BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

Thursday, October 2, 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


2.2. ACTION ITEM - Adopt a resolution of appreciation for retiring VTA staff:
- Sandra Weymouth, former VTA Board Secretary and Acting Chief of Staff
- Mark Robinson, Director of Engineering & Construction

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

There are no Public Hearings.

5. REPORTS


5.3. General Manager Report. (Verbal Report)

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

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.

6. CONSENT AGENDA

6.1. Approve the Board of Directors Special Meeting Minutes of August 15, 2014.

6.2. Approve the Board of Directors Regular Meeting Minutes of August 28, 2014.

6.3. ACTION ITEM - Ratify the appointments to the Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee for the two-year term ending June 30, 2016 of: (1) Paul Goldstein, representing the City of Palo Alto; and (2) Kristal Caidoy, representing the City of Milpitas.

6.4. ACTION ITEM - Authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Itech Solution, the lowest responsible bidder, in the amount of $415,000 for the procurement and installation of Closed Circuit Television at Various Locations Phase 2.

6.5. ACTION ITEM - Authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Restoration Resources, the lowest responsible bidder, in the amount of $348,425 for the Combined Landscaping Maintenance Project (Rebid).

6.6. ACTION ITEM - Authorize the General Manager to execute On-Call Right-of-Way Engineering, Survey and Aerial Photography Services task order contracts with up to six of the following firms: BKF Engineers; Chaudhary & Associates, Inc.; HMH Engineers; Psomas; R.E.Y. Engineers, Inc; and Towill, Inc. The executed contracts would span a maximum five-year period and the total of all executed contracts would not exceed $7,500,000.

6.7. ACTION ITEM - Authorize the General Manager to enter into a Fourth Amendment to the Cooperative Parking Agreement Permitting the Shared Use of Parking at the San Jose Diridon Caltrain Station (Agreement), between the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (PCJPB) and San Jose Arena Management, LLC (SJAM), granting a five-year extension on revised profit-sharing terms for the management of parking lots collectively owned by VTA and PCJPB at the Diridon Caltrain Station during events at SAP Center (Arena).

6.8. ACTION ITEM - Authorize the General Manager to execute a sole source contract for a not to exceed amount of $810,000 with Electronic Data Magnetics, Inc. (EDM) for the purchase of 3.0 million limited-use smart cards (LUSCs) for vending VTA Transit Day Passes from bus fareboxes.
6.9. ACTION ITEM - Authorize the General Manager to renew health benefit contracts with Kaiser, United Health Care (UHC) Medicare, and Valley Health medical plans for SEIU, ATU and TAEA represented employees and retirees for calendar year 2015; and to renew Delta Dental, Pacific Union Dental, Vision Service Plan, CIGNA insurance and Custom Benefit Administrators for all VTA employees for calendar year 2015.

6.10. ACTION ITEM - Consider the Addendum to the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) and approve the design changes to the Upper Penitencia Creek Improvement Project (UPC Project).

6.11. ACTION ITEM - Approve the Valley Transportation Plan 2040 (VTP 2040) as Santa Clara County’s long-range countywide transportation plan.

6.12. ACTION ITEM - Adopt the updated VTA Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Guidelines.

6.13. INFORMATION ITEM - Receive a staff presentation on the Preliminary Discussion Draft of Updates to the CEQA Guidelines Implementing SB 743 by the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research.


6.15. INFORMATION ITEM - Receive a report on the October 2014 Transit Service Changes.

6.16. INFORMATION ITEM - Receive the report from SPUR on VTA entitled “Freedom to Move”.


6.18. INFORMATION ITEM - Receive update on regional tolling policies on express lanes.


6.21. INFORMATION ITEM - Review the Legislative Update Matrix.
7. **REGULAR AGENDA**

   **Administration and Finance Committee**

   7.1. ACTION ITEM - (a) Introduce Amended and Restated Ordinance 98.1, Vehicles and Facilities, which updates references to relevant California statutes, adds restrictions that align with current issues faced by the VTA, updates references to the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority’s name, and clarifies the conditions under which third parties may use transit vehicles, transit facilities and administrative facilities; (b) Consider the proposed Amended and Restated Ordinance 98.1; and (c) Direct that Amended and Restated Ordinance 98.1 be placed on the agenda for the next regularly scheduled Board meeting for adoption.

   **Regular Agenda**

   7.2. ACTION ITEM - Amend the employment contract for General Manager Nuria I. Fernandez to change the performance evaluation rating period from a fiscal year to a calendar year term.

8. **OTHER ITEMS**

8.1. ITEMS OF CONCERN AND REFERRAL TO ADMINISTRATION

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

   8.2.A. VTA Standing Committees

   8.2.B. VTA Advisory Committees

   8.2.C. VTA Policy Advisory Boards (PAB)

   8.2.D. Joint Powers Boards and Regional Commissions

8.3. Announcements

9. **CLOSED SESSION**

9.1. Recess to Closed Session

   A. Existing Litigation - Conference with Legal Counsel

      [Government Code Section 54956.9(a)]

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

      Santa Clara County Superior Court Case No.: 1-13-CV-238806
B. Conference with Real Property Negotiators  
[Government Code Section 54956.8]

Property: Property located at near the intersections of Sunol and West San Carlos Streets in San Jose, California  
(APNs: 264-14-69, 90, 122, 130 and 131)

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

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

Under Negotiation: Price and terms of payment for VTA sale of Real Property

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

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

Employee Organization
Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 265

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: Employees of the Month for October 2014

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

Olga Medina, a Management Analyst with the Disadvantage Business Enterprise Program at River Oaks, is the Administration Award Winner for October. For over 16 years with VTA Olga has provided her customers with exceptional service by attending outreach events and helping firms obtain certifications to compete fairly for work on federally funded projects. Her great attitude and attention to detail support VTA’s vision of achieving contract-specific goals set by the Department of Transportation. Recognized for her dedication and strong work ethic, Olga has an infectious smile and is a pleasure to work with. Congratulations to Olga Medina, Administration Employee of the Month for October!

Sukhraj Singh, Coach Operator at Cerone Operations, is the Operations Award Winner for October. Sukhraj is a respected employee who upholds VTA’s commitment to high standards and quality customer service. In addition to his Operator duties, Sukhraj serves on the Youth Partnership Program, working to educate our community youth about safe behavior on and around transit systems. He sets a great example, and is appreciated by his coworkers for his hard work and truly caring nature. Serving VTA proudly for over 13 years, Sukhraj is an exemplary representative of VTA and is deserving of this award. Congratulations to Sukhraj Singh, Operations Employee of the Month for October!

Joseph Perino, a Transit Mechanic with Chaboya Maintenance, is the Maintenance Award Winner for October. A VTA employee for over 39 years, Joseph has an established record of efficiently and effectively getting the job done, and going the extra mile to ensure the morning pullout is met for our daily commuters. Joseph has mentored fellow transit and service mechanics by sharing his technical knowledge and displaying a positive attitude when faced with challenging issues. He is an outstanding role model and promotes an inviting work environment.
making him a true asset to VTA. Congratulations to Joseph Perino, Maintenance Employee of the Month for October!

Prepared By: Employee Relations
Memo No. 4699
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: N/A

FROM: Chairperson Ash Kalra

SUBJECT: Board Resolutions of Appreciation

Resolution

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt a resolution of appreciation for retiring VTA staff:

- Sandra Weymouth, former VTA Board Secretary and Acting Chief of Staff
- Mark Robinson, Director of Engineering & Construction

BACKGROUND:

VTA is fortunate to employ talented, diligent and effective individuals. It is even more fortunate to have these individuals commit many years, and, in some cases, a majority of their careers, serving VTA, its customers and the residents of Santa Clara County.

DISCUSSION:

The Board of Directors will honor, commend and express its appreciation for the dedicated service provided by two veteran VTA executive managers upon their retirement:

- Sandra Weymouth, who served as Board Secretary (twice), Policy & Administrative Manager, and most recently as Acting Chief of Staff, who is retiring after almost 19 years of visionary and distinguished service.
- Mark Robinson, who started his career at VTA, rose through the ranks and attained increasingly responsible positions culminating with Director of Engineering &
Construction, is retiring after 32 years of distinguished service and many achievements.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

There is no fiscal impact.

Prepared by: Stephen Flynn, Advisory Committee Coordinator
Memo No. 4711
RESOLUTION NO. 2014.10.XX
RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
OF THE SANTA CLARA VALLEY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (VTA)
GIVING SPECIAL TRIBUTE, DUE HONOR, AND RECOGNITION TO
BOARD SECRETARY
SANDRA WEYMOUTH

WHEREAS, Sandra Weymouth is retiring from VTA after almost 19 years, having served with integrity and inspired leadership; and

WHEREAS, Sandra was hired in 1994 as the first Board Secretary to assist in the development and implementation of the new organization that would become VTA;

WHEREAS, Sandra was both visionary and instrumental in developing, maintaining and implementing the VTA Administrative Code and Board Rules of Procedure that guide the functioning of VTA and its policy makers; and

WHEREAS, Sandra was integral in the development, implementation, and ongoing refinement of the Board of Directors’ current five Board standing committees, five advisory committees, four policy advisory boards, and numerous ad hoc committees; and

WHEREAS, as Board Secretary she presided over in excess of 230 Board of Directors’ meetings and workshops spanning a 16-year period, displaying the utmost professionalism in providing excellent service to the Board;

WHEREAS, during Sandra’s long tenure as VTA Board Secretary she provided service to the Board as it implemented a long list of major new projects and initiatives to enhance service, convenience and the travel experience for the public, a few examples of which include:

- **Light Rail**: Alum Rock, Mountain View and Campbell extensions completed.
- **VTA’s BART Silicon Valley Extension**: Phase I (to Berryessa) construction initiated.
- **1996 Measures A+B**: projects implemented and completed.
- **BRT**: Construction of Santa Clara Alum Rock initiated.
- **Highway Projects**: Numerous projects completed and placed into service including: (A) Coleman/880 Interchange; (B) SR 237 Express Lanes from I-880; (C) U.S. 101 Improvement Project (Capitol Expressway to Yerba Buena Interchange); and (D) SR-152/156 Improvement Project.

WHEREAS, since late 2013 she served as the acting Chief of Staff for GM/CEO Nuria I. Fernandez, leading development of several key innovative initiatives including the internal Great Ideas dashboard, the VTA Hackathon, and the Driving the Economy of Silicon Valley pamphlet; and

WHEREAS, equally important as her accomplishments are Sandra’s leadership, vision, commitment to team-building and excellent customer service, and her personal qualities of integrity, honesty, humility and approachability. She demonstrated the highest regard for VTA and the responsibilities of her positions by her conduct, which has always been honorable, ethical, and that demonstrated mutual respect for all those she encountered.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Board of Directors does hereby commend and express its sincere gratitude to Sandra Weymouth for her exemplary service to VTA; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this resolution is presented with the thanks and best wishes of the VTA.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Board of Directors on October 2, 2014 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

______________________________  
ASH KALRA, Chairperson

ATTEST:  
APPROVED AS TO FORM:

______________________________  ____________________________
ELAINE F. BALTAO  ROBERT FABELA  
Board of Directors  General Counsel
RESOLUTION

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
OF THE SANTA CLARA VALLEY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
GIVING SPECIAL TRIBUTE, DUE HONOR, AND RECOGNITION TO
DIRECTOR OF ENGINEERING AND CONSTRUCTION
MARK ROBINSON

WHEREAS, Mark Robinson is retiring from the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) on November 1, 2014, with 32 years of distinguished public service; and

WHEREAS, Mark Robinson began his career with the Santa Clara County Transit District in July of 1982. In his more than three decades of service, he rose through the ranks at VTA from a Junior Civil Engineer to Director of Engineering and Construction; and

WHEREAS, Mark demonstrated his expertise on VTA facilities projects and delivered the Tasman West Light Rail Project in December of 1999, which paved the way for the subsequent light rail extensions, including the 1996 Measure B Transit Improvement Program; and

WHEREAS, Mark received the prestigious Supervisor of the Quarter award in June of 2005, and was recognized in October of 2005 for delivering the $320 million Vasona Light Rail Extension in collaboration with the Federal Railroad Association, Caltrain, City of San Jose, Union Pacific Railroad, and State of California; and

WHEREAS, Mark Robinson built important relationships throughout VTA, demonstrated strong, dynamic leadership in the Engineering and Construction Division, and led his team to the successful completion of many facility modification projects, light rail rehabilitation contracts, highway improvement projects, and transit projects, a few examples of which include:

- Engineering of the original Eastridge Transit Center over 25 years ago and the direction of the rebuilding of the new facility currently in construction
- Management of the retrofit of the Guadalupe Light Rail system, including Downtown San Jose, to accommodate low-floor vehicles to improve the efficiency and access to public transit
- Engineering and management of Light Rail into the cities of Mountain View and Sunnyvale
- Station improvements for Bus Rapid Transit on the Santa Clara/Alum Rock corridor
- Track improvements in the cities of Santa Clara and Mountain View

WHEREAS, Mark was highly respected by all who knew and worked with him and will be missed as he begins a new chapter in his life.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority does hereby give special tribute, due honor, and recognition to Mark Robinson for his valued and dedicated public service; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this resolution is presented with the thanks and best wishes of the VTA.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Board of Directors on this second day of October 2014.

ASH KALRA, Chairperson
Board of Directors
FOR INFORMATION ONLY

Significant activities and progress on VTA’s BART Silicon Valley Extension during September 2014 include:

**Berryessa Extension Project Construction Activities**

**Milpitas**

Skanska, Shimmick, Herzog (SSH) crews continued to install rebar and conduit for the outer station walls of the station box and the lower walls that will support the passenger platforms at the Milpitas Station area. South of the station box, the contractor has poured the concrete for the trench walls and bridge deck, and has commenced removal of trench support materials.

SSH has started installation of materials to support trench excavation at Dixon Landing Road. Relocation of the city’s 12-inch waterline was completed and PG&E continued relocation of utility lines. As of the submittal of this report, weekend closures for PG&E to connect relocated utilities were scheduled for the last weekend in September.

**San Jose**

SSH continued to construct the aerial guideway south of the station in preparation for concrete pours at the Berryessa Aerial Structure. Crews began pouring concrete sections of the station’s passenger platform.

Trench construction activities continued within the project corridor around Hostetter Road. North of the roadway, crews continued to install rebar and materials used to form the concrete walls of the trench. South of the roadway, crews have begun pouring concrete sections of the trench floor, while continuing to place materials to support the remaining trench excavation south to the
intersection of Sierra Road and Lundy Avenue.

**Corridor Preparation Activities**

RGW, the C101 contractor, continued with pavement construction on Mission Boulevard, with completion anticipated by the end of September. Shortly thereafter, traffic will be shifted toward the median to allow construction of the concrete barriers and placement of metal beam guardrail, as well as construction of a groundwater filtration system. Mission Boulevard is anticipated to be completed and open to traffic before the Thanksgiving holiday.

The Warren Avenue grade separation has been completed except for installation of the pedestrian railing, and minor punch list items. All work is expected to be completed by mid-October.

The SVRT substation site (just south of Warren Avenue) was turned over to SVBX at the end of August. The rest of the corridor is anticipated to be turned over at the end of September.

All work under the C101 contract is anticipated to be complete by mid-December, at least four months ahead of schedule.

**Parking Garages Design-Build Contract**

A contract with McCarthy Builders was authorized in August and executed in early September. A Notice to Proceed is anticipated to be issued in mid-September. Once the Notice to Proceed is issued, staff will hold a project design kick-off meeting to introduce the contractor to the project team and staff who will interface with the contract. Construction is anticipated to begin in early 2015, pending an approved schedule from the contractor.

**Residential Noise Insulation Program (RNIP)**

Contracts C750, C751 and C752 are being closed out. Materials for the final contract (C753) are being procured, with installations anticipated to begin in October. Future close out of the C753 contract will complete the installation of noise insulation materials for 247 residences that qualified for the improvements based on the Federal Transit Administration’s threshold for project noise impacts to residences.

**Communications and Outreach**

During the August - September period two project press releases were sent to local media outlets, three construction updates and five traffic advisories were sent through VTA’s email notification service. Two project tours were provided, including those for groups such as the Federal Transit Administration Region IX and Headquarters, and the SVRT Program Working Committee. In early August, after 15 months of full road closure, VTA and the City of Fremont celebrated the opening of a new grade-separated Warren Avenue from future BART service and the existing freight railroad. In mid-August VTA, in partnership with the California Transportation Commission and Silicon Valley Leadership Group, participated in a state funding allocation milestone event held adjacent to the future Berryessa BART Station site. A new project update video for Hostetter Road was released and distributed on YouTube.

Community outreach staff continued with conducting door-to-door visits and direct
communication with area stakeholders for trench construction and sheet pile installation south of Hostetter Road in San Jose and south of Dixon Landing Road in Milpitas. Additional outreach activities supported weekend closures of Dixon Landing Road for utility relocations, construction of corridor retaining walls in the City of Fremont and traffic lane reductions on Mabury Road, Hostetter Road, Capitol Avenue and Dixon Landing Road.

### SVBX Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FFGA Date</th>
<th>Forecast Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Service</td>
<td>June 2018</td>
<td>August 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SVBX Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Forecast at Completion</th>
<th>Incurred to Date (Through 8/31/14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SVBX New Starts Project</td>
<td>$2,330.0</td>
<td>$2,330.0</td>
<td>$832.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concurrent Non-Project Activities)</td>
<td>$ 91.3</td>
<td>$ 91.3</td>
<td>$ 19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVBX Total</td>
<td>$2,421.3</td>
<td>$2,421.3</td>
<td>$851.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$Millions - Year of Expenditure

Prepared By: Kevin Kurimoto
Memo No. 4281
VTA’s BART Silicon Valley Extension Update

Board of Directors Meeting

October 2, 2014
Completed BART bridges over Warren Avenue.
Current Project Activities - Milpitas

Aerial view of the construction of Milpitas Station.
Construction continues on the BART trench at Hostetter Road.
Current Project Activities – San Jose

Installation of systems facilities near Hostetter Road.
Construction underway of the southern portion of Berryessa Aerial Structure.
### SVBX Project Integrated Summary 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>C101 Mission Valley BART Bridges</td>
<td>C101 UNIP</td>
<td>C222 TKO to C/O</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C222 Kato Rd BART Bridge</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C810 Piper Dr Utilities</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW Parcel Acquisition</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal Utility Relocation</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C700 LTSS Design/Build</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guideway Construction</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stations Construction</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Procurement &amp; Construction</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Integration Testing</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus, Roadsides, &amp; Parking</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART provided Materials, Software and Equipment</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Vehicles - Design</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacture &amp; Delivery Pilot &amp; Production Vehicles</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward Yard Primary Shop Conversion</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Revenue Operations Testing</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
<td>TKO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SVBX Summary Schedule - FFGA (Baseline) with Forecast (Progress through: August 29, 2014)**
## SVBX Cost Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SVBX Project Element (FTA Standard Cost Category)</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Forecast at Completion</th>
<th>Incurred to date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SVBX – New Starts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Guideway and Track Elements</td>
<td>416.1</td>
<td>325.2</td>
<td>99.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Stations, Stops, Terminals &amp; Intermodal</td>
<td>250.3</td>
<td>269.9</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Support Facilities: Yards, Shops, Admin. Buildings</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Sitework and Special Conditions</td>
<td>220.1</td>
<td>238.4</td>
<td>97.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Systems</td>
<td>260.7</td>
<td>228.4</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 ROW, Land, and Existing Improvements</td>
<td>261.0</td>
<td>249.7</td>
<td>153.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 Vehicles</td>
<td>174.3</td>
<td>150.8</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 Professional Services</td>
<td>548.3</td>
<td>542.2</td>
<td>373.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 Unallocated Contingency</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>148.6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Finance Charges</td>
<td>112.5</td>
<td>112.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FTA New Starts Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,330.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,330.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$832.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>999 Concurrent Non-project Activities</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SVBX Project Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,421.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,421.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>$851.8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Incurred through August 31, 2014.

$Millions – Year of Expenditure
End
1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The Special Meeting of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority’s (VTA) Board of Directors was called to order by Chairperson Kalra at 10:10 a.m. in the VTA Auditorium, 3331 North First 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>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xavier Campos</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Carr</td>
<td>Alternate Board Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Chavez</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Absent</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>Absent</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>Absent</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>Present</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>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Yeager</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Absent</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. CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

Chairperson Kalra thanked the Board Members for attending the meeting, and noted the importance of having the full Board of Directors participate in the initial discussion about a potential ballot measure in 2016. Chairperson Kalra stated the main focus of the sub-committee will be to provide recommendations to the Board in several key areas during the development of a ballot measure such as communications, community engagement
strategies, criteria development, and evaluation. Chairperson Kalra emphasized that it is the full Board who will make the final decision on if, when, and what will be included in the ballot measure.

Nuria I. Fernandez, General Manager, noted that VTA serves the growing population of Santa Clara County (County) with over 313 directional miles of freeways and 62 miles of expressways that travel through 11 cities. On the transit side, VTA has 70 bus routes traveling 3,646 trips per weekday. Light Rail has 42.2 miles of track and travels 405 trips per weekday. Ms. Fernandez stated VTA needs a new funding source to address the increasing growth and congestion, and this is why VTA wants to formulate an inclusive process to frame the future ballot measure. VTA is committed to partnering with the community and stakeholders to ensure that any potential ballot measure is fully vetted and widely supported.

**Introductions**

Chairperson Kalra introduced Carl Guardino, President and CEO of the Silicon Valley Leadership Group, who discussed working with VTA to bring forth a potential ballot measure in 2016. Mr. Guardino noted the lessons learned from previous transportation sales tax initiatives. He noted the importance of: 1) the effort must be driven by good policy; 2) listening to transportation professionals and urge them to think regionally; 3) looking for what is truly going to make a difference for the people who work and live in the County; 4) listening to the policy professionals who help guide you to what voters will support; 5) continuing communication with voters to determine support for a ballot measure, and; 6) continuing working together as policy makers to ensure we are creating a climate leading to on-going job growth.

Members of the Board queried about: 1) the Valley’s future job growth outlook, and; 2) VTA’s vision for additional modern and effective transit.

Board Member Campos requested that staff provide the Board with an update on the Capitol Corridor Extension Project which provides service to Salinas.

**4. Receive Report Depicting Current Conditions of Santa Clara County’s Transportation Network**

Ms. Fernandez, introduced John Ristow, Director of Planning and Program Development, and Chris Augenstein, Planning Deputy Director.

Staff provided a PowerPoint presentation, highlighting: 1) Development Trends Snapshot; 2) Roadway Network; 3) Bicycle Network; 4) Transit Network; 5) Transit Rail Network; 6) 2013 Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) Jobs; and 7) 2013 ABAG Workers.

Mr. Ristow outlined the entire transportation network including freeways, highways, bike and pedestrian networks, light rail and bus noting where the stress points are and which areas are in need of immediate improvements.
Mr. Augenstein outlined the bike path network system, highlighting: 1) Class 1 paved bikeways; 2) Class 2 on-street bikeways, and; 3) designated bike routes by signage with no facilities. Mr. Augenstein noted there are segments of the bike path network system that need to be built to complete the system.

Mr. Augenstein noted current trends for land use including job growth clustering and disbursement as well as worker location. He stated VTA is focused on improving connections in this suburban like environment, and discussed the importance of increasing density around the transit network.

Board Member Khamis left the meeting at 10:45 a.m.

Mr. Ristow provided a PowerPoint presentation, highlighting: 1) Origin Counties of Commuters Who Work In Santa Clara County Year 2009; 2) Local Roads Pavement Condition Index; 3) Pavement Condition Index – Santa Clara County & Cities; 4) Pavement Condition Index – Bay Area Counties, and 5) Major Developments in Santa Clara County. Mr. Ristow outlined operations and maintenance including the annual funding needed for pavement, and noted VTA is currently preparing the Short Range Transportation Plan (SRTP) which will be presented to the Board of Directors.


Ms. Fernandez provided a handout entitled “30 in 15 – Moving Silicon Valley Forward” and highlighted the importance of delivering projects while maintaining financial sustainability. She noted the tasks listed will help VTA craft a measure that can address the congestion and service gaps within the first 15 years of the 30-year measure. Ms. Fernandez introduced Eileen Goodwin, Consultant and President of Apex Strategies.

Ms. Goodwin referenced the graphic “30 in 15 – Moving Silicon Valley Forward,” highlighting the recommended timeline for public meetings, communications and community outreach development and approval of projects list.

Ms. Fernandez noted VTA will conduct polling to ensure there is voter support.

Board Member Whittum requested that VTA regularly update the Board on strategic plans and priorities based on current conditions.

Board Member Campos noted the importance of communicating and coordinating Level of Service (LOS) with cities.

Board Member Price expressed support and encouraged flexibility in the language of the ballot measure itself to allow for changing circumstances. She commented on the following: 1) suggested VTA consider experts outside traditional transportation planning and political constraints to capture innovative transportation thinking; 2) encouraged VTA to include the transit dependent user in the planning process; 3) queried about the Caltrain modernization project, and; 4) encouraged leadership to consider appointing an individual from the northern section of Santa Clara County to chair a standing committee.
Ms. Goodwin noted that flexibility can be a goal. One option is to have a voter-approved flexible plan that is transparent.

Board Member Pirzynski recommended that the first slide “Origin Counties of Commuters Who Work in Santa Clara County Year 2009” be updated to reflect contemporary actual numbers.

Vice Chairperson Woodward expressed concern with the safety issues that exist in Gilroy and around Highway 152 and requested further clarification.

Mr. Ristow noted most of California State Route 152 as it comes into US 101 is currently a two lane country road which carries mostly commercial trucks, commuters and recreational vehicles. The route has a high accident and fatality rate. VTA has a new alignment planned for the east/west corridor.

Board Member Whittum suggested providing the Board Members adequate notice to encourage a more robust discussion.

**Public Comment**

Chris Lepe, Interested Citizen, expressed support for the proposed 2016 ballot measure planning process, encouraged VTA to connect local goals to regional and state objectives, and suggested VTA take a look at Level of Service (LOS) for buses.

Colin Heyne, Interested Citizen, thanked the Board for the planned engagement of community partners and stakeholders, and encouraged the direct and significant role of advocacy groups to help develop a well-crafted plan which is supported by voters.

Roland Lebrun, Interested Citizen, informed the Board of the San Francisco developed outreach tool “Budget Czar” [www.sfbudgetczar.com](http://www.sfbudgetczar.com) and encouraged VTA to consider developing a similar tool for polling and outreach. Mr. Lebrun suggested VTA focus on the Capitol Corridor segment from Diridon Station to Great America.

Leah Toeniskoetter, Director of SPUR San Jose, expressed support and indicated the agency looks forward to working with VTA to determine projects that will improve the transportation system in Santa Clara County.

Ms. Fernandez noted all handouts will be posted on the VTA website.
6. ADJOURNMENT

On order of Chairperson Kalra and there being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 11:55 a.m.

Respectfully submitted

Anita McGraw, Board Assistant
VTA Office of the Board Secretary
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 5:31 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>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xavier Campos</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Carr</td>
<td>Alternate Board Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Herrera</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash Kalra</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnny Khamis</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Absent</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>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Rocha</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</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>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Yeager</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Alternates do not serve unless participating as a Member.

A quorum was present.

1.2. Orders of the Day

Chairperson Kalra noted the Standing Committees met last week and their comments to the items on the agenda are in the reading folder and on the Public Table. The Committees recommended that the following Agenda Items be removed from the Regular Agenda and placed on the Consent Agenda: Agenda Item #7.6., Passenger Safety Improvements Project Contract; Agenda Item #7.7., Design Services for Light Rail Special Trackwork – Engineering Contract; Agenda Item #7.8., Mission Boulevard/Warren Avenue/Freight Railroad Relocation – Amendment to the RGW Construction, Inc. Construction Contract; Agenda Item #7.10., State Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP)
Amendments, and; **Agenda Item #7.12.**, Amendment of Agreement for Reimbursement for Santa Clara Valley Water District’s Costs for SVBX Project Support.

Chairperson Kalra noted staff requested the following items be removed from the Regular Agenda and placed on the Consent Agenda: **Agenda Item #7.1.**, Adopt the 2014 Short Range Transit Plan; **Agenda Item #7.9.**, 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, and; **Agenda Item #7.13.**, Transit Assistance Program Annual Update.

Chairperson Kalra noted staff also requested that the following two items be heard together: **Agenda Item #7.3.**, Approval of CalPERS Medical Resolutions for AFSCME and **Agenda Item #7.4.**, Approval of CalPERS Medical Resolutions for Non-Represented Employees and Retirees together.

**Public Comment**

The following interested citizens expressed support for the Transit Assistance Program (TAP) low-income fare pilot program, and noted the following: 1) the program is the solitary source of transportation for qualifying low-income clients; 2) the program makes a significant positive impact in the lives of the working poor and seniors allowing them to get to and from work, drop children at school, and appointments; 3) there is an increasing demand for TAP passes, and; 4) thanked the VTA and encouraged expansion of the program.

- Elizabeth Deloach, Sacred Heart
- Maureen Wadiak, Community Services Agency
- Marie Bernard, Sunnyvale Community Services
- Elizabeth Porcella, St. Joseph’s Family Center
- Sujatha Venkatraman, West Valley Community Services
- Lupe Sanchez, Salvation Army
- Poncho Guevara, Sacred Heart

Chairperson Kalra thanked the speakers for their important feedback on the TAP pilot project.

**M/S/C (Matthews/Pirzynski)** to accept the Orders of the Day, and approve the Consent Agenda.**RESULT: ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOVER:</th>
<th>Jaime Matthews, Alternate Board Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SECONDER:</td>
<td>Joe Pirzynski, Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYES:</td>
<td>Campos, Chavez, Kalra, Matthews, Pirzynski, Rocha, Whittum, Woodward, Yeager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSENT:</td>
<td>Herrera, Khamis, Price</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

2.1 Employees of the Month for September 2014

Chairperson Kalra recognized Kevin Kuhlmann, Bus Maintenance Instructor, Chaboya Bus Maintenance Training Center, and; Diana Sotelo, Coach Operator, Chaboya Operations as Employees of the Month for September, 2014. Jean Pierre Graveline, Transit Mechanic, Chaboya Maintenance, was unable to attend.

2.2 Recognize VTA Operator Janell Rubbo

The Board of Directors recognized Janell Rubbo, Coach Operator, Chaboya Operations, who came to the aid of an unresponsive woman lying on a nearby bench at her coach stop.

Nuria I. Fernandez, General Manager, presented Janell Rubbo with a General Manager Award and thanked her for her courageous and selfless actions.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

James Wightman, Interested Citizen, suggested adding more Levi’s Stadium parking, and expressed concern with the length of time it takes to replace a VTA Clipper Card.

4. PUBLIC HEARINGS

4.1. BART Silicon Valley Berryessa Extension (SVBX) Project Resolution of Necessity


Public Comment

There was no public comment.

M/S/C (Chavez/Matthews) to close the Public Hearing.

RESULT: ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: Cindy Chavez, Board Member
SECONDER: Jaime Matthews, Alternate Board Member
AYES: Campos, Chavez, Kalra, Matthews, Pirzynski, Rocha, Whittum, Woodward, Yeager
ABSENT: Herrera, Khamis, Price
M/S/C (Matthews/Pirzynski) to adopt Resolutions of Necessity Nos. 2014.08.14 and 2014.08.15 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.

Motion approved by 9 Board Members.

Resolution No.: 2014.08.14

Property ID/Assessor's Parcel Number/Owner

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

Resolution No.: 2014.08.15

Property ID/Assessor's Parcel Number/Owner

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

RESULT: ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]

MOVER: Jaime Matthews, Alternate Board Member

SECONDER: Joe Pirzynski, Board Member

AYES: Campos, Chavez, Kalra, Matthews, Pirzynski, Rocha, Whittum, Woodward, Yeager

ABSENT: Herrera, Khamis, Price

5. REPORTS


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:

- Ridership Report for July 2014, noting total system ridership is up by 1.8 percent compared to the same period last year.

- Fare Revenue Performance for July 2014, noting revenue was up 1.9 percent compared to July 2013.
• Key Performance Indicators for July 2014, noting bus and light rail operations met performance goals for Percent of Scheduled Service Operated, Miles Between Mechanical Failure for Bus, and Absenteeism.

• VTA employees participated in the Family Giving Tree Back to School Backpack Drive, noting that employees contributed over $1400 in monetary donations and 45 backpacks.

• A more in-depth presentation regarding the Minority and Women-Owned Business Enterprise Program (MWBE Program) will be provided later on the agenda.

5.3.A Receive Update on Procurement Program Evaluation


Board Member Chavez expressed support and suggested VTA work with peer agencies to make the system more efficient for users. She also suggested VTA conduct a study of current system users to determine if the process has become more efficient. Staff responded VTA plans to conduct a survey to make the system more efficient and allow VTA to be more service oriented.

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

Ms. Fernandez provided a brief report, highlighting

• Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) did not meet in August, 2014.

• The California Transportation Commission (CTC) allocated the final installment of Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP) funding allocated for VTA’s BART Silicon Valley Berryessa Extension Project (SVBX) on August 20, 2014. The Silicon Valley Leadership Group, together with VTA, hosted an event to celebrate this important milestone.

• The Federal Transit Administration awarded VTA $150M of New Start funds for the Silicon Valley Berryessa Extension as part of the Full Funding Grant Agreement on August 20, 2014.
5.4. **Chairperson’s Report**

There was no Chairperson’s Report.

5.4.A. **Levi’s Stadium Program Committee Update**

Chairperson Kalra provided a brief report from the August 27, 2014, meeting, noting: 1) received and reviewed transit service plan information from Levi’s Stadium events held on August 2, August 17, and August 24 around the areas of intersection control, use of the pocket track and revisions to the queue lines for crowd egress; 2) staff reported improved service at each event based upon lessons learned and flexibility to meet unexpected crowd demand; 3) both vehicle traffic and transit operations showed major improvement at each event; 4) transit ridership for the events was near 20%; 5) customer feedback is overwhelmingly positive, and; 6) VTA will continue to be flexible and learn from each event.

**Public Comment**

Michael Ludwig, Interested Citizen, provided a handout, and noted: 1) additional postgame service is needed; 2) preventative maintenance is needed; and 3) pocket track contract promised completion by August 2, 2014.

5.4.B. **Rename the Ad Hoc Governance Committee**

Chairperson Kalra noted that the Board held a special meeting on August 15, 2014, to discuss the process for creating a potential ballot measure which addresses the transportation challenges in Silicon Valley.

Ms. Fernandez commented in September, 2014, VTA will be developing a multi-tiered public engagement strategy for community outreach. VTA has identified six stakeholder groups that will provide feedback: 1) VTA Board of Directors; 2) VTA Advisory Committees; 3) City and County Government Representatives; 4) General Manager Advisory Group; 5) Community Representatives, and 6) Regional State and Federal Partners. VTA will hold a community forum at the end of September for the Community Representatives Group. This will be led by Camille Williams, Accessible Services Program Manager.

Chairperson Kalra thanked the entire Board for their feedback. He noted the Ad Hoc Governance Committee created earlier this month will no longer work on the potential ballot measure. Staff will instead bring the creation of the Governance Committee through the process to establish it as a regular standing committee of the Board.

Chairperson Kalra stressed the need for the VTA Board of Directors to create an Ad Hoc Committee on Envisioning Silicon Valley for the purpose of guiding VTA through the process of creating of a potential ballot initiative. Chairperson Kalra recommended a six member committee.
with the following membership: 1) Ash Kalra as Chairperson; 2) Perry Woodward; 3) Cindy Chavez; 4) Rich Larsen; 5) Jamie Matthews, and; 6) Jason Baker. This membership represents the different regions within VTA including the City of San Jose and County of Santa Clara.

Board Member Whittum noted his support.

**Public Comment**

The following interested citizens expressed support for VTA’s commitment to the inclusive planning process and creation of a potential tax ballot initiative, and noted the following: 1) support for stakeholder groups working together; 2) support for community working groups to assist in outreach and provide transparency; 3) highlighted the importance of building consensus; 4) suggested reaching out to transportation minded organizations such as TransForm and Silicon Valley Riders Union, and; 5) encouraged the use of open and transparent language when referring to taxes or fees.

- Bob Brownsten
- Helen Chapman, Shasta/Hanchett Park
- Chris Lepe
- Michael Ludwig
- Omar Chatty

**M/S/C (Matthews/Woodward)** to rename the “Ad Hoc Governance Committee,” to “Ad Hoc Committee on Envisioning Silicon Valley,” and approve the nominees as members of the Committee.

RESULT: ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]

MOVER: Jaime Matthews, Alternate Board Member
SECONDER: Perry Woodward, Vice Chairperson
AYES: Campos, Chavez, Kalra, Matthews, Pirzynski, Rocha, Whittum, Woodward, Yeager
ABSENT: Herrera, Khamis, Price

6. **CONSENT AGENDA**

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

M/S/C (Matthews/Pirzynski) to approve the Board of Directors Regular Meeting Minutes of August 7, 2014.

6.2. **BPAC Reappointments**

M/S/C (Matthews/Pirzynski) to 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. Annual Reserve Funds Transfers

M/S/C (Matthews/Pirzynski) to 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. Facility Use Agreement Between the County of Santa Clara and VTA

M/S/C (Matthews/Pirzynski) to 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. Bill Positions

M/S/C (Matthews/Pirzynski) to 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. 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

M/S/C (Matthews/Pirzynski) to 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. VTA’s Extension of BART to Silicon Valley Project Construction Schedule Assessment

M/S/C (Matthews/Pirzynski) to review and receive the Auditor General's report on the VTA Extension of BART to Silicon Valley Project Construction Schedule Assessment.

6.8. VTA Procurement and Contracting Process Assessment

M/S/C (Matthews/Pirzynski) to review and receive the Auditor General's report on the VTA Procurement and Contracting Process Assessment.
6.9. Legislative Update Matrix

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

6.10. Cap and Trade Funds for Transportation

M/S/C (Matthews/Pirzynski) to receive a report on Cap and Trade Funds for Transportation.

6.11. Proactive CMP Quarterly Report for April-June 2014

M/S/C (Matthews/Pirzynski) to receive the Proactive CMP Quarterly Report for April-June 2014.


M/S/C (Matthews/Pirzynski) to receive Existing Conditions Report for the Pedestrian Access to Transit Plan.

6.13. SR 237 Express Lanes Fiscal Year 2014 Update

M/S/C (Matthews/Pirzynski) to receive performance update on SR 237 Express Lanes for Fiscal Year 2014.


7.1 Adopt the 2014 Short Range Transit Plan

M/S/C (Matthews/Pirzynski) to adopt the 2014 Short Range Transit Plan.

7.6. Passenger Safety Improvements Project Contract

M/S/C (Matthews/Pirzynski) to 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. Design Services for Light Rail Special Trackwork – Engineering Contract

M/S/C (Matthews/Pirzynski) to 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. Mission Boulevard/Warren Avenue/Freight Railroad Relocation – Amendment to the RGW Construction, Inc. Construction Contract

M/S/C (Matthews/Pirzynski) to 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. 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

M/S/C (Matthews/Pirzynski) to 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.

7.10. State Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP) Amendments

M/S/C (Matthews/Pirzynski) to 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.

7.12. Amendment of Agreement for Reimbursement for Santa Clara Valley Water District’s Costs for SVBX Project Support

M/S/C (Matthews/Pirzynski) to 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. Transit Assistance Program Annual Update

M/S/C (Matthews/Pirzynski) to receive update on first year of 2-year Transit Assistance Program (TAP), a low-income fare pilot program.

7. REGULAR AGENDA

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

Adopt the 2014 Short Range Transit Plan.
7.2. Minority and Women-Owned Business Enterprise Program

Sylvester Fadal, Deputy Director of Human Resources Diversity & Inclusion, and Civil Rights, provided a presentation entitled “Minority and Women-Owned Business Enterprise Program,” highlighting: 1) Today VTA has two main programs – Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) for federally funded projects and the Small Business Enterprise (SBE) for state funded projects; 2) Proposal; 3) Disparity Studies - Driving Factors; 4) Snapshot of Different Federal/State & and Local Programs, and; 5) Steps to doing business with VTA.

Public Comment

The following interested citizens expressed support for VTA’s Minority and Women-Owned Business Enterprise Program, and noted the following: 1) importance of deliberate community minority outreach; 2) the program will lead to greater equity in our community, a larger pool of bidders and constitutes an important investment in our local economy; 3) the program will encourage community partnerships and local preference, and; 4) the policy brings opportunities for family owned minority businesses.

- Reginald Swilley, Minority Business Consortium
- Bob Brownsten
- Tony Alexander
- Cathy Zhang, Sound of Hope Radio Network
- Neil Struthers
- Milan Balinton, African American Community Service Agency
- Josue Garcia
- Walter Wilson, Minority Business Consortium

Board Member Rocha requested periodic updates which include tracking and performance measures. He also suggested providing a report to one of the Standing Committees that lays out the issues for minority and women-owned businesses as well as the local preference policy.

Board Member Campos noted the aspirations should not have a ceiling and VTA should encourage minority and women-owned businesses to share their talents to build community.

Board Member Chavez noted VTA should look at how contracts are structured and what can be accomplished relative to construction contracts versus goods and services, and requested VTA consider an amendment to the language.

Chairperson Kalra thanked the City of Santa Clara for providing regional leadership for this program, and VTA staff for instituting the program.

M/S/C (Campos/Rocha) to adopt, as amended, 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. Further, provide periodic updates to a Standing Committee regarding program details and local preference policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULT:</th>
<th>ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOVER:</td>
<td>Javier Campos, Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDER:</td>
<td>Donald Rocha, Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYES:</td>
<td>Campos, Chavez, Kalra, Matthews, Pirzynski, Rocha, Whittum, Woodward, Yeager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSENT:</td>
<td>Herrera, Khamis, Price</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.3 Approval of CalPERS Medical Resolutions for AFSCME and 7.4 Approval of CalPERS Medical Resolutions for Non-Represented Employees and Retirees

Chairperson Kalra noted that Agenda Item #7.3, Approval of CalPERS Medical Resolutions for AFSCME, and Agenda Item #7.4, Approval of CalPERS Medical Resolutions for Non-Represented Employees and Retirees, will be heard together.

Bill Lopez, Director of Business Services, provided a brief report noting the following: 1) the resolutions are verification that VTA has met the minimum standards; 2) the agreement represents a savings of approximately 1.35M for these two groups, and 3) it is our intent to transition all groups to CalPERS.

M/S/C (Chavez/Matthews) to 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 No. 2014.08.16

2. AFSCME Survivor Resolution (CalPERS) No. 2014.08.17 - for Surviving Spouses of AFSCME retirees.

3. AFSCME (non-CalPERS) Resolution No. 2014.08.18 - 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) No. 2014.08.19 - 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.
RESULT: ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: Cindy Chavez, Board Member
SECONDER: Jaime Matthews, Board Member
AYES: Campos, Chavez, Kalra, Matthews, Pirzynski, Rocha, Whittum, Woodward, Yeager
ABSENT: Herrera, Khamis, Price

7.4. Approval of CalPERS Medical Resolutions for Non-Represented Employees and Retirees

M/S/C (Chavez/Matthews) to adopt the following Resolutions for CalPERS Medical Plans for Non-Represented employees and retirees, effective January 1, 2015:

1. Non-Represented Resolution (CalPERS) No. 2014.08.20.
2. Non-Represented Survivor Resolution (CalPERS) No. 2014.08.21 - for Surviving Spouses of deceased Non-Represented retirees.
3. Non-Represented (non-CalPERS) Resolution No. 2014.08.22 - 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) No. 2014.08.23 - 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.

RESULT: ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: Cindy Chavez, Board Member
SECONDER: Jaime Matthews, Board Member
AYES: Campos, Chavez, Kalra, Matthews, Pirzynski, Rocha, Whittum, Woodward, Yeager
ABSENT: Herrera, Khamis, Price

7.5. Rescind ICMA Retirement Health Savings (RHS) Plan Agreements for AFSCME and Non-Represented Employees

Bill Lopez provided a brief report noting this is a companion measure to Agenda Item #7.3., Approval of CalPERS Medical Resolutions for AFSCME, and Agenda Item #7.4., Approval of CalPERS Medical Resolutions for Non-Represented Employees and Retirees.
M/S/C (Chavez/Matthews) to 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)

RESULT: ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]

MOVER: Cindy Chavez, Board Member
SECONDER: Jaime Matthews, Board Member
AYES: Campos, Chavez, Kalra, Matthews, Pirzynski, Rocha, Whittum, Woodward, Yeager
ABSENT: Herrera, Khamis, Price

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

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

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

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

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.

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

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. **Opportunities to Enhance the Relationship of Land Use and Transportation**

Chairperson Kalra noted this item is a referral from the February 20, 2014, Congestion Management Program and Planning (CMPP) Committee after a robust discussion about regional collaboration between VTA and local agencies to improve the relationship on how local agencies implement best practices in integrating land use and transportation planning.

John Ristow, Director of Planning and Program Development, provided a presentation entitled “Local Agency and VTA Roles in Land Use and Transportation,” highlighting: 1) VTA Involvement in Land Use and Development; 2) Land Development and Entitlement Process; 3) VTA Involvement in Land Use and Development – Possible Changes to Improve Effectiveness.

**Public Comment**

Omar Chatty, Interested Citizen, commented on the opportunities to enhance the relationship between land use and transportation, and expressed support for BART around the Bay.

Mr. Ludwig expressed support for improving the relationship between land use and transportation planning.

Board Member Chavez expressed support and recommended the following: 1) VTA look at their communication plan; and 2) suggested VTA concurrently provide the Board of Directors and Member Agency staff with General Plan Update comments and recommendations.

Ms. Fernandez noted VTA will be doing outreach and present the recommendations to each of the Cities.

Board Member Whittum noted it would be helpful for VTA to work directly with city decision makers, allow them to view development proposals, and have access to VTA’s technical expertise. Staff noted VTA’s intention of becoming a technical resource for city staff.

Alternate Board Member Matthews noted the importance of not becoming an advocacy group, and encouraged a partnership with a comprehensive look at where people are moving and where the opportunity is for VTA to increase ridership.
7.12. **(Removed from the Regular Agenda and placed on the Consent Agenda.)**

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

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**

There were no Items of Concern and Referral to Administration.

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

8.2.A. **VTA Standing Committees**

- Silicon Valley Rapid Transit (SVRT) Program Committee – August 4, 2014 Minutes were accepted as contained in the Agenda Packet.
- Congestion Management Program and Planning (CMPP) Committee – There was no report.
- Administration and Finance Committee (A&F) – There was no report.
- Transit Planning and Operations Committee (TP&O) – There was no report.
- Audit Committee – There was no report.
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) – August 13, 2014 Minutes were accepted as contained on the dais.
- Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) – There was no report.
- Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) – August 14, 2014 Minutes were accepted as contained on the dais.
- Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) – August 14, 2014 Minutes were accepted as contained on the dais.

8.2.C. VTA Policy Advisory Boards (PAB)

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

8.2.D. Joint Powers Boards and Regional Commissions

- Peninsula Corridor JPB – There was no report.
- Capitol Corridor JPB – There was no report.
- Dumbarton Rail Corridor Policy Committee – There was no report.
- Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) – There was no report.
- Sunol Smart Carpool Lane Joint Powers Authority – There was no report.
- SR 152 Mobility Partnership – There was no report.

8.3. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Board Member Whittum announced City of Sunnyvale, City Council Open House on September 9, 2014 at 5:30 p.m.
9. CLOSED SESSION

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

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. Reconvened to Open Session at 8:06 p.m.

9.3. Closed Session Report

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

   Rob Fabela, General Counsel, reported that the Board of Directors directed
   VTA to mediate with ATU regarding the policy.

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

   Title: General Counsel

   Chairperson Kalra 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 8:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Nuria I. Fernandez

FROM: Board Secretary, Elaine F. Baltao

SUBJECT: 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) Paul Goldstein, representing the City of Palo Alto; and (2) Kristal Caidoy, representing the City of Milpitas.

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 Palo Alto reappointed Paul Goldstein, who was first appointed as Palo Alto’s representative in 2009. Previous to that, he served on the BPAC as the Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition’s alternate ex-officio member from 2009-2012.
- The City of Milpitas reappointed Kristal Caidoy, who was first appointed to the BPAC in 2013.

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.

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

The Administration & Finance Committee considered this item at its September 18, 2014 meeting as part of its Consent Agenda and approved it unanimously without comment.

Prepared by: Stephen Flynn, Advisory Committee Coordinator
Memo No. 4685
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: Closed Circuit Television at Various Locations Phase 2

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Itech Solution, the lowest responsible bidder, in the amount of $415,000 for the procurement and installation of Closed Circuit Television at Various Locations Phase 2.

BACKGROUND:

The VTA light rail system includes Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) at 46 stations out of the total of 62 stations on the system.

This contract will enhance and expand the CCTV video-on-demand program by adding CCTV at the San Jose Diridon and Bayshore/NASA stations, with an option to add the Orchard Station (Exhibit A).

The CCTV video-on-demand system directs live video streams via a network from the monitored locations to the VTA Light Rail Operations Control Center and the Protective Services Department for 24/7 monitoring as well as allowing retrieval of data by date/time query.

DISCUSSION:

The CCTV at Various Locations Phase 2 contract was advertised on July 28, 2014. The construction documents were advertised with a base bid for two of the stations and an option for a third location. This approach was used in order to maximize the available grant funding.
Twelve bids were submitted on August 27, 2014 with the following results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>Base Bid Amount</th>
<th>Option Bid Amount</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Itech Solution</td>
<td>$269,707</td>
<td>$145,293</td>
<td>$415,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAS Security Systems, Inc.</td>
<td>$295,196</td>
<td>$129,932</td>
<td>$425,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsh Electronics Technology</td>
<td>$302,630</td>
<td>$146,748</td>
<td>$449,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Technology</td>
<td>$311,659</td>
<td>$147,534</td>
<td>$459,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3D Datacom</td>
<td>$307,399</td>
<td>$154,032</td>
<td>$461,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegis ITS</td>
<td>$310,481</td>
<td>$158,988</td>
<td>$469,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson Controls All Phase</td>
<td>$344,540</td>
<td>$180,450</td>
<td>$524,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Coast Telecom</td>
<td>$406,767</td>
<td>$185,388</td>
<td>$592,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMZ Builders</td>
<td>$465,110</td>
<td>$131,106</td>
<td>$596,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blocka Construction</td>
<td>$504,200</td>
<td>$251,030</td>
<td>$755,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elecytonic Inno</td>
<td>$565,215</td>
<td>$353,585</td>
<td>$918,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennyson Electric</td>
<td>$675,690</td>
<td>$332,800</td>
<td>$1,008,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer's Estimate</td>
<td>$423,000</td>
<td>$176,000</td>
<td>$599,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average of 12 Bids</td>
<td>$396,550</td>
<td>$193,074</td>
<td>$589,621</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Itech Solution is the lowest responsible and responsive bidder. The total amount bid is 30.7% under the Engineer’s Estimate, while the Engineer’s Estimate was within 2% of the total amount bid average. The high number of bidders resulted in very competitive bids. VTA staff has completed a bid analysis, has determined the bid to be fair and reasonable, and recommends award of this contract to Ittech Solution.

For contracting purposes, staff is prepared to execute the base contract for the San Jose Diridon and Bayshore/NASA stations and begin construction. If the base contract can be performed without the need of contingency, or if additional funds can be secured, staff would then execute the option for the additional Orchard Station. Board authorization would allow the base and option to be executed.

Construction is scheduled to begin in October 2014 with completion in January 2015.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

There are no practical alternatives to the recommended action. Delaying the award of this contract will delay the delivery of the project, and risk not meeting the schedule requirements of the state funds.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

This action will authorize funds in the amount of $415,000 for the procurement and installation of CCTV at various locations. Appropriation for Base Bid portion of the contract is available in the FY15 Adopted VTA Transit Fund Capital Budget. The Base Bid portion of contract is fully...
funded by Prop 1B California Transit Security Grant Program – California Transit Assistance Fund (FY11- CTSGP-CTAF).

This project is utilizing budget savings from a previous security contract. The savings are not sufficient to do both the base and option bids. Funds are sufficient for the Base Bid. Staff recommends awarding the Base Bid. If additional funds can be obtained later, then the Option Bid can be exercised at that time.

**SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISE (SBE) PARTICIPATION:**

Based on identifiable subcontracting opportunities, a Small Business Enterprise (SBE) goal of 6.6% was established for this contract. Contractor has met the established goal and has committed to 100% SBE participation on this contract.

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

The Administration & Finance Committee considered this item as part of its September 18, 2014 Consent Agenda and approved it unanimously without comment.

Prepared by: Robert Magliocco, Assoc. Systems Design Engineer
Memo No. 4638
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: Combined Landscaping Maintenance Project Contract Award (Rebid)

Policy-Related Action: No

Government Code Section 84308 Applies: No

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Restoration Resources, the lowest responsible bidder, in the amount of $348,425 for the Combined Landscaping Maintenance Project (Rebid).

BACKGROUND:

As part of the State Proposition 1B bond measure, Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) program, VTA designed and Caltrans built the I-880 HOV Widening (SR-237 to US-101) Project and US-101 Auxiliary Lanes (SR-85 to Oregon Expressway) Project. VTA also designed and built the US-101/Capitol-Yerba Buena Interchange Project as part of the program. All three projects included landscaping and one year of plant maintenance. Caltrans policy is that any landscaping over $200,000 in value requires a total of 3 years plant maintenance before transferring maintenance responsibility to Caltrans. This contract would provide maintenance of the planting for the remaining two years for all three projects.

On October 4, 2012, the VTA Board of Directors approved funding for the Combined Landscape Maintenance, authorizing use of reprogrammed local program reserves.

DISCUSSION

The Combined Landscaping Maintenance Project was first advertised on June 2, 2014 and bids were opened on July 2, 2014. VTA received three bids. The lowest bidder did not meet the Small Business Enterprise goal and the second low bid was nearly three times the engineer’s estimate. VTA rejected all the bids and rebid the project on July 16, 2014. Bids were opened on
August 13, 2014 with the following results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>Bid Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restoration Resources</td>
<td>$348,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayscape Management, Inc.</td>
<td>$395,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ Nguyen, Inc.</td>
<td>$880,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bortolussi and Watkin, Inc.</td>
<td>$931,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina Landscape</td>
<td>$1,522,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer’s Estimate</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Restoration Resources is the lowest responsible and responsive bidder. The bid is 7% below Engineer’s Estimate. VTA has completed a bid analysis, has determined the bid to be fair and reasonable, and recommends award of this contract to Restoration Resources. Restoration Resources has worked previously on VTA projects and has met contract requirements.

Landscape maintenance on the I-880 HOV Widening Project will begin in October 2014, with the last of the three projects (US-101 Auxiliary Lanes Project) being completed in November 2017.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

There are no practical alternatives to the recommended action. Rejecting all bids or delaying the award of this contract will delay the maintenance of the planting and would risk losing plants. This would also delay meeting our CMIA obligation of delivery of the projects to Caltrans.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

This action will authorize $348,425 for the Combined Landscaping Maintenance Project. Budget appropriation for this contract is included in the FY15 Adopted VTP Highway Improvement Program Fund Capital Budget. Funding for this contract is derived from Local Program Reserves.

**SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISE (SBE) PARTICIPATION:**

Based on the identifiable opportunities, a Small Business Enterprise (SBE) goal of 4.7% is established for this contract. Contractor has met the established goal and has committed to 100% SBE participation on this contract.

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

The Administration & Finance Committee considered this item as part of its September 18, 2014 Consent Agenda and approved it unanimously without comment.

Prepared by: Ven Prasad, Engineering Group Manager
Memo No. 4587
Exhibit A - Combined Landscaping & Maintenance Project
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: On-Call Right-of-Way Engineering, Survey and Aerial Photography Services

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the General Manager to execute On-Call Right-of-Way Engineering, Survey and Aerial Photography Services task order contracts with up to six of the following firms: BKF Engineers; Chaudhary & Associates, Inc.; HMH Engineers; Psomas; R.E.Y. Engineers, Inc; and Towill, Inc. The executed contracts would span a maximum five-year period and the total of all executed contracts would not exceed $7,500,000.

BACKGROUND:

It has been VTA’s practice to use consultant services to supplement its in-house survey capabilities. These consultant services have been instrumental in supporting VTA’s capital project delivery efforts which include highway projects, transit capital improvements, and Measure A projects including VTA’s BART Silicon Valley (SVBX) Extension. These projects will continue to require right-of-way engineering, survey and aerial photography services to support engineering and construction activities over the next five years.

The last solicitation for these consultant services occurred in 2007 when seven firms were deemed qualified. In August 2007, the Board authorized a total not-to-exceed amount of $11,500,000 for the seven firms. Five-year contracts were executed with the four top-ranked firms: Towill, Inc., BKF Engineers, HMH Engineers and Geomatic Transportation Services, Inc. (GTS). The option of extending these contracts for an additional two years was exercised. GTS subsequently went out of business and the contract with HMH Engineers was closed due to a perceived conflict of interest pertaining to their involvement as sub-contractor to Skanska-Shimmick-Herzog (SSH) on the SVBX project. The existing contracts with the remaining two
firms, Towill, Inc. and BKF Engineers, will expire at the end of 2014.

**DISCUSSION:**

A Request for Proposals (RFP) for Aerial Photography, Right-of-Way Engineering and Survey Services was issued by VTA on May 22, 2014. The RFP was advertised in the San Jose Post Record and was listed on the VTA website. A total of 70 firms requested a copy of the RFP. Additionally, a notification regarding the RFP was sent directly to 23 firms with offices in or near Santa Clara County. The following thirteen firms submitted proposals on July 10, 2014:

- BKF Engineers
- Chaudhary & Associates, Inc.
- HMH Engineers
  - Hogan Land Services
  - Kier & Wright
  - Lee Incorporated
  - Mark Thomas & Company, Inc.
- Psomas
- R.E.Y. Engineers, Inc.
  - Ruggeri-Jensen-Azar (R.J.A.)
  - Rail Surveyors and Engineers, Inc. (R.S.E.)
- Sandis
- Towill, Inc.

(Note: Firms listed in bold are recommended for the On-Call List.)

A review panel consisting of VTA’s Survey and Mapping Manager, Senior Land Surveyor, Associate Surveyor, and Highway’s Engineering Group Manager evaluated all proposals using the following criteria:

- Qualification of the Firm
- Staffing and Project Organization
- Project Understanding
- Local Firm Preference

Based on the quality of the written proposals, eight firms advanced into the next phase of the evaluation. There were two firms, Towill, Inc. and BKF Engineers, where interviews were not required due to the high quality of their proposals and the familiarity of staff with the recent work performed by the firms for VTA.

Oral interviews with the six remaining firms were conducted by the review panel on August 7 and August 8, 2014.

As a result of the panel’s final evaluation, the six highest ranking firms were selected to be placed on the on-call list. The potential work load over the next five years would not support an on-call list of considerable length. The review panel chose the top six ranked firms to be placed on the final list of qualified firms in consideration of the potential work load.
The list of each firm’s team of consultants is provided in Exhibit A.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The Board may elect to contract with a modified list of firms, request staff to seek additional proposals, or solicit proposals on a project-by-project basis. These alternatives are not recommended since the recommended list includes six highly qualified firms that were selected through an open and thorough selection process.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

Funds for these contracts are encumbered upon execution of each task order. Survey services are budgeted as part of VTA’s biennial Capital Projects budget process approved by the Board of Directors. In the case of unanticipated survey service emergencies that are unrelated to a capital project, task orders are funded from the appropriate Operating budget. Budget appropriation for existing projects requiring surveying services is included in the FY15 Adopted VTA Transit Fund, 2000 Measure A Transit Improvement Program Fund, 1996 Measure B Transit Improvement Program Fund, and VTP Highway Improvement Program Fund Capital Budgets. Appropriation for any additional projects will be included in future capital budgets.

**DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS ENTERPRISE (DBE) AND SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISE (SBE) PARTICIPATION:**

Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) and Small Business Enterprise (SBE) goals will be set on individual task orders based on the project funding source and the determination of subcontracting opportunities for each assignment of work.

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

The Administration & Finance Committee considered this item as part of its September 18, 2014 Consent Agenda and approved it unanimously without comment.

Prepared by: Julia MacRory, Survey & Mapping Manager
Memo No. 4556
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIME CONSULTANT</th>
<th>SUB-CONSULTANT</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>CONTACT NAME</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BKF Engineers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1650 Technology Drive, Suite 650, San Jose, CA 95110</td>
<td>Davis Thresh, Vice President</td>
<td>408-467-9114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SBE</td>
<td>2210 Mt. Pleasant Road, San Jose, CA 95148</td>
<td>Kristina D. Comerer, President</td>
<td>408-274-7994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DBE/SBE</td>
<td>6220 24th Street, Sacramento, CA 95822</td>
<td>Carol Radman, President</td>
<td>916-391-1651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>777 Campus Commons Rd., Suite 200, Sacramento, CA 95825</td>
<td>Dan Wobbe, Project Manager</td>
<td>541-312-2624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>800 Bancroft Way, #201, Berkeley, CA 94710</td>
<td>Denise D. Baker, President</td>
<td>510-526-0993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaudhary &amp; Associates, Inc. (DBE/SBE)</td>
<td>211 Gateway Road West, Suite 204, Napa, CA 94558</td>
<td>Arvin K. Chaudhary, President</td>
<td>707-255-2729</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DBE/SBE</td>
<td>4200 Concurs, Suite 150, Ontario, CA 91764</td>
<td>Robert M. Perez, Associate</td>
<td>909-481-5750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>6220 24th Street, Sacramento, CA 95822</td>
<td>Carol Radman, President</td>
<td>916-391-1651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMH Engineers (SBE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>1570 Oakland Road, San Jose, CA 95131</td>
<td>David R. Stanton, Principal</td>
<td>408-487-2200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DBE/SBE</td>
<td>37428 Centralmont Place, Ste A-1, Fremont, CA 94536</td>
<td>Sandra Williamson, President</td>
<td>510-796-8555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>738 Alfred Nobel Dr., Hercules, CA 94547</td>
<td>Jackie Luk, CEO</td>
<td>510-724-3388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DBE/SBE</td>
<td>193 Blue Ravine Road, Suite 150, Folsom, CA 95630</td>
<td>Kurt Okraski, CEO</td>
<td>916-817-1486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>460 Boulevard Way, 2nd Floor, Oakland, CA 94610</td>
<td>Robert Wong, President</td>
<td>510-601-5101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DBE/SBE</td>
<td>25 North 14th St., Suite 880, San Jose, CA 95112</td>
<td>Ellen Lee, President</td>
<td>408-885-9300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DBE/SBE</td>
<td>738 Alfred Nobel Dr., Hercules, CA 94547</td>
<td>Jackie Luk, CEO</td>
<td>510-724-3388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vertical Mapping Resources, Inc.</td>
<td>193 Blue Ravine Road, Suite 150, Folsom, CA 95630</td>
<td>Kurt Okraski, CEO</td>
<td>916-817-1486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.E.Y. Engineers, Inc. (SBE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2880 Zanker Road, Suite 203, San Jose, CA 95734</td>
<td>Michael Shoup, Project Manager</td>
<td>408-775-4195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3Di (GeoTerra)</td>
<td>3410 W. 11th Ave., Eugene, OR 97402</td>
<td>Bret Hazell, President</td>
<td>541-343-8877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SBE</td>
<td>2210 Mt. Pleasant Road, San Jose, CA 95148</td>
<td>Kristina D. Comerer, President</td>
<td>408-274-7994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DBE/SBE</td>
<td>37428 Centralmont Place, Ste A-1, Fremont, CA 94536</td>
<td>Sandra Williamson, President</td>
<td>510-796-8555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>25 North 14th St., Suite 880, San Jose, CA 95112</td>
<td>Ellen Lee, President</td>
<td>408-885-9300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towill, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2081 Bering Drive, Suite K, San Jose, CA 95131</td>
<td>Ken Meme, President</td>
<td>925-682-6976</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SBE</td>
<td>2220 Calle De Luna, Santa Clara, CA 95054</td>
<td>Jack Barcelona, President</td>
<td>408-988-0107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DBE/SBE</td>
<td>460 Boulevard Way, 2nd FL., Oakland, CA 94610</td>
<td>Alex Martinez, Survey Manager</td>
<td>510-601-5101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>991 George Street, Santa Clara, CA 95054</td>
<td>Dennis Mead, Project Manager</td>
<td>408-988-0101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SBE</td>
<td>2210 Mount Pleasant Road, San Jose, CA 95148</td>
<td>Kristina D. Comerer, President</td>
<td>408-274-7994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>37428 Centralmont Place, Ste A-1, Fremont, CA 94536</td>
<td>Sandra Williamson, President</td>
<td>510-796-8555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>40 W. Carmel Valley Rd, Suite C, Carmel Valley, CA 93924</td>
<td>Lynn A. Kovach, Principal Land Surveyor</td>
<td>831-659-9564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SBE</td>
<td>905 Sutter Street, Suite 200, Folsom, CA 95630</td>
<td>James Brainard, Principal</td>
<td>916-366-3040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>855 Folsom St. #142, San Francisco, CA 94107</td>
<td>Earl Woods, Survey Manager</td>
<td>415-837-1336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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: Fourth Amendment to the San Jose Arena Cooperative Parking Management Agreement

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the General Manager to enter into a Fourth Amendment to the Cooperative Parking Agreement Permitting the Shared Use of Parking at the San Jose Diridon Caltrain Station (Agreement), between the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (PCJPB) and San Jose Arena Management, LLC (SJAM), granting a five-year extension on revised profit-sharing terms for the management of parking lots collectively owned by VTA and PCJPB at the Diridon Caltrain Station during events at SAP Center (Arena).

BACKGROUND:

In the Diridon Caltrain Station area, VTA owns a 180 space parking lot, (Lot 1), and PCJPB owns 400 parking spaces in three lots, (Lots 2-4), used primarily for commuting, and as shown on Exhibit A. Since 1996, PCJPB, VTA and SJAM have worked together under a tri-party parking management agreement pursuant to which SJAM operates the collectively-owned parking lots (SJAM Managed Lots) during Arena special events. SJAM takes control of the SJAM Managed Lots 2.5 hours prior to an Arena event and collects parking fees from event attendees. Under the current Agreement, the revenue collected, less a management fee for SJAM, is shared between PCJPB and VTA, 69% and 31%, respectively. These shares are based on the percentage of the 580 parking stalls each agency owns within the SJAM Managed Lots. The PCJPB, as the majority property holder, acts as the lead agency in this Agreement.

Any existing Caltrain commuters already parked at the facility are left alone and remain...
unaffected by SJAM’s control of the parking lot. Experience has shown there is little conflict between commuter parking and Arena event parking. Transit commuters tend to use the lots heavily during daytime hours on weekdays, while Arena events tend to be in the evenings and on weekends.

The Agreement currently expires on October 31, 2014. Staff proposes to enter into a Fourth Amendment to the Agreement which will extend the term by five years and revise the profit sharing terms between PCJPB and VTA on the terms described below.

**DISCUSSION:**

Under the Agreement, annual revenue to VTA historically has averaged $190,000 per year for the past 5 years and is expected to meet this expectation again in FY 2013/14. Annual revenues are affected by San Jose Sharks regular season home game attendance, number of playoff games and other non-hockey SAP Center event performances. In late 2012 and early 2013, the NHL lockout did impact the financial performance of the lot, decreasing rent collected by 16% for a full quarter. Since early 2013 however, rental revenue has returned to pre-lockout numbers.

Importantly, while analyzing the historic rental revenue during negotiations of the proposed Fourth Amendment, VTA staff discovered that a different profit-sharing arrangement would be beneficial to VTA. The data shows that Lots 1 and 2 are more consistently occupied and therefore generate higher gross revenue because they are in closer proximity to the Arena. Specifically, the analysis indicates that, in 2013, Lots 1 and 2 earned approximately $535,220 in gross revenue. This would equate to approximately $52,000 in additional annual net revenue VTA could be earning if the Agreement’s allocation of 69% (PCJPB) and 31% (VTA) did not control.

VTA and PCJPB Staff collectively agreed that a new revenue sharing formula was appropriate in light of the analysis. The proposed new revenue structure will more closely align with agency ownership of each lot, allocating 47% to PCJPB and 53% to VTA for Lots 1 and 2 combined and 100% to PCJPB for Lots 3 and 4.

In addition to the revenue sharing formula, the Fourth Amendment will change the allocation of SJAM’s management fee, which covers labor and lot maintenance costs. Under the existing Agreement, the management fee had been split 50% between VTA and PCJPB. The proposed new management fee structure will allocate the fee, 69% to PCJPB and 31% to VTA, consistent with the agency ownership of Lots 1 - 4.

In addition, SJAM has requested a 5% management fee increase, from $9,481 to $9,955 per month. Their fee has remained the same since July 2011. Staff from PCJPB and VTA believes that SJAM’s management fee increase request is valid due to increased labor costs. SJAM operates under a 16% expense ratio which is at a market rate comparable to other parking operating arrangements in the region. SJAM provides an efficient, low expense ratio for this Agreement because it maintains an economy of scale with the number of spaces it controls coupled with strong demand for Arena events.

Finally, the Fourth Amendment will extend the parking management arrangement with SJAM for another five years, changing the expiration date from October 31, 2014 to October 31, 2019,
and update the insurance requirements. All other terms and conditions of the Agreement will remain unchanged.

ALTERNATIVES:

The Board could choose not to approve the Fourth Amendment. This would not impact VTA operations, but it would deny VTA the additional revenues generated each year by this Cooperative Parking Agreement.

FISCAL IMPACT:

The proposed Fourth Amendment will generate an estimated $52,000 in additional net annual revenue to an expected range of $240,000 - $250,000 in annual net revenue to VTA.

STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:

This item was on the consent calendar of the September Administration and Finance committee. After Chairperson Chavez commended staff on the increased revenue to VTA resulting from the agreement amendment, the committee unanimously approved the consent calendar items.

Prepared by: Kevin Balak
Memo No. 4559
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: Limited-Use Smart Cards (LUSC) for Vending Day Passes from Bus Fareboxes- Authorization to Use Preferred Vendor

Policy-Related Action: Yes

Government Code Section 84308 Applies: Yes

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the General Manager to execute a sole source contract for a not to exceed amount of $810,000 with Electronic Data Magnetics, Inc. (EDM) for the purchase of 3.0 million limited-use smart cards (LUSCs) for vending VTA Transit Day Passes from bus fareboxes.

BACKGROUND:

EDM is the current supplier of LUSCs for distribution from our upgraded coach fareboxes. Customers purchasing a Day Pass on boarding the coach are issued these special electronic cards by the farebox mechanism. VTA now has the opportunity to purchase the cards directly from the manufacturer. They were previously purchased through the farebox contractor as part of that contract. There were challenges in introducing this new electronic technology and it is staff’s opinion that the safest and most efficient approach is to contract directly with the current vendor.

VTAs current fareboxes were placed into service in 2011. A significant feature of the fareboxes is the ability to issue electronically encoded Day Passes directly from the farebox. The LUSCs will also be used to provide proof-of-payment receipts for VTA’s Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) service when this commences in late 2015.

VTA was the first major public transit operator to procure a farebox that would issue LUSCs. To ensure accountability, initial supplies of LUSCs were acquired through the farebox system supplier (GFI/Genfare). This approach proved valuable when there were issues with the first batches of LUSCs delivered to VTA, resulting in an unacceptable number of errors. VTA staff put in many hours tracking and analyzing these issues and working to identify a solution with
GFI/Genfare and its ticket supplier, EDM.

**DISCUSSION:**

The LUSC ticket is a “sandwich” product including an RFID chip and an antenna, glued between layers of paper or other material. VTA has found that it is challenging to ensure that thousands of LUSCs are printed, electronically encoded, and dispensed reliably from fareboxes every day, without jamming or causing other mechanical failures.

GFI and EDM worked cooperatively with VTA to address the various issues that were causing jamming and other mechanical failures due in large part to the design and manufacture of the LUSCs. EDM has initiated a more rigorous screening process and quality control for their product.

VTA has been using the new LUSCs for the past several months and it appears that the changes to the devices and production procedures put in place by EDM have significantly reduced the service impacts experienced with the prior LUSC stock.

Although VTA’s intention has always been to acquire LUSCs on a competitive basis, at this time EDM is the only supplier with experience supplying LUSCs for the GFI farebox. VTA invested significant time and expense working with GFI and EDM in order to obtain an LUSC that now works with acceptable reliability. Therefore, it is recommended at this time to procure LUSCs directly from EDM. Upon completion of this contract, it is staff’s intention to investigate the market and see if there are other potential vendors that could respond to a competitive bid.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The Board could reject the recommendation and direct staff to perform a competitive sealed-bid procurement process. However this would not provide the assurance of reliability and quality control that we could expect from going directly to EDM. VTA would risk having to go through once again an extended development process with a new supplier, with the potential for significant impacts on service as well as on VTA manpower.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

This action will authorize up to $810,000 for procurement of limited-use smart card ticket stock for VTA fareboxes to be used over the next two years. Appropriation for ticket stock purchased through June 30, 2015 is included in the FY15 Adopted VTA Transit Fund Operating Budget. Appropriation for the remainder of the contract will be included in subsequent Biennial Operating Budgets.

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

This item was approved at the September meeting of the Administration and Finance Committee. Chairperson Chavez, recommended that VTA provide an update to the Transit Planning and Operations (TP&O) Committee prior to the next competitive procurement.

Prepared by: David Sausjord, Fare Programs & Systems Manager
Memo No. 4707
Attachment A:

Contractor’s list - Limited Smart Use Cards for Vending Day Passes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prime Contractor</th>
<th>Electronic Data Magnetics, Inc. (EDM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>210 Old Thomasville Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Point, NC 27260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Web Address: <a href="http://www.electronicdata.com">www.electronicdata.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Name</td>
<td>Russ Hallman, Chief Operating Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Number</td>
<td>(800) 336-8115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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: Renewal of Employee Health Benefit Contracts

Policy-Related Action: No

Government Code Section 84308 Applies: Yes

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the General Manager to renew health benefit contracts with Kaiser, United Health Care (UHC) Medicare, and Valley Health medical plans for SEIU, ATU and TAEA represented employees and retirees for calendar year 2015; and to renew Delta Dental, Pacific Union Dental, Vision Service Plan, CIGNA insurance and Custom Benefit Administrators for all VTA employees for calendar year 2015.

BACKGROUND:

For all employees and retirees VTA currently contracts with Kaiser, UHC Medicare Plan, Valley Health Plan, Delta Dental, Pacific Union Dental and Vision Service Plan for health benefits which include medical, dental, and vision insurance. VTA also contracts with Custom Benefit Administrators for pre-tax flexible spending account plan administration (for health care, childcare, and commuter expenses); and with CIGNA for life, accidental death and dismemberment (AD&D), and long term disability insurance. These contracts expire December 31, 2014.

Beginning January 1, 2015, non-represented employees/retirees and employees/retirees represented by AFSCME will transition to CalPERS health plans for medical insurance, but will remain on plans contracted directly with VTA for dental, vision, life, AD&D and long term disability insurance. The remaining employees represented by ATU, SEIU, and TAEA will continue to receive all health benefits via health care providers contracting directly with VTA.

The contracts recommended for approval with this Board action are necessary to continue these benefit plans for VTA employees and retirees, effective January 1, 2015.
DISCUSSION:

VTA's contracted health benefits broker, The Arlen Group, has marketed VTA as a potential client to health benefit and life insurance providers, analyzed the resulting bids, and negotiated pricing. The results project a slight decrease in overall cost compared to last fiscal year for all VTA plans covered by the proposed contracts (based on current enrollment and projected rates).

There was a slight increase (0.2%) for medical insurance rates, and no increases for dental and vision plans, and for flexible benefit administration. Rates for life and AD&D insurance will decrease by 11.5%.

VTA’s overall renewal rate for Kaiser plans decreased 4.7%, with the exception of Kaiser Multi-Site rates (offered outside of California for retirees), which are not yet final. Valley Health Plan renewed with a 26% overall rate increase. UHC Medicare Supplement Plans will increase 6%.

The table below shows the rate changes in previous years, and projected for next calendar year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEDICAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>-4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Health Care</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>6%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Health Plan</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medical Overall</strong></td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DENTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta Dental</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Union Dental</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VISION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision Service Plan</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FLEX PLANS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custom Benefit Administrators</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LIFE/AD&amp;D</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIGNA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-11.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The UHC rate increase for 2014 and 2015 reflect the cost of Medicare Plans only
**2015 Medical rates are only for ATU, TAEA, and SEIU

ALTERNATIVES:

An alternative would be to re-bid VTA’s medical benefits business. However, the outcome is not likely to change because the major carriers in the region have advised that they would not bid due to the high number of VTA employees enrolled in the Kaiser plan (over 60%). In addition, any changes to medical providers require collective bargaining with employee unions.
FISCAL IMPACT:

Based on current enrollment, the estimated annual total cost of these benefits for calendar year 2015 is $42,734,555. The employer portion of the cost for these benefits is $38,550,206. The employee/retiree portion is $2,785,183. The ATU Spousal Medical Fund portion is $1,399,166.

In comparison with current rates and holding enrollment constant, this represents an estimated total cost decrease of approximately $16,128 from calendar year 2014 costs. This is comprised of an employer cost decrease of $847,530, an employee/retiree cost increase of $782,963 (Note, this employee/retiree cost figure assumes no change in enrollment, however, it is very likely that many employees/retirees will migrate to lower cost plans to avoid rate increases) and an ATU Spousal Medical Fund increase of $48,438.

Because these are calendar year contracts, one half of these costs will be incurred during this fiscal year. These costs are appropriated in the FY 2015 VTA Transit Fund Operating Budget. The remaining half of these costs will be appropriated in the FY 2016 budget.

STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:

The Administration and Finance Committee considered this item at the September 17, 2014 meeting attended by Board Member Chavez, Board Member Estevez, and Alternate Board Member Carr as part of the Regular Agenda. Director Chavez inquired about the rate increase for Valley Health plans, and led a discussion regarding the prospect of VTA partnering with Valley Health on wellness initiatives, and with the County of Santa Clara on cost containment strategies. Directors Chavez and Carr both inquired about VTA's efforts to transition VTA's entire workforce to CalPERS health plans, and on VTA's employee unions' participation in the effort. The item was approved unanimously.

Prepared by: Bill Lopez
Memo No. 4440
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor Name</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Custom Benefits Administrators</td>
<td>UHC Pacific Union Dental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O. Box 2170</td>
<td>3110 Lake Center Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocklin, CA 95677</td>
<td>Santa Ana, CA 92704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>916-303-7095</td>
<td>714-513-6580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Row</td>
<td>Cheryle Romain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIGNA</td>
<td>United Health Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Front Street #700</td>
<td>2300 Clayton Road #1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco, CA 94111</td>
<td>Concord, CA 94520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623-277-1587</td>
<td>760-720-1784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Asamoah</td>
<td>Nichole Bohnert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta Dental</td>
<td>Valley Health Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11155 International Drive</td>
<td>2480 N. First Street, Suite 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Cordova, CA 95670</td>
<td>San Jose, CA 95131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>916-861-2338</td>
<td>408-793-2774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lois Cannon</td>
<td>Susan Brauss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser Permanente</td>
<td>Vision Service Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Great Oaks Blvd.</td>
<td>One Embarcadero Center #1540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose, CA 95119</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA 94111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408-361-2005</td>
<td>415-957-0977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Fuselier</td>
<td>Denise Donovan, Hanh McMurray</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: Upper Penitencia Creek Trail Addendum

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Consider the Addendum to the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) and approve the design changes to the Upper Penitencia Creek Improvement Project (UPC Project) as discussed in the Addendum.

BACKGROUND:

The Upper Penitencia Creek (UPC) Project is located at the downstream end of Upper Penitencia Creek in San Jose. The site is situated approximately 1,400 feet upstream from the Coyote Creek confluence. The project included floodplain wetland habitat creation, riparian habitat restoration, and in-stream habitat creation as mitigation for permanent impacts to Federal and State jurisdictional wetlands and waters due to construction of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority’s (VTA) BART Silicon Valley - Berryessa Extension (SVBX). Construction of the UPC Project was completed in October 2012, and native riparian and wetland plants were installed in January 2013.

The UPC Project included an 18-foot-wide trail segment along the top-of-bank on the west side of Upper Penitencia Creek. The trail would begin at the sidewalk/bike path on Berryessa Station Way (to be constructed as part of the SVBX Project) and terminate at the south end of the UPC Project site. While construction of the restoration site is complete, the trail component has not been implemented, as the area is currently being used as a construction staging for the SVBX Project.

The Addendum to the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) addresses design
changes related to the trail and any potential environmental impacts that result from these changes.

DISCUSSION:

Design Changes

The major changes to the UPC Project related to the trail are as follows:

- The original trail alignment along the top-of-bank on the west side of Upper Penitencia Creek would no longer serve as a public trail; however, it would serve as a secured maintenance access road to the restoration site.

- A new trail for public use would begin at the existing City of San Jose Penitencia Creek Trail on the east side of King Road, cross the King Road/Salamoni Court intersection (via a traffic signal by others), extend west to the BART Berryessa Station, follow the sidewalk/bikepath on Berryessa Station Way, and terminate at the San Jose Flea Market eastern property line.

The new trail alignment would provide a critical gap closure for bicyclists, pedestrians, and equestrians traveling between the Penitencia Creek Trail and the planned Coyote Creek Trail. When the City of San Jose trail network is complete in the vicinity of the BART Berryessa Station and along the San Jose Flea Market site, closure of this gap would create a regional trail system connecting the east/west Penitencia Creek Trail with the north/south Coyote Creek Trail.

A Fact Sheet for the proposed trail is included as Attachment A.

Environmental Impacts

The Addendum re-examines the following environmental subject areas: 1) aesthetics, 2) biological resources, 3) cultural resources, 4) hydrology and water quality, and 5) noise. For all topical areas, no significant impact would result from the design changes. All mitigation measures described in the IS/MND are either not applicable or remain valid.

The Addendum is included as Attachment B.

Community Outreach

Community outreach related to the new trail includes direct stakeholder correspondence, mailings, email distribution, website updates, and social media. During the initial planning phase, VTA staff made presentations to the VTA Board of Directors BART Silicon Valley Program Working Committee in November 2012 and January 2013. In December 2012, VTA staff made presentations at a San Jose City Council District IV Community Meeting and to the Berryessa Citizens Advisory Committee in February 2013. VTA coordinated with Santa Clara County and City of San Jose Departments of Parks and Recreation staff on design development from December 2012 through March 2014, including site visits. In early June 2014, once design of the project had progressed, VTA mailed a two-page color project update flyer to residents within 1,500 feet of the proposed trail and distributed the notice to over 500 email recipients for the BART Berryessa Station Area. In August 2014, VTA conducted a field meeting with a
Community First Housing representative for a low-income/senior housing apartment complex north of the creek corridor and mailed a detailed project notification to the Kingston Village residential development south of the proposed trail.

On July 1, 2014, VTA received a letter from Marty Keller of Betty Ann Gardens requesting that VTA construct a barrier fence as part of the trail connector project to secure Betty Ann Gardens’ property from any potential unsafe activity associated with use of the trail. VTA determined that because the proposed trail is on the opposite side of the creek, and there is no direct access to Betty Ann Gardens to/from the trail, a barrier fence was not warranted. VTA provided a formal written response to Mr. Keller on August 12, 2014 regarding this issue.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The Board could decide to not to approve the design changes. This action could limit bicycle and pedestrian access to the BART Berryessa Station campus.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

This project will cost approximately $1.2 million for design and construction. Appropriation for the project is available in the FY15 Adopted 2000 Measure A Transit Improvement Program Fund Capital Budget. Funding for the project is provided by One Bay Area Grant (OBAG), City of San Jose, and 2000 Measure A funds.

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

The Transit Planning and Operations Committee heard this item at their September 18, 2014 meeting. Staff responded to a question regarding funding for the project. The Committee voted to recommend the Board to approve this item.

Prepared by: Ann Calnan
Memo No. 4621
**History**

VTA in collaboration with the City of San Jose conducted a comprehensive access study for the Berryessa BART Station in 2010. The results of the study called for bicycle and pedestrian facilities and connections to be added to existing city roadways adjacent to the station area. Provisions were also made to enable a connection to a future Upper Penitencia Creek (UPC) trail within the UPC corridor. Berryessa community members recently requested the trail segment be constructed in conjunction with the BART Silicon Valley project.

VTA and the City of San Jose received the highest ranking in the county for grant funding to construct the trail through the Berryessa Station area and install a signal on King Road. VTA will complete environmental clearance, design the trail, administer grant funds, and manage construction of the trail. The City of San Jose will provide a local match for the grant.

