional and accredited affiliations. This would help to insure VTA personnel to stay current on industry standards and trends, and enable staff to have access to best practices and comparable performance metrics.

VII. **Succession Planning** - it is essential for organizations to project the vacancies of key management levels for the next three to five years and to be prepared to fill those
positions with highly skilled and knowledgeable replacements. It is recommended to work closely with the General Manager and Executive Staff to put into place a practical and viable succession plan.

APTA PEER Review Findings & Recommendations

VIII. **Cultural Change** - those involved with procurement and/or purchasing from both the Procurement & Contracts department and user departments should become more collaborative and develop long range strategic plan goals, and acquisition planning, along continuous process improvement.

IX. **Department Restructuring** - consolidate processes and simplify the procedures for engaging the procurement and contracting services. Assess and revise job descriptions predicated on the improvement made and a result of the automation program. Provide a single line of support for the technology department.

FTA Triennial Review Findings & Recommendations

X. Federal procurement rules are modified on a recurring basis and as such VTA current policies may not reflect the most current changes made by the FTA. Consequently, one of the recommendations was to update the relevant policies to reflect more closely the current federal procurement guidance. This is not so much a finding but an opportunity for the FTA to lend assistance to grantee organizations, like VTA, whose procurement activities comply with current regulation, but the policies do not reflect the most current changes.

XI. Provide procurement oversight if a separate agency procures products or services using grant funds from VTA.

To continue with the effort to affect additional efficiencies VTA has created the VTA Procurement Advisory Council. The Council is comprised of executive staff and its purpose is to enhance to production of the procurement and contracts department. The Council facilitates collaborative efforts between the P&C Department and the user departments within the agency, including long range acquisition planning and other process improvements.

The attached charts illustrate the findings/recommendations along with the current status and scheduled completion date.

Prepared By: Robert L. Escobar
Memo No. 4684
## Auditor General, APTA Peer and FTA Triennial Reviews 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AG REPORT* &amp; APTA PEER REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
<th>ACTIVITY/STATUS</th>
<th>COMPLETION DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AG - Review &amp; Raise Purchasing Limits</strong></td>
<td>Current levels have been in place for nearly 20 years; current limits are highest among comparable agencies including bay area transit properties</td>
<td>Dec 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Current limits established in 1994</td>
<td>Should the Board approve increasing the authorization limits, changes to policies and amending the Administrative Code are required.</td>
<td>Dec 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have not adjusted with inflation</td>
<td>Review of policies are underway with consolidation and removal of redundancies anticipated to be completed prior to the end of the calendar year.</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AG – Legal Review</strong></td>
<td>General Counsel agrees with the recommendation.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review is time consuming Create boilerplate language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AG – Certified Purchasing Manager</strong></td>
<td>Professional organizations have been selected and memberships are being processed. There are 8 Buyers, 4 Construction Contract Administrators, 6 Professional Services Contract Administrators and 3 Managers. Assuming all participate, estimated cost ranges from $2,730 to $3,885 annually.</td>
<td>Completed pending approval of expenditure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Becoming certified enables staff to be current with industry standards and trends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AG – Succession Planning</strong></td>
<td>P&amp;C has evaluated its procurement and contracting processes and has effected changes (in conjunction with automating the processes). The revise processes are being converted to electronic implementation. Due to process changes, an evaluation of the classification structure is being conducted to modifying current classifications to better support the operation of the P&amp;C</td>
<td>Sept/Oct 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AG - Procurement Outreach</strong></td>
<td>Initial outreach was conducted with “Input Sessions” – continued proactive customer service has become integral part of staff performance</td>
<td>Aug 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Proactive customer service (internal)</td>
<td>Internal website capability for training is implemented in conjunction with automation</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Guidance &amp; Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use internal website for ongoing training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AG – Create Customer Friendly Guides</strong></td>
<td>Guides are in draft form; completion of guides will be concurrent with automation and training will be conducted accordingly</td>
<td>Aug/Sept 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Procurement processes are no clear and in some cases are inconsistent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AG – Procurement Staff Skills &amp; Continuous Growth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Professional Memberships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Professional Training &amp; Ed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Professional Certification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Procurement Division Accreditation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adds professionalism to staff’s credentials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AG – Procurement and Contracts Department restructure &amp; Staffing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes
- **AG** refers to the Auditor General's report.
- **AP** refers to the APTA Peer review.
- **REVIEW** refers to the FTA Triennial Review.

---

**Footer:**
Auditor General (AG)  
APTA PEER (AP)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seven (7) Total Findings</th>
<th>Activity/Status</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First 3 Findings are to Update Policies:</td>
<td>Final report from FTA is pending – staff has initiated the implementation of the recommendations to the findings.</td>
<td>In compliance with FTA final report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Design Build Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clarifying requirement to abide by Federal Cost Principals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• On rolling stock procurement to be limited to grantee’s needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final report from FTA is pending – staff has initiated the implementation of the recommendations to the findings.</td>
<td>In compliance with FTA final report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create two policy:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Require that raw scores along with names of evaluators be maintained with evaluator forms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide procurement oversight if a separate agency procures products or services using federal grant funds from VTA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise one policy:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Revise VTA policy to update the requirement to include proof of checking with System for Awards Management (SAM). Our policy currently references the previous requirement to use the Excluded Parties List (EPL). Since our policy was written, the federal government changed to the SAM website. This site lists all contractors that are debarred by the federal government.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modification to Admin Code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To reflect federal wording for Officers, Agents and Board Members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
Thursday, August 7, 2014
MINUTES

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

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

1.1. ROLL CALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jason Baker</td>
<td>Alternate Board Member</td>
<td>Absent</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>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Chavez</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Cortese</td>
<td>Alternate Board Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jose Esteves</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Herrera</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash Kalra</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnny Khamis</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Larsen</td>
<td>Alternate Board Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Liccardo</td>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie Matthews</td>
<td>Alternate Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Pirzynski</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail A. Price</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Rocha</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Whittum</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry Woodward</td>
<td>Vice Chairperson</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Yeager</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Alternates do not serve unless participating as a Member.

A quorum was present.

1.2. Orders of the Day

Chairperson Kalra noted that the Revised Agenda in the Members’ reading folder and on the Public Table reflects the following: 1) updated language for Agenda Item #6.3, BPAC Appointments and Reappointments, to reflect the addition of James Wiant, representing the City of Cupertino; and 2) recommended contractor and contractor amount for Agenda Item #7.3, LRT Efficiency Project – Mountain View Double Track Phase 1 and Signal Work.

Chairperson Kalra noted that staff requested the following items be removed from the Regular Agenda and placed on the Consent Agenda: Agenda Item #7.3, LRT Efficiency Project – Mountain View Double Track Phase 1 and Signal Work, and
Agenda Item #7.4, Mountain View Double Track – URS Contract Amendment for Final Design and Design Services during Construction.

Board Member Whittum suggested that Agenda Item #7.2, Light Rail Efficiency Project: Mountain View Double Track Phase II, also be placed on the Consent Agenda as it is related to Agenda Items #7.3 and #7.4.

Chairperson Kalra noted that the meeting would be adjourned in memory of Ira Ruskin, former California Assemblyman and Redwood City Mayor.

Board Member Price took her seat at 5:35 p.m.

Robert Fabela, General Counsel, clarified that the approval of Agenda Item #7.2 was contingent upon the approval of Agenda Items #7.3 and #7.4.

M/S/C (Pirzynski/Herrera) to accept the Orders of the Day and approve the Consent Agenda, as amended.

RESULT: ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS] (Orders of the Day, Consent Agenda Items #: 6.1-6.13, and Regular Agenda Items #: 7.2-7.4)  
MOVER: Joe Pirzynski, Board Member  
SECONDER: Rose Herrera, Board Member  
AYES: Campos, Carr, Chavez, Esteves, Herrera, Kalra, Khamis, Pirzynski, Price, Whittum, Yeager  
NOES: None  
ABSENT: Rocha, Woodward  

2. AWARDS AND COMMENDATION  

2.1 Employees of the Month for July and August 2014

Chairperson Kalra recognized Elizabeth “Liz” French, Senior Transportation Planner, River Oaks and Glorietta McKinnis, Light Rail Operator, Guadalupe Division as Employees of the Month for July 2014. Fortunato DeAsis, Overhaul & Repair Mechanic, Cerone Maintenance Employee of the Month for July 2014 and Debbie Polm, Office Support Supervisor, Chaboya Division, Supervisor of the Quarter for the Third quarter of 2014 were unable to attend.

Chairperson Kalra recognized Thomas Smith, Coach Operator, Cerone Operations and Jesus MontesdeOca, Lead Maintenance Worker, Guadalupe/Way Power & Signal, as Employees of the Month for August 2014. Baljinder Sandhu, Human Resources Analyst, River Oaks was unable to attend.

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

Danny Garza, La Raza Roundtable and Plata Arroyo Neighborhood Association, spoke on a color scheme issue concerning the Santa Clara-Alum Rock Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Project station art enhancement. He requested to meet with VTA Board Members or VTA staff who have the authority to approve station art enhancements.

Marie Bernard, Sunnyvale Community Services, spoke about the VTA, Santa Clara County Social Services, and Emergency Assistance Network partnership on the Transit Assistance Program (TAP) pilot program that will aim to make public transit accessible to the low income community.

Amantha Lott, Interested Citizen, expressed concern on her experience with a VTA Fare Inspector and urged the Board to consider her suggestions to improve customer service.

Omar Chatty, Interested Citizen, noted the fatal accident rate along State Route (SR) 152 and advocated for conducting an Environmental Impact Report to convert SR 152 to four lanes.

James Wightman, Interested Citizen, made the following comments: 1) expressed dissatisfaction that the bus bridge was discontinued before construction of the Santa Clara Pocket Track was completed; and 2) inquired on when the pocket track will open, and inquired on when the Mountain View Double Track Project will start.

Poncho Guevara, Sacred Heart Community Service, thanked the Board for its support of the TAP pilot program.

John Rainville, Interested Citizen, expressed concern on safety at the North First Street and Tasman Drive intersection.

4. **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

There were no Public Hearings.

5. **REPORTS**

5.1. **Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) / 2000 Measure A Citizens Watchdog Committee (CWC) Chairperson’s Report**

There was no CAC/CWC report.

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

There was no PAC report.
5.3. General Manager’s Report

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

- VTA’s Inaugural Service to Levi’s Stadium on August 2, 2014, noting: 1) safely moved over 8,000 light rail and over 700 bus patrons in 90 minutes; 2) enhanced service to accommodate the stadium event attendees was provided as part of regular service; 3) service plan to the stadium will be adjusted based on initial experience and continually thereafter; 4) will continue to seek customer feedback; and 5) a more flexible service plan will be implemented by the next Levi’s Stadium event.

Board Member Yeager made the following comments: 1) expressed his appreciation to Ms. Fernandez for being out in the field during the inaugural event; and 2) shared operations and safety concerns.

Ms. Fernandez noted that the Santa Clara Pocket Track will be available by the next Levi’s Stadium event on August 17, 2014. VTA also requested additional support from the Santa Clara Police Department to facilitate crowd control and pedestrian safety.

Upon query of Board Member Herrera, Ms. Fernandez noted that VTA’s goal is to attract 20 percent of Levi’s Stadium event attendees to take public transit. Ms. Fernandez added that increasing capacity is currently not feasible due to VTA’s existing fleet, and further planning and ridership evaluation will be conducted before any decision on fleet expansion is made.

Upon query of Board Member Esteves, staff elaborated on bus capacity and road conditions in the stadium’s immediate area.

Chairperson Kalra invited members of the public who wish to speak on Agenda Item #5.4.B, Levi’s Stadium Transit Program Committee Report to speak under Agenda Item #5.3, General Manager’s Report instead.

Public Comment

Mr. Chatty commented that buses are more flexible than light rail and suggested that future planning include maximizing the bus network.

Board Member Esteves left the meeting at 6:24 p.m.

Eugene Bradley, Silicon Valley Transit Users, provided suggestions for service improvement during Levi’s Stadium events and inquired on pocket track construction delay.

Michael Ludwig, Interested Citizen, expressed concern that the pocket track was not available for the August 2, 2014, Levi’s Stadium Inaugural Event and provided suggestions for service improvement.
Ms. Fernandez continued her report, highlighting:

- Ridership Report for June 2014, noting total system ridership is up by 3.7 percent compared to the same period last year.

- Fare Revenue Performance for June 2014, noting revenue was up 2.2 percent compared to June 2013.

- Key Performance Indicators for June 2014, noting bus and light rail operations exceeded established goals for Percent of Scheduled Service Operated, Service Recovery, and Absenteeism.

- VTA’s community engagement highlights, including: 1) provided an update on VTA’s BART Silicon Valley Program to the Silicon Valley Leadership Group (SVLG) Board; 2) presented to the San Jose Downtown Association, Cupertino Rotary, and SPUR San Jose Lunchtime Forum; 3) threw out first pitch at the San Jose Giant’s game; 4) participated in the ribbon-cutting event for Levi’s Stadium; and 5) VTA Community Relations Team held two Open House sessions in Santa Clara on July 21, 2014, and presented on several VTA projects.

- VTA hosted the Mineta Summer Transportation Institute high school students on a tour of the Cerone Bus Yard, Santa Clara Pocket Track construction project, and future Milpitas BART Station.

- VTA employees participated in the National “Dump the Pump” Day campaign challenge, noting that 294 employees dumped the pump at least once a week for the month of June 2014 and 99 employees dumped the pump every day for the month of June 2014.

- VTA Bus Operator Janell Rubbo’s heroic actions to be formally recognized at next month’s Board Meeting.

- Addition of unarmed, uniformed AlliedBarton Security Specialists who will ride VTA’s light rail system during revenue hours in an “observe and report” function. These Security Specialists will also be deployed as needed to support Levi’s Stadium events.

- VTA Staff met with San Jose Police Department and Santa Clara County Sheriff’s Office Command Staff on July 10, 2014, and discussed concerns regarding law enforcement coverage near VTA stations in San Jose and budget issues.

- Introduced Captain David Lera, Santa Clara County Sheriff’s Department, who reported on Security and Public Safety, highlighting the following: 1) June and July 2014 statistics for the Sheriff Transit Patrol and citations from the VTA Fare Inspectors; and 2) where arrests and incident reports were handled.
5.3.A **VTA's BART Silicon Valley Program Update**

Carolyn Gonot, Director of SVRT Program, provided a brief report and presentation, highlighting: 1) construction activities at the Milpitas Station, Dixon Landing Road, and the Berryessa Station; 2) tour of Berryessa Station area by SVRT Program Committee Members; and 3) SVBX integrated summary schedule and cost summary.

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

Scott Haywood, Policy & Community Relations Manager, provided a brief report on CTC, noting: 1) the August 19-20, 2014, CTC meeting will be held in San Jose; 2) CTC is anticipated to allocate the remaining state funding for VTA’s BART to Silicon Valley Extension Project; and 3) extended invitation to Board Members for the milestone celebration event and project tour scheduled for August 20, 2014 at the San Jose Flea Market.

5.4. **Chairperson’s Report**

Chairperson Kalra provided a brief report, noting: 1) next Regular Board Meeting will be held August 28, 2014; 2) appointment of Board Member Price and Alternate Board Member Larsen to the Dumbarton Rail Policy Advisory Committee; and 3) appointment of Brent Pearse, Community Outreach Supervisor, to Caltrain’s Centralized Equipment Maintenance and Operations Facility (CEMOF) Monitoring Committee.

5.4.A. **Ad Hoc Governance Committee**

Chairperson Kalra provided a brief overview of the proposed Ad Hoc Governance Committee and noted that he has received comments concerning the committee structure.

Board Member Whittum made the following comments: 1) the Ad Hoc Governance Committee could be split into two different committees – one that concerns the ballot measure, and another concerning VTA governance; 2) suggested that membership continuity be considered, particularly concerning the ballot measure; and 3) asked what are success criteria for the Ad Hoc Governance Committee.

Board Member Price proposed a change on committee membership structure, emphasizing the need to ensure broader participation and representation throughout Santa Clara County. Board Member Price also stressed the importance of early stakeholder engagement and garnering voter support and turnout.

Chairperson Kalra concurred that early stakeholder engagement and widespread representation should be part of the process. The current
proposal to form an ad hoc committee composed of the Board Chairperson, Vice Chairperson, and the Chairpersons of the Administration and Finance Committee (A&F), Congestion Management Program & Planning Committee (CMPP), and Transit Planning and Operations (TP&O) Committee will facilitate ballot measure recommendations and oversee governance of VTA.

Board Member Whittum made additional comments, noting: 1) inquired on what can be done to engage the Board and VTA Committees in prioritizing the various needs of Santa Clara County; 2) expressed support if the Ad Hoc Governance Committee were split into two separate committees, one concerning the ballot measure and another concerning governance; 3) suggested that the Board recommend the Ad Hoc Governance Committee to provide a monthly or quarterly report; and 4) inquired on what has been done to engage the support of elected officials.

Board Member Pirzynski expressed support for Chairperson Kalra’s proposal. He also proposed a period of time in which the Board can evaluate committee performance.

Board Member Herrera expressed her support for the ad hoc committee structure as recommended by Chairperson Kalra, but suggested adding an “At-large” Member as a compromise to the alternative motion.

Public Comment

Mr. Ludwig expressed support on a ballot measure that is less BART-centric and more regionally focused to include funding for Caltrain and the expansion of VTA bus and light rail fleet.

Jaime Fearer, California Walks, expressed support on the formation of the Ad Hoc Governance Committee and urged the Board to develop a clear public participation plan.

Chris Lepe, TransForm, expressed support on the formation of the Ad Hoc Governance Committee. He provided suggestions to increase public participation and noted other suggestions outlined in the recent SPUR report, “Freedom to Move: How the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority can create better transportation choices in the South Bay”.

Adina Levin, Friends of Caltrain, expressed appreciation to the Board for its leadership for a potential ballot measure and advocated for robust public participation as part of the process. She also noted suggestions outlined in the recent SPUR report on VTA.

Charisse Ma Lebron, Working Partnerships USA, expressed strong support on the formation of the Ad Hoc Governance Committee and urged the Board to allow for public participation and input.
Wendy Ho, United Way Silicon Valley, expressed support on the formation of the Ad Hoc Governance Committee and recommended the Board establish a community advisory committee to facilitate public engagement.

Mr. Chatty expressed support for the formation of the Ad Hoc Governance Committee, asked the Board to examine safety policy, and advocated for BART around the Bay Area.

Mr. Bradley expressed concern on the imbalance of fund distribution of the 2000 Measure A Program, emphasized transparency in the crafting of any future ballot measure, and urged the Board to make transit more accessible to everyone.

M/S/F (Price/Whittum) on a vote of 2 ayes, 8 noes, and 0 abstentions to approve the creation of an Ad Hoc Governance Committee of the Board of Directors for the purpose of preparing recommendations on a potential ballot measure supporting transportation in Santa Clara County. The committee membership is to consist of one representative from each of the VTA City Groups: one from the Santa Clara County, one from the City of San Jose, one from the North West Group, one from the North East Group, one from the West Valley Group, and one from the South County Group. Alternate Board Member Carr; Board Members Campos, Chavez, Herrera, Khamis, Pirzynski, and Yeager; and Chairperson Kalra opposed.

Board Member Chavez expressed support for Chairperson Kalra’s recommendation and noted the following: 1) importance of allowing for public feedback; and 2) suggested that the Ad Hoc Governance Committee report to the Board as often as possible in a Workshop format.

Members of the Board and Staff engaged in a discussion on strategies for the first Ad Hoc Governance Committee meeting. Chairperson Kalra noted that he will convene a Special Board Meeting on August 15, 2014 to ensure that all Board Members have the opportunity to participate in the initial discussion regarding the potential ballot measure.

M/S/C (Chavez/Campos) to approve the creation of an Ad Hoc Governance Committee of the Board of Directors for the purpose of preparing recommendations on a potential ballot measure supporting transportation in Santa Clara County. The committee membership is to consist of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) Board Chair, Vice Chair and the Chairs of the Administration and Finance Committee (A&F), Congestion Management Program & Planning Committee (CMPP), and Transit Planning and Operations (TP&O) Committee.

Board Members Campos, Chavez, and Khamis left the meeting at 7:27 p.m.

NOTE: M/S/F MEANS MOTION SECONDED AND FAILED.
5.4.B. Levi’s Stadium Transit Program Committee Report

There was no Levi’s Stadium Transit Program Committee report.

6. CONSENT AGENDA

6.1. Board of Directors Regular Meeting Minutes of June 5, 2014

M/S/C (Pirzynski/Herrera) to approve the Board of Directors Regular Meeting Minutes of June 5, 2014.

6.2. Board of Directors Workshop Meeting Minutes of June 6, 2014

M/S/C (Pirzynski/Herrera) to approve the Board of Directors Workshop Meeting Minutes of June 6, 2014.

6.3. BPAC Appointments and Reappointments

M/S/C (Pirzynski/Herrera) to ratify the appointments to the Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee for the two-year term ending June 30, 2014 of: (1) Barry Chafin, representing the City of Montes Sereno; (2) Mary Seehafer, representing the City of Morgan Hill; (3) Simon Purdon, representing the City of Mountain View; (4) Breene Kerr, representing the Town of Los Altos Hills; (5) Herman Wadler, representing the City of Campbell; (6) Jim Bell, representing the City of San José; and (7) James Wiant, representing the City of Cupertino.

6.4. Citizens Advisory Committee Appointment: Senior Citizens

M/S/C (Pirzynski/Herrera) to ratify the appointment of Stephen Schmoll to the Citizens Advisory Committee position representing Senior Citizens.

6.5. Mountain View Double Track Light Rail Efficiency Project - Real Estate Right of Way Authority

M/S/C (Pirzynski/Herrera) to authorize the General Manager to (1) acquire on VTA’s behalf the requisite right-of-way for the Mountain View Double Track Light Rail Efficiency Project (“Project”) through the execution of applicable conveyance documents, and (2) where private property is acquired through the eminent domain process, approve and execute the following types of transactions and/or instruments with the following criteria:

1) Real property purchase agreements where the purchase price equals VTA’s statutory offer price of just compensation based upon an approved appraisal;
2) Any settlement where the negotiated purchase price is not more than $100,000 over VTA’s statutory offer price of just compensation; and
3) Possession and use agreements allowing immediate access for VTA to construct the Project prior to resolution of the purchase price.

Such authority to be conditioned on the Board’s approval of the Project.

M/S/C (Pirzynski/Herrera) to authorize the General Manager to execute a contract amendment with Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board in the amount of $810,000 for a new not-to-exceed total contract value of $1,059,400 to complete Design Review and provide Construction Support for the Mountain View Double Track Project.

6.7. **Santa Clara Alum Rock Bus Rapid Transit Project – Granite Pavers at the Downtown San Jose BRT Station**

M/S/C (Pirzynski/Herrera) to authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Granite Rock Company, the lowest responsive and responsible bidder, in the amount of $1,645,700 for the installation of Granite Pavers at the Downtown San Jose BRT Station.

6.8. **North Coach Division BRT Improvement Project (Rebid)**

M/S/C (Pirzynski/Herrera) to authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Blocka Construction, the lowest responsible bidder, in the amount of $968,200 for the construction of North Coach Division BRT Improvement Project (Rebid).

6.9. **Transit Center Park and Ride Upgrades Phase II**

M/S/C (Pirzynski/Herrera) to authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with QLM Inc., the lowest responsive and responsible bidder, in an amount of $356,181 for the construction of the Transit Center Park and Ride Upgrades - Phase II.

6.10. **Active Transportation Program Grant Application**

M/S/C (Pirzynski/Herrera) to adopt a resolution authorizing the General Manager to file and execute grant applications and agreements with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for $7,442,650 in funding from the Regional Competitive Active Transportation Program (ATP).

6.11. **2014 Priority Development Area Planning Grant Projects**

M/S/C (Pirzynski/Herrera) to approve the 2014 Priority Development Area (PDA) Planning Grant Program of Projects for funding and adopt a Resolution of Local Support.


6.13. **Legislative Update Matrix**

M/S/C (Pirzynski/Herrera) to review the Monthly Legislative Update Matrix.

7.2. **Light Rail Efficiency Project: Mountain View Double Track Phase II**

M/S/C (Pirzynski/Herrera) to adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program of the Light Rail Efficiency Project: Mountain View Double Track Phase II and approve the recommended project.

7.3. **LRT Efficiency Project – Mountain View Double Track Phase 1 and Signal Work**

M/S/C (Pirzynski/Herrera) to authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with the lowest responsible bidder for construction of the LRT Efficiency Project - Mountain View Double Track Phase 1 and Signal Work.

7.4. **Mountain View Double Track – URS Contract Amendment for Final Design and Design Services During Construction**

M/S/C (Pirzynski/Herrera) to authorize the General Manager to execute a contract amendment with URS in the amount of $2,500,000 for a new not-to-exceed total contract value of $9,799,375 to complete Final Design and provide Design Services during Construction for the Mountain View Double Track project.

7. **REGULAR AGENDA**

7.1. **Contract Award for C730 - Parking Structures at Milpitas and Berryessa Stations**

Ms. Gonot provided a brief background and overview report of the design-build contract.

RESULT: APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: Ken Yeager, Board Member
SECONDER: Rose Herrera, Board Member
AYES: Carr, Herrera, Kalra, Pirzynski, Price, Whittum, Yeager
NOES: None
ABSENT: Campos, Chavez, Esteves, Khamis, Rocha, Woodward

M/S/C (Yeager/Herrera) to authorize the General Manager to award and execute a design-build contract with McCarthy Building Companies, Inc., the lowest responsive and responsible bidder for the design and construction of the Silicon Valley BART Extension (SVBX) C730-Parking Structures at Milpitas and Berryessa Stations, in the amount of $86,851,623.
7.2. **(Removed from the Regular Agenda and placed on the Consent Agenda.)**

Adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program of the Light Rail Efficiency Project: Mountain View Double Track Phase II and approve the recommended project.

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

Authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with the lowest responsible bidder for construction of the LRT Efficiency Project - Mountain View Double Track Phase I and Signal Work.

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

Authorize the General Manager to execute a contract amendment with URS in the amount of $2,500,000 for a new not-to-exceed total contract value of $9,799,375 to complete Final Design and provide Design Services during Construction for the Mountain View Double Track project.

7.5. **Actuarial Valuation of VTA’s Other Post Employment Benefits (OPEB) – Conversion to CalPERS Medical for AFSCME and Non-Represented Employees effective January 1, 2015**

Bill Lopez, Director of Business Services, provided a brief report, noting: 1) American Federation of State County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), Local 101 and Non-Represented employees are now in the process of transitioning to CalPERS Medical; 2) actuarial calculations reveal a total savings of $1.35 Million annually; and 3) will continue to work with other VTA labor unions to transition the entire organization to CalPERS Medical as it provides better options for employees and retirees.

Board Member Whittum inquired on the status of other VTA labor union groups with regards to transitioning to CalPERS Medical.

Mr. Lopez responded that negotiations with Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU), Local 265 will begin in the Fall 2014.

**On order of Chairperson Kalra** and there being no objection, the Board reviewed the Actuarial Cost Analysis of VTA’s Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) - Conversion to CalPERS Medical for AFSCME and Non-Represented Employees effective January 1, 2015.

8. **OTHER ITEMS**

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

There were no Items of Concern and Referral to Administration.
8.2. Reports from VTA Committees, Joint Powers Boards (JPB), and Regional Commissions.

8.2.A. VTA Standing Committees

There were no Standing Committee meetings in June/July 2014.

8.2.B. VTA Advisory Committees

- Committee for Transit Accessibility (CTA) – There was no report.
- Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) and 2000 Measure A Citizens Watchdog Committee (CWC) – June 11, 2014 Minutes and July 9, 2014 Cancellation Notice were accepted as contained in the Agenda Packet.
- Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) – June 11, 2014 Cancellation Notice was accepted as contained in the Agenda Packet.
- Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) – June 12, 2014 Minutes and July 10, 2014 Cancellation Notice were accepted as contained in the Agenda Packet.
- Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) – June 12, 2014 Minutes and July 10, 2014 Cancellation Notice were accepted as contained in the Agenda Packet.

8.2.C. VTA Policy Advisory Boards (PAB)

- Downtown East Valley PAB – June 5, 2014 Cancellation Notice was accepted as contained in the Agenda Packet.
- Diridon Station Joint Policy Advisory Board – June 20, 2014 Cancellation Notice was accepted as contained in the Agenda Packet.
- El Camino Real Rapid Transit PAB – There was no report.

8.2.D. Joint Powers Boards and Regional Commissions

- Peninsula Corridor JPB – August 7, 2014, Summary Notes were accepted as contained on the dais.
- Capitol Corridor JPB – There was no report.
- Dumbarton Rail Corridor Policy Committee – There was no report.
- Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) – July 23, 2014 Summary Notes were accepted as contained on the dais.
- Sunol Smart Carpool Lane Joint Powers Authority – There was no report.
- SR 152 Mobility Partnership – There was no report.

8.3. ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no Announcements.
9. CLOSED SESSION

9.1. Recessed to Closed Session at 7:33 p.m.

A. Conference with Legal Counsel – Existing Litigation
   [Government Code Section 54956.9(a)]

   Name of Case: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority v. Martina, et al. (CBS Outdoor, Inc.)

   Santa Clara County Superior Court Case #: 1-12-CV-234287

B. Conference with Legal Counsel – Existing Litigation
   [Government Code Section 54956.9(a)]

   Name of Case: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority v. MVI., et al.

   Santa Clara County Superior Court Case #: 1-12-CV-238005

C. Conference with Labor Negotiators
   [Government Code Section 54957.6]

   VTA Designated Representatives
   Bill Lopez, Chief Administrative Officer
   Robert L. Escobar, Deputy Director, Labor Relations
   Ali Hudda, Acting Chief Financial Officer

   Employee Organizations

   Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 265

9.2. Reconvened to Open Session at 8:03 p.m.

9.3. Closed Session Report

A. Conference with Legal Counsel – Existing Litigation
   [Government Code Section 54956.9(a)]

   Name of Case: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority v. Martina, et al. (CBS Outdoor, Inc.)

   Santa Clara County Superior Court Case #: 1-12-CV-234287

   Rob Fabela, General Counsel, reported that no reportable action was taken during Closed Session.
B. Conference with Legal Counsel – Existing Litigation
   [Government Code Section 54956.9(a)]

   Name of Case: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority v. MVI., et al.
   Santa Clara County Superior Court Case #: 1-12-CV-238005

   Mr. Fabela reported that no reportable action was taken during Closed Session.

C. Conference with Labor Negotiators
   [Government Code Section 54957.6]

   VTA Designated Representatives
   Bill Lopez, Chief Administrative Officer
   Robert L. Escobar, Deputy Director, Labor Relations
   Ali Hudda, Acting Chief Financial Officer

   Employee Organizations
   Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 265

   Mr. Fabela reported that no reportable action was taken during Closed Session.

10. ADJOURNMENT

   On order of Chairperson Kalra and there being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 8:04 p.m. in memory of Ira Ruskin, former California Assemblyman and Redwood City Mayor.

   Respectfully submitted,

Michelle Oblena, Board Assistant
VTA Office of the Board Secretary
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Nuria I. Fernandez

FROM: Board Secretary, Elaine F. Baltao

SUBJECT: BPAC Reappointments

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Ratify the appointments to the Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee for the two-year term ending June 30, 2016 of: (1) David Simons, representing the City of Sunnyvale; (2) Dale Schouten, representing the City of Santa Clara; (3) Wes Brinsfield, representing the City of Los Altos; (4) Melanie Hanssen, representing the Town of Los Gatos; and (5) Corinne Winter, ex-officio member, and Colin Heyne, ex-officio alternate member, representing the Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition.

BACKGROUND:

The Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) advises the VTA Board of Directors on planning and funding for bicycle and pedestrian projects and issues. The BPAC consists of 16 voting members, one appointed by each of VTA’s Member Agencies (the 15 cities in the county and the County of Santa Clara), and one non-voting member and alternate appointed by the Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition (SVBC). The BPAC also serves as the countywide bicycle and pedestrian advisory committee for the County of Santa Clara.

The BPAC bylaws specify that the appointment term is two years and that members may be appointed to successive terms. Committee members must live, work or both in Santa Clara County during their term. Voting members of the Committee must also be a representative of the Member Agency’s local bicycle advisory committee or, for Member Agencies without a local bicycle advisory committee, their representative must be an individual who lives or works in the local jurisdiction and is interested in bicycle or pedestrian issues. BPAC members are precluded from representing a Member Agency that is their employer.
The process to fill BPAC vacancies is that staff notifies the appointing authority of the vacancy or approaching term expiration and provides the current membership requirements. The appointing authority then appoints one member for the designated membership position. For vacancies occurring mid-term, the bylaws specify that they be filled for the remainder of the term by the appointing authority. In both cases, the VTA Board must ratify the appointment.

DISCUSSION:

In early 2014, VTA staff notified appointing authorities on the upcoming June 30th BPAC term expiration, advised them on their current representative’s standing, provided information on the appointment process and requested that they appoint their BPAC representative for the new term.

In response, the indicated appointing authority appointed the following individual to serve as its BPAC representative for the new term that commenced July 1, 2014. All are current members of the BPAC. The specific appointments are:

Reappointment

- The City of Sunnyvale reappointed David Simons, who was first appointed to the BPAC in 1998.
- The City of Santa Clara reappointed Dale Schouten, who was first appointed in 2012.
- The City of Los Altos reappointed Wes Brinsfield, who was first appointed to the BPAC in 2011. Mr. Brinsfield is serving as the chairperson of the BPAC for 2014.
- The Town of Los Gatos reappointed Melanie Hanssen, who was first appointed in 2010.
- For its ex-officio position, the Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition reappointed Corinne Winter as the member and Colin Heyne as the alternate. They were first appointed in 2007 and 2012, respectively.

The aforementioned individuals are members in good standing and have served the committee well. Staff recommends that the Board ratify the reappointment of these individuals due to their qualifications, experience, community involvement, knowledge of bicycle, pedestrian, trails and safety issues, and proven service to the committee and the Board.

ALTERNATIVES:

The Board could choose to not ratify any or all of these appointments.

FISCAL IMPACT:

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

Prepared by: Stephen Flynn, Advisory Committee Coordinator
Memo No. 4682
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Nuria I. Fernandez

FROM: Acting Chief Financial Officer, Ali Hudda

SUBJECT: Annual Reserve Funds Transfers

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve the allocation of $2.803 million to the VTA Transit Fund Operating Reserve in order to maintain a reserve equal to 15% of the annual operating budget.

BACKGROUND:

On April 5, 2012, the Board of Directors approved policies that guide the administration and maintenance of the VTA Transit Fund Operating Reserve and VTA Transit Sales Tax Stabilization Fund. The adopted policies require that the Board of Directors approve any projected fiscal year-end allocation to, or withdrawal from, the VTA Transit Fund Operating Reserve or VTA Transit Sales Tax Stabilization Fund, subject to actual receipts and expenditures, no later than the September Board meeting.

DISCUSSION:

VTA Transit Fund Operating Reserve

The VTA Transit Fund Operating Reserve Policy calls for maintaining a reserve equal to 15% of the annual operating budget for the VTA Transit Fund. The Operating Reserve balance as of June 30, 2013 was $57.024 million (15% of the Adopted FY 2014 VTA Transit Fund Operating Budget). The Adopted FY 2015 VTA Transit Fund Operating Budget is $398.846 million. To maintain the 15% level, staff recommends an allocation of $2.803 million to the Operating Reserve bringing the balance to $59.827 million.
VTA Transit Sales Tax Stabilization Fund

No annual allocation is required.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The Board could choose to amend the allocation amount to either the VTA Transit Fund Operating Reserve or the VTA Transit Sales Tax Stabilization Fund.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

This action will increase the VTA Transit Fund Operating Reserve by $2.803 million to a total of $59.827 million.

Prepared by: Carol Lawson, Fiscal Resources Manager
Memo No. 4657
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Nuria I. Fernandez

FROM: Acting Chief Financial Officer, Ali Hudda

SUBJECT: Facility Use Agreement Between the County of Santa Clara and VTA

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the General Manager to execute a Facility Use Agreement between the County of Santa Clara and VTA for continued use of critical communications equipment at 2700 Carol Drive in San Jose for 10 years with two, five-year renewal options.

BACKGROUND:

Since 2001, VTA has installed, operated and maintained a primary antennae transmitter and T-Band UHF Radio System within the County-owned 150 foot tower and communication facility located atop Communication Hill in South San Jose (See Exhibit A). VTA also installed equipment racks within an existing pre-cast concrete shelter and ran fiber optic transmission conduits between the shelter, communication room and tower. This equipment is a major component of VTA’s radio communication system known as the Advanced Communications System (ACS), which was implemented from 2000-2001 to replace all elements of VTA’s transit communication system.

The ACS project completely overhauled radio and fleet management services for bus and light rail service through the installation of a computer-aided dispatching system, addition of mobile terminals in Field Supervision and Transit Patrol vehicles, and implementation of a simulcast radio repeater system at three separate locations within Santa Clara County.

The Communication Hill site is one of the three radio repeater locations that provide coverage as part of the ACS. In addition to this site, VTA’s ACS program includes radio repeater stations at El Toro Mountain with the City of Morgan Hill and equipment atop a shared telecommunications monopole located within the VTA-owned North Division.
DISCUSSION:

The long standing facility use partnership between VTA and the County provides mutual benefits to both organizations and serves the public interest. The tower and equipment space that the County offers at no monthly rental cost is situated on an elevated location affording widespread radio frequency coverage for buses, light rail and other VTA vehicles. As consideration to the County for the use of this space, VTA shares a portion of its fiber optic cabling and termination equipment with County for its own use.

The existing agreement expired in 2013. The County of Santa Clara and VTA would like to enter into a new, long term agreement under similar terms as the existing agreement. This Facility Use Agreement carries an initial ten (10) year term and includes two, five-year, renewal options.

ALTERNATIVES:

The Board could choose not to approve the Facility Use Agreement. VTA would then need to seek alternative tower and equipment locations for its radio repeater system that would require expenditures due to relocation, reinstallation and monthly rental costs.

FISCAL IMPACT:

VTA pays for repair, preventative maintenance and utility expenses associated with the continued operation of equipment at the site. No rent consideration is paid to County.

Prepared by: Kevin Balak
Memo No. 4677
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Nuria I. Fernandez

FROM: Exec. Policy Advisor & Director of Public Affairs, Jim Lawson

SUBJECT: Bill Positions

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt a support position for AB 1193 (Ting), which provides cities and counties with more flexibility when it comes to design standards used to plan and construct bikeway facilities on local streets and roads. In addition, adopt a support position for SB 1368 (Wolk), which adds joint powers authorities and transit districts to the list of public agencies to which the California Transportation Commission (CTC) may relinquish park-and-ride lots owned and operated by Caltrans.

BACKGROUND:

Staff is recommending that the Board of Directors adopt support positions for the following two pieces of legislation: (1) AB 1193; and (2) SB 1368.

DISCUSSION:

**AB 1193:** Current state law defines “bikeways” to mean all facilities that provide primarily for bicycle travel, and categorizes these facilities into three different types: (1) bike paths; (2) bike lanes; and (c) bike routes. For each type of bikeway, Caltrans is required to establish minimum safety design criteria and standards, which apply not only to bikeways on the state highway system, but also to those on local streets and roads under the jurisdiction of cities and counties that are not part of the state highway system. Cities and counties are required to use these criteria and standards when planning and constructing bikeways on their local roadway systems, unless they obtain a design exception from Caltrans. This process is cumbersome, time-consuming and expensive. If a design exception is approved, the bikeway facility is considered
to be temporary, with removal sometimes required by Caltrans after an experimentation period.

The National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) has developed an Urban Bikeway Design Guide that some cities and counties in California are already using for planning and constructing bicycle facilities. However, since cities and counties must comply with minimum safety design criteria and standards developed by Caltrans, they cannot rely upon this guide alone.

AB 1193, which is being sponsored by the California Bicycle Coalition, was introduced to encourage the implementation of innovative bicycle facilities that have been shown to dramatically increase bicycling and improve safety in other metropolitan area around the country. First, the bill establishes “cycle tracks” as a fourth type of “bikeways” under state law. Cycle tracks are bikeways that are separated from the roadway by a physical barrier, such as a grade separation, flexible posts, inflexible physical barriers, or on-street parking. While already well-established in numerous bicycle-friendly European cities, cycle tracks are becoming more prevalent in major metropolitan areas in the United States and in California. The city of San Jose, for instance, recently installed a “parking protected” cycle track pilot project along the San Jose State University frontage on Fourth Street, between San Fernando and San Carlos Streets.

Second, similar to the other types of bikeways defined in state law, AB 1193 requires Caltrans to establish minimum safety design criteria and standards for the planning and construction of cycle tracks. However, the legislation eliminates the Caltrans design exception process. Instead, AB 1193 allows cities and counties to either use the minimum safety design criteria and standards developed by the department for cycle tracks and the other three types of bikeways defined in state law, or adopt their own criteria by resolution at a public meeting as a standing policy.

The intent of AB 1193 is to modernize bikeway design practices, and encourage the development of innovative bicycle facilities in California. It provides more flexibility to cities and counties by allowing them to adopt their own minimum safety design criteria and standards for bikeway facilities on their local roadway systems, rather than being forced to use the criteria established by Caltrans. In essence, AB 1193 gives cities and counties the same authority when it comes to the planning and construction of bikeways on their own streets and roads that they currently have with regard to the roadways themselves.

It is worth noting that a recent assessment of Caltrans conducted by the University of Wisconsin’s State Smart Transportation Initiative (SSTI) and commissioned by the California State Transportation Agency recommends that the department: (1) relinquish oversight of bicycle facilities on locally owned streets and roads; and (2) give cities and counties the option of using the NACTO urban design standards in metropolitan areas. While AB 1193 does not achieve all of these goals, it is an important first step. The bill is being supported by the Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition, the Silicon Valley Leadership Group and the city of San Jose. Staff recommends that the Board of Directors also support this legislation.

SB 1368: Existing state law authorizes the CTC to relinquish park-and-ride lots owned and operated by Caltrans to a county transportation commission or a regional transportation planning agency. Once this occurs, the county transportation commission or regional transportation planning agency is required to maintain, at a minimum, the number of parking spaces provided
in the lot at the time of the relinquishment. SB 1368, which is being sponsored by the Solano County Transit Joint Powers Authority (SolTrans) and supported by the California Transit Association, also allows the CTC to relinquish such a park-and-ride lot to a transit district or to a joint powers authority formed for purposes of providing transportation services.

The relinquishment process for state highway and park-and-ride lot facilities is well-established, and involves negotiation between the local jurisdiction and Caltrans with regard to the condition of facility upon relinquishment. In certain cases, Caltrans may agree to bring the facility into “a state of good repair” prior to relinquishment or provide funding necessary to do so. In other cases, local jurisdictions may simply acquire the facility in an “as is” condition. After the terms of the relinquishment have been established, the CTC must vote to approve it. Once CTC approval is obtained, the relinquished facility becomes the property of the local jurisdiction.

The relinquishment of these facilities can be seen as a “win-win” for both local jurisdictions and the state. Local jurisdictions that gain control of certain state highway and park-and-ride lot facilities are able to make improvements based on local needs. For Caltrans, cost savings can be realized by turning over future maintenance requirements to local jurisdictions.

In Santa Clara County, there is one park-and-ride lot that falls under the jurisdiction of Caltrans. This lot is located at I-280 and Page Mill Road in the city of Palo Alto. If SB 1368 were to be enacted into law, this park-and-ride lot could be transferred to VTA if the Board of Directors ever decided to pursue such a relinquishment. Therefore, staff recommends that the Board support this measure.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The Board of Directors could decide to adopt a position for AB 1193 or SB 1368 that is different from the one being recommend; or could opt to take no position on any of these bills at this time.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

There is no fiscal impact associated with this recommendation.

Prepared by: Kurt Evans
Memo No. 4620
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
 Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Nuria I. Fernandez

FROM: Director of Engineering & Construction, Mark S. Robinson

SUBJECT: Santa Clara/Alum Rock Bus Rapid Transit Project – Amendment Between the City of San Jose and the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority for Engineering Support of Traffic Signals and Street Lights

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the General Manager to execute an Amendment to perform additional Engineering Support for traffic signal and street light design for $1,000,000 with the City of San Jose for the Santa Clara/Alum Rock Bus Rapid Transit Project for a new contract amount of $1,580,000.

BACKGROUND:

The Santa Clara/Alum Rock Bus Rapid Transit (SC/AR BRT) Project is included in the VTA 2000 Measure A Transit Improvement Program. The SC/AR BRT Project is located in the City of San Jose and extends approximately 7.2 miles from the western terminus at the San Jose Arena (SAP Center) on Santa Clara Street to the Alum Rock Transit Center on Capitol Avenue and terminating at the Eastridge Transit Center.

The improvements for this project include the construction of traffic signals and street lights along Santa Clara Street and Alum Rock Avenue. In order to be most efficient and ensure that the engineering for these critical items were designed according to the latest City Standard and in compliance with the most recent City lighting criteria, it was decided that City design staff should provide the preparation of the construction plans and specifications for the street lights and traffic signals for the project. Therefore, in August 2012, VTA and the City entered into a Cooperative Agreement in an amount of $580,000 to perform the engineering of 11 traffic signals and all of the street lights on Alum Rock Avenue.
**DISCUSSION:**

Since August 2012 with the completion of the final engineering of the civil construction contract, it has been identified that traffic signal modifications were needed at an additional 14 locations. While the current construction document includes basic information in order to provide bidding amount, the details of these intersections are being performed during preparation for construction. To complete the details for all of the traffic signal and street light engineering will require an amendment in the amount of $1,000,000 for a total contract amount of $1,580,000.

Also included in the amendment is a refined level of effort to perform design support during construction for all of the traffic signal and street light for submittal review and approval, design changes during construction and solution of field issues throughout the contraction activities. The term of the Agreement also needs to be extended from December 31, 2013 to December 31, 2015.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The Board could choose to not approve this amendment. This alternative would require consultant support to provide the related traffic signal and street light engineering with an increased cost and schedule delay.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

This action will authorize $1,000,000 for finalizing the design and providing design support during construction for the Santa Clara/Alum Rock BRT Project. Appropriation for this expenditure is included in the FY15 Adopted 2000 Measure A Transit Improvement Program Fund Capital Budget. This contract is funded with State Proposition 1B and 2000 Measure A funds.

Prepared by: Ken Ronsse, Deputy Director
Memo No. 4690
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

FROM: Auditor General, Patrick J. Hagan

SUBJECT: VTA’s Extension of BART to Silicon Valley Project Construction Schedule Assessment

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Review and receive the Auditor General's report on the VTA Extension of BART to Silicon Valley Project Construction Schedule Assessment.

BACKGROUND:

VTA’s Extension of BART to Silicon Valley Project is the 16-mile extension of the existing Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) system to the Santa Clara County cities of San Jose, Milpitas and Santa Clara. This 2000 Measure A Transit Sales Tax project is being delivered through a phased approach. The first phase, the Berryessa Extension Project (SVBX), is the initial 10-mile segment from Fremont south through Milpitas to the Berryessa area of north San Jose. The SVBX project is currently under construction.

Because completing the SVBX project on schedule is critical to public perception as well as public support that will be needed for the second phase from Berryessa through downtown San José to Santa Clara, the VTA Board of Directors authorized the Auditor General’s Office to assess the construction schedule of the SVBX project and the related controls and therefore this project was included in the FY 2014 Internal Audit Work Plan approved by the Board.

DISCUSSION:

In January 2014, the Auditor General’s Office initiated the VTA Extension of BART to Silicon Valley Project Construction Schedule Assessment.
The primary risk to VTA for the SVBX project schedule is, due to the project’s complexity magnitude and large number of interrelated and concurrent processes, can be characterized as a “domino effect.” Should the project schedule not be adequately monitored, one interrelated component piece that is delayed would likely have a very large ripple effect, affecting both other component pieces as well as the overall project schedule.

The purpose of our review was to provide independent expert assurance that there are appropriate controls in place within the BART SV management team to adequately manage the SVBX schedule, identify and communicate challenges, and remediate risks to the schedule as they arise.

Based on the scope of our assessment and the work performed, we rated the overall risk exposure as Medium based on four observations, three of which were assessed as Medium and one as Low; no High Risk issues were identified. These four matters, described in detail in the attached report, present distinct risks to the project regarding timely communication of both the project schedule and ready-for-construction drawings to VTA project management as well as timely resolution of change order issues. The Auditor General Office’s recommended corrective actions are detailed in that same section.

VTA management agrees with all Auditor General Office’s recommendations and has committed to assess, implement and report results by October 30, 2014.

Overall, VTA appears to be effectively monitoring and managing the construction schedule and related contingency. The project team has been able to maintain the dates for the Forecasted Revenue Operations and the Baseline Revenue Operations, which are August 2017 and June 2018, respectively. The project management team has also managed the schedule to determine that appropriate construction methods have been used to assist in meeting the construction schedule.

Recommendations for improvement or efficiency opportunities contained in this report are presented for the consideration of VTA management, which is responsible for the effective implementation of any action plans.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

There is no financial impact associated with acceptance of this report.

Prepared by: Pat Hagan, Auditor General & Stephen Flynn, Advisory Committee Coordinator
Memo No. 4586
Attached is our report for the VTA Extension of BART to Silicon Valley Project Schedule Assessment.

Our engagement was performed in accordance with the terms of the agreement between Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (“VTA”) and McGladrey LLP (“McGladrey”) for Auditor General Services, Contract No. S13044 dated February 1, 2013, and in accordance with the Standards for Consulting Services issued by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants.

This report is intended solely for the use of VTA’s Board of Directors, Audit Committee and management and is not intended to be used by anyone other than these specified parties. Recommendations for improvement are presented for management’s consideration, and management is responsible for the effective implementation of corrective action plans.

Questions or concerns should be addressed to Patrick Hagan in the VTA Auditor General’s Office at: Auditor.General@VTA.org.
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I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

VTA’s Extension of BART to Silicon Valley Project (BART SV), also known as the Silicon Valley Rapid Transit (SVRT) Project, is the 16-mile extension of the existing Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) system to the Santa Clara County cities of San Jose, Milpitas and Santa Clara. The BART SV project is managed by VTA in cooperation with BART.

The BART SV Project is being delivered through a phased approach. The first phase, the Berryessa Extension Project (SVBX), is the initial 10-mile, two-station extension that begins in Fremont south of the future BART Warm Springs Station and proceeds in the former Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) right-of-way through Milpitas to the Berryessa area of north San Jose.

Because completing the SVBX project on schedule is critical to public perception as well as public support that will be needed for the second phase of the extension from Berryessa through downtown San Jose to Santa Clara, the VTA Board of Directors authorized the Auditor General’s Office to assess the construction schedule of the SVBX project and the related controls.

The primary risk to VTA related to the SVBX project schedule can be best described as a “domino effect.” Should the project schedule not be adequately monitored, the related contingency may be inadvertently consumed at an unreasonable pace. If completion dates are jeopardized, then scrutiny from the media and the general public may increase to the extent that VTA could be exposed to the risk that funding for the second phase of the BART SV Extension Project may be delayed or not supported. The intent of our review was to provide comfort that there are appropriate controls in place within the BART SV management team to adequately manage the schedule, identify and communicate challenges, and remediate risks to the schedule as they arise.

Accordingly, the Auditor General’s Office analyzed the numerous Integrated Master Schedules (IMS) that have been prepared by the project team. We also reviewed a single, very broad change order processed against the project (“Change Order 38”) which included requirements amending the substantial completion date set for the design builders, Skanska-Shimmick-Herzog (SSH).

The purpose of the assessment was to:

- Determine if there is an adequate system in place to monitor the schedule and the schedule contingency;
- Determine if changes to the schedules have been properly communicated to management;
- Evaluate the status of the current baseline schedule submitted under Change Order #38; and
- Determine if the parties are complying with the various contract terms.

Based on the scope of our assessment and the work performed, we have rated the overall risk exposure as Medium based on four observations, three of which were assessed as Medium and one as Low; no High Risk issues were identified. These four matters, which are detailed later in this report, present distinct risks to the project regarding timely communication of both the
project schedule and ready-for-construction drawings by SSH to VTA project managers, and timely resolution of change order issues. The Auditor General Office’s recommended corrective actions are detailed in that same section.

Overall, VTA appears to be effectively monitoring and managing the construction schedule and related contingency. The project team has been able to maintain the dates for the Forecasted Revenue Operations and the Baseline Revenue Operations, which are August 2017 and June 2018, respectively. The project management team has also managed the schedule to determine that appropriate construction methods have been used to assist in meeting the construction schedule.

VTA management agrees with all Auditor General’s Office recommendations and has committed to assess, implement and report results by October 30, 2014.

The exceptions and opportunities for management’s consideration, along with management’s responses and action plans, are provided in Section IV of the attached report. We would like to acknowledge VTA staff for their cooperation and professionalism throughout the process.
II. BACKGROUND, OBJECTIVE, SCOPE & APPROACH

A. Background

VTA’s Extension of BART to Silicon Valley (BART SV) Project, previously known as the Silicon Valley Rapid Transit (SVRT) Project, is the 16-mile extension of the existing Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) system to the Santa Clara County cities of San Jose, Milpitas and Santa Clara. The SVRT project, a key component of the 2000 Measure A Sales Tax passed by county voters in November 2000, is managed by VTA in cooperation with BART.

The BART SV project is being delivered through a phased approach. The first phase, the Berryessa Extension Project (SVBX), is the initial 10-mile, two-station extension that begins in Fremont south of the future BART Warm Springs Station and proceeds in the former Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) right-of-way through Milpitas to the Berryessa area of north San Jose.

In January 2012, VTA entered into its first design-build agreement, which was with Skanska Shimmick Herzog Joint Venture (SSH) for the C700 -- Line, Track, Stations and Systems (LTSS) contract for the BART SV Berryessa Extension (SVBX) project.

On October 28, 2011, a Project Integrated Master Schedule (IMS) was issued for the SVBX project and found to be complete and reliable and an accurate reflection of the project scope and method of project delivery. The schedule was found to be sufficient for the Full Funding Grant Agreement and reported a Revenue Service Date of June 29, 2018. The schedule included 3,990 activities.

In February 2013, VTA prepared the first update of the SVBX IMS that incorporated an approved Baseline from the C700 -- Line, Track, Stations and Systems (LTSS) contract with SSH. The February 2013 update of the IMS was the first update to incorporate an approved baseline from SSH. The IMS reported Baseline Revenue Operations date of June 2018 and SVBX reported a Forecast Revenue Operations date of August 2017. Until that point, the LTSS construction schedule did not have the necessary information to provide an accurate assessment of the various relationships nor had it demonstrated an acceptable plan to complete the work.

In August 2013, an IMS update incorporated the current schedule and included a VTA forecast time contingency. On December 16, 2013, Change Order #38 was executed which modified the substantial completion date for SSH to August 31, 2016. However, the original FTA schedule, the August 2013 IMS and the schedule submitted pursuant to change order #38 is still reporting a Forecasted Revenue Operations and a FTA Baseline Revenue Operations dates of August 2017 and June 2018, respectively.

The project management team has five dedicated individuals assigned to the construction process. The individuals are necessary to manage the schedule, construction methods and potential changes submitted by the design-build team. Normally projects of this nature would not require this level of staffing but in this case it is necessary to manage this project due to its size, complexity, concurrent elements and aggressive completion schedule. This level of thorough coordination is necessary to ensure the schedule is appropriately updated. There have
been instances where the updates may not be acceptable which requires additional resources to monitor the processes.

**B. Objective**

The purpose of the VTA BART to Silicon Valley Extension Project Schedule Assessment was to confirm that the SVRT management team has an adequate system in place to monitor the SSH baseline schedule, the IMS, and the related project contingency. In addition, the purpose was also to determine if the design-build contractor, SSH, has complied overall with applicable contract terms as well as the current specific requirements of Change Order #38.

**C. Scope**

The scope of the Auditor General Office’s assessment was to review the IMS submitted through our field work which concluded March 28, 2014. We reviewed the following schedules:

- Baseline IMS May 2011
- Updated IMS April 2013
- Updated IMS August 2013
- Update Schedule February 2014

The Auditor General Office’s scope also included a review of the requirements set forth in change order number 38 executed with an effective date of December 9, 2013.

**D. Approach**

To assess the status of the project schedule and the controls in place to adequately monitor and manage it effectively, we conducted the following:

1. Reviewed the policies and procedures related to the process;
2. Conducted interviews related to the scheduling process;
3. Reviewed contract requirements related to the scheduling process;
4. Reviewed documentation submitted and approved related to the schedule for the Full Funding Agreement;
5. Reviewed the requirements for Change Order #38 executed on December 9, 2013;
6. Reviewed job site activity in comparison to the construction schedule;
7. Assessed changes in the IMS and the activities on the critical path;
8. Reviewed and analyzed float contingencies;
9. Reviewed the status of ready for construction design activities;
10. Analyzed the slippage in activities; and
11. Reviewed the process for communicating in a timely manner the construction schedule and any changes thereof to the VTA unit responsible for the public relations function.
III. RATINGS SCALE:

Risk ratings are assigned to each observation to provide VTA Management with a better understanding of the risk and potential impact of each observation. In addition, an overall risk rating is provided to help Management understand the overall risk to VTA and the impacts of the individual observations combined.

The risk rating definitions are:

- **High** – Significant control weakness presents a high likelihood of the event occurring, potentially exposing VTA to significant financial loss, business or service interruption, and/or an impact to the VTA brand or public perception. This control weakness should be addressed immediately.

- **Medium** – Significant control weakness presents a possibility the event will occur potentially exposing VTA to moderate levels of financial loss, short-term disruption to operations, short-term impact to VTA brand or public perception and/or not making optimal use of human or system resources. This control weakness should be addressed in the near term.

- **Low** – Control weakness, if corrected or mitigated, will further strengthen the system of internal control. Likelihood of occurrence and impact if the event did occur are rated as low.

- **Other Opportunities (No Rating)** – Opportunity to improve efficiency or profitability of operations, but does not indicate an internal control weakness.

Both the overall and individual process improvement ratings resulting from the work performed are provided in Section IV that follows. They are provided as an estimate to help Management understand the risk and opportunity of the observations, both individually as well as collectively, as well as the benefit of the recommendations.
IV. RESULTS:

OVERALL RISK

An overall risk rating has been provided to help Management understand the risks and opportunities as well as the impact to VTA of all the individual observations combined.

*Overall risk rating: Medium*

The Medium rating is based upon our having identified four findings, three of which were assessed as Medium and one as Low; no High Risk issues were identified. These four matters present distinct risks to the project regarding timely communication of both the project schedule and ready-for-construction drawings by SSH to VTA project managers and timely resolution of change order issues.

The individual process improvement opportunities for management’s consideration, along with management’s responses and action plans, are provided in the following.

INDIVIDUAL RISK AREA(S)

1. **Public Relations**  [Medium Risk]

VTA has a requirement to notify directly impacted parties of upcoming construction projects within 30 days of major construction activities. Additionally, VTA must be notified of future construction to monitor the noise and vibration related to construction activities.

Initially, SSH did not consistently provide construction schedules to VTA’s Public Relations unit, as required. VTA has since initiated weekly meetings to address the three week look-ahead construction schedule and its impact to the public. On a monthly basis, an interim schedule is provided to reflect a 120-day look-ahead. SSH has assigned one individual to communicate the construction schedule to the appropriate parties, and accordingly has begun providing schedules that have improved the process. Through the weekly meetings, SSH has made an effort to communicate their construction schedule.

However, there have been instances where construction has proceeded without proper notification to VTA Public Relations. For example, there was one instance where work was being performed on a project site at 2:00 am without VTA having been notified in advance. Accordingly, VTA was unable to provide the appropriate notifications and mitigate concerns around noise and vibration; and since no notification could be provided to the public, there was immediate exposure to potential public safety issues. VTA has not been able to rely on the interim schedule.
Risk
Failure to properly notify the public may result in adverse public perception of the project, which could jeopardize public support both for the SVBX component and, more importantly, for the second phase from Berryessa through downtown San José to Santa Clara. Failure to notify the public increases the risk of accidents involving the public that are related to the construction. This will become notably more significant as construction is projected to increase substantially within the next year and will require additional time to monitor and report the construction schedules timely to VTA.

Recommendation
We recommend that VTA continue to conduct the weekly meetings with SSH and emphasize the importance of communicating the current, accurate and complete schedules. We also recommend that VTA request SSH to review the staffing level for this requirement to ensure staffing is adequate to meet the upcoming construction, and provide a report back to VTA on their go-forward plans to ensure adequate staffing, including measures such as provisions for back-up personnel and cross-training provisions.

Management’s Response
We agree with the recommendation as stated and will continue to use the contractual tools at our disposal including formal notifications to SSH for corrective actions needed, non-compliance reports and/or withholding portions of payments until SSH is fully compliant. VTA is reorganizing its team that will closely coordinate with SSH’s field staff to assure seamless communication.

By April 30, 2014, VTA will reiterate contractual obligations regarding community outreach requirements to SSH, indicate that given their current performance SSH resources applied to this requirement appear to be insufficient, and strongly encourage them to consider making changes to the SSH organization to realize needed performance improvement in this area.

2. Change Order 38  [Medium Risk]
Change Order #38 was executed on December 13, 2013. The change order stated that the Contractor shall submit a revised baseline schedule that is compliant with the dates contained in the change order. The revised baseline schedule was to be submitted by January 8, 2014. On February 14, 2014, SSH resubmitted the “Baseline Schedule Contract Report”; however, the schedule has not been approved. On March 11, 2014 VTA’s Project Manager returned the schedule to SSH with the status of “make corrections noted.” The acceptance of the submittal was conditional until the following items are resolved to VTA’s satisfaction:

- Schedule is resource and cost loaded per comments.
- Schedule activities are developed to a level detail where activity durations do not exceed 21 days as indicated. The lack of detail is impacting the ability to clearly establish the critical path(s) and to demonstrate complete and accurate planning and sequencing of the Contract to permit monitoring and evaluation of progress and time impacts.
- The disposition of all comments has been resolved in a manner acceptable to VTA.
These three items contained a total of 61 issues identified by the Project Manager that will need to be resolved for the schedule to be approved.

**Risk**

The project management team may not be able to effectively evaluate the project schedule and monitor the construction progress, including impact upon the critical path, which could lead to missed milestones and adverse financial, operational and public perception impacts.

**Recommendation**

We recommend that VTA work closely with SSH to ensure that they submit timely and accurate information as requested by Change Order #38 and the subsequent Project Manager’s response dated March 11, 2014. Additionally, should future change orders arise whereby schedule updates are required, VTA should work with SSH to help ensure that the process is completed timely.

**Management Response**

SSH submitted a revised Baseline Contract Schedule on January 16, 2013 that was accepted with status Make Corrections Noted (MCN) on February 10, 2014. SSH made a subsequent submittal on February 14th as stated. It was also accepted MCN on March 11, 2014.

We agree with the recommendation that VTA work closely with SSH to ensure they submit timely and accurate information as requested by CO #38 and for any future schedule revisions. This can be augmented by the Project Manager’s potential usage of Contract provisions relative to withholding of payment as described in Contract section 7.3.2, Special Withholding.

By April 30, 2014, VTA will reiterate contractual obligations regarding schedule submittal requirements to SSH, indicate that based on past performance SSH resources applied to this requirement appear to be insufficient, and make specific recommendations about changes to the SSH organization to improve performance in this area.

### 3. **Ready for Construction** [Medium Risk]

There are three phases of design on the project: (1) definitive design; (2) ready for construction (RFC) design; and (3) final design. There have been 47 submissions for RFC design. The total sheets submitted have been 4,925; with 2,872 having been thus far approved. Based on the documents provided, it has taken approximately 40 days to review the drawings. However, the records indicate that it is taking approximately 99 days to resolve the comments. The records also indicate that the delays may be due to questions regarding the accuracy of the drawings.

**Risk**

Delays in reviewing and approving RFC drawings could impact the start of construction, achievement of subsequent milestones, and the ultimate completion date for the project, causing potentially adverse financial impact and heightened exposure to reputational risk. This also increases the risk associated with potential claims and additional cost to meet the completion dates.
**Recommendation**

The Project Management team should continue to dedicate resources to review the RFC design. SSH should be advised to dedicate the necessary resources to provide current, accurate, and complete RFC drawings. VTA should also work closely between the Project Management team and SSH to help ensure that the review and subsequent questions are facilitated timely.

**Management Response**

Management concurs. It should be pointed out that the team has been working closely with SSH and has developed a modification to the existing incentive program that is designed to encourage SSH to focus on quality and timeliness of their design submittals. While the contract stipulates review of no more than three design packages in a 21-day period, VTA has dedicated resources to simultaneously review significantly more packages to expedite the process. VTA has fully documented the timeliness and content in all communications relating to design review and resolution of comments to establish a record of VTA and SSH performance on this process.

By April 30, 2014, VTA will reiterate contractual obligations regarding design requirements to SSH, indicate that based on past performance SSH resources applied to this requirement appear to be insufficient to assure adequate coordination between technical disciplines and design packages, and suggest that changes to the SSH organization might be needed to improve performance in this area.

**4. SSH Turnover**

We were advised that SSH has incurred turnover of personnel. This turnover, along with other recently made organizational changes within its organization, have impacted SSH’s ability to effectively support their planning and scheduling effort. We are unaware of the circumstances regarding the turnover; however, it has resulted in additional time spent on the learning curve, initial loss in productivity as well as a loss of institutional knowledge.

**Risk**

Personnel turnover increases the risk of inaccurate and untimely schedules submissions.

**Recommendation**

SSH should take the appropriate measures to ensure that there is stability by dedicating a team of schedulers to support the scheduling function. Additionally, SSH should also ensure that the accuracy and timeliness of schedule submissions is consistently adhered to, regardless of personnel turnover. To the extent possible, VTA should communicate its dissatisfaction with SSH’s inability to provide continuity of personnel.

**Management Response**

Management agrees. To-date there have been numerous changes in SSH management and in the field support staff that have likely had substantial impacts on scheduling. Directions from upper SSH management about their implementation strategies have not been consistent and the recurring reorganization of staff over the first two years of SSH’s contract has not helped with the comprehensive planning for the project’s implementation. Although coordination between
SSH scheduling and field personnel has greatly improved in recent months, the SSH scheduling group remains understaffed. We do see a risk to timely and complete schedule submissions unless the SSH Scheduling Department staff is increased. As a result, VTA will continue to express its concern in writing and encourage that SSH take steps to ensure the stability and continuity of whoever is assigned to this position.

By April 30, 2014, VTA will reiterate contractual obligations regarding scheduling requirements to SSH, indicate that based on past performance SSH resources applied to this requirement appear to be insufficient, and make specific recommendations about changes to the SSH organization that might improve performance in this area. Also, to address the general concern regarding comprehensive planning, VTA will add two additional Field Engineers to the VTA team to coordinate and assure that SSH adequately addresses this issue.
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

FROM: Auditor General, Patrick J. Hagan

SUBJECT: VTA Procurement and Contracting Process Assessment

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Review and receive the Auditor General's report on the VTA Procurement and Contracting Process Assessment.

BACKGROUND:

VTA’s Contracts and Materials Management Department (CAMM) is responsible for purchasing, messenger/mail services, contracts administration, and the disadvantaged business enterprise program for VTA. CAMM ensures VTA is compliant with Federal and State guidelines, procurement related rules, regulations, policies and procedures.

Since an efficient and effective process to procure needed goods and services while safeguarding the organization’s interests is essential for any organization, but is especially critical for VTA, the Board approved the Auditor General’s recommendation to include in the FY 2014 Internal Audit Work Plan an assessment of VTA’s contracting and procurement processes.

DISCUSSION:

In January 2014, the Auditor General’s Office initiated the Procurement & Contracting Process Assessment. This assessment focused exclusively on CAMM’s procurement-related functions.

The objective of the Procurement and Contracting Process Assessment was to evaluate: (1) whether the procurement and contracting processes are operating at the optimal levels, ensuring effectiveness and cost-efficiency; (2) if reasonable safeguards are in place to minimize VTA exposure to either financial loss or reputational harm as a result of the programs; and (3) whether
key controls over the process have been designed and are operating effectively. The scope covered the purchasing and contracting activities primarily for 2013 and included factors such as: ease of use for customers and effectiveness of the process; timeliness of contract/purchase order execution and approval; methods, frequency and effectiveness of communication; etc.

In April 2014, the Auditor General’s Office completed its Procurement and Contracting Process Assessment, the results of which are presented on Attachment A. Overall, based on the assessment’s scope and the information gathered, it appears that although a comprehensive portfolio of controls is in operation, there is substantial opportunity for these processes to operate in a more efficient and effective manner, primarily on the Purchasing side:

- Although CAMM is following its departmental policies and procedures, they are neither consistently well-communicated nor easily understandable by their VTA customers.
- The numerous policies, which are not user friendly, combined with the time-consuming enforcement, appears to be causing notable delays in the process and creating customer service inconsistencies.
- Customers do not have a consistent understanding of the process and the associated timelines, including requirements imposed upon VTA by external parties.
- There also appears to be significant opportunity for improvement within CAMM’s customer service culture, and notable efficiencies to be gained by automating the process.

Accordingly, we assessed the Procurement and Contracting Process at an overall Medium level of potential opportunities for process improvements, based on seven identified areas of potential process improvement: one judged as High potential, three Medium and three Low. The process improvement opportunities for management’s consideration, along with management’s responses and action plans, are provided in Section IV of the report. Most of the recommended process improvement opportunities deal with automating and streamlining the process, improving both communication with the customer and CAMM’s customer-service culture, and making the process easier to understand and use.

VTA management agreed with all Auditor General’s Office recommendations. It committed to implement most recommendations by the October 2014. Regarding the recommendation to automate the process, staff will immediately undertake the process to secure outside assistance to implement the SAP functionality and provide an implementation schedule to the Audit Committee at its next meeting.

Recommendations for improvement or efficiency opportunities contained in this report are presented for the consideration of VTA management, which is responsible for the effective implementation of any action plans.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

There is no financial impact associated with acceptance of this report.

Prepared by: Pat Hagan, Auditor General & Stephen Flynn, Advisory Committee Coordinator
Memo No. 4593
TO: Gail Price, Chairperson
 Audit Committee, VTA Board of Directors

FROM: Patrick Hagan
 Auditor General’s Office

DATE: April 25, 2014

SUBJECT: Procurement and Contracting Process Assessment

Attached is our report for the Procurement and Contracting Process Assessment.

Our engagement was performed in accordance with the terms of the agreement between Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (“VTA”) and McGladrey LLP (“McGladrey”) for Auditor General Services, Contract No. S13044 dated February 1, 2013, and in accordance with the Standards for Consulting Services issued by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants.

This report is intended solely for the use of VTA’s Board of Directors, Audit Committee and management and is not intended to be used by anyone other than these specified parties. Recommendations for improvement are presented for management’s consideration, and management is responsible for the effective implementation of corrective action plans.

Questions or concerns should be addressed to Patrick Hagan in the VTA Auditor General’s Office at: Auditor.General@VTA.org.
AUDITOR GENERAL REPORT No. 2014-13

Procurement and Contracting Process Assessment Report

April 25, 2014
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I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

VTA’s Contracts and Materials Management Department (CAMM) is responsible for purchasing, messenger/mail services, contracts administration, and the disadvantaged business enterprise program for VTA. CAMM ensures VTA is compliant with Federal and State guidelines, procurement related rules, regulations, policies and procedures.

This Procurement and Contracting Process Assessment focused exclusively on CAMM’s procurement-related functions, which involved two CAMM programs: (1) Contracts Administration; and (2) Purchasing.

**Contracts Administration** is primarily responsible for construction and professional services procurements, and are made using Invitations for Bid, Design-Build method, and Request for Proposals. Procurements typically include contracts related to facilities, light rail, heavy rail and highways as well as various professional and non-professional services needed by VTA. Currently, the Contracts Administration group has seven employees and approximately 850 professional services contracts in place, of which 161 worth $176 million were new during 2013. It should be noted that this includes providing services to VTA’s Extension of BART to Silicon Valley project.

**Purchasing** is primarily responsible for contracts and procurements for goods, supplies, non-professional services, and equipment. The procurement-related portion of the Purchasing group currently has 10 employees with one vacancy and two temporary employees. Purchasing has approximately 160 contracts in place. During 2013, Purchasing awarded 36 contracts with an aggregate value of approximately $152 million and purchase orders for over 6,200 line items with an aggregate value of approximately $12 million.

It should be noted that the stated annual figures for contracts and purchase orders issued do not reflect all procurement-related services provided by CAMM. Other services provided include conducting pre-proposal and pre-bid conferences, completing contract and task order amendments, contract change orders, solicitations, etc.

Both the Purchasing and Contracts Administration groups use contracts and purchase orders to execute and document agreements between VTA and vendors. The process starts with a VTA work unit (requestor) determining a need for a product or service and whether that need can be satisfied within the VTA. If not, the requestor submits a requisition package which entails several required forms with the goal of helping CAMM procure the good or service cost-effectively while ensuring compliance with applicable rules, regulations, policies and procedures.

The objective of the Procurement and Contracting Process Assessment was to evaluate: (1) whether the procurement and contracting processes are operating at the optimal levels, ensuring effectiveness and cost-efficiency; (2) if reasonable safeguards are in place to minimize VTA exposure to either financial loss or reputational harm as a result of the programs; and (3) whether key controls over the process have been designed and are operating effectively.