**Overview**

Extending the existing Upper Penitencia five mile trail system will close an important gap in the trail and provide a safe crossing for bicyclists and pedestrians across King Road. The proposed trail along the newly restored Upper Penitencia Creek will connect with both the Berryessa BART Station and proposed San Jose Flea Market development site. Future improvements to the nearby Coyote Creek trail system will integrate with the trail connector further improving the regional trail network.

The trail connector will be complimented by the following planned enhancements at the Berryessa BART Station: indoor bicycle storage room, dedicated bicycle and pedestrian pathways and a new VTA transit center with Express Bus service to downtown San Jose.

**Planned Trail Improvements**

- Installation of new traffic signal on King Road
- Decorative trailhead gateways
- 1/8th mile shared use trail connection
- Interpretive displays and trail landscaping
- Increased access to planned Berryessa BART Station

**Partnerships**

VTA, in partnership with the City of San Jose’s Department of Transportation and Parks and Recreation, and the Santa Clara County Parks, has a common goal of improving county-wide mobility and enhancing safety for bicyclists and pedestrians.

**Preliminary Cost and Schedule**

- Estimated project cost approximately $2.5 million
- Trail opening to coincide with BART Silicon Valley passenger service, 2018
- Environmental clearance and final design, 2014

**How to Reach Us**

If you have questions, please contact BART Silicon Valley Community Outreach at (408) 934-2662, (TTY) for hearing-impaired at (408) 321-2330. You may also sign up for project updates at www.vta.org/bart or email us at vtabart@vta.org.

(See Trail Map on back)
UPPER PENITENCIA CREEK IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

Addendum to the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration

Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
August 2014
Table of Contents

SECTION 1.0  INTRODUCTION ...................................................................................................................... 1
  1.1 PURPOSE OF THE ADDENDUM .............................................................................................................. 1
  1.2 OVERVIEW OF THE UPPER PENITENCIA CREEK IMPROVEMENT PROJECT ............................................. 1
  1.3 SCOPE OF THIS ADDENDUM .................................................................................................................. 4
  1.5 COMMUNITY OUTREACH ...................................................................................................................... 4

SECTION 2.0  UPC “TRAIL CONNECTOR” PROJECT ..................................................................................... 4
  Project Description ......................................................................................................................................... 5
  Related Projects ............................................................................................................................................. 10

SECTION 3.0  ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION .......................................................................................... 10
  3.1 IMPACTS DISCUSSION .............................................................................................................................. 10
    Aesthetics ..................................................................................................................................................... 10
    Biological Resources ................................................................................................................................. 10
    Cultural Resources ....................................................................................................................................... 12
    Hydrology and Water Quality ..................................................................................................................... 13
    Noise ......................................................................................................................................................... 13
  3.2 CONCLUSION ........................................................................................................................................... 13

SECTION 4.0  ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION .................................................................................... 14
SECTION 1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of the Addendum

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) recognizes that between the date a project is approved and the date a project is constructed, one or more of the following changes may occur: 1) the scope of the project may change, 2) the environmental setting in which the project is located may change, 3) certain environmental laws, regulations, or policies may change, and 4) previously unknown information may be identified. CEQA requires that lead agencies evaluate these changes to determine whether or not they are significant.

The mechanism for assessing the significance of these changes is found in CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 – 15164. Under these Guidelines, a lead agency should prepare a subsequent or supplemental CEQA document if the triggering criteria set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 and 15163 are met. These criteria include a determination whether any changes to the project, or the circumstances under which the project will be undertaken, involve new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. In addition, a subsequent or supplemental CEQA document may be prepared if “new information” meeting certain standards under Guidelines Section 15162 is presented. If the changes do not meet these criteria, or if no “new information of substantial importance” is presented, then an Addendum per CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 is prepared to document any minor corrections to the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) or Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND). CEQA does not require that an Addendum be circulated for public review.

1.2 Overview of the Upper Penitencia Creek Improvement Project

The Upper Penitencia Creek Improvement Project (UPC Project) is located at the downstream end of Upper Penitencia Creek in San Jose, Santa Clara County, California (Figure 1). The site is situated approximately 1,400 feet upstream from the Coyote Creek confluence. The project included floodplain wetland habitat creation, riparian habitat restoration, and instream habitat creation as mitigation for permanent impacts to Federal and State jurisdictional wetlands and waters due to construction of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority’s (VTA) BART Silicon Valley – Berryessa Extension (SVBX). Construction of the UPC Project was completed in October 2012, and native riparian and wetland plants were installed in January 2013.

The UPC Project included an 18-foot-wide trail segment along the top-of-bank on the west side of Upper Penitencia Creek. The trail would begin at the sidewalk/bike path on Berryessa Station Way (to be constructed as part of the SVBX Project) and terminate at the south end of the UPC Project site (Figure 2). While construction of the restoration site is complete, the trail component has not been implemented, as the area is currently being used as a construction staging area for the SVBX Project.
Figure 1: Vicinity Map
Figure 2: Upper Penitencia Creek Improvement Project Trail
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Original 18-foot-wide Trail and Maintenance Access Road
An Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) (July 2011) was prepared to examine the environmental impacts from the UPC Project, including a trail. The draft environmental document was circulated for agency and public review between June 3, 2011 and July 6, 2011. The final IS/MND was presented to the VTA Board of Directors and approved on August 4, 2011.

1.3 Scope of this Addendum

This Addendum is limited in scope to an evaluation of the construction of the new trail, and to determine whether this modification to the UPC Project results in any substantial change to the environmental setting, impacts, and mitigation measures as previously described in the approved IS/MND.

1.5 Community Outreach

Community outreach related to the new trail includes direct stakeholder correspondence, mailings, email distribution, website updates, and social media. During the initial planning phase, VTA presented to the VTA Board of Directors BART Silicon Valley Program Working Committee in November 2012 and January 2013. In December 2012, VTA presented at a San Jose City Council District IV Community Meeting and to the Berryessa Citizens Advisory Committee in February 2013. VTA coordinated with Santa Clara County and City of San Jose Departments of Parks and Recreation staff on design development from December 2012 through March 2014, including site visits. In early June 2014, once design of the project had progressed, VTA mailed a two-page color project update flyer to residents within 1,500 feet of the proposed trail and distributed the notice to over 500 email recipients for the BART Berryessa Station Area. In August 2014 VTA conducted a field meeting with a Community First Housing representative for a low-income/senior housing apartment complex north of the creek corridor and mailed a detailed project notification to the Kingston Village residential development south of the proposed trail.

SECTION 2.0 UPC “TRAIL CONNECTOR” PROJECT

The following major design changes to the UPC Project related to a new trail are as follows:

- The original trail alignment along the top-of-bank on the west side of Upper Penitencia Creek would no longer serve as a public trail; however, it would serve as a secured maintenance access road to the restoration site.
- A new trail for public use would begin at the existing City of San Jose Penitencia Creek Trail on the east side of King Road, cross the King Road/Salamoni Court intersection (via a traffic signal by others), extend west to the BART Berryessa Station, follow the shared use sidewalk on Berryessa Station Way, and terminate at the San Jose Flea Market eastern property line.
Project Description

The Upper Penitencia Creek Trail Connector Project (Project) consists of an 1/8th mile segment of shared use trail that would extend the existing 5-mile Penitencia Creek Trail from its current terminus east of King Road to the BART Berryessa Station. The Project would increase access to the existing and planned City of San Jose trail network and provide bicycle and pedestrian access to the BART Berryessa Station and San Jose Flea Market.

In the future, the Project would provide a critical gap closure for bicyclists, pedestrians, and equestrians traveling between the Penitencia Creek Trail and the planned Coyote Creek Trail (Figure 3). When the City of San Jose trail network is complete in the vicinity of the BART Berryessa Station and along the San Jose Flea Market site, closure of this gap would create a regional trail system connecting the east/west Penitencia Creek Trail with the north/south Coyote Creek Trail.

The Project would be designed and constructed by VTA in partnership with the City of San Jose; and the City would own and operate the trail. The trail would be designed according to the Santa Clara County Uniform Inter-Jurisdictional Trail Design, Use, and Management Guidelines for a combined paved trail and unpaved jogging trail. The trail typical cross-section would consist of a 12-foot paved trail bounded by a 5-foot gravel shoulder for jogging and/or equestrian use and a 2-foot gravel shoulder (see Figure 4). Project trailheads, monuments, and interpretive displays would be designed consistent with City of San Jose Trail Design Guidelines and BART Berryessa Station landscape design aesthetics. Some excavation would be required to address an approximate seven foot elevation change from King Road to the BART Berryessa Station in order to meet American with Disabilities Act requirements.

The project would include the following primary features:

- Shared use trail;
- Three trailhead gateways;
- Landscaping; and
- “Contemplation Garden” with interpretive signs.

The project is described in detail below by location from east to west (see Figure 5).

East of King Road

The Project would begin with a connection to the existing Penitencia Creek Trail east of King Road. This segment of the Project would consist of a gravel trail from the existing Penitencia Creek Trail to a new East King Road Trailhead consisting of patterned concrete. The trailhead would be located just east of King Road on City of San Jose property. The trailhead would align with an approved traffic signal and crosswalk at the intersection of King Road and Salamoni Court (see Related Projects below).
Figure 3: Trail Gap Closure
Figure 4: Combination Paved Trail and Unpaved Jogging Trail

Source: Santa Clara County Uniform Interjurisdictional Trail Design, Use, and Management Guidelines (April 1999)
Figure 5: Upper Penitencia Creek Trail – Project Features
West of King Road to Berryessa Station Way

Continuing west, the trail would connect to the existing sidewalk and a modified curb ramp (see Related Projects below) on the northwest corner of the King Road and Salamoni Court intersection. The trail would be constructed within a public trail easement between the King Road right-of-way and Kingston Village residential development. The trail easement is a dedication by the development within a Homeowners Association (HOA) common area to accommodate a trail for public use.

The second trailhead, the West King Road Trailhead, would be located on the west side of King Road where the trail leaves the trail easement area and “turns the corner” to align with the creek corridor. The trailhead would consist of a trail monument (with signage) and patterned concrete. A maintenance vehicle access point would be provided just north of the trailhead from King Road.

The trail continues west following the alignment of the creek riparian corridor. Up to six non-native trees at the edge of the corridor would be removed to accommodate the trail. These trees would be replaced within the riparian corridor or nearby in landscaping areas. Non-native vegetation would also be removed between the Kingston Village property line fence and the southern edge of the trail, a distance of approximately 10 feet. Replacement landscaping would include native trees and shrubs planted along the fence in between any existing native trees to remain. These trees and shrubs would provide a visual buffer between the trail and adjacent residences and help deter graffiti on the fence.

A connection to an existing gravel maintenance road would be provided from the trail and a new gate would be installed to provide secure access to the Upper Penitencia Creek mitigation area. The third trailhead, the Berryessa Station Way Trailhead, would be located west of the maintenance road access. The trailhead would consist of a trail monument (with signage), patterned concrete, and decorative railing. Near the trailhead, a Contemplation Garden would be constructed to include seating areas, native plants, and interpretive displays illustrating the cultural and biological resources associated with Upper Penitencia Creek.

Beginning at the City of San Jose/VTA property line located approximately half way between the West King Road Trailhead and Berryessa Station Way Trailhead, a split-rail fence would be constructed to separate the trail from the Upper Penitencia Creek mitigation site. The fence would be parallel to the trail, connect to the maintenance access gate, extend along the west edge of the maintenance road, and terminate approximately where the maintenance access road and Berryessa Station Way intersect.

West of Berryessa Station Way

The trail would cross Berryessa Station Way at a signalized intersection adjacent to the Berryessa Station Way Trailhead. The east/west crosswalk on the northern leg of the intersection would be designed to meet City of San Jose standards and would include a decorative pattern of fish (or another pattern as directed by City of San Jose) inside the thermoplastic crosswalk striping.
The trail would continue north along a shared use sidewalk adjacent to Berryessa Station Way. The sidewalk would serve as a continuation of the trail until just south of the Berryessa Station Way bridge over Upper Penitencia Creek. The trail would turn west and terminate at the BART Berryessa Station property line. A future trail connection from the adjacent property would be provided by others.

**Related Projects**

**King Road Traffic Signal and Crosswalk**

An approved traffic signal and crosswalk will be constructed at the T-intersection of King Road and Salamoni Court within City of San Jose right-of-way. Associated improvements include repaving and striping; new curb, curb ramps, gutter, and sidewalks; relocation of a communication power pole; and bicycle/pedestrian activated signal heads.

**SECTION 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION**

**3.1 Impacts Discussion**

The discussion that follows focuses on the following environmental subject areas: 1) aesthetics, 2) biological resources, 3) cultural resources, 4) hydrology and water quality, and 5) noise. No additional information or changes in other subject areas that include air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, and hazards and hazardous materials have occurred due to the design change described in this addendum.

**Aesthetics**

Currently, the project area is littered with garbage and debris. The fence separating the project site from the adjacent neighborhood (Kingston Village) is a target for vandalism. Construction of the trail connector would improve the visual quality of the area by providing regular maintenance and cleanup of the site, replacing non-native vegetation with native riparian species, and planting a landscaping buffer between the trail and the fence to discourage vandalism.

**Biological Resources**

**Special Status Species**

Three special-status wildlife species protected under the federal Endangered Species Act (FESA) and/or the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) have the potential to occur in the project area: California red-legged frog (*Rana aurora draytonii*), California tiger salamander (*Ambystoma californiense*), and western pond turtle (*Actinemys marmorata*). The status of these species has not changed since publication of the UPC Project IS/MND in July 2011. The red-legged frog is listed as threatened under the FESA and as a species of special concern under CESA. The tiger salamander is listed as threatened under both FESA and CESA. The western pond turtle is only listed as a species of special concern under CESA. No new species that have the potential to occur in the project area have been added to the federal or state lists since 2011.
Upper Penitencia Creek in the project area has been highly modified due to the UPC Project and is surrounded by urban infrastructure such as commercial businesses, housing, roadways, and construction activity for the new BART Berryessa Station. Thus, the riparian area is narrow, fragmented by bisecting roadways, and heavily disturbed with anthropogenic ground disturbance. Therefore, it is unlikely California red-legged frogs or California tiger salamanders and their habitat are present in the project area. Furthermore, there are no known occurrences of California red-legged frog or California tiger salamander on Upper Penitencia Creek downstream of Interstate 680, which includes the project area (CDFW 2014). In addition, prior to construction of the UPC Project and associated stream diversion placement, biologists conducted preconstruction surveys for red-legged frogs and tiger salamanders. Spot checks also occurred throughout the construction period. No red-legged frogs or tiger salamanders were found during any of these surveys (H.T. Harvey 2012). Nonetheless, in the unlikely event a frog is washed down from Alum Rock Park, upstream of the project site and where there are known occurrences of California red-legged frogs (H.T. Harvey 2012), the mitigation measures from the UPC Project IS/MND will be implemented for the project for both the California red-legged frog or California tiger salamander to avoid impacts to these species. These measures include preconstruction surveys, seasonal restrictions, environmental training for construction workers, and habitat restoration (see Appendix A). Relocation of red-legged frogs and tiger salamanders is not anticipated.

There is a known occurrence of western pond turtle approximately one mile from the project area, and suitable aquatic habitat for this species exists in Upper Penitencia Creek. Therefore, it is possible that western pond turtle occurs in the project area along Upper Penitencia Creek. While no western pond turtles were identified during surveys for the UPC Project, as described above for the red-legged frog and tiger salamander, the mitigation measures from the UPC Project IS/MND will be implemented for the project to avoid impacts to this species (see Appendix A). If found, relocation of western pond turtles may be required.

Nesting Birds

As with the UPC Project, nesting raptors and other bird species protected under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Fish and Game Code could be impacted by the project, which includes removal of up to six non-native trees along the outer edge of the Upper Penitencia Creek riparian corridor. Construction disturbance during the breeding season (January 1 through August 31) could result in the incidental loss of eggs or nestlings, either directly through the destruction or disturbance of active nests or indirectly by causing the abandonment of nests. The mitigation measures from the UPC Project IS/MND will be implemented for the project to avoid impacts to nesting birds. However, since approval of the IS/MND, CDFW requires surveys to be conducted no more than 48 hours in advance of the potentially disturbing activity.

Riparian Habitat

As mentioned previously, up to six non-native trees would be removed from along the outer edge of the riparian corridor. Removal of these trees would require a permit from CDFW. VTA consulted with CDFW in August 2014 regarding replacement of the trees. As the project includes a substantial landscaping component with native trees and other vegetation, no
mitigation is required of the removal of the non-native trees. The replacement trees would be planted within the riparian corridor and along the Kingston Village fence.

**Cultural Resources**

The IS/MND reported that no archaeological resources were identified in the project area and that the project area, however, had a high potential for buried archaeological deposits, including human remains. Project activities, therefore, had the potential to disturb, damage, or destroy such resources and result in significant impacts. These impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level by implementation of a Cultural Resources Treatment Plan (CRTP). The CRTP was prepared to support the Programmatic Agreement (PA) developed and executed by VTA, the Federal Transit Administration, and the State Historic Preservation Officer on March 25, 2010 for the SVBX Project. The PA and CRTP applied to the UPC Project because the Area of Potential Effects (APE) identified in the PA and CRTP encompassed the entire UPC project area.

To determine whether the new trail would result in any substantial change to the environmental setting, impacts, and mitigation measures for cultural resources as described in the approved IS/MND, an Archaeological Survey Report was prepared (Far Western Anthropological Research Group, Inc., 2014).

The new trail extended the APE beyond the area studied for the UPC Project and identified in the PA and CRTP. The extended APE included areas to the east of the original APE along Upper Penitencia Creek, across King Road, and a portion of the vacant property on the east side of King Road. A supplemental records search and field survey were completed for the extended APE in June 2014. No previously recorded cultural resources were identified within the extended APE by the records search. Ground conditions, disturbances, and impacts were noted during the field survey; however, no archaeological resources were identified. The survey report concluded that the trail modification is not likely to impact any significant cultural resources or result in any substantial change to cultural resources as previously described in the IS/MND.

There is, however, the possibility that previously unknown cultural resources, including burials, could be present within the extended APE and adversely impacted by construction of the new trail. Implementation of mitigation, as described in the IS/MND, would reduce these potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.
Hydrology and Water Quality

It is expected that water quality impacts due to trail construction would be negligible because no construction would take place in the channel, and project activities are required to adhere to National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits that area issued to protect water quality standards. Applicable NPDES permits for the project include the Construction General Permit for Stormwater (Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ, as amended by Orders 2010-0014-DWQ and 2012-0006-DWQ), the Phase 1 Municipal Regional Stormwater Permit (Order No. R2-2009-0074) for work in the City of San Jose right-of-way, and the Phase 2 Small Municipal Separate Storm Sewer (MS4) General Permit (Order No. 2013-0001 DWQ) for work within VTA right-of-way.

During construction, VTA would avoid and minimize the potential for sediment and pollutant effects during construction by requiring the contractor to comply with best management practices (BMPs), including the implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and a Spill Prevention, Control, and Response Plan. As part of the SWPPP, erosion control and sediment control BMPs would be implemented to protect the creek during construction activities nearby. In addition, tracking controls would be implemented to ensure that sediment is not transported by tires onto paved areas, street sweeping would be performed as needed to clean roadways, and nearby storm drainage inlets would be protected as an added precaution. Hazardous material containment such as spill absorbent pads and trained personnel would be required onsite during all phases of construction. The impact on the creek is expected to be minor because of the small amount of petroleum products used during the limited construction activities and because of required spill containment measures. The Spill Prevention, Control, and Response Plan would be implemented during all construction activities requiring the need for petroleum-based liquids.

Implementation of the applicable post-construction requirements of the above-listed NPDES permits would ensure that storm water runoff after construction meets water quality standards.

Noise

Construction of the new trail would occur near a residential community (Kingston Village). However, the duration of construction and the extent of construction activity compared to the UPC Project would be considerably less. Therefore, construction of the trail would not cause any additional significant noise impacts beyond those previously described in the IS/MND. The mitigation measures from the IS/MND will be implemented, as applicable, for the project to avoid impacts to the nearby community (see Appendix A).

3.2 Conclusion

It is the intent of this Addendum and the previous environmental document adopted by VTA to fully disclose the potential environmental impacts of the project. The construction of the trail described in this Addendum will not adversely affect the physical environment, and will improve the human environment by connecting the existing Penitencia Creek Trail to the future BART Berryessa Station and San Jose trail network.
SECTION 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

Based upon the evaluation of the proposed design modifications to the approved Upper Penitencia Creek Improvement Project, the Addendum No. 1 to the Project has not identified any new significant adverse impacts nor any substantial increase in the severity of any previously identified significant adverse impacts previously documented for the Project, nor has any "new information of substantial importance" been presented pursuant the CEQA Guidelines Section 15162. Therefore, an Addendum to the previous IS/MND is the appropriate environmental document.

Thomas W. Fitzwater, Manager
Environmental Programs and Resources Management
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority

[Signature]
Sept. 2, 2018
Date
Appendix A

All mitigation measures for the Upper Penitencia Creek Improvement Project remain valid as applicable, and are included below for the reader’s convenience.

Air Quality

**Mitigation Measure AQ-1 (Construction Impacts): Implement BAAQMD Basic Construction Mitigation Measures to Control Construction-Related Criteria Pollutants.**

- All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.
- All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material offsite shall be covered.
- All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
- All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.
- All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible.
- Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
- All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer’s specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.
- A public notification program will be implemented by VTA to alert residents and businesses in advance of construction activities. VTA shall include a telephone number for Community Outreach in notices sent to neighbors regarding the anticipated scope of work and construction schedule.

The Contractor will post a publicly visible sign at the construction site with the telephone number and person to contact at VTA regarding dust complaints. VTA Community Outreach staff shall be responsible for receiving, documenting, and responding to general construction and air quality concerns (i.e., dust) from neighboring properties. Community Outreach staff shall consult with the contractor to identify the source of the concerns and determine if proper notification and protocol were issued and followed and if not, implement reasonable measures to correct the problem. The Contractor shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours.

**Mitigation Measure AQ-2: Require Diesel Particulate Filters on Construction Equipment**

The project applicant will require that all diesel powered construction equipment install diesel particulate filters to achieve a 75% reduction in PM emissions, compared to the state-wide fleet average, on all construction equipment (California Air Resources Board 2010a).

Biological Resources

**Mitigation Measure BIO-1: Conduct Preconstruction Surveys for California Red-Legged Frog, Tiger Salamander, and Western Pond Turtle**

A qualified biologist will conduct pre-construction surveys for California red-legged frog, California tiger salamander, and Western Pond Turtle within the vicinity of the project site no earlier than two days before ground-disturbing activities. The survey area will include 300 feet upstream and downstream from the project site.
**Mitigation Measure BIO-2: Seasonal Restrictions on Scheduling Activities in Frog or Salamander Habitat**

No activities will occur in suitable frog or salamander habitat after October 15 or the onset of the rainy season, whichever occurs first, until May 1 except for during periods greater than 72 hours without precipitation. Activities can only resume after the 72-hour period or after May 1 following a site inspection by a qualified biologist, in consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). The rainy season is defined as a frontal system that results in depositing 0.25 inches or more of precipitation in one event.

**Mitigation Measure BIO-3: Relocation of California Red-Legged Frog, Tiger Salamander, and Western Pond Turtle**

If individual pond turtles, California red-legged frogs, or California tiger salamanders are located, they will be captured by a qualified biologist and relocated to the nearest suitable habitat upstream or downstream of the project site. If individuals are relocated, then the contractor will install barrier fencing along each side of the work area to prevent individual animals from re-entering the work area. In the event barrier fencing is installed, the qualified biologist will conduct relocation surveys for three consecutive days to ensure that all animals are removed from the disturbance area.

**Mitigation Measure BIO-4: Restoring Disturbed Habitat**

If suitable red-legged frog habitat or tiger salamander is disturbed or removed, VTA will restore the suitable habitat back to its original value by hydroseeding or covering bare areas with mulch and revegetating all cleared areas with plant native species.

**Mitigation Measure BIO-5: Implement Measures to Avoid Frog, Salamander, and Turtle Entrapment**

If a California red-legged frog, tiger salamander, or western pond turtle is encountered prior to or during project activities, measures to avoid frog and turtle entrapment will be implemented. To prevent accidental entrapment of California red-legged frogs and western pond turtle, all open trenches will be covered at the end of each workday, fully surrounded by silt fences or equipped with earthen escape ramps. Trenches will be inspected daily before construction to ensure that no animals are trapped and that fences or ramps are intact and working properly.

**Mitigation Measure BIO-6: Conduct Preconstruction Clearance Surveys for Nesting Raptors and Other Birds**

Impacts on nesting raptors and other bird species can be avoided through the implementation of one of two impact-avoidance strategies. These strategies include:

- Schedule construction activities outside of raptor nesting season (January 1 to August 31), or
- Retain a qualified biologist with knowledge of avian species to conduct focused nesting surveys throughout the site no more than 30 days prior to the start of ground-disturbing activities.

Given the temporal constraint on the project to conduct all in-stream work outside of the steelhead migration window (June 1 to October 15), scheduling construction activities outside of the raptor breeding season will not be possible. Therefore, a preconstruction survey for nesting raptors and other bird species will be conducted.

The survey will be conducted no more than 30 days prior to the initiation of construction. During the survey, the biologist will inspect all trees and electrical towers in, and immediately adjacent to, the project area for raptor nests. If no nesting raptors are found, no further mitigation is warranted.

If an active raptor nest is found close enough to the project area to be disturbed by construction activities, the biologist, in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Game, will determine the extent of a construction-free buffer zone, typically 250 feet, to be established around the nest until the chicks have fledged.

**Mitigation Measure BIO-7: Environmental Biological Resources Training Program**

- Prior to construction, VTA will conduct a training program for all supervisory personnel (such as the Resident Engineer, Resident Inspector, Foreman) and construction workers prior to the start of construction to educate and inform VTA staff and contractors about sensitive plant and animal species in the project area and mitigation measure requirements and resources agency permit conditions to avoid or
minimize impacts to biological resources. A list of all personnel who received training will be made available upon request by USFWS or CDFG.

**Cultural Resources**

**Mitigation Measure CUL-1: Implement the Cultural Resources Treatment Plan**

A Programmatic Agreement (PA) was developed and executed by VTA, the Federal Transit Administration, and the State Historic Preservation Officer on March 25, 2010 for the SVBX Project. The PA is supported by the Cultural Resources Treatment Plan (CRTP), which was developed and will be implemented by VTA in consultation with the appropriate government and historic preservation bodies and Native American community. The PA and CRTP also apply to the proposed project because the Area of Potential Effect (APE) identified in the PA and CRTP encompasses the entire project area.

The CRTP specifies the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) criteria that will be applicable, the procedures to be used to implement the Section 106 process in the field, and the standards of evaluation that will be appropriate given the locations and kinds of cultural properties predicted. The CRTP also presents methods that combine pre-testing where possible (i.e., on open lots or undeveloped lands), testing after demolition of extant structures but before new ground-disturbing construction begins, construction-phase monitoring where appropriate, and standards for data recovery. In any event, areas within the APE where potential resources have been identified, or that are designated as highly or moderately sensitive, will be field investigated, concentrating on, but not confined to, the area of direct effect. The CRTP meets The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology and Historic Preservation (U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1983, as amended and annotated).

Appropriate testing or mitigation measures may include the following:

- Conducting controlled subsurface excavations at prehistoric or historic archaeological resources;
- Conducting subsurface exploratory trenching in large construction-element areas within highly and moderately sensitive zones to determine the presence of buried deposits;
- Undertaking detailed and focused archival research of particular historic archaeological resources;
- Protecting sites or portions of sites from intrusion where practical and feasible, to minimize adverse effects;
- Conducting onsite monitoring during surface-disturbing construction activities;
- Following procedures established in the CRTP when human remains are encountered;
- Completing detailed analyses of artifacts and organic remains consistent with the parameters detailed in the CRTP;
- Preparing and distributing reports and results of the technical studies, as detailed in the CRTP;
- Providing for the curation of archaeological materials recovered from project sites;
- Adhering to the procedures detailed in the CRTP regarding how interested parties will be invited to participate; and
- Providing for a public interpretation component in the technical archaeological studies.

**Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

**Mitigation Measure GHG-1: Implement the BAAQMD’s Best Management Practices for GHG Emissions**

The project applicant will implement, to the extent feasible, the BAAQMD’s BMPs outlined in their CEQA Guidelines, which include:
• Using alternative-fueled (e.g., biodiesel, electric) construction vehicles/equipment of at least 15% of the fleet;
• Using local building materials of at least 10%; and
• Recycling or reusing at least 50% of construction waste or demolition materials.

Noise

Mitigation Measure N-1: Employ Noise-Reducing Construction Practices

• Stationary equipment, such as generators and compressors, will be located as far as feasible from noise and vibration sensitive sites, and be acoustically treated. Grout batch plants, and grout silos, mixers, and pumps, and diesel pumping equipment will also be located as far as feasible from noise sensitive sites, and be acoustically treated if necessary.

• Temporary noise barriers or noise control curtains will be constructed in areas between noisy activities and noise-sensitive receptors, where practical and effective. To be most effective, the barrier will be placed as close as possible to the noise source or the sensitive receptor. Temporary barriers tend to be particularly effective because they can be easily moved as work progresses to optimize performance. If temporary noise barriers and site layout do not result in compliance with the noise criteria, retrofitting existing windows and doors with new acoustically rated units may be considered for the residential structures.

• When feasible, the following equipment will be used: electric powered equipment instead of diesel-powered equipment; hydraulic tools instead of pneumatic impact tools; and electric driven saws instead of air- or gasoline-driven saws.

• Local jurisdiction construction time periods will be adhered to, to the extent feasible, recognizing that nighttime and weekend construction may be necessary and/or preferred by both VTA and local jurisdictions to reduce other related environmental impacts such as traffic. Note that local jurisdictions typically prohibit construction operations between the hours of 7:00 pm and 7:00 am. If necessary to finish on schedule, VTA will work with the local jurisdictions and the affected property owners to determine if the daytime working hours may be extended without severely impacting the nearby residents.

• Turn off idling equipment, whenever possible.

• Construction-related truck traffic will be routed along roadways that would cause the least disturbance to residents. Loading and unloading zones will be laid out to minimize truck idling near sensitive receptors and to minimize truck reversing so back-up alarms do not affect residences.

• Use back-up alarms that are less intrusive in noise-sensitive areas. At nighttime and weekends, use strobe warning lights and/or back-up observers during any back-up operations, where permitted by the local jurisdiction.

• Steel and/or concrete plates over excavated holes and trenches will be secured to reduce rattling when vehicles pass over. Use of thicker plates, stiffer beams beneath the plates, and rubber gaskets between the beams and plates will also reduce rattling noise.

• The contractor will use the best available practices to reduce the potential for excessive noise and vibration from construction activities. This may require the use of equipment with special exhaust silencers, and/or construction of temporary enclosures or noise barriers around activities.
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: Valley Transportation Plan 2040: Final Document

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve the Valley Transportation Plan 2040 (VTP 2040) as Santa Clara County’s long-range countywide transportation plan.

BACKGROUND:

As the Congestion Management Agency for Santa Clara County, VTA has developed a long-range countywide transportation plan called Valley Transportation Plan (VTP) 2040. This is an update to VTP 2035 adopted by the VTA Board of Directors in February 2009. VTP 2040 provides programs, projects and policies for roadways, transit, Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)/Systems Operations Management (SOM), bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and land use/transportation integration. VTP 2040 projects serve as VTA’s recommendations for the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) - Plan Bay Area.

VTA’s development of the long range transportation contains two tasks. The first task is the creation of a stand-alone companion piece to the VTP 2040 entitled Forward Shift. Forward Shift is the introductory summary of the VTP that describes the purpose of the document and provides a snapshot of the information of VTA as an agency implementing the plan. Its intent is to gather support from our partners on the plan’s implementation. These partners include, but are not limited to, city councils, the business community, advocates, and the public.

The second task was the development of the VTP document itself which was a three-year process involving the VTA committees, the public, and other stakeholders. This plan includes a funding strategy, a list of projects and programs that require discretionary funding, and discusses
the development of new programs that address improvements to the transportation system.

At its January 2012 meeting, the VTA Board adopted the core financial elements of VTP 2040 the program area allocations and the financially constrained and unconstrained projects lists contained in the plan. This action followed an effort that included a three-month call-for-project during spring 2011, presentations to various VTA Committees and the Board, open house meetings throughout the County, and an interactive VTA Web site that included the proposed project lists and a VTP survey.

It is important to note that VTP 2040 is a plan, not a programming document. It does not set priorities or schedules for when projects will be implemented, or make assumptions regarding financing costs that may be needed to implement specific projects at specific times. Programming decisions are made by the VTA Board of Directors in separate processes. Revenues and costs included in VTP 2040 are shown in year 2013 dollars to be consistent with the funding estimates received from MTC as part of the development of Plan Bay Area.

**DISCUSSION:**

Forward Shift

Forward Shift represents an open invitation to work with VTA and providing a collaborative approach to developing the transportation system that we would want to have. It discusses how the plan is moving forward in addressing congestion, providing transportation options to its users, and addresses how all users have ownership of the transportation system.

The purpose of the Forward Shift is to identify VTA as a competent agency ready to address the transportation needs of Santa Clara County. It is a call to action for the business community, community leaders, City Councils, and other local stakeholders to join with VTA in implementing its long range plan. The messaging for Forward Shift involves discussing how VTA, through VTP 2040 will help address transportation needs through a select group of projects designed to improve conditions. It presents the efforts included in the VTP 2040 document as vital to provide transportation options, identify important initiatives that involve technology, and an integrated planning approach to transportation challenges.

It is also a vision for how we want to develop the long range transportation plan using all our available resources and partners to create a comprehensive plan that identifies needs and provides direction on how to address those needs. Forward Shift also shows that VTP 2040 addresses all types of travel, creates roads that utilize technology, makes transit a viable option, and reduces congestion through efficiency improvements on the system.

**VTP 2040 Document**

VTP 2040 provides a framework for making key transportation decisions, a plan for investing in our transportation system, and strategic direction for VTA’s involvement in land use, climate protection, and other livability issues. VTP 2040 core planning themes center on:

- Strengthening and expanding the transit system;
- Developing a countywide Express Lane system and exploring other pricing strategies;
- Maintaining and improving local and regional roadways, bike routes, and pedestrian facilities;
- Improving transportation systems efficiency across all modes;
- Improving the relationship between land use and transportation decisions;
- Integrating all modes using complete streets methods; and
- Outlining the needs and shortfalls of the transportation system.

VTP 2040 covers 3 Main Program Areas: Transit, Highways, and Local System. The Local System Program area includes local roadways, expressways, bicycle/pedestrian improvements, Transportation Systems Operations and Management (SOM), and Community Design & Transportation (CDT). Initial recommendations for Program Area allocations and project lists were approved by the VTA Board at its January 2012 meeting. The VTP 2040 Transit Program includes the 2000 Measure A transit projects, as well as new System Efficiency Improvements and Bus Rapid Transit Improvements. This program area allocation is designed to give VTA additional flexibility in future funding decisions for the SOM, Bicycle/Pedestrian, and Community Design & Transportation (CDT) program areas. The total constrained financial program contains $13.3 Billion worth of projects and programs.

In addition, VTP 2040 includes a new plan element that was not in the previous plan. A new chapter discusses the challenges of funding a complete transportation system. It details cost to operate and maintain an optimum transportation network. There is shown a deficit in maintaining the local roadway system which may require us to look at other funding sources to help us bring down the deficit. It also suggests measures that could be taken in order to meet the overall transportation needs in this county.

In summary, the Final VTP 2040 document contains:

- Plan setting, vision, goals and objectives;
- Fund projections and a description of the VTP capital investments, services, and planning activities;
- Land-use Integration, Partnership, and Efficiency programs to continue and expand VTA’s involvement in livability initiatives and better link transportation and land use decision-making;
- Near-term implementation tasks and transportation studies to be undertaken; and an
- Operations and Maintenance element

The VTP 2040 draft can be downloaded here: [http://www.vta.org/vtp2040](http://www.vta.org/vtp2040)

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The VTA Board may choose to make changes to the VTP Document.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

There will be no direct fiscal impact from the adoption of VTP 2040.
ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:

Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)
The CAC approved the item under the consent agenda.

Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)
The BPAC approved the item under the consent agenda.

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
The TAC approved the item under the consent agenda with the addition of comments coming from County Roads and Airports staff.

Policy Advisory Committee (PAC)
Alternate Member Sinks pulled the item from the consent agenda. He commented that the plan should consider alternate fuel vehicles as a contributor to the reduction of greenhouse gases and hoped that future planning looked at technology and zero emission vehicles as part of the solution. After Alternate Member Sinks' comments, the PAC approved the item.

STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:

Congestion Management Program & Planning Committee (CMPP)
CMPP approved the item under the consent agenda.

Board Member Whittum noted Sunnyvale had a project in the VTP for a very long time. He inquired how the project could be funded as it will help alleviate the congestion brought by the Levi’s Stadium. Staff responded that the update to the next plan is underway and it will focus on those projects that could relieve congestion and this project may be considered.

Prepared by: John Sighamony
Memo No. 4467
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: Adopt the Updated VTA Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Guidelines

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt the updated VTA Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Guidelines.

BACKGROUND:

As the Congestion Management Agency (CMA) for Santa Clara County, VTA is responsible for maintaining the County’s Congestion Management Program (CMP). One of VTA's responsibilities in this role is to establish the Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Guidelines that local agencies use when analyzing the transportation impacts of land development projects on the CMP transportation system. The Guidelines are also often used by local agencies as a reference for the Transportation Analysis in environmental documents.

Over the past 20 months, VTA has undertaken an update of the TIA Guidelines to respond to a number of trends and changes since the last update of the Guidelines in early 2009, and to improve and clarify the document. VTA staff provided presentations on the TIA Guidelines Update goals, proposed work areas, schedule, and outreach strategy at VTA Advisory Committees between April and June 2013; provided a Progress Report on the Update at VTA Advisory Committees and the Congestion Management Program & Planning (CMPP) Standing Committee in March 2014; and provided a presentation focusing on the draft document and key comments at Advisory Committees in August 2014. Further background information on the Update is included in the report for August Advisory Committees, which is provided as Attachment A.
DISCUSSION:

This section provides an overview of the TIA Guidelines Update process and outreach efforts; themes and major changes in the updated Guidelines; key comments on the draft document and corresponding changes; and benefits of the updated Guidelines.

Update Process and Outreach Efforts

VTA staff began this update process by identifying goals and desired outcomes as well as key areas to address, and gathering input on these topics from VTA’s Member Agencies and other stakeholders. VTA conducted extensive outreach efforts throughout the update process, which contributed to the development of an Administrative Draft of the updated Guidelines released in June 2014. The Administrative Draft was shared with Member Agencies and other stakeholders for a four-week comment period. VTA received a number of comments and questions on the Administrative Draft, which are summarized in Attachment B. VTA staff discussed key comments with two working groups of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) in July and August and also solicited input at Advisory Committee meetings in August. Based on this input, VTA staff addressed comments and questions and developed the Final Draft of the Guidelines, which is provided as Attachment C.

Throughout the TIA Guidelines Update process, VTA has taken great care to incorporate input from a wide variety of stakeholders. Agencies and stakeholders consulted include:

- Transportation/engineering and planning staff through the Systems Operations & Management (SOM) and Land Use / Transportation Integration (LUTI) Working Groups of the VTA TAC
- An ad hoc TIA Guidelines Update Technical Working Group (TWG) consisting of Member Agency and Caltrans representatives, who provided input through two web surveys and three in-depth meetings in October 2013, January 2014, and April 2014
- VTA Advisory Committees and the CMPP Standing Committee
- Advocacy groups including TransForm, Greenbelt Alliance, California Walks, the Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition, and SPUR
- Business, development, and policy groups including the Silicon Valley Leadership Group (SVLG) Transportation Policy Committee; the SVLG Public Officials Luncheon; the Moffett Park Business Group Board of Directors; the Building Industry Association (BIA) South Bay, the San Jose Developers and Construction Roundtable; and the Joint Venture Silicon Valley Public Sector Climate Task Force
- Major transportation and environmental consulting firms who work in Santa Clara County.

VTA staff has received and synthesized the input from these various groups to ensure that the TIA Guidelines Update is responsive to emerging trends and opportunities, and reflective of local conditions and needs in Santa Clara County. A more detailed summary of outreach activities is provided in Attachment D. Letters of support from stakeholders involved in the TIA Guidelines Update process are provided in Attachment E.

Themes and Major Changes in the Guidelines

To address the goal and desired outcomes of the TIA Guidelines Update, VTA staff organized
the Update into four broad themes:

1. Improve the TIA process
2. Emphasize the reduction of auto trip generation
3. Improve the analysis of alternative modes
4. Improve guidance on mitigation measures

The following is a summary of the key changes in the updated TIA Guidelines, which were developed through the update and outreach process described above:

**Theme #1: Improve TIA Process:**
- Maintain TIA Notification requirement but shift to web-based form
- Clarify that agencies may rely on California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process for TIA submittal and response to comments, except for stand-alone TIAs where an explicit comment response step has been added
- Eliminate the requirement to prepare a TIA Submittal Form

**Theme #2: Emphasize Reduction of Auto Trip Generation**
- Add a requirement for a 2-page Auto Trip Reduction Statement (ATRS) at the start of a TIA, to highlight measures by projects to reduce their auto trip generation
- Add new options for taking/documenting trip reductions - Target-Based and Peer/Study Based; both require additional documentation, monitoring and data-sharing to provide predictability for applicants and transparency to decision-makers and the public
- Add trip reductions for proximity to BART and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) stations; BART reduction will be on a case-by-case basis, BRT reduction will be the same as rail proximity; also update reduction for employment near light rail, Caltrain and BRT

**Theme #3: Improve Analysis of Alternative Modes**
- Clarify that maps are required for both pedestrian and bicycle existing conditions; better define study area, emphasizing project frontages and paths to major attractors
- For pedestrian and bicycle analysis, shift from Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) 2000/capacity-based methodology to Quality of Service (QOS)-based approach, with various options in choosing the specific methodology
- Eliminate requirement to analyze pedestrian/bicycle demand and capacity except for special projects; revise ped/bike descriptive checklist for clarify and possibility of project-related benefits
- For transit analysis, shift from capacity-based methodology to a focus on congestion impacts on transit delay/travel times; basic delay analysis except for special projects
- Eliminate requirement to analyze transit demand and capacity except for special projects

**Theme #4: Improve Guidance on Mitigation Measures**
- Divide mitigation measures chapter into two parts: mitigation measures to address areas with established CMP standards/impact thresholds (i.e., Auto Level of Service, or LOS) and improvements to address negative effects in areas without established CMP
standards/impact thresholds (i.e., pedestrian, bicycle, transit, automobile queuing)

- Clarify that lead agencies should consider operational/efficiency improvements in addition to physical capacity enhancements and align more closely with the intent of CEQA to lessen impacts
- Clarify requirements for evaluation of secondary effects of mitigations on transit, bicycle and pedestrian modes

Key Comments from on Draft Document and at August Advisory Committees

During the comment period on the Administrative Draft document in June/July, VTA received written comments and questions from six cities, three consulting firms, one advocacy group, and Caltrans. Comment themes included:

- TIA Process
- Trip Credits for Existing Uses
- Trip Generation
- Trip Reductions and Transportation Demand Management (TDM)
- Pedestrian and Bicycle Analysis
- Transit Analysis
- Changes to CMP Auto LOS Standard and Thresholds
- Mitigation Measures
- Queuing Analysis
- CEQA Alignment
- Other Topics

VTA staff also received input from Advisory Committees at their August meetings, including supportive comments on the direction of the Update and VTA’s outreach efforts from the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC); comments and questions on bicycle and pedestrian analysis from the Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC); several technical questions and comments, as well as a comment supporting secondary effects analysis of mitigations from the TAC; and several questions and a comment encouraging VTA to emphasize what is meaningful for bicyclists, pedestrians and transit riders from the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC). As noted above, VTA staff revised the Administrative Draft based on this input to produce the Final Draft provided with this report. Attachment B provides a summary of key written comments on the Administrative Draft document and verbal comments at August Advisory Committees, along with corresponding changes to address these comments that are included in the Final Draft.

Benefits of the Updated Guidelines

VTA staff believes that the Updated TIA Guidelines will provide a number of benefits to local agencies, development applicants, and members of the public. These include:

- A clearer TIA process that will save local agencies time through a web-based TIA Notification Form and elimination of the TIA Submittal Form
- An easier way to compare auto trip reductions between projects, using the ATRS form
- More options for applicants and local agencies to take and document auto trip reductions, reflecting current trends and incentivizing trip reduction efforts while improving accountability through associated monitoring and data sharing
- More meaningful analysis of impacts on pedestrians, bicyclists and transit passengers that
reflects factors that are relevant in Santa Clara County

- Better guidance on mitigations to encourage agencies to consider a range of measures that will help improve mobility, manage congestion, and improve air quality - improvements that will improve the county’s quality of life and economic competitiveness

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The Board may ask for modifications to the updated VTA TIA Guidelines, or may choose not to adopt the document.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

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

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

This item was on the Consent Agenda as an Action Item at the September meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC), Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC), and Policy Advisory Committee (PAC). The item was approved as part of the Consent Agenda at each meeting, with no questions or comments from the Committees.

This item was on the Regular Agenda as an Action Item at the September meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). Committee Vice Chairperson Servin noted that the City of Gilroy is trying to attract job growth, and City staff is not certain whether the changes to the TIA Guidelines would change outcomes for development projects in Gilroy to make them more or less attractive. Vice Chairperson Servin stated that City staff would find it helpful to have a comparison of what a TIA would look like under the new Guidelines versus under the current ones, or an opportunity to discuss this further. Committee Member Batra asked if there is a certain time frame when the new TIA Guidelines need to be adopted by; VTA staff replied that the current Guidelines are becoming outdated due to changes in legislation and industry practice, and VTA staff would like to be accountable for delivering a product after a 2-year-long process. Committee Ex-Officio Member Saleh suggested that a technical workshop of VTA and Member Agency staff might be a way to improve Member Agency comfort level with the new Guidelines. VTA staff pointed out that if such a workshop is held, it would be important to have participation from TAC members rather than their designees for it to be meaningful. Committee Member Collen noted that there are some specific considerations in the VTA TIA Guidelines for the County, as it is mostly a reviewing agency for land development projects. VTA staff noted that County staff responsible for development review has actively participated in numerous meetings and their input on several topics was incorporated. TAC made a motion to approve but that motion did not pass, by a vote of 8-0-4, with abstentions by Vice Chairperson Servin representing the City of Gilroy, Member Cherbone representing the City of Saratoga, Member Collen representing the County of Santa Clara, and Alternate Member Shariat representing the City of Sunnyvale.

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**
This item was on the Regular Agenda as an Action Item at the Congestion Management Program and Planning Committee (CMPP). The Committee approved the item by a unanimous 4-0 vote. In the discussion, Committee Member Yeager asked a question about how the updated Guidelines might help a situation where multiple development projects in an area are causing increases in congestion that may not be feasible to mitigate. VTA staff noted that the TIA Guidelines call for a Cumulative Conditions analysis, which analyzes the proposed project with both approved and pending development projects; this can help inform decision-makers; General Manager Fernandez also pointed out that this is part of VTA's role as a Congestion Management Agency, and there is a tie-in to Valley Transportation Plan and the strategic planning VTA will be doing over the next two years. Committee Member Whittum offered a comment about the need for transit improvements to follow land use intensification, such as along the Mathilda Avenue corridor. Committee Member Whittum also asked questions about guidance on what a reasonable trip reduction requirement is, on whether the updated Guidelines help address sidewalk gaps, and whether VTA staff has considered that timeline/uncertainty is a greater concern for developers than cost of analysis. VTA staff replied that the new Auto Trip Reduction Statement should help provide points of comparison for trip reduction goal-setting; that the revised pedestrian and bicycle sections emphasize gaps and deficiencies in the network; and that VTA specifically added a deadline for reviewer comments on TIA reports to address the timeline/uncertainty issue. Committee Chairperson Pirzynski pointed out that there is a growing gap between the perception of congestion and the numbers generated in transportation analyses, and we need to conduct public education efforts to inform people. VTA staff noted that the updated TIA Guidelines give local agencies some tools to do this.
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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: Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Guidelines Update - Draft Document and Key Issues

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

As the Congestion Management Agency (CMA) for Santa Clara County, VTA is responsible for maintaining the county’s Congestion Management Program (CMP) and establishing the Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Guidelines that local agencies use when analyzing the transportation impacts of land use and development projects on the CMP transportation system. VTA’s TIA Guidelines also generally serve as the basis for local agency analysis of impacts on the local transportation system. In addition, the Guidelines are often used by local agencies as a reference for the Transportation Analysis in environmental documents.

In late 2012, VTA began to lay the groundwork to update the TIA Guidelines, responding to a number of trends and changes that have occurred since the last update of the Guidelines in early 2009:

- Progress on implementation of Senate Bill (SB) 375 and the Sustainable Communities Strategy, with the corresponding emphasis on reductions in automobile trips and Vehicle-Miles-Traveled (VMT)
- The 2010 updates to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Transportation checklist, which allowed agencies more flexibility in determining how to perform transportation analysis
- The release of the 2010 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM), including new Multimodal Level of Service measures
- Additional emphasis on Complete Streets policies in General Plan Circulation Elements
- A trend for major development projects in Santa Clara County to pursue aggressive reductions in automobile trip generation
It is worthwhile to note that this update does not directly address SB 743, the CEQA reform bill passed in September 2013 that addresses the use of Auto Level of Service (LOS) in CEQA Transportation Analysis. Potential changes to the VTA CMP to respond to SB 743 would need to first be addressed in the CMP document, which establishes the CMP LOS standard. VTA staff believes it is important to proceed with the current update of the Guidelines now, to address the other trends and changes listed above, as a near-term improvement.

This update is included in the FY 2014-2015 CMP Work Program adopted by the VTA Board of Directors in June 2013. VTA staff provided presentations on the TIA Guidelines Update goals, proposed work areas, schedule, and outreach strategy at VTA Advisory Committees between April and June 2013, and provided a Progress Report on the Update at VTA Advisory Committees and CMPP Standing Committee in March 2014.

**DISCUSSION:**

This update reflects a major milestone in the TIA Guidelines Update process: the release of the Administrative Draft updated Guidelines in June 2014. This section includes the key issues and changes in the draft document; comments on the Administrative Draft; outreach efforts; next steps; and schedule.

**Progress Report**

VTA staff initiated this update process in early 2013 by identifying the goal and desired outcomes as well as key areas to address, and gathering input on these topics from local agencies and other stakeholders. The goal and desired outcomes of the VTA TIA Guidelines update were discussed with VTA Committees at their April-June 2013 and March 2014 meetings. The goal of the update is to emphasize the reduction of auto trip generation rates and take a balanced, multimodal approach to addressing congestion impacts and transportation solutions of development projects. The desired outcomes of this effort include:

1. Recognize projects and plans that reduce their auto trip generation rates and associated congestion impacts.
2. Improve the Guidelines to provide more meaningful, relevant analysis of alternative transportation modes in TIA reports.
3. Lessen emphasis on auto capacity and increase emphasis on multimodal and operational improvements in mitigation measures.
4. Provide more comprehensive and relevant information in TIAs to support better decision-making.

VTA conducted extensive outreach efforts throughout the process (described further below), which contributed to the development of an Administrative Draft of the updated Guidelines, released in June 2014. The Administrative Draft is provided as Attachment A.

**Key Issues and Changes in the Administrative Draft Updated Guidelines**

Table 1 summarizes a selection of the Key Issues and the Proposed Changes that are included in the Administrative Draft updated TIA Guidelines, which were developed through discussions with local agency staff and stakeholders. These Key Issues are grouped by broader Topic Areas, which relate back to the Goal and Desired Outcomes of this effort. The changes in Topic Areas
#1 through #3 were presented in the March 2014 Progress Report to VTA Committees, and are largely unchanged here. The proposed changes in Topic Area #4 were under development at the time of the March 2014 Committee meetings, and are presented in this report.

Table 1 - Summary of Select Key Issues and Proposed Changes in TIA Guidelines Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Issue</th>
<th>Proposed Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topic Area #1: Improve TIA Process</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIA Notification Process</td>
<td>Maintain TIA Notification requirement; clarify expectations; shift to web-based form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing Comments on TIAs</td>
<td>Add explicit comment response step; Clarify that written response is required for TIAs prepared with an EIR and for comments related to CMP compliance; for other comments, response encouraged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topic Area #2: Emphasize Reduction of Auto Trip Generation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Trip Reduction Statement</td>
<td>Add requirement for 2-page Auto Trip Reduction Statement at start of TIA; draft form is in Appendix C of the Administrative Draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Trip Reductions: - New Options (Target-Based and Peer/Study-Based)</td>
<td>Add new sections for ‘Target-Based Reductions’ and ‘Peer/Study-Based Reductions’ to give Lead Agencies more options for documenting trip reductions; both require additional documentation, monitoring and data-sharing with VTA, to provide predictability for applicants and transparency to decision-makers and the public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Trip Reductions: Approach for Standard Reductions</td>
<td>Add reductions for Proximity to BART and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) stations; BART reduction will be on a case-by-case basis, BRT reduction will be policy-driven, same percentage as rail proximity; Update reduction for employment near LRT, BRT and Caltrain to 6% per 2004 study of Transit-Oriented Developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-Orient Parking Analysis</td>
<td>Remove existing section, add discussion of parking management as part of Auto Trip Reduction section; Clarify that parking adequacy is not a CMP issue, but may be for local or CEQA purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topic Area #3: Improve Analysis of Alternative Modes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Pedestrian/ Bicycle Facilities</td>
<td>Clarify that maps are required for both pedestrian and bicycle conditions; Better define study area, emphasizing project frontages and paths to major attractors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Pedestrian/ Bicycle Analysis | Shift from HCM 2000/capacity-based methodology to Quality of Service (QOS)-based methodology, with flexibility; Move discussion of ped/bike capacity to Special Projects chapter, only for projects that generate unusually high numbers of ped/bike trips; Require QOS analysis when projects make changes to roadway geometry and/or intersection geometry, or signal operations; Revise descriptive checklist for clarity and possibility of project-related
Transit Analysis

| Benefits | Shift from capacity-based methodology to a focus on congestion impacts on transit travel times; Require basic analysis of project effects on transit vehicle delay and on transit access and facilities near the project site; Require capacity analysis or more extensive transit vehicle delay analysis only for large or unique projects |

**Topic Area #4: Improve Guidance on Mitigation Measures**

| Approach to Mitigation Measures | Clarify existing guidance on several mitigation issues; Clarify that operational/efficiency improvements may serve as mitigations (in addition to physical capacity enhancements), and align more closely with the intent of CEQA to lessen impacts; Clarify requirements for evaluation of secondary effects of mitigation on transit, bicycle and pedestrian modes |

**Comments on Administrative Draft Document**

The Administrative Draft was shared with Member Agencies and other stakeholders for a four-week comment period, from June 20, 2014 through July 18, 2014. During the comment period, VTA received written comments and questions from six cities, three consulting firms, one advocacy group, and Caltrans. Attachment B provides a summary of the key comments received on the Administrative Draft. VTA staff is now in the process of addressing comments and questions and developing the Final Draft of the updated Guidelines.

**Outreach Efforts**

Throughout the TIA Guidelines Update process, VTA has taken great care to seek out and incorporate input from a wide variety of stakeholders. Outreach efforts have included:

- Frequent consultation with Member Agency transportation/engineering and planning staff through the Systems Operations & Management (SOM) and Land Use / Transportation Integration (LUTI) Working Groups of the VTA Technical Advisory Committee (TAC);
- Formation of an ad hoc TIA Guidelines Update Technical Working Group (TWG) consisting of Member Agency and Caltrans representatives, who have provided input through two web surveys and three in-depth meetings in October 2013, January 2014, and April 2014;
- Presentations to all five VTA Advisory Committees in April through June 2013, and to four VTA Advisory Committees and CMPP Standing Committee in March 2014;
- Several meetings with representatives of advocacy groups including TransForm, Greenbelt Alliance, California Walks, the Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition, and SPUR;
- Presentations to a variety of business, development, and policy groups including the Silicon Valley Leadership Group (SVLG) Transportation Policy Committee; the SVLG Public Officials Luncheon; the Moffett Park Business Group; the Building Industry Association (BIA) South Bay, the San Jose Developers and Construction Roundtable;
and the Joint Venture Silicon Valley Public Sector Climate Task Force;
• A forum with transportation and environmental consulting firms in February 2014.

VTA staff has received and synthesized the input from these various groups to ensure that the TIA Guidelines Update is responsive to emerging trends and opportunities (as described in the Background section above), and reflective of local conditions and needs in Santa Clara County. A more detailed summary of outreach activities is provided in Attachment C.

Summary
Overall, the proposed changes represent significant improvements over the existing Guidelines, to provide more meaningful and relevant analysis to support better decision-making. These changes are based on an updated understanding of trends in transportation analysis, careful consideration of various issues and feedback from local agency staff and consultants in applying the Guidelines. In some areas, staff recognized that additional refinements will be needed in the near future as legislation changes (e.g. SB743) are better understood and analytical tools improve. However, these proposed changes will help VTA achieve the goals set forth at the beginning of the process and the timing of bringing this update forward is very appropriate.

Next Steps and Schedule
VTA will continue to address the comments received on the Administrative Draft updated Guidelines in consultation with Member Agency staff, and preparing the Final Draft document.

The following are the key upcoming milestones:
• LUTI and SOM Working Group discussions, outreach to commenters - July/August
• Action Item to adopt new VTA TIA Guidelines - September VTA Committee meetings, October 2nd VTA Board of Directors meeting

Prepared By: Robert Swierk
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# VTA TIA Guidelines Update 2014
## Summary of Comments on Administrative Draft and VTA Responses/Document Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Commenters on this Topic</th>
<th>Description/Key Points</th>
<th>VTA Response/Document Changes</th>
<th>Final Draft Sections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| TIA Process                | Mtn. View, Sunnyvale, Caltrans, D.J. Powers | Comments and questions about the TIA notification, submittal and review process. Key points: a) Lead time for reviewers; b) Responding to comments (lead time and CEQA alignment); c) TIA Notification requirements (submission of work scope and CEQA alignment). | a) Improve consistency in lead times (calendar vs. business days: e.g., converted 10 business days to 15 calendar days for comments on TIA Notification Forms); add deadline for VTA and other agencies to submit comments on TIA reports (15 calendar days)  
   b) Clarify that submittal/review of TIAs can rely on CEQA process;  
   c) Revise TIA Notification Form to include key information such as analysis scenarios, study intersections/freeway segments; make submittal of draft scope encouraged, not required                                                               | 3.1 3.2 |
| Trip Credits for Existing Land Uses | Palo Alto, Sunnyvale, D.J. Powers | Comments and questions about the use of trip credits for existing land uses. Key points: a) Whether credits for vacant or underutilized development should be factored in when determining whether a TIA is required;  
   b) Lead Agency discretion regarding trip credits in analysis – e.g., whether VTA should specify a time limit for credits for vacant uses. | a) Clarify that credits for vacant and underutilized development can be factored in when determining whether TIA is required, but note Lead Agency has discretion to be more strict;  
   b) Based on input from majority of agencies, continue to allow credits in analysis without specifying a time limit, but give Lead Agency discretion to be more strict. | 2.1 7.2 |
| Trip Generation            | D.J. Powers              | Comments and questions about trip generation methodologies. Key points: a) Concern about possible “trip shopping” with different methodologies;  
   b) CEQA defensibility of methodologies other than ITE and SANDAG. | a) Add further resources summarizing the research and practice basis of methodologies and providing comparison between them;  
   b) Note that professional judgment should always be used when selecting a trip generation methodology.                                                                                                               | 8.1 Appendix D |
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### VTA TIA Guidelines Update 2014

#### Summary of Comments on Administrative Draft and VTA Responses/Document Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Commenters on this Topic</th>
<th>Description/Key Points</th>
<th>VTA Response/Document Changes</th>
<th>Final Draft Sections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Trip Reductions and TDM** | Los Altos, Mtn. View, Sunnyvale, Fehr & Peers | Comments and questions about Target-Based and Peer/Study-Based trip reductions. Key points:  
  a) Monitoring and data sharing expectations under Peer/Study-Based and Target-Based trip reductions;  
  b) Expectations for Lead Agency enforcement/penalties for non-adherence to TDM measures – whether to provide more guidance. | a) Based on discussion with commenters and SOM WG, no change in text except to clarify that Peer/Study-Based Approach can provide additional justification for trip rates based on local data;  
  b) Based on Member Agency consensus, no change in text; following Update, VTA can bring topic of trip reduction enforcement to TAC Working Groups if there is interest. | 8.2 |
| **Pedestrian and Bicycle Analysis** | Los Gatos, Palo Alto, Sunnyvale, California Walks, D.J. Powers | Comments and questions about bicycle and pedestrian analysis, including Quality of Service (QOS) analysis and suggested methodologies. Key points:  
  a) Circumstances under which QOS analysis is required;  
  b) Methodology – specifying one approach, vs. multiple options to give Lead Agencies more discretion;  
  c) Lack of an impact threshold for QOS analysis;  
  d) Suggestions on specific pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure to include in Descriptive Analysis, and suggestion to note possible ped/bike improvements | a) Clarify that QOS analysis is required when a project or its mitigation proposes geometric changes to roadway segments or intersections or substantial changes to signal operations; Otherwise QOS analysis is encouraged but not required;  
  b) Add further resources in Appendices regarding research/practice basis for QOS analysis; continue to give Lead Agencies discretion;  
  c) Based on Member Agency consensus, continue to not specify an impact threshold; make this clear in document (see Mitigation Measures and Multimodal Improvements topic below);  
  d) Further specify pedestrian infrastructure to include in analysis, add examples of possible ped/bike improvements in Mitigation Measures and Multimodal Improvements chapter. | 5.2.5  
  5.2.6  
  9.3  
  10.2  
  Appendix G |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Commenters on this Topic</th>
<th>Description/Key Points</th>
<th>VTA Response/Document Changes</th>
<th>Final Draft Sections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Transit Delay Analysis | California Walks, D.J. Powers, Fehr & Peers | Comments and questions about transit analysis. Key points:  
  a) Methodology for transit delay analysis;  
  b) Lack of an impact threshold for transit delay analysis;  
  c) Mitigation measures/improvements for transit impacts. | a) Add further resources in Appendices regarding research/practice basis for transit delay analysis;  
  b) Based on Member Agency consensus, continue to not specify an impact threshold; make this clear in document (see Mitigation Measures and Multimodal Improvements topic below);  
  c) In discussion of possible improvements, clarify that VTA will coordinate with Lead Agencies to make improvements to transit system. | 5.2.7  
  9.2  
  10.2  
  12.5 Appendix F |
| Changes to CMP Auto LOS Standard and Thresholds | Palo Alto, Caltrans, D.J. Powers. | Comments and questions about the Congestion Management Program’s Auto LOS standard and impact thresholds for intersections and freeway segments. Key points:  
  a) Impact criteria for freeway segments – suggestion to establish a separate threshold for HOV/Express Lanes vs. mixed-flow lanes;  
  b) Definition of cumulatively considerable impacts for intersections operating below the Auto LOS threshold – consider revisiting this definition. | a) No change to text; possible changes to CMP Auto LOS standard, establishment of standards for other modes, or changes to address SB 743 would occur in biennial CMP Document update, in coordination with Member Agencies (next update is in 2015);  
  b) No change to text; same as a) above. | 5.2 |
## VTA TIA Guidelines Update 2014
### Summary of Comments on Administrative Draft and VTA Responses/Document Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Commenters on this Topic</th>
<th>Description/Key Points</th>
<th>VTA Response/Document Changes</th>
<th>Final Draft Sections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measures and Multimodal Improvements</td>
<td>Sunnyvale, Caltrans, California Walks, D.J. Powers</td>
<td>Comments and questions about mitigation measures for project impacts. Key points:</td>
<td>a) Distinguish between impacts/mitigation measures that relate to CMP Auto LOS standards (which tie to CEQA mitigations) and other effects/improvements, and split up the Mitigation Measures and Multimodal Improvements chapter into these 2 sections; b) Clarify that any substantial change in signal operations, including changes to phasing and/or cycle length, requires analysis of secondary effects on peds/bikes; c) Note that Multimodal Improvement Plans may be implemented after project approval (applicant must agree to participate), consistent with VTA Deficiency Plan (Multimodal Improvement Plan) Requirements; d) Based on review by VTA Legal and Environmental staff and recent examples by cities in Santa Clara County, maintain reference to voluntary contributions in context of mitigation measures; e) Added brief extra guidance on cost estimates</td>
<td>10.1 10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queuing Analysis</td>
<td>Caltrans, D.J. Powers</td>
<td>Comments and questions about queuing analysis. Key points:</td>
<td>a) Clarify when queuing analysis is required based on commenter/SOM WG input; b) Based on input from majority of agencies, continue to require analysis but no threshold for queuing conditions; c) Based on discussion with Caltrans staff, modify suggested mitigations of queuing impacts.</td>
<td>9.1.2 10.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

August 29, 2014

4
## VTA TIA Guidelines Update 2014

### Summary of Comments on Administrative Draft and VTA Responses/Document Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Commenters on this Topic</th>
<th>Description/Key Points</th>
<th>VTA Response/Document Changes</th>
<th>Final Draft Sections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CEQA Alignment| Campbell, AECOM, D.J. Powers, Fehr & Peers | Comments and questions about the relationship between the TIA Guidelines and transportation impact analysis for CEQA studies. Key points:  
a) Differences between CMP and CEQA analysis requirements;  
b) Mitigation measures under TIA Guidelines vs. under CEQA;  
c) Relationship of TIA Guidelines to upcoming CEQA analysis changes under Senate Bill (SB) 743. | a) Based on discussions with commenters and VTA Environmental Staff, maintain existing/updated analysis requirements for CMP purposes;  
b) Distinguish between impacts/mitigation measures that relate to CMP Auto LOS standard (which tie to CEQA mitigations) and other effects/improvements, as noted above;  
c) Address implications of SB 743 through CMP Document update and future efforts (see Changes to CMP Standards and Thresholds topic above). | 9.2  
 | | | | 9.3  
 | | | | 10.1  
 | | | | 10.2 |
| Other Topics  | Multiple commenters         | Move and consolidate several sections from Admin Draft;  
Minor content and editorial changes elsewhere in the Administrative Draft document.                                                                                                                               | a) Consolidate discussion of Background scenario analysis in new chapter (Chapter 7);  
b) Move discussion of analysis of vacant/underutilized development, including net new trips, to Background chapter (Section 7.2);  
c) Miscellaneous editorial changes. | 7  
 | | | | 7.2  
 | | | | Global |
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PART I - STATUTE AND AUTHORITY

Chapter 1. CMP Statute and Intent of VTA TIA Guidelines

On January 1, 1995, the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) was designated as Santa Clara County's Congestion Management Agency. The Congestion Management Program (CMP) statute requires that uniform methods be used for evaluating transportation impacts of land use decisions on the CMP System. Furthermore, the statute allows the agency responsible for the CMP to choose the analysis methods.

This document presents VTA's guidelines for preparing Transportation Impact Analyses (TIAs) for CMP purposes. TIAs are prepared to assess the transportation impacts of land development projects and to assist in identifying improvements to minimize a development project’s impacts. TIAs are prepared by local jurisdictions as part of environmental assessments completed for development proposals. These Guidelines are intended to be used by Member Agencies as part of their regular process of evaluating land use decisions and may be viewed as a minimum scope for assessing transportation impacts. Member Agencies may maintain their own guidelines that supplement the procedures in the VTA TIA Guidelines, and Member Agencies may also have a lower size threshold for when a transportation analysis must be prepared in their jurisdiction. Therefore, a TIA may not be required by the CMP but may be required by Member Agencies.

The VTA TIA Guidelines are intended for transportation analysis related to land development projects. The VTA TIA Guidelines may be used as a reference point for the analysis of transportation improvement projects, subject to the judgment of the Lead Agency.

It is not intended that TIAs following the VTA CMP TIA Guidelines will provide all information required for California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) purposes. VTA encourages Member Agencies to include any other pertinent information not outlined in the VTA TIA Guidelines to identify environmental impacts.

Finally, VTA encourages the development of transit-friendly, pedestrian-friendly, and bicyclist-friendly land use projects. In particular, projects in Cores, Corridors or Station Areas as defined in the VTA Community Design and Transportation (CDT) Program Manual of Best Practices for Integrating Transportation and Land Use are encouraged to follow CDT Program best practices and actions.

1.1 Background

TIA Guidelines were originally included in Santa Clara County's 1991 Congestion Management Program (CMP). In 1993, the CMP technical documents, including the VTA TIA Guidelines, were published in a document titled Technical Standards and Procedures for the Santa Clara County Congestion Management Program. Since then, the VTA TIA Guidelines has been subsequently updated.
This document supersedes the 2009 *TIA Guidelines* and includes the following sections:

**Part I: Statute and Authority**
- Chapter 1: CMP Statue and Intent of VTA TIA Guidelines
- Chapter 2: TIA Scoping

**Part II: Notification and Review**
- Chapter 3: TIA Notification, Preparation and Review Process

**Part III: TIA Contents and Methodology**
- Chapter 4: Recommended TIA Table of Contents
- Chapter 5: Analysis Periods and Methodologies
- Chapter 6: Existing Conditions
- Chapter 7: Background Conditions
- Chapter 8: Trip Generation and Auto Trip Reductions
- Chapter 9: Project Conditions and Impacts/Effects
- Chapter 10: Mitigation Measures and Multimodal Improvements
- Chapter 11: Future Year Scenarios (Cumulative Conditions)

**Part IV: Other Considerations**
- Chapter 12: Special Project Types

### 1.2 Definition of Transportation Impact Analysis

Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) is the term used for the study of the expected effects of development projects on transportation facilities. The TIA’s purpose is to determine whether the transportation system can accommodate the activity generated by the proposed development project and if improvements are needed to the roadways, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and transit services and facilities affected by the project. TIA reports are also intended to assist in identifying improvements to minimize a development project’s transportation impacts, which may include reducing the number of automobile trips the project generates. This documentation helps decision makers determine whether to approve the project and what conditions to impose on the project.

### 1.3 Legislative Requirement

California's CMP statute requires that all CMAs develop a uniform program for evaluating the transportation impacts of land use decisions on the designated CMP System. Specifically, CMP Statute requires:

*A program to analyze the impacts of land use decisions made by local jurisdictions on the regional transportation systems, including an estimate of the costs associated with mitigating those impacts. [California Government Code: 65089 (b) (4).]*

The *TIA Guidelines* are designed to meet the requirement for a uniform land use impact analysis program in the CMP Statute.
In order to conform with the CMP, Member Agencies must follow the methodologies described in this document to evaluate the transportation impacts of development projects on the CMP System.

In addition, as part of the CMP Land Use Impact Analysis Program, all Member Agencies are required to forward a summary of land use changes and their transportation impacts to VTA on an annual basis. The purpose of collecting land use data on an annual basis is to ensure that development projects that do not meet the threshold for preparing a TIA are evaluated in the CMP process. This land use data will be incorporated into the countywide transportation model maintained by VTA and will be used to monitor conformance with the CMP. Please see the latest version of VTA’s *CMP Annual Monitoring and Conformance Requirements*, for more information on land use monitoring.

### 1.4 CMP Transportation Impact Analysis Requirements

Member Agencies must follow the methodologies presented in this document to prepare TIAs for land use decisions that impact the CMP System. In order to conform with the CMP, Member Agencies must do the following:

1. Use the VTA *TIA Guidelines* to evaluate the transportation impacts of all land use decisions within the Member Agency's jurisdiction that are projected to generate 100 or more net new weekday (AM or PM peak hour) or weekend peak hour trips, including both inbound and outbound trips.

2. Submit a copy of the TIA Report to VTA at least 20 calendar days before the development decision or recommendation is scheduled by the Member Agency.

Section 2.1 contains further information about when a TIA must be completed. Sections 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 detail the responsibilities of the Member Agency and VTA in meeting the CMP TIA requirements.

### 1.5 Benefits of CMP Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines

The most significant benefit of these Guidelines is that they promote the use of uniform procedures for performing TIAs and evaluating land use decisions on CMP facilities in Santa Clara County. The use of these common procedures helps ensure that the performance of the CMP transportation system is not adversely affected by land use decisions, and that opportunities to minimize impacts and improve the transportation system are identified. Moreover, the use of a common set of Guidelines allows each Member Agency to understand the impacts of development projects in other jurisdictions. Furthermore, it allows a Member Agency to request mitigation measures on its transportation facilities as a result of a project under development in another jurisdiction.

The use of a standard set of *TIA Guidelines* is the first step in developing stronger linkages between transportation and land use planning, which is a goal of VTA.
1.6 Exemption Process

Portions of the TIA Guidelines described in this document may need to be modified for use in analyzing the impacts of a specific situation. The following process should be used in order to obtain approval for modifying the requirements of the Guidelines contained herein:

1. The Member Agency should contact VTA requesting modification of a specific TIA Guidelines requirement for a project.\(^1\) The Member Agency should provide the reasons for the request(s). VTA staff will take action on the request if the request requires immediate action and is of a nature to not require action by VTA Committees.

2. If action cannot be taken by VTA staff, the VTA Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), with input from the Systems Operations & Management (SOM) and Land Use / Transportation Integration (LUTI) Working Groups, will review the request and recommend an action to the VTA Board.

3. The VTA Board will review the TAC's recommendation(s) and take action.

1.7 CMP Technical Standards and Procedures Amendment Process

The VTA TIA Guidelines are part of the Technical Standards and Procedures for the Santa Clara County Congestion Management Program (referred to throughout this document as the Technical Standards and Procedures). The most recent versions of the Technical Standards and Procedures, including the TIA Guidelines, are posted on the VTA website. The intent is to update the Technical Standards and Procedures on a regular basis by providing revisions where appropriate.

Technical Update Memos may be prepared periodically to address technical questions regarding standards and procedures as these questions are raised by Member Agencies. Technical Update Memos are divided into two categories, each having its own approval process, as described below:

1. Memos with New or Revised Requirements: These memos are to be prepared by VTA staff, reviewed by the SOM and LUTI Working Groups and TAC, and approved by the VTA Board.

2. Memos with Clarifications or Additional Information: These memos are to be prepared by VTA staff, and received by the SOM and LUTI Working Groups and TAC.

Once adopted or received, these technical update memos have precedence over or clarify previously adopted procedures. Technical update memos are to be posted on the VTA website and emailed to all members of the VTA TAC, SOM Working Group, and LUTI Working Group.

\(^1\) Modifications to VTA TIA Guidelines regarding the following aspects of a project’s analysis do not require CMP action: trip generation rates, trip distribution/assignment, and default values used in the Auto Level of Service analysis. However, these modifications should be clearly documented in the TIA. Documentation should include source and comparison with values or procedures specified in the VTA TIA Guidelines.
The VTA *TIA Guidelines* must be reviewed and revised on a regular basis to incorporate all technical update memos adopted since the last revision and to address new policy direction adopted by the VTA Board. With VTA Board approval the revised *TIA Guidelines* shall be distributed to Member Agencies for incorporation into the *Technical Standards and Procedures*.

### 1.8 Local Transportation Model Consistency

If travel demand forecasting models are used to evaluate transportation impacts of land use decisions, they must be consistent with the VTA Countywide Transportation Model. VTA has developed procedures for Member Agencies to use in developing consistent models. These procedures are described in the "Local Model Consistency Guidelines" of the *Technical Standards and Procedures*.

### 1.9 Document Conventions

Throughout this document, certain conventions are used, which are listed below. In addition to these document conventions, a Glossary with definitions of key terms is provided at the end of the document.

1. The acronym “TIA” is used throughout this document to indicate Transportation Impact Analysis.

2. Unless explicitly identified, all references to documents in these VTA *TIA Guidelines* shall mean the most recent version of the document published.

3. In this document, the word “should” is used to indicate a recommended action. The words “shall” or “must” are used to indicate required actions.

4. The word “facility” is used generally in this document to refer to CMP System roadway facilities, which include CMP intersections, freeways, and rural highways. CMP facilities also include the CMP Transit Network and the CMP Bicycle Network, but these are generally called out specifically in the text.

5. The agency responsible for preparing the TIA is referred to in this document as the “Lead Agency.”
Chapter 2. TIA Scoping

This section provides direction on the scoping of TIA studies. The Lead Agency is responsible for scoping the TIA, with input from VTA and other agencies through the process described in Chapter 3. The description of TIA scoping focuses on three areas:

1. Determining when and if a TIA needs to be completed;
2. Determining roadway facilities to be included in the analysis;
3. Determining other transportation issues to assess.

2.1 When Must a TIA be Completed?

The Trip Threshold for when a TIA must be completed is the following:

A complete TIA for CMP Purposes shall be performed for any project in Santa Clara County expected to generate 100 or more net new weekday (AM or PM peak hour) or weekend peak hour trips, including both inbound and outbound trips.

The following are points that expand or provide detail on the above statement:

1. Net New Peak Hour Trip: Net new peak hour trips are defined as those proposed project trips not associated with an existing development on the site and not included in an approved project. If the proposed project involves a vacant or underutilized site with development rights, the number of net new trips that count towards the Trip Threshold are the proposed project trips minus the trips originally associated with the prior development. If the proposed project involves a vacant or underutilized site without development rights, all project trips are considered net new trips and count towards the Trip Threshold. Discounting of trips from existing or entitled development on the project site is subject to Lead Agency discretion. The Lead Agency may always take a more conservative approach than the one outlined in this document. For further guidance on trips from vacant or underutilized development, refer to item 7 below and Section 7.2.

2. Pass-by and Diverted Linked Trips: The number of pass-by and diverted linked trips of the proposed project shall not be used to reduce the number of new peak hour trips for determining whether a TIA is to be completed except for the following uses:
   - Gas stations;
   - Fast food restaurants; and
   - Stand-alone mini-markets.

For these uses, if the pass-by trip reduction results in less than 100 net new weekday peak hour trips, a TIA is not required. However, an operational analysis of the adjacent CMP facilities should be conducted with input from VTA staff. This analysis should be submitted to VTA.
3. **Trip Reductions:** The application of trip reductions (as described in Chapter 8) shall not be used to reduce the number of new peak hour trips for determining whether a TIA is to be completed.

4. **Special Events:** Special events that do not require issuance of a discretionary permit or environmental review do not require a TIA. For example, holding a one-day “Harvest Festival” in a downtown area would not require a TIA, while building a theater for use on an irregular basis would require a TIA.

5. **Addition to Existing Development Project:** A TIA must be completed for an addition to an existing development when the addition is projected to generate 100 or more net new AM or PM peak hour trips.

6. **Revision to Approved Unbuilt Development Project:** A TIA must be completed for an approved but unbuilt development that originally was not projected to generate 100 or more net new weekday peak hour trips, if the development is revised so that it is projected to generate 100 or more net new peak hour trips.

7. **Re-Occupancy of Vacant or Underutilized Development:** Generally, Member Agencies will not require a new TIA to be conducted for the re-occupancy of vacant or underutilized buildings or developments unless a discretionary permit is required from the jurisdiction. A vacant or underutilized building is generally understood to have development entitlement. Two situations are described below that note whether a TIA is required:

   a. **Same Land Use:** A new tenant on a site who is planning to use the site for the same use (i.e., the land use designation for trip generation calculation purposes would not change) may not need to conduct a new TIA. For example, if the tenant improvements necessary to re-occupy the site do not require discretionary permits, a TIA is not required by VTA (though the preparation of a TIA may be required by the Member Agency). However, if the tenant improvements require a discretionary permit and the project produces net new trips that meet or exceed 100 during the peak hour, a TIA is required.

   b. **Change of Land Use:** A new tenant occupying a vacant development or building who is changing the original use (and, therefore, the site's trip generation characteristics) may need to conduct a new TIA. If the change of use requires a discretionary permit and the number of net new trips during a peak hour meets or exceeds 100, a TIA is required. If the new land use is expected to generate significantly different travel patterns from the previous use (e.g., conversion from employment to residential), based on engineering judgment, net new trips may be calculated without subtracting all trips associated with the prior development.

See **Chapter 7** for analysis approach for vacant and underutilized developments.
8. **General Plan Amendment:** General Plan Amendments (GPAs) may be of several types depending upon the jurisdiction and the specific situation. If the GPA approval grants an entitlement to build a specific development project (or allows approval of a project in the future as a right, or through a ministerial act) then a TIA must be completed for the GPA. Conversely, if the GPA does not grant an entitlement, then no TIA is required until a specific project application is considered by the Lead Agency.

A TIA is not required for a GPA when:
   a. The GPA grants no specific project entitlement;
   b. The GPA is prepared for a citywide plan; or
   c. The GPA is submitted with an entitlement for a specific project, but that project is not expected to generate 100 or more net new peak hour trips.

As long as a transportation analysis is being completed, VTA recommends that the analysis be consistent with the *TIA Guidelines* to the extent possible. Please refer to Section 11.2.2 for details.

9. **Special Project Types:** For further guidance on large or unique projects; projects on the jurisdiction border; multi-agency projects; projects generating large numbers of pedestrian, bicycle or transit trips; or large projects or plans involving more extensive transit delay analysis, see Chapter 12 – Special Project Types.

10. **Conformance Exemptions:** Some types of projects and situations are statutorily exempt from conforming with the CMP standards. If this is the case for the project under consideration, a TIA must still be completed, but the particular exemption should be identified in the TIA Report.

    The types of projects and situations exempted from level of service standards are described in California Government Code Section 65089.44(b). For complete information on how these exemptions is to be addressed in a TIA, see the VTA *Traffic Level of Service Analysis Guidelines*.

    Although these projects or situations are exempt from CMP standards, these exemptions do not apply to the CEQA process. For example, the effects of freeway ramp metering on level of service are exempt from the CMP standards; however, the effects of freeway ramp metering should be reflected in evaluating impacts under CEQA to properly address mitigation.

**2.2 Which Roadway Facilities Should be Included in a TIA?**

The Lead Agency is responsible for determining which CMP roadway facilities should be included in a TIA. The remainder of this section describes procedures for determining inclusion of intersections, freeway segments and rural highway segments on the CMP roadway network in a TIA.
2.2.1 Intersections

A CMP intersection shall be included in a TIA if it meets any one of the following conditions:

1. The proposed development project is expected to add 10 or more peak hour vehicles per lane to any intersection movement;
2. The intersection is adjacent to the project;
3. Based on engineering judgment, Lead Agency staff determines that the intersection should be included in the analysis.

Study intersections should be selected without consideration for jurisdictional boundaries. The 10 or more vehicles per lane requirement applies to any intersection movement (left turn, through or right turn). If a movement uses a shared lane, the shared lane shall be considered a full lane for these calculation purposes. For example, 40 new left turns in two lanes (one left turn lane and one shared left-through lane) should be calculated as 20 vehicles per lane. It should be remembered that this calculation is only intended for determining inclusion of an intersection in a TIA. The allocation of new trips to travel lanes for operational analysis purposes could be quite different from this equal allocation of trips to the travel lanes.

2.2.2 Freeway Segments

A freeway segment shall be included in a TIA if it meets any one of the following conditions:

1. The proposed development project is expected to add traffic equal to or greater than one percent of the freeway segment’s capacity. The TIA must provide a tabulation, as shown in Appendix A (Table A-1: Sample of Freeway Analysis Requirement Determination), to show that freeway segments have been assessed to determine if freeway analysis is required, even in the case where it is determined that no freeway segments meet the one percent threshold, or include text indicating that this assessment has been conducted;
2. The proposed development project is adjacent to one of the freeway segment’s access or egress points;
3. Based on engineering judgment, Lead Agency staff determines that the freeway segment should be included in the analysis.

The freeway segments analyzed in a TIA shall correspond to the segments included in the latest VTA CMP Monitoring and Conformance Report, which also correspond to Caltrans segment definitions.

For calculating the amount of added traffic compared to freeway segment capacity, the capacities cited in Highway Capacity Manual 2000 (HCM 2000) shall be used (2,200 vphpl for four-lane freeway segments and 2,300 vphpl for six-lane or larger freeway segments). For five-lane freeway segments, 2,200 vphpl shall be used for the two-lane direction and 2,300 vphpl for the three-lane direction. Auxiliary lanes shall not be considered for the purpose of this calculation.
2.2.3 Rural Highway Segments

A rural highway segment shall be included in a TIA if it meets any one of the following conditions:

1. The proposed development project is expected to add traffic equal to or greater than one percent of the rural highway segment’s capacity;
2. The rural highway segment is adjacent to the project;
3. Based on engineering judgment, Lead Agency staff determines that the rural highway segment should be included in the analysis.