This report is intended solely for the internal use of VTA’s Board of Directors, Audit Committee and management and is not intended to be used by anyone other than these specified parties.
The scope of the assessment covered the purchasing and contracting activities primarily for 2013 and included the following:

- Ease of use for customers and effectiveness of process
- Timeliness of contract/purchase order execution and approval
- Methods, frequency and effectiveness of communication
- Enforcement of delegation of authority, roles and responsibilities
- Maintenance of contracting and procurement files

The above objectives were each discussed with key members of CAMM and VTA management as well as a large number of internal VTA requestors (customers) to help further understand the process, its benefits, and potential challenges. Auditor General’s Office staff also reviewed all relevant CAMM policies and procedures as well as several completed and in-process requisitions to understand the transaction flow and timeframes associated with completing a requisition.

The process for executing contracts and procurements appears to have reliable internal controls in operation to mitigate most risks, as evidenced by the multiple levels of review required. As this was a process assessment and not a full-scope audit, we did not substantively test any final CAMM contracts or procurement files for compliance with VTA policies and procedures.

Overall, based on the assessment’s scope and the information gathered, it appears that although a comprehensive portfolio of internal controls is in operation, there is substantial opportunity for these processes to operate in a more efficient and effective manner, primarily on the Purchasing side. Although CAMM is following its departmental policies and procedures, they are neither consistently well-communicated nor understood by the customer. In addition, the numerous policies, which are not user friendly, combined with the time consuming enforcement of the process and procedures appears to be causing notable delays in the process and creating customer service inconsistencies.

It also appears customers do not have a consistent understanding of the process and the associated timelines, including requirements imposed on VTA by external factors, nor do they have uniform, easy-to-follow guidelines, which can result in customer dissatisfaction. There also appears to be significant opportunity for improvement in CAMM’s customer service culture.

Accordingly, we have assessed the procurement and contracting process at an overall Medium level of potential opportunities for process improvements, based on seven identified areas of potential process improvement: one judged as High potential, three Medium and three Low. The process improvement opportunities for management’s consideration, along with management’s responses and action plans, are provided in Section IV of this report.

VTA management agreed with all Auditor General’s Office recommendations. It committed to implement most recommendations by the October 2014. For the recommendation to automate the process, staff will immediately undertake the process to secure outside assistance to implement the SAP functionality and provide an implementation schedule to the Audit Committee at its next meeting.

We would like to acknowledge VTA staff for their cooperation and professionalism throughout the process.

This report is intended solely for the internal use of VTA’s Board of Directors, Audit Committee and management and is not intended to be used by anyone other than these specified parties.
II. BACKGROUND, OBJECTIVE, SCOPE & APPROACH

A. Background

VTA’s Contracts and Materials Management Department (CAMM) is responsible for purchasing, messenger/mail services, contracts administration, and the disadvantaged business enterprise program for VTA. CAMM ensures VTA is compliant with Federal and State guidelines, procurement related rules, regulations, policies and procedures.

The Procurement and Contracting Process Assessment focused exclusively on CAMM’s procurement-related functions, and therefore two CAMM programs were involved: (1) Contracts Administration; and (2) Purchasing.

*Contracts Administration* is primarily responsible for construction and professional services procurements, and is further segmented into two functional responsibility centers:

1) *Construction Contracts* is responsible for the procurement of construction services needed by VTA. Purchases are made using Invitations for Bid and Design Build method and typically include contracts related to facilities, light rail, heavy rail and highways.

2) *Professional Services Contracting* is responsible for the procurement of various professional and non-professional services needed by VTA including architects, engineers, planners, consultants and other types of service providers. Purchases are made using a Request for Proposals method.

Currently, the overall Contracts Administration group has seven employees and approximately 850 professional services contracts in place, of which 161 worth $176 million were new during 2013. It should be noted that this includes providing services to VTA’s Extension of BART to Silicon Valley project.

*Purchasing* is primarily responsible for contracts and procurements for goods, supplies, non-professional services, and equipment. The procurement-related portion of the Purchasing group currently has 10 employees, including one vacancy and two temporary employees. Purchasing has approximately 160 contracts in place. During 2013, Purchasing awarded 36 contracts with an aggregate value of approximately $152 million and purchase orders for over 6,200 line items with an aggregate value of approximately $12 million.

Besides ensuring compliance with policies, procedures and regulations, CAMM staff also provides expertise, resources and guidance to help the customer through the process in order to receive the needed product or service.

It should be noted that the previously-stated annual figures for contracts and purchase orders issued do not reflect all procurement-related services provided by CAMM. Others include conducting pre-proposal and pre-bid conferences, completing contract and task order amendments, contract change orders, solicitations, etc.
Both the Purchasing and Contracts Administration groups use contracts and purchase orders to execute and document agreements between VTA and vendors. The process starts with a VTA work unit (requestor) determining a need for a product or service and whether that need can be satisfied within the VTA. If not, the requestor submits a requisition package which entails several required forms necessary to provide CAMM staff with the information necessary to procure the good or service cost-effectively while ensuring compliance with applicable rules, regulations, policies and procedures.

Examples of the forms required to be submitted with the requisition package include:

- Contract Request Form -- contains a brief description of the supply or service needed as well as the necessary approvals.
- Statement of Work (SOW) – a very detailed project plan which outlines all requested services, materials and funding sources/amounts.
- Independent Cost Estimate (ICE) – the requestor provides an estimate of the cost of the product or service.

Based on this information, CAMM will issue a Request for Proposal (RFP), an Invitation for Bid (IFB), or a Request for Quote (RFQ). Once the process is successfully completed, CAMM will either award a contract or issue a Purchase Order (PO).

CAMM’s review includes ensuring all the documents are complete and accurate as well as that all necessary signatures are obtained timely. If the forms are complete and no additional information is needed from the requestor, CAMM will prepare the Invitation to Bid (IFB) form.

The IFB includes the SOW, any special requirements, and VTA’s terms and conditions, among other documents, which make up the Solicitation packet that is used to inform the public of the project and the process to follow to submit a bid or proposal. The completed IFB is provided to the Purchasing Manager and the Purchasing and Materials Manager for review.

Once the Buyer receives approval, they will announce the solicitation by posting the IFB on the VTA website, releasing through news and media outlets, or by posting to other websites specifically intended for such solicitations to the general public.

A pre-bid conference may be used to allow potential bidders to ask questions. A log sheet is used to document the individuals present at the conference, which generally include at least one representative from CAMM, the project manager, and the potential bidders. Per VTA policy #FRS-PR-030, both CAMM and the requestor must be present at the pre-bid conference. Once the bids are received by the required due date, two CAMM staff members participate in opening the bids. One opens and the other documents the bid. A Bid Opening Sign-in Sheet is used to document the individuals present at the bid opening. The Price Sheet is used to note the bid amounts from each bidder. The Auditor General’s Office selected certain bid sheets and reviewed each against the respective Bid Opening Sign-in Sheet, noting no exceptions.
CAMM performs a pricing reasonableness assessment based on the bids received, which is compared to the requestor's ICE and other bids. Occasionally, if the winning bid is materially lower than the other vendors and the requestor's ICE, CAMM will investigate as this can indicate that the vendor may not have fully understood the SOW. Before notifying a vendor of contract award, references are checked. No other approvals are needed to notify the vendor and the public for the intent to award. The contract is prepared and sent to VTA’s General Counsel’s Office for legal review. The contract, bid package, and planning documents are then sent to the Purchasing Manager and Purchasing and Materials Manager for review. Evidence of their review and approval is indicated on the signed contract.

B. Objective

The objective of the Procurement and Contracting Process Assessment was to: (1) assess whether the procurement and contracting processes are operating efficiently and at optimal levels; (2) assess if reasonable safeguards are in place to minimize VTA exposure to either financial loss or reputational harm as a result of the programs; and (3) assess whether key controls over the process are well-designed and are operating effectively.

C. Scope

The scope of the assessment covered the purchasing and contracting activities primarily for 2013 and included the following, each of which were discussed with key members of management and key process owners to gain an understanding of the business processes and the associated risks:

- Ease of use for customers and effectiveness of process
- Timeliness of contract/purchase order execution and approval
- Methods, frequency and effectiveness of communication
- Enforcement of delegation of authority, roles and responsibilities
- Maintenance of contracting and procurement files

We reviewed all CAMM policies and procedures, interviewed CAMM management and staff as well as a large number of internal VTA customers (requestors) from a wide spectrum of VTA organizational units including Technology, General Counsel’s Office, Engineering & Construction, Operations, Fiscal Resources, Marketing and others to help further understand the process, its benefits and potential challenges, as well as the level of customer satisfaction and awareness. We reviewed several completed and in-process requisitions to understand the transaction flow and timeframes associated with completing a requisition and to understand documentation flow and amount of effort expended.
D. Approach

To assess the design and operating effectiveness of the processes and controls related to VTA’s procurement and contracting processes, the following procedures were performed:

- Reviewed existing policies and procedures in detail to help understand and document controls within the process.
- Interviewed CAMM personnel and management as well as related internal VTA customers to understand the process, recent changes, potential challenges/risks and developing trends.
- Performed walkthroughs with appropriate members of the CAMM team who are currently working on procurements/contracts to gain a better understanding of the process; reviewed all forms currently required to be submitted by requestors.
- Reviewed available CAMM documentation to understand the departmental metrics used to track procurement completion times, turn-around times, and performance against departmental goals.
- Identified opportunities for VTA to improve operational effectiveness, efficiency and customer satisfaction.

It is also important to note that this assessment was somewhat limited due to the predominantly manual nature of the processes, the lack of system-derived data (due to the department’s non-use of SAP, VTA’s enterprise-wide data management software), and the review’s pre-approved budget allocation.

Given additional time to assess each in-process or outstanding contract/procurement, for example, we could compare and develop a more detailed list of potential issues and perform a trend analysis which could help identify very specific potential operational and/or staffing issues. Given the manual nature of this process, further detailed work was not feasible given the budget available; we recommend that consideration be given to a detailed audit of these processes in future years.
III. RATINGS SCALE:

Process improvement ratings are assigned to each observation to provide VTA Management with a better understanding of the potential impact of each observation. The process improvement rating definitions are:

- **High** – Significant process improvement opportunities exist to help VTA meet or improve its goals, meet or improve its internal control structure, and further protect its brand or public perception presents. This opportunity should be addressed immediately.

- **Medium** – Process improvement opportunities exist to help VTA meet or improve its goals, meet or improve its internal control structure, and further protect its brand or public perception. This opportunity should be considered in the near term.

- **Low** – Process improvements exist but are not in an immediate priority for VTA. Taking advantage of these opportunities would be considered best practice for VTA.

- **Other Opportunities (No Rating)** – Opportunity to improve efficiency or profitability of operations, but does not indicate an internal control weakness or a material inefficiency.

Both the overall and individual process improvement ratings resulting from the work performed are provided in Section IV. They are provided as an estimate to help Management understand the opportunity and benefit of the observations, both individually as well as collectively.
IV. RESULTS:

OVERALL PROCESS IMPROVEMENT RATING

An overall process improvement rating has been provided to help Management understand both the opportunity and impact for VTA of all the individual observations combined.

*Overall opportunity for process improvement:* Medium

The Medium rating is based upon our having identified seven areas of potential process improvement, one of which was assessed as High, three as Medium and three as Low. The process improvement opportunities for management’s consideration, along with management’s responses and action plans, are provided in Section IV of this report.

Overall, based on the scope of the assessment and the information gathered, it appears that although a comprehensive portfolio of internal controls is in operation, there is substantial opportunity for these processes to operate in a more efficient and effective manner, especially on the Purchasing side. Although CAMM is following their departmental policies and procedures, they appear to be neither well-communicated nor understood by the customer. In addition, the numerous policies, which are not user friendly, combined with the time consuming enforcement of the process procedures appears to be causing notable delays in the process and creating customer service inconsistencies. Furthermore, it appears customers do not have a consistent understanding of the process and the associated timelines, including requirements imposed on VTA by external factors, nor do they have uniform, easy-to-follow guidelines, which can result in customer dissatisfaction.

There appears to be significant opportunity for improvement in CAMM’s customer service culture. It should be noted that CAMM potentially has, and may be currently, affected by vacancies and/or possibly inadequate staffing levels. However, appropriate staffing level was beyond the scope of this assessment.

The individual process improvement opportunities for management’s consideration, along with management’s responses and action plans, are provided in the following.
INDIVIDUAL PROCESS IMPROVEMENT OPPORTUNITIES

1. Automate process [High Priority]

Per our review of the contracting and procurement process, we noticed that it is very manual and paper-intensive. We noticed that several documents are manually routed back and forth within the CAMM department, rather than using SAP to its fullest capabilities. VTA does indeed have access to the full SAP Procurement module; however, only the requisition/finance section of the module is being utilized. We recommend that VTA management consider automating the procurement process from the requisition/contract request phase through the contract award phase. This would allow:

- CAMM, as a service department, to develop metrics (timeframes, amounts, etc.) that could be easily monitored, tracked, and analyzed to ultimately help identify trends with certain classes of purchases or customers, workloads and staffing levels.
- Greater visibility into the process, allowing the requestor to check on the status of their request, reducing time and resource- and time-consuming emails and phones calls to CAMM staff.
- Reduced risk of misplaced documentation, since all documents are located within SAP for easy storage and retrieval.
- Use of standard online SAP templates, with electronic workflow, will vastly streamline the process.
- Timely alerts to both the requestor and a CAMM representative well in advance of when a contract or agreement will end, thereby allowing VTA to proactively renegotiate the current agreement or develop a new arrangement with no lapse in service.
- Requestors to send the requisition package directly to the buyer/contract administrator that deals with the specific item; if the administrator transfers the package to another buyer, an email alert goes automatically to the requestor to keep them informed.
- The ability to report on CAMM’s production as several more data elements and attributes would be captured in SAP.

Potential Risk
- The process is, at times, prohibitively delayed, jeopardizing critical deadlines.
- Project documents are in several places and not organized; documents may be misplaced or lost.
- Buyer/Status of project is unknown, or not readily available.
- No formal reporting of metrics; limited or no capability to quickly gather needed data.

Control
- CAMM currently uses an Excel spreadsheet to track all projects, which is updated on a regular basis.
Recommendation
- We strongly recommend Management explore fully implementing and using the SAP procurement and contracts module. This would allow all documents to be online and easily accessible, tracked and reported upon, which would help remediate current communication gaps. Utilizing the system to its full capabilities would streamline the process, reduce paperwork, allow for online signatures/approvals, simplify workflow and reduce procurement turnaround time.

Management Response
Management concurs. To implement this recommendation, staff will take the following steps:

- Identify functions within the SAP procurement and contracting modules that have not been implemented, yet are necessary to completely automate the date tracking and reporting functionality.
- In support of this, staff has initiated development of the prototype workflow process and status reporting functionality in SAP. The first reports using this process will be produced by the close of April 2014.
- Initiate the process to procure the services of a third-party contractor to expedite the automation of the procurement and contracting process. Staff will report on the timeline for full implementation at the next (August 28, 2014) Audit Committee meeting.

2. Communicate roles and responsibilities [Medium Priority]

Throughout our assessment we heard numerous inconsistencies when inquiring with process owners regarding the purchasing/contracting process and requirements, indicating a general lack of understanding of roles and responsibilities throughout the transaction flow. This resulted in, and we were provided evidence of, process “work-arounds” built by individual departments to help them comply with a CAMM process. This type of action shows the process is cumbersome, difficult to follow, and not efficient. CAMM should have been proactive and built a more streamlined process to make it easy for the customer to complete their portion of the procurement process.

In certain cases, CAMM is doing training. However, CAMM is also having to meet regularly with Operations Division management to discuss project and timeframes, which is indicative of a process that has issues and requires improvements, since the highest level of management is required to be involved. We also observed instances where a contract was executed and in place with a set price, yet the requestor was required to complete an Independent Cost Estimate form to order more from the contract.

Potential Risk
- Roles and responsibilities are not clearly defined
- Documentation may not be processed or completed in a timely manner, may be provided twice, or may not be provided at all
- Process requirements/forms are not clearly explained, understood or used consistently
- Lack of communication or miscommunication

This report is intended solely for the internal use of VTA’s Board of Directors, Audit Committee and management and is not intended to be used by anyone other than these specified parties.
Control
A well-enforced workstream review hierarchy, albeit manual and time-consuming, appears to reasonably mitigate risks of inadequately reviewed procurements or contracts being transacted through CAMM.

Recommendation
As a part of recommendation Number 1, we recommend that Management re-evaluate and determine the purpose and function of the contracts and purchasing functions within CAMM. With this, management should:

- Decide if the CAMM group is a true service department that supports VTA customers, find efficiencies and cost savings while ensuring VTA compliance, or are they just “gate-keepers” with complete control over this process.
- Clearly communicate and train all appropriate VTA personnel on the roles and responsibilities so all have a good understanding of the requirements, timeframes, communication channels and expectations in order to simplify the process.
- Include tracking and reporting of metrics, (timeframes, budget vs. actual dollars used, renegotiation, etc.)

Management Response
Management concurs. To implement this recommendation, staff will take the following steps:

- CAMM will obtain needed assistance from VTA’s Organizational Development and Training staff to provide guidance, instruction and training to CAMM staff to ensure they understand the service nature of the procurement process and provide the proper level of assistance to CAMM internal customers.
- With the assistance of internal customer departments, staff will develop a training plan that will communicate and train all appropriate VTA personnel on the roles and responsibilities of both CAMM and the user departments so that there is a clear understanding of the requirements, timeframes, communication channels and expectations in order to simplify the procurement process.
- Expand the use of e-procurement where possible to expedite the procurement process.
- As a part of the implementation of the SAP procurement and contracting modules, staff will develop tracking and reporting metrics that provide meaningful information to VTA management and staff.

These steps will be completed by the end of October 2014.
3. **Review and raise purchasing limits**  
[MEDIUM Priority]

VTA management should consider increasing the level of authority that the Board of Directors delegates to the General Manager, as Purchasing Agent, to commit VTA to a contract or procurement without prior Board approval of that specific procurement, and also concurrently increasing the level of authority delegated by the GM to CAMM management. The current VTA Administrative Code limits were established in 1994 and have not increased along with inflation, creating more reviews and approvals as costs have increased. Additionally, most of the delegation (or authorization limits) guidance, such as in VTA Administrative Code Section 9-2, were written prior to VTA’s large construction projects, especially its extension of BART to Silicon Valley. Most, if not all, change orders for these large projects need several reviews to approve.

**Potential Risk**
- Projects may be delayed based on approval matrix requiring several approvals.
  - Dollar thresholds may not be assigned using a risk-based tolerance perspective, thereby causing unnecessary reviews and extending the end-to-end process turnaround time.

**Control**
- Purchasing levels are clearly defined within policy.

**Recommendation**
- Since the existing limits have been in place, in some cases for more than 20 years, we recommend Management consider increasing the limits to help streamline the procurement and contracting process. Increasing limits will reduce the amount of review and approvals needed to make basic purchases.

**Management Response**
Management concurs with this recommendation. To implement, staff will take the following steps:
- Conduct a review with other similar governmental agencies and assess industry standards for levels of purchasing authority other governmental bodies have delegated to their general manager.
- Analyze how inflation has eroded current authorization limits since their inception.
- Based on that information, staff will recommend increasing the Board authorized delegation of contracting authority if it is determined that such a recommended change would help streamline the procurement and contracting process.

These steps will be completed by the end of August 2014.
4. **Create customer-friendly “users guide”** [Low Priority]

We noted that CAMM has thorough desktop procedures; however, the policy and procedure documents that are on the VTA’s intranet that requestors rely upon are:

1) Not user friendly and don’t describe how to complete the required documents.
2) Are vast, numerous and not easily readable or understandable. Most customers do not have the time, patience or inclination to search and read these specific documents for guidance.
3) Are duplicative. Both the policy and the procure state basically the same thing.

Policies should describe requirements, limits, and authority while procedures should describe how to complete the process. Additionally, we noted instances in which the policies and procedures do not clearly outline roles and responsibilities, potentially leaving VTA employees outside of CAMM to frequently reach out to the CAMM managers with questions they could answer themselves if provided more clear and concise procedural guidance.

**Potential Risk**
- Lack of clearly stated procedures and inadequate training on said procedures can cause CAMM customers to submit inaccurate or incomplete data, thereby delaying their procurement or contracting requests.

**Control**
- A well-enforced workstream review hierarchy, albeit manual and time consuming, appears to reasonably mitigate risks of inadequately reviewed procurements or contracts being transacted through CAMM.

**Recommendation**
- We recommend management thoroughly review and evaluate from the customer’s perspective existing policies and procedure to either combine existing documents or replace the current procedures with the CAMM desktop procedures (or something similar) which describe the process and how to comply with the process. This will be especially important if the process is automated as outlined in Recommendation #1.
- Additionally, CAMM should create a short, easy-to-use “users guide” that clearly describes how to submit the required documents and how to use the SAP functionality. This would allow those customers that rarely use request procurements to submit the proper requirements correctly the first time with little or no help from CAMM staff.

**Management Response**
Management concurs. To implement this recommendation, staff will take the following steps:
- Perform a review of existing Policies and Procedures with internal customer departments to update, simplify and make them more user-friendly.
- With assistance of outside resources, develop short, easy-to-use “user guides” to clearly describe how to submit required documents and how to use SAP functionality.

These steps will be completed by the end of calendar 2014.
5. **Legal Review**

Currently the legal department reviews all contracts. While this is an excellent control, it can be excessive and time consuming as several contracts are simple and routine. Best practices would state to use a standard template to reduce approval times and ensure consistency. Legal should review large, complex or unusual contracts to ensure VTA is properly protected.

**Potential Risk**
- Legal becomes the bottleneck holding up the process on routine items. Several contract forms or templates are currently being used thus requiring several levels of review.

**Control**
- A well-enforced workstream review hierarchy, albeit manual and time consuming appears to reasonably mitigate risks of inadequately approving a contract without legal review.

**Recommendation**
- We recommend Legal and CAMM Management consider developing a series of standardized contract templates, if not already developed for simple and routine contracts. Legal should write the template to ensure proper terms and conditions are included. Both CAMM and legal would work on a new set of requirements that a contract must meet before it is sent to legal for review. These pre-approved requirements may include contracts over a certain dollar threshold, contracts that are complex or unusual or possibly new or questionable vendors.

- If the contract does not meet the legal requirements, CAMM would only input the required information and submit it to CAMM management for review and approval. Contracts that would not go to legal for review might include basic or routine items, simple changes or updates in part numbers or pricing, or simple contract renewals. These can be approved within CAMM which will also streamline the process.

**Management Response**
Management concurs. To implement this recommendation, staff will take the following steps:

- Work with the VTA General Counsel’s Office to develop a process that allows a one-time review of frequently used standard contract documents. Once the standard is approved by Counsel, no further review will be needed if the item does contain any changes from the standard contract.

This step will be completed by August 2014.
6. **Certified Purchasing Manager** [Low Priority]

CAMM management should consider having all procurement and contracting personnel become certified, (i.e. Certified Purchasing Manager- CPM) through a national accreditation organization. Becoming certified, specifically in the transportation industry, would help ensure VTA staff stays current on the latest trends and developments in transportation. Additionally, being a member of an organization will allow access to certain industry standards, best practices and comparable performance metrics which CAMM can leverage when developing their metrics.

- **Potential Risk**
  - VTA doesn’t keep up on the latest best practices and trends.
  - From a public perspective or reputation, the CAMM group may not appear qualified or professional having not been certified.

- **Control**
  - VTA currently does not require CPM for CAMM staff.

- **Recommendation**
  - We recommend Management consider having all CAMM personnel become certified in transportation purchasing and contracting through a national accreditation organization, if not already certified.

- **Management Response**
  - Management concurs with this recommendation. To implement, staff will take the following steps:
    - Determine the requirements to obtain the Certified Purchasing Manager certification as well as other certification achievement that may be appropriate for procurement staff.
    - For appropriate classifications, recruitment bulletins will list “CPM” credentials as a “Desired” attribute as well as seek those candidates that have the ability to obtain the CPM designation while employed at VTA.
    - Where appropriate, management will create incentives for obtaining the CPM for those employees/candidates seeking advancement in the CAMM department.
    - Review and update if necessary, the existing training matrix for CAMM staff.

These steps will be completed by the end of August 2014.

7. **Succession Planning** [Low Priority]

Leading and prudent practices around business continuity recommend engaging in succession planning to address at least three-to-five years into the future, and longer if specific key employee turnover is known (i.e., retirements, transfers, etc).

- **Potential Risk**
  - Lack of adequate succession planning can lead to less than adequate change management during times of anticipated or unanticipated employee turnover.
Inadequate change management can cause inconsistencies in the application of policies and procedures, and additional delays in end-to-end procurement turnaround times.

**Recommendation**
- We recommend that CAMM management work with VTA’s General Manager and other members of executive management to develop a succession plan for key CAMM purchasing and contracts-related positions that covers the next 3-5 years.

**Management Response**
Management concurs with this recommendation. To implement, staff will take the following steps:

- VTA is currently developing a formal, agency-wide Succession Planning program that will meet the needs of CAMM.
- In the short term, an important consideration is the implementation of cross-training opportunities for staff where feasible, enabling employees to increase their knowledge and skill levels to become proficient in all disciplines within CAMM. This will also allow employees to take on greater responsibilities and ensure that quality service is provided at all levels.

These steps will be completed by the end of calendar 2014.
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Nuria I. Fernandez

FROM: Exec. Policy Advisor & Director of Public Affairs, Jim Lawson

SUBJECT: Legislative Update Matrix

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

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

DISCUSSION:

The purpose of this report is to provide an update on a number of key transportation measures pending before lawmakers in Sacramento. The Legislature will be in session until August 31. At that time, the 2013-2014 regular session will officially come to a close. Thus, lawmakers have until then to complete work on all of the bills that are still moving through the process.

Climate Change: AB 69 (Perea) calls for delaying the inclusion of transportation fuels in the state’s cap-and-trade system from January 1, 2015, to January 1, 2018. Supported by the petroleum industry, this bill is being pushed by a group of Democratic lawmakers representing districts in the Central Valley who are concerned about the impact on gas prices if transportation fuels were to fall under the cap-and-trade system. Environmental organizations, as well as investor-owned utilities and other businesses currently regulated under the cap-and-trade system, are opposing the measure. They contend that the inclusion of transportation fuels is a critical element of the state’s efforts to reduce carbon emissions, given that the transportation sector is responsible for about 40 percent of those emissions. They further point out that to ignore the transportation sector would force other industries to bear a disproportionate share of the burden for meeting the state’s greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets established in AB 32 (Nunez), the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. AB 69 is an emergency statute and, thus, requires a two-thirds vote of both the Assembly and Senate in order to reach Gov. Jerry Brown’s desk.
Three other pieces of legislation dealing with climate change are worth noting. SB 1121 (de Leon) requires the California Alternative Energy and Advanced Transportation Financing Authority to develop and administer a program to provide assistance for greenhouse gas emissions reduction projects that are unable to obtain financing at attractive terms in the capital markets. Meanwhile, SB 1204 (Lara) requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to set up a program to provide funding for the development, demonstration and early deployment of new and cleaner technologies for heavy duty trucks, buses and off-road vehicles. Under the provisions of SB 1204, the money for this program would come from cap-and-trade auction proceeds. Finally, SB 1217 (Leno) requires the state Natural Resources Agency to prepare a risk assessment to determine California’s vulnerability to the impacts of climate change, including sea level rise, drought, flooding, wildland fires, and wildlife. The bill requires this assessment to identify potential mitigation measures and funding sources to pay for them. SB 1217 also requires the Office of Planning and Research to develop guidelines for integrating climate change risks into capital outlay and public infrastructure planning and investment.

**Express Lanes:** A number of measures dealing with express lanes are still moving through the legislative process. AB 2250 (Daly) requires any revenues generated from an express lane on the state highway system that is administered by a local agency to be expended only within the corridor in which the lane is located. The bill was introduced to prevent the Transportation Agency and Caltrans from trying to divert locally generated express lane revenues to maintenance and rehabilitation projects on the state highway system that are outside of the corridor or the county in which the express lane is located.

AB 1721 (Linder) clarifies that local agencies implementing express lanes have the choice of either allowing solo drivers of clean air vehicles to use the lanes for free or charging them a reduced toll rate. In 2012, legislation was enacted that exempts clean air vehicles from toll charges related to express lanes in order to provide an additional incentive for California residents to purchase these vehicles. This state-imposed prohibition, however, is negatively impacting the ability of local agencies to finance the construction of their express lanes projects because it reduces the revenues that otherwise would be available to meet bond repayment requirements. As opposed to repealing the 2012 legislation outright, AB 1721 offers a middle-ground approach by explicitly allowing local agencies to charge clean air vehicles a discounted toll rate.

Finally, SB 983 (Hernandez) calls for reinstituting a process that would allow regional and local agencies to submit applications for constructing and operating express lanes on state highway facilities to the CTC for approval. This process was initially established on a temporary basis through the enactment of legislation in 2006, but it expired at the end of 2011. The purpose of SB 983 is to put in place a way for regional and local agencies to pursue express lanes without having to seek specific authorization through the Legislature on a corridor-by-corridor basis.

**Project Delivery:** In 2013, lawmakers passed and Gov. Brown signed into law AB 401 (Daly), which allows for the continued use of design-build contracting for state highway projects. Similar legislation is needed for public transit projects, given that current state statutes addressing this subject sunset on January 1, 2015. Therefore, the California Transit Association is sponsoring SB 1433 (Hill), which extends the authority for local agencies to use design-build
contracting for public transit projects until January 1, 2024.

Meanwhile, SB 785 (Wolk) provides general authorization for all cities and counties, and for most special districts to use design-build contracting for public works projects that cost in excess of $1 million. Current state law concerning the use of design-build contracting is somewhat bewildering. There are separate design-build statutes that apply to cities, counties, agencies that operate wastewater facilities, school districts, community college districts, and public transit agencies. By consolidating this myriad of existing local agency design-build statutes into one uniform law, SB 785 would be a vast improvement. The bill would eliminate numerous inconsistencies in current state law by establishing a standardized, three-step, design-build procurement process, under which a local agency generally would: (1) prequalify firms based on specified criteria; (2) develop a request for proposals (RFP) inviting the prequalified firms to submit competitive bids; and (3) award the design-build contract by using either low bid or best value. If SB 785 moves forward, then public transit would be covered, and SB 1433 would not be needed.

Caltrans Reform: SB 486 (DeSaulnier) includes a series of provisions that are intended to expand the role of the CTC in terms of overseeing Caltrans. For example, this legislation authorizes the CTC to develop and adopt goals and performance measures for Caltrans, and to annually evaluate the department’s progress toward meeting them. SB 486 also requires Caltrans to develop and submit an Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan to the CTC for its approval. The bill states that this plan must be “directed at achieving a high-functioning and balanced interregional transportation system … and present clear, concise policy guidance for the department for managing the state’s transportation system.” Other key provisions embodied in SB 486 are as follows: (1) requires the CTC to adopt guidelines for Caltrans to follow in developing and selecting projects for the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP), and the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP); (2) requires projects included in the ITIP to be consistent with the Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan; and (3) prohibits projects from being included in the SHOPP without a project study report or major investment study.

Megaprojects: SB 969 (DeSaulnier) imposes certain requirements on so-called “megaprojects” being implemented by state and local agencies. Specifically, the bill requires a public agency implementing a transportation project with a total estimated cost exceeding $2.5 billion to undertake a number of actions related to identifying and managing the risks associated with the project. In addition, SB 969 requires the public agency to establish a peer review group to provide feedback on the planning, engineering and financing of the project. If this legislation were to be enacted into law, it would apply to Phase 2 of VTA’s BART Silicon Valley Extension Project. However, SB 969 does include language stating that the requirements of the bill would be deemed to have been met if a public agency is directed to undertake similar activities for its megaproject by a federal entity. Therefore, SB 969 would not put VTA in the position of having to duplicate work for the state that the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) is already requiring VTA to perform.

Bicycles: SB 1183 (DeSaulnier) authorizes a city, county or regional parks district, with a two-thirds vote of the electorate, to impose a surcharge of up to $5 on vehicles registered within its
jurisdiction. Under the provisions of this measure, the revenues generated from the surcharge could be used to fund: (1) the maintenance and upkeep of existing trails and bikeways; (2) improvements to existing paved and natural surface trails and bikeways; (3) the creation of new trails and bikeways; and (4) the development of other bicycle facilities. The intent of SB 1183 is to put in place a local funding tool to help those communities that want to upgrade, improve and build out their bicycle and trail infrastructure.

**Regional Governance:** SB 792 (DeSaulnier) requires the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC), and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) to jointly conduct an analysis of common functions, and identify opportunities to save costs and reduce redundancies. In addition, this measure requires MTC to convene a Public Engagement Advisory Committee to assist in the development of a draft public participation plan to be used for updates to the Bay Area’s regional transportation plan (RTP). Finally, SB 792 requires the Bay Area’s Joint Policy Committee to appoint an Advisory Committee on Economic Competitiveness to assist in the development and adoption of regional goals and policies related to economic development.
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## 2014 Regular Session Calendar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>JANUARY</th>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>JUNE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Statutes signed into law in 2013 take effect.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Budget must be passed by midnight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Legislature reconvenes.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Last day for legislative measures to qualify for placement on the November 4, 2014, general election ballot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Budget must be submitted by the Governor to the Legislature on or before this date.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Last day for policy committees to hear and report bills introduced in the other house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Last day for policy committees to hear and report fiscal bills introduced in their house of origin in 2013.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Last day for any committee to hear and report to the floor bills introduced in their house of origin in 2013.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Last day to submit bill requests to the Legislative Counsel’s Office.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Last day for bills introduced in 2013 to be passed out of their house of origin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>FEBRUARY</th>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>JUNE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Last day for new bills to be introduced.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>APRIL</th>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>JULY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Spring Recess begins upon adjournment.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Summer Recess begins upon adjournment, provided that the Budget Bill has been enacted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Legislature reconvenes from Spring Recess.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>MAY</th>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>AUGUST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Last day for policy committees to hear and report fiscal bills introduced in their house of origin in 2014.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Legislature reconvenes from Summer Recess.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Last day for policy committees to hear and report to the floor non-fiscal bills introduced in their house of origin in 2014.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Last day for fiscal committees to hear and report to the floor bills introduced in the other house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Last day for fiscal committees to hear and report to the floor bills introduced in their house of origin in 2014.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Last day to amend bills on the Assembly and Senate floors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Last day for bills introduced in 2014 to be passed out of their house of origin.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Last day for each house to pass bills. Final Recess begins at the end of this day’s session.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>SEPTEMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Last day for the Governor to sign or veto bills passed by the Legislature before September 1, and in his possession after September 1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>DECEMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The 2015-2016 regular legislative session convenes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>JANUARY 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Statutes signed into law in 2014 take effect.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## State Assembly Bills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Assembly Bills</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Last Amended</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>VTA Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 25</strong> (Campos)</td>
<td>Public Employment: Social Media</td>
<td>5/1/13</td>
<td>Senate Floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 26 (Bonilla)</td>
<td>For purposes of requirements regarding the payment of prevailing wages, revises the definition of “construction” to also include work performed during post-construction, such as all clean-up work at a public works jobsite.</td>
<td>6/16/14</td>
<td>Assembly Floor: Concurrence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 69</strong> (Perea)</td>
<td>Delays the inclusion of suppliers of transportation fuels in the cap-and-trade system administered by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) from January 1, 2015, to January 1, 2018.</td>
<td>7/2/14</td>
<td>Senate Rules Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 194</strong> (Campos)</td>
<td>Amends the Brown Act to prohibit the legislative body of a public agency, or its presiding officer or staff acting in their official capacity on behalf of the legislative body from prohibiting, limiting or otherwise preventing any of the following: (1) public criticism of acts or omissions on the part of the officers or employees of the local agency acting in their official capacity; (2) comment by a member of the public during the presentation of an agenda item who has not provided notice of his or her desire to speak prior to the consideration of the item by the legislative body; and (3) comment by a member of the public based on his or her viewpoint where the comment is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the legislative body. If a legislative body limits the total amount of time allocated for public testimony on a particular issue or for each individual speaker, provides that the questioning or interrupting of the speaker by the legislative body, its officers or its employees, and the speaker’s response to questioning shall not reduce the total amount of time allocated for public testimony on the issue or for an individual speaker.</td>
<td>7/1/14</td>
<td>Senate Floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assembly Bills</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Last Amended</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>VTA Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 229 (J. Perez) Infrastructure and Revitalization Financing Districts</td>
<td>Authorizes cities to form an infrastructure and revitalization financing district to finance the following types of facilities and projects of communitywide significance: (1) highways, interchanges, ramps, bridges, arterial streets, parking facilities, and transit facilities; (2) sewage treatment and water reclamation plants and interceptor pipes; (3) facilities and watershed lands used for the collection and treatment of water for urban uses; (4) flood management, including levees, bypasses, dams, retention basins, and drainage channels; (5) child care facilities; (6) libraries; (7) parks, recreational facilities, open space, and habitat restoration; (8) facilities for the transfer and disposal of solid waste; (9) brownfields restoration and other environmental mitigation; (10) purchase of land and property for development purposes and related site improvements; (11) acquisition, construction or repair of housing for rental or purchase, including multipurpose facilities; (12) acquisition, construction or repair of commercial or industrial structures for private use; (13) projects on a former military base; and (14) projects that implement a sustainable communities strategy prepared pursuant to SB 375. Prohibits an infrastructure and revitalization financing district from being used to finance routine maintenance, repair work, or the costs of ongoing operations or providing services of any kind. Allows an infrastructure and revitalization financing district to fund projects in any portion of a redevelopment project area, former redevelopment project area or former military base. Authorizes the creation of an infrastructure and revitalization financing district, adoption of a financing plan, and the issuance of bonds for implementing a financing plan with a two-thirds vote of landowners within the proposed district. Allows an infrastructure and revitalization financing district to be created for up to 40 years. Allows a district to issue debt with a final maturity date of up to 30 years. In proposing the formation of an infrastructure and revitalization financing district, prohibits a city from providing for the division of incremental property tax revenues of any affected taxing entity unless a resolution approving the district’s financing plan has been adopted by the governing body of an affected taxing entity.</td>
<td>8/12/13</td>
<td>Assembly Floor: Concurrence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assembly Bills</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Last Amended</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>VTA Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 243</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Dickinson)&lt;br&gt;Infrastructure and Revitalization Financing Districts</td>
<td>Authorizes cities to form an infrastructure and revitalization financing district to finance the following types of facilities and projects of communitywide significance: (1) highways, interchanges, ramps, bridges, arterial streets, parking facilities, and transit facilities; (2) sewage treatment and water reclamation plants and interceptor pipes; (3) facilities and watershed lands used for the collection and treatment of water for urban uses; (4) flood management, including levees, bypasses, dams, retention basins, and drainage channels; (5) child care facilities; (6) libraries; (7) parks, recreational facilities, open space, and habitat restoration; (8) facilities for the transfer and disposal of solid waste; (9) brownfields restoration and other environmental mitigation; (10) purchase of land and property for development purposes and related site improvements; (11) acquisition, construction or repair of housing for rental or purchase, including multipurpose facilities; (12) acquisition, construction or repair of commercial or industrial structures for private use; (13) projects on a former military base; and (14) projects that implement a sustainable communities strategy prepared pursuant to SB 375. Prohibits an infrastructure and revitalization financing district from being used to finance routine maintenance, repair work, or the costs of ongoing operations or providing services of any kind. Allows an infrastructure and revitalization financing district to fund projects in any portion of a redevelopment project area, former redevelopment project area or former military base. Authorizes the creation of an infrastructure and revitalization financing district, adoption of a financing plan, and the issuance of bonds for implementing a financing plan with a 55 percent vote of landowners within the proposed district. Allows an infrastructure and revitalization financing district to be created for up to 40 years. Allows a district to issue debt with a final maturity date of up to 30 years. In proposing the formation of an infrastructure and revitalization financing district, prohibits a city from providing for the division of incremental property tax revenues of any affected taxing entity unless a resolution approving the district’s financing plan has been adopted by the governing body of an affected taxing entity.</td>
<td>8/19/13</td>
<td>Senate Floor</td>
<td>6.9.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 278</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Gatto)&lt;br&gt;Low-Carbon Fuel Standard: Food Supply Sustainability</td>
<td>When promulgating regulations or other policies on the carbon intensity of fuels, requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to consider all of the following sustainability factors: (1) the full life-cycle carbon emissions from the production of a fuel; (2) the positive or negative effect of a fuel source on the domestic food supply, as determined by CARB, including crop displacement, food prices, food shipping, and market conditions; and (3) the direct and indirect land-use changes resulting from fuel production. In addition, requires CARB to consider the state of the fuel market and technologies. By December 1, 2014, requires CARB to: (1) include mechanisms and policies that favor low-carbon fuels with the highest possible sustainability based on the aforementioned factors; and (2) encourage incentives for sustainable fuels produced without food stock or displacement of food crops.</td>
<td>8/5/14</td>
<td>Senate Rules Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 471</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Atkins)&lt;br&gt;Infrastructure Financing Districts</td>
<td>Authorizes an infrastructure financing district (IFD) to finance a project or a portion of a project that is located in, or overlaps with, a redevelopment project area or former redevelopment project area.</td>
<td>1/29/14</td>
<td>Signed into Law: Chapter #1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assembly Bills</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Last Amended</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>VTA Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **AB 515**  
(Dickinson)  
CEQA: Peremptory Writ of Mandate | Clarifies the procedures that apply when a court orders a public agency to take corrective action to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) by way of a peremptory writ of mandate. Specifically, requires a peremptory writ of mandate issued by the court to include the time by which the public agency must make an initial return of the writ. Requires the public agency’s initial return of the writ to describe the following: (1) the actions that the public agency will take to come into compliance with CEQA; and (2) a schedule for those actions. | 6/5/14 | Senate  
Environmental Quality Committee |  

**AB 543**  
(Campos)  
CEQA: Translations | By July 1, 2016, requires the Office of Planning and Research to prepare, develop and transmit to the secretary of the Natural Resources Agency recommended amendments to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines to establish criteria for a lead agency to use to assess the need for translating certain notices required by the act into non-English languages and requirements for posting these notices in non-English languages. Requires the Natural Resources Agency secretary to certify and adopt these amendments by January 1, 2017. | 6/24/14 | Senate  
Appropriations Committee |  

**AB 716**  
(Quirk-Silva)  
State Infrastructure Plan | Requires the five-year state infrastructure plan to include an analysis of investment coordination opportunities related to infill and transit-oriented development. For purposes of the plan, expands the definition of infrastructure to include housing. | 6/18/13 | Senate  
Appropriations Committee |  

**AB 840**  
(Ammiano)  
Driver’s License Application Requirements | Requires that every application for an original or a renewal of a driver’s license contain a statement requiring the applicant to acknowledge that he or she knows of the dangers of distracted driving. Requires the statement to be incorporated at the first reprinting of the application on or after January 1, 2014, and at each reprinting thereafter. | 5/24/13 | Senate  
Transportation & Housing Committee |  

**AB 1046**  
(Gordon)  
Innovative Delivery Team Demonstration Program | Authorizes the director of Caltrans District 4 to direct existing resources to the Innovative Delivery Team Demonstration Program (iTeam), and to utilize department staff to perform reimbursed work for projects on and off the state highway system within Santa Clara County pursuant to the demonstration program’s master agreement and accompanying work programs. | 3/21/13 | Senate  
Appropriations Committee | Sponsor  

**AB 1081**  
(Medina)  
Goods-Movement-Related Infrastructure | Requires the state’s five-year infrastructure plan to include: (1) information pertaining to new, rehabilitated, modernized, improved, or renovated infrastructure identified by state or federal agencies, or by regional transportation agencies that directly relates to enhancing the movement of goods; (2) identification of state goods movement needs and strategies to address them, as outlined in the state freight plan; (3) recommendations for private-sector financing for goods-movement-related infrastructure; and (4) any good-movement-related infrastructure projects identified by Caltrans as eligible to submit to infrastructure financing exchanges. | 8/12/13 | Senate  
Appropriations Committee |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Assembly Bills</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Last Amended</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>VTA Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1193</strong></td>
<td>Bikeways</td>
<td>7/1/14</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1330</strong></td>
<td>Environmental Justice</td>
<td>9/6/13</td>
<td>Senate Floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Perez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1333</strong></td>
<td>Local Agency Contracts: Automatic Renewal Clauses</td>
<td>6/26/13</td>
<td>Senate Governance &amp; Finance Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hernandez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Add “cycle tracks” as a separate type of bikeway in California. Defines “cycle tracks” to mean a bikeway that provides a right-of-way designated exclusively for bicycle travel adjacent to a roadway, and that is protected from vehicle traffic. In cooperation with city and county governments, requires Caltrans to establish minimum safety design criteria for the planning and construction of each type of bikeway identified in state law. In developing these criteria, requires Caltrans to take into consideration the safety of vulnerable populations, such as children, seniors, persons with impaired vision, and persons of limited mobility. Requires Caltrans to public these criteria by January 1, 2016, and to update them at least biennially. Requires local agencies responsible for developing or operating bikeways or roadways where bicycle travel is permitted to utilize the uniform specifications and symbols for signs, markers and traffic control devices established by Caltrans. Also requires such local agencies to use the minimum safety design criteria established by Caltrans, unless they adopt alternative criteria by resolution at a public meeting as a standing policy.

If the legislative body of a local government entity limits the time for public comment, prohibits that body from counting the time used by a translator to translate comments from a non-English-speaker in determining whether the speaker has exceeded his or her time limit, unless simultaneous translation equipment is used. By January 1, 2015, requires the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA) to establish a list of environmental justice communities that identifies the top 15 percent of communities in the state, based on census tracts, disproportionately impacted by environmental hazards. Requires CalEPA to revise the list on a triennial basis. Requires enforcement agencies with jurisdiction over certain environmental laws and the courts to double the maximum amount of fines and penalties assessed if a violation occurs at a facility located in an environmental justice community that results in an increased level of emissions or discharges that exceeds the level permitted under law. Requires a portion of these fines and penalties to be deposited into the Green Zone Trust Fund to be used to support projects that are environmentally beneficial to environmental justice communities. By January 1, 2016, requires the Department of Toxic Substances Control to prepare and submit to the Legislature a state Hazardous Waste Reduction Plan that identifies measures necessary to achieve a significant reduction in the amount of hazardous waste generated and disposed of in California by 2025 to the maximum extent practicable. Requires the department to report to the Legislature on a biennial basis on its progress toward achieving the goals in the plan.