For calculating the amount of added traffic based on rural highway segment capacity, the capacities cited in *HCM 2000* shall be used. For two-lane highways, the capacity shall be 1,700 vph for each direction of travel. For four-lane highways, the capacity shall be 2,200 vphpl. For special conditions, refer to Chapter 20 of *HCM 2000* for guidance.

2.3 Determining Other Transportation Issues to Address

In addition to an Auto Level of Service analysis covering the facilities identified in Section 2.2, the TIA shall include an analysis of auto trip reductions; transit, bicycle and pedestrian conditions; project access and circulation; and other issues identified in Chapters 6 through 9 of the *TIA Guidelines*. In addition, the TIA may also include an analysis of other issues as determined by the Lead Agency. These analyses are not required for CMP purposes but may be included in a TIA to address local requirements or CEQA, and may include:

- Adequacy of automobile parking supply compared to demand or local standards;
- Queuing on local (non-CMP) facilities;
- Existing Plus Project analysis scenario (See Chapter 4).

The Lead Agency may require that additional scenarios be analyzed in the TIA. For example, unfunded transportation facility improvements may be evaluated as part of an additional scenario. Phased projects may also require additional scenarios.
PART II - NOTIFICATION AND REVIEW

Chapter 3. TIA Notification, Preparation and Review Process

This chapter outlines the process for notifications regarding TIAs, the preparation of TIAs, and review of TIAs. The chapter begins with an overview of the process including a step-by-step summary and figure. This chapter also defines the roles of the Lead Agency and VTA by listing the responsibilities of each in preparing or reviewing TIAs.

3.1 Overview of Process

The following is an outline of the key steps in the TIA Notification, Preparation and Review Process. These steps are shown in Figure 1. Note that the term “Lead Agency” in this context refers to the agency responsible for preparing the TIA.

1. Lead Agency Submits TIA Notification Form: Lead Agencies are required to send notification that a TIA is being started to VTA, as well as to designated contacts for cities, towns, the County, and Caltrans as appropriate. The purpose of this notification is to inform interested agencies of the study and to allow them to comment on the scope of the analysis.

A sample of the TIA Notification Form is provided in Appendix B. A PDF version that may be electronically filled out will be posted on the VTA website. VTA is in the process of developing a web-based TIA Notification Form, which will be linked from the VTA website when available. The Lead Agency is encouraged to submit the draft work scope of the TIA along with the TIA Notification Form. Lead Agencies are encouraged to submit TIA Notification Forms and work scopes electronically rather than in hardcopy format wherever possible.

Comments from interested agencies on the TIA scoping must be received by the Lead Agency within 15 calendar days of notification mailing.

2. Lead Agency Submits TIA with Hearing Date: Upon completion of the study and at least 20 calendar days before the project is considered for approval (e.g., City Council or Board of Supervisors hearing) or is “recommended for approval” (e.g., Planning Commission meeting), the Lead Agency is required to submit the TIA report to VTA, as well as to designated contacts for cities, towns, the County, and Caltrans as appropriate.

With the TIA submittal, the Lead Agency should indicate the expected hearing date for project approval or recommendation. Lead Agencies are encouraged to submit TIA reports electronically (via an email with an attachment, or a link to the TIA location online) rather than in hardcopy format wherever possible. A draft version of the TIA may also be submitted earlier in the process for preliminary feedback from VTA and other agencies.
VTA may grant exceptions to this submittal time frame. The Lead Agency must request the exemption to the submittal date at least **25 calendar days prior** to the appropriate hearing dates.

The deadline and process for TIA submittal are intended to apply to cases where the TIA is not submitted with an environmental document. When a TIA is submitted along with an environmental document following CEQA guidelines, the time frame provided by the CEQA process is considered to be sufficient.

3. **VTA and Other Agencies Respond**: VTA will review the TIA for consistency with CMP standards and with VTA’s *CDT Manual*. VTA will forward a response to the Lead Agency staff prior to action by the Planning Commission and/or City Council with copies sent to the jurisdiction's members on the VTA Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) and TAC Working Groups, as appropriate. Other interested agencies may offer suggestions for the Lead Agency at this point as well. Comments from interested agencies on the TIA report must be received by the Lead Agency **within 15 calendar days** of the TIA mailing.

The deadline and process for agency comments on TIAs are intended to apply to cases where the TIA is not submitted with an environmental document. When a TIA is submitted along with an environmental document following CEQA guidelines, the time frame provided by the CEQA process is considered to be sufficient.

4. **Lead Agency Addresses Comments**: Upon receiving comments on the draft TIA report from VTA or other agencies, the Lead Agency should address these comments. If an EIR is being prepared for the project, the Lead Agency shall respond in writing to comments on the TIA and transportation analysis if they are received through the CEQA comment process, pursuant to the requirements of CEQA. If an EIR is not being prepared, the Lead Agency should contact the agency that submitted comments to discuss them. For comments that address the compliance of the TIA with CMP requirements, the Lead Agency shall submit a written response to VTA and other agencies as appropriate. The response may take the form of a revised TIA, supplemental memo, or email clarification, as appropriate. For other comments not related to CMP compliance, the Lead Agency is encouraged to respond to VTA and other agencies.
Figure 1: TIA Notification and Review Process
5. **Lead Agency Decision and Project Conditions**: The Lead Agency staff analyzes the project and makes recommendations to the appropriate decision-making body (Planning Commission, City Council and/or County Board of Supervisors). The decision-making body takes action on the project. If the decision-making body rejects the project, no further action by the Lead Agency is required. If the project is modified substantially so that a new TIA is required, the Lead Agency must complete the TIA process again, beginning with TIA notification. If the project is approved, the Lead Agency is encouraged to send text of the relevant adopted conditions relating to the CMP Transportation System and the promotion of alternative transportation modes to VTA.

6. **VTA Reports on Development Activity**: VTA will prepare regular reports summarizing relevant VTA comments on projects reviewed by VTA, and relevant conditions of projects approved by Member Agencies that improve CMP facilities, relate to alternative transportation modes, and/or meet other goals such as those related to VTA’s CDT Program. The report is typically presented on a quarterly basis to the VTA Board, the Congestion Management Program and Planning (CMPP) Committee, and the Technical, Citizen, Bicycle and Pedestrian, and Policy Advisory Committees (TAC, CAC, BPAC and PAC), and TAC Working Groups. VTA will also report on Member Agency compliance with CMP requirements though the CMP Monitoring and Conformance Program.

### 3.2 Lead Agency Responsibilities

1. The agency that is responsible for certifying the project's CEQA environmental document shall be responsible for performing the TIA.

2. The Lead Agency is responsible for notifying all appropriate jurisdictions that a TIA is being prepared by submitting a **TIA Notification Form** to all appropriate jurisdictions.

3. The Lead Agency is responsible for providing direction on the TIA study scope including:
   
   a. Determining facilities to be included in analysis (following the procedure set forth in Section 2.2 in these Guidelines);
   
   b. Defining analysis scenarios (following the procedures outlined in Chapters 4 and 5 of these Guidelines);
   
   c. Determining the proper analysis method to use in a study when more than one approach is possible.

4. The Lead Agency is responsible for preparing and submitting the TIA Report that meets all the requirements included in these Guidelines to VTA within the time frame outlined in Section 3.1 of these Guidelines.
5. The Lead Agency is responsible for addressing comments on the draft TIA report as described in **Section 3.1.** The Lead Agency is encouraged to consult with VTA in preparing any Conditions of Approval that relate to improving CMP facilities and promoting alternative transportation modes.

6. After project approval, the Lead Agency is encouraged to send to VTA any adopted Conditions of Approval that relate to improving CMP facilities and promoting alternative transportation modes.

### 3.3 VTA Review for Conformance

VTA shall review TIA reports for consistency with the *TIA Guidelines*. This review shall not constitute approval or disapproval of the project that is the subject of the report. VTA does not have the authority to approve or reject projects; that decision rests with the Lead Agency. However, VTA may provide comments to the Lead Agency on the TIA Report based on staff review. When appropriate, Lead Agency staff should discuss these comments with the preparer of the TIA Report to insure that future TIAs comply with CMP requirements. VTA will monitor the final project TIA Reports to ensure that they are consistent with CMP standards.

VTA will prepare regular reports of projects that were approved through the TIA process. These reports will summarize adopted conditions that improve CMP facilities and relate to alternative transportation modes, and will be presented to the VTA Board and its committees as described earlier in this chapter.
PART III – TIA CONTENTS AND METHODOLOGY

Chapter 4. Recommended TIA Table of Contents

This chapter presents a recommended outline and organization of a TIA. For more detailed guidelines, the chapter is noted where the guidelines are further discussed.

1. Executive Summary
   The executive summary should summarize major findings from the TIA. At a minimum, topics covered should include:
   - Project description;
   - Existing Conditions;
   - Brief summary of project trip generation and auto trip reductions, including Auto Trip Reduction Statement – See Appendix C;
   - Project impacts/effects and proposed mitigation measures/improvements.

2. Project Description, Study Area and Analysis Parameters
   This section should provide a description of the project, the transportation context surrounding it and the parameters of the transportation analysis. Topics covered should include:
   - Location of Proposed Project;
   - Proposed Land Use and Project Size;
   - Site Plan, indicating buildings, vehicular access, and pedestrian and bicycle accommodations – See Chapter 9, Section 4;
   - Study Intersections and Freeway Segments – See Chapter 2 and 5;
   - Analysis Periods and Methodologies – See Chapter 5;
   - Analysis Scenarios – see this chapter and Chapter 11.

3. Existing Conditions
   This study scenario shall evaluate existing conditions. Topics in this section should include:
   - Roadway Network;
   - Existing Transit System;
   - Existing Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities and TDM Programs;
   - Existing Volumes and Lane Configurations;
   - Existing Intersection Levels of Service;
   - Existing Freeway Segment Level of Service;
   - Field Observations.
   See Chapter 6 for more information on what is required in the existing conditions section.
4. **Trip Generation and Auto Trip Reductions**
   This section shall document the methods used in the TIA for estimating trip generation associated with a project, approaches for reducing automobile trips to and from the project and documenting these reductions in a TIA report, and assumptions about how trips are distributed throughout the transportation network.

   Topics covered in this section should include:
   - Trip Generation;
   - Auto Trip Reductions and Transportation Demand Management;
   - Trip Distribution and Assignment;
   - Pass-by Trips and Diverted Linked Trips.

   See *Chapter 8* for more information on trip generation.

5. **Optional: Existing Plus Project Conditions**
   This study scenario typically evaluates the addition of the project, along with estimated project-generated trips, to the existing conditions. This section typically identifies project impacts on the surrounding transportation network, including an analysis of roadways, freeway segments, and queuing. For any impacts identified, mitigation measures are typically developed based on the results of this study scenario. If mitigation measures are proposed, then an analysis with the mitigations measures is typically conducted.

   **Note:** This scenario is not required for CMP purposes but may be included in a TIA to address local requirements or CEQA. However, Existing + Project freeway analysis is required for CMP purposes for all projects meeting freeway analysis requirement conditions. Please refer to Section 2.2.2 regarding analysis conditions and Section 5.2.8 regarding analysis methods.

6. **Background Conditions (Existing + Approved Projects)**
   This study scenario shall evaluate background conditions, based on the sum of existing trips and trips from approved developments in the area, along with any changes to roadways and intersections associated with approved development or other funded changes to the transportation network.

   Topics covered in this section should include:
   - Approved Development Projects;
   - Secured Roadway/Intersection Improvements;
   - Background Intersection Analysis & LOS.

   See *Chapter 7* for more information on how to conduct the Background Conditions analysis.

7. **Background Plus Project Conditions (Existing + Approved Projects + Project)**
   This study scenario shall evaluate the addition of the project, along with estimated project-generated trips, to the background conditions. This section shall identify project impacts on the surrounding transportation network, including an analysis of roadways
and queuing. The Lead Agency is encouraged, but not required, to include an analysis of freeway segments under Background Plus Project Conditions. For any impacts identified, mitigation measures shall be developed based on the results of this study scenario. If mitigation measures are proposed, then an analysis with the mitigations measures shall be conducted.

See Chapter 9 for more information on how to conduct the Project Conditions analysis.

8. Multimodal Evaluation, Site Access and Circulation
This section shall include an analysis of transit, bicycle and pedestrian modes under Plus Project Conditions (Existing, Background and/or Cumulative conditions with the addition of the project), if not included elsewhere in the TIA. In addition, this section shall include an analysis of project access and circulation.

See Chapter 9 for more information on how to conduct this analysis.

9. Future Year (Cumulative) Conditions
This study scenario shall evaluate the addition of the project, along with estimated project-generated trips, to longer term conditions than those described under Background Plus Project conditions. In general, the Cumulative Conditions scenario is analyzed as the combination of Background Conditions (Existing Conditions + Approved Projects) + Expected Growth + Project. This section shall identify project impacts on the surrounding transportation network. For any impacts identified, mitigation measures shall be developed based on the results of this study scenario. The parameters of the Cumulative Conditions scenario should be clearly defined in the TIA. Cumulative scenarios can be near- or long-term, as follows:

- **Near-Term Cumulative Conditions**: This scenario is a near-term cumulative analysis scenario to be provided for each jurisdiction’s planning and information purposes. The analysis shall include expected growth until the project is expected to be available for final occupancy;

- **Alternate Cumulative Conditions Analysis** - The Lead Agency may substitute an alternate Cumulative Conditions analysis for the near-term Cumulative Conditions analysis described above. For example, the long-term Cumulative Conditions analysis conducted as part of an environmental analysis may be provided in place of the near-term Cumulative Conditions analysis.

See Chapter 11 for more information on Cumulative Scenario analysis.
Chapter 5. Analysis Periods and Methodologies

This section describes the typical analysis parameters to be included in the TIA. The Lead Agency shall be responsible for defining the analysis periods and documenting the analysis methodologies in the TIA.

5.1 Analysis Period

The TIA shall include, at a minimum, an analysis of transportation conditions in the peak hours for which the project generates 100 or more net new trips. In other words:

- If the project is expected to generate 100 or more net new weekday trips during both the AM and PM peak hours, then both weekday peak hours must be analyzed;
- If the project is expected to generate 100 or more net new weekday AM peak-hour trips but less than 100 new weekday PM peak hour trips, then only the AM peak hour must be analyzed;
- If the project is expected to generate 100 or more net new weekday PM peak hour trips but less than 100 new weekday AM peak hour trips, only the PM peak hour must be analyzed.

The TIA Report must document the project's trip generation for both the weekday AM and PM peak periods to justify the peak period(s) analyzed in the TIA.

The Lead Agency may require that additional periods be analyzed, based on engineering judgment. For example, additional analysis of midday or weekend peak periods may be required.

5.2 Analysis Methodologies

This section describes analysis method requirements for the various types of CMP roadway facilities: arterials, intersections, freeways, and rural highways. This section also describes analysis methodologies for non-vehicular facilities, i.e. bicycle, pedestrian and transit facilities. Much of this information is also described in the VTA Traffic Level of Service Analysis Guidelines. This section also includes discussion about the use of the VTA travel demand forecast model and other local models.

A more detailed description of analysis requirements and thresholds for determination of Level of Service impacts are provided in Chapter 9.

5.2.1 Urban Arterials

The analysis of CMP urban arterials, including County Expressways, is accomplished by evaluating designated intersections along the arterials. The analysis of these intersections is to be conducted following the guidelines and the default values for CMP intersection analysis in the latest Board-adopted VTA Traffic Level of Service Analysis Guidelines. Thresholds for determination of an impact are described in Chapter 9.
When conducting Auto LOS analysis on County Expressway and/or Caltrans intersections, the Lead Agency should consult with County and/or Caltrans staff to determine the appropriate actual signal timing information for the analysis. Lead Agencies are also encouraged to obtain appropriate actual signal timing information for local intersections with traffic-adaptive signal timing.

In certain situations, more detailed analysis may be needed than what can be provided using isolated intersection analysis software. In these cases, such as on corridors with coordinated or adaptive signal control, the Lead Agency may choose to conduct additional analysis using other software programs, such as microsimulation software for operational analysis, when appropriate.

5.2.2 Rural Highways

The analysis of rural highways shall be based on the methodology described in latest Board-adopted VTA Traffic Level of Service Analysis Guidelines. The analysis is primarily segment-based, but in some cases, it may also be appropriate to evaluate adjacent rural highway intersections, as discussed in the VTA Traffic Level of Service Analysis Guidelines.

5.2.3 High Occupancy Vehicle Lanes

In cases where roadways with high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes are analyzed and project trips are assigned to the HOV facility, HOV lane usage and impacts must be evaluated. The following applies to the evaluation of an HOV lane:

- Assignment of trips to an HOV lane shall be described and justified in the TIA Report;
- Operational analysis of an HOV lane (including analysis of impacts) shall be documented in the TIA Report;
- Traffic LOS analysis for an HOV lane should be performed according to VTA Traffic Level of Service Analysis Guidelines;
- Caltrans recommends maintaining LOS C operations on HOV facilities, which occurs at approximately 1,650 vphpl;\(^2\)
- For County Expressway HOV Lane Capacity, the Lead Agency should consult with County Roads & Airports Department staff to determine the saturation flow rate as it varies depending on the Expressway segment.

Refer to the latest CMP Monitoring and Conformance Report for existing performance data for freeway HOV lane segments. Consult with the County of Santa Clara for the latest Expressway HOV lane volumes, including volumes at Expressway intersections.

\(^2\)“The occupancy requirements for HOV facilities should be based on the following considerations: … C. Maintaining a free flow condition, preferably LOS-C… For buffered or contiguous HOV facilities, Caltrans considers LOS-C occurs at approximately 1,650 vehicles per hour, less if there is significant bus volume or if there are physical constraints.” Caltrans, High-Occupancy Vehicle Guidelines, 2003 Edition, Section 2.5.
5.2.4 Express Lanes

In cases where roadways with Express Lanes are analyzed and project trips are assigned to the Express Lane facility, Express Lane usage and impacts must be evaluated. The following applies to the evaluation of an Express Lane:

- Assignment of trips: Lead Agency shall consult with VTA, and assignment shall be described and justified in the TIA Report;
- Operational analysis of an Express Lane (including analysis of impacts) shall be documented in the TIA Report;
- Traffic LOS analysis for an Express Lane should use the following saturation flow rates: 1,650 vehicles per hour per lane (vphpl).³

The CMP Monitoring and Conformance Report includes performance data for freeway Express Lane segments.

5.2.5 Bicycle

A Quality of Service (QOS)-based methodology, such as the one in the Highway Capacity Manual 2010 (Chapters 16 – 18) or a similar methodology,⁴ is encouraged for analysis of bicycle conditions. Bicycle QOS methodologies typically measure features of the physical environment that affect the comfort and safety of bicyclists from the user’s perspective, such as the presence of dedicated bicycle facilities (lanes, paths, etc.), intersection delay and exposure to automobile traffic. The TIA should include a description of the methodology being used as part of the analysis. See Section 9.3 for more information on bicycle analysis requirements.

5.2.6 Pedestrian

A Quality of Service (QOS)-based methodology, such as the one in the Highway Capacity Manual 2010 (Chapters 16 – 18) or a similar methodology,⁵ is encouraged for analysis of pedestrian conditions. Pedestrian QOS methodologies typically measure features of the physical environment that affect comfort and safety for pedestrians from the user’s perspective, such as lateral separation from traffic, crossing distance and delay, and presence of landscaped buffer or trees. The TIA should include a description of the methodology being used as part of the analysis. See Section 9.3 for more information on pedestrian analysis requirements.

³ For Express Lanes, which function to provide a time savings over non-tolled lanes, the relevant performance measure is the maintenance of LOS C operations. Per Caltrans Guidelines (see footnote 2), this occurs at approximately 1,650 vphpl.
⁴ Alternative QOS methodologies, including City of San Francisco’s Bicycle Environmental Quality Index, are described in Appendix G.
⁵ Alternative QOS methodologies, including City of San Francisco’s Pedestrian Environmental Quality Index, are described in Appendix G.
5.2.7  Transit

The transit analysis shall consider the effects of the project on transit delay and transit access and facilities. See Section 9.2 for more information on transit analysis requirements.

5.2.8  Freeway Segments

The analysis of freeway segments is to be conducted following the guidelines in the latest Board-adopted VTA Traffic Level of Service Analysis Guidelines. One criterion for assessing the impact of a development project on freeways is LOS. As in the CMP Monitoring and Conformance Program, density is the parameter for determining LOS for freeway segments in TIAs in Santa Clara County. The relationship between density, speed and flow rate (or traffic volume) is described as follows:

\[
d = \frac{V}{N \times S}
\]  

(Eqn. 1)

where:
- \(d\) = density (vehicles per mile per lane, vpmpl)
- \(V\) = peak hour volume (vehicles per hour, vph)
- \(N\) = number of travel lanes (lanes)
- \(S\) = average travel speed (miles per hour, mph)

A table of Freeway LOS Criteria based on density ranges is provided in the Traffic Level of Service Analysis Guidelines. For Existing Conditions, the number of lanes as well as performance data for freeway segments in Santa Clara County are included in the most recent CMP Monitoring and Conformance Report produced by VTA.

For the analysis of project conditions, the volume \(V\) used in the density calculation (Equation 1) is:

\[
V = V_o + V_p
\]  

(Eqn. 2)

where:
- \(V_o\) = existing peak hour volume (vph)
- \(V_p\) = peak hour project trips distributed on the freeway segment (vph)

The Lead Agency is encouraged, but not required, to include an analysis of freeway segments under Background Plus Project Conditions and Cumulative Conditions. The TIA should include a description of the methodology being used to forecast future traffic volumes on freeways, which could include use of a transportation model.

The TIA shall include freeway analysis table(s) identifying whether the project would have an impact on the freeway system. Tables for the freeway analysis determination and impact analysis should include detailed data such as project trips, density and speed. Sample tables are shown in Appendix A (Table A-1: Sample of Freeway Analysis Requirement Determination and Table A-2: Sample of Freeway Analysis Summary).
5.3 **Use of Transportation Models**

Travel demand forecasting models may be used for long-term analysis of development projects, planning efforts or transportation facilities. The use of a forecasting model for a buildout scenario should only be used for a period of at least five years from the preparation of a TIA Notification Form. If the project were to be built entirely within five years, the “near-term” development approach discussed in Section 11.1 shall be used.

The long-term analysis may include the use of either the countywide transportation model or local transportation models as described below:

1. **Countywide Transportation Model:** The countywide transportation model developed and maintained by VTA may be used for transportation impact analyses. Use of this model may be appropriate for the long-term analyses of large projects and general planning efforts. The cost for this modeling may be borne by the Lead Agency on the work effort.

2. **Local Transportation Models:** In some cases, local sub-area transportation models are appropriate. Under the CMA statutes, VTA must approve any local sub-area transportation models used for TIAs. VTA has adopted guidelines for developing local land use transportation impact models that are designed to ensure that local models are consistent with the countywide model. These guidelines are documented in the *Local Transportation Model Consistency Guidelines* in the *Technical Standards and Procedures*.
Chapter 6. Existing Conditions

The TIA Report shall include a description of the existing transportation system in the area affected by the project. The project area transportation system shall include all CMP system facilities affected by the project (see Section 2.2). The following section details the items that should be included in the description of roadways, transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and other transportation elements.

6.1 Counts and Data Collection

Field data, including counts and field observations, will be needed in order to accurately assess existing conditions. The following are the key points regarding data collection for TIA completion:

1. **Data for Existing Study Scenario Analysis:** Freeway and intersection data collected as part of VTA’s CMP Monitoring and Conformance Program are available for use in all TIAs. When possible, these data from VTA shall be used in the TIA.

2. **Additional Data:** In some cases, additional data will need to be collected for a different time period or to more accurately reflect existing travel that differs from the most recent CMP Monitoring data. The study should not use traffic volume data more than two years old. The use of growth factors should be considered if the traffic volume data is older than one year. Other data collected as required by the Lead Agency shall be provided to VTA (as part of the TIA Report) so that VTA’s database may be updated. Submittal of data electronically (i.e., in files that can be used with traffic analysis software) is encouraged, where feasible.

3. **Bicycle and Pedestrian Data:** The collection of pedestrian and bicycle counts is encouraged whenever new traffic volume counts are conducted.

4. **Field Data Collection Methodology:** Field data should be collected using procedures outlined in the most recent version of the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Manual of Transportation Engineering Studies, or in the most recent version of the Transportation Research Board’s Highway Capacity Manual.

5. **Field Observations:** Field observations of traffic conditions, access points, intersection geometrics, traffic signal operations, pedestrian and bicycle accommodations, transit facilities and access, and adjacent land uses should be conducted in the study area for the proposed project. The Lead Agency may also request additional information from the field. Field observations should be noted and may be used to refine or revise level of service calculations when there are discrepancies in the observed and calculated level of service.
6.2 Description of Existing Roadways

The following information shall be provided for the project area’s CMP Roadway System:

a. Local/arterial roadway, County Expressway, and freeway network description and map; all County Expressway and freeway descriptions must include a description of High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) facilities (including HOV lanes and ramp metering bypasses) and Express Lane facilities;

b. Intersection geometry, traffic controls, and traffic signal timing parameters;

c. Recent turning movement counts (see Section 6.1);

d. Existing Auto LOS evaluated using VTA-approved LOS methodology and standard values (see Chapter 5). In most cases, the existing LOS should be those presented in the latest CMP Monitoring and Conformance Report. However, counts may need to be taken to reflect a change in travel patterns since the last monitoring cycle;

e. Existing locations of congested traffic conditions (as identified with assistance of Lead Agency staff and field observations). This information includes description of queues extending into the upstream intersection(s), queue "spill-back" in turn lanes, effects of ramp metering, and duration of congestion;

f. Funded and planned roadway improvements.

It may be necessary to provide field measurements of delay and queuing to accurately reflect existing conditions. Field measurements could account for situations where the congestion is more than that represented by the calculated LOS. Additional information gathered from field observations may also be included in the TIA.

6.3 Description of Existing Transit System

The following information shall be provided for the project area's transit system (the project area transit system shall be defined as transit routes within 2,000 feet of the project boundaries):

a. Transit route description and map;

b. Transit station/stop locations;

c. Site access to major regional transit providers (BART, Caltrain, etc.);

d. Transit hours of operation and headway information;

e. Public or private shuttle services provided in the project area;

f. Location of park-and-ride lots in project area;

g. Planned transit facilities within the project area; determination of planned transit facilities or services should occur in consultation with VTA and other operators, as appropriate.

6.4 Description of Existing Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities and TDM Programs

The following information shall be provided for the bicycle facilities within the project area:

a. Existing bicycle paths, lanes, and routes as well as bicycle/pedestrian over and under crossings;

b. Future planned or programmed bicycle improvements including, but not limited to, those facilities, routes, and programs in the Lead Agency’s adopted Bicycle Plan, Pedestrian Plan,
Trails Master Plan, and/or bicycle/circulation element of their General Plan, and in other agencies’ plans (e.g., adjacent cities’ Bicycle Plans or Pedestrian Plans, cross-county bicycle corridors in the VTA Santa Clara Countywide Bicycle Plan, Bay Trail Plan);

c. A basic characterization of existing bicycling conditions in terms of safety, ease of access to the project site, and Quality of Service indicators, emphasizing gaps and deficiencies in the bicycle network near the site (e.g., missing bicycle lanes, narrow outside lanes);

d. Map showing existing bicycle facilities within 2,500 feet of the project boundaries. This map should indicate bicycle paths, lanes, and routes as well as bicycle/pedestrian over and under crossings;

e. The description and map of existing bicycle conditions should focus on the project street frontages and paths to major attractors such as transit facilities, schools, shops and services, and major residential developments.

The following information shall be provided for the project area's pedestrian facilities:

a. Existing pedestrian facilities in project area including sidewalks, crosswalks and other crossing control devices (e.g. beacons, refuge islands, etc.), and other non-motorized connections and paths in project area;

b. Future planned or programmed pedestrian improvements including, but not limited to, those facilities, improvements, and programs in Member Agencies' pedestrian elements and plans;

c. A basic characterization of existing walking conditions in terms of safety and Quality of Service indicators such as tree barriers, landscape buffers, and sidewalk width, emphasizing gaps and deficiencies in the pedestrian network near the site (e.g., missing crosswalks, missing pedestrian signal heads/phases, inadequate Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accommodations);

d. Map showing existing pedestrian facilities within 1,000 feet of the project boundaries. This map should indicate sidewalks (showing each side of a street), sidewalk gaps, crosswalks, other crossing control devices (e.g., beacons, refuge islands, etc.), and bicycle/pedestrian over and under crossings;

e. The description and map of existing pedestrian conditions should focus on the project street frontages and paths to major attractors such as transit facilities, schools, shops and services, and major residential developments.

When applicable, the following information shall be provided on Transportation Demand Management (TDM) or unique transportation or land use plans affecting the project area:

a. TDM ordinances in effect for the project site (reference to ordinance and key aspects affecting project is sufficient);

b. TDM programs at an existing facility, in the case of a project that is an expansion or a relocation to a nearby facility;

c. Other transportation plans or land use plans unique to the project area;
Chapter 7. Background Conditions

This study scenario shall evaluate Background Conditions, based on the sum of existing trips and trips from approved developments in the area, along with any changes to roadways and intersections associated with approved development or other funded changes to the transportation network.

The following sections present additional information on estimated trips from approved development projects, appropriate transportation facility improvements to include in the analysis, and other considerations.

7.1 Approved Development Projects

Approved projects include not yet completed or occupied projects that have undergone an approval process (i.e., been granted a land use entitlement). Approved projects may be projects within the Lead Agency's jurisdiction or a neighboring jurisdiction. Local jurisdictions are encouraged to maintain an inventory of “approved trips.” This inventory would include anticipated intersection turning movement volumes from approved projects. This information is useful in ensuring consistency among TIAs in the analysis of Background and Cumulative Conditions.

7.2 Vacant or Underutilized Development

If the proposed project involves a vacant or underutilized site with development rights, the number of trips originally associated with that development may be included in the Background Conditions. The background trips associated with the vacant or underutilized development should be estimated from driveway counts or trip generation rates, size, and land use type of the existing site. The "project trips" would be the additional trips generated by the re-occupancy of the site, i.e., the total number of trips generated by the proposed project minus the estimated background trips of the vacant or underutilized development. If the proposed project involves a vacant or underutilized site without development rights, all trips generated by the proposed project would be "project trips." The Lead Agency always has the discretion to consider trips associated with prior development rights to be project trips, rather than background trips.

7.3 Addition to Existing Development Project

If the proposed project involves the addition of a new use or expansion of an existing use at the site of an existing development, the number of trips originally associated with that site would be included in the Background Conditions. The background trips associated with the existing development should be estimated from driveway counts or trip generation rates, size, and land use type of the existing site. The "project trips" would be the additional trips generated by the addition or expansion project.
7.4 Transportation Facility Improvements

The transportation network for Background Conditions shall include all funded transportation facility improvements expected to be completed within one year of the proposed development project's completion. With VTA approval, a Lead Agency may request inclusion of other funded improvements or other developer-conditioned improvements.

7.5 Background Auto Level of Service Analysis

Transportation system operations for Background Conditions should be analyzed in a manner consistent with the analysis presented under Existing Conditions and following the methodology in Chapter 5.
Chapter 8. Trip Generation and Auto Trip Reductions

This chapter describes methods for estimating trip generation associated with a project; approaches for reducing automobile trips to and from the project and for documenting these reductions in a TIA report; and assumptions about how trips are distributed throughout the transportation network.

8.1 Trip Generation

The TIA should clearly identify the source of each trip generation rate used in the transportation analysis.

8.1.1 Sources and Methodologies

The Lead Agency may use trip generation rates from the most recent version of the Institute of Transportation Engineers’ (ITE’s) Trip Generation Manual, rates developed from local data, or rates developed using alternative trip generation methodologies.

For the most common land uses, numerous studies have been used in developing the ITE trip generation rates. In some cases, however, the published ITE trip generation rates are based on very limited data. There are at least four cases in which the Lead Agency should consider using alternative sources for trip generation rates:

- When ITE data is insufficient (e.g. small sample size, not statistically valid);
- When a project’s specific land use is not covered by the ITE manual or is known to show trip generation characteristics that differ from the categories covered in the ITE manual;
- When the land use context, such as high-density infill or development adjacent to transit, is not addressed by the ITE manual;
- When the project includes a mix of land uses (mixed-use development type).

Lead Agencies may also develop trip generation rates based on local data specifically for use in the transportation impact analysis. If custom trip generation rates are developed, techniques in the ITE’s Manual of Transportation Engineering Studies should be used. The local data used to develop a custom rate should either be included in the TIA or made readily available by the Lead Agency.
Trip generation rates from other methodologies may be used instead of ITE rates, where defensible and appropriate. Alternative methodologies include:

- SANDAG Traffic Generation Manual & Trip Generation for Smart Growth;
- City of San José Trip Generation Rates;
- MXD Model/SANDAG Model – US EPA;
- NCHRP 8-51 – Enhancing Internal Trip Capture Rate for Mixed-Use Development;
- Station Area Resident Survey – MTC;
- California Smart Growth Trip Generation Tool – Caltrans/UC Davis;
- Travel demand forecasting models;
- California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod)\(^6\)

Additional information on the research and professional practice basis of alternative trip generation methodologies can be found in Appendix D.

Professional judgment should always be used when selecting a trip generation data source or methodology. When using trip rates from any of the alternate trip generation methodologies listed, the Lead Agency shall include in the TIA report a full description of the trip generation methodology used and a summary of all inputs and assumptions. Professional judgment should be exercised to avoid double counting when using an alternate trip generation methodology. Some methodologies already account for attributes contained in the Standard Trip Reductions, which should not be taken on top of reductions provided by an alternate methodology.

In cases where the chosen trip generation methodology is based on a limited sample size, Lead Agencies are encouraged to conduct additional research or use local data to validate the trip rates before applying the suggested trip reductions from the alternate methodology.

### 8.1.2 Documentation of Trip Rates

A summary table showing trip generation for each type of land use in the project for each period of analysis (daily, AM peak, PM peak, etc.) shall be provided. The summary table shall include a quantification (square feet, number of units, etc.) upon which the trip generation calculation is based for each land use type, the trip generation rates used, and resulting generated trips.

The choice of trip generation rates shall be justified in the TIA. This includes any trip generation rate used for high occupancy vehicles.

Additionally, any unique project attributes affecting the trip generation calculations shall be documented. For example, assumptions regarding peak spreading and pass-by trips shall be documented.

---

\(^6\) CalEEMod is recommended for VMT analysis by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). CalEEMod may be useful as a supplemental resource for verification and justification of trip generation and trip reductions. However, since CalEEMod does not produce detailed trip generation estimates, it is not recommended that Lead Agencies rely on CalEEMod as their primary source for trip generation when preparing a TIA. See Appendix D for more detail.
8.1.3 Mode Split

For large projects that use a transportation model (either the countywide model or a local model), the Lead Agency is encouraged to prepare a summary table for either the daily or peak hour that indicates the number of vehicle trips, transit trips, bicycle trips and pedestrian trips generated for each type of land use. The Lead Agency may determine the project mode split based on factors from the VTA countywide model, in consultation with VTA. Based on engineering judgment, some projects may need further analysis of bicycle and pedestrian trips generated by the project. See Chapter 12, Special Project Types, for more information.

8.2 Automobile Trip Reductions and Transportation Demand Management

An important goal of VTA’s CMP is to encourage development that reduces system wide traffic congestion and improves air quality in the region. Several strategies can be used to encourage this type of development and to accomplish these goals, including:

- Mixed-use development (which increases internal trips);
- A strong transportation demand management (TDM) program (which provides incentives and services to encourage alternatives to the automobile);
- Project location and design features that encourage walking, bicycling and transit usage;
- Parking demand management programs, which discourage drive-alone trips; and
- Development near frequent transit services.

These strategies are most effective when combined into a comprehensive program that is integrated into the project’s design and operation.

Implementation of one or more of these strategies will encourage reductions in automobile trips generated by new development projects compared to standard automobile-trip rates. Projects that incorporate these concepts into their design may be awarded trip reduction credits, which may be applied to the total number of trips generated by the project. Trip reduction credits are subject to Lead Agency approval and discretion.

This section outlines three approaches for developing automobile trip reductions for a TIA:

- **Standard Trip Reductions** are established percentage reductions based on research or local policy that are provided within the TIA Guidelines. They can be taken for projects which include a mix of land uses, are located near transit, and/or have certain programs for Transportation Demand Management (TDM);

- **Target-Based Reductions** may be taken when the project applicant has entered into an enforceable agreement with the Lead Agency that limits the number of automobile trips traveling to and from the project site. The trip reduction program must include a commitment to monitor trip generation and determine whether targets are met, an enforcement structure, and a commitment to summary-level data sharing;

- **Peer/Study-Based Trip Reductions** may be taken when studies of similar projects, or of other sites occupied by the project applicant, have demonstrated comparable trip reductions.
through survey results or other data. The trip reduction program must include a commitment to monitor trip generation, and a commitment to summary-level data sharing.

All auto trip reductions must be clearly explained, documented, and justified in the project’s TIA report. Lead Agencies must state which of the above approaches is being used to develop auto trip reductions, if any reductions are claimed. Trip reductions shall be summarized in an Auto Trip Reduction Statement in the Executive Summary of the TIA report, using the form provided in Appendix C.

8.2.1 Standard Trip Reductions

VTA has developed the following guidelines for estimating auto trip reductions due to mixed-use development (internal trips), certain TDM programs, and transit station proximity. These guidelines should be used to determine the standard reductions in project vehicle trip generation from the estimates produced using the trip generation sources and methodologies referred to in Section 8.1.1. It must be emphasized that the vehicle trip reduction values or percentages should be applied carefully using professional judgment. In some cases, following the guidelines for standard trip reductions outlined in this section would overestimate trip generation from the project. Sections 8.2.2, Target-Based Trip Reductions, and 8.2.3, Peer/Study-Based Trip Reductions, provide guidance for cases when trip reduction percentages are likely to be higher than those detailed in this section. These subsequent sections also provide the procedures for documenting and justifying larger trip reductions for “special circumstances” which are referred to in this section.

The effectiveness of mixed-use development, TDM programs, and location near transit at reducing project vehicle trip generation should be monitored by Lead Agencies as part of the CEQA mitigation measure monitoring process and/or the agency’s TDM effectiveness monitoring program. Lead Agencies are encouraged to provide this type of monitoring data to VTA, when available, to assist in revising the vehicle trip reduction guidelines in the future. VTA will gather data on trip reduction experiences from Member Agencies through the CMP Monitoring and Conformance Program, and may share this data online to assist agencies in preparing TIAs.

Table 1: Standard Auto Trip Reduction Rates summarizes the maximum trip reduction rates that can be applied under the Standard Trip Reduction Approach. It should be noted that standard vehicle-trip generation rates already include some measure of transit use, biking, walking and TDM programs, so trip reductions summarized in Table 1: Standard Auto Trip Reduction Rates may be smaller than measured transit use and TDM program participation in a given project. The trip reduction values in this Chapter may be revised as new information is gathered.

8.2.1.1 Mixed-Use Developments

The Standard Reduction approach allows the largest trip reductions (i.e., 10 to 15%) for mixed-use developments that combine retail uses with a housing or hotel component. Based on a review of mixed-use developments, other mixed-use projects will be allowed smaller trip reductions due to the reduced amount of internal trip-making found in these projects. Table 1 summarizes the maximum trip reductions for mixed-use developments under the Standard Reductions approach.
### Table 1: Standard Auto Trip Reduction Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trip Reduction Strategy</th>
<th>Standard Trip Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed-Use Development Project</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with housing and retail components</td>
<td>15.0% off the smaller trip generator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with hotel and retail components</td>
<td>10.0% off the smaller trip generator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with housing and employment</td>
<td>3% off the smaller trip generator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with employment and employee-serving retail</td>
<td>3% off employment component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effective TDM Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Incentives</td>
<td>up to 5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuttle Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Project-funded dedicated shuttle</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Partially-funded multi-site shuttle</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location Within 2,000-Foot Walk of Transit Facility</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing near LRT, BRT or Caltrain station</td>
<td>9.0%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing near a Major Bus Stop</td>
<td>2.0%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Near a BART station</td>
<td>Case-by-Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment near LRT, BRT or Caltrain Station</td>
<td>6.0%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment near a Major Bus Stop</td>
<td>2.0%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Near a BART station</td>
<td>Case-by-Case</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The LRT/BRT/Caltrain Station, BART Station, and Major Bus Stop reductions cannot be combined.

**Note: See Section 8.2.1.3, below, for a description of the case-by-case method for proximity to BART stations.

---

7 The proposed trip reductions calculated for all land uses within the development area shall be based on the land use that produces the least amount of new trips. In other words, the same trip reduction rate for the land use that produces the least number of new trips should be used to determine the trip reduction for all developments.

8 Same as footnote 7.

9 Same as footnote 7.

10 All trips made to retail services (employee-serving retail) within the proposed development/complex may be considered internal trips. However, to qualify for this reduction, the employee-serving retail must be integrated into the employment complex and must not have a dedicated parking area.

11 In order for a project applicant to claim a TDM reduction, a commitment to make the TDM program available to all current and future occupants of the development must be included in a legally enforceable document. See Section 8.2.1.2 for more details.

12 Financial incentives must be offered on an ongoing basis and must be roughly equivalent to or higher than the monthly maximum pre-tax commuter benefit allowed under federal law at the time of TIA preparation in order for the project to receive full trip reduction. See Section 8.2.1.2.

13 If the shuttle trip reduction is being combined with the “Employment near LRT, BRT or Caltrain Station” reduction, the maximum shuttle trip reduction that can be taken is 1.5%.

14 See Section 8.2.1.3, below, for further detail.

15 A major bus stop is defined as a stop where six or more buses per hour from the same or different routes stop during the peak period in core, corridor or station areas.

16 Same as footnote 15.
The following are further descriptions of the trip reduction categories listed in Table 1: Standard Auto Trip Reduction Rates:

1. **Housing/Retail Mixed-Use Projects**: Mixed-use development projects that include a substantial housing component and a retail component can reduce vehicle trips by increasing internal trips. For example, project residents patronizing the retail uses would reduce the number of external retail and residential trips. Hence, a reduction in vehicle trips can be taken off the smaller trip generator of the project in an amount not to exceed fifteen percent (15%) unless special circumstances are justified in the project's TIA. The trips generated by the larger trip generator should be reduced by no more than the same number of trips reduced for the smaller trip generator.

2. **Hotel/Retail Mixed-Use Projects**: Mixed-use projects combining hotel and retail components will also increase internal trips. Hotel guests patronizing the project’s retail uses would reduce the number of external retail and hotel trips. A reduction on the trips generated by the smaller trip generator can be taken in an amount not to exceed ten percent (10%) unless special circumstances are justified in the project’s TIA. The trips generated by the larger trip generator should be reduced by no more than the same number of trips reduced for the smaller trip generator.

3. **Housing/Employment Mixed-Use Projects**: Mixed-use projects combining housing and employment components may have trips made between the two uses if some housing residents are also employed on-site. No more than a three percent (3%) reduction off the trips generated by the smaller of the two trip generators shall be taken unless special circumstances are justified in the project's TIA. The trips generated by the larger trip generator should be reduced by no more than the same number of trips reduced for the smaller trip generator.

4. **Retail/Employment Mixed-Use Projects**: Mixed-use projects combining employment and employee-serving retail components, such as dry cleaning, gift store, and service-oriented uses offer opportunities for employees to run errands during the day that they may have otherwise done during a peak period. In order to qualify for a trip reduction, the employee-serving retail must be integrated into the employment complex, with no designated parking area for the retail. The TIA should document that the project is eligible for a reduction. No more than a three percent (3%) reduction off the trips generated by the employment site shall

---

17 This value is based on data cited in “Transit Oriented Development, Using Public Transit to Create More Accessible and Livable Neighborhoods” from the Victoria Transport Policy Institute, April 4, 2006; this value is comparable to Metropolitan Transportation Commission’s Characteristics of Rail and Ferry Station Area Residents in the San Francisco Bay Area: Evidence from the 2000 Bay Area Travel Survey (Volume I), September 2006.


19 This value is based on Member Agency policies to encourage mixed-use development.
be taken unless special circumstances are justified in the project's TIA. All of the employee-serving retail trips may be considered to be internal to the project.

8.2.1.2 Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program

A reduction in project vehicle trip generation can be made for provision of a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program. In the VTA TIA Guidelines, reductions for certain TDM programs may be taken through the Standard Trip Reduction approach below. It should be understood that most trip generation rates include a certain ambient level of non-single occupant vehicle trips. Therefore, the actual effectiveness of the TDM program is assumed to be greater than the values listed below, but the maximum trip reduction that may be taken from trip generation rates must comply with the guidelines below, for TIAs that take the Standard Trip Reductions approach.

In order for a project applicant to claim a TDM reduction in a TIA, a commitment to make the TDM program available to all current and future occupants of the development must be included in a legally enforceable document. Examples of such documents, for trip reduction documentation purposes, include Conditions of Approval, Development Agreements, CEQA Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Programs (MMRPs), and/or Covenants, Conditions, & Restrictions (CC&Rs). The commitment to participate in a TDM program must be documented in the TIA.

VTA offers Standard Trip Reduction values for two types of TDM programs:

1. **Financial Incentives:** TDM programs that are based on financial incentives have the greatest effect on reducing trip generation. Trip reductions can be taken for projects which include the following types of financial incentives: transportation allowance for alternative modes to driving alone; parking cash-out; pre-tax commuter benefits for biking, carpooling, vanpooling, and using transit; and subsidies such as free transit passes or transit fare incentives provided by employers and/or residential complexes. In addition, charging for parking is a financial disincentive for solo driving and is considered a TDM measure. The maximum trip reduction that can be taken for such TDM programs is five percent (5%) unless special circumstances are justified in the project's TIA.

   The actual trip reduction that can be used in the TIA will depend on the level of financial subsidy provided to residents and/or employees and the number of residents and/or employees eligible for the subsidy. The standard 5% reduction can be taken if the financial subsidy is offered to all residents and/or employees of the development on an ongoing basis and is roughly equivalent to or higher than the monthly maximum pre-tax commuter benefit allowed under federal law at the time of TIA preparation.

---

20 This value is based on Member Agency policies to encourage mixed-use development.

21 This figure is based on two sources: US Department of Transportation, “The Effects of Land Use and Travel Demand Management Strategies on Commuting Behavior,” November, 1994, which indicated a reduction in Drive Alone mode of approximately 5% for sites providing financial incentives; and Donald Shoup, "Parking Cash Out," Chicago: Planning Advisory Service, 2005, indicating reductions in vehicle trips of at least 5% at employers offering parking cash-out.
The level of financial incentives to be provided must be documented in the TIA report.

2. **Shuttle Programs:** Projects which participate in shuttle programs linking the site to major transit facilities or other locations with high employee densities will be allowed a three percent (3%) trip reduction unless special circumstances are justified in the project's TIA. The full 3% trip reduction may be taken only when the project is committed to fully funding a dedicated shuttle to light rail, Caltrain, or BART facilities or other locations with high employee densities. A 2% reduction may be taken if the project is committed to partially funding a shuttle that serves other sites in addition to the project site. If the shuttle trip reduction is being combined with the 'Employment near LRT, BRT or Caltrain Station' reduction, the maximum shuttle trip reduction that can be taken is one and one-half percent (1.5%).

**8.2.1.3 Proximity to Transit (Rail or Major Bus Line)**

Housing and employment projects that are located near transit have different mode splits resulting in generally lower vehicle-trip generation characteristics. The extent is different for different types of transit facilities. To qualify for the Proximity to Transit trip reduction rates, developments must be located near existing or future Light Rail Transit (LRT) stations, Caltrain stations, BART stations, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) stations, and major bus stops. For a project to qualify for an auto trip reduction near a future transit station, the transit capital project that will include the station must be under construction at the time of the TIA Notification Form issuance. A major bus stop for the purposes of trip reductions is defined as a stop where six or more buses per hour (from the same or different routes) stop during the peak period. A development qualifies as being located near transit if the project entrance (housing front door, office pedestrian entrance) and greatest density of the project are within approximately 2,000-foot walking distance of the specified transit facility.

Projects that take any of the trip reductions described in this section shall provide a map or text description indicating the walking route from the project to the transit stop. The TIA should identify any pedestrian barriers that affect access from the development to the transit facility, including gaps in the sidewalk network and/or street crossings that lack pedestrian crossing facilities. If any pedestrian barriers as described above exist in the route between the project site and the transit stop, the project would be disqualified from taking a trip reduction for proximity to transit unless the project commits to fully funding any improvements needed to close the gap.

It is recognized that the 2,000 foot walking distance is not all or nothing – since many residents and employees outside that radius still walk to transit, though at diminishing rates as the distance from the station increases. In the case where the full development is not within a 2000-foot walk, placement of the more concentrated land uses closest to the transit facility is recommended. Projects located greater than 2,000 foot walking distance may qualify for the trip reductions described below. To qualify, the TIA must include a justification for the trip reduction based on evidence from studies of similar projects. The evidence provided should demonstrate that the proposed trip reduction is

---

22 Based on VTA’s review of 1997 Caltrain and LRT shuttle ridership to and from Santa Clara County employment sites.
likely to be achieved given the land use context, distance from transit, type of transit service available, and pedestrian and bicycle conditions between the project site and the station. The Lead Agency may consider using the Peer/Study-based Approach to trip reductions (see Section 8.2.3), if appropriate.

To bolster the case for a trip reduction at a distance of greater than 2,000 feet from transit, VTA recommends that the project increase the quality of the walk experience between the development and the transit facility. Examples of these types of improvements include constructing sidewalks greater than the minimum sidewalk width, providing pedestrian scale lighting and landscaping, and adding signs to direct pedestrians and bicyclists to transit. In addition, the project must show that safe, pedestrian-friendly sidewalks or paths extend all the way from the project site to the transit stop.

Professional judgment should be used when taking transit proximity-related trip reductions from trip generation developed using specialized methods. Where a travel demand model or mixed-use trip generation model is used to estimate trips on all modes (i.e., including a mode choice component), care should be taken to not double-count the effect of proximity to transit.

The trip reduction values allowed for each type of project are as follows:

1. **Housing Near Light Rail, Bus Rapid Transit or Caltrain Station:** Housing developments where the walking distance from the unit or the front door of the housing complex to the station is 2,000 feet or less may reduce their trip generation volumes by nine percent (9%).

   In the case that a development is located near a rail/BRT station and a major bus stop, a reduction can only be taken for either the major bus stop or the rail/BRT station, and not a combination of the two transit facilities.

2. **Housing Near a Major Bus Stop:** Housing developments where the walking distance from the unit or the front door of the housing complex to the major bus stop is 2,000 feet or less may reduce their trip generation volumes by two percent (2%).

   This reduction may not be combined with the trip reduction for housing located near light rail, BRT or Caltrain.

3. **Employment Near Light Rail, Bus Rapid Transit or Caltrain Station:** Employment sites where the walking distance from the front door of the development to the station is 2,000 feet or less may reduce their trip generation volumes by six percent (6%).

   In the case that a development is located near a rail/BRT station and a major bus stop, a reduction can only be taken for either the major bus stop or the rail/BRT station, and not a combination of the two transit facilities.

4. **Employment Near a Major Bus Stop:** Employment sites where the walking distance from the front door of the development to the major bus stop is 2,000 feet or less may reduce their trip generation volumes by two percent (2%).

   This reduction may not be combined with the trip reduction for employment located near light rail, BRT or Caltrain.

   In the case that a development is located near a rail/BRT station and a major bus stop, a reduction can only be taken for either the major bus stop or the rail/BRT station, and not a combination of the two transit facilities.

---

24 Same as previous footnote.
trip generation volumes by **two percent** (2%). *This reduction may not be combined with the trip reduction for employment sites located near light rail, BRT or Caltrain.*

5. **Case-by-Case Approach for Proximity to BART Stations:** Residential and employment developments where the walking distance from the front door of the development to an existing or future BART station is 2,000 feet or less may apply a trip reduction in a TIA. When proposing such a reduction, Lead Agencies must obtain concurrence from VTA and provide a description of the methodology, source data and justification for the trip reduction in the TIA report. The trip reduction for proximity to BART should take into account the attributes of the station area (land uses, transportation network, pedestrian and bicycle connections to the station) to ensure that the requested reductions are appropriate for the context. VTA may in the future provide suggested trip reduction rates (standard reductions) when data from the Santa Clara County BART stations becomes available.

### 8.2.1.4 Standard Trip Reduction Combinations

Projects that combine two or more trip reduction strategies for which Standard Reductions are specified may take reductions off the trips generated by individual project components, as discussed below. The reductions shall be clearly explained, documented, and justified in the project's TIA Report and shall conform to the values listed in Section 8.2 unless special circumstances are justified in the project’s TIA.

Application of multiple trip reduction strategies will depend on the type and ratio of uses present in the project under study. For example, a mixed-use project composed mostly of housing with some retail that also participates in a shuttle program is allowed a 15% mixed-use reduction on the retail trip generation of the project. The housing trips should be reduced by no more than the same number of retail trips internal to the project. In addition, the housing component of the project will be allowed a 3% reduction for participation in a shuttle program. However, if the shuttle will serve the retail use as well as the housing component, and the retail use is large and generates a majority of the daily project trips, the 3% reduction for shuttle participation may be applied to both the retail and housing components of the project.

Similarly, a mixed-use housing and retail project located near transit will be allowed 15% reduction on trips generated by the retail portion of the project to account for the mixed-use nature of the project. Again, the housing trips should be reduced by no more than the same number of retail trips internal to the project. In addition, the housing portion will be allowed a 9% reduction for the location near transit.

If the TDM shuttle trip reduction is being combined with the 'Employment near LRT, BRT or Caltrain Station' reduction, the maximum shuttle trip reduction that can be taken is one and one-half percent (1.5%).
8.2.1.5 Parking and Automobile Trip Reduction

Recognizing that parking oversupply may itself have negative secondary effects, the TIA should discuss the project’s approach to parking management. A parking management plan, shared parking, parking cash out, unbundled parking, carpool parking, and parking layout and design can be ways to encourage the use of alternative modes and reduce auto trips. If the project is using any of these measures as part of its overall TDM/trip reduction strategy, the Lead Agency shall document it in the TIA, and note it in the Auto Trip Reduction Statement. The parking analysis must explicitly discuss the relationship between the project's parking supply, parking demand and parking costs (if any) to vehicle trip reductions applied to the project.

8.2.2 Target-Based Trip Reductions

In addition to Standard Trip Reduction and Peer/Study-Based Trip Reduction approaches, projects may take a Target-Based Trip Reduction if documentation and justification are provided in the TIA Report, based on the guidance below. This approach may be taken when the project applicant has entered into an enforceable agreement with the Lead Agency that limits the number of automobile trips traveling to and from the project site. The trip reduction program must include a commitment to monitor trip generation and determine whether targets are met, an enforcement structure, and a commitment to summary-level data sharing.

It is recognized that Lead Agencies ultimately make decisions on project approvals, and therefore commitments to certain elements that would justify a Target-Based Trip Reduction will occur as an agreement between the project applicant and the Lead Agency, and it is responsibility of the Lead Agency to enforce those commitments. For the purpose of a TIA, stating a commitment and providing the documentation noted below is sufficient, provided that the commitment also appears in a legally enforceable document. Examples of such documents, for trip reduction documentation purposes, include Conditions of Approval, Development Agreements, CEQA Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Programs (MMRPs), and/or Covenants, Conditions, & Restrictions (CC&Rs).

The following elements are **required** in a TIA Report for a project taking a Target-Based Trip Reduction:

- **State a commitment to a specific reduction target (percentage trip reduction, non-auto mode split or trip cap).** This statement should specify the starting point for the reduction (e.g., ITE auto trip generation rates based on square footage or number of units, total person-trips based on employee/resident count) and the time period for the reduction (peak hour, peak period and/or full day). For targets based on mode split, the statement should include a clear explanation of how to convert these figures back to auto trip generation rates to allow later monitoring and comparison;

- **Provide a description of the types of TDM/trip reduction measures that are proposed in the program.** It is recognized that the list will be preliminary and may change over time;
• State a commitment to periodic monitoring of project trip reduction. The methodology should follow industry standards to determine auto trip generation rates or mode splits and should be conducted by the Lead Agency or a third party. The TIA report should describe the proposed monitoring approach;

• State a commitment to an enforcement/penalty structure. Lead Agencies retain flexibility to determine the parameters, and the enforcement/penalty structure may take the form of a ‘reinvestment clause’ where the project applicant/owner is required to invest more in trip reduction efforts if not meeting the target;

• State a commitment to provide summary level monitoring data (e.g., auto trip generation rates, mode shares) to VTA, through the Lead Agency. Data shall be provided on a biennial basis as part of the CMP Monitoring and Conformance Program.

The following elements are encouraged in a TIA Report for a project taking a Target-Based Trip Reduction:

• Provide a detailed description of the TDM/trip reduction measures that are proposed in the program;

• Sharing of trip monitoring reports or more in-depth trip generation or survey data for the purpose of improving the TIA Guidelines in the future.

### 8.2.3 Peer/Study-Based Trip Reductions

In addition to Standard Trip Reduction and Target-Based Trip Reduction approaches, projects may take a Peer/Study-Based Trip Reduction if documentation and justification are provided in the TIA Report, based on the guidance below. This approach may be used to justify a trip reduction based on a project’s similarity to other projects with demonstrated trip reductions or a project occupant’s track record of reducing trips at other sites, or to provide additional justification for trip rates based on local data collection efforts.

The following describes the requirements for documenting and justifying a Peer/Study-Based Trip Reduction percentage:

• Provide Data/Documentation in TIA Report: Lead Agencies may rely on existing studies or conduct their own study, as appropriate to develop the Peer/Study-Based trip reductions, and this data and documentation must be included in the TIA Report or its appendices. The documentation must include the data used to justify the Peer/Study-Based trip reduction rate, the source(s) referenced, and a detailed discussion of the assumptions and methodologies used. The methodology used to develop the Peer/Study-Based trip reduction rate should follow industry standards and in cases where the trip reduction rate is based on a limited sample size, professional judgment should be used to determine the suitability of the sample data;

• Ensure Appropriateness: Care must be taken to use data that is applicable to Santa Clara County conditions. As part of the documentation, Lead Agencies must specify the sample size, urban context, quality and type of transit services available, and any other relevant findings pertaining to the particular project attribute(s) in question;
• Provide a description of the types of TDM/trip reduction measures that are proposed in the program, if applicable;

• State a commitment to periodic monitoring of project trip reduction: The methodology should follow industry standards to determine auto trip generation rates or mode splits and should be conducted by the Lead Agency or a third party. The TIA report should describe the proposed monitoring approach;

• State a commitment to provide summary level monitoring data (e.g., auto trip generation rates, mode shares) to VTA, through the Lead Agency. Data shall be provided on a biennial basis as part of the CMP Monitoring and Conformance Program.

See Table 2: Comparison of Trip Reduction Approaches, below, for a comparison of Standard, Peer/Study-Based and Target-Based trip reduction approaches.

**Table 2: Comparison of Trip Reduction Approaches**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Standard Reductions</th>
<th>Peer/Study-Based Reductions</th>
<th>Target-Based Reductions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum percentages in VTA TIA Guidelines?</td>
<td>Yes, see Table 1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data required in TIA Report?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, existing or new studies</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to a target required?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of measures required?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, if applicable</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring required?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement required?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Sharing required?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.3 Trip Distribution

The trip distribution step of a TIA consists of forecasting the travel direction of project-generated trips to and from the project site.

The trip distribution percentages shall be included in the TIA Report on a figure showing an area map with transportation facilities (roadways, transit lines, etc.) and the project site. The trip distribution figure should, at a minimum, show trip percentages at gateways, on nearby freeway segments, and along major arterials that provide direct access to the project site.

The trip assignment step of a TIA consists of assigning trips to specific transportation facilities on the basis of the trip distribution percentages. Assignment of trips should be based on existing traffic volumes, existing travel patterns or expected future travel patterns. The assignment of trips shall account for pass-by and diverted linked trips on transportation facilities near the project site.
The following are points that expand or provide detail regarding trip distribution and assignment:

1. **Review by Other Jurisdictions**: The Lead Agency shall be responsible for developing the trip distribution and assignment for a project. The trip distribution and assignment shall be reviewable by other jurisdictions (other cities, towns, the County, Caltrans, and/or VTA). Review by other jurisdictions should occur at the TIA Notification Form stage of the TIA preparation process. It is the responsibility of other jurisdictions to request trip distribution and assignment information from the Lead Agency once they are notified about a project.

2. **Use of VTA or Local Agency Models**: Model data may be used to develop trip distribution assumptions for a project. The use of this data is most appropriate for long-term projects or for near-term development projects where the roadway network in the vicinity of the project will change substantially. VTA can also provide trip tables by trip purpose and travel networks to Member Agencies that may be used to develop trip distribution assumptions for a project.

3. **Documentation of Assumptions**: The project’s trip distribution and assignment assumptions shall be clearly documented in the TIA Report.

### 8.3.1 Pass-by Trips and Diverted Linked Trips

Some projects will attract a large number of trips already on the system. For example, many people who would stop at a new neighborhood convenience store would do so on their way home from work; these people would not be making new vehicle-trips on the roadway. These pass-by trips are generally captured by small neighborhood services such as dry cleaners, convenience stores, gas stations and coffee shops and to a lesser extent such uses as grocery stores, pharmacies, shopping centers and restaurants. Such trips are classified into two categories: pass-by and diverted linked trips. According to the ITE *Trip Generation Handbook*, pass-by trips are attracted from traffic passing a site on an adjacent street that contains direct access to the generator. Pass-by trips do not require a diversion from another roadway. Diverted linked trips are attracted from roadways in the vicinity of a site and require a diversion from one roadway to another to gain access to the site.26

### 8.3.2 Allowable Reductions for Pass-by Trips and Diverted Linked Trips

A reduction in project vehicle trip generation can be made for pass-by and diverted linked trips, provided that the reduction is applied according to the methodology outlined in the following section. *This reduction must be clearly explained, justified, and documented in the TIA report*. The trip reduction for pass-by and diverted linked trips shall be determined from established sources, such as ITE's *Trip Generation Handbook*, SANDAG, or surveys of similar land uses. Note that reductions for pass-by trips often differ from those for diverted linked trips. The pass-by and

---

diverted linked trip reduction may only be taken for commercial land uses and should not be more
than a **thirty percent (30%) combined pass-by and diverted linked trip reduction**. In addition,
pass-by and diverted linked trips may not be excluded from the calculation of the 100 net new peak
hour trip threshold that triggers the requirement for conducting a TIA except as noted in Section 2.1.

There are a few exceptions where pass-by and diverted linked trips may account for more than 30% of
the trips made, such as at gas stations, fast food establishments, community centers, local public
libraries, and isolated mini-markets. A higher trip reduction rate may be applied to these uses with
approval of the Lead Agency and VTA. As with other pass-by trip reductions, the reduction rate
must be clearly explained, justified, and documented in the TIA.

8.3.3 **Application of Pass-by Trip and Diverted Linked Trip Reductions**

Subtracting pass-by and diverted linked trips from a site's trip generation volumes lowers the number
of new trips added to the surrounding transportation system. However, additional turning movements
or changes to the turning movements due to pass-by and diverted linked trips should be taken into
account in transportation analyses to determine their impact on adjacent roadways. Answers to
questions such as whether left turn pockets are long enough, whether U-turns are allowed, and
whether additional turning movements will slow or conflict with other traffic are dependent on all
project trips including the pass-by and diverted linked trips. **Appendix E** includes a methodology for
applying pass-by and diverted linked trip reductions.
Chapter 9. Project Conditions and Impacts/Effects

The TIA Report shall evaluate the addition of the project, along with estimated project-generated trips, to the “without project” analysis scenario (Existing, Background, or Cumulative Conditions without the project, as appropriate). This shall include the identification of any project impacts on CMP roadway facilities, and any negative effects on bicycle, pedestrian or transit conditions or vehicle queuing. Mitigation measures and their associated costs shall be identified for impacts that exceed the impact thresholds described below. In some cases, such as a development project that closes a sidewalk gap or adds a bicycle lane to its frontage, effects on the transportation system may be beneficial as well as adverse. Lead Agencies are encouraged to describe the beneficial effects of a project; this information may also be included in a CEQA document.

9.1 Traffic

The TIA Report shall contain an evaluation of project impacts to traffic operations. Evaluation of impacts to traffic operations shall include, but not be limited to evaluation of Auto Level of Service and queuing impacts.

9.1.1 Level of Service Analysis

The CMP traffic LOS standard is LOS E. If the analysis shows that a development project is projected to cause traffic LOS on a CMP facility (roadway or intersection) to fall from LOS E or better to LOS F under project conditions, then the project is said to impact the facility.

In addition, for facilities determined to have been at LOS F under the without project analysis scenario (Existing, Background or Cumulative Conditions without the project), a project is said to impact the facility if the analysis shows that the project will cause LOS to deteriorate by a given threshold amount. The threshold amounts for each of the three CMP facility types are described as follows:

1. **Intersections at LOS F**: A project is said to impact an intersection determined to have been at LOS F under the without project analysis scenario if:
   - addition of the project traffic increases the average control delay for critical movements by four (4) seconds or more, and
   - project traffic increases the critical v/c value by 0.01 or more.

   The exception to this threshold is when the addition of project traffic reduces the amount of average control delay for critical movements, i.e., the change in average control delay for critical movements are negative. In this case, the threshold is when the project increases the critical v/c value by 0.01 or more.

2. **Freeway Segments at LOS F**: A project is said to impact a freeway segment determined to have been at LOS F under the without project analysis scenario if **the number of new trips**

   The determination of which facilities to evaluate is described in Section 2.1 of these Guidelines.
**added by the project is more than one percent of the freeway capacity.** This calculation shall be for each direction of travel. Analysis should be conducted for all freeway lane types to which project trips are assigned, including HOV and Express Lanes, if applicable. Tables for the freeway analysis determination and impact analysis should include detailed data such as density and speed. Sample tables are shown in **Appendix A** (**Table A-1: Sample of Freeway Analysis Requirement Determination** and **Table A-2: Sample of Freeway Analysis Summary**).

3. **Rural Highway at LOS F:** A project is said to impact a rural highway determined to have been at LOS F under the without project analysis scenario, if the number of new trips added by the project is more than one percent of the rural highway capacity. This calculation shall consider both directions of travel.

**9.1.2 Queuing Analysis**

A queuing analysis shall be included in a TIA, at a minimum, in the following instances:

- At CMP intersections where Auto LOS analysis indicates that there will be a significant impact according to the CMP LOS standard;
- At on-ramps with existing or planned operational ramp meters;
- At off-ramps controlled by signals at junctions with local streets;
- At any other intersection or freeway on-ramp, based on engineering judgment, proximity of the project to a freeway interchange, existing queuing situations (such as spillback onto local streets from on ramps), or localized conditions along the project’s frontage.

Negative effects of queuing on CMP facilities shall be identified by comparing the calculated design queue to the available queue storage. Queuing effects to be identified include, but are not limited to the following:

- Spillback queues from turn lanes at intersections that block through traffic;
- Queues from one intersection or closely-spaced intersections that extend back and impact other intersections;
- Queues from bottleneck locations such as lane drops that impact the operation of the facility;
- Spillback queues on ramps that impact surface street or freeway operations;
- Queues at intersections in proximity to freeway ramps.

Evaluation of queuing effects is required for only the near-term analysis. However, Lead Agencies may require this analysis for longer term projects to plan for improvements in later years.

Refer to the VTA *Traffic Level of Service Analysis Guidelines* for further information on ramp queuing analysis. Lead agencies should contact Caltrans staff to obtain current ramp metering rates.

**9.2 Transit**

The TIA Report shall include an analysis of project effects on the transit system. The evaluation shall consider transit vehicle delay, transit access and facilities, as described below.
**Transit Vehicle Delay:** The TIA report shall include an analysis of the effects of the project on transit vehicle delay. This analysis shall include the following components:

- A quantitative estimate of additional seconds of transit vehicle delay that will result from automobile congestion caused by the project and any signal operations changes proposed by the project. This analysis may utilize information produced by the intersection Auto LOS analysis or other sources, if available;
- A qualitative assessment of additional transit vehicle delay caused by any roadway or intersection geometry changes proposed by the project, taking into consideration unique considerations of transit vehicles compared to autos (e.g., pulling into and out of stops, longer gaps needed for left turns). These qualitative considerations may also inform the assessment of transit vehicle delay caused by auto congestion.

If increased transit vehicle delay is found in this analysis, the Lead Agency should work with VTA to identify feasible transit priority measures near the affected facility and include contributions to any applicable projects that improve transit speed and reliability in the TIA. Refer to Section 10.2 for more information on improvements to address congestion effects on transit travel times.

More information on the practice and research basis for transit delay analysis can be found in Appendix F.

**Transit Access and Facilities:** The TIA report shall include an assessment of transit access and facilities near the project site. The assessment shall include the following elements:

- Description of pedestrian access from the project to nearby transit stops. This should include both an assessment of access within the site (i.e., from buildings on the site to the public sidewalks) and off-site (i.e., presence/absence of continuous sidewalks and safe crossings to access transit);
- Disclosure of any permanent or temporary reduction of transit availability or interference with existing transit users (e.g. relocation/closure of a transit stop or vacation of a roadway utilized by transit);
- Disclosure of project location more than 1/2 mile from existing or planned transit services, with the potential for generating a demand for such services. Such projects are encouraged to identify funding sources to provide public or private transit services, if needed;
- Description of proposed actions to enhance transit service, access or facilities (e.g., bus stop improvements on a project frontage), or to mitigate negative effects on existing transit systems or facilities that result from the proposed project.

**9.3 Bicycle and Pedestrian**

The TIA Report shall include an analysis of bicycle and pedestrian modes under project conditions. The analysis shall address project effects on existing bicyclists and pedestrians as well as the effects and benefits of site development and associated roadway improvements on bicycle/pedestrian infrastructure, circulation, Quality of Service (QOS), and conformance to existing plans and policies. (Bicycle/pedestrian site access and circulation are addressed in Section 9.4.)
Quality of Service Analysis

Projects that propose geometric changes to roadway segments or intersections, or changes to signal operations, shall include a QOS analysis for bicyclists and pedestrians for those locations where changes are proposed.

Lead Agencies have the discretion to select appropriate methodologies for bicycle and pedestrian QOS analysis. Agencies must include a description and justification of the methodology being used, and identify key data inputs and assumptions for the methodology. Agencies are encouraged to use the methodology in the latest Highway Capacity Manual, or a similar methodology, for the QOS analysis. See Chapter 5 and Appendix G for more information on pedestrian and bicycle QOS methodologies. VTA staff can act as an additional resource to Lead Agencies in selecting QOS methodologies.

Projects that do not propose geometric changes to roadway segments or intersections, or changes to signal operations, are not required to include a QOS analysis, but such analysis is encouraged for project frontages.

Descriptive Analysis

In addition to the QOS analysis (if applicable), the TIA Report shall include a descriptive evaluation of project effects on and benefits to bicycle and pedestrian conditions. The descriptive analysis should encompass a radius of 2,500 feet from the project site for bicycle facilities, and a radius of 1,000 feet from the project site for pedestrian facilities. Within this radius, the descriptive analysis should focus on the project street frontages, paths to major attractors (such as transit facilities, schools, shops and services, and major residential developments), and bicycle and pedestrian deficiencies identified in the Existing Conditions analysis.

The following questions should be addressed:

1. Consistency with Existing Adopted Plans
   - How does the project implement, preclude, modify, or otherwise affect proposed bicycle and pedestrian projects and/or policies identified in the Lead Agency’s adopted Bicycle Plan, Pedestrian Plan, Trails Master Plan, and/or bicycle/circulation element of their General Plan?
   - How does the project implement, preclude, modify, or otherwise affect proposed bicycle and pedestrian projects and/or policies identified in other agencies’ plans (e.g., Countywide Bicycle Plan, adjacent cities’ Bicycle Plans or Pedestrian Plans, Bay Trail Plan)?
   - What provisions for bicycle parking and storage are provided by the project? Calculate the required bicycle parking in accordance with the City’s ordinance or, if none, VTA Bicycle Technical Guidelines (BTG), and indicate proposed type of Class 1 and Class 2 parking to be provided by the project. Proposed bicycle parking locations should be noted on the site plan. Refer to Appendix H for a table of Bicycle Parking Supply Recommendations from the VTA BTG.
2. Effects on Existing Bicyclist/Pedestrian Circulation in the Project Area
   - Would the project benefit or enhance existing bicycle and pedestrian access and circulation? For example, would it provide bicycle-friendly and pedestrian-friendly improvements like those identified in VTA BTG, Pedestrian Technical Guidelines, or CDT Manual? If so, describe;
   - Would the project reduce, sever or eliminate existing bicycle or pedestrian access and circulation? If so, describe;
   - How does the project address bicycle and pedestrian deficiencies identified in the Existing Conditions analysis?
   - If a new traffic signal is being installed as part of the project or project mitigation, the TIA should note that adequate bicycle and pedestrian detection and signal timing should be provided. (See VTA BTG, Chapter 6.)

9.4 Project Access and Circulation

The TIA Report shall include an analysis of site circulation and access. The evaluation of site circulation and access shall consider the following issues:

- The assessment of site circulation and access must explicitly discuss the relationship between site design and any vehicle trip reductions that are applied to the project. The assessment should include the pass-by and diverted trips that would access the site;
- The assessment of access shall include an analysis of trips entering and exiting the site at each driveway. Distribution of trips to access points should consider street configuration, storage lanes, acceleration and deceleration lanes, and sight distance;
- A Site Plan shall be provided with adequate detail to show auto, bicycle and pedestrian circulation within the site and connections to the outside transportation network;
- The site circulation and access assessment shall include an analysis of the proposed bicycle access and onsite circulation with recommendations to encourage bicycle trips to and within the site. Address adverse circulation issues, if any, which were identified in the Existing Conditions analysis;
- The assessment of site access shall include an analysis of the proposed pedestrian access and onsite circulation with recommendations to encourage pedestrian trips to and within the site. Include an assessment of pedestrian access between the site and the nearest bus stops. Address adverse site circulation issues, if any, which were identified in the Existing Conditions analysis. Also address the extent to which the ability of bicyclists and pedestrians to access the project site is inhibited by manmade and natural barriers such as railroad crossings, rivers, freeways, dead-end streets, and cul-de-sacs;
- The site circulation and access assessment may also include analysis of emergency vehicles and service vehicles, including delivery and garbage trucks.
Chapter 10. Mitigation Measures and Multimodal Improvements

This chapter describes the analysis required to evaluate 1) mitigation measures to address project impacts per CMP standards, and 2) improvements to address other project-related effects on the transportation system, including changes that affect transit, pedestrian and bicycle modes and queuing at ramps and intersections. Throughout this section, “impact” is used to refer to project effects on the CMP system as determined by the standards and impact thresholds established by VTA, and “mitigation” is used to refer to changes that address those impacts. The term “effect” refers to project-related effects on elements of the transportation system for which no CMP standard or impact threshold has been established, and “improvement” is used to refer to changes that address those effects. The TIA should particularly focus on project-related effects that tend to degrade pedestrian, bicycle and transit conditions.

10.1 Mitigations to Address CMP Standards

The TIA Report shall include a discussion of mitigation measures to address any impacts per CMP standards identified in the analysis. The TIA shall identify those mitigations for which the sponsor of the proposed project is responsible. The following issues regarding mitigation measures shall be addressed:

1. The goal of the Lead Agency shall be to maintain the CMP Auto Level of Service standard on CMP facilities, and to mitigate any other impacts identified in the TIA Report. However, if this is not possible, mitigation measures that minimize impacts by limiting the degree or magnitude of the action and its implementation, and/or compensate for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources shall also be considered. The mitigation measure could be fully-funded and implemented by the project sponsor or the project sponsor could make a contribution to the cost of implementing the measure, in coordination with other agencies. Information on voluntary contributions to regional transportation improvements can be found in Appendix I (Board Memorandum: Update on Voluntary Contributions to Transportation Improvements).

2. The Lead Agency shall consider all of the following categories of mitigation measures for impacts identified through the analysis:
   - Physical or capacity-enhancing improvements to the affected transportation facility (e.g., adding a turn lane to an intersection to address an Auto LOS impact);
   - Operational and/or efficiency improvements to the affected transportation facility (e.g., changing signal operations at an intersection or contributing to the implementation of Express Lanes on a freeway segment to address an Auto LOS impact);
   - Projects and programs used to reduce project auto trip generation, including TDM programs as well as capital improvements to transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, if not already included in the proposed project description. Examples could include constructing wider sidewalks, adding a bicycle lane or non-motorized trail, or a shuttle service from the proposed development to a nearby transit facility (e.g., BRT stop or light rail station).
3. The Lead Agency shall identify the feasibility of the proposed mitigation measures. Feasibility of physical improvements shall be verified in the field. Feasibility of all measures shall be confirmed with the appropriate agency or agencies (e.g., the agency responsible for maintaining a roadway or for implementing an operational improvement). Proposed mitigation measures for impacts to CMP facilities must be reviewed with VTA staff prior to the issuance of the TIA report.

4. The description of all mitigation measures shall include identification of who is responsible for implementing each mitigation measure, when the mitigation measure will be implemented as it relates to the occupancy of the proposed project, and the cost of implementation, as appropriate. The cost estimate for mitigation shall be based on the feasibility analysis and/or a Capital Improvement Program estimate, if available. Lead Agencies are encouraged to have a registered civil engineer develop the cost estimate for any physical mitigations.

5. If a project causes a transportation impact that cannot be mitigated to the CMP traffic LOS standard, a Multimodal Improvement Plan must be provided along with the TIA, or the project applicant must agree in advance to participate in the implementation of the Multimodal Improvement Plan after project approval. Multimodal Improvement Plans are plans to identify offsetting measures to improve transportation conditions on CMP facilities in lieu of making physical traffic capacity improvements such as widening an intersection or roadway. Further information regarding steps for developing Multimodal Improvement Plans, and how Multimodal Improvement Plans relate to the land use approval process, is provided in the VTA Deficiency Plan Requirements.

Multimodal Improvement Plans can range in size from Areawide (such as an entire city) to Specific Area (such as a roadway segment within a downtown area) to Mini (covering a single intersection). If the need arises for the preparation of a Multimodal Improvement Plan, VTA will work with the Lead Agency to tailor the level of the Multimodal Improvement Plan to match the scope of the deficiency. VTA will work with the Lead Agency as necessary to identify action items (or offsetting measures) as described in the VTA Deficiency Plan Requirements. Action items from the Deficiency Plan Requirements are provided in Appendix J.

6. If a project impacts a CMP System facility that has a Multimodal Improvement Plan, it is subject to the conditions of the Plan. The project's TIA Report shall identify what role the project will play in implementing the Multimodal Improvement Plan actions.

7. Mitigation measures for Auto Level of Service shall not unreasonably degrade bicycle, pedestrian or transit access, and circulation. If a project proposes mitigation for Auto LOS involving an intersection modification, change to roadway geometry, or change in signal operations, the TIA shall analyze and disclose secondary effects on other modes, i.e., whether the mitigation would affect pedestrian or bicycle conditions or increase transit vehicle delay.
For the bicycle and pedestrian secondary effects analysis, a QOS-based methodology (as cited in Sections 5.2.4 and 5.2.5) is encouraged, although a text description of changes may be substituted. At a minimum, the TIA shall disclose any of the following effects that would result from a recommended mitigation measure:

- Reducing, severing or eliminating existing bicycle or pedestrian access and circulation;
- Narrowing of sidewalk or removal of sidewalk (even if only on one side of street);
- Removal of crosswalk;
- Increased crossing distances;
- Longer signal cycles;
- Removal of a buffer between pedestrians and automobiles;
- Decreasing bike lane width or eliminating bike lane including at intersection approach due to addition of right-turn only lane;
- Reducing shoulder width to less than five feet on roadways without bike lanes (see VTA BTG, Section 7.4.2);
- Decreasing outside lane width on roadway without bike lanes or shoulders (see VTA BTG, Section 7.2);
- Installation of double right-turn lane, a free right-turn lane, or free-flowing freeway on and off ramps (see VTA BTG, Section 5.1);
- Revised signal timing and inadequate detection (see VTA BTG, Chapter 6, for recommendations on bicycle signal timing and detection at intersections);
- Changes to existing bike paths such as alignment, width of the trail ROW or trail tread, length of the trail, horizontal and vertical clearance;
- Precluding, modifying, or otherwise affecting proposed bicycle and pedestrian projects and/or policies identified in the Lead Agency’s adopted Bicycle Plan, Pedestrian Plan, Trails Master Plan, and/or bicycle/circulation element of their General Plan; or other agencies’ plans, e.g., Countywide Bicycle Plan, adjacent Cities’ Bicycle Plan or Pedestrian Plan, Bay Trail Plan;
- Other roadway modifications that adversely impact bicycle or pedestrian conditions.

The analysis of secondary effects on transit vehicle delay resulting from proposed mitigation measures shall include the following components:

- A quantitative estimate of additional seconds of transit vehicle delay that will result from any signal operations changes proposed by the mitigation. This analysis may utilize information produced by the intersection Auto LOS analysis or other sources, if available;
- A qualitative assessment of additional transit vehicle delay caused by any roadway or intersection geometry changes proposed by the mitigation, taking into consideration unique considerations of transit vehicles compared to autos (e.g., pulling into and out of stops, longer gaps needed for left turns).
10.2 Improvements to Address Other Project-Related Effects

Per the requirements set forth in Chapter 9, the TIA Guidelines require Lead Agencies to analyze project effects on certain parts of the transportation system for which no CMP standard or impact threshold has been established. For the bicycle and pedestrian analysis of Project Conditions, a QOS-based methodology is required in certain situations and a descriptive analysis is required in all cases (as described in Section 9.3). For the transit analysis of Project Conditions, an analysis of transit vehicle delay, transit access and facilities is required (as described in Section 9.2).

As no CMP standards or impact thresholds have been established for these modes, Lead Agencies may opt to include this analysis in the TIA for informational purposes only. However, if the bicycle, pedestrian and/or transit analysis shows that the project would degrade conditions for one or more of these modes, the Lead Agency is encouraged to identify improvements that would reduce the effects. Improvements may include, but are not limited to:

- Providing or improving sidewalks, providing pedestrian crossing facilities or pedestrian wayfinding systems, or modifying intersections to shorten crossing distances (e.g., by installing curb extensions);
- Providing additional bicycle lane markings at intersections, bicycle signage, and/or increasing bicycle lane widths;
- Modifying signal timing and/or signal equipment for bicyclists and pedestrians;
- Adding a queue jump lane or bulb-out transit stop to address a congestion effect on transit travel speed;
- Contributing to the implementation of Transit Signal Priority\(^{28}\) to address a congestion effect on transit travel speed.

Some improvements to address congestion effects on transit travel speed may be feasible to implement on a case-by-case basis, such as queue jump lanes and bulb-out transit stops, while some measures that would require closer coordination with VTA to determine whether an applicable project exists, such as transit priority signal timing and dedicated transit lanes. In all cases, the Lead Agency should consult with VTA to determine the feasibility of any improvement.

If the TIA includes queueing analysis (see Section 9.1.2) and finds that freeway ramp spillback will occur, potential improvements include additional lanes (either HOV or mixed-flow) on ramps, or restriping. If the Lead Agency proposes a change to freeway ramps, including ramp metering flow rates, it should consult Caltrans. If the queueing analysis finds that spillback will occur at intersections, potential improvements include lengthening turn pockets, restriping, or changes to signal operations.

---

\(^{28}\) VTA will coordinate with the Lead Agency before implementing Transit Signal Priority.
Chapter 11. Future Year Scenarios (Cumulative Conditions)

This chapter provides guidance for future year (Cumulative Conditions) scenario analysis for CMP purposes. In general, the Cumulative Conditions scenario is analyzed as the combination of Background Conditions (Existing Conditions + Approved Projects) + Expected Growth + Project.

Lead Agencies should note that future year/Cumulative Conditions scenarios may be defined differently for CEQA documents than for TIAs. The analysis method that shall be used for preparing a Cumulative Conditions Scenario in a TIA depends on the type of project under development or planning effort underway, as well as the time horizon. Analysis methods for preparing a TIA for near-term development projects, long-term development projects and long-term general planning efforts are presented in this chapter. Definitions for terms used in this chapter are provided in Appendix L.

11.1 Near-Term Development Project (occupancy within 5 years of approval)

Near-term development projects include most development projects encountered by local agencies as part of their day-to-day operations. The development proposal for a near-term project, when approved, will generally result in the granting of an entitlement for the construction of a specific type and size development. A near-term project will usually be built and occupied within five years of project approval.

The TIA Guidelines must be followed to analyze transportation impacts associated with near-term specific development projects. For near-term development projects, Lead Agencies may use two cumulative analysis scenarios for planning and information purposes: Opening Year/Short-Term and Long-Term.

11.1.1 Opening Year/Short-Term Analysis

The opening year/short-term Cumulative Conditions analysis of a near-term development project shall consist of an analysis of growth expected until the project is available for final occupancy. The Lead Agency shall be responsible for determining the approach for calculating Expected Growth. Expected Growth can be estimated in three ways:

a. Apply an annual growth rate to Background Conditions;

b. Estimate trips generated by other proposed development projects in the area; or

c. Apply an annual growth rate and estimate trips generated by other proposed development projects in the area.

Data from the CMP Monitoring and Conformance Program can be used to estimate an annual traffic growth rate for near-term developments. If other proposed development projects are expected to generate more trips in the area than the estimated trips using a growth rate, then the Expected Growth should be based on method (b) or (c) above.
11.1.2 Long-Term Analysis

The Lead Agency may choose to conduct a long-term Cumulative Conditions analysis (e.g., over a 20 or 25-year time horizon) for CEQA or local purposes. The Lead Agency shall be responsible for determining the approach for calculating Expected Growth. In this case, Expected Growth is typically analyzed in one of two ways:

a. Apply an annual growth rate to Background Conditions; or
b. Use information from a travel demand forecasting model for the Expected Growth in the horizon year.

11.2 Long-Term Development Project (occupancy beyond five years from approval)

Long-term development projects include those that have a specific development proposal that is expected to be built and occupied in more than five years from the date of approval. Due to this project completion time, most long-term development projects are phased-development projects. The following describes the analysis approach for a long-term project with full entitlement and a long-term project with phased entitlement:

- **Entire Project Granted Full Entitlement:** If the entire long-term project is to receive development entitlement, the *TIA Guidelines* must be followed to analyze transportation impacts associated with the entire long-term project. This analysis shall set the likely magnitude of mitigations required of the developer.

- **Phased Project with Phased Entitlement:** The approach to assessing the effects of a long-term project where development entitlement will be phased consists of initially completing a long-term analysis for the entire project at buildout. This analysis shall set the likely magnitude of mitigations required of the developer. This may require the use of a transportation demand model to assist in estimating traffic volumes or travel patterns and conduct the analysis for the buildout scenario. The approach also consists of following the *TIA Guidelines* to analyze transportation impacts for each phase of the project.

With the analysis of each subsequent project phase after the first phase, the long-term analysis for the entire project at buildout shall be re-evaluated. If conditions have not changed, the initial mitigation measures for buildout conditions would remain valid. If conditions have changed, a revised set of mitigation measures for buildout conditions would be developed. The advantage of this approach is that it is unlikely that there will be significant unanticipated transportation impacts of the project that the Member Agency itself will need to mitigate.

Use of the countywide transportation model developed and maintained by VTA or a local transportation sub-model may be appropriate for the analyses of long-term development projects. Refer to Section 5.3 for more information on modeling procedures and consistency.
11.3 Long-Term General Planning Efforts

Long-term general planning efforts typically include General Plan Amendments, General Plan updates, Precise Plans and Specific Plans, which grant no entitlements for any specific development project. In many cases, preparation of these planning efforts will require environmental review, which will consider transportation. As long as a transportation analysis is being completed, VTA recommends that the analysis be consistent with the TIA Guidelines to the extent possible.

Use of the countywide transportation model developed and maintained by VTA may be appropriate for the analyses of long-term general planning efforts. Refer to Section 5.3 for more information on modeling procedures and consistency.

In many cases, the transportation analysis for a long-term general planning effort may produce freeway and arterial volumes, but there may not be enough data to perform detailed intersection-level analyses. The analysis of intersection turning movements as part of a long-term general planning effort analysis should recognize the difficulty in predicting specific travel patterns within a long-term planning horizon. The Lead Agency may wish to supplement the analysis with other, broader measures, such as percent of congested lane-miles, Vehicle Miles Traveled, changes in mode share, and/or measures of network connectivity and distance to destinations for pedestrians and bicyclists.
PART IV. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Chapter 12. Special Project Types

12.1 Large or Unique Projects

Lead Agencies that are evaluating large or unique development projects such as arenas, stadiums, large scale mixed-use developments, and large Transit-Oriented Developments (TODs), should facilitate early coordination with the agencies whose jurisdictions will be affected by the projected increased vehicle and person trips by using the TIA Notification Form. Examples of transportation related areas that may require early coordination are trip assignment and trip distribution, assessment of approved projects for the Background Conditions, and assumptions that may be used to identify mitigation measures and improvements.

12.2 Projects on a Jurisdiction Border

Similar to the early coordination process recommended for large or unique projects, a Lead Agency evaluating a development project that is located near or on the city or county border and projected to generate 100 or more net new peak hour trips, should coordinate with the adjacent jurisdiction(s) to discuss transportation related issues such as assessment of existing conditions, trip assignment, trip distribution, and mitigation measures and improvements as appropriate.

12.3 Multi-Agency Projects

For projects that extend in multiple jurisdictions such as shopping centers or large developments, the Lead Agency should facilitate early coordination with the participating agencies. Examples of transportation-related areas that may require early coordination are assessment of approved projects for Background Conditions, assumptions for the travel demand model, and feasibility of and responsibility for mitigations.

12.4 Projects Generating Large Numbers of Pedestrian, Bicycle or Transit Trips

For projects that generate unusually large volumes of pedestrian, bicycle or transit trips, it may be necessary to include a quantitative analysis of demand and capacity for these modes. Examples of typical land uses that may require a pedestrian, bicycle or transit capacity analysis are arenas and stadiums, special event sites, large mixed-use developments and TODs, and schools.

The transit capacity analysis should consider the existing ridership and load factors of transit routes near the proposed project, which can be obtained by consulting with VTA and other transit operators that may be affected (e.g. Caltrain, ACE, etc.). If the new transit ridership generated by the project causes the load factor of one or more transit routes to exceed the standard established by the applicable transit agency, the project should contribute to transit improvements to enhance the capacity of the affected route or provide alternative facilities.
Projects that generate unusually large pedestrian or bicycle volumes should consider the effects of those volumes on pedestrian or bicycle facilities. VTA recommends using a methodology that accounts for pedestrian and bicycle capacity, spacing, and conflicts, such as the Highway Capacity Manual 2010 methodology (Chapters 16 and 23), or similar methodologies. If the additional bicycle or pedestrian volumes generated by the project would unreasonably degrade conditions on bicycle and pedestrian facilities, the project should contribute to improvements to the conditions of the affected facility or provide alternative facilities.

12.5 Transit Delay Analysis for Large Projects, General Plans and Areawide Plans

Large development projects, General Plans Amendments and General Plan updates, and area-wide plans should include a more extensive quantitative analysis of transit delay than the analysis discussed in Section 9.2. VTA recommends using travel demand model data, when available, to estimate transit delay on transit corridors within the project study area. If a travel demand model is not prepared for the project, VTA recommends that transit delay be analyzed based on the methodology discussed in Section 9.2.

If increased transit vehicle delay is found in this analysis, the Lead Agency should work with VTA to identify feasible transit priority measures near the affected facility and include contributions to any applicable projects that improve transit speed and reliability in the TIA. Refer to Section 10.2 for more information on improvements to address congestion effects on transit travel times.
APPENDIX A: Sample Freeway Analysis Tables
APPENDIX A:

Sample Freeway Analysis Tables

TABLE A-1:
SAMPLE OF FREEWAY ANALYSIS REQUIREMENT DETERMINATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freeway</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Peak Hour</th>
<th>Lanes</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Project Trips</th>
<th>&lt; 1%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Capitol to Tully</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6600</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Capitol to Tully</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6600</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway</td>
<td>Segment</td>
<td>Direction</td>
<td>Peak Hour</td>
<td>EXISTING</td>
<td>PROJECT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>Lanes</td>
<td>Average Speed</td>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>Density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Capitol to Tully</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Capitol to Tully</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Capitol to Tully</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Capitol to Tully</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Capitol to Tully</td>
<td>SB HOV</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Capitol to Tully</td>
<td>SB HOV</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Capitol to Tully</td>
<td>NB HOV</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Capitol to Tully</td>
<td>NB HOV</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: HOV lanes shall be analyzed if project trips are assigned to the HOV lane. See *TIA Guidelines* for details.
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APPENDIX B: TIA Notification Form
### Congestion Management Program
Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA)

**NOTIFICATION FORM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Lead Agency:</strong></th>
<th><strong>This form sent to:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Agency</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Name of Person(s)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>City of Campbell</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>City of Cupertino</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>City of Gilroy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>City of Los Altos</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Town of Los Altos Hills</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Town of Los Gatos</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>City of Milpitas</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>City of Monte Sereno</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>City of Morgan Hill</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>City of Mountain View</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>City of Palo Alto</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>City of San Jose</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>City of Santa Clara</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>City of Saratoga</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>City of Sunnyvale</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>County of Santa Clara</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                  | **Agency Contact:**     |
|                  | **Telephone:**          |
|                  | **Fax:**                |
|                  | **E-mail:**             |
|                  | **Developer:**          |
|                  | **Transportation Consultant:** |
|                  | **Form Prepared By:**   |
|                  | **Date:**               |

* SF=square feet; DU=dwelling units

**Note:** The Lead Agency is encouraged to submit the draft TIA work scope along with this form when circulating it to other agencies. Comments from interested agencies on the TIA scoping must be received by the Lead Agency within 15 calendar days of the mailing of this TIA Notification Form.
APPENDIX C: Auto Trip Reduction Statement
Introduction

The Auto Trip Reduction Statement is intended to provide a concise summary of automobile trip reduction efforts made by a project. It is intended only as a summary; any automobile trip reductions claimed for the development must be fully documented and justified in the TIA. Lead Agencies must complete an Auto Trip Reduction Statement for all TIAs and include the Statement in the TIA Executive Summary, whether or not trip reductions are claimed. Section 8.2 of the VTA TIA Guidelines describes three different approaches to auto trip reduction in TIAs.

The Auto Trip Reduction Statement must describe trip reductions claimed in the trip generation section of the TIA. It may also be used to describe additional trip reduction efforts undertaken in order to mitigate project impacts. A Lead Agency may choose to provide an initial Statement with the reductions that are used in the Project Conditions analysis, and a revised statement with the final reductions reflecting mitigation measures. Examples have been provided of Auto Trip Reduction Statements for typical projects using the Standard, Peer/Study-Based and Target-Based trip reduction approaches.

Brief Guidelines for filling out the Auto Trip Reduction Statement

**Project Auto Trip Generation** – Specify trip generation methodology (ITE or Other). If “Other” is selected, briefly describe methodology used. Refer to Section 8.1 for more information about trip generation methodologies.

**Auto Trip Reduction Approach** – Specify the approach taken in the TIA. See section 8.2 for further information about the three approaches.

**Standard Approach** – List any reductions claimed based on the Standard Reductions described in Table 1 of the TIA Guidelines. See Section 8.2.1 for further information.

**Peer/Study-Based Approach** – Document the project’s Peer/Study-Based approach to trip reduction, if applicable (see Section 8.2.3). This approach may be used to justify a trip reduction based on a project’s similarity to other projects with demonstrated trip reductions or a project occupant’s track record of reducing trips at other sites, or to provide additional justification for trip rates based on local data collection efforts. The “Basis of Reduction” box should note the starting point for the trip reduction claimed, whether starting from ITE auto trip generation rates based on square footage or number of units, or total person-trips based on employee/resident count. The “Total Reduction Claimed” box should also reference the starting point. Note that in some cases the “Total Reduction Claimed” box may not be applicable, depending on the methodology.

**Target-Based Approach** – Document the project’s Target-Based approach, if applicable (see Section 8.2.2). This approach may be taken when the project applicant has entered into an enforceable agreement with the Lead Agency that limits the number of automobile trips traveling to and from the project site. The “Description” should note the starting point for the trip reduction claimed, whether starting from ITE auto trip generation rates based on square footage or number of units, or total person-trips based on employee/resident count. The “Total Reduction Claimed” box should also reference the starting point. Note that in some cases the “Total Reduction Claimed” box may not be applicable, depending on the methodology.
# AUTO TRIP REDUCTION STATEMENT

**UPDATED: 8-12-2014**

## PROJECT INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant TIA Section:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Density:</th>
<th>D.U. / Acre</th>
<th>Floor Area Ratio (FAR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Located within 2000 feet walking distance of an LRT, BRT, BART or Caltrain station or major bus stop?</th>
<th>Y / N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## PROJECT AUTO TRIP GENERATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant TIA Section:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auto Trips Generated:</th>
<th>AM Pk Hr</th>
<th>PM Pk Hr</th>
<th>Total Weekday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology (check one)</th>
<th>□ ITE</th>
<th>□ Other (Please describe below)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Describe alternative trip generation methodology, if applicable.

## AUTO TRIP REDUCTION APPROACH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant TIA Section:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>□ Standard</th>
<th>□ Peer/Study-Based</th>
<th>□ Target-Based</th>
<th>□ None Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete Table A below</td>
<td>Complete Table B below</td>
<td>Complete Table C below</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## TRIP REDUCTION REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant TIA Section:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the project required to meet any trip reduction requirements or targets?</th>
<th>Y / N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If so, specify percent:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference code or requirement:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## TRIP REDUCTION APPROACHES

### A. STANDARD APPROACH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Reduction</th>
<th>Relevant TIA Section:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Mixed-Use</th>
<th>Financial Incentives</th>
<th>Shuttle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Reduction from ITE Rates</th>
<th>Total Trips Reduced (AM/PM/Daily)</th>
<th>TOTAL REDUCTION CLAIMED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Trips</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Specify AM, PM and/or Daily reduction | Specify AM, PM and/or Daily reduction |

### B. PEER/STUDY-BASED APPROACH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis of Reduction</th>
<th>Relevant TIA Section:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summarize basis of reduction, addressing:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Data used to justify trip reduction rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Source(s) referenced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assumptions and methodologies used to develop the trip reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How the trip reduction rate is appropriate for the proposed development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL REDUCTION CLAIMED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Specify AM, PM and/or Daily reduction | Specify AM, PM and/or Daily reduction |

---

Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines – Final Draft

8/29/14
### C. TARGET-BASED APPROACH

#### Type of Reduction (check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reduction Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>% Trip Reduction</th>
<th>% SOV mode share</th>
<th>Trip Cap</th>
<th>TOTAL REDUCTION CLAIMED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Trip Reduction</td>
<td>e.g., ITE auto trip generation rates based on square footage or number of units, total person-trips based on employee/resident count</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time period for reduction</th>
<th>Peak Hour</th>
<th>Peak Period</th>
<th>Full Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specify AM, PM or both</td>
<td>Specify AM, PM or both</td>
<td>Specify AM, PM or both</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### OTHER TDM/REDUCTION MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Y / N</th>
<th>Relevant TIA Section:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Management</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Planning and Design</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDM Program</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Bicycle/Pedestrian**: Describe any bicycle/pedestrian improvements related to the project. Note both infrastructure (improvements to sidewalks, bicycle facilities, etc.) and programs (subsidies, bike share, etc.).
- **Parking Management**: Describe any parking management strategies that would lead to reduced auto trips, such as parking pricing, parking cash-out, unbundled parking, etc.
- **Transit**: Describe any transit service or access improvements that would lead to reduced auto trips, such as improved pedestrian connections to transit, added shuttle service, etc.
- **Site Planning and Design**: Describe features of the site plan and design of the project that encourage walking, biking, and transit use, while discouraging solo automobile trips.
- **TDM Program**: Describe any other TDM program elements at the site, such as: carpool/vanpool programs, emergency ride home service, trip planning, on-site mobile services, etc.

#### IMPLEMENTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Relevant TIA Section:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>Describe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td>Describe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Sharing</td>
<td>Describe.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Standard Reduction Approach

## AUTO TRIP REDUCTION STATEMENT

**UPDATED: 8-12-2014**

### PROJECT INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project Name:</strong> Baytown Apartment Complex</th>
<th><strong>Relevant TIA Section:</strong> Chapter 2: Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong> Baytown, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong> Construct 250 apartment units on a 5-acre vacant site. Main complex entrance located 1,250 feet walking distance from Baytown Light Rail Station.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Size (net new):</strong> 250 D.U. Residential</th>
<th><strong>Density:</strong> 50 D.U. / Acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sq. Ft. Comm.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Floor Area Ratio (FAR)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Located within 2000 feet walking distance of an LRT, BRT, BART or Caltrain station or major bus stop? | Y |

### PROJECT AUTO TRIP GENERATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Auto Trips Generated:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Methodology (check one):</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>126 AM PK Hr</td>
<td>✓ ITE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**155 PM PK Hr**

| **1639 Total Weekday** |

Describe alternative trip generation methodology, if applicable

### AUTO TRIP REDUCTION APPROACH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Complete Table A below</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| **Complete Table B below** |

| **Complete Table C below** |

### TRIP REDUCTION REQUIREMENTS

Is the project required to meet any trip reduction requirements or targets?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>If so, specify percent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Reference code or requirement:

### TRIP REDUCTION APPROACHES

#### A. STANDARD APPROACH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Reduction</strong></th>
<th><strong>% Reduction from ITE Rates</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total Trips Reduced (AM/PM/Daily)</strong></th>
<th><strong>TOTAL REDUCTION CLAIMED</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>Proximity to LRT (within 2000 ft walk)</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>11/14/148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Incentives</td>
<td>Unbundled Parking</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>1/1/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuttle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. PEER/STUDY-BASED APPROACH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Basis of Reduction</strong></th>
<th><strong>TOTAL REDUCTION CLAIMED</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specify AM, PM and/or Daily reduction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summarize basis of reduction, addressing:

- Data used to justify trip reduction rate
- Source(s) referenced
- Assumptions and methodologies used to develop the trip reduction
- How the trip reduction rate is appropriate for the proposed development
### C. TARGET-BASED APPROACH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Reduction (check all that apply)</th>
<th>Relevant TIA Section:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ % Trip Reduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ % SOV mode share</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Trip Cap</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL REDUCTION CLAIMED</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specify AM, PM and/or Daily reduction</td>
<td>Specify AM, PM and/or Daily reduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Description
- e.g., ITE auto trip generation rates based on square footage or number of units, total person-trips based on employee/resident count

#### Time period for reduction
- Peak Hour: Specify AM, PM or both
- Peak Period: Specify AM, PM or both
- Full Day: Specify AM, PM or both

### OTHER TDM/REDUCTION MEASURES

#### Bicycle/Pedestrian
- Y
- Relevant TIA Section: Chapter 7: Multimodal Evaluation
- Description:
  - Fill sidewalk gaps on south side of project site
  - Pedestrian and bicycle crossing improvements at adjacent intersections: bicycle detector loops, high-visibility ladder crosswalks
  - Bicycle parking: 85 spaces in locked section of garage, 20 outdoor spaces near building entrances

#### Parking Management
- Y
- Relevant TIA Section: Chapter 9: TDM Plan
- Description:
  - Unbundled parking: First parking space included in rent, $300/month for second parking space

#### Transit
- N
- Relevant TIA Section:

#### Site Planning and Design
- Y
- Relevant TIA Section: Chapter 8: Site Access and Circulation
- Description:
  - Building entrance oriented to face street, with small public plaza
  - Mixed use pedestrian and bicycle paths within site to connect buildings

#### TDM Program
- Y
- Relevant TIA Section: Chapter 9: TDM Plan
- Description:
  - On-site transit and alternative travel information kiosk
  - Unbundled parking as noted above

### IMPLEMENTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant TIA Section:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Have the project sponsor and Lead Agency agreed to any of the following measures?

- ☐ Monitoring
- ☐ Enforcement
- ☐ Data Sharing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Describe.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Describe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### AUTO TRIP REDUCTION STATEMENT

**UPDATED: 8-12-2014**

#### PROJECT INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant TIA Section:</th>
<th>Chapter 2: Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Name:</strong> Technology Office Expansion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong> Techville, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong> Replace 1.4 Million SF of office space in one building with 1.5 Million SF of office in one building and 620 KSF of R&amp;D space in another building, on a 49-acre site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROJECT AUTO TRIP GENERATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant TIA Section:</th>
<th>Chapter 3: Trip Generation and Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auto Trips Generated:</strong></td>
<td>1,316 AM Pk Hr 1,358 PM Pk Hr 14,769 Total Weekday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methodology (check one):</strong></td>
<td>ITE Other (Please describe below)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Driveway counts at existing 1.4 Million sf office space were used to calculate per-employee trip rates. These rates were multiplied by net new employees projected for the new office space.

### AUTO TRIP REDUCTION APPROACH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant TIA Section:</th>
<th>Chapter 3: Trip Generation and Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard</strong></td>
<td>Complete Table A below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peer/Study-Based</strong></td>
<td>Complete Table B below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target-Based</strong></td>
<td>Complete Table C below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>None Taken</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TRIP REDUCTION REQUIREMENTS

| Relevant TIA Section: | |
|-----------------------| |
| **Is the project required to meet any trip reduction requirements or targets?** | N |
| **If so, specify percent:** | Reference code or requirement: |

### TRIP REDUCTION APPROACHES

#### A. STANDARD APPROACH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Reduction</th>
<th>% Reduction from ITE Rates</th>
<th>Total Trips Reduced (AM/PM/Daily)</th>
<th>TOTAL REDUCTION CLAIMED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Specified in ITE Guidelines</td>
<td>% Trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use</td>
<td></td>
<td>Specified in ITE Guidelines</td>
<td>% Trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Incentives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Specified in ITE Guidelines</td>
<td>% Trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuttle</td>
<td></td>
<td>Specified in ITE Guidelines</td>
<td>% Trips</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### B. PEER/STUDY-BASED APPROACH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis of Reduction</th>
<th>TOTAL REDUCTION CLAIMED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trip generation studies were conducted at the existing campus. The rates used in the TIA are based on number of employees rather than building square footage and assume that Technology Employer’s existing TDM program will be expanded to the expanded campus.</td>
<td>% Trips</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 30% non-SOV mode share for all AM and PM peak hour trips | % Trips |
## Peer/Study-Based Reduction Approach

### C. Target-Based Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Reduction (check all that apply)</th>
<th>TOTAL REDUCTION CLAIMED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Trip Reduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% SOV mode share</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trip Cap</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Specify AM, PM and/or Daily reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e.g., ITE auto trip generation rates based on square footage or number of units, total person-trips based on employee/resident count</td>
<td>Specify AM, PM and/or Daily reduction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time period for reduction</th>
<th>Peak Hour</th>
<th>Peak Period</th>
<th>Full Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specify AM, PM or both</td>
<td></td>
<td>Specify AM, PM or both</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other TDM/Reduction Measures

#### Bicycle/Pedestrian
- Y

**Relevant TIA Section:** Chapter 9: Multimodal Evaluation
- Improve off-campus bicycle facilities: Connect bicycle lanes on Woodland Lane to campus main entrance
- Construct curb extensions at intersection of Woodland Lane and Techville Avenue (at corner of site) to shorten pedestrian crossing distance
- Bike lockers (275) in parking garage, 75 short-term bicycle parking spaces outside main entrance

#### Parking Management
- N

**Relevant TIA Section:**
- Describe any parking management strategies that would lead to reduced auto trips, such as parking pricing, parking cash-out, unbundled parking, etc.

#### Transit
- Y

**Relevant TIA Section:** Chapter 9: Multimodal Evaluation
- Long-distance private commuter shuttles
- Financial contribution to shuttle service to nearest Caltrain station (Downtown Techville)
- Transit subsidy for commuters: VTA Eco Pass and Caltrain Go Pass provided at no cost on ongoing basis

#### Site Planning and Design
- Y

**Relevant TIA Section:** Chapter 10: Site Access and Circulation
- Parking located far from work areas to discourage driving for commuting
- Long-distance commuter shuttle and Caltrain shuttle pick-up and drop-off at main building entrance

#### TDM Program
- Y

**Relevant TIA Section:** Chapter 11: TDM Plan
- Carpool matching service provided to all employees
- Flexible work schedules and telecommuting encouraged as company policy
- On-site amenities (free cafeteria, coffee stand, dry cleaning pick-up and drop-off)

### Implementation

**Have the project sponsor and Lead Agency agreed to any of the following measures?**

- ✓ Monitoring
  - Annual monitoring via driveway surveys and employee TDM surveys will be conducted by outside consultants and reported to City of Techville.

- □ Enforcement

- ✓ Data Sharing
  - City of Techville will share annual monitoring reports with VTA after staff approval of reports.
## AUTO TRIP REDUCTION STATEMENT

**Target-Based Reduction Approach**

**PROJECT INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Large Company Campus Expansion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Treeview, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Redevelop 9 acre site into two office buildings totalling 470,000 sf of office with structured parking, to replace four existing buildings totalling 123,000 sf of office space and surface parking, resulting in 347,000 sf of net new growth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Size (net new):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D.U. Residential</th>
<th>347,000 Sq. Ft. Comm.</th>
<th>Acres (Gr.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Density:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D.U. / Acre</th>
<th>1.2 Floor Area Ratio (FAR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### PROJECT AUTO TRIP GENERATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auto Trips Generated</th>
<th>507 AM Pk Hr</th>
<th>467 PM Pk Hr</th>
<th>3,477 Total Weekday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Methodology (check one)

- ✓ITE
- ☐ Other (Please describe below)

### TRIP REDUCTION APPROACHES

#### A. STANDARD APPROACH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Reduction</th>
<th>% Reduction from ITE Rates</th>
<th>Total Trips Reduced (AM/PM/Daily)</th>
<th>TOTAL REDUCTION CLAIMED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Incentives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuttle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### B. PEER/STUDY-BASED APPROACH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis of Reduction</th>
<th>TOTAL REDUCTION CLAIMED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TRIP REDUCTION REQUIREMENTS

- Is the project required to meet any trip reduction requirements or targets? **Y**
  - Daily - 20%
  - Peak Hour - 30%
- Reference code or requirement: Treeview Business Park Specific Plan (2013)
### C. TARGET-BASED APPROACH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Reduction (check all that apply)</th>
<th>TOTAL REDUCTION CLAIMED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ % Trip Reduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ % SOV mode share</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Trip Cap</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description**

Target reduction based on ITE trip generation estimates for Large Company site. Reduction taken in compliance with Treeview Business Park Specific Plan (2013).

**Time period for reduction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peak Hour</th>
<th>Peak Period</th>
<th>Full Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER TDM/REDUCTION MEASURES

**Bicycle/Pedestrian**

- Improving project's street frontage with wider sidewalks and landscape buffer with street trees to help offset effect of increased auto traffic
- Bike lockers (58), showers (2), pumps and tools provided in bicycle center (Building A), plus mobile bicycle repair services 1x/week
- Free bike share program for employees traveling between buildings and within Treeview Business Park

**Parking Management**

- Vanpool service provided to all employees
- FreeCaltrain and VTA passes provided to employees on an ongoing basis

**Site Planning and Design**

- Multi-use paths between buildings designed to encourage bicycle and pedestrian travel on campus

**TDM Program**

- Carpool matching provided for all employees
- Telecommuting encouraged
- Guaranteed ride home program

### IMPLEMENTATION

**Have the project sponsor and Lead Agency agreed to any of the following measures?**

- ✓ Monitoring
  Monitoring agreement with City of Treeview: quarterly trip generation monitoring via driveway counts for first two years of full occupancy; annual monitoring thereafter.

- ✓ Enforcement
  City of Treeview will assess a $1000 per-trip fee for vehicle trips that exceed peak hour or daily trip generation estimated in TIA.

- ✓ Data Sharing
  Monitoring reports will be made available to VTA after City of Treeview staff approval.
APPENDIX D: Alternative Trip Generation Resources
Introduction

Chapter 8 of the TIA Guidelines presents several trip generation methodologies that may be appropriate for development projects in Santa Clara County. Typically, Lead Agencies rely on trip generation rates published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). In some cases, however, the published ITE trip generation rates are based on very limited data. There are at least four cases in which the Lead Agency should consider using alternative sources for trip generation rates:

- When ITE data is insufficient (e.g. small sample size, not statistically valid);
- When a project’s specific land use is not covered by the ITE manual or is known to show trip generation characteristics that differ from the categories covered in the ITE manual;
- When the land use context, such as high-density infill or development adjacent to transit, is not addressed by the ITE manual;
- When the project includes a mix of land uses (mixed-use development type).

Professional judgment should always be used when selecting a trip generation methodology. When using trip rates from any of the alternate trip generation methodologies identified in Chapter 8 and in this appendix, the Lead Agency shall include in the TIA report a full description of the trip generation methodology used and a summary of all inputs and assumptions.

This appendix includes information on the research and practice basis of several alternative trip generation methodologies identified in the TIA Guidelines. Table D-1, next page, provides an overview of trip generation methods and tools identified in the TIA Guidelines. The following pages present profiles that may be helpful to Lead Agencies selecting between methodologies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool/Method</th>
<th>Tool Type</th>
<th>Project Type/Context</th>
<th>Validation Locations</th>
<th>Level of Effort</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of San José</td>
<td>Rate Table and Guidelines</td>
<td>Typically used for projects in San Jose</td>
<td>National, San Diego, Other</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>For alternative rates, seek approval from City of San Jose staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCHRP 684</td>
<td>Spreadsheet tool</td>
<td>Mixed use developments</td>
<td>Georgia and Texas</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>• Internal trip capture</td>
<td>Recommended for developments of up to 300 acres; not recommended for larger developments, suburban activity centers or new towns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA MXD</td>
<td>Spreadsheet tool</td>
<td>Mixed use developments</td>
<td>National with a California emphasis</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>• Internal trip capture</td>
<td>Sensitive to 7D’s (land use characteristics); combined MXD/NCHRP 684 model has been adapted for use in several TIAs in Santa Clara County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDAG MXD</td>
<td>Trip Generation table with Spreadsheet tool</td>
<td>Site within a Priority Development Area</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>• Internal trip capture</td>
<td>This was developed for “Smart Growth Opportunity Areas” in San Diego, but is considered appropriate for use in the Priority Development Areas in Santa Clara County.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# TABLE D-1: SUMMARY OF TRIP GENERATION METHODOLOGIES AND TOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool/Method</th>
<th>Tool Type</th>
<th>Project Type/Context</th>
<th>Validation Locations</th>
<th>Level of Effort</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CalEEMod</td>
<td>Model with option to adjust rates</td>
<td>Air quality analysis for any site</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Med.</td>
<td>• Criteria pollutant and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions</td>
<td>Required by BAAQMD for air quality analysis. Not recommended as primary source for trip generation, but may be useful as supplemental resource for justification of trip reductions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTC STARS</td>
<td>Mode share tables</td>
<td>Site within 1/2 to 1 mile of rail or ferry stops</td>
<td>San Francisco Bay Area</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>May be a resource to help justify a reduction in trip generation rates based on non-auto mode share data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans/UC Davis</td>
<td>Spreadsheet tool</td>
<td>Single use sites within smart growth areas</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>• Reduction to ITE rate • Adjustment can be applied to AM peak, PM peak, and Daily rates</td>
<td>For use only with a single land use that is part of a multi-use site, and only at sites located in smart-growth areas. Other limitations may apply – see documentation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methodology Profiles

City of San José Trip Generation Rates

The City of San Jose maintains a Traffic Impact Analysis Handbook which includes a set of trip generation rates based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation report, San Diego Traffic Generators, data from other agencies and publications, reports and estimates. ITE rates and rates obtained through surveys of similar land uses may also be used when appropriate. The trip generation rates provided in the tables do not account for mixed use environments or proximity to transit, however the City of San Jose TIA Guidelines allow for standard reductions to trip generation using the VTA methodology included in VTA TIA Guidelines. The City of San Jose has final authority to approve the trip generation rates used in the TIA analysis.


NCHRP 684 – Enhancing Internal Trip Capture Rate for Mixed-Use Development

The National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) Report 684, Enhancing Internal Trip Capture Estimation for Mixed-Use Developments, analyzed the internal-capture relationships of mixed use sites and examined the travel interactions among six individual types of land uses: office, retail, restaurant, residential, cinema, and hotel. The study looked at three master-planned developments in Georgia and Texas to ascertain the interactions among these six land use types within each of the sites. The study considered site context factors and described percentage reductions in site-wide traffic generation that might result from the availability of transit service and other factors. Researchers then verified analysis results by comparing them to trip generation for three earlier ITE studies at Florida mixed use sites. The validation confirmed that the estimated values were a reasonable match for observed traffic. The interaction percentages among the land use types are then used to discount ITE trip-generation rates by the number of trips that would remain internal to the project site due to the presence of multiple land uses.

The tool provides peak period trips and requires the user to input mode split, vehicle occupancy by land use, and distance between land uses. Researchers recommend its use for developments of up to 300 acres, but do not recommend use of this method for larger developments, suburban activity centers or new town types of development. This method could be used for mixed-use developments in an urban context, including station area plans or transit oriented developments. Recently findings from this study and the MXD tool developed by EPA were combined into one comprehensive tool – MXD+. (See below.)


MXD Model – US EPA
This spreadsheet tool is based on a robust national sample of 239 mixed-use developments in six metro areas and has been validated at 40 sites, mostly in California. The tool applies elasticities for transportation behavior response to land-use variables from peer-reviewed literature. It is sensitive to 7 “D’s” factors: density, diversity, design, distance from transit, destination accessibility, development scale, and demographics. More recently, a tool has been developed that combines the EPA MXD model with the National Cooperative Highway Research Program Report 684 (see above). The combined EPA/NCHRP MXD model has been adapted for use in several transportation impact analysis studies in Santa Clara County, including the Apple Campus II EIR, the Lawrence Station Area Plan for the City of Sunnyvale, as well as a number of impact analysis projects in other Bay Area counties.


SANDAG Traffic Generation Manual & Trip Generation for Smart Growth
The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) published the San Diego Traffic Generators Manual in 2000, which includes trip generation rates based on traffic counts collected at four to seven sites for each land use category provided within the manual. In 2010, SANDAG released Trip Generation for Smart Growth: Planning Tools for the San Diego Region as a supplement to the manual in order to provided reductions for mixed use that accounted for the specific context of a site.

The study resulted in a spreadsheet tool which is based on the MXD tool developed for EPA (see above), but modified for use by SANDAG. The study validated the MXD tool for use within the San Diego region by comparing the method’s trip generation estimates to actual travel data from twenty of the region’s Smart Growth Opportunity Areas (SGOAs) and six smaller mixed-use/transit-oriented development (TOD) sites. Travel data for a representative group of SGOAs was compiled from the SANDAG 2006 Regional Household Travel Behavior Survey and 24 hour counts were conducted for use in the study. Based on observed data, the MXD tool was an excellent predictor of external vehicle trips generated by smart growth development. SANDAG’s SGOAs are similar to Priority Development Areas (PDAs) as planned for in the San
Francisco Bay Area’s Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy, or *One Bay Area* Plan. This tool could be useful for developments within PDAs as it has been refined for this type of focused growth.

  

**CalEEMod – CAPCOA/BAAQMD**

The California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) was released by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) and is used by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) for determining air quality conformity. The tool calculates vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) in order to estimate air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions arising from development. ITE *Trip Generation* (8th Edition) trip generation rates are used as default in the program, although users have the option to manually add rates. Trip types are broken down by residential and commercial trips. Residential trips include home-work, home-shopping and home-other trips. The trip type breakdown is from the 1999 Caltrans Statewide Travel Survey; however, users can overwrite these inputs if sufficient justification for alternative sources of data (e.g., project-specific traffic study) can be provided. The tool also identifies a number of mitigation measures that can be chosen by the user, such as changes to land use, parking policies, transportation systems management and transportation demand management that can be used to reduce the resulting VMT. It should be noted, however, that the CalEEMod trip model does not produce detailed trip generation estimates or output reductions to vehicle trips, but rather reductions to VMT. The tool may be therefore be most appropriate for analyses that primarily examine VMT rather than peak-hour trip generation.


**Station Area Resident Survey – MTC**

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Station Area Residents Survey (STARS) was conducted in 2006. It characterizes the demographic and travel characteristics of transit station area residents in the San Francisco Bay Area. A GIS analysis was conducted using county-level results from the 2000 *Bay Area Travel Survey* to group residents based on population density and their proximity to rail or ferry stations. MTC’s website provides tables showing mode split by population densities and proximity to rail and ferry stops. The STARS tables can be used to help justify a reduction in trip generation rates based on actual survey data for Santa Clara County that shows residents near transit have higher non-auto mode share splits.

  

  
California Smart Growth Trip Generation Tool – Caltrans/UC Davis

This spreadsheet tool provides ITE rate adjustment factors based on a database of vehicle trip counts and site/context data for a sample of 50 smart growth sites in California. The tool can be used for daily or peak rates. The tool was validated at 11 mixed-use sites for the AM peak period and 13 mixed-use sites for the PM peak period. Rates are based on density, land use mixture, regional location, transit service, and parking. The research team defined specific criteria that should be met in order to apply the model, which can be found in the California Smart-Growth Trip Generation Rates Study report cited below. Resulting models are only appropriate for analysis for a single land use that is part of a multi-use site, and only at sites located in smart-growth areas. (UCSD, 2013 p. 10) For example, for residential development analysis, the input for the tool is the number of dwelling units for an entire residential-only site or targeted residential use within a multi-use building or multi-use site.

APPENDIX E: ITE Methodology for Applying Pass-By and Diverted Linked Trip Reductions
ITE Methodology for Applying Pass-by and Diverted Linked Trip Reductions

The Institute of Transportation Engineers methodology for applying pass-by and diverted linked trip reductions should be used in TIAs and is summarized below.¹

1. Obtain peak hour traffic volumes passing the project site driveway(s) in both directions for a two-way street or the travel direction on a one-way street.

2. Obtain driveway volumes entering and exiting the site. The driveway volumes are determined from the project size and trip rates.

3. For each driveway, calculate the number of pass-by and diverted linked trips by multiplying the total number of project trips by the appropriate reduction percentage. (Other methods may be used to determine the reduction. See Chapter VII of ITE’s *Trip Generation* report.) Note that reductions for pass-by trips often differ from those for diverted linked trips.

4. Determine the trip distribution on roadways adjacent to the site for pass-by trips, and determine the trip distribution on roadways that would be used by diverted linked trips.

5. Determine pass-by and diverted linked trip distribution based on the volume of traffic passing the driveway in both directions.

6. Assign pass-by and diverted linked trip volumes to the driveway based on the distributions calculated in Step 5 above. These trips should also be analyzed on the street system to accurately reflect the turning movements necessary to access the site.

Figure C-1 illustrates the application of the pass-by trip methodology. Diverted linked trips are not included in this example but should be analyzed in TIAs. In Figure C-1, the 50 pass-by trips should be examined in the context of the turning movements already handled by existing facilities. For example, can the existing left turn pockets and/or signal timing accommodate the eight additional U-turns added by the project?

Figure C-1: Application of Pass-by Trips

(Note: Diverted linked trips are not included in this example but should be analyzed in TIAs.)
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APPENDIX F: Transit Delay Analysis Resources
Introduction
To provide a more meaningful and relevant analysis of project effects on transit service, the 2014 TIA Guidelines shifted a portion of the transit analysis requirements from a capacity-based to a delay-based approach for most projects. The TIA Guidelines require basic analysis of project effects on transit vehicle delay and on transit access and facilities near the project site. For large or unique projects that are likely to generate high numbers of transit trips, the Guidelines recommend a transit capacity analysis as well as the delay analysis. The following section provides additional information on the research and professional practice basis of the transit delay analysis requirement.

Transit Delay Analysis Overview and Methodology
Current research thoroughly documents the impacts of roadway congestion on transit performance. Traffic congestion has negative impacts on bus travel time and service reliability (McKnight et al. 2003) (Perk et al. 2008). This congestion also leads to higher operational costs for the transit provider due to more vehicle hours in service for the transit vehicle (McKnight et al. 2003).

To date, some Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) reports in Santa Clara County have examined transit delay as part of the analysis of a proposed land use development or general planning effort.

The Apple Campus II TIA (2013) examines transit delay due to increased traffic from the proposed development. The TIA found that project traffic will result in increased congestion at intersections, which will increase travel time for transit vehicles. The project is also likely to indirectly increase transit ridership. This is due to the conversion of current auto trips in the project area to transit trips to avoid increased roadway congestion. Near the project site, this will affect bus routes traveling in the vicinity. To mitigate this impact, the TIA proposed improving amenities at bus stops near the project site by adding elements such as shelters, benches, and lighting.

The San Antonio Village Phase II TIA (2014) also examines transit delay due to increased traffic from future development. The TIA found that the project will increase congestion on the surrounding roadway network, which will also increase travel time for transit vehicles. Intersection capacity improvements are proposed to mitigate impacts due to project traffic; these capacity improvements will also benefit transit vehicles. Transportation Demand Management (TDM) policies for the project will also reduce the number of trips during the peak hour, which will further reduce impacts due to project traffic on the roadway network used by transit.

In addition to being evaluated in published TIA reports, transit delay analysis is required or encouraged in several technical guidelines and policy documents in the San Francisco Bay Area, notably Alameda County TIA Technical Guidelines and the City of San Jose’s General Plan. The Alameda County Transportation Commission has a requirement for analyzing transit delay as part of its 2013 Congestion Management Program TIA Technical Guidelines. This requirement states that “The analysis should evaluate if vehicle trips generated by the project will
cause congestion that degrades transit vehicle operations. Analysis may be qualitative and may
be based on auto traffic circulation analysis.”

The Envision San Jose 2040 Plan, published by the City of San Jose in 2011, is a General Plan
for development and smart growth in the City. The plan provides goals and policies for many
different aspects of development, including land use and transportation. In the Environmental
Impact Report for the plan, the City analyzed the effects of future proposed growth in the plan on
transit travel times and speeds along 14 key corridors, referred to as “Grand Boulevards.” These
key corridors connect city neighborhoods and serve as primary routes for public transit vehicles.
Transit vehicles are given priority in the roadway design over automobiles, trucks, and other
vehicles. The plan also details what transit impacts would be considered significant, including
when they would:

- Disrupt existing, or interfere with planned transit services or facilities;
- Cause the average speed on a transit priority corridor (referred to as a Grand Boulevard in
  the General Plan Update’s Draft Circulation Element) to drop below 15 mph or decrease
  by 25% or more during the AM peak hour; or.
- Cause a transit priority corridor with an existing average speed below 15 mph to decrease
  by one mph or more during the AM peak hour.

A TIA in the City of San Jose could implement these policies by evaluating delay to transit
vehicles as a result of project-related congestion.
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APPENDIX G: Pedestrian and Bicycle Quality of Service Analysis

Resources
Introduction
To provide a more meaningful and relevant analysis of project effects on pedestrian and bicycle conditions, the 2014 *TIA Guidelines* shifted a portion of the pedestrian and bicycle analysis requirements from a capacity-based to a Quality of Service (QOS)-based approach for most projects. For large or unique projects that are likely to generate high numbers of pedestrian or bicycle trips, the *Guidelines* recommend a capacity analysis as well as the QOS analysis.

For additional detail on bicycle and pedestrian analysis, refer to Chapter 5, Section 9.3 and Chapter 12 of the VTA *TIA Guidelines*. The following section provides additional information on the research and professional practice basis of the pedestrian and bicycle QOS analysis requirement.

This appendix provides selected QOS methodologies that TIA preparers may find useful for evaluating bicycle and pedestrian conditions. This summary is adapted from materials prepared by Fehr & Peers in their *MMLOS Toolkit*.

At a minimum, methodologies used to evaluate bicycle and pedestrian QOS should:
- Directly address bicycling and/or walking
- Measure factors that can be addressed by project sponsors and/or Lead Agencies (such as sidewalk widths, presence of bicycle lanes, signal operations, etc.)
- Be readily adaptable for use in Santa Clara County

VTA has not evaluated all of these methodologies in depth and does not recommend one methodology over another. The methodologies described below address different priorities and some may be more appropriate than others for specific projects. In some cases, the TIA preparer may need to calibrate or otherwise adapt a methodology to better reflect local conditions. Quality of Service methodologies continue to be developed, and other methodologies not included in this appendix may be more appropriate than those included in the appendix, depending on the nature of the project. Over time, VTA and its Member Agencies may revisit these methodologies and provide further guidelines for TIA preparers. Therefore, professional judgment should be applied when selecting a QOS methodology for TIA.

Table G-1, next page, summarizes major features of the methodologies presented in this appendix.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Analysis Level</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Data Required</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Bicycle and Pedestrian LOS</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>General Plan</td>
<td>Pedestrian Bicycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Segment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian/Bicycle Environmental Quality Index</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Traffic Stress</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This methodology is appropriate for General Plan-level goal setting, but evaluating an entire street network would involve a substantial effort.
Research and Practice Basis of QOS Methodologies

Several bicycle and pedestrian quality of service (QOS) methodologies have been developed to measure how well transportation infrastructure and streetscape features support bicycling and walking. The VTA TIA Guidelines identify several QOS methodologies that could be used in TIAs in Santa Clara County. This section describes the research and professional practice basis for these methodologies.

Numerous recent research studies have shown that the built environment has a substantial effect on travel behavior, particularly walking and bicycling. Access to destinations and a well-connected street network correlate to higher levels of walking and bicycling (Ewing and Cervero 2010; Saelens et al. 2003). Infrastructure design is also tied to walking and bicycling. People are more likely to walk where sidewalks are present (Saelens and Handy 2008), to prefer walking on wide sidewalks with landscaping separating them from vehicle traffic, and to feel more comfortable at intersections with short crossing distances (Transportation Research Board, 2008). People also prefer to ride bicycles in dedicated lanes and on low-traffic streets (Buehler and Pucher 2012; Broach et al. 2012).

References


Pedestrian and Bicycle Environmental Quality Indices (PEQI and BEQI)
The San Francisco Department of Public Health developed the Pedestrian Environmental Quality Index (PEQI) and Bicycle Environmental Quality Index (BEQI) based on reviews of existing literature and with input from bicycle and pedestrian experts, advocates and facility users. To develop the PEQI, researchers conducted a literature review to identify specific indicators of pedestrian quality of service, such as vehicle speeds and sidewalk widths. These indicators were then assigned weights based on results from surveys of transportation experts and pedestrian
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advocates. The BEQI was developed using a similar two-part process: first identifying indicators of bicycle quality of service, such as bicycle lane width and pavement quality, and then weighting those indicators based on surveys of experts, advocates and local bicyclists. Site assessments are conducted via a walking audit and checklist; this data can be collected using an Android smart phone application and integrated into a GIS database. The PEQI has been used for community planning and health assessment projects in San Francisco, Los Angeles, Denver and Massachusetts. The BEQI has been used primarily in San Francisco.


Charlotte Pedestrian and Bicycle LOS
In 2007 the City of Charlotte, North Carolina, developed a methodology to assess design features that impact pedestrians and bicyclists crossing signalized intersections. The methodology was developed with input from several professional standards documents published by the Federal Highway Administration, the Institute of Transportation Engineers, Florida DOT and the City of Portland. Developers also consulted with local government staff and transportation consultants when identifying and ranking variables. These variables were compiled into two intersection scoring tools that grade intersections from A to F for pedestrian and bicycle travel. The City of Charlotte uses these tools to evaluate proposed intersection improvements. If automobile-oriented improvements would degrade pedestrian and bicycle conditions, alternative improvements or capacity enhancements are considered.


HCM 2010 Bicycle and Pedestrian Level of Service
The Highway Capacity Manual 2010 (HCM 2010) is published by the Transportation Research Board (TRB) of the National Research Council, the preeminent transportation research organization in the United States. HCM 2010 bicycle and pedestrian evaluation methodologies were developed via a user-focused research effort that built on two decades of prior research on bicycle and pedestrian level of service. Researchers conducted a literature review and pilot tests to determine which factors in the bicycling and pedestrian environments are most important to street users. Locations that represented a mix of these factors were identified in Tampa, Florida (bicycle and pedestrian modes) and San Francisco (pedestrian only). At these locations, video footage was collected showing street segments and intersections from bicyclist and pedestrian points of view. Over one hundred survey participants in four cities around the United States then ranked video clips from A (excellent quality of service) to F (extremely poor quality of service). Regression models were developed to determine which variables had the greatest influence on
user ratings of street segments, and equations were created to evaluate pedestrian and bicycle quality of service on street segments and at intersections.


Layered Network Approach

The Layered Network Approach is a planning-level evaluation of a local area’s transportation network. The approach was articulated in a white paper developed for the City of Los Angeles in its most recent update of the Transportation Element of its General Plan. The methodology is based on planning practice in cities that have assigned travel mode priorities to streets in order to create a complete streets network. Several cities have adopted this method, including Seattle, Austin, Denver, Alameda, CA and Glendale, CA. In cities that have identified the creation of layered networks as transportation planning priorities, the TIA can identify how a proposed project would contribute to or detract from that network.


Level of Traffic Stress

Researchers at the Mineta Transportation Institute developed the Level of Traffic Stress methodology to evaluate level of service for bicycle travel. Based on Dutch design standards for bicycle facilities and resident surveys from Portland, Oregon, the method classifies bicycle facilities on a scale from one to four. Lower numbers are assigned to facilities with low exposure to auto traffic and easy crossings at intersections, indicating low-stress environments attractive to many types of cyclists. The researchers piloted a network-wide analysis of San Jose, California using the Level of Traffic Stress model. They analysis measured the street network’s connectivity for each of the four levels of traffic stress. Researchers then identified and tested intersection improvements that could increase the low-stress connectivity throughout the city.


Built Environment Factors

As described in the introduction to this section, many variables in the built environment affect whether a street or intersection supports walking and bicycling. QOS methodologies measuring these built environment factors have been customized for specific urban contexts, notably San Francisco, California, Charlotte, North Carolina (as described above) and Fort Collins, Colorado. Similar methodologies could be developed for other local areas, relying on existing research, professional judgment and local knowledge. The papers cited below and under the introduction to this section provide a starting point for developing such a methodology.

Summary
The City of Charlotte, North Carolina, developed a methodology to assess bicyclist and pedestrian safety and comfort at intersections. Quality of service is calculated based on a point system, with points awarded for design and operational features that improve or worsen conditions for bicyclists or pedestrians. The sum of the points accumulated for each mode establishes the LOS, with LOS A receiving the highest points and LOS F receiving the lowest points.

For pedestrian LOS, key characteristics include crossing distance, signal phasing and timing, corner radius, right-turn on red, crosswalk treatment, and adjustment for one-way street crossings. For bicycle LOS, key characteristics include width of bicycle travel way, speed of adjacent traffic, signal features, right-turning vehicle conflicts, right-turn on red, and crossing distance.

Advantages
- Medium level of data input required
- Focused on factors within the public right-of-way, which can be addressed through planning and engineering
- Intersection-level analysis allows straightforward comparison with auto LOS

Disadvantages
- Does not address bicycle and pedestrian QOS between intersections

Data Requirements
- Signal phasing
  - RTOR
  - Left-turn conflicts
  - Pedestrian phasing
  - Countdown timer
- Intersection measurements:
  - Crosswalk type
  - Crossing distances
  - Lane widths
  - Curb radii
  - Presence and width of bicycle lanes
- Motorized traffic speeds

Reference
Summary
The San Francisco Department of Public Health developed the Pedestrian Environmental Quality Index (PEQI) and Bicycle Environmental Quality Index (BEQI) to measure the effects of built environment factors on bicycle and pedestrian environmental quality, activity and safety.

The PEQI and BEQI evaluate QOS for pedestrians and bicyclists at the intersection and street segment levels. The intersection-level assessment looks only at safety features that aim to protect pedestrians and bicyclists from vehicle traffic, while the segment-level assessment looks at land use, traffic and design features as well as perceived safety from crime and safety measures to increase cyclist visibility.

Advantages
• Straightforward application: checklist and index
• Basic software requirements (Microsoft Access, ArcGIS) for network analysis

Disadvantages
• Does not address street connectivity and presence of pedestrian attractors
• May not address all relevant design factors
• Not designed for use outside urban areas
• Requires extensive data inputs, many of which must be measured in the field

Data Requirements
Substantial data requirements for:
• Intersection safety features (e.g. pedestrian crossing treatments, signal operations)
• Auto speeds and volumes
• Street design (e.g. sidewalks, bicycle facilities, landscaping signage)
• Land use (e.g. street-fronting retail, bicycle parking)
• Perception of safety (e.g. lighting, litter, abandoned buildings)

Reference
HCM 2010 BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN LOS

Summary
The 2010 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM 2010) provides detailed instructions on calculating QOS for bicycles and pedestrians on urban streets (at the link, segment and facility levels) and at signalized and 2-way stop intersections. QOS scores are based on pedestrian or cyclist perception of their travel experience, taking into account dedicated facilities, accommodation at intersections, and exposure to automobiles.

Note that early testing in Santa Clara and Los Angeles Counties has indicated that this methodology is not fully sensitive to all input changes; in some cases (e.g. road diets) it produces results that are inconsistent with expectations or typical professional judgment. Further information on VTA’s evaluation of HCM 2010 methodology is available on request from VTA staff.

Advantages
• Provides a comprehensive evaluation of bicycle and pedestrian QOS at different scales
• Focused on factors within the public right-of-way, which can be addressed through planning and engineering
• Letter scoring enables straightforward comparison to auto LOS

Disadvantages
• Requires extensive data inputs
• Scores are heavily influenced by automobile volumes, which are difficult to mitigate in a planning or engineering context
• May not address all relevant design factors
• Can be insensitive to some input changes; some scenarios (e.g. road diets) produce inconsistent results

Data Requirements
Substantial data requirements for:
• Street segment and intersection geometry
• Intersection operations
• Automobile traffic speed and volumes
• Locations of landscaping, parking and sidewalk obstructions

Reference
Layered Network Approach

Summary
This approach, which is suitable for General Plan-level analysis, designates travel mode priority by street to create a complete streets network. Layered networks recognize that while all travel modes need to be accommodated within a community, no single street can accommodate all transportation users at all times.

The layered network concept envisions streets as systems, with each street type designed to create a high quality experience for its intended users. A layered network approach can also use context-sensitive land use and mode overlays to enhance additional transportation modes. This approach can also be integrated with methodologies that measure quality of service for bicyclists and pedestrians at the intersection and corridor level. Implementing this methodology may require a commitment to rethinking the transportation network of an entire city or plan area.

Advantages
- Helps mitigate the challenge of accommodating all users on every roadway
- Creates flexibility and options with multiple travel routes, accommodating different travel modes on different streets
- Allows network layout and roadway design for ideal bicycle or transit networks
- Works well with other QOS methodologies

Disadvantages
- May require additional street connectivity and redundancy to create the multi-modal network
- Less effective if land uses do not support design of layered networks

Data Requirements
Data requirements vary, depending on whether the approach includes QOS methodologies and on which methodologies are used.

Reference
Summary
The Level of Traffic Stress (LTS) method evaluates bicycle QOS by measuring low-stress connectivity, defined as “the ability of a network to connect traveler' origins to their destinations without subjecting them to unacceptably stressful links.”

Based on Dutch standards for bicycle facility design, the method classifies bicycle facilities on a scale from one to four. Better scores are assigned to facilities with low exposure to auto traffic and easy crossings at intersections, indicating low-stress environments which are attractive to many types of cyclists.

Level of traffic stress can be mapped onto an entire transportation network, producing stress maps and making it possible to evaluate how well an entire network serves bicyclists.

Advantages
- Focuses on factors that government planners and engineers can control
- Most data are readily available in public records

Disadvantages
- May require further adaptation to be used outside San José
- Stress mapping requires GIS extensions developed specifically for LTS evaluation
- Does not address pedestrian QOS

Data Requirements
- Street geometry: width, number of lanes, bicycle lane widths, presence of parking and width of parking lanes
- Other data: intersection control type, functional street classification or average daily traffic, percent of time bicycle lane is blocked

Reference
Mekuria, M.C., Furth, P.G., Nixon, H. 2012. Low-Stress Bicycling and Network Connectivity. Mineta Transportation Institute, San José State University; San Jose, California. http://transweb.sjsu.edu/project/1005.html
BUILT ENVIRONMENT FACTORS

Summary
An inventory of each category of physical features translates to a facility’s perceived quality of service based on the elements of the built environment. This QOS approach evaluates two levels of physical features: basic (key) elements and enhancement elements.

For example, when assessing the pedestrian experience, key features would include: travel and crossing lane widths and presence of sidewalks, crosswalks and pedestrian signals. Enhancement features would include: pedestrian refuges, curb extensions, landscape buffers and pedestrian-oriented lighting. A similar approach could be used to evaluate bicycle QOS. Use of this methodology should involve a rating system with weights assigned to key and enhancement features, which would then be translated into a QOS score for the facility.

To adapt this methodology for use in TIAs, the Lead Agency should identify sets of basic and enhanced features for bicycle and pedestrian facilities and consider adding a rating system, in consultation with VTA staff. The methodology should be documented in the TIA.

Examples
http://www.fcgov.com/transportationplanning/pedplan.php

Advantages
• Design and intervention-focused
• Straightforward measurement of variables
• Can readily be adapted to specific contexts

Disadvantages
• Does not necessarily address presence of motor vehicles, which can have significant effect for bicycles and pedestrians
• Lead Agency must use discretion in determining relevant factors

Data Requirements
Data requirements vary significantly based on what factors are considered. This method may require traffic volumes, posted speed limits, bicycle facility locations, transit system data, and measurements and inventory of streetscape amenities.

Most local governments do not collect detailed information about the built environment as it applies to pedestrians. Information on the presence and attributes of bicycle facilities are generally easier to obtain.
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APPENDIX H: Bicycle Parking Supply Recommendations
(Table 10-3 of VTA Bicycle Technical Guidelines)
### Table 10-3
Bicycle Parking Supply Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Required Number of Bicycle Spaces&lt;sup&gt;(1)(2)&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential (such as apartments, condominiums &amp; townhouses)</strong></td>
<td>1 Class I per 3 units + 1 Class II per 15 units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• General, multi-dwelling</td>
<td>1 Class I per 2 units + 1 Class II per 15 units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Primarily for students &amp; low-income families, multi-dwelling</td>
<td>1 Class I per 30 units + 1 Class II per 30 units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Primarily for residents 62 and older, multi-dwelling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schools</strong></td>
<td>1 Class I per 30 employees&lt;sup&gt;(3)&lt;/sup&gt; + 1 spot per 12 students (50% Class I and 50% Class II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Elementary, middle &amp; high schools</td>
<td>1 Class I per 4.5 beds + 1 Class I per 30 employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Colleges - Student residences</td>
<td>1 Class I per 30 employees + 1 spot per 9 student seats (25% Class I and 75% Class II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic buildings and other university facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Park-and-Ride Lots/Parking Garages</strong></td>
<td>7% of auto parking (75% Class I &amp; 25% Class II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit Centers</strong></td>
<td>2% of daily home-based boardings (75% Class I and 25% Class II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural/Recreational</strong> (includes libraries, theaters, museums, &amp; religious institutions)</td>
<td>Class I per 30 employees + (Class II 1,500 sq. ft. or Class II per 60 seats (whichever is greater)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parks/Recreational Fields</strong></td>
<td>1 Class I per 30 employees + Class II per 9 users During peak daylight times of peak season</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retail Sales/Shopping Center/Financial Institutions/Supermarkets</strong></td>
<td>1 Class I per 30 employees + Class II per 6,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office Buildings/Offices</strong></td>
<td>1 per 6,000 sq. ft. (75% Class I &amp; 25% Class II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hotels/Motels/Bed-&amp;-Breakfasts</strong></td>
<td>1 Class I per 30 rooms + Class I per 30 employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hospitals</strong></td>
<td>1 Class I per 30 employees + 1 Class II per 45 beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Restaurants</strong></td>
<td>1 Class I per 30 employees + 1 Class II per 3,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industrial</strong></td>
<td>1 Class I per 30 employees or 1 Class I per 15,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day Care Facilities</strong></td>
<td>1 Class I per 30 employees + 1 Class II per 75 children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auto-Oriented Services</strong></td>
<td>1 Class I per 30 employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Uses</strong></td>
<td>Same as most similar use listed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

1. For cities with less than 2% bicycle commuter rate. Cities with different bicycle commuter rates should pro-rate these accordingly.
2. The minimum number of required Class II Bicycle parking spaces is 4, except when the code would require 1 or less, in which case 2 bicycle spaces must be provided.
3. Employees = maximum number of employees on duty at any one time.

APPENDIX I: Board Memorandum: Update on Voluntary Contributions to Transportation Improvements (March 6, 2014)
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Nuria I. Fernandez

FROM: Chief CMA Officer, John Ristow

SUBJECT: Update on Voluntary Contributions to Transportation Improvements

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

Santa Clara County is projected to continue to add substantial population and jobs in the coming years, and travel demand for all freeway segments is projected to grow. Many development projects, especially those closest to freeway ramps, will likely have significant impacts on the already congested freeway segments. However, the ability to add freeway capacity is limited due to right of way, financial and environmental constraints, making traditional capacity increasing improvements no longer feasible. As a result, local agencies are increasingly turning to other approaches to mitigate impacts to freeways.

One approach taken by certain Member Agencies in Santa Clara County is to identify contributions to improvements of freeway, transit and other regional facilities as mitigation measures for significant freeway impacts resulting from proposed land development projects. Other Member Agencies are also recognizing the value and need of pursuing mitigation for freeway impacts even if the impacts are not fully mitigated, and some have had conversations with VTA on this topic.

DISCUSSION:

At the request of some Member Agencies, VTA developed a structure for a program of Voluntary Contributions to Transportation Improvements. This structure provides guidance for local agencies pursuing contributions and provides VTA staff a consistent approach to commenting on projects with significant transportation impacts. The structure is also designed for flexibility recognizing that different circumstances will present different opportunities to contribute. Local agencies can use this voluntary program structure in their “tool box” of measures to address freeway impacts as part of their project approval process. The proposed voluntary program includes the following process and responsibilities:
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a. VTA, as the Congestion Management Agency, comments on projects with significant impacts on the Congestion Management Program (CMP) facilities, including freeways, County Expressways, CMP intersections, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and the transit system;

b. The Member Agency (City or County) approving the project, in its role as the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Lead Agency, could choose to request a voluntary contribution from the developer toward transportation improvements as a mitigation measure for impacts to freeways using one or more of the agreed upon formulas;

c. The local agency would subsequently condition the project to pay the determined voluntary contribution toward regional transportation projects, and may cite this contribution in their CEQA documentation;

d. VTA and the local jurisdiction would execute agreements that would provide for the transfer of funds to regional transportation projects.

Benefits for VTA and local jurisdictions:

- VTA can follow a consistent process to comment on development projects with significant impacts on CMP freeway facilities;
- VTA can collect funds for regional transportation improvements that are already planned or under development and would otherwise could take longer to implement;
- Member Agencies, in their role as CEQA Lead Agencies, may benefit from a streamlined and more predictable CEQA process, specifically related to freeway impacts;
- In some cases, the Lead Agency may not need to issue a Statement of Overriding Considerations for significant freeway impacts that are mitigated through this Program; In other cases, the Lead Agency may be able to present findings, including efforts to reduce impacts, when issuing the Statements of Overriding Considerations;
- The transportation projects that receive funding from voluntary contributions would improve overall mobility in Santa Clara County and thereby increase business competitiveness, economic vitality, and quality of life.

Voluntary Contribution Commitments to Date

As of January 2014, four projects in Santa Clara County, in the Cities of Cupertino and Sunnyvale, have included commitments to provide voluntary contributions to transportation improvements within CEQA documents (summarized in Table 1, below). These contributions will be executed by funding agreements between the City and VTA, triggered when the project applies for a building permit or other development agreements. Two additional projects in the City of San José include commitments to contribute to transportation improvements tied to the issuance of permits such as a Caltrans Encroachment Permit, building permit, or tract/parcel map.
In the City of Cupertino, the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for Apple Campus 2 found significant impacts on I-280 and SR 85 and included a commitment of approximately $1.3 million to freeway and transit projects on these freeways and parallel corridors as mitigation. In the City of Sunnyvale, three projects, the NetApp Master Plan, Moffett Place and Moffett Gateway, found significant impacts on US 101 and SR 237 and identified contributions to Express Lanes projects on these facilities as mitigation. In the case of the Moffett Place project, the developer has applied for a building permit and the City has initiated a funding agreement to transfer the voluntary contributions to VTA to help fund the Express Lanes projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>City Action / Date</th>
<th>Contribution Amount</th>
<th>Transportation Improvements Identified for Contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Cupertino</td>
<td>Apple Campus 2</td>
<td>Certified DEIR - 10/15/2013</td>
<td>$1,292,215</td>
<td>SR 85 Express Lanes Project, improvements on SB I-280 between El Monte Rd. and Magdalena Ave., BRT stations, or an alternative improvement or study towards on the impacted I-280 corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sunnyvale</td>
<td>Moffett Place</td>
<td>Certified DEIR, -12/3/2-13, Issued building permit and initiated agreement with VTA - Dec. 2013</td>
<td>$577,062</td>
<td>US 101 Express Lanes Project, SR 237 Express Lanes Project Phase II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sunnyvale</td>
<td>Moffett Gateway</td>
<td>Certified MND - 8/26/2013</td>
<td>$1,162,042</td>
<td>US 101 Express Lanes Project, SR 237 Express Lanes Project Phase II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San José</td>
<td>America Center (Legacy Partners)</td>
<td>Approved March 2000, Contribution tied to Caltrans Encroachment Permit</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>SR 237 corridor improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San José</td>
<td>Valley Fair Expansion</td>
<td>Approved April 2007, Contribution tied to Tract/Parcel Map or Building Permit</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>I-800/Stevens Creek Boulevard Interchange Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
DEIR - Draft Environmental Impact Report
MND - Mitigated Negative Declaration
Outreach Summary and Committee Comments

Staff previously brought an item on voluntary contributions to the March 2013 of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and brought a follow-up item to the August 2013 meetings of the TAC, Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) and Policy Advisory Committee (PAC), and the September 2013 meeting of the Board of Directors as an information item. Staff also presented the item to the Systems Operations and Management (SOM) Working Group and the Land Use /Transportation Integration (LUTI) Working Group, two of TAC’s working groups.

There was general concurrence from all groups that a structure for voluntary contributions could offer a useful tool for jurisdictions to consider when reviewing development projects. VTA can provide a suite of common methodologies or approaches to estimating voluntary contributions that all jurisdictions can use, cautioning that flexibility should be retained to allow jurisdictions to respond as effectively as possible to individual projects. The TAC asked VTA to proceed with more detailed development of a concept Voluntary Contribution Program for consideration by the Board of Directors. By request, VTA also brought a follow-up item to the October 2013 meeting of the SOM Working Group providing examples of potential contribution formulas for city staff to consider when conditioning a project to provide contributions.

There was general concurrence from all groups that a structure for voluntary contributions could offer a useful tool for jurisdictions to consider when reviewing development projects. VTA can provide a suite of common methodologies or approaches to estimating voluntary contributions that all jurisdictions can use, cautioning that flexibility should be retained to allow jurisdictions to respond as effectively as possible to individual projects. The TAC asked VTA to proceed with more detailed development of a concept Voluntary Contribution Program for consideration by the Board of Directors. By request, VTA also brought a follow-up item to the October 2013 meeting of the SOM Working Group providing examples of potential contribution formulas for city staff to consider when conditioning a project to provide contributions.

Next Steps

VTA and City of Sunnyvale staff are working on finalizing the funding agreement for the voluntary contributions to Express Lanes projects included in Moffett Place project approval. Once the funding agreement is finalized, it will be brought before the Board of Directors as an Action Item for approval.

Voluntary contributions from the other projects listed in Table 1, as well as future projects that commit to contributions, will be executed by funding agreements between the Lead Agency and VTA and will be brought to the Board of Directors for approval.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:

This item was on the Regular Agenda at the February 2014 Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC), Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), and Policy Advisory Committee (PAC).

CAC Chairperson Hadaya asked how contribution amounts are determined and staff responded that they are determined by agreement between the City and the project applicant. He further
asked if the contributions are part of a City’s Transportation Impact Fee program and staff responded that the contributions are separate from that program. Committee member Blaylock asked if this would supersede other approaches to transportation demand management and staff responded that the approaches could be used in tandem. Member Powers and Vice Chair Wadler asked why the program is voluntary and staff responded that it will continue to be a voluntary program unless staff is directed by the Board to adopt a mandatory program, such as a Countywide Traffic Impact Fee program. Member Rogers asked if County Expressways are included and staff responded that the County has separately been collecting contributions for Expressway improvements.

At TAC, staff gave a brief presentation. Member Salvano noted that the City of San Jose conditioned the Valley Fair Mall Expansion project to contribute $2.5 million to the I-880/Stevens Creek interchange and should be added to the list of projects. He also suggested a wording change to the America Center project. Committee member Saleh asked if there are any guidelines on calculating the contribution amount and staff responded that staff works with Cities to suggest contribution formulas but it is ultimately the City’s decision which formula to use. Committee member Salvano asked about the time limit on the use of contributions. Committee member Batra commented that the time limit applies to the programming of funds and committee member Borden commented that the time limit does not apply when the contribution is part of a development agreement.

At PAC, staff gave a brief presentation. Member Jensen asked how a nexus is established between the contributions and the impacts and staff responded that the project’s transportation analysis would establish the nexus by analyzing the impacts and their locations. Vice Chairperson Carr asked if there are transportation projects in every part of the County that developments could contribute to, and staff responded that in some cases there may not be an appropriate project for contributions. Committee member Abe-Koga asked if the purpose of the contribution is to fund a transportation improvement that would mitigate the level of service impact back to “less than significant” and staff responded that operational and efficiency improvements are acceptable even if they do not mitigate all the way to “less than significant.” Member Allan asked staff to explain how contribution amounts are determined. Vice Chairperson Carr asked if the contributions would fully fund the transportation improvements and staff responded that the contributions would go towards project development and VTA would need to leverage other funds. He also asked if VTA would oppose an EIR if a project has significant impacts on the freeway. Staff responded that there is no action as “oppose” in the CEQA process. VTA’s role is to comment on the transportation impacts and will continue to do so consistently. Committee members Kniss, Miller, Davis and Jensen questioned the use of the term “voluntary” and suggested changing the name of the program. Some of the members stated that if a City requires a contribution, it is not voluntary. Staff agreed and explained that the word “voluntary” distinguishes it from a mandatory regional impact fee program, as in some other Counties.

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

This item was on the Regular Agenda at the February 2014 Congestion Management Program & Planning Committee (CMPP). Staff gave a brief presentation, followed by questions from the committee. Committee Chairperson Pirzynski brought the committee’s attention to the
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comments made at the PAC meeting. He asked staff to explain how the program is voluntary when it is implemented through enforceable documents such as development agreements and Environmental Impact Reports. Staff responded that the program is voluntary on the part of the Cities because it is not part of a mandatory regional impact fee. Member Whittum expressed support for VTA’s comments on development projects. He stated that the voluntary contribution doesn’t necessarily have to be a CEQA mitigation, it could just be a condition for approval. Chairperson Pirzynski stated that the Silicon Valley continues to be a magnet for jobs and this could be a valuable tool to mitigate traffic impacts on the freeway system. Vice Chairperson Herrera stated that certainty in the development process is the key and this program is a “good carrot”. She asked staff to confirm that contribution from the City of San Jose’s Valley Fair Mall Expansion project would be added to the list of projects. She asked how this program relates to the Cities’ own Traffic Impact Fees (TIF). Staff responded that Cities’ own TIF programs don’t include freeway improvements so this one would be in addition to the individual TIF programs. Committee Members had a discussion on how the contribution is calculated. Staff explained that VTA could provide some examples on how to calculate the contribution based on a percentage impact on specific freeway segments, but ultimately it is the City Council’s decision to determine the amount through negotiation with the developer. Chairperson Pirzynski requested that staff continue to update the committee as future projects come forward with contributions. Member Whittum asked which Cities don’t have TIF programs and staff responded that staff would provide the information separately. He also suggested VTA may facilitate a nexus study for several small Cities that don’t have sufficient resource to conduct one.

Prepared By: Robert Cunningham
Memo No. 4473
APPENDIX J: CMP Multimodal Improvement Plan Action List
| Table 4-1 |
| Deficiency Plan Action List |

**A. BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN MEASURES**
- A1. Improved Roadway Bicycle Facilities and Bike Paths
- A2. Transit and Bicycle Integration
- A3. Bicycle Lockers and Racks at Park and Ride Lots
- A4. Bicycle Facilities and Showers at Developments
- A5. Improved Pedestrian Facilities
- A6. Pedestrian Signals
- A7. Lighting for Pedestrian Safety

**B. TRANSIT**
- B1. Improvement of Bus, Rail, and Ferry Transit Service
- B2. Expansion of Rail Transit Service
- B3. Expansion of Ferry Services
- B4. Preferential Treatment for Buses and In-Street Light Rail Vehicle (LRVs)
- B5. Transit Information and Promotion
- B6. Transit Pricing Strategies to Encourage Ridership and Reduce Transit Vehicle Crowding
- B7. Transit Fare Subsidy Programs
- B8. Transit Centers
- B9. Improved and Expanded Timed Transfer Programs
- B10. Improved and Expanded Fare Coordination
- B11. Signal Preemption by Transit Vehicles
- B12. Bus Stop Bulbs
- B13. School Bus Transit Service

**C. CARPOOLS, BUSPOOLS, VANPOOLS, TAXIPOOLS, JITNEYS, CASUAL CARPOOLS AND OTHER SHARED RIDES (Ridesharing)**
- C1. Preferential Treatment for Shared Ride Vehicles
- C2. Increased Use of Commuter/Employer Services

**D. HIGH OCCUPANCY VEHICLE (HOV) FACILITIES**
- D1. Preferential Treatment for HOVs
- D2. Bus and Carpool/Buspool/Vanpool/Taxipool Priority Lanes on Local Arterials
- D3. Accelerated Implementation of the 2005 HOV Master Plan
- D4. HOV to HOV Facilities
- D5. Direct HOV Lane Entrance/Exit Ramps to Arterials and Space Generators

**E. OTHER TCMs, RELATED MEASURES**
- E1. Stricter Travel Demand Management/Trip Reduction Ordinance
- E2. Expanded Public Education Programs
- E3. Child Care Facilities at or close to Employment Sites, Transit Centers and Park and Ride Lots
- E4. Retail Services at or close to Employment Sites, Transit Centers and Park and Ride Lots
- E5. Telecommuting Centers and Work-at-Home Programs
- E6. Parking Management
F. TRAFFIC FLOW IMPROVEMENTS
F1. Preferential Treatment of HOVs (See measures B4 and C1)
F2. Ramp Metering
F3. Auxiliary Lanes
F4. Signalization Improvements
F5. Computerized Traffic and Transit Control/Management on Arterials
F6. Turn Lanes at Intersections
F7. Turn Restrictions at intersections
F8. Reversible Lanes
F9. One-Way Streets
F10. Targeted Traffic Enforcement Programs
F11. Restrictions on Curb Side Deliveries and On-Street Parking

Source: Table 4-1, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, Deficiency Plan Requirements, 2010. For more information, refer to Appendix C in the above document.
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APPENDIX K: TIA Preparation Checklist
TIA Preparation Checklist

This checklist is intended to provide a concise summary of the key items a Lead Agency must consider when preparing a TIA Report for CMP purposes. It is designed to serve as an aid to assist agency staff and consultants. However, it is not intended to replace the TIA Guidelines themselves, and does not provide the same level of detail or cover every required topic. Lead Agencies should still consult the main TIA Guidelines document to ensure that all requirements are being addressed.

TIA Scoping, Notification and Preparation

☐ 1) Determine if a TIA is required for CMP purposes (project generates > 100 net new trips without applying trip reductions), Section 2.1;

☐ 2) Determine whether the project falls into any of the Special Project Types identified in the TIA Guidelines (Large or Unique Projects; Projects on a Jurisdiction Border; Multi-Agency Projects; Projects Generating Large Numbers of Pedestrian; Bicycle or Transit Trips; or Large Projects, General Plans or Areawide Plans where a more extensive transit delay analysis may be appropriate); If the project falls into any of these Types, refer to Chapter 12 for more guidance;

☐ 3) Notify all appropriate jurisdictions that a TIA is being prepared using the TIA Notification Form, See Section 3.1 and Appendix B;

☐ 4) Provide guidance to TIA preparer/consultant on TIA study scope, considering both Lead Agency direction and other agency input from the TIA Notification process. This guidance will include:
   - Determination of roadway facilities that should be included in analysis, Section 2.2;
   - Determination of other transportation issues to address, Section 2.3
   - Identification of the appropriate study scenarios, See Chapter 4 – Recommended TIA Table of Contents, and Chapter 11 – Future Year Scenarios (Cumulative Conditions);

☐ 5) Prepare and submit a draft TIA report to VTA and other agencies within the time frame outlined in Section 3.1, Item 2;

☐ 6) Address comments received on the draft TIA report, Section 3.1, Item 4;

☐ 7) Send adopted conditions for approved projects that relate to the CMP Transportation System and the promotion of alternative transportation modes to VTA, Section 3.1, Item 5 (Encouraged).

Project Description, Study Area and Existing Conditions

☐ 8) Provide a description of the project and the transportation context surrounding it. Topics covered should include: Location of Proposed Project; Proposed Land Use and Project Size; and Site Plan, See Chapter 4 –
Recommended TIA Table of Contents.

9) Provide information about the existing Project Area roadway system, Section 6.2;

10) Use a table similar to Freeway Analysis Requirement Determination to assess whether freeway segment analysis is required; Section 5.2.8 and Appendix A;

11) Provide a description and map of the existing Project Area transit system, Section 6.3;

12) Provide a description and map of the existing Project Area bicycle system, Section 6.4;

13) Provide a description and map of the existing Project Area pedestrian system, Section 6.4;

14) When applicable, provide information on Transportation Demand Management (TDM) or unique transportation or land use plans affecting the Project Area, Section 6.4;

Trip Generations and Trip Reductions

15) Clearly identify the source of each trip generation rate used in the transportation analysis; Include in the TIA report a full description of the trip generation methodology used and a summary of all inputs and assumptions, Section 8.1;

16) Consider all available options to reduce project-generated automobile trips, including mixed-use development, a strong transportation demand management (TDM) program, project location, parking management, and development near frequent transit service. Clearly explain, document and justify all auto trip reductions claimed in the TIA report; this includes stating which trip reduction approach (Standard, Peer/Study-Based, and/or Target-Based) is being used, Section 8.2;

17) Provide a trip generation rate summary table, Section 8.1.2; This table should show:
   - Quantification (e.g. square feet, number of units, etc) of trip generation rate for each land use type;
   - Trip generation rates used;
   - Resulting trips generated;
   - If applicable, any trip reductions.

18) If the project is using parking management measures as part of its overall TDM/trip reduction strategy, document this in the TIA report and note it in the Auto Trip Reduction Statement, Section 8.2.1.5;

19) For all projects, summarize trip generation and any trip reductions, if applicable, in an Auto Trip Reduction Statement in the Executive Summary of the TIA report, using the form provided in Appendix C;

Trip Distribution and Assignment
 Provide trip distribution percentages on an area map with transportation facilities and the project site, Section 8.3;

 Provide clear explanation with justification and documentation of pass-by and diverted trip reductions, Sections 8.3.1, 8.3.2 and 8.3.3;

 Provide trip assignments on a figure showing project trips at study intersections, Section 8.3;

 **Project Conditions**

 Provide a Traffic Analysis of the “without project” scenario(s) (Existing, Background or Cumulative, as applicable); This analysis shall include, but not be limited to evaluation of Level of Service and queuing impacts, Section 9.1;

 Provide a Traffic Analysis of Project Conditions compared to the “without project” scenarios(s) (Existing, Background or Cumulative, as applicable); This analysis shall include, but not be limited to evaluation of Level of Service and queuing impacts, Section 9.1;

 Provide an analysis of project effects on the transit system; The evaluation shall consider transit vehicle delay, transit access and facilities, Section 9.2;

 Provide an analysis of bicycle and pedestrian modes under project conditions; This analysis shall address project effects on existing bicyclists and pedestrians as well as the effects and benefits of site development and associated roadway improvements on bicycle/pedestrian infrastructure, circulation, Quality of Service (QOS), and conformance to existing plans and policies, Section 9.3;

 Provide an analysis of site circulation and access, Section 9.4;

 **Mitigation Measures and Multimodal Improvements**

 Discuss mitigation measures to address porject impacts per CMP standards, and improvements to address other project-related effects on the transportation system; The discussion of mitigation measures and improvements shall take into account all the issues noted in Chapter 10 of the *TIA Guidelines*, including consideration of all categories of mitigation measures and improvements (physical or capacity-enhancing improvements, operational and/or efficiency improvements, and projects and programs used to reduce project auto trip generation), identification of the feasibility of proposed measures, who is responsible for implementing each measure, when the measure will be implemented, and the cost of implementation, as appropriate;

 If a project causes a transportation impact that cannot be mitigated to the CMP traffic LOS standard, a Multimodal Improvement Plan must be provided along with the TIA, or the project applicant must agree in advance to participate in the implementation of a Multimodal Improvement Plan after project approval, Section 10.1, Item 5;
30) If a project impacts a CMP System facility that has a Multimodal Improvement Plan, it is subject to the conditions of the Plan; The project’s TIA Report shall identify what role the project will play in implementing the Multimodal Improvement Plan Actions, Section 10.1, Item 6;

31) Mitigation measures for Auto Level of Service shall not unreasonably degrade bicycle, pedestrian or transit access, and circulation. If a project proposes mitigation for Auto LOS involving an intersection modification, change to roadway geometry, or signal operations, the TIA shall analyze and disclose whether the mitigation would affect pedestrian or bicycle conditions or increase transit vehicle delay, Section 10.1, Item 7;
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APPENDIX L: Glossary of Terms
The following are definitions for terms used in the TIA Guidelines:

**Approved Project**: A specific project for which an entitlement to build has been granted.

**Background Conditions**: The analysis scenario including Existing Conditions and approved projects.

**Carpooling**: Commuting in a privately-owned vehicle with at least two passengers. Carpooling can be arranged informally or with employer assistance.

**CDT Program**: VTA’s Community Design & Transportation Program to integrate transportation infrastructure improvements and land use development. The Program includes the Cores, Corridors and Station Areas framework, which shows VTA and local jurisdiction priorities for supporting concentrated development in the County.

**CEQA**: California Environmental Quality Act. This act requires that Lead Agencies disclose and evaluate the significant environmental impacts of proposed projects and adopt all feasible mitigation measures to reduce or eliminate those impacts. Although there is some overlap in the analysis of transportation impacts under CEQA and the CMP, it is not intended that TIAs following the VTA CMP TIA Guidelines will provide all information required for CEQA purposes.

**Changes to Signal Operations**: Substantive changes to traffic signal operations, including changes to phasing or cycle length.

**CMA**: Congestion Management Agency: The CMA is a countywide organization responsible for preparing and implementing the county’s Congestion Management Program. In Santa Clara County, VTA is the designated CMA.

**CMP**: Congestion Management Program: A comprehensive program designed to reduce traffic congestion, to enhance the effectiveness of land use decisions, and to improve air quality. Unless otherwise specified, CMP means Santa Clara County’s Congestion Management Program.

**Cumulative Conditions**: The analysis scenario including Background Conditions (Existing Conditions plus Approved Projects) and expected growth, plus the project.

**Deficiency Plan**: See Multimodal Improvement Plan.

**Diverted Linked Trip**: Trips generated by the proposed project that would be attracted from roadways in the vicinity of a proposed project site. This type of trip requires a diversion from one roadway to another to gain access to the site.
Effect: Used to refer to project-related effects on elements of the transportation system for which no CMP standard or impact threshold has been established. Distinct from “impact,” which refers to project effects on the CMP system as determined by the standards and impact thresholds established by VTA. The TIA should particularly focus on project-related effects that tend to degrade pedestrian, bicycle and transit conditions.

Existing Conditions: Roadway, transit, bicycle and pedestrian conditions at the time that the Lead Agency issues the TIA Notification Form.