If a contract or memorandum of understanding (MOU) between a local agency and a private party with a total annual value of $250,000 or more contains an automatic renewal clause, requires the local agency to adopt a resolution that either exercises or declines to exercise the option to rescind the contract on or before the annual date by which the contract may be rescinded. Excludes a contract or MOU between a public agency and an employee organization that establishes terms and conditions of employment for the agency’s employees from the provisions of the bill.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Assembly Bills</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Last Amended</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>VTA Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB 1447 (Waldron)</td>
<td>Cap-and-Trade Auction Proceeds: Signal Synchronization Projects</td>
<td>7/1/14</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specifies that traffic signal synchronization may be eligible for an allocation of cap-and-trade auction proceeds from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund as a component of an eligible sustainable infrastructure project, if both of the following conditions are met: (1) the sponsoring agency’s governing board makes a finding that the traffic signal synchronization component is designed and implemented to achieve cost-effective reductions in greenhouse gas emissions; and (2) the traffic signal synchronization component includes specific emissions-reduction targets and metrics to evaluate its effect.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1501 (Patterson)</td>
<td>High-Speed Rail: Federal Funding</td>
<td>3/13/14</td>
<td>Assembly Transportation Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prohibits the California High-Speed Rail Authority from expending federal funds appropriated pursuant to the Budget Act of 2012 unless state dollars appropriated from the High-Speed Rail Passenger Bond Act or from another state funding source are immediately available to the authority for the purpose of matching the federal funds. Specifies that this prohibition shall apply regardless of whether the federal government has authorized the expenditure of the federal funds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1522 (Gonzalez)</td>
<td>Employment: Paid Sick Leave</td>
<td>6/15/14</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beginning July 1, 2015, provides that an employee who works in California for 30 or more days in a calendar year is entitled to paid sick days to be accrued at a rate of no less than one hour for every 30 hours worked. Specifies that an employee is entitled to use accrued sick days beginning on the 90th calendar day of employment. Authorizes an employer to limit an employee’s use of paid sick days to 24 hours or three days in each calendar year. Does not require the employer to provide additional paid sick days if the employer has a paid leave policy or paid time off policy, and the employer makes available an amount of leave that: (1) satisfies the accrual requirements of this bill; and (2) may be used for the same purposes and under the same conditions as specified in this bill. Does not require an employer to provide compensation to an employee for accrued, unused paid sick days upon termination, resignation, retirement, or other separation from employment. If an employee separates from an employer and is rehired by the employer within one year, requires previously accrued and unused paid sick days to be reinstated. Requires an employer to provide paid sick days, upon the request of an employee, for: (1) diagnosis, care or treatment of an existing health condition of, or preventive care for, the employee or an employee’s family member; and (2) leave related to domestic violence, sexual assault or stalking. Prohibits an employer from discriminating or retaliating against an employee who requests paid sick days. Requires the Labor Commissioner to administer and enforce these requirements, including the promulgation of regulations; and the investigation, mitigation and relief of violations. Specifies that the provisions of the bill do not apply to employees covered by a collective bargaining agreement that provides for paid sick days and that does not lessen any other obligations of the employer to employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1536 (Olsen)</td>
<td>Public Transportation Employees: Strike Prohibition</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Public Employees, Retirement &amp; Social Security Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prohibits public transportation employees or public transportation employee organizations from engaging in, causing, instigating, encouraging, or condoning a strike. Provides that a public transportation employee who violates this prohibition is subject to removal or other disciplinary action. Specifies that if the Public Employee Relations Board determines that a public transportation employee organization has violated the provisions of this bill, the board may order forfeiture of specified rights granted to the organization under state law.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assembly Bills</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Last Amended</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>VTA Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1620</strong> (Rodriguez) California Emergency &amp; Disaster Preparedness Commission</td>
<td>Establishes the California Emergency &amp; Disaster Preparedness Commission to assess and improve the condition of the state’s emergency preparedness, management and disaster recovery capabilities. Requires the commission to review and make recommendations on emergency management and disaster preparedness, including all of the following: (1) vulnerabilities in the state’s health care, energy, transportation, communication, and other systems infrastructure; (2) the availability of adequate equipment, fuel, food, water, and other emergency supplies; and (3) the ability of first responders and other critical personnel to communicate effectively with each other and have access to adequate resources.</td>
<td>4/22/14</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1639</strong> (Grove) Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund: High-Speed Rail</td>
<td>Prohibits cap-and-trade auction proceeds deposited in the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund from being appropriated for purposes of the state’s proposed high-speed rail system.</td>
<td>4/22/14</td>
<td>Assembly Natural Resources Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1646</strong> (Frazier) Electronic Wireless Communication Devices</td>
<td>Requires the driver’s license examination administered by the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to include a test of the applicant’s understanding of the distractions and dangers of handheld cellular phone use and text-messaging while operating a motor vehicle. Increases the penalties for driving a motor vehicle while using: (1) a wireless telephone; and (2) an electronic wireless device to write, send or read tax-based communications.</td>
<td>8/5/14</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1684</strong> (Chavez) North San Diego County Transit District: Three-Position Bike Racks</td>
<td>Allows the North San Diego County Transit District to install folding devices attached to the front of its buses that are designed and used exclusively for transporting bicycles if: (1) the device does not extend more than 43 inches from the front of the bus, or more than 36 inches from the front bumper, when fully deployed; (2) the device, including all bicycles mounted on it, does not materially affect the efficiency or visibility of vehicle safety equipment; (3) the handlebars of a bicycle being transported on the device do not extend more than 49 inches from the front of the bus, or more than 42 inches from the front bumper; and (4) the total length of the bus, including the device and load, does not exceed 45 feet. Requires the district to establish a route review committee prior to the installation of the initial folding device on a bus that is more than 40 feet in length. Requires the committee to perform an initial review of the routes on which the district proposes to operate a bus that is longer than 40 feet and that is equipped with a front-mounted bicycle rack, and to determine, by a unanimous vote of all members, the routes that are suitable for the safe operation of such buses. Before conducting a vote, requires the committee to obtain certification approved by a licensed traffic engineer that all proposed routes are safe for travel by such buses.</td>
<td>3/28/14</td>
<td>Assembly Transportation Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1705</strong> (Williams) Public Contracts: Retention Proceeds</td>
<td>As it relates to retention proceeds in public works contracts, clarifies that a project is not “substantially complex” if it is regularly, customarily or routinely performed by a public agency or by licensed contractors. If a project is deemed to be substantially complex, requires details explaining the basis of that finding to be included in the bid documents in addition to the actual retention amount.</td>
<td>6/11/14</td>
<td>Senate Floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assembly Bills</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Last Amended</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>VTA Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1720 (Bloom)</td>
<td>Public Transit Bus Weight Limit</td>
<td>Extends until January 1, 2016, provisions in existing law that allow a public transit agency to buy a new bus exceeding the 20,500-pound single axle weight limit if it is of the same or lesser weight than the vehicle that is being replaced, or is being procured in order to incorporate a new fleet class into the public transit agency’s inventory. Also allows a public transit agency, until January 1, 2016, to procure a new bus exceeding the weight limit to expand an existing fleet class.</td>
<td>6/10/14</td>
<td>Governor’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1721 (Linder)</td>
<td>Express Lanes: Clean Air Vehicles</td>
<td>Authorizes a local agency administering express lanes to either allow single-occupant, low-emission and fuel-efficient vehicles to use the lanes for free or charge them a discounted toll.</td>
<td>8/6/14</td>
<td>Senate Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1724 (Frazier)</td>
<td>CMCG Contracting</td>
<td>Authorizes a regional transportation agency, as defined, to use the Construction Manager/General Contractor (CMGC) project delivery method for highway, bridge, expressway, and tunnel projects. Defines “Construction Manager/General Contractor” to mean a project delivery method in which a construction manager is procured to provide preconstruction services during the design phase of the project and construction services during the construction phase of the project. Requires a regional transportation agency to make a written finding that the use of CMGC contracting for a particular project will accomplish one or more of the following objectives: (a) reduce project costs; (b) expedite the project’s completion; or (c) provide features not achievable through the design-bid-build method. Requires a regional transportation agency that intends to use CMGC contracting to establish a procedure for evaluating and selecting a construction manager through a request for qualifications. Provides that a contract for construction services may be awarded after the design plans have been sufficiently developed, and either a fixed price or a guaranteed maximum price has been successfully negotiated with the construction manager. In the event that a fixed price or guaranteed minimum price cannot be negotiated with the construction manager, allows a regional transportation agency to publicly advertize and award the contract for construction services.</td>
<td>6/10/14</td>
<td>Senate Transportation &amp; Housing Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1799 (Gordon)</td>
<td>Mitigation Property</td>
<td>If a governmental entity or special district is a project proponent required to provide long-term stewardship of real property conveyed to mitigate the environmental impact of the project, specifies that an endowment or other financial mechanism for long-term stewardship is not required if the governmental entity or special district: (1) provides evidence that it possesses an investment-grade credit rating by a nationally recognized statistical rating organization or other equivalent evidence of financial reliability; and (2) enters into a contractual agreement with the state or local agency enforcing the mitigation requirements to fund the long-term stewardship of the property. Authorizes the state or local agency enforcing the mitigation requirements to require the governmental entity or special district to provide an endowment if: (1) the governmental entity or special district is subsequently downgraded below an investment-grade credit rating; or (2) the governmental entity or special district fails to adequately fund the long-term stewardship pursuant to the terms of the contractual agreement.</td>
<td>5/1/14</td>
<td>Assembly Appropriations Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assembly Bills</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Last Amended</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>VTA Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1811 (Buchanan) Alameda County Transportation Commission: Express Lanes</td>
<td>Amends the enabling statutes for the Alameda County Transportation Commission related to the implementation of express lanes to allow for the use of switchable tags.</td>
<td>4/8/14</td>
<td>Signed into Law: Chapter #94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1813 (Quirk) Fuel Producer Capital Assistance Program</td>
<td>Establishes the Fuel Producer Capital Assistance Program to be administered by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to provide financial assistance to liquid-transportation-fuel producers who wish to locate within the state a large-scale facility that produces more than 3 million gallons per year. Appropriates $100 million in cap-and-trade auction proceeds from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund for this program.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Natural Resources Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1864 (Daly) Registration of Vehicles and Certificates of Title</td>
<td>In consultation with the California Highway Patrol (CHP), requires the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to assess the need for a temporary vehicle identification system that is different from the current practice of displaying the report of sale on a vehicle. Requires the types of temporary vehicle identification systems to be examined by the DMV to include all of the following: (1) an enhanced display of the report of sale on a vehicle; (2) a temporary license plate system that is not integrated with the databases of the DMV or law enforcement; (3) a temporary license plate system with a database that is accessible to the DMV and law enforcement; and (4) a temporary license plate system that is fully integrated with the DMV’s database and the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System. By January 1, 2016, requires the DMV to submit to the Legislature a report that includes the results of the assessment. In consultation with the CHP, requires the DMV to make a recommendation in the report as to whether the state should implement a new temporary vehicle identification system.</td>
<td>8/6/14</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assembly Bills</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Last Amended</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>VTA Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1970 (Gordon) Community Investment and Innovation Program</td>
<td>Requires the Strategic Growth Council, in consultation with the California Air Resources Board (CARB), to administer the Community Investment and Innovation Program to provide grants and other financial assistance on a competitive basis to local entities to develop and implement integrated community-level greenhouse gas emissions reduction projects in their region, subject to appropriations from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund by the Legislature. Requires the Strategic Growth Council to develop guidelines for the program. Requires these guidelines to provide for a portfolio of projects to be implemented that reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and maximize the ability to achieve one or more of the following: (1) decrease air or water pollution; (2) reduce the consumption of natural resources or energy; (3) provide opportunities to increase localized energy resources; (4) promote public-private partnerships to implement energy efficiency and clean energy projects; (5) promote financing incentives for residential and commercial facilities; (6) increase the reliability of local water supplies; (7) increase solid waste diversion from landfills; (8) increase electric vehicle infrastructure; (9) reduce vehicle miles traveled; or (10) prevent the conversion of agricultural, forest and open space lands to uses that result in higher greenhouse gas emissions. In evaluating potential projects to be funded, requires the Strategic Growth Council to give priority to projects that demonstrate one or more of the following characteristics: (1) the ability to leverage additional public and private funding; (2) the potential for co-benefits or multi-benefit attributes; (3) the potential for the project or program to be replicated, and to create best practices to serve as a model for communities across the state; and (4) demonstration of innovative strategies and approaches to reducing greenhouse gas emissions.</td>
<td>4/10/14</td>
<td>Assembly Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1992 (Quirk) Very Low Carbon Liquid Transportation Fuels</td>
<td>Authorizes the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to establish a Very Low Carbon Fuel Market Commitment Program. Under this program, allows CARB to require wholesalers, producers, importers, or any other entity that provides transportation fuel to a retailer or sells such fuel to a consumer to include a specified percentage not to exceed 2 percent of very low carbon transportation fuel as part of its fuel sales in California. Specifies that the bill does not replace or modify any existing standards or requirements under the state’s Low-Carbon Fuel Standard regulation.</td>
<td>6/5/14</td>
<td>Senate Transportation &amp; Housing Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1998 (Grove) Vehicle Registration Fees</td>
<td>Requires the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to do all of the following: (1) clearly identify the $43 registration fee as the “base registration fee” on any application for initial registration or renewal of registration; (2) clearly identify each additional fee or surcharge added to the base registration fee as a separate and distinct line item on those applications; and (3) provide with each application a brief description of the purpose for each fee or surcharge, as well as the statutory authority for them.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Transportation Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2008 (Quirk) Transit Village Plans: Goods Movement</td>
<td>Increases the number of demonstrable public benefits that a transit village plan must address from five to six. Adds the following to the list of public benefits that a local agency could consider when preparing a transit village plan: (1) the minimization of the impact of goods movement on air quality, traffic and public safety through the provision of dedicated loading and unloading facilities for commercial space.</td>
<td>5/7/14</td>
<td>Signed into Law: Chapter #88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assembly Bills</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Last Amended</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>VTA Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **AB 2013** (Muratsuchi)  
HOV Lanes: Low-Emission and Fuel-Efficient Vehicles | Increases the number of green stickers that can be issued by the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to allow certain low-emission and fuel-efficient vehicles to use high-occupancy vehicle lanes regardless of the number of occupants from 40,000 to 70,000. | 8/7/14 | Senate Appropriations Committee | |
| **AB 2021** (Gordon)  
San Mateo County Transit District: CMGC Contracting | Authorizes the San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans) to elect to use its own state-approved labor compliance program to enforce prevailing wage requirements for contracts that it awards using the Construction Manager/General Contractor (CMGC) procurement method. | 6/17/14 | Senate Appropriations Committee | |
| **AB 2030** (Campos)  
Employees: Time Off | Prohibits an employee from being required to use existing vacation, personal leave or compensatory time off for purposes of a planned absence to participate in activities of the K-12 school or licensed child day care facility of any of his or her children, unless otherwise provided by a collective bargaining agreement entered into before January 1, 2015, and in effect on that date. In addition, prohibits an employee from being required to use time off without pay for this purpose. Specifies that the entitlement of any employee under the provisions of this bill shall not be diminished by any collective bargaining agreement term or condition that is agreed to on or after January 1, 2015. | As Introduced | Assembly Labor & Employment Committee | |
| **AB 2036** (Mansoor)  
Orange County Toll Facilities: Voter-Approval Requirement | Authorizes a toll facility to be initially implemented on a public highway within the boundaries of Orange County only if it is approved by a two-thirds vote of the electorate in that county. | 4/9/14 | Assembly Transportation Committee | |
| **AB 2040** (Garcia)  
Public Official Compensation | Requires a local agency to report to the Controller’s Office the annual compensation of its public officials in accordance with reporting instructions developed by the Controller’s Office in consultation with the affected local agencies. Also requires a local agency to post this information on its Internet Web site. Defines “public official” to mean every member, officer and employee of a local agency. | 6/25/14 | Senate Appropriations Committee | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Assembly Bills</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Last Amended</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>VTA Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 2050</strong> (Quirk) Global Warming Solutions Act: Scoping Plan</td>
<td>For purposes of advising the update of the next Scoping Plan for the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB), by January 1, 2016, to develop all of the following: (1) a proposal for further reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 2050, including intermediate goals; (2) an evaluation of the proposed emissions-reduction goals based on what policies and technologies can be scaled to the rest of the country and the world; (3) an economic assessment using the best models and data of the various strategies required to achieve the proposed emissions-reduction goals; (4) an analysis of the benefits to the health, safety and welfare of California residents, worker safety, the state’s environment and quality of life, and other benefits associated with the various strategies required to achieve the proposed emissions-reduction goals; and (5) the establishment of consistent metrics to accurately quantify reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, quantify public health benefits, and measure the cost-effectiveness of various policies and technologies.</td>
<td>6/30/14</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 2053</strong> (Gonzalez) Employment Discrimination or Harassment</td>
<td>Requires the sexual harassment education and training provided to all supervisory positions by an employer to include the prevention of abusive conduct. Defines “abusive conduct” to mean conduct of an employer or employee in the workplace, with malice, that a reasonable person would find hostile, offensive and unrelated to an employer’s legitimate business interests.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 2090</strong> (Fong) Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority: Express Lanes</td>
<td>Amends the enabling statutes for the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) and the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) related to the implementation of express lanes to allow for the use of switchable tags. Rather than maintaining a certain level of service for their express lanes, requires VTA and SANDAG, with the consent of Caltrans, to instead establish appropriate performance measures, such as speed or travel times, for the purpose of ensuring optimal use of the express lanes by high-occupancy vehicles without adversely affecting other traffic on the state highway system. Allows VTA and SANDAG to use “net” revenues generated from their express lanes for transportation corridor improvements that are not directly linked to the express lane facilities.</td>
<td>8/4/14</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
<td>Co-Sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 2119</strong> (Stone) County Taxes</td>
<td>Clarifies that a county board of supervisor may levy, increase or extend a transactions and use tax for special purposes either throughout the entire county or only within the unincorporated area of the county, if approved by a two-thirds vote of the electorate of the entire county or the unincorporated area of the county, as applicable. Requires the revenues derived from the imposition of the tax to be used within the area for which the tax was approved by the voters. Also, clarifies that a county board of supervisor may levy, increase or extend a transactions and use tax for general purposes either throughout the entire county or only within the unincorporated area of the county, if approved by a majority vote of the electorate of the entire county or the unincorporated area of the county, as applicable.</td>
<td>5/14/14</td>
<td>Signed into Law: Chapter 149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assembly Bills</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Last Amended</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>VTA Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **AB 2135**<br>(Ting)  
Local Agencies: Surplus Land | Increases the minimum time that a local agency disposing of surplus land is required to conduct negotiations from 60 to 90 days. Requires an entity proposing to use the surplus land for developing low- and moderate-income housing to agree to make available not less than 25 percent of the total number of units developed on the parcels at affordable housing cost or affordable rent for a period of at least 55 years to lower-income households. Requires a local agency to give first priority in disposing of the surplus land to an entity that agrees to these requirements. In the event that a local agency disposing of surplus land receives offers from more than one entity agreeing to these requirements, requires the local agency to give first priority to the entity that proposes to provide the greatest number of units that meet these requirements at the deepest level of affordability. Permits the payment period for surplus land sold for low- and moderate-income housing properties to exceed 20 years. If a local agency does not agree to price and terms with an entity to which notice and an opportunity to purchase or lease are given, and disposes of the surplus land to an entity that uses the property for the development of 10 or more residential units, requires the entity or a successor-in-interest to provide not less than 15 percent of the total number of units developed on the parcels at affordable housing cost or affordable rent for a period of at least 55 years to lower-income households. | 6/9/14 | Senate Appropriations Committee | |
| **AB 2170**<br>(Mullin)  
Joint Powers Authorities: Common Powers | Clarifies that a joint powers authority may exercise any power common to the contracting parties, including the ability to levy a fee, assessment or tax. | 6/17/14 | Senate Governance & Finance Committee | |
| **AB 2197**<br>(Mullin)  
Vehicles: Temporary License Plates | By April 1, 2015, requires the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to issue a request for proposals for purposes of contracting with a private industry partner for the development of a system to enable new and used car dealers to print on a standard laser printer a unique temporary license plate to be installed on any vehicle sold without a permanent metal plate. Requires this temporary license plate system to be in operation by January 1, 2016. Requires the license plate information to be entered into an electronic database in real time at the point of sale to allow law enforcement and toll agencies to access the relevant information needed for public safety purposes and for processing toll violations. | 4/23/14 | Assembly Appropriations Committee | |
| **AB 2202**<br>(Logue)  
Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Regulations: Small Independent Fuel Marketers | Exempts small independent fuel marketers from the following California Air Resources Board (CARB) regulations relating to the Global Warming Solutions Act: (1) annual reporting and monitoring of greenhouse gas emissions; (2) compliance with greenhouse gas emission limits and implementation of reduction measures; and (3) participation in market-based compliance mechanisms, such as cap-and-trade. Defines “small independent fuel marketers” to mean a company with gross annual revenues from motor vehicle fuel sales in California of $10 billion or less. | As Introduced | Assembly Natural Resources Committee | |
| **AB 2250**<br>(Daly)  
Express Lanes: Toll Revenues | Requires any toll revenues generated from a managed lane on the state highway system that is administered by a local agency to be expended only within the respective corridor in which the lane is located. | 6/26/14 | Senate Appropriations Committee | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Assembly Bills</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Last Amended</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>VTA Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB 2280 (Alejo) Community Revitalization and Investment Authorities</td>
<td>Authorizes cities, counties and special districts to establish community revitalization and investment authorities to invest property tax increment revenues to relieve conditions of unemployment, reduce high crime rates, repair deteriorated or inadequate infrastructure, promote affordable housing, and improve conditions leading to increased employment opportunities. Prohibits a city or county with a redevelopment agency that was dissolved from forming a community revitalization and investment authority, unless the successor agency or designated local authority for the former redevelopment agency has received a finding of completion from the Department of Finance. Requires at least 80 percent of the land calculated by census tracts within the area for which a community revitalization and investment authority is proposed to be formed to be characterized by both of the following conditions: (1) an annual median household income that is less than 80 percent of the statewide annual median income; and (2) three of the following four conditions: non-seasonal unemployment that is at least 3 percent higher than statewide median unemployment, crime rates that are 5 percent higher than the statewide median crime rate, deteriorated or inadequate infrastructure, or deteriorated commercial or residential structures. Allows a community revitalization and investment authority to: (1) provide funding to rehabilitate, repair, upgrade, or construct infrastructure; (2) provide funding for low- and moderate-income housing; (3) remedy or remove a release of hazardous substances; (4) provide for seismic retrofits of existing buildings; (5) make loans or grants for owners or tenants to improve, rehabilitate or retrofit buildings or structures; and (6) provide direct assistance to businesses in connection with new or existing facilities for industrial or manufacturing uses. Allows a community revitalization and investment authority to receive property tax increment revenues from only those affected taxing entities that have adopted a resolution approving the authority’s investment plan. Every 10 years, requires a community revitalization and investment authority to conduct a protest proceeding to consider whether the property owners within the area wish for the authority to continue to take further actions to implement its investment plan. Every five years, requires a community revitalization and investment authority to contract for an independent audit with respect to the maintenance and replacement of affordable housing.</td>
<td>4/7/14</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2292 (Bonta) Infrastructure Financing Districts: Broadband</td>
<td>Allows an infrastructure financing district (IFD) to finance public capital facilities or projects that include broadband. Defines “broadband” to mean communications network facilities that enable high-speed Internet access.</td>
<td>6/11/14</td>
<td>Assembly Local Government Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assembly Bills</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Last Amended</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>VTA Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 2312</strong> (Nestande) Metal Theft: Theft Alert Notifications</td>
<td>Requires junk dealers and recyclers to request to receive theft alert notifications regarding the theft of commodity metals in their geographic region from the theft alert system maintained by the Institute of Scrap Recycling Industries, Inc. Requires a junk dealer or recycler applying for a new weightmaster license or for a renewal of such a license from the Department of Food &amp; Agriculture to indicate on the application that he or she has requested to receive these theft alert notifications. Encourages law enforcement agencies to report thefts of commodity metals that have occurred within their jurisdiction to the theft alert system in order to ensure that people using the system receive timely and thorough information regarding metal thefts. Prohibits the Institute of Scrap Recycling Industries, Inc., from requiring payment for the use of the theft alert system by law enforcement agencies or members of the public. Also prohibits the institute from selling subscribers’ information to third parties.</td>
<td>8/5/14</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 2313</strong> (Nestande) Metal Theft Task Force Program</td>
<td>Requires the Department of Justice to establish a Metal Theft Task Force Program to award grants to applicant agencies for the purpose of enhancing the capacity of local law enforcement and district attorneys to deter, investigate and prosecute illegal recycling operations, and metal theft and related recycling crimes. Also allows the Department of Justice to expend funds under this program to serve as the lead law enforcement agency in the investigation of metal theft crimes. Creates the Metal Theft Task Force Fund to be administered by the Department of Justice. Continuously appropriates all revenues in the fund to the Department of Justice for implementing the Metal Theft Task Force Program. Imposes a license fee, as determined by the Department of Justice, on a weighmaster who is a recycler or a junk dealer, or who is performing services on behalf of a recycler or junk dealer. Requires the revenues generated from this license fee to be deposited in the Metal Theft Task Force Fund. Specifies that the Metal Theft Task Force Program shall not be implemented until the Department of Justice determines that sufficient revenues have been deposited in the Metal Theft Task Force Fund to cover all costs relating to the start-up and administration of the program.</td>
<td>8/4/14</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 2355</strong> (Levine) Streets and Roads: Recycled Materials</td>
<td>By January 1, 2017, requires a local agency that has jurisdiction over a street or highway to do either of the following: (1) adopt standards developed by Caltrans for recycled paving materials, as well as for recycled base, subbase and pervious backfill materials; or (2) discuss at a regularly scheduled public hearing of the local agency’s legislative or other governing body why the standards are not being adopted.</td>
<td>6/11/14</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 2445</strong> (Chau) Community Colleges: Transportation Fees</td>
<td>Specifies that a community college district is authorized to enter into a contract for transportation services if a majority of the students of that district, or of a campus of that district, as appropriate, approves the payment of the fee for those services.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Signed into Law: Chapter #63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 2447</strong> (Cooley) Sacramento Regional Transit District: Public Contracts</td>
<td>Raises the dollar threshold for when the Sacramento Regional Transit District must use the formal competitive bidding process for construction contracts from $5,000 to $25,000.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Local Government Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assembly Bills</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Last Amended</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>VTA Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 2471</strong></td>
<td>Public Contracts: Change Orders</td>
<td>When authorized to order changes or additions to the work in a public works contract awarded to the lowest responsible bidder, requires a public entity to issue a change order for the extra work required of the original contractor promptly, and in no event later than 60 days after the extra work is complete, and an agreement is reached concerning the merit, conditions, costs, and time for performance. Requires an original contractor to respond promptly to a request from a duly authorized representative of a public entity for documentation to support a request for a change order. Provides that a public entity shall specify in the contract the information required from the contractor to support any requested change order. Allows an original contractor to present to a public entity a request for a change order for extra work performed by a subcontractor or by a lower-tier subcontractor. Also allows a subcontractor to request in writing that an original contractor present a change order for extra work directed by the public entity that was performed by the subcontractor or by a lower-tier subcontractor on behalf of the subcontractor. Requires the subcontractor to furnish reasonable documentation to support the change order. Within 45 days of receipt of this written request, requires the original contractor to notify the subcontractor in writing as to whether the original contractor presented the request to the public entity or, if not, a statement of the reasons for not doing so.</td>
<td>8/4/14</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 2565</strong></td>
<td>Rental Property: Electronic Vehicle Charging Stations</td>
<td>Voids any term in a lease that is executed, renewed or extended on or after January 1, 2015, that conveys any possessory interest in commercial property that either prohibits or unreasonably restricts the installation or use of an electric vehicle charging station in a parking space associated with the commercial property. For any lease executed, renewed or extended on or after July 1, 2015, requires the lessor of a dwelling to approve a written request of a lessee to install an electric vehicle charging station at the lessee’s designated parking space that complies with the lessor’s procedural approval process for modification to the property. Specifies that this requirement does not apply to residential rental properties where: (1) electric vehicle charging stations already exist for lessees in a ratio that is equal to or greater than 10 percent of the designated parking spaces; (2) parking is not provided as part of the lease agreement; (3) there are less than five parking spaces; and (4) a dwelling is subject to the residential rent control ordinance of a public entity. Specifies that a lessor is not be obligated to provide an additional parking space to a lessee in order to accommodate an electric vehicle charging station. Provides that if the electric vehicle charging station has the effect of providing the lessee with a reserved parking space, allows the lessor to charge a monthly rental amount for that parking space. Requires the lessee to maintain a $1 million general liability insurance policy.</td>
<td>6/16/14</td>
<td>Senate Judiciary Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| AB 2650  
(Conway)  
High-Speed Rail:  
Bond Funding | Subject to voter approval, provides that no further bonds shall be sold for high-speed rail purposes pursuant to the Safe, Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the 21st Century (Proposition 1A). Upon appropriation by the Legislature, requires the unspent proceeds received from outstanding bonds issued and sold prior to the effective date of the provisions of this bill to be redirected from high-speed rail purposes to retiring the debt incurred from the issuance and sale of those outstanding bonds. Authorizes the remaining unissued bonds, as of the effective date of the provisions of this bill, to be issued and sold. Upon appropriation by the Legislature, requires the net proceeds from the sale of the remaining unissued bonds to be made available as follows: (1) 40 percent to fund projects in the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP); (2) 40 percent to fund projects in the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP); and (3) 20 percent to fund port and freight infrastructure improvement projects identified in the state’s freight plan. Directs the Secretary of State’s Office to submit the provisions of this bill to the voters on the ballot of the next statewide general election. | As Introduced | Assembly Transportation Committee |
| AB 2651  
(Linder)  
Vehicle Weight Fee  
Revenues | Effective January 1, 2016, prohibits vehicle weight fee revenues from being used to pay debt service on transportation general obligation bonds. | As Introduced | Assembly Transportation Committee |
| AB 2652  
(Linder)  
General Fund  
Revenues | Appropriates any revenues that exceed the Governor’s January 10th forecast for FY 2014 and FY 2015 as follows: (1) to meet the Proposition 98 guaranteed spending levels for K-12 public schools and community colleges; (2) to repay outstanding loan balances owed by the General Fund to various transportation accounts in an amount not to exceed $2.534 billion; and (3) for deposit in the Budget Stabilization Account. Requires any loans repaid to the State Highway Account, the Transportation Congestion Relief Fund and the Highway Users Tax Account to be allocated to cities and counties for local streets and roads. | 3/28/14 | Assembly Budget Committee |
| AB 2653  
(Linder)  
Transportation  
Funding | Requires all of the revenues derived from increases in the state gasoline excise tax resulting from the transportation funding swap initially enacted in 2010 and reaffirmed in 2011 to be allocated to cities and counties for local streets and roads. Requires State Highway Account revenues derived from miscellaneous Caltrans activities, such as the sale of documents to the public, rental income and the sale of surplus property, to be apportioned as follows: (1) 44 percent to the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP); (2) 44 percent to cities and counties for local streets and roads; and (3) 12 percent to the State Highway Operation & Protection Program (SHOPP). | 3/28/14 | Assembly Budget Committee |
| AB 2707  
(Chau)  
Three-Position Bike  
Racks | Allows a public transit agency to install folding devices attached to the front of its buses that are designed and used exclusively for transporting bicycles if: (1) the device does not extend more than 40 inches from the front of the bus when fully deployed; (2) the device, including all bicycles transported thereon, is mounted in a manner that does not materially affect efficiency or visibility of vehicle safety equipment; (3) the handlebars of the bicycles being transported do not extend more than 46 inches from the front of the bus; and (4) the device is installed on a bus that is not more than 40 feet in length. | 5/22/14 | Assembly Floor: Concurrence | Support |
<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 2728**  
(Perea) Vehicle Weight Fee Revenues | Until January 1, 2019, prohibits vehicle weight fee revenues from being used to pay for debt service on transportation-related, general obligation bonds or from being loaned to the General Fund. | 4/24/14      | Assembly Appropriations Committee           |                    |
| **ACA 6**  
(Gatto) Constitutional Amendments | Calls for placing before the voters an amendment to the California Constitution that would increase the voting requirement from a simple majority to a 55 percent majority to amend the Constitution by an initiative measure. However, continues to permit the electors to repeal a previously adopted initiative or legislative amendment to the Constitution by an initiative measure passed by a simple majority. | 7/3/14      | Assembly Elections & Redistricting Committee |                    |
| **ACA 8**  
(Blumenfield) Local Government Financing: Voter Approval | Calls for placing before the voters an amendment to the California Constitution to allow a local agency to incur indebtedness in the form of general obligation bonds, if approved by its electorate by a 55 percent majority, to fund the construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, maintenance, replacement, earthquake repair, or seismic retrofit of: (1) public improvements, including improvements to transportation infrastructure, streets and roads, sidewalks, transit systems, highways, freeways, sewer systems, water systems, wastewater systems, storm drain systems, and park and recreation facilities; and (2) facilities or buildings used primarily to provide sheriff, police or fire protection services to the public. Creates an exception to the 1 percent limit for property tax assessments if the revenues are being used to pay bonded indebtedness, approved by a 55 percent majority vote, to fund the construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, maintenance, replacement, earthquake repair, or seismic retrofit of: (1) public improvements, including improvements to transportation infrastructure, streets and roads, sidewalks, transit systems, highways, freeways, sewer systems, water systems, wastewater systems, storm drain systems, and park and recreation facilities; and (2) facilities or buildings used primarily to provide sheriff, police or fire protection services to the public. | 4/4/13      | Senate Governance & Finance Committee      |                    |
| **HR 29**  
(Gomez) Outsourcing of Public Services and Assets | States that the Assembly opposes the outsourcing of public services and assets, and supports processes that give public service workers the opportunity to develop their own plan on how to deliver cost-effective, high-quality services. States the intent of the Assembly to introduce and advocate for responsible outsourcing legislation. | 4/3/14      | Adopted by the Assembly                    |                    |
## 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. Provides that a city or county that created a redevelopment agency that was dissolved pursuant to state law cannot form a Sustainable Communities Investment Authority, unless the successor agency or designated local authority for the former redevelopment agency has received a finding of completion from the Department of Finance. Also provides that a city, county or special district that has declared a fiscal emergency cannot form a Sustainable Communities Investment Authority, unless it subsequently declares that the fiscal emergency has been resolved. Requires a Sustainable Communities Investment Area to include only the following: (1) transit priority project areas; (2) areas that are small walkable communities; or (3) sites that have land-use approvals, covenants, conditions, or other effective controls restricting them to clean energy manufacturing. 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; (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; and (5) an ordinance that prohibits the number of housing units occupied by extremely low-income, very low-income and low-income households from being reduced in the Sustainable Communities Investment Area, and that requires the replacement of any such units upon their removal. 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>9/3/13</td>
<td>Senate Floor: Concurrence</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 11 (Pavley)</td>
<td>Alternative Fuel and Vehicle Technologies: Funding Programs</td>
<td>Extends the authorization and various funding sources for the following three alternative fuel and vehicle technology programs until January 1, 2024: (1) the Enhanced Fleet Modernization Program administered by the California Air Resources Board (CARB); (2) the Alternative and Renewable Fuel and Vehicle Technology Program administered by the California Energy Commission; and (3) the Air Quality Improvement Program administered by CARB. Extends the authorization for the Carl Moyer Program administered by local air districts until January 1, 2024. Provides that this bill shall become operative only if AB 8 (Perea) is also enacted.</td>
<td>9/6/13</td>
<td>Assembly Transportation Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 33 (Wolk)</td>
<td>Infrastructure Financing Districts</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. Prohibits an infrastructure financing district from financing any project or portion of a project within the boundaries of a former redevelopment agency until the successor agency to the former redevelopment agency has received a finding of completion from the Department of Finance. 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>8/26/13</td>
<td>Assembly Floor</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><strong>SB 64</strong> (Corbett) Global Warming Solutions Act: Clean Technology Innovation Account</td>
<td>Creates the Clean Technology Innovation Account within the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund. Requires the Legislature to annually appropriate cap-and-trade auction proceeds or other funds to the Clean Technology Innovation Account in the Budget Act. Requires the revenues in the account to be made available to the Governor’s Office of Business and Economic Development for the following purposes: (1) to evaluate the efficacy of a new technology or product that could potentially reduce greenhouse gas emissions; and (2) to provide grants for technologies or products that have been evaluated and confirmed to have the potential to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and that require financial assistance for commercialization. Requires the Governor’s Office of Business and Economic Development to establish a Science and Business Review Committee to assist in: (1) developing criteria for greenhouse gas emissions evaluation and efficacy programs; (2) determining funding priorities and developing the policy guidelines for the grants; and (3) evaluating and scoring funding requests.</td>
<td>7/2/14</td>
<td>Assembly Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 151</strong> (DeSaulnier) SHOPP Projects</td>
<td>Beginning February 1, 2016, requires a California Transportation Commission (CTC) allocation for a State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) project to include all capital and support costs. For a SHOPP project that experiences increases in capital or support costs above the amount in the allocation approved by the CTC, requires Caltrans to submit a supplemental project allocation request to the commission for approval. Allows the CTC to establish guidelines to provide exceptions to these requirements in order to ensure that projects are not unnecessarily delayed.</td>
<td>8/4/14</td>
<td>Assembly Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 242</strong> (Wyland) Toll Collection: Alternative Technologies</td>
<td>Authorizes Caltrans, and local and regional transportation agencies with existing or planned toll facilities within their respective jurisdictions to conduct a pilot project that uses automated toll collection technologies as an alternative to the existing radio-frequency identification tolling technology in order to identify opportunities to facilitate lower-cost tolling infrastructure, lower related operating costs and more rapid deployment of high-occupancy toll lane networks. Provides that such a pilot project may include the deployment of tolling technologies that may or may not meet interoperability requirements. Allows Caltrans, and local and regional transportation agencies to undertake alternative tolling technology pilot projects for a period of up to four years. Requires any vendor electing to participate in such a pilot project to cover all related costs incurred by Caltrans, or the local or regional transportation agency. Allows a pilot project to be conducted if it does not cause a reduction in California’s federal-aid highway funds. Sunsets the provisions of the bill on January 1, 2018.</td>
<td>4/23/13</td>
<td>Assembly Transportation Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 263</strong> (Monning) State Agencies: Public Transit Service Contracts</td>
<td>Requires a state agency to give a 10 percent preference to any bidder on a contract to provide public transit services who agrees to retain employees of the prior contractor or subcontractor for a period of not less than 90 days.</td>
<td>1/21/14</td>
<td>Assembly Appropriations 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><strong>SB 391</strong></td>
<td>Imposes a fee of $75 to be paid at the time of the recording of every real estate instrument, paper or notice required or permitted by law to be recorded. Requires that the revenues from this fee be allocated quarterly to the Department of Housing and Community Development for deposit into the California Homes and Jobs Trust Fund. Upon appropriation by the Legislature, authorizes the money in the fund to be expended for the following purposes: (1) supporting the development, acquisition, rehabilitation, and preservation of housing affordable to low- and moderate-income households; (2) administering housing programs that receive an allocation from the fund; and (3) the cost of periodic audits of the fund by the California State Auditor’s Office. For all public works projects costing in excess of $1 million that are funded in whole or in part from the Homes and Jobs Trust Fund, requires either of the following: (1) the Department of Industrial Relations to monitor and enforce compliance with prevailing wage requirements for any construction contract; or (2) the project sponsor to have in place a collective bargaining agreement that binds all of the contractors performing work on the project and that includes a mechanism for resolving disputes regarding the payment of wages. Requires the Department of Housing and Community Development to develop and submit to the Legislature a five-year California Homes and Jobs Trust Fund Investment Strategy in conjunction with the Governor’s FY 2015 May Revision to the State Budget. Beginning with FY 2020, requires the department to submit an update of the California Homes and Jobs Trust Fund Investment Strategy every five years concurrent with the release of the Governor’s proposed budget.</td>
<td>8/8/13</td>
<td>Assembly Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 486</strong></td>
<td>Authorizes the California Transportation Commission (CTC), in consultation with Caltrans, to develop and adopt specific goals and performance measures for the department. Requires the commission to include an evaluation of the department’s progress toward meeting these goals and performance measures in its annual report to the Legislature. Commencing with the update to the California Transportation Plan that is required on or before December 31, 2020, authorizes the CTC, in consultation with Caltrans, to prescribe study areas for analysis and evaluation by the department. Also authorizes the CTC to establish guidelines for the preparation of updates to the plan. By October 15, 2015, requires Caltrans to submit to the CTC for approval an Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan directed at achieving a high-functioning and balanced interregional transportation system. Requires this plan to: (1) be action-oriented and pragmatic; and (2) present clear, concise policy guidance to Caltrans for managing the state’s transportation system. Requires the CTC to adopt guidelines for Caltrans to follow in developing and selecting projects for the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP), and the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP). Requires these guidelines to include all of the following: (1) standards for project deliverability; (2) standards for identifying projects and project components; (3) standards for cost estimating; (4) programming methods for cost increases and schedule changes; (5) objective criteria for measuring system performance and the cost-effectiveness of candidate projects. Requires projects included in the ITIP to be consistent with the Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan. When submitting the ITIP to the CTC, requires Caltrans to include a summary of the major comments received at public hearings and the department’s responses to those comments. Prohibits projects from being included in the SHOPP without a project study report or major investment study. Requires the CTC’s Annual Report to the Legislature to contain a discussion of Caltrans’ costs for capital projects.</td>
<td>8/4/14</td>
<td>Assembly Appropriations 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 556 (Corbett) Contractor Disclosures</td>
<td>Prohibits a non-governmental entity that contracts to perform labor or services relating to public health and safety for a public agency from displaying on a vehicle or uniform a logo of the public agency that reasonably could be interpreted as implying that the labor or services are being provided by employees of the public agency, unless the vehicle or uniform conspicuously displays a disclosure, as specified.</td>
<td>8/7/14</td>
<td>Assembly Floor</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 592 (Lieu) Trade Promotion of California Ports</td>
<td>By December 1, 2014, requires the Governor’s Office of Business &amp; Economic Development to provide to the Legislature a strategy for promoting trade for California’s airports, land ports and seaports. At a minimum, requires the strategy to include all of the following: (1) policy goals, objectives and recommendations necessary to implement a comprehensive plan for promoting greater use of California’s ports; (2) measurable outcomes and timelines anticipated for the goals, objectives and recommended actions; (3) identification of impediments to achieving the goals and objectives; (4) identification of key stakeholder partnerships that will be used in implementing the strategy; and (5) identification of funding options for implementing the recommended actions.</td>
<td>8/13/13</td>
<td>Assembly Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 605 (Lara) Global Warming Solutions Act: Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund and Scoping Plan</td>
<td>During FY 2014, requires the Controller’s Office to determine the amount of cap-and-trade auction proceeds collected and deposited into the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund by the California Air Resources Board (CARB). Requires $125 million of the unencumbered amount to be appropriated to CARB to expend by June 30, 2014, on projects and programs that are located within and benefit disadvantaged communities in accordance with existing programs within the three-year Cap-and-Trade Auction Proceeds Investment Plan. Prohibits these revenues from being transferred or loaned to any other fund in FY 2014. When updating the scoping plan pursuant to the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, requires CARB to do the following: (1) prioritize and emphasize measures and actions resulting in greenhouse gas emission reductions that create jobs in California, and that reduce co-pollutants in regions of the state most impacted by toxic and criteria air pollutants; (2) prioritize and emphasize current regulations and actions; (3) recommend additional actions and measures that could be implemented beginning no later than December 31, 2015, to achieve maximum technologically feasible and cost-effective emission reductions in short-lived climate pollutants with high global warming potentials; (4) limit the use of offsets; and (5) include a plan to be implemented in the event that any regulatory measures adopted by CARB are not projected to result in the greenhouse gas emission reductions necessary to meet the goals established in the Global Warming Solutions Act. Requires CARB to submit this information to the Joint Legislature Budget Committee.</td>
<td>7/3/13</td>
<td>Assembly Appropriations 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 731 (Steinberg) CEQA Modernization Act of 2013</td>
<td>States the intent of the Legislature to appropriate $30 million in the annual Budget Act to the Strategic Growth Council to provide competitive grants to local agencies for planning activities related to the implementation of regional sustainable communities strategies. Upon the request of a project applicant, requires the lead agency for CEQA purposes to prepare a record of proceedings concurrently with the preparation, adoption or certification of an environmental document for a project, as specified. Provides that aesthetic and parking impacts of a residential, mixed-use residential or employment center project on an infill site within a transit priority area shall not be considered significant impacts on the environment. By July 1, 2015, requires the Office of Planning &amp; Research to prepare and submit to the Natural Resources Agency for certification and adoption proposed revisions to the CEQA Guidelines establishing criteria for a lead agency to assess the need for translating notices into non-English languages for projects considered pursuant to CEQA and requirements for the posting of those notices in non-English languages. Until January 1, 2017, establishes in the Governor’s Office the position of Renewable Energy Facilities Advisor. If a court finds, as a result of a trial, hearing or remand from an appellate court, that any determination, finding or decision of a public agency has been made without complying with CEQA, requires the court to enter an order that includes issuing an peremptory writ of mandate specifying what action by the public agency is necessary to comply with CEQA. Requires the writ to be limited to that portion of a determination, finding or decision, or the specific project activities found to be in non-compliance only if the court finds all of the following: (1) the portion or specific project activities are severable; (2) severance will not prejudice complete and full compliance with CEQA; and (3) the court has not found the remainder of the project to be in non-compliance. Requires the lead agency, as part of the mitigation monitoring plan and upon the request of a member of the public, to prepare or cause to be prepared an annual report on project compliance with the required mitigation measures that is publicly available online. Requires the Office of Planning &amp; Research to prepare and transmit to the Natural Resources Agency for certification and adoption proposed revisions to the CEQA Guidelines establishing criteria for determining the significance of transportation impacts of projects within transit priority areas. Requires these criteria to promote the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, the development of multi-modal transportation networks, and a diversity of land uses. In preparing the criteria, requires the Office of Planning &amp; Research to recommend potential metrics to measure transportation impacts that may include vehicle miles traveled, vehicle miles traveled per capita, automobile trip generation rates, or automobile trips generated. Specifies that upon certification of these revisions by the Natural Resources Agency, automobile delay as described solely by level of service or similar measures of vehicular capacity or traffic congestion shall not be considered a significant impact on the environment for projects located in a transit priority area. Authorizes the Office of Planning &amp; Research to adopt revisions to the CEQA Guidelines establishing alternative metrics to traffic levels of service for measuring transportation impacts outside transit priority areas. Requires the Office of Planning &amp; Research to produce a report on economic displacement.</td>
<td>9/9/13</td>
<td>Assembly Local Government 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 785 (Wolk)</td>
<td>Design-Build Contracting</td>
<td>8/4/14</td>
<td>Assembly Appropriations Committee</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminates numerous existing individual agency statutes and, instead,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>enacts one general statute providing local agencies with the authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to utilize design-build contracting for any public works project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>exceeding $1 million in cost, except for projects on the state highway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>system. Allows a local agency to use either low bid or best value to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>award a design-build contract. Defines “local agency” to mean the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>following: (1) a city or county; (2) a special district that operates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wastewater facilities, solid waste management facilities, water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>recycling facilities, or fire protection facilities; or (3) any transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>district, including municipal operators, county transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>commission, or any other local or regional agency that is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>responsible for the construction of transit projects. Establishes an</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>standardized, three-step, design-build procurement process, under</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>which a local agency generally would: (1) prequalify firms based on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>specified criteria; (2) develop a request for proposals (RFP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inviting the prequalified firms to submit competitive proposals; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) award the design-build contract by using either low bid or best</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>value. Prohibits a design-build entity from being prequalified or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>shortlisted unless it provides an enforceable commitment to the local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>agency that the entity and its subcontractors at every tier will use a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>skilled and trained workforce to perform all work on the project that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>falls within an apprenticeable occupation in the building and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>construction trades.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 792 (DeSaulnier)</td>
<td>Bay Area’s Joint Policy Committee</td>
<td>6/30/14</td>
<td>Assembly Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requires the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), the Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), the San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC), and the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), as the member agencies of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the Bay Area’s Joint Policy Committee, to complete an analysis of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>common functions, and identify opportunities to save costs, reduce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>redundancies and further their goals. Requires the analysis to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>include a statement as to the expected reduction in overhead costs,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and in operation and management costs of these agencies. Requires MTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to convene a public engagement advisory group to assist in the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>development of a draft public participation plan to be used for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>updates to the regional transportation plan (RTP). Requires the Joint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy Committee to appoint an Advisory Committee on Economic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competitiveness. In consultation with this advisory committee, requires</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the Joint Policy Committee to adopt goals and policies related to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>economic development. Subjects the Joint Policy Committee and the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advisory Committee on Economic Competitiveness to the Brown Act.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 893 (Hill)</td>
<td>Automated License Plate Recognition Systems</td>
<td>5/29/14</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requires an operator of an automated license plate recognition (ALPR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>system to do all of the following: (1) make sure that the information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>collected is protected with reasonable operational, administrative,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>technical, and physical safeguards to ensure its confidentiality and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>integrity; (2) implement and maintain reasonable security procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and practices appropriate for the nature of the information collected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in order to protect it from unauthorized access, destruction, use,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>modification, or disclosure; and (3) implement and maintain a usage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and privacy policy in order to ensure that the information collected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is consistent with respect for individuals’ privacy and civil liberties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prohibits an operator of an ALPR system from collecting license plate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>data when a license plate number is not in public view. In addition to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>any other sanctions, penalties or remedies provided under current law,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>allows an individual who has been harmed by a violation under the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>provisions of this bill to bring a civil action in any court of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>competent jurisdiction against a person who knowingly caused that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>violation. In addition to any other sanctions, penalties or remedies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>provided under current law, allows an individual who has been harmed by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a violation under the provisions of this bill to bring a civil action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in any court of competent jurisdiction against a person who knowingly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>caused that violation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></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 901 (Vidak)</td>
<td>High-Speed Rail: Bond Funding</td>
<td>Subject to voter approval, amends the Safe, Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the 21st Century (Proposition 1A) to provide that no further bonds shall be sold for high-speed rail and related rail purposes. Upon appropriation by the Legislature, authorizes the net proceeds received from outstanding bonds issued and sold prior to the effective date of the provisions of this bill to be redirected from high-speed rail purposes to retiring the debt incurred from the issuance and sale of those outstanding bonds. Directs the Secretary of State’s Office to submit the provisions of this bill to the voters on the ballot of the November 4, 2014, statewide general election. Until November 4, prohibits: (1) bond proceeds from Proposition 1A from being expended for high-speed rail purposes; and (2) the issuance or sale of any additional bonds.</td>
<td>4/7/14</td>
<td>Senate Transportation &amp; Housing Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 902 (Vidak)</td>
<td>High-Speed Rail: Eminent Domain</td>
<td>Prohibits the California High-Speed Rail Authority, and the State Public Works Board acting on behalf of the authority, from adopting a resolution of necessity to commence an eminent domain proceeding to acquire a parcel of real property for the state’s proposed high-speed train system unless the resolution includes both of the following: (1) identification of the sources of all funds that are to be invested in the property, and the anticipated time of receipt of those funds; and (2) a declaration that the authority or board has offered to purchase the property at not less than the fair market value or the amount necessary to discharge the liens against the property, whichever is greater. Requires the High-Speed Rail Authority or the Public Works Board to be responsible for compliance with any environmental protection laws or regulations that are applicable to any real property acquired through eminent domain.</td>
<td>4/7/14</td>
<td>Senate Transportation &amp; Housing Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 903 (Vidak)</td>
<td>High-Speed Rail: Property Tax Revenues</td>
<td>With regard to any real property that it acquires, requires the California High-Speed Rail Authority to annually pay the county in which the property is located an amount equal to the property tax equivalent, as defined. Requires the authority to make these payments with proceeds generated from the Safe, Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the 21st Century (Proposition 1A).</td>
<td>4/7/14</td>
<td>Senate Transportation &amp; Housing Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 904 (Vidak)</td>
<td>High-Speed Rail: Access to Private Property</td>
<td>Requires an employee or contractor of the California High-Speed Rail Authority to do both of the following before entering onto privately owned property for any purpose: (1) identify himself or herself to the property owner as an employee or contractor of the authority working on the state’s proposed high-speed rail project; and (2) obtain the consent of the property owner to enter onto the property.</td>
<td>4/7/14</td>
<td>Senate Transportation &amp; Housing Committee</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 918 (Gaines)</td>
<td>By February 1, 2015, requires Caltrans to develop and implement an asset management program that will efficiently and effectively catalog its assets to ensure the most efficient usage and maintenance of those assets. Requires Caltrans to update this program at least once every five years. As part of a construction project’s file, requires Caltrans to retain all documents that are in any way related to the design, construction or administration, at every stage, of the project. Requires these documents to be retained until final close-out and payment in full for each element of the project is complete, and all outstanding claims relating to the project have been resolved, including any available appeal. Before commencing the design of a project’s plans, requires Caltrans to first obtain full, complete and accurate survey information of the field conditions existing in the location where construction of the project is to be performed. Requires each proposed budget prepared by Caltrans to include detailed financial information about all outstanding claims submitted by contractors, including pass-through claims submitted on behalf of subcontractors. Requires each budget to contain a reserve sufficient to pay outstanding accumulated claims for all construction projects.</td>
<td>5/7/14</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 935 (Leno)</td>
<td>Increases the minimum wage for all industries as follows: (1) to $11 per hour beginning January 1, 2015; (2) to $12 per hour beginning January 1, 2016; and (3) to $13 per hour beginning January 1, 2017. Commencing on January 1, 2018, requires the Industrial Welfare Commission to automatically adjust the minimum wage each year to maintain employee purchasing power diminished by the rate of inflation that occurred during the previous year. Requires the automatic adjustment to be calculated using the California Consumer Price Index. Prohibits the Industrial Welfare Commission from adjusting the minimum wage if the average percentage of inflation for the previous year was negative. Specifies that the provisions of the bill apply to all industries, including public and private employment.</td>
<td>5/27/14</td>
<td>Assembly Labor &amp; Employment Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 969 (DeSaulnier)</td>
<td>Requires a public agency managing a megaproject to take all of the following actions: (1) establish a comprehensive risk management plan that clearly defines roles and responsibilities for risk management, and addresses the process by which the agency will identify and quantify project risks, implement and track risk response activities, and monitor and control risks throughout the duration of the project; (2) qualify the effect of identified risks in financial terms; (3) develop and maintain documents to track identified risks and related mitigation steps; (4) regularly update its estimates of capital and capital outlay support costs; (5) regularly reassess its reserves for potential claims and unknown risks, incorporating information related to risks identified and quantified through its risk assessment process; and (6) regularly integrate estimates for capital, capital outlay support costs, and contingency reserves into a programwide report. Defines “megaproject” to mean a transportation project with total estimated development and construction costs exceeding $2.5 billion. Requires a public agency managing a megaproject to establish a peer review group for the purpose of reviewing the planning, engineering, financing, and other elements of the agency’s plans. In addition, requires the agency to make available to the public via its Internet Web site a list of all engineers in responsible charge of work related to the megaproject.</td>
<td>6/11/14</td>
<td>Assembly Appropriations 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>
</tbody>
</table>
| **SB 983**  
(Hernandez)  
Express Lanes | Authorizes the California Transportation Commission (CTC) to approve an unlimited number of project applications submitted to the commission by regional transportation agencies, as defined, for constructing and operating express lanes on state highway facilities. For each application submitted, requires the CTC to conduct at least one public hearing in northern California and one in southern California. Requires a regional transportation agency that submits such an application to the CTC to reimburse the commission for all of its costs and expenses incurred in processing the application. Requires the CTC to establish guidelines for express lanes approved by the commission, subject to the following minimum requirements: (1) the regional transportation agency shall develop and operate the express lanes in cooperation with Caltrans, and with the active participation of the California Highway Patrol (CHP), pursuant to an agreement that addresses all matters related to the design, construction, maintenance, and operation of state highway facilities in connection with the express lanes; (2) the regional transportation agency shall be responsible for establishing, collecting and administering the tolls; (3) the regional transportation agency shall be responsible for paying for the maintenance of the facilities from net toll revenues, pursuant to an agreement with Caltrans; (4) the revenues generated from the operation of the express lanes shall be available to the regional transportation agency for the direct expenses related to the maintenance, administration and operation of the express lanes, including collection and enforcement; and (5) all remaining revenues generated by the express lanes shall be used in the corridor pursuant to an expenditure plan adopted by the regional transportation agency. Authorizes a regional transportation agency to issue bonds to finance the construction of the express lane facilities or any projects included in an expenditure plan specifying how any net revenues generated by the lanes would be used. In addition, includes comparable provisions for express lanes proposed to be constructed and operated by Caltrans. Does not authorize the conversion of any existing non-toll lanes into toll lanes, except in the case where a high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane is being converted into an express lane. | 8/4/14 | Assembly Appropriations Committee | |
| **SB 990**  
(Vidak)  
Transportation Funds;  
Disadvantaged Small Communities | Requires a regional transportation planning agency (RTPA) and a county transportation commission to program in its regional transportation improvement program (RTIP) not less than 5 percent of the amount available under its county share to projects in disadvantaged small communities. Defines “disadvantaged small community” to mean a city or census-designated place that has a population of 25,000 or fewer people, and that has a median household income less than 80 percent of the statewide median household income. Exempts an RTPA and county transportation commission that does not contain any city or census-designated place with a population that exceeds 25,000 people from the requirements of the bill. | 4/21/14 | Senate Transportation & Housing Committee | |
<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 1064 (Hill) California Public Utilities Commission: Rail Safety</td>
<td>When the federal National Transportation Safety Board (NTSA) submits a safety recommendation letter concerning rail safety to the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), requires the commission to provide the NTSA with a formal written response to each recommendation no later than 90 days after receiving the letter. Requires the response to state whether the CPUC intends to implement the recommendations in full or in part, or whether the commission will refuse to implement them. If the NTSA issues a safety recommendation letter concerning any CPUC-regulated rail facility to the U.S. Department of Transportation, to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), to a CPUC-regulated rail operator, or to the CPUC, requires the CPUC to determine if implementation of the recommendation is appropriate. If FTA issues a safety advisory concerning any CPUC-regulated rail facility, requires the commission to determine if implementation of the advisory is appropriate. Requires the CPUC, if it determines that a NTSA safety recommendation is appropriate or that action concerning an FTA safety advisory is necessary, to issue orders or adopt rules to implement the safety recommendation or advisory as soon as practicable.</td>
<td>4/8/14</td>
<td>Assembly Appropriations 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 1077 (DeSaulnier) Mileage-Based Fee Pilot Program</td>
<td>Creates the Mileage-Based Fee Task Force within the California Transportation Commission (CTC) to guide the development and evaluation of a pilot program to assess the potential for mileage-based revenue collection for California’s roads and highways as an alternative to the gas tax system. Requires the task force to study mileage-based fee (MBF) alternatives to the gas tax. Requires the task force to make recommendations to the CTC on the design of a pilot program to test alternative MBF approaches, and the criteria to be used to evaluate the program. In developing these recommendations, requires the task force to take all of the following into consideration: (1) the availability, adaptability, reliability, and security of methods that might be used in recording and reporting highway use; (2) the necessity of protecting all personally identifiable information used in reporting highway use; (3) the ease and cost of recording and reporting highway use; (4) the ease and cost of administering the collection of taxes and fees as an alternative to the current system of taxing highway use through motor vehicle fuel taxes; (5) effective methods of maintaining compliance; (6) the ease of re-identifying location data, even when personally identifiable information has been removed from the data; (7) increased privacy concerns when location data is used in conjunction with other technologies, such as automatic license plate readers; and (8) public and private agency access, including law enforcement, to data collected and stored for purposes of the MBF to ensure individual privacy rights are protected pursuant to the California Constitution. Requires the CTC to approve the design of the pilot program by January 1, 2016. Based on the design approved by the CTC, requires the California State Transportation Agency to implement the pilot program by January 1, 2017. At a minimum, requires the pilot program to accomplish all of the following: (1) analyze alternative means of collecting road usage data, including at least one alternative that does not rely on electronic vehicle location data; (2) collect a minimum amount of personal information, including location tracking information, necessary to implement the MBF program; and (3) ensure that processes for collecting, managing, storing, transmitting, and destroying data are in place to protect the integrity of the data and safeguard the privacy of drivers. By January 1, 2018, requires the Transportation Agency to prepare and submit a report of its findings based on the results of the pilot program to the task force, the CTC and the Legislature. Requires this report to include a discussion of all of the following issues: (1) cost; (2) privacy; (3) jurisdictional issues; (4) feasibility; (5) complexity; (6) acceptance; (7) use of revenues; (8) security and compliance, including measures necessary to minimize fraud and tax evasion rates; (9) data collection technology; (10) potential for additional driver services; and (11) implementation issues. Requires the CTC to include its recommendations regarding the pilot program in its annual report to the Legislature.</td>
<td>8/4/14</td>
<td>Assembly Appropriations Committee</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SB 1121
(De Leon)
California Climate Technology and Infrastructure Financing Act

In consultation with the California Air Resources Board (CARB), requires the California Alternative Energy and Advanced Transportation Financing Authority to develop and administer the California Climate Technology and Infrastructure Financing Program to provide financial assistance for greenhouse gas emissions reduction projects. Requires greenhouse gas emissions reduction projects eligible for such financial assistance to demonstrate all of the following: (1) reduction in net emissions of greenhouse gases; (2) partnership with a private financial institution or lender; (3) ability to meet applicable permitting requirements; (4) ability to create jobs in California; (5) technological viability; (6) ability to, over time, pay back the financial assistance provided; (7) the existence of a financing gap that is a barrier to project implementation or market growth; and (8) other requirements deemed necessary by the authority. Allows the authority to accept applications for financial assistance under the California Climate Technology and Infrastructure Financing Program on an ongoing and open solicitation basis. In consultation with CARB, requires the authority to establish guidelines and project eligibility for the program that are consistent with the requirements under the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. Requires the guidelines to include consideration of whether providing financial assistance for a greenhouse gas emissions reduction project will do the following: (1) increase private investment in greenhouse gas emissions reduction projects that are not currently able to obtain financing at attractive terms or through an existing state program; (2) enable the implementation and scaling of greenhouse gas emissions reduction projects to increase deployment of innovative financing by leveraging limited public dollars to attract private capital; (3) facilitate the deployment of greenhouse gas emissions reduction projects at an accelerated rate; (4) enhance the competitiveness of California-based companies and reduce leakage of greenhouse gas emissions to other jurisdictions; (5) achieve co-benefits, such as enhanced water supply, improved water quality, improved air quality, enhanced urban environments, and improved public health and wildlife habitat; and (6) address barriers that have prevented adequate commercial financing of greenhouse gas emissions reduction projects. Requires priority to be given to projects that demonstrate the ability to meet the following criteria: (1) increase private investment in otherwise commercially viable greenhouse gas emissions reduction projects not currently able to obtain financing in the capital markets at a reasonable cost with a reasonable rate of return; (2) increase private investment in greenhouse gas emissions reduction projects located in disadvantaged communities; and (3) maximize economic, environmental and public health benefits to the state.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Senate Bills</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Last Amended</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>VTA Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 1122</strong></td>
<td>To support the planning and development of sustainable communities, authorizes the Strategic Growth Council to manage and award financial assistance to a council of governments, metropolitan planning organization (MPO) or regional transportation planning agency to implement a sustainable communities strategy that the California Air Resources Board (CARB) has determined would achieve the greenhouse gas emission reduction target established for its respective region. Requires the Strategic Growth Council to adopt guidelines for the use of such funds by award recipients to include all of the following: (1) require that projects meeting threshold criteria relating to project feasibility and applicant capacity be selected within each region by the regional granting authority through a competitive public process based on reductions in greenhouse gas emissions; (2) establish the methods for evaluating, monitoring and verifying greenhouse gas emission reductions, as well as other grant requirements; and (3) provide for public participation in the review of proposed projects. Requires the Strategic Growth Council to allocate money to regional granting authorities in each region on a per capita basis. Specifies that the eligible uses of the money shall include any of the following: (1) transportation network and demand management, including trip reduction programs, congestion and parking pricing, safe routes to school, and roadway modifications; (2) increasing public transportation service or frequency of service; (3) enhancing public transit and active transportation options, including complete streets, bicycle and pedestrian safety facilities, and roadway improvements that facilitate public transit operations; (4) clean transportation fueling infrastructure and support; (5) multimodal network connectivity to improve access to parks, schools, jobs, housing, and markets for rural and urban communities; (6) development and adoption of local plans and land-use policies that help to implement a sustainable communities strategy; (7) community infrastructure, including public works and municipal improvements necessary to support transit-oriented development, affordable housing, infill in existing urbanized areas, and small walkable communities in rural neighborhoods; (8) multi-use facilities and accommodations for bicyclists, pedestrians and neighborhood electric vehicles; and (9) administrative costs and development, and the use of evaluation, monitoring and verification systems.</td>
<td>5/5/14</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 1125</strong></td>
<td>By January 1, 2016, requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to develop quantitative, advisory reduction targets for 2030 for greenhouse gas emissions and short-lived climate pollutants with high global warming potential in order to inform future legislative action.</td>
<td>5/13/14</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 1134</strong></td>
<td>Authorizes the Antelope Valley Transit Authority to implement a pilot program to equip its buses with illuminated signs that display advertising, subject to certain conditions and only if the University of California, Irvine, decides not to move forward with a similar program.</td>
<td>6/15/14</td>
<td>Signed into Law: Chapter #100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 1140</strong></td>
<td>Makes non-substantive changes to provisions in existing law relating to county transportation commissions.</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>
</tbody>
</table>
| **SB 1151**  
(Cannella)  
Traffic Violations:  
School Zones | Adds $35 to the base fine for certain traffic violations that occur when passing a school building or grounds contiguous to a highway, or not separated from the highway by a fence, gate or other physical barrier while in use by children. Requires the revenues from these additional fines to be deposited in the State Transportation Fund for school zone safety projects in the Active Transportation Program. | 6/23/14 | Assembly Appropriations Committee | |
| **SB 1156**  
(Steinberg)  
Carbon Tax | Exempts suppliers of fossil fuels from California’s cap-and-trade system. Instead, imposes a carbon tax of an unspecified amount per ton of carbon-dioxide-equivalent emissions on suppliers of fossil fuels, effective January 1, 2015. States the intent of the Legislature that the revenues collected from the carbon tax should be rebated to low- and medium-income taxpayers. Specifies that the implementation of the carbon tax is intended to be revenue-neutral. | As Introduced | Senate Governance & Finance Committee | |
| **SB 1183**  
(DeSaulnier)  
Vehicle Registration Surcharge: Bicycle Infrastructure | Until January 1, 2025, allows a city, county or regional park district to impose, as a special tax subject to two-thirds voter approval, a local vehicle registration surcharge in an amount not to exceed $5 on each vehicle registered within the jurisdiction of the local agency. Requires the amount of the surcharge to be in whole dollars and to be specified in an ordinance adopted by the local agency. Requires the net revenues from the surcharge to be used by the local agency for improvements to paved and natural surface trails and bikeways, including: (1) the rehabilitation, restoration and expansion of existing trails and bikeways; (2) the development of new trails and bikeways; (3) the improvement and development of other bicycle facilities; and (4) the maintenance and upkeep of local and regional trail and bikeway systems, networks and other bicycle facilities. Requires a local agency that imposes the surcharge to submit an annual fiscal year-end report to the Legislature that includes the following information: (1) the total net revenues received from the surcharge and expended during the previous fiscal year; and (2) a summary of the infrastructure and projects funded. | 6/25/14 | Assembly Appropriations Committee | |
| **SB 1184**  
(Hancock)  
Sea Level Rise:  
Regional Resilience Strategy | Requires the Bay Conservation & Development Commission (BCDC) to prepare a regional resilience strategy for adapting to rising sea levels in the San Francisco Bay. Requires the strategy to include the following two integrated components: (1) community- or agency-based planning efforts undertaken with local governments and special districts to increase the resilience of shoreline areas and assets; and (2) a regional assessment of shoreline vulnerabilities, and a planning process to identify and develop adaptation options necessary at the regional scale. Requires the formulation of the strategy to address a number of goals and objectives, including protecting infrastructure that is crucial to public health or the region’s economy, such as airports, ports, regional transportation, wastewater treatment facilities, major parks, recreational areas, and trails. By December 31, 2015, requires BCDC to submit the strategy and its recommendations for future actions to be taken regarding sea level rise to the Legislature. | As Introduced | Senate Appropriations Committee | |
<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 1204 (Lara)</td>
<td>Establishes the California Clean Truck, Bus and Off-Road Vehicle and Equipment Technology Program to be administered by the California Air Resources Board (CARB), in conjunction with the State Energy Resources Conservation &amp; Development Commission, and funded with cap-and-trade auction proceeds from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund. Under this program, requires the money to be used to fund the following types of projects: (1) technology development, demonstration, pre-commercial pilots, and early commercial deployments of zero-emission and near-zero-emission medium- and heavy-duty truck technology, including projects to help facilitate clean goods-movement corridors; (2) zero-emission and near-zero-emission bus technology development, demonstration, pre-commercial pilots, and early commercial deployments, including pilots of multiple vehicles at one site or region; (3) zero-emission and near-zero-emission off-road vehicle and equipment technology development, demonstration, pre-commercial pilots, and early commercial deployments, including vehicles and equipment in the port, agriculture, marine, construction, and rail sectors; (4) purchase incentives for commercially available zero-emission and near-zero-emission trucks, bus and off-road vehicle and equipment technologies and fueling infrastructure to support early market deployments of new technologies and to increase manufacturer volumes and accelerate market acceptance; and (5) non-vehicle-based projects that support greater freight efficiency and greenhouse gas emissions reductions, including advanced intelligent transportation systems, autonomous vehicles, and other freight information and operations technologies. In evaluating potential projects to be funded, requires CARB to give priority to projects that demonstrate one or more of the following characteristics: (1) benefit to disadvantaged communities; (2) the ability to leverage additional public and private funding; (3) the potential for co-benefits or multiple-benefit attributes; (4) the potential for the project to be replicated; (5) regional benefit, with focus on collaboration between multiple entities; (6) support for technologies with broad market and emission reduction potential; (7) support for projects addressing technology and market barriers not addressed by other programs; and (8) support for enabling technologies that benefit multiple technology pathways. In consultation with the State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission, requires CARB to create an annual framework and plan that must do all of the following: (1) articulate an overarching vision for technology development, demonstration, pre-commercial pilots, and early commercial deployments, with a focus on moving technologies through the commercialization process; (2) outline technology categories and performance criteria for technologies and applications that may be considered for funding under the program; and (3) describe the roles of the relevant agencies and the process for coordination.</td>
<td>6/18/14</td>
<td>Assembly Appropriations 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 1217 (Leno)</td>
<td>Climate Change: Preparedness</td>
<td>7/2/14</td>
<td>Assembly Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>By July 1, 2018, and every three years thereafter, requires the Natural Resources Agency to prepare a California climate risk assessment that provides: (1) original research on regionally appropriate climate risk vulnerabilities; (2) risk management options; and (3) other needed scientific research to support the state’s development of informed climate policy and actions to address climate change. By January 1, 2019, and every five years thereafter, requires the Natural Resources Agency to update the Safeguarding California Plan to reduce risks to the state from the impacts of climate change. Requires the plan and updates to include a summary of the best known science on climate change impacts affecting California, and to assess the state’s vulnerability to the identified impacts, including: (1) sea level rise; (2) drought and flooding; (3) impacts on wildlife habitats; (4) increasing temperatures; (5) increased occurrence of extreme weather events; and (6) increased wildland fire risk. Requires the plan and updates to identify mitigation measures that increase climate resiliency. Requires the Natural Resources Agency to identify possible funding for mitigation measures in the plan and updates. By January 1, 2016, and every five years thereafter, requires the Office of Planning and Research to develop Infrastructure Resilience Guidelines to integrate climate risks into capital outlay and public infrastructure planning and investment. Requires these guidelines, at a minimum, to include all of the following: (1) climate risks to be considered in capital outlay and public infrastructure planning; (2) relevant timeframes for considering climate impacts; and (3) potential climate risks and options for managing and reducing those risks. Requires state agencies and departments to use the Infrastructure Resilience Guidelines to inform their capital outlay and public infrastructure planning and investment. Requires the Strategic Growth Council to do all of the following: (1) use the Infrastructure Resilience Guidelines to review the state’s investments in capital outlay and public infrastructure projects with regard to the impacts of climate change; (2) identify where capital outlay and public infrastructure projects may be needed to further incorporate the Infrastructure Resilience Guidelines, and provide recommendations to state agencies responsible for those projects; (3) identify any capital outlay and public infrastructure projects that should receive priority for implementation because the projects offer the state important protection from the impacts of climate change; and (4) whenever possible, identify potential funding sources for these projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
</tbody>
</table>
| **SB 1228**
(Hueso)
Trade Corridors Improvement Fund | Continues the existence of the Proposition 1B Trade Corridors Improvement Fund (TCIF) for the purposes of receiving and expending revenues from sources other than the bond act. Upon appropriation by the Legislature, requires the California Transportation Commission (CTC) to allocated TCIF dollars for infrastructure improvements on federally designated Trade Corridors of National and Regional Significance; on the Primary Freight Network; and along other corridors that have a high volume of freight movement as determined by the commission. Specifies that eligible projects for TCIF dollars shall include: (1) highway capacity and operational improvements to more efficiently accommodate the movement of freight, and to relieve traffic congestion along major trade or goods movement corridors; (2) freight rail system improvements to enhance the ability to move goods from seaports, land ports of entry and airports to warehousing and distribution centers throughout California; (3) projects to enhance the capacity and efficiency of ports; (4) truck corridor improvements; (5) border access improvements that enhance goods movement between California and Mexico, and that maximize the state’s ability to access coordinated border infrastructure funds made available to California by federal law; and (6) surface transportation and connector road improvements to effectively facilitate the movement of goods, and to relieve traffic congestion along major trade or goods movement corridors. Requires the CTC to allocate TCIF dollars in a manner that: (1) is consistent with Proposition 1B and the TCIF Guidelines adopted by the commission on November 27, 2007; (2) addresses the state’s most urgent needs; (3) balances the demands of various land ports of entry and seaports; (4) provides reasonable geographic balance between the state’s regions; and (5) places an emphasis on projects that improve trade corridor mobility while reducing emissions of diesel particulate and other pollutant emissions. To extent that revenues from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund are transferred to the TCIF, requires projects funded with these revenues to demonstrate how they will reduce emissions consistent with the goals and objectives of the California Global Warming Solutions Act. Requires the CTC to allocate TCIF dollars to projects that have identified and committed supplemental funding from appropriate local, federal or private sources. Except for border access improvements, requires projects funded with TCIF dollars to have supplemental funding that is at least equal to the amount of money received from the TCIF. | 6/25/14 | Assembly Appropriations Committee |

| **SB 1236**
(Monning)
Passenger Misconduct Violations and Fare Evasion | Authorizes the governing board of a public transit district to designate contracted security officers or district employees, except for union-represented transit vehicle operators, to enforce passenger misconduct violations and fare evasion. Makes it an infraction for a person to: (1) knowingly give false information to a public transit district employee or contracted security officer engaged in the enforcement of district ordinances or state law; (2) obstruct the issuance of a citation for a violation of district ordinances or state law; and (3) violate any conditions established by a public transit district under which a passenger may board a transit vehicle with a bicycle and where the bicycle may be stowed. | 4/24/14 | Governor’s Office |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Senate Bills</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Last Amended</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>VTA Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 1253</strong></td>
<td>Initiative Measures</td>
<td>Upon receipt of a request to prepare the circulating title and summary of a proposed initiative measure, requires the Attorney General’s Office to initiate a 30-day public review process to allow for the public to submit written comments on the measure. During this public review process, allows the proponents of the proposed initiative measure to submit amendments that further its purposes, as determined by the Attorney General’s Office. Requires the fiscal estimate for a proposed initiative measure to be prepared jointly by the Department of Finance and the Legislative Analyst’s Office. Requires the Secretary of State’s Office to transmit copies of a proposed initiative measure, along with its circulating title and summary, to the Legislature after receiving a certification from the proponents, signed under penalty of perjury, that they have collected 25 percent of the number of signatures needed to qualify the measure for the ballot. Requires the appropriate committees of the Assembly and Senate to hold a joint public hearing on the subject of the proposed initiative measure, but specifies that this provision of the bill shall not be construed as authority for the Legislature to alter the measure or prevent it from appearing on the ballot. Authorizes the proponents of a proposed initiative measure to have it withdrawn from the ballot at any time before the measure qualifies for the ballot. Requires the Secretary of State’s Office to post on its Internet Web site the following information: (1) a current list of the top 10 contributors supporting and opposing a particular ballot measure; and (2) a list of each committee primarily formed to support or oppose a particular ballot measure, and a means to access information about the sources of contributions reported for each committee. Makes it a crime for a proponent of a proposed initiative measure to seek, solicit, bargain for, or obtain any money or thing of value for the purpose of withdrawing an initiative petition after filing it with the appropriate elections official.</td>
<td>8/4/14</td>
<td>Assembly Appropriations Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 1260</strong></td>
<td>Infrastructure Financing Districts: Affordable Housing</td>
<td>Requires an infrastructure financing district (IFD) to do all of the following relative to affordable housing: (1) dedicate no less than 25 percent of allocated tax revenues for affordable housing purposes; (2) ensure that the number of housing units occupied by extremely low, very low and low-income households is not reduced in its area during the effective period of the district; (3) ensure the replacement of dwelling units for extremely low, very low and low-income households within two years of their removal by public or private action from the area of the district; (4) ensure that during its effective period, at least 20 percent of all new and substantially rehabilitated dwelling units developed in the area of the district by public or private entities are available at affordable housing cost to and occupied by persons and families of low or moderate income. Every five years, requires an IFD to contract for an independent financial and performance audit with respect to the production, maintenance and replacement of affordable housing in its area.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</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>
</tbody>
</table>
| **SB 1275**  
(De Leon)  
Charge Ahead California Initiative | Establishes the Charge Ahead California Initiative to be administered by the California Air Resources Board (CARB). States that the goals of this initiative are as follows: (1) to put in service at least 1 million zero-emission and near-zero-emission vehicles by January 1, 2023; (2) to establish a self-sustaining zero-emission and near-zero-emission vehicle industry in which these vehicles are a viable mainstream option for individual vehicle purchasers, businesses and public fleets; (3) to increase access for disadvantaged, low-income and moderate-income communities and consumers to zero-emission and near-zero-emission vehicles; and (4) to increase the placement of zero-emission and near-zero-emission vehicles in disadvantaged, low-income and moderate-income communities, and with disadvantaged, low-income and moderate-income consumers to enhance air quality, lower greenhouse gases and promote the overall benefit for those communities and consumers. Under the Charge Ahead California Initiative, requires CARB to adopt a plan, commencing in FY 2017, to meet the goals of the initiative, including establishing an estimate for the total funding necessary for the following programs and projects: (1) the Clean Vehicle Rebate Project; (2) the Hybrid and Zero-Emission Truck and Bus Voucher Incentive Project; (3) the Advanced Technology Demonstration Projects; (4) zero-emission and near-zero-emission vehicle fueling infrastructure projects eligible under the Alternative and Renewable and Vehicle Technology Program; (5) light-duty, medium-duty and heavy-duty zero-emission and near-zero-emission vehicle deployment projects eligible under the Alternative and Renewable and Vehicle Technology Program; (6) medium-duty and heavy-duty zero-emission and near-zero-emission vehicle technology demonstration projects eligible under the Alternative and Renewable and Vehicle Technology Program; and (7) pre-commercial demonstration projects of advanced freight and transit technology to move cargo and passengers in the state. Requires the plan to be updated at least every three years through January 1, 2023. | 7/1/14 | Assembly Appropriations Committee | |
| **SB 1298**  
(Hernandez)  
LA Metro: Express Lanes | Revises and recasts provisions in current law relating to the statutory authority for the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro) to operate express lanes on I-10 and I-110. Authorizes LA Metro to continue to require carpoolers to have an electronic transponder or other electronic device to use the express lanes on I-10 and I-110 for enforcement purposes. Requires LA Metro, with the consent of Caltrans, to establish appropriate performance measures for the express lanes on I-10 and I-110, such as speed or travel times, for the purpose of ensuring optimal use of the express lanes by high-occupancy vehicles without adversely affecting other traffic on the state highway system. Requires LA Metro to enter into agreements to reimburse Caltrans, the California Highway Patrol (CHP) and other state agencies for their costs incurred in connection with the implementation, operation and maintenance of these express lanes. Requires any net revenues from the express lanes on I-10 and I-110 to be used in the corridor from which the dollars were generated, and exclusively for the following: (1) the preconstruction, construction and other related costs of high-occupancy vehicle facilities; (2) transportation corridor improvements; and (3) the improvement of public transit service in the corridor. Requires LA Metro to continue to work with the affected communities in the I-10 and I-110 corridors, and provide mitigation measures for commuters of low income, including reduce toll charges and toll credits for public transit users. Allows LA Metro to issue bonds, backed by express lane revenues, to fund improvements in the I-10 and I-110 corridors. | 6/17/14 | Assembly Appropriations Committee | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Senate Bills</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Last Amended</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>VTA Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| SB 1312 (Steinberg)  
CTC: Annual Report to the Legislature | Deletes obsolete provisions in existing law requiring the California Transportation Commission (CTC) to include in its annual reports submitted to the Legislature between 2001 and 2008 a summary and discussion of loans and transfers of transportation revenues to the General Fund. | As Introduced | Assembly Transportation Committee |  |
| SB 1360 (Padilla)  
Rest and Recovery Periods | Provides that a rest or recovery period mandated pursuant to state law shall be counted as hours worked. | As Introduced | Signed into Law: Chapter #72 |  |
| SB 1365 (Padilla)  
California Voting Rights Act: District-Based Elections | Prohibits the use of a district-based election in a political subdivision in a manner that would impair the ability of a protected class to elect candidates of its choice, or its ability to influence the outcome of an election as a result of the dilution or the abridgment of the rights of voters who are members of a protective class. Requires a court to implement specified remedies upon a finding that a district-based election was imposed or applied in a manner that violates the provisions of this bill. Specifies that any voter who is a member of a protected class and who resides in a political subdivision where a violation of the provisions of this bill is alleged to have occurred may file an action in the superior court of the county in which the political subdivision is located. | 8/7/14 | Assembly Elections & Redistricting Committee |  |
| SB 1368 (Wolk)  
Park-and-Ride Lots | Authorizes the California Transportation Commission (CTC) to relinquish to a transit district or a joint powers authority (JPA) formed for purposes of providing transportation services a park-and-ride lot within the transit district’s or JPA’s jurisdiction, if Caltrans enters into an agreement with the transit district or JPA providing for that relinquishment. Requires the transit district or the JPA to agree to maintain, at a minimum, the number of parking spaces provided by Caltrans in the lot at the time of the relinquishment. | 6/16/14 | Assembly Appropriations Committee |  |
| SB 1409 (Hill)  
CPUC: Safety Investigations | With respect to its annual submission of information to the Governor and the Legislature, requires the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) to provide a succinct description of each open staff safety investigation and each staff safety investigation concluded during the prior calendar year. Requires the categories within this description to include: (1) the date of the safety incident; (2) the reason for the investigation; (3) the facility type involved; and (4) the owner of the facility. | 8/5/14 | Assembly Appropriations Committee |  |
| SB 1418 (DeSaulnier)  
Vehicle Weight Fee Revenues | Retains the revenues generated by vehicle weight fees in the State Highway Account, and requires the General Fund to pay debt service on transportation general obligation bonds. With regard to the revenues derived from increases in the state gasoline excise tax resulting from the transportation funding swap initially enacted in 2010 and reaffirmed in 2011, requires 56 percent of the money to be deposited in the State Highway Account, and 44 percent to be allocated to cities and counties for local streets and roads. Requires a minimum of 21.453 percent of the revenues deposited in the State Highway Account to be allocated to the State Highway Operation & Protection Program (SHOPP). | 5/1/14 | Senate Appropriations Committee |  |
<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 1433 (Hill)</td>
<td>Design-Build Contracting: Public Transit Projects</td>
<td>Eliminates the January 1, 2015, sunset date and extends the authority to use design-build contracting for public transit projects indefinitely. Clarifies that design-build contracting can be used for any public transit project, regardless of the cost. Eliminates provisions in current law that requires a public transit agency to prepare and submit a report to the Legislative Analyst’s Office (LAO) when it uses design-build contracting.</td>
<td>8/7/14</td>
<td>Assembly Appropriations Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1451 (Hill)</td>
<td>CEQA: Judicial Review</td>
<td>Precludes an individual from challenging a public agency’s compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) if the alleged grounds of non-compliance were known or could have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence during the public comment period, but were presented to the public agency at a time other than during the public comment period. In addition, precludes an individual from challenging a public agency’s compliance if he or she objected to the approval of the project at a time other than during the public comment period when such a period was provided.</td>
<td>4/21/14</td>
<td>Senate Judiciary Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA 4 (Liu)</td>
<td>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 with a 55 percent majority vote of the electorate, if the ballot proposition does all of the following: (1) contains a specific list of programs and purposes to be funded, and a requirement that the tax proceeds be spent solely for those programs and purposes; (2) includes a requirement for an annual independent audit of the amount of tax proceeds collected and expended, and the specified programs and purposes funded; (3) requires the governing board to create a citizens’ oversight committee to review all expenditures of proceeds and financial audits, and to report its findings to the governing board and the public; (4) requires at least 50 percent of the tax proceeds to be expended for programs or purposes included in a sustainable communities strategy; and (5) when expending any of the tax proceeds for an expansion project on the state highway system, requires a portion of those proceeds to be dedicated for the ongoing maintenance of that expansion project. Requires the Legislature to define “local transportation projects” for purposes of this constitutional amendment. Provides that a local government could not expend revenues derived from a special tax approved by a 55 percent majority vote for the completion of a statutorily identified capital project funded in whole or in part by revenues derived from another special tax of the same local government that was approved by a two-thirds majority.</td>
<td>8/28/13</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA 6 (DeSaulnier) Initiative Measures: Funding Source</td>
<td>Calls for placing before the voters an amendment to the California Constitution to prohibit an initiative measure that would result in a net increase in state or local government costs from being submitted to the electors unless the Legislative Analyst’s Office and the Department of Finance jointly determine that the measure provides for additional revenues in an amount that meets or exceeds the net increase in costs.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations 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>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 with a 55 percent majority vote of the electorate, if the ballot proposition does all of the following: (1) contains a specific list of programs and purposes to be funded, and a requirement that the tax proceeds be spent solely for those programs and purposes; (2) includes a requirement for an annual independent audit of the amount of tax proceeds collected and expended, and the specified programs and purposes funded; and (3) requires the governing board to create a citizens’ oversight committee to review all expenditures of proceeds and financial audits, and to report its findings to the governing board and the public. Requires the Legislature to define “local transportation projects” for purposes of this constitutional amendment.</td>
<td>5/21/13</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA 9 (Corbett) Local Government: Economic Development Special Taxes</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 community and economic development projects with a 55 percent majority vote, if the ballot proposition does all of the following: (1) contains a specific list of programs and purposes to be funded, and a requirement that the tax proceeds be spent solely for those programs and purposes; (2) includes a requirement for an annual independent audit of the amount of tax proceeds collected and expended, and the specified programs and purposes funded; and (3) requires the governing board to create a citizens’ oversight committee to review all expenditures of proceeds and financial audits, and to report its findings to the governing board and the public. Specifies that community and economic development projects includes projects that improve, upgrade or revitalize areas within a local government’s jurisdiction that have become blighted because of deterioration, disuse or unproductive economic conditions.</td>
<td>5/21/13</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA 11 (Hancock) Local Government: Special Taxes</td>
<td>Calls for placing before the voters an amendment to the California Constitution to allow a city, county or special district to impose, extend or increase a special tax for any purpose with a 55 percent majority vote, if the ballot proposition does all of the following: (1) contains a specific list of programs and purposes to be funded, and a requirement that the tax proceeds be spent solely for those programs and purposes; (2) includes a requirement for an annual independent audit of the amount of tax proceeds collected and expended, and the specified programs and purposes funded; and (3) requires the governing board to create a citizens’ oversight committee to review all expenditures of proceeds and financial audits, and to report its findings to the governing board and the public.</td>
<td>5/21/13</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCR 2 (DeSaulnier) Constitutional Convention</td>
<td>Proposes that the people of California vote at the next statewide general election on the question of whether to call a convention to revise the California Constitution.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Senate Rules Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Nuria I. Fernandez

FROM: Director of Planning and Program Development, John Ristow

SUBJECT: Cap and Trade Funds for Transportation

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

California’s Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, enacted through Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32), sets a series of policies and programs across all major industry sectors to return California’s greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) is the state agency responsible for updating a Scoping Plan to outline California’s AB32 goals and implementation. In order to ensure that AB32 GHG emissions reductions are met, CARB established the Cap and Trade Program in 2011.

As defined by CARB’s Regulatory Guidance, the “cap” refers to setting limits on emissions from industries that exceed annual emissions of 25,000 metric tons of GHG, namely the power and industrial sectors since 2013 and will soon expand to cover natural gas and transportation fuels in 2015. CARB estimates that these sectors are responsible for producing roughly 85% of California’s GHG emissions, which once they are fully regulated, can gradually reduce the amount of pollutants released into the atmosphere.

The “trade” refers to the creation of a free market for the sale of carbon allowances, encouraging companies to be innovative, in order to meet (or beat) their allocated limit and avoid fines. The less these industries emit, the less they pay, so it is in their economic interest to pollute less. Another incentive is that most earnings will be reinvested back into programs that will further reduce GHG emissions.

Hence, the California Cap and Trade Program sets maximum, statewide GHG emissions for all covered sectors each year (the “cap”) and allows companies to sell off exceeding allowances (“the trade”) to those who fall short. The carbon price is driven by allowance trading occurring through auctions held on a quarterly basis by CARB. The revenues generated are then available for appropriation by the California Legislature.
On June 15, 2014, the California Legislature approved the FY2014-2015 Budget Act, enacted through Senate Bill 852 (SB 852) and a series of other trailer bills that provide further details on how funds collected through the Cap and Trade Program shall be spent. In the budget, the Legislature appropriated $872 million to be used for one-time expenditures of Cap and Trade auction proceeds in FY14-15 including $630 million dedicated for transit-related purposes as follows:

- $ 50 million for public transit ($25 million formula; $25 million competitive)
- $130 million for affordable housing and sustainable communities
- $200 million for state vehicle incentives (passenger clean vehicles)
- $250 million for High-Speed Rail

Please note that as a one-time appropriation, these funds and the corresponding program categories and revenue shares are different in FY 2014-2015 than in subsequent years. In fact, the long-term investment strategy for Cap and Trade auction proceeds beginning in FY 2016 and beyond was enacted by the California Legislature in a separate bill, Senate Bill 862 (SB 862), which was chaptered and signed into law by Governor Jerry Brown on June 20, 2014.

SB 862 will continuously appropriate Cap and Trade funds in which 60% will be allocated to various specified transportation-related programs and 40% will be allocated to unspecified programs left to the discretion of the Legislature to allocate each budget cycle, see Figure 1 below:

**Figure 1: Long Term Cap and Trade Allocation**
Transit and Intercity Rail [and Bus] Capital Program: will receive 10 percent of all cap-and-trade auction proceeds, beginning in FY 2016. The Transit and Intercity Rail Program is intended to fund capital improvements and operational investments that will reduce GHG, and modernize intercity, commuter and urban transit systems. As stated in the legislation, the policy objectives of this program are to:

- Reduce GHG emissions
- Expand and improve rail [and bus] service to increase ridership
- Integrate the services of the state’s various rail operators
- Improve rail [and bus] safety

Low-Carbon Transit Operations Program: will receive 5 percent of all future cap-and-trade auction proceeds and is intended to reduce GHG emissions, improve mobility, and enhance or expand public transit service to increase mode share. Funding would flow to public transit agencies according to the State Transit Assistance Program (STA) formula and could be used to support:

- New or expanded bus or rail services
- Expanded intermodal transit facilities
- Equipment acquisition
- Fueling, maintenance and other costs to operate those services or facilities

Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program: will receive 20 percent of all cap-and-trade auction proceeds, starting in FY 2016. The Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program is intended to fund projects that reduce GHG emissions by implementing land-use, housing, transportation, and agricultural land preservation practices that support infill and compact development. As outlined in SB 862, the policy objectives of this program are to:

- Reduce air pollution
- Improve conditions in disadvantaged communities
- Support or improve public health
- Improve connectivity and accessibility to jobs, housing and services
- Increase options for mobility, including the implementation of the Active Transportation Program
- Increase public transit ridership
- Preserve and develop affordable housing for lower-income households
- Protect agricultural lands to support infill development

High-Speed Rail: will receive 25 percent of the annual amount of cap-and-trade auction proceeds, beginning in FY 2016. These funds are intended for further environmental review work, design, right-of-way acquisition and construction of the state’s proposed high-speed rail system. In addition, SB 862 proposes repaying the $400 million balance from last loan of cap-and-auction proceeds to the General Fund to the California High-Speed Rail Authority.
**Uncommitted Funds**: Beginning in FY 2016, SB 862 calls for setting aside 40 percent of annual cap-and-trade auction proceeds for the following:

- Energy efficiency
- Clean energy
- Weatherization
- Low-carbon transportation
- Wetlands and coastal watersheds
- Fire prevention and urban forestry
- Waste diversion

Also, SB 862 provides greater clarity on how the “disadvantaged communities” targets enacted by Senate Bill 535 (SB 535) are to be met by requiring CalEPA to hold at least one public workshop before identifying disadvantaged communities and by requiring CARB, in consultation with CalEPA to develop funding guidelines for how administering agencies should “maximize benefits for disadvantaged communities”. Specifically SB 535 requires that 25% of Cap and Trade funds be invested in a manner that benefits disadvantaged communities, with 10% required to spent in those communities.

**DISCUSSION:**

In addition to the FY14-15 one-time $872 million appropriation, the revenues generated by cap and trade may reach as much as $2-$3 billion annually, and perhaps as much as $5 billion per year by FY2021, thus becoming a substantial source of revenue for all public transit agencies statewide.

For the Bay Area, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission has released estimates on the availability of cap and trade funding at its July 2, 2014, Transportation Finance Working Group, as follows:

1. **Cap and Trade Funding for S.F. Bay Area Transportation in FY2014-15**

   A. $350 million available to all transportation agencies in California, through the State-Administered Competitive Program for FY 2014-2015 distributed in accordance with SB 852 as follows:
      a. $25 million in public transit statewide competitive program
      b. $130 million in affordable housing and sustainable communities programs with a 50/50 split
      c. $200 million in low carbon transportation programs (clean vehicles)

   B. Approximately $9.3 million will also be eligible for the San Francisco Bay Area in formula-based funds for the FY2014-15 Cap and Trade Program. VTA will be able to claim its qualifying portion of the formula allocation currently estimated to be $850,603 of the public transit share.
2. Cap and Trade Funding Estimates for S.F. Bay Area Transportation starting in FY16 State Budget and beyond

Table 1: Estimates of State-Administered Competitive Cap and Trade Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Future Years Scenario 1 ($2.5 billion total)</th>
<th>Future Years Scenario 2 ($3.75 billion total)</th>
<th>Future Years Scenario 3 ($4.5 billion total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit</td>
<td>20% (~$500 million)</td>
<td>20% (~$750 million)</td>
<td>20% (~$900 million)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Amounts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable</td>
<td>10% (~$250 million)</td>
<td>10% (~$375 million)</td>
<td>10% (~$450 million)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities</td>
<td>(Includes transportation &amp; affordable housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>split 50/50)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Carbon</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(clean vehicles)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Estimates of Formula Cap and Trade Program Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Future Years Scenario 1 ($2.5 billion total)</th>
<th>Future Years Scenario 2 ($3.75 billion total)</th>
<th>Future Years Scenario 3 (4.5 billion total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Amounts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Formula</td>
<td>$125,000,000</td>
<td>$187,500,000</td>
<td>$225,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>$46,531,250</td>
<td>$69,796,875</td>
<td>$83,756,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay area Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue-Based</td>
<td>$34,468,750</td>
<td>$51,703,125</td>
<td>$62,043,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population-Based</td>
<td>$12,062,500</td>
<td>$18,093,750</td>
<td>$21,712,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Undoubtedly, VTA will be pursuing a maximum allocation of these new state funds. In order to qualify and better compete, VTA must understand and keep abreast of the cap and trade framework and its intended regulatory policy objectives. Attachment 1 shows a summary of the Cap and Trade Program detailing each of the five categories, their share of appropriations, project eligibility and selection criteria, as well as which State agency is responsible for its administration and project selection pursuant to SB 862.

Furthermore, SB 862 offers only the first overview on how the program should be administered and did not specify any dates by which guidelines must be developed. Therefore, it is imperative for VTA, along with the transportation community, to monitor the process to ensure that the
programs are implemented in a timely manner.

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

The Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC), Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) accepted this item as part of their respective consent calendars at their respective August 13 & 14, 2014 meetings.

The Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) heard a staff presentation on the item at their August 13, 2014 Workshop. The Committee asked for information on items of interest and concern to bicyclists and pedestrians. Staff explained that the programs are in a very early stage of development and program focus and criteria remain to be developed. Staff informed the Committee of upcoming public workshops being held by the California State Transportation Agency and committed to provide the Committee with the workshop notice and future developments.

Prepared By: Lorena Bernal Vidal
Memo No. 4655
**Attachment 1: Cap and Trade Program Overview (Pursuant to SB 862)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Allocated Revenue by %</th>
<th>Agency (s) Responsible</th>
<th>Eligible Projects</th>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Disadvantage Community Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Transit and Intercity Rail [and Bus] Capital Program | 10%                    | California State Transportation Agency reviews and scores projects and develops program guidelines. California Transportation Commission allocates funds. | • Rail capital improvements  
• Intercity and commuter rail projects that increase service levels, improve reliability and decrease travel times  
• Rail integration implementation, such as: integrated ticketing and scheduling systems, shared-use corridors, related planning efforts, and other service integration initiatives  
• Bus rapid transit and other bus transit investments | In all cases, a project must demonstrate that it will reduce greenhouse gas emissions and be consistent with the adopted sustainable communities strategy and recommendation of the regional agencies, plus meet any of the following criteria:  
• Reduce of auto vehicle miles traveled through growth in rail ridership;  
• Promote housing development in the vicinity of rail stations; or  
• Expand existing rail and public transit systems;  
• Implement clean vehicle technology;  
• Promote active transportation;  
• Improves public health;  
• Furthers the implementation of the blended system approach for high-speed rail along the Peninsula Corridor and in the Los Angeles Basin;  
• Promotes geographic equity | ≥ 25% of funds should benefit Disadvantaged Communities |
| Low-Carbon Transit Operations Program         | 5%                     | Transit Agency (or regional transportation planning agency for population-based funds) must submit project to Caltrans for approval and verification of eligibility as a GHG reducing Project. Controller allocates funds. | • Transit capital and operating expenses that enhance transit service and reduce green house gas emissions  
• Support new or expand bus or rail services  
• Support new or expand intermodal facilities and equipment  
• Support fueling and maintenance costs for equipment and facilities | After the enactment of the annual Budget Act, the Controller’s Office would issue apportionments to all public transit agencies using the STA formula. A public transit agency would then submit a list of proposed expenses based on these anticipated funding levels to Caltrans. | ≥ 50% of funds should benefit Disadvantaged Communities |
| Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program | 20%                    | Strategic Growth Council (in coordination with the MPOs and other regional Agencies) | • Intermodal and affordable housing projects  
• Public transit capital projects and programs  
• Active transportation capital projects that qualify under the Active Transportation Program, including pedestrian and bicycle facilities.  
• Non-infrastructure-related active transportation projects that Transit-oriented development projects or connect those developments to such stations  
• Capital projects that implement local complete streets programs  
• Acquisition of easements, or other approaches or tools that protect agricultural lands that are under pressure of being converted to non-agricultural uses.  
• Planning to support the implementation of a sustainable communities strategy | In all cases, a project must demonstrate that it will reduce greenhouse gas emissions and be consistent with the adopted sustainable communities strategy and recommendation of the regional agencies; and,  
• Support infill and compact development  
• Support ridership  
• Encourages active transportation goals  
• Reduces automobile trips and vehicle miles traveled within a community  
• Qualifies under the Active Transportation Program  
• Implements local complete streets programs  
• Protects agricultural lands | ≥ 50% of funds should benefit Disadvantaged Communities |
| High Speed Rail Program                       | 25%                    | High-Speed Rail Authority                                   | • Environmental review, design work, acquisition and construction of the state’s proposed high-speed rail system  
• Repayment of loans made to the Authority | Costs associated with the construction of the High-Speed Rail System. | N/A |
| Uncommitted Funds                             | 40%                    | California Legislature                                     | Intended but not limited to projects needed for energy efficiency, clean energy, weatherization, low-carbon transportation, wetlands and coastal watersheds, fire prevention and urban forestry and waste diversion THD | THD | N/A |
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Nuria I. Fernandez

FROM: Director of Planning and Program Development, John Ristow

SUBJECT: Proactive CMP Quarterly Report for Apr-June 2014

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

VTA has two programs through which it reviews and comments on development and transportation projects occurring in and adjacent to Santa Clara County: 1) the Development Review Program which reviews environmental documents and development proposals submitted by Member Agencies; and 2) the review of Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) reports for proposed projects meeting the Congestion Management Program (CMP) TIA Guideline requirements.