Express Lanes: Express Lanes are HOV (high-occupancy vehicle) lanes which solo drivers can access by paying a toll. Tolls vary by congestion levels to keep the lanes operating at a minimum of 45 mph. In other areas outside Santa Clara County, Express Lanes may be called high-occupancy toll (HOT) or managed lanes.

Facility: A part of the transportation network, such as a roadway, intersection, bicycle lane, sidewalk or transit station.

Financial Incentives: Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs sometimes offer financial incentives to participants who choose to commute by carpooling, vanpooling, transit, bicycling or walking. Incentives can include: transportation allowances; parking cash-out; pre-tax commuter benefits; and subsidies such as free transit passes or transit fare incentives.

General Planning Efforts: General planning efforts are planning studies that are designed to provide basic guidelines for land uses, the transportation system, and design characteristics in a relatively large area. The key element of this definition is that these types of planning efforts do not confer, as a right, the ability to develop a specific project.

HCM: Highway Capacity Manual. A manual published by the Transportation Research Board (TRB) that contains concepts, guidelines, and equations to calculate the level of service on highways and intersections. In 2010 the manual was updated to include new level of service/quality of service measures for transit, pedestrians, and bicycles.

HOV: High Occupancy Vehicle Lane. A lane on a street or highway reserved for the use of high occupancy vehicles either all day or during specified periods (for example, during rush hours). Buses, carpools, and/or vanpools are allowed to use HOV lanes.

ITE: The Institute of Transportation Engineers is a professional organization that publishes technical guidelines for transportation engineering. ITE Trip Generation is a standard reference for estimating trips based on the type and size of proposed development.

Impact: Used to refer to project effects on the CMP system as determined by the standards and impact thresholds established by VTA. Distinct from “effect,” which refers
to project-related effects on elements of the transportation system for which no CMP standard or impact threshold has been established.

**Improvement:** A change that addresses the effects, particularly negative effects, of a development project on elements of the transportation system for which no CMP standard or impact threshold has been established.

**Lead Agency:** The agency responsible for preparing the Transportation Impact Analysis report.

**Level of Service (LOS):** This is a measure used by transportation professionals to grade performance of transportation facilities. LOS is graded on a scale of A (the best performance) to F (the worst performance).

**Long-Term Development Project:** A specific development project expected to be completed beyond five years from the date of approval. Most long-term development projects will also be phased-development projects.

**Member Agency:** A local jurisdiction that is a signatory of the CMA’s Joint Powers Agreement. This includes all cities within the county, Santa Clara County, and the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority.

**Mitigation:** A change that addresses the impacts of a development project on elements of the transportation system for which a CMP standard or impact threshold has been established.

**Mixed-Use Development:** A project that combines one or more land uses. Depending on the land uses, the vehicle trips generated by the development may be fewer than if the uses were developed separately.

**Mode Split:** The share of all trips to and from a project site taken by each of the four major transportation modes (automobile, transit, bicycle and pedestrian).

**Multimodal Improvement Plan:** VTA terminology for “Deficiency Plan” as defined by CMA statute. Multimodal Improvement Plans are plans to identify offsetting measures to improve transportation conditions on CMP facilities in lieu of making physical traffic capacity improvements such as widening an intersection or roadway.

**Near-Term Development Project:** A near-term development project will be built and occupied within five years of project approval. Most near-term development projects will also be specific development projects.

**Net New Peak Hour Trip:** Proposed project trips which are not associated with an existing development on the site and not included in an approved project.
Parking Management Program: Parking policies that are designed to make the most efficient use of parking supply, and encourage alternatives to driving alone, such as parking charges, parking cash out, shared parking, or preferential parking for carpool or vanpool vehicles.

Pass-By Trips: Trips generated by the proposed project that would be attracted from traffic passing the proposed project site on an adjacent street that contains direct access to the generator.

PDA: Priority Development Area. These locations were identified for concentrated development as part of Plan Bay Area, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission’s 2040 Regional Transportation Plan for the nine-county Bay Area.

Peak Hour: The highest morning or evening hour of travel reported on a transportation network or street.

Peer/Study-Based Reduction: Automobile trip reduction approach that may be used when studies of similar projects, or of other sites occupied by the project applicant, have demonstrated comparable trip reductions through survey results or other data.

Phased-Development Project: A project that will be completed in separate pieces over a period of time.

Pre-Tax Commuter Benefit: Federal tax code allows the use of tax-free dollars to pay for transit commuting and parking costs. The monthly benefit amount varies from year to year based on adopted legislation.

Project Conditions: A study scenario evaluating the addition of the project, along with estimated project generated trips, to the “without project” scenario (Existing, Background, or Cumulative conditions, as appropriate).

Quality of Service (QOS): A metric used to evaluate how well a transportation facility serves its users. Several different QOS methodologies are currently used by transportation professionals, often with a focus on bicyclists, pedestrians or transit passengers.

Queuing: Formation of a line of vehicles at an intersection or driveway, when vehicle arrival rates are higher than departure rates.

Specific Development Project: A project that, when approved, grants an entitlement for construction of a particular size and type.
Target-Based Reduction: Automobile trip reduction approach that may be used when the project applicant has entered into an enforceable agreement with the Lead Agency that limits the number of automobile trips traveling to and from the project site.

TDM: Transportation Demand Management. This is a term used to describe policies and programs to reduce the number of cars on the road. Examples of transportation demand management include flextime, ridesharing, telecommuting, and financial incentives.

Transit Fare Incentives: Transit fare incentives are financial incentives offered to reduce drive-alone commuter trips, such as free transit passes or pre-paid fares.

Transportation Demand Forecasting Model: An analytical tool that predicts travel patterns based upon the spatial relationship between various types of land uses and connecting transportation facilities (e.g., roadways and transit).

Trip Assignment: The trip assignment step of a TIA consists of assigning trips to specific transportation facilities on the basis of the trip distribution percentages.

Trip Distribution: The trip distribution step of a TIA consists of forecasting the travel direction of project-generated trips to and from the project site.

Trip Generation: Trip generation predicts the total number of trips to and from a project site.

Trip Reduction: Similar to but broader than TDM, trip reduction refers to any effort to reduce the number of automobile trips generated by a development project. The VTA TIA Guidelines provide guidance on several approaches that encourage and document reductions in automobile trips generated by new development projects compared to standard automobile-trip rates.

Trip Threshold: A complete TIA for CMP Purposes shall be performed for any project in Santa Clara County expected to generate 100 or more net new weekday (AM or PM peak hour) or weekend peak hour trips, including both inbound and outbound trips.

Vanpooling: Commuting in a seven- to 15-passenger van, with driving undertaken by commuters. The riders usually pay for some portion of the van’s ownership and operating cost. The van may be privately owned, employer-sponsored or provided through a private company that leases vehicles.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Meeting/Audience</th>
<th>Topics Covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/8/2012</td>
<td>VTA Land Use / Transportation Integration (LUTI) Working Group</td>
<td>Background, goals &amp; desired outcomes, potential work areas, Auto Trip Reduction Statement (ATRS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/29/2012</td>
<td>VTA System Operations &amp; Management (SOM) Working Group</td>
<td>Background, goals &amp; desired outcomes, potential work areas, ATRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14/2012</td>
<td>VTA LUTI WG</td>
<td>ATRS (blank - draft 3 plus filled-out examples), Questions on how agencies would use ATRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/23/2013</td>
<td>VTA SOM WG</td>
<td>ATRS (blank draft 3 plus filled-out examples), Questions on how agencies would use ATRS, Questions on TIA/Notification Form process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/14/2013</td>
<td>VTA LUTI WG</td>
<td>Proposed work plan, schedule and outreach approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/27/2013</td>
<td>VTA SOM WG</td>
<td>Proposed work plan, schedule and outreach approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/26/2013</td>
<td>Advocacy groups (Silicon Valley Leadership Group, TransForm, Greenbelt Alliance)</td>
<td>Background, goals &amp; desired outcomes, work plan, schedule, ATRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/10/2013</td>
<td>VTA Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)</td>
<td>Background, goals &amp; desired outcomes, work plan, schedule, ATRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/11/2013</td>
<td>VTA Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)</td>
<td>Background, goals &amp; desired outcomes, work plan, schedule, ATRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/10/2013</td>
<td>VTA Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)</td>
<td>Background, goals &amp; desired outcomes, work plan, schedule, ATRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/2/2013</td>
<td>Joint Venture Silicon Valley Public Sector Climate Task Force</td>
<td>Background, goals &amp; desired outcomes, work plan, schedule, ATRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/8/2013</td>
<td>VTA LUTI WG</td>
<td>Summary of feedback received, plan for updates/Technical Working Group (TWG), upcoming outreach activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/22/2013</td>
<td>VTA SOM WG</td>
<td>Summary of feedback received, plan for updates/Technical Working Group, upcoming outreach activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/12/2013</td>
<td>VTA Committee for Transit Accessibility</td>
<td>Background, goals &amp; desired outcomes, work plan, schedule, ATRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/13/2013</td>
<td>VTA Policy Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Background, goals &amp; desired outcomes, work plan, schedule, ATRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/8/2013</td>
<td>Advocacy groups (Silicon Valley Leadership Group, TransForm, Greenbelt Alliance, Urban Habitat)</td>
<td>Background, goals &amp; desired outcomes, work plan, ATRS, status of TWG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Meeting/Audience</td>
<td>Topics Covered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Late August-early</td>
<td>WEB SURVEY #1 of TIA Guidelines Update Technical Working Group (TWG) - agency staff</td>
<td>Key topics from Chapters 1-7 of the current Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 10/1/2013</td>
<td>TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP MEETING #1</td>
<td>Key topics from Chapters 1-7 of the current Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 10/2/2013</td>
<td>Silicon Valley Leadership Group Transportation Policy Committee</td>
<td>Background, goals &amp; desired outcomes, work plan, schedule, ATRS, relevance to employers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 10/23/2013</td>
<td>VTA SOM WG</td>
<td>Recap of TWG #1, Discussion on auto trip reductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 11/13/2013</td>
<td>VTA LUTI WG</td>
<td>Recap of TWG #1, Discussion on auto trip reductions (including brief presentations from Sunnyvale/Palo Alto/Friends of Caltrain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 12/6/2013</td>
<td>Silicon Valley Leadership Group Public Officials Luncheon</td>
<td>Background, goals &amp; desired outcomes, work plan, schedule, ATRS, relevance to local decision-makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Early December 2013-</td>
<td>WEB SURVEY #2 of TIA Guidelines Update Technical Working Group (TWG) - agency staff</td>
<td>Key topics from Chapters 8 - 12 of current Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>early January 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 12/20/2013</td>
<td>Advocacy groups (Silicon Valley Leadership Group, TransForm, California Walks)</td>
<td>Update on recent meetings and activities (TWG #1, Web Survey #2), discussion on Auto Trip Reduction approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 1/13/2014</td>
<td>Moffett Park Business Group Board</td>
<td>Background, goals, ATRS, other update areas, expectations for customized trip reductions, how employers &amp; developers can get involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 1/29/2014</td>
<td>TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP MEETING #2</td>
<td>Key topics from Chapters 8 - 12 of current Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 2/12/2014</td>
<td>VTA LUTI WG</td>
<td>Recap of TWG #2, Preview of final Key Topics (Transit Analysis, Mitigation Measures, CEQA Scenarios Alignment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 2/26/2014</td>
<td>VTA SOM WG</td>
<td>Recap of TWG #2, Preview of final Key Topics (Transit Analysis, Mitigation Measures, CEQA Scenarios Alignment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 2/27/2014</td>
<td>Consultant Forum (Transportation and Environmental consultants)</td>
<td>Background, goals, ATRS, summary of Key Topics from TWG #1 and #2, preview of final Key Topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 3/12/2014</td>
<td>VTA CAC</td>
<td>Background, goals, Key Topics &amp; Proposed Changes (in progress), outreach, next steps, schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 3/12/2014</td>
<td>VTA BPAC</td>
<td>Background, goals, Key Topics &amp; Proposed Changes (in progress), outreach, next steps, schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 3/13/2014</td>
<td>VTA TAC</td>
<td>Background, goals, Key Topics &amp; Proposed Changes (in progress), outreach, next steps, schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 3/13/2014</td>
<td>VTA PAC</td>
<td>Background, goals, Key Topics &amp; Proposed Changes (in progress), outreach, next steps, schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 3/20/2014</td>
<td>VTA CMPP</td>
<td>Background, goals, Key Topics &amp; Proposed Changes (in progress), outreach, next steps, schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Meeting/Audience</td>
<td>Topics Covered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 4/24/2014</td>
<td>TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP MEETING #3</td>
<td>Remaining Key Topics (incl. Transit Analysis, Mitigation Measures, Peer/Study-Based Trip Reductions, Queuing Analysis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 4/30/2014</td>
<td>Building Industry of America (BIA) South Bay - Regional Policy Committee</td>
<td>Background, goals, Key Topics &amp; Proposed Changes (in progress), outreach, next steps, schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 5/14/2014</td>
<td>VTA LUTI WG</td>
<td>Recap of TWG #2 Key Topics &amp; Proposed Changes, next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 5/22/2014</td>
<td>Advocacy groups (SPUR, Greenbelt Alliance, TransForm, SV Bicycle Coalition, SV Leadership Group, SV Community Foundation)</td>
<td>Key Topics &amp; Proposed Changes (in progress), outreach, next steps, schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 5/28/2014</td>
<td>VTA SOM WG</td>
<td>Recap of TWG #2 Key Topics &amp; Proposed Changes, next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 6/20/2014</td>
<td>San Jose Developers and Construction Roundtable</td>
<td>Background, goals, Key Topics &amp; Proposed Changes (in progress), outreach, next steps, schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 7/9/2014</td>
<td>Conference Call for External Reviewers</td>
<td>Questions and Comments on the June 2014 Administrative Draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 7/16/2014</td>
<td>Conference Call for External Reviewers</td>
<td>Questions and Comments on the June 2014 Administrative Draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 7/23/2014</td>
<td>VTA SOM WG</td>
<td>Status Update, Key Comments on the June 2014 Administrative Draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 8/13/2014</td>
<td>VTA LUTI WG</td>
<td>Status Update, Key Comments on the June 2014 Administrative Draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 8/13/2014</td>
<td>VTA CAC</td>
<td>Status Update, Key Comments on Admin Draft, Staff Analysis/Response, outreach, next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 8/13/2014</td>
<td>VTA BPAC</td>
<td>Status Update, Key Comments on Admin Draft, Staff Analysis/Response, outreach, next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 8/14/2014</td>
<td>VTA TAC</td>
<td>Status Update, Key Comments on Admin Draft, Staff Analysis/Response, outreach, next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 8/14/2014</td>
<td>VTA PAC</td>
<td>Status Update, Key Comments on Admin Draft, Staff Analysis/Response, outreach, next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 8/27/2014</td>
<td>VTA SOM WG</td>
<td>Status Update, preview of September VTA Committee item</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
June 13, 2014

Chris Augenstein
Deputy Director of Planning
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority

Dear Chris:

On behalf of the Silicon Valley Leadership Group, I write to comment on VTA’s Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Guidelines update.

By way of background, the Silicon Valley Leadership Group, founded in 1978 by David Packard of Hewlett-Packard, represents nearly 400 of Silicon Valley’s most respected employers on issues, programs and campaigns that affect the economic health and quality of life in Silicon Valley, including energy, transportation, education, housing, health care, tax policies, economic vitality and the environment. Leadership Group members collectively provide nearly one of every three private sector jobs in Silicon Valley and have more than $3 trillion in annual revenue.

Traffic congestion is a byproduct of the Valley’s growth as we climb out of the economic recession. Many Leadership Group companies are at the forefront of reducing traffic congestion through cutting edge transportation demand management programs like corporate shuttles, subsidized transit passes and robust carpools/vanpools.

We support the overall direction of the TIA guidelines update because it better organizes information from existing Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs) so stakeholders and elected officials can see how well developments are taking a balanced, multimodal approach to addressing congestion. We also applaud VTA for doing reaching out to the Leadership Group and developers about the plan. We encourage VTA to continue to this important stakeholder outreach.

Sincerely,

Bena Chang
Senior Director, Transportation
August 28, 2014

Board of Directors
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
3331 N. 1st Street
San Jose, CA 95134

Dear Chairperson Kalra:

We are writing to urge you to support the staff recommendations for updating VTA’s Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Guidelines. SPUR is a non-profit, member-supported organization that promotes good planning and good government. SPUR is pleased to have been included in the stakeholder process for updating the TIA guidelines.

Reforming the TIA guidelines is an action that SPUR has specifically identified in our recent policy report *Freedom to Move: How the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority can Create Better Transportation Options*. We found that reforming VTA guidelines like these are necessary to let VTA transit thrive, reduce auto-dependency and to facilitate great urban design in VTA’s 15 member jurisdictions.

We support the overall direction of the TIA update, including the emphasis on an improved TIA process, the reduction of auto trips, more meaningful analysis of alternative modes such as walking and cycling and improved guidance on mitigations. These updated guidelines will help provide better information to decision-makers about the transportation impacts and options for land use projects. We hope you will support this update.

Sincerely,

Ratna Amin
SPUR Transportation Policy Director
August 28, 2014

VTA Board of Directors  
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority  
3331 North First Street  
San Jose, CA 95134

Dear Chairperson Kalra,

On behalf of Greenbelt Alliance, I am writing in support of VTA’s TIA Guidelines. In particular, we are very appreciative of how staff has involved us every step of the way, seeking our input and updating us on their process.

Greenbelt Alliance is the champion of the places that make the Bay Area special. We ensure the right development happens in the right places. We work to protect the region’s open spaces and make sure cities grow in a way that creates great neighborhoods for everyone. This includes designing our streets so they support more walking, bicycling and transit trips.

We support the overall themes of the Update, including an emphasis on

- an improved TIA process, especially the shift to a web-based form;
- the reduction of auto trips, especially by encouraging new development near BART, light rail and BRT stations, as well as recognizing the role that an over-supply of parking can play in encouraging drive-alone trips;
- more meaningful analysis of alternative modes including moving to a Quality of Service analysis for pedestrian and bicycle trips, and
- improved guidance on mitigation measures.

Cities across Santa Clara County are approving plans that support a compact mix of homes and jobs near bus and rail stations. It will be critical to ensure that new development leverages these locations by putting an emphasis on walking and cycling. Parking management and transportation demand management plans, plus streets designed for people help reduce car trips and the resulting traffic and air pollution.

VTA is demonstrating a commitment to finding ways to reduce car trips. The updated TIA Guidelines will provide better information to decision-makers. They will be able to see how all trips are impacted by a project and how that project can make improvements to the pedestrian and bicycle realm.
Greenbelt Alliance looks forward to the discontinued use of automobile level of service (LOS), which is widely used in California and has resulted in an over-emphasis on roadway expansions for car throughput. This only encourages more car traffic and leads to a degraded urban form. A shift to vehicle miles traveled (VMT) allows for other things to be measured, like the project’s effect on overall travel.

VTA is on the right path with the updated TIA Guidelines. They provide a near-term improvement that promotes a reduction in auto trips and an increase in trips made by other modes. Greenbelt Alliance knows this will lead to more attractive, accessible communities.

Sincerely,

Michele Beasley
Regional Director
August 29, 2014

Chairperson Ash Kalra
VTA Board of Directors
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
3331 North First Street
San Jose, CA 95134

RE: VTA TIA Guidelines Update

Dear Chairperson Kalra,

California Walks would like to thank the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) for involving our organization in the VTA Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines Update for 2014 (TIA Update). We commend VTA for supporting multimodal transportation, and in particular, for the emphasis on active transportation.

Staff at VTA has included California Walks as an active stakeholder throughout the process, and we welcomed the opportunity to review the draft TIA Update and to provide comments. We appreciate the direction in which VTA is going with the TIA Update process, including its emphasis on an improved TIA process, the reduction of auto trips, more meaningful analysis of alternative modes, and improved guidance on mitigations.

California Walks looks forward to continuing the conversation with VTA on active transportation in the Santa Clara Valley, not only through this and future TIA updates, but also through additional process updates and plans, including the Pedestrian Access to Transit Plan.

Please do not hesitate to reach out to me with any questions—I can be reached directly at 408-693-0602 or jaime@californiawalks.org. We look forward to the continued progress of the 2014 TIA Guidelines Update.

Best,

Jaime Fearer, Planning & Policy Manager
September 8, 2014

Board of Directors
Valley Transportation Authority
3331 North First Street
San José, CA 95131

Re: VTA Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) guidelines update

Dear Chairperson Kalra and Members of the Board:

I am writing on behalf of Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition (SVBC), a membership-based organization that seeks to create a healthy community, environment, and economy, through bicycling, for people who live, work, or play in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties. I am writing to express my organization’s support for Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority’s (VTA’s) Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) guidelines update.

SVBC appreciates the more multi-modal approach in the TIA update. Too often, the impacts of development projects on bicycling, walking, and transit use are overlooked, and the emphasis on improving Level of Service for automobiles can further degrade conditions for active transportation and transit. We are happy that the proposed updates not only recognize projects and plans that reduce auto trip generation, but also provide guidance on the evaluation of secondary impacts of mitigation measures on biking, walking, and transit access.

Moving forward, we’re encouraged to know that VTA staff is already discussing ways to appropriately address and integrate future changes to CEQA transportation analysis requirements that may result from Senate Bill 743.

We’ve been grateful for the opportunity to work with VTA throughout the TIA update process, both in meetings with staff and other advocacy groups, and through our role on the VTA Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee. We look forward to continuing to engage with VTA as the agency continues its work to balance the needs of all road users and the statewide effort to reduce carbon emissions. If you have any questions about our support for this process or any of our other work with VTA, please do not hesitate to contact me at (408) 464-5195 or colin@bikesiliconvalley.org.

Sincerely,

Colin Heyne
Deputy Director
September 12, 2014

Board of Directors
Valley Transportation Authority
3331 North First Street
San Jose, CA 95134

Dear Chairperson Kalra and Members of the Board:

I am writing on behalf of the Moffett Park Business Group (MPBG) to express support for VTA’s holistic approach to the Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Guidelines.

By way of reference, the MPBG is a consortium of major employers in the Sunnyvale Moffett Park area, including NetApp, Lockheed Martin Space Systems, Yahoo!, Jay Paul, Juniper Networks, Detati, Labcyte, Rambus, JSR Micro, Foothill College and Infinera: over 14,000 employees represented. We advocate for transportation infrastructure improvements and support reasonable transportation demand management efforts that improve the environmental and economic health of the area. A core value of our organization is to support projects that help our member companies achieve these goals.

Many companies, represented by the MPBG, have transportation demand management efforts to reduce traffic congestion. These programs may include pre-tax benefits, subsidized transit passes, shared resources, and incentives to carpool or bicycle to work. A key element of the TIA Guidelines update will be to provide better documentation of such robust transportation demand management programs, allowing projects to highlight these efforts for decision-makers. The updated TIA Guidelines will also improve existing requirements to provide a more meaningful analysis of pedestrian, bicycle and transit modes.

The MPBG supports the overall multi-modal approach of the TIA Guidelines Update, as well as VTA’s robust outreach process. VTA staff communicated directly to the MPBG taking in feedback and providing numerous update during the TIA Guidelines process. We encourage VTA to continue this important process and its stakeholder outreach.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Kerry Haywood
Executive Director
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: Update on SB 743 Changes to CEQA Transportation Analysis

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

Senate Bill (SB) 743, approved by the California legislature in September 2013, directs the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to develop alternative metrics to the use of vehicular “level of service” (LOS) for evaluating transportation impacts under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). These changes to CEQA analysis are likely to have significant implications for VTA and Member Agencies. Staff presented an overview of SB 743 for discussion at the April 2014 meetings of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), Policy Advisory Committee (PAC), and Congestion Management Program & Planning Committee (CMPP).

OPR released the Preliminary Discussion Draft of Updates to the CEQA Guidelines Implementing Senate Bill 743 on August 6, 2014. This document contains recommended amendments to the CEQA Guidelines to comply with SB 743, with a comment deadline of October 10, 2014.

DISCUSSION:

The purpose of this item is to provide the key points from OPR’s Preliminary Discussion Draft of Updates to the CEQA Guidelines Implementing Senate Bill 743 to Member Agencies.

A brief overview of the highlights of the Preliminary Discussion Draft is provided below.

Background
Currently, environmental review of transportation impacts under CEQA focuses on delay to vehicles at intersections and roadway segments, measured by level of service (LOS). Mitigation measures for LOS impacts typically involve increasing roadway capacity.

Pursuant to SB 743, the focus of transportation analysis will shift from vehicle delay to the amount and distance of vehicle travel associated with the project, typically measured by “vehicle miles traveled” (VMT). Other relevant considerations include the effects of the project on transit, bicycle and pedestrian modes and the safety of all travelers.

Once the new transportation guidelines are adopted, vehicle delay will no longer be considered to be an environmental impact under CEQA.

Proposed Transportation Impact Criteria

- **Analysis of Land Use Projects:** A development project that results in vehicle miles traveled greater than the regional average of the land use type may indicate a significant impact. OPR’s guidance recommends that the threshold be set based on the average for the MPO region. Certain types of projects may be presumed to have less than significant transportation impacts:
  - Projects within ½ mile of a Major Transit Stop or High Quality Transit Corridor, as defined in statute (see Attachment A).
  - Projects that result in a net decrease in VMT.
  - Land use plans that are consistent with the Sustainable Communities Strategy.

- **Analysis of Transportation Projects:** New general purpose highway or arterial lanes, and other projects that induce vehicle travel, may have significant impacts. Certain transportation projects may be presumed to have less than significant impacts:
  - Projects to improve safety or operations, undertake maintenance or rehabilitation, provide grade separations from rail or improve transit operations.
  - New managed lanes (e.g. HOV, Express Lanes) included in the Regional Transportation Plan.
  - Transit, bicycle and pedestrian projects, including transit priority lanes.

- **Analysis of Safety:** New language on the analysis of safety noting that increased crossing exposure of bicyclists and pedestrians to auto traffic and increased vehicle speeds could constitute significant impacts.

- **Mitigation/Alternatives:** Potential mitigation measures to reduce VMT include improving or increasing access to transit and implementing Transportation Demand Management...
Management (TDM) measures to reduce vehicle trips. Project alternatives that could reduce VMT include locating in an area of the region that exhibits low VMT, locating near transit, increasing project density, increasing the mix of uses, and/or increasing connectivity.

Adoption Schedule

- OPR will accept comments on the Preliminary Discussion Draft until October 10, 2014.
- After a full public vetting, OPR will submit a draft to the Natural Resources Agency for formal rulemaking, which includes additional public review.
- The new rules would go into effect after the Natural Resources Agency adopts the new CEQA Guidelines and the package undergoes review by the Office of Administrative Law. The updated CEQA Guidelines will apply prospectively to new projects that have not already commenced environmental review.

Phased Implementation

- The new procedures will apply immediately in areas within ½ mile of a Major Transit Stop or High Quality Transit Corridor, as defined in statute (see Attachment A).
- Lead agencies may elect to adopt the procedures anywhere else under their jurisdiction, provided they update their own procedures.
- On January 1, 2016, the new procedures apply to all projects statewide.

As the Congestion Management Agency (CMA), transit provider, and CEQA Lead Agency for transit and highway capital projects, VTA will play an important role in implementing SB 743 in Santa Clara County, including providing comments on OPR’s draft guidelines.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:
The Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) reviewed this item at their September 2014 meeting. Members of the Committee made the following comments: a) asked if there is a mechanism to estimate vehicle miles traveled (VMT) for a project; b) asked if VTA has tested the new methodology on land use projects in the county; c) what are the impacts of the federal requirements to project schedules; d) what is VTA’s position on this matter; e) commented that mitigation measures for transportation impacts should be designed so that they do not inadvertently encourage sprawl development; f) commented that vehicle miles traveled would tend to provide the opposite incentives for the location of development as compared to level of service (LOS); and g) commented that CEQA lawsuits are an important reason for this change. Staff noted that VTA is focused on the implementation of the requirements and how these will affect the Authority and the Member Agencies. General Manager Fernandez commented that VTA will be working with Member Agencies on the process moving forward.

This item was on the Regular Agenda at the September meeting of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC). Members of the Committee made the following comments: a)
asked why the regional average VMT was suggested as a threshold; b) consequences if a project produces above average VMT but reduces overall VMT in an area; c) commented that the Town of Los Gatos could benefit from a VMT standard; d) commented that LOS and VMT standards are inverse in terms of the incentives they provide for the location of development; e) asked if a threshold such as the regional average would be static or change over time; and f) asked whether the incentives for dense development in Plan Bay Area are in conflict with the proposed VMT standard. Staff clarified that OPR chose the regional average as threshold but VTA may suggest flexibility in the guidelines. Staff noted the incentives are intended to align since the areas targeted for dense development in Plan Bay Area would tend to have lower VMT impacts than other areas in the region. Staff added that there are still unresolved issues regarding this matter that need to be addressed.

This item was on the Regular Agenda at the September meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). Members of the Committee inquired about the impacts of SB 743 to the Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Guidelines and the Traffic Impact Fee (TIF) programs. Staff responded that any update to the TIA Guidelines would occur after the transportation standards and thresholds in the Congestion Management Program (CMP) have been updated, which itself would follow the update to the CEQA Guidelines. SB 743 allows local jurisdictions to retain LOS standards for local purposes, including TIF programs, but such findings would occur outside the CEQA process after the new CEQA Guidelines are adopted.

This item was on the Consent Agenda at the September meeting of the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC). The item was accepted as part of the Consent Agenda with no questions or comments from the committee.

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION**

This item was on the Regular Agenda at the Congestion Management Program and Planning Committee (CMPP). Committee member Whittum commented that morning congestion affects parents driving their kids to school, and level of service (LOS) standards help address this issue. Staff commented that local agencies may retain LOS standards for local planning, outside the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process. Committee member Yeager asked about the geographic scope of the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) analysis, and commented that VMT may be impacted by the lack of affordable housing in Santa Clara County. Staff responded that the scope of the study area will be an issue that VTA and local agencies will need to determine for each project, and that the distance factor of VMT would give preference to projects near housing. Committee member Yeager commented that even if housing is available near worksites, the workers may not live in that housing. General Manager Fernandez commented that VTA recognizes that Member Agencies have concerns over the implementation of this law and that VTA is gathering feedback from Member Agencies. VTA will be submitting a comment letter as VTA and Member Agencies are also encouraged to submit comment letters. Committee member Whittum commented that abandoning LOS would increase congestion. Chairperson Pirzynski commented that he is skeptical of Sacramento. He noted that schools should do more to address school-related traffic. He further noted that we shouldn’t eliminated tools we already have to address congestion, such as LOS, and that the Town of Los Gatos is affected by traffic passing through on Highway 17 which could be alleviated by improvements to the Highway 17 bus service.
Attachment A – Definitions of Major Transit Stop and High Quality Transit Corridor

- 21064.3. "Major transit stop" means a site containing an existing rail transit station, a ferry terminal served by either a bus or rail transit service, or the intersection of two or more major bus routes with a frequency of service interval of 15 minutes or less during the morning and afternoon peak commute periods.

- 65088.1 (e). For purposes of this section, a high-quality transit corridor means a corridor with fixed route bus service with service intervals no longer than 15 minutes during peak commute hours.
Updating Transportation Impacts Analysis in the CEQA Guidelines

Preliminary Discussion Draft of Updates to the CEQA Guidelines Implementing Senate Bill 743 (Steinberg, 2013)
Senate Bill 743 (Steinberg, 2013)

Excerpt of Public Resources Code § 21099

(b) (1) The Office of Planning and Research shall prepare, develop, and transmit to the Secretary of the Natural Resources Agency for certification and adoption proposed revisions to the guidelines adopted pursuant to Section 21083 establishing criteria for determining the significance of transportation impacts of projects within transit priority areas. Those criteria shall promote the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, the development of multimodal transportation networks, and a diversity of land uses. In developing the criteria, the office shall recommend potential metrics to measure transportation impacts that may include, but are not limited to, vehicle miles traveled, vehicle miles traveled per capita, automobile trip generation rates, or automobile trips generated. The office may also establish criteria for models used to analyze transportation impacts to ensure the models are accurate, reliable, and consistent with the intent of this section.

(2) Upon certification of the guidelines by the Secretary of the Natural Resources Agency pursuant to this section, 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 pursuant to this division, except in locations specifically identified in the guidelines, if any.

(3) This subdivision does not relieve a public agency of the requirement to analyze a project’s potentially significant transportation impacts related to air quality, noise, safety, or any other impact associated with transportation. The methodology established by these guidelines shall not create a presumption that a project will not result in significant impacts related to air quality, noise, safety, or any other impact associated with transportation. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the adequacy of parking for a project shall not support a finding of significance pursuant to this section.

(4) This subdivision does not preclude the application of local general plan policies, zoning codes, conditions of approval, thresholds, or any other planning requirements pursuant to the police power or any other authority.

(5) On or before July 1, 2014, the Office of Planning and Research shall circulate a draft revision prepared pursuant to paragraph (1).

(c) (1) The Office of Planning and Research may adopt guidelines pursuant to Section 21083 establishing alternative metrics to the metrics used for traffic levels of service for transportation impacts outside transit priority areas. The alternative metrics may include the retention of traffic levels of service, where appropriate and as determined by the office.

(2) This subdivision shall not affect the standard of review that would apply to the new guidelines adopted pursuant to this section.
Executive Summary

On September 27, 2013, Governor Brown signed Senate Bill 743 (Steinberg, 2013). Among other things, SB 743 creates a process to change the way we analyze transportation impacts under the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code section 21000 and following) (CEQA). Currently, environmental review of transportation impacts focuses on the delay that vehicles experience at intersections and on roadway segments. That delay is often measured using a metric known as “level of service,” or LOS. Mitigation for increased delay often involves increasing capacity (i.e. the width of a roadway or size of an intersection), which may increase auto use and emissions and discourage alternative forms of transportation. Under SB 743, the focus of transportation analysis will shift from driver delay to reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, creation of multimodal networks and promotion of a mix of land uses.

SB 743 requires the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to amend the CEQA Guidelines (Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations sections and following) to provide an alternative to level of service for evaluating transportation impacts. The alternative criteria must “promote the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, the development of multimodal transportation networks, and a diversity of land uses.” (New Public Resources Code Section 21099(b)(1).) Measurements of transportation impacts may include “vehicle miles traveled, vehicle miles traveled per capita, automobile trip generation rates, or automobile trips generated.” (Ibid.)

This document contains a preliminary discussion draft of changes to the CEQA Guidelines implementing SB 743. In developing this preliminary discussion draft, OPR consulted with a wide variety of potentially affected stakeholders, including local governments, metropolitan planning organizations, state agencies, developers, transportation planners and engineers, environmental organizations, transportation advocates, academics, and others. OPR released its preliminary evaluation of different alternatives for public review and comment in December 2013. Having considered all comments that it received, and conducted additional research and consultation, OPR now seeks public review of this preliminary discussion draft.

This document contains background information, a narrative explanation of the proposed changes, text of the proposed changes, and appendices containing more detailed background information.
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Analyzing Transportation Impacts

Proposed New Section 15064.3 and Proposed Amendments to Appendix F

Background
Californians drive approximately 332 billion vehicle miles each year. That driving accounts for 36 percent of all greenhouse gases in the state. (California Air Resources Board, First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan (May 2014).) Meanwhile, existing roadway networks are deteriorating. While new development may pay the capital cost of installing roadway improvements, neither the state nor local governments are able to fully fund operations and maintenance. (See, e.g., Nichols Consulting Engineers, California Statewide Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment (January 2013).) While the health benefits of walking, bicycling and transit use are becoming more well-known, planning has literally pushed those other modes aside. Why?

Traffic studies used in CEQA documents have typically focused on one thing: the impact of projects on traffic flows. By focusing solely on delay, environmental studies typically required projects to build bigger roads and intersections as “mitigation” for traffic impacts. That analysis tells only part of the story, however.

Impacts on pedestrians, bicyclists and transit, for example, have not typically been considered. Projects to improve conditions for pedestrians, bicyclist and transit have, in fact, been discouraged because of impacts related to congestion. Requiring “mitigation” for such impacts in the CEQA process imposes increasing financial burdens, not just on project developers that may contribute capital costs for bigger roadways, but also on taxpayers that must pay for maintenance and upkeep of those larger roads. Ironically, even “congestion relief” projects (i.e., bigger roadways) may only help traffic flow in the short term. In the long term, they attract more and more drivers (i.e., induced demand), leading not only to increased air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions, but also to a return to congested conditions. (Matute and Pincetl, “Use of Performance Measures that Prioritize Automobiles over Other Modes in Congested Areas;” Handy and Boarnet, “DRAFT Policy Brief on Highway Capacity and Induced Travel,” (April 2014).) Under current practice, none of these impacts are considered in a typical project-level environmental review.

Such impacts have not completely escaped notice, however. For many years, local governments, transportation planners, environmental advocates and others have encouraged the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to revise the CEQA Guidelines to reframe the analysis of transportation impacts away from capacity. In 2009, the Natural Resources Agency revised the Appendix G checklist to focus more on multimodal, “complete streets” concepts. (Natural Resources Agency, Final Statement of Reasons: Amendments to the State CEQA Guidelines Addressing Analysis and Mitigation of Greenhouse Gas Emissions Pursuant to SB97 (December 2009).)
Just last year, the Legislature passed, and Governor Brown signed into law, Senate Bill 743 (Steinberg, 2013), which requires OPR to develop alternative methods of measuring transportation impacts under CEQA. At a minimum, the new methods must apply within areas that are served by transit; however, OPR may extend the new methods statewide. Once the new transportation guidelines are adopted, automobile delay will no longer be considered to be an environmental impact under CEQA. SB 743 requires OPR to circulate a first draft of the new guidelines by July 1, 2014. The preliminary discussion draft below satisfies that requirement.

Before turning to a detailed explanation of the proposed text, OPR urges reviewers to consider the following:

- This is a preliminary discussion draft of a proposal that responds to SB 743. It reflects the information and research contained in OPR’s Preliminary Evaluation of Alternative Methods of Transportation Analysis (December 2013), as well as comments submitted on that evaluation and informal consultation with stakeholder groups across the state. However, OPR expects this draft to evolve, perhaps substantially, in response to this larger vetting and review process.
- Because this is a preliminary discussion draft, reviewers may notice some terms that should be defined, or concepts that should be further explored. OPR invites your suggestions in that regard.
- This proposal involves changes to the CEQA Guidelines. Because the CEQA Guidelines apply to all public agencies, and all projects, throughout the state, they generally must be drafted broadly. Similarly, this proposal reflects CEQA’s typical deference to lead agencies on issues related to methodology. The background paper accompanying this proposal, however, provides additional detail on a sample methodology for conducting an analysis, lists models capable of estimating vehicle miles traveled, and ideas for mitigation and alternatives. We invite reviewers to let us know if greater or less detail should be included in the new Guidelines.

This preliminary discussion draft consists of several parts. First, it contains a proposed new section 15064.3 of the CEQA Guidelines, which itself contains several subdivisions. Second, it proposes amendments to Appendix F (Energy Impacts) to describe possible mitigation measures and alternatives. Each of these components is described below.

**Explanation of Proposed New Section 15064.3**

OPR proposes to add a new section 15064.3 to the CEQA Guidelines to provide new methods of measuring transportation impacts. OPR initially considered whether to put the new methods in an appendix or in a new section of the Guidelines. OPR chose the latter, because experience with Appendix F, which requires analysis of energy impacts, has shown that requirements in appendices may not be consistently applied in practice.

Having decided to add a new section to the Guidelines, the next question was where to put it. As required by SB 743, the new guidelines focus on “determining the significance of transportation impacts.” Section 15064 of the CEQA Guidelines contains general rules regarding “determining the
significance of the environmental effects caused by a project.” Since the new Guideline section focuses on the specific rules regarding transportation impacts, OPR determined that it would be appropriate to place the new rules close to the section containing the general rules. Also, the new section 15064.3 would be contained within Article 5 of the Guidelines, which address “preliminary review of projects and conduct of initial study,” and therefore would be relevant to both negative declarations and environmental impact reports.

The proposed new section 15064.3 contains several subdivisions, which are described below.

**Subdivision (a): Purpose**

Subdivision (a) sets forth the purpose of the entire new section 15064.3. First, the subdivision clarifies that the primary consideration, in an environmental analysis, regarding transportation is the amount and distance that a project might cause people to drive. This captures two measures of transportation impacts: auto trips generated and trip distance. These factors are important in an environmental analysis for the reasons set forth in the background materials supporting vehicle miles traveled as a transportation metric. These factors were also identified by the legislature in SB 743. (Pub. Resources Code § 21099(b)(1).) Specifying that trip generation and vehicle miles traveled are the primary considerations in a transportation analysis is necessary because impacts analysis has historically focused on automobile delay.

The second sentence in subdivision (a) also identifies impacts to transit and the safety of other roadway users as relevant factors in an environmental analysis. Impacts to transit and facilities for pedestrians and bicyclists are relevant in an environmental impacts analysis because deterioration or interruption may cause users switch from transit or active modes to single-occupant vehicles, thereby causing energy consumption and air pollution to increase. Further, impacts to human safety are clearly impacts under CEQA. (Pub. Resources Code § 21083(b)(3) (a significance finding is required if “a project will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly”).) Finally, SB 743 requires the new guidelines to promote “multimodal transportation” and to provide for analysis of safety impacts. (Pub. Resources Code § 21099(b)(1), (b)(3).)

The third sentence clarifies that air quality and noise impacts related to transportation may still be relevant in a CEQA analysis. (Pub. Resources Code § 21099(b)(3) (the new guidelines do “not relieve a public agency of the requirement to analyze a project’s potentially significant transportation impacts related to air quality, noise, safety, or any other impact associated with transportation”).) However, those impacts are typically analyzed in the air quality and noise sections of environmental documents. Further, there is nothing in SB 743 that requires analysis of noise or air quality in a transportation section of an environmental document. In fact, the content of any environmental document may vary provided that any required content is included in the document. (State CEQA Guidelines § 15120(a).)

Finally, the last sentence clarifies that automobile delay is not a significant effect on the environment. This sentence is necessary to reflect the direction in SB 743 itself that vehicle delay is not a significant environmental impact. (Pub. Resources Code § 21099(b)(2) (“Upon certification of the guidelines by the Secretary of the Natural Resources Agency pursuant to this section, 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 pursuant to this division, except in locations specifically identified in the guidelines, if any”). As noted above, traffic-related noise and air quality impacts, for example, may still be analyzed in CEQA and mitigated as needed. Mitigation would consist of measures to reduce noise or air pollutants, however, and not necessarily the delay that some vehicles may experience in congestion.

Subdivision (b): Criteria for Analyzing Transportation Impacts
While subdivision (a) sets forth general principles related to transportation analysis, subdivision (b) focuses on specific criteria for determining the significance of transportation impacts. It is further divided into four subdivisions: (1) vehicle miles traveled and land use projects, (2) induced travel and transportation projects, (3) safety, and (4) methodology.

The lead-in sentences to these subdivisions clarify two things. First, CEQA’s general rules regarding the determination of significance apply to all potential impacts, including transportation impacts. These general rules include the necessity to consider context and substantial evidence related to the project under consideration, as well as the need to apply professional judgment. These rules are contained in section 15064 of the CEQA Guidelines, which is included as a cross-reference in subdivision (b). The second lead-in sentence clarifies that the new section 15064.3 contains rules that apply specifically to transportation impacts.

Subdivision (b)(1): Vehicle Miles Traveled and Land Use Projects
The first sentence in subdivision (b)(1) states that vehicle miles traveled is generally the most appropriate measure of transportation impacts. It uses the word “generally” because OPR recognizes that the CEQA Guidelines apply to a wide variety of project types and lead agencies. Therefore, this sentence recognizes that in appropriate circumstances, a lead agency may tailor its analysis to include other measures.

SB 743 did not authorize OPR to set thresholds, but it did direct OPR to develop Guidelines “for determining the significance of transportation impacts of projects[.]” (Pub. Resources Code § 21099(b)(2).) Therefore, to provide guidance on determining the significance of impacts, subdivision (b)(1) describes factors that might indicate whether the amount of a project’s vehicle miles traveled may be significant, or not.

For example, a project that results in vehicle miles traveled that is greater than the regional average might be considered to have a significant impact. Average in this case could be measured using an efficiency metric such as per capita, per employee, etc. Travel demand models can provide information on those regional averages. “Region” refers to the metropolitan planning organization or regional transportation plan area within which the project is located. Notably, because the proposed text states that greater than regional average “may indicate a significant impact,” this subdivision would not prevent a local jurisdiction from applying a more stringent threshold. (Pub. Resources Code § 21099(e) (the new Guidelines do not “affect the authority of a public agency to establish or adopt thresholds of
significance that are more protective of the environment”). Note, this potential finding of significance would not apply to projects that are otherwise statutorily or categorically exempt.

Why regional average? First, the region generally represents the area within which most people travel for their daily needs. Second, focusing on the region recognizes the many different contexts that exist in California. Third, pursuant to SB 375, metropolitan planning organizations throughout the state are developing sustainable communities strategies as part of their regional transportation plans, and as part of that process, they are developing data related to vehicle miles traveled. Fourth, average vehicle miles traveled per capita, per employee, etc., can be determined at the regional level from existing data. Finally, because SB 375 requires all regions to reduce region-wide greenhouse gas emissions related to transportation, projects that move the region in the other direction may warrant a closer look.

Subdivision (b)(1) also gives examples of projects that might have a less than significant impact with respect to vehicle miles traveled. For example, projects that locate in areas served by transit, where vehicle miles traveled is generally known to be low, may be considered to have a less than significant impact. (See, e.g., California Air Pollution Control Officers Association, “Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures,” (August 2010).) Further, projects that are shown to decrease vehicle miles traveled, as compared to existing conditions, may be considered to have a less than significant impact. Such projects might include, for example, the addition of a grocery store to an existing neighborhood that enables existing residents to drive shorter distances. Notably, in describing these factors, the Guidelines use the word “may” to signal that a lead agency should still consider substantial evidence indicating that a project may still have significant vehicle miles traveled impacts. For example, the addition of regional serving retail to a neighborhood may draw customers from far beyond a single neighborhood, and therefore might actually increase vehicle miles traveled overall. Similarly, a project located near transit but that also includes a significant amount of parking might indicate that the project may still generate significant vehicle travel.

Most of the examples in this subdivision are most relevant to specific development projects. Land use plans, such as specific plans or general plans, might be considered to have a less than significant effect at the plan level if they are consistent with an adopted sustainable communities strategy.

Subdivision (b)(2): Induced Travel and Transportation Projects
While subdivision (b)(1) addresses vehicle miles traveled associated with land use projects, subdivision (b)(2) focuses on impacts that result from certain transportation projects. Specifically, research indicates that adding new traffic lanes in areas subject to congestion tends to lead to more people driving further distances. (Handy and Boarnet, “DRAFT Policy Brief on Highway Capacity and Induced Travel,” (April 2014).) This is because the new roadway capacity may allow increased speeds on the roadway, which then allows people to access more distant locations in a shorter amount of time. Thus, the new roadway capacity may cause people to make trips that they would otherwise avoid because of congestion, or may make driving a more attractive mode of travel. Research also shows that extending new roadway capacity, like the addition of water or sewer infrastructure, may remove barriers to growth in undeveloped areas. Subdivision (b)(2) would therefore require lead agencies that add new physical roadway capacity in congested areas to consider these potential growth-inducing impacts.
Subdivision (b)(2) also clarifies that not all transportation projects would be expected to cause increases in vehicle miles traveled. For example, projects that are primarily designed to improve safety or operations would not typically be expected to create significant impacts. The same is true of pedestrian, bicycle and transit projects, including those that require reallocation or removal of motor vehicle lanes.

Subdivision (b)(3): Local Safety
Subdivision (b)(3) recognizes that vehicle miles traveled may not be the only impacts associated with transportation. While vehicle miles traveled may reflect regional concerns, transportation impacts may also be felt on a local level. The convenience of drivers and the layout of local roadway systems are issues that can, and likely will continue to be, addressed in local planning processes. Safety impacts, as noted above, are local impacts that are appropriate in a CEQA analysis.

Specifically, subdivision (b)(3) clarifies that lead agencies should consider whether a project may cause substantially unsafe conditions for various roadway users. The potential safety concern must be one that affects many people, not just an individual. Further, the potential safety concern must relate to actual project conditions, and not stem solely from subjective fears of an individual. Subdivision (b)(3) includes a non-exclusive list of potential factors that might affect the safety of different roadway users.

Subdivision (b)(4): Methodology
Subdivision (b)(4) provides guidance on methodology. First, it clarifies that analysis of a project’s vehicle miles traveled is subject to the rule of reason. In other words, a lead agency would not be expected to trace every possible trip associated with a project down to the last mile. Conversely, to the extent that available models and tools allow, a lead agency would be expected to consider vehicle miles traveled that extend beyond the lead agency’s political boundaries. (See, e.g., State CEQA Guidelines § 15151 (“An evaluation of the environmental effects of a proposed project need not be exhaustive, but the sufficiency of an EIR is to be reviewed in the light of what is reasonably feasible”).) This clarification is needed because under current practice, some lead agencies do not consider the transportation impacts of their own projects that may be felt within adjacent jurisdictions.

Subdivision (b)(4) also recognizes the role for both models and professional judgment in estimating vehicle miles traveled. Many publicly available models are available that can estimate the amount of vehicle miles traveled associated with a project. Models, however, are only tools. A model relies on certain assumptions and its use may, or may not, be appropriate given a particular project and its context. For similar reasons, model outputs may need to be revised. Thus, subdivision (b)(4) expressly recognizes the role of professional judgment in using models. Notably, this is consistent with general CEQA rules in determining significance. (See, e.g., State CEQA Guidelines § 15064(b) (determining significance “calls for careful judgment on the part of the public agency involved, based to the extent possible on scientific and factual data”).) To promote transparency, subdivision (b)(4) requires that any adjustments to model inputs or outputs be documented and explained. Further, this documentation should be made plain in the environmental document itself.
Subdivision (c): Mitigation and Alternatives
Subdivision (c) restates the general rule that when a lead agency identifies a significant impact, it must consider mitigation measures that would reduce that impact. The selection of particular mitigation measures, however, is always left to the discretion of the lead agency. Further, OPR expects that agencies will continue to innovate and find new ways to reduce vehicular travel. Therefore, OPR proposes to identify several potential mitigation measures and alternatives in existing Appendix F (regarding energy impacts analysis), and include a cross-reference to Appendix F in subdivision (c). Subdivision (c) also makes explicit that this section does not limit any public agency’s ability to condition a project pursuant to other laws. For example, while automobile delay will not be treated as a significant impact under CEQA, cities and counties may still require projects to achieve levels of service designated in general plans or zoning codes. (Pub. Resources Code § 21099(b)(4) (“This subdivision [requiring a new transportation metric under CEQA] does not preclude the application of local general plan policies, zoning codes, conditions of approval, thresholds, or any other planning requirements pursuant to the police power or any other authority”).) Similarly, with regard to projects that have already undergone environmental review, subdivision (c) clarifies that nothing in these proposed rules would prevent a lead agency from enforcing previously adopted mitigation measures. In fact, within the bounds of other laws, including adopted general plans, lead agencies have discretion to apply or modify previously adopted mitigation measures. (Napa Citizens for Honest Government v. Napa County Bd. of Sup. (2001) 91 Cal. App. 4th 342, 358 (because “mistakes can be made and must be rectified, and ... the vision of a region's citizens or its governing body may evolve over time... there are times when mitigation measures, once adopted, can be deleted”).) Notably, deletion of measures imposed solely to address automobile delay should not require any additional environmental review because section 21099 of the Public Resources Code states that automobile delay is not a significant impact under CEQA.

Subdivision (d): Applicability
OPR recognizes that the procedures proposed in this section may not be familiar to all public agencies. Therefore, to allow lead agencies time to familiarize themselves with these new procedures, OPR proposes a phased approach to implementation. Doing so will also allow OPR to continue studying the application of vehicle miles traveled in the environmental review process, and to propose further changes to this section if necessary.

Subdivision (d) explains when these new rules will apply to project reviews. The first sentence restates the general rule that changes to the CEQA Guidelines apply prospectively to new projects that have not already commenced environmental review. (See State CEQA Guidelines § 15007.)

The second sentence provides that the new procedures will apply immediately upon the effective date of these Guidelines to projects located within one-half mile of major transit stops and high quality transit corridors. Those transit-served areas have been the focus of planning under SB 375 and jurisdictions containing such areas may be more likely to be familiar with tools that estimate vehicle miles traveled.
The third sentence allows jurisdictions to opt-in to these new procedures, regardless of location, provided that they update their own CEQA procedures to reflect the rules in this section. (See State CEQA Guidelines § 15022.) This is intended to provide certainty to project applicants and the public regarding which rules will govern project applications. Notably, a lead agency’s adoption of updates to its own CEQA procedures will not normally be considered a project that requires its own environmental review. (See California Building Industry Assn. v. Bay Area Air Quality Management Dist. (2014) 218 Cal. App. 4th 1171, 1183-1192 (certiorari granted on other grounds).)

Finally, the last sentence states that after January 1, 2016, the rules in this section will apply statewide.

**Explanation of Amendments to Appendix F: Energy Impacts**

OPR proposes to provide suggestions of potential mitigation measures and alternatives that might reduce a project’s vehicle miles traveled in Appendix F of the State CEQA Guidelines. Appendix F provides detailed guidance on conducting an analysis of a project’s energy impacts. Inclusion of the list of suggested measures in Appendix F is proposed for at least two reasons. First, vehicle miles traveled may be a relevant consideration in the analysis and mitigation of a project’s energy impacts. Second, the list of potential mitigation measures is lengthy and is more appropriate for an appendix than the body of the Guidelines.

Notably, the suggested mitigation measures and alternatives were largely drawn from the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association’s guide on Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures. That guide relied on peer-reviewed research on the effects of various mitigation measures, and provides substantial evidence that the identified measures are likely to lead to quantifiable reductions in vehicle miles traveled.

**Explanation of Amendments to Appendix G: Transportation**

OPR proposes several changes to the questions related to transportation in Appendix G to conform to the proposed new Section 15064.3. First, OPR proposes to revise the question related to “measures of effectiveness” so that the focus is more on the circulation element and other plans governing transportation. Second, OPR proposes to revise the question that currently refers to “level of service” to focus instead on a project’s vehicle miles traveled. Third, OPR proposes to recast the question related to design features so that it focuses instead on whether a roadway project would tend to induce additional travel. Fourth, OPR proposes to revise the question related to safety to address the factors described in subdivision (b)(3) of the proposed new Section 15064.3.
Text of Proposed New Section 15064.3

Proposed New Section 15064.3. Determining the Significance of Transportation Impacts; Alternatives and Mitigation Measures

(a) Purpose.

When analyzing a project’s potential environmental impacts related to transportation, primary considerations include the amount and distance of automobile travel associated with the project. Other relevant considerations include the effects of the project on transit and non-motorized travel and the safety of all travelers. Indirect effects of project-related transportation, such as impacts to air quality and noise, may also be relevant, but may be analyzed together with stationary sources in other portions of the environmental document. A project’s effect on automobile delay does not constitute a significant environmental impact.

(b) Criteria for Analyzing Transportation Impacts.

Section 15064 contains general rules governing the analysis, and the determination of significance, of environmental effects. Specific considerations involving transportation impacts are described in this section. For the purposes of this section, “vehicle miles traveled” refers to distance of automobile travel associated with a project.

1) Vehicle Miles Traveled and Land Use Projects. Generally, transportation impacts of a project can be best measured using vehicle miles traveled. A development project that is not exempt and that results in vehicle miles traveled greater than regional average for the land use type (e.g. residential, employment, commercial) may indicate a significant impact. For the purposes of this subdivision, regional average should be measured per capita, per employee, per trip, per person-trip or other appropriate measure. Also for the purposes of this subdivision, region refers to the metropolitan planning organization or regional transportation planning agency within which the project is located. Development projects that locate within one-half mile of either an existing major transit stop or a stop along an existing high quality transit corridor generally may be considered to have a less than significant transportation impact. Similarly, development projects, that result in net decreases in vehicle miles traveled, compared to existing conditions, may be considered to have a less than significant transportation impact. Land use plans that are either consistent with a sustainable communities strategy, or that achieve at least an equivalent reduction in vehicle miles traveled as projected to result from implementation of a sustainable communities strategy, generally may be considered to have a less than significant impact.
(2) Induced Vehicle Travel and Transportation Projects. To the extent that a transportation project increases physical roadway capacity for automobiles in a congested area, or adds a new roadway to the network, the transportation analysis should analyze whether the project will induce additional automobile travel compared to existing conditions. The addition of general purpose highway or arterial lanes may indicate a significant impact except on rural roadways where the primary purpose is to improve safety and where speeds are not significantly altered. Transportation projects that do not add physical roadway capacity for automobiles, but instead are for the primary purpose of improving safety or operations, undertaking maintenance or rehabilitation, providing rail grade separations, or improving transit operations, generally would not result in a significant transportation impact. Also, new managed lanes (i.e. tolling, high-occupancy lanes, lanes for transit or freight vehicles only, etc.), or short auxiliary lanes, that are consistent with the transportation projects in a Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy, and for which induced travel was already adequately analyzed, generally would not result in a significant transportation impact. Transportation projects (including lane priority for transit, bicycle and pedestrian projects) that lead to net decreases in vehicle miles traveled, compared to existing conditions, may also be considered to have a less than significant transportation impact.

(3) Local Safety. In addition to a project’s effect on vehicle miles traveled, a lead agency may also consider localized effects of project-related transportation on safety. Examples of objective factors that may be relevant may include:

(A) Increase exposure of bicyclists and pedestrians in vehicle conflict areas (i.e., remove pedestrian and bicycle facilities, increase roadway crossing times or distances, etc.).

(B) Contribute to queuing on freeway off-ramps where queues extend onto the mainline.

(C) Contribute to speed differentials of greater than 15 miles per hour between adjacent travel lanes.

(D) Increase motor vehicle speeds.

(E) Increase distance between pedestrian or bicycle crossings.

(4) Methodology. The lead agency’s evaluation of the vehicle miles traveled associated with a project is subject to a rule of reason; however, a lead agency generally should not confine its evaluation to its own political boundary. A lead agency may use models to estimate a project’s vehicle miles traveled, and may revise those estimates to reflect professional judgment based on substantial evidence. Any assumptions used to estimate vehicle miles traveled and any revisions to model outputs should be documented and explained in the environmental document prepared for the project.

(c) Alternatives and Mitigation.

Examples of mitigation measures and alternatives that may reduce vehicle miles travelled are included in Appendix F. Neither this section nor Appendix F limits the exercise of any public agency’s discretion provided by other laws, including, but not limited to, the authority of cities and counties to condition project approvals pursuant to general plans and zoning codes. Previously adopted
measures to mitigate congestion impacts may continue to be enforced, or modified, at the discretion of the lead agency.

(d) Applicability.

The provisions of this section shall apply prospectively as described in section 15007. Upon filing of this section with the Secretary of State, this section shall apply to the analysis of projects located within one-half mile of major transit stops or high quality transit corridors. Outside of those areas, a lead agency may elect to be governed by the provisions of this section provided that it updates its own procedures pursuant to section 15022 to conform to the provisions of this section. After January 1, 2016, the provisions of this section shall apply statewide.

Text of Proposed Amendments to Appendix F

Appendix F

Energy Conservation

I. Introduction

The goal of conserving energy implies the wise and efficient use of energy. The means of achieving this goal include:

1. decreasing overall per capita energy consumption,

2. decreasing reliance on fossil fuels such as coal, natural gas and oil, and

3. increasing reliance on renewable energy sources.

In order to assure that energy implications are considered in project decisions, the California Environmental Quality Act requires that EIRs include a discussion of the potential energy impacts of proposed projects, with particular emphasis on avoiding or reducing inefficient, wasteful and unnecessary consumption of energy (see Public Resources Code section 21100(b)(3)). Energy conservation implies that a project's cost effectiveness be reviewed not only in dollars, but also in terms of energy requirements. For many projects, cost effectiveness may be determined more by energy efficiency than by initial dollar costs. A lead agency may consider the extent to which an energy source serving the project has already undergone environmental review that adequately analyzed and mitigated the effects of energy production.

II. EIR Contents

Potentially significant energy implications of a project shall be considered in an EIR to the extent relevant and applicable to the project. The following list of energy impact possibilities and potential conservation measures is designed to assist in the preparation of an EIR. In many instances specific items may not apply or additional items may be needed. Where items listed below are applicable or relevant to the project, they should be considered in the EIR.

A. Project Description may include the following items:

1. Energy consuming equipment and processes which will be used during construction, operation and/or removal of the project. If appropriate, this discussion should consider the energy intensiveness of materials and equipment required for the project.

2. Total energy requirements of the project by fuel type and end use.
3. Energy conservation equipment and design features.

4. Identification of energy supplies that would serve the project.

5. Total estimated daily vehicle trips to be generated by the project and the additional energy consumed per trip by mode.

B. Environmental Setting may include existing energy supplies and energy use patterns in the region and locality.

C. Environmental Impacts may include:

1. The project's energy requirements and its energy use efficiencies by amount and fuel type for each stage of the project including construction, operation, maintenance and/or removal. If appropriate, the energy intensiveness of materials maybe discussed.

2. The effects of the project on local and regional energy supplies and on, requirements for additional capacity.

3. The effects of the project on peak and base period demands for electricity and other forms of energy.

4. The degree to which the project complies with existing energy standards.

5. The effects of the project on energy resources.

6. The project's projected transportation energy use requirements and its overall use of efficient transportation alternatives.

D. Mitigation Measures may include:

1. Potential measures to reduce wasteful, inefficient and unnecessary consumption of energy during construction, operation, maintenance and/or removal. The discussion should explain why certain measures were incorporated in the project and why other measures were dismissed.

2. The potential of siting, orientation, and design to minimize energy consumption, including transportation energy, increase water conservation and reduce solid-waste.

3. The potential for reducing peak energy demand.

4. Alternate fuels (particularly renewable ones) or energy systems.

5. Energy conservation which could result from recycling efforts.
6. Potential measures to reduce vehicle miles traveled include, but are not limited to:

a. Improving or increasing access to transit.

b. Increasing access to common goods and services, such as groceries, schools, and daycare.

c. Incorporating affordable housing into the project.

d. Improving the jobs/housing fit of a community.

e. Incorporating neighborhood electric vehicle network.

f. Orienting the project toward transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

g. Improving pedestrian or bicycle networks, or transit service.

h. Traffic calming.

i. Providing bicycle parking.

j. Limiting parking supply.

k. Unbundling parking costs.

l. Parking or roadway pricing or cash-out programs.

m. Implementing a commute reduction program.

n. Providing car-sharing, bike sharing, and ride-sharing programs.

o. Providing transit passes.

E. Alternatives should be compared in terms of overall energy consumption and in terms of reducing wasteful, inefficient and unnecessary consumption of energy. **Examples of project alternatives that may reduce vehicle miles traveled include, but are not limited to:**

1. Locating the project in an area of the region that already exhibits below average vehicle miles traveled.

2. Locating the project near transit.

3. Increasing project density.

4. Increasing the mix of uses within the project, or within the project’s surroundings.

5. Increasing connectivity and/or intersection density on the project site.
6. Deploying management (e.g. pricing, vehicle occupancy requirements) on roadways or roadway lanes.

F. Unavoidable Adverse Effects may include wasteful, inefficient and unnecessary consumption of energy during the project construction, operation, maintenance and/or removal that cannot be feasibly mitigated.

G. Irreversible Commitment of Resources may include a discussion of how the project preempts future energy development or future energy conservation.

H. Short-Term Gains versus Long-Term Impacts can be compared by calculating the project's energy costs over the project's lifetime.

I. Growth Inducing Effects may include the estimated energy consumption of growth induced by the project.

Text of Proposed Amendments to Appendix G
The following is an excerpt of Section XVI of existing Appendix G, as proposed to be amended to conform to proposed Section 15064.3:

[...]

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the addressing the safety or performance of the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle lanes and pedestrian paths? taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

b) Cause vehicle miles traveled (per capita, per service population, or other appropriate measure) that exceeds the regional average for that land use? Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

c) Result in substantially unsafe conditions for pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, motorists or other users of public rights of way by, among other things, increasing speeds, increasing exposure of bicyclists and pedestrians in vehicle conflict areas, etc.? a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

d) Substantially induce additional automobile travel by increasing physical roadway capacity in congested areas (i.e., by adding new mixed-flow lanes) or by adding new roadways to the network? increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

[...]
Providing Input
This is a preliminary discussion draft, which we expect to change for the better through public input. We hope that you will share your thoughts and expertise in this effort.

When and Where to Submit Comments
Input may be submitted electronically to CEQA.Guidelines@ceres.ca.gov. While electronic submission is preferred, suggestions may also be mailed or hand delivered to:

Christopher Calfee, Senior Counsel
Governor’s Office of Planning and Research
1400 Tenth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Please submit all suggestions before October 10, 2014 at 5:00 p.m.

Tips for Providing Effective Input
OPR would like to encourage robust engagement in this update process. We expect that participants will bring a variety of perspectives. While opposing views may be strongly held, discourse can and should proceed in a civil and professional manner. To maximize the value of your input, please consider the following:

• In your comment(s), please clearly identify the specific issues on which you are commenting. If you are commenting on a particular word, phrase, or sentence, please provide the page number and paragraph citation.
• Explain why you agree or disagree with OPR’s proposed changes. Where you disagree with a particular portion of the proposal, please suggest alternative language.
• Describe any assumptions and support assertions with legal authority and factual information, including any technical information and/or data. Where possible, provide specific examples to illustrate your concerns.
• When possible, consider trade-offs and potentially opposing views.
• Focus comments on the issues that are covered within the scope of the proposed changes. Avoid addressing rules or policies other than those contained in this proposal.
• Consider quality over quantity. One well-supported comment may be more influential than one hundred form letters.
• Please submit any comments within the timeframe provided.
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: VTA-ATU Pension Plan Actuarial Valuation as of January 1, 2014

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

In accord with state law applicable to all public pension plans and as required by the collectively bargained terms of the VTA-ATU Pension Plan (Plan), Cheiron has prepared the actuarial valuation report of the Plan as of January 1, 2014. The actuarial valuation is performed annually to determine the financial condition and contribution requirements of the Plan as well as to present those items required for disclosure by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB).

DISCUSSION:

Cheiron has recommended that the Plan contribution rate be decreased from $25.7 million in FY 2014 to $25.5 million in FY 2015. The primary reason for the increase was investment gain both on a market value basis and on an actuarial value basis.

The Plan had Actuarial assets of $426.7 million and Actuarial Accrued Liability of $572.2 million. The Unfunded Actuarial Accrued Liability (UAAL) decreased by $12.0 Million from $157.6 million in the previous year to $145.6 million primarily due to investment experience. The funded ratio of the plan on an actuarial basis was 74.6%, and increased by 3.6% over the previous year. The funded ratio of the plan on a market value basis was 80.3% and increased by 6.5% over the previous year. The market value of the Plan’s assets was $459.4 million resulting in a ratio of Actuarial Value to Market Value (assets) of 92.9%. The chart on the following page depicts the funded status of the pension plan on an actuarial value as well as market value basis for the past 10 years.
The Board of Pensions elected to continue to amortize the UAAL over a period of 20 years. The required pension contribution was prepaid at the start of the fiscal year 2015.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

The required contribution of $25.5 million as adopted by the SCVTA-ATU Pension Plan is included in the FY15 VTA Transit Fund Operating Budget adopted by the Board.

**DEFINITIONS:**

*Actuarial Value of Assets:*

The Actuarial Value of Assets, used for funding purposes, is computed using an asset smoothing technique in which investment gains and losses are not fully recognized in the year they occur, but are spread over future years.

*Market Value of Assets:*

The market value of investments as of the valuation date. Gains and losses are recognized immediately.
Unfunded Actuarial Accrued Liability (UAAL):
The excess of the Actuarial Accrued Liability over Plan assets.

STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:
The Administration and Finance Committee accepted the report at its September meeting.

Prepared By: Ali Hudda
Memo No. 4676
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO:        Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
           Board of Directors

THROUGH:   General Manager, Nuria I. Fernandez

FROM:      Chief Operating Officer, Michael A. Hursh

SUBJECT:   Transit Service Changes - October 2014

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

VTA implements transit service changes on a quarterly basis in January, April, July and October. Major changes are typically planned for January and July, while minor changes are implemented in April and October. Proposed “major” service changes must be submitted to the VTA Board of Directors for review and approval. For Title VI compliance purposes, all “major” service changes also require that VTA staff perform a Service Equity Analysis.

The following modifications are considered “major” service changes as adopted by the VTA Board of Directors on October 3, 2013.

- Establishment of a new transit line or service.
- Elimination of a transit line or service.
- Route change that impacts 25 percent or more of a line’s route miles.
- Span of service or frequency changes affecting 25 percent or more of a line’s revenue vehicle hours.
- Series of changes on a single route which are included in the two-year Transit Service Plan and cumulatively meet any of the above criteria.
- Proposed changes that are anticipated to be controversial with a particular community or interested parties based on public feedback.
- System-wide change concurrently affecting five percent or more of the total system revenue hours.

Service change proposals that do not meet the criteria for ”major” service changes are handled at the staff level and are still subject to an appropriate level of public and community review and comment.
DISCUSSION:

The following transit service changes will take effect on Monday, October 13, 2014, and were approved by the VTA Board of Directors in May 2013 as part of the two year FY14-FY15 Transit Service Plan. The Transit Service Plan also included the required Title VI Service Equity Analysis.

MAJOR CHANGES

**Line 23 (De Anza College-Alum Rock Transit Center):** The frequency will be improved on Saturday and Sunday evenings to reduce overcrowding. Minor weekday running time changes will be made in the eastbound direction due to Santa Clara-Alum Rock BRT construction.

**Community Bus Line 37 (West Valley College-Capitol LRT Station):** On weekdays, hourly evening service will be extended from 6:30 p.m. until 10 p.m. between West Valley College and Winchester Light Rail Station.

**Line 52 (Foothill College-Mountain View):** Hourly evening service will be added from 5:00 p.m. until approximately 9:30 p.m. leaving Foothill College. Other minor schedule changes will be made.

**Line 58 (West Valley College-Alviso):** New midday service will operate every 30 minutes on weekdays between the Alviso and De La Cruz & Aldo part of this route. Currently this route only has AM and PM peak service. The new midday service will operate from about 8:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. It is aimed at passengers from Alviso that currently don't have midday transit service to connect to light rail and other bus routes. Also the service provides transit access for the growing North San Jose and North Santa Clara housing areas to access light rail, River Mark and the @First commercial development at First and Route 237. Both employees and customers of these locations will benefit.

**Express Line 102 (South San Jose-Palo Alto):** A new northbound morning trip will be added leaving the Santa Teresa Light Rail Station at 6:15 a.m. and arriving Hansen & Page Mill at 7:13 a.m. A new southbound afternoon trip will be added leaving Hansen & Page Mill at 4:13 p.m. and arriving at the Santa Teresa Light Rail Station at 5:31 p.m. This increases the number of trips on this express route from six to seven during both the a.m. and p.m.

OTHER CHANGES

**Line 10 (Santa Clara Transit Center--Metro Airport LRT Station):** Weekday morning schedule changes will be made to improve frequency before 7 a.m. to improve connections to light rail. Other minor weekday and weekend schedule changes will be made due to the new Caltrain schedule.
Line 22 and Rapid 522 (Palo Alto-Eastridge): Minor weekday running time changes will be made in the eastbound direction due to Santa Clara - Alum Rock BRT construction.

Line 68 (Gilroy-San Jose Diridon Station): The southbound routing will be slightly modified in South San Jose to use Endicott to Great Oaks to Cottle in order to provide a bus stop in the area. Minor weekday and weekend schedule changes will be made.

Line 89 (California Ave. Caltrain Station-Palo Alto Veteran's Hospital): Minor schedule changes will be made due to the new Caltrain schedule.

DASH (San Jose Diridon Station-San Jose State University)- Minor schedule changes will be made due to the new Caltrain schedule.

New Express Buses: VTA will be receiving 20 new express buses during the last quarter of 2014. This will bring our total express bus fleet up to 40. Express buses will now be deployed from both Cerone and North Bus Divisions. By mid-December all trips on Express Lines 101, 102, 103, 104, 120, 121, 122, 168, and 182 will operate with Express buses.

Minor Schedule Changes:
- Community Bus Line 19 (Gilroy Transit Center to Wren & Mantelli)
- Community Bus Line 32 (San Antonio Shopping Center-Santa Clara Transit Center)
- Community Bus Line 48 (Los Gatos-Winchester Transit Center)
- Community Bus Line 49 (Los Gatos-Winchester Transit Center)
- Line 51 (De Anza College-Moffett Field/Ames Center)
- Line 54 (De Anza College-Sunnyvale/Lockheed Martin)
- Line 55 (De Anza College-Great America)
- Line 57 (West Valley College-Great America)
- Line 63 (Almaden Valley-San Jose State)
- Community Bus Line 65 (Kooser & Meridian-13th & Hedding)
- Line 66 (Kaiser San Jose-Milpitas)
- Line 82 (Westgate-Downtown San Jose)
- Limited Stop Line 328 (Almaden & Via Valiente to Lockheed Martin/Moffett Park)

STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:

The Transit Planning & Operations Committee received this item at their September 2014 meeting. Staff informed the Committee that VTA will receive 20 new Express Buses toward the end of 2014. There were no comments or discussion from Committee members.

Prepared By: Jim Unites
Memo No. 4335
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: SPUR Report: VTA - "Freedom to Move"

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

SPUR staff will present a report on the VTA entitled “Freedom to Move”. The report is included as Attachment A.

This report discusses the growth in congestion within the county for the past two decades. It identifies steps VTA can take to improve the multimodal transportation environment in Santa Clara County. There is a list of seven strategies that the VTA can implement to help deliver transportation options to this county’s residents. The strategies in this document include those that the VTA is currently implementing. As VTA prepares to update its long range transportation plan in 2015, it will look towards SPUR and other organizations to help in the plan’s preparation. It will also consider the strategies as a part of future planning.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Comments

The TAC received the report from Ratna Amin of SPUR and provided some comments.

Member Batra noted that when his city is developing multimodal streets and options where there is a removal of a lane to accommodate a bike/ped mode, it can be very challenging to explain to the public why a street changed from an existing typology to another. Ratna explained that a good education process would really benefit the community. Member Salvano also responded that education to the public based on data driven results can have a positive impact.

Member Salvano also opined that while there is a call to end road expansion it is important to note that commute traffic has the biggest impact on congestion. It could be beneficial for transportation demand management tools that can provide a solution to some of the congestion impacts. Ratna agreed that employers could provide support to commuters through items such as
Member Collen commented that he supported some of the goals contained within the report however he noted new changes in transportation such as driverless cars and personal rapid transit could add vehicle trips and not reduce congestion. He also stated that while road expansion is not optimal, in some cases it benefits congestion and might be necessary. Member Collen also noted that the County’s land use policy has, since the 1970s, discouraged sprawl and encouraged smart growth. This and other initiatives should be recognized. He also noted the Expressway program has added pedestrian improvements such as overcrossings and bicycle adaptive signal timing with the support of local agency partners.

Member Batra and Ex-Officio Saleh commented that there are opportunities that are outside of the box that need to be looked at to address transportation solutions.

Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) Comments

The PAC received the report from Ratna Amin of SPUR and did not comment.

STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:

Congestion Management Program & Planning Committee (CMPP)

The CMPP received the report from Ratna Amin of SPUR and provided some comments.

Member Yeager noted the presentation outlined some transit strategies that involve increasing transit ridership and wondered whether some of these strategies outline with what VTA is actually doing. He also asked how the transit market is being captured for those who live outside the County and commute in without using transit. Ratna responded that it is a challenge to make transit an attractive option. For optimal service, frequency should be targeted. She went to state that people drive because there is ample parking. Some strategies could involve charging for parking, aligning developments near jobs, and providing good alternatives to transportation.

Chair Pirzynski noted that there needs to be an efficient transportation solution that works for all users. It would be helpful to work with other agencies to develop meaningful outcomes.

Member Whittum opined that transit sometimes does not serve those that need it the most, namely school children. How can transit that is on the routes of significant routes miss those school kids? He also stated that his city has clear transportation goals and they do their best to implement them but it can be a struggle sometimes. He went on to say that one way to increase funding was to grow the farebox recovery rate. How can big companies capture the riders that we, as an agency, should be reaching? Are there things we can learn about that?

Member Herrera asked if there was an example of another city that did apply some similar strategies outlined in the SPUR report. Ratna responded that Denver has been taking good land use and transportation measures to have an efficient system that has an increased ridership and making changes to land use policy.

Member Herrera also felt as if the Capitol Expressway Light Rail project was not looked at in a
positive light. She felt that corridor has good ridership and with the proximity of the BART Extension at Berryessa, there was a good opportunity to provide a good connection. Ratna responded that the report attempted to articulate that the corridor could be built up through BRT first before light rail. Member Herrera responded that there should be focus on what should be around light rail because the demand for the service is there. She stated that each situation is different and that working together we can understand each situation appropriately.

**Administration & Finance Committee (A&F)**

A&F received the report from Ratna Amin of SPUR and provided some comments.

Member Esteves asked how SPUR could be more involved with city planning issues. Ratna responded that SPUR actively engages the City of San Jose and is working to engage more cities in Santa Clara County. Member Esteves also stated that he was interested in SPUR looking at major projects and providing suggestions.

Member Carr stated that these transportation strategies in the report were urban in nature and wondered if these concepts are applicable to those areas that were not as urban. Ratna responded that the strategies apply to any location. She noted that one of the challenges is to note that there must be a good solution for commuters coming from South County through innovation, technology, and public/private partnerships. The focus is on long work trips and doable short trips.

**Transit Planning & Operations Committee (TP&O)**

TP&O received the report from Ratna Amin of SPUR and provided some comments.

Member Price appreciated the report and asked if SPUR was taking this presentation to City Councils and other venues such as candidate forums. Ratna responded that they have not so far but would be open to taking it to any venue and have a healthy discussion. She also noted that SPUR San Jose has forums that they host and are open to having more focused topics.

Member Price commented politics play a big role in decision making and sometimes hinders good progress on specific issues. She also stated Silicon Valley is the hub of technology, academia, and research. She asked how the knowledge can be taken, applied to transportation and shared to the average person. Member Price continued that parking was a big component and that solutions to parking related elements could be beneficial in the long run. Ratna stated that SPUR was open to using the resources that this County has to offer.

Member Khamis noted that Europe has been doing smart planning for many years and commented that the European strategies should be applied in the area. Ratna stated that it would be difficult to implement what Europe is doing but by rethinking the planning, there are benefits that would help address issues.

Chair Rocha asked what level SPUR involves itself in development decisions made by cities. Ratna stated SPUR has worked with the City of San Jose on particular projects and provided comment. Chair Rocha welcomed SPUR input on development projects in San Jose.
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How the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority can create better transportation choices in the South Bay
Executive Summary

Like many urban areas that experienced dramatic growth after World War II, Santa Clara County grew up around the car. Now roadway traffic is making significant contributions to climate change and creating problems for the county in terms of economic growth, social equity and quality of life. With the population expected to grow 36 percent by 2040, congestion and its negative impacts are only going to get worse.

History shows that we can’t build our way out of traffic. Projects to add new highway lanes only encourage more people to drive, and studies show that within a few years congestion is just as bad.

Meanwhile, the county’s past attempts to shift people away from car use haven’t worked. Despite investments in a light-rail system and widespread bus service, the percentage of people who drive to work remains high at 87 percent.

How can we get Santa Clara County, its people and its economy moving in a more sustainable way? By working to expand the range of available transportation choices, so that driving alone does not continue to be the only practical, reliable way to get around most of the county.

The Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) is the agency best-positioned to lead this change. VTA does everything from planning and operating transit to constructing highways. The agency has the sophistication and expertise to create the South Bay’s sustainable transportation system of the future. Together with the towns and cities of the South Bay, VTA can deliver great transportation options.

There are many reasons why driving has dominated in the South Bay:

The car has shaped the county’s growth. Most growth in the South Bay took place during the highway-building era of the 1950s, ’60s and ’70s. Land use decisions were made without regional coordination, and housing and jobs were distributed in different places, often resulting in long, car-dependent commutes. In recent years VTA and other agencies have begun developing plans to focus growth in compact, transit-oriented communities. But the private market is driving where growth actually happens — and it isn’t always near transit.

Transit doesn’t thrive throughout Santa Clara County. Because the county didn’t grow up around a transit system, buses and light rail have difficulty covering the vast area efficiently. Many transit destinations don’t attract riders because they aren’t integrated into a dense, walkable community. Some shopping centers and office parks may be near transit, but many lack sidewalks and can be difficult and dangerous to access from transit stops.

Political factors play a role. In the course of our research, two political challenges to shifting the transportation system became apparent: the lack of a shared vision about what the system should look like, and the lack of champions to make the hard decisions necessary for a move to a different future.

Despite these challenges, it is both possible and imperative for the South Bay to become a region with great transportation options. Because it’s not easy to create a new transportation culture, SPUR recommends using many strategies simultaneously to transition the system.

VTA is already shifting to becoming a “multi-modal” agency that balances the needs of walking, biking, transit and cars, and it is innovating new solutions to complex transportation problems. The strategies we recommend build on this momentum and set goals for achieving success.
STRATEGY 1: Make transit great in the places it works best.
In the corridors where transit can work well, it should be great. Bus and light-rail services should be frequent, productive, appealing and easy to access and navigate. For high-demand trips, transit travel times should be competitive with the car. Useful, high-quality transit service spurs a virtuous cycle: Improved transit supports cycling and walking, which in turn helps to shape communities around transit access, which then improves the productivity and attractiveness of transit.

STRATEGY 2: Develop mobility solutions beyond transit.
For suburban areas where transit service is impractical to run and transit stations are hard to access, VTA should pilot new kinds of transportation services. Innovations such as ridesharing, bikesharing, smartphone apps and new vehicle technology are all examples of ways transportation is changing. The opportunities these developments present for the South Bay are substantial.

STRATEGY 3: Make streets work for all users and stop expanding roads.
Roads have consumed a large portion of the developable land in Santa Clara County and can be a significant barrier for transportation modes other than cars. There is not enough funding to maintain all the roads in the county, and current pavement conditions are poor. In this context, it is imperative that road expansion projects stop and that existing roads move more people using a wider variety of modes. Local streets and expressways should benefit all users and provide safe space for pedestrians, cyclists and transit riders. Highways should be increasingly used by carpools and transit vehicles and should be priced to manage demand.

STRATEGY 4: Shape communities around transit.
Transportation should help shape great places and support a high quality of life — not contribute to degrading these things. Because VTA is a transportation agency, and local cities manage land use and the built environment, we must be proactive and intentional when it comes to integrating transportation and communities if we want to shape growth in a different way. VTA, the county and local cities and towns should have a shared vision for a region that supports a multitude of transportation options, and communities should be designed in ways that support this vision.

STRATEGY 5: Set clear sustainable transportation goals and align resources to meet them.
To become a leader of a different transportation future, VTA must have clear goals for increased sustainability and mobility. VTA is a large agency with a broad range of functions, many of which lead to conflicting plans and investments. Setting high-level goals for the county’s transportation system will help align VTA’s functions, enable partnerships and resolve difficult decisions.

STRATEGY 6: Increase public engagement and innovation.
VTA’s services affect every single person who lives in, works in or visits Santa Clara County. The agency can use its reach to help connect people with its vision for the future. VTA should develop a trusting and productive relationship with all of its constituencies and a culture of co-creation and open innovation, where the public is treated as an integral player in moving the region forward.

STRATEGY 7: Grow funding.
There is not enough funding today to implement all the recommendations presented in this report. To make up for decreasing public subsidies from the state and federal government, we recommend cultivating new local funding sources. Some, like user fees or impact fees, could even drive changes in traveler behavior or land use patterns and help VTA achieve its goals. SPUR encourages VTA to test and pilot new funding sources. 

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
A new direction for transportation in the South Bay

Santa Clara County grew up around the car. Rapid conversion of agricultural land into suburban developments, a boom in tech office campuses, and big investments in highways and expressways over the last half-century have all contributed to a region where driving is usually the most practical way to get around.

Now the county is poised to grow dramatically. Estimates project 641,830 new residents by 2040—a 36 percent increase. As it grows, is the South Bay destined to be dominated by cars, pollution and congestion? Not necessarily. The future is full of opportunities to create great transportation choices and more livable communities in Santa Clara County.