The Proactive CMP (“Proactive”) process integrates these two VTA review processes to provide comments on projects prior to approval by Member Agencies. The objectives of the Proactive CMP process include improving land use/transportation coordination, promoting alternative travel modes, and encouraging a balanced approach to addressing congestion. As part of the Proactive process, VTA produces quarterly reports on project proposals highlighting two sets of projects and types of information:

- **Projects Reviewed by VTA:** For projects or environmental documents reviewed by VTA staff under the Congestion Management Program and Development Review Program in the past quarter, relevant VTA comments are summarized.

- **Projects Approved by Local Agencies:** For projects or environmental documents approved by local agencies in the past quarter, relevant VTA comments and agency responses or conditions of approval are summarized.

DISCUSSION:

The following discussion provides a summary of the April through June 2014 Proactive CMP Quarterly Report. The summary highlights key projects and topics contained in the report, which
is provided as Attachment A. The report includes a table summarizing all of the reviewed and approved projects, and a reference map showing the locations of these projects.

- VTA commented on 24 projects through the Proactive CMP process between April and June 2014. The City with the largest number of projects was San José with eight projects followed by Mountain View with three projects.

- Thirteen of the 24 projects that VTA commented on involved environmental documents such as an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), Notice of Preparation (NOP), or Mitigated Negative Declaration. Five of the projects involved stand-alone TIA documents and the remaining projects included Site Development Permits, a Traffic Operations Study and a General Plan Amendment.

- Sixteen of the 24 items that VTA commented on were private development projects. The remainder consisted of agency-led area planning efforts such as Precise Plans, General Plan updates, Specific Plans and a Climate Action Plan.

- Eleven projects which VTA previously commented on were approved by local agencies during this quarter. The City of San José had the greatest number of approvals with four projects, followed by Santa Clara and Mountain View with two projects approved each.

Key plans and documents that VTA reviewed and commented on during the past quarter included the following:

- **North Forty Specific Plan and North Forty Phase I, Town of Los Gatos**: The Town of Los Gatos circulated a DEIR and TIA for the North Forty Specific Plan, for up to 555 residential units, 420,000 square feet of retail, 162,000 square feet of office, and 150 hotel rooms on 44 acres. Concurrently, the Town circulated a development application and site plan for the first phase of the development, consisting of 335 residential units and 66,000 square feet of commercial on a 20-acre site. VTA submitted comment letters on both referrals supporting the proposed density and land use mix; recommending appropriate Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures and bicycle and pedestrian improvements for the area; encouraging the Town to work with the applicant to include active uses along Los Gatos Boulevard; and requesting bus stop improvements adjacent to the site. The Town and the developer have recently been working with VTA staff to incorporate VTA’s comments.

- **The Village at San Antonio Center, City of Mountain View**: The City of Mountain View circulated a DEIR for 420,000 s.f. commercial/office, 157,000 s.f. retail/entertainment, and 142,000 s.f. hotel uses on 9.9 acres at the southeast corner of San Antonio Road and California Street. VTA submitted a comment letter supporting the land use intensification at this important site in proximity to Caltrain and El Camino Real bus service; commending the project applicant for including pedestrian-friendly features in the project site design; requesting bus stop improvements adjacent to the site; recommending that abundant bicycle parking be provided throughout the site; supporting the project’s approach to Transportation Demand Management (TDM) including a 30% trip reduction target, monitoring and
enforcement; and recommending that a Mini Deficiency Plan be prepared if impacts to a CMP facility noted in the DEIR cannot be mitigated to a Less than Significant level.

- **Marshall Squares, City of San José:** The City of San José circulated a Site Development Permit and Traffic Operations Study Scope of Work for a seven-story, 195-unit multifamily residential building with 6,900 square feet of ground floor retail on a 1.4-acre site between North First Street, North Second Street, and St. John Street. VTA submitted comment letter supporting the land use intensification at this important downtown location; recommending transit incentives and parking management as appropriate Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures for the location; noting that permits will be required to construct the project near the light rail tracks; and recommending that the Traffic Operations Study account for increased light rail frequencies and speeds projected in the Light Rail Efficiency Project.

As noted above, eleven items that VTA previously provided comments on were approved during this past quarter. The following is a brief summary of key VTA comments and the local agency responses or conditions of approval on three of these items.

- **2600 Marine Way Intuit Campus, City of Mountain View:** The City of Mountain View circulated a DEIR and TIA for 364,000 square feet of new office space at a site bounded by Marine Way, Garcia Avenue, and Bayshore Parkway. VTA submitted a comment letter commending the project applicant for proposing a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program with a target to reduce auto trips by 35%, including monitoring, enforcement, and membership in the Mountain View Transportation Management Association (MVTMA); and noting that the DEIR found significant impacts on US 101 and voluntary contributions to transportation improvements on the affected corridor would be an appropriate mitigation measure. The project was approved by City Council on June 10, 2014, with the TDM Program included as part of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP).

- **Monticello Village, City of Santa Clara:** The City of Santa Clara circulated a DEIR and TIA for 825 residential units and 43,849 square feet of retail space on a 16.11-acre at the northeast corner of Monroe Street and French Street, across the street from the Lawrence Caltrain Station. VTA submitted a comment letter supporting the land use intensification at this important site within the future Lawrence Station Area Plan; commending the City and applicant for including a thorough analysis of bicycle and pedestrian modes and proposing several improvements in the TIA; noting that the TIA found significant impacts at two CMP Intersections and recommending that the applicant implement automobile trip reduction strategies from the Deficiency Plan Action List, including transit fare incentives; noting that VTA will continue to work with the City and applicant to ensure that the design of the development does not preclude future potential bus service to the Lawrence Caltrain Station; and requesting improvements to an existing bus stop that would be moved by the development. The project was approved by City Council on May 8, 2014, with conditions of approval requiring the project to prepare a 20 percent vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction strategy with annual reporting.
• **Diridon Station Area Plan, City of San José:** The City of San José circulated a DEIR for the expansion of the Diridon Station and transit center as well as a vision and framework for higher intensity development in 250-acre area surrounding the Station. VTA submitted a comment letter supporting the objectives of the Plan to accommodate future transit improvements and intensify land uses in this important location; recommending that projects in the area include exceptional pedestrian accommodations to facilitate access to transit; recommending an analysis of congestion impacts to transit service and offsetting measures to maintain transit speed; requesting clarifications related to analysis of CMP facilities; and making specific recommendations for the design of the transit center to serve transit operational needs. The Plan was approved on June 17, 2014, with a condition to study the formation of a Transportation Management Association (TMA) in the area. VTA provided extensive input during the development of the draft Plan and continues to be closely involved as a stakeholder and land owner in the project area.

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

This item was on the regular agenda at the August 2014 meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC). Committee Member Tebo asked for clarification about the location of the North Forty Specific Plan in Los Gatos. Vice Chairperson Wadler asked if the Village at San Antonio Center project would accommodate bicycle access and staff replied that it would. Committee Member Elias noted that electric vehicle infrastructure would help projects reduce emissions from transportation. Committee Member Tebo asked how VTA’s operational plans account for projects under construction and staff replied that VTA considers development activity in its annual service planning process. Committee Member Elias commented that VTA should be involved in the development of General Plans to play a more effective role in influencing land use development. The Committee had a brief discussion about how VTA’s role in the development process could be improved.

This item was on the regular agenda at the August 2014 meeting of the Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC). A member of the public commented to encourage transparency and to discourage driver fees. Committee Member Wadler stated concerns regarding an emphasis on buffered bike lanes in development plans or comments. Staff responded that VTA comments follow the recommendations of the VTA Bicycle Technical Guidelines (BTG). Committee Member Simons expressed a concern regarding proposed modifications to the Commercial Street / Central Expressway area in the Landbank R&D project in Sunnyvale. Committee Member Goldstein commented that the next update of the BTG could include further guidance on buffered bike lanes, and requested a copy of VTA comments on Palo Alto Comprehensive Plan Update NOP. Committee Member Bell commented that VTA should continue to focus on bicycle/pedestrian accommodations in the Diridon Station Area going forward. Vice Chairperson Kerr commented that San Antonio Road lacks safe bicycle accommodations, especially across US 101 and north of El Camino Real, and suggested that development projects could be opportunities to address this. Committee Member Stallman noted that the Homewood Suites project in San Jose provides an opportunity to build a Class I bicycle trail along the bay side of SR 237. Committee Member Wadler agreed and noted that the Mountain View representative should pay attention to bicycle accommodations as the Village at San Antonio Center project is developed. Chairperson Brinsfield noted that local BPACs should continue to follow-up on
bicycle and pedestrian improvements as these projects are implemented, and as future
development projects are considered by local agencies.

This item was on the consent agenda at the August 2014 meetings of the Technical Advisory
Committee (TAC) and Policy Advisory Committee (PAC). The item was accepted as part of the
consent agenda at both committees.

Prepared By: Robert Cunningham
Memo No. 4602
VTA Development Review Program

Proactive CMP Quarterly Report
April, May, and June of 2014
# Development Review Projects Summary

**April to June 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map No.</th>
<th>CMP ID</th>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Project Name/Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Document Type</th>
<th>Comments this quarter?</th>
<th>Approved this quarter?</th>
<th>VTA Comment Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CM1401</td>
<td>City of Campbell</td>
<td>Creekside Center - 675 and 705 Creekside Way, near Highway 17 off-ramp</td>
<td>183,500 s.f. office on 5 acres</td>
<td>Initial Study</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Land Use; Transit Incentives; Transportation Demand Management; Intersection Analysis; Freeway Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CM1402</td>
<td>City of Campbell</td>
<td>Dell Avenue Area Plan - Generally bounded by Winchester Blvd, Hacienda Ave, the Los Gatos Creek Trail, and Knowles Dr</td>
<td>Area Plan for a total of 300 dwelling units, 2.85 million s.f. office, 350k s.f. light industrial/R&amp;D, and 72k retail</td>
<td>TIA Notification</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Land Use; Pedestrian and Bicycle Accommodations; Hacienda Station; Transportation Demand Management; Freeway Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CO1401</td>
<td>Santa Clara County</td>
<td>County Circulation Element Update</td>
<td>Circulation and mobility element for expressways and roads</td>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation Analysis; Transportation Network and Land Use Assumptions; Consistency with VTA Travel Demand Model; Congestion Impacts to Transit Service; Secondary Effects of Roadway Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CU1401</td>
<td>City of Cupertino</td>
<td>Housing Element and General Plan Update</td>
<td>Combination of: 1) a focused General Plan Amendment to increase citywide office, commercial, hotel and residential allocations, and 2) Update to City Housing Element</td>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Land Use; Impacts of Congestion on Transit Travel Times; CMP Facilities; Transportation Demand Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CU1402</td>
<td>City of Cupertino</td>
<td>Hyatt House - Southeast corner of I280 and Wolfe Road</td>
<td>148-room hotel and restaurant</td>
<td>Site Development Permit</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td>TIA Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>GI1302</td>
<td>City of Gilroy</td>
<td>UNFI Warehouse - Camino Arroyo and Ventura Way, 1000 feet south of SR 152</td>
<td>802,000 s.f. warehouse and distribution center</td>
<td>DEIR, TIA</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bus Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>LG1103</td>
<td>Town of Los Gatos</td>
<td>North Forty Specific Plan - Bounded by SR 17, SR 85, Los Gatos Boulevard &amp; Lark Ave</td>
<td>Specific Plan for 364 housing units, up to 400,000 sf retail, 125,000 sf office, and 125-150 room hotel on 44 acres</td>
<td>DEIR, TIA</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Land Use; Pedestrian and Bicycle Accommodations; Site Design; Freeway Analysis; Transportation Demand Management; Bus Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>LG1302</td>
<td>Town of Los Gatos</td>
<td>North Forty Phase 1</td>
<td>335 residential units and 66,000 s.f. commercial</td>
<td>Revised Site Plan</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian and Bicycle Accommodations; Site Design; Bus Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map No.</td>
<td>CMP ID</td>
<td>Lead Agency</td>
<td>Project Name/Location</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Document Type</td>
<td>Comments this quarter?</td>
<td>Approved this quarter?</td>
<td>VTA Comment Topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>MH1203</td>
<td>City of Morgan Hill</td>
<td>Cochrane Commercial - Southeast corner of Cochrane Road and Butterfield Boulevard</td>
<td>136,300 s.f. retail and 60,000 s.f. medical office on 20-acre site</td>
<td>Initial Study, TIA</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian and Bicycle Accommodations; Bus Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ML0805</td>
<td>City of Milpitas</td>
<td>Piper Montague/Citation Homes</td>
<td>Citation II - 381 Apartments and 8,100 s.f. retail (Part of total development of 638 units)</td>
<td>Tentative Map/Site Development Permit</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordination with BART Silicon Valley Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>MV1301</td>
<td>City of Mountain View</td>
<td>2600 Marine Way Intuit Campus - Bounded by Marine Way, Garcia Avenue, and Bayshore Parkway</td>
<td>369,500 s.f. office on 8.49 acres (231,213 net new s.f.)</td>
<td>DEIR, TIA</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Transportation Demand Management; Freeway Impacts and Mitigation Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>MV1307</td>
<td>City of Mountain View</td>
<td>The Village at San Antonio (formerly San Antonio Center Phase II)</td>
<td>392,855 s.f. office, 118,050 s.f. commercial, 167 room hotel, movie theater on 9.9 acres</td>
<td>DEIR, TIA, Planned Community Permit</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Land Use; Pedestrian Accommodations; Bicycle Access and Parking; Transportation Demand Management; Significant Impacts to CMP Facilities; Bus Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>MV1311</td>
<td>City of Mountain View</td>
<td>1616 El Camino Real Residential</td>
<td>66 apartment units on a 1-acre site</td>
<td>Initial Study, TIA</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Land Use; Pedestrian Accommodations; Parking Ratio; Transit Incentives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>MV1401</td>
<td>City of Mountain View</td>
<td>600 National Avenue at Ellis Street</td>
<td>140,634 s.f. office building on 4.82 acres</td>
<td>Initial Study/TIA</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation Demand Management; Pedestrian Accommodations and Access to Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>MV1402</td>
<td>City of Mountain View</td>
<td>El Camino Real Precise Plan - Various parcels along El Camino Real from San Antonio Road to South Bernardo Avenue</td>
<td>Planning priorities, development regulations, and implementation strategy for El Camino Real area</td>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Relationship to El Camino Real BRT Project; Pedestrian and Bicycle Accommodations; Potential Congestion Impacts on Transit Travel Times; CMP Facilities; Transportation Demand Management/ Trip Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>MV1403</td>
<td>City of Mountain View</td>
<td>San Antonio Precise Plan - Frontage includes El Camino Real, San Antonio Road, California Street, and Showers Drive</td>
<td>Planning policies, development regulations, public infrastructure improvements, and implementation strategy for San Antonio area</td>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian and Bicycle Accommodations; Potential Congestion Impacts on Transit Travel Times; CMP Facilities; Transportation Demand Management/ Trip Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map No.</td>
<td>CMP ID</td>
<td>Lead Agency</td>
<td>Project Name/Location</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Document Type</td>
<td>Comments this quarter?</td>
<td>Approved this quarter?</td>
<td>VTA Comment Topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>PA1401</td>
<td>City of Palo Alto</td>
<td>Comprehensive Plan Update</td>
<td>Comprehensive Plan Update to year 2030</td>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Transportation Analysis; Transportation Network and Land Use Assumptions; Consistency with VTA Travel Demand Model; Congestion Impacts to Transit Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>SC1307</td>
<td>City of Santa Clara</td>
<td>Monticello Village - NE corner of Monroe Street and French Street</td>
<td>835 residential units and 43,849 square feet of retail space on 16.11 acres</td>
<td>DEIR, TIA</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Land Use; Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodations; CMP Intersection Impacts; Potential Future Bus Route Options; Existing Transit Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>SC1402</td>
<td>City of Santa Clara</td>
<td>Santa Clara Square - Several sites northeast of the Bowers Dr/Scott Blvd intersection, south of US 101</td>
<td>GPA from High Intensity Office/R&amp;D to Community Commercial (14.15 acres) and Light Industrial to High Intensity Office/R&amp;D (16.84 acres)</td>
<td>General Plan Amendment</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>TIA Report; Transportation Demand Management; Bus Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>SJ1110</td>
<td>City of San José</td>
<td>Diridon Station Area Plan</td>
<td>Vision and framework for higher intensity/transit-oriented development in 250-acre area surrounding Diridon station, west of Downtown San José</td>
<td>DEIR</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Land Use; Pedestrian Accommodations; Congestion Impacts to Transit Service; Project Phasing; Queuing Analysis at Freeway On-Ramp Locations; Existing Intersection LOS; Freeway Analysis; Transit Center Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>SJ1305</td>
<td>City of San José</td>
<td>Great Oaks / iStar Mixed Use</td>
<td>720 residential units, 154,000 s.f. commercial uses, and 260,000 s.f office/commercial uses</td>
<td>DEIR, TIA</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Access to Transit and Trip Reductions; Freeway Impacts and Mitigation Measures; Bicycle Accommodations; Transit Incentives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>SJ1320</td>
<td>City of San José</td>
<td>Park Housing - Northeast corner of Park Avenue and Laurel Grove Lane</td>
<td>182 multi-family housing units</td>
<td>Initial Study, TIA</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Land Use; Transit Incentives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>SJ1401</td>
<td>City of San José</td>
<td>505 Lincoln Avenue</td>
<td>190 condominiums on a 2.94-acre site</td>
<td>TIA</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Land Use; Pedestrian Accommodations and Access to Transit; Transit Incentives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>SJ1404</td>
<td>City of San José</td>
<td>Fairfield Apartments - Southeast corner of San Carlos Street and Sunol Street</td>
<td>318 residential units and 23,543 s.f. commercial/office on 4.18 net acres</td>
<td>Planned Development Permit, TIA Notification</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Land Use; Pedestrian Accommodations; Transit Incentives; Parking Management; TIA Report; Light Rail Operations; VTA Permit Coordination; Pedestrian Accommodations and Access to Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>SJ1405</td>
<td>City of San José</td>
<td>Homewood Suites Hotel - Northwest corner of SR 237 and North First Street</td>
<td>145-room hotel</td>
<td>TIA Notification</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Freeway Analysis; CMP Intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map No.</td>
<td>CMP ID</td>
<td>Lead Agency</td>
<td>Project Name/Location</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Document Type</td>
<td>Approved this quarter?</td>
<td>Comments this quarter?</td>
<td>VTA Comment Topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>SJ1406</td>
<td>City of San José</td>
<td>900 N First Street - At northeast corner of Hedding Street</td>
<td>78 multi-family residential units and 16,000 s.f. commercial</td>
<td>TIA Notification</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Land Use; Transit Incentives; Pedestrian Accommodations; CMP Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>SJ1407</td>
<td>City of San José</td>
<td>Samaritan Medical Offices</td>
<td>65,000 s.f. medical office</td>
<td>TIA</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation Demand Management; Pedestrian Accommodations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>SJ1408</td>
<td>City of San José</td>
<td>Marshall Squares - Between N. First Street and Second Street, south of St. John Street</td>
<td>195 residential units and 6,900 s.f. retail on a 1.4-acre site</td>
<td>Site Development Permit, Traffic Operations Study Scope</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Land Use; Transit Incentives; Parking Management; VTA Permit Coordination; Light Rail Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>SJ1409</td>
<td>City of San José</td>
<td>Arcadia Evergreen - 2218 Quimby Road at Capitol Expressway</td>
<td>200,000 s.f. retail center</td>
<td>Traffic Operations Study Scope</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian Accommodations; Trail Connections; Bus Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>SJ1410</td>
<td>City of San José</td>
<td>Saratoga Convenience - Southwest corner of Saratoga Avenue and Williams Road</td>
<td>Redevelopment of existing gas station, removal of two restaurants and addition of convenience store</td>
<td>Site Development Permit</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bus Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>SU1401</td>
<td>City of Sunnyvale</td>
<td>Landbank R&amp;D Campus - Southwest corner of Wolf Road and Arques Avenue</td>
<td>777,170 s.f. (518,449 s.f. net new s.f.) R &amp; D development</td>
<td>DEIR</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian and Bicycle Accommodations; Transportation Demand Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>SU1402</td>
<td>City of Sunnyvale</td>
<td>Climate Action Plan</td>
<td>Climate action plan to reduce greenhouse gas emissions</td>
<td>IS/MND, Draft Plan</td>
<td>y y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation and Land Use Measures; Transportation Demand Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABAG</td>
<td>Association of Bay Area Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>Across Barrier Connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Acre(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE</td>
<td>Altamont Commuter Express</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A(PD)</td>
<td>Planned Development Zoning District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART</td>
<td>Bay Area Rapid Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMPs</td>
<td>Best Management Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>Bus Rapid Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTG</td>
<td>Bicycle Technical Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDT</td>
<td>Community Design &amp; Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG</td>
<td>Commercial General Zoning District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI/C</td>
<td>Combined Industrial/Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMP</td>
<td>Congestion Management Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA</td>
<td>Construction Staging Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>Conditional Use Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWC</td>
<td>Citizen Watchdog Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DASH</td>
<td>Downtown Area Shuttle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Downtown Commercial Zoning District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEIR</td>
<td>Draft Environmental Impact Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DU/AC</td>
<td>Dwelling Units Per Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIR</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER</td>
<td>Environmental Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>Floor Area Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEIR</td>
<td>Final Environmental Impact Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>General Plan Amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Heavy Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOV</td>
<td>High-Occupancy Vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSR</td>
<td>High-Speed Rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Industrial Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>Initial Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITR</td>
<td>Industrial to Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>Intelligent Transportation System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI</td>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRT</td>
<td>Light Rail Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU/TD</td>
<td>Land Use/Transportation Diagram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCR</td>
<td>Monitoring and Conformance Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MND</td>
<td>Mitigated Negative Declaration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTC</td>
<td>Metropolitan Transportation Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVHDR</td>
<td>Multifamily Very High Density Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND</td>
<td>Negative Declaration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOI</td>
<td>Notice of Intent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>Notice of Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPDES</td>
<td>National Pollution Discharge Elimination System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCC</td>
<td>Portland Concrete Cement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDA</td>
<td>Priority Development Area (MTC/ABAG Plan Bay Area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDR</td>
<td>Planned Development Rezoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPOS</td>
<td>Public Park/Open Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTG</td>
<td>Pedestrian Technical Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUD</td>
<td>Planned Urban Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D</td>
<td>Research &amp; Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-M</td>
<td>Multi-Family Residential Zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>Right-Of-Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RVHD</td>
<td>Residential Very High Density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAR</td>
<td>Site and Architectural Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCVWD</td>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Water District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDP</td>
<td>Site Development Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>Square Foot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFR</td>
<td>Single Family Residences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA</td>
<td>Specific Plan Amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRR</td>
<td>Southern Pacific Railroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVRT</td>
<td>Silicon Valley Rapid Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWPPP</td>
<td>Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>Temporary Construction Easement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCR</td>
<td>Transit Corridor Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDM</td>
<td>Transportation Demand Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIA</td>
<td>Transportation Impact Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIA NF</td>
<td>Transportation Impact Analysis Notification Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM</td>
<td>Tentative Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMA</td>
<td>Transportation Management Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOD</td>
<td>Transit-Oriented Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPA</td>
<td>Transit Priority Area (SB 743/SB 375)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UB</td>
<td>Utility Box</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPRR</td>
<td>Union Pacific Railroad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Nuria I. Fernandez

FROM: Director of Planning and Program Development, John Ristow

SUBJECT: Pedestrian Access to Transit Plan - Existing Conditions Report

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

In fall of 2013, VTA staff began developing a Pedestrian Access to Transit Plan (Plan). The Plan will inventory and evaluate pedestrian-related access improvements within walking distance of major transit corridors in Santa Clara County, and include implementation strategies for funding and delivering improvements. The plan is anticipated to be completed in 2016.

The Plan is partially funded by a $100,000 Safe Routes to Transit grant, with the remainder of funding provided through the FY 2014 and FY 2015 Congestion Management Program Work Program, which includes staff time for Pedestrian Programming Activities.

A Pedestrian Access to Transit Plan Task Force (Task Force) was formed to gather input from stakeholders that have special interest in pedestrian access to transit in Santa Clara County. Members represent seniors, disabled community, people with limited English proficiency as well as walking and transit advocacy groups, academia, public health, Caltrans, Santa Clara County and the City of San Jose.

The Existing Conditions Report is the first report of this planning process. It was presented to the Task Force in July 2014. Comments made by the Task Force have been incorporated into the draft being presented to VTA Committees.

DISCUSSION:

The Existing Conditions Report includes a summary of the available plans, demographic data relevant to walking, and pedestrian access and safety data relevant to Santa Clara County. The report also includes a revised Focus Area map, which will guide the field review for the next stage of plan development. The Report (Attachment A) serves as an important first look at walking conditions in Santa Clara County and sets the background for the Pedestrian Access to...
Transit Plan. Key findings of this report include:

- Walking is affected by the built environment, and most strongly affected by land use diversity, intersection density (a measure of street network connectivity) and the number of destinations within walking distance.
  - Intersection density varies throughout the county, with the highest intersection density occurring in downtown Palo Alto, downtown Mountain View, residential areas of Sunnyvale and Santa Clara, and in residential areas of San Jose surrounding downtown.
  - Job-worker balance - a ratio of the number of jobs in an area compared to the number of workers who live in that area - is one measure of land use diversity. A handful of Census Tracts in the county show job-housing equity. Job-rich areas are located in North County and along the 101, 237, 87 and 17 highway corridors. Most of the rest of the county is housing-rich.

- In California, 12.5% of all trips are made on foot. In the Bay Area, nearly 55% of all trips of a mile or less is made by car, while only 38% are made on foot. In comparison, approximately 1.9 percent of commute trips are made on foot, and 3.3 percent are made by transit Santa Clara County.

- Between 2003 and 2012, there were 4,300 pedestrian-vehicle collisions in Santa Clara County. Of these, 6 percent were fatal and 12 percent resulted in severe injury. During this time period, the number of motor vehicle collisions declined, while the number of pedestrian collisions remained constant at about 430 annually.

- Pedestrian collisions are not distributed evenly throughout the county: Although data show that San Jose, Palo Alto, Santa Clara, Sunnyvale, and Milpitas experience higher numbers of motor vehicle to pedestrian collisions than other cities in the county, the most severe injuries occur primarily along major corridors in Mountain View, Sunnyvale, and San Jose.

- The Existing Conditions Report reviews seventy eight (78) local and countywide planning documents that address pedestrian-transit access needs. These documents range in detail from station area plans to citywide pedestrian plans to VTA’s countywide Pedestrian Technical Guidelines. From these plans, VTA identified two hundred forty (240) planned projects that relate to pedestrian access to transit.

The report concludes by evaluating a set of socio-economic, planning, transit, and other factors to identify areas that will be the focus of field work during the next stage of plan development. The report includes a draft map of focus areas.

This existing conditions report casts a wide net-looking at the entire county. It is intended to serve as a reference for not only the Pedestrian Access to Transit Plan, but also future countywide pedestrian planning efforts.
NEXT STEPS:

For the remainder of the planning effort, VTA will focus on pedestrian access to transit. As the transit agency for the county, VTA has a vested interest in focusing on transit access improvements. The quality of the transit trip doesn’t start and stop at the vehicle door. The majority of our customers walk to or from their stop or station. By working with the cities and county to improve the quality, safety, and convenience of the walking environment near our transit stops, we improve the entire transit experience, benefit the surrounding community, and encourage more people to walk or ride transit.

The key findings of the Existing Conditions Report will guide the development of the study, including identification of improvements, planning priorities, and funding opportunities.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:

Staff presented the Pedestrian Access to Transit Plan Existing Conditions Report to the August meetings of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC), Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC), Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Policy Advisory Committee (PAC).

Staff presented the item at the CAC’s meeting on August 13, 2014. The CAC expressed support for the report. One member asked if collision data included pedestrian-train collisions, and staff responded that they did not.

Staff presented the item at the BPAC’s meeting on August 13, 2014. The BPAC expressed support for the report, and particularly for the maps. Member Simons noted that some studies are moving toward using bedrooms per acre as a unit of density. Chair Brinsfield asked a question about how the next stage of the plan would relate to future development in the Cities. Staff responded that VTA staff would work with Member Agencies to identify proposed development within the Focus Areas, and that future development could be one potential implementation mechanism for pedestrian improvements.

Staff presented the item at the TAC’s meeting on August 14, 2014. Member Servin requested that staff consider lighting adequacy at bus stops and suggested that further analysis of pedestrian collisions could identify locations where inadequate lighting is a contributing factor. Member Rodriguez suggested that a disclaimer be included on the collision map indicating that it does not necessarily show locations where there is higher risk, due to the fact that the collisions may be the fault of the pedestrian rather than the driver. Member Servin asked a question about optimal sidewalk width for enticing pedestrians to walk. Staff responded that optimal sidewalk width should be based on local context and that walking rates depend on a variety of additional factors—most importantly, distance between destinations.

Staff presented the item at the PAC’s meeting on August 14, 2014. Members asked staff to clarify intersection density. Several members noted that the intersection density map did not reflect their understanding of their communities. At the conclusion of the presentation, members discussed land use and its relationship to transit service. Staff clarified that the plan does not address land use or transit service changes, but rather pedestrian connections to existing transit service. Member Waterman noted that he started using transit recently, but recognizes that due to
the time it takes, it would not be for everyone. He asked what staff would say to people who would not relocate to areas that are denser and more transit-supportive. Member Larsen described Los Altos Hill’s pedestrian amenities and walkable destinations and indicated that he would like to see more collaboration between the town and VTA in supporting walking in the community. Member Abe-Koga and Member Mahoney expressed concern about VTA duplicating or conflicting with related planning work that is currently ongoing in their communities. Staff responded that Member Agencies would be closely involved in identifying the specific geographic scope of focus areas, and that the intention of the plan is to complement existing efforts. Member Mahoney requested clarification on the goal and deliverable of the plan. Staff responded that the plan’s intention is to identify infrastructure projects that improve pedestrian access to transit, and to develop an estimate of the financial need in the county for these improvements. Member Davis expressed concern that higher density projects near locations with high pedestrian collision numbers may result in more people walking, and therefore even more pedestrian collisions.

Prepared By: Lauren Ledbetter
Memo No. 4477
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1 Introduction

This existing conditions report serves as an important first look at walking conditions in Santa Clara County and sets the background for the Pedestrian Access to Transit Plan. This report includes:

- A description of walkable communities and the benefits of walking
- A summary of relevant pedestrian-related plans and policies
- A summary of built environment factors that affect walking in Santa Clara County
- Information about how much, and why people walk
- A summary of historic pedestrian collision data

The report concludes by evaluating a set of socio-economic, planning, transit, and other factors to identify areas that will be the focus of field work during the next stage of plan development. A draft map of focus areas is presented.

This existing conditions report casts a wide net—looking at the entire county. It is intended to serve as a reference for not only the Pedestrian Access to Transit Plan, but also future countywide pedestrian planning efforts that may come out of the development of the Pedestrian Access to Transit Plan.

For the remainder of the planning effort, VTA will focus on pedestrian access to transit. As the transit agency for the county, VTA has a vested interest in focusing on transit access improvements. The quality of the transit trip doesn't start and stop at the vehicle door. The majority of our customers walk to or from their stop or station. People feel comfortable walking to transit facilities when the access between major uses and these facilities is continuous. By working with the cities and county to improve the quality, safety, and convenience of the walking environment near our transit stops, we improve the entire transit experience, benefit the surrounding community, and encourage more people to walk or ride transit.

---

2 Benefits of Walking and Walkable Environments

Walking is the most basic way of traveling from place to place, and is a mode of travel open to all—regardless of age, ability, or income.2 Walkable communities—those where one can safely, comfortably, and conveniently walk to meet most daily needs—are livable, sustainable, and dynamic places, with vibrant street life and cohesive communities. Walkable communities and transit support and complement each other. Sidewalks, trails, and other pedestrian infrastructure are many times less costly to build and maintain than infrastructure for other types of transportation. The benefits of walkable communities are wide-ranging and much research has been conducted to understand and quantify them. Key benefits include:

Health: The health benefits of walking are not just limited to weight management, but include prevention of a variety of diseases, including cardiovascular disease, high blood pressure, diabetes, depression, osteoporosis, and some cancers.3 According to a Health Economic Assessment Tool developed by the World Health Organization, if all adults in Santa Clara County between ages 18 and 65 were to get 30 minutes of walking a day, mortality would be reduced by 23 percent, resulting in 347 fewer deaths annually.4

Economic and environmental benefits: In walkable communities, people are more likely to leave the car at home and walk or bike to get somewhere. Driving fewer miles results in immediate fuel and maintenance cost savings. The American Automobile Association (AAA) estimates it costs $61 for every 100 miles of commuting, and an average of 78.3 cents per mile to operate a car.5 Motor vehicles are the major source of air pollution in the Bay Area, contributing 36% of the greenhouse gas emissions and up to 28% of fine particulate matter (PM 2.5).6, 7 By reducing vehicle miles traveled, walkable communities contribute to reductions in air pollutants.

Safety benefits: Transportation infrastructure in walkable communities tends to promote safe and respectful driving behavior. Drivers are primed by environmental queues—sidewalks, narrow streets, crosswalks, street trees, pedestrian-scale streetscapes—to drive slower and expect pedestrians, and as a result, are more likely to yield for pedestrians.

Property values: People are more willing to pay for more for property in walkable communities. Two studies looking at Walk Score8 and property values found that commercial and residential

---

2 In this report, “walking” and “pedestrian” are inclusive terms that include people who use mobility assistive devices, including, but not limited to motorized scooters and wheelchairs.


6 Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Source Inventory of Bay Area Greenhouse Gas Emissions (San Francisco: Bay Area Air Quality Management District, 2010).

7 Center on Urban Environmental Law, Air Pollution and Environmental Inequity in the San Francisco Bay Area (San Francisco: Golden Gate University School of Law, 2011).

8 Walk Score (www.walkscore.com) is an online tool that calculates the walkability of a neighborhood based on how close amenities such as restaurants, coffee shops, stores, parks, libraries are to an address. It is often advertised in real estate listings. Walk Scores range from 0 to 100, with higher Walk Scores more walkable. Walk Scores over 70 indicate locations where it is possible to meet daily needs without a car.
properties both increased in value with an increase in Walk Score.
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**Accessibility and equity benefits:** Walking, both by itself and in conjunction with transit, provides a means to access important goods, services, and activities. This accessibility is particularly important for those who may have limited transportation options: youth, the elderly, people with disabilities, and people with low incomes.

**Social Capital:** In walkable communities, public space becomes a stage for informal interactions between neighbors, workers, visitors. These interactions support relationships, networks, and involvement in the community—social capital.11 12

---

3 Relationship to Other Plans and Policies

3.1 Pedestrian Planning in Santa Clara County
The VTA Pedestrian Access to Transit Plan is the first countywide plan to emphasize improving pedestrian access to transit on a regional scale. It complements local pedestrian planning documents, which cover specific geographic areas based on the communities’ needs.

This section provides a summary description of pedestrian-related plans on the local level, their area of influence, and their proposed outcomes. The reviewed documents have been adopted by local governments in the last 10 to 15 years. Not all local planning documents are included in this chapter: Documents were selected based on their proposed pedestrian facility improvements around transit facilities. The plans are from 15 cities in Santa Clara County, County of Santa Clara, and VTA.

3.2 State and Regional Pedestrian-Related Plans
The primary outcome of this plan is to identify locations in Santa Clara County which are in close proximity of transit facilities and would benefit from pedestrian improvements. This outcome is supported by and consistent with state, regional, and local planning documents.

At the state and regional level, the pedestrian-related plans are mainly policy documents and design guidelines and manuals. For instance, the California Strategic Highway Safety Plan, adopted by California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), provides strategies for improving pedestrian safety. Caltrans’ Complete Streets Policy (Deputy Directive 64-R1) is that agency’s policy to facilitate multi-modal transportation planning efforts including accommodating pedestrians and transit in all roadway projects. Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines and the Public Rights-Of-Way Accessibility Guidelines are Federal documents that provide specific design guidelines for buildings, facilities, and public rights of way—including sidewalks—under the American with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements.

At the regional level, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) provides policies, plans, and funding programs for pedestrian projects. MTC’s One Bay Area Plan is a long-range regional plan with a vision for the year 2040. The transportation element of One Bay Area Plan provides strategies to reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions by developing and strengthening multi-modal transportation options, including options for walking and transit.

3.3 VTA’s Pedestrian-Related Plans
There are two planning documents prepared by VTA in 2003 that relate to pedestrian planning. VTA’s Community Design and Transportation Manual and the Pedestrian Technical Guidelines are complementary documents which provide best practice examples and design details for pedestrian facilities and street design. VTA’s Transit Passenger Waiting Environment Plan is currently in the progress.

16 Metropolitan Transportation Commission, One Bay Area (Oakland: MTC, 2013).
It provides guidelines for bus stop amenities based on ridership levels. All three documents will be referred to in the next phase of the Pedestrian Access to Transit Plan, when VTA will conduct field review of focus areas.

3.4 Local Pedestrian-Related Plans

At the local level, city governments prepare and adopt pedestrian plans to meet the needs in their community. To different extents, the 15 cities in Santa Clara County, VTA, and County of Santa Clara all address pedestrian improvements in their adopted planning documents. More than seventy local plans were reviewed to understand local planning efforts related to pedestrian access to transit, and identify the projects for inclusion in the Pedestrian Access to Transit Plan. These documents identify more than 240 projects near transit that could potentially be included in the Pedestrian Access to Transit Plan.

Broad categories of the planning documents reviewed are described below:

3.4.1 Capital Improvement Programs

Local governments update Capital Improvement Programs (CIP) annually, bi-annually, or for a longer term of 4–5 years. Capital improvement programs include projects that the city expects to fund over the timeframe of CIP. For pedestrian facility improvements, CIPs suggest detailed road geometry improvements, signal modifications, and pedestrian facility installation, etc. Reviewing CIPs helps to identify the projects that will be implemented in the short-term. Projects listed in CIPs will generally not be included in this plan because these projects are more likely to have secure implementation funds and to be implemented in the near future.

3.4.2 Transit Center and Station Area Plans

Transit center and station area plans are master development plans for areas around major transit facilities. They are long-range plans which propose street improvement and land development to support an existing or future major transit facility and the surrounding activities. These planning documents commonly cover land use and circulation planning in the area. The study area is typically selected by walkable (0.5 mile) or bikeable (2 miles) access to the transit facility. Santa Clara Station Area Plan, Milpitas Transit Area Specific Plan, Diridon Master Plan, Eastridge Transit Center Development and Access Plan, and Lawrence Station Area Plan are examples of transit center and station area plans in Santa Clara County. These planning documents commonly propose details about circulation patterns, pedestrian connections, the passenger waiting area, etc… Locations that are proposed by these planning documents for pedestrian improvements are candidates for inclusion in the VTA Pedestrian Access to Transit Plan project list.

3.4.3 Corridor Plans

Corridor Plans are long-range, local planning documents to guide the transportation, land use, and economic activities along an urban street. The corridor plans in Santa Clara County support future or existing transportation networks, preserve historic characteristics, create pedestrian-friendly environments, and enhance commercial activities. Locations that are proposed by these planning documents for pedestrian improvements are candidates for inclusion in the VTA Pedestrian Access to Transit Plan project list.

Examples of reviewed corridor plans include Saratoga Village Pedestrian Enhancement Plan, Winchester Boulevard Master Plan, and The Alameda Plan for The Beautiful Way.
Another example are the El Camino Real precise plans which have been adopted or are in progress by the cities along the El Camino Real corridor. Cities of Santa Clara and Mountain View are in the process of developing precise plans for the corridor. The City of Sunnyvale adopted an El Camino Real Precise Plan in 2007. The El Camino Real precise plans will support future transit projects along the corridor by providing design guidelines and development strategies for mixed-used development and a multi-modal transportation system.

### 3.4.4 Trail and Road Overpass/Underpass Improvement Projects

This group of planning documents includes improvements to enhance pedestrian and bicycle connectivity. Surrounding land uses and activities are not generally addressed in the plans. Examples of these planning documents are the Adobe Creek-Highway 101 Pedestrian and Bike Overpass-Underpass Feasibility Study in Palo Alto and the Stevens Creek Trail Feasibility Study in Los Altos.

Locations that are proposed by these planning documents are candidates for inclusion in the VTA Pedestrian Access to Transit Plan project list, but only the locations which provide access to transit facilities.

### 3.4.5 Community-Based Transportation Plans

Community-based transportation plans provide improvement strategies for all modes of transportation in a community. These strategies are made based on extensive community outreach and neighborhood meetings. VTA has developed Community-Based Transportation Plans for Gilroy, East San Jose, Milpitas, and Alviso. VTA’s community-based transportation plans focus on MTC’s Lifeline Transportation Report’s selected areas and Communities of Concern in Santa Clara County. The community-based plans propose improvements to transit accessibility and services, pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure and other improvements.

Locations that are proposed by these planning documents for pedestrian improvements are candidates for inclusion in VTA’s Pedestrian Access to Transit Plan project list.

### 3.4.6 Citywide Pedestrian Plans

Citywide Pedestrian Plans are long-range plans for pedestrian improvements in the entire city based on the neighborhood and land use characteristics of the area. Local pedestrian plans are typically consistent with countywide long-range plans such as VTA’s Valley Transportation Plan. Table 3.1 lists the citywide pedestrian plans in Santa Clara County.

Citywide pedestrian plans identify priority locations for enhancing pedestrian facilities. These locations could be downtown, areas adjacent to transit, schools, trails, major commercial corridors, and historic areas. Citywide pedestrian plans typically propose design guidelines for each of these area types.

Locations that are proposed by these planning documents for pedestrian improvements are candidates for inclusion in the VTA’s Pedestrian Access to Transit Plan project list if they provide access to transit facilities.
### Table 3.1: Citywide Pedestrian Plans in Santa Clara County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Document Name</th>
<th>Year Adopted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
<td>City of Palo Alto Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>Pedestrian Master Plan</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cupertino</td>
<td>Cupertino Pedestrian Transportation Plan</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Altos</td>
<td>Los Altos Pedestrian Master Plan</td>
<td>In Process (as of June 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>San Jose Pedestrian Master Plan (policy document)</td>
<td>2008 (Administrative Draft)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.4.7 General Plans and Area Specific Plans

City’s General and Master Plans are policy documents for long-term developments and include different subjects such as land use, transportation, safety, natural environment, and historic preservation. Pedestrian planning items are typically included in the circulation or transportation element of the General Plans.

In 2010, California Office of Planning and Research (OPR) updated the General Plan Guidelines to modify the circulation element guidelines to support multi-modal transportation system planning. The update was adopted to fulfill the requirement for AB 1358, the California Complete Streets Act. Starting in January 2011, all cities and counties are required to include a multi-modal transportation element in their General Plan update. VTA has worked closely with the Member Agencies within the County to review their General Plans and ensure that they meet the requirements of AB1358. To date, the majority of member agencies have met the requirements, and those that have not yet are in the process of doing so.
4 Santa Clara County’s Walkability

Most people know a good walking environment when they experience it and can easily identify streets and intersections that are uncomfortable or inconvenient. A successful walkable place typically is combination of several positive components that happen in a location such as land use density and diversity, environment safety, street design, access to transit and other urban amenities, and willingness of real estate developers and city governments to invest in that location. The necessary ingredients for a high quality walking environment have been summarized by many, and include characteristics such as “density, diversity, and design,” or tenets such as “a walk must be interesting, safe and useful.” VTA’s Community, Design and Transportation Manual presents four land use and street design principles that should be addressed to create walkable communities:

Place Making – planning and designing buildings and spaces in such a way that people want to be there through human-scale design

Access by Proximity - clustering complementary land uses together with careful consideration of access by foot, bicycle, transit, and automobile

Interconnection – designing land uses so that they connect to adjacent uses, and do not preclude future connections

Choice – broadening the range of choices for residents, including well-designed denser residences coupled with quality public spaces and local amenities

These four principles roughly correlate to the “D’s” often cited by urban planners: density, diversity, design, destination accessibility, and distance to transit. Academic research has shown these “D’s” to have a modest to moderate and cumulative effect on how much people walk. In 2010, researchers Reid Ewing and Robert Cervero conducted a meta-analysis of academic literature that explored the relationship between the built environment and travel. They found that walking is most strongly related to measures of land use diversity, intersection density (a measure of street network design), and the number of destinations within walking distance.

Given the importance of the built environment on walkability, how then can one describe the walkability of Santa Clara County as a region? Qualities that affect walkability are easier to discern at a smaller scale- that of a neighborhood or street than at a regional level. However, there are several characteristics that can be shown at a regional level to give a general picture of walkability in Santa Clara County. These are discussed below.

4.1 Street Networks

For most people, the main deciding factor in whether to walk or not is distance. The average distance of a walking trip in the Bay Area is just under three-quarters of a mile—about 12 minutes.

The design of a street network directly affects how far one must walk to reach a destination. Grid-like street networks, with short
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19 Valley Transportation Authority, Community Design and Transportation Manuals (San Jose, California: VTA, 2003).
block lengths and few dead-ends—like those found in historic downtowns throughout the County—are ideal for walking trips. A highly connected street network translates to shorter distances between destinations. High connectivity also means there is a greater variety of routes to choose, so a pedestrian may be able to choose a route that avoids a high-traffic street or difficult intersection.

In contrast, curvilinear streets with looping roads, cul-de-sacs are much less connected. Street networks with low connectivity have large blocks, dead-ends, and few connections. These include many of the business parks and industrial centers located along the US 101 and Hwy 280 corridors, and residential neighborhoods on the outer edges of the urbanized portion of Santa Clara County.

At a regional level, street connectivity can be approximated by looking at intersection density.21 22 23 The more intersections per mile, the more connected the network. Several research studies have shown that higher intersection densities are correlated with higher rates of walking to work and walking for other purposes and with more miles walked per person. Based on the research, “intersection density and street connectivity has higher impact on walking rate than land use mix and density.” Walking in an urban environment with smaller blocks and more intersections is more comfortable than walking along a big block.24 Ewing and Cervero’s meta-analysis estimates that a doubling of intersection density increases walking trips by 39%, increases transit use by 23% and decreases vehicle miles traveled by 12%.25

Figure 4.1 illustrates street network connectivity in three different neighborhoods at the same scale, illustrating how intersection density is affected by connectivity.

Figure 4.2 maps intersection density per mile in Santa Clara County. Areas with higher intersection density have higher connectivity and are potentially more walkable than areas with lower intersection density. Connectivity can potentially be improved by creating new connections for pedestrians such as pedestrian-only bridges or undercrossings, pedestrian cut-throughs at the end of cul-de-sacs, and new trails and trailheads to existing trails.
Figure 4.2: Intersection Density in Santa Clara County
4.2 Land Use Mix/Diversity

Locating many different uses within one neighborhood reduces how much people drive. By mixing uses, destinations are closer together, reducing the distance and time traveled and enticing people to walk, bike, or take transit in lieu of driving. This is particularly true for neighborhoods where there are similar numbers of jobs and workers and where residential areas are located close to stores.

Based on Ewing and Cervero’s meta-analysis, doubling land use diversity (measured by land use heterogeneity) may:

- Increase walking trips by 15%
- Increase transit use by 12%
- Decrease vehicle miles traveled by 9%

A doubling of the jobs-worker balance may:

- Increase walking trips by 19%
- Decrease vehicle miles traveled by 2%

Figure 4.3 shows the land use diversity of Santa Clara County, based on parcel data provided by the County Assessor’s Office. The map categorizes parcels into five land use types: single-family residential, multi-family residential, commercial, job center, school, and park-recreation-agriculture. As shown in the map, most land uses are segregated from each other. Most of the county land area is dedicated to residential uses, with commercial uses located along major roadways, and job centers located in the north along Highways 101, 880, and 237 and to a lesser extent, along Highway 280. The areas with the highest mix of land uses include downtowns and small areas along major corridors.

Land use mix can also be measured by jobs-worker balance. Figure 4.4 shows the jobs-worker balance in Santa Clara County, by Census tract. Job-worker balance is calculated by dividing the total number of jobs in a Census tract by the total number of workers who live in that tract. When a Census Tract has similar numbers of jobs and resident workers, it is balanced, and people may drive less. In areas where jobs and resident workers are imbalanced, people drive more. If there are more jobs than resident workers, it is jobs-rich, and workers will generally commute in to that tract. If there are more resident workers than jobs, it is housing rich, and people will have to commute out of that tract to work.

Areas with a jobs-worker balance between 0.8 and 1.2 are considered balanced. As can be seen in Figure 4.4, though the jobs-worker ratio may be balanced at the city or county level, at a smaller geographic scale—a walkable scale—one finds that jobs and housing are not distributed equally within cities. Job-rich census tracts are located in north county and along the 101, 237, 87 and 17 highway corridors. Most of the rest of the county is housing-rich. As a result, even within cities with good jobs-housing balance, people may not be able to walk to work, since the land uses are segregated. These findings illustrate that scale matters when making decisions to support walking.
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Figure 4.3: Land Use Diversity in Santa Clara County
Figure 4.4: Job-Worker Balance in Santa Clara County
4.3 Density
People are more likely to walk in denser neighborhoods, but the effect of density on walking rates is not as strong as street network design or land use mix.27 By locating residential, commercial, and jobs close together, higher density communities encourage people to walk, bike, or take transit.

Ewing & Cervero’s meta-analysis estimates that doubling household/population density may reduce vehicle miles traveled by 4%, increase walking rates by 7%, and increase transit use by 7%. Doubling job density has lower effects, and may increase walking rates by 4%, and increase transit use by 1%.

Figure 4.5 shows residential density and Figure 4.6 shows job density, using American Community Survey data. As expected given the land use mix and jobs-worker maps discussed above, the residential density and job density maps are negative images of each other. Jobs are concentrated in the north and along the area bounded by Highway 237, US 101 and Highway 880. Residential density is low throughout Santa Clara County—most census tracts are 5 to 6 dwelling units per acre and are not supportive of walking as a transportation mode.

4.4 Urban Design
Urban design is important for creating an interesting, comfortable walking environment. SPUR’s 2013 report, Getting to Great Places, defines urban design as addressing:

- The placement, orientation, and form of buildings
- Site planning, or the physical arrangement of buildings and uses within development projects
- Multiple scales, from the human body to the neighborhood or district
- Circulation and access for all travel modes
- Human experience, activity, social interaction, and travel behavior
- The arrangement and design of streets and open spaces
- The connection of buildings to the public realm and to one another
- Above all: the integration of these things28

There are numerous urban design qualities that affect the perception of walkability. VTA’s Community Design, and Transportation Manual provides excellent overall guidance and best practices on urban design to support walking. Additionally, SPUR’S Getting to Great Places report identifies seven components for creating walkable urban areas:

- Fine-grained pedestrian circulation
- Buildings that oriented to streets and open spaces
- Land uses that support public activity
- Locating parking behind or below buildings
- Addressing human scale components in building designs
- Clear, continues pedestrian access
- Complete streets

As important as urban design is in creating a comfortable, interesting walking environment, it is not possible to evaluate at a


countywide level. Additionally, these components are the responsibility of many different entities, ranging from landowners, private developers, city and county staff, to Caltrans and VTA, and cannot all be addressed by the Pedestrian Access to Transit Plan.

However, urban design components and their integration will be considered when VTA evaluates focus areas for pedestrian-related improvements. Recommendations for improvement—appropriate to the scope and scale of the Pedestrian Access to Transit Plan—will be identified.
Figure 4.5: Residential Density in Santa Clara County
Figure 4.6: Employment Density in Santa Clara County
4.5 Perception of Safety and Comfort

Elements of the built environment can affect a person’s sense of safety and comfort when walking. In recent years, transportation planners and traffic engineers have developed a variety of tools to measure the quality of a pedestrian environment. These tools are called Quality of Service measures, and use specific measureable characteristics of a street, sidewalk, or intersection to come up with a score that generally measures the pedestrian comfort of a street segment or intersection. The calculations underlying Quality of Service measurements are typically backed up by research that supports how important each characteristic is to providing a comfortable walking environment. Many Quality of Service tools measure similar characteristics, some of which are listed below.

In general, pedestrians feel safer from traffic and more comfortable walking along a street if there are:

- Sidewalks, paths or other dedicated pedestrian facilities
- Wider sidewalks
- Continuous buffer from adjacent travel lanes (e.g. landscaping strip, fence, parked cars)
- Low speed traffic
- Low traffic volumes, particularly low truck volumes

Pedestrians feel safer crossing a street if there are:

- Short crossing distances
- Fewer travel lanes to cross
- Marked crosswalks
- Lower traffic speeds
- Stop or signal-controlled crossings
- Short wait times to cross

It is not possible to evaluate these factors at a countywide level. There is no countywide map or inventory of pedestrian infrastructure—including basic infrastructure such as sidewalks. Several local jurisdictions have mapped sidewalks, but it is not a universal practice.

Sidewalk gaps and the presence or lack of components that create a high-quality pedestrian environment will be noted when VTA evaluates Focus Areas for pedestrian-related improvements.

4.6 Implications for Santa Clara County

The Pedestrian Access to Transit Plan is working within the existing parameters of the built environment. SPUR’s “Getting to Great Places” report notes that:

“Silicon Valley, the most dynamic and innovative economic engine in the world, is not creating great urban places. Having grown around the automobile, the valley consists largely of low-slung office parks, surface parking, and suburban tract homes. But tastes and values are rapidly moving away from strictly suburban lifestyles. Today’s firms and top talent are increasingly demanding engaging places, diverse experiences, and convenient amenities. Simply put, they are demanding urbanism.”

Generally, land uses in Santa Clara County are dispersed and separated. Most housing is not within walking distance of retail, jobs, and services, making it difficult to attend to daily life without a car. Low residential densities and separated land uses make it difficult to serve some areas with transit. However, there are
locations within the county that do support walking and transit, including historic downtowns, and areas along major corridors like El Camino Real, Alum Rock, and Stevens Creek. Many cities are looking to improve the pedestrian environment, and support good pedestrian access, improved transit service, or higher density, mixed use development.

Improving walkability and increasing walking rates in Santa Clara County requires a multi-jurisdictional, multi-disciplinary approach to address land use, transportation infrastructure, and urban design elements. Stakeholders include public agencies, private developers, elected officials, community members, landowners, transit agencies, and county, regional and state agencies. To date, the cities, County, and VTA have conducted numerous planning and policy efforts that support walkable communities. However, the challenge of implementing these plans, working with different stakeholders, with differing and sometimes competing priorities, remains.

Targeted improvements at the local level can make a big difference in shifting short trips to walking. It takes an able-bodied adult 15 minutes to walk a mile. Yet, in the Bay Area, more than half of all trips a mile or less are made by car. By filling in gaps in the pedestrian network, making new connections, and improving the urban design of a neighborhood, people can be enticed to walk that 15 minutes. By improving access to transit, the reach of the pedestrian increases dramatically, removing that many more cars from the road.

The Pedestrian Access to Transit Plan takes a targeted approach to identifying improvements, with a focus on improvements that will improve the convenience, safety, and comfort of the walking environment, and in particular transit access.
5 Walking Behavior
The summary given so far describes elements of the built environment in Santa Clara County that affect walking. This section summarizes results of counts and surveys to describe actual walking behavior in the County.

Understanding walking rates, locations, and purposes is important for several reasons, including, but not limited to:

- Allows agencies to direct limited resources to locations that have the highest level of pedestrian use
- Allows agencies and organizations to tailor programs and infrastructure to pedestrian needs
- Allows one to calculate vehicle exposure rate, thus identifying the riskiest locations for pedestrian collisions
- Informing before-after studies to determine the success of a project intended to increase walking

5.1 Pedestrian Counts
Field counts are necessary to understand actual pedestrian volumes at specific locations. Pedestrian counts are often collected by local agencies as part of infrastructure projects or regular traffic count programs. Local data are not currently collated at the countywide level.

In 2012, VTA collected pedestrian counts at 252 intersections along the Congestion Management Program’s (CMP) roadway network. In accordance with state statute, VTA monitors the CMP roadway network regularly to ensure that it conforms to the CMP traffic level of service standard (LOS). LOS is currently defined as a maximum level of traffic congestion.

The intersections included in the counts tend to be large, high-volume and as a result, pedestrian counts at these locations may not represent the true pedestrian activity in any given area. Figure 5.1 shows pedestrian counts collected at CMP intersections in 2012. Counts are highest in downtown San Jose, downtown Mountain View, and along the high-ridership transit corridors of El Camino Real, and Santa Clara/Alum Rock.

Transit ridership can be used as a rough proxy for pedestrian counts, given that the majority of transit trips either end or begin with a walking trip, and over a quarter of all walking trips are to access or egress transit.30 VTA collects transit boardings and alightings by stop/station on an ongoing basis.

Figure 5.1: PM Peak Hour Pedestrian Counts at CMP Intersections (September 2012)
Since 2002, VTA has collected pedestrian counts at ten additional locations. Data from the last five counts are summarized in Table 5.1 and Figure 5.2. Counts are collected approximately every two years, and include counts of pedestrians by approach to the intersection (e.g., northbound) and side of street (e.g., east side) during the morning (7 – 9 AM), midday (11 AM – 1 PM) and evening (4 – 6 PM) peak periods. The counts have been tabulated for the maximum peak-hour within each two-hour count period. VTA is revisiting this count program and will likely develop an alternative program in 2014-15 calendar year.

Table 5.1: Peak Hour Pedestrian Counts at Selected Intersections (2008-2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Mid-day</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyvale &amp; Washington</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio &amp; El Camino Real</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castro &amp; Villa</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borregas &amp; Moffet Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. First &amp; Tasman</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester &amp; Stevens Creek</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main &amp; Tasman</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey &amp; Tully</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24th &amp; Santa Clara</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Gatos &amp; Blossom Hill</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>1224</td>
<td>1127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 How much are People Walking?

There are a variety of surveys that provide useful information on how frequently people walk, how far they walk, and the purpose of their walking trip. This section highlights relevant data drawn from several of these major travel surveys.

According to the 2009 National Household Travel Survey and the 2010-2012 California Household Travel Survey:

- Approximately 12.5% of all trips in California are made on foot.
- Including walking to/from transit, it is estimated that there are 1.3 billion walking trips in the Bay Area annually.\(^3\)
- The average length of a walk in Bay Area is 0.71 miles.
- The hypothetical average California resident (age 5 and up) takes a walk every other day.
- In California, the majority of people walk at least once a week, with nearly 70% reporting walking 4 or more times in the past week.

There is significant opportunity for more walking trips to be made. It takes an able-bodied adult approximately 15 minutes to walk a mile. However, in the Bay Area, nearly 55% of all trips of a mile or less are made by car. Only 38% of these are made on foot. These trips—short trips that originate and end at the same destination—are candidates for shifting modes.\(^3\)

5.2.1 Walking Rates and Land Use

Walking rates vary by land use. This is particularly true for the walking behavior of children. In California, children ages 5 to 15 living in urban areas walk 35% more than children living in suburban areas. Figure 5.3 compares the average annual walking trips made by children and adults in urban, suburban and “other” areas. “Other” areas include rural areas.


\(^{32}\) Ibid.
5.3 When are people walking?
The majority of walking trips occur during the day. This is especially true for children. As shown in Figure 5.4, over three-quarters of adults’ walking trips occur between 6 am and 6 pm, while 86% of children’s walking trips occur between these hours.

5.4 Commuting to Work
People who usually walk to work are very loyal to their travel mode. On any given day, 80% of Bay Area commuters who usually walk to work will walk, 9.6% will drive alone, 4.3% will carpool, 5.3% will take transit, and 2.4% will use some other way. The only other travel mode that has that high loyalty is drive alone, where on any given day, 92.5% of commuters who usually drive will drive. For commuters who typically take transit, 68.4% will take transit on any given day.33

In Santa Clara County, the percentage of people who walk to work has not changed over the last decade. In 2000, 1.8% of workers walked to work, whereas from 2010 to 2012, between 1.7% and 2.1% walked to work.34 As shown in Figure 5.5, Santa Clara County has one of the lowest walk commute rates in the Bay Area, with the exception of Contra Costa County. In comparison, San Mateo County’s walking rate for the same time period is between 2.2% and 3% and Alameda County’s is between 3.5% and 3.9%.

---

Figure 5.5: Commute Mode Comparison by County

Figure 5.6 shows where concentrations of people who walk to work live. Darker census tracts have higher percentages of walk commuters. Areas with higher percentages include downtown Palo Alto and Stanford, pockets in Santa Clara just east of Lawrence Expressway and near Santa Clara University, the Rose Garden neighborhood in San Jose, downtown San Jose—particularly near San Jose State University, agricultural areas north of Morgan Hill and downtown Morgan Hill.
Figure 5.6: Percent of Residents Who Walk to Work (ACS 2008-2012, Journey to Work)
5.5 Why do people walk?
As can be seen in Table 5.2, people walk for a variety of reasons. Walking purpose varies by the age of the pedestrian. The most common reason why children walk is to get to or from school. The most common reason why adults walk is for exercise, followed by shopping/errands. Note that only 10.7% of adult walking trips are work-related. However, since commute trips contribute significantly to congestion, it is important to find ways to permit more people to walk to work.

Table 5.2 Walking Trip Purpose for Children and Adults

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Age 5 to 15</th>
<th>Age 16 and up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Go to school</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop/errands</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Social/Rec</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work and Work Related</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pet Care/Walk the Dog</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other reasons</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total % of Walk Trips</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Household Travel Survey California Add-On 2009.

The data above do not include walking trips to transit. Walking trips to and from transit are estimated to add 33% on to the total number of walking trips taken in the Bay Area. In the Bay Area, 78.6% of transit riders walk to their transit stop, 5.7% transfer, 8.8% drive alone, 2.8% bike. In comparison, 71% of VTA customers walk to their transit stop, 19% transfer, 4% drive alone, and 3% bike. Access mode to transit is further discussed in Section 7.4.

5.6 Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Frequent Walkers
There are socio-demographic differences between people who walk and people who report not walking at all. These are shown in Table 5.3. People who walk tend to be younger and have higher incomes than those who do not walk at all. People who walk a lot tend to be more highly educated than those who do not walk at all. Asians and Hispanics of any race are less likely to walk than African-Americans, Whites, and people of other races. New immigrants are the most likely to walk, with nearly 40% reporting walking seven or more times in the prior week.

35 Ibid.

36 Valley Transportation Authority, VTA On-Board Customer Survey, 2006 (San Jose, California: VTA, 2006).
Table 5.3: Socio-Demographic Characteristics of California Walkers, by Frequency of Reported Walking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person Characteristic</th>
<th>Number of Walks Last Week</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None (zero last week)</td>
<td>Some (1-6 walks last week)</td>
<td>Frequent (7+ walks last week)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Age</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Income</td>
<td>$59,483</td>
<td>$63,912</td>
<td>$62,657</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Working</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent by Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School or Less</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College or BA</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad Degree or Higher</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent by Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic (of any race)</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Immigrants (2 years or less)</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent for full sample 16+</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Table 13, Nancy McGuckin, Walking and Biking in California: An Analysis of California National Household Travel Survey 2009. Institute of Transportation Studies, U.C. Davis. August 2012.
5.7 Barriers to Walking More

The NHTS California Add-On asked respondents to choose from a list reasons why they didn't walk more. People could choose more than one response. Figure 5.7 summarizes the responses.

Many of the responses can be categorized into three topics that relate to the built environment: Density and Destination, Safety and Perception, and Facilities.

The top reason, with 56% of respondents citing it, was “too busy.” This response can be interpreted in at least two ways: a) people’s schedules are so tight that they don’t make time for walking, even for exercise b) people can't walk because places are too far, or the street network is too circuitous, so it takes too long to walk there.

Distance to destinations could also be a factor in the fact that 27% of people choose “no shops or other interesting places to go” as a barrier.

Concerns for personal safety also rank highly. Nearly a third of respondents chose “not enough light at night” as a barrier, and 21% chose “fear of street crime.”

The Pedestrian Access to Transit Plan will seek to address these barriers by identifying locations for new pedestrian connections in the existing network, making recommendations for improved pedestrian infrastructure, and addressing safety.

Figure 5.7: Barriers to Walking More
5.8 Special Groups to Consider in Pedestrian Planning

The pedestrian experience is not the same for all people—it varies by a person’s age, ability, and even race. Any analysis of the pedestrian environment and recommended improvements to that environment should understand and address this variation in experience. This is also true of education, encouragement, and enforcement efforts that seek to change people’s behavior.

5.8.1 Age

Youth and seniors are more likely to walk than people of other ages, and have the highest per capita rates of pedestrian-motor vehicle collisions of all age groups. Of these two age groups, the risk of an older pedestrian dying in a motor vehicle collision is much higher.37

The act of crossing a street requires learned motor skills, decision-making, and cognitive skills. Children must learn and practice these skills in order to safely cross the street. Young children’s skills are developing, and they cannot be expected to predictably follow “rules of the road.” A combination of youth safety education/training and infrastructure improvements that reduce the risk and severity of pedestrian-vehicle collisions can benefit child pedestrians.

As people age, physical and sensory abilities can change. In comparison to younger pedestrians, older pedestrians may have reduced flexibility, agility and strength and reduced visual acuity, contrast sensitivity, and visual field. As a result, older pedestrians may have difficulty scanning for traffic and avoiding potential collisions with motor vehicles. Infrastructure improvements that allow increased time for crossing the street, increase the contrast of crosswalks, and increase driver yielding can benefit older pedestrians.

5.8.2 Ability

In Santa Clara County, there are approximately 70,750 people with an ambulatory disability living in the County.

People who have a travel disability make a variety of adjustments to accommodate their disability. Figure 5.8 shows the types of accommodations used by people with travel disabilities for all of California.

37 San Diego State University, Older Pedestrian Safety in California: A Fact Sheet (San Diego, California: SDSU, Center for Injury Prevention Policy and Practice, 2004).
5.8.3 Race
Racial and ethnic minorities are disproportionately represented in traffic-related pedestrian fatalities. Nationally, pedestrian fatality rates for Black and Hispanic men are twice the rate for White men, according to the Center for Disease Control: 3.93 and 3.73 per 100,000 population vs. 1.78. Minority pedestrians are more likely to be killed in a motor vehicle crash, even after controlling for increased traffic in urban areas, socioeconomic status, and alcohol use. There is research that suggests these disparate outcomes are due to drivers’ subtle racial attitudes and biases. A Portland, Oregon study found that drivers were two times likely to yield to black pedestrians than to white pedestrians, all other things being equal.38

Prioritizing minority communities for pedestrian safety improvements and educational campaigns for drivers may benefit minority pedestrians.

5.9 Implications for Santa Clara County
Walking rates in Santa Clara County are lower than walking rates in comparable counties in the Bay Area, and the percentage of people walking to work has not changed since 2001. At the same time, there is opportunity for increasing how much people walk, given that more than half of trips a mile or less are driven. If key barriers are addressed, and the unique needs of different demographic groups are supported, it may be possible to significantly shift people out of their cars.

38 Kimberly Barsamian Kahn et al., Racial Bias in Driver Yielding Behavior at Crosswalks (Portland: Oregon Transportation Research and Education Consortium, 2014).
6 Collisions

Motor vehicle collisions are the leading cause of unintentional death in the United States.\(^{39}\) Nationally, in 2012, 4,743 pedestrians died as the result of a pedestrian-vehicle collision (14% of all motor vehicle fatalities).

Despite this high number, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) notes that injuries resulting from motor vehicle accidents are a “winnable battle” because of the great impact these collisions have on health but the relative ease at which this impact can be reduced through behavior modification and roadway design.\(^{40}\) Since all transit riders are pedestrians for some part of their journey to the bus stop or train station, they will benefit from safe pedestrian conditions while accessing transit.

6.1 Geographic Distribution of Collisions in Santa Clara County

Pedestrian collisions are not evenly distributed across Santa Clara County. Figure 6.2 shows a pedestrian-vehicle collision map for 2003-2012, weighted by the severity of the collision, with fatal and severe collisions in the darkest shade and non-injury collisions in the lightest shade.

4,300 pedestrian-vehicle collisions occurred between 2003 and 2012, which represents 7% of all motor vehicle collisions in Santa Clara County. Of the 4,300 pedestrian-vehicle collisions, 237 (6%) were fatal and 521 (12%) resulted in severe injury. Although data shows that San Jose, Palo Alto, Santa Clara, Sunnyvale, and Milpitas experience higher numbers of motor vehicle collisions than other cities in the county, the most severe injuries occur primarily along major corridors in Mountain View, Sunnyvale, and San Jose.

It is important to note that the distribution of collisions across the county does not necessarily equate to risk of collision because the distribution does not account for pedestrian volumes. Areas with higher volumes of pedestrians may see greater numbers of collisions simply because there are more pedestrians, not because the locations are riskier. Additional data and field observations will be needed to assess risk factors at individual locations.

6.2 Demographics of Victims

Despite a decline in motor vehicle traffic collisions between 2003 and 2012, in 2012 motor vehicle collisions were still one of the leading causes of injury among all age groups in Santa Clara County, ranking first among ages 5-14 and 25-34, and second among all other age cohorts.\(^{41}\) Despite this decline, pedestrian-involved collisions remained stable at approximately 430 collisions per year during the same time frame (Figure 6.1).


6.2.1 Children
Children and adolescents are more at risk of being involved in a pedestrian-vehicle collision because of their inability to fully process a situation and make decisions in the same way as an adult. Nationwide, approximately 20% of children between the ages of 5 and 9 who died from a vehicle collision were pedestrians at the time of the collision.\(^4\)

6.2.2 Seniors
Seniors, like children, are more at risk of being in a pedestrian-involved collision and much more likely to be killed as the result of a pedestrian-vehicle collision than other age cohorts. In Santa Clara County, between 2002 and 2011, 22% of collision victims over 65 years of age were within a half mile of a senior center and 46% were within one mile.\(^4\)

6.3 Type of Collisions

6.3.1 Unsafe Speed
The number one contributing factor to vehicle collisions, and especially dangerous to pedestrians, is unsafe speed. In Santa Clara County between 2003 and 2012, 35% of all types of collisions involved unsafe travel speed. Of that 35%, 7% were pedestrian-involved collisions.

6.3.2 Distracted Driving
Distracted driving is any activity performed by the driver that diverts the driver's attention from the road. This includes eating, texting, talking on a cell phone, operating a radio, and other activities. Between 2009 and 2011, 12% of all collisions listed distracted driving as an associated factor in the motor vehicle traffic collisions report.\(^4\)

---


\(^4\) Santa Clara County Public Health Department, Traffic Safety and Active Transportation in Santa Clara County (San Jose, California: County of Santa Clara, May 2014).
Figure 6.2: Pedestrian Involved Collisions in Santa Clara County – Weighted by Severity of Collision
### 6.3.3 Alcohol and Drug Use
Alcohol and drugs are major causes of injuries and deaths in motor vehicle collisions. The rate of alcohol-involved vehicle collisions between 2003 and 2012 has remained steady at more than 10%. In 2012 the California Office of Traffic Safety found that statewide, 14% of drivers tested positive for drugs and 7% tested positive for alcohol. In Santa Clara County, between 2003 and 2012, 6% of motor vehicle collisions were due to intoxication and accounted for 1% of all pedestrian-vehicle collisions.

### 6.3.4 Pedestrian Behavior
According to the Federal Highway Administrations report: Pedestrian Safety Guide for Transit Agencies:

“Pedestrians traveling to transit stops are frequently preoccupied with reaching the stop before the bus or train arrives. As a result, pedestrians who are running late may take more risks than they typically would under normal circumstances. Pedestrians traveling to the bus or train may exhibit some of the following behaviors.

- Running to catch transit
- Jaywalking, or crossing at locations that do not have pedestrian crossing facilities or safety enhancements
- Walking between stopped or parked vehicles, including buses
- Stepping into street to get around people waiting at a stop”

Between 2002 and 2012, pedestrian behavior violations accounted for 19% of the pedestrian-involved vehicle collisions in Santa Clara County. Of those pedestrian violations, 77% were due to a pedestrian not crossing at a crosswalk and 16% were due to jaywalking. The other 7% came from pedestrians in the roadway, pedestrians not yielding to cars at bridges or tunnels, or pedestrians walking in the bike lane.

Although pedestrian behavior is the reason for 19% of pedestrian-vehicle collisions, 81% of pedestrian-vehicle collisions are still due to driver behavior/other factors. Table 6.1 summarizes the primary types of collisions discussed in this section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>All Vehicle Collisions</th>
<th>Pedestrian-Vehicle Collisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Driver at Fault: 81% of all pedestrian collisions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe Speed</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distracted Driving</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intoxication</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Factors</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrian at fault: 19% of all pedestrian collisions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not crossing at crosswalk</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaywalking</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other pedestrian fault</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.4 Countermeasures
In pedestrian-vehicle collisions, pedestrians and drivers attempt to use the same space at the same time. Consequently, the

---


responsibility for many pedestrian-vehicle collisions is shared by pedestrians and drivers. As such, no single countermeasure will have a significant impact on collisions. A combination of engineering, education, and enforcement is required to reduce pedestrian-vehicle collisions and severity.

The application of countermeasures to pedestrian involved collisions should be context specific rather than a one-size-fits-all cure. For example, reducing travel speed requires both the perception of increased law enforcement as well as a redesign of the roadway geometry.47 In the case of distracted driving and alcohol and drug abuse, strict law enforcement and administrative license revocation have proven to reduce the number of incidents.48 Students near public schools and seniors near senior centers may benefit from better signage, ADA compliance, multi-lingual education. Education and awareness are key factors to change pedestrian behavior and to reduce the number and severity of collisions caused by pedestrian decisions; however, roadway redesign, greater connectivity, and good facilities are important methods to stop pedestrians from not crossing at crosswalks and from jaywalking.49

The Pedestrian Safety Guide and Countermeasure Selection System identifies 67 countermeasures that can be divided into three categories: engineering, education, and enforcement.50 More information on these context-specific countermeasures can be found at http://www.pedbikesafe.org/PEDSAFE/countermeasures.cfm

7 Transit Services

Transit and walking are complementary. A comfortable pedestrian environment is the foundation for good access to transit, critical to attracting new riders, increasing ridership, and improving the overall travel experiences. A good transit system increases the distance a pedestrian can travel, and makes it possible to live everyday life without a car. Seventy-one percent of VTA customers walk from their origin to their station and 73% walk to their final destination, further emphasizing the importance of an attractive and safe walking environment for transit riders.51

7.1 Transit Service in Santa Clara County

Santa Clara County is served by several different bus and rail operators. Table 7.1 summarizes the variety of public transit service in the county. Not included in this table are the numerous private services such as employer shuttle buses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operator</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>Light Rail, Bus</td>
<td>All Cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>Paratransit</td>
<td>All Cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain</td>
<td>Rail</td>
<td>Palo Alto to Gilroy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amtrak</td>
<td>Rail</td>
<td>Santa Clara, San Jose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE</td>
<td>Rail</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART (future)</td>
<td>Rail</td>
<td>Milpitas, San Jose, Santa Clara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marguerite</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

51 Valley Transportation Authority. VTA On-Board Customer Survey, 2006. (San Jose, California: VTA, 2006.)

7.2 Transit Ridership

VTA has 3,805 bus stops, 62 light rail stations, and 23 transit centers over a total service area of 346 square miles (Figure 7.1). The average daily ridership in 2013 for light rail was 34,242 and 106,161 for bus. Despite the large coverage area, approximately 25% of the average daily ridership occurs on five bus lines. Figure 7.2 maps average daily transit ridership at VTA’s top 100 bus locations.

Transit is a vital service for people with disabilities, who rely on transit to meet their daily needs such as doctor appointments or accessing government services. Paratransit service covers parts of the county not served by bus or light rail, providing transit to people with disabilities. VTA’s facilities, bus and light rail vehicles are ADA accessible as required by law. In 2013, the wheelchair lift was deployed an average of 415 times per day. The geographic distribution of lift usage can be seen in Figure 7.3.

7.3 Rider Demographics

VTA serves a diverse customer base. According to VTA’s 2005 On-Board Survey, VTA passengers are younger than the County population as a whole, with the majority of VTA passengers (59%) being under the age of 35. The largest percentage (37%) of passengers is Hispanic/Latino, followed by White (28%), Asian (20%), and African American (10%).

Fifty-six percent of VTA customers have an annual household income of less than $25,000 per year, with 33% earning less than $10,000 per year. In addition, 19% of respondents reported that they would not have made the trip if transit did not exist. This indicates those people are dependent on transit service and further necessitates the need for a safe and comfortable walk to the transit stop.
These demographic factors will play an important role when considering pedestrian projects for inclusion in this plan.

7.4 Access to Transit
The majority of VTA customers access transit by foot. The results of the 2006 VTA On-Board Customer Survey found that VTA customers use the following modes to access transit:

- 71% of riders access their first stop/station on foot
- 19% transferred from VTA bus, light rail, or Caltrain
- 4% drove
- 3% biked
- 3% were dropped off or picked up
- 0.5% used a mobility device

According to the 2005 On Board Survey, 78% of passengers took less than 10 minutes to walk to their first transit stop while 85% of passengers, using mobility devices, took less than 10 minutes to access their first stop. At the end of their trip, 80% of passengers spent less than 10 minutes walking to their final destination, while only 62% of passengers using mobility devices anticipated spending less than 10 minutes to access their final destination.
Figure 7.1: VTA Bus Stops, Light Rail Stations, and Transit Centers
Figure 7.2: Transit Ridership at the Top 100 VTA Bus Stop Locations
Figure 7.3: ADA Wheel Chair Lift Deployment in Santa Clara County
8 Defining the Focus Areas

The cities, County, and VTA have made pedestrian access improvements for many transit locations throughout the county, and efforts are continuing. There are many projects that have been planned or studied and are waiting capital funding to proceed. There are also locations that have a need for improvements, but have not yet been studied.

In developing the Pedestrian Access to Transit Plan, VTA seeks to identify planned projects that are a high priority for transit access, and conduct focused field work at locations that are important to study, but have not yet been addressed in prior planning efforts. The outcomes will include a list of pedestrian projects for which VTA, the Cities, and the County can seek funding.

This section describes the process used to identify locations in which VTA will conduct focused field work to evaluate pedestrian access to transit and identify new pedestrian projects.

8.1 Evaluation Methodology

As previously mentioned, VTA’s service area covers 346 square miles and has nearly 4,000 transit stops or stations, many of which would benefit from improved pedestrian access. The sheer size of the system renders it difficult for VTA to evaluate pedestrian access to all stops. As such, a geographic analysis was used to identify locations where the most impact will be realized for the most number of pedestrians.

The focus areas were chosen using Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis (MCDA), a commonly used tool applied to complex decisions, such as site location. MCDA assists in the consideration of complex trade-offs among varying alternatives, such as our focus area analysis that involves many different factors that vary in importance among stakeholder groups. The process facilitates thinking, testing, adjusting, more testing, questioning, and finally decision making.

8.2 Evaluation Factors

VTA, in conjunction with stakeholder groups, chose six key factors to evaluate overall transit supportiveness and highlight areas for comprehensive evaluation of pedestrian projects. In that there are immediate pedestrian needs to address, the factors reflect existing conditions in the county, rather than future planned conditions. The six factors are described below and summarized in Table 8.1.

1. Ridership

Ridership is an important factor for VTA because this plan aims to improve pedestrian access to transit and because improvements implemented near stops with high ridership will benefit the most customers.

2. Barriers

Barriers to safely accessing transit emerged as an important in discussions with stakeholders. Barriers include physical features such as sidewalk presence and condition, curb cuts, freeways, train tracks, rivers, and intersections.

Due to lack of available county-wide sidewalk and other barrier data, Across Barrier Connections (ABCs) from the 2008 Countywide Bike Plan were included as a factor. The Countywide Bike Plan evaluated existing bicycle/pedestrian crossings of all major barriers in the county, and identified locations with substandard crossings. The plan also evaluated the distance between existing crossings and identified potential locations for pedestrian bridges or tunnels to keep distances between crossings to a mile or less. These two groups of projects comprise the ABCs.
Collision data was included as a proxy for overall safety. Pedestrian-vehicle collisions are an important factor in choosing project locations. Targeting improvements to areas with higher incidence of collisions has a greater impact on safety.

3. Socioeconomic Factors
For the purpose of this study, two pre-defined geographic areas of disadvantaged communities were included in the focus area evaluation. These are Communities of Concern (COC) and Community Air Risk Evaluation (CARE). These are mapped in . COC are areas that meet low income and minority thresholds as defined by the MTC and/or at least 4 of 8 other factors considered to render people in a census tract as disadvantaged. CARE communities are areas with high concentrations of Toxic Air Contaminants (TAC) where sensitive populations (youth under 18, seniors over 64, and people with respiratory illness) meet a certain threshold and where the census block group had income below 185% of the federal poverty level.

A secondary benefit of using COC and CARE in the evaluation is that these areas are often included in the scoring criteria for grant funding.

4. Major Destinations
Major destinations are important to consider when choosing focus areas because they are, or can be, major ridership generators. Destinations were selected that may be critically important to transit riders: government services, major employers, colleges, senior centers, schools, and health care facilities.

5. Residential Density
Residential density based on the 2010 Census was included as an evaluation factor.

6. Journey to Work
Census journey to work data is used to identify locations with high numbers of residents whose primary method of commuting to work is bus or rail. These tracts are more likely to have higher percentages of people who walk to their transit stop.

8.2.1 Factors Discussed but Not Included
Several factors were considered for inclusion in the analysis, but for a variety of reasons were not included.

Bus Stop Amenities
Bus stop amenities were not included in the evaluation criteria because while they influence the comfort and safety of a pedestrian at a bus stop, they do not affect the walking trip to the bus stop. As of 2006, approximately 20% of VTA’s bus stops contained a shelter and 49% contained a bench. VTA’s Transit Passenger Environment Plan outlines the types of amenities that should be included at bus stops.

Future Development
Not included as a weighted evaluation factor is future growth and development in Santa Clara County. The Priority Development Areas (PDA) are designated for future housing and employment growth within the county. The areas are locally identified and ready to accept more housing, employment, and amenities in the form of infill or redevelopment. Local agencies have established policies and guidelines to provide and/or improve pedestrian facilities as part of development. It is anticipated that pedestrian access will be
addressed in the local agencies’ land use approval process. The Pedestrian Access to Transit Plan is intended to focus on existing pedestrian access deficiencies, as it is generally more difficult to have the resources available to address these deficiencies.

**Employment Density**

Though major employers are included as one of the six factors, employment density is not. After looking at available employment density data, it was determined that the data would not accurately reflect employment density in the county for the purposes of this evaluation, and so it was not included in the analysis.

### 8.3 Alternatives Analysis Approach

Available data were categorized into one of the six evaluation factors, which were weighted based on the goals of the plan and the stakeholder preferences (Table 8.1). These weighted layers were combined to identify “hot spots” for potential focus areas.

Based on feedback from the second Task Force meeting, staff performed multiple variations of the ranking and weighting process, which included such scenarios as excluding transit ridership completely, weighting barriers the highest, and including outreach and senior clipper card usage by line.

The type of data available for the outreach card and senior clipper card usage were not helpful for refining the focus areas and ultimately excluded from the final analysis. The data were included qualitatively during staff evaluation of the results of the analysis.

The resulting hotspot maps had little variation. This is most likely due to the fact that land use within Santa Clara County follows a distinct pattern of development and activity along major corridors.

As a result, the results are not highly sensitive to change in the weighting of the evaluation factors.

### 8.4 Evaluation Results and Recommended Focus Areas

Figure 8.1 shows the results of the MCDA analysis and the 11 focus areas recommended for detailed ground work to enhance pedestrian access to transit stops and stations.

Locations along the El Camino Real corridor, parts of Stevens Creek Corridor, downtown San Jose, and East San Jose show the highest concentration of evaluation factors discussed previously. The random, small but dark locations are explained by the heavy weighting of proposed across barrier connections from the 2008 Countywide Bicycle Plan. While these are vital connections for pedestrians, not all are located within a reasonable distance of transit or they fall within areas with current pedestrian planning work.

Staff reviewed the results of the analysis in comparison with areas of the county that already have existing pedestrian plans or planning work (Figure 8.2). To make the most of limited resources available for this plan, staff recommended focus areas based on the analysis, known pedestrian needs, relationship to PDA’s and CCSA’s, and limited existing pedestrian plan or planning work.

Lists of the recommended focus areas, and areas covered by existing are shown in the matrices in Table 8.2 and Table 8.3, respectively. The tables note the evaluation factors pertinent to each location, the jurisdiction of the location, the plan that contains pedestrian/transit accessibility planning, and the type of location.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Evaluation Factor</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Heaviest</td>
<td>Transit Ridership</td>
<td>Top 100 Bus Locations by Ridership</td>
<td>Top 100 bus locations (may include intersections with multiple bus stops) based on average daily boardings</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ADA Lift Employment</td>
<td>Annual ADA lift employment (wheelchair lift) by bus stop</td>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Top 20 Paratransit Stops</td>
<td>Top 20 most frequently used paratransit locations</td>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriers</td>
<td>Across Barrier Connections</td>
<td>Recommended ABC's from the 2008 Courtyard Bike Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian - Vehicle Collisions</td>
<td>Pedestrian-vehicle collisions resulting in death or severe injury: Data from TAMS</td>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomics</td>
<td>Communities of Concern</td>
<td>Census tracts that meet low income and minority thresholds as defined and/or at least 4 of 8 other factors considered to render people in a census tract as disadvantaged</td>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CARE</td>
<td>Census block groups with high concentrations of Toxic Air Contaminants, that are also home to sensitive populations with income below 185% of the Federal Poverty Level</td>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government Services</td>
<td>Social Services Agency, Services for Families and Children, DMV, Dept. of Employment and Benefits Services, Social Security Administration, US Citizenship and Immigration Services, Courthouses</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Destinations</td>
<td>Major Employers</td>
<td>Top 72 employers, based on employee numbers, in Santa Clara County as per the Business Journal Book of Lists</td>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colleges</td>
<td>All four-year and junior colleges</td>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Centers</td>
<td>All senior centers and senior nutrition centers in the county</td>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>All public and private middle and high schools in Santa Clara County</td>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health Care Facilities</td>
<td>Hospitals; drop in clinics, surgical centers, cancer treatment centers</td>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Housing Density</td>
<td>Housing density calculated from the 2010 US Census</td>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journey to Work</td>
<td>Residents who commute by Bus</td>
<td>Census 2010 residents by census tract</td>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residents who commute by Rail</td>
<td>Census 2010 residents by census tract</td>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 8.1: Recommended Focus Areas
Table 8.2: Pedestrian Planning Matrix - Focus Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Location/Corridor</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Planning Effort</th>
<th>Evaluation Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Capitol Expressway @ Alum Rock</td>
<td>County of Santa Clara</td>
<td>Comp Cty Expwy Planning Study - Capitol Expwy</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Capitol Expressway @ Story</td>
<td>County of Santa Clara</td>
<td>Comp Cty Expwy Planning Study - Capitol Expwy</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Gilroy Downtown/PDA</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>Downtown Gilroy Specific Plan</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>San Antonio @ El Camino</td>
<td>Mountain View/Los Altos</td>
<td>MV ECR Precise Plan/San Antonio Precise Plan</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shoreline @ El Camino</td>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>MV ECR Precise Plan</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>El Camino Real @ SR 85</td>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>MV ECR Precise Plan</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Bascom @ Moorpark</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Complete Street Audit Buscom</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Downtown San Jose - Santa Clara St</td>
<td>San Jose - San Carlos</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>King Road Corridor - Tully to Alum Rock</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Taylor @ Park</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>William/Keyes @ First</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Fair Oaks @ El Camino</td>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>SV ECR Precise Plan</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 8.2: Locations with Existing Pedestrian Planning Work
Table 8.3: Pedestrian Planning Matrix – Existing Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Location/Corridor</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Planning Effort</th>
<th>Evaluation Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Downtown Campbell</td>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>Downtown Campbell Development Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Winchester from Hamilton to Friar</td>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>Winchester Blvd Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Capitol Expressway</td>
<td>County of Santa Clara</td>
<td>Comprehensive County Expwy Planning Study - Capitol Expressway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Vallco Mall Area</td>
<td>Cupertino</td>
<td>South Vallco Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Stevens Creek in Cupertino</td>
<td>Cupertino</td>
<td>Heart of the City Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Stevens Creek Corridor / DeAnza</td>
<td>Cupertino, Santa Clara, San Jose</td>
<td>Stevens Creek BRT Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Collisions</th>
<th>ABC</th>
<th>COC</th>
<th>CARE</th>
<th>Emp</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Gov</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Rider</th>
<th>Para</th>
<th>Lift</th>
<th>CCSCA</th>
<th>PDA</th>
<th>JTW B</th>
<th>JTWB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Location/Corridor</td>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Planning Effort</td>
<td>Evaluation Factors</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>----</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Gilroy Downtown/PDA</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>Downtown Gilroy Specific Plan</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>8</td>
<td>Foothill Espuy from Parma to 280</td>
<td>Los Altos</td>
<td>Stevens Creek Trail Feasibility Study</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>9</td>
<td>Milpitas BART Silicon Valley/Great Mall</td>
<td>Milpitas</td>
<td>Milpitas Transit Area Specific Plan</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>10</td>
<td>Milpitas Midtown/Milpitas BART</td>
<td>Milpitas</td>
<td>Midtown Specific Plan</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>11</td>
<td>Downtown Morgan Hill</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>Downtown Morgan Hill Specific Plan</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>12</td>
<td>NASA LRT Station</td>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>NASA Ames Bayshore Light Rail Station Pedestrian Access Improvement Plan</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>13</td>
<td>Shoreline Park area north of 101</td>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>Shoreline Regional Park Community Transportation Study</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>14</td>
<td>San Antonio @ El Camino</td>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>San Antonio Precise Plan</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>15</td>
<td>Mountain View El Camino</td>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>Mountain view MV ECR Precise Plan</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>16</td>
<td>Mountain View Transit Center</td>
<td>MV/VTA/PB</td>
<td>MV Transit Center</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>17</td>
<td>Palo Alto Transit Center</td>
<td>PA/VTA/PB</td>
<td>Palo Alto Transit Center</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>18</td>
<td>Diridon Station</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Diridon Station Area Plan</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>19</td>
<td>San Carlos from San Tomas to Sunol</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Complete Streets Audit San Carlos</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>20</td>
<td>Bascom from I-280 to Southwest Expressway</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Complete Street Audit Bascom</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>21</td>
<td>Tamien Caltrain/Light Rail Station Area</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Tamien Station Area Specific Plan</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>22</td>
<td>Hitachi/Cottle Area</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Hitachi Transit Village Master Plan</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>23</td>
<td>North San Jose Hwy 101/I-800</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Vision North San Jose</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>24</td>
<td>Junction to Sth 280</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Central Park Pedestrian and Bicycle Access Study</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>25</td>
<td>Homestead @ Kiely</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>Santa Clara Pedestrian and Bicycle Access Study</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>26</td>
<td>Santa Clara Caltrain</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>Santa Clara Station Area Plan</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></td>
<td>Levi Stadium</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>49ers Stadium</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>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8.2: Pedestrian Planning Matrix, Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Location/Corridor</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Planning Effort</th>
<th>Evaluation Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Lawrence Caltrain Station</td>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>Lawrence Station Area Plan</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Santa Clara El Camino</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>SC ECR Precise Plan</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Saratoga Village Pedestrian Enhancement Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Downtown Saratoga</td>
<td>Saratoga</td>
<td>Fair Oaks Junction Sense of Place Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Fair Oaks @ Arques</td>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>Saratoga Village Pedestrian Enhancement Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Tarman @ Fair Oaks</td>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>Tarman Fair Oaks Pedestrian Circulation Plan</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Sunnyvale El Camino</td>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>SV ECR Precise Plan</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Eastridge Transit Center</td>
<td>VTA/San Jose</td>
<td>Eastridge Transit Center Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Berryessa BART Silicon Valley</td>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>Berryessa BART Silicon Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Collisions | ABC | COC | CARE | Emp | School | College | Health | Senior | Gov | House | Rider | Para | Lift | CCSA | PDR | JTWR | JTWB
---|-----|-----|------|-----|--------|---------|--------|--------|-----|-------|-------|------|------|------|-----|------|------
Figure 8.3: Communities of Concern and Community Air Risk Evaluation Areas in Santa Clara County
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BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Nuria I. Fernandez

FROM: Director of Planning and Program Development, John Ristow

SUBJECT: SR 237 Express Lanes Fiscal Year 2014 Update

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

At the December 2008 Board Meeting, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) Board of Directors approved the Silicon Valley Express Lanes Program (Program). The Program is to implement a roadway pricing system to allow for the use of unused capacity in the carpool lanes to provide congestion relief. The roadway pricing system will allow solo commuters to use the available capacity in the carpool lanes for a fee. The fee would change dynamically in response to existing congestion levels and available capacity in the carpool lanes. Implementation of roadway pricing is also part of the Bay Area Regional Transportation Plan update that was approved by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) on July 18, 2013.

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

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

DISCUSSION:

The SR 237/I-880 Express Connectors project is the first phase of the SR 237 Express Lanes project that converted the carpool lane connector ramps at the SR 237/I-880 interchange to Express Lanes operations (Attachment A). This opening represents the first major milestone in delivering VTA’s Program. The second phase of the SR 237 Express Lanes involves extending Express Lanes between Lawrence Expressway and Mathilda Avenue where the existing carpool lane ends which is currently at the completion of environmental document approval and
beginning of the design phase.

**SR 237 Express Lanes Update for Fiscal Year 2014**

This update reflects the second full fiscal year (July 1, 2013 to June 30, 2014) of operation for the SR 237 Express Lanes. The Express Lanes operate on Monday to Friday, from 5:00 am to 10:00 am in the westbound direction, from 5:00 am to 9:00 am for the eastbound direction, and from 3:00 pm to 7:00 pm for both directions in the evening commute. This includes public holidays that occur on weekdays. At all other times and on weekends the lane is “OPEN TO ALL.”

The SR 237 Express Lanes has served over 1.3 million toll paying vehicles (about 20% of the total over 6 million vehicles that have used the facility since inception). About 120,000 vehicle hours of travel time savings have been gained in the corridor while generating about $2.5 million since it opened for tolling on March 20, 2012.

In Fiscal Year 2014, the SR 237 Express Lanes maintained the performance standard of operating at a minimum speed of 45 miles per hour while exceeding revenue projections with an estimated net revenues of over $400,000. The travel time savings in the corridor varied between up to 14 minutes in the westbound direction during the AM peak period versus up to 4 minutes in the eastbound direction during the PM peak. The SR 237 Express Lanes continue to draw both repeat users and first time users consistently at a rate of about 9,600 customers and 2,900 customers per month respectively.

**Express Lanes Traffic Usage**

During FY 2014, the SR 237 Express Lanes served a total of over 3 million vehicles including both carpoolers (also referred to as High Occupancy Vehicles or HOVs) and solo drivers (also referred to as Single Occupant Vehicles or SOVs). Over 600,000 (about 20%) of the total express lanes traffic volume chose to pay a fee to use the express lane to gain travel time reliability (see Table 1). The average daily traffic for FY 2014 was about 11,500 vehicles consisting of about 9,200 non-tolled vehicles and 2,300 tolled vehicles. The majority of the toll users (70%) are users commuting in the westbound direction between I-880 to SR 237 (see Table 2). About 60% of the total tolls paying users are from the westbound AM peak period alone.

**Table 1: FY 2014 SR 237 Express Lanes - Traffic Usage by Quarter**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>Quarter 1 (July - Sep.)</th>
<th>Quarter 2 (Oct. - Dec.)</th>
<th>Quarter 3 (Jan. - Mar.)</th>
<th>Quarter 4 (Apr. - June)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Tolling Days</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOV /Toll</td>
<td>162,655</td>
<td>143,866</td>
<td>150,679</td>
<td>151,567</td>
<td>608,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOV /Non-Toll</td>
<td>592,723</td>
<td>580,620</td>
<td>593,639</td>
<td>629,414</td>
<td>2,396,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. SOV /Day</td>
<td>2,464</td>
<td>2,180</td>
<td>2,354</td>
<td>2,332</td>
<td>2,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. HOV /Day</td>
<td>8,981</td>
<td>8,797</td>
<td>9,276</td>
<td>9,683</td>
<td>9,182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOV = Single Occupant Vehicle
HOV = High Occupancy Vehicle
Table 2: FY 2014 SR 237 Express Lanes - Traffic Usage by Direction (SOV Users)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tolled Vehicles</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>19,150</td>
<td>164,227</td>
<td>183,377</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>364,075</td>
<td>61,134</td>
<td>425,390</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>383,225</td>
<td>225,541</td>
<td>608,767</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Express Lanes Toll Revenues and Expenses

The SR 237 Express Lanes have been well utilized and have generated toll revenues that have exceeded projections. Figure 1 shows the total traffic volumes on Express Lanes and revenues by month. Figure 1 also illustrates the continued increase in toll revenues with seasonal dips including holidays. The average revenues collected is about $102,100 per month for FY 2014. This translates to average revenue per tolling day of about $4,700. The month of December was the lowest revenue month at about $76,000 while October was the highest at $125,000 per month. The toll rates are dynamically priced and vary by the level of congestion in the Express Lanes. The average toll rate for FY 2014 was $2.01 with the toll rate varying between $0.30 and $5.00.

Figure 1: FY 2014 SR 237 Express Lanes - Total Traffic Volumes and Revenues by Month

The toll revenues generated for FY 2014 exceeded projections (see Table 3) while the total expenses incurred were close to projections. Overall, the SR 237 Express Lanes resulted in positive net revenue over expenses of about $427,000. Parts of the expenses ($79,000) for the program were recorded in capital project where funds were set aside for the initial operating expenditures.
Table 3: FY 2014 SR 237 Express Lanes - Comparison of Revenues and Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>FY13 Projection</th>
<th>FY13 Actual</th>
<th>FY14 Projection</th>
<th>FY14 Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toll Revenues</td>
<td>$ 592,000</td>
<td>$ 1,049,000</td>
<td>$ 920,000</td>
<td>$ 1,222,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment earnings</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 5,000</td>
<td>$ 9,000</td>
<td>$ 19,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$ 592,000</td>
<td>$ 1,054,000</td>
<td>$ 929,000</td>
<td>$ 1,241,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Special Services</td>
<td>$ 427,000</td>
<td>$ 341,000</td>
<td>$ 535,000</td>
<td>$ 541,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 10,000</td>
<td>$ 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>$ 39,000</td>
<td>$ 3,000</td>
<td>$ 2,000</td>
<td>$ 2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTA Staff Services</td>
<td>$ 126,000</td>
<td>$ 191,000</td>
<td>$ 370,000</td>
<td>$ 270,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expense</strong></td>
<td>$ 591,000</td>
<td>$ 535,000</td>
<td>$ 917,000</td>
<td>$ 814,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues Over (Under) Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$ 1,000</td>
<td>$ 519,000</td>
<td>$ 12,000</td>
<td>$ 427,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1- Preliminary unaudited number as of August 7, 2014. Final audited number may vary.

Express Lanes Operations

Travel Time Savings
Travel time savings in the SR 237 Express Lanes corridor for the solo toll paying traffic can be up to about 14 minutes (between Dixon Landing Road and Great America Parkway) in the westbound AM Peak direction and up to 4 minutes in the eastbound PM direction. The PM travel time savings are significantly affected by downstream congestion beyond the SR 237 Express Lanes project limit. About 120,000 hours of total travel time savings have been gained in the entire corridor since opening to tolling operations. In addition, the SR 237 Express Lanes has served over 1.3 million toll paying vehicles that chose to use the facility to obtain the travel time reliability.

Travel times increased between 1 to 5 minutes for carpoolers accessing the Express Lanes via local streets in the westbound direction namely Calaveras Boulevard and McCarthy Boulevard compared to before Express Lanes was opened. The average carpool users using either Calaveras Boulevard on-ramp or McCarthy Boulevard is minimal at about 90 vehicles per hour respectively on either of the roads.

Speed
The SR 237 Express Lanes has been operating well above the 45 miles per hour (mph) performance standard. The average Express Lane travel speed on SR 237 in the westbound direction (shown in Figure 2) varied between 50 and 70 mph with minimum travel speeds at about 50 mph between 8 am and 10 am and between 60 mph and 70 mph between 5pm and 7pm. The average Express Lane travel speed on SR 237 in the eastbound direction (shown in Figure 3) has been about 70 mph during the AM peak period with speeds dropping to between 50 mph and 55 mph between 5 pm and 7 pm.
**HOV ONLY Operations**

The SR 237 Express Lanes maintains a minimum performance standard of 45 miles per hour (mph). The express lane restricts the usage to HOV users only when the speed starts to fall below this minimum speed. Part of the reason for the drop in the average speed below 45 mph in the evening commute in the eastbound direction is the downstream congestion on I-880 that occurs north of the Santa Clara County limits (north of Dixon Landing Road). During this time period, the express lane signage displays “HOV ONLY” sign to motorists. This is done to manage the traffic from approaching the downstream bottleneck faster as well as to maintain the minimum performance standard. The facility was restricted to HOV ONLY use for a total of about 240 hours in FY 2014 in comparison to about 206 hours in FY 2013. The 240 hours
represents about 6 percent of the total express lanes operating hours which has reduced total toll vehicle usage by about 15,000 vehicles (2%) for FY 2014. The other observation is that HOV ONLY restriction also occurred earlier in the PM peak period compared to FY 2013 since the opening of the HOV lane on I-880 between US 101 and SR 237 which opened to traffic in late June 2013.

Enforcement
The main enforcement related topic is the motorist crossing the double white lines. The majority of the double white line crossings occurs between McCarthy Boulevard and Zanker Road during the peak hours of the commute period in the westbound direction of SR 237 as shown in Figures 4 and 5. Working with the California Highway Patrol (CHP), focused enforcement activities on a periodic basis have taken place. Figure 6 highlights that the primary citation issued has been for carpool violation, amounting to about 55% of all the citations (over 1,000 total citations in FY 2014).

Figure 4: FY 2014 SR 237 Express Lanes Westbound Average Double White Line Crossing Violators between McCarthy Blvd. and Zanker Road

![Figure 4](image)

Figure 5: FY 2014 SR 237 Express Lanes Eastbound Average Double White Line Crossing Violators between McCarthy Blvd. and Zanker Road

![Figure 5](image)
Incidents
The number of major incidents resulting in express lanes closure has been minimal. The only major incident involving Express Lanes was on May 6, 2014 when the Caltrans Traffic Management Center (TMC) requested to suspend operations by closing the southbound I-880 to westbound SR 237 connector to traffic due to a traffic collision in the Express Lane between Zanker off-ramp and on-ramp.

Operations and Maintenance
The Express Lanes staff worked with Bay Area Toll Authority (BATA) staff and maintained uninterrupted toll transactions during the relocation of the BATA back office in June 2014.

VTA installed three (3) additional CCTV cameras along the SR 237 Express Lanes near I-880/SR 237 interchange toll reader location, SR 237/McCarthy Boulevard interchange, and SR 237/Zanker Road eastbound on-ramp as shown in Figure 7. Since March 2014, these monitoring devices now provide added coverage at some of the most congested locations within the express lane corridor. In addition, an existing CCTV on I-880 was also replaced in March 2014 due to malfunction.

The bi-annual maintenance for the corridor was undertaken in November 2013 and March 2014. The maintenance activity consists of inspecting toll system equipment on the field including the pricing sign, CCTV cameras, tolling equipment, pavement sensors, communication equipment, and gantry poles. In addition, work on two failed pavement detectors was also undertaken in March 2014.
Outreach
There was continued dialogue about the access location on SR 237 in the westbound direction with the City of Milpitas. The primary concern expressed by City leaders has been about the distance that needs to be traveled before HOV traffic from Calaveras Boulevard can access the Express Lane. Caltrans, VTA and City staffs are continuing with on-going discussions and are studying potential changes that can be undertaken as part of the SR 237 Express Lanes (Phase 2) project.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:

The Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) heard this item on August 13, 2014 and had no comments.

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Policy Advisory Committee heard this item on August 14, 2014 and had no comments.

Prepared By: Murali Ramanujam, Jane Yu, Arshad Syed and Adam Paranal Memo No. 4670
FOR INFORMATION ONLY

Please find attached the Semi-Annual Report for the VTP Highway Program for the period ending April 30, 2014. Highlights for this reporting period include the following accomplishments:

a. The Initial Study/Environmental Assessment and Proposed Negative Declaration for the SR 85 Express Lanes project was circulated for public review and comment in December 2013 with the comment period closing in February 2014.

b. The US 101/Capitol Expressway - Yerba Buena Interchange project was completed in March 2014 including landscaping the US 101/Tully Road and US 101/Capitol Expressway Interchanges.

c. In April 2014, the construction of freeway-to-freeway connector began for the I-880/I-280/Stevens Creek Improvements project. The bridge widening at Stevens Creek over I-880 is complete. The project is being built in several stages to minimize disruption to freeway and local traffic.

d. The one-year plant establishment period for I-880 HOV Lane project was completed and project was accepted by Caltrans in April 2014. The project was selected as the project of the year by the APWA (American Public Works Association) Silicon Valley chapter. The project was also nominated for freeway project of the year by the California Transportation Foundation.

Prepared By: Suja Prasad, Sr. Cost & Schedule Coordinator
Memo No. 4471
### VTP PROGRAM SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT (NOVEMBER 2013 – APRIL 2014) - SUMMARY OF MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Key Accomplishment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>P 0619: US 101 Auxiliary Lanes – Embarcadero Rd to SR 85</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor: O.C. Jones Sons, Inc. (Administered by Caltrans) Designer: URS Corporation</td>
<td>Approved Budget: $17.0M* Estimated Cost: $17.0M Fund Source: CMIA; Local *excl. construction administered by Caltrans</td>
<td>Construction Completion: August 2014; One Year Plant Establishment Period (PEP) Mid-2015</td>
<td>Construction began in February 2012. Civil construction is expected to be completed and new lanes opened to traffic in August 2014. Project is in one-year plant establishment period and closeout is expected to be completed by mid-2015. In November 2013, Board approved the allocation of $0.26mil of Local Program Reserve (LPR) to the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **P 0720: SR 85 Express Lanes** | | | |
| Contractors: TBD Designer: URS Corporation | Approved Budget: $6.6M Estimated Cost: $170.0M Fund Source: Local/Federal/TBD | PA/ED: Late 2014 Engineering and construction schedule dependent on funding | The Initial Study/Environmental Assessment and Proposed Negative Declaration were circulated for public review and comment in December 2013 with the comment period closing in February 2014. Request for Proposal (RFP) for final design services for Segment 85A and 85D was issued on July 18, 2014; proposals are due on August 14, 2014. |

| **P 0721: US 101 Express Lanes** | | | |
| Contractors: TBD Designer: URS Corporation | Approved Budget: $7.86M Estimated Cost: $425.0M Fund Source: Local/TBD | PA/ED: Early 2015 Engineering and construction schedule dependent on funding | Traffic operation analysis and environmental studies are underway for the PA/ED phase. The circulation of the Draft Environmental Document is targeted for Fall 2014 with final approval anticipated in early 2015. Request for Proposal (RFP) for final design services for Segment 101A was issued on July 18, 2014; proposals are due on August 14, 2014. |

| **P 0788: SR 237 Express Lanes - Phase 2** | | | |

| **P 0730: US 101/Capitol Expressway – Yerba Buena Interchange** | | | |
| Contractor: Granite Rock dba Pavex Designer: HMH Engineers | Approved Budget: $33.7M Estimated Cost: $30.5M Fund Source: Local; State; Federal; City | Construction Completion: March 2014 PEP: April 2015 | Construction was completed in March 2014 including landscaping the US 101/Tully Road and US 101/Capitol Expressway Interchanges and providing improved access and congestion relief to commuters. |

| **P 0455: I-880/I-280/Stevens Creek Improvements** | | | |
| Contractor: DeSilva Gates Construction Designer: Mark Thomas & Company, Inc. | Approved Budget: $63.0M Estimated Cost: $63.0 M Fund Source: Local/State/Federal | Construction Completion: April 2015 | In April 2014, the construction of freeway-to-freeway connector began. The bridge widening at Stevens Creek over I-880 is complete. The project is being built in several stages to minimize disruption to freeway and local traffic. Construction is expected to be completed by early 2015. |
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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. VTP Highway Program developed by VTA feeds projects into the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), and projects must be included in the RTP 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 Transit funds are used for these projects.
B. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Valley Transportation Plan (VTP) Highway Program consists of potentially over $1 billion of highway improvement projects 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, as the congestion management agency (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 2014 and 2015, for various VTP Highway Program projects. Since these projects can run beyond FY15, 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 FY14/15 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.

![Diagram of VTP Highway Program Identified Funding Sources]

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>Project Name</th>
<th>Portion of Estimated Cost For Which Funding Has Been Identified**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conceptual Study Projects</strong>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-0570 El Camino Real/SR 85/237/Middlefield</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental/Preliminary Engineering</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-0749 Freeway Performance Initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-0617 SR 152 Trade Corridor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-0606 US 101 Widening - Monterey Road to SR 129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-0565 US 101 De La Cruz Boulevard/Trimble Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-0720 SR 85 Express Lanes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-0721 US 101 Express Lanes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-0678 SR 237/US 101 Mathilda Interchange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-0788 SR 237 Express Lanes - Phase II Extension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projects in Final Design (PS&amp;E)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-0826 Combined Landscaping &amp; Maint. Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-0812 I-280/Foothill Expressway Ramp Improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projects Under Construction</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-0619 US 101 Aux Lanes – Embarcadero to SR 85 (CMIA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-0620 I-880 HOV Widening (CMIA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-0519 US 101 Improvements - I-280 to Yerba Buena (CMIA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-0655 Ramp Metering Implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-0694 SR 237/I-880 Express Connectors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-0730 US 101 Capitol Expwy – Yerba Buena Int. (CMIA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-0455 I-880/I-280/Stevens Creek Improvements (CMIA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Estimated cost for projects in the Conceptual Study category includes only the conceptual study.

**(Identified Funding) / (Estimated Cost) x 100%
See page 1-3 for definitions of Identified Funding and Estimated Cost
The following are activities of note that took place during the six-month period from November 2013 to April 2014 covered by this report:

a. At the November 2013 meeting, VTA Board approved the allocation of $5,460,000 of Local Program Reserve (LPR) to the following projects:

   SR 680 Corridor Study $250,000
   I-280 Corridor Study $250,000
   I-280/Winchester Blvd Off-Ramp $250,000
   US 101 Auxiliary Lanes Project $260,000 and
   SR 237, SR 85 and US101 Express Lanes $4,450,000

b. In November the VTA Board adopted a resolution to program 2014 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) capacity to projects. The Board approved programming $14.5 million in 2014 STIP program capacity to the BART Silicon Valley Santa Clara Extension (SVSX) project and direct $14.5 million in Measure A funds that would otherwise have been used for the SVSX project to the VTA Expressway program. The Measure A funds will be used to advance design development work for the Express Lanes in 2014.

c. The Initial Study/Environmental Assessment and Proposed negative Declaration for the SR 85 Express Lanes project was circulated for public review and comment in December 2013 with the comment period closing in February 2014.

d. The US 101/Capitol Expressway – Yerba Buena Interchange project was completed in March 2014 including landscaping the US 101/Tully Road and US 101/Capitol Expressway Interchanges and providing improved access and congestion relief to commuters.

e. In April 2014, the construction of freeway-to-freeway connector began for the I-880/I-280/Stevens Creek Improvements project. The bridge widening at Stevens Creek over I-880 is complete. The project is being built in several stages to minimize disruption to freeway and local traffic.

f. The one-year plant establishment period for I-880 HOV Lane Widening project was completed and project was accepted by Caltrans in April 2014. In April 2014, I-880 HOV Lane Widening project was selected as the project of the year by the APWA (American Public Works Association) Silicon Valley chapter. The project was also nominated for freeway project of the year by the California Transportation Foundation.
C. SECURED FUNDING

Figure 1.3 shows the prior and current period funding for the VTP Highway projects. Secured funding increased by a net $3.2 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 remains unchanged at $25.4 million.

3. Projects in Final Design (PS&E)

   Secured funding remains unchanged at $3.5 million.

4. Projects Under Construction

   Secured funding increased by $0.3 million to a new total of $146.1 million. This was due to allocation of $0.3 million of Local Program Reserve (LPR) to the US 101 Auxiliary Lanes project.

5. Silicon Valley Express Lanes

   Secured funding increased by $3.0 million to a new total of $35.3 million. This was primarily due to allocation of LPR funds to the Express Lanes projects; $0.65 million to SR 85 Express Lanes project, $0.3 million to US 101 Express Lanes project and $2.0 million to SR 237 Express Lanes – Phase 2 project.
## Figure 1.3

**VTP Highway Program Secured Funding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/Category</th>
<th>Previous Secured Funding Oct-13</th>
<th>Current Secured Funding Apr-14</th>
<th>Changes This Period</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/SR 85/SR 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></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>SR 152 Trade Corridor</td>
<td>$13.0</td>
<td>$13.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 101 Widening - Monterey Rd to SR 129</td>
<td>$5.9</td>
<td>$5.9</td>
<td>$0.0</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>SR 237/US 101/ Mathilda Interchange</td>
<td>$4.0</td>
<td>$4.0</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>Projects In Final Design (PS&amp;E)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-280/Foothill Expressway Ramp Improvements</td>
<td>$0.7</td>
<td>$0.7</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Landscaping &amp; Maint. Project</td>
<td>$2.8</td>
<td>$2.8</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$3.5</td>
<td>$3.5</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td></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 SR 85 (CMIA)</td>
<td>$16.4</td>
<td>$16.6</td>
<td>$0.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-880 HOV Widening (CMIA)</td>
<td>$19.1</td>
<td>$19.1</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 101 Improvements I-280 to Yerba Buena (CMIA)</td>
<td>$14.2</td>
<td>$14.2</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>$30.5</td>
<td>$30.5</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-880/I-280/Stevens Creek Improvements (CMIA)</td>
<td>$63.0</td>
<td>$63.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$145.8</td>
<td>$146.1</td>
<td>$0.3</td>
<td></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>$2.93</td>
<td>$2.93</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 237/I-880 Express Connectors</td>
<td>$11.8</td>
<td>$11.8</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 85 Express Lanes</td>
<td>$5.9</td>
<td>$6.6</td>
<td>$0.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 101 Express Lanes</td>
<td>$7.6</td>
<td>$7.9</td>
<td>$0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 237 Express Lanes-Phll Extension</td>
<td>$4.2</td>
<td>$6.2</td>
<td>$2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$32.4</td>
<td>$35.3</td>
<td>$3.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$207.9</td>
<td>$211.1</td>
<td>$3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 April 30, 2014.

![Figure 1.4](image.png)

**VTP Highway Program Incurred Costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/Category</th>
<th>Incurred Costs Through Oct-13</th>
<th>Incurred Costs Through Apr-14</th>
<th>Incurred Costs This Period</th>
<th>Percent of Secured Funding Apr-14</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/SR 85/SR 237/Middlefield</td>
<td>$0.8</td>
<td>$0.8</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$0.8</td>
<td>$0.8</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>100.0%</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>$1.4</td>
<td>$1.5</td>
<td>$0.1</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 152 Trade Corridor</td>
<td>$7.7</td>
<td>$7.8</td>
<td>$0.1</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 101 Widening - Monterey Rd to SR 129</td>
<td>$5.9</td>
<td>$5.9</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>99.8%</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>97.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 237/US 101 Mathilda Interchange</td>
<td>$0.1</td>
<td>$0.2</td>
<td>$0.1</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$15.9</td>
<td>$16.3</td>
<td>$0.4</td>
<td>64.2%</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>I-280/Foothill Expressway Ramp Improvements</td>
<td>$0.7</td>
<td>$0.7</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Landscaping &amp; Maint. Project</td>
<td>$0.4</td>
<td>$0.6</td>
<td>$0.2</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$1.0</td>
<td>$1.2</td>
<td>$0.2</td>
<td>34.9%</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 SR 85 (CMIA)</td>
<td>$15.8</td>
<td>$16.1</td>
<td>$0.2</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-880 HOV Widening (CMIA)</td>
<td>$18.0</td>
<td>$18.2</td>
<td>$0.1</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 101 Improvements I-280 to Yerba Buena (CMIA)</td>
<td>$13.1</td>
<td>$13.3</td>
<td>$0.2</td>
<td>93.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramp Metering Implementation</td>
<td>$2.4</td>
<td>$2.5</td>
<td>$0.1</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 101 Capitol Expressway - Yerba Buena Int. (CMIA)</td>
<td>$19.7</td>
<td>$26.8</td>
<td>$7.0</td>
<td>87.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-880/I-280/Stevens Creek Improvements (CMIA)</td>
<td>$27.4</td>
<td>$35.0</td>
<td>$7.6</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$96.5</td>
<td>$111.8</td>
<td>$15.3</td>
<td>76.6%</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>SR 237/I-880 Express Connectors</td>
<td>$11.7</td>
<td>$11.7</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>99.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 85 Express Lanes</td>
<td>$5.4</td>
<td>$5.8</td>
<td>$0.4</td>
<td>87.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 101 Express Lanes</td>
<td>$5.1</td>
<td>$6.1</td>
<td>$0.9</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 237 Express Lanes-Phll Extension</td>
<td>$0.8</td>
<td>$1.6</td>
<td>$0.8</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$25.9</td>
<td>$28.1</td>
<td>$2.1</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$140.2</td>
<td>$158.2</td>
<td>$18.1</td>
<td>75.0%</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/SR 85/SR 237/Middlefield

B. PROJECTS IN THE ENVIRONMENTAL/PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING PHASE
   1. Freeway Performance Initiative
   2. SR 152 Trade Corridor
   3. US 101 Widening - Monterey Road to Route 129
   4. US 101/De La Cruz Boulevard/Trimble Road Interchange
   5. Mathilda Avenue Improvements at SR237 and US101

C. PROJECTS IN FINAL DESIGN (PS&E)
   1. Combined Landscaping & Maintenance Project
   2. I-280/Foothill Expressway Ramp Improvements

D. PROJECTS UNDER CONSTRUCTION
   1. US 101 Auxiliary Lanes – Embarcadero to SR 85 (CMIA)
   2. I-880 HOV Widening (CMIA)
   3. US 101 Improvements - I-280 to Yerba Buena Road (CMIA)
   4. Ramp Metering Implementation
   5. US 101 Capitol Expressway – Yerba Buena Interchange (CMIA)
   6. I-880/I-280/Stevens Creek Improvements (CMIA)

E. SILICON VALLEY EXPRESS LANES PROGRAM
   1. Program Overview
   2. SR 237/I-880 Express Connectors
   3. SR 85 Express Lanes
   4. US 101 Express Lanes
   5. SR 237 Express Lanes – Phase 2
El Camino Real/SR 85/SR 237/Middlefield

**Estimated Cost:** TBD

**Appropriation through FY 15:**
$0.8 million

**Secured Funding to Date:**
$0.8 million

**Year of Completion:** TBD
(Project Initiation Document (PSR-PDS) completed 2013)

**Project Manager:** Chris Metzger

**Designer:** Nolte Associates

**Project Description:**
Project alternatives include operational improvements to the El Camino Real/SR 85 Interchange, auxiliary lanes on SR 85 from El Camino Real to the SR 85 / SR 237 Interchange, and operational improvements at the Middlefield Road / Route 237 Interchange. The approved funding was solely for the production of a Project Initiation Document.

**Project Status:**
VTA and City of Mountain View prepared a Project Initiation Document. A Final Project Study Report/Project Development Support (PSR-PDS) was approved by Caltrans in early 2013.

Preparation of environmental documents and preliminary engineering are dependent upon funding.

**Project Schedule:**
Schedule is dependent upon on scope and funding.
## Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding</th>
<th>Apr-14 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Apr-14 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>792</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing Costs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>792</strong></td>
<td><strong>792</strong></td>
<td><strong>792</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred 100%
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>$0.54</td>
<td>$0.54</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>$0.79</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.79</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Portion of Estimated Cost for which funding has been identified (PID only)
VTP Highway Projects

Freeway Performance Initiative

**Estimated Cost:** $5.6 million

**Appropriation through FY 15:**
$5.6 million

**Secured Funding to Date:**
$1.6 million

**Year of Completion:**
2014

**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: SR 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 final design efforts. Completion anticipated by June 2014.

**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>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Mid 2011</td>
<td>End 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design (PS&amp;E)</td>
<td>Early 2012</td>
<td>Mid 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction*</td>
<td>Mid 2014</td>
<td>Mid 2015*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open to Traffic</td>
<td>Mid 2015*</td>
<td>End 2015*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td>Mid 2015*</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 (a)</th>
<th>Apr-14 Committed Costs (b)</th>
<th>Apr-14 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>1,563</td>
<td>1,548</td>
<td>1,543</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>1,563</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,548</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,543</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred: 99%
Secured Funding Committed: 99%

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>$1.56</td>
<td>$1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5.56</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1.56</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding Source Identified: 28%
Funding Source Secured: 72%

### Typical Configuration of Freeway On-ramp Layout with Ramp Metering
SR 152 Trade Corridor

**Estimated Cost:** $1.2 billion
Estimate Class 5 *(see appendix)*

**Appropriation through FY 15:**
$26.4 million

**Secured Funding to Date:**
$13 million

**Year of Completion:**
TBD

**Project Manager:**
Chris Metzger

**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 SR 152 from US 101 to SR 156, including the SR 25/US 101 interchange, safety and operational improvements from SR 156 to Pacheco Pass, and new Eastbound Pacheco Pass climbing lanes.

Major improvements outside Santa Clara County may include: improvements to the SR 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 **Next Steps** are to:
- Secure Funding to Continue Engineering and Environmental Studies and Complete PAED
- Develop and Execute Necessary Agreements

**Project Schedule:**

Additional funds are required to complete PAED. Schedule is dependent upon funding.
Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding</th>
<th>Apr-14 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Apr-14 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>7,856</td>
<td>7,756</td>
<td>1,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>3,275</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,012</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,856</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,756</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,256</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred 60%
Secured Funding Committed 60%

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>Federal</td>
<td>$2.86</td>
<td>$2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State - STIP</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$1,122.99</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,136.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13.01</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Portion of Estimated Cost for which funding has been identified
US 101 Widening - Monterey Road to SR 129

Estimated Cost: $450 million
Estimate Class 4 (see appendix)

Appropriation through FY 15: $11.1 million

Secured Funding to Date: $5.9 million

Year of Completion: TBD

Project Manager: Chris Metzger

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 SR 25, extending Santa Teresa Boulevard to connect to SR 25 at the SR 25/US 101 Interchange, and improvements on SR 25 required for efficient traffic operations at the SR 25/US 101 interchange.

The project proposes approximately 4.1 miles of freeway improvements on US 101 into Santa Clara County and approximately 2.6 miles of improvements on US 101 in San Benito 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/SR 25 interchange to the US 101/SR 129 interchange.

The SR 25/US 101 Interchange reconstruction is a central element to both the US 101 Widening Project and the SR 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 SR 152 Trade Corridor Project estimated cost in the amount of $225 million.

Project Status:

Environmental/Preliminary Engineering:
The FEIR was approved at the June 2013 Board Meeting. Design and construction is dependent upon funding.

Project Schedule:

Schedule is dependent upon funding.
## Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding $a$</th>
<th>Apr-14 Committed Costs $b$</th>
<th>Apr-14 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>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>5,832</td>
<td>0</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>5,900</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred 100%
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>$4.90</td>
<td>$4.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meas B Swap</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$444.10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$450.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5.90</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Portion of Estimated Cost for which funding has been identified

### Northbound US 101 approaching SR 129 Overcrossing

### Northbound US 101 at SR 25 Overcrossing
US 101 De La Cruz Boulevard/Trimble Road Interchange Improvements

**Estimated Cost:** $40 million

Estimate Class 4 (see appendix)

**Appropriation through FY 15:**

$4.9 million

**Secured Funding to Date:**

$0.9 million

**Year of Completion:** 2014 (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. The Final PSR/PDS was completed in November 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 end 2014. Design and construction is dependent upon on funding.

**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>2014</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>Apr-14 Committed Costs (b)</th>
<th>Apr-14 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>904</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing Costs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>904</strong></td>
<td><strong>886</strong></td>
<td><strong>880</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</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>Local (San Jose)</td>
<td>$0.85</td>
<td>$0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meas A Swap</td>
<td>$0.05</td>
<td>$0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$39.10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$40.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.90</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Diagram showing portion of estimated cost for which funding has been identified]

Rendering of Proposed Overcrossing

Rendering of US 101/De La Cruz Blvd Interchange
Mathilda Avenue Improvements at SR 237 and US 101

**Estimated Cost:** $20.3 million  
Estimate Class 5 *(see appendix)*

**Appropriation through FY 15:**  
$5.9 million

**Secured Funding to Date:**  
$4.0 million

**Year of Completion:** 2018

**Project Manager:** Sajeeni DeAlwis-Mima

**Designer:** WMH Corporation

---

**Project Description:**

The project proposes to reduce congestion and improve traffic operations on Mathilda Avenue at SR 237 and US 101 in Sunnyvale and enhance bicycle and pedestrian movements through both interchange areas.

**Project Status:**

**Environmental/ Preliminary Engineering:** The preparation of the Project Study Report – Preliminary Development Study (PSR-PDS) is underway for the Project Initiation Document (PID) phase. The PID phase is targeted for completion by late 2014 and environmental approval is targeted for Mid 2016.

**Project Schedule:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start (Year)</th>
<th>End (Year)</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>FY18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental/PE</td>
<td>Mid 2013</td>
<td>Mid 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design (PS&amp;E)</td>
<td>Late 2015</td>
<td>Late 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>Early 2016</td>
<td>Late 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Late 2016</td>
<td>Late 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open to Traffic</td>
<td>Late 2017</td>
<td>Mid 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td>Late 2017</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>Apr-14 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Apr-14 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>4,000</td>
<td>1,613</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>3,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>1,613</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>3,767</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred 6%
Secured Funding Committed 40%

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 (City)</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$16.30</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20.30</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Portion of Estimated Cost for which funding has been identified:
- Local 20%
- TBD 80%

Aerial View of Mathilda Avenue between US 101 and SR 237
Aerial View of Mathilda Avenue at SR 237
Combined Landscaping and Maintenance Project

Estimated Cost: $3.8 million
Estimate Class 1 (see appendix)

Appropriation through FY 15:
$3.8 million

Secured Funding to Date:
$2.8 million

Year of Completion: 2018

Project Manager:
Ven Prasad

Designers:
HMH Engineers

Project Description:
The combined projects consist of landscape planting, irrigation and plant establishment (PEP)/landscape maintenance for five separate locations. The projects are designed and separated into three contracts at the following locations:

• Contract 1
  o I-880/ Coleman Ave. Landscaping: A follow-on replacement planting project to the highway interchange improvements project completed in 2007. The project provides landscape planting and irrigation streetscape improvements at Coleman Avenue and slope planting within adjacent Caltrans right-of-way.

• Contract 2
  o I-880 HOV Widening: a follow-on 2-year plant establishment (PEP)/landscape maintenance contract to complete the required Caltrans 3-year PEP.
  o US 101/ Aux Lanes: a follow-on 2-year plant establishment (PEP)/landscape maintenance contract to complete the required Caltrans 3-year PEP.
  o US 101/ Yerba Buena Rd – Tully Rd: a follow-on 2-year plant establishment (PEP)/landscape maintenance contract to complete the required Caltrans 3-year PEP.

• Contract 3
  o SR 237/ McCarthy Blvd. Medians Landscaping: The project provides landscape planting and irrigation streetscape improvements at McCarthy Blvd. in Milpitas. Adjacent highway slope planting in Caltrans right-of-way will complete the landscaping.

Project Status:
Contract 1: Cooperative Agreement between VTA and Caltrans pending execution. Advertisement for bids is planned for August 2014.

Contract 2: Bid opening in August 2014 and is expected to be awarded at the October 2014 Board meeting.

Contract 3: Advertisement for bids currently planned for August 2014.

Project Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>April 2013</td>
<td>Nov-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planting</td>
<td>Dec 2014</td>
<td>Apr 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Establishment</td>
<td>Sept 2014</td>
<td>Apr 2018</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-13 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Oct-13 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Secured Funding Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>1,334</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,824</strong></td>
<td><strong>580</strong></td>
<td><strong>378</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,446</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred 13%
Secured Funding Committed 21%

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>City of Milpitas</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Jose</td>
<td>$0.12</td>
<td>$0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure A/Swap</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State -GARVEE</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3.82</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2.82</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Portion of Estimated Cost for which funding has been identified

I-880 HOV at Route 237 Interchange
US 101 Tully Interchange
I-280/Foothill Expressway Ramp Improvements

**Estimated Cost:** $3.2 million
Estimate Class 5 confirm (see appendix)

**Appropriation through FY 15:**
$2.7 million

**Secured Funding to Date:**
$0.7 million

**Year of Completion:** 2014 (PS&E)

**Project Manager:** Michelle Jiang

**Designer:** Transportation Infrastructure Group

**Project Description:**
The I-280/Foothill Expressway Ramp Improvements 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:**
Geometric Approval Drawings (GAD), environmental studies and 100% PS&E have been completed. The project is currently on hold and construction is contingent on funding.

**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>Mid 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Construction is contingent upon funding.
### Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding (a)</th>
<th>Oct-13 Committed Costs (b)</th>
<th>Oct-13 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>700</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>700</strong></td>
<td><strong>682</strong></td>
<td><strong>659</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred: 94%
Secured Funding Committed: 97%

**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>$0.70</td>
<td>$0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3.20</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.70</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Local** 22% of Estimated Cost has been identified
- **TBD** 78% of Estimated Cost has not been identified

**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 Road to SR 85

Estimated Cost: $70.9 million
(includes $54.3M construction cost administered by Caltrans. Estimate Class 1 - see appendix)

Appropriation through FY 15: $17.0 million

Secured Funding to Date: $16.4 million

Year of Completion: 2015

Project Manager: Lam Trinh

Designer: URS Corporation

Contractor: O.C. Jones Sons, Inc.

Project Description:
Construct auxiliary lanes and extended dual HOV lanes in each direction of a 3.2 mile segment of US 101 between SR 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 April 2011. Utility relocations were completed in late 2011.

Construction began on February 27, 2012 and continues. Civil construction is expected to be completed and new lanes opened to traffic in August 2014. Project is in one-year plant establishment period and closeout is expected to be completed by mid 2015.

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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental/PE</td>
<td>Mid 2007</td>
<td>Mid 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design (P&amp;S&amp;E)</td>
<td>Mid 2009</td>
<td>Mid 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yellow</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Certification</td>
<td>4/19/2011</td>
<td>Early 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans Bidding Process</td>
<td>Mid 2011</td>
<td>Mid 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Red</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Early 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open to Traffic</td>
<td>Mid 2014</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>End 2015</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>Apr-14 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Apr-14 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Secured Funding Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>1,512</td>
<td>1,462</td>
<td>1,435</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>1,609</td>
<td>1,484</td>
<td>1,469</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>13,503</td>
<td>13,377</td>
<td>13,188</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,624</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,323</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,093</strong></td>
<td><strong>531</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>VTA Administered</th>
<th>Administered By Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meas A/STIP Swap</td>
<td>$15.03</td>
<td>$15.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (CMIA)</td>
<td>$55.90</td>
<td>$1.60</td>
<td>$54.30</td>
<td>$55.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$70.92</strong></td>
<td><strong>$16.62</strong></td>
<td><strong>$54.30</strong></td>
<td><strong>$70.92</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State 79%
Local 21%

Portion of Estimated Cost for which funding has been identified

---

**US 101 - at Rengstorff looking North**

**US 101 – San Antonio looking North**
I-880 HOV Widening

**Estimated Cost:** $64.1 million
(includes $45M construction cost administered by Caltrans. Estimate Class 1 - see appendix)

**Appropriation through FY 15:** $19.5 million

**Secured Funding to Date:** $19.1 million

**Year of Completion:** 2014

**Project Manager:** Lam Trinh

**Designer:** Mark Thomas & Company, Inc.

**Contractor:** Bay City Paving and Grading

**Project Description:**
This project adds a High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lane in each direction of 4.6 miles of Interstate 880 between US 101 in San Jose and SR 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 relocation in October 2012, and construction began in April 2012.

Civil construction was completed and opened to traffic in June 2013. One year plant establishment period was completed and project was accepted in April 2014. Project closeout is expected to be completed by late 2014.

Project was selected by the American Public Work Association (APWA) Silicon Valley Chapter as Project of the Year Award in May 2014.

**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><img src="chart1.png" alt="Chart" /></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><img src="chart2.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td></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><img src="chart3.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Certification</td>
<td>5/4/2011</td>
<td>Early 2012</td>
<td><img src="chart4.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans Bidding Process</td>
<td>Mid 2011</td>
<td>Early 2012</td>
<td><img src="chart5.png" alt="Chart" /></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><img src="chart6.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open to Traffic</td>
<td>6/22/2013</td>
<td>Mid 2013</td>
<td><img src="chart7.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td>Mid 2013</td>
<td>Late 2014</td>
<td><img src="chart8.png" alt="Chart" /></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>Apr-14 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Apr-14 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Secured Funding Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$a$</td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>$c$</td>
<td>$d = (a - c)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>3,347</td>
<td>3,347</td>
<td>2,936</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>4,234</td>
<td>4,177</td>
<td>4,126</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>11,512</td>
<td>11,265</td>
<td>11,104</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$19,115$</td>
<td>$18,789$</td>
<td>$18,166$</td>
<td>$948$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Secured Funding Incurred: 95%
- 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>VTA Administered</th>
<th>Administered By Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meas A/STIP Swap</td>
<td>$18.19</td>
<td>$18.19</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$18.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (CMIA)</td>
<td>$45.93</td>
<td>$0.93</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td>$45.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$64.12</strong></td>
<td><strong>$19.12</strong></td>
<td><strong>$45.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$64.12</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Local 28%
- State 72%

Portion of Estimated Cost for which funding has been identified

---

**I-880/SR 237 Interchange**

**I-880 at Brokaw**
US 101 Improvements - I-280 to Yerba Buena Road

Estimated Cost: $45 million  
Approptiation through FY 15: $50.9 million (includes $36.7 million for Caltrans Administered Construction)

Secured Funding to Date: $14.2 million*

Year of Completion: 2014

Project Manager: Ven Prasad

Designer: HMH Engineers

Contractor: RGW Construction, Inc.

Project Description:
Improve operations 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 and replace Tully road overcrossing.

The balance of the operational improvements between Capitol Expressway and Yerba Buena Road covered in the Environmental Document were addressed in a separate project (see Page 2-27)

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 was 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. Construction was administered by Caltrans and was completed in October 2012.

Project is being closed out by Caltrans. Final accounting by Caltrans is in the process.

*For design and Project Management

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>
<th>2014</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>
<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>
<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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open to Traffic</td>
<td>Mid 2012</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>Late 2012</td>
<td>Late 2014</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>Apr-14 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Apr-14 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Secured Funding Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>5,714</td>
<td>5,245</td>
<td>5,170</td>
<td>544</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>7,875</td>
<td>7,706</td>
<td>7,706</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,230</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,396</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,321</strong></td>
<td><strong>909</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Secured Funding Incurred: 94%
- Secured Funding Committed: 94%

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>$5.99</td>
<td>$5.99</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meas B Swap</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (CSJ)</td>
<td>$6.63</td>
<td>$6.63</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (Other)</td>
<td>$0.30</td>
<td>$0.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (CMIA)</td>
<td>$16.89</td>
<td>$1.22</td>
<td>$15.68</td>
<td>$16.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (SHOPP)</td>
<td>$1.24</td>
<td>$1.24</td>
<td>$1.24</td>
<td>$1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal (ARRA)</td>
<td>$4.06</td>
<td>$4.06</td>
<td>$4.06</td>
<td>$4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal (Earmark)</td>
<td>$7.20</td>
<td>$7.20</td>
<td>$7.20</td>
<td>$7.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** $42.41  $14.23  $28.18  $42.41

- Federal: 26%
- State: 43%
- Local: 31%

Portion of Estimated Cost for which funding has been identified.
Ramp Metering Implementation

**Estimated Cost:** $2.6 million
Estimate Class 1 (see appendix)

**Appropriation through FY 15:**
$11.8 million

**Secured Funding to Date:**
$2.6 million

**Year of Completion:**
2014

**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 SR 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 SR 237 and SR 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 is ongoing.

Metering plans were developed in the opposite direction (northbound) of the I-280 corridor and were finalized in early 2013. A public informational meeting was held in late 2012 and metering for the northbound direction of the I-280 corridor was initiated in early 2013.

Completion of the ramp metering studies is anticipated by Fall 2014.

**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><strong>US 101, Route 87, I-880, and Route 85</strong></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 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Late 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Late 2008</td>
<td>Mid 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Early 2011</td>
<td>Late 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Mid 2010</td>
<td>Late 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I-280 Corridor</strong></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>Late 2011</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>Late 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>Apr-14 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Apr-14 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>2,337</td>
<td>2,281</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**: 2,561

- **Secured Funding Incurred**: 97%
- **Secured Funding Committed**: 99%

**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>

### Ramp Metering Schematic

**Metered Onramp**

**Ramp Metering Hardware Example**
(Typical One Lane On-Ramp)

---

P-0655
US 101 Capitol Expwy – Yerba Buena Interchange

**Estimated Cost:** $30.5 million

This is Phase 2 of a US 101 Improvements Effort; see page 2-23 for Phase 1.

**Appropriation through FY 15:**
$33.7 million

**Secured Funding to Date:** $30.5 million

**Year of Completion:** 2015

**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 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 in August 2012, with construction beginning in September 2012. Construction was completed in March 2014 and a 1-year plant establishment is underway. 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>Early 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open to Traffic</td>
<td>Early 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Establish</td>
<td>Early 2014</td>
<td>Early 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td>Early 2015</td>
<td>Late 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>Apr-14 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Apr-14 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Secured Funding Balance $d = (a-c)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>23,142</td>
<td>21,183</td>
<td>19,930</td>
<td>3,212</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>7,356</td>
<td>6,925</td>
<td>6,826</td>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,523</strong></td>
<td><strong>28,108</strong></td>
<td><strong>26,757</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,766</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Secured Funding Incurred**: 88%
- **Secured Funding Committed**: 92%

**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>$1.57</td>
<td>$1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meas A/STIP Swap</td>
<td>$5.48</td>
<td>$5.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (CMIA)</td>
<td>$22.37</td>
<td>$22.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal - Others</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$30.52</strong></td>
<td><strong>$30.52</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Local**: 23% of Estimated Cost for which funding has been identified
- **State**: 73%
- **Federal**: 4%
**I-880/I-280/Stevens Creek Improvements**

**Estimated Cost:** $63 million
*Estimate Class 1 (see appendix)*

**Appropriation through FY 15:** $66 million

**Secured Funding to Date:** $63 million

**Year of Completion:** 2016

**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 SR 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.
- Constructing direct off-ramp to Monroe Street from southbound I-880.

**Project Status:**
The construction contract was awarded in September 2012. Construction began in October 2012 and is expected to be completed by early 2015.

VTA is administering the construction contract. Construction is progressing.

**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>Apr-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>Apr-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>Apr-14 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Apr-14 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Secured Funding Balance d = (a-c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>42,954</td>
<td>36,874</td>
<td>18,839</td>
<td>24,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>2,360</td>
<td>2,252</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>16,824</td>
<td>14,863</td>
<td>13,982</td>
<td>2,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing Costs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(40)</td>
<td>(40)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>63,022</strong></td>
<td><strong>54,927</strong></td>
<td><strong>35,034</strong></td>
<td><strong>27,948</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred 56%
Secured Funding Committed 87%

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>$1.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meas B/STIP Swap</td>
<td>$1.65</td>
<td>$1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (San Jose)</td>
<td>$1.55</td>
<td>$1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (CMIA)</td>
<td>$39.23</td>
<td>$39.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal (Earmark, STP)</td>
<td>$19.59</td>
<td>$19.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$63.02</strong></td>
<td><strong>$63.02</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Portion of Estimated Cost for which funding has been identified

Aerial Photo of I-880/Stevens Creek

Construction of North Bound I-280 to Stevens Creek Off-ramp
Estimated Cost:

**Initial Study** - $3 million, Estimate Class 1

**SR 237/I-880 Express Connector** - $12 million, Estimate Class 1

**SR 85 Express Lanes** - $170 million, Estimate Class 5

**US 101 Express Lanes** - $425 million, Estimate Class 5

**SR 237 Express Lanes-Phase II Extension** - $20 million, Estimate Class 5

See appendix for description of estimate classes

Appropriation through FY 15: $67 million

Secured Funding to Date: $35 million

Year of Completion Target Opening Year:

- SR 237/I-880 Express Connectors – Open to Traffic 2012
- SR 85 Express Lanes; US 101 Express Lanes; SR 237 Express Lanes-Phase 2 project schedules are dependent upon funding.

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. Encouraging transit and carpools, and allowing solo drivers to pay a fee to access the lanes, will result in 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. 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>Apr-14 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Apr-14 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Secured Funding Balance</th>
<th>d = (a-c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>5,637</td>
<td>5,637</td>
<td>5,637</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>28,822</td>
<td>25,581</td>
<td>21,786</td>
<td>7,036</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations (P-0694 Only)</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35,302</td>
<td>31,887</td>
<td>28,073</td>
<td>7,229</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred 80%
Secured Funding Committed 90%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000’s

Funding (millions):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Initial Study</th>
<th>US 101 Express Lanes</th>
<th>Route 85 Express Lanes</th>
<th>237 I-880 Conn.</th>
<th>Total Identified</th>
<th>Secured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$2.93</td>
<td>$7.86</td>
<td>$1.80</td>
<td>$4.30</td>
<td>$21.45</td>
<td>$21.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>13.85</td>
<td>13.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>417.15</td>
<td>163.41</td>
<td>13.90</td>
<td>594.46</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$2.93</td>
<td>$425.00</td>
<td>$170.00</td>
<td>$20.06</td>
<td>$629.75</td>
<td>$35.30</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, carpool, vanpool, motorcycles, and eligible hybrids can use the Express Lanes at no charge.
Estimated Cost: $11.8 Million, Estimate Class 1
Appropriation through FY 15: $11.8 Million
Secured Funding to Date: $11.8 Million
Year of Completion: 2016
Project Manager: Jane Yu
Designer: PB Americas
System Integrator: Transcore

Project Description:
The SR 237/I-880 Express Connectors project converts the direct carpool lane to carpool lane connector ramps at the SR 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:
Construction was completed and opened to traffic in March 2012. Daily usage and revenue of Express Connector Lanes has been trending upwards during initial operations.

The California Transportation Foundation (CTF) recognized the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority’s SR 237 express lanes as Project of the Year in May 2013. This project has cut trip time for drivers in all lanes and provides a model for self-sustaining congestion pricing on Santa Clara County’s highways.

VTA continues to monitor usage and revenue of the Express Connectors. Contract closeout is anticipated by Summer 2016.

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>
</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>
<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>
<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>
<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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warranty Maintenance</td>
<td>March 2012</td>
<td>March 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Contract</td>
<td>April 2013</td>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Closeout</td>
<td>April 2016</td>
<td>June 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>Apr-14 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Apr-14 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Secured Funding Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>5,637</td>
<td>5,637</td>
<td>5,637</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>5,453</td>
<td>5,434</td>
<td>5,429</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,760</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,740</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,715</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred 100%
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>$4.30</td>
<td>$4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$7.46</td>
<td>$7.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11.76</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11.76</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local 37%
Fed 63%

Portion of Estimated Cost for which funding has been identified

---

SR 237 Express Lane

Project Team at the California Transportation Foundation’s Project of the Year Award Ceremony
Estimated Cost: $170 Million
Estimated Appropriation through FY 15: $12.3 Million
Secured Funding to Date: $6.6 Million
Year of Completion: TBD
Project Manager: Maren Schram
Designer: URS Corporation

Project Description:
This project includes conversion of 24 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 between I-280 and SR 87 to provide added congestion relief and operational benefits to users.

Project Status:
Environmental/Preliminary Engineering: The draft Environmental Document was circulated for public review/comments in December 2013 and ended in February 2014. The completion of Project Approval/Environmental Document (PA/ED) is targeted for late 2014.

Final Design and Electronic Tolling System (ETS) Development: Project will be designed and constructed in multiple phases. The final engineering and ETS development for the northern and southern segments (HOV conversion only) of the SR 85 Express Lanes project are anticipated to begin late 2014 with revenue service targeted for late 2017.

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>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental/PE</td>
<td>Early 2009</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>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design (PS&amp;E)</td>
<td>Late 2014</td>
<td>TBD</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>ETS *</td>
<td>NV 2014</td>
<td>TBD</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>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>Late 2014</td>
<td>TBD</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>Construction</td>
<td>Early 2016</td>
<td>TBD</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>Revenue Service</td>
<td>Late 2017</td>
<td>TBD</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 2021</td>
<td>TBD</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>
</tbody>
</table>

* ETS includes development and implementation

Funding not fully identified, schedule is tentative

Project will be designed and constructed in multiple phases

P-0720
**Cost:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding</th>
<th>Apr-14 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Apr-14 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>6,583</td>
<td>5,870</td>
<td>5,775</td>
<td>808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,590</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,870</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,775</strong></td>
<td><strong>815</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred 88%
Secured Funding Committed 89%

*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>Measure A Swap</td>
<td>$0.65</td>
<td>$0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure B Swap</td>
<td>$1.15</td>
<td>$1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$4.79</td>
<td>$4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$163.41</td>
<td>$163.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$170.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6.59</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*100% Portion of Estimated Cost for which funding has been identified*

---

*Aerial view of SR 85 - US 101 Interchange in South San Jose*
US 101 Express Lanes

Estimated Cost: $425 Million
Estimate Class 5
Appropriation through FY 15: $19.86 Million
Secured Funding to Date: $7.86 Million
Year of Completion: TBD
Project Manager: Lam Trinh
Designer: URS Corporation

Project Description:
The project involves converting 36 miles of the existing high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes along US 101 between Dunne Avenue in Morgan Hill and the San Mateo County line to combined HOV/Express Lanes. The proposed facility will allow single occupancy vehicles to gain access to the combination HOV/Express Lanes by paying a toll. The current recommendation is to implement a combination of single and dual Express Lanes where feasible to provide added congestion relief and operational benefits to users.