There are costs to not changing course: Autos make an enormous contribution to greenhouse gases and climate change. Land allocated for cars—i.e., roads and parking spots—is unavailable for other uses, such as housing or jobs, which makes it difficult to grow in a compact and sustainable way. Long or expensive peak-hour commutes, traffic and dispersed development all slow economic growth. And there are social costs as well, such as traffic injuries and deaths, poorer health outcomes, social isolation, and limited access to basic services and educational opportunities.

The county has tried to reduce the impact of cars, but despite countless adopted plans, the construction of the light rail system, widespread bus service, and strategies like telecommuting and carpool lanes, little has changed in the way South Bay residents get around. Within the county, public transportation still accounts for just over 3 percent of all trips to work while cars are used for 87 percent of those trips. See Figure 1.

Change has been difficult for numerous reasons. The suburban, spread-out land use pattern is not

---

**FIGURE 1**
How Santa Clara County Gets to Work

In Santa Clara County, 87 percent of all trips to work are made by car, while transit accounts for just over 3 percent of these trips. These rates have hardly changed since 1960 despite many efforts to shift them, including the development of a light rail transit system. (Note: Bike commuting was not measured before 2000.)
well-suited for transportation modes other than the car. Low-density, single-use buildings, most of which were not designed around the transit system, make it difficult for buses and light rail to meet people’s needs. As a result, transit usage is low despite a high-quality system that consistently meets high benchmarks for reliability, cleanliness and capacity, among other measures. Low ridership and a spread-out system also mean that transit is expensive to provide to those who do use it.

Highway building, road expansions and an ample supply of parking throughout the region have reinforced the dominance of the car while other modes of travel, like walking or cycling, are often uncomfortable and impractical.

While the land use pattern will be slow to change, we can take steps toward a more sustainable and effective transportation system. We can find ways to help public transportation thrive; make streets work for bicyclists, pedestrians and transit riders; and innovate new solutions for getting around in the places where transit will never work well. We can also agree that transportation and cities grow together — and then support this idea with our transportation planning and land use decisions. Effective transportation is what allows a city to grow and prosper.

The Valley Transportation Authority is poised to lead change

The Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) is the agency best positioned to lead this change in Santa Clara County. Most local transportation agencies have a narrower focus, but VTA does everything from planning and operating transit to constructing highways. VTA owns real estate around transit stops, reviews local development projects and is building the BART extension to Silicon Valley. The agency also helps to run Caltrain, the Altamont Commuter Express (ACE) and Amtrak’s Capitol Corridor route. Additionally, VTA serves as a sales tax authority for the county, collecting funding and building transportation projects that voters have approved.

In Appendix A, we look in more detail at how VTA evolved, how it is governed and the many kinds of services it provides. The agency’s key services include:

**Bus service.** VTA buses provide approximately 106,161 weekday transit trips on 71 lines that serve more than 3,805 bus stops. The agency

---

2 According to the 2013 Silicon Valley CEO Business Climate Survey, 47 percent of respondents agree that traffic congestion is the top cost-of-living challenge in Silicon Valley for workers and families (p. 6). Available at: http://svlg.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/CEO_Survey_2013.pdf
3 Many residents are frustrated by traffic, and wish to walk, bike or use public transportation more. From Santa Clara County General Plan Health Element, October 2012, available at: www.sccgov.org/sites/planning/PlansPrograms/GeneralPlan/Health/Documents/HealthElement_QualityOfLife_Surveyreport.pdf
4 Figures include Valley Transportation Authority transit and partner operators (Caltrain, Capitol Corridor and the Altamont Commuter Express). Use of public transit peaked at 5.2 percent in 1960 and has not reached that level since.
5 The Valley Transportation Authority’s 2013 Bus Rider Survey found that 79 percent of riders rated its service a 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale (with 5 being the best). Available at: http://www.vta.org/sfc/servlet.shepherd/document/download/069A0000001OahEIAS
also operates peak-hour express buses, which have been gaining in popularity, and a paratransit service. It is currently developing bus rapid transit (high-amenity bus service) for three corridors.

**Light rail service.** The network is centered in downtown San Jose and serves approximately 35,000 weekday trips. Two lines and one spur operate across 42.2 miles to the cities of Campbell, Milpitas, Mountain View, San Jose, Santa Clara and Sunnyvale.

**Roads and highways.** As a state-designated congestion management agency, VTA manages auto congestion and builds capital projects to address congestion. It funds county expressway projects, as well as local street projects; it designs and builds highway projects; and it builds and operates the Silicon Valley Express Lanes network.

VTA has the sophistication and expertise to create the sustainable transportation system of the future for the South Bay. Together with its 16 member agencies (the cities, towns and county governments of Santa Clara County) and stakeholders across the region, it can establish and grow great transportation options.

### Who does VTA serve?

VTA serves Santa Clara County, which is home to 1.8 million people or one-fourth of the Bay Area’s population. It is the state’s fastest-growing county, driven by the growth in Silicon Valley employment as well as the availability of housing. The county includes 15 incorporated cities and towns. These jurisdictions are the entities that VTA serves. (The county is the 16th). Santa Clara County’s largest city is San Jose, which houses more than half of the county’s population.  

The county’s population is exceptionally diverse; it has the highest percentage of foreign-born residents of any county in the United States — 37 percent — and more than half of households speak a language other than English at home. It is also one of the wealthiest counties in the country; the median household income is over $90,747, compared to $61,400 statewide, and the poverty rate is 9.7 percent, compared to 15.3 percent for the rest of the state.  

Approximately 5 percent of households across the county do not own a vehicle, and there are some census blocks, particularly near universities, where 15 percent of households do not own a vehicle. (See page 53 in Appendix A for a map of no-car households.) Many of these people make up VTA’s transit ridership: VTA riders are generally less affluent and have less access to cars than residents of the county as a whole. Especially in a suburban environment, access to a car is often necessary to meet basic needs or access economic opportunity. The county also has an aging population that is spread throughout the county: By 2030 more than one in four Santa Clara County residents will be over age 60.

---


10. This percentage, 27.6 percent, is higher than what is expected for either the State of California (23.3 percent) or the United States (24.7 percent). From Community Health Existing Condition Report for the County of Santa Clara General Plan Health Element (May 2013), accessed May 2014, available at: www.sccgov.org/sites/planning/PlansPrograms/GeneralPlan/Health/Documents/SCC_Existing_Health_Conditions_FINAL_May_2013.pdf
In addition to residents, VTA's systems also serve those who arrive from outside the county to one of the nearly 1 million jobs located here.

**SPUR’s vision for VTA**

There are three key reasons why now is the time for VTA to act:

**Political support.** Member agencies and the region have committed to growing in a more compact and sustainable way, exemplified through local plans and policies. The area’s civic leaders recognize that our streets and neighborhoods should serve many people and functions. They have also recognized that we can and should protect natural resources by using energy-efficient transportation and by maintaining our open spaces. State laws like AB 32 and SB 375 demonstrate a state-level commitment to growing more sustainably.11

**Funding.** Santa Clara County has consistently been willing to invest in a better future for itself, and the region is investing in the county’s future as well. Approximately $8 billion dollars in transit investments are funding bus rapid transit, the extension of BART to Silicon Valley, light rail system improvements and the modernization of Caltrain.

**A paradigm shift in transportation.** Demographic shifts are setting the stage for dramatic changes in transportation. We are seeing a new generation less interested in owning cars and an aging population that will need new transportation solutions. Research and development labs are creating entirely new ways to get around, such as autonomous vehicles, while new social technologies, like ridesharing applications for smart phones, are

---

11 AB 32, the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, requires the California Air Resources Board to regulate statewide greenhouse gas emissions. SB 375, the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008, instructs the California Air Resources Board to set regional greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets from passenger vehicles and light trucks. The metropolitan planning organization for each region (the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, in the Bay Area) must now develop a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) that integrates transportation, land-use and housing policies to plan for achieving the emissions reduction target. Plan Bay Area, adopted in 2013, includes the first SCS for the Bay Area.
changing travel behavior. Many of these advances are being born right here in the Bay Area.

SPUR would like to see VTA become an agency that aggressively uses every tool at its disposal to provide sustainable transportation options to people traveling in Santa Clara County. We believe that growing both the number and quality of transportation choices is the best way to improve quality of life, protect natural resources and support compact and sustainable growth.

SPUR recommends seven strategies VTA can use to achieve this vision:

1. Make the transit network great in the places it works best.
2. Develop mobility solutions beyond transit.
3. Make streets work for all users and stop expanding roads.
4. Shape communities around transit.
5. Set clear sustainable transportation goals and align resources to meet them.
6. Increase public engagement and innovation.
7. Grow funding.

VTA is a large and complex agency, but this report focuses specifically on its opportunity to improve transit, create new transportation services and tools, and better integrate transportation into communities. While our recommendations are addressed to VTA, we know that changing how people move around the county will require cooperation and persistence from VTA’s member agencies, other public agencies, employers, business organizations and nonprofits, among others.

VTA supports many transportation modes across the county: walking, cycling, bus and light rail, in addition to automobiles. Growing both the number and quality of transportation choices will improve quality of life, protect natural resources and support compact and sustainable growth.

This study does not attempt to analyze or provide recommendations on some important aspects of VTA, such as operations, design and construction, goods movement, governance, labor, budgeting and financial health, technology or project delivery. However, we acknowledge that these are all important areas and each one may be the focus of future SPUR work.
Challenges
to creating great transportation options

Transportation choices other than driving have had difficulty supplanting the car in the South Bay for many reasons, some resulting from transportation investment decisions and others related to the way cities were designed and developed over time.

The car has shaped the county’s growth

Early development in Santa Clara County was oriented around a private streetcar and interurban rail system, which was removed in the early 20th century after the introduction of the car. Like other places in the western United States, the county experienced its most dramatic population and job growth during the highway era of the 1950s through the 1970s. During this period, new tract housing took over orchards and open space, parking lots replaced older homes and other buildings, and wide roads and highways appeared at a rapid pace. The people who moved to the quickly growing South Bay suburbs favored driving; private automobiles allowed for a high level of mobility and provided an affordable way to get around.

At close to 1,300 square miles, Santa Clara County is a flat expanse that is both wide and long. The lack of any natural obstacles or urban growth boundaries made it easy for development to spread outward. As a result, communities had no reason to grow taller or more compactly. Local land use decisions, made without regional coordination or planning, led to significant distances between housing and jobs. Today, most of the county’s large employment centers are in North San Jose or in nearby cities like Sunnyvale, Santa Clara, Mountain View and Palo Alto. Meanwhile, the majority of housing is concentrated far from these jobs, in places like East and South San Jose. See Figure 3.

Federal policies also played a role in accelerating suburban growth in the South Bay during the highway era. These included the home mortgage deduction, which subsidized home-ownership; the highway trust fund, which subsidized highway construction; and investment in the aerospace and electronics industries, which drove the development of large tech campuses like Intel and Fairchild semiconductor. At all levels of government, public spending on roadways was ramping up at the same time public spending on transit was declining.

Because so many people and jobs fit within Santa Clara Valley, most transportation trips do not leave the county: 86.5 percent of residents here work and live within the same county, compared to the Bay Area average of 69.9 percent.

Over the past two decades, VTA and its member agencies have adopted policies and plans to better focus growth into compact, transit-oriented communities. This has resulted in several different programs that each identify their own set of areas for investment and growth. (See Figure 8 on page 42 for a map of these areas.) VTA’s Community Design for Transportation Program has targeted locations it calls “cores” (i.e., downtowns and other community centers); “corridors,” which parallel transit routes; and “station areas,” which surround transit stations. As part of Plan Bay...
Housing and Jobs Are Spread Out
Many of Silicon Valley’s traditional tech campuses are located in low-density developments on the northern side of Santa Clara County, while housing is dispersed all over the county. This means that there are often long distances between workers and jobs, and the routes between the two are difficult to serve with transit.

FIGURE 3

CHALLENGES TO CREATING GREAT TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS
Area, the region’s land use and transportation plan, cities and VTA have identified “priority development areas,” places designated for regional and local investment. The City of San Jose has identified 70 “urban villages” where growth should be focused over the next 30 years, mostly along transit lines. Many other member agencies have also prioritized specific areas for investment and growth, such as the North Bayshore Precise Plan Area in Mountain View and the Milpitas Transit Area Specific Plan. Within these plans, cities have taken very different approaches to zoning for growth near transit.

To complicate matters, the market has largely determined where growth goes, and local government’s eagerness to be responsive to development proposals means that planning commissions and city councils have often disregarded growth plans and guidelines.

Transit doesn’t thrive throughout Santa Clara County

Because the county didn’t grow up around a transit system, transit has difficulty covering the vast area efficiently. Select VTA bus lines through more urban areas — such as the 22, 522 and 23 — perform very well and have some of the highest ridership rates in the region. But outside of these few corridors, the largely suburban environment is a bad fit for transit, both buses and rail.

Transit works best in regions that feature a large, dominant center, dense residential development and long corridors of development radiating from the center. In contrast, jobs and housing in Santa Clara County are highly decentralized, and people’s transportation trips go from almost everywhere to almost everywhere. There is no dominant center in the South Bay: Only 3.5 percent of the county’s office and research and development (R&D) space are in downtown San Jose, the South Bay’s largest downtown. The majority of the county’s housing, employment and other activities are located in suburban places marked by:

- Low-density, single-use development
- Hierarchical street patterns with long blocks, dead ends and cul-de-sacs
- Generous road and parking capacity
- Auto-oriented site design
- Stand-alone, private and disconnected sites

While there are some transit-friendly places to start a journey, such as downtown and East San Jose, as well as along the El Camino and Stevens Creek corridors, there are relatively few

18 Source: SPUR Analysis.
transit-friendly destinations: places where transit would be a preferable way to arrive because the transit stop has been integrated with a dense, walkable community. The largest concentrations of transit-friendly destinations are in downtown San Jose, with small pockets in shopping and employment sites and on some college campuses. Many large employment sites (mostly the traditional tech campuses) are not transit-friendly destinations due to lack of density. And although many shopping areas and office parks are located near transit, they are actually very difficult and dangerous to access from transit. Many of these projects were built without sidewalks, and the walk to or from the transit stop passes through isolated areas under freeways, requires crossing major arterials or forces people to take long, circuitous routes.

The predominant street patterns in the South Bay make operating buses and light rail difficult. The street network is comprised of discontinuous routes, circuitous patterns and streets whose widths keep changing, particularly when traversing multiple cities. Additionally, the traffic conditions on local streets can slow both light rail and buses. Cities can give transit vehicles priority through two tools: signal priority (see “What Makes Transit Work?” on page 19) and dedicated transit-only traffic lanes. But these tools have not been implemented consistently. For example, in downtown San Jose VTA’s light rail vehicles travel in mixed flow with pedestrians.

19 VTA Comprehensive Operations Analysis Final Report 2008. After completing this analysis, VTA chose to focus high-frequency service on “core” routes that have more transit-friendly origins and destinations.

FIGURE 4

How VTA Compares to Other Transit Systems
Among its peer operators with bus and light rail, VTA ranks among the lowest ridership rates and farebox recovery ratios (the percent of operating costs covered by fares).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit Operator</th>
<th>Service Area (square miles)</th>
<th>Population in Service Area</th>
<th>Average Weekday Trips (bus and light rail combined)</th>
<th>Farebox Recovery Ratio (bus and light rail combined)</th>
<th>Cost Per Passenger Mile (bus)</th>
<th>Cost Per Passenger Mile (light rail)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dallas (DART)</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>2,423,480</td>
<td>237,516</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver (RTD)</td>
<td>2,326</td>
<td>2,619,000</td>
<td>325,050</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td>$0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston (Metro)</td>
<td>1,285</td>
<td>3,527,625</td>
<td>274,736</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>$1.01</td>
<td>$0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles (Metro)</td>
<td>1,513</td>
<td>8,626,817</td>
<td>1,465,927</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>$0.61</td>
<td>$0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland (TriMet)</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>1,489,796</td>
<td>328,358</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>$0.99</td>
<td>$0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego (MTS)</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>1,960,088</td>
<td>271,069</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td>$0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco (Muni)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>805,235</td>
<td>696,203</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>$1.13</td>
<td>$1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Valley (VTA)</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>1,880,876</td>
<td>141,162</td>
<td>11%*</td>
<td>$1.28</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2012 National Transit Database
* VTA’s 2013 farebox recovery ratio is 13.5% (FY 2013 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report, page 3-23).
The Cycle of Auto-Orientation

Like many places across the country, the South Bay has found itself in a cycle of auto-orientation that is difficult to break. Traffic congestion has produced a demand for more roads and for the removal of impediments to traffic flow, such as pedestrians, traffic lights, cyclists and transit. These “improvements,” which have typically been publicly funded and driven by engineering standards, have made driving ever more preferable at the expense of other modes of travel, which then induces more car use. Simultaneously, building design has responded to the movements and space needs of cars, creating more suburban shopping centers and office parks — places that often require cars to reach them and don’t provide much access for pedestrians, bicyclists or transit riders. These modes have been stigmatized, while roads have continued to get bigger, consuming increasing amounts of land that might otherwise have been used for development and place-making.20

When road capacity expands to accommodate more vehicles, it increases the need for parking. We are only now beginning to understand and address the broad range of impacts that automobile parking has had on our communities and the cycle of auto-orientation. Free or underpriced parking provides a large hidden subsidy to the cost of operating a car and works against efforts to shift people to other modes of travel. Off-street and on-street parking take up space that could be used for dense, transit-friendly development or for wider sidewalks, bicycle parking or transit lanes.

In an auto-oriented environment, decision-makers are more familiar with the concerns of drivers and may overlook effective and low-cost ways of improving other modes of travel. As early as half a century ago, visionary public leaders in the South Bay recognized the high costs of auto orientation and set ambitious goals to reform the transportation system. Despite a desire to reduce driving, however, Santa Clara County voters and leaders spent decades building highways and expanding roads in order to ease auto congestion. (See Appendix A for this history.)

Historically, some VTA policies have privileged cars. For example, the agency has assessed roadway performance using a measurement called “auto level of service,” a metric for how quickly cars can pass through an area. Like other transportation agencies, VTA did not formally measure the performance of other modes (i.e., transit, cycling or walking). Increasing roadway capacity and traffic speeds may measurably improve auto level of service to a location but will reduce access for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit riders.

Many transportation agencies are now exploring how this cycle can be interrupted. Implementing VTA’s Complete Streets Program,21 its Community Design for Transportation Program and its revisions to transportation guidelines and performance measures are all examples of ways we can break the cycle of auto-orientation.

---

20 For more information on auto-orientation (also known as auto-dependency), see “Costs & Benefits,” Victoria Transport Policy Institute, available at: www.vtpi.org/tdm/tdm66.htm

21 VTA defines “complete streets” as streets that are planned and designed for safe mobility for all users including pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists and transit users of all ages and abilities. For more information, see: www.vta.org/complete-streets
Light rail exemplifies a disconnect between transit and land use planning

For years, media coverage of VTA has often focused on its light rail system's low ridership and low farebox recovery ratio (the percentage of the cost of service that is covered by fares). VTA invested heavily in light rail technology, but simply building the system never led to significant ridership. Nearly $3 billion has been invested in the system to date. However, farebox recovery, which has hovered around 11 to 15 percent, is lower than most otherwise comparable transit systems and much lower than the 25 percent goal that the VTA board has set.  

When the light rail system was designed, cities agreed that growth would be focused around transit stations. A total of $13 billion of private investment has occurred within one-half mile of the light rail system since it opened. However, in the many instances where development has taken place near the light rail system, projects have been largely car-oriented in their design, such as the office projects along the Alum Rock-Santa Teresa Line on North 1st Street in San Jose and the Mountain View-Winchester line.  

The way downtown San Jose has grown has had a particular impact on the effectiveness of light rail. When VTA light rail was being designed in the 1980s, there was a debate about whether the system should go through downtown San Jose or bypass it like the freeway did. City leaders pushed to make sure light rail served the core of downtown as part of revitalization efforts; however, the planned vision of a dense downtown with a diversity of uses never fully developed. Specifically, there has been a lack of large employers, a late commitment to significant housing projects and a loss of most retail.  

The county also built several new freeways before the light rail transit vision came to fruition, thereby undermining both transit ridership and the role of downtown. (See Appendix A for a fuller discussion.) Other local decisions undercut downtown San Jose's ability to anchor the light rail system:

---

22 The overall numbers do not illustrate significant disparity in performance between individual lines, although some light rail stations continue to serve few passengers year after year. See the VTA Transit Service Plan — Fiscal Year 2014–2015, available at: www.vta.org/sfc/servlet.shepherd/version/download/068A0000001FZVM

23 This $13 billion represents one-third of all private investment in urbanized areas in the county during that time, while the half-mile area around light rail station comprises only 10 percent of the urbanized area. Source: VTA Where VTA Goes, Community Grows pamphlet (2014).

24 For more information, see SPUR’s report The Future of Downtown San Jose, available at: www.spur.org/publications/spur-report/2014-03-17/future-downtown-san-jose
• Heavy-rail train tracks for passenger service were moved from 4th Street to a new station a mile west of downtown (now Diridon Station), making that connection difficult.

• Abundant and cheap parking was built downtown in a quest to compete with malls and office parks.

• The walkability and transit-friendliness of downtown was diminished through projects like the construction of Highway 87.

• Many downtown streets were converted to one-way couplets to deal with heavy traffic through downtown.

Criticism of VTA light rail often focuses on its slow speeds. Several factors have led to time-consuming trips:

• Circuitous segments, such as through downtown and the Tasman Line to Mountain View

• Segments where there is only a single track for both directions, such as on the Tasman Line

• The Transit Mall on 1st and 2nd streets in downtown San Jose, which requires operating speeds of 10 mph due to the proximity of pedestrians

• Unscheduled stops, fare inspections and layovers

VTA’s projects to add double tracks where there are single tracks and introduce express services (which skip many stops) will help to overcome some of these challenges.

The transit system can be difficult to understand or access

Two other challenges to the transit system are related: Stations are not integrated into communities, and residents have trouble planning a trip or understanding how transit could fit into their lives. These manifest in several ways:

Trip-planning tools are inadequate. Transit maps and online tools work for those who are familiar with the system, but they do not provide enough information to many who are considering using the system for the first time. These tools provide only limited information when it comes to available shuttle services or private transit services.

Bus service requires a high level of transit literacy. Without advance knowledge of where a particular route goes, how often it runs and at what hours, it’s difficult to make a bus journey due to the complexity of the system.

There are language and geographic barriers. The county’s population is extremely diverse; many languages are spoken, and there are different cultural understandings of how transit systems should work. The large geography that VTA serves makes it difficult to convey information to everyone.
What Makes Transit Work?

Transit investments yield increased ridership when they happen in corridors that have certain characteristics. Some of these characteristics can be influenced by VTA, but many are shaped by cities. Transit works well when it:

Serves areas of high demand with strong anchors at both ends. These anchors should be dense and diverse centers of population or activity, ideally with all-day activities, such as shopping centers, universities or hospitals. Anchors should also be highly walkable, because communities that are good for walking are also good for accessing transit. When demand is highest in the middle of a transit line, it means that transit vehicles are full in the middle of a line and empty at the ends. This unused capacity makes the transit less efficient to operate.

Is as direct, simple and consistent as possible. The strongest transit lines are as straight as possible and follow a reasonably direct path. Adding turns or deviations to a transit line makes trips slower for riders and also makes the route more expensive to operate.

Maintains speed and reliability along the entire route. Separating transit from other traffic in bus-only lanes, providing “signal priority” so that transit vehicles go first at stop lights and reducing the number of times a vehicle stops (limited stop or “skip-stop” service) can decrease delays. A faster service has lower operating costs; when transit speeds increase, more service can be provided for the same amount of money.

Avoids duplication and competition. Where different transit services take parallel routes, the competition can make both services less successful.

Has similar passenger volumes across directions, stops and times of day. When transit serves a balanced number of riders in both directions, the operator is not paying to run nearly empty buses or trains. A high turnover of customers along a route, with a consistently high number of passengers at any time, provides financial efficiency. A diversity of land uses near stops helps to achieve this kind of balanced service and activity.

Offers the right amount of service. Transit is successful when it has the appropriate frequency, hours of service, number of stops and amount of dedicated lanes and signal priority. VTA’s different bus service types (core, community, express, etc.) represent different types of service appropriate for different places; light rail can also be provided at different levels of service depending on demand.

Transit is often provided in places where it is desired but doesn’t work well — where ridership is expected to be low and investments do not increase the numbers of riders. Services in these areas are called “coverage” or “access” services. Leaders must make difficult decisions about how to meet desires to provide coverage throughout the region while also offering “ridership” services, i.e., services where demand is greatest.

Pursuing high ridership usually leads to frequent all-day service in dense and walkable areas, frequent all-day connections between major activity centers and frequent service on routes that serve employers during peak hours. VTA’s bus rapid transit projects and Transit Sustainability Policy emphasize ridership goals. VTA achieves coverage goals, on the other hand, by making service available regardless of how many people use it. The agency may pursue coverage goals to serve certain populations who use the service or to provide geographic equity. VTA’s Community Bus Program and paratransit service reflect its interest in providing coverage. VTA’s adopted Transit Sustainability Policy and Service Design Guidelines outline how to objectively determine which lines are unproductive or which light rail projects shouldn’t move forward, but the guidelines have been difficult to adhere to for political reasons. In some instances, the agency may provide low-ridership service to spur land use development, but in those cases the service should aim for a ridership target.


26 For more discussion of ridership and coverage, or access, goals, see: Jarrett Walker, Human Transit, Island Press, 2011 pp.117-134.
Connections are hard to make. After passengers arrive at a station like Diridon or the Palo Alto Transit Center, navigating the next leg of a journey can be confusing. For example, there is little signage at Diridon showing which type of transit is on which track, and choosing a bus line requires users to find information without the help of clear signs.

Access to light rail stations by walking or biking is difficult to navigate. Stations placed in the middle of highways or on one side of an expressway can be unsafe or confusing to access. Large parking lots create divisions between communities and light rail stations in suburban areas.

Political factors play a role

Interviews with local officials and transportation experts have revealed several political challenges, including the lack of a shared vision and the lack of champions or coalitions to make the hard decisions necessary for a shift to a different future.

The structure of the VTA board, which is composed of 18 city and county representatives, leads to mixed goals and a lack of direct accountability for transit. At times, the goals of a board member’s city or town may conflict with his or her fiduciary responsibility to VTA. For example, a board member may want to support a local development project even though its design, density or location could undermine the success of VTA transit. SPUR found that the VTA board is not aligned around a set of adopted mobility goals or countywide sustainability objectives, such as mode shift (i.e., moving a percentage of people to transportation options other than cars) or reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.27 Goals set by the county before VTA was formed are not being used by VTA today, and newer goals are not in use.

Other than the five San Jose representatives and two county supervisors, VTA board members are part-time elected officials, and all VTA board members serve two-year terms. The limited time that board members are involved with VTA makes it more difficult to develop and implement complex, long-term solutions to problems such as coordinating growth among cities or implementing a transit project that crosses several jurisdictions.

Uneven support of transit

Although leaders and voters have supported transit, our research indicates that many of them view transit as a transportation mode for a narrow segment of the population. Transit lacks powerful political champions, and in the South Bay it has been typically presented as a social service rather than a mainstream transportation mode.

The wealth of Santa Clara County and the inconvenience of transit have allowed that mindset to endure: Most people who have the means to drive do. This means that VTA, particularly its bus service, serves a disproportionate number of patrons with special physical or social needs, which has fed opposition to transit by those who fear the impact of those riders on other riders and on areas near transit.

In the 1970s VTA vehicles and stations experienced significant crime (like their peers across the nation), and some of those images endure. Impacts from past transit construction have also made some residents or businesses reluctant to embrace transit, particularly in downtown San Jose.

Historically, efforts have been made to spread VTA’s transit resources and services around the county, whether they are well-utilized or not. The expectation of geographic equity continues to shape policy and funding decisions today. VTA thus faces a dilemma: to invest in transit that can achieve high ridership or to provide broad coverage across the county. Ridership and coverage are worthy goals, and addressing both will require a strategic use of resources and innovation.

What does success look like?

Despite these challenges, it is both possible and imperative that the VTA Board of Directors, its member agencies and the community at large find a way to move toward a region where people have great transportation options.

VTA is already shifting into a “multi-modal” agency that balances the needs of different transportation modes — walking, biking, transit and cars — and innovates new solutions to complex

27 VTA adopted a sustainability program in 2008 to focus on the environmental impacts of its facilities. The program has reduced greenhouse gas emissions, fuel usage and water usage, among other benefits. VTA also promotes the environmental benefits of public transportation and is a voluntary signatory to the American Public Transit Association’s Sustainability Commitment. See VTA’s 2013 Sustainability Report, accessed May 2015, available at http://www.vta.org/sfc/servlet.shepherd/document/download/069A0000001ODIVIA4
The growth of the Bay Area’s population and economy creates new challenges for transportation. To ensure a sustainable future, we need to provide opportunities for most people to meet their daily needs without driving alone.

transportation problems. For example, VTA’s Express Lanes network will be one of the largest road-pricing programs in the nation. (See Appendix A for details.) And its Transit Sustainability Policy provides sophisticated guidance to direct transit funding to the most productive lines. If VTA continues this shift and its partners — cities, the county, regional agencies and other institutions — are all aligned, we can create a place with abundant transportation choices.

We will know we have arrived when:

- Most people can get to work and meet their daily needs easily and safely through walking, cycling, transit, carpool/vanpool or sharing a car.
- Roads benefit all users, including bicyclists, pedestrians and transit riders, and streets are designed to knit communities together rather than dividing them.
- New development projects in growth areas can confidently design projects based on multi-modal access and will no longer be expected to cater to the automobile.

How will we know if all of VTA’s efforts are working together to achieve more sustainable transportation choices? SPUR recommends that VTA adopt the following goals and key targets for the county to achieve in five years:

- Decrease the countywide share of people who drive alone to work from 77 percent to 65 percent
- Grow the share of people using modes other than driving alone by 10 percent for all trips countywide (not just trips to work)

Because we recognize that it is not simple to create a new kind of transportation, one that shifts away from the private car, SPUR recommends using many strategies simultaneously to transition the system. Our recommendations focus on making transit great for people on the routes where transit can succeed and finding mobility solutions for trips that do not take place on those routes. At the same time, VTA and its member agencies should retrofit streets and design land use projects to work well with walking, cycling and transit. Leading this type of change will require the organization to adopt a more proactive mode-shift policy and investment strategy and will also necessitate finding new funding sources. None of this will be possible without engaging with the public and partners. When all of these strategies are implemented together, we believe VTA can reach the targets described above. ☑
STRATEGY 1

Make the transit network great in the places it works best

Goal: Bus and light rail services are frequent, productive, appealing and easy to access and navigate. Transit speeds between high-demand origins and destinations are competitive with car trips.

In the corridors where transit can work well, it should be great. Useful, high-quality transit service spurs a virtuous cycle: Improved transit supports modes of travel such as cycling and walking, which in turn helps to shape communities around walking and transit, which then improves the productivity and attractiveness of transit.

The Santa Clara County transit network should be composed of regional services, local services and feeder services that connect seamlessly with one another. This network provides a stable backbone for local land use and urban design decisions as well as regional planning efforts.

SPUR’s recommendations for transit

1. Offer great bus service in corridors where there is a large transit market.

Several bus corridors see enough demand to warrant a significant upgrade to very high-frequency and high-amenity bus service, also known as bus rapid transit (BRT). One of the features that makes BRT work is a dedicated traffic lane for buses only. A dedicated lane allows buses not to be slowed by other vehicles — and for other vehicles not to be slowed by buses. Adding technology to turn traffic signals green for buses, allowing riders to pay their fare on station platforms and offering bus arrival information at stations are other BRT features that could boost ridership in these corridors.

Recent analysis by VTA shows that the best corridors for BRT are Santa Clara Street–Alum Rock Avenue, The Alameda–El Camino Real and West San Carlos Street–Stevens Creek Boulevard (where the heavily used 22, 522, 23 and 323 bus routes operate). While VTA has selected these three corridors to launch BRT service, not all of the cities where the planned routes go have made a commitment to true BRT service with dedicated lanes. SPUR believes that VTA BRT projects on these three corridors should adhere to high standards for BRT service. Dedicating lanes for bus service today can be more effective than trying to dedicate space in the future when these corridors will be more congested. VTA should not necessarily provide this high-quality bus service without partnership from cities, particularly in the areas of land use, policies and street design. When a particular jurisdiction is unwilling to accommodate fully featured BRT, the operational, environmental and other impacts of this decision on the entire BRT corridor should be evaluated, which may suggest not building a particular segment of BRT.

As neighborhoods become denser and local congestion increases, bus speeds (on routes without dedicated lanes) may degrade. Not only do riders dislike slower buses, but this trend increases the cost of operations. VTA and local governments should use traffic data to proactively understand where the slowing of bus lines is likely to occur and should take action to ensure that new development does not impact transit speeds. Such action could include impact fees, dedicated lanes, agreed-upon street improvements or new technology. While it is important to look at an individual development project’s impact on transit speeds during the project’s environmental review process, this is not as useful as a proactive, corridor-wide approach to studying the problem.

2. Identify low-cost improvements on high-potential bus lines.

On the five highest-ridership core bus lines (after the BRT corridors identified above), VTA should identify and implement low-cost service or capital improvements.

Improving vehicle access. Add curb space or platforms to make it easier to board transit vehicles. Move transit stops to locations that are better for riders.

Improving operations. Replace stop signs with traffic signals or other measures, add transit-only lanes, add turn lanes, eliminate stops or add new stops.

Implementing a transit signal priority program. Signal priority for buses enables traffic signals to turn green as buses approach. VTA is implementing transit signal priority in several cities.

Redesigning highway routes. Bus routes on expressways could be redesigned. For examples, bus routes on the same primary expressway corridor could have different pickup and drop-off points in order to serve different market clusters.

3. Make the light rail system fast and direct.

As development increases along light rail corridors — including housing, offices and destinations like Levi’s Stadium — light rail could compete with cars if it were faster or if the service were more direct. VTA’s Light Rail Efficiency Project aims to make strategic investments and service changes to better match VTA’s services to demand. SPUR supports these projects, and we recommend that VTA continue to pursue all of these approaches to improving light rail services.

Offer more direct services to match demand. For example, a critical mass of passengers want to travel from the Almaden area to downtown San Jose, but this trip currently requires a connection at the Ohlone–Chynoweth Station. Where ridership models or observations show market demand on the light rail system, express services (either all-day or during peak hours only) should be

VTA’s Rapid Bus service offers frequent bus service on routes with high demand. The 522 Rapid bus runs from the Palo Alto Transit Center to the Eastridge Transit Center.

VTA’s current top five ridership bus lines are the 22, 23, 25, 522 and 66. The top five lines that are not on planned BRT corridors are the 25, 66, 68, 70 and 26. Source: VTA Transit Service Plan FY 2014 – FY 2015, available at: www.vta.org/sfc/servlet.shepherd/version/download/068A0000001FZVM


31 The plan includes double-tracking in Mountain View, adding a pocket track in Santa Clara and track additions in downtown San Jose will allow for a turnback on the Winchester line. For more information see http://www.vta.org/projects-and-programs/Planning/Projects-Studies-and-Programs-Light-Rail-System-Analysis-Introduction
Source: Map by Brian Stokle based on data from VTA
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offered or connections eliminated. In some cases, this may only require the introduction of a new service; in others, it may mean constructing passing tracks or storage tracks for light rail vehicles.

**Offer more frequent service.** Frequent service (every 15 minutes or less) should be provided on high-ridership corridors, particularly where light rail connects to a high-frequency service, such as BART or BRT. VTA should also provide more frequent service at peak event times at locations served by transit lines, such as Levi's Stadium and the San Jose Arena; if light rail is able to accommodate many riders, it can reduce the need for parking and cut down on auto congestion.

**Use skip-stop and express train services.** Stations that have low ridership today and low ridership potential in the future should be closed. Typically, these are stops surrounded by auto-oriented office parks and stops used as park-and-ride stations. Skipping stops lowers operating costs and makes trips shorter for passengers. Most park-and-ride customers can use a different park-and-ride facility and continue to ride light rail. When determining which stops should be closed, VTA should consider whether riders can be accommodated at another stop and whether the travel time or cost savings from eliminating the stop can be reinvested in a different part of the system to increase ridership by a much larger amount.

**Improve connectivity.** An efficient transit network has to have connections, and they should be fast and simple for the riders who use them. VTA should scrutinize and improve the connections from one light rail line to another, from light rail to bus, and from light rail to regional transit systems like Caltrain, ACE, BART and the Dumbarton Express.

**Reassess opportunities for light rail regularly.** As land uses change and as transit options such as BRT, BART and electrified Caltrain begin service, the optimal service configurations for the light rail system should be reevaluated.

**Implement signal priority at intersections.** VTA should work with member agencies to install continuous greens lights at intersections for light rail trains.

**Make capital improvements.** Adding train storage tracks or passing tracks can significantly improve transit service by reducing stopping times, enabling express service or

---

32 Many of the lowest ridership light rail stops are on the Mountain View Line, which is surrounded by car-oriented office parks. See VTA Transit Service Plan — Fiscal Year 2014–2015, available at: [www.vta.org/sfc/servlet.shepherd/version/download/068A0000001FZVM](http://www.vta.org/sfc/servlet.shepherd/version/download/068A0000001FZVM)

33 The light rail system will connect with BART at four stations: Milpitas (Montague Station), Diridon Station (light rail and Caltrain station), Downtown San Jose (First Street) and Alum Rock (proposed light rail station).

34 VTA will be upgrading and installing transit signal priority at traffic lights throughout the light rail network. This project will speed operations for light rail trains, improving operating efficiency and customer travel times.
When the extension of BART from Warm Springs to Santa Clara County is completed, it could be transformative. BART could make VTA's existing transit network much more useful to more people by extending its reach to the East Bay and San Francisco. BART can also help turn the neighborhoods surrounding transit into vibrant, multi-modal places where residents or workers don't need to rely on a car.

BART was chosen as the transit solution for the congested I-680/I-880 corridor because studies indicated that BART would attract more riders than bus service, commuter rail (like Caltrain) or light rail. BART is appealing because it is:

- **Frequent.** The two lines that will serve Silicon Valley currently run every 15 minutes most of the day.

- **Fast and reliable.** Thanks to a dedicated right of way, BART can travel at high speeds without having to slow for grade crossings and does not suffer delays caused by congestion or other trains.

- **High-capacity.** BART Silicon Valley will have 10-car trains, each with a peak capacity of about 2,000 passengers (200 per car).

- **Regional.** The BART system provides access to the inner and outer East Bay, San Francisco and two airports. When it opens, Berryessa Station will be served by the Green Line (Berryessa-Daly City) and the Orange Line (Berryessa-Richmond).

The extension of BART to Silicon Valley is based on the premise that the South Bay will deliver a large ridership. For example, BART predicts that ridership will be fairly balanced, with just as many riders going north from the South Bay as vice versa. It will be the responsibility of VTA, together with its members agencies, to ensure that BART achieves its ridership goals. Unlike other transit services, it is unlikely that BART service can be stopped or moved if it underperforms. If ridership goals are not achieved, VTA will have to find funding to subsidize BART service, and this could come at a cost to other transit services.

VTA is succeeding at building the BART extension safely and is expected to finish ahead of schedule. The agency and city leaders should also focus on integrating BART into the community in a way that maximizes the social, economic and environmental benefits that this enormous investment provides. Specific areas of focus that SPUR recommends are:

- **Careful station site selection**

  BART presents the first-ever opportunity in the South Bay to create dense job centers (which will also include retail stores and housing) focused around high-frequency regional rail transit. BART stations should be located where both zoning and the market will support intensive development.

- **Well-designed neighborhoods around stations**

  The half-dozen planned BART station areas present an opportunity for the South Bay to develop neighborhoods for transit, walking and biking instead of cars. These communities around BART stations can build far less parking than is typical, because transit becomes a viable option for local or regional trips. In the interest of shaping a vibrant and complete community, these neighborhoods should minimize the size of parking structures and ensure the structures don’t make it harder for pedestrians, cyclists and transit users to access BART. (See recommendations 23 and 25.)

- **Seamless transportation connections**

  BART to Silicon Valley will close a longstanding gap in the region’s transit network, connecting the East Bay to the South Bay with all-day transit service. In addition to completing this circle around the bay, BART will give regional riders access to sites all over Santa Clara County by delivering them to VTA’s light rail, BRT and bus lines.

  BART station locations and designs should maximize connectivity to these transit lines with highly integrated stations, particularly at Diridon Station. Until each BART extension segment begins service, VTA should work to develop the future ridership along that route. For example, VTA should continue to grow ridership between downtown San Jose and Fremont (the end of the BART line) today by marketing and enhancing the 181 Express service. When BART service begins in Warm Springs, the 181 Express should move to the new station. The goals is to

---


36 See www.bart.gov/about/history/facts


develop habits of new riders to connect by transit. VTA should also develop goals and strategies to make the ways people access BART stations increasingly sustainable. Where BART riders may need a car to access BART today, other modes of access — such as foot, bike or shuttle — should be cultivated for the future. (See Recommendations 4 and 5.)

BART will also make many employment centers in the “Golden Triangle,” the Silicon Valley industrial district of North San Jose, much easier to access using “last mile” solutions. These services — such as bike sharing, taxis and shuttles — should be accommodated thoughtfully and should be easy for first-time riders to navigate.

Supporting BART’s sustainability

Making BART Silicon Valley a success also means ensuring that the entire BART system is sustainable. The system has major unfunded capital projects that need to happen in order to maintain reliable and safe operations (known as a “state of good repair”). BART also needs to find funding to purchase new cars for an estimated 1 million riders per day in 2047: BART estimates that the fleet will have to grow to 1,000 cars (up from 775 today) to accommodate the extension to Silicon Valley and ridership growth throughout the system. Today’s fleet includes cars that have been in operation since service began in 1972 and that need to be retired. Other major unfunded BART system priorities include a new automatic train control system and expanded maintenance yards. VTA should involve its member cities and stakeholders proactively to inform regional decisions that pertain to the long-term sustainability of BART. (See Recommendation 6.)
shortening routes when there is less demand. Double-tracking light rail through downtown San Jose has been identified in SPUR’s report *The Future of Downtown San Jose* as a project worth studying.\(^{39}\)

In the very long term — decades from now — VTA might pursue very large light rail capital projects, but this should only happen if a city focuses enough growth in one place to justify the ridership or placemaking benefits. Potential projects include straightening out the curves on the Mountain View Line and through downtown San Jose, separating light rail tracks from other traffic (by elevating or depressing roads) in places such as the Montague Expressway and downtown San Jose and moving the downtown San Jose light rail route from San Carlos Street to San Fernando Street.

### 4. Improve access to transit stations.

In the spread-out communities of Santa Clara County, bus and light rail transit stations are often far from a rider’s final destination. First- and last-mile solutions or feeder bus services are critical to the success of the entire transit network, particularly BART. In order to understand where such services are needed the most, and to develop creative ways of providing them, VTA should undertake a comprehensive station access policy and plan. The agency has begun to study pedestrian access to transit, and SPUR recommends doing this for other modes of travel as well.\(^{40}\) Improving access to transit stations is best done in partnership with cities or others who manage the land and the right of way around transit stations.

To improve access to its transit services, SPUR recommends that VTA continue to pursue these strategies:

- **Launch new VTA transit services.** Develop new VTA shuttle or local bus routes to transit stations. Develop new VTA feeder systems to new BART stations, and make it a flexible model that can adapt and move as new BART stations open and land uses and destinations change.

- **Partner with activity centers.** Work with business districts, employers, transportation management associations, institutions or residential complexes to provide local shuttle buses to transit stations.

- **Partner with cities or adjoining property owners.** Create strong pedestrian connections to transit. Add wayfinding signs and markers, create short and direct travel paths to stations, remove and reduce barriers, make safer road crossings, widen sidewalks and make urban design enhancements.

- **Promote bicycles as a transit link.** Together with advocates like the Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition, VTA can provide adequate bike parking and storage at stations, facilitate bike transport on trains and buses and provide clearly marked pathways to transit. Bikesharing can be a very effective last-mile solution.

### 5. Make transit simple and appealing.

Transit is a product; the same things that make consumer products appealing — pleasing physical design, ease of use — can apply to transit. VTA can make its transit system more simple and appealing in several ways. Some examples are:

- **Vehicles.** VTA buses and light rail vehicles should demonstrate the advantages of riding transit over driving a car by celebrating the social experience and the freedom of transit. Just as a well-designed workplace attracts top talent, well-designed buses and trains can draw riders and give them a sense of dignity. Clean vehicles that feature large windows, clear glass, comfortable seating and Wi-Fi access support this approach.

- **Legibility.** Part of making transit useful to riders is ensuring that information such as routes, schedules and connections is easy to find and understand. For example, as the number of transit options in the county grows, VTA should develop a clear naming style that works across service types, including BRT, light rail and BART, such as adding color coding to route names. For example, the OhloneChynoweth–Almaden Line might also become the Green Line.\(^{41}\)

- **Transit stations.** Transit stations should be part of the neighborhoods in which they are located and should communicate a sense of place to those who arrive or depart by transit. Station areas should be pleasant, easy to navigate and, above all, safe. VTA has begun to focus on station areas, and SPUR suggests that as part of the process these recommendations be shared with member agencies as educational information on what makes transit work.\(^{42}\) High-use stations should take priority for improvements: 5 percent of VTA’s bus stops account for half of all bus boardings, with the top 1 percent of bus stops accounting for 21 percent of all daily weekday boardings and the top 10 busiest light rail stops (out of 62 stops) accounting for 45.2 percent of all boardings.\(^{43}\) Efforts to enhance stations should focus on these features:

  - **Safety, comfort and cleanliness.** Waiting areas should be well-lit and feel safe and clean. This means frequent trash pickup, frequent cleaning and repainting, and zero

---


\(^{40}\) In 2014, VTA began developing a Countywide Pedestrian Access to Transit Plan. The plan will inventory and evaluate pedestrian-related access investments within walking distance of major transit corridor stations and stops in Santa Clara County.


\(^{42}\) In 2013, the VTA began its Transit Passenger Environments Plan (TPEP). As part of the TPEP, VTA staff is developing a series of policies covering every possible element of the bus stop waiting environment so that cities, developers and the public can understand VTA’s position on bus stop elements.

\(^{43}\) See VTA Transit Service Plan Fiscal Year 2014-2015, available at: [www.vta.org/sfc/servlet.shepherd/version/download/06BAD00000FZVM](http://www.vta.org/sfc/servlet.shepherd/version/download/06BAD00000FZVM)
tolerance for graffiti. Amenities that can improve stations include shelters, real-time transit arrival information, seating, Wi-Fi access and enclosed or secured waiting zones for paid customers.

Art and sense of place. Art can make transit stations attractive and create opportunities to connect with communities and partners. Many transit agencies have robust public art programs and can form useful partnerships with cultural affairs programs in cities.

Navigation. Maps and navigation tools should be user-friendly and easy to understand in a multilingual community. VTA should ensure clear wayfinding to nearby destinations and other local and regional transit connections, including rail, buses, shuttles, bike sharing and taxis.

Operator support. To improve the customer experience, VTA should continue to invest in the long-term professional development of its transit operators. Bus drivers and light rail operators are the primary staff members who interact with VTA customers. These are high-stress jobs, involving long, irregular hours with limited breaks and requiring skillful interaction with a broad cross-section of the public. VTA should build on its successful Joint Workforce Investment partnership with Amalgamated Transit Union 265 to train and equip drivers with the tools to provide the highest-quality customer service.44 VTA can also develop rewards programs for exemplary operators.

6. Support regional rail services.

Together, VTA’s transit system and the regional rail services offered by other agencies make up one larger network. It is in the interest of the county and VTA’s transit system to ensure that regional rail services — including Caltrain, BART, ACE and Amtrak’s Capitol Corridor — are integrated with VTA transit and are frequent, reliable and financially sustainable. For example, a combined light rail and Caltrain trip from South San Jose to Mountain View or Palo Alto overcomes some of the travel speed issues of light rail alone and is competitive with a car trip — but the services are not that well coordinated, priced or marketed.

Caltrain has long been the backbone of transit along the peninsula and previously had greater involvement from VTA.45 The Caltrain modernization project, which will electrify Caltrain and install a modern train control system, provides many potential benefits to the South Bay, including shorter travel times.

44 The Joint Workforce Initiative, developed by VTA in 2006, is a combination of career ladder and skill upgrade training for maintenance employees and transit operators.

45 According to SPUR interviews with former VTA transportation planners.
for Caltrain passengers; it also delivers greater numbers of passengers to VTA’s transit system. Caltrain is currently fiscally unstable, as it relies on voluntary funding contributions from three counties (Santa Clara County through VTA, San Mateo County and San Francisco County) which govern the service through the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board. A stable funding stream for Caltrain should be identified so that it can continue to be the backbone of transit in the South Bay and can anchor new transit-oriented growth. Similarly, once BART operations begin in the county, it will be important to ensure that BART service can be relied upon and that the agency is sustainable.

We recommend that VTA use its funding and political influence or lead planning efforts, as appropriate, to support these broader parts of the VTA transit network.

7. Extend transit only when there is demonstrated demand.

Transit service costs money to provide, so it’s important that resources be invested where there are riders and where transit will be supported by the surrounding community. VTA’s Transit Sustainability Policy and Service Design Guidelines offer guidance for basing new transit services on the greatest potential for ridership.

Specifically, new extensions of the light rail system, which have been funded by 2000 Measure A, should be carefully reevaluated to ensure that there is adequate demand. The Capitol Expressway light rail project would extend the Alum Rock Line south to Eastridge, paralleling current bus route 522 and future BRT service. The 1.6-mile Vasona extension would be a continuation of the Winchester Line into Los Gatos. Where communities desire light rail extensions, testing a transit service may be the right step to take before committing to a large capital investment. While models can project demand, they are imperfect and not sensitive to all factors that can motivate transit usage. BRT projects can demonstrate demand for rail and trigger private investment and land-use improvements in those corridors. The current development of the Santa Clara–Alum Rock BRT line fits with this approach. VTA’s Service Design Guidelines provide a framework for testing new services. The standards in the Service Design Guidelines should be raised over time so that VTA’s limited transit funding can be spent on the most productive services.

Santa Clara County is one of three counties that funds and governs Caltrain. Seamless connections between VTA transit and regional transit would make both more welcoming to riders.
8. **Make transit fares reasonable and rational.**

Transit should be affordable to most travelers and fares should be rational (i.e., similar services should be priced similarly). Possible steps to achieve this include:

**Moving toward a regional fare structure.** VTA’s fare structure is different from that of adjoining services like Caltrain or BART. (This is the case across the Bay Area’s many transit operators.) VTA should help move toward a more uniform and integrated regional fare structure that might be based on distances or zones, or simply begin by developing an integrated VTA and Caltrain fare structure. Fare categories such as “youth” or “senior” should also be consistently priced and defined between operators.

**Reducing or eliminating connection penalties between operators.** VTA has some agreements with other operators for discounted fares for people with monthly transit passes. Over time, VTA should work with other operators to remove any costs for riders who need to transfer between transit operators. The BART Silicon Valley extension presents an opportunity for VTA to develop a more integrated fare structure that makes transit connections free. This will encourage BART riders to use VTA light rail or bus connections.

**Offering bulk discounts.** VTA can continue to provide bulk or discount passes to employers and should make them available in an equitable way to employers of different sizes or through transportation management associations.

**Improving the Clipper fare payment system.** VTA can work with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission to reduce the cost of the Clipper system and then pass the savings on to riders. If riders could also use Clipper to pay for other modes of transportation, such as bike sharing or taxis, it would be that much more convenient to travel without a car.

Recommendation 16 on page 34 further discusses integrating VTA’s fare structure with other operators.
STRATEGY 2

Develop mobility solutions beyond transit

**Goal:** New kinds of transportation services, especially in places where transit does not work well, are tested and then scaled up to widespread service. New transportation technology increases mobility and cost-efficiency.

This is a time of great innovation and change in transportation. New vehicle technology; shared mobility programs like car sharing, ride sharing and bike sharing; and smartphone apps all present substantial opportunities for VTA and its member cities.

For the places where transit doesn’t have a high chance of success, VTA can take a big role in testing and scaling a variety of other mobility solutions by building on its past work creating bike-sharing and shuttle programs. New mobility solutions are particularly important for suburban areas where running transit service is impractical for VTA and getting to a transit station may be difficult for travelers.

**SPUR’s recommendations for mobility solutions**

9. **Establish a Mobility Solutions and Innovation Team at VTA.**

In this report, SPUR recommends that VTA create a range of transportation options beyond traditional bus and rail transit, help people understand all of their transportation options and enable travelers to make real-time decisions about which choice is best for a specific trip. To organize all of these activities, SPUR recommends creating a Mobility Solutions and Innovation Team to organize all aspects of transportation in Santa Clara County (even for services that VTA does not operate). The role of this team would be similar to that of a traditional transportation demand management (TDM) program. TDM uses strategies and policies to shape travel behavior. Many large employers have TDM programs to help their workers travel without a private car.

This Mobility Solutions and Innovation Team would focus on both urban and suburban mobility solutions and would partner with other agencies as it scaled existing mobility solutions and tested new ones. For example, this team could test a publicly supported ride-sharing program for suburban neighborhoods.

10. **Support jurisdictions, employers and institutions pursuing mode shift.**

Many cities, employers, institutions and organizations like transportation management associations are investing their resources in providing or promoting transportation options other than driving alone. VTA should consider them partners in achieving countywide mode shift goals. VTA can provide expertise on transit operations or service planning, partner on marketing and outreach, provide technical assistance on parking or land use policies or share research and best practices for changing travelers’ behavior.
Managing parking, in particular, represents a significant opportunity to improve conditions for travelers who walk, bike or take transit while freeing up land or street space for other uses. SPUR recommends supporting cities to implement more sophisticated parking management programs. These parking programs may include demand-responsive pricing (parking costs that vary in order to shape demand), shared parking (parking lots or structures shared by multiple users) or TDM strategies that reduce the demand for parking. Cities can reform parking policies through their general plans.

To help achieve countywide mode-shift goals, VTA should support local transit services run by other operators, as well as local TDM efforts and transportation management associations, member-controlled associations that provide transportation services. For example, the City of Palo Alto’s free Embarcadero and Crosstown shuttles help the city reach its economic development and social goals; VTA can support services like this through a local grant program. Cities would match the VTA funding with local resources for transit service that can be tailored to the community. These local services may involve some private funding, such as contributions from transport managing associations. The benefit of this model is that member agencies become direct beneficiaries of VTA’s transit investments. VTA can help develop unified signage, maps and the like to make the travel experience consistent for riders across multiple transit operators.

12. Manage or operate employee transit.
Larger employers in Silicon Valley are able to provide private transportation for their workers. However, smaller employers, institutions and business parks are unable to provide this service, and VTA has the expertise needed to fulfill this need. Private shuttles services managed by VTA could operate in an open system available to the public or in a closed system that only serves designated employers. This would particularly apply to small office parks where several smaller businesses may have, in aggregate, a large number of employees. VTA would determine routes that make sense and the amount of public subsidy; as services become popular and could sustain themselves, subsidies could decrease over time. This type of transit service would augment what VTA has already done with its Caltrain shuttle.

Carsharing, ridesharing and other technology-driven innovations create new opportunities for transportation in suburban areas.
13. Create or scale new transportation options.

Large expanses of the county will never be served well by bus or rail transit, but people in these areas should still have great transportation options beyond driving alone. VTA should seek to provide new niche transit services by studying market trends and testing pilot programs. Possibilities include partnering with ride-sharing services or transportation network companies to provide door-to-door service in suburban areas or with private jitneys that offer small bus service on regular routes during peak hours.


Working with its member agencies, VTA should designate car-light corridors with higher goals for shifting the population away from car use. These would be narrowly defined places where there is high population density, low car ownership, good walkability and high transit availability. In these corridors, VTA should test and scale a wide range of mobility solutions and communications, offering travelers choices, incentives and information with the goals of maximizing the use of other kinds of transportation and then increasing the size of the car-light corridors over time.

SPUR recommends that these initial car-light corridors would include parts of:

- Santa Clara Street and Alum Rock through downtown San Jose
- North First Street to Tasman in North San Jose
- West San Carlos/Stevens Creek Boulevard in San Jose
- El Camino Real from San Jose to Palo Alto

VTA and its member agencies could test numerous interventions, including bike sharing, improved pedestrian and bicycle signage, transit passes for residents and workers, policies to manage parking, car sharing, and customized information on transportation options for new residents and employees. This very targeted approach, similar to efforts by employers, has been shown to be highly effective.

15. Support transportation demand management into and out of Santa Clara County.

Twenty-four percent of trips in Santa Clara County originate outside the county. SPUR recommends working with partners outside the county to provide cohesive marketing and other solutions to shift those trips away from the single-occupant car. Specific corridors include highways I-680, I-880, I-280 and I-101; the El Camino Real; and BART and Caltrain routes. One such strategy would be to actively market the Capitol Corridor train to travelers on I-880 or the ACE train to commuters on I-680. Transit services run by other operators should not be viewed as competition to VTA’s transit service but rather as another way to deliver customers to VTA transit and reduce car demand on the county’s roads.

Transportation network companies (TNCs), as defined by the California Public Utilities Commission, provide prearranged transportation services for compensation using an online platform (such as a smartphone app) to connect passengers with drivers using their personal vehicles. Some TNCs in operation today are UberX, Lyft and Sidecar.

The InMotion program in Seattle targeted two neighborhoods to increase BRT ridership. The program helped increase bus ridership by 12 percent and 11.5 percent in the two neighborhoods. See Eric Jaffe, “Cutting Car Reliance, One Trip at a Time,” The Atlantic Cities, accessed April 10, 2014, available at: www.theatlanticcities.com/commute/2014/04/cutting-car-reliance-one-trip-time-seattle/8822

In some cases, there is an existing TDM organization such as commute.org in San Mateo County.
16. **Create a seamless experience across transportation modes.**

Creating an integrated and seamless travel experience across transportation services would improve the user experience, save money and make the most of investments in transportation. The following areas present opportunities to integrate transit services:

**Infrastructure and operations.** VTA’s services should have easy physical connections to one another and to services like Caltrain or BART. An effort should also be made to integrate operation schedules or hours of service. Physical connections to feeder services like shuttles or bike sharing should also be straightforward for the rider.

**Information.** Maps and wayfinding, online and mobile trip planners, and real-time information services should incorporate as many transportation services as possible.

**Payment methods.** Over time, riders should only have to use one payment method (such as a Clipper card) to pay for a range of mobility solutions, including VTA buses, light rail, paratransit, regional rail services, bike sharing, ride sharing, taxis, on-street and off-street parking, and tolls. VTA could pilot different types of electronic payment technologies. This level of integration will be complicated, which means it’s time to begin this process. Similar integrated payment systems exist in many cities around the world, including Singapore and London.

17. **Collect and share detailed transportation data and use it to conduct research.**

Both VTA and South Bay travelers can use transportation data to make real-time decisions. This data can also inform long-term planning. Data sources have grown dramatically and now include phones, GPS systems, payment systems like Fastrak and Clipper, sensors embedded in roadways and online trip-planning tools. Combining data sources like these yields more sophisticated information, often referred to as “big data.” VTA can foster private data-gathering and take advantage of data about potential ridership provided by major employers and transportation management associations. The use of big data can give a much more nuanced understanding of travel behavior and allow VTA to make more effective investment decisions. VTA has initiated the use of big data for its congestion monitoring program. The proper use of data by the public sector is an important issue. Privacy concerns should be balanced with the public benefit provided through proper use of the data.

---

49 VTA is considering piloting a smartphone-based transit payment system for use at events at Levi’s Stadium.
STRATEGY 3

Make streets work for all users and stop expanding roads

**Goal:** Local streets and expressways benefit all users, with safe space for pedestrians, cyclists and transit riders. Highways are increasingly used by carpools and transit vehicles and are priced to manage demand.

Roads have consumed a large portion of the developable land in Santa Clara County and are a significant barrier for modes of transportation besides the car. There is not enough funding to maintain all the roads in the county, and current road pavement conditions are generally poor. Meanwhile, it is well known that cities can’t build their way out of traffic: Road expansions offer increased speeds for a while, but the extra capacity fills up within a few years. In this context, it is imperative that road expansions stop and existing roads become more productive, meaning that they move more people using a larger variety of modes and help deliver people to transit systems. VTA already acknowledges this shift in its Valley Transportation Plan (VTP) 2040, which calls for the majority of future funding to go toward transit projects and not highway projects.

Car traffic on local roads is also becoming an increasing problem in some of the county’s downtowns. Local congestion is a good sign of a vibrant community, but it also forces difficult decisions about the best transportation solutions for our limited available street area. VTA can help implement solutions that use existing roads more efficiently and more safely for all users.

**SPUR’s recommendations for streets and roads**

18. **Manage and price existing auto facilities.**

VTA should work with its member agencies to cease roadway expansion projects and control the demand for more auto capacity. When a jurisdiction is designing solutions to congested intersections or corridors, VTA can help determine ways to reduce the demand on those roads or promote alternative choices for travelers, rather than default to building more roads.

Strategies to reduce demand include providing transportation alternatives, promoting high-occupancy vehicles (i.e., carpools) and charging a toll or user fee, also known as road pricing. Road pricing can move demand away from peak hours, reducing the need to build extra roads or lanes that will only be used a few hours each day. But

---

50 This phenomenon in transportation systems is known as “latent demand.” For more information, see Surface Transportation Policy Project (1998), *An Analysis of the Relationship Between Highway Expansion and Congestion in Metropolitan Areas*, available at: [www.transact.org](http://www.transact.org)

51 VTA has developed a Transportation Systems Operations and Management Program, which seeks to improve the operation and management of Santa Clara County’s transportation system through the use of new technologies, including electronics, computers and communication infrastructure.
note that we don’t recommend expanding a road to add a toll lane, which would increase demand by creating new space and therefore negate the benefits of pricing. Road pricing should apply to existing lanes.

Road pricing can also generate funds for other transportation modes. Revenue from pricing a road should be used to support mode shift in the same travel corridor, such as moving trips to a parallel transit line.

Traffic management or intelligent transportation systems offer other strategies to address congestion. These technologies use data collection and communication to help make vehicle flow more efficient or to move traffic to less congested areas. Real-time traffic information could help people choose alternate modes of transportation, thereby reducing demand for more roads.

Traffic management or intelligent transportation systems offer other strategies to address congestion. These technologies use data collection and communication to help make vehicle flow more efficient or to move traffic to less congested areas. Real-time traffic information could help people choose alternate modes of transportation, thereby reducing demand for more roads.

The Santa Clara County expressway system deserves particular focus due to its congestion and continued pressure from peak-hour commuters to complete road-widening projects. Demand on the expressways should be managed through pricing or other strategies. While VTA does not have jurisdiction over the expressways, the agency could play a strong role in the expressways master planning process, developing new solutions to ensure that the expressways evolve to support mobility and sustainability goals set by the VTA board.

19. Retrofit streets for all users.

Most streets are controlled by local jurisdictions. However, through its role as a funding agency for local transportation projects, VTA can promote or require the design and retrofit of streets for all users, including pedestrians, cyclists and transit riders. VTA can also provide roadway policy, design and construction management assistance to its member agencies. SPUR recommends that VTA require design review when funding a project. VTA should also assist cities with adopting multi-modal street guidelines, sometimes referred to as...
“complete streets” guidelines. This assistance may be particularly important to smaller cities that do not have staff capacity to implement these types of projects on their own.

Retrofitting streets or roads, or making them into complete streets, can be very expensive. VTA should ensure that funds are allocated to locations where they will affect the most people and make the best use of investments (for example, connections to transit stations and areas with specific plans) and not just to any roadway project.

This recommendation also applies to facilities that are not managed by VTA. Conflicts between different types of users are worst when several kinds of infrastructure meet, such as large intersections between local roads and highways. When Caltrans completes a roadway project such as an interchange, VTA should aggressively pursue exceptions to Caltrans design standards, such as separated bike lanes or raised crosswalks, to allow for safe bicycle and pedestrian travel. In addition, VTA should continue to work with Caltrans and local jurisdictions and advocate for the state to turn state routes over to local jurisdictions so that state roads can more easily integrate with local planning or design programs. These so-called “relinquishments” will require local agencies or VTA to identify local funding for maintaining former state roadways.

The county’s expressways (which are not managed by VTA) should be made consistently safe for everyone to cross. Today, speeds on expressways exceed 40 mph in many places, making them unsafe for biking or walking. Expressways also impede pedestrian and cyclist access to several light rail stations. The Santa Clara County Expressway Master Plan has historically promoted additional auto capacity and grade separations (separating cars from local cross-traffic to increase their throughput), with limited accommodation for other types of travelers. Future expressway master plans should aim for a multi-modal expressways system that is integrated with local efforts to grow sustainable, multi-modal communities.

20. Increase cycling and walking.

Santa Clara County’s flat topography, temperate climate and spread-out land uses make cycling a great opportunity for the area. In addition to improving street design to accommodate cycling and walking, VTA should apply all possible funds and leverage to improve access to safe cycling throughout the county. This includes:

- Aggressively pursuing a 24/7 bicycle and pedestrian network
- Completing the Countywide Bicycle Plan
- Expanding the bike-sharing program, particularly in car-light corridors, and increasing subscriptions to Bay Area Bike Share

![FIGURE 7](image)

Reallocation of street space can move more people

Number of people an 11.5-foot-wide lane can convey per hour

Some transportation modes can move far more people than others using the same size lane. Allocating more space for biking or transit can move more people than designating lanes exclusively for cars.

---

52 Examples of multi-modal street guidelines include the National Association of City Transportation Officials’ Urban Street Design Guide (http://nacto.org/usdg) or the Congress for New Urbanism—Institute for Transportation Engineers’ Designing Walkable Urban Thoroughfares: A Context Sensitive Approach (www.cnu.org/node/127)
53 The expansion of several county expressways is included in VTP 2040.
54 In 2014, VTA is working with all cities in the county to update the Countywide Expressway Study, which is making an effort to accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians where appropriate. VTA is also supporting the county’s efforts through funding pedestrian improvements.
Improving pedestrian and bike access to transit, creating guidelines for pedestrian and bike access to transit, and funding priority projects

Growing contributions to local programs that promote using walking and cycling for transportation, including Safe Routes to School programs such as the City of San Jose's Walk n' Roll program

Analyzing pedestrian and bike safety data to determine the best ways to reduce collisions and the severity of injuries, then sharing best practices with cities

Commenting on federal and state highway design manuals to ensure that travel by foot, bike or transit is prioritized

In addition, VTA should design its transit services, and train its transit operators, to safely operate on streets with pedestrians and cyclists.

21. **Reevaluate existing road projects.**

As a state-designated congestion management agency, VTA is required to monitor the performance of the transportation system, which is typically measured by auto level of service. If one part of the congestion monitoring program fails to meet VTA's standard for auto level of service, the agency must approve a “deficiency plan” to construct improvements that will increase auto throughput.55

Over the years, many road expansion projects have been created through these deficiency plans, through mitigations for development agreements or through the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). But local, regional and state policy goals have changed since these projects were proposed, and political leaders have come to embrace more compact, transit-oriented growth. VTA should work with its member agencies to update existing transportation mitigation program deficiency plans to reflect these new policies. Avoiding some of the projects that aim only to improve car travel would free up funding for enhancing other modes and allow for better placemaking. VTA has already acknowledged the need to reform this process by redesignating deficiency plans as “multi-modal improvement plans” beginning with the 2013 Congestion Management Program.56

Green bike lanes are one way that city streets can make space for many users.  

---

55 Santa Clara County’s level-of-service standard is LOS E (where “A” represents free traffic flow and “E” represents unstable flow). Member agencies that do not maintain the level-of-service standard risk having their Proposition 111 gas tax funds withheld.

56 This approach could apply to projects like the Coleman–Autumn transportation corridor project in San Jose, developed as part of San Jose’s 2000 Downtown Strategy Plan, available at: www.sjredevelopment.org/publications.htm, or to projects in the 2006 North San Jose Deficiency Plan, available at: https://www.sanjoseca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/4373
STRATEGY 4

Shape communities around transit

Goal: VTA has a shared vision, developed with its member agencies, for a region that supports a multitude of transportation options for residents and workers. Communities are designed and grown in ways that support this vision.

Transportation is only a means to an end, not an end in itself. As part of the larger picture, transportation should help shape great places and support a high quality of life — not contribute to degrading these things. Because VTA is a transportation authority and it is the local cities that manage land use and the built environment, we must be proactive and intentional when it comes to integrating transportation and communities if we want to shape growth in a different way.

SPUR’s recommendations for shaping communities

22. Create a Community Planning Team at VTA.

VTA should develop a cross-functional team composed of staff from different departments to lead efforts to make places around transit station and transit lines great for travel by foot, bike or even shuttle. The team would implement VTA’s Community Design and Transportation Program, the One Bay Area Grant Program and the VTA Joint Development Program and would also focus on BART, Caltrain and high-speed station areas.

The Community Planning Team can also guide suburban cities that wish to diversify their transportation options. Suburbs function more and more like center cities and should be seen as places that can evolve to become more amenable to walking, cycling and transit.57

Organizing planning around corridors such as North 1st Street or El Camino Real is one way VTA can coordinate transportation and land use across and travel modes, and in the case of El Camino Real, across jurisdictions.58

23. Champion a grand vision for BART station areas.

BART is a multi-billion-dollar investment in Santa Clara County. Future BART station areas, especially Diridon, present unprecedented placemaking opportunities. Each BART station area should have a clear vision that is championed by both the city where it’s located and by VTA. If there are any challenges to station area design, addressing these before the environmental review process offers the best chance of keeping the vision intact. (See “BART: VTA’s Big Opportunity” on page 26.)

24. Integrate short- and long-range transit and land use planning.

Cities should regularly present their land use visions to VTA. Similarly, VTA should present

58 This would be a similar approach to the Grand Boulevard Initiative led by Samtrans. See www.grandboulevard.net
its transit network plans to cities to inform them about how transit can shape land use plans. VTA board members are well-suited to engage their jurisdictions in continuous conversation with the agency to coordinate transportation and land use planning.

We also recommend:

• VTA and cities work together on the land development process at the concept phase, well before the CEQA process, to share best practices and design solutions to land use and transportation integration challenges.

• VTA work with member agencies to seek MTC or ABAG planning grants for land use planning and policy-making processes in priority transit corridors, including specific plans, station area plans, general plans and environmental impact reports.

• VTA make its Community Design and Transportation Manual available online and provide trainings for VTA board, staff and member agencies.

• When requesting a transit service extension, cities show a commitment to land use that supports transit (for example, through zoning for a minimum density near the proposed transit line). 59

We recommend that VTA, together with its member agencies, work with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) to help these regional planning agencies refine their definitions of priority development areas. (See Figure 8 map on page 42.) These areas should focus on those places that would be best served by transit and that are most likely to succeed in shifting people’s travel habits away from driving.

25. **Use VTA real estate to model transit-oriented development.**

The primary goal for the real estate VTA owns around transit stations should be to develop great communities that are integrated with transit. Development projects on VTA sites could demonstrate to local jurisdictions how to do transit-oriented development well — for example, how to provide high-quality access to transit stations, manage cars and parking,

59 MTC has a similar policy (Resolution 3434), which requires cities to complete zoning before releasing transit extension funds.
and use CEQA policies that support multi-modal solutions. When market realities don’t allow for the suitable joint development for a station area, VTA and local partners can explore creative solutions or seek funding together to make projects feasible.

Many of VTA’s real estate assets are light rail park-and-ride lots that provide more parking than future ridership growth requires. When the market presents an opportunity, VTA should accelerate the redevelopment of these sites. Partial or full redevelopment of the VTA headquarters site on River Oaks Road and North 1st Street in San Jose presents a particularly exciting opportunity to showcase transit-oriented development.

For key sites, VTA should work with member agencies and community stakeholders to adopt a development framework and funding sources that promote an integrated land use and transportation vision, rather than simply focusing on present-day revenue generation. Such a framework could also address the issues of housing affordability, job density, cultivating transit ridership and urban design.

26. **Work to locate large institutions around transit.**

Large institutions can be the ideal partner for a major transit-oriented development because of the size of their projects and the possibility of incorporating social or environmental goals. We recommend that VTA designate a point person for communicating with large institutions or employers (e.g., government agencies, health care providers and universities) about locating near VTA’s transit service.

---

**FIGURE 8**

**Policies Aim to Focus Investment and Growth Near Transit**

To counter decades of car-oriented growth, VTA and other agencies are now adopting policies to concentrate growth near transit. VTA has identified a set of “cores,” “corridors” and “station areas.” As part of Plan Bay Area, cities have defined “priority development areas.” Working with its member cities, VTA has also prioritized “joint development sites” — VTA-owned property adjacent to transit stations — and set a schedule for their development. See Appendix A for details.

---

How Cities Shape Transportation

While VTA secures funding for, designs and manages transportation systems like highways and transit, the places the agency serves are shaped by local government: cities and towns. The decisions that cities make about land use and development shape the breadth and effectiveness of transportation choices. When it comes to designing cities, local governments have many tools at their disposal:

**General Plans and zoning** guide a city’s growth. These tools should address density, types of land uses, smart parking policies and good urban design. Policies to support dense, walkable, mixed-use development in areas near transit stations are especially important. When good planning and zoning are embodied in a recent general plan, this gives developers certainty about what they can build. Executing general plans and zoning are essential to determining the success of transit.

**CEQA guidelines** are used by cities to project the environmental impacts that a new project will have on a community and how those impacts can be avoided or mitigated. For the most part, each city determines how the impacts of transportation projects are measured and then addressed. For example, through CEQA guidelines, cities can express the amount of congestion they are willing to live with before they charge developers impact fees. CEQA guidelines also guide whether impacts to pedestrians, cyclists or transit will be measured and disclosed.

**Development fees** can pay for mitigating project impacts or for other improvements to the community. These fees are typically standardized for an area and are used to fund projects outlined in an established program. For example, if a project is expected to increase congestion, the developer might pay the city a traffic impact fee, which can be used to widen roadways, improve transit or fund transportation demand management programs. Cities can also incentivize development without forgoing community benefits by delaying or deferring fees or by allowing developers to build higher-density projects in exchange for including affordable housing or creating parks.

**Developer agreements** are made between cities and individual developers to outline a set of near-term or long-term improvements, services or mitigations that will enable a project to move forward. Developer agreements can require that a project fund particular infrastructure improvements or amenities, such as bike sharing, streetscape improvements, shuttles or a transportation management association.

**Capital program** dollars can be used to shape transportation choices. Cities can prioritize funding from gas taxes, sales taxes and discretionary grants for investment in places where they want to encourage growth or redevelopment. Transportation choices are shaped by all kinds of capital investments; even a capital project like sewer rehabilitation can facilitate creating a bicycle lane.

**Transportation engineering and design standards** determine what happens on city streets. Do streets prioritize cars or transit? Do they integrate with citywide networks? When cities use multi-modal street and road guidelines, they can create streets that serve the most diverse set of users. Engineering standards can lower vehicle speeds and create safer spaces for those on foot, bicycle or transit.

**Parking policies** have been shown to have considerable influence over transportation choices. Giving developers the flexibility to reduce the amount of parking they provide can allow for better urban design, reduce project costs and provide space for transportation modes other than the car. In areas that are redeveloping, cities can strategically manage both on-street and off-street parking to ensure that parking is not overbuilt.

**Public space and amenities**, including a network of well-designed city streets, shape the experience of getting around. Amenities like lighting, trees, signage, bus shelters, street furniture or open space can make travel by foot, bike or transit more comfortable or accessible.

**Development standards and design guidelines**, which govern the shape and integration of new development, can contribute to walkable places, an essential element for effective transit service. Good urban design requires a clear vision and a sustained commitment. It depends on, and in turn supports, a robust multi-modal transportation system.

**A reason for dialogue**

Designing communities well at the outset is both more economical and simpler than retrofitting later. Cities can decide how early and how often to engage with VTA about shaping their communities. While VTA’s Community Design and Transportation Manual offers clear guidance on urban design and designing for transit, the principles need to be applied in a nuanced way to each project in a community so that a city can achieve its livability goals.
STRATEGY 5

Set clear sustainable transportation goals and align resources to meet them

Goal: VTA adopts sustainability and mobility goals for the county’s transportation system. Decision-making tools and processes help VTA make choices that support those goals.

VTA must have clear goals that turn the agency in a more sustainable direction. It is a large agency with a broad range of functions and goals, many of which lead to conflicting plans and investments. For example, highway expansion activities can undermine the productivity of transit services, or a road-widening project can make walking or cycling more difficult. Setting goals for the county’s transportation system will help align VTA’s functions, enable partnerships and resolve difficult decisions.

SPUR’s recommendations for setting goals

27. Articulate shared goals and mobility objectives. Track progress against goals.

The VTA board should work to articulate the shared social, ecological and sustainability goals of its member jurisdictions. VTA and its member cities should work together to develop the goals so that they reflect local values.

In order to measure the effectiveness of VTA’s investments against its goals, the board should adopt a set of performance indicators and track progress for the entire county, for priority development areas and for car-light corridors. A regular – even weekly – look at progress on key performance indicators could build continuous improvement into operations.

Some key performance indicators that point to a more balanced transportation picture were described on page 21. Additional performance indicators include:

- Lower per capita car ownership
- Lower per capita vehicle miles traveled
- Higher percentage of trips taken by bike, walking, transit or shared vehicle
- Lower average door-to-door travel times for residents
- Lower average annual household transportation expenditures per capita
- More quality transportation options for different user groups, such as non-drivers or lower-income people
- More quality pedestrian and cycling environments
- Greater land use accessibility (e.g., number of jobs and public services within walking distance of residents)
- Fewer vehicle crashes and crash fatalities per capita

New data sources or research tools may need to be developed to use these nuanced indicators.
28. **Match investments to policy goals.**

Rather than managing highways, transit and other modes separately, VTA should choose investments or strategies that best achieve the agency’s transportation goals. Adopting “integrated” or “cross-modal” planning helps to identify options early, during the planning process, which allows economically efficient TDM solutions or street retrofit projects to compete for funding with road-capacity expansions.

We also recommend that the board define the role of VTA’s bus and light rail transit more clearly so that it can allocate resources between ridership and coverage goals. This may take the form of a policy that states, “Devote percent of resources to services justified by patronage, and the remaining percent to maximizing coverage.” Similarly, the board can divide resources between peak-hour, employment-oriented services and services for other types of transit trips. Once these goals are clear, VTA and its member agencies can seek out new, innovative solutions for areas that are difficult to serve with traditional transit.

29. **Ensure that congestion monitoring program tools reflect multi-modal goals.**

In general, the success of all transportation modes should be measured, and roadway capacity should be calculated, by the throughput of people, not cars. State congestion management program legislation offers some flexibility, and VTA should take advantage of that to promote multi-modal solutions for auto congestion. Programs to prioritize for reform include:

 Valley Transportation Plan project selection

The board-adopted criteria for the Valley Transportation Plan — particularly for highways, expressways, and local and street and road projects — should reflect sustainable transportation and multi-modal goals. A simple set of performance measures should help the board determine which projects are most effective for achieving the most mobility for the least amount of money and in the most sustainable way.

**Congestion monitoring program guidelines and level-of-service policy**

Moving away from the auto level-of-service metric to a multi-modal measurement tool or other performance measurement methods would lead to the development and funding of multi-modal solutions for roads. The congestion monitoring program should also require that cities adopt TDM programs for new development before they can receive some of their funds for road improvements. Updating these guidelines successfully will require the cooperation of member agencies.

**Development review process and Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines**

VTA uses Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Guidelines and auto level-of-service standards when reviewing a development proposal for its impacts on transportation. This typically happens during the CEQA process. Similar standards are also used by member agencies, the county and Caltrans.

Existing standards can be a detriment to creating better development. The current TIA Guidelines don’t provide much credit for putting active land uses near transit hubs or for including transportation or parking demand management strategies. Developers have little incentive to include these as part of their projects. Under CEQA, developers are often required to mitigate projected auto congestion through transportation investments that maintain the existing auto level of service (more lanes, narrower sidewalks, easier car turns). Not only are these investments costly, but they can also degrade the quality of the street environment by allowing less space for sidewalks or bike lanes. TIA Guidelines should be revised to measure impacts to all modes and to ensure that all other mobility options have been exhausted before expanding auto facilities at development projects.  

**Local CEQA and level-of-service guidelines**

Cities can use grants or other funding sources to support revising their CEQA and level-of-service guidelines to enable a full range of transportation solutions for increased demand. VTA could require such updates as a condition for receiving some types of VTA funding. VTA could provide education and technical assistance to its member agencies about the unintended consequences of focusing on auto performance goals at the expense of other modes.

---

61 VTA is currently updating its TIA Guidelines to require measurement of impacts to pedestrians, cyclists and transit.

62 Some cities are now updating their auto level-of-service standards. The City of San Jose went from requiring a minimum of LOS D in its downtown to exempting downtown intersections from auto level-of-service standards. This means that it is city policy not to be concerned about auto throughput on any of the downtown streets. However, there is still opposition to projects that appear to impair the free flow of autos. SB 743, passed in 2013 by the state, will require an alternative to auto level of service for CEQA transportation analysis.
As an unofficial leader in the region, VTA touches every single person who lives in, works in or visits Santa Clara County. VTA can use its reach to help connect people with the agency and communicate a compelling vision for the future.

**SPUR’s recommendations for public engagement**

**30. Improve VTA’s brand and public image.**

Every interaction with VTA shapes the agency’s brand and public image. Transit is a particularly important place to improve the public experience. Creating consistently branded, well-designed and up-to-date touch points — i.e., websites, apps, social media, maps and signage — for new and existing transit riders will be critical to the success of a multi-modal vision. VTA should regularly assess its brand and test new communications and tools with both riders and non-riders. While the agency focuses on attracting new riders to transit, it should continue to value existing riders and strive to improve those important relationships. From a marketing perspective, keeping riders is much less expensive than acquiring new riders.

**31. Partner with the public for planning and problem-solving.**

The challenges of making transportation work within individual communities while making it more sustainable across the county are complex and can’t be solved by VTA alone. VTA has created new channels like social media to communicate with riders, but more can be done to make its processes feel accessible. VTA can welcome the public by:

- Better integrating outreach and planning efforts, making it easy for community members and other stakeholders to follow the planning process and understand how decisions get made. VTA should work with stakeholders sooner and more often during visioning and planning processes. New public participation models, such as social media, can help bring more people into conversation with VTA about the future of transportation in their communities. Smartphone apps could play a role in communicating with riders.

- Adopting best practices in crowdsourcing to attain the best ideas. This approach promises dual benefits: It brings the best thinking and ideas to VTA and creates a dialogue with VTA constituents. Consulting the “crowd” can help VTA...
collect, test and deploy ideas. Possible crowdsourcing projects include developing solutions to provide mobility to low-coverage or low-density areas and learning about pain points on bus or light rail lines. Collecting rider stories is one way to let riders become spokespeople, offering them the chance to communicate the value of transit in their lives and spreading the image of transit as a useful and desirable product.

- Finding ways to share transportation data more openly, such as opening up real-time General Transit Feed Specification (GTFS) data\(^{63}\) or ridership information. Sharing this data could spur the local tech community to develop new programs and services that would be beneficial both to private industry and to VTA.

VTA can also improve its reach by partnering with community groups and businesses to hold public programs and events similar to CicLAvia in Los Angeles, which closes a section of roadway to cars and opens it to pedestrians and cyclists for a day.

32. Partner with Silicon Valley companies and with universities.

The many Silicon Valley companies, universities and individuals who create new technology are driving dramatic changes in transportation. These innovations include social web technology to enable ride sharing, new ways of collecting data for real-time or strategic decision-making, and automotive technologies that improve safety or allow vehicles to use streets more efficiently (such as autonomous vehicle and connected vehicle technologies). Silicon Valley also offers expertise in tools like design thinking, an approach to problem-solving that focuses on human needs, and the lean startup, a methodology for testing and improving service. VTA can partner with universities like San Jose State University or Stanford University to apply for grants to pilot new technology or transportation research. Silicon Valley has embraced a culture of testing, iterating and accommodating failure that VTA could adopt.

VTA can also pursue financial partnerships with Silicon Valley companies or other partners. For example, VTA could seek voluntary contributions toward an existing VTA project or program, a joint venture to try a new technology or service, or an in-kind donation such as data or equipment. \(\Diamond\)

---

\(^{63}\) GTFS defines a common format for public transportation schedules and related geographic information. GTFS feeds allow public transit agencies to publish their transit data and developers to write applications that use that data in an interoperable way.
Grow funding

Goal: Increased funding is available for transit capital projects, operations, station area improvements, partnerships with cities and new mobility solutions.