Project Status:
Environmental/Preliminary Engineering: Project Study Report-Preliminary Development Study (PSR-PDS) was approved by Caltrans in August 2012. Traffic operation analysis and environmental studies are underway for the PA/ED phase. The circulation of the Draft Environmental Document is targeted for Fall 2014 with final approval anticipated in early 2015.

Final Design and Electronic Tolling System (ETS) Development: Project will be designed and constructed in multiple phases. The final engineering and ETS development for the northern segment (HOV conversion only) of the US101 Express Lanes project are anticipated to begin late 2014 with revenue service targeted for late 2017.

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>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental/PE</td>
<td>Late 2010</td>
<td>Early 2015</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>Design (PS&amp;E)</td>
<td>Late 2014</td>
<td>TBD</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>ETS *</td>
<td>Mid 2014</td>
<td>TBD</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>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>Late 2014</td>
<td>TDB</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>Construction</td>
<td>Early 2016</td>
<td>TDB</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>Revenue Service</td>
<td>Late 2017</td>
<td>TDB</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 2021</td>
<td>TDB</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>
</tbody>
</table>

* ETS includes development and implementation
Project will be designed and constructed in multiple phases

Funding not fully identified, schedule is tentative
Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding</th>
<th>Apr-14 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Apr-14 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>7,823</td>
<td>7,337</td>
<td>6,053</td>
<td>1,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,855</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,337</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,053</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,802</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred 77%
Secured Funding Committed 93%

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>$7.86</td>
<td>$7.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$417.15</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$425.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7.86</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Northern US 101/SR 85 Interchange
Express Lanes Conceptual Rendering
Estimated Cost: $20 Million
Estimate Class 5
Appropriation through FY 15: $20.1 Million
Secured Funding to Date: $6.2 Million
Year of Completion: 2017
Project Manager: Lam Trinh
Designer: Mark Thomas & Company, Inc.

Project Description:
The SR 237 Express Lanes Phase 2 project is an extension of the SR 237/I-880 Express Connectors (Phase 1) project. The project proposes to extend express lanes operations by converting the existing HOV lanes to express lanes, beginning at the current phase 1 project limits and extending to approximately Mathilda Avenue in Sunnyvale. The Project will implement a roadway pricing system to allow for the use of unused capacity in the High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes to provide congestion relief. Access to the available capacity in the HOV lanes would be made available to commuters meeting the carpool requirement and solo commuters for a fee.

Project Status:
Environmental/Preliminary Engineering: Preliminary Engineering and environmental technical studies are ongoing. Environmental approval is targeted for completion in late 2014.

Final Design and Electronic Tolling System (ETS) Development: Final Engineering and ETS development are on-going and expected to be completed by late 2015. Revenue service is targeted for late 2016.

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>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental/PE</td>
<td>Late 2012</td>
<td>Late 2014</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 2014</td>
<td>Late 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETS *</td>
<td>Early 2014</td>
<td>Late 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>Mid 2014</td>
<td>Late 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Late 2015</td>
<td>Late 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Service</td>
<td>Late 2016</td>
<td>Late 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td>Late 2016</td>
<td>Late 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* ETS includes development and implementation
Project will be designed and constructed in multiple phases

Funding not Identified, schedule is tentative
Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding</th>
<th>Apr-14 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Apr-14 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>6,030</td>
<td>4,007</td>
<td>1,596</td>
<td>4,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>6,164</td>
<td>4,007</td>
<td>1,596</td>
<td>4,568</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred 26%
Secured Funding Committed 65%

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>Measure A/Swap</td>
<td>$4.56</td>
<td>$4.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$1.60</td>
<td>$1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$13.90</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20.06</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6.16</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aerial View of SR 237 from Zanker Road to Mathilda Avenue
APPENDIX – COST ESTIMATE CLASSES

Figure 1.6 – 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, Nuria I. Fernandez

FROM: Director of Engineering & Construction, Mark S. Robinson


FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

Please find attached the Semi-Annual Report for the Transit Capital Projects ending March 31, 2014. Highlights for this reporting period (summarized in Exhibit A) include the following accomplishments:

- Design for the FY13 Bus Stop Improvements Project was completed in December 2013. The construction contract was advertised for bids in March 2014 and was awarded at the June 2014 Board meeting.
- Design for the Transit Center Upgrades Phase 2 Project was completed in March 2014. The construction contract was advertised for bids in April 2014 and was awarded at the August 7, 2014 Board meeting.
- Construction work for the Middlefield Utility Relocation contract began in March 2014 and was completed in May 2014.
- The construction contract for the Bridge Repairs and Hamilton Structure Stabilization Project was advertised for bids in January 2014 and was awarded at the April 2014 Board meeting.
- The Signal and Track Improvements construction contract for the Rail Replacement and Rehabilitation Project was awarded to Shimmick Construction at the January 2014 Board meeting.
- The construction contract for the Pedestrian Swing Gates Replacement Project was awarded at the October 2013 Board meeting. Construction work started in December 2013.
- The Cerone Switch Replacement Project completed construction work in March 2014.
The Overhead Catenary System Rehabilitation completed construction work in February 2014.

The goal of these reports is to communicate overall progress in a simple yet informative manner. We look forward to your continued feedback on these reports as VTA’s capital programs move forward.

Prepared By: Suja Prasad, Sr. Cost & Schedule Coordinator
Memo No. 4470
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Key Accomplishment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P 0764: Transit Center Park and Ride Upgrades</td>
<td>Contractor: George Bianchi Construction, Designer: VTA</td>
<td>Approved Budget: $0.59M, Estimated Cost: $0.59M, Fund Source: Local</td>
<td>Construction Completion (Ph1): Nov 2013, Construction Completion (Ph2): Jan 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 0820: Middlefield Utility Relocation</td>
<td>Contractors: Cratus Inc, Designer: VTA</td>
<td>Approved Budget: $0.15M, Estimated Cost: $0.15M, Fund Source: Local</td>
<td>Construction Completion: May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 0670: Rail Replacement &amp; Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Contractors: Stacy &amp; Witbeck Inc./Con-Quest J.V; Shimmick Construction, Designer: Rail Surveyors &amp; Engineers, HMH, VTA</td>
<td>Approved Budget: $20.67M, Estimated Cost: $20.67M, Fund Source: Federal/Local</td>
<td>Construction Completion: December 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 0819: Pedestrian Swing Gates Replacement</td>
<td>Contractor: Giron Construction, Designer: VTA</td>
<td>Approved Budget: $0.57M, Estimated Cost: $0.57M, Fund Source: Local</td>
<td>Construction Completion: August 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 0759: Cerone Switch Replacement</td>
<td>Contractor: Harris Electric, Designer: VTA</td>
<td>Approved Budget: $0.85M, Estimated Cost: $0.85M, Fund Source: Local</td>
<td>Construction Completion: Mar 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 0689: Traction Power Substation (TPSS)</td>
<td>Contractor: Balfour Beatty Rail, Designer: Stantec/Elcon; PGH Wong</td>
<td>Approved Budget: $20.06M, Estimated Cost: $20.06M, Fund Source: Federal, State, Local</td>
<td>Construction Completion (Ph1): Dec 2014, Construction Completion (Ph2): Nov 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>Key Accomplishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P 0707: Overhead Catenary System (OCS) Rehabilitation</strong>&lt;br&gt;Contractor: Balfour Beatty Rail&lt;br&gt;Designer: Parsons Transportation Group</td>
<td>Approved Budget: $10.24M&lt;br&gt;Estimated Cost: $10.24M&lt;br&gt;Fund Source: State</td>
<td>Construction Completion: Feb 2014</td>
<td>Construction of Guadalupe Overhead Catenary System (OCS) Rehabilitation &amp; Replacement project including contact wire, steady arms, section insulators, and under-bridge supports started in January 2013 and was completed in February 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P 0816: Closed-Circuit Television at LR Stations /Tail Tracks</strong>&lt;br&gt;Contractor: Cal Coast Telecom&lt;br&gt;Designer: VTA</td>
<td>Approved Budget: $2.02M&lt;br&gt;Estimated Cost: $2.02M&lt;br&gt;Fund Source: Federal; State; Local</td>
<td>Construction Completion (Ph1): May 2014&lt;br&gt;Construction Completion (Ph2): Jan 2015</td>
<td>Phase 1 of this project was awarded at the October 2013 Board. Construction started in November 2013 and was completed May 2014. Design for phase 2 has been completed and the contract advertised for bids in June 2014. Construction is planned to start in September 2014 and completed by January 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P 0741: SCADA System Hardening</strong>&lt;br&gt;Contractors: General Electric; Advance Digital Solutions&lt;br&gt;Designer: NA</td>
<td>Approved Budget: $4.23M&lt;br&gt;Estimated Cost: $4.23M&lt;br&gt;Fund Source: Federal; State; Local</td>
<td>Construction Completion: Oct 2014</td>
<td>GE work on hardening VTA’s Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) system was completed in March 2014. VTA Operations is currently working on SCADA room reconfiguration, network configuration for ring 1, network support for PA controllers and RTU replacement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND
PROJECT COSTS
SECTION 1.0
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND PROJECT COSTS

A. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Transit Capital Projects are comprised of diverse efforts that include upgrades to passenger facilities, maintenance of public-facing light rail and bus infrastructure, upgrades and improvements of fueling facilities, improvements to system-wide security, and energy efficiency initiatives. The prioritization of projects and the allocation of funding have always focused on advancing the most needed upgrades and repairs, and this Semi-Annual report was conceived to better communicate the scope and progress of these projects.

VTA is maintaining the required capital infrastructure investment while creatively leveraging federal and state revenue sources. This includes using State Proposition 1B funds to provide matching funding for federal rail grants that will pay for rail, substation, and overhead catenary rehabilitation and replacement. In addition, federal and state security funding is utilized to pay for a series of security improvements including closed-circuit television and facility perimeter fencing.

Project activities during the six-month period covered by this progress report include:

- Design for FY13 Bus Stop improvements started in April 2013 and was completed in December 2013. Contract is expected to be awarded to the lowest bidder at the June 2014 Board meeting.
- Design for phase 2 Transit Center Park & Ride started in September 2013 and was completed in March 2014. Contract is expected to be awarded at the August 2014 Board meeting.
- The Middlefield Utility Relocation construction contract started field work in March 2014 and will be completed by May 2014.
- The construction contract for Structural Repair to Light Rail Bridges and Structures was advertised for bids in January 2014 and will be awarded at the April 2014 Board.
- The Rail Rehabilitation contract for rehabilitation/ replacement of existing embedded or ballasted track and crossovers, rail de-stressing, tie replacement, and track signal improvements was awarded at the January 2014 VTA Board meeting to Shimmick Construction Company, the lowest responsible bidder, in the amount of $5,865,000. Project is currently in the submittal review and procurement phase. Major construction is expected to start in Fall 2014.
- Pedestrian Swing Gates Replacement (P-0819) project to replace existing spring-hinge pedestrian swing gates at various locations along VTA's light rail system was awarded to the second lowest bidder GECMS Inc. dba Giron Construction, at the November 2013
Board meeting. Construction started in December 2013 and is expected to be completed in August 2014.

- The replacement of low voltage circuit breakers at the Cerone Bus Maintenance Facility started in August 2013 and was completed in March 2014.

- The Phase 1 of the Traction Power Substation Replacement (TPSS) project is in progress. Foundation construction, underground utility vaults and duct work, and conduits for the feeder distribution are completed. Manufacture of substation equipment is in progress and construction is planned for completion by December 2014. TPSS Replacement Phase 2 which involves procurement and replacement of three TPSS is currently in the manufacturing phase. Field work is expected to start in May 2014 and construction is planned for completion by November 2014.

- Construction of Guadalupe Overhead Catenary System (OCS) Rehabilitation & Replacement project including contact wire, steady arms, section insulators, and under-bridge supports started in January 2013 was completed in February 2014.

- Installation of video surveillance and recording equipment including Closed-Circuit Television (CCTV) cameras, video recorders, and associated hardware at Civic Center, Fair Oaks, Bascom, River Oaks, and Fruitdale LRT Stations was awarded to Radonich Corp. dba Cal Coast Telecom the lowest responsible bidder, in the amount of $1,052,095. This contract also includes CCTV installation at River Oaks Facility and the Great Mall Transit Center. Construction started in November 2013 and is expected to be completed by May 2014.

- Work on hardening VTA’s Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) system by installing new software, servers, networks, firewalls, global positioning system, and supporting SCADA equipment that will replace important outdated software and hardware was completed in March 2014. VTA Operations is currently working on SCADA room reconfiguration, network configuration for ring 1 and network support for the PA controllers and Remote Terminal Unit (RTU) replacement.
B. PROJECT APPROPRIATIONS

Figure 1.1 on Page 1-5 shows the prior and current period appropriations for each group of Facilities Projects. During this period, facilities project appropriations had a net decrease of $0.1 million to a new total of $123.3 million. The net change in appropriations does not include projects closed during the last 6 months. Changes in appropriations during the report period are discussed below:

Changes in Appropriations

1. Passenger Facilities Projects
   The appropriation increased by $0.4 million to a new amount of $3.7 million due to the following:
   a. The authorized budget for the Transit Center Park and Ride Upgrades (P-0764) project increased by $0.4 million as additional local funds were transferred from P-0809. Transit Center Phase 2 design revealed more extensive repairs necessary than what was previously assumed. Hence this transfer from P-0809 which forecasted excess funds was requested and approved.

2. Maintenance of Way Projects
   The appropriation increased by $0.1 million to a new amount of $97.4 million due to the following:
   a. The authorized budget for Update Santa Teresa Interlock Signal House (P-0771) project increased by $1.3 million to a total of $2.16 million as additional funds was transferred from P-0707 Guadalupe OCS Rehabilitation/ Replacement.
   b. The authorized budget for the Vasona Safety Improvements (P-0797) project increased by $71K to a total of $1.24 million as additional local funds was authorized.

3. LRV/ Bus Facilities Projects
   The appropriation decreased by a total of $0.4 million to a new amount of $12.68 million due to the following:
   a. The authorized budget for the Chaboya Paving Rehabilitation (P-0809) project decreased by $0.4 million to a total of $1.8 million as excess local funds were transferred to Transit Center Park and Ride Upgrades (P-0764).

4. Security Projects
   The appropriation decreased by $167K to a new amount of $9.6 million due to the following:
   a. CCTV Surveillance Equipment FY 13 (P-0816) – The authorized budget was decreased by $0.17 million. An under run was estimated for this project and funds were transferred to another CCTV related project (P-0815) under Technology Division.
## Facilities Projects Appropriations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/Category</th>
<th>a Previous Appropriation Through FY14 Sep-13</th>
<th>b Current Appropriation Through FY14 Mar-14</th>
<th>c = (b - a) Changes This Period</th>
<th>d Text Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Passenger Facilities Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Stop/Transit Center/Utility Improvements</td>
<td>$1.8</td>
<td>$2.2</td>
<td>$0.4</td>
<td>1.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade LR Sta Public Address System</td>
<td>$1.5</td>
<td>$1.5</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$3.3</td>
<td>$3.7</td>
<td>$0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance of Way Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Repairs/Hamilton Structure Stabilization</td>
<td>$1.7</td>
<td>$1.7</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Rail Signal/Communications Improvements</td>
<td>$4.4</td>
<td>$5.7</td>
<td>$1.3</td>
<td>2.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe Platforms Retrofit</td>
<td>$26.9</td>
<td>$26.9</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$24.1</td>
<td>$24.1</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Facility Improvements</td>
<td>$5.2</td>
<td>$5.2</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track Intrusion Abatement/Prevention¹</td>
<td>$3.4</td>
<td>$3.5</td>
<td>$0.1</td>
<td>2.b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traction Power/OCS Improvements</td>
<td>$31.6</td>
<td>$30.3</td>
<td>($1.3)</td>
<td>2.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$97.3</td>
<td>$97.4</td>
<td>$0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LRV/Bus Facilities Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Rail Maintenance Facility Upgrades</td>
<td>$6.6</td>
<td>$6.6</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Maintenance Facility Upgrades</td>
<td>$4.9</td>
<td>$4.5</td>
<td>($0.4)</td>
<td>3.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Facilities Upgrades</td>
<td>$1.6</td>
<td>$1.6</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$13.1</td>
<td>$12.7</td>
<td>($0.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Security Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCTV Projects¹</td>
<td>$3.8</td>
<td>$3.6</td>
<td>($0.2)</td>
<td>4.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR Signal/Communications Improvements</td>
<td>$4.2</td>
<td>$4.2</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Safety Improvements</td>
<td>$1.7</td>
<td>$1.7</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$9.7</td>
<td>$9.5</td>
<td>($0.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$123.4</td>
<td>$123.3</td>
<td>($0.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Appropriation for previous period does not include projects closed during this period (P-0666 and P-0751)
C. INCURRED COSTS

Figure 1.2 below shows incurred costs for the Facilities Projects at the beginning and end of the period as well as the percent of the project appropriation incurred as of March 31, 2014.

Figure 1.2
Facilities Projects Incurred Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/Category</th>
<th>a Incurred Costs Through Sep-13</th>
<th>b Incurred Costs Through Mar-14</th>
<th>c = (b - a) Incurred Costs This Period</th>
<th>d Percent of Appropriation Incurred Through Mar-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Passenger Facilities Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Stop Improvements</td>
<td>$0.5</td>
<td>$0.9</td>
<td>$0.4</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade LR Sta Public Address System</td>
<td>$1.3</td>
<td>$1.3</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1.8</td>
<td>$2.2</td>
<td>$0.4</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Maintenance of Way Projects**                                                                                       |
| Bridge Repairs/Hamilton Structure Stabilization                  | $0.2                            | $0.3                            | $0.1                                   | 17.6%                                           |
| Lt. Rail Signal/Communications Improvements                     | $0.2                            | $0.2                            | $0.0                                   | 3.5%                                            |
| Guadalupe Platforms Retrofit                                    | $26.6                           | $26.7                           | $0.1                                   | 99.3%                                           |
| Rail Rehabilitation                                              | $4.8                            | $5.1                            | $0.2                                   | 21.2%                                           |
| Green Facility Improvements                                      | $3.4                            | $3.6                            | $0.2                                   | 69.2%                                           |
| Track Intrusion Abatement/Prevention¹                          | $2.6                            | $3.0                            | $0.3                                   | 85.7%                                           |
| Traction Power/OCS Improvements                                  | $4.3                            | $8.5                            | $4.2                                   | 28.1%                                           |
| Total                                                           | $42.1                           | $47.4                           | $5.0                                   | 49%                                             |

| **LRV/Bus Facilities Projects**                                                                                       |
| Light Rail Maintenance Facility Upgrades                         | $0.1                            | $0.2                            | $0.1                                   | 3.0%                                            |
| Bus Maintenance Facility Upgrades                                | $0.3                            | $2.2                            | $1.9                                   | 48.9%                                           |
| Other Facilities Upgrades                                       | $0.1                            | $0.2                            | $0.1                                   | 13%                                             |
| Total                                                           | $0.5                            | $2.6                            | $2.1                                   | 20%                                             |

| **Security Projects**                                            |
| CCTV Projects¹                                                   | $0.2                            | $1.5                            | $1.3                                   | 41.7%                                           |
| LR Signal/Communications Improvements                            | $2.4                            | $3.5                            | $1.1                                   | 83.3%                                           |
| Passenger Safety Improvements                                    | $0.1                            | $0.1                            | $0.1                                   | 5.9%                                            |
| Total                                                           | $2.7                            | $5.1                            | $2.5                                   | 54%                                             |

| **GRAND TOTAL**                                                   | $47.1                           | $57.3                           | $10.0                                  | 46.5%                                           |

¹ Incurred cost through Mar-14 does not include projects closed during this period (P-0666 and P-0751)
SECTION 2.0

PROJECT SUMMARY REPORTS
TRANSIT CAPITAL PROJECTS SUMMARY REPORTS

A. PASSENGER FACILITIES PROJECTS
   1. Bus Stop/Transit Center Improvements
   2. Upgrade LR Stations Public Address System

B. MAINTENANCE OF WAY PROJECTS
   1. Bridge Repairs and Hamilton Structure Stabilization
   2. LR Signal/Communications Improvements
   3. Guadalupe Platforms Retrofit – South Line
   4. Rail Rehabilitation
   5. Green Facility Improvements
   6. Track Intrusion Abatement/Prevention
   7. Traction Power Improvements

C. LRV/BUS FACILITIES PROJECTS
   1. Light Rail Maintenance Facilities Upgrades
   2. Bus Maintenance Facilities Upgrades
   3. Other Facilities Upgrades

D. SECURITY PROJECTS
   1. CCTV Projects
   2. LR Systems Security Improvements
   3. Passenger Safety Improvements
Passenger Facilities Projects

Bus Stop/Transit Center Improvements

Estimated Cost: $2.18 million

Approved Budget: $2.18 million

Year of Completion: 2015

Project Managers: Jing Quan, Sal Lanzo

Designers: VTA

Contractors:
FY12 Bus Stop – Rosas Brothers Construction
Transit Centers, P&R’s - George Bianchi Construction
Middlefield Utility Relocation- Cratus Inc

Project Description:
This is part of an annual program to identify, repair and upgrade bus stops. The scope of the upgrades includes concrete bus pads along roadways, pedestrian access improvements and repair of elements of transit center/park and ride lots. In addition, accessibility improvements will be made to enable wheelchair use of the bus stops and to provide appropriate access clearances.

Bus Stop Improvements (P-0781) FY12 covered the cities of Mountain View, Cupertino, Santa Clara, Milpitas and San Jose. FY13 improvements will cover additional bus stops in Mountain View, Santa Clara, San Jose and Gilroy. The Transit Center Park & Ride Upgrades (P-0764) Phase 1 project provided refurbishment/repair of elements of Blossom Hill Transit Center and Roeder Road/Grey Ghost Ave. bus stop. Phase 2 will cover Palo Alto, Great Mall and Tamien Transit Centers.

The Middlefield Utility Relocation (P-0820) involves relocating two utility lines along the pedestrian path from Logue Avenue to Middlefield LRT Station in Mountain View.

Project Status:

Bus Stop Improvements – FY12 construction was completed in June 2013 and contract was closed out at $237,548, 5.6% over the bid amount. Design for FY13 Bus Stop improvements started in April 2013 and was completed in December 2013. Contract was advertised for bids in March 2014 after the award of the FY13/14 Federal grant. Contract is expected to be awarded at the June 2014 Board meeting.

The Transit Center Park & Ride Upgrades phase 1 construction package was completed in November 2013 and contract was closed out at $169,931, 10.0% over the bid amount. Design for phase 2 started in September 2013 and was completed in March 2014. Contract was advertised for bids in April 2014, and is expected to be awarded at the August 2014 Board meeting.

The Middlefield Utility Relocation contract was awarded at the February 2014 Board meeting. Construction started in March 2014 and is expected to be complete by May 2014.

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>P-0781FY12 Bus Stop Imp.</td>
<td>Jan-12</td>
<td>Oct-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-0781FY13 Bus Stop Imp.</td>
<td>Apr-13</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-0764 Ph1 Transit Ctr Upgrades</td>
<td>Oct-12</td>
<td>Mar-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-0764 Ph2 Transit Ctr Upgrades</td>
<td>Sep-13</td>
<td>Mar-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-0820 Middlefield Utility Relo.</td>
<td>Nov-12</td>
<td>Jul-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P-0764, P-0781, P-0820
## Approved Budget:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Approved Project Budget $a$</th>
<th>Mar-14 Committed Costs $b$</th>
<th>Mar-14 Incurred Costs $c$</th>
<th>Budget Balance $d = (a-c)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>1,056</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,180</td>
<td>1,598</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>1,274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved Budget Incurred 42%
Approved Budget Committed 73%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

## Approved Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>P-0781</th>
<th>P-0764</th>
<th>P-0820</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$0.84</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.84 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$0.21</td>
<td>$0.99</td>
<td>$0.15</td>
<td>$1.34 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$1.05</td>
<td>$0.99</td>
<td>$0.15</td>
<td>$2.18 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local 38%
Federal 62%
Upgrade LR Stations Public Address System

**Estimated Cost:** $1.3 million  
**Approved Budget:** $1.3 million  
**Year of Completion:** 2014  
**Project Manager:** Jane Yu  
**Designer:** SBTA / Lamoreaux McLendon  
**Contractor:** HSQ Technology

**Project Description:**

The project consists of Public Address (PA) system modifications to 15 North Line Stations, from Old Ironsides Station in the north to Japantown/Ayer Station in the south, as well as the Convention Center Station.

This contract upgraded the PA system by replacing existing amplifiers, speakers, associated PA hardware, maintenance telephone system and wiring. The separate Real Time Information (RTI) project was planned to provide the software functionality to complete the enhanced information system, including separate messaging to center and split platforms, with accurate and reliable real-time transit information.

**Project Status:**

Construction of the PA Upgrades contract was completed in July 2010. The construction contract provided fundamental physical infrastructure improvements to the North Line light rail stations to facilitate audible messages at split platforms. However, to complete the system and allow the split platform messaging, some additional software modifications are required to the existing communications system. Originally, it was thought that the solution would be provided with communications software refinement as part of a separate RTI project. However, due to the RTI project delays, the outstanding scope will be completed through a sole source contract with GE Transportation Systems (GETS) (the contractor who designed and installed the existing communications system). The GETS contract was approved by VTA Board in May 2013, contract is in place and work orders are being negotiated for the various locations. Hence this project was closed out in March 2014 and remaining funds transferred to P-0689 Traction Power Substation for GETS software modification and systems integration.

**Project Schedule:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Jun-08</td>
<td>Aug-09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Phase 1</td>
<td>Aug-09</td>
<td>Jul-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Closeout</td>
<td>Aug-09</td>
<td>Mar-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: Design/Bid, Construction, Closeout
## Approved Budget:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Approved Project Budget $</th>
<th>Mar-14 Committed Costs $</th>
<th>Mar-14 Incurred Costs $</th>
<th>Budget Balance $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>491</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>812</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,302</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,302</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,302</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved Budget Incurred 100%
Approved Budget Committed 100%

**NOTE:** All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

## Approved Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$1.04 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$0.26 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$1.30 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Race Station PA Speakers on Visual Message Board Pole](image1)

![Winchester Station PA Speakers on an Overhead Power Pole](image2)
Bridge Repairs and Hamilton Structure Stabilization

Estimated Cost: $1.7 million
Approved Budget: $1.7 million
Year of Completion: 2016
Project Manager: Sal Lanzo
Designer: Nolte Associates Inc.
Contractor: George Bianchi Construction

Project Description:
In accordance with California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) requirements, VTA completed an inspection of all light rail bridges and structures. The inspection findings indicate that a number of structures show defects that either need further investigation or require corrective actions.

This project funds a consultant to address further detailed investigation in those areas required and take corrective actions for those items that have an immediate need to be addressed. This project also includes additional stabilization measures for the Hamilton structure and repair of cracks in various other structures.

Project Status:
The construction contract for structural repair to light rail bridges and structures was advertised for bids in January 2014 and awarded at the April 2014 Board. Construction work started in April 2014 and will be completed end September 2014. The design scope for the Hamilton structure is dependent on the engineers assessment of the mechanically stabilized earth (MSE) walls that was done to address the stability issues previously. This is currently planned for April 2015 after exposure to rain in winter.

Project Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Jan-13</td>
<td>Sep-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Apr-14</td>
<td>Apr-16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td>May-16</td>
<td>Jul-16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P-0761
## Approved Budget:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Approved Project Budget</th>
<th>Mar-14 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Mar-14 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Budget Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>1,011</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,250</strong></td>
<td><strong>345</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,355</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved Budget Incurred 20%
Approved Budget Committed 74%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

## Approved Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$1.36 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$0.34 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1.70 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Federal 80%
Local 20%

Hamilton Station

Hamilton Elevated Guideway
LR Signal/Communications Improvements

Estimated Cost: $5.7 million
Approved Budget: $5.7 million
Year of Completion: 2015
Project Manager: Ramesh Dhingra
Designer: PGH Wong
Contractor: Harris Electric; Shimmick

Project Description:
The **Light Rail Signal Assessments/SCADA** project (P-0762) will provide an assessment of the condition of the overall VTA Light Rail Signal System and its ability to accommodate future planned light rail operating scenarios, and to develop life-cycle replacement guidelines and cost estimates for the rehabilitation of the Guadalupe Corridor signalization system. In addition, this project will also provide initial engineering of the signal rehabilitation and light rail Supervisory Control And Data Acquisition (SCADA) system replacement planned for 2014. Approved budget will cover assessment and preliminary engineering. Additional funds required for final engineering and construction will be requested after preliminary engineering.

The **Santa Teresa Interlock** project (P-0771) includes the rehabilitation and updating of the Santa Teresa Interlock System from the current relay system to an advanced Vital Logic Controller system with associated advanced monitoring and diagnostics.

**Project Status:**
Preliminary assessment/design for the **Light Rail Signal Assessments/SCADA** project is anticipated to begin in mid 2014. The **Santa Teresa Interlock** work was included in the rail rehabilitation contract that was awarded at the January 2014 Board. Construction submittal preparations are in progress and field work is expected to begin in summer 2014.

**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>P-0762 LR Signal/SCADA</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-0771 Santa Teresa Interlock</td>
<td>Nov-12</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Approved Budget:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Approved Project Budget</th>
<th>Mar-14 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Mar-14 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Budget Balance (d = (a-c))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>3,956</td>
<td>1,615</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>1,538</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>1,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,660</td>
<td>1,878</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>5,484</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved Budget Incurred 3%
Approved Budget Committed 33%

*NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000’s*

### Approved Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>P-0762</th>
<th>P-0771</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$2.80</td>
<td>$1.73</td>
<td>$4.53 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$0.70</td>
<td>$0.43</td>
<td>$1.13 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$3.50</td>
<td>$2.16</td>
<td>$5.66 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Federal 80% Local 20%*

Cerone main panel

Existing Santa Teresa interlock components
Guadalupe Platforms Retrofit – South Line

Estimated Cost: $26.9 million
Approved Budget: $26.9 million
Year of Completion:
Platforms: 2009
Elevators/Escalators: 2014

Project Managers:
Ehsan Ilyas, John O’Brien

Designer: Nolte Associates
Contractor:
Platforms: Robert A. Bothman
Elevators/Escalators: KONE Elevator and Escalator

Project Description:
The South Line Platforms Retrofit project retrofitted station platforms located on the Guadalupe line from Children’s Discovery Museum south to Santa Teresa and Almaden Stations. This project also provided upgrades to the public address system, shelter lighting, furnishings and landscaping.

The second phase of the Platform Retrofit program involved retrofitting and rehabilitating all elevators and escalators located on the South Line stations and Snell Park and Ride. Elevators and escalators had reached the end of their useful life, and require major retrofit and code upgrades. The South Line Elevator and Escalator Project provided all elevator cabs with new stainless steel walls, ceiling and sill, lighting, flooring, controls, speakers and emergency communications, and closed circuit television for increased passenger safety and security. The scope of work for the escalators included updating the step chains, handrails, skirt panels, and replacing emergency shutdown switches and controllers. This project provides full compliance with ADA requirements.

Project Status:
With the completion of the South Line Platforms Retrofit project, VTA’s 42-mile light rail system and 62 stations are fully accessible with level boarding at all doors for all passengers. All South Line stations were returned to service in November 2008, with contract closeout completed in June 2009. The construction contract cost at close-out was $14,210,909, 6% over the bid amount.

The Elevator and Escalator construction contract was closed out in March 2014. The construction contract cost at close-out was $4,427,821, 4.3% over the bid amount.

Project Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td>Mar-14</td>
<td>Sep-14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Approved Budget:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Approved Project Budget ((a))</th>
<th>Mar-14 Committed Costs ((b))</th>
<th>Mar-14 Incurred Costs ((c))</th>
<th>Budget Balance ((d = (a-c)))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>21,226</td>
<td>21,098</td>
<td>21,098</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>5,630</td>
<td>5,565</td>
<td>5,565</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>26,895</strong></td>
<td><strong>26,663</strong></td>
<td><strong>26,663</strong></td>
<td><strong>232</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved Budget Incurred 99%
Approved Budget Committed 99%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

## Approved Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$18.42 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$8.47 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$26.89 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local 31%
Federal 69%

---

Skirt Replacement Work in progress

Virginia Station Elevator Retrofit
Rail Rehabilitation

Estimated Cost: $21.4 million
Approved Budget: $21.4 million
Year of Completion: 2017
Project Manager: Mohamed Basma
Designers: Rail Surveyors & Engineers, HMH, VTA
Contractors: Stacy & Witbeck, Inc./Con-Quest J.V., H&H Engineering; Shimmick Construction

Project Description:
The Rail Rehabilitation project addresses various track issues throughout the VTA Light Rail System. Work includes rehabilitation or replacement of existing embedded or ballasted track and crossovers, rail de-stressing, tie replacement, and track signal improvements. Rail rehabilitation scope and priorities are based on the Track Assessment Study and VTA Operations input.

Project Status:
Work Completed: Four construction contracts have been completed under this project: Almaden/Market Rail Rehabilitation, Hardwood Spur Removal, Rio Robles Destressing and Tasman/Lick Mill Track Rehabilitation.

Work in Progress: The following scope will be executed under one contract that was awarded at the January 2014 VTA Board meeting:
- Broken Rail and Concrete at various locations on First St (P-0670)
- Broken Panels at various locations (P-0670)
- Clayton Crossover replacement (P-0670)
- Turnouts 59 and 61 repair (P-0670)
- Santa Teresa interlocking (P-0771)

Upcoming Work: Crossovers for Younger Half Grand (P-0670) - Request for Proposal (RFP) for design services for Younger Half-Grand & two new Crossovers on the Guadalupe Line was issued in April 2014. Design is anticipated to start in September 2014. This RFP will also cover the design scope of P-0757, LRT Crossovers and Switches. P-0757 includes the design and construction of additional crossovers and associated power switches along the Guadalupe Corridor (located near the Karina and Bonaventura light rail stations). Construction is currently planned to start in early 2016 and is dependent on award of federal grant.

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>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-0670 Rail Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Jan-09</td>
<td>Dec-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-0757 LRT Crossovers/ Switches</td>
<td>Apr-14</td>
<td>Dec-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: Design/Bid, Construction, Closeout
Approved Budget:

| Project Cost Element          | Approved Project Budget | Mar-14 Committed Costs | Mar-14 Incurred Costs | Budget Balance 
|------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------
| Construction and Major Procurement | 8,542                   | 5,663                  | 1,952                 | 6,590             |
| Real Estate                  | -                       | -                      | -                     | -                 |
| Labor, Services and Support  | 5,019                   | 3,944                  | 3,099                 | 1,920             |
| Contingency                  | 651                     | -                      | -                     | 651               |
| To be secured/categorized    | 7,186                   | -                      | -                     | 7,186             |
| Total                        | 21,398                  | 9,607                  | 5,051                 | 9,161             |

Approved Budget Incurred 24%
Approved Budget Committed 45%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's. Approved budget includes $7.2 mil of unsecured budget.

Approved Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>P-0670</th>
<th>P-0757</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$16.03</td>
<td>$0.58</td>
<td>$16.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>$1.47</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$3.18</td>
<td>$0.14</td>
<td>$3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$20.67</td>
<td>$0.72</td>
<td>$21.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* includes $7.2 million Federal and local match that is yet to be awarded

Tasman/Lick Mill Track Rehabilitation – Tampering Ballast
Tasman/Lick Mill Track Rehabilitation – Wood Tie Replacement
Estimated Cost:  
$5.2 million

Approved Budget:  
$5.2 million

Year of Completion:  
2014

Project Manager:  
Tom Fitzwater  
Mark Mahaffey

Designers / Contractors:  
Various

Project Description
The VTA Board of Directors created the Green Facility Improvement Program to proactively reduce the consumption of natural resources, the creation of greenhouse gases, and the generation of pollution in the provision of public transportation services.

Project Status:
The Environmental Management System (EMS) Core team has successfully completed the FTA Environmental & Sustainability Management Institute for the 14001 International Standard. There are seventeen elements that make up the standard. These elements include establishing an environmental policy, assigning roles and responsibilities, identifying legal and other requirements, analyzing environmental aspects, and implementing a document control procedure, just to name a few. The EMS was introduced to the Cerone division at Earth Day in April 2014. The EMS Core team is working with the Maintenance staff at the Cerone division to accomplish the objectives, targets and programs for the four environmental aspects that have been identified.

Since December 2013, VTA and Energy Cap/UMC have been working on setting up a utility management system to enable VTA to track utility usage and cost more effectively, and to identify abnormal electrical, natural gas, water, and solid waste usage so corrective actions can be taken. The system will also result in efficiencies in the processing of utility bills for payment with an electronic interface between the utility management system and VTA’s accounting system.

VTA continues to install LED fixtures at our light rail stations with Ayer done; Children’s Discovery Museum, and Gish in progress; and Tasman, River Oaks, Orchard, Bonaventura, Component, Karina, and Metro/Airport next in line. Other projects that are in the pipeline are single-unit solar trash compactors at the Great Mall Transit Center, carsharing program at select park-and-ride lots, and a printing optimization project to reduce paper use.

Project Schedule:
VTA’s Sustainability Program Team continues to meet on a bi-monthly basis to discuss initiatives. The following milestones are anticipated for the projects described above:

Utility Management System goes live in July 2014
EMS Gap Audit in September 2014
Approved Budget:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Approved Project Budget a</th>
<th>Mar-14 Committed Costs b</th>
<th>Mar-14 Incurred Costs c</th>
<th>Budget Balance d = (a-c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>1,273</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>1,586</td>
<td>1,347</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>2,333</td>
<td>2,016</td>
<td>1,869</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(161)</td>
<td>(161)</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,096</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,626</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,574</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved Budget Incurred 70%
Approved Budget Committed 79%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

Approved Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$5.20 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5.20 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local 100%

UMSS Screenshot

The Four Significant Aspects

EMS Significant Aspects
Track Intrusion Abatement/Prevention

**Estimated Cost:** $3.5 million

**Approved Budget:** $3.5 million

**Year of Completion:** 2014

**Project Manager:** Jagdish Dadhania, Jing Quan

**Designer:** VTA

**Contractor:** George Bianchi Construction Inc. (P-0681; P-0797); Giron Construction (P-0819)

**Project Description:**
This project implements various safety measures and strategies to reduce left-hand turn and track intrusion incidents on the existing Light Rail System. Various contracts are programmed that will include replacement of existing train approaching signs with new active no left turn/train approaching alternating signs, reconstructing existing traffic loops and striping and replacing existing pedestrian gates with new safer and reliable gates. Contracts will also include fencing, installing warning signs, pavement markings and reflective markers.

**Project Status:**

**Additional Track Intrusion Abatement Between-Car-Barrier (BCB) (P-0681)** on the station platform edges at LRT stations are designed to prevent visually impaired passengers from entering the trackway between stopped light rail vehicles. Contract was awarded in January 2013. Construction was completed in September 2013. The construction contract cost at close-out was $1,028,038, 15% over the bid amount.

**Light Rail Safety Enhancements (P-0797)** started installation work in July and was completed in October 2013. The construction contract cost at close-out was $154,399.04, 2.5% over the bid amount.

**Pedestrian Swing Gates Replacement (P-0819)** This project to replace existing spring-hinge pedestrian swing gates at various locations along VTA's light rail system was advertised for bids in August 2013 and awarded at the November 2013 Board meeting. Construction started in December 2013 and is expected to be completed in August 2014. Unforeseen site conditions necessitated additional work with cost impact. Remaining scope is being reviewed to prioritize locations and complete contract within the authorized value.

**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>P-0666 Rail Intrusion Abatement</td>
<td>Jul-09</td>
<td>Jul-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-0681 Additional Abatement (BCB)</td>
<td>Oct-11</td>
<td>Dec-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-0797 Vasona Gate Crossing</td>
<td>Apr-09</td>
<td>Sep-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-0797 LR Safety Enhancement</td>
<td>Mar-12</td>
<td>Dec-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-0819 Ped. Swing Gates Replace</td>
<td>Jan-13</td>
<td>Nov-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Design/Bid  Construction  Closeout
## Approved Budget:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Approved Project Budget ( a )</th>
<th>Mar-14 Committed Costs ( b )</th>
<th>Mar-14 Incurred Costs ( c )</th>
<th>Budget Balance ( d = (a-c) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td>1,779</td>
<td>1,401</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>1,647</td>
<td>1,574</td>
<td>1,567</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,514</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,353</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,968</strong></td>
<td><strong>546</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved Budget Incurred: 84%
Approved Budget Committed: 95%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

P-0666 closed/removed March 2014

## Approved Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>P-0681</th>
<th>P-0797</th>
<th>P-0819</th>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$1.70</td>
<td>$1.24</td>
<td>$0.57</td>
<td>$3.51 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1.70</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1.24</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.57</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3.51 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local 100%
**Maintenance of Way Projects**

**Traction Power Improvements**

**March 2014**

**Estimated Cost:** $30.49 million

**Approved Budget:** $30.49 million

**Year of Completion:** 2015

**Project Manager:** Ramesh Dhingra

**Designer:** PGH Wong Engineering Inc, Stantec/Elcon, Parsons Transportation Group

**Contractor:** TPSS Rehab - Bleyco Inc. TPSS and OCS Replacement - Balfour Beatty Rail

**Project Description:**

A program of phased upgrades and retrofits to the traction power system was identified in the Traction Power and Overhead Contact System assessment report. VTA is implementing the following portions of the recommendations:

- Design rehabilitation for Traction Power Substation (TPSS) components (DC switches, transfer trip, etc.) for all Guadalupe substations
- Procure material for replacement of cable and TPSS components at the Younger yard
- Design replacement of entire substations at priority locations on the Guadalupe line
- Procure and replace a portion of the priority substations
- Rehabilitation/Replacement of worn Overhead Contact System (OCS) components at various locations

**Project Status:**

**TPSS Replacement Phase 1** (P-0689): Phase 1 of this project for the procurement and installation of new substations to replace TPSS-03, 04, and install new 15A, was awarded to Balfour Beatty Rail in January 2013. Preconstruction work including submittals and manufacturing is ongoing and on site construction is planned for August 2014 and is planned for completion by Dec 2014.

**TPSS Replacement Phase 2** (P-0689): which involves procurement and replacement of TPSS-01, TPSS-05 and TPSS-14 was advertised for bids in April 2013 and was awarded to Balfour Beatty Rail at the August 2013 Board. Manufacturing is in progress and field construction is expected to start in May 2014 and completed by November 2014.

**OCS Rehabilitation/Replacement** (P-0707): The contract was advertised for bid in August 2012 and awarded to Balfour Beatty Rail in December 2012. Construction work began in January 2013 and was completed in February 2014. The construction contract cost at close-out was $2,480,633, 9.6% under the bid amount.

**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>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-0689 TPSS Phase 1</td>
<td>Mar-10</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-0689 TPSS Phase 2</td>
<td>Dec-12</td>
<td>Feb-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-0707 Guadalupe OCS Rehab/Replace</td>
<td>Jul-10</td>
<td>May-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Design/Bid | Construction | Closeout]
## Approved Budget:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Approved Project Budget</th>
<th>Mar-14 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Mar-14 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Budget Balance d = (a-c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>18,073</td>
<td>12,572</td>
<td>4,953</td>
<td>13,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>6,704</td>
<td>4,940</td>
<td>3,536</td>
<td>3,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be secured/categorized</td>
<td>5,700</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,499</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,511</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,489</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,011</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved Budget Incurred: 28%
Approved Budget Committed: 57%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's. Approved budget includes $5.7 mil of unsecured budget.

## Approved Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>P-0689</th>
<th>P-0707</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$13.55</td>
<td>$7.96</td>
<td>$21.51 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>$1.47</td>
<td>$1.15</td>
<td>$2.62 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$5.23</td>
<td>$1.13</td>
<td>$6.36 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20.25</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10.24</strong></td>
<td><strong>$30.49 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* includes $5.7 million Federal and local match that is yet to be awarded

Federal: 70%
State: 9%
Local: 21%

### TPSS #1 New DC Switchgear

### OCS Pocket Track cross-span replacement
Estimated Cost: $6.6 million
Approved Budget: $6.6 million
Year of Completion: 2014
Project Managers: John O’Brien
Designer: VTA, URS
Contractor: TBD

Project Description:
This program includes various maintenance and rehabilitation projects for the Guadalupe Light Rail Division.

The **LRV Body Shop – Dust Separation Wall** project (P-0776) will provide a new wall that separates the body repair and paint preparation bays from surrounding shop spaces at the Guadalupe Division Light Rail Vehicle (LRV) Maintenance Facility (Bldg. "A"). This wall will prevent dust and grit created by sanding and grinding activities from entering adjacent component rebuild spaces.

The **LRV Maintenance Shop Hoist** project (P-0777) will add a shallow pit in-ground hoist system to Track #5 at the Guadalupe Division Light Rail Vehicle (LRV) Maintenance Facility (Bldg. "A"). The new in-ground hoist will support truck change out, and will supplement the existing in-ground hoist system on Track #8 used for running repairs.

The **Replacement Wheel Truing Machine** project (P-0839) will replace the existing Hegenscheidt wheel truing machine located on Track #5 at the Guadalupe Division Light Rail Vehicle (LRV) Maintenance Facility (Bldg. "A"). Wheel truing is required to maintain proper wheel profiles on the light rail vehicles. The existing Hegenscheidt was installed in 1989 and has an equipment life of 25 years, thus requiring replacement or overhaul.

**Project Status:**
**LRV Body Shop Dust Separation Wall** project requires coordination with the **LRV Maintenance Shop Hoist** project, as both projects will result in construction occurring along Tracks #4 and #5. A Task Order for assessment services to jointly address both projects was awarded to URS in December 2013. The final Basis of Design report, completed by URS in June 2014, is under management review.

The project program and constraints for the **Replacement Wheel Truing Machine** are still under review. An RFP for design services is forthcoming.

**Project Schedule:**
The project program and constraints are still being evaluated and detailed schedules are yet to be developed. The in-ground hoist will require a lead-time of 9 to 12 months for shop drawing preparation, approvals, fabrication and delivery.
**Approved Budget:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Approved Project Budget</th>
<th>Mar-14 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Mar-14 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Budget Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>2,675</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>2,832</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>2,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>1,075</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,582</strong></td>
<td><strong>370</strong></td>
<td><strong>201</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,381</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

**Approved Funding:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>P-0776</th>
<th>P-0777</th>
<th>P-0839</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$0.44</td>
<td>$2.75</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$3.19 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$0.11</td>
<td>$0.69</td>
<td>$2.60</td>
<td>$3.40 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.55</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3.44</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2.60</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6.58 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local 52%  
Federal 48%

**Location of Proposed LRV Body Shop Separation Wall**  
**Location of Proposed Hoist in LRV Body Shop**
LRV/Bus Facilities Upgrades

Bus Maintenance Facilities Upgrades

Estimated Cost: $4.5 million
Approved Budget: $4.5 million
Year of Completion: 2016
Project Managers: Bob Magliocco
Sal Lanzo, John O’Brien
Designer: PGH Wong, VTA
Contractor: Harris Electric, O’Grady Paving Inc

Project Description:
The Cerone Core Switch Replacement project (P-0759) replaces the electrical switchgear and sub-panels at the Cerone Bus Operating Division. The existing electrical switchgear and original sub-panel are obsolete, and finding replacement parts or a vendor willing to make repairs has been difficult.

The Chaboya Paving Rehabilitation project (P-0809) will provide necessary pavement rehabilitation for bus parking area at Chaboya Division. Scope includes removal of asphalt in areas where existing pavement is deficient.

The Cerone Propane Tank Replacement project (P-0844) will replace the existing 30,000 gallon LPG Aboveground Storage Tank (AST) and vaporizer assembly, and provide safety enhancements consistent with current, regulatory requirements. Existing tank was installed in 1978, and is in need of replacement. Propane is the fuel source for the majority of non-electrical energy needs at Cerone Division.

The Cerone Boiler Replacement project (P-0849) will replace existing propane fueled boilers that are approximately 30 years old. Boilers provide hot water heating needs for Cerone Division.

The Cerone Emergency Generator Replacement project (P-0852) will replace the existing propane fueled generators with a new diesel generator system. A vaulted tank and piping will be installed to allow tie-in to existing diesel Underground Storage Tanks (UST) serving bus fueling operations.

Project Status:
PGH Wong completed the assessment and design for the Cerone Core Switch replacement and/or repairs. The single bid that was received in January 2013 was considerably higher than the engineer’s estimate hence the bid was cancelled and rebid in June 2013. The Contract was awarded to Harris Electric. Field work started in August 2013 and was completed in March 2014.

The Chaboya Paving Rehabilitation contract was awarded at the August 2013 Board meeting and construction started in October 2013 and was completed in January 2014. The construction contract cost at closeout was $1,159,842, 5.7% over the bid amount.

For the work at Cerone, Propane Tank Replacement, Boiler Replacement and Emergency Generator Replacement, selection of design consultants and initiation of engineering work to begin in fall 2014. Construction to begin in mid 2015.

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>P-0759 Cerone Switch Replacement</td>
<td>Mar-12</td>
<td>May-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-0809 Chaboya Paving Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Jul-12</td>
<td>Mar-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-0844 Cerone Propane Tank Replacement</td>
<td>Apr-14</td>
<td>Dec-16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-0849 Cerone Boiler Replacement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-0852 Cerone Emergency Replacement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P-0759, P-0809, P-0844, P-0849, P-0852
### Approved Budget:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Approved Project Budget $a$</th>
<th>Mar-14 Committed Costs $b$</th>
<th>Mar-14 Incurred Costs $c$</th>
<th>Budget Balance $d = (a-c)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>2,965</td>
<td>1,674</td>
<td>1,601</td>
<td>1,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>1,274</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,487</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,354</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,241</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,246</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved Budget Incurred 50%
Approved Budget Committed 52%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

### Approved Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>P-0759</th>
<th>P-0844</th>
<th>P-0849</th>
<th>P-0809</th>
<th>P-0852</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>$4.49 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.85</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.35</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.30</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.78</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.20</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4.49 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deep Lift Paving Operations as Part of the Pavement Rehabilitation Work at Chaboya Division

Energy Building Boiler Flumes at Cerone Division
Other Facilities Upgrades

Estimated Cost: $1.6 million
Approved Budget: $1.6 million
Year of Completion: 2015
Project Manager: John O’Brien, Bob Magliocco
Designer: FMG Architects, VTA
Contractor: CCS Presentation Systems

Project Description:
The Auditorium Improvements project (P-0780) upgrades existing facilities at the VTA River Oaks Campus, including the auditorium to accommodate future VTA committee and public meetings.

The GFCI (switchgear) Testing & Replacement project (P-0750) will test and replace all major circuit breakers and ground fault circuits for switch gear under simulated operating conditions to assure safe and reliable operation at North, Cerone, Chaboya, Guadalupe and River Oaks.

The LED (Light Emitting Diode) Exterior Lighting Replacement project (P-0840) will provide new LED light fixtures to replace aging exterior fixtures at all operating Divisions. All wall mounted, parking lot and spot lights will be replaced including fixtures at all fueling facilities.

Project Status:
The Auditorium Improvements project consisting of infrastructure and audio/video equipment installation as well as wall, flooring and ceiling replacement, is complete (Phase 1). The assessment and evaluation report, consisting of programming and costing to accommodate Board meetings in the auditorium, is complete, and under management review. This work (Phase 2), if implemented, will be performed in 2015.

The GFCI (switchgear) Testing & Replacement design work started in mid 2013 and is anticipated to complete by early 2014 for construction contract advertisement.

Design of the LED Exterior Lighting Replacement project will commence mid 2014.

Project Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-0750 GFCI (switchgear) Testing &amp; Replacement</td>
<td>May-13</td>
<td>Jul-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-0780 Auditorium Conversion</td>
<td>Mar-13</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-0840 LED Exterior Lighting Replacement</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: Design/Bid, Construction, Closeout
### Approved Budget:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Approved Project Budget</th>
<th>Mar-14 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Mar-14 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Budget Balance d = (a-c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>1,079</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,612</strong></td>
<td><strong>236</strong></td>
<td><strong>189</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,423</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved Budget Incurred: 12%
Approved Budget Committed: 15%

**NOTE:** All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

### Approved Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>P-0780</th>
<th>P-0750</th>
<th>P-0840</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Local 100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td>$0.21</td>
<td>$0.90</td>
<td>$1.61 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.21</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.90</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1.61 million</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

River Oaks Auditorium Improvements in Progress
Security Projects

CCTV Projects

Estimated Cost: $3.6 million
Approved Budget: $3.6 million
Year of Completion: 2015
Project Manager: Bob Magliocco
Designer: VTA
Contractors: Cal Coast Telecom

Project Description:
Install video surveillance and recording equipment including Closed-Circuit Television (CCTV) cameras, video recorders, and associated hardware at these VTA facilities:

Project P-0803 includes the St. James, Great America, Old Ironsides, Tasman, Capitol, and Metro Airport LRT Stations, and the Alum Rock Transit Center.

Project P-0816 Phase 1 covered the Civic Center, Fair Oaks, Bascom, River Oaks, and Fruitdale LRT Stations. It also includes CCTV installation at River Oaks Facility and Great Mall Transit Center. Phase 2 will cover two additional locations, Bayshore/NASA and San Jose Diridon Light Rail Stations.

Project Status:
P-0803 – Final Design was completed in March 2014 and advertised for bids in April 2014. VTA Board award for the construction contract is scheduled for June 2014. Field work will start in June 2014 and will be completed by November 2014.
P-0816 – Phase 1 construction contract was advertised in July 2013 and awarded at the October 2013 VTA Board. Construction started in October 2013 and will be completed by May 2014. Design for phase 2 will start in May 2014 and is expected to be advertised for bids in June 2014. Construction is planned to start in September 2014 and completed by January 2015.

Project Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-0803 CCTV Surveillance Equipment</td>
<td>Aug-13</td>
<td>Jan-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-0816 CCTV Surveillance Eqpt FY13</td>
<td>Apr-13</td>
<td>Mar-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Design/Bid  Construction  Closeout
## Approved Budget:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Approved Project Budget</th>
<th>Mar-14 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Mar-14 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Budget Balance $ = (a-c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>2,361</td>
<td>2,201</td>
<td>1,026</td>
<td>1,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,630</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,748</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,536</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,094</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Approved Budget Incurred: 42%
- Approved Budget Committed: 76%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's  

P-0751 closed/removed March 2014

## Approved Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>P-0803</th>
<th>P-0816</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>$1.61</td>
<td>$2.02</td>
<td>$3.63 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1.61</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2.02</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3.63 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State 100%

Pole Mounted Camera installation at River Oaks Station

Cameras installed at Bascom Station
Security Projects

LR Systems Security Improvements

**Estimated Cost:** $3.9 million

**Approved Budget:** $4.23 million

**Year of Completion:** 2014

**Project Manager:** Ramesh Dhingra

**Contractor:** General Electric; Advance Digital Solutions

**Project Description:**

The **SCADA (Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition) System Hardening** project (P-0741) will install new software, servers, networks, firewalls, global positioning system, and supporting SCADA equipment that will replace important outdated software and hardware used by SCADA. Additional local funds obtained will be used for network upgrades.

**Project Status:**

The contract was awarded in April 2013. The contractor, General Electric completed software development, testing and validation in March 2014. VTA Operations is currently working on SCADA room reconfiguration, SCADA Network Configuration for Ring 1, network support for the PA controllers, and network support for RTU (Remote Terminal Unit) replacement, to be completed in October 2014.

**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>Design</td>
<td>Aug-11</td>
<td>Feb-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Feb-12</td>
<td>Mar-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCADA Room Reconfiguration</td>
<td>Feb-14</td>
<td>Oct-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td>Oct-14</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Design
- Construction
- Closeout
Approved Budget:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Approved Project Budget</th>
<th>Mar-14 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Mar-14 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Budget Balance d = (a-c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>1,008</td>
<td>1,008</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>2,880</td>
<td>2,624</td>
<td>2,604</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be categorized (Expired Federal Funds)</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,220</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,632</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,513</strong></td>
<td><strong>707</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

Approved Budget Incurred 83.2%
Approved Budget Committed 86.1%

Approved Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal*</td>
<td>$1.09 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>$2.57 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$0.58 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4.23 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* includes $0.33 million of expired funds

Operations Control Center
Operations Control Operator
**Passenger Safety Improvements**

**Estimated Cost:** $1.7 million  
**Approved Budget:** $1.7 million  
**Year of Completion:** 2015  
**Project Manager:** Sal Lanzo  
**Designer:** VTA  
**Contractor:** TBD

**Project Description:**

The **Passenger Safety Improvements** project (P-0802) will provide fencing and barriers at the Civic Center Station and Convention Center Station that will prevent LRT passengers from unsafe mid-block crossing of the LRT trackway. The proposed fencing will discourage pedestrians from illegally and unsafely crossing the light rail tracks at random locations, and direct them to signalized crosswalks.

Fencing along North First Street between Sonora Avenue and Gish Road will discourage pedestrians from illegally and unsafely crossing the light rail tracks and direct them to signalized crosswalks at Sonora Avenue and Gish Road. Similarly, fencing between Karina Court and Brokaw Road will direct pedestrians to signalized crosswalks at Karina Court and Brokaw Road.

**Project Status:**

Project is currently in final design and is planned to be advertised for bids in June 2014 and awarded at the August 2014 Board. Construction is planned to start in September 2014 and finish by January 2015.

**Project Schedule:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Mar-13</td>
<td>Apr-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Apr-14</td>
<td>Oct-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td>Oct-14</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Design/Bid:  
Construction:  
Closeout:
### Approved Budget:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Approved Project Budget</th>
<th>Mar-14 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Mar-14 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Budget Balance d = (a-c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,730</strong></td>
<td><strong>168</strong></td>
<td><strong>132</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,599</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved Budget Incurred: 7.6%
Approved Budget Committed: 9.7%

**NOTE:** All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

### Approved Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>$1.73 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1.73 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local: 100%

---

Proposed location of fencing at Convention Center – West San Carlos St.

Proposed location of fencing at Gish and N. First St.
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Nuria I. Fernandez

FROM: Director of Planning and Program Development, John Ristow

SUBJECT: Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP) 2014

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt the 2014 Short Range Transit Plan.

BACKGROUND:

The Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP) is a planning document that presents VTA’s plan for transit service over the next ten years. It includes a ten-year projection of transit capital and operating expenses and revenues, along with supporting information about VTA’s services and programs. For Fiscal Year 2014, VTA has produced a SRTP as defined by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), which presents the System Overview, Service Evaluation, Operating Plan, and Capital Improvement Program. At present, MTC requires transit agencies to adopt a SRTP this year. VTA's last SRTP was adopted in 2010.

DISCUSSION:

The most noteworthy information in the 2014 SRTP is presented in the Operating Plan and Capital Improvement Program (CIP). Each chapter presents a 10-year projection of revenues and expenses. VTA's SRTP requires that planned transit services identify the sources of operating revenues to match those services in order to be classified as funded in the Plan.

The Operating Plan includes planned service improvements between 2014 and 2019 and an assumed increase in service of 2% per year for the Plan years 2020 through 2023. Planned service improvements for the first half of the plan include: changes to the light rail network such as direct service between the future Milpitas BART station and the Mountain View line;
implementation of the Bus Rapid Transit network; and additional improved bus service and connections to the new BART stations. Beginning in FY17, VTA will need to apply savings measures to maintain its 15% operating reserve. The operating savings required is $164M over the 10-year SRTP period.

The Core Capital Improvement Program focuses on VTA’s current transit network and ensures adequate investment and enhancements in its existing infrastructure. VTA has prioritized a number of rehabilitation and replacement projects to keep the bus and light rail system in a state of good repair. Clean fuel, safety and security and passenger facility improvements will also contribute to improving the overall level of transit service in Santa Clara County. The Measure A Capital Improvement Program includes the BART extension (Berryessa Extension, BART Core System Modifications -- e.g. facility additions, revenue vehicles and operations control center per VTA/BART Comprehensive Agreement and Phase II from Berryessa to Santa Clara via Downtown San Jose) and the Bus Rapid Transit program (Santa Clara/Alum Rock, El Camino and Stevens Creek). Phase II of the BART extension is funded through Measure A, New Starts and 28% ($1.1B) "anticipated/unspecified" funds which may include a TIGER Grant, new financing, an extension of the existing sales tax or Express Lane revenues.

The projections contained in the 2014 SRTP represent the most up-to-date information as VTA staff understands it at the time of its writing. However, financial information is always subject to change, particularly in the out years of the plan. Over time, more information will be available and financial conditions will change in subsequent updates of the SRTP.

The document can be downloaded here: www.vta.org/srtp/MT4152attachment.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The Committee can direct staff to modify the document and recommend Board adoption pending the incorporation of changes. Alternatively, the Committee can direct staff to modify the document and return in June for recommendation at the August Board.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

There is no direct fiscal impact resulting from approval of the FY 2014-2023 Short Range Transit Plan. The SRTP presents updates to VTA’s Operations Plan and Capital Improvement Program, which may indicate future expenditures for transit operations and capital improvements. Approval of the SRTP document makes VTA eligible for federal transportation grants and complies with the MTC mandate for recipients of Federal Funds such as 5307.

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

Committee for Transit Accessibility:
The Chairperson asked about the breakdown of vehicle procurement for the paratransit system which is included in Appendix D of the document. He also asked about the Eco Pass policy requiring additional fare to ride paratransit and strongly urged for Eco Pass to include full coverage of paratransit fare. James Unites, Deputy Director of Service and Operations Planning,
pointed out that the Plan should be used as a reference document. Ex-Officio Member Katie Heatley requested additional language be added describing the CTSA coordinated system between VTA and OUTREACH.

Citizens Advisory Committee:
Member Elias asked about the large increase in light rail operation costs between 2016 and 2017 compared with the small increase between 2017 and 2018. He suggested there should be a similar increase in bus service between those years. He mentioned that the General Manager has been talking to business about focusing on employment corridors - does this plan include that intention? How will high speed rail and other new transit services to the County impact the plan?

Member Chang asked for verification that the sales tax funding referred to in the presentation was Measure A. Member Tebo asked for clarification on the Southern Express as compared with the Commuter Express, the difference between the VTA Core program and the VTA Measure A program in the Capital Improvement Program (CIP). Member Tebo inquired how the operating savings needs would be addressed. He commented on the BART extension and how those financial needs will impact other projects.

Technical Advisory Committee:
Member Salvano asked about the BART Transit Integration Plan. Vice Chairperson Servin asked if the replacement of community bus vehicles is funded. Member Batra asked about opportunities to pay for unfunded projects. Member Collen asked about the operating shortfall and how VTA’s performance compares with other agencies nationwide. The Committee approved the item.

Policy Advisory Committee:
The item was deferred in May. The Committee approved the SRTP item in August 2014 as part of the consent agenda.

Prepared by: Lilia Scott
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BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Nuria I. Fernandez

FROM: Director of Business Services, Bill Lopez

SUBJECT: Minority and Women-Owned Business Enterprise Program

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt the Minority and Women-Owned Business Enterprise Program (MWBE Program) in effort to increase minority and women-owned business participation for *locally funded* contracts and to ensure that these businesses are afforded an equitable opportunity to compete.

BACKGROUND:

VTA currently has the federally mandated *Disadvantaged Business Enterprise* (DBE) Program in accordance with USDOT regulations to ensure nondiscrimination in the award and administration of federally funded contracts. VTA also administers the *Small Business Enterprise* (SBE) Program complying with California Proposition 209, the 1996 California Civil Rights Initiative. The MWBE Program is intended to help address underutilization of minorities and Women as it relates to contracting opportunities.

The proposed Minority and Women-Owned Business Enterprise (MWBE) program applies to business entities that are operated and controlled by minorities or women. This means that the primary power, direct or indirect, to influence the management of the entity shall rest with minority persons or a corporation, partnership, or sole proprietorship in which minority persons collectively own, operate, control, and share in earnings of 51 percent or more of such an enterprise.

Implementation of this program will help attain following:

- Increase minority and women business opportunity,
- Connect MWBEs to services and resources to enable them to compete and qualify for VTA contracts,
- Establish outreach opportunities that outlines strategies to help with bonding qualifications for MWBE businesses,
- Provide seminars on certification to help qualify MWBEs,
- Invest in the local business communities as part of VTA’s community engagement efforts,
- Conduct procurement basics workshops for aspiring MWBEs.

**DISCUSSION:**

The MWBE program while new to VTA is a standard program with other regional agencies that have implemented similar programs to help expand opportunities for minorities and women. The Target MWBE Aspirational Goal is 18%.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The VTA Board of Directors could decide to adopt the proposed MWBE Program in whole, request additional information or re-evaluate certain aspects of the program.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

There is no direct fiscal impact to VTA that will result from the adoption of the proposed MWBE Program.

Prepared by: Sylvester Fadal
Memo No. 4648
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority

Minority and Women Owned Business Enterprise (MWBE) Non-Discrimination Program
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MINORITY AND WOMEN-OWNED NON-DISCRIMINATION PROGRAM

Policy Statement

It is the policy of Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) that its contractors, subcontractors and suppliers shall not discriminate on the basis of sex, gender, gender identity, gender expression, race, religious creed, color, national origin, ancestry, physical disability (including HIV and AIDS), mental disability, medical condition (cancer), marital status, age (over 40), sexual orientation, or military and veteran status, and the denial of family care leave, in the award and performance of contracts and subcontracts, and to remove barriers for minority and women-owned business enterprises to compete for those contracts and subcontracts.

It is the policy of VTA to encourage the growth and development of minority and women-owned businesses to successfully compete for VTA contracting opportunities.

It is the policy of VTA to enhance participation of minority and women-owned businesses in VTA contracts and subcontracts to the extent permitted by federal, state and local regulations and requirements.

It is the policy of VTA not to contract or continue to contract with any business entity that engages in discriminatory conduct in the award and performance of contracts and subcontracts.

This program has been developed to apply to locally funded projects, including Measure A, as an extension of the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Program.

The Non-Discrimination Program for Minority and Women-Owned Business Enterprise is designed to increase participation and ensure that minority and women-owned businesses are afforded an equitable opportunity to compete on all VTA contracts and subcontracts.

Nuria I. Fernandez, General Manager
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority

Ash Kalra, Board Chairperson
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
SUBPART A – GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

A. Objectives
The objectives are found in the policy statement on the first page of this program.

B. Applicability
This program is applicable to locally funded contracts. VTA shall implement a minority and women-owned program that enhances opportunity specifically in the areas of public contracting. This program sets forth the policies and procedures to be implemented by VTA to ensure that all minority and women-owned businesses shall have the maximum opportunity to participate in all VTA non-federally funded contracts.

C. Authority
VTA’s policy on Minority and Women-Owned Business Enterprise Non-Discrimination, Board Resolution number ___________, adopted on ________,2014.

D. Non-discrimination Requirements
VTA will ensure that the following clause is placed in every non-federally funded contract and subcontract:

During the performance of this contract, contractor and its subcontractors shall not unlawfully discriminate, harass or allow harassment against any employee or applicant for employment because of sex, gender, gender identity, gender expression, race, religious creed, color, national origin, ancestry, physical disability (including HIV and AIDS), mental disability, medical condition (cancer), marital status, age (over 40), sexual orientation, or military and veteran status, and the denial of family care leave. Failure by the contractor to comply with the program requirements will be considered a breach of the contract, which may result in the termination of this contract or such other remedy as VTA deems appropriate.

E. Definitions
VTA will adopt the following definitions listed below for this program:

Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) – a for-profit small business that is (1) at least 51 percent owned by one or more individuals who are both socially and economically disadvantaged or, in the case of a corporation, in which 51 percent of the stock is owned by one or more such individuals; and (2) whose management and daily business operations are controlled by one or more socially and economically disadvantaged individuals who own it. Any certified DBE that is owned and controlled by women or minority business enterprise is eligible to participate in the MWBE program.

MWBE Directory – VTA’s list of firms certified by VTA, which is used by VTA and its contractors to identify MWBE potential contractors and subcontractors and suppliers. The MWBE directory can be accessed at the website link at www.vta.org/osdb.
Minority and Women-Owned Business Enterprise (MWBE) – A business entity which is operated and controlled by a minority or a woman, as the case may be.

a. The terms "operated and controlled" shall mean that the managerial and official staff of this entity shall be comprised of minority persons, sufficient in ratio and gross earnings to demonstrate that the business transactions are, in fact, controlled by minority persons; and that the primary power, direct or indirect, to influence the management of this entity shall rest with minority persons or a corporation, partnership, or sole proprietorship in which minority persons collectively own, operate, control and share in earnings of 51 percent or more of such an enterprise.

b. A minority persons shall mean Black Americans, Hispanic Americans, Native Americans, Asian-Pacific Americans and Subcontinent Asian Americans, and women.

Other Business Enterprises (OBE) – Any business that is not an MWBE.

Pre-Bid/Pre-Proposal Conference – A meeting held by VTA prior to the bid/proposal closing date of a particular project for prospective bidders/proposers.

Small Business Enterprise (SBE) -Small Business Enterprise is defined by SBA as a small business concern that is independently owned and operated, is organized for profit, and is not dominant in its field. Depending on the industry, size standard eligibility is based on the average number of employees for the preceding twelve months or on sales volume averaged over a three-year period; and meets SBA’s size standards of 13 CFR Part 121, established for types of economic activity, or industry, generally under the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS).
SUBPART B - ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS

A. MWBE Non-Discrimination Program Updates

VTA General Manager will provide to the VTA Board of Directors (Board) updates representing significant changes in the Program.

B. Responsibility of the MWBE Program Implementation

VTA has designated the following individual as its MWBE Liaison Officer (MWBELO):

Sylvester Fadal
Dep. Director of Human Resources and Diversity Programs
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
3331 North First Street, Building A
San Jose, CA 95110
Phone: (408) 952-4190. Email: Sylvester.Fadal@vta.org

In that capacity, the MWBELO is responsible for implementing all aspects of the MWBE Non-discrimination Program. The MWBELO has direct, independent access to the General Manager concerning MWBE Non-Discrimination Program matters. An organization chart displaying the MWBELO"s position in the organization is found in Attachment A, “Organizational Chart”.

The MWBELO is responsible for developing, implementing and monitoring the MWBE Non-Discrimination Program, in coordination with other appropriate officials. The duties and responsibilities include the following:

1. Gathers and reports statistical data and other information as required.
2. Works with all departments for program compliance.
3. Ensures that bid notices and requests for proposals are available to MWBEs in a timely manner.
4. Identifies contracts and procurements so that MWBEs are included to the same level as OBEs in solicitations.
5. Analyzes VTA’s progress toward attainment and identifies ways to improve progress.
6. Advise the General Manager and/or VTA Board of Directors on MWBE matters and achievement.
7. Provides MWBEs with information and assistance to the same level as OBEs in preparing bids and obtaining bonding and insurance.
8. Plans and participates in MWBE training seminars.
9. Certifies MWBEs according to the certification criteria of the MWBE Non-Discrimination Program.
10. Provides outreach to MWBEs and community organizations to advise them of opportunities to the same extent provided to OBEs.
11. Maintains the VTA”s updated directory on certified MWBEs.
C. MWBE Directory

_VTA_ administers a full MWBE certification program. MWBE certification activities are updated monthly. Only firms that are certified by the _VTA_ Office of Small and Disadvantaged Businesses (OSDB) are included in the _VTA_ MWBE database. The directory lists the firm’s name, address, phone number, date of the most recent certification, and the type of work the firm has been certified to perform as a MWBE. Interested persons can contact the _VTA_ MWBELO for more information about this Directory and/or obtain access at [www.vta.org/osdb](http://www.vta.org/osdb).

D. Record Keeping Requirements

The OSDB Department will monitor the _VTA_’s MWBE contracts to ensure that the contractors are in compliance with the requirements and regulations of the MWBE program. OSDB staff will report MWBE participation to the General Manager using the Uniform Report of MWBE Awards or Commitments and Payments. The report is generated from the web-based Diversity Tracking System, B2GNow, see Attachment B, “Sample Uniform Report of MWBE Awards or Commitments/Payments”.

Bidders List

_VTA_ will create a bidders list, consisting of information about all firms that bid on _VTA_ contracts. The purpose of this requirement is to allow use of the bidders list as historical participation information and information that may be considered in the MWBE Non-Discrimination Program. The bidder list will include the name, address, certification status, age, and annual gross receipts of firms.

_VTA_ collects this information on a form in Attachment C, “Form 4A - Supplemental Contractor/Proposer and Subcontractor Information” and/or Attachment D, “Listing of MWBE Contractor or Subcontractors,” provided with all solicitations to bidders/proposers. The form directs all respondents and their subcontractors to report bidders’ list information on the form and submit it with its bids or proposal documents.

Information, Confidentiality, and Cooperation

Except as required to be disclosed by federal, state, or local law, _VTA_ will safeguard from disclosure to third parties information that has been reasonably identified as confidential business information.

_VTA_ will require contractors to maintain records and documents of payments to MWBEs for three years following the performance of the contract. _VTA_ will perform interim audits of contract payments to MWBEs. The audit will review payments to MWBE subcontractors to ensure that the actual amount paid to MWBE subcontractors equals or exceeds the dollar amounts stated in the contract.

E. Public Outreach

_VTA_ shall conduct outreach through strategic community interactions with businesses and provide procurement related workshops to encourage/increase participation of small, minority, women owned and disadvantaged firms. This includes outreach events with other
Bay Area Agencies, municipalities and community based organizations. VTA shall also participate in Caltrans’” CalMentor Protégé Program.