There is not enough funding today, nor is the funding that exists flexible enough, to implement all the recommendations presented in this report. SPUR provides suggestions below for local sources of transportation funding, but the importance of addressing the predictability and growth of regional, state and federal transportation funding, while beyond the scope of this report, cannot be overstated. New funding sources such as California’s cap-and-trade program or a future regional measure are opportunities for VTA to fund catalytic transit projects, active transportation or transit-oriented development.

SPUR encourages VTA to test and pilot new funding sources. Some sources, like user fees or impact fees, could even drive behavior changes or land use patterns and help VTA achieve its mode-shift goals.

SPUR’s recommendations for funding

33. Charge user fees to rebalance funding to travel modes other than cars.

Charging user fees means that those who benefit from something pay for it directly. For many years, those who benefitted most from road widening or parking were drivers, but the costs were borne by all taxpayers. New technology makes the collection of user fees feasible for greater numbers of facilities; it also allows us to vary the fee schedule over the course of the day (for example, charging higher fees for roads during peak hours). The possibilities for charging user fees include road pricing (all types of roads are eligible), parking at transit stations, taxes on fuel or vehicle registration fees.

64 A vehicle miles travelled (VMT) tax, which is being evaluated by the state as a replacement for the gas tax, is also a user fee.

34. Collect impact fees as a way to fund sustainable growth.

Impact fees are like user fees, but they’re paid by new development projects for benefits enjoyed over time. These fees can be a good way to fund the transportation improvements needed to accommodate growth. But it’s important that any impact fees that contribute to improving conditions for drivers don’t come out of the pockets of those who don’t drive.

VTA could also consider a regional impact fee, paid by projects that impact roadways or projects that don’t adopt an approved aggressive TDM program. This would allow VTA to control which projects would be worth funding — a better approach than the current strategy of widening roads and/or ignoring impacts that worsen.
Other types of impact fees that could be studied include fees for property owners in areas that enjoy a specific benefit from transit service (a transit benefit district) or a transit payroll tax on employers.

35. **Continue to use broad-based revenue sources.**

Broad-based transportation revenue sources such as sales taxes and property taxes generally provide funding for a set of large projects like highways or BART. If a local transportation sales tax is proposed or renewed in Santa Clara County, it should cover several priorities identified in this report that currently do not receive sales tax funding, such as the planned countywide bicycle network, as described in Recommendation 20, or transit-oriented development. A sales tax can also stipulate new requirements for the use of the funds; for example, it can mandate that jurisdictions adopt a complete streets policy if they are receiving funds for road maintenance. While the county does not currently have a parcel tax for transportation, it is possible to enact one in the future.

VTA has begun a voluntary impact fee that development can pay to contribute toward regional transportation projects. This was based on a similar program to fund county expressway projects.
Appendix A

About VTA: History, governance and services

Most local transportation agencies have a narrower focus, but VTA does everything from planning and operating transit to constructing highways. Here we look in more detail at how VTA evolved, how it is governed and the many kinds of services it provides.

How VTA came to be

At the end of the 19th century, South Bay cities were oriented around a robust network of streetcars. The country’s first electric streetcars appeared in San Jose in the 1890s; the lines eventually ran west to Los Gatos and north to Palo Alto. Service began to decline in the 1930s due to the rise of the private automobile and freight trucks. As streetcars were abandoned, many routes were converted to bus service. In the 1950s, bus ridership declined as prosperity and suburban growth brought more cars to the region. Bus companies were increasingly losing money and asking for government subsidies to continue service.

In 1972, the Santa Clara County Transit District, predecessor to VTA, was created to manage a gasoline tax and assume control over the failing private bus lines. The county supervisors governed the new transit district, supported by a 29-member County Transportation Commission. The new county transit district began operating public bus service in 1973. In 1976, voters approved a half-cent sales tax to support transit operations (which continues to be collected today).

In 1972, the Santa Clara County Transit District, predecessor to VTA, was created to manage a gasoline tax and assume control over the failing private bus lines. The county supervisors governed the new transit district, supported by a 29-member County Transportation Commission. The new county transit district began operating public bus service in 1973. In 1976, voters approved a half-cent sales tax to support transit operations (which continues to be collected today).

Due to growing congestion in the 1970s, the transit district and the Santa Clara County Transportation Commission, with support from MTC and ABAG, began to undertake a serious study of rapid transit. County leaders eventually settled on a plan to construct a 55-mile light rail system with a 1,500-bus feeder system. Construction began on the first light rail line, along the Guadalupe corridor (the line that today runs in the median of Highway 87), in 1984. The corridor opened in 1991 and was followed by extensions to Mountain View, Milpitas, East San Jose and Campbell. By 1999, the light rail network covered 29 miles, connecting Mountain View with downtown San Jose.

Despite a stated interest in moving away from cars, the county taxed itself in the 1980s and 1990s to complete links in the interstate highway network and to grow a network of expressways. For example, when Santa Clara County passed sales tax Measure A in 1984, the county was contemplating building a rail transit system to handle congestion. But the measure put forward a package of highway projects (separating Route 237 from local roads, widening Highway 101 and building Highway 85). The highway investments undermined attempts to grow the county around a robust transit network. The growth in road capacity has not decreased congestion — in fact, congestion has only increased.

In 1991, the state passed legislation creating congestion management agencies, or CMAs. A state-designated body in each county would spend a five-cent gas tax to relieve congestion and coordinate land uses with transportation. In 1995, the county transit district assumed the CMA role, and in 2000 the transit district became the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA). That year, motivated by increasing car traffic, voters approved a sales tax to bring BART to Silicon Valley.

Transit ridership peaked in 2001 during the dot-com boom, but the recession that followed coincided with declining ridership and a declining operating budget. The recession revealed problems in VTA’s operations: low ridership, low productivity and the highest subsidy rate in North America. VTA engaged in several programs to reform its internal practices, adopted policies to make transit services more efficient and won the trust of voters on a sales tax to fund BART operations in 2008. One outcome of the new transit policies has been...
the development of three bus rapid transit projects, a light rail efficiency project and an express bus program.

VTA’s Transit Sustainability Policy and accompanying Service Design Guidelines, adopted in 2007, provide specific guidelines to determine where transit extensions should be built and what type of transit service should be provided based on expected or actual ridership. This was an important change to help facilitate difficult decisions about where to allocate limited transit resources.

**VTA board and member cities**

The VTA Board of Directors is composed of 17 locally elected officials who are assigned based on their city’s population and geography; 12 of these are voting members while five members serve as alternates. The county’s representative to MTC also serves as a nonvoting, ex-officio member of the VTA board.

As the county’s population center, the City of San Jose appoints five directors; the other cities are grouped and allocated one or two director seats that rotate among the cities in that group. (See map on page 9.) Santa Clara County also appoints two members to the board. Voting representatives from cities are appointed to VTA as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>San Jose</th>
<th>Five directors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>Los Altos, Los Altos Hills, Mountain View, Palo Alto</td>
<td>One director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>Campbell, Cupertino, Los Gatos, Monte Sereno, Saratoga</td>
<td>One director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td>Gilroy, Morgan Hill</td>
<td>One director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 5</td>
<td>Milpitas, Santa Clara, Sunnyvale</td>
<td>Two directors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Santa Clara County**

Two directors

Three VTA board members are ex-officio members of the Caltrain Board of Directors.

The cities of Santa Clara County are very diverse in size, demographics and setting, which can result in differing transit needs depending on, for example, the proportion of young people or older adults in the population, the accessibility of jobs and transit, and the average distance to community services like schools or health care.

**VTA’s transit services**

VTA runs or helps to run nearly all of the public transit services in the county.68 Transit services fall under three operating categories:

**Operated by VTA:** Buses, light rail, the Downtown Area Shuttle (DASH) and the Airport Flyer shuttle. The county’s planned bus rapid transit (BRT) service will also be operated by VTA.

**Operated by VTA contractors or cities:** ACE shuttle buses, Caltrain shuttles and Outreach paratransit. The Silicon Valley BART extension will be operated by BART.

**Operated by others and governed by VTA and partners:** Regional bus service (the Highway 17 Express, Dumbarton Expressway light rail project Phase 1 ($276 million), Capitol Expressway light rail project Phase 2 ($254 million), Vasona light rail extension ($176 million))

In addition to this existing transit network, more than $8 billion in investments in new public transit services are underway — the largest set of transportation investments the county has ever seen. These projects include:70

- VTA’s extension of BART to Silicon Valley: Warm Springs to Berryessa ($2.4 billion)
- VTA’s extension of BART to Silicon Valley: Berryessa to San Jose/Santa Clara ($3.6 billion)
- Modernization and electrification of the Caltrain system ($608 million)
- Santa Clara-Alum Rock bus rapid transit ($128 million)
- El Camino Real bus rapid transit ($200 million71)
- Stevens Creek bus rapid transit ($145 million72)
- Light Rail Efficiency project ($75 million73)
- Capitol Expressway light rail project Phase 1 ($276 million)
- Capitol Expressway light rail project Phase 2 ($254 million)

---


68 In many cities, large employers and institutions are increasingly providing private transit services in the form of local or regional shuttles or feeder services from VTA transit stations. In some cases, a private shuttle is required by a development agreement or as mitigation for traffic impacts.

69 Average weekday ridership as of 4th Quarter 2013: Caltrain 50,800; ACE 4,100; Capitol Corridor 4,300; Highway 17 Express 1,217. See www.apta.com/resources/statistics/Documents/2013-q4-ridership-APTA.pdf and www.scmtd.com/images/department/planning/april2013_ridership.pdf

70 Several of these projects are under construction, others are regional priorities for federal New Starts and Small Starts transit funding. Several transit projects are not included in this list due to the uncertainty of their implementation, such as the Mineta San Jose International Airport Automatic People Mover Connector. All figures from VTP 2040 project list, available at http://www.vta.org/projects-and-programs/planning/valley-transportation-plan-2040-vtp-2040, unless otherwise specified.


With faster connections to San Francisco and new local transit services like BRT, Diridon Station in San Jose will become a far more significant transit hub, serving tens of thousands passengers per day.\(^\text{74}\) The Milpitas and Downtown San Jose BART stations will connect with VTA light rail. VTA’s BRT will also connect with Caltrain and BART at several stations.

### VTA local transit

VTA buses and light rail transit, which operate across the county, are the VTA services most familiar to locals. Buses provide approximately 78,000 weekday transit trips on 71 lines that serve more than 4,000 bus stops. VTA’s bus service is most concentrated and frequent through downtown and East San Jose; 18 core network routes account for 74.2 percent of total bus system ridership.\(^\text{75}\) The three initial corridors planned for high-quality BRT service will run on these high ridership routes. (See page 22 for a description of BRT service.)

VTA also operates two shuttle buses. The DASH shuttle is designed as a last-mile solution, providing a free bus connection from Diridon Station to downtown San Jose, including San Jose State University. The Airport Flyer is a free bus running between the Santa Clara Caltrain station and the Metro/Airport light rail station, connecting passengers with the Mineta San Jose International Airport.

VTA’s light rail system serves approximately 35,000 weekday riders. The current network is centered in downtown San Jose. Two lines and one spur operate across 42.2 miles to the cities of Campbell, Milpitas, Mountain View, San Jose, Santa Clara and Sunnyvale. Light rail connects to several regional transit services at Diridon Station in San Jose, as well as to Caltrain at Mountain


### Santa Clara County Cities Differ From One Another

The populations of VTA’s 15 member cities and towns share some characteristics and differ in other areas. For example, 50 percent of Milpitas residents are foreign-born while only 17 percent of those in Los Gatos are. The City of San Jose’s population is greater than that of all the other cities combined.

### Age of Residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Area (square miles)</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Percentage of Foreign-Born Residents</th>
<th>Age of Residents</th>
<th>Travel Mode to Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Under 18 years</td>
<td>18-64 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>39,349</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cupertino</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>58,302</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48,821</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Altos</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28,976</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Altos Hills</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7,922</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Gatos</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29,413</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milpitas</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>66,790</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte Sereno</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,341</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37,882</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>74,066</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>64,403</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>945,942</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>116,468</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saratoga</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29,926</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>140,081</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census American Community Survey 2012 1-year estimates; age distribution from 2010 Census.
At least 15% of households do not own cars
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FIGURE 10
No-Car Households in Santa Clara County
Household incomes vary widely among different parts of the county. Meanwhile, certain corridors have a higher concentration of households with no car. Lower income and no-car households may have a higher reliance on public transportation to meet their mobility needs.

View. The Light Rail System Analysis, adopted by the VTA board in 2010, recommended immediate development of several capital projects and service improvements to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of VTA’s light rail system. The resulting Light Rail Efficiency project is expected to produce a 20 to 30 percent savings in travel time between key origins and destinations. Some of the projects have been accelerated to be completed before the opening of Levi’s Stadium in 2014.

Transit operated by VTA contractors or cities
VTA contracts with partner agencies and companies to run paratransit and some shuttle services. Shuttles are generally used to connect passengers with workplaces that are not immediately adjacent to stations. ACE shuttles are designed to improve connections: Eight shuttles transport commuters from the Santa Clara Great America Station to employment destinations in the northern and western parts of the county, especially within the area bounded by highways 237, 880 and 101 (known as the “Golden Triangle”). Caltrain shuttles connect to the rail line at University Avenue and California Avenue (Palo Alto), Mountain View, Lawrence and Santa Clara University (Santa Clara), Tamien (San Jose) and Gilroy. These shuttles are managed by VTA together with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Caltrain and certain employers.76

For passengers with disabilities who are unable to access VTA’s bus and light rail routes, VTA contracts with partners to provide paratransit service within three-quarters of a mile of all regular bus and light rail system stops. Paratransit is available to these customers for no more than twice the standard transit fare. The nonprofit organization Outreach has been providing paratransit services in the county for more than 30 years.

Transit governed by VTA and partners

VTA participates in the management of several regional transit services. Along with the San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans) and the City and County of San Francisco, VTA provides operating and capital funding for Caltrain. Caltrain provides weekday and weekend train service between San Jose and San Francisco along the peninsula. Trains run most frequently during peak hours, when “baby bullet” express service is offered. Weekend peak commute-direction service also runs south to Gilroy. Caltrain has experienced a surge in ridership following the creation of the baby bullet service, job growth in San Francisco and peninsula/South Bay cities, and growing car traffic on Highways 101 and 280.

VTA also partners to provide regional bus services (to Santa Cruz and Monterey from San Jose), the Dumbarton Express bus and the ACE train. The Dumbarton Express provides service across the Dumbarton Bridge, connecting the Union City Intermodal Station with the Palo Alto Caltrain station and Stanford Research Park. The ACE connects workers in the San Joaquin Valley with places of employment in Silicon Valley; four daily roundtrip commuter trains travel between San Joaquin, Alameda and Santa Clara counties. Service runs from Stockton to San Jose in the mornings, and San Jose to Stockton in the evenings.

Active transportation: walking and cycling

While “active transportation” (i.e., walking and cycling) are generally local transportation modes supported by cities, VTA does have some specific programs to promote active transportation and can support these modes more through its policies and funding.

VTA’s Countywide Bicycle Plan was adopted in 2008 and identifies cross-county bicycle corridors, intended to complement local and regional bicycle plans. In 1996, VTA was one of the first transit agencies in the nation to equip all buses and light rail vehicles with bicycle racks. It was also a pioneer in developing a bike-sharing program, which has now been implemented as part of Bay Area Bike Share. This program allows members to rent shared bicycles in several downtown areas in the county and across the Bay Area.77

Existing and planned trail networks in the county provide more off-street biking facilities than most other parts of the Bay Area. The City of San Jose Trail Program aims to develop 100 miles of paved trails. A trail like San Jose’s Guadalupe River Trail, thanks to its connection to downtown San Jose from outlying neighborhoods, or the Upper Penitencia Creek trail, which will connect with the Berryessa BART station, enable bicycling to jobs or to transit in addition to recreational riding. The county also operates a network of dedicated bike trails, such as the Los Gatos Trail.

77 The first phase of Bay Area Bike Share, sponsored by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, launched in August 2013 with 700 bicycles and 70 stations in five cities along the Caltrain corridor.
VTA also works with MTC to develop a complete streets program for the county. This program promotes designing streets that are safe and functional for all kinds of users, including transit riders. VTA’s Bicycle Technical Guidelines provide design standards for cycling facilities, and VTA supports Safe Routes to School, which facilitates and encourages active transportation to schools in the county; the program is run by the Traffic Safe Communities Network and the Santa Clara County Public Health Department.

VTA works with its member agencies to improve active transportation through the Land Use Transportation Integration working group, a forum that shares information on regional land use and transportation planning.

While road investments have dominated VTA’s past, transit investments dominate today.

VTA builds and operates the Silicon Valley Express Lanes network. This project redesigns existing carpool lanes on several highways so that solo drivers can use them for a fee, which is collected using a Fastrak transponder. The price to use the lane is raised or lowered throughout the day to manage demand and ensure free flow of traffic in

Roads and highways

Roads and highways dominate the county’s transportation system, and as a CMA, VTA exerts a large influence over them. When part of the designated congestion management program network drops below established car throughput standards, VTA is responsible for funding improvements to reduce the delay. The program does not similarly evaluate the performance of other parts of the transportation system, such as transit, cycling or walking, nor does it assess the overall travel experience or availability of transportation options through the county. To measure the performance of other modes like biking, walking and transit would be a complex task using today’s tools, but it would also enable better decision-making for the transportation network and the region as a whole.

VTA builds and operates the Silicon Valley Express Lanes network. This project redesigns existing carpool lanes on several highways so that solo drivers can use them for a fee, which is collected using a Fastrak transponder. The price to use the lane is raised or lowered throughout the day to manage demand and ensure free flow of traffic in

---

78 CMAs are expected to coordinate transportation, air quality and land use among their member jurisdictions. VTA’s congestion management program focuses on ensuring that 252 intersections, 270 freeway segments and seven rural highways meet its performance standards for auto level of service.
this lane. (Carpools and buses continue to use the lanes for free.) The project’s objective is to provide relief from car traffic while also generating revenue. VTA’s express lane legislation requires the tolls to be used to pay back project costs and to finance highway operations and maintenance, but they can also be spent on transit in the same corridor.\textsuperscript{79}

Caltrans, the state Department of Transportation, owns the highways and also owns and operates state routes within Santa Clara County, including parts of State Route 82 (El Camino Real), State Route 152 and State Route 17. VTA funds and builds highway projects for Caltrans. Caltrans opened an office housed at VTA in 2013, the Caltrans iTeam Demonstration Program. The iTeam focuses on reducing costs and delivery time for Caltrans projects within the county.\textsuperscript{80}

Various agencies manage other roads within Santa Clara County. The County Roads and Airports Department owns and operates the county’s expressway system and unincorporated roads. The 62-mile expressway system is composed of regular streets that were turned into expressways in the 1960s and early 1970s through the addition of lanes and shoulders. Expressways promote high-speed travel but have some intersections and driveways.

\begin{figure}[h]
\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure12.png}
\end{center}
\caption{VTA Transportation Spending}
\end{figure}

\textbf{Countywide transportation planning}

As a CMA, VTA is responsible for developing a countywide transportation plan, called the Valley Transportation Plan (VTP). The VTP addresses funding needs that include transit, land use, pedestrians, bicycles, highways, expressways, local streets and roads, and technology. This 25-year plan is updated every four to five years; its process parallels the development of the Regional Transportation Plan by MTC. Projects are proposed by cities, VTA, the county and other agencies, such as Caltrain. VTA uses its board-adopted guidelines to score projects for inclusion. Based on anticipated funding and input from MTC, VTA develops a list of projects that are likely to be funded during the life of the plan. Proposed projects are vetted internally at VTA, through VTA committees and with outside stakeholders. A final project list is approved by the VTA board.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{VTP 2040 Project Expenditures} & (millions of dollars) \\
\hline
\textbf{Transit Projects} & $8,130 \\
\hline
BART & $6,065 \\
Bus Rapid Transit & $509 \\
Light Rail & $585 \\
Commuter Rail (Caltrain, ACE, High Speed Rail) & $855 \\
Other Transit Related Projects & $116 \\
\hline
\textbf{Major Road Projects} & $3,391 \\
Expressways Projects & $267.2 \\
Express Lane Projects & $2,282 \\
Highway Projects & $842 \\
\hline
\textbf{Local Streets & County Roads Projects} & $781 \\
\hline
\textbf{Multimodal Transportation Investments} & $1,000 \\
\hline
\textbf{All Projects} & $13,302 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{VTP 2040 Project Expenditures}
\end{table}


\textsuperscript{79} The first phase of the SR 237 express lanes, one of the first segments of express lanes in operation, had revenue of $1,049,000 in its first year of operation between July 2012 and June 2013. See http://santaclaravta.iqm2.com/Citizens/FileOpen.aspx?Type=30&ID=1734

\textsuperscript{80} VTA’s major projects on Caltrans roads include the express lanes project, implementation of traffic management technology and the development of the SR 152 Trade Corridor.
VTA’s influence on land use and urban design

While VTA is a transportation authority, it does have some influence over land use. In its CMA role, VTA reviews development projects, provides planning expertise to member agencies and can tie funding to land use planning or policies. VTA also owns real estate and can develop it.

VTA reviews and comments on development and transportation projects in and adjacent to the county and VTA facilities. The process aims to improve land use and transportation coordination and encourage a balanced approach to addressing motor vehicle congestion. The CMA maintains the county’s Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Guidelines, which are used by member agencies to measure the impacts of land use and development projects on transportation. VTA requires cities to produce TIA reports for projects that are expected to generate 100 or more new peak-hour trips. VTA reviews the TIA report and provides suggestions to comply with the process and improve the project. VTA calls this process its Proactive Congestion Monitoring Program and reports to the VTA board quarterly on major project recommendations and approved development conditions. In addition to this program, VTA staff members review environmental documents and development proposals submitted by member agencies.

To facilitate partnership with local jurisdictions, VTA established its Community Design and Transportation (CDT) Program in 2002. The CDT manual identifies places where growth should be focused and designed to be walkable and transit-friendly: “cores,” i.e., downtowns and other community centers; “corridors” that parallel transit routes; and “station areas” around transit stations. The CDT manual explains best practices in urban design and street design.

All of VTA’s member jurisdictions endorsed the CDT guidelines. In 2012, approximately 66 percent of approved housing units and 37 percent of jobs added within the county were located within the identified cores, corridors and station areas. VTA previously administered a grant program to assist cities with planning and capital projects that implement the CDT guidelines, but that has been blended with the new One Bay Area Grant Program (OBAG) established by MTC and ABAG as part of the 2013 Plan Bay Area.

Similar to the CDT Program, OBAG supports focused growth near transit service. OBAG offers funding for capital projects near transit stations and also includes planning funds to assist cities and counties in promoting employment and housing growth in their city centers and transit-served corridors. As part of the program, VTA must produce an annual Investment and Growth Strategy to explain how funds can encourage development in the region’s priority development areas, places that cities have identified to focus their growth over the next 30 years in order to meet the objectives of Senate Bill 375, the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008.

VTA real estate

VTA owns considerable real estate assets and continues to acquire real estate as needed for transportation projects. Many of these properties are used for VTA operations, while others are available for sale, and a small subset of VTA’s real estate assets have been prioritized for joint development projects. (See map on page 42.) VTA adopted a revised Joint Development Policy in 2009. The stated goals are to generate revenue, carry out transit-oriented development and increase ridership on VTA’s transit system, in that order. The Joint Development Program was projected to provide $554 million in revenue toward transit and transportation projects over the 25-year duration of the 2035 Valley Transportation Plan. Projects completed under the Joint Development Program are the Tamien Child Care Center, Almaden Lake Village housing and the Ohlone-Chynoweth Mixed-Use Project. Like other land use efforts, the Joint Development Program relies on cooperation with municipalities and local communities.

As part of its light rail system development, VTA acquired a great deal of land around the transit stations with the expectation of growing transit-oriented communities. VTA has obtained authority from the state to acquire land for transit-oriented development and to create a transit benefit district to assess property owners for special benefits provided by their transit service.

81 CMP statute requires “a program to analyze the impacts of land use decisions made by local jurisdictions on the regional transportation systems, including an estimate of the costs associated with mitigating those impacts.” See California Government Code: 65089(b)(4).
83 The CDT Program structure considers all transportation modes and stresses the importance of a healthy pedestrian environment, concentrated mixed-use development patterns integrated with transit service, innovative street design and the interrelationships of buildings and sites with transportation facilities and services. The VTA is working to update this program in 2014–15.
85 From 2013–2017, $88 million has been allocated for OBAG grants in Santa Clara County.
86 SB 375 (Chapter 728, Statutes of 2008) directs the California Air Resources Board to set regional targets for reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The new law establishes a “bottom up” approach to ensure that cities and counties are involved in the development of regional plans to achieve those targets. See “The Basics of SB 375,” accessed April 2014, available at: www.ca-ilg.org/post/basics-sb-375
87 Institute for Local Government, available at: www.vta.org/sfc/servlet.shepherd/version/download/068A000000001Hdw1
VTA funding

In 1984, Santa Clara County became the first “self-help” county in the state, passing a local tax to build a specific list of projects. While county voters have repeatedly supported transportation sales taxes, state and federal funding is also necessary to keep the transportation system running and to build new projects. However, the existing transportation funding framework in the United States is based on the federal gas tax, and this pot of money is approaching bankruptcy. This is because the gas tax has been set at the same rate of 18.4 cents per gallon since 1993, yet Americans are driving less and cars are becoming more fuel-efficient.

Because of VTA’s unique structure (it’s a transit operator, CMA and sales tax authority all in one), it’s difficult to compare its budget to that of other transportation agencies. VTA’s funding sources today include:

User fees. User fees collected by VTA include transit fares, express lane tolls and vehicle license fees.88

Local sales taxes. 1976 Measure A, a half-cent sales tax that never expires, provides about $170 million per year, or about half of VTA’s transit budget.89

2000 Measure A, a 30-year half-cent sales tax, was the main funding source to begin constructing the BART extension to Silicon Valley and provides additional operating funds for light rail, as well as for several transit capital projects either completed or underway. 2008 Measure B provides one-eighth of a cent in sales tax for operating BART. Santa Clara County has repeatedly gone through boom and bust cycles, experiencing large influxes of sales taxes or other funding followed by a rapid decline in revenue. Other sales taxes — the 1984 10-cent sales tax for highway improvements and the 1996 half-cent 9-year sales tax for transit, highways and roadways — have both concluded.

State funding. VTA receives state funding through several programs that allocate gas and diesel tax revenue, sales tax revenue, general fund revenue, bond revenues and a vehicle license fee. California’s Transit Development Act allows counties to devote a quarter-cent of a 1 percent state sales tax for public transportation operations. These funds finance transit operations for VTA.

VTP 2040 Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>(millions of dollars)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>Federal New Starts</td>
<td>$2,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal Small Starts</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Congestion Management and Air Quality Improvement Program</td>
<td>$252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal/State</td>
<td>Transportation Enhancements + Transportation Fund for Clean Air + Transportation Development Act</td>
<td>$254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Improvement Plan</td>
<td>$975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interregional Transportation Improvement Program</td>
<td>$271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTC Freeway Performance Initiative</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>2000 CA Traffic Congestion Relief Program</td>
<td>$176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CA Prop. 1A and 1B</td>
<td>$145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CA High Speed Rail</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>County Measure A (with renewal)</td>
<td>$3,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Express Lane and Toll Revenues</td>
<td>$2,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Transportation Impact Fees (committed)</td>
<td>$617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Anticipated Funding</td>
<td>$877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County Measure B Vehicle Registration Fee</td>
<td>$71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$13,252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Federal funding.** Federal Transit Administration New Starts and Small Starts funding is used for large and small transit capital projects, such as BART and BRT. This funding source is getting increasingly competitive and is also very unpredictable due to the lack of a long-term federal transportation funding bill. Some VTA transit funds also come from Federal Transit Administration formula programs. Flexible federal funding comes from several other programs that are funded largely by the Highway Trust Fund.

**Impact and mitigation fees.** Development projects may pay voluntary fees to VTA to mitigate transportation impacts identified through CEQA or through a development agreement negotiated with a city. Several cities in the county levy transportation impact fees to fund projects identified in an area transportation plan. Impact or mitigation fees may also be collected by VTA through CMA mechanisms, such as a local area or countywide deficiency plan, and funds from those efforts could be used for a range of mitigation measures.

**Member agency dues.** Member agencies pay a fee to be a member of the CMA. The actual fee is based on a formula adopted by the VTA board, based on each agency’s share of state gas tax monies and each agency’s proportion of total employment in the county. Funds are paid out of the total gas tax funding the member agency receives from being a part of the CMA. 

---

**APPENDIX A**
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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: I-280 Ramp Metering After Study

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

On April 3, 2008, VTA Board of Directors authorized the General Manager to execute a funding agreement for $2,051,000 with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) that specified the roles and responsibilities to implement ramp metering on three corridors in Santa Clara County:

- Southbound SR 85 between Almaden Expressway and Cottle Road in the PM peak period
- Northbound and Southbound SR 87 between US 101 and SR 85 in both the AM and PM peak period
- Southbound US 101 between Embarcadero Road and De La Cruz Boulevard in the PM peak period.

The listed corridors were successfully deployed with reductions in travel delays as high as 40 percent, with findings reported to the VTA Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), Congestion Management Program & Planning (CMPP) Committee, and VTA Board of Directors in the fall of 2010 and 2011.

After the three initial corridors were implemented, VTA Board of Directors approved two amendments to the scope of work for two additional freeway corridors as follows:

- Southbound I-880 corridor between Dixon Landing Road and I-280 on November 5, 2009

The southbound I-880 corridor was successfully deployed with reductions in travel delays as high as 26 percent, with findings reported to the VTA Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), Congestion Management Program & Planning (CMPP) Committee, and VTA Board of Directors.
in fall 2011. The report on the I-280 ramp metering that was activated on February 12, 2013 for northbound and May 30, 2012 for southbound are summarized in this memorandum.

As part of these ramp metering implementation efforts, a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was developed that defines the roles and responsibilities for VTA and Caltrans to manage, maintain, and operate freeway metering systems in Santa Clara County. This MOU that was approved at the VTA Board meeting on February 5, 2009 has been used to guide the implementation of the above metering.

Attachment A shows the limits of five implemented ramp metering corridors (Southbound SR 85, Northbound and Southbound SR 87, Southbound US 101, Southbound I-880, and Northbound and Southbound I-280, including future turn-ons).

**DISCUSSION:**

This memorandum summarizes findings from the implementation of ramp metering along the following limits:

- Northbound I-280 between Jackson Avenue and I-880/Highway 17
- Southbound I-280 between I-880/Highway 17 and US 101

The ramp metering implementation on I-280 between US 101 and I-880/SR 17 occurred in May 30, 2012 and February 12, 2013 (Northbound and Southbound, respectively). Post implementation traffic data collection efforts were not undertaken immediately due to a series of copper theft incidents in the corridor resulting in delayed data collection effort. When the data collection effort was undertaken in October 2013, the general traffic conditions in the corridor had changed significantly due to the recovering economy with increased traffic volume levels in the corridor. The following locations were affected by the copper wire theft issues:

- Southbound I-280 diagonal on-ramp from 10th and 11th Streets
- Northbound I-280 freeway to freeway connector ramp from Northbound SR 87

In order to evaluate the immediate effect of the ramp metering installation on the I-280 corridor, staff utilized travel time information that was collected using smartphone/mobile phone data from users traveling along the corridor as made available from data provider INRIX. Table 1 summarizes this data by comparing the pre-implementation month data (typically no more than two months before implementation) with the immediate post metering conditions (within the same month when ramp metering was activated).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Peak Period</th>
<th>Average Travel Time Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Over 4.25 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>3 seconds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 show that the implementation of ramp metering on I-280 showed travel time benefits over 4 minutes in the northbound direction in the AM peak period with minimal or no changes observed in the southbound direction in the PM peak period.
In October 2013, with the copper wire replaced to the ramp meters, data collection was undertaken to collect travel times on the freeway mainline (including delays), on-ramp queues, and on-ramp delays. These data were compared with the pre-ramp metering implementation data for the two corridors were that were collected during May and October 2011 for both Northbound and Southbound I-280 respectively.

**Delay**

When comparing the “before” and “after” conditions data for the project, the data showed an increase in freeway delays as shown in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Peak Period</th>
<th>Average Travel Time Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Over 6 1/4 mins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Over 6 ¾ mins.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As mentioned earlier, the traffic volumes in the corridor have changed significantly between summer 2012/early 2013 and fall 2013. A comparison of the “Before” Study and “After” Study for mainline volumes over the four-hour study period shows that mainline volumes along the corridor have increased by as much as 1,650 vehicles among the 14 mainline count locations in the northbound direction resulting in increased delays in the corridor.

In addition, there was a shift in traffic demand throughout the study corridor during the duration of the study period. The most significant change occurred in the first hour of the AM or PM peak periods where the traffic volumes increased between three and 18 percent (over 190 and over 1000 vehicles per hour, respectively). This volume increase has placed further burden on the existing bottlenecks and has limited the amount of traffic that can be accommodated in the subsequent hours.

**Wait Time**

Measurement of wait times and queues on the on-ramps were collected every 15 minutes for the corridor. The overall wait time over the four-hour implementation period for the corridor for the corridor is just over 39 seconds for northbound in the AM peak period and 55 seconds for southbound in the PM peak period.

**Queue**

Backups beyond available storage or increases in queue length were observed at the following locations:

**Northbound I-280 AM Peak:**
- McLaughlin Avenue diagonal on-ramp exceeded storage by two vehicles
- Southbound I-880 diagonal on-ramp increased queue by 58 vehicles. It should be noted that queues existed on this ramp prior to metering.

**Southbound I-280 PM Peak:**
- The queue was contained within the available storage at all times except in a few
observations where the Southwest Expressway on-ramp exceeded storage by five vehicles.
- The queue was contained within the available storage at all times except in a few observations where the Bird Avenue on-ramp exceeded storage by two vehicles.
- The queue was contained within the available storage at all times except in a few observations where the Northbound SR 87 connector on-ramp exceeded storage by 37 vehicles.
- SR 82 - N. First Street loop on ramp exceeded storage by 15 vehicles in multiple observations.

The locations above had occasional backups and delays that Caltrans staff is continuing to monitor following procedures outlined in the Ramp Metering Program MOU.

**NEXT STEPS:**

Traffic volumes on the corridor will probably continue to increase due to the improvement in the economic conditions in Silicon Valley. The following is a list of proposed next steps to be taken on this corridor to help provide congestion relief:

**Northbound I-280 AM peak:**
- Monitor the upstream bottleneck near McLaughlin Avenue and US-101. This bottleneck went away when ramp metering was first implemented, but got much worse in the months following implementation.
- Monitor the downstream bottleneck near I-880. This bottleneck may be affected by the Stevens Creek Boulevard/I-880/I-280 construction.

**Southbound I-280 PM peak:**
- Monitor the downstream bottleneck near SR-87, 7th Street, and 11th Street. This bottleneck was affected by the increase in on-ramp volumes at these three locations.
- Conduct a feasibility study for widening the NB SR-87 connector ramp to SB I-280. If widening is feasible, this location could be metered. Currently, one lane exists at this location and the volumes are too high to be accommodated by a single lane meter.

The above actions will be considered as part of work planned to study the I-280 corridor.

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

The Technical Advisory Committee considered this item as part of their Consent Agenda on September 11, 2014.

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

The Congestion Management Program & Planning Committee considered this item as part of their Consent Agenda on September 18, 2014.

Prepared By: David Kobayashi
Memo No. 4679
Figure 1: Santa Clara County Ramp Meter Implementations

Ramp Meters
- ▲ Future
- ■ Existing But Not Operational
- ● Operational
- □ Major roads

Implementation since 2008
- □ Implemented
- ▲ Future

Data Source: Caltrans and VTA
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: Update on regional tolling policies on express lanes

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

The Silicon Valley Express Lanes Program (referred to as the Program) has been under development since 2003 and was approved by the VTA Board of Directors in 2008. The Program (see Attachment A for projects in Program) implements a roadway pricing system allowing for the use of unused capacity in the carpool lanes to provide congestion relief. The roadway pricing system allows solo commuters to use this available capacity in the carpool lanes for a fee. The fee changes dynamically in response to existing congestion levels and available capacity in the carpool lanes as is current practice on the SR 237 Express Lanes. This memorandum highlights tolling policies for express lanes that are being considered by other agencies in the Bay Area.

DISCUSSION:

Bay Area Express Lanes Projects

The Bay Area has two express lanes projects in operation, the I-680 Southbound Express Lanes led by Alameda County Transportation Commission (ACTC) and the SR 237 Express Lanes by Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA). VTA is working on an expansion of express lanes on SR 237 as well as express lanes on US 101/SR 85. ACTC is also leading the implementation of I-680 Northbound Express Lane and I-580 Express Lanes.

The Bay Area Infrastructure Financing Authority (BAIFA), which is a subset of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) comprised of five voting members (the MTC Chair, the Bay Area Toll Authority (BATA) Oversight Committee Chair, and county commissioners from Alameda, Contra Costa and Solano), is the other entity that has been granted authority to implement express lanes in the Bay Area. Through this authority, BAIFA is implementing express lanes on I-680, I-880, I-80 and the approaches to the Dumbarton and San Mateo bridges.
in three above named counties. Attachment B shows the map of express lanes projects that are in operation and under development.

**Switchable Toll Tags**
Among the changes coming to the Bay Area is the introduction of switchable toll transponders, more commonly referred to as switchable toll tags. BATA, who is the distributor of toll tags in the Bay Area, is planning to distribute this new switchable toll tag in the Bay Area in spring 2015. The switchable toll tags provide to the motorist the option to declare vehicle occupancy level (1- solo driver, 2- two people, 3 - three or more people). Switchable toll tags are currently in use in Los Angeles and in Washington D.C. (see Attachment C).

**Requirement for All Express Lane Users to Use Toll Tags**
The ACTC I-580 Express Lanes along with BAIFA’s I-680 Express Lanes (in Contra Costa County), I-880 Express Lanes (in Alameda County) and I-80 Express Lanes (in Solano County) will be requiring all express lane users to carry a toll tag to use the express lanes. The two existing Bay Area Express Lanes projects (I-680 Southbound Express Lane and SR 237 Express Lanes) do not have this requirement. The I-580 Express Lanes is expected to be opened for tolling in fall 2015 and the I-680 Express Lanes (in Contra Costa County) would be open in summer 2016 with the requirement for users to use a toll tag to be in the express lane.

The requirement that all users must have a toll tag also means that carpoolers will have to carry a toll tag to use the express lanes facility. The switchable toll tag helps to accommodate this requirement by providing the ability for carpoolers to declare their occupancy levels (1- solo driver, 2- two people, 3 - 3 or more people) accordingly when they use the facility. Currently, if you register the toll tag to an account that is automatically replenished by a credit card, there is no fee for the toll tag. However, if you register your toll tag to an account that is replenished by a cash/check payment, then $20 will remain as a refundable deposit for your toll tag. It is expected that similar rules may apply for acquiring a switchable toll tag.

The current tolling operations on SR 237 Express Lanes and I-680 Southbound Express Lanes do not require carpoolers to carry a toll tag. A carpooler with a toll tag using SR 237 Express Lanes are required to remove the toll tag and place it in the provided mylar bag or employ other strategies to prevent a toll from being charged. Switchable toll tags sold in Southern California that are used in the SR 237 Express Lanes are charged a toll regardless of the occupancy declaration setting. VTA plans to maintain a “no toll tag required” approach for carpoolers using the existing SR 237 Express Lanes. This approach allows VTA to first observe lessons learned from the implementation of I-580 and I-680 Express Lanes requiring the use of toll tags by all users before formalizing express lanes tolling requirement changes in Santa Clara County.

The Bay Area bridges today require carpoolers to have a toll tag to receive a discounted toll fare during weekday commute peak times by driving through dedicated lanes reserved for carpoolers. Currently, there are over 20,000 carpoolers that daily cross Bay Area bridges during the times using discounted toll fares.

**Legislation**
Assembly Bill 1811 introduced by Member Buchanan and Assembly Bill 2090 introduced by
Members Fong and Gordon that clarify existing statute to allow for the implementation of operational policy requiring carpoolers to use a toll tag to use express lanes. Assembly Bill 1811 was signed into law in summer 2014 and covers express lanes operations by ACTC. Assembly Bill 2090 is progressing toward being signed as well and covers express lanes operations by VTA.

**Violation Enforcement System**

A Violation Enforcement System (VES) allows for automated enforcement of toll violations whereby a vehicle without a toll tag could have its license plate photographed for the purposes of ascertaining whether a violation notice is in order. If a violation is determined, the notice would be sent to the owner of the vehicle through a look-up of the Department of Motor Vehicles database. Implementation of a VES would allow California Highway Patrol (CHP) officers to focus their enforcement activities on solo drivers with toll tags claiming to be a carpooler. Attachments D and E provide an illustration of the two types of enforcement. The express lanes projects under development by BAIFA and ACTC include the implementation of a VES.

The VES could be a deterrent to toll violations and also result in reduced revenue leakage. Implementation of a VES system however would require additional back office processing to process video images. The additional cost to process video images could be offset by the violation fee collected. A toll ordinance along with new business rules for customers would have to be established in order to collect the fines related to toll violations.

**Next Steps**

VTA will maintain its "no toll tag required" approach for carpoolers using the SR 237 Express Lanes and monitor operations requiring toll tags use by carpoolers and the use of VES on the ACTC and BAIFA express lanes projects to determine their applicability in Santa Clara County. Upon evaluation, staff will provide recommendations to the VTA Board of Directors on whether changes related to the use of toll tags by carpoolers and the use of a VES should be implemented on upcoming express lanes projects in Santa Clara County.

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

The Citizen’s Advisory Committee (CAC) and the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) heard this item on September 10, 2014 and September 11, 2014 respectively and approved this item under consent agenda.

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) heard this item on September 11, 2014. There was discussion on how the region can approach towards uniform operational policies in the region. Staff informed that there are coordination efforts between the toll operator agencies, Caltrans and Metropolitan Transportation Commission to achieve this goal. Staff also explained that different toll operators might achieve this goal on different time schedule. Clarification was also provided that the Bay Area Toll Authority plans to issue the switchable tag in Spring 2015 and this tag will become the standard tag being issued moving forward.
STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:

The Congestion Management Planning and Programming (CMPP) heard and approved this item on September 18, 2014. The Committee inquired if there was any upside in adopting these policies such as reducing associated costs for California Highway Patrol (CHP) service. Staff clarified that the potential upside will be that the amount of toll violation collected can serve as another source of revenue generation. With regards to a question on tag deposit, staff explained that when you purchase a tag, the entire purchase amount is credited as a pre-paid toll amount, thus making the toll tag free if the customer links the tag to a credit card account. Tags linked to cash or checking account will require a $25 deposit for the tag. Finally, staff also informed that the FasTrak tags can be used on any toll facilities within California.

Prepared By: Murali Ramanujam, Jane Yu and Arshad Syed
Memo No. 4349
Source: Metropolitan Transportation Commission
ATTACHMENT C: SWITCHABLE TAGS

Source: I-10 and I-110 Metro Express Lanes (Los Angeles)

Source: I-495 Express Lanes, Virginia Department of Transportation
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: Programmed Project Monitoring - Quarterly Report

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

Every quarter, the Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report is presented to the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) and the VTA Board of Directors. The purpose of the report is to assist the VTA Board, committees, staff and project sponsors in tracking progress of projects funded through programming actions of the VTA Board. Additionally, the report helps to ensure implementing agencies comply with MTC’s Regional Project Funding Delivery Policy and do not lose any funds due to missing a federal or state funding deadline.

The Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report for April to June 2014 is attached for review. This report provides the latest status on discretionary funded projects. A project summary sheet highlighting status of projects with funds expiring in 2014 is also attached. The project summary sheet identifies projects in three categories:

- Red: Projects at the risk of losing funds due to delivery difficulties.
- Yellow: Projects that need extra attention or will risk running into difficulties.
- Green: Projects are progressing smoothly.

The next Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report will cover the period July-September 2014.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:

The Technical Advisory and Policy Advisory Committees received this item as part of the Consent Agendas at their September 11, 2014 meetings. There was no discussion of this item.

STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:

The Congestion Management Planning and Programming (CMPP) Committee received this item
as part of its consent agenda at the September 18, 2014 meeting. There was no discussion.

Prepared By: Bill Hough
Memo No. 4654
Red = Project at risk of losing funds due to delivery difficulties.  
Yellow = Project may need extra attention or will risk running into difficulties.  
Green = Project is progressing smoothly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Federal/State Funds for 2014/15</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>Virginia Avenue Sidewalks</td>
<td>SCL130017</td>
<td>$708,000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>In progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Altos Hills</td>
<td>El Monte Road Preservation</td>
<td>SCL130013</td>
<td>$186,000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>In progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Gatos</td>
<td>Hillside Road Preservation</td>
<td>SCL130014</td>
<td>$139,000</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Scheduling field review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milpitas</td>
<td>Milpitas Various Streets and Roads Preservation</td>
<td>SCL130035</td>
<td>$1,652,000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>In progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
<td>Palo Alto Various Street Resurfacing</td>
<td>SCL130042</td>
<td>$956,000</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Performing Field Review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>San Jose Citywide Pavement Management Program</td>
<td>SCL130005</td>
<td>$11,003,000</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>PE obligated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>San Jose Citywide SRTS Program</td>
<td>SCL130006</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>PE obligated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Jackson Ave Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>SCL130007</td>
<td>$975,000</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Near 65% design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>San Jose Pedestrian Oriented Traffic Signals</td>
<td>SCL130010</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>PE obligated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>San Jose Smart Intersections Program [PE]</td>
<td>SCL130036</td>
<td>$360,800</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>In progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.C. County</td>
<td>East San Jose Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>SCL110121</td>
<td>$1,871,977</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Project in design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.C. County</td>
<td>Santa Clara County NonInfrastructure SRTS</td>
<td>SCL130021</td>
<td>$838,000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>In progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.C. County</td>
<td>San Tomas Aquino Spur Multi-Use Trail</td>
<td>SCL130022</td>
<td>$3,234,000</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Waiting for NEPA clearance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saratoga</td>
<td>Saratoga Village Sidewalk Rehabilitation</td>
<td>SCL130027</td>
<td>$162,000</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>In progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>Fair Oaks Avenue Bikeway</td>
<td>SCL130029</td>
<td>$143,700</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Project scoping begins October 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>Sunnyvale East and West Channel Trails</td>
<td>SCL130031</td>
<td>$596,000</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Design 99% complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>Sunnyvale SRTS Ped Infrastructure</td>
<td>SCL130032</td>
<td>$1,569,000</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Project scoping underway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>Duane Avenue Roadway Preservation</td>
<td>SCL130033</td>
<td>$1,296,000</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Interviewing design consultants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report
April-June 2014

#### Sponsor: City of Campbell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Milestone</th>
<th>Grants ($000)</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCL110028</td>
<td>Widen north and south sides to include a bicycle lane; install new sidewalk; replace existing abutment walls with new retaining and wing walls.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fund Source**
- CMAQ $4,142
- Local $588

**Manager Name**: Fred Ho

**Phone/Fax**: 408-866-2156

**E-Mail**: fredh@cityofcampbell.com

**Project Title**: Campbell Avenue Portals Bike/Ped Improvements

**Field Review**
- ENV: $0, complete
- Design: $530, 2011, complete

**Schedule**
- Programmed Year: 2014
- Start mm/yyyy: 8/2014
- End mm/yyyy: 2015

**Comments**
- Funds Expire obligated
- Last Updated: 7/30/2014
- Last Invoice (sub/app): 2/2014
- 8/2014

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Milestone</th>
<th>Grants ($000)</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCL110116</td>
<td>In Campbell: On Hacienda Avenue between Winchester Boulevard and Virginia Avenue: Construct bike lanes, on-street parking, accessibility ramps, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fund Source**
- Local: $136
- STIP-TE: $544

**Manager Name**: Fredrick Ho

**Phone/Fax**: 408-866-2156

**E-Mail**: fredh@cityofcampbell.com

**Project Title**: Hacienda Ave Streetscape and Bicycle Improvements

**Field Review**
- ENV: $0, 2012
- Design: $0, 5/2012

**Schedule**
- Programmed Year: 2014
- Start mm/yyyy: 8/2014
- End mm/yyyy: 7/2015

**Comments**
- CON obligated 12/12/2013.
- Funds Expire obligated
- Last Updated: 8/18/2014
- Last Invoice (sub/app): 8/2014

---
### Hamilton Avenue Preservation

**Project No:** SCL130003  
**Project Description:** In Campbell: Rehabilitation of roadway on Hamilton Avenue west of Phoenix Drive.  
**CON obligated:** 1/30/2014.  
**Fund Source:**  
- CMAQ $279  
- Local $69  
**Manager Name:** Fred Ho  
**Phone/Fax:** 408-866-2156  
**E-Mail:** fredh@cityofcampbell.com  
**Sponsor:** City of Campbell  
**Project Title:** Hamilton Avenue Preservation  
**Programmed Year:** 2013  
**Start mm/yyyy:** 9/2013  
**End mm/yyyy:** 9/2013  
**Comments:** CON obligated 1/30/2014.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Programmed Year</th>
<th>Start mm/yyyy</th>
<th>End mm/yyyy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENV</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>9/2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Schedule**  
- ROW: $0  
- Construction: $316  
- Start mm/yyyy: 8/2014  
- End mm/yyyy: 8/2014  
**Comments:** Funds Expire obligated  
**Last Updated:** 8/18/2014  

**Costs**  
- Total: $348  
- Last Invoice (sub/app): 7/2014  
- Last Updated: 8/18/2014

---

### Virginia Avenue Sidewalks

**Project No:** SCL130017  
**Project Description:** On Virginia Avenue between Budd Avenue and Hacienda Avenue, add pedestrian sidewalks, curb, gutter, and curb ramps.  
**Fund Source:**  
- CMAQ $708  
- Local $92  
**Manager Name:** Fred Ho  
**Phone/Fax:** 408-866-2156  
**E-Mail:** fredh@cityofcampbell.com  
**Sponsor:** City of Campbell  
**Project Title:** Virginia Avenue Sidewalks  
**Programmed Year:** 2014  
**Start mm/yyyy:** 8/2014  
**End mm/yyyy:** 8/2014  
**Comments:** Add new project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Programmed Year</th>
<th>Start mm/yyyy</th>
<th>End mm/yyyy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENV</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>8/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$92</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>8/2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Schedule**  
- ROW: $0  
- Construction: $708  
- Start mm/yyyy: 6/2015  
- End mm/yyyy: 12/2015  
**Comments:** Funds Expire 4/30/2015  
**Last Updated:** 8/18/2014  

**Costs**  
- Total: $800  
- Last Invoice (sub/app): 2/2015  
- Last Updated: 8/18/2014
### Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report

**April-June 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor:</th>
<th>City of Cupertino</th>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>Stevens Creek Blvd Preservation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 of 1</td>
<td>Project No</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCL130009</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td></td>
<td>Install rubberized overlay on Stevens Creek Blvd between SR-85 and De Anza Blvd.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Fund Source | Local $565 | STP $735 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manager Name</th>
<th>David Stillman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>(408) 777-3249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:davids@cupertino.org">davids@cupertino.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grants ($000)</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programmed Year</td>
<td>Start mm/yyyy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>12/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funds Expire**

**Last Updated**

**8/18/2014**

**Last Invoice (sub/app)**

**E-76 Const (sub/app)**

**Last Updated**

**8/18/2014**

**CON obligated 3/26/2014.**
## Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report
### April-June 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor:</th>
<th>City of Gilroy</th>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>New Ronan Channel and Lions Creek Trail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1/3</strong></td>
<td>Project No</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCL110032</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project will convert existing unpaved creek-side maintenance road closed to the public to a multi-use public trail along the New Ronan Channel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund Source</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CMAQ $1,706, Local $223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manager Name</strong></td>
<td>Henry Servin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phone/Fax</strong></td>
<td>408-846-0451</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E-Mail</strong></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Henry.Servin@cityofgilroy.org">Henry.Servin@cityofgilroy.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schedule</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Programmed Year: 10/2010, Start mm/yyyy: 10/2011, End mm/yyyy: 2/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CON E76 in progress.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor:</th>
<th>City of Gilroy</th>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>School Crossings, Sidewalks &amp; Bicycle Lanes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2/3</strong></td>
<td>Project No</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCL110049</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide school crossing improvements, fill in sidewalk gaps, and extend bicycle lanes-VERBS project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund Source</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local $241, STIP-TE $697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manager Name</strong></td>
<td>Henry Servin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phone/Fax</strong></td>
<td>408-846-0451</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E-Mail</strong></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Henry.Servin@cityofgilroy.org">Henry.Servin@cityofgilroy.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schedule</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Programmed Year: 11/2012, Start mm/yyyy: 10/2011, End mm/yyyy: 2/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VERBS RPST PLE 5034(24). CON In progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor:</td>
<td>City of Gilroy</td>
<td>Project Title:</td>
<td>Eigleberry Street Resurfacing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 of 3</td>
<td>Project No</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>In Gilroy: resurface roadway on Eigleberry St between 1st and 10th. Provide complete streets treatment including bike lanes-OBAG guarantee funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td>Grants ($000)</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ $808</td>
<td>Field Review</td>
<td>Programmed Year</td>
<td>Start mm/yyyy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local $95</td>
<td>ENV $95</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design $0</td>
<td>2/2014</td>
<td>2/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROW $0</td>
<td>2/2014</td>
<td>2/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$903</td>
<td>E-76 Const (sub/app)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Last Invoice (sub/app)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Last Updated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Manager Name: Henry Servin/Jay Yu
Phone/Fax: 408-846-0451
E-Mail: henry.servin@ci.gilroy.ca.us

Sponsor: City of Gilroy

Funds Expire obligated

Last Updated 8/6/2014
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor:</th>
<th>City of Los Altos</th>
<th>Project Title: Various Streets and Roads Preservation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 of 1</td>
<td>Project No</td>
<td>SCL130023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Field Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ROW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City of Los Altos
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor:</th>
<th>City of Milpitas</th>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>Milpitas Various Streets and Roads Preservation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project No</td>
<td>SCL130035</td>
<td>In City of Milpitas at various locations, repair failed AC pavement, road resurfacing, repair sidewalks and curbs, and install signing and pavement striping.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td>Local $275</td>
<td>Field Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STP $1652</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Name</td>
<td>Steve Chan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>408-586-3324</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:schan@ci.milpitas.ca.gov">schan@ci.milpitas.ca.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants ($000)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Programmed Year</td>
<td>Start mm/yyyy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV</td>
<td>$55</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$1,867</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,927</td>
<td>E-76 Const (sub/app)</td>
<td>2/2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City of Milpitas Various Streets and Roads Preservation

Project Description:
In City of Milpitas at various locations, repair failed AC pavement, road resurfacing, construct ADA curb ramps, repair sidewalks and curbs, and install signing and pavement striping.

Grants:
- Design: $0
- ROW: $5 (2014)
- Construction: $1,867 (2015)
- Total: $1,927

Funds Expire: 4/30/2015

Last Updated: 7/26/2013
**Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report**  
April-June 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor:</th>
<th>City of Monte Sereno</th>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>Various Street and Roads Preservation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 of 1</td>
<td>Project No</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Programmed Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCL130024</td>
<td>Repair damaged street pavement segments and re-surface with hot-mix asphalt concrete overlay.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Field Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENV $0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Design $30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ROW $0</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction $283</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total $313</td>
<td>E-76 Const (sub/app)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fund Source**  
Local $63  
STP $250

**Manager Name**  
Mo Sharma

**Phone/Fax**  
(408) 354-7635

**E-Mail**  
mo@cityofmontesereno.org

**City of Monte Sereno**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor: City of Morgan Hill</th>
<th>Project Title: Monterey Road Preservation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project No SCL130043</td>
<td>Project Description Resurfacing of Monterey Road between East Dunne Avenue and East Middle Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td>Grants ($000) Field Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENV $153 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design $0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Name</td>
<td>ROW $0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>Construction $1,558 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail <a href="mailto:scott.creer@morganhill.ca.gov">scott.creer@morganhill.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>Total $1,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Last Invoice (sub/app)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-76 Const (sub/app) 2/2015 4/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funds Expire 4/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Last Updated 8/5/2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In progress.
**Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report**

**April-June 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor: City of Mountain View</th>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>Castro Street Complete Streets</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 of 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project No</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Grants ($000)</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCL130015</td>
<td>Implement complete street and &quot;road diet&quot; on Castro Street between El Camino Real and Miramonte Avenue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Milestone</td>
<td>Start mm/yyyy</td>
<td>End mm/yyyy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Review</td>
<td>8/2014</td>
<td>10/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>8/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$95</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>8/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Name</td>
<td>Sayed Fakhry</td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>650-903-6511</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sayed.fakhry@mountainview.gov">sayed.fakhry@mountainview.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor: City of Mountain View</th>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>Various Road Preservation &amp; Bike lanes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 of 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project No</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Grants ($000)</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCL130018</td>
<td>In Mountain View: resurface Rengstorff/Old Middlefield/Charleston Roads.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Milestone</td>
<td>Start mm/yyyy</td>
<td>End mm/yyyy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Review</td>
<td>8/2014</td>
<td>9/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>9/2014</td>
<td>10/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$151</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>10/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Name</td>
<td>Quan Tran</td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>650-903-6311</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:quan.tran@mountainview.gov">quan.tran@mountainview.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report
April-June 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor:</th>
<th>City of Mountain View</th>
<th>Project Title: Mountain View Non-Infrastructure SRTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project No</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Grants ($000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCL130019</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure Safe Routes to School educational program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Milestone</td>
<td>Programmed Year</td>
<td>Start mm/yyyy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Review</td>
<td>CON obligated 4/1/2014.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Manager Name: Dennis Drennan

Fund Source:
- CMAQ $500
- Local $65

E-Mail: dennis.drennan@mountainview.gov

Last Updated: 5/8/2014

Phone/Fax: 650-903-6633

City of Mountain View
### Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report
April-June 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor: City of Palo Alto</th>
<th>Project Title: Palo Alto Safe Routes to School</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Manager Name</th>
<th>Phone/Fax</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Milestone</th>
<th>Grants ($000)</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project No</td>
<td>Project No</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Project Milestone</td>
<td>Grants ($000)</td>
<td>Start</td>
<td>End</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>Design</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CMAQ $528 Local $132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor: City of Palo Alto</th>
<th>Project Title: Arastradero Road Schoolscape/Multiuse Trail</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Manager Name</th>
<th>Phone/Fax</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Milestone</th>
<th>Grants ($000)</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project No</td>
<td>Project No</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Project Milestone</td>
<td>Grants ($000)</td>
<td>Start</td>
<td>End</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCL130034</td>
<td>Reconstruct the sidewalk along the south side of Arastradero Road between the Hetch Hetchy Los Altos Pathway and Miranda Avenue to a multiuse trail.</td>
<td>Working on preliminary design.</td>
<td>Holly Boyd</td>
<td>650-329-2612</td>
<td><a href="mailto:holly.boyd@cityofpaloalto.org">holly.boyd@cityofpaloalto.org</a></td>
<td>Field Review</td>
<td>ENV</td>
<td>$196</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CMAQ $1,000 Local $502</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City of Palo Alto
### Adobe Creek/ Highway 101 Bicycle Pedestrian Bridge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Grants ($000)</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCL130041</td>
<td>In Palo Alto, provide a year round ped crossing of Highway 101 to replace the existing Lefkowitz tunnel, which is a seasonal underpass subject to repeated and unanticipated closures that limit its use to less than half the year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project delayed due to new studies required for environmental process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Milestone</th>
<th>Field Review</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Manager Name</th>
<th>Phone/Fax</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Last Updated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENV</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$9,500</td>
<td>CMAQ $4,000 Local $5,500</td>
<td>Elizabeth Ames</td>
<td>650-329-2502</td>
<td><a href="mailto:elizabeth.ames@cityofpaloalto.org">elizabeth.ames@cityofpaloalto.org</a></td>
<td>6/2016</td>
<td>10/2016</td>
<td>8/7/2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Street Resurfacing & Streetscape Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Grants ($000)</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCL130042</td>
<td>Street resurfacing for various streets in Palo Alto.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Field Review expected in August 2014.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Milestone</th>
<th>Field Review</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Manager Name</th>
<th>Phone/Fax</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Last Updated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENV</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,091</td>
<td>Local $135 STP $956</td>
<td>Holly Boyd</td>
<td>650-329-2612</td>
<td><a href="mailto:holly.boyd@cityofpaloalto.org">holly.boyd@cityofpaloalto.org</a></td>
<td>10/1/2014</td>
<td>12/1/2014</td>
<td>8/7/2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report
April-June 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor:</th>
<th>City of San Jose</th>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>Almaden Expressway Pedestrian Bridge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 of 21</td>
<td>SCL050039</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Plans are at 65% for Coleman and underpasses and ramps that offer similar routing as bridge. Design of retaining wall structure and final plan set under development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grants ($000)</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earmark $496</td>
<td></td>
<td>Programmed Year</td>
<td>Start mm/yyyy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Review</td>
<td></td>
<td>ENV</td>
<td>$113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Name</td>
<td>Yves Zsutty</td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>(408) 793-5561</td>
<td>Project Milestone</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:yves.zsutty@sanJoseca.gov">yves.zsutty@sanJoseca.gov</a></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$9,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 of 21</td>
<td>SCL050079</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Transportation Incident Management Center: Implement subregional hub for traffic management activities including arterial traffic, incident management, traveler information and emergency incident management center. HPP #2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grants ($000)</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earmark $6,039</td>
<td></td>
<td>Programmed Year</td>
<td>Start mm/yyyy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local $1,511</td>
<td></td>
<td>Field Review</td>
<td>ENV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Name</td>
<td>Ken Salvail</td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>(408) 975-3705</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$3,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ken.salvail@sanJoseca.gov">ken.salvail@sanJoseca.gov</a></td>
<td>Project Title:</td>
<td>Silicon Valley TIMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>Last Invoice (sub/app)</td>
<td>3/2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Bay Trail Reach 9 & 9B

**Project Description:**
Preparation of CON and ENV documents for 1.2 miles of trail, a pedestrian bridge, and underpass with safety and enhancement improvements.

- **NEPA:** completed for both reaches.
- Reach 9 (1.1-mile) trail is designed to the 95% stage.
- Reach 9B (Ped Bridge) is designed to the 35% stage.

- Considering use of local dollars and investigating grants to complete design and proceed with construction in future years.

**Schedule:**

| Field Review | ENV | $815 | 06/07 | complete |
| Design | $0 | 08/09 | 3/2008 | 12/2013 |

**Comments:**
- Funds Expire: no expiration

---

### Coyote Creek Trail

**Project Description:**
Master Plan, design of 9.8 miles transportation trail, including safety and improvements between SR 237 and Story Rd.

- Preparing plans for construction from Story to Selma Olinder Park. Plans are at 95%. Funding in place to support construction during summer 2015. Need to seek E-76 from Caltrans for construction and an easement underneath Interstate 280.

**Schedule:**

| Field Review | ENV | $572 | 08/09 | complete |
| Design | $1,077 | 08/09 | 9/2008 |

**Comments:**
- Funds Expire: No expiration
## Downtown San Jose Bike Lanes and De-couplet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Manager Name</th>
<th>Phone/Fax</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Start mm/yyyy</th>
<th>End mm/yyyy</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCL090004</td>
<td>In San Jose: Conversions of one-way couplets to two-way streets.</td>
<td>CMAQ $1,500, Dev Fees $18,000, Local $315</td>
<td>John Raaymakers</td>
<td>408-975-3297</td>
<td><a href="mailto:john.raaymakers@sanjoseca.gov">john.raaymakers@sanjoseca.gov</a></td>
<td>$19,815</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>In progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Programmed Year** | **Schedule**                  | **Comments**                  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$1,815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Title:** Innovative Bicycle Detection System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Manager Name</th>
<th>Phone/Fax</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Start mm/yyyy</th>
<th>End mm/yyyy</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCL110016</td>
<td>Identify &quot;best&quot; Bicycle Detection System technology, implement on additional city bikeways.</td>
<td>CMAQ $1,500, Local $210</td>
<td>Ken Salvail</td>
<td>408-975-3705</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ken.salvail@sanjoseca.gov">ken.salvail@sanjoseca.gov</a></td>
<td>$1,710</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>6/2016</td>
<td>Project being reviewed by MTC for conversion to another TDM project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Programmed Year** | **Schedule**                  | **Comments**                  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$1,710</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**City of San Jose**
# Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report

## April-June 2014

### Los Gatos Creek Reach 5 Bridge Crossings

**Project No:** SCL110029

- **Project Description:** Develop construction drawings for trail improvements

**Manager Name:** Yves Zsutty

- **Phone/Fax:** 408-793-5561
- **E-Mail:** yves.zsutty@sanjoseca.gov

**Fund Source:**
- CMAQ $1,200
- Local $350
- RTP-LRP $3,000

**Schedule:**
- **Start mm/yyyy:** TBD
- **End mm/yyyy:** TBD

**Grants ($000):**
- **ENV:** $1,450 (2011)
- **Design:** $0

**Comments:**
- Service order with CH2M-Hill executed. Design work underway. Coordination on-going with Caltrain and DOT regarding complicated intersection of San Carlos Street Bridge, proposed replacement rail bridge and master planned underpass. Awaiting Caltrain bridge proposal so trail design can proceed further. Developing creek restoration plans that supports both trail and bridge.

### Fund Source:
- **2011:** ENV $4,550
- **Total:** $4,550

**Last Updated:** 7/28/2014

### San Carlos Multimodal Phase 2

**Project No:** SCL110034

- **Project Description:** Pedestrian-oriented improvements along the south side of San Carlos Street between Second Street and Market Street.

**Manager Name:** Anthony Smith

- **Phone/Fax:** 408-975-3299
- **E-Mail:** anthony.smith@sanjoseca.gov

**Fund Source:**
- CMAQ $350
- Local $628
- STP $2,024

**Schedule:**
- **Start mm/yyyy:** 12/2013
- **End mm/yyyy:** 9/2015

**Grants ($000):**
- **ENV:** $359 (2011)
- **Design:** $0

**Comments:**
- CON obligated 10/22/2013.

**Total:** $2,702

**Last Updated:** 8/7/2014

**Last Invoice (sub/app):** 6/2012

---

**City of San Jose**

Page 17 of 41
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#### Sponsor: City of San Jose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Manager Name</th>
<th>Phone/Fax</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
<th>Sponsor: City of San Jose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCL110057</td>
<td>Encourage and promote pedestrian and bicycle safety along SRTS by installing low cost enhancements.</td>
<td>CMAQ $5688, Local $85</td>
<td>Devin Gianchandani</td>
<td>(408) 975-3254</td>
<td><a href="mailto:devin.gianchandani@sanjoseca.gov">devin.gianchandani@sanjoseca.gov</a></td>
<td>City of San Jose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Project Title: Walk N Roll - Safe Access

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Milestone</th>
<th>Grants ($000)</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction Obligation is still pending.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENV $97</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>E-76 originally submitted to Caltrans on May 9, 2014. Caltrans requested below information on May 29, 2014: PIF signed by PW and DOT Director Plans and Specs Comparison of Detailed Cost Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design $0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programmed Year</th>
<th>Start mm/yyyy</th>
<th>End mm/yyyy</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Last Updated      | 6/11/2014     | pending    |

| Last Invoice (sub/app) | 11/2013       |

#### Sponsor: City of San Jose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Manager Name</th>
<th>Phone/Fax</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
<th>Sponsor: City of San Jose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCL110117</td>
<td>In San Jose: Improve pedestrian and bicycle facilities along Park Avenue between Hedding and Montgomery Streets.</td>
<td>Local $364, STIP-TE $1,456</td>
<td>Anthony Smith</td>
<td>408-975-3299</td>
<td><a href="mailto:anthony.smith@sanjoseca.gov">anthony.smith@sanjoseca.gov</a></td>
<td>City of San Jose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Project Title: Park Avenue Multi-Modal Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Milestone</th>
<th>Grants ($000)</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Field Review completed and PES submitted. Currently working on ENV clearance and design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENV $137</td>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design $69</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programmed Year</th>
<th>Start mm/yyyy</th>
<th>End mm/yyyy</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6/30/2015</td>
<td>Funds Expire 6/30/2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Last Updated      | 5/8/2014      | pending    |

| Last Invoice (sub/app) | 2/2015         |

City of San Jose
## Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report
### April-June 2014

#### Sponsor: City of San Jose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Title: St. John Street Multi-Modal Improvements - Phase 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCL110118</td>
<td>In San Jose: Improve bicycle and pedestrian facilities along St John Street between North Market Street and North Almaden Boulevard.</td>
<td><strong>Field review completed and PES submitted.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Milestone | Grants ($000) | Schedule | Comments |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV</td>
<td>$82</td>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$71</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>$10</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Manager Name:** Amy Chan

**Phone/Fax:** 408-793-6947

**E-Mail:** amy.chan@sanjoseca.gov

**Fund Source:**
- Local $376
- STIP-TE 1,500

**Grants ($000):**
- Local $376
- STIP-TE 1,500
- CMAQ $1,150
- Local $306

**Sponsor:** City of San Jose

### San Jose Citywide Bikeway Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Title: San Jose Citywide Bikeway Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCL130004</td>
<td>Fills existing bicycle gaps on a total of 43 segments citywide.</td>
<td>PES submitted. Starting design.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Milestone | Grants ($000) | Schedule | Comments |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>$37</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Manager Name:** Anthony Smith

**Phone/Fax:** 408-975-3299

**E-Mail:** anthony.smith@sanjoseca.gov

**Fund Source:**
- CMAQ $1,150
- Local $306

**Grants ($000):**
- CMAQ $1,150
- Local $306

**Sponsor:** City of San Jose
### San Jose Citywide Pavement Management Program

**Project No:** SCL130005  
**Project Description:** Rehabilitate and repair approximately 18.7 miles of high volume arterial streets by removing damaged pavement areas and providing a smooth surface course improving safety for vehicles and bicycles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Milestone</th>
<th>Grants ($000)</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Manager Name:** Heloisa Jones

**Phone/Fax:** 408-794-1956

**E-Mail:** heloisa.jones@sanjoseca.gov

**Fund Source:** 
- Local $1,572
- STP $11,531

**Project Title:** E-76 Const (sub/app)

**Last Updated:** 5/8/2014

### San Jose Citywide SRTS Program

**Project No:** SCL130006  
**Project Description:** Implement walking route improvements around schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Milestone</th>
<th>Grants ($000)</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Manager Name:** Devin Gianchandani

**Phone/Fax:** 408-975-3254

**E-Mail:** devin.gianchandani@sanjoseca.gov

**Fund Source:** 
- CMAQ $1,150
- Local $157

**Project Title:** E-76 Const (sub/app)

**Last Updated:** 5/8/2014

---

**City of San Jose**

**Sponsor:** City of San Jose
## Jackson Ave Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements

**Project No**: SCL130007  
**Project Description**: Construct pedestrian safety and transit access enhancements along Jackson Avenue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Manager Name</th>
<th>Phone/Fax</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>Grants ($000)</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CMAQ $1,500  
Local $399 | Anthony Smith | 408-975-3299 | anthony.smith@sanjoseca.gov | E-76 Const (sub/app) | $1,899 | 2/2015 - 4/2015 | Last Updated: 8/7/2014 |

**Schedule**
- **Programmed Year**: 2014
- **Start mm/yyyy**:  
- **End mm/yyyy**:  
- **Comments**: NEPA CE received, near 65% design.

### San Jose Walk N’ Roll Phase 2

**Project No**: SCL130008  
**Project Description**: Non-infrastructure SRTS project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Manager Name</th>
<th>Phone/Fax</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>Grants ($000)</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CMAQ $1,000  
Toll Credit $115 | Devin Gianchandani | 408-975-3254 | devin.gianchandani@sanjoseca.gov | E-76 Const (sub/app) | $1,115 | 2/28/2014 - pending | Last Updated: 6/9/2014 |

**Schedule**
- **Programmed Year**: 2014
- **Start mm/yyyy**:  
- **End mm/yyyy**:  
- **Comments**: CON obligated 05/28/2014.
## Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report
### April-June 2014

### San Jose Pedestrian Oriented Traffic Safety Signals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor: City of San Jose</th>
<th>Project Title: San Jose Pedestrian Oriented Traffic Safety Signals</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project No: SCL130010</td>
<td>Traffic signal controlled crossings will be implemented at 6 key intersections.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Source:</td>
<td>CMAQ $3,000, Local $472</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Name: Ken Jung</td>
<td>ROW $0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax: 408-975-3257</td>
<td>Design $0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail: <a href="mailto:ken.jung@sanjoseca.gov">ken.jung@sanjoseca.gov</a></td>
<td>Field Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENV $1,735, 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction $1,736, 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total $3,471, E-76 Const (sub/app) 2/2015 4/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Last Invoice (sub/app) 5/8/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PE obligated 1/31/2014.

### St. Johns Bikeway and Pedestrian Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor: City of San Jose</th>
<th>Project Title: St. Johns Bikeway and Pedestrian Improvements</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project No: SCL130011</td>
<td>In San Jose: fill bikeway and sidewalk gaps on St. John Street.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Source:</td>
<td>CMAQ $1,185, Local $315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Name: Amy Chan</td>
<td>ROW $75, 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax: 408-793-6947</td>
<td>Design $0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail: <a href="mailto:amy.chan@sanjoseca.gov">amy.chan@sanjoseca.gov</a></td>
<td>Field Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENV $240, 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction $1,185, 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total $1,500, E-76 Const (sub/app) 2/2015 4/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Last Invoice (sub/app) 5/8/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In progress.

City of San Jose
# Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report
## April-June 2014

### The Alameda Grand Blvd Phase 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Grants ($000)</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCL130012</td>
<td>Extends work on The Alameda that enhances pedestrian and vehicle safety in accordance with the Grand Boulevard Initiative.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Working on environmental clearance and design.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Programmed Year</th>
<th>Start mm/yyyy</th>
<th>End mm/yyyy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field Review</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV</td>
<td></td>
<td>$890</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td></td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ $3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local $930</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manager Name</th>
<th>Anthony Smith</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>408-975-3299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:anthony.smith@sanjoseca.gov">anthony.smith@sanjoseca.gov</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total | $4,430 |
| Last Updated | 5/8/2014 |

---

### East San Jose Bike/Ped/Transit Connections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Grants ($000)</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCL130016</td>
<td>Improve the bicycle network in East San Jose by the installation of 42 miles of new bikeways, traffic calming features, public bike racks, bike-friendly signal detection and pavement markings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PES submitted. Design starting soon.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Programmed Year</th>
<th>Start mm/yyyy</th>
<th>End mm/yyyy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field Review</td>
<td>3/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV</td>
<td></td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
<td>$382</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td></td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ $2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local $532</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manager Name</th>
<th>Anthony Smith</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>408-975-3299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:anthony.smith@sanjoseca.gov">anthony.smith@sanjoseca.gov</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Total | $2,532 |
| Last Updated | 5/8/2014 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor: City of San Jose</th>
<th>Project Title: San Jose Smart Intersections Program</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project No</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>CMAQ $1,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/21</td>
<td>Upgrade traffic signal controls at</td>
<td>Local $157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35 intersections along six miles of Tully Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Saratoga Avenue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENV $410 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design $0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Name</td>
<td>Ken Salvail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>408-975-3254</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ken.salvail@sanjoseca.gov">ken.salvail@sanjoseca.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Milestone</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmed Year</td>
<td>Start mm/yyyy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End mm/yyyy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmed Year</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $1,307 E-76 Const</td>
<td>2/2015 4/2015 Last Updated 8/18/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(sub/app)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Invoice (sub/app)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report
### April-June 2014

#### Project 1: Santa Clara Various Streets and Roads Preservation
- **Project No**: SCL130038
- **Project Description**: Rehabilitation of various roadways in the City of Santa Clara.
- **Fund Source**: Local $449, STP $1,891
- **Manager Name**: Falguni Amin
- **Phone/Fax**: 408-615-3015
- **E-Mail**: famin@santaclaraca.gov
- **Sponsor**: City of Santa Clara
- **Project Title**: E-76 Const (sub/app)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Grants ($000)</th>
<th>Programmed Year</th>
<th>Start mm/yyyy</th>
<th>End mm/yyyy</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design $0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Grants ($000)</th>
<th>Programmed Year</th>
<th>Start mm/yyyy</th>
<th>End mm/yyyy</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **Last Updated**: 8/14/2014
- **Funds Expire**: awarded

#### Project 2: Santa Clara Non-Infrastructure SR2S Phase 2
- **Project No**: SCL130039
- **Project Description**: Develop and implement a comprehensive education and outreach program to promote safe walking, biking and carpooling to and from school for 12 Santa Clara schools.
- **Fund Source**: CMAQ $550, Toll Credits $57
- **Manager Name**: Marshall Johnson
- **Phone/Fax**: 408-615-3023
- **E-Mail**: mjohnson@santaclaraca.gov
- **Sponsor**: City of Santa Clara
- **Project Description**: E-76 Const (sub/app)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Grants ($000)</th>
<th>Programmed Year</th>
<th>Start mm/yyyy</th>
<th>End mm/yyyy</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field Review</td>
<td>ENV $0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design $0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Grants ($000)</th>
<th>Programmed Year</th>
<th>Start mm/yyyy</th>
<th>End mm/yyyy</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Total $557</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Last Updated**: 8/14/2014
- **Funds Expire**: obligated

---

**City of Santa Clara**
### Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report
April-June 2014

#### Highway 9 Safety Improvements (BEP Project)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Grants ($000)</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCL070050</td>
<td>Construct bike/ped safety improvements on SR9 in Saratoga.</td>
<td>Field Review</td>
<td>ENV $522</td>
<td>2008/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Design $0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phone/Fax 408-868-1274</td>
<td>Construction $2,104</td>
<td>2008/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E-Mail <a href="mailto:iharvancik@saratoga.ca.us">iharvancik@saratoga.ca.us</a></td>
<td>Total $2,626</td>
<td>E-76 Const (sub/app)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fund Source CMAQ $462</td>
<td>HSIP-T3 $900</td>
<td>Local $364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sponsor: City of Saratoga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Saratoga Village Ped Enhancement Phase 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Grants ($000)</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCL110017</td>
<td>Pedestrian enhancements in Downtown Saratoga</td>
<td>Field Review</td>
<td>ENV $167</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Design $0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phone/Fax 408-868-1218</td>
<td>Construction $1,284</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E-Mail <a href="mailto:mnunez@saratoga.ca.us">mnunez@saratoga.ca.us</a></td>
<td>Total $1,451</td>
<td>E-76 Const (sub/app)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fund Source CMAQ $1,160 (TLC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sponsor: City of Saratoga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Manager Name:** Iveta Harvancik
**Phone/Fax:** 408-868-1274
**E-Mail:** iharvancik@saratoga.ca.us

**Funds Expire:** awarded

**Last Updated:** 8/8/2014

---

**Manager Name:** Macedonio Nunez
**Phone/Fax:** 408-868-1218
**E-Mail:** mnunez@saratoga.ca.us

**Funds Expire:** obligated

**Last Updated:** 8/12/2014

---

**Manager Name:** Iveta Harvancik
**Phone/Fax:** 408-868-1274
**E-Mail:** iharvancik@saratoga.ca.us

**Funds Expire:** awarded

**Last Updated:** 8/8/2014

---

**Manager Name:** Macedonio Nunez
**Phone/Fax:** 408-868-1218
**E-Mail:** mnunez@saratoga.ca.us

**Funds Expire:** obligated

**Last Updated:** 8/12/2014

---

**Manager Name:** Iveta Harvancik
**Phone/Fax:** 408-868-1274
**E-Mail:** iharvancik@saratoga.ca.us

**Funds Expire:** awarded

**Last Updated:** 8/8/2014

---

**Manager Name:** Macedonio Nunez
**Phone/Fax:** 408-868-1218
**E-Mail:** mnunez@saratoga.ca.us

**Funds Expire:** obligated

**Last Updated:** 8/12/2014

---

**Manager Name:** Iveta Harvancik
**Phone/Fax:** 408-868-1274
**E-Mail:** iharvancik@saratoga.ca.us

**Funds Expire:** awarded

**Last Updated:** 8/8/2014

---

**Manager Name:** Macedonio Nunez
**Phone/Fax:** 408-868-1218
**E-Mail:** mnunez@saratoga.ca.us

**Funds Expire:** obligated

**Last Updated:** 8/12/2014

---

**Manager Name:** Iveta Harvancik
**Phone/Fax:** 408-868-1274
**E-Mail:** iharvancik@saratoga.ca.us

**Funds Expire:** awarded

**Last Updated:** 8/8/2014

---

**Manager Name:** Macedonio Nunez
**Phone/Fax:** 408-868-1218
**E-Mail:** mnunez@saratoga.ca.us

**Funds Expire:** obligated

**Last Updated:** 8/12/2014
### Prospect Road Complete Streets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Grants ($000)</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCL130026</td>
<td>Traffic calming on Prospect Road between Saratoga/Sunnyvale Rd and Lawrence Expressway and on Saratoga Ave between Highway 85 to the City Limits to the north.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Add new project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Field Review</td>
<td>Programmed Year</td>
<td>Start mm/yyyy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENV</td>
<td>4/2014</td>
<td>4/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>9/2014</td>
<td>10/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>05/2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Saratoga Village Sidewalk Rehabilitation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Grants ($000)</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCL130027</td>
<td>Sidewalk rehabilitation along Big Basin Way between 6th street and Hwy 9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Add new project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Field Review</td>
<td>Programmed Year</td>
<td>Start mm/yyyy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENV</td>
<td>4/2014</td>
<td>4/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>7/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>05/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$183</td>
<td>05/2015</td>
<td>11/2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City of Saratoga

**Sponsor:** City of Saratoga

**Project Title:**

**Saratoga Village Sidewalk Rehabilitation**

**Project Title:**

**Prospect Road Complete Streets**

**Fund Source**

CMAQ $4,205
Local $560

**Manager Name:** Macedonio Nunez

**Phone/Fax:** 408-868-1218

**E-Mail:** mnunez@saratoga.ca.us

**Last Updated:** 8/12/2014
### Hendy Ave Complete Street Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Programmed Year</th>
<th>Start mm/yyyy</th>
<th>End mm/yyyy</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCL110014</td>
<td>Reconstruct Hendy Avenue to provide new and reconstructed sidewalk, bike lanes, and enhanced streetscape features consistent with downtown Sunnyvale design standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction underway.</td>
<td>CMAQ $1,460, Local $673, STP $617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Milestone</th>
<th>Grants ($000)</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV</td>
<td>$404</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manager Name</th>
<th>Phone/Fax</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
<th>Grant ($000)</th>
<th>Last Updated</th>
<th>Last Invoice (sub/app)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jack Witthaus</td>
<td>408-730-7330</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jwithaus@ci.sunnyvale.ca.us">jwithaus@ci.sunnyvale.ca.us</a></td>
<td>$2,346</td>
<td>8/8/2014</td>
<td>8/14/2014 1/31/2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sunnyvale/Saratoga Road Bike/Ped Safety Enhancements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Programmed Year</th>
<th>Start mm/yyyy</th>
<th>End mm/yyyy</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCL130028</td>
<td>On Sunnyvale-Saratoga Road, install pedestrian signal and modify intersection to eliminate free right turns and reduce crosswalk length.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project scoping begins October 2014.</td>
<td>CMAQ $162, Local S21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Milestone</th>
<th>Grants ($000)</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV</td>
<td>$90</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manager Name</th>
<th>Phone/Fax</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
<th>Grant ($000)</th>
<th>Last Updated</th>
<th>Last Invoice (sub/app)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nasser Fakih</td>
<td>408-730-7415</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nfakih@sunnyvale.ca.gov">nfakih@sunnyvale.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>$524</td>
<td>4/30/2016</td>
<td>2/2016 4/2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone/Fax</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
<th>Grant ($000)</th>
<th>Last Updated</th>
<th>Last Invoice (sub/app)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>408-730-7330</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jwithaus@ci.sunnyvale.ca.us">jwithaus@ci.sunnyvale.ca.us</a></td>
<td>$2,750</td>
<td>8/8/2014</td>
<td>8/14/2014 1/31/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408-730-7415</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nfakih@sunnyvale.ca.gov">nfakih@sunnyvale.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>$614</td>
<td>8/8/2014</td>
<td>8/14/2014 4/2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City of Sunnyvale
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor:</th>
<th>City of Sunnyvale</th>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>Fair Oaks Avenue Bikeway and Streetscape</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project No</td>
<td>SCL130029</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>In Sunnyvale: On three separate section of Fair Oaks Avenue, construct bike lanes and associated medians.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td>CMAQ $936 Local $254</td>
<td>Project Milestone</td>
<td>Field Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Name</td>
<td>Nasser Fakih</td>
<td>Grants ($000)</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>408-730-7415</td>
<td>Programmed Year</td>
<td>$1,210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nfakih@sunnyvale.ca.gov">nfakih@sunnyvale.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>Start mm/yyyy</td>
<td>2/2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>End mm/yyyy</td>
<td>4/2016</td>
<td>Last Updated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor:</th>
<th>City of Sunnyvale</th>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>Maude Avenue Bikeway and Streetscape</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project No</td>
<td>SCL130030</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>In Sunnyvale, on Maude Avenue between Mathilda Avenue and Fair Oaks Avenue, install medians, modify roadway geometry and stripe bike lanes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td>CMAQ $695 Local $135</td>
<td>Project Milestone</td>
<td>Field Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Name</td>
<td>Nasser Fakih</td>
<td>Grants ($000)</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>408-730-7415</td>
<td>Programmed Year</td>
<td>$830</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nfakih@sunnyvale.ca.gov">nfakih@sunnyvale.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>Start mm/yyyy</td>
<td>2/2016</td>
<td>Last Updated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>End mm/yyyy</td>
<td>4/2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor: City of Sunnyvale</td>
<td>Project Title: Sunnyvale East and West Channel Trails</td>
<td>Programmed Year</td>
<td>Start mm/yyyy</td>
<td>End mm/yyyy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project No</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Grants ($000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCL130031</td>
<td>In Sunnyvale, construct multi-use paved trails on four segments of drainage channels.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Review</td>
<td>ENV $0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design $0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Name</td>
<td>Nasser Fakih</td>
<td>ROW $0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>408-730-7415</td>
<td>Construction $4,345</td>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nfakih@sunnyvale.ca.gov">nfakih@sunnyvale.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>Total $4,745</td>
<td>E-76 Const (sub/app) 2/2015</td>
<td>4/2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor: City of Sunnyvale</th>
<th>Project Title: Sunnyvale SRTS Ped Infrastructure Improvements</th>
<th>Programmed Year</th>
<th>Start mm/yyyy</th>
<th>End mm/yyyy</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project No</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Grants ($000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCL130032</td>
<td>In Sunnyvale: Construct sidewalks, bulb-outs, and curb ramps; install in-pavement crosswalk lights, signs, and pavement markings; upgrade (reduce) corner radius.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Review</td>
<td>ENV $331</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design $0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Name</td>
<td>Nasser Fakih</td>
<td>ROW $0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>408-730-7415</td>
<td>Construction $1,569</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nfakih@sunnyvale.ca.gov">nfakih@sunnyvale.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>Total $1,900</td>
<td>E-76 Const (sub/app) 2/2015</td>
<td>4/2015</td>
<td>Last Updated 8/8/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report

**April-June 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor:</th>
<th><strong>City of Sunnyvale</strong></th>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th><strong>Duane Avenue Roadway Preservation</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 of 7</td>
<td>Project No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCL130033</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In Sunnyvale, rehabilitate Duane Avenue pavement, curb and gutter between San Juan Avenue and Stewart Drive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Project Milestone</strong></td>
<td><strong>Grants ($000)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Schedule</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Field Review</td>
<td>ENV 335</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design $0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manager Name</td>
<td>ROW $0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>408-730-7415</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nfakih@sunnyvale.ca.gov">nfakih@sunnyvale.ca.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td>Local $223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STP $1,576</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grants ($000)</td>
<td>Total $1,799</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Last Invoice (sub/app)</td>
<td>8/2015</td>
<td>10/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Last Updated</td>
<td>8/8/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**
- Interviewing design consultants.