To attain VTA’s MWBE initiatives, outreach efforts shall include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Meet & Greet/Networking Sessions - Meet and greet with VTA project managers and learn about upcoming and current contracting opportunities in addition to networking opportunities with Prime Contractors, Consultants and Commodity Suppliers.

2. Encourage new relationships with VTA through increased community engagement efforts and informational workshops on (a) accessing capital, (b) insurance and bonding, and (c) estimating and bidding, among others.

3. Certification Workshop – Conduct certification workshops to help assist with the MWBE certification process. VTA certification officers will review and answer questions from potential applicants to open doors and business opportunities.

4. Procurement Basics – Assist businesses with “Doing Business with VTA”, including how to access VTA upcoming business opportunities, website and vendor registration.
A. Accountability
The OSDB Department will monitor the VTA’s contracts to ensure that the contractors are in compliance with the MWBE Non-Discrimination Program policy. The Uniform Report of MWBE Awards or Commitments and Payments are generated from the web-based Diversity Tracking System, B2GNow.

B. Affirmation of Non-Discrimination
The successful bidder/proposer shall sign an affidavit and questionnaire that it has not discriminated against minority and women-owned businesses.

The Deputy Director of Human Resource and Diversity Programs is responsible for determining whether a bidder/proposer has documented sufficient information that it has not discriminated against minority and women-owned business enterprise.

Administrative Reconsideration
Within 3 days of being informed by VTA that it is not responsive because it has not documented sufficient non-discrimination information, a bidder/proposer may request administrative reconsideration. Bidder/proposers should make this request in writing to:

Sylvester Fadal
Dep. Director of Human Resources and Diversity Programs
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
3331 North First Street, Building A San Jose, CA 95110
Phone: (408) 952-4190. Email: Sylvester.Fadal@vta.org

As part of this reconsideration, the bidder/proposer will have the opportunity to provide written documentation or argument concerning the issue of whether it made adequate documentation that it has not discriminated against minority and women-owned business enterprises. In addition, the bidder/proposer can request to meet in person with the VTA MWBELO to discuss the issue of whether it made adequate documentation. VTA will send the bidder/proposer a written decision on reconsideration, explaining the basis for finding as to whether the bidder did not provide adequate documentation.

C. Counting MWBE Participation
MWBEs may perform as Contractors, subcontractors to a Contractor (1st tier), or subcontractor to subcontractor (2nd tier). Only the value of the work actually performed by the MWBE, including materials and supplies, will be counted.

In a joint venture, only the portion of the total dollar value of the contract equal to the distinct, clearly-defined portion of the work of the contract that the MWBE performs with its own forces will be counted.
During the life of a contract, work performed by MWBE firms whose certification has expired will not continue to be counted. Only work performed by a VTA certified MWBE firm will be counted.

**D. Quarterly MWBE Utilization Report**

Contractors are required to submit quarterly MWBE Utilization Reports electronically to the VTA Office of Small & Disadvantaged Businesses. These quarterly reports shall be submitted electronically and the Contractor will document the dollar value of payments to MWBE firms and the percentage of the contract completed. VTA will monitor the contract for compliance with MWBE requirements.

This system is web-based, accessible from any computer via the internet at [www.vta.org/osdb](http://www.vta.org/osdb). Each Contractor and subcontractor will receive an email providing them with Log On identification, and a temporary password and instructions on how to use the system. Training will also be provided upon request. Contractor will include this reporting requirement in all of its subcontracts and purchase orders when required to provide or verify MWBE utilization documentation.

If the MWBE Utilization Reports indicate potential problems, the Contractor shall meet with the appropriate VTA representative(s) to address any deficiencies and discuss appropriate corrective actions.

Prior to final payment, Contractor will be required to submit a final MWBE Utilization Report by selecting the “Final Audit” reporting designation within B2GNow database system. In addition to payments to the MWBEs, the final report must include payments to and other information about all other businesses, including non-MWBE subcontractors, suppliers of materials, trucking firms, consultants and others.

Failure by Contractor to submit required reports as described above is a breach of contract and may be considered grounds for a determination by VTA of non-responsibility in consideration of Contractor’s eligibility to bid on or be awarded future work.
SUBPART D – CERTIFICATION STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES

A. Certification Process

_VTA_ will use certification standards to determine the eligibility of firms to participate as MWBEs in _VTA_ contracts. To be certified as a MWBE, a firm must meet all certification eligibility standards. For information about the certification process or to apply for certification, firms should contact:

Liz Brazil, DBE Program Manager
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
3331 North First Street, Building A
San Jose, CA 95134
Phone: (408) 321-5874
Email: Liz.Brazil@vta.org

The certification application forms and documentation requirements are found at [www.vta.org/osdb](http://www.vta.org/osdb) or Attachment E, “MWBE Certification Procedures and Forms”. The certification review process includes, but is not limited to:

1. Preliminary Review – Submitted documents are checked for completeness. All applications must be signed. Applications not signed will be returned.

2. Desk Audit – Supporting documents are reviewed and additional information may be requested to ensure that it meets the MWBE program criteria.

3. Final Recommendation – A recommendation for approval or denial is made after a thorough review of the application and submitted documents.

4. All certifications are valid until a firm is de-certified if it no longer meets eligibility standards. Certified firms are subject to renewal review after 5 years. An MWBE Renewal Application is required from MWBE certified firms to confirm their continued eligibility.

B. Certification Eligibility Standards

Firms certified eligible by _VTA_’s Office of Small and Disadvantaged Businesses (OSDB) and firms accepted as certified as MWBE by another agency are eligible to participate in _VTA_’s MWBE Program.

1. The MWBE certification program is intended to support participation in _VTA_ contracts by businesses owned and controlled by minority and women business owners. _VTA_ shall ensure that the MWBE Program supports businesses which are owned and controlled, in both form and substance, by small business owners and that the ownership and control by minority and women business owners is real and substantial.
2. Firms seeking MWBE certification shall cooperate fully with VTA’s request for information relevant to the certification process. VTA may consider, in making certification decisions, whether a firm has exhibited a pattern of conduct indicating its involvement in attempts to evade or subvert the intent or requirements of the MWBE Non-Discrimination Program. Failure or refusal to provide such information may be grounds for denial or removal of certification.

3. An MWBE is a for-profit business that has demonstrated by a preponderance of evidence that it satisfies the following MWBE program certification standards:

**Quality of Ownership**
The ownership by each of these individuals must be real, substantial and continuing, going beyond pro forma ownership, as represented in merely the ownership documents.

**Ownership Discretion and Control**
- The owner(s) should be able to demonstrate the basic decisions pertaining to the daily operations of the business are independently made.
- The owner(s) should have some technical competence in the industry for which certification is sought. Technical competence does not mean expert knowledge. It does mean the qualifying owners should have a working knowledge of the technical requirements of the business needed to operate in the industry.
- The business must be independent. Its viability must not depend on a relationship with another firm or firms.
- The owner(s) should be able to demonstrate that basic decisions pertaining to the daily operations of the business are independently made.
- The business must not be subject to any formal or informal restrictions that limit the customary discretion of the owner(s).
- The owner(s) must possess the power to direct or change the direction of the management and policies of the firm, and to make day-to-day as well as major and long-term decisions on matters of management policy and operations.
- The owner(s) may delegate authority, but such delegations must be revocable and the owners must retain a managerial role and the power to hire and separate from employment the person to whom they delegate.
- The owner(s) must have an overall understanding of, and managerial, technical competence and experience directly related to, the type of work in each industry the firm is doing business in and the firm’s operations.
- Owners must possess all the state or locally required licenses or credentials.
- Owner(s) must work in the business in order to be considered as controlling the firm. They cannot engage in outside employment or other business interests that conflict with managing the firm, unless the firm is itself a part-time business.

**Subsequent Changes in Ownership and/or Control**
Applicants are evaluated on the basis of documentation submitted at the time of certification. Any changes contemplated in the ownership and/or control of the firm or the documentation submitted with the application for Certification, including but not limited to those set forth
below, must be fully disclosed at the time of application;

a. Changes in ownership, amendments, modifications, additions, deletions, revisions;
b. Execution of new agreements, board and/or shareholders’ resolutions, memoranda of understanding;
c. Consolidation, liquidation, reorganization, merger;
d. Election of new officers and/or directors, appointment of new principals and/or key personnel;
e. The purchase and/or sale, new issues of shares; and
f. The purchase or sale of the entire business.

C. Certification Appeals and Removals

Appeals

a. If VTA initially determines that an applicant firm does not meet the eligibility requirements for MWBE certification, VTA shall notify the applicant firm in writing of its findings that led to the denial of certification.

b. Any firm that disagrees with VTA’s denial of its certification may file an appeal with VTA, in writing, signed and dated, within ten working days of the denial. The appeal must include the reasons why the applicant disagrees with VTA’s denial of the certification and should include any additional documentation to support the appeal.

c. In appeal proceedings, the applicant has the burden of proof to demonstrate, by a preponderance of evidence, that the business is eligible. VTA may require the firm to produce additional documentation to support its certification eligibility.

d. After considering an appeal, with all relevant information, VTA shall make one of the following determinations and inform the SBE in writing of the determination:
   1) The MWBE application denial is reversed and the firm is certified; or
   2) The applicant’s denial of certification by VTA is upheld; or
   3) The MWBE application denial is remanded back to OSDB for further review.

   If the denial of certification is upheld, the decision by VTA is administratively final.

Removals of Certification

a. A certified MWBE may be removed for ineligibility, for lack of cooperation, or at the wishes of the certified MWBE. When a firm’s eligibility is removed, the burden of proof for removal of certification shall be on VTA.

b. In a removal of certification for ineligibility, VTA must ensure that the decision to remove a firm’s MWBE certification is made by a VTA representative other than those who participated in actions leading to the removal of the firm. VTA has designated the Manager of Contracts Administration and Material Management or her/his designee to hear appeals for removals due to ineligibility.
Renewal of Certification

A firm denied certification or who has had its certification removed under these provisions shall be permitted to re-apply for certification after a period of one year following the date of initial denial or removal.


SUBPART E – COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT

\textit{VTA} has available several remedies to enforce compliance of the MWBE Non-Discrimination Program requirements contained in its contracts, including, but not limited to, the following:

1. Breach of contract action, pursuant to the terms of the contract.
2. Any other available remedy.

\textit{VTA} has implemented the following monitoring mechanisms to ensure compliance with MWBE Program requirements:

1. \textit{VTA} will verify that work committed to MWBEs at contract award is actually performed by the MWBEs. This will be accomplished by direct observation, interviews and review of submitted documents.
2. \textit{VTA} will keep a running tally of actual payments to MWBE firms for work committed to them at the time of contract award with the use of \textit{VTA}'s Diversity Tracking System.
ATTACHMENT A

Organizational Chart
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## ATTACHMENT B

Sample Uniform Report of MWBE Awards or Commitments/Payments

Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority - OSCDI
Report of SBE Commitments/Awards and Payments
Reporting Period: Apr 1 - Sept 30, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awards/Commitments Made During This Reporting Period (total contracts and subcontracts awarded or committed during the reporting period)</th>
<th>Total Dollar</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Total to SBE's (dollars)</th>
<th>Total to SBE's (number)</th>
<th>Total to SBE's size conscious (dollars)</th>
<th>Total to SBE's size conscious (number)</th>
<th>Total to SBE's size neutral (dollars)</th>
<th>Total to SBE's size neutral (number)</th>
<th>Percentage of total dollars to SBE's</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prime contracts awarded this period</td>
<td>$6,001,629.64</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$1,261,600.64</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$1,251,699.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>20.86%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcontracts committed/awarded this period</td>
<td>$730,371.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$730,371.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$730,371.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$6,731,999.64</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$1,992,646.64</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$1,982,070.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>33.03%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SBE Awards/Commitments This Reporting Period - Breakdown By Ethnicity & Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black American</th>
<th>Hispanic American</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>Subcont. Asian American</th>
<th>Asian Pacific American</th>
<th>Non-minority Women</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Totals for this reporting period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Contracts (Prime and Sub)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Dollar Value</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$81,334.00</td>
<td>$33,222.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$149,347.00</td>
<td>$159,764.00</td>
<td>$1,298,703.64</td>
<td>$1,982,370.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Actual Payments On Contracts Completed This Reporting Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size Conscious</th>
<th>Size Neutral</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Prime Contracts Completed</td>
<td>Total Dollar Value of Prime Contracts Completed</td>
<td>Total SBE Participation (dollars)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size Conscious</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT C

Form 4A – Supplemental Contractor/ Proposer and Subcontractor Information

The form shall be copied by the bidder and distributed to all bidders. The completed forms are to be submitted at time of bid submittal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Contract Name &amp; Number:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Firm Name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Firm Address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phone #:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fax #:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age of Firm:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Check one)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Gross Receipts</td>
<td>Indicate bracket of income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$500K - $1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1M - $4M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$4M - $6M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$6 - $13M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above $13M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Check one: DBE _____ SBE _____ MBE _____ WBE _____ Non-MBE/WBE/SBE/DBE _______

Ethnicity*____ Gender ____ Work/Trade_________________________

Category_________________________
*A= Asian, AI= Asian Indian, B= Black, C= Caucasian, H= Hispanic, NA= Native American, O= Other

Completed by: ________________________________

Email address: ________________________________

To be completed by bidder:

Was this firm selected for a subcontract or purchase for this contract? Yes____ No____

If yes, the dollar value of this subcontract or purchase is: $_______________

The description of this firm’s work is: ________________________________

VTA, Office of Small & Disadvantaged Businesses
3331 North First Street, Building A, San Jose, CA 95134-1927

If you require additional forms or information, call (408) 321-5962
ATTACHMENT D

FORM 4 - LISTING OF DBE/SBE/MBE/WBE CONTRACTOR OR SUBCONTRACTORS

Firm (Contractor): __________________________ Phone/ Fax: __________________________

DBE: ______ Y/N  SBE: ______ Y/N  MBE: ______ Y/N  WBE: ______ Y/N  Age of Firm: __________________________

Street Address: __________________________ Name & Title: __________________________

City, State, Zip: __________________________ Signature/ Date: __________________________

Contract dollar value must exclude work performed by non-MBEs/WBEs/SBE/DBEs except materials or equipment purchased and used in this contract.

CREDIT FOR SBE VENDOR of materials or supplies is limited to 60% of its expenditures for materials and supplies required under this Contract and obtained from a WBBE regular dealer. Credit for WBBE manufacturers is given at 100% only where the WBBE vendor manufactures or substantially alters the material prior to resale.

CREDIT FOR WBBE BROKERS (Distributor or Representative) is limited to the fees and commissions of the amount paid. All other firms receive 100% credit, less work subcontracted by the WBBE to non-WBBE firms.

CREDIT FOR SBE TRUCKING FIRMS is limited to amount performed by the WBBEs own trucks and drivers and by certified WBBE trucking subhaulers. A WBBE trucking firm must itself own and operate at least one fully licensed, insured and operational truck used on the contract.

A WBBE must be certified or accepted as Certified by VTA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; Address of Certified SBE</th>
<th>Certification Number</th>
<th>Agency Certifying</th>
<th>Age of Firm</th>
<th>Dollar Value Of Contract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Total Contract Amount  $____________________

WBBE Contract Amount:  $____________________

IMPORTANT! THIS FORM MUST BE SUBMITTED WITH YOUR BID/PROPOSAL
ATTACHMENT E
MWBE Certification Procedures and Forms
Dear Business Owner:

Thank you for your interest in participating in the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority’s (VTA) Minority & Women-Owned Business Enterprise (MWBE) Non-Discrimination Program. The MWBE Program is designed to enhance participation of minority and women-owned businesses in VTA contracts and subcontracts, and to remove barriers for minority and women-owned enterprises to compete for those contracts and subcontracts.

MWBE Certification Criteria
- MWBE firm must be at least 51% owned by one or more socially disadvantaged individuals (minority or women). A minority person shall mean Black American; Hispanic American; Asian Pacific American, Native American or Alaskan Native; Subcontinent Asian American and women, regardless of race or ethnicity.
- The firm must be an independent business, and one or more of the socially disadvantaged owners must control its management and daily operations.
- The firm’s management and daily business operations must be controlled by individuals who are citizens or lawfully admitted permanent residents of the United States.
- A firm certified as one of the socially Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) under Title 49 CFR Part 26 of the U.S. Department of Transportation qualifies as an MWBE and does not need to obtain further MWBE certification. If you believe your firm may qualify as a DBE and wish to be certified as such, please go to this website for more information [http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/bep/find_certified.htm](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/bep/find_certified.htm).

Please answer all questions on the application – do not leave any questions blank. If a question is not applicable to your firm, insert N/A in the space provided. The application must be signed by ALL owners. Incomplete applications (including supporting documentation) will be delayed in processing and/or returned to you.

MWBE APPLICATION SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS
In order to complete your application for MWBE certification, you must attach copies of all of the following documents:

1. Current business licenses, all relevant licenses, license renewal forms, permits, and haul authority forms
2. Ownership documentation, if any
3. Proof of ethnicity and gender
4. Resumes (that include places of ownership/employment with corresponding dates), for all owners and officers of your firm

Please forward the completed application and all supporting documentation to:
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA)
Office of Small & Disadvantaged Businesses (OSDB)
3331 N. First Street, Building B
San Jose, CA 95134

Phone: (408) 321-5962
Email: osdb.osdb@vta.org

(Revised 5/2014)
MINORITY & WOMEN-OWNED BUSINESS ENTERPRISE (MWBE) APPLICATION

Do not leave any questions blank. Indicate Not Applicable (N/A) if it does not apply. Application may be returned if incomplete.

Firm Information
1. Legal Name of Firm: ____________________________________________
2. Owner to Contact: ______________________________________________
3. Business Address: (Post Office Box Not Acceptable) Street City State Zip
4. Mailing Address: (if different) Street City State Zip
5. Phone Number:__________________________________ Email: __________________________
   Fax Number:__________________________________ Website: __________________________
6. Is business address and/or business telephone number also a residence address or telephone number? □ YES □ NO
7. Indicate the nature of the firm's business: □ Construction □ Professional Services □ Manufacturer
   □ Supplier □ Broker/Manufacturer's Representative □ Other ______________
8. Specify the firm's major line of business: (Requires Supporting Documentation')
   ________________________________________________________________
9. Current number of employees: ________ 10. Date this firm was established: ______________________
10. Type of Business Structure: □ Sole Proprietor □ Partnership □ Corporation □ Limited Liability
    □ Joint Venture □ Other Business Entity: ______________________

Owner's Information (Supporting Documentation Required')
11. Name of Owner(s) (Attach additional sheets if necessary) US Citizen Permanent Resident  % Owned Ethnicity* Gender
    ____________________________________________  (Yes/No)  %  % % % %
    ____________________________________________
    ____________________________________________

*For Ethnicity, use: SA=Subcontinent Asian, AP=Asian Pacific, B=Black, C=Caucasian, H=Hispanic, NA=Native American

Certification Information
12. Refer to the attached list of expertise codes and indicate below the areas of expertise your company performs: (Maximum 5 work codes) (Requires Supporting Documentation')

   NAICS Code(s) Description of Work
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
13. Has this firm been certified as a Disadvantaged Business Enterprise by any government agency?  
   If YES, name of Government Agency: ___________________________  
   Date of Certification: _______________  Date Certification Expires: _______________

14. Contracting: List at least three (3) major recent contracts or projects your firm has participated in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Client</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Scope of Work</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES: SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION
In order to complete your application for WMBE certification, you must attach copies of the following documents
1. Current business licenses, all relevant licenses, license renewal forms, permits, and haul authority forms
2. Ownership documentation, if any
3. Proof of ethnicity and gender
4. Work experience resumes (that include places of ownership/employment with corresponding dates), for all owners and officers of your firm

Signature(s)
I (We) declare under penalty of perjury of the laws of the United States that the foregoing statements are true, accurate and complete. (Each individual owner is required to sign.) (Add additional sheets if necessary.)

Signature: ____________________________  
Printed Name: ____________________________  
Title: ____________________________  
Date: ____________________________

Signature: ____________________________  
Printed Name: ____________________________  
Title: ____________________________  
Date: ____________________________

Signature: ____________________________  
Printed Name: ____________________________  
Title: ____________________________  
Date: ____________________________

Signature: ____________________________  
Printed Name: ____________________________  
Title: ____________________________  
Date: ____________________________

Please Return Application and All Supporting Documents To:
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA)  
Office of Small & Disadvantaged Businesses  
3331 N. First Street, Building A  
San Jose, CA 95134

Phone: (408) 321-5962  
Email: osdb.osdb@vta.org

(Rev. 5/2014)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Programs</th>
<th>Federal Program</th>
<th>State/Local Program</th>
<th>Local Program Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Disadvantaged Business Enterprise</td>
<td>Small Business Enterprise</td>
<td>Minority and Women-Owned Non-Discrimination Program - Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>SBE</td>
<td>MWBE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Objectives       | - To ensure nondiscrimination in the award and the administration of DOT-assisted contracts in the Department’s financial assistance programs;  
- To create a level playing field on which DBEs can compete fairly for DOT-assisted contracts;  
- To ensure that the Department’s DBE program is narrowly tailored in accordance with applicable law;  
- To ensure that only firms that fully meet this part’s eligibility standards are permitted to participate as DBEs;  
- To help remove barriers to the participation of DBEs in DOT-assisted contracts;  
- To assist the development of firms that can compete successfully in the marketplace outside the DBE program; and  
- To ensure nondiscrimination in the award and the administration of non-federally funded contracts;  
- To create a level playing field on which SBEs can compete fairly for non-federally funded contracts;  
- To ensure that only firms that fully meet SBE certification eligibility standards of Title 13, Part 121 of the U.S. Small Business Administration (SBA) and 49 CFR, Part 26 are permitted to participate as SBEs;  
- To help remove barriers to the participation of SBEs in non-federally funded contracts;  
- To assist the development of firms that can compete successfully in the marketplace outside the SBE program;  
- To encourage the growth and development of minority and women-owned businesses to successfully compete for VTA contracting opportunities;  
- To ensure contractors, subcontractors and suppliers shall not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, or sex in the award and performance of contracts and subcontracts, and to remove barriers for minority and women-owned business enterprises to compete for those contracts and subcontracts;  
- To apply to locally funded projects as an extension of the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Program designed to increase participation of minorities and women-owned business. |
| Goals            | 13% VTA Overall DBE Goal – FFY 2014-2016. Goals are “narrowly tailored” for each individual contract where there are subcontracting opportunities to cumulatively achieve agency DBE Overall goal of 13%. | 19% VTA Annual SBE Goal. Goals are “narrowly tailored” for each individual contract where there are subcontracting opportunities to cumulatively achieve agency SBE Overall goal of 19%. | 18% VTA Annual Aspirational Goal |
| Certification Required | Federally-assisted contracts. | State and locally assisted contracts. | Locally assisted contracts. |
| Certification Required | California Unified Certification Program (CUCP) | Santa Clara Valley Transportation Agency, Office of Small and Disadvantaged Businesses and/or other reciprocal SBE certification. | Santa Clara Valley Transportation Agency, Office of Small and Disadvantaged Businesses and/or other reciprocal agency MWBE certification. |
| Criteria          | Must show social and economic disadvantage (Owner personal net worth under $750k and annual gross receipts under Small Business Administration size standard applicable to business, but in no case over $22.41m). | Must show Small Business Administration size standard (Applicable to business classification per the requested NAICS code, but in no case over $22.41m). | Must belong to the economic disadvantaged group as defined in 49 CFR Part 26. |
| Requisite Expertise | Disadvantaged owner must possess requisite expertise for type of business. | Small business owner may hire employee with requisite expertise. | Minority and Women-Owned business owner may hire employee with requisite expertise. |
| Reporting Requirements | Semi-Annually | Semi-Annually | Annually to VTA Board |
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Nuria I. Fernandez

FROM: Director of Business Services, Bill Lopez

SUBJECT: Approval of CalPERS Medical Resolutions for AFSCME

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

Resolution

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt the following Resolutions for CalPERS Medical Plans for employees and retirees represented by American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), Local 101, effective January 1, 2015.

1. AFSCME (CalPERS) Resolution.
2. AFSCME Survivor Resolution (CalPERS) - for Surviving Spouses of AFSCME retirees.
3. AFSCME (non-CalPERS) Resolution - for AFSCME employees who do not have five years of CalPERS service time but qualify for retiree medical based on VTA/ATU retirement service and total VTA years of service.
4. AFSCME Survivor resolution (non-CalPERS) - for Surviving Spouses of AFSCME employees who did not have five years of CalPERS service time but qualified for retiree medical based on VTA/ATU Pension retirement and total agency time.

BACKGROUND:

To reduce costs and increase employee and retiree options for medical insurance, VTA and the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), Local 101 are pursuing a transition to CalPERS medical plans for AFSCME represented employees and retirees. On June 5, the Board approved VTA’s labor agreement with AFSCME to pursue the transition. On August 7, as required by law, the Board and the public were presented with an actuarial study which projected the costs or savings of the transition. This study projected...
significant savings as a result of the transition.

As the final step in the required CalPERS transition process, the VTA Board of Directors is required to approve a series of Resolutions which reflect VTA’s negotiated agreement with AFSCME, such as the employer contribution and the fact that AFSCME retirees will be able to qualify based on combined service credits from both the CalPERS and the VTA/ATU Pension systems. This is an important consideration since many AFSCME employees promoted from Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU) positions and have service credits in both systems. In these circumstances, an employee may need service credits from both systems to vest into the CalPERS retiree medical benefit.

VTA currently contracts with Kaiser, Valley Health Plan, and United Health Care Medicare Supplement plans to provide medical benefits for AFSCME represented employees and retirees. These contracts expire December 31, 2014. Adoption of the AFSCME Resolutions enters VTA into a contract with CalPERS to provide medical benefits for AFSCME employees and retirees instead of the current providers, effective January 1, 2015.

DISCUSSION:

Because VTA counts total years of service (whether CalPERS or non-CalPERS) to qualify for retiree medical, both CalPERS and non-CalPERS resolutions are required. This allows members in both VTA/ATU and CalPERS retirement systems to qualify for retiree medical with total years of VTA service time. Without the additional resolutions, an AFSCME employee who promoted from an ATU position, and later retired prior to vesting with five years of CalPERS service time, would not be eligible for CalPERS Medical plans. This is not the intent of the negotiated transition agreement with AFSCME.

To include eligibility for surviving spouses of deceased retirees who do not receive a monthly warrant (applicable to survivors of those who retired prior to the effective date of January 1, 2015), VTA is also required to submit optional Survivor Resolutions for both CalPERS and non-CalPERS surviving spouses.

ALTERNATIVES:

An alternative would be to maintain AFSCME employees and retirees on existing medical plan contracts with Kaiser, Valley Health Plan, and UHC Medicare (which continue to cover ATU, TAEA and SEIU union employees and retirees). In addition, any changes to medical providers would require a return to collective bargaining with AFSCME.

FISCAL IMPACT:

VTA’s analysis of cost savings estimated $67,542 savings for AFSCME employees, (using 2014 rates), and $153,885 annually for AFSCME retirees (using 2014 rates), for a total of $221,427 annual premium savings. The total estimated $221,427 in annual savings for employees and retirees is based on enrollment assumptions and lower cost CalPERS Medical plans.
An OPEB Actuarial evaluation reported savings presented at the August 7, 2014 Board meeting. The study showed an estimated reduction in the Accrued Liability (compared to the June 30, 2013 OPEB Actuarial Valuation) of approximately $7.1 million, and a reduction in the GASB Annual Required Contribution (ARC) of $836,622. This represents a reduction in the ARC of 3.94% of the projected payroll for AFSCME employees and retirees. Both the normal cost and unfunded liability (UAL) amortization components decreased with the transition to CalPERS Medical.

Prepared by: Bill Lopez
Memo No. 4490
RESOLUTION ELECTING TO BE SUBJECT TO PUBLIC EMPLOYEES’ MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL CARE ACT AND FIXING THE EMPLOYER’S CONTRIBUTION AT AN AMOUNT EQUAL TO OR GREATER THAN THAT PRESCRIBED BY GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 22892(b)

WHEREAS, (1) Government Code Section 22922(a) provides the benefits of the Public Employees’ Medical and Hospital Care Act to employees, retirees, and survivors of local agencies contracting with the Public Employees’ Retirement System on proper application by a local agency; and

WHEREAS, (2) Section 22892(a) of the Act provides that a local contracting agency shall fix the amount of the employer’s contribution; and

WHEREAS, (3) Government Code Section 22920(b) defines any Special District as a contracting agency, and

WHEREAS, (4) A Special District is hereby defined as a non-profit, self-governed public agency within the State of California, and comprised solely of public employees performing a governmental rather than proprietary function, and

WHEREAS, (5) Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, hereinafter referred to as Special District is an entity meeting the above definition; and

WHEREAS, (6) The Special District desires to obtain for the members of the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), Local 101, who are active and retired employees and survivors of the agency, the benefit of the Act and to accept the liabilities and obligations of an employer under the Act and Regulations; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, (a) That the Special District elects, and it does hereby elect, to be subject to the provisions of the Act; and be it further

RESOLVED, (b) That the employer’s contribution for each employee, retiree, or survivor shall be the amount necessary to pay the full cost of his/her enrollment, including the enrollment of family members in a health benefits plan up to a maximum of the Kaiser Bay Area Basic/Supplement to Medicare Single Party Rate, plus administrative fees and Contingency Reserve Fund assessments; and be it further

RESOLVED, (c) That the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority has fully complied with any and all applicable provisions of Government Code Section 7507 in electing the benefits set forth above; and be it further

RESOLVED, (d) That the participation of the employees, retirees, and survivors of Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority shall be subject to determination of its status as an “agency or instrumentality of the state or political subdivision of a State” that is eligible to participate in a governmental plan within the meaning of Section 414(d) of the Internal Revenue Code, upon publication of final Regulations pursuant to such Section. If it is determined that Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority would not
qualify as an agency or instrumentality of the state or political subdivision of a State under such final Regulations, CalPERS may be obligated, and reserves the right to terminate the health coverage of all participants of the employer.

RESOLVED, (e) That the executive body appoint and direct, and it does hereby appoint and direct, Nuria Fernandez, General Manager, to file with the Board of Administration of the Public Employees’ Retirement System a verified copy of this Resolution, and to perform on behalf of said Special District all functions required of it under the Act and Regulations of the Board of Administration; and be it further

RESOLVED, (f) That coverage under the Act be effective on January 1, 2015

Adopted at a regular/special meeting of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority at San Jose, California this 28th day of August, 2014.

Signed: _________________________________
(President, Chairman, etc.)

Attest: _________________________________
(Secretary or appropriate officer)
INSTRUCTIONS

This resolution form is the approved form designated by the Public Employees' Retirement System. It should be used by a Special District to assure proper filing with the Public Employees' Retirement System for the combined purpose of:

1. Contracting for coverage under the Public Employees' Medical and Hospital Care Act (PEMHCA), and

2. Fixing the employer's contribution toward employees' health insurance at an amount equal to or greater than that prescribed in GC 22892(b)

If the resolution (RESOLVED) is filed on or before the tenth day of any month, it will be effective on the first of the following month (date stamped as received in the office of the Board of Administration, Public Employee's Retirement System, 400 Q Street, P.O. Box 942714, Sacramento, CA 94229-2714)

WHEREAS, (5) should be completed with full name of the contracting agency/Special District.

WHEREAS, (6) should be completed with full name of the recognized employee organization.

RESOLVED, (b) should be completed to specify the amount of the employer's (agency or district) contribution toward the cost of enrollment for active employees, retirees, and survivors. The amount specified by this Resolution would be an amount equal to or greater than that specified in Section 22892(b) as authorized by Section 22892(a) of the Government Code. Minimum employer contributions as prescribed in Section 22892(b).

Commencing January 1, 2009, the employer contribution shall be adjusted annually by the Board to reflect any change in the medical component of the Consumer Price Index, and shall be rounded to the nearest dollar.

RESOLVED, (c) should be completed with full name of the contracting agency/Special District.

RESOLVED, (d) should be completed with full name of the contracting agency/Special District.

RESOLVED, (e) requests the position title of the individual who handles the Public Employees' Medical and Hospital Care Act contract for the Special District.

RESOLVED, (f) should be completed with the date the coverage is to become effective.

Because resolutions serve as our legal contract, we require the original resolution, certified copy with original signatures, or a copy of the resolution with the agency's raised seal.

For resolution processing, deliver to the following:

**Overnight Mail Service**
California Public Employees' Retirement System
CASD, Contract & Membership Services Section
400 Q Street
Sacramento, CA 95811-6210

**Regular Mail**
California Public Employees' Retirement System
CASD, Contract & Membership Services Section
PO BOX 942714
Sacramento, CA 94229-2714

The certification shown following the resolution is to be completed by those individuals authorized to sign for the Public Agency in legal actions and is to include the name of the executive body; i.e. Board of Directors, Board of Trustees, etc., the location and the date of signing.
RESOLUTION ELECTING TO BE SUBJECT TO
PUBLIC EMPLOYEES’ MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL CARE ACT
AND FIXING THE EMPLOYER’S CONTRIBUTION AT AN AMOUNT EQUAL TO OR
GREATER THAN THAT PRESCRIBED BY GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 22892(b)

WHEREAS, (1) Government Code Section 22922(a) provides the benefits of the Public
Employees’ Medical and Hospital Care Act to employees and annuitants
of local agencies contracting with the Public Employees’ Retirement
System on proper application by a local agency; and

WHEREAS, (2) Section 22892(a) of the Act provides that a local contracting agency shall
fix the amount of the employer's contribution; and

WHEREAS, (3) Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, hereinafter referred to as
Public Agency, is a local agency contracting with the Public Employees’
Retirement System; and

WHEREAS, (4) The Public Agency desires to obtain for the members of the American
Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), Local
101, who are employees and annuitants of the agency, the benefit of the
Act and to accept the liabilities and obligations of an employer under the
Act and Regulations; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, (a) That the Public Agency elects, and it does hereby elect, to be subject to
the provisions of the Act; and be it further

RESOLVED, (b) That the employer’s contribution for each employee or annuitant shall be
the amount necessary to pay the full cost of his/her enrollment, including
the enrollment of family members, in a health benefits plan or plans up to
a maximum of the Kaiser Bay Area Basic/Supplement to Medicare Single
Party Rate, plus administrative fees and Contingency Reserve Fund
assessments; and be it further

RESOLVED, (c) That the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority has fully complied
with any and all applicable provisions of Government Code Section 7507
in electing the benefits set forth above; and be it further

RESOLVED, (d) That the participation of the employees and annuitants of Santa Clara
Valley Transportation Authority shall be subject to determination of its
status as an “agency or instrumentality of the state or political subdivision
of a State” that is eligible to participate in a governmental plan within the
meaning of Section 414(d) of the Internal Revenue Code, upon publication
of final Regulations pursuant to such Section. If it is determined that
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority would not qualify as an
agency or instrumentality of the state or political subdivision of a State
under such final Regulations, CalPERS may be obligated, and reserves
the right to terminate the health coverage of all participants of the
employer.
RESOLVED, (e) That the executive body appoint and direct, Nuria Fernandez, General Manager to file with the Board of Administration of the Public Employees' Retirement System a verified copy of this Resolution, and to perform on behalf of said Public Agency all functions required of it under the Act and Regulations of the Board of Administration; and be it further

RESOLVED, (f) That coverage under the Act be effective on January 1, 2015.

Adopted at a regular/special meeting of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority at San Jose, California this 28th day of August 2014.

Signed: ________________________________  
(President, Chairman, etc.)

Attest: ________________________________  
(Secretary or appropriate officer)
INSTRUCTIONS

This resolution form is the approved form designated by the Public Employees' Retirement System. It should be used by a Public Agency to assure proper filing with the Public Employees' Retirement System for the combined purpose of:

1. Contracting for coverage under the Public Employees' Medical and Hospital Care Act (PEMHCA), and
2. Fixing the employer's contribution toward employees' health insurance at an amount equal to or greater than that prescribed in GC 22892(b)

If the resolution (RESOLVED) is filed on or before the tenth day of any month, it will be effective on the first of the following month (date stamped as received in the office of the Board of Administration, Public Employee's Retirement System, 400 Q Street, P.O. Box 942714, Sacramento, CA 94229-2714)

WHEREAS, (3) should be completed with full name of the contracting agency.

WHEREAS, (4) should be completed with full name of the recognized employee organization.

RESOLVED, (b) should be completed to specify the amount of the employer's (agency or district) contribution toward the cost of enrollment for active employees and annuitants. The amount specified by this Resolution would be an amount equal to or greater than that specified in Section 22892(b) as authorized by Section 22892(a) of the Government Code. Minimum employer contributions as prescribed in Section 22892(b).

Commencing January 1, 2009, the employer contribution shall be adjusted annually by the Board to reflect any change in the medical component of the Consumer Price Index, and shall be rounded to the nearest dollar.

RESOLVED, (c) should be completed with full name of the contracting agency.

RESOLVED, (d) should be completed with full name of the contracting agency.

RESOLVED, (e) requests the position title of the individual who handles the Public Employees' Medical and Hospital Care Act contract for the Public Agency.

RESOLVED, (f) should be completed with the date the coverage is to become effective.

Because resolutions serve as our legal contract, we require the original resolution, certified copy with original signatures, or a copy of the resolution with the agency's raised seal.

For resolution processing, deliver to the following:

**Overnight Mail Service**
California Public Employees' Retirement System
CASD, Contract & Membership Services Section
400 Q Street
Sacramento, CA 95811-6210

**Regular Mail**
California Public Employees' Retirement System
CASD, Contract & Membership Services Section
PO BOX 942714
Sacramento, CA 94229-2714

The certification shown following the resolution is to be completed by those individuals authorized to sign for the Public Agency in legal actions and is to include the name of the executive body; i.e. Board of Directors, Board of Trustees, etc., the location and the date of signing.
RESOLUTION ELECTING TO BE SUBJECT TO SECTION 22819.1
OF THE PUBLIC EMPLOYEES’ MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL CARE ACT
FOR FAMILY MEMBERS OF A DECEASED RETIREE

WHEREAS, (1) Government Code Sections 22922(b) provides the benefits of the Public Employees’ Medical and Hospital Care Act to employees of local agencies contracting with the Public Employees Retirement System; and

WHEREAS, (2) Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, hereinafter referred to as Special District, is a local agency contracting with the Public Employees’ Retirement System under the Act; and

WHEREAS, (3) The Special District desires to obtain for the members of the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), Local 101, who are annuitants and of the agency, the benefit of the Act and to accept the liabilities and obligations of an employer under the Act and Regulations; now, therefore, be it

WHEREAS, (4) Government Code Section 22819.1 provides certain additional benefits to retirees of local agencies contracting under the Act upon proper application; and

WHEREAS, (5) The Special District desires to obtain for its retirees the benefit of Section 22819.1 and accepts the liabilities and obligations of a contracting agency under the Section; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, (a) That the Special District elects, and it does hereby elect, to be subject to the provisions of Section 22819.1 of the Government Code.

Adopted at a regular/special meeting of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority at San Jose, California this 28th day of August, 2014.

Signed: _______________________________
(President, Chairman, etc.)

Attest: _______________________________
(Secretary or appropriate officer)
INSTRUCTIONS

This resolution is the approved form designated by the Public Employees’ Retirement System. It should be used by a Special District which is contracting for coverage under the Public Employees’ Medical and Hospital Care Act when the agency desires to provide health benefit coverage for survivors of deceased retirees as authorized by Section 22819.1 of the Government Code.

If the resolution (RESOLVED) is filed on or before the tenth day of any month, it will be effective on the first of the following month (date stamped as received in the office of the Board of Administration, Public Employee’s Retirement System, 400 Q Street, P.O. Box 942714, Sacramento, CA 94229-2714)

WHEREAS, (2) should be completed with full name of the contracting agency/Special District.

WHEREAS, (3) should be completed with the full name of the recognized employee organization.

Because resolutions serve as our legal contract, we require the original resolution, certified copy with original signatures, or a copy of the resolution with the agency’s raised seal.

For resolution processing, deliver to the following:

**Overnight Mail Service**
California Public Employees’ Retirement System
CASD, Contract & Membership Services Section
400 Q Street
Sacramento, CA 95811-6210

**Regular Mail**
California Public Employees’ Retirement System
CASD, Contract & Membership Services Section
PO BOX 942714
Sacramento, CA 94229-2714

The certification shown following the resolution is to be completed by those individuals authorized to sign for the Public Agency in legal actions and is to include the name of the executive body; i.e. Board of Directors, Board of Trustees, etc., the location and the date of signing.

The certification shown following the resolution is to be completed by those individuals authorized to sign for the Public Agency in legal actions and is to include the name of the executive body; i.e. Board of Directors, Board of Trustees, etc., the location and date of signing.
RESOLUTION ELECTING TO BE SUBJECT TO SECTION 22819.1
OF THE PUBLIC EMPLOYEES’ MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL CARE ACT
FOR FAMILY MEMBERS OF A DECEASED ANNUITANT

WHEREAS, (1) Government Code Sections 22922(b) provides the benefits of the Public Employees’ Medical and Hospital Care Act to employees of local agencies contracting with the Public Employees Retirement System; and

WHEREAS, (2) Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, hereinafter referred to as Public Agency, is a local agency contracting with the Public Employees’ Retirement System under the Act; and

WHEREAS, (3) The Public Agency desires to obtain for the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), Local 101, who are annuitants and of the agency, the benefit of the Act and to accept the liabilities and obligations of an employer under the Act and Regulations; now, therefore, be it

WHEREAS, (4) Government Code Section 22819.1 provides certain additional benefits to annuitants of local agencies contracting under the Act upon proper application; and

WHEREAS, (5) The Public Agency desires to obtain for its annuitants the benefit of Section 22819.1 and accepts the liabilities and obligations of a contracting agency under the Section; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, (a) That the Public Agency elects, and it does hereby elect, to be subject to the provisions of Section 22819.1 of the Government Code.

Adopted at a regular/special meeting of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority at San Jose, California this 28th day of August, 2014.

Signed: _________________________________
(President, Chairman, etc.)

Attest: _________________________________
(Secretary or appropriate officer)
INSTRUCTIONS

This resolution is the approved form designated by the Public Employees' Retirement System. It should be used by a Public Agency which is contracting for coverage under the Public Employees' Medical and Hospital Care Act when the agency desires to provide health benefit coverage for survivors of deceased annuitants as authorized by Section 22819.1 of the Government Code.

If the resolution (RESOLVED) is filed on or before the tenth day of any month, it will be effective on the first of the following month (date stamped as received in the office of the Board of Administration, Public Employee's Retirement System, 400 Q Street, P.O. Box 942714, Sacramento, CA 94229-2714)

WHEREAS, (2) should be completed with full name of the contracting agency.

WHEREAS, (3) should be completed with the full name of the recognized employee organization.

Because resolutions serve as our legal contract, we require the original resolution, certified copy with original signatures, or a copy of the resolution with the agency’s raised seal.

For resolution processing, deliver to the following:

**Overnight Mail Service**
California Public Employees' Retirement System
CASP, Contract & Membership Services Section
400 Q Street
Sacramento, CA 95811-6210

**Regular Mail**
California Public Employees' Retirement System
CASP, Contract & Membership Services Section
PO BOX 942714
Sacramento, CA 94229-2714

The certification shown following the resolution is to be completed by those individuals authorized to sign for the Public Agency in legal actions and is to include the name of the executive body; i.e. Board of Directors, Board of Trustees, etc., the location and the date of signing.

The certification shown following the resolution is to be completed by those individuals authorized to sign for the Public Agency in legal actions and is to include the name of the executive body; i.e. Board of Directors, Board of Trustees, etc., the location and date of signing.
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Nuria I. Fernandez

FROM: Director of Business Services, Bill Lopez

SUBJECT: Approval of CalPERS Medical Resolutions for Non-Represented Employees and Retirees

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

Resolution

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt the following Resolutions for CalPERS Medical Plans for Non-Represented employees and retirees, effective January 1, 2015.

1. Non-Represented Resolution (CalPERS).
2. Non-Represented Survivor Resolution (CalPERS) - for Surviving Spouses of deceased Non-Represented retirees.
3. Non-Represented (non-CalPERS) Resolution - for Non-Represented retirees who do not have five years of CalPERS service time but qualify for retiree medical based on VTA/ATU Retirement service and total VTA years of service.
4. Non-Represented Survivor Resolution (non-CalPERS) - for Surviving Spouses of deceased Non-Represented retirees who did not have five years of CalPERS service time when they retired, but qualified for retiree medical based on VTA/ATU Retirement service and total VTA years of service.

BACKGROUND:

To reduce costs and increase employee and retiree options for medical insurance, VTA is pursuing a transition to CalPERS medical plans for union represented employees and non-represented employees and retirees. On August 7, as required by law, the Board and the public were presented with an actuarial study which projected the costs or savings of the transition for
non-represented employees and employees represented by the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), who have agreed to pursue the transition. This study projected significant savings as a result of the transition.

As the final step in the required CalPERS transition process, the VTA Board of Directors is required to approve a series of Resolutions which reflect VTA’s preferences for the structure of the CalPERS health care benefit for non-represented employees, such as the employer contribution and the fact that non-represented retirees will be able to qualify based on combined service credits from both the CalPERS and the VTA/ATU Pension systems. This is an important consideration since several non-represented employees promoted from Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU) positions and have service credits in both systems. In these circumstances, an employee may need service credits from both systems to vest into the CalPERS retiree medical benefit.

VTA currently contracts with Kaiser, Valley Health Plan, and United Health Care Medicare Supplement plans to provide medical benefits for non-represented employees and retirees. These contracts expire December 31, 2014. Adoption of the Non-Represented Employees Resolutions enters VTA into a contract with CalPERS to provide medical benefits for non-represented employees and retirees instead of the current providers, effective January 1, 2015.

DISCUSSION:

Because VTA counts total years of service (whether CalPERS or non-CalPERS) to qualify for retiree medical benefits, both CalPERS and non-CalPERS resolutions are required. This allows members with service in both VTA/ATU and CalPERS retirement systems to qualify for retiree medical with total years of VTA service time. Without the additional resolutions, an non-represented employee who promoted from an ATU position, and later retired prior to vesting with five years of CalPERS service time, would not be eligible for CalPERS Medical plans. This is not VTA's intent for the transition.

To include eligibility for surviving spouses of deceased retirees who do not receive a monthly warrant (applicable to survivors of those who retired prior to the effective date of January 1, 2015), VTA is also required to submit optional Survivor Resolutions for both CalPERS and non-CalPERS surviving spouses.

ALTERNATIVES:

An alternative would be to maintain non-represented employees and retirees on existing medical plan contracts with Kaiser, Valley Health Plan, and UHC Medicare (which continue to cover ATU, TAEA and SEIU union employees and retirees).

FISCAL IMPACT:

VTA’s analysis of cost savings found an anticipated $38,169 savings for Non-Represented employees, (using 2014 rates), and $47,076 annually for Non-Represented retirees (using 2014 rates), for a total of $70,692 annual savings. The total estimated $70,692 in annual premium
savings for employees and retirees is based on enrollment assumptions and lower cost CalPERS Medical plans.

An OPEB Actuarial evaluation reported savings presented at the August 7, 2014 Board meeting. The study showed an estimated reduction in the Accrued Liability (compared to the June 30, 2013 OPEB Actuarial Valuation) of approximately $3.26 million, and a reduction in the GASB Annual Required Contribution (ARC) of $416,716. This represents a reduction in the ARC of 3.07% of the projected payroll for Non-Represented employees and retirees. Both the normal cost and unfunded liability (UAL) amortization components decreased with the transition to CalPERS Medical.

Prepared by: Bill Lopez
Memo No. 4669
RESOLUTION ELECTING TO BE SUBJECT TO
PUBLIC EMPLOYEES’ MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL CARE ACT
AND FIXING THE EMPLOYER’S CONTRIBUTION AT AN AMOUNT EQUAL TO OR
GREATER THAN THAT PRESCRIBED BY GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 22892(b)

WHEREAS, (1) Government Code Section 22922(a) provides the benefits of the Public Employees’ Medical and Hospital Care Act to employees, retirees, and survivors of local agencies contracting with the Public Employees’ Retirement System on proper application by a local agency; and

WHEREAS, (2) Section 22892(a) of the Act provides that a local contracting agency shall fix the amount of the employer's contribution; and

WHEREAS, (3) Government Code Section 22920(b) defines any Special District as a contracting agency, and

WHEREAS, (4) A Special District is hereby defined as a non-profit, self-governed public agency within the State of California, and comprised solely of public employees performing a governmental rather than proprietary function, and

WHEREAS, (5) Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, hereinafter referred to as Special District is an entity meeting the above definition; and

WHEREAS, (6) The Special District desires to obtain for the members of the Non-Represented Executive Management, Non-Represented Management, and Non-Represented Administrative and Support Staff, who are active and retired employees and survivors of the agency, the benefit of the Act and to accept the liabilities and obligations of an employer under the Act and Regulations; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, (a) That the Special District elects, and it does hereby elect, to be subject to the provisions of the Act; and be it further

RESOLVED, (b) That the employer's contribution for each employee, retiree, or survivor shall be the amount necessary to pay the full cost of his/her enrollment, including the enrollment of family members in a health benefits plan up to a maximum of the Kaiser Bay Area Basic/Supplement to Medicare Single Party Rate, plus administrative fees and Contingency Reserve Fund assessments; and be it further

RESOLVED, (c) That the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority has fully complied with any and all applicable provisions of Government Code Section 7507 in electing the benefits set forth above; and be it further

RESOLVED, (d) That the participation of the employees, retirees, and survivors of Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority shall be subject to determination of its status as an “agency or instrumentality of the state or political subdivision of a State” that is eligible to participate in a governmental plan within the meaning of Section 414(d) of the Internal Revenue Code, upon publication of final Regulations pursuant to such Section. If it is
determined that Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority would not qualify as an agency or instrumentality of the state or political subdivision of a State under such final Regulations, CalPERS may be obligated, and reserves the right to terminate the health coverage of all participants of the employer.

RESOLVED, (e) That the executive body appoint and direct, and it does hereby appoint and direct, Nuria Fernandez, General Manager, to file with the Board of Administration of the Public Employees’ Retirement System a verified copy of this Resolution, and to perform on behalf of said Special District all functions required of it under the Act and Regulations of the Board of Administration; and be it further

RESOLVED, (f) That coverage under the Act be effective on January 1, 2015

Adopted at a regular/special meeting of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority at San Jose, California this 28th day of August, 2014.

Signed: _________________________________
(President, Chairman, etc.)

Attest: _________________________________
(Secretary or appropriate officer)
INSTRUCTIONS

This resolution form is the approved form designated by the Public Employees’ Retirement System. It should be used by a Special District to assure proper filing with the Public Employees’ Retirement System for the combined purpose of:

1. Contracting for coverage under the Public Employees’ Medical and Hospital Care Act (PEMHCA), and

2. Fixing the employer's contribution toward employees' health insurance at an amount equal to or greater than that prescribed in GC 22892(b)

If the resolution (RESOLVED) is filed on or before the tenth day of any month, it will be effective on the first of the following month (date stamped as received in the office of the Board of Administration, Public Employee’s Retirement System, 400 Q Street, P.O. Box 942714, Sacramento, CA 94229-2714)

WHEREAS, (5) should be completed with full name of the contracting agency/Special District.

WHEREAS, (6) should be completed with full name of the recognized employee organization.

RESOLVED, (b) should be completed to specify the amount of the employer's (agency or district) contribution toward the cost of enrollment for active employees, retirees, and survivors. The amount specified by this Resolution would be an amount equal to or greater than that specified in Section 22892(b) as authorized by Section 22892(a) of the Government Code. Minimum employer contributions as prescribed in Section 22892(b).

Commencing January 1, 2009, the employer contribution shall be adjusted annually by the Board to reflect any change in the medical component of the Consumer Price Index, and shall be rounded to the nearest dollar.

RESOLVED, (c) should be completed with full name of the contracting agency/Special District.

RESOLVED, (d) should be completed with full name of the contracting agency/Special District.

RESOLVED, (e) requests the position title of the individual who handles the Public Employees' Medical and Hospital Care Act contract for the Special District.

RESOLVED, (f) should be completed with the date the coverage is to become effective.

Because resolutions serve as our legal contract, we require the original resolution, certified copy with original signatures, or a copy of the resolution with the agency’s raised seal.

For resolution processing, deliver to the following:

**Overnight Mail Service**
California Public Employees’ Retirement System
CASD, Contract & Membership Services Section
400 Q Street
Sacramento, CA 95811-6210

**Regular Mail**
California Public Employees’ Retirement System
CASD, Contract & Membership Services Section
PO BOX 942714
Sacramento, CA 94229-2714

The certification shown following the resolution is to be completed by those individuals authorized to sign for the Public Agency in legal actions and is to include the name of the executive body; i.e. Board of Directors, Board of Trustees, etc., the location and the date of signing.
RESOLUTION ELECTING TO BE SUBJECT TO SECTION 22819.1 OF THE PUBLIC EMPLOYEES’ MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL CARE ACT FOR FAMILY MEMBERS OF A DECEASED RETIREE

WHEREAS, (1) Government Code Sections 22922(b) provides the benefits of the Public Employees’ Medical and Hospital Care Act to employees of local agencies contracting with the Public Employees Retirement System; and

WHEREAS, (2) Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, hereinafter referred to as Special District, is a local agency contracting with the Public Employees’ Retirement System under the Act; and

WHEREAS, (3) The Special District desires to obtain for the members of the Non-Represented Executive Management, Non-Represented Management, and Non-Represented Administrative and Support Staff who are annuitants and of the agency, the benefit of the Act and to accept the liabilities and obligations of an employer under the Act and Regulations; now, therefore, be it

WHEREAS, (4) Government Code Section 22819.1 provides certain additional benefits to retirees of local agencies contracting under the Act upon proper application; and

WHEREAS, (5) The Special District desires to obtain for its retirees the benefit of Section 22819.1 and accepts the liabilities and obligations of a contracting agency under the Section; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, (a) That the Special District elects, and it does hereby elect, to be subject to the provisions of Section 22819.1 of the Government Code.

Adopted at a regular/special meeting of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority at San Jose, California this 28th day of August, 2014.

Signed: ____________________________________________
(President, Chairman, etc.)

Attest: _____________________________________________
(Secretary or appropriate officer)
INSTRUCTIONS

This resolution is the approved form designated by the Public Employees' Retirement System. It should be used by a Special District which is contracting for coverage under the Public Employees' Medical and Hospital Care Act when the agency desires to provide health benefit coverage for survivors of deceased retirees as authorized by Section 22819.1 of the Government Code.

If the resolution (RESOLVED) is filed on or before the tenth day of any month, it will be effective on the first of the following month (date stamped as received in the office of the Board of Administration, Public Employee's Retirement System, 400 Q Street, P.O. Box 942714, Sacramento, CA 94229-2714)

WHEREAS, (2) should be completed with full name of the contracting agency/Special District.

WHEREAS, (3) should be completed with the full name of the recognized employee organization.

Because resolutions serve as our legal contract, we require the original resolution, certified copy with original signatures, or a copy of the resolution with the agency's raised seal.

For resolution processing, deliver to the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overnight Mail Service</th>
<th>Regular Mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California Public Employees' Retirement System</td>
<td>California Public Employees' Retirement System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASD, Contract &amp; Membership Services Section</td>
<td>CASD, Contract &amp; Membership Services Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 Q Street</td>
<td>PO BOX 942714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento, CA 95811-6210</td>
<td>Sacramento, CA 94229-2714</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The certification shown following the resolution is to be completed by those individuals authorized to sign for the Public Agency in legal actions and is to include the name of the executive body; i.e. Board of Directors, Board of Trustees, etc., the location and the date of signing.

The certification shown following the resolution is to be completed by those individuals authorized to sign for the Public Agency in legal actions and is to include the name of the executive body; i.e. Board of Directors, Board of Trustees, etc., the location and date of signing.
RESOLUTION ELECTING TO BE SUBJECT TO SECTION 22819.1 OF THE PUBLIC EMPLOYEES’ MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL CARE ACT FOR FAMILY MEMBERS OF A DECEASED ANNUITANT

WHEREAS, (1) Government Code Sections 22922(b) provides the benefits of the Public Employees’ Medical and Hospital Care Act to employees of local agencies contracting with the Public Employees Retirement System; and

WHEREAS, (2) Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, hereinafter referred to as Public Agency, is a local agency contracting with the Public Employees’ Retirement System under the Act; and

WHEREAS, (3) The Public Agency desires to obtain for the Non-Represented Executive Management, Non-Represented Management, and Non-Represented Administrative and Support Staff, who are annuitants and of the agency, the benefit of the Act and to accept the liabilities and obligations of an employer under the Act and Regulations; now, therefore, be it

WHEREAS, (4) Government Code Section 22819.1 provides certain additional benefits to annuitants of local agencies contracting under the Act upon proper application; and

WHEREAS, (5) The Public Agency desires to obtain for its annuitants the benefit of Section 22819.1 and accepts the liabilities and obligations of a contracting agency under the Section; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, (a) That the Public Agency elects, and it does hereby elect, to be subject to the provisions of Section 22819.1 of the Government Code.

Adopted at a regular/special meeting of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority at San Jose, California this 28th day of August, 2014.

Signed: _________________________________
(President, Chairman, etc.)

Attest: _________________________________
(Secretary or appropriate officer)
INSTRUCTIONS

This resolution is the approved form designated by the Public Employees' Retirement System. It should be used by a Public Agency which is contracting for coverage under the Public Employees' Medical and Hospital Care Act when the agency desires to provide health benefit coverage for survivors of deceased annuitants as authorized by Section 22819.1 of the Government Code.

If the resolution (RESOLVED) is filed on or before the tenth day of any month, it will be effective on the first of the following month (date stamped as received in the office of the Board of Administration, Public Employee's Retirement System, 400 Q Street, P.O. Box 942714, Sacramento, CA 94229-2714)

WHEREAS, (2) should be completed with full name of the contracting agency.

WHEREAS, (3) should be completed with the full name of the recognized employee organization.

Because resolutions serve as our legal contract, we require the original resolution, certified copy with original signatures, or a copy of the resolution with the agency's raised seal.

For resolution processing, deliver to the following:

**Overnight Mail Service**
California Public Employees' Retirement System
CASD, Contract & Membership Services Section
400 Q Street
Sacramento, CA 95811-6210

**Regular Mail**
California Public Employees' Retirement System
CASD, Contract & Membership Services Section
PO BOX 942714
Sacramento, CA 94229-2714

The certification shown following the resolution is to be completed by those individuals authorized to sign for the Public Agency in legal actions and is to include the name of the executive body; i.e. Board of Directors, Board of Trustees, etc., the location and the date of signing.

The certification shown following the resolution is to be completed by those individuals authorized to sign for the Public Agency in legal actions and is to include the name of the executive body; i.e. Board of Directors, Board of Trustees, etc., the location and date of signing.
RESOLUTION ELECTING TO BE SUBJECT TO
PUBLIC EMPLOYEES’ MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL CARE ACT
AND FIXING THE EMPLOYER’S CONTRIBUTION AT AN AMOUNT EQUAL TO OR
GREATER THAN THAT PRESCRIBED BY GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 22892(b)

WHEREAS, (1) Government Code Section 22922(a) provides the benefits of the Public Employees’ Medical and Hospital Care Act to employees and annuitants of local agencies contracting with the Public Employees’ Retirement System on proper application by a local agency; and

WHEREAS, (2) Section 22892(a) of the Act provides that a local contracting agency shall fix the amount of the employer’s contribution; and

WHEREAS, (3) Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, hereinafter referred to as Public Agency, is a local agency contracting with the Public Employees’ Retirement System; and

WHEREAS, (4) The Public Agency desires to obtain for the Non-Represented Executive Management, Non-Represented Management, and Non-Represented Administrative and Support Staff, who are employees and annuitants of the agency, the benefit of the Act and to accept the liabilities and obligations of an employer under the Act and Regulations; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, (a) That the Public Agency elects, and it does hereby elect, to be subject to the provisions of the Act; and be it further

RESOLVED, (b) That the employer’s contribution for each employee or annuitant shall be the amount necessary to pay the full cost of his/her enrollment, including the enrollment of family members, in a health benefits plan or plans up to a maximum of the Kaiser Bay Area Basic/Supplement to Medicare Single Party Rate, plus administrative fees and Contingency Reserve Fund assessments; and be it further

RESOLVED, (c) That the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority has fully complied with any and all applicable provisions of Government Code Section 7507 in electing the benefits set forth above; and be it further

RESOLVED, (d) That the participation of the employees and annuitants of Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority shall be subject to determination of its status as an “agency or instrumentality of the state or political subdivision of a State” that is eligible to participate in a governmental plan within the meaning of Section 414(d) of the Internal Revenue Code, upon publication of final Regulations pursuant to such Section. If it is determined that Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority would not qualify as an agency or instrumentality of the state or political subdivision of a State under such final Regulations, CalPERS may be obligated, and reserves the right to terminate the health coverage of all participants of the employer.
RESOLVED, (e) That the executive body appoint and direct, Nuria Fernandez, General Manager to file with the Board of Administration of the Public Employees' Retirement System a verified copy of this Resolution, and to perform on behalf of said Public Agency all functions required of it under the Act and Regulations of the Board of Administration; and be it further

RESOLVED, (f) That coverage under the Act be effective on January 1, 2015.

Adopted at a regular/special meeting of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority at San Jose, California this 28th day of August 2014.

Signed: ________________________________
(President, Chairman, etc.)

Attest: ________________________________
(Secretary or appropriate officer)
INSTRUCTIONS

This resolution form is the approved form designated by the Public Employees' Retirement System. It should be used by a Public Agency to assure proper filing with the Public Employees' Retirement System for the combined purpose of:

1. Contracting for coverage under the Public Employees' Medical and Hospital Care Act (PEMHCA), and

2. Fixing the employer's contribution toward employees' health insurance at an amount equal to or greater than that prescribed in GC 22892(b)

If the resolution (RESOLVED) is filed **on or before the tenth day** of any month, it will be **effective on the first of the following month** (date stamped as received in the office of the Board of Administration, Public Employee's Retirement System, 400 Q Street, P.O. Box 942714, Sacramento, CA 94229-2714)

WHEREAS, (3) should be completed with full name of the contracting agency.

WHEREAS, (4) should be completed with full name of the recognized employee organization.

RESOLVED, (b) should be completed to specify the amount of the employer's (agency or district) contribution toward the cost of enrollment for active employees and annuitants. The amount specified by this Resolution would be an amount equal to or greater than that specified in Section 22892(b) as authorized by Section 22892(a) of the Government Code. Minimum employer contributions as prescribed in Section 22892(b).

Commencing January 1, 2009, the employer contribution shall be adjusted annually by the Board to reflect any change in the medical component of the Consumer Price Index, and shall be rounded to the nearest dollar.

RESOLVED, (c) should be completed with full name of the contracting agency.

RESOLVED, (d) should be completed with full name of the contracting agency.

RESOLVED, (e) requests the position title of the individual who handles the Public Employees' Medical and Hospital Care Act contract for the Public Agency.

RESOLVED, (f) should be completed with the date the coverage is to become effective.

Because resolutions serve as our legal contract, we require the original resolution, certified copy with original signatures, or a copy of the resolution with the agency’s raised seal.

For resolution processing, deliver to the following:

**Overnight Mail Service**
California Public Employees’ Retirement System
CASD, Contract & Membership Services Section
400 Q Street
Sacramento, CA 95811-6210

**Regular Mail**
California Public Employees’ Retirement System
CASD, Contract & Membership Services Section
PO BOX 942714
Sacramento, CA 94229-2714

The certification shown following the resolution is to be completed by those individuals authorized to sign for the Public Agency in legal actions and is to include the name of the executive body; i.e. Board of Directors, Board of Trustees, etc., the location and the date of signing.
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Nuria I. Fernandez

FROM: Director of Business Services, Bill Lopez

SUBJECT: Rescind ICMA Retirement Health Savings (RHS) Plan Agreements for AFSMCE and Non-Represented Employees

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve the following actions:

1. Rescind the ICMA Retirement Health Savings (RHS) Plan Number 803302 for Non-Represented employee groups who are converting to CalPERS Medical plans effective January 1, 2015. (Resolution No. 2012.01.09)

2. Rescind the ICMA Retirement Health Savings (RHS) Plan Number 803313 for employees represented by AFSMCE, Local 101, who are converting to CalPERS Medical plans, effective January 1, 2015. (Resolution No. 2012.01.10)

Such approval is conditioned on the Board’s approval of the CalPERS Medical Plans Resolutions for AFSCME and Non-Represented employees.

BACKGROUND:

On January 5, 2012, the Board approved independent resolutions adopting the ICMA Retirement Corporation’s (ICMA-RC) Vantage Care Retirement Health Savings Plan (RHS) for three of VTA’s four employee unions and non-represented employees, including American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), Local 101; Service Employees International Union (SEIU); Local 521; Transportation Authority Engineers and Architects Association (TAEA); and non-represented employees.

Pursuant to this Board action, AFSCME represented and non-represented employees who were hired (or re-hired) after January 1, 2012, currently have the option to choose a Defined
Contribution Retirement Health Savings Plan, in lieu of the Defined Benefit Retiree Medical Plan. However, because employees qualifying for CalPERS retirement are automatically eligible for CalPERS retiree medical, a Defined Contribution Plan in lieu of the Defined Benefit Plan for AFSCME or Non-Represented employees is no longer feasible or cost effective.

Under CalPERS rules, an employee who enrolled in VTA’s Retirement Health Savings Plan could also enroll in CalPERS retiree medical, resulting in both retiree medical and a Health Savings Plan for the retiree. To avoid the liability of covering double retirement benefits, pending the Board’s approval of this action, VTA’s Defined Contribution Retirement Health Savings Plan will no longer be offered and the current plans will be terminated for AFSCME and Non-Represented employees.

**DISCUSSION:**

Approval of this Board action rescinds the agreements made with ICMA for two groups, AFSCME, Local 101, and Non-Represented employees, and terminates these plans, effective 12/31/14.

The ICMA Retirement Corporation’s (ICMA-RC) Retirement Health Savings Plans for employees represented by TAEA and SEIU, Local 521 will continue, since these groups will continue with existing medical benefits under VTA contracts, and are not subject to CalPERS Medical rules.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

If the Board approves the CalPERS Medical Resolutions but does not approve rescinding the ICMA Retirement Health Savings Plans for AFSCME and Non-Represented employees, VTA could be liable for the cost of both retiree medical and RHS plans for any one retiree, since there can be no “in lieu” of benefit under CalPERS rules. The Board should not approve termination of ICMA plans if CalPERS Medical is not approved, so that employees could still maintain this option under current VTA Medical Plans.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

None.

Prepared by: Bill Lopez
Memo No. 4672
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Nuria I. Fernandez

FROM: Director of Engineering & Construction, Mark S. Robinson

SUBJECT: Passenger Safety Improvements Project Contract

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Granite Rock Company, the lowest responsible bidder, in an amount of $1,170,202 for the construction of the Passenger Safety Improvements Project.

BACKGROUND:

VTA operates 42 miles of light rail service throughout Santa Clara Valley. Trains operate at street level on 37 miles of track, interacting with motor vehicles, bicycles and pedestrians. In just the last five years, VTA has experienced 29 incidents involving pedestrians. The passenger safety improvements project will enhance the safety along the light rail system. This project will install fencing at four locations along the light rail right-of-way to discourage pedestrians from illegally and unsafely crossing the light rail tracks, and direct them to signalized crosswalks. The project will also install concrete barriers at Capitol Avenue/I-680 where automobile traffic has encroached into the operating right-of-way on numerous occasions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karina Station</td>
<td>Karina Court to Brokaw Road (east side of tracks)</td>
<td>270’ Concrete Barrier and 485’ of Decorative Fence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gish Station</td>
<td>Sonora Avenue to Gish Road (west side of tracks)</td>
<td>200’ Concrete Barrier and 710’ of Decorative Fence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention Center Station</td>
<td>Almaden Boulevard to Market Street (north side of tracks)</td>
<td>180’ Concrete Barrier and 600’ of Decorative Fence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Diridon Station</td>
<td>South End of Light Rail Station Platform to South of Caltrain Platform (east side of tracks)</td>
<td>500’ of Decorative Fence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Avenue/I-680</td>
<td>Opposite I-680 Southbound Off-Ramp (west side of tracks):</td>
<td>225’ Concrete Barrier:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opposite I-680 Northbound Off-Ramp (east side of tracks)</td>
<td>150’ Concrete Barrier</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An example of the typical decorative fence and concrete barrier treatment is shown in Exhibit A, at the Convention Center Station location.

The designer on the project was VTA.

**DISCUSSION:**

The Passenger Safety Improvements Project contract was advertised June 19, 2014. Two bids were submitted on July 24, 2014 with the following results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>Bid Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Granite Rock Company</td>
<td>$1,170,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert A. Bothman</td>
<td>$1,198,721</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Engineer’s Estimate $1,065,438

Granite Rock Company is the lowest responsible and responsive bidder. The bid is 9.8% over the Engineer’s Estimate. VTA staff has completed a bid analysis, has determined the bid to be fair and reasonable, and recommends award of this contract to Granite Rock Company.

Construction is scheduled to begin in September 2014 with completion by February 2015.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The Board could decide not to award the contract and re-advertise. This is not recommended as VTA would lose the opportunity to enhance safety at the project locations and would risk forfeiting the grant funds.
**FISCAL IMPACT:**

This action will authorize $1,170,202 for construction of the Passenger Safety Improvements Project. Appropriation for this contract is included in the FY15 Adopted VTA Transit Fund Capital Budget. The contract will be funded through a State grant, California Transit Security Grant Program – California Transit Assistance Fund (aka Prop 1B), CTSPG12.

**SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISE (SBE) PARTICIPATION:**

Based on identifiable subcontracting opportunities, a Small Business Enterprise (SBE) goal of 14.96% was established for this contract. Contractor has met the goal, and has committed to 25.5% SBE participation on this contract.

Prepared by: Ken Ronsse, Deputy Director  
Memo No. 4235
Exhibit A
Sample of Fence and Barrier

Intersection Looking South
Intersection Looking North

Convention Center

Concrete Barrier Sample
Decorative Fence Sample
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Nuria I. Fernandez

FROM: Director of Engineering & Construction, Mark S. Robinson

SUBJECT: Design Services for Light Rail Special Trackwork - Engineering Contract

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Rail Surveyors and Engineers, Inc. to perform engineering design services for the Light Rail Special Trackwork contract. The contract shall be for a three-year period for a total value not to exceed $1,200,000.

BACKGROUND:

There are two projects in the FY15 Capital Improvement Program, Rail Replacement and Rehabilitation, and LRT Crossovers and Switches Project that have similar engineering and construction scope and would gain efficiencies if combined into one engineering effort. The Light Rail Special Trackwork design contract will be assigned these two projects through final design and design support during construction. The scope includes the design of special trackwork such as a “half-grand” and crossovers, and associated disciplines such as civil, overhead catenary system and train signals to provide the infrastructure and system elements required for the special trackwork (Exhibit A). Design services during construction will also be included in the scope of services.

DISCUSSION:

The Request for Proposals (RFP) was issued on March 20, 2014 with proposals submitted on April 30, 2014. Proposals were received from six firms:

- URS
- STV Inc.
- Rail Surveyors and Engineers, Inc. (RSE)
A review panel consisting of four staff (two Senior Transportation Engineers, an Assistant Transportation Engineer and a Deputy Project Manager - Transit) evaluated the written proposals based on the following criteria as outlined in the RFP.

- Experience of the firm and team especially with similar projects of designing complex special trackwork in an operating environment
- Project understanding and work plan
- Staffing Plan, including key staff assigned to the project

Based on the evaluation by the review panel, two firms, STV and RSE, were invited to continue in the selection process and oral interviews. These firms showed the strongest relevant experience and staff qualifications to perform the work.

On May 30, 2014 the review panel interviewed the two teams. These interviews provided VTA staff with additional details about the specific work plan, approach and experience of the proposing teams. Both teams demonstrated a solid understanding of the project and developed thorough work plans, and are well qualified for the tasks requested.

The review panel determined that RSE submitted the best overall proposal to perform the services as prescribed in the RFP. The RSE team showed a better understanding of VTA’s operational challenges that are key in developing a work plan for the construction of the special trackwork elements. The RSE team demonstrated a superior understanding of the key issues and potential resolutions.

Based on final scoring, the review panel recommends the award of the contract for Design Services for Light Rail Special Trackwork to RSE. Rail Surveyors and Engineers, Inc. provides a full range of professional services to the rail transit industry. RSE's projects range in size and scope from small roadway and rail station projects to large complex rail transportation corridor and multimodal station projects. RSE has provided program management, construction management, and engineering services for over 15 years. RSE's major rail transit clients include VTA, Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCARRA), Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC), the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (PCJPB), Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), and numerous city, county, and state agencies.

The RSE team includes the sub consultants listed in Exhibit B.

Negotiations with RSE for final design services were initiated in July 2014 and completed on August 5, 2014. The agreement between VTA and RSE is ready for execution pending approval of this item by the Board. The proposed contract type is a Cost Plus Fixed Fee with a term of three years. An allowance for design services during construction has been included in the requested authorization. This scope will be negotiated with RSE at the time projects move into construction. This contract will provide approximately 7500 hours of engineering services.
**ALTERNATIVES:**

The Board of Directors can elect not to authorize award of this contract, however that action would delay the replacement of deteriorating trackwork and the implementation

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

This action will authorize up to $1,200,000 for Design Services for Light Rail Special Trackwork over the next three years. Budget appropriation for the contract is included in the FY15 Adopted VTA Transit Fund Capital Budget. This contract is funded by a Federal Grant (80%) and a VTA local match (20%).

**DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS ENTERPRISE (DBE) PARTICIPATION:**

Based on identifiable subcontracting opportunities, a Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) goal of 5.5% has been established for this contract. Contractor has met the goal and has committed to 49.6% DBE participation on this contract.

Prepared by: Mohamed Basma, Deputy Project Manager
Memo No. 4650
Exhibit A
Special Trackwork Construction Sites
### Exhibit B
List of Consultants - Design Services for Light Rail Special Trackwork

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor Firm</th>
<th>Contractor Role</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rail Surveyors and Engineers, Inc. (RSE)</td>
<td>Prime Consultant</td>
<td>650-826-1858</td>
<td>Morgan Hill, CA 95037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bay Signal</td>
<td>Sub-Consultant</td>
<td>408-569-5698</td>
<td>Petaluma, CA 94952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elcon Associates</td>
<td>Sub-Consultant</td>
<td>503-644-2490</td>
<td>Daly City, CA 94015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stack Traffic Consulting</td>
<td>Sub-Consultant</td>
<td>714-315-4640</td>
<td>Carlsbad, CA 92010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acosta Engineering Solutions</td>
<td>Sub-Consultant</td>
<td>415-426-7826</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA 94111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMA Companies</td>
<td>Sub-Consultant</td>
<td>408-362-4920</td>
<td>San Jose, CA 95119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Nuria I. Fernandez

FROM: Director of Engineering & Construction, Mark S. Robinson

SUBJECT: Mission Boulevard/Warren Avenue/Freight Railroad Relocation – Amendment to the RGW Construction, Inc. Construction Contract

Policy-Related Action: No

Government Code Section 84308 Applies: Yes

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the General Manager to amend the Mission Boulevard/Warren Avenue/Freight Railroad Relocation construction contract with RGW Construction, Inc. to accommodate scope additions in the amount of $2,200,000 for a new contract amount of $56,746,318.

BACKGROUND:

The Mission Boulevard/Warren Avenue/Freight Railroad Relocation (MWT) Program is a joint effort by the Alameda County Transportation Commission, City of Fremont and VTA, to widen Mission Boulevard (State Route 262), grade separate Warren Avenue from the UPRR freight tracks and the future BART tracks, and to relocate the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) freight tracks in the City of Fremont.
RGW Construction Contract Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor Name: RGW Construction, Inc.</th>
<th>Original Contract Amount: $45,040,277</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Including GM Contingency: $51,796,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Number: C101 (12004F)</td>
<td>Prior Modifications: $2,750,000 increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Contract Term(s): April 27, 2015</td>
<td>Current Contract Amount: $54,546,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Contract Term: April 27, 2015</td>
<td>Amount Requested: $2,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicitation Type: Bid</td>
<td>Total Amount Including Request: $56,746,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement Type: Competitive</td>
<td>% of Request to Current Amount: 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDBE Goal: 8%</td>
<td>% Modifications including request to original contract: 9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBE Goal: N/A</td>
<td>Funding Source(s): Measure A; State AB 1462; City of Fremont</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Original Contract Award Amount: $45,040,277

Original Contract Amount Including General Manager Contingency (15%): $51,796,318

On June 7, 2012, the VTA Board of Directors authorized the General Manager to enter into a construction contract with RGW Construction, Inc. (RGW) in the amount of $45,040,277 to execute the Mission Boulevard/Warren Avenue/Freight Railroad Relocation Program improvements (C101 contract). Including the General Manager Contingency of 15%, the total authorized amount was $51,796,318. The scope of the C101 contract includes the following work activities:

- Construct Deep Soil Mix retaining walls to prepare for grade separation
- Grade separate the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) freight tracks and roadway by depressing Warren Avenue
- Construct a steel UPRR railroad bridge, a cast-in-place roadway access bridge serving the UPRR Yard, and a cast-in-place bridge for BART service spanning Warren Avenue
- Widen Mission Boulevard (State Route 262) and construct Kato Road on/off ramps
- Construct a steel UPRR railroad bridge, and a cast-in-place bridge for BART service spanning Mission Boulevard
- Relocate UPRR freight tracks

Prior Contract Modifications:

On March 6, 2014, the VTA Board of Directors authorized the General Manager to amend the contract with RGW in the amount of $2,750,000 for a new authorized amount of $54,546,318 including the General Manager Contingency.
This contract amendment added the following scope of work:

- **Truck-Rail Handling Site Mitigation ($1,550,000)** - Mitigation of site impacts including the relocation of equipment and utilities serving the site.
- **Temporary Boiler Unit ($300,000)** - Providing and maintaining a temporary boiler unit during the relocation of the natural gas service by PG&E.
- **Shoofly Construction at Warren Avenue ($600,000)** - Construction of shoofly in order to maintain freight traffic by UPRR during construction of retaining walls.
- **Additional UPRR Work ($300,000)** - Assisting UPRR with track construction including grading of existing track embankment, removal of tracks and furnishing track materials.

**Current Contract Amount (including General Manager Contingency): $54,546,318**

**This Request:** $2,200,000

Percentage of this request to Current Amount: 4.0%

Percentage of Modifications (including this request) to Original Amount: 9.1%

**DISCUSSION:**

The proposed contract amendment adds unanticipated scope of work to the C101 contract as outlined below. A site plan of the area is attached as Exhibit A.

- **Mission Boulevard Contaminated Ground Water Mitigation ($565,000)** - Additional sampling and testing of the ground water in the depressed section of Mission Boulevard has indicated that the hydrocarbon levels are higher than what the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) will allow for discharge into the storm drain system. A carbon filtration system is required to be installed to treat the water before it can be discharged.
- **Mission Boulevard Widening at Brown Road ($250,000)** - The City of Fremont has requested VTA to widen westbound Mission Boulevard near Brown Road (a distance of approximately 150 feet) to allow restriping for three lanes.
- **Warren Avenue Rehabilitation ($385,000)** - Remove and replace approximately 23,000 square feet of damaged Warren Avenue pavement from the east side conform to Warm Springs Boulevard.
- **Mission Boulevard Rehabilitation ($250,000)** - Rehabilitate approximately 30,000 square feet of westbound Mission Boulevard.
- **Fiber Optic Cable Relocation ($750,000)** - Relocate the fiber optic cables and manholes impacted by the grade separations at Mission Boulevard and Warren Avenue.
Mission Boulevard Contaminated Ground Water Mitigation

At the time the project was advertised and awarded, preliminary ground water test results did not indicate a level of contamination that would require mitigation measures. However, during construction of the pavement widening, additional tests were performed and the results indicated a much higher level of hydrocarbons in the ground water. After discussions with RWQCB and Caltrans, two options were identified to mitigate the higher concentrations:

- Install a carbon filter system and treat the ground water before discharge into the storm drain system
- Discharge the ground water into the Union Sanitary District (USD) sanitary sewer system

USD would allow discharge of the untreated ground water under a permit with associated fees based on the volume of water discharged into the system. Based on the estimated flow rate and subsequent annual fees, Caltrans decided that it would be more cost effective to install a filtration system and discharge into the storm drain system.

Currently, the ground water is being stored and filtered through Baker tanks and discharged into the sanitary sewer system. During construction of the UPRR and BART bridges over Mission Boulevard, it was the responsibility of the contractor to dewater the site and pay any discharge costs. However, that work has been completed and the costs to discharge the ground water is now a Mission Boulevard Widening Project cost, with the contractor being reimbursed as extra work until the permanent system has been constructed and is operational.

The work includes: grading existing embankment (to avoid construction of retaining wall); furnishing and installing a sump with two pumps and a filtration system; discharge piping; paving; chain link fence; electrical system; and 3-year scheduled maintenance.

Mission Boulevard Widening at Brown Road

The City of Fremont has requested VTA to include the widening of Mission Boulevard between the southbound I-680 off ramp and Brown Road (approximately 150 feet in length) to provide three through lanes on Mission Boulevard (Exhibit B). The work includes widening Mission Boulevard approximately 12 feet, constructing curb & gutter and sidewalk, storm drainage improvements, relocating signs, and pavement delineation. An amendment to the Warren Avenue Grade Separation Cooperative Agreement has been executed with the City of Fremont to establish the roles and responsibilities for the widening of Mission Boulevard at Brown Road. VTA will be responsible for the preparation of the environmental document, plans and specifications, coordination with Caltrans, and construction management and administration, and inspection. The City will be responsible for all associated costs, including VTA labor.

Warren Avenue Rehabilitation

The executed Warren Avenue Grade Separation Cooperative Agreement requires the Warren Grade Separation Project to repair damages to local city streets caused by trucks hauling or
removing materials and equipment to the project site. The City and VTA agreed that the rehabilitation of Warren Avenue from the easterly conform to Warm Springs Boulevard would satisfy the conditions in the agreement. The work includes the removal and replacement of the damaged pavement, traffic control, pavement delineation, and replacement of damaged traffic signal loop detectors.

**Mission Boulevard Rehabilitation**

The pavement in the westbound direction of Mission Boulevard has deteriorated to the point that it would not be able to withstand the additional traffic loads when the project is completed. In addition, the project caused additional damage to the pavement during construction. Caltrans has asked that the project rehabilitate the pavement up to the Mission Boulevard/Warm Springs Boulevard intersection (approximately 500 linear feet) as part of the Mission Boulevard Widening Project. The work includes grinding existing pavement, placement of reinforcing fabric and asphalt concrete pavement, hauling and disposal of materials, temporary pavement delineation, and replacement of signal loop detectors.

**Fiber Optic Cable Relocation**

The fiber optic facilities impacted by the improvements included in the Mission Boulevard and Warren Avenue grade separations was planned to be relocated by the owners of the facilities under a separate utility relocation contract administered by MCI. However, in order to expedite the work and reduce the coordination effort for the contractors, reduce the potential for schedule delays, as well as to minimize the construction administration expenses, it was agreed to include the work in the C101 contract. The work, which is related to all three projects (Mission, Warren and FRR), involves the relocation of the fiber optic facilities from Warren Avenue to Agua Caliente Creek, and pulling and splicing new fiber optic cables from Kato Road to Grimmer Boulevard.

The C101 construction contract is approximately 90% complete and remains on schedule to be completed in spring 2015. A list of the subcontractors involved in the construction is attached as Exhibit C.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The Board could choose to not authorize any additional funds at this time, or choose to fund only a portion of the additional work. This is not recommended as it could jeopardize the completion of the improvements and the C101 contract, and potentially delay the SVBX Project.

If the filtration system for the contaminated ground water is not installed, the temporary collection and discharge system must remain in place and the Mission Boulevard widening improvements included in the C101 contract could not be completed.

If the funds for the Mission Boulevard widening at Brown Road are not authorized, the work will not proceed under this contract. The City could bid this work separately under a new contract.

If the funds for the rehabilitation of Warren Avenue are not authorized, this work would not be completed, and the terms and conditions in the Cooperative Agreement would not be satisfied.

If the funds for the rehabilitation of Mission Boulevard are not authorized, this work would not
be completed, and pavement conditions would rapidly deteriorate and fail shortly following the completion of the project.

If the funds for the relocation of the fiber optic facilities are not authorized, the SVBX Line Track Station and System Design Build contract would be delayed until the work is completed by MCI.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

This action will authorize an additional $2,200,000 for construction of Mission Boulevard/Warren Avenue/Freight Railroad Relocation Program improvements. Appropriation for these expenditures is available in the FY15 Adopted 2000 Measure A Transit Improvement Program Fund Capital Budget. Funding for this effort will include State AB 1462 and City of Fremont funds.

**UNDERUTILIZED DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS ENTERPRISE (UDBE) PARTICIPATION:**

Based on identifiable subcontracting opportunities, an Underutilized Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (UDBE) goal of 8% was established for this contract. Contractor is currently meeting the goal and is committed to achieving the goal including the additional scope of work.

Prepared by: Jim Costantini, Deputy Director
Memo No. 4614
MISSION BLVD./WARREN AVE./FREIGHT RAILROAD RELOCATION
EXHIBIT A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor Firm</th>
<th>Contractor Role</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RGW, Inc.</td>
<td>General Contractor</td>
<td>925-606-2400</td>
<td>Livermore, CA 94550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA Fence</td>
<td>Fencing</td>
<td>408-727-5465</td>
<td>Santa Clara, CA 95050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC Curb &amp; Dike</td>
<td>Ac Dike</td>
<td>916-689-5300</td>
<td>Isleton, CA 95641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC Dike</td>
<td>AC Dike</td>
<td>916-652-0159</td>
<td>Lincoln, CA 95648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acacia Erosion Control</td>
<td>Erosion Control</td>
<td>805-964-2585</td>
<td>Santa Barbara, CA 93111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACL</td>
<td>Type 60 Barrier</td>
<td>909-391-4477</td>
<td>Ontario, CA 91761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams &amp; Smith, Inc.</td>
<td>Structural Steel</td>
<td>801-785-6900</td>
<td>Lindon, Utah 84042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alanuillo Rebar</td>
<td>Rebar</td>
<td>707-551-2166</td>
<td>Vallejo, CA 94592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASC Engineers</td>
<td>Photo Survey</td>
<td>510-207-1387</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA 94129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVAR</td>
<td>Soil Nail</td>
<td>510-354-2000</td>
<td>Fremont, CA 94538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayala Boring</td>
<td>Bore and Jack</td>
<td>909-350-8940</td>
<td>Fontana, CA 92335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baines Group, Inc.</td>
<td>Architectural Concrete</td>
<td>510-238-4668</td>
<td>Oakland, CA 94607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Contracting Services</td>
<td>Waterproofing</td>
<td>510-886-7240</td>
<td>Union City, CA 94587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown &amp; Fesler Inc.</td>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>925-960-9150</td>
<td>Livermore, CA 94550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Fence</td>
<td>Fencing</td>
<td>510-895-8477</td>
<td>San Leandro, CA 94577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Wrecking</td>
<td>Structure Demolition</td>
<td>510-568-2626</td>
<td>Oakland, CA 94621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMC Rebar</td>
<td>Permanent Signage</td>
<td>209-951-9620</td>
<td>Stockton, CA 95219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMC Traffic Control</td>
<td>Rebar</td>
<td>415-206-1700</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA 94124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Electric</td>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>510-430-9505</td>
<td>San Leandro, CA 94577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condon Johnson</td>
<td>DSM, Soil Nail</td>
<td>510-636-2100</td>
<td>Oakland, CA 94621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated Engineering</td>
<td>QCQA</td>
<td>925-314-7100</td>
<td>San Ramon, CA 94583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crusader Fence</td>
<td>Fencing</td>
<td>916-631-9191</td>
<td>Rancho Cordova, CA 95912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culver Group</td>
<td>Surveying, Staking</td>
<td>925-356-2044</td>
<td>Concord, CA 94520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dees-Hennessey Inc.</td>
<td>Shotcrete, Slope Paving</td>
<td>650-595-8933</td>
<td>San Carlos, CA 94070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drill Tech</td>
<td>Soil Nail</td>
<td>925-978-2060</td>
<td>Antioch, CA 94509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DY Widag Systems, Inc.</td>
<td>Pre-Stressing Concrete</td>
<td>562-531-6161</td>
<td>Long Beach, CA 90805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bay Construction</td>
<td>Erosion Control</td>
<td>209-627-3797</td>
<td>Tracy, CA 95376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans Brothers, Inc.</td>
<td>Structural Demolition</td>
<td>925-443-0225</td>
<td>Livermore, CA 94550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3 &amp; Associates</td>
<td>Surveying, Staking</td>
<td>707-748-4300</td>
<td>Benicia, CA 94510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBD Vanguard</td>
<td>Type 60 Barrier</td>
<td>925-245-1300</td>
<td>Livermore, CA 94550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FD Thomas</td>
<td>Waterproofing</td>
<td>916-922-1505</td>
<td>Sacramento, CA 95838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor Firm</td>
<td>Contractor Role</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Constructors</td>
<td>Pile Driving</td>
<td>925-754-6633</td>
<td>Oakley, CA 94561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox Loomis, Inc.</td>
<td>Dewatering</td>
<td>916-383-2140</td>
<td>Sacramento, CA 95828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Medina</td>
<td>Fencing</td>
<td>530-743-0744</td>
<td>Oroville, CA 95966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Bay Fence</td>
<td>Fencing</td>
<td>209-944-9754</td>
<td>Stockton, CA 95206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenscape</td>
<td>Erosion Control</td>
<td>916-771-0524</td>
<td>Roseville, CA 95757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffin Soil</td>
<td>Lime Stabilization</td>
<td>925-862-2260</td>
<td>Pleasanton, CA 94566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H &amp; H Engineering</td>
<td>Rail Track</td>
<td>209-983-0708</td>
<td>Stockton, CA 95206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris Salinas Rebar</td>
<td>Rebar</td>
<td>925-373-0733</td>
<td>Livermore, CA 94551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jafec, USA, Inc.</td>
<td>Deep Soil Mixing</td>
<td>408-467-2240</td>
<td>San Jose, CA 95110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffco Painting &amp; Coating</td>
<td>Graffiti Resistant Coating</td>
<td>707-562-1900</td>
<td>Vallejo, CA 94590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm Drilling</td>
<td>DSM, Soil Nail</td>
<td>510-780-1167</td>
<td>Hayward, CA 94545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Thomas &amp; Co. Inc.</td>
<td>Surveying, Staking</td>
<td>408-453-5393</td>
<td>San Jose, CA 95112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain States Steel</td>
<td>Structural Steel</td>
<td>801-785-5085</td>
<td>Lindon, Utah 84042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municon Consultants</td>
<td>Vibration Monitoring</td>
<td>415-641-2570</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA 94107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVE Inc.</td>
<td>Surveying, Staking</td>
<td>866-526-4214</td>
<td>Modesto, CA 95354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitta Erosion Control</td>
<td>Erosion Control</td>
<td>916-652-7459</td>
<td>Loomis, CA 95650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliveira Fence</td>
<td>Fencing</td>
<td>408-727-3811</td>
<td>Santa Clara, CA 95050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Boring</td>
<td>Bore and Jack</td>
<td>559-864-9442</td>
<td>Caruthers, CA 93609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Coast Steel</td>
<td>Rebar</td>
<td>707-863-3933</td>
<td>Fairfield, CA 94534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Waterproofing</td>
<td>Waterproofing</td>
<td>909-444-3054</td>
<td>Pomona, CA 91768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipe Jacking Unlimited</td>
<td>Bore and Jack</td>
<td>909-880-8446</td>
<td>San Bernardino, CA 92407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rain for Rent</td>
<td>Dewatering</td>
<td>925-479-2803</td>
<td>Oakley, CA 94561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raito Inc.</td>
<td>DSM</td>
<td>510-259-9900</td>
<td>Hayward, CA 94545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood Painting</td>
<td>Graffiti Resistant Coating</td>
<td>925-432-4500</td>
<td>Pittsburgh, CA 94565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMA Group</td>
<td>QCQA</td>
<td>408-362-4920</td>
<td>San Jose, CA 95119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMT Landscape</td>
<td>Landscape Irrigation</td>
<td>510-568-3208</td>
<td>Oakland, CA 94621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schnabel Foundation</td>
<td>DSM, Soil Nail</td>
<td>303-481-8765</td>
<td>Aurora, CO 80017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selby’s Soil</td>
<td>Erosion Control</td>
<td>800-578-2354</td>
<td>Loomis, CA 95650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signet Testing Labs, Inc.</td>
<td>QCQA</td>
<td>510-887-8484</td>
<td>Hayward, CA 94545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Francis Electric</td>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>510-639-0639</td>
<td>San Leandro, CA 95577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steiney &amp; Co.</td>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>707-552-6900</td>
<td>Vallejo, CA 94490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stinger Welding Inc.</td>
<td>Structural Steel</td>
<td>520-723-5383</td>
<td>Coolidge, AZ 85128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoer &amp; Graff, Inc.</td>
<td>Pile Driving</td>
<td>925-778-0200</td>
<td>Antioch, CA 94509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor Firm</td>
<td>Contractor Role</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennyson Electric</td>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>925-606-1038</td>
<td>Livermore, CA 94550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevicos</td>
<td>DSM, Soil Nail</td>
<td>617-241-4800</td>
<td>Charleston, MA 02129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah Pacific</td>
<td>Structural Steel</td>
<td>801-785-3557</td>
<td>Lindon, Utah 84042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. C. Maloney Inc.</td>
<td>Structural Demolition</td>
<td>209-942-1129</td>
<td>Stockton, CA 95213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter G. Smith</td>
<td>Bore and Jack</td>
<td>559-299-9727</td>
<td>Clovis, CA 93613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteside Concrete</td>
<td>Minor Concrete</td>
<td>510-234-6681</td>
<td>Richmond, CA 94801</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Nuria I. Fernandez

FROM: Director of Engineering & Construction, Mark S. Robinson

SUBJECT: Santa Clara/Alum Rock Bus Rapid Transit Project – Agreement Between the City of San Jose, the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority and Merge Conceptual Design, Inc. to Fabricate and Deliver Works of Art

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the General Manager to execute an Agreement with the City of San Jose and Merge Conceptual Design, LLC for $1,000,000 to finalize design, fabricate and deliver art elements for the Santa Clara/Alum Rock Bus Rapid Transit Project.

BACKGROUND:

The Santa Clara/Alum Rock Bus Rapid Transit (SC/AR BRT) Project is included in the VTA 2000 Measure A Transit Improvement Program. The SC/AR BRT Project is located in the City of San Jose and extends approximately 7.2 miles from the western terminus at the San Jose Arena (SAP Center) on Santa Clara Street to the Alum Rock Transit Center on Capitol Avenue and terminating at the Eastridge Transit Center (Exhibit A).

The improvements for this project include the construction of 21 passenger platforms which are the primary focus of the SC/AR BRT art program. The art program reinforces the identity of the transit line while strengthening the unique character of the individual stations as neighborhood landmarks. It will contribute to the vibrancy of the cityscape, promote neighborhood pride and create engaging experiences for transit users and the community as a whole.

The approved art design focuses on the paving, windscreens and ceiling elements of the platform shelters, creating a distinct “Room within a Room” concept. Based on site specific opportunities presented by the physical and cultural context, the art elements detail the unique patterns, imagery and colors for each station. These designs were
developed from extensive research and community outreach by the artists including community focus groups, workshops with schools, one-on-one meetings with community leaders, strategic plan presentations, committee presentations and technical coordination meetings.

**DISCUSSION:**

Under previous agreements, VTA has engaged both City staff and Merge Conceptual Design, LLC (Merge) to develop the artwork design for passenger platforms along the project alignment. City staff was engaged through its Public Art Program to provide public art management services for the artwork. Merge was selected by a panel of arts professionals and project stakeholders as the most qualified to provide art master planning, and design development for the project. Merge has provided these services and has completed an engaged community outreach process and developed designs per station. The Merge team is identified in Exhibit B.

This agreement will be a three-party agreement between City, VTA and Merge for the fabrication, delivery and installation oversight of the design enhancement pieces at 21 platforms along the SC/AR BRT corridor. City will be responsible for project oversight and disbursement of funds to the artist on behalf of VTA. Artist will be paid upon meeting milestones related to fabrication, delivery of artwork to project site, and providing technical oversight to the VTA construction team on the installation of elements.

The cost for the artist’s services and the fabrication/delivery of the art elements is estimated at $1,000,000. These funds will be expended over the next two fiscal years.

Fabrication is expected to begin in September 2014, with installation completed by late 2015.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The Board could choose to not approve this agreement. This alternative is not recommended because it would result in the project not being able to provide art elements for both the transit users and the community in general.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

This action will authorize $1,000,000 for finalizing design, fabricating and delivering art elements for the SC/AR BRT Project. Appropriation for this expenditure is included in the FY15 Adopted 2000 Measure A Transit Improvement Program Fund Capital Budget. This contract is funded with State Proposition 1B and 2000 Measure A funds.

Prepared by: Ken Ronsse, DeputyDirector
Memo No. 4649
## EXHIBIT B

**List of Merge Team Members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultant Firm</th>
<th>Contact Person</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Jose-Office of Cultural Affairs, Public Art Program</td>
<td>Mary Rubin</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Merge-Conceptual Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Claudia Reisenberger/Franka Diehnelt</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Nuria I. Fernandez

FROM: Director of Planning and Program Development, John Ristow

SUBJECT: State Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP) Amendments

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) program amendments that exchange funds between two Palo Alto and San Jose projects.

BACKGROUND:

On June 6, 2013 the VTA Board of Directors approved the FY2012-16 One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Program of projects. The $88 million OBAG program provides Federal grant funding to the cities, the County, and VTA. OBAG funding provides funding for local road repair ($39 million) distributed via formula and local pedestrian, bicycle and technology improvements ($49 million) allocated through a competitive program. The actual Federal funding sources included in the OBAG program were Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ), Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Transportation Alternative Program (TAP) funds.

Of Santa Clara's $88 million of OBAG funding, $4.35 million was TAP. At that time TAP funds were actually administered through the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) by the California Transportation Commission (CTC). All projects programmed with TAP funds were programmed in the STIP.

Shortly after OBAG was programmed, the 2014 California State Budget consolidated all TAP funds statewide with Safe Routes to School funding and Bicycle Lane Account funding into the new State Active Transportation Program (ATP). ATP is now being administered at the State and regional level, and the TAP funds are no longer available to OBAG projects. The CTC has retained those projects in the STIP, but provided them with other funds and in many cases
programmed them several years later than originally requested.

This series of actions affects two OBAG projects in Santa Clara County—*The Alameda, The Beautiful Way Grand Boulevard, Phase 2* (City of San Jose) and *US 101/Adobe Creek Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge* (City of Palo Alto). Originally, The Alameda was programmed with $1.35 million in TAP funds in FY15, while US 101/Adobe Creek was originally programmed with $3 million TAP funds and $1 million Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) in FY16.

**DISCUSSION:**

Following the CTC approval of the 2014 STIP and the consolidation of TAP into the ATP program, the CTC placed STIP funds for both projects in FY16/17. However, The Alameda project is on schedule to begin construction in FY15 and City staff requested assistance in keeping the project on schedule. Therefore, with both cities’ concurrence presented as Attachment A, VTA staff recommends the following programming changes, shown in Tables 1 & 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Current Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>City</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Proposed Program (Amendments)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>City</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff recommends that the VTA Board program $1.35 million STIP funds to City of Palo Alto’s *Rt. 101/Adobe Creek Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge* from City of San Jose’s *The Alameda “Beautiful Way” Grand Blvd, Phase 2*. Staff then recommends that the Board program $1 million in CMAQ funds to the City of San Jose project from the City of Palo Alto project. Finally, staff recommends that the Board program $350,000 of local VRF, Countywide Matching Funds to the San Jose project. These programming actions remove all STIP funds and the FY16/17 restriction from The Alameda project, allowing it to begin construction in FY15.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The VTA Board of Directors may choose not to approve the exchange of funds, however this would result in The Alameda project being delayed until FY 16/17, and risking loss of the FY'15/16 CMAQ funding that it currently has.
FISCAL IMPACT:

There is no fiscal impact to VTA as a result of approving the State Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP) Amendments.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) reviewed and discussed this item at their August 14, 2014 meeting and unanimously recommended the item to the VTA Board for approval.

The Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) reviewed and discussed this item at their August 14, 2014 meeting and unanimously recommended the item to the VTA Board for approval. The committee expressed concerns about the $350,000 STIP windfall to Palo Alto.

Prepared by: Celeste Fiore
Memo No. 4639
June 25, 2014

Celeste Fiore
Transportation Planner
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA)
3331 N. First Street
San Jose CA  95134

Subject: Concurrence letter to change funding sources and amount for Adobe Creek/Highway 101Bicycle Pedestrian Bridge Project

Dear Celeste:

The City concurs that VTA Programming & Grants staff may perform the exchange of $1 million in funds of Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) for $1.350 million Regional Improvement Program (RIP) funds as requested by VTA on June 17, 2014. This brings the project's total RIP funds to $4.350 million. In addition, the local funds are to be decreased by $350,000.

Thank you for increasing the funds for this exciting project within our community.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Ames

Senior Project Manager
Public Works Department
June 25, 2014

Ms. Celeste Fiore
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Agency
3331 North First Street
San Jose, CA 95134

SUBJECT: Letter of Concurrence for The Alameda Phase II Project

Dear Ms. Fiore,

In response to your letter dated June 17, 2014 regarding our The Alameda Phase II project, we concur with the request to exchange $1.35 million dollars of existing RIP funds for $1 million in CMAQ funds and $350,000 in Vehicle Registration Fee program funds.

We understand that the funding change will not result in any adjustments to the project schedule.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

John Raaymakers, P.E.
Senior Engineer
Local Projects & Grant Delivery
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Nuria I. Fernandez

FROM: Director of Planning and Program Development, John Ristow

SUBJECT: Opportunities to Enhance the Relationship of Land Use and Transportation

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

This item is a referral from the February 20, 2014 meeting of the Congestion Management Program and Planning Committee (CMPP). This came up during a discussion of regional collaboration between VTA and local agencies to improve the relationship between land use and transportation planning. The Committee requested additional information on how local agencies implement best practices in integrating land use and transportation planning. The Committee expressed that VTA should play a leadership role and discussed how VTA can increase its influence on land development that supports transit.

This Board Report highlights VTA’s current roles in the land use and transportation development process and will generate ideas and discussion about how the process can be improved.

DISCUSSION:

As a Congestion Management Agency (CMA) for Santa Clara County, VTA has always had a role in integrating land use and transportation planning. State legislation requires CMAs to establish “A program to analyze the impacts of land use decisions made by local jurisdictions on the regional transportation system, including an estimate of the costs associated with mitigating those impacts.” (Government Code 65089 (b) (4)) To serve this goal, VTA has developed several programs and initiatives to coordinate local land use decision-making with regional transportation planning. These efforts are described further in Attachment A.

One way of thinking about how VTA fits into the development process is to consider the built environment as a whole, including development sites and transportation rights-of-way. As a transit agency, VTA has the greatest degree of influence over VTA transit lines themselves, including the development and maintenance of physical infrastructure (light rail tracks, BRT...
lanes, bus stops) as well as decisions on where and when transit service operates. Transportation rights-of-way, including streets, bike lanes, and sidewalks, are influenced to varying degrees by VTA, local agencies, and other agencies such as Caltrans, depending on the facility. VTA is actively engaged with local agencies in implementing the Complete Streets legislation (AB 1358) in this area. Finally, land development sites are primarily influenced by private property owners and local agencies, while VTA plays an indirect role in most cases. These relationships are shown in Attachment A, page 1.

VTA has developed several programs and initiatives that influence the land use development process directly and indirectly. As a direct influence, VTA develops the Valley Transportation Plan and the Transit Service Plan, which define the transportation investments that help shape development decisions. The Congestion Management Program (CMP) and Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Guidelines establish standards and guidelines for analyzing the transportation impacts of proposed projects. In addition, VTA’s Joint Development Program provides a framework for pursuing opportunities for development on VTA-owned land near transit. Finally, VTA has several programs and initiatives that indirectly influence the land use process, including Land Use/Transportation Integration efforts to work proactively with local agencies to establish transit-supportive land use policies at the general plan/area plan level, the Community Design and Transportation (CDT) Program, the Development Review process, and grant funding programs. These programs/initiatives and their relationship to the development process are shown on pages 2-3 of Attachment A.

VTA has made headway in these efforts, and its programs, guidelines and policies have demonstrated leadership in these areas. However, to further enhance VTA’s role, more work, by VTA and its Member Agencies, is needed. The fundamental goal is to strengthen the connection between land use decisions and transportation investments in order to increase walking, biking and transit ridership, reduce congestion and improve the livability and economic vitality of Silicon Valley. This relationship clearly mutually beneficial; VTA’s transportation investments greatly influence many aspects of city livability and sustainability, and the local land use decisions greatly influence the effectiveness of the various types of travel (e.g., car, walk, bike, and transit). Building on VTA’s experience and understanding from years of working closely with local agencies, staff developed several ideas for opportunities to improve VTA’s involvement in land use and transportation, shown on pages 4-5 of Attachment A.

Implementing these changes may require actions from both VTA and local agencies. The outcome would be to make VTA’s involvement more meaningful at all stages of the process: from the development of land use policies, through the entire project proposal and approval process, and ending with improved VTA monitoring and research activities that feed back into transportation planning, policies and investments. These ideas are presented to generate discussion only, and are not intended to be construed as “recommendations” by VTA staff at this stage.

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

This item was on the regular agenda at the August 2014 meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC). Committee Member Rogers asked if VTA is involved in the General Plan updates underway in Morgan Hill and Gilroy. Staff responded that VTA is not involved yet but may get involved in the future if the cities are open to this. Committee Member Powers asked for
clarification on VTA’s proposal in the report to improve land use data collection. Committee Member Elias asked if VTA’s proposal to conduct transportation research in the report would include research on trail usage by bicycle and pedestrian modes. Staff responded that this effort could potentially include such research.

This item was on the regular agenda at the August 2014 meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). Vice Chairperson Servin asked a question about how VTA would collect data on Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs. Staff responded that the effort could start with the process laid out in the TIA Guidelines Update for Target-Based Reductions of auto trips and also mentioned that the purpose of this list is to start discussion so the details of implementing any given proposal would be worked out later. Committee Member Salvano asked whether VTA would also consider the development of VTA-owned land as an approach to integrate land use and transportation. Staff responded that land development is part of VTA’s strategy and would follow VTA’s Board-adopted Joint Development Policy.

This item was on the regular agenda at the August 2014 meeting of the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC). Committee Member Wasserman commented that most existing roads are physically constrained between buildings, making it difficult to address all modes of transportation within the available right-of-way, and cautioned against adding layers to the development review process. Committee Member Abe-Koga commented that Cities are working to approve more Transit Oriented Development (TOD) but it can be a challenge in areas with limited transit service. Committee Member Abe-Koga further commented that after the Plan Bay Area process there is some pushback regarding transportation agencies being involved in the land use process, and that VTA should focus on improving transit service as a way to encourage TOD.

Prepared By: Robert Cunningham
Memo No. 4656
Local Agency and VTA Roles in Land Use and Transportation

VTA Degree of Influence

- Building/Development (Local Agency + Private Developers, VTA Review/Comment)
- Public Right-of-Way (Local Agency + VTA)
- Transit Service (Operated by VTA)

Increasing VTA Influence

Transit Service: Bus, light rail or Bus Rapid Transit

Public Right-of-way:
Roadway, Sidewalk, Bicycle, and Transit Facilities, Plus Streetscape Elements
**VTA Involvement in Land Use & Development**

**Direct Influence**

*Valley Transportation Plan (VTP)* – County-wide planning and policy framework for developing and delivering future transportation projects

*Transit Service Plan* – Evaluates existing service and recommends improvements

*Congestion Management Program (CMP)*

**Auto LOS Standard** – Used as a threshold of significance for CMP and CEQA analysis of CMP intersections and freeways

*Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA)*

**Guidelines** – Provides framework of required and recommended transportation analysis

*Joint Development* – Develop transit-supportive land use, subject to market demand and City regulations.

**Indirect Influence**

*VTA Land Use/Transportation Integration Efforts*

– Includes proactive efforts to work with Member Agencies to establish transit-supportive land use policies, input on General/Specific Plans, etc.

*Community Design and Transportation (CDT)*

**Program** – Identifies best practices for transportation and development design

*Proactive CMP/Development Review* – Process through which VTA reviews and comments on projects throughout the County

*VTA Monitoring Activities* – Includes regular assessments of land use, congestion, and transit ridership in the County.

*Grant Funding Efforts* – Includes the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Program tied to PDA Planning, and other efforts.
VTA Involvement in Land Use & Development

**Background Context of Development**
Transportation System, Economic Considerations, Policy and Community Considerations

**Developer Proposes Project**
Developer determines land use, project size, and location

**Local Agency Review**
- Economic Considerations
- Policy/Community Considerations
- Environmental Considerations

**Local Agency Approval/Denial**

**Applicant Builds Project**
Mitigation measures and/or conditions of approval are implemented

**Project Operates**
Auto, Transit & Pedestrian/Bike trips generated

**Transportation Planning & Investments**
- VTP
- Transit Service Planning
  - City GPs/CIPs, County Expressways, Caltrans

**VTA Land Use/Transportation Integration Efforts**

**Legend**
- Development Process
- VTA Direct Influence
- VTA Indirect Influence

**Camden Planning Review**
- CMP Auto LOS Standard
- TIA Guidelines
- CDT Program
- Proactive CMP/Development Review
- VTA Land Use Monitoring

**VTA Transportation Monitoring Activities**
# VTA Involvement in Land Use and Development – Possible Changes to Improve Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic/Step</th>
<th>Possible Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> Background Context of Development</td>
<td><strong>Local agencies</strong> evaluate transportation impacts and integrate transportation solutions early in the process of planning and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong> Background Context of Development</td>
<td><strong>Local agencies</strong> involve VTA as an active participant (e.g., on stakeholder group) when developing plans/policies (resource implications for VTA); <strong>Local agencies</strong> integrate CDT principles into land use plans/policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong> Developer Proposes Project</td>
<td><strong>Local agencies</strong> notify/consult with VTA/transit agencies for any project near a rail transit or BRT station, or any project with potential to generate transit demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong> Local Agency Review: Project Design</td>
<td><strong>Local agencies</strong> update street design standards consistent with Complete Streets best practices; <strong>VTA</strong> provides grant funding and incentives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong> Local Agency Review: Transportation Measures/Standards</td>
<td><strong>VTA</strong> develops alternative measure(s) to Auto LOS and new standard/threshold; <strong>Local agencies</strong> to adopt their own alternative measures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## VTA Involvement in Land Use and Development – Possible Changes to Improve Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic/Step</th>
<th>Possible Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Local Agency Review: Local Agency Response</td>
<td><strong>Local agencies</strong> consult with VTA when responding to comments and when developing Conditions of Approval/mitigation measures related to transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Applicant Builds Project: Notification</td>
<td><strong>Local agencies</strong> notify VTA when enforcing Conditions of Approval that affect VTA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Project Operates: TDM/Trip Reduction</td>
<td><strong>VTA</strong> provides framework for TDM monitoring; <strong>Local agencies</strong> track and share data on TDM; <strong>Local agencies</strong> form Transportation Management Associations (TMAs); <strong>VTA</strong> plays an active role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Transportation Monitoring and Planning</td>
<td><strong>VTA</strong> monitors building permit data instead of (or in addition to) planning permits as part of annual Monitoring activities; <strong>VTA</strong> improves the land use tracking process to better inform and guide planning efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Transportation Monitoring and Planning</td>
<td><strong>VTA</strong> to conduct local research on trip generation and parking utilization in Santa Clara County.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Nuria I. Fernandez

FROM: Director of SVRT Program, Carolyn M. Gonot

SUBJECT: Amendment of Agreement for Reimbursement for Santa Clara Valley Water District'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 an amendment to the existing cooperative agreement with the Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD) regarding the reimbursement of SCVWD’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 to increase the authorization by $550,000, from an existing amount of $1,723,000 to $2,273,000.

BACKGROUND:

Both of the proposed stations sites in the SVBX project (Milpitas and Berryessa) are traversed by major water transmission pipelines owned by SCVWD. The 42” diameter Milpitas Pipeline crosses the Milpitas station site, and the 66” diameter Central Pipeline lies within the Berryessa station site. Both pipelines are being relocated to accommodate the BART guideway and stations. In addition, other project elements require coordination with SCVWD’s flood control facilities, such as the restoration of Upper Penitencia Creek within the Berryessa Station site.

VTA entered into a Relocation Agreement with SCVWD for the SVBX project on April 27, 2011, which provided a framework for cooperative efforts between the two agencies for the project. The Relocation Agreement stated that VTA would reimburse the internal staff costs of SCVWD related to the project, but did not provide a specific budget for the reimbursements. In May, 2013, VTA entered into an agreement with SCVWD authorizing a budget of $1,723,000 for SCVWD’s services on the project.
DISCUSSION:

SCVWD has been working cooperatively with VTA for over three years on SVBX, assisting with technical issues, planning activities, plan reviews and construction inspection for the pipeline relocation and flood channel modifications described above. Some of the activities to date include:

- Assistance with design and construction of the first phase of relocation of the Milpitas Pipeline in Piper Drive, to make way for the relocation of the Chevron petroleum pipeline - a necessary precursor to constructing the BART guideway.
- Planning and technical assistance with the design and construction of the Upper Penitencia Creek relocation and restoration, for which construction is now substantially complete.
- Planning, design and construction inspection activities for the remaining pipeline relocations.

In addition, at the request of VTA, SCVWD has made a senior staff member available to serve as a liaison and technical resource working at the SVBX Project Office.

SCVWD initially provided an estimate to VTA of their anticipated staff time for SVBX support through approximately January, 2014. This budget estimate covered the most active period of project support, and served as the basis of the May, 2013 Reimbursement Agreement. The Agreement also provided a schedule of hourly rates. The initial budget authorization has now been depleted. While much of the pipeline relocation work has been completed, there is still some remaining construction work, as well as right-of-way transfers and acceptance processes that will require SCVWD support. SCVWD has furnished a new budget estimate, projecting their total anticipated costs through the completion of the SVBX project at approximately $550,000.

This amendment would increase the amount of SCVWD’s budget authorization for SVBX support to a total of $2,273,000. The amendment also updates the SCVWD billing rates to match their current rate schedule. Other terms of the May, 2013 Reimbursement Agreement would remain unchanged.

ALTERNATIVES:

Because VTA has already agreed, through the existing Relocation Agreement, to reimburse SCVWD’s internal costs related to SVBX, and because VTA relies upon the technical assistance of SCVWD staff for the pipeline relocations, there is no practical alternative to providing funding for this support.

FISCAL IMPACT:

This amendment provides a total authorization of up to $2,273,000 - an increase of $550,000 above the previously approved budget - for SCVWD’s support services for SVBX.
Appropriation for this expenditure is included in the FY15 Adopted 2000 Measure A Transit Improvement Program Fund Capital Budget and is funded by a combination of 2000 Measure A and grant funds.

Prepared by: John Morris
Memo No. 4681
First Amendment to
Agreement Between
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority and
Santa Clara Valley Water District For Reimbursement of Costs for
The Silicon Valley Berryessa Extension (SVBX) Project

This First Amendment to Agreement ("Amendment") is entered into between the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, a special district created pursuant to California Public Utilities Code Sections 100,000 et seq. ("VTA") and the Santa Clara Valley Water District, a California special district authorized by the State Legislature as codified in the annotated California Water Code Appendix, Chapter 60, ("SCVWD"), collectively referred to as the "Parties." This Amendment is effective on the date it is fully executed (the "Effective Date").

Recitals

A. On or about May 10, 2013, VTA and SCVWD entered into an Agreement ("Agreement") to address the reimbursement from VTA to SCVWD for costs related to SCVWD’s plan review, inspection and acceptance services for the Silicon Valley Berryessa Extension Project ("Project").

B. VTA and SCVWD now wish to amend the Agreement to provide budgetary augmentation of reimbursement provisions for SCVWD’s costs related to plan review, inspection and acceptance services through completion of the Project.

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual covenants and conditions contained herein, the Parties agree to amend the Agreement as follows:

1. Section 2.3 is modified to read in its entirety as follows:

2.3 The total reimbursement from VTA to SCVWD under this Agreement shall not exceed Two Million Two Hundred Seventy-Three Thousand Dollars ($2,273,000.00). If the total SCVWD cost required for the Project under this
Agreement exceeds this amount, then a written amendment to this Agreement shall be executed by the Parties prior to performance of any services for which such increased authorization is required.

2. Modification of Exhibits. Exhibit A and Exhibit B of the Agreement are replaced with Exhibit A (Revised) and Exhibit B (Revised), attached, and all references to Exhibit A and Exhibit B in the Agreement are deemed to be references to Exhibit A (Revised) and Exhibit B (Revised).

3. All other provisions of the Agreement shall remain in full force and effect.

Santa Clara Valley Water District  
a special District

By: ____________________________  By: ___________________________
Beau Goldie      Nuria I. Fernandez
Chief Executive Officer    General Manager

Date: ____________________________  Date: ___________________________

Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority

Approved as to form:

By: ____________________________  By: ___________________________
Brian Hopper      Robert Fabela
Sr. Assistant District Counsel  General Counsel
Exhibit “A” (Revised)

Schedule of Hourly Rates*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Hourly Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sr Office Specialist</td>
<td>$92.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Maintenance Mechanic II</td>
<td>$120.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr Engineering Tech</td>
<td>$123.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Electrician II</td>
<td>$130.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control System Tech II</td>
<td>$130.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Plant Maintenance Mechanic</td>
<td>$133.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Corrosion Control Tech</td>
<td>$133.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Party Chief</td>
<td>$136.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Construction Inspector</td>
<td>$136.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Real Estate Agent</td>
<td>$140.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist. Engineer II (Mec)</td>
<td>$139.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist. Engineer II (Civil)</td>
<td>$139.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist. Civil Engineer II</td>
<td>$143.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Control System Tech</td>
<td>$143.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Water Quality Specialist</td>
<td>$150.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Construction Inspector</td>
<td>$150.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Maintenance Supervisor</td>
<td>$154.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Real Estate Agent</td>
<td>$154.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biologist III</td>
<td>$158.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Engineer (Civil)</td>
<td>$162.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Civil Engineer</td>
<td>$166.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Electrical Engineer</td>
<td>$174.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Engineer</td>
<td>$188.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Treated Water Ops Unit Manager</td>
<td>$199.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Assist. District Counsel</td>
<td>$200.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Project Manager</td>
<td>$207.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Unit Manager</td>
<td>$209.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rates subject to annual adjustment.
## Exhibit “B” (Revised)

### Scope of Services and Budgeted Hours

#### 2013 Labor Charges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil System Tech II</td>
<td>30.04</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Extension Control Tech</td>
<td>22.38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey/Farm Chief</td>
<td>73.25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>76.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Construction Inspector</td>
<td>18.46</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>143.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Engineer I</td>
<td>10.94</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Real Estate Agent</td>
<td>40.70</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>41.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Extension Control Tech</td>
<td>13.72</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Conservation Inspector</td>
<td>151.91</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>252.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Maintenance Supervisor</td>
<td>71.86</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>109.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Real Estate Agent</td>
<td>72.12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>78.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Civil Engineer</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>125.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>149.00</td>
<td>46.25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39.25</td>
<td>105.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Unit Manager</td>
<td>294.80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>836.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2014 Labor Charges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil System Tech II</td>
<td>30.04</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Extension Control Tech</td>
<td>22.38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey/Farm Chief</td>
<td>73.25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Construction Inspector</td>
<td>18.46</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>143.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Engineer I</td>
<td>10.94</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>197.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Real Estate Agent</td>
<td>40.70</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Extension Control Tech</td>
<td>13.72</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Conservation Inspector</td>
<td>151.91</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>252.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Maintenance Supervisor</td>
<td>71.86</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>109.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Real Estate Agent</td>
<td>72.12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Civil Engineer</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>125.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Senior Engineer</td>
<td>191.40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>291.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineer</td>
<td>149.00</td>
<td>46.25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>219.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Unit Manager</td>
<td>294.80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>328.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</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>836.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2015 Labor Charges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil System Tech II</td>
<td>30.04</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Extension Control Tech</td>
<td>22.38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey/Farm Chief</td>
<td>73.25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Construction Inspector</td>
<td>18.46</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>143.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Engineer I</td>
<td>10.94</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>197.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Real Estate Agent</td>
<td>40.70</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Extension Control Tech</td>
<td>13.72</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Conservation Inspector</td>
<td>151.91</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>252.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Maintenance Supervisor</td>
<td>71.86</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>109.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Real Estate Agent</td>
<td>72.12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Civil Engineer</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>125.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Senior Engineer</td>
<td>191.40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>291.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineer</td>
<td>149.00</td>
<td>46.25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>219.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Unit Manager</td>
<td>294.80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>328.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</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>836.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2016 Labor Charges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sr Office Specialist</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Engineering Tech</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Construction Inspector</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance/Maintenance Supv</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr Food Service Agent</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biologist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Civil Engineer</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biologist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Site Manager</td>
<td>20.68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr Assistant District Counsel</td>
<td>200.12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 248 $18,769.65

### 2017 Labor Charges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sr Office Specialist</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Engineering Tech</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Construction Inspector</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance/Maintenance Supv</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr Food Service Agent</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biologist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Civil Engineer</td>
<td>10.54</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biologist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Site Manager</td>
<td>20.68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr Assistant District Counsel</td>
<td>200.12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 248 $18,769.65

Total Estimate Through 2017: $535,582.87
VTA has completed the first year of a 2-year pilot program called TAP (Transit Assistance Program). TAP provides low-cost monthly passes to low-income individuals receiving case management services from the Emergency Assistance Network, a county-wide network of safety net social service providers. This update looks at the first year of the program, which has been successful overall.

VTA is working through Santa Clara County Social Services with the network of provider agencies who have found the program a helpful tool in their kit of services to assist the very-low-income in Santa Clara County break the cycle of poverty. At the end of the pilot program, VTA expects to be able to make a strong case to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) to renew the grant funding that allowed VTA to provide the low-cost pass.

BACKGROUND:

At the urging of a number of VTA Directors and in response to the group People Acting in Community Together (PACT), in 2012 the Transit Planning and Operations Committee (TP&O) considered several options for providing a discounted fare to low-income residents of Santa Clara County.

PACT, which describes itself as “…an inter-faith, multi-ethnic grassroots organization that empowers everyday people to create a more just community,” suggested that such a fare would benefit those most in need in our community, while boosting ridership and revenue for VTA.

VTA hired the consulting firm CH2M HILL, which has extensive experience in the transit fare policy arena, and in October 2012, the consultant reported the results of the analysis to TP&O. These included the cost implications of alternative fare reduction programs for low-income riders, administrative considerations and alternatives for subsidizing them.
The consultant examined five alternatives based on interviews with stakeholders, staff and peer agencies. Of the five, two were recommended as programs that VTA could undertake without outside funding, that would not duplicate existing transportation subsidies, and that were sustainable. These were an increase in the current UPLIFT program with Santa Clara County and a 50% discount on sales of day pass tokens to non-profit organizations.

Thereafter, VTA applied for and received a $1.3 million grant from MTC to promote transit ridership by providing free or reduced-cost transit passes to low-income adults not currently receiving other forms of transportation support. The grant is part of MTC’s Transit Performance Initiative (TPI) Incentive Program, and as such requires an increase in ridership.

**DISCUSSION:**

Upon receiving the grant from MTC, VTA began working through Santa Clara County Social Services with the Emergency Assistance Network (EAN), a countywide network of safety net providers, to distribute the monthly TAP passes to case-managed individuals, as well as to provide reporting. VTA worked with the County and the EAN agencies to structure the program, determine its parameters, and set up and train agency employees on the use of an online reporting tool to capture pertinent information about TAP pass recipients.

The program targets the working poor - those residents of Santa Clara County who are at or below 200 percent of the Federal Poverty Level (approximately $47,700 for a family of four) - to promote transit ridership among those who lack the economic means to afford public transit. The monthly passes cost $25, reduced from VTA’s regular price of $70, with the difference funded by the grant.

The EAN agencies determine eligibility, distribute the passes, collect the $25 per-pass charge, reimburse VTA, monitor clients and report on outcomes. Because the Board of Directors required case management of clients receiving the passes, clients are in monthly contact with their service providers, returning during a window of time each month to renew their passes. This requirement has allowed the recipients to show their dedication, as it is often difficult to leave work or school to return to the agency to renew their cards.

One thousand passes are available monthly for a period of 24 months and are made available on Clipper cards. The first month of the program was September 2013.

VTA Technology staff developed a cloud-based application for EAN member agencies and County Social Services to manage the intake of recipients, assignment of passes and adds/deletes to the program, as well as capture reporting information.

County Social Services is providing coordination between VTA and the EAN agencies. They have the experience, expertise and staff to provide meaningful oversight and help assure the success of the program.

**Number of Passes**

The total number of passes distributed each month has not reached the 1,000 allotted; however, it has been on the rise since the inception of the program. The table below shows how many passes...
were distributed each month. The number has been steadily increasing, but agency capacity to provide case management for clients as well as their access to transit have kept distribution numbers down.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>Total</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>612</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to note that the passes are being used almost to the level of monthly passes purchased at full price. The boardings per unique user for TAP pass recipients is approximately 50 per month, and for those purchasing monthly passes at full fare, the number is approximately 60 per month.

Staff will continue to work with County Social Services and the EAN providers to assure the program is well managed and benefiting the intended target audience.

Prepared By: Colleen Valles
Memo No. 4683
CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Silicon Valley Rapid Transit (SVRT) Program Working Committee was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by Chairperson Yeager in Conference Room 157, County Government Center, 70 West Hedding Street, San Jose, California.

1. ROLL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Chavez</td>
<td>Vice Chairperson</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jose Esteves</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Liccardo</td>
<td>Ex-Officio Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Yeager</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A quorum was present.

2. Public Presentations

There were no Public Presentations.

3. Meeting Minutes of May 5, 2014

M/S/C (Esteves/Yeager) to approve the meeting minutes of May 5, 2014.

4. Announcements

Member Esteves referenced the San Jose Mercury News article entitled “Roadshow: Verschlimmbesserung – road improvements that haven’t panned out.” He requested that VTA staff provide a written response to the article clarifying the City of Milpitas’ position on the Highway 237 Express Lanes and that the City of Milpitas be copied on the response.

Vice Chairperson Chavez arrived at the meeting at 10:03 a.m.

5. Adjournment

On order of Chairperson Yeager and there being no objection, the meeting was adjourned to a Tour of the VTA BART Silicon Valley Berryessa Extension Project at 10:04 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Tracene Y. Crenshaw, Assistant Board Secretary
VTA Office of the Board Secretary

NOTE: M/S/C MEANS MOTION SECONDED AND CARRIED AND, UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED, THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.
Administration and Finance (A&F) Committee
Minutes of August 21, 2014

WILL BE FORWARDED UNDER SEPARATE COVER
Congestion Management Program and Planning (CMPP) Committee
Minutes of August 21, 2014

WILL BE FORWARDED UNDER SEPARATE COVER
Transit Planning & Operations (TP&O) Committee
Minutes of August 21, 2014

WILL BE FORWARDED UNDER SEPARATE COVER
Citizens Advisory Committee and 2000 Measure A Citizens Watchdog Committee (CAC/CWC) Minutes of August 13, 2014

WILL BE FORWARDED UNDER SEPARATE COVER
CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was called to order at 1:33 p.m. by Chairperson Capurso in Conference Room B-104, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), 3331 North First Street, San José, California.

1. ROLL CALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee Name</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rajeev Batra</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>City of Santa Clara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Riley</td>
<td>Alternate Member</td>
<td>City of Santa Clara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl Bjarke</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>City of Morgan Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Creer</td>
<td>Alternate Member</td>
<td>City of Morgan Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timm Borden</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>City of Cupertino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Capurso</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>City of Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cherbone</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>City of Saratoga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Chiu</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Town of Los Altos Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Collen</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>County of Santa Clara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Kim</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>City of Mountain View</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Moneda</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>City of Milpitas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Morley</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Town of Los Gatos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedric Novenario</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>City of Los Altos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaime Rodriguez</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>City of Palo Alto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Salvano</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>City of San José</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Servín</td>
<td>Vice Chairperson</td>
<td>City of Gilroy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo Sharma</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>City of Monte Sereno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Saleh</td>
<td>Ex-Officio Alternate Member</td>
<td>California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Witthaus</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>City of Sunnyvale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Shariat</td>
<td>Alternate Member</td>
<td>City of Sunnyvale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Alternates do not serve unless participating as a Member.

A quorum was present.

2. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

There were no Public Presentations.
3. **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

There were no Orders of the Day.

4. **Committee Staff Report**

Kurt Evans, Government Affairs Manager, introduced Aaron Quigley, VTA’s Senior Policy Analyst, Government Affairs Department.

John Ristow, Director of Planning and Program Development and Staff Liaison, reported:
1) California Transportation Commission (CTC) has a joint workshop meeting with Washington State Transportation Commission on August 19 and 20, 2014, at the Fairmont Hotel in San Jose. On August 20, 2014, at 10:00 a.m. there will be a joint CTC and Santa Clara VTA celebratory event at the Berryessa BART Station to receive the final allocation of state funding for VTA’s BART Silicon Valley Extension; 2) VTA is planning to conduct a National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) Complete Streets Workshop in November 2014, for jurisdictions located within Santa Clara County; 3) there is a Special Board of Directors’ meeting scheduled for Friday, August 15, 2014, where a timeline and process will be presented for 2016 ballot measure consideration, and; 4) VTA’s new community bus is currently on display.

5. **Chairperson’s Report**

Chairperson Capurso reported that the TAC Subcommittee met prior to the Committee meeting to discuss and receive an update on present and future projects.

6. **TAC Working Groups Report**

- Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Working Group

  Celeste Fiore, Transportation Planner III, provided a brief report from the July 22, 2014, meeting, highlighting the following: 1) Metropolitan Transportation Commission’s (MTC) 2013 Pavement Condition Index Draft Report; 2) 2014 Pothole Report comments are due to (MTC) by August 18, 2014; 3) CTC released their Program of Projects for the first Active Transportation Program on August 8, 2014. There may be an additional call for Capital Projects in the spring of 2015; 4) discussed the new Caltrans Risk Based Invoicing. 5) received Pedestrian Access to Transit Plan Existing Conditions Report; and 6) VTA will host four Caltrans iTeam Training workshops for E-76 Process and Requirements, Quality Assurance Program, Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Program and Risk Based Invoicing.

  The next meeting of the CIP Working Group is scheduled for August 26, 2014.

- Systems Operations & Management (SOM) Working Group

  Eugene Maeda, Senior Transportation Planner, provided a brief report from the July 23, 2014, meeting, highlighting the following: 1) reviewed comments on the administrative draft of the Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Guidelines Update; 2) continued discussion on the Traffic Level of Service (LOS) Software Evaluation; and 3) began a discussion on traffic signal preemption coordination with fire departments along VTA’s bus rapid transit corridors.

  The next meeting of the SOM Working Group is tentatively scheduled for August 27, 2014.
• Land Use/Transportation Integration (LUTI) Working Group

Robert Swierk, Senior Transportation Planner, provided a brief report from the August 13, 2014, meeting, highlighting: 1) received a presentation from the City of Santa Clara Planning staff focusing on major developments within the City of Santa Clara with an emphasis on the two major developments across from LEVI’s Stadium; 2) discussed TIA Guidelines Update; 3) previewed Agenda Item 15, Relationship of Land Use and Transportation, and; 4) discussed Priority Development Area (PDA) Investment & Growth Strategy Second Year Report. VTA has developed a draft of the report which has been shared with the LUTI group and will be forwarded to TAC Committee in October, 2014.

The next meeting of the LUTI Working Group is scheduled for November 12, 2014.

On order of Chairperson Capurso and there being no objection, the Committee received the TAC Working Group Reports.

CONSENT AGENDA

7. Regular Meeting Minutes of June 12, 2014

M/S/C (Borden/Morley) to approve the Regular Meeting Minutes of June 12, 2014.

8. Proactive Congestion Management Program (CMP) Project Quarterly Report

M/S/C (Borden/Morley) to receive the Proactive CMP Quarterly Report for April-June, 2014.

9. Legislative Update Matrix

M/S/C (Borden/Morley) to review the Monthly Legislative Update Matrix.

10. Cap and Trade Funds for Transportation

M/S/C (Borden/Morley) to receive a report on Cap and Trade Funds for Transportation.

11. Bike Share Program Update

M/S/C (Borden/Morley) to receive an update on the Bay Area Bike Share Pilot Program.

12. SR 237 Express Lanes Fiscal Year 2014 Update

M/S/C (Borden/Morley) to receive a performance update on SR 237 Express Lanes for Fiscal Year 2014.

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

13. **State Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP) Amendments**

Ms. Fiore provided the staff report.

M/S/C (Salvano/Servin) to recommend that the VTA Board of Directors approve State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) amendments and programming changes.


Members of the Committee discussed the following: 1) multi-jurisdictional impacts and mitigation; 2) the difference between near-term cumulative and alternate cumulative conditions; 3) use of transportation models; 4) trip reduction credits, and; 5) mitigation measures.

On order of Chairperson Capurso and there being no objection, the Committee received a status update on the Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Guidelines Update including the Administrative Draft Document and Key Issues.

15. **Opportunities to Enhance the Relationship of Land Use and Transportation**

Robert Cunningham, Transportation Planner III, provided a presentation entitled “Local Agency and VTA Roles in Land Use and Transportation,” highlighting: 1) VTA Degree of Influence; 2) VTA Involvement in Land Use & Development, and; 3) Possible Changes to Improve Effectiveness. Staff noted the purpose of this item is to start a discussion, and the details of implementing the proposals would be worked out later.

Member Collen left the meeting at 2:27p.m.

Vice Chairperson Servin queried how VTA would collect data on Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs. Staff responded that the effort could start with the process laid out in the TIA Guidelines Update for Target-Based Reductions of auto trips.

Member Salvano inquired whether VTA would consider development of VTA-owned land as an approach to integrate land use and transportation. Staff responded that VTA has extensive land holdings, and that land development is part of VTA’s strategy of following a Board-adopted Joint Development Policy.

On order of Chairperson Capurso and there being no objection, the Committee received and discussed a report on Opportunities to Enhance the Relationship of Land Use and Transportation.
16. **Traffic Level of Service Software Evaluation Update**

Shanthi Chatradhi, Associate Transportation Engineer, provided the staff report and noted support and upgrades to the current TRAFFIX software are no longer supported by the developer, and the SOM Working Group is in the process of evaluating a potential replacement for the current Traffic Level of Service (LOS) analysis software that supports the entire County of Santa Clara. Ms. Chatradhi noted that VTA will continue to use TRAFFIX during the analysis.

*On order of Chairperson Capurso* and there being no objection, the Committee received an update on the Traffic Level of Service Software Evaluation.

17. **Pedestrian Access to Transit Plan – Existing Conditions Report**

Lauren Ledbetter, Senior Transportation Planner, presented a PowerPoint presentation entitled "Pedestrian Access To Transit Plan Existing Conditions Report,” highlighting:


Vice Chairperson Servin requested that staff consider lighting at major bus stop/crosswalk combination locations and suggested that additional analysis of pedestrian collisions could help identify locations where inadequate lighting is a contributing factor.

Member Rodriguez suggested a disclaimer be included on the collision map indicating the map does not necessarily show locations where there is higher risk, noting the collisions may be the fault of the bicyclist or pedestrian rather than the motorist.

*On order of Chairperson Capurso* and there being no objection, the Committee received the Existing Conditions Report for the Pedestrian Access to Transit Plan.

**OTHER**

18. **Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Activities and Initiatives**

Mr. Ristow reported that the State has released their results for the Active Transportation Program and the regional list of projects will be released next month.

19. **Caltrans Activities and Initiatives**

Nick Saleh, Caltrans Program District Division Chief – South Region, reported the following: 1) completion and opening of construction project US 101 auxiliary lanes; 2) training sessions will be forthcoming, and; 3) released a Sustainability Application Grant Notice.

Mr. Ristow noted VTA will provide the iTTeam Workshop dates to the Committee via email.
20. **TAC Committee Work Plan**

On order of Chairperson Capurso, and there being no objection, the Committee reviewed the TAC Committee Work Plan.

21. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Member Collins’ assistant announced the August 22, 2014, official ribbon cutting ceremony and opening of The Gilroy Wine Trail. The trail connects Gilroy and Morgan Hill.

22. **ADJOURNMENT**

On order of Chairperson Capurso, and there being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 3:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Anita McGraw, Board Assistant  
VTA Office of the Board Secretary
CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) was called to order at 5:05 p.m. by Chairperson Miller in Conference Room B-104, Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), 3331 North First Street, San Jose, California.

1. ROLL CALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rich Waterman</td>
<td>City of Campbell</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Kotowski (Alternate)</td>
<td>City of Campbell</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orrin Mahoney</td>
<td>City of Cupertino</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod Sinks (Alternate)</td>
<td>City of Cupertino</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dion Bracco</td>
<td>City of Cupertino</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant (Alternate)</td>
<td>City of Cupertino</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeannie Bruins</td>
<td>City of Los Altos</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jarrett Fishpaw (Alternate)</td>
<td>City of Los Altos</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Larsen</td>
<td>Town of Los Altos Hills</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant (Alternate)</td>
<td>Town of Los Altos Hills</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcia Jensen</td>
<td>Town of Los Gatos</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane McNutt (Alternate)</td>
<td>Town of Los Gatos</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armando Gomez</td>
<td>City of Milpitas</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant (Alternate)</td>
<td>City of Milpitas</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lon Allan</td>
<td>City of Monte Sereno</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall Anstandig (Alternate)</td>
<td>City of Monte Sereno</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Carr</td>
<td>City of Morgan Hill</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Constantine (Alternate)</td>
<td>City of Morgan Hill</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Abe-Koga</td>
<td>City of Mountain View</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John McAlister (Alternate)</td>
<td>City of Mountain View</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz Kniss</td>
<td>City of Palo Alto</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Shepherd (Alternate)</td>
<td>City of Palo Alto</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansen Chu</td>
<td>City of San Jose</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa O’Neill</td>
<td>City of Santa Clara</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Marsalli (Alternate)</td>
<td>City of Santa Clara</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Miller</td>
<td>City of Saratoga</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Page (Alternate)</td>
<td>City of Saratoga</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Davis</td>
<td>City of Sunnyvale</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gustav Larsson (Alternate)</td>
<td>City of Sunnyvale</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Wasserman</td>
<td>SCC Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A quorum was not present and a Committee of the Whole was declared.

Member Mahoney arrived and took his seat at 5:05 p.m.
2. **ORDERS OF THE DAY**  
There were no Orders of the Day.

3. **PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS**  
There were no Public Presentations.

4. **Committee Staff Report**  
Jim Lawson, Executive Policy Advisor and Director of Public Affairs and Staff Liaison, provided a report noting the following: 1) the new 30ft Community Bus is on display; 2) VTA Board of Directors took the following actions at the August 7, 2014 Regular Meeting: a) approved the Contract Award for C730 - Parking Structures at Milpitas and Berryessa Stations; b) adopted the Light Rail Efficiency Project: Mountain View Double Track Phase II; c) approved Mountain View Double Track – URS Contract Amendment for Final Design and Design Services During Construction; d) receive an Actuarial Valuation of VTA’s Other Post Employment Benefits (OPEB) –Conversion to CalPERS Medical for AFSCME and Non-Represented Employees effective January 1, 2015; e) approved the Ad Hoc Governance Committee and noted that the first meeting will be held on August 15, 2014; f) received an update on the transit service to Levi’s Stadium noting some of the successes and challenges; 3) VTA and California Transit Commission (CTC) Event to celebrate the last installment of the state’s funding allocation for the Silicon Valley Berryessa Extension Project.

Kurt Evans, Government Affairs Manager introduced Aaron Quigley, Senior Policy Analyst who recently joined VTA’s staff.

Members of the Committee inquired about the following: 1) what was the cause of the power outage on VTA Light Rail on August 2, 2014; 2) pocket track opening timeline; 3) VTA coordination efforts with the Santa Clara Police Department.

Mr. Lawson reported that one of the causes of the power outage was due to the amount of trains running at the same time and surge with the air conditioning. He stated that the pocket tracks are completed and will accommodate three-car trains. Mr. Lawson noted that Nuria I. Fernandez, General Manager met with City of Santa Clara Mayor Mathews and the Santa Clara Police Chief to discuss how to improve conditions adjacent to the Levi’s Stadium.

Member Abe-Koga and Bruins arrived and took their seats at 4:22 p.m. and a quorum was declared.

5. **Chairperson’s Report**  
There was no report.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

6. **Regular Meeting Minutes of June 12, 2014**

M/S/C (Larsen/Wasserman) to approve the Regular Meeting Minutes of June 12, 2014.

**NOTE:** M/S/C MEANS MOTION SECONDED AND CARRIED AND, UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED, THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY
7. **Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP) 2014**

M/S/C (Larsen/Wasserman) to adopt the 2014 Short Range Transit Plan.

8. **Proactive CMP Quarterly Report for Apr-June 2014**

M/S/C (Larsen/Wasserman) to receive the Proactive CMP Quarterly Report for April-June 2014.

9. **Legislative Update Matrix**

M/S/C (Larsen/Wasserman) to review the Monthly Legislative Update Matrix.

10. **Cap and Trade Funds for Transportation**

M/S/C (Larsen/Wasserman) to receive a report on Cap and Trade Funds for Transportation.

11. **SR 237 Express Lanes Fiscal Year 2014 Update**

M/S/C (Larsen/Wasserman) to receive performance update on SR 237 Express Lanes for Fiscal Year 2014.

**REGULAR AGENDA**

12. **State Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP) Amendments**

Marcella Rensi, Transportation Planning Manager, provided an overview of the staff report.

Members of the Committee made the following comments: 1) inquired about the remaining balance once the $350,000 is removed from the Vehicle Registration Fee Countywide Matching Funds; 2) inquired about the consequences of not approving the recommended amendments; and 3) expressed concern about the transfer of the STIP funds to Palo Alto.

Ms. Rensi noted The Beautiful Way Grand Boulevard, Phase 2 will be significantly delayed if the STIP amendments are not passed. She added that staff will re-evaluate the STIP in FY2016.

**Public Comment**

Omar Chatty, Interested Citizen, expressed concerns about Highway 152 and noted that funds generated from motorists should not fund non-motorized projects.

Member Larsen inquired about the status of Highway 152 improvements.

Mr. Lawson noted that the funds from STIP will not be going towards improvements along Highway 152.

M/S/C (Abe-Koga/Bruins) to recommend that the VTA Board of Directors approve State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) amendments and programming changes.


Mr. Swierk noted that staff will be bringing it back to the Committee and then the Board of Directors the following month.

Members of the Committee commented on the following: 1) the need to have a designated area for bicyclists, motorcyclists and passengers to enhance safety; 2) suggested focusing on things that would motivate people to take public transit; 3) supported the idea of having parking spots for bicyclists and motorcyclists; and 4) expressed concerns about the multi-county intersections.

Mr. Swierk reported that congestion management is still being addressed within the county.

**Public Comment**

Mr. Chatty suggested broadening the TIA guidelines in order to get a better perspective and expressed concern about Caltrain stops in the City of Mountain View.

Upon query of Members of the Committee, Mr. Lawson reported the following: 1) VTA staff is reaching out to the charter and private bus companies to see if there are partnership opportunities; and 2) VTA is responsible for the VTA Park and Ride Lots in the various cities throughout Santa Clara County.

**On order of Chairperson Miller** and there being no objection, the Committee received a status update on the Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Guidelines Update including the Administrative Draft document and Key Issues.

14. **Opportunities to Enhance the Relationship of Land Use and Transportation**

Ying Smith, Transportation Planning Manager provided an overview of the staff report and provided a presentation on Local Agency and VTA Roles in Land Use and Transportation, highlighting: 1) VTA Involvement in Land Use & Development; and 2) VTA Involvement in Land Use and Development–Possible Changes to Improve Effectiveness.

Member Wasserman noted the need to look for solutions with existing conditions when it comes to building because most roads in the cities have physical constraints.

Member Abe-Koga commented on the following: 1) expressed concern about the push of higher density without the guarantee of more VTA service; 2) expressed concern on the community’s feedback about OneBayArea Grant Program (OBAG) impacting land use decisions; 3) suggested VTA to focus on improving transit service as a way to encourage Transit Oriented Development (TOD).
Mr. Lawson noted the ability to provide better transit service to the higher density areas.

Public Comment

Mr. Chatty expressed support and discussed advantages about BART around the Bay.

On order of Chairperson Miller and there being no objection, the Committee received and discussed a report on Opportunities to Enhance the Relationship of Land Use and Transportation

15. Pedestrian Access to Transit Plan – Existing Conditions Report


Member Wasserman inquired what percentage of all trips people take that is less than mile on foot.

Ms. Ledbetter responded that she would provide that information at a later date.

Members of the Committee made the following comments: 1) asked clarification on intersection density; 2) expressed concern that the intersection density map did not reflect their communities; 3) noted that taking transit is not for everyone due to longer trip times; 4) expressed concern that higher density projects near locations with high pedestrian collision numbers may result to even more pedestrian collisions; 5) would like to see more collaboration between the town of Los Altos Hill’s and VTA when it comes to walk friendly area’s; 6) expressed concern about any conflict related to planning work that is currently ongoing in the communities.

Ms. Ledbetter addressed the following: 1) noted that the plan does not address land use or transit service changes, but pedestrian connections to existing transit service; and 2) member agencies would be closely involved in identifying the specific geographic scope of focus areas, and the intention of the plan is to complement planning efforts of the member agencies.

Mr. Lawson mentioned that VTA had decided to change the emphasis from taking buses everywhere and to concentrate in areas that are high in ridership. He stated in order to provide that extra service, VTA had to cut service in some areas.

On order of Chairperson Miller and there being no objection, the Committee received Existing Conditions Report for the Pedestrian Access to Transit Plan.
16. **Update on Regional Reports**
   
   A. **Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)**
   
   There was no report.

   B. **California Transportation Commission (CTC)**
   
   There was no report.

**OTHER**

14. **Committee Work Plan**

   On order of Chairperson Miller and there being no objection, the Committee reviewed the Work Plan.

15. **Announcements**

   There were no Announcements.

16. **ADJOURNMENT**

   On order of Chairperson Miller and there being no objection, the Committee meeting was adjourned at 5:47 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Theadora Travers, Board Assistant
VTA Office of the Board Secretary