**Funds Expire:** 4/30/2015

**Manager Name:** Nasser Fakih
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor:</th>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>San Tomas Expressway Box Culvert Rehabilitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County of Santa Clara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 of 5</td>
<td>Project No</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCL090002</td>
<td>Environmental clearance, and construction for rehabilitating the box culvert under San Tomas Expressway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earmark $490</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local $1,277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STP $7,850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manager Name</td>
<td>Gamin Rajapakse/Dawn Cameron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>408-573-2497/408-573-2465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gamin.rajapakse@dawn.cameron">gamin.rajapakse@dawn.cameron</a>@rda.sccgov.org</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Grants ($000)</td>
<td>$9,617,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Last Updated</td>
<td>8/7/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor:</td>
<td>Project Title:</td>
<td>East San Jose Pedestrian Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Santa Clara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 of 5</td>
<td>Project No</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCL110121</td>
<td>Fill in sidewalk gaps and provide ADA enhancements within existing rights-of-way on various roads.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local $532</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STP $2,128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manager Name</td>
<td>Sadegh Sadeghi/Dawn Cameron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>408-494-1335/408-573-2465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sadegh.sadeghi@dawn.cameron">sadegh.sadeghi@dawn.cameron</a>@rda.sccgov.org</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Grants ($000)</td>
<td>$2,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Last Updated</td>
<td>8/7/2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report
**April-June 2014**

#### Project: Non-infrastructure SRTS Program
**Sponsor:** County of Santa Clara

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Program Milestone</th>
<th>Grants ($000)</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCL130021</td>
<td>Non-infrastructure SRTS education and encouragement services for schools.</td>
<td>Field Review</td>
<td>4/2014</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>Add new project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENV $0</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Design $0</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td>CMAQ $838 Local $08</td>
<td>ROW $0</td>
<td>7/2015 6/2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Name</td>
<td>Bonnie Broderick</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$946 2015</td>
<td>7/2015 6/2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>(408) 793-2700</td>
<td>Start mm/yyyy</td>
<td>7/10/14 10/30/14</td>
<td>Last Updated</td>
<td>8/7/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Bonnie.Broderick@phd.sccgov.org">Bonnie.Broderick@phd.sccgov.org</a></td>
<td>End mm/yyyy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Project: San Tomas Aquino Spur Trail Multi-Use Trail Phase 2
**Sponsor:** County of Santa Clara

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Program Milestone</th>
<th>Grants ($000)</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCL130022</td>
<td>Construct an extension of the San Tomas Aquino Spur Trail (a Class I bicycle/pedestrian trail) on the west side of San Tomas Expressway from SR 82 (El Camino Real) to Homestead Road.</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$4,994 2015</td>
<td>2/2015 5/2015</td>
<td>Still waiting for NEPA clearance so County can submit the E-76. Anticipated submittal is now August.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,394 E-76 Const (sub/app)</td>
<td>2/2015 5/1/2015</td>
<td>Last Updated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td>CMAQ $1,884 Local $1,760 TAP $1,350</td>
<td>Start mm/yyyy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Name</td>
<td>Dawn Cameron/Craig Petersen</td>
<td>ROW $0</td>
<td>9/2013 5/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>408-573-2465/408-573-2490</td>
<td></td>
<td>2/2015 5/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td>dawn.cameron <a href="mailto:craig.petersen@rdac.sccgov.org">craig.petersen@rdac.sccgov.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funds Expire:**
- 4/30/2015 for the Non-infrastructure SRTS Program
- 9/30/2015 for the San Tomas Aquino Spur Trail Multi-Use Trail Phase 2
### Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report
April-June 2014

#### Sponsor:
**County of Santa Clara**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Grants ($000)</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCL130037</td>
<td>In San Jose: Install Intelligent Transportation System infrastructure, fill in sidewalk gaps, install pedestrian sensors and bike detection at all intersections and implement traffic responsive and adaptive signal timing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consultant contract for PE phase being negotiated. Expect contract award by August 2014.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ $8,085</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local $4,049</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manager Name</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Cameron/Bill Yeung</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone/Fax</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>408-573-2465/408-494-1309</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E-Mail</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dawn.cameron/bill.yeung@rda.scgov.org</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Milestone</th>
<th>Start mm/yyyy</th>
<th>End mm/yyyy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field Review</td>
<td>9/2013</td>
<td>12/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>5/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$1,434</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$8,700</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$10,134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title: <strong>Capitol Expressway ITS and Bike/Ped Improvements</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Description:**
In San Jose: Install Intelligent Transportation System infrastructure, fill in sidewalk gaps, install pedestrian sensors and bike detection at all intersections and implement traffic responsive and adaptive signal timing.

**Funds Expire:** 4/30/2016

**Last Updated:** 8/7/2014
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor: Town of Los Altos Hills</th>
<th>Project Title: El Monte Road Preservation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project No</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCL130013</td>
<td>Rehabilitate El Monte Road Pavement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmed Year</td>
<td>Start mm/yyyy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Review</td>
<td>ENV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Name</td>
<td>ROW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>650-947-2510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants ($000)</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds Expire</td>
<td>4/30/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Updated</td>
<td>7/28/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Invoice (sub/app)</td>
<td>E-76 Const (sub/app)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: In progress.
### Hillside Road Preservation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Manager Name</th>
<th>Project Title: Base repairs and resurfacing on Shannon Road from Los Gatos Blvd to Hicks Road.</th>
<th>Grants ($000)</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local $18 STP $139</td>
<td>Maziar Bozorginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Town in the process of scheduling a field visit with Caltrans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax 408-395-3460</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail <a href="mailto:mbozorginia@losgatosca.gov">mbozorginia@losgatosca.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Milestone</th>
<th>Programmed Year</th>
<th>Start mm/yyyy</th>
<th>End mm/yyyy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENV</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>7/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>8/2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start mm/yyyy</th>
<th>End mm/yyyy</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/2015</td>
<td>4/2015</td>
<td>Last Updated 4/30/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/2/14</td>
<td>5/2015</td>
<td>Last Updated 4/30/2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programmed Year</th>
<th>Start mm/yyyy</th>
<th>End mm/yyyy</th>
<th>Funds Expire</th>
<th>Last Updated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Last Invoice (sub/app) | |
|------------------------| |
| 5/2/14                 | 5/2015 |
### I-880/Stevens Creek Interchange Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Grants ($000)</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCL070002</td>
<td>Interchange improvements at the I-280/I-880/Stevens Creek Blvd interchange.</td>
<td>Field Review</td>
<td></td>
<td>Under construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Milestone</th>
<th>Grants ($000)</th>
<th>Programmed Year</th>
<th>Start mm/yyyy</th>
<th>End mm/yyyy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENV</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$7,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fund Source**
- CMA $41,275
- Base CMA $19,552
- Federal STP $1,000
- Local $2,677

**Manager Name**
- Ven Prasad

**Phone/Fax**
- 408-321-5647

**E-Mail**
- ven.prasad@vta.org

**Sponsor:** VTA

**Last Updated:** 8/16/2013

---

### Route 152 new alignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Grants ($000)</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCL090016</td>
<td>Route 152 new alignment from Rte 101 to Rte 156. Realign highway and evaluate route management strategies, including potential roadway pricing. Also includes SR152 &quot;trade corridor&quot; study from 101 to I-5.</td>
<td>Field Review</td>
<td></td>
<td>VTA is requesting additional funding from CTC to continue project efforts, including PA/ED. Actual funding amounts currently unknown.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Milestone</th>
<th>Grants ($000)</th>
<th>Programmed Year</th>
<th>Start mm/yyyy</th>
<th>End mm/yyyy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENV</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>08/09</td>
<td>3/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fund Source**
- IP 55
- Local 55

**Manager Name**
- Darrell Vice

**Phone/Fax**
- 408-952-4214

**E-Mail**
- darrell.vice@vta.org

**Sponsor:** VTA

**Last Updated:** 1/3/2013
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### Project: SR 85 Express Lanes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor:</th>
<th>VTA</th>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>Grants ($000)</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SR 85 Express Lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 of 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project No</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Programmed Year</td>
<td>Start mm/yyyy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCL090030</td>
<td>Implement roadway pricing on SR 85 carpool lanes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PA/ED in progress.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARRA ($3,300,000)</td>
<td>Earmark ($1,500,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local ($1,800,000)</td>
<td>RTP-LRP ($54,200,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manager Name</td>
<td>Maren Schram</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>408-952-4214</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:maren.schram@vta.org">maren.schram@vta.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Field Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENV</td>
<td>$6,600</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>7/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$54,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$60,800</td>
<td>E-76 Const (sub/app)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Last Updated</td>
<td>8/6/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project: Santa Clara Caltrain Station Bike/Ped Tunnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor:</th>
<th>VTA</th>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>Grants ($000)</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Clara Caltrain Station Bike/Ped Tunnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 of 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project No</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Programmed Year</td>
<td>Start mm/yyyy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCL090031</td>
<td>Provide a safe crossing for pedestrians to cross the UPRR tracks between the Caltrain Station on the west side to the commercial and industrial complexes on the east side of the tracks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FHWA to FTA fund transfer approved March 2014.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CMAQ $2,719</td>
<td>Local $7,990</td>
<td>Regional $675</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manager Name</td>
<td>Ken Ronsse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>(408) 952-4129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ken.ronsse@vta.org">ken.ronsse@vta.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Field Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENV</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$1,974</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>8/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$11,384</td>
<td>E-76 Const (sub/app)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Last Updated</td>
<td>7/30/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Last Updated: 8/6/2014
### Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report
**April-June 2014**

#### Regional Planning Activities and PPM - Santa Clara

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Milestone</th>
<th>Grants ($000)</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programmed Year</strong></td>
<td><strong>Start mm/yyyy</strong></td>
<td><strong>End mm/yyyy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>10/11-14/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$7,478</td>
<td>E-76 Const (sub/app)</td>
<td>Last Updated 2/2/2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Last Invoice (sub/app):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STIP $3,478</td>
<td>STP $4,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Managers: Amin Surani**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone/Fax</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(408) 546-7989</td>
<td><a href="mailto:amin.surani@vta.org">amin.surani@vta.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sponsor:** VTA

---

#### US 101 Express Lanes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Milestone</th>
<th>Grants ($000)</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programmed Year</strong></td>
<td><strong>Start mm/yyyy</strong></td>
<td><strong>End mm/yyyy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV</td>
<td>$7,555</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$7,555</td>
<td>E-76 Const (sub/app)</td>
<td>Last Updated 8/4/2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Last Invoice (sub/app):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VTA LPR $7,555</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Managers: Lam Trinh**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone/Fax</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>408-952-4217</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lam.trinh@vta.org">lam.trinh@vta.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sponsor:** VTA
## Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report

### April-June 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor:</th>
<th>VTA</th>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>SR 237 Express Lanes: Zanker Rd to Mathilda Ave</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project No</td>
<td>SCL110008</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Implement roadway pricing on SR 237 carpool lane; extending the Express Lanes on SR 237 to Mathilda Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td>Local $4,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RTP-LRP $10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VPPP $1,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Name</td>
<td>Lam Trinh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>(408) 952-4217</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$11,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Start</td>
<td>1/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>End</td>
<td>11/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funds Expire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lam.trinh@vta.org">lam.trinh@vta.org</a></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Last Updated</td>
<td>8/4/2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:** PID and PA/ED in progress. PS&E is underway.

### Upper Penitencia Creek Multi-Use Trail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor:</th>
<th>VTA</th>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>Upper Penitencia Creek Multi-Use Trail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project No</td>
<td>SCL130020</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Design, environmental clearance and construction of Class I bike path, equestrian trail, trail amenities and new traffic signal (King Road/Salamoni Court).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td>CMAQ $1,514</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local $610</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Name</td>
<td>Oxo Slayer</td>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>408-942-6157</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$1,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Start</td>
<td>1/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>End</td>
<td>12/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:oxo.slayer@vta.org">oxo.slayer@vta.org</a></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$2,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Last Updated</td>
<td>7/30/2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:** FHWA to FTA fund transfer approved 3/17/2014.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor: VTA</th>
<th>Project Title: Montague Expy Ped Bridge at Milpitas BART Station</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>9 of 9</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project No</td>
<td>SCL130040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Final Engineering and Environmental Clearance of a pedestrian bridge in Milpitas over Montague Expressway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund Source</strong></td>
<td>CMAQ $744 Local $97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manager Name</strong></td>
<td>Kevin Kurimoto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phone/Fax</strong></td>
<td>408-952-4198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E-Mail</strong></td>
<td><a href="mailto:kevin.kurimoto@vta.org">kevin.kurimoto@vta.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Milestone</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grants ($000)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schedule</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV</td>
<td>$106</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$638</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$744</td>
<td>E-76 Const (sub/app)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funds Expire</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>fund transfer approved</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Last Updated</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/30/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Last Invoice (sub/app)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ABAG - Association of Bay Area Governments
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SF - Square Foot
SHOPP - State Highway Operation and Protection Program
SPA - Specific Plan Amendment
STIP - State Transportation Improvement Program
STP - Surface Transportation Program
SVRT - Silicon Valley Rapid Transit
SVRTC - Silicon Valley Rapid Transit Corridor
SWPPP - Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program
TDM - Transportation Demand Management
TE - Transportation Enhancements
TFCA - Transportation Fund for Clean Air
TIA - Transportation Impact Analysis
TOD - Transit-Oriented Development
UPRR - Union Pacific Railroad
VPPP - Value Pricing Pilot Program
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Nuria I. Fernandez

FROM: Robinson, Ristow, Gonot


FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

Please find attached the Semi-Annual Report for the Measure A Program for the period ending June 30, 2014. Highlights for this reporting period include the following accomplishments:

a. The BART Silicon Valley Berryessa Extension (SVBX) Line Track Station and System (LTSS) contractor accomplished the following:
   - Installed the Union Pacific Railroad Line along the Great Mall in Milpitas
   - Reopened Piper Drive
   - Completed the trench invert at the Capitol Avenue bridge structure
   - Completed the Montague Expressway Bridge deck
   - Started concrete placement at the Milpitas Station invert
   - Achieved Ready For Construction status on 80% of the total drawings

b. The SVBX Milpitas Campus design consultant continued efforts on the development of the final design for Milpitas Campus and Berryessa Campus. The contract for the design and build of the parking structures at Berryessa and Milpitas Stations was re-advertised on May 1, 2014. The contract was awarded on August 7, 2014.

c. On the Mission Boulevard/Warren Avenue/Union Pacific Railroad Relocation Construction Contract, Warren Avenue was reopened to traffic on August 11, 2014.

d. VTA Board authorized the award of the Tasman Drive Pocket Track contract to Stacy & Witbeck, Inc., in the amount of $13.69 million in January 2014. Construction started in February 2014 and major track work was completed in August and systems construction will be completed by fall 2014.
e. The Mountain View Phase I design was completed and construction contract was advertised for bids in May 2014. VTA Board award took place on August 7, 2014. Phase II environmental clearance, right-of-way and design are underway and forecast to be completed in summer 2014. Phase II Construction Contract is planned for advertisement in late August 2014.

f. The new loop road and pump station under the Capitol Expressway Light Rail Bus Improvements and Eastridge Transit Center contract is complete and opened to traffic on July 23, 2014. Construction of the Transit Center, Bus Operators Facility and Park & Ride lot is expected to be completed by mid-2015.

g. Construction Contract for the Santa Clara/Alum Rock Bus Rapid Transit project was awarded in November 2013 and field work started in March 2014 and is expected to be completed by late 2015. Utility relocation is currently ongoing and is expected to be complete by late 2014.

The goal of this report is to communicate overall progress in a simple yet informative manner. We look forward to your continued feedback as the 2000 Measure A Transit Improvement Program moves forward.

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

The Transit Planning & Operations Committee received the Measure A Semi-Annual Report as part of its September 18, 2014 Consent Agenda.

Prepared By: Suja Prasad, Sr. Cost & Schedule Coordinator
Memo No. 4472
Semi-Annual Report
June 2014
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SECTION 1.0

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND PROJECT COSTS
SECTION 1.0

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND PROJECT COSTS

A. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Semi-Annual Report is a periodic update of the 2000 Measure A Transit Improvement Program prepared by VTA staff and provided to the 2000 Measure A Watchdog Committee and the VTA Board of Directors. The report is based on the Program’s budgeted, forecast, and incurred costs as of June 30, 2014. Additionally, key activities that occurred in the six months leading up to that date are described.

By way of a brief progress report, during the six-month period covered by this report:

Silicon Valley Rapid Transit

- VTA received the FY2013 $141.8 million increment of the SVBX FFGA Grant on April 14, 2014.

- During this report period, the BART Silicon Valley Berryessa Extension (SVBX) Line Track Station and System (LTSS) contractor accomplished the following:
  - Installed the Union Pacific Railroad Line along the Great Mall in Milpitas
  - Reopened Piper Drive.
  - Completed the trench invert at the Capitol Avenue bridge structure.
  - Completed the Montague Expressway Bridge deck.
  - Started concrete placement at the Milpitas Station invert.
  - Achieved Ready For Construction (RFC) status on 80% of the total drawings.

- The SVBX Milpitas Campus design consultant continued efforts on the development of the final design for Milpitas Campus (C740) and Berryessa Campus (C742). The contract for the design and build of the parking structures at Berryessa and Milpitas Stations (C730) was re-advertised on May 1, 2014. Award is forecast for August 2014.


Light Rail Program

- In January 2014 VTA Board authorized the award of the Tasman Drive Pocket Track contract to Stacy & Witbeck, Inc., in the amount of $13.69 million. The Board also approved to amend the FY 2014 2000 Measure A Transit Improvement Program Fund Capital Budget to add $14,810,000 for the Tasman Drive Pocket Track Project. Construction started in February 2014 and major track work is planned for completion by early August and systems construction by fall 2014.
The Mountain View Phase I design was completed and construction contract was advertised for bids in May 2014; VTA Board award is expected in August 2014. Phase II environmental clearance, right of way & design are underway and forecast to be completed in summer 2014. Phase II Construction Contract is planned for advertisement in August 2014.

Construction for the Phase I of the Light Rail to Eastridge Capital Center which involves pedestrian and bus improvements along Capitol Expressway was completed in spring 2013. The new loop road and pump station is almost complete and will be opened to traffic in July 2014. Construction of the Transit Center, Bus Operators Facility and Park and Ride lot is expected to be completed by mid-2015.

Commuter Rail Program

Design for approximately 15 crossings along the UPRR segment is currently ongoing for at-grade crossings, for improvements to pedestrian gates, sidewalks, signing and striping, warning bands, advanced signal preemption and channelization for pedestrians. Advertisement for bids is planned for mid-2015 and construction is anticipated to start by late 2015.

Design coordination with stakeholders and final design is underway for the Santa Clara Station Pedestrian Underpass and is expected to be completed by fall 2014 for construction contract advertisement in late 2014 pending securing grant funding.

Bus Program

Construction Contract for the Santa Clara Bus Rapid Transit project was awarded in November 2013 and field work started in March 2014 and is expected to be completed by late 2015. Utility relocation is currently ongoing and is expected to be complete by late 2014.

In January 2014, VTA Board authorized contract amendment with the Parsons Transportation Group to study improved transit services in portions of Sunnyvale, Mountain View and Santa Clara and to include two new alternatives in the environmental analysis for the El Camino Real Bus Rapid Transit Project.

In the same manner VTA was committed to and completed all projects in the 1996 Measure B Program, VTA is committed to completing all the projects in the 2000 Measure A Program. During FY2015, VTA will advance projects to a ready state and advocate for outside fund sources and matched funds to advance projects including potential public-private partnerships.

This report shows a snapshot of the 2000 Measure A Program at the time of writing. However, it is important to understand that the timing and prioritization of projects in the program remains fluid.
B. PROJECT APPROPRIATIONS

Figure 1.1, on page 1-8, shows the prior and current appropriations for each project/category in the 2000 Measure A Program. Changes in appropriations during the report period are discussed below.

2000 Measure A Programwide

Programwide costs are incurred when activities are performed that provide either an indirect benefit to multiple projects or provide benefit to the overall 2000 Measure A Program. There are five programwide cost components to the 2000 Measure A Program:

- Capitalized Interest and Bond Costs
- Non-Capitalized Interest and Bond Costs
- Programwide Expenses
- VTA Operating Assistance
- Miscellaneous Operating Expenses

Interest and Bond Costs

Interest and Bond Costs represent interest and other bond charges (net of interest earned on bond proceeds) related to 2000 Measure A Sales Tax Revenue Bonds. Other bond charges include periodic fees related to variable rate bonds, including liquidity, remarketing, trustee and rating fees.

Capitalized interest/bond charges need to be associated with the assets that were funded by the bond proceeds. In accordance with Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) 62, capitalized interest related to restricted assets should be net of the interest income earned by the reinvested bond proceeds. Costs are allocated directly to specific projects based on the prorata share of bond proceeds used to fund expenditures on a quarterly basis. These costs will continue to be allocated directly to project expenditures until the bonds are repaid in full or until such projects are completed, whichever comes first.

Non-Capitalized interest/bond charges represent the bond costs allocated to projects that have been completed as well as the costs associated with Taxable Build America Bonds proceeds that have not yet been drawn down.

Bonds were initially issued beginning in 2003, prior to the start of the 2000 Measure A Sales Tax, in order to advance the SVRT, Commuter Rail, and Light Rail programs prior to sales tax revenue collections. Currently there are approximately $969.7 million in 2000 Measure A Sales Tax Revenue Bonds outstanding.
Programwide Expenses

Programwide expenses include preparation of progress and cost reports and other general project related tasks that are not attributable to individual projects. On a quarterly basis, the programwide expenses are allocated to individual projects based on the incremental costs of the projects during the quarter. The allocation is necessary to associate the costs to the individual projects that were benefited by the incurrence of the programwide costs.

VTA Operating Assistance

18.46% of the Measure A Sales Tax revenue is used in support of VTA operations. Through June 30, 2014, a cumulative total of $243.6 million has been expended for this purpose.

Miscellaneous Operating Expenses

Miscellaneous Operating Expenses represent expenditures related to the ongoing costs of administering the overall Measure A program. These expenses include financial forecasting, investment consultants, annual financial audit preparation, election fees, publication of annual financial audits and public hearings conducted by the 2000 Measure A Citizen’s Watchdog Committee, and other general tasks.

Changes in Appropriations

1. Programwide Costs (including VTA Operating Assistance)

   The appropriation increased by $59.5 million to a new value of $701.4 million due to the following:

   a. $5.7 million of Capitalized Interest and Bond costs were allocated to various ongoing projects, as described below.

   b. $1.8 million was transferred to VTA Operating Assistance, $1.6 million of the Operating Budget expired\(^1\), and appropriation increased $31.1 million with the adoption of the FY15 budget.

   c. $0.7 million of Measure A Programwide costs were allocated to various projects as described below.

   d. $1.8 million was transferred from Non-Capitalized Interest and Bond Costs, $0.8 million of the Operating Budget expired\(^1\), and appropriation increased $35.1 million with the adoption of the FY15 budget.

   e. $24.5 million of the Operating Budget expired\(^1\) and appropriation increased $26.4 million with the adoption of the FY15 budget.

---

\(^1\) Operating Budgets expire at the end of each Fiscal Year
2. **Silicon Valley Rapid Transit and Freight Rail Relocation**

   The project appropriation decreased by a net $3.1 million to a new total of $3.021 billion due to the following:
   
   a. The program appropriation increased by $4.9 million due to the allocation of Bond Interest to the SVRT program.
   
   b. The program appropriation decreased by $8.0 million due to the transfer of that amount from the UPRR-Performed Activities project to the Northern Express Rail project.

3. **Light Rail Program**

   The appropriation increased by $83.0 million to a new value of $477.3 million due to the following:
   
   a. $0.5 million of Bond Interest was allocated to the Light Rail program.
   
   b. $0.5 million of Measure A Programwide costs were allocated to the Light Rail Program, primarily the CELR to Eastridge project and Northern Express Rail project.
   
   c. The appropriation for the CELR to Eastridge project was increased by $18.6 million primarily for cost associated with property acquisition.
   
   d. The appropriation for the CELR Pedestrian Improvements projects was decreased by $1.2 million as the project has closed; remaining funds were transferred to the Northern Express Rail project.
   
   e. The appropriation for the Santa Clara Pocket Track project increased by $14.8 million.
   
   f. The appropriation for the Northern Express Rail project was increased by $49.8 million.

4. **Commuter Rail Program**

   The appropriation decreased by $24.1 million to a new value of $161.8 million due to the following:
   
   a. $0.2 million of Bond Interest was allocated to Caltrain Service Upgrades project.
   
   b. $0.03 million of Measure A Programwide costs were allocated to the Commuter Rail Program.
   
   c. The appropriation for the Santa Clara San Jose Diridion Station upgrades project, Dumbarton Rail Corridor project, Caltrain South County Capacity Improvement project decreased by a total $24.3 million and this amount was transferred to Northern Express Rail project.
5. **Bus Program**

   The appropriation decreased by $16.5 million to a new value of $216.7 million due to the following:
   
   a. $0.2 million of Measure A Programwide costs were allocated to the Bus Program, primarily to the BRT Santa Clara/Alum Rock project.
   
   b. The appropriation for the Procurement of Articulated Buses project and BRT Modifications – Chaboya and North yard project decreased by a total $16.7 million and this amount was transferred to Northern Express Rail project.

6. **San Jose Mineta Airport People Mover**

   The project appropriation remained unchanged at $4.0 million during the period.

7. **Fund Exchange Payments**

   The project appropriation remained unchanged at $122.5 million during the period.
## Figure 1.1
Measure A Appropriations

### $'s in millions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/Category</th>
<th>a Previous Appropriation Through FY15 Dec-13</th>
<th>b Current Appropriation Through FY15 Jun-14</th>
<th>c=(b - a) Changes This Period</th>
<th>d Text Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2000 Measure A Programwide</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitalized Interest and Bond Costs</td>
<td>$98.4</td>
<td>$92.7</td>
<td>($5.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Capitalized Interest and Bond Costs¹</td>
<td>$266.1</td>
<td>$293.9</td>
<td>$27.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programwide Expenses</td>
<td>$4.2</td>
<td>$3.5</td>
<td>($0.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTA Operating Assistance</td>
<td>$242.6</td>
<td>$278.8</td>
<td>$36.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Operating Expenses</td>
<td>$30.6</td>
<td>$32.5</td>
<td>$1.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$641.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>$701.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>$59.5</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SVRT</strong> (incl. FRR and Warm Springs Ext.)</td>
<td><strong>$3,024.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,021.2</strong></td>
<td>($3.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Light Rail Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CELR to Eastridge</td>
<td>$153.4</td>
<td>$171.6</td>
<td>$18.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Rail Efficiency</td>
<td>$27.4</td>
<td>$92.2</td>
<td>$64.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension to Vasona Junction</td>
<td>$12.9</td>
<td>$12.9</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Floor Light Rail Vehicles</td>
<td>$200.6</td>
<td>$200.6</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$394.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>$477.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>$83.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commuter Rail Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain Service Upgrades²</td>
<td>$81.0</td>
<td>$80.2</td>
<td>($0.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain South County</td>
<td>$40.8</td>
<td>$17.6</td>
<td>($23.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain Electrification</td>
<td>$61.3</td>
<td>$61.3</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumbarton Rail Corridor</td>
<td>$2.4</td>
<td>$2.3</td>
<td>($0.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto Intermodal Transit Center</td>
<td>$0.4</td>
<td>$0.4</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE Upgrades²</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$185.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>$161.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>($24.1)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bus Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRT - Santa Clara/Alum Rock</td>
<td>$115.0</td>
<td>$115.1</td>
<td>$0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRT - El Camino Real</td>
<td>$19.5</td>
<td>$19.5</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRT - Stevens Creek</td>
<td>$6.0</td>
<td>$6.0</td>
<td>($16.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other BRT (incl Bus Procurement)</td>
<td>$70.7</td>
<td>$54.1</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 17 Bus Service Improvements</td>
<td>$2.5</td>
<td>$2.5</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEB Demonstration and Improvements</td>
<td>$19.5</td>
<td>$19.5</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$233.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>$216.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>($16.5)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>San Jose Mineta Airport People Mover</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4.0</strong></td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund Exchange Payments</strong></td>
<td><strong>$122.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>$122.5</strong></td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,606.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,704.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>$98.8</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Repayment obligation for both principal and interest.

² $10.0 million in appropriation for Caltrain Santa Clara Station improvements that benefit the ACE Upgrades project is included in the Caltrain Service Upgrades project.
## C. INCURRED COSTS

Figure 1.2 below shows incurred costs for Measure A at the beginning and end of the period as well as the percent of the appropriation (through FY’15) incurred as of June 30, 2014.

**Figure 1.2**

### Measure A Incurred Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/Category</th>
<th>2000 Measure A Programwide</th>
<th>SVRT (incl. FRR and Warm Springs Ext.)</th>
<th>Light Rail Program</th>
<th>Commuter Rail Program</th>
<th>Bus Program</th>
<th>Fund Exchange Payments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Incurred Costs Through Dec-13</td>
<td>b) Incurred Costs Through Jun-14*</td>
<td>c) = (b-a) Incurred Costs This Period</td>
<td>d) Percent of Appropriation Incurred Through Dec-13</td>
<td>d) Percent of Appropriation Incurred Jun-14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitalized Interest and Bond Costs</td>
<td>$31.7</td>
<td>$38.1</td>
<td>$6.4</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Capitalized Interest and Bond Costs*</td>
<td>$247.6</td>
<td>$262.7</td>
<td>$15.1</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programwide Expenses</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTA Operating Assistance</td>
<td>$226.2</td>
<td>$243.6</td>
<td>$17.4</td>
<td>87.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Operating Expenses</td>
<td>$5.7</td>
<td>$6.0</td>
<td>$0.3</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$511.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>$550.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>$39.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>78.5%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVRT (incl. FRR and Warm Springs Ext.)</td>
<td>$1,551.8</td>
<td>$1,702.8</td>
<td>$151.0</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CELR to Eastridge</td>
<td>$97.8</td>
<td>$125.5</td>
<td>$24.7</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Rail Efficiency</td>
<td>$8.1</td>
<td>$20.8</td>
<td>$12.7</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension to Vasona Junction</td>
<td>$0.8</td>
<td>$1.0</td>
<td>$0.2</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Floor Light Rail Vehicles</td>
<td>$200.6</td>
<td>$200.6</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$307.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>$344.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>$37.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>72.3%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comtrain Service Upgrades</td>
<td>$56.1</td>
<td>$56.7</td>
<td>$0.6</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain South County</td>
<td>$17.6</td>
<td>$17.6</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain Electrification</td>
<td>$2.0</td>
<td>$4.0</td>
<td>$2.0</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumbarton Rail Corridor</td>
<td>$2.3</td>
<td>$2.3</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto Intermodal Transit Center</td>
<td>$0.2</td>
<td>$0.2</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE Upgrades</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$78.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>$80.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>49.9%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRT - Santa Clara/Alum Rock</td>
<td>$27.1</td>
<td>$34.5</td>
<td>$7.4</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRT - El Camino Real</td>
<td>$6.8</td>
<td>$8.2</td>
<td>$1.4</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRT - Stevens Creek</td>
<td>$1.5</td>
<td>$2.1</td>
<td>$0.6</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other BRT (incl Bus Procurement)</td>
<td>$2.7</td>
<td>$4.4</td>
<td>$1.7</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 17 Bus Service Improvements</td>
<td>$2.5</td>
<td>$2.5</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEB Demonstration and Improvements</td>
<td>$19.4</td>
<td>$19.4</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>99.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$60.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$71.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>32.8%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Mineta Airport People Mover</td>
<td>$2.0</td>
<td>$2.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Exchange Payments</td>
<td>$79.7</td>
<td>$87.6</td>
<td>$7.9</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,590.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,839.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>$249.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>60.4%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Repayment obligation for both principal and interest.

* June 30, 2014 incurred costs are unaudited and are subject to change.
D. MEASURE A FUND EXCHANGE

State law guarantees Santa Clara County a formula share of the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) over a six-year period. State law and regional policy make the VTA Board of Directors responsible for determining which eligible transportation projects will receive those funds.

The VTA Board of Directors, at its June 7, 2007, and December 13, 2007 meetings approved the exchange of STIP grant funds for Measure A funds and programmed STIP funds to Measure A projects in exchange for an equivalent amount of 2000 Measure A Sales Tax funds. The exchange of funds creates the Local Program Reserve (LPR) which allows the Board of Directors to use those funds to program to other transportation projects. The Board approved the fund exchange because it:

- **Accelerates Project Delivery and Reduces Administrative Costs** - STIP funds come with substantial state requirements that impact schedule and cost of project delivery. The exchange of funds allows the Board to free the projects from costly administrative burdens.

- **Enables the VTA Board to Manage Valley Transportation Plan (VTP) Expenditures** - By exchanging STIP funds, the VTA Board eliminates the need for Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and the California Transportation Commission (CTC) to approve all STIP programming decisions after they are approved by the VTA Board. Further, it eliminates the CTC’s approval of all subsequent STIP fund allocations for all STIP funded projects.

A portion of the exchange funds will be used to pay interest to the Measure A Program for fund advances. The initial amount is paid back when the CTC allocates STIP funds to the Measure A projects and VTA draws the cash from the State. The interest will be calculated, and paid from the LPR account when (1) all STIP funds are drawn by the project and (2) all associated LPR funds are actually paid to projects. Interest will be calculated at that time as well, based on VTA’s rates of return on its pooled investment accounts at the time the advances occurred.

Of note, the first three projects in the "Local Program Reserve Projects" table (Appendix C) qualified for CMIA funds only because we were able to use exchange funds to advance these projects. These CMIA projects are under construction.

These and other VTP Highway projects that utilize Measure A exchange funds are the subject of the VTP Highway Semi-Annual Report that goes as an information item to the VTA Board in September and January of each year.
E. FUNDING

Funding is a key issue for many of the 2000 Measure A projects. As a consequence, in this report we refer 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. In the case of projects where there is little or no scope definition, “TBD” (To be Determined) is shown. As the project is better defined, estimated cost figures will be included for these projects. 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 Appendix A.

2. **Appropriation Through FY15** - The most recent Adopted Budget includes appropriations, based on an estimate of expenditures during FY14 and FY15, for various 2000 Measure A projects. Since these projects can run beyond FY15, the appropriation amount is only a time-constrained slice of total estimated expenditures.

3. **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/FY15 period. It is important to note that, regardless of the level of appropriation, actual expenditures will not exceed secured funding at any time.
SECTION 2

PROJECT SUMMARY REPORTS
MEASURE A PROJECT SUMMARY REPORTS

A. SILICON VALLEY RAPID TRANSIT
   1. VTA’s BART Silicon Valley Berryessa Extension (SVBX)
   2. SVRT Corridor Establishment and Maintenance
   3. VTA’s BART Silicon Valley Project Development

B. LIGHT RAIL PROGRAM
   1. Capitol Expressway Light Rail to Eastridge
   2. Light Rail Efficiency Projects
   3. Extension to Vasona Junction

C. COMMUTER RAIL PROGRAM
   1. Caltrain Service Upgrades
   2. Caltrain Electrification
   3. Dumbarton Rail Corridor

D. BUS PROGRAM
   1. BRT - Bus Rapid Transit
   2. BRT - Santa Clara / Alum Rock
   3. BRT - El Camino Real
   4. BRT- Stevens Creek

E. SAN JOSE MINETA AIRPORT PEOPLE MOVER

F. CLOSED/INACTIVE PROJECTS
   1. Palo Alto Intermodal Transit Center
   2. ACE Upgrades
   3. Low Floor Light Rail Vehicles
   4. ZEB Demonstration and Facility Improvements
   5. Highway 17 Bus Service Improvements
   6. Caltrain South County
VTA’s BART Silicon Valley Berryessa Extension (SVBX)

Estimated Cost:
- SVBX New Starts (FFGA) $2.33 billion
- SVBX Other (CNPA) $0.09 billion
- BART Core System Mods $0.27 billion
- TOTAL $2.69 billion*

Estimate Class 1 (see appendix)

Appropriation Through FY15:
$2.14 billion

Secured Funding:
$2.14 billion

Year of Completion: 2018

Project Manager: Carolyn Gonot

Designers:
HNTB, HMM/Bechtel, Wong/PB, AECOM, Kimley-Horn

Contractors:
Skanska-Shimmick-Herzog JV (C700 LTSS)
Con-Quest Contractors Inc (C610 Piper Dr)
GE Chen and G&G Specialty (C75x RNIP)

Project Description:
The first phase of VTA’s 16.1-mile Silicon Valley Rapid Transit (SVRT) extension of BART, the Berryessa Extension (SVBX) is an approximately 10-mile extension of BART service.

SVBX extends from the planned Warm Springs Station in the City of Fremont, proceeds on the former Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) right-of-way, and ends near Las Plumas Avenue in the City of San Jose.

The SVBX Project includes one station in retained-cut (Milpitas Station) and one above-grade station (Berryessa Station).

In addition to the scope described above, the SVBX Project includes facility additions to the existing Hayward Yard (located approximately 14 miles north of Santa Clara County) to provide fleet management operations for the 60 new revenue vehicles that BART is procuring for VTA for SVBX.

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>Environmental</td>
<td>Early 2004</td>
<td>Early 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>Design</td>
<td>Early 2004</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>Mid 2007</td>
<td>Mid 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Mid 2012</td>
<td>Late 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing and Commissioning</td>
<td>Mid 2017</td>
<td>Mid 2018</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>Mid 2018</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P-0728, P-0800, P-0801, P-0861
Project Status:

Project Development

On March 12, 2012, the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority received a $900 million grant commitment from the FTA for the SVBX Project. On December 6, 2012, the California Transportation Commission (CTC) allocated $50 million in State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funding to help expand and improve BART’s Hayward Maintenance Complex to accommodate the operation of the Berryessa Extension. VTA received the FY2013 $141.8 million increment of the SVBX FFGA Grant on April 14, 2014.

Right-of-Way

All major municipal and utility master agreements required for SVBX have been executed. Remaining third-party agreements are forecast to be in place to support SVBX implementation.

Approximately 102 property acquisitions, which include full and partial takes, are required from both private and public property owners for the SVBX Project. To date, VTA staff has completed 62 appraisals and has made 61 offers. FTA reviewed and concurred with appraisals for 11 high value properties. VTA is in possession of 53 properties. Efforts continue on the relocation of commercial business.

Line, Track, Stations and Systems (LTSS)

Full Notice To Proceed on C700 was granted to the Design-Build contractor, Skanska-Shimmick-Herzog JV (SSH), on April 30, 2012.

SSH has achieved Ready For Construction status on 80% of total drawings. During this report period, SSH also accomplished the following:

- Installed the Union Pacific Railroad Line along the Great Mall in Milpitas
- Reopened Piper Drive.
- Completed the trench invert at the Capitol Avenue bridge structure.
- Completed the Montague Expressway Bridge deck.
- Started concrete placement at the Milpitas Station invert.

To date, the LTSS contractor has reported no lost work day cases.

Campus and Parking Garages

The Campus, Roadways and Parking Structure (CR&PS) design and construction contract dates have been coordinated to integrate with the Line, Track, Station, & System (LTSS) construction schedule. The design consultant (D720) continued efforts on the development of the final design for Milpitas Campus (C740) and Berryessa Campus (C742).

The contract for the design and build of the parking structures at Berryessa and Milpitas Stations (C730) was re-advertised on May 1, 2014. Award is forecast for August 2014.

*P-0728, P-0800, P-0801, P-0861
Project Status, continued:

Hayward Yard Primary Shop Conversion

Final design efforts continued on Hayward Shop Modifications, including the Component Repair Facility.

BART Vehicle Procurement

BART continued Final Design Reviews, First Article Configuration Inspections (FACIs) at the subsystem level and subsystem qualification testing.

Utility Relocation

PG&E completed the distribution feeder main (transmission) relocation at Dixon Landing Road and the distribution gas and electrical relocations at Mabury Road. PG&E also began construction of the distribution gas and electrical relocations at Sierra Road/Lundy Avenue and the electrical relocation at Hostetter Road.

Verizon completed their relocation at Dixon Landing Rd. AT&T completed their live cable lift and lay at Montague Expressway. San Jose Water completed stage three of their work at Hostetter Blvd.

Environmental Mitigation

VTA met with the Native American Most Likely Descendant (MLD) on June 10, 2014 to discuss storage and reburial of the Native American remains from the Great Mall and Penitencia Creek sites. VTA will continue to coordinate with the MLD on the reburials.

Survey staking was completed and orange fencing installed in the location of a new storm drain outfall at Mabury Road and Coyote Creek. Construction of the outfall is planned for the 3rd quarter of 2014.

The Residential Noise Insulation Program (RNIP) continues to move toward completion of installing improvements at eligible residences. The first three construction contracts are in the closeout phase with substantial construction attained. Phase 4 is underway, with completion planned by December 2014.

Communications and Outreach

Highlights during this period included providing a project update and tour for Congresswoman Zoe Lofgren and Congressman Michael Honda, and hosting a well-attended community meeting in Milpitas on March 25 to discuss upcoming construction.

Two project press releases and eight construction updates and traffic advisories were sent. More than ten project tours were also given, including for the Mineta Transportation Institute Board of Trustees.

A new time lapse video displaying a year’s worth of station construction was created including a Milpitas Station spring update video. The summer project newsletter was mailed to neighbors of the entire 10 mile project alignment in June. It included specific translated updates in three languages for each city and new photos.

Following up on interest from the Sustainability Brochure, a new social media campaign was created for the month of July to garner additional project interest.
### Cost Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding</th>
<th>Jun-14 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Jun-14 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Balance d = (a-c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>1,235,552</td>
<td>1,006,487</td>
<td>329,552</td>
<td>906,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>292,066</td>
<td>175,161</td>
<td>174,326</td>
<td>117,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>580,511</td>
<td>469,376</td>
<td>394,789</td>
<td>185,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>27,085</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing Costs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,135,214</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,651,024</strong></td>
<td><strong>898,667</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,236,547</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Secured Funding Incurred: 42%
- Secured Funding Committed: 77%

**NOTES:** All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000’s
December 31, 2013 incurred cost figures are unaudited and are subject to change

### Anticipated Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State (TCRP)</td>
<td>$353 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (STIP)</td>
<td>50 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (SLPP)</td>
<td>35 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>900 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (Meas A, Others)</td>
<td>1,352 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,690 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Federal 34%**
**State 16%**
**Local (Meas A) 50%**

Superstructure of Berryessa Aerial Structure
June 2014 Silicon Valley Rapid Transit

SVRT Corridor Establishment and Maintenance

**Estimated Cost:** $451.7 million*

*Estimate Class 1 (see appendix)

** Appropriation Through FY15:** $451.7 million

**Secured Funding:** $451.6 million

**Year of Completion:** 2017

**Project Manager:** Carolyn Gonot, Jim Costantini

**Designer:** HNTB Corporation, WMH, HMH Engineers

**Contractors:** Gordon N Ball, RGW Construction, Con-Quest Contractors, Top Grade Construction

**Project Description:**

- Relocate freight railroad from VTA-purchased right-of-way to existing UPRR right-of-way, between Warm Springs Yard and Calaveras Blvd.
- Build a new railroad overcrossing structure at Mission Boulevard and a new roadway underpass at Warren Avenue and Kato Road, and sever shipper freight service south of Montague Expressway.
- Construct flood control improvements at Berryessa Creek, Wrigley Creek, Scott Creek and Line B.
- Construct creek improvements and environmental mitigation at Wrigley Creek and Lower Penitencia Creek.
- Widen Montague Expressway and construct flood control improvements near the intersection of South Milpitas Blvd.
- Construct a shared-use trail, a new traffic signal, and intersection improvements to connect to the Upper Penitencia Creek (UPC) Trail.

**Project Status:**

- The Chevron petroleum pipelines relocation, SFPP/Kinder-Morgan petroleum pipeline relocation, and Verizon/MCI fiber optic relocation have been completed.
- The Berryessa Creek crossing, Abel Street Seismic Retrofit, and Railroad Relocation contract has been completed.
- Construction of Wrigley Creek Improvements is complete, and the Plant Establishment Period is underway.
- On the Mission Boulevard/Warren Avenue Union Pacific Railroad Relocation Construction contract (C101), the UPRR main track was switched over to the new UPRR Mission and Warren bridges in October 2013. Warren Avenue is scheduled to reopen in August 2014.
- The Agua Fria, Toroges and Agua Caliente Creek Improvement contract is complete. This contract accomplished creek and other improvements ahead of the C101 contract.
- The Alum Rock Fish Passage Improvements project is in the landscape maintenance phase.
- The Kato Grade Separation contractor fully re-opened Kato Road on April 29, 2013, handed over the work area to the LTSS contractor on schedule, and the contract was completed in February 2014 except for the Plant Establishment Period (PEP).
- Following the completion of the Joint Powers Agreement between Santa Clara County, SCVWD and VTA, the Montague Expressway Reconstruction Project is underway. Review of the final design was completed in December 2013, and right-of-way acquisition work is proceeding. Construction is anticipated to begin in mid 2015.
- Environmental and design work on the Upper Penitencia Creek (UPC) Trail Connector is underway and is anticipated to be complete in fall 2014.

**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>Design</td>
<td>Early 2008</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>Utility Relocations</td>
<td>Mid 2008</td>
<td>Late 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>Early 2009</td>
<td>Early 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P-3100, P-3121 through P-3129, P-0508, P-0832, P-0890
Cost Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding</th>
<th>Jun-14 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Jun-14 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Balance d = (a-c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>204,353</td>
<td>182,707</td>
<td>170,257</td>
<td>34,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>140,068</td>
<td>138,076</td>
<td>137,757</td>
<td>2,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>88,036</td>
<td>82,544</td>
<td>79,908</td>
<td>8,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>19,276</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>451,733</strong></td>
<td><strong>403,326</strong></td>
<td><strong>387,921</strong></td>
<td><strong>63,812</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred 86%
Secured Funding Committed 89%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's
December 31, 2013 incurred cost figures are unaudited and are subject to change

Anticipated Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local (Measure A)</td>
<td>$299.8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (Fremont)</td>
<td>22.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (SCVWD)</td>
<td>26.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (SCC)</td>
<td>7.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (ACTC)</td>
<td>5.9 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (ACTIA)</td>
<td>2.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (ACFC)</td>
<td>1.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (Milpitas, San Jose)</td>
<td>0.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (TCRP, HRCSA, AB1462, AB1171, Others)</td>
<td>79.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal (FHWA, OHS, CMAQ)</td>
<td>5.8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$451.7 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Federal 1%
State 18%
Local (Other) 15%
Local (Meas A) 66%
VTA’s BART Silicon Valley Project Development

Estimated Cost:
- Project Dev. through FY09: $370.3 million
- Project Dev. after FY09: $56.0 million
- Warm Springs Extension: $8.0 million
- TOTAL: $434.3 million

Appropriation Through FY15:
- $434.3 million

Secured Funding: $434.3 million**

Year of Completion: TBD

Project Manager: Carolyn Gonot

Project Description:

Project Development Through FY09: When work began on VTA’s Silicon Valley Rapid Transit (SVRT) extension, environmental clearance and preliminary engineering was performed for the entire 16-mile extension. However, in 2009 this approach was changed to focus on the first 10 miles of the extension, VTA’s Silicon Valley Berryessa Extension (SVBX), leading to the execution of a Full Funding Grant Agreement in 2012.

A portion of the initial project development costs have been transferred to the SVBX project and are included in the FFGA budget. Remaining costs are associated with early work on VTA’s six-mile Santa Clara Extension (SVSX), as well as previously allocated Measure A program-wide and bond costs.

Project Development after FY09: Some work is currently underway on planning and programming related to a future phase of SVRT. A contract for environmental work is underway. Additionally, SVRT program management and ongoing allocations of Measure A program-wide and bond costs are included.

Warms Springs Extension: The BART Warm Springs Extension is a 5.4-mile extension from the Fremont BART station to southern Fremont, which is the starting point for VTA’s SVRT project. VTA has assigned $8 million in State Local Partnership Program (SLPP) funds and $111.4 million in TCRP funds directly to BART for the project, and will provide an additional $8 million of Measure A funds to match the SLPP grant.

Project Status:
The full scope and implementation plan for future BART extension projects has not been established. When sufficient capital funding is identified through improved revenue forecasts from 2000 Measure A and/or other sources, future BART extensions will be implemented through one or more subsequent projects within the SVRT Program. At that time, a portion of actual project development and other costs may be included in the budget for the subsequent projects, similar to what was done with SVBX.

Project Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proj Dev. Through FY09</td>
<td>Early 2003</td>
<td>Mid 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj Dev. After FY09</td>
<td>Mid 2009</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm Springs Extension</td>
<td>Mid 2009</td>
<td>Late 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Work</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P-0501 through P-0507, P-0509, P-0732, P-3101
**Warm Springs Extension cost does not include $8M in SLPP and $111.4M in TCRP grant funds designated directly to BART.
### Cost Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding</th>
<th>Jun-14 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Jun-14 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Balance d = (a-c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>10,134</td>
<td>10,134</td>
<td>8,690</td>
<td>1,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>312,040</td>
<td>302,383</td>
<td>297,464</td>
<td>14,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>2,033</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing Costs</td>
<td>109,059</td>
<td>109,059</td>
<td>109,059</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>434,265</strong></td>
<td><strong>422,575</strong></td>
<td><strong>416,213</strong></td>
<td><strong>18,053</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred 96%
Secured Funding Committed 97%

NOTES: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000’s
December 31, 2013 incurred cost figures are unaudited and are subject to change

### Anticipated Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State (TCRP)</td>
<td>$284 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>0.8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (San Jose)</td>
<td>0.1 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (Santa Clara)</td>
<td>0.1 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (Meas A, Others)</td>
<td>149 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$434 million</strong> **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Warm Springs / South Fremont Station Construction

*P-0501 through P-0507, P-0509, P-0732, P-3101
**Warm Springs Extension cost does not include $8M in SLPP and $111.4M in TCRP grant funds designated directly to BART.
Capitol Expressway Light Rail to Eastridge

Estimated Cost: $430 million*

Appropriation Through FY15: $171.55 million

Secured Funding: $149.4 million

Year of Completion: Phase 1: 2015, Phase 2 TBD

Project Manager: Ken Ronsse

Designer: Rajappan & Meyer

Project Description:

This project will transform Capitol Expressway into a multi-modal boulevard offering bus and light rail transit, and safe pedestrian pathways with connections to the regional trail system.

Phase I includes pedestrian and bus improvements along Capitol Expressway to improve pedestrian access to the transit system and to improve safety along the corridor. It includes new sidewalks, pedestrian and street lights, and a landscaping buffer between the sidewalk and roadway from Capitol Avenue to Quimby Road. During this phase, reconstruction of the Eastridge Transit Center will also take place. These improvements will support subsequent BRT shelters and amenities at Story, Ocala and Eastridge Transit Center as part of the future Santa Clara/Alum Rock BRT service.

Phase II will extend light rail from the existing Alum Rock Light Rail Station to the Eastridge Transit Center. Light rail will operate primarily in the center of Capitol Expressway, with elevated track structures crossing Capitol Avenue, Story Road, and Tully Road. The Eastridge extension will include LRT station at Story Road (aerial) and Eastridge (at-grade).

Project Status:

In May 2005 and in August 2007, the VTA Board of Directors certified the Final Environmental Impact Report, and the Supplemental EIR, respectively, and approved the Light Rail Alternative. In order to make the project eligible for federal funding, VTA is in the process of preparing an Environmental Impact Statement for the Light Rail Alternative.

The pedestrian improvement portion included State (STIP) and Measure A funding. This was completed in the spring of 2013. Construction of the new loop road and pump station is complete and was opened to traffic in July 2014. Construction of the Transit Center, Bus Operators Facility and Park and Ride lot is expected to be completed by mid 2015.

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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Env. Impact Stmt.</td>
<td>Mid 2009</td>
<td>Late 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk and Landscaping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Early 2010</td>
<td>Early 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Early 2011</td>
<td>Late 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td>Late 2012</td>
<td>Early 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastridge Transit Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Mid 2010</td>
<td>Early 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>Mid 2010</td>
<td>Early 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Mid 2013</td>
<td>Mid 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td>Mid 2015</td>
<td>Late 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P-0375, P-0476, P-0743, P-0744, P-0787
## Cost Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding $a$</th>
<th>Jun - 14 Committed Costs $b$</th>
<th>Jun - 14 Incurred Costs $c$</th>
<th>Balance $d = (a-c)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>33,486</td>
<td>30,747</td>
<td>19,118</td>
<td>14,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>30,254</td>
<td>28,392</td>
<td>27,622</td>
<td>2,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>65,942</td>
<td>64,263</td>
<td>63,561</td>
<td>2,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>7,565</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing Costs</td>
<td>12,188</td>
<td>12,188</td>
<td>12,188</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>149,434</strong></td>
<td><strong>135,590</strong></td>
<td><strong>122,488</strong></td>
<td><strong>26,946</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred 82%
Secured Funding Committed 91%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

## Anticipated Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local (Measure A)</td>
<td>$100.7 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (Other)</td>
<td>$5.7 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (STIP)</td>
<td>$24.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (Other)</td>
<td>$0.2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$18.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (TBD)</td>
<td>$280.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$430.0 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concrete pour on the north section of the new loop road
Contractor setting the pump station access hatch
Light Rail Efficiency Projects

Estimated Cost: $92.2 million*

Appropriation Through FY15:
$92.2 million

Secured Funding: $92.2 million

Year of Completion: Varies

Project Manager:
Sarah Syed; Adolf Daaboul; Ying Smith

Designers: URS Corporation

Description Of Efforts:
The VTA Board adopted the Light Rail Systems Analysis in May 2010. The Systems Analysis provides an evaluation of infrastructure and operational shortcomings of the existing light rail system along with a three-phase improvement plan for immediate action. Near-term recommended projects from the Light Rail Systems Analysis are as follows:

The Santa Clara Pocket Track project will install an additional track and supporting infrastructure so one track can be used as a pocket track to store additional cars on Tasman near Old Ironsides Station in the City of Santa Clara.

Northern Light Rail Express will implement a series of improvements including double-tracking in Mountain View to establish a new line from Mountain View to Alum Rock to connect with Caltrain and the new Milpitas BART Station, commensurate with the opening of the BART Silicon Valley Berryessa extension.

Southern Light Rail Express will reconfigure the southern half of the Light Rail System to allow express trains and integrate the Almaden shuttle trains into the larger system.

Status:
The Light Rail Systems Analysis was adopted by the VTA Board in May 2010. The initial projects recommended from the Systems Analysis began planning, design and construction in fall 2011.

The Tasman Drive Pocket Track was advertised for bids in July 2013. The contract was awarded in January 2014 and construction started in February and major track work is planned for completion by early August and systems construction is planned for completion by fall 2014.

The Mountain View Phase I construction contract was advertised for bids in May 2014; VTA Board award is expected in August 2014. Phase II environmental clearance, right of way & design are underway and forecast to be completed in summer 2014. Construction Contract is planned for advertisement in August 2014.

Southern Light Rail Express project is currently under planning phase, subsequent phases are dependent on findings and budget.

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>Santa Clara Pocket Track</td>
<td>Late 2012</td>
<td>Late 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View Phase I</td>
<td>Early 2013</td>
<td>End 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View Phase II</td>
<td>Mid 2013</td>
<td>End 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P-0552, P-0660, P-0784, P-0799, P-0860
### Cost Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding (a)</th>
<th>Jun - 14 Committed Costs (b)</th>
<th>Jun - 14 Incurred Costs (c)</th>
<th>Balance (d = a - c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>56,294</td>
<td>32,842</td>
<td>7,192</td>
<td>49,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>2,104</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>1,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>26,936</td>
<td>14,677</td>
<td>12,439</td>
<td>14,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>6,734</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing Costs</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>92,246</strong></td>
<td><strong>48,721</strong></td>
<td><strong>20,813</strong></td>
<td><strong>71,433</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Secured Funding Incurred**: 23%
- **Secured Funding Committed**: 53%

**NOTE:** All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

### Anticipated Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local (Measure A)</td>
<td>$92.2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$92.2 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local (Meas A) 100%

---

Double Crossover installation for the new Santa Clara Pocket Track
Light Rail Program

Extension to Vasona Junction

Estimated Cost: $176 million
Estimate Class 4 (see appendix)

Appropriation Through FY15: $12.8 million

Secured Funding: $0.9 million

Year of Completion: TBD

Project Manager: Ann Calnan

Designer: N/A

Project Description:
The original Vasona Corridor Light Rail Transit (LRT) Project was a 6.8-mile extension of VTA’s LRT system from downtown San José through Campbell and into Los Gatos. The project was approved in 2000 by VTA and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). Subsequent to approval, the project was constructed between downtown San José and the Winchester Station in Campbell. The proposed Extension to Vasona Junction Project would complete the originally planned Vasona Corridor with a 1.6-mile extension of the Vasona LRT Line from the existing Winchester Station to a new Vasona Junction Station in Los Gatos.

Project Status:
Since 2000, environmental and design conditions have changed; therefore, the extension project was re-evaluated in a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR)/Environmental Assessment (EA). The VTA Board of Directors certified the SEIR and approved the project in March 2014. Federal approval is anticipated in August 2014. Once the environmental clearance process is complete, the project will be eligible for Federal funds.

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</td>
<td>Late 2009</td>
<td>Early 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schedule for future activities will be established when funding is secured.
### Cost Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding</th>
<th>Jun - 14 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Jun - 14 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Balance $ 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>878</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>893</strong></td>
<td><strong>876</strong></td>
<td><strong>876</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Secured Funding Incurred: 98%
- Secured Funding Committed: 98%

**NOTE:** All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

### Anticipated Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local (Measure A)</td>
<td>$0.9 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (TBD)</td>
<td>$175.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$175.9 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Railroad alignment in Los Gatos - terminus of the Vasona extension](image1)

![Visual simulation of the Hacienda Station](image2)
Commuter Rail Program

Caltrain Service Upgrades

**Estimated Cost:** $84.7 million  
**Appropriation Through FY15:** $80.2 million  
**Secured Funding:** $72.4 million  
**Year of Completion:** TBD  
**Project Managers:** Ken Ronsse  
**Designer:** Various

**Project Description:**
Capital improvement projects to the Caltrain system with the goals of improving service, ridership and passenger accessibility.

**Project Status:**
- **Mountain View Parking** – Project is inactive until right-of-way needs of High Speed Rail project are known, and the plan for future Caltrain capital and operating improvements is determined. Funds from the City of Mountain View could be used for preliminary engineering and environmental clearance.
- **Blossom Hill Pedestrian Grade Separation** – The bridge was opened to the public in September 2012.
- **Safety Enhancements** – The current phase of the project includes engineering and construction for at-grade crossings, with improvements such as pedestrian swing gates, sidewalks, signing and striping, warning bands, and channelization for pedestrians. Construction along the JPB segment is completed and design for approximately 15 crossings along the UPRR segment started in January 2012. Construction on the 15 crossings along the UPRR segment is currently on hold pending decision on budget availability.
- **Santa Clara Caltrain Station Pedestrian Underpass Extension** - This project will provide an extended pedestrian tunnel under the UPRR tracks to Brokaw Road at the Santa Clara Station. Final design is in progress and will be completed in fall 2014. Construction is dependent on funding availability.
- **Santa Clara and Diridon Station Upgrades** – This work, which was administered by Caltrain, is now complete. Final invoice from Caltrain has been paid.
- **The Bike Share Pilot Program** opened on August 29, 2013 with 280 bicycles and 28 bike share stations at Caltrain stations and downtown areas in the cities of San Jose, Mountain View and Palo Alto. The project will expand to approximately 400 bikes and 40 stations by 2015. The new bike share program will allow users to transition between transit and bikes seamlessly, connecting to major activity centers without the need to drive or walk long distances between transit stops.

**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>Santa Clara Station Ped UC Design/Bid</td>
<td>Mid 2010</td>
<td>Early 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Station Ped UC Construction</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain Safety Enhancements Design</td>
<td>Mid 2011</td>
<td>Mid 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain Safety Enhancements Construction</td>
<td>Late 2015</td>
<td>Early 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cost Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding (a)</th>
<th>Jun - 14 Committed Costs (b)</th>
<th>Jun - 14 Incurred Costs (c)</th>
<th>Balance (d = a-c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>30,635</td>
<td>23,381</td>
<td>23,336</td>
<td>7,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trackage Rights</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>25,972.77</td>
<td>20,025</td>
<td>19,658</td>
<td>6,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>2,026.97</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing Costs</td>
<td>3,738</td>
<td>3,738</td>
<td>3,738</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>72,395</td>
<td>57,166</td>
<td>56,750</td>
<td>15,646</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred: 78%
Secured Funding Committed: 79%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

Anticipated Funding (reflects only appropriated budget):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local (Measure A)</td>
<td>$58.4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (Mt. View)</td>
<td>0.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (San Jose)</td>
<td>0.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (RM2)</td>
<td>0.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (MA-Match)</td>
<td>0.2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (Prop 1B)</td>
<td>7.2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal (FHWA)</td>
<td>3.7 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal (CMAQ)</td>
<td>1.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>7.8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$80.2 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local (Meas A) 73%
Local (Other) 2%
State 9%
TBD 10%
Federal 6%

Blossom Hill Pedestrian Bridge Internal View

Bike Share Station at San Fernando and 4th
Caltrain Electrification

Estimated Cost: $1.4 billion  
Appropriation Through FY15: $61.3 million  
Secured Funding: $61.3 million  
Year of Completion: 2019  
Project Manager: Caltrain – Marian Lee  
Designer: TBD

Project Description:
Caltrain from San Jose to San Francisco will be upgraded to an electric system in conjunction with the California High Speed Rail (CHSRA) Project.

Project Status:
After an extensive period of public review, an agreement was reached which culminated in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) of project stakeholders, including the CHSRA, JPB, VTA, Samtrans, MTC, San Francisco, and San Jose to fund an electrified Caltrain system from Tamien to San Francisco and an upgraded train signal system. The capability would be there to serve a limited number of High Speed Trains in the future.

The completion date is in 2019 with implementation means still under development. The $1.4 billion program is funded by a variety of federal and state sources. VTA has committed $60 million plus an additional $26 million of state bond funds which VTA was due to receive.

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</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></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project is anticipated to be complete by 2019
## Cost Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding</th>
<th>Jun - 14 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Jun - 14 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Balance $(a-c)$</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>61,252.74</td>
<td>4,024</td>
<td>4,024</td>
<td>57,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>61,338</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,024</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,024</strong></td>
<td><strong>57,314</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Secured Funding Incurred 7%  
Secured Funding Committed 7%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

---

## Anticipated Funding (reflects only appropriated budget):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local (Measure A)</td>
<td>$61.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$61.3 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local (Meas A) 100%
Dumbarton Rail Corridor

**Estimated Cost:** $0.7 - $1 billion  
Estimated Class 3 (see appendix)

**Appropriation Through FY15:**  
$2.3 million

**Secured Funding:** $2.3 million

**Year of Completion:** TBD

**Project Manager:**  
Caltrain – April Chan

**Designer:** TBD

**Project Description:**
The project will rehabilitate rail bridges and tracks that span the bay between Redwood City and Newark and make improvements to existing tracks in Union City and Fremont. The project will involve the construction of two new rail stations at Menlo Park and Newark, as well as upgrades to the Fremont Centerville Station and a new intermodal station at the Union City BART station.

**Project Status:**

**Environmental/Design:** Based on the detailed cost estimate prepared by the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB), the project is now projected to cost between $700 million and $1 billion.

Environmental information was prepared but due to funding constraints an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was not completed. Operational funds and an operator have yet to be identified for the proposed service.

This Project is currently inactive.

**Project Schedule:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Late 2006</td>
<td>Mid 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Project development will proceed on a schedule consistent with available funding.*
Cost Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding</th>
<th>Jun - 14 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Jun - 14 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>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>2,133</td>
<td>2,133</td>
<td>2,133</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing Costs</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>2,260</td>
<td>2,260</td>
<td>2,260</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred 100%
Secured Funding Committed 100%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

Anticipated Funding (reflects only appropriated budget):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local (Measure A)</td>
<td>$2.3 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total $2.3 million

View of Dumbarton Rail Bridge from the West

Aerial view of the existing alignment
Bus Program

June 2014

Bus Rapid Transit

**Estimated Cost:** $54.1 million

**Appropriation Through FY15:**
$54.1 million*

**Secured Funding:** $54.1 million*

**Year of Completion:** TBD

**Project Manager:**
Chris Augenstein, Mohamed Basma

**Designers:** CH2M Hill, Parsons Transportation Group

**Project Description:**
Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) is an enhanced bus transit service that offers many of the same service attributes as rail transit, such as specialized vehicles, large stations, real-time information, and more frequent and reliable operations. VTA intends to develop an integrated BRT network throughout the County, providing high quality service to areas not served by light rail transit (LRT).

**Project Status:**
The VTA Board of Directors adopted the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Strategic Plan in May 2009. The major corridors in this program include:

- **Santa Clara/Alum Rock corridor** (Please refer to page 2-26 for details).
- **El Camino Real corridor** (Please refer to page 2-28 for details).
- **Stevens Creek Boulevard corridor** (Please refer to page 2-30 for details).
- **King Road** was identified in the BRT Strategic Plan for future (Phase II) development. However, because the BART extension is being delivered in phases, the scope for the King Road BRT project was revised as a feeder and distributor for BART patrons using the Phase I terminus at Berryessa Station. Recommendations for new routing and service configurations have been developed and will be incorporated into the BART Transit Integration Study which commenced in FY 2014. The preliminary recommendation is for a re-routing of the Stevens Creek BRT to terminate at the Berryessa BART station instead of Eastridge Mall and for this service to be augmented with a Limited Stop service running between the Berryessa Station and downtown. With the opening of BART Phase 2, King Road BRT service will be studied again and modified accordingly.

Other supplementary projects under this program include:

- **Procurement of Articulated Buses** required for 2015 service on the Santa Clara/Alum Rock and El Camino corridors was initiated in FY 2012. A contract to purchase 29 buses was awarded in February 2013 to New Flyer of America Inc. and buses are expected to arrive by end of 2014.

- **Modifications at Chaboya and North Divisions** are required in order to accommodate BRT buses. Phase I (North Yard) construction contract was advertised in March 2014 however the bid was non-responsive and was rejected. A rebid of the contract is scheduled for June and VTA Board award is expected in August. Field work is to start in fall 2014.

- Funds were included in FY12 for a new **Money Counting Facility** at Cerone Division that would provide dedicated rooms for Ticket Vending Machine (TVM) and revenue processing to support initiation of BRT service. However, the elimination of the TVMs from the BRT program has resulted in a reassessment of facility needs, and subsequent cancelation of the project.

**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>Programming</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>Late 2014</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>Late 2014</td>
<td>Early 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>

* P-0551, P-0719, P-0725, P-0783, P-0785, P-0786, P-0875
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Cost Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding</th>
<th>Jun - 14 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Jun - 14 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Balance $ (a - c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>40,500.93</td>
<td>30,863</td>
<td>1,182</td>
<td>39,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>9,481.81</td>
<td>3,472</td>
<td>3,174</td>
<td>6,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>4,148</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>54,131</strong></td>
<td><strong>34,335</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,356</strong></td>
<td><strong>49,774</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Secured Funding Incurred: 8%
- Secured Funding Committed: 63%

**NOTE:** All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

**Anticipated Funding (reflects only appropriated budget):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>State (Prop 1B) 36%</th>
<th>Federal (Other) 1%</th>
<th>Local (Meas A) 63%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local (Measure A)</td>
<td>$34.2 million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal (Other)</td>
<td>$0.7 million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (Prop 1B)</td>
<td>$19.2 million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$54.1 million</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specialized BRT Vehicle
BRT - Santa Clara / Alum Rock

**Estimated Cost:** $115.0 million

Estimate Class 1 *(see appendix)*

**Appropriation Through FY15:**
$115.1 million

**Secured Funding:**
$115.1 million

**Year of Completion:**
2016

**Project Manager:**
Ken Ronsse

**Designer:**
CH2M Hill

**Contractor:** Goodfellow Top Grade Construction

**Project Description:**
This project will provide a transit enhancement in the county’s highest transit ridership corridor from Downtown San Jose to the Eastridge Transit Center on Capitol Expressway.

The project will introduce Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) in the corridor with dedicated lanes on Alum Rock Avenue (eastern segment) and mixed flow operations on Santa Clara Street (western segment). This BRT project is being designed in an alignment consistent with light rail stations level amenities, enabling a conversion to light rail in the future, if desired.

**Project Status:**
Project environmental review was completed with the certification of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) in December 2008 and Supplemental EIR in May 2013.

Procurement of buses for this project is included separately as part of the overall procurement of articulated buses for BRT *(see page 2-24).* Construction Contract was awarded in November 2013 and field work started in March 2014 and is expected to be completed by late 2015. San Jose Water Company and AT&T started utility relocation in October 2013 and is expected to be complete by fall of 2014. PG&E started electric and gas relocation in spring 2014 and is also expected to be complete by late 2014.

**Project Schedule:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Late 2007</td>
<td>Late 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Early 2010</td>
<td>Mid 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>Mid 2011</td>
<td>Late 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Late 2013</td>
<td>Late 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Service</td>
<td>Late 2015</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td>Late 2015</td>
<td>Early 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cost Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding a</th>
<th>Jun - 14 Committed Costs b</th>
<th>Jun - 14 Incurred Costs c</th>
<th>Balance d = (a-c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>69,742</td>
<td>61,196</td>
<td>2,185</td>
<td>67,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>5,028</td>
<td>4,950</td>
<td>4,706</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>38,070</td>
<td>30,983</td>
<td>27,654</td>
<td>10,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>2,226</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>115,066</strong></td>
<td><strong>97,129</strong></td>
<td><strong>34,545</strong></td>
<td><strong>80,522</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred 30%
Secured Funding Committed 84%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

Anticipated Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local (Measure A)</td>
<td>$25.1 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (Prop 1B)</td>
<td>$90.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$115.1 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local (Meas A) 21%
State 79%
Estimated Cost: $250 million

Estimate Class 4 (see appendix)

Appropriation Through FY15:
$19.5 million

Secured Funding: $19.5 million

Year of Completion: 2018

Project Manager:
Steven Fisher

Designer:
Parsons Transportation Group

Project Description:
The proposed alignment extends 17.4 miles from SAP Center in downtown San Jose to the Palo Alto Transit Center and is an extension of the BRT – Santa Clara/Alum Rock project. BRT improvements will consist of new exclusive bus lanes, bulb outs, distinct shelters, branded hybrid vehicles and other improvements along the corridor. The project is envisioned to include 14 new BRT stations.

Project Status:
Conceptual Engineering began in May 2010 with a project environmental review, the Caltrans process, and FTA Small Starts project initiation. Different cross-sections have been analyzed and preliminary ridership and traffic projections have been developed. The environmental scoping process took place in February and March 2013 with five alternatives being studied ranging from No-Build to an alternative with a 10-mile dedicated bus lane. Based on comments received, additional alternatives were added to include more dedicated lane segments. The Caltrans review process began in February 2013. A Project Study Report has been sent to Caltrans for review. FTA has approved the project for Small Starts review to compete for a discretionary grant.

Project Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual</td>
<td>Early 2010</td>
<td>Early 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Early 2015</td>
<td>Mid 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Early 2016</td>
<td>Mid 2018</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>Mid 2018</td>
<td>Late 2018</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></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 Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding</th>
<th>Jun - 14 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Jun - 14 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>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>19,522</td>
<td>10,364</td>
<td>8,171</td>
<td>11,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,522</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,364</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,171</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,351</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Secured Funding Incurred</th>
<th>Secured Funding Committed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

### Anticipated Funding (reflects only appropriated budget):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local (Measure A)</th>
<th>$19.5 million</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$19.5 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local (Meas A) 100%

BRT Photo Simulation at Scott Blvd
## BRT – Stevens Creek

**Estimated Cost:** $145 million  
Estimate Class 5 (see appendix)

**Appropriation Through FY15:**  
$6.0 million

**Secured Funding:** $6.0 million

**Year of Completion:** 2019

**Project Manager:**  
Jody Littlehales

**Designer:**  
CDM Smith Inc.

### Project Description:
The Stevens Creek Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Project would provide a rapid transit service for 8.5 miles from DeAnza College to downtown San Jose using San Carlos Avenue and Stevens Creek Boulevard. The Stevens Creek project would add a BRT service in addition to the local service which would provide fast, frequent service, with limited stops, and enhanced amenities for passengers.

### Project Status:
Conceptual Engineering began in May 2012 and the project has created early conceptual design for the corridor and is developing the traffic and ridership projections. The project has collected existing traffic and parking data but traffic projections will help shape the final design for the corridor and what would move forward as a project alternative.

### Project Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Planning</td>
<td>Mid 2012</td>
<td>Mid 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design</td>
<td>Mid 2014</td>
<td>Late 2015</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>Late 2015</td>
<td>Late 2017</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>Mid 2018</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 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P-0715  
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Cost Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding</th>
<th>Jun - 14 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Jun - 14 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Balance d = (a-c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>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>5,673</td>
<td>4,014</td>
<td>2,115</td>
<td>3,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,008</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,049</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,115</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,893</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred: 35%
Secured Funding Committed: 67%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000’s

Anticipated Funding (reflects only appropriated budget):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Federal 12%</th>
<th>Local (VTA) 2%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local (Measure A)</td>
<td>$5.2 million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$0.7 million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (VTA)</td>
<td>$0.1 million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6.0 million</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Typical BRT Station
San Jose Mineta Airport People Mover

Estimated Cost: TBD

Appropriation Through FY15:
$4.0 million

Secured Funding:
$4.0 million

Year of Completion: TBD

Project Manager:
City of San Jose – Laura Stuchinsky
VTA – Chris Augenstein

Designer: TBD

Project Description:
The Airport People Mover Project will provide a dedicated guideway connection from the San Jose International Airport to the Caltrain, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) and future BART stations at the Santa Clara Transit Center, and the VTA Light Rail on North First Street.

Project Status:
The original preferred option, a tunnel under the airport, proved to be cost-prohibitive given both available funds and anticipated ridership. The City of San Jose envisioned a Personal Rapid Transit (PRT) application to meet this need given its reported low cost to construct and operate. They engaged a team of consultants including ARUP to lead planning, and a federally funded research center firm, Aerospace, to assess the viability of PRT technology for the San Jose Mineta International Airport People Mover Connection. The study found that PRT technology is not ready for a public application of this scale.

Project Schedule:
The schedule for future activities will be established once funding is secured.
### Cost Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding (a)</th>
<th>Jun - 14 Committed Costs (b)</th>
<th>Jun - 14 Incurred Costs (c)</th>
<th>Balance (d = a - c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>4,021</td>
<td>2,061</td>
<td>2,046</td>
<td>1,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>4,021</td>
<td>2,061</td>
<td>2,046</td>
<td>1,975</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred 51%
Secured Funding Committed 51%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

### Anticipated Funding (reflects only appropriated budget):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local (Measure A)</td>
<td>$4.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4.0 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following projects are either closed upon completion of scope, transfer of scope to other projects, or are inactive:

### Palo Alto Intermodal Transit Center

**Project Description:** This project will create an intermodal facility for trains, buses, bicycles, autos and pedestrians, and act as a gateway to both Downtown Palo Alto and Stanford University. This project is inactive as significant issues related to the High Speed Rail project will need to be resolved before further planning work can proceed for this project.

**Final Cost:** $0.21 million  
**Year of Completion:** NA  
**Project Code:** P-0529

### ACE Upgrades

**Project Description:** ACE provides weekday commuter service between Stockton and San Jose to three stations in Santa Clara County: Great America, Santa Clara and Downtown San Jose. A $10 million Measure A contribution to the $26 million Santa Clara Station project was approved and included in the Caltrain Service Upgrades project for improvements to the Santa Clara Station to allow ACE trains to stop at the station. Work was completed in 2012.

**Final Cost:** $10.0 million  
**Year of Completion:** 2013  
**Project Code:** P-0590

### Low Floor Light Rail Vehicles

**Project Description:** VTA purchased 70 low floor light rail vehicles to serve the entire VTA Light Rail system. Low floor vehicles provide enhanced ADA accessibility and improved service by minimizing boarding and exit times for all riders. Low floor light rail vehicles eliminate the need for wheelchair lifts and enhance access for all VTA riders, as well as providing additional space for bicycles. Project is closed.

**Final Cost:** $200.6 million  
**Year of Completion:** 2004  
**Project Code:** P-0447

### ZEB Demonstration and Facility Improvements

**Project Description:** VTA procured three 40-foot low-floor zero-emission fuel-cell bus (ZEB) to comply with California Air Resources Board’s (CARB) regulation to reduce nitrogen oxide and particulate matter emitted by public transit buses. Facilities were modified, hydrogen fueling station was installed, and training was provided for staff, emergency responders and others. The three ZEBs started revenue service in February 2005. Project is closed.

**Final Cost:** $19.5 million  
**Year of Completion:** 2005  
**Project Codes:** P-0336, P-0449, P-0597

### Highway 17 Bus Service Improvements

**Project Description:** VTA reimbursed Santa Cruz Metro $2.5 million for the procurement of five buses necessary to operate service between Santa Cruz, Scotts Valley, and Downtown San Jose. These buses replaced existing buses that are 20 years old, with an average of 950,000 miles each. The five buses went into service in March/April 2011. Project is closed.

**Final Cost:** $2.5 million  
**Year of Completion:** 2011  
**Project Code:** P-0589

### Caltrain South County

**Project Description:** Original scope included 8 miles of double tracking on the existing Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) corridor between San Jose and Gilroy to increase Caltrain capacity. On June 11, 2013, California Transportation Commission (CTC) took action to de-allocate remaining funds to Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC). Hence, this Project was closed.

**Final Cost:** $17.6 million  
**Year of Completion:** NA  
**Project Codes:** P-0550, P-0553
Figure 1 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.
DISTRIBUTIONAL
SANTA CLARA VALLY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

A ½ CENT TRANSIT SALES TAX

To:

- Connect BART to Milpitas, San Jose, Santa Clara;
- Build rail connection from San Jose International Airport to BART, Caltrain, light rail;
- Purchase vehicles for disabled access, senior safety, clean air buses;
- Provide light rail throughout Santa Clara County;
- Expand, electrify Caltrain;
- Increase rail, bus service.

Shall Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority enact a ½ cent sales tax for 30 years beginning 4/1/06 when current tax expires, with annual audits published in local newspapers and an independent citizens watchdog committee?

COMPLETE TEXT OF MEASURE A

Shall the Board of Directors of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) be authorized to enact a retail transactions and use tax ordinance imposing (a) a tax for the privilege of selling tangible personal property at retail upon every retailer in Santa Clara County, the territory of VTA; such tax to be at the rate of one-half of one percent of the gross receipts of the retailer from the sale of all tangible personal property sold by him at retail in the territory of VTA, and (b) a complimentary tax upon the storage, use, or other consumption in Santa Clara County, the territory of VTA; such tax to be at the rate of one-half of one percent of the sales price of the property whose storage, use, or other consumption is subject to the tax, such taxes to be imposed for a period not to exceed 30 years, and to take effect only upon the expiration of the current County of Santa Clara 1996 Measure B ½ cent sales tax in April, 2006, and to be used only to:

- Extend BART from Fremont through Milpitas to Downtown San Jose and the Santa Clara Caltrain Station, specifically,
  To build a BART Extension from Fremont to Milpitas, San Jose and Santa Clara with a major connection to the Tasman Light Rail line at the Milpitas BART Station. In San Jose to include a BART subway section with stations at San Jose State University, the new San Jose City Hall, Downtown San Jose at Market Street, San Jose Arena and the Diridon Multimodal Station connecting to Caltrain, ACE, Amtrak, the Vasona Light Rail line and VTA bus service. In Santa Clara, to serve Santa Clara University, and the Caltrain Station with a
people mover connection to San Jose International Airport.

- **Provide Connections from San Jose International Airport to BART, Caltrain and the VTA Light Rail, specifically,**
  
  To build a people mover rail line connecting the airport passenger terminals directly with BART, Caltrain and the VTA Light Rail line.

- **Extend Light Rail from Downtown San Jose to the East Valley by**
  
  Building a Downtown/East Valley Light Rail line from downtown San Jose serving the new San Jose City Hall and San Jose State University, out Santa Clara Street to Capitol Avenue to join the Capitol Light Rail line then south to Eastridge Shopping Center.

- **Purchase Low Floor Light Rail Vehicles, specifically**
  
  To better serve disabled, seniors and others; purchase an additional 20 low floor light rail vehicles to join the 30 low floor vehicles now being constructed for the new Tasman, Capitol and Vasona Light Rail lines and 50 new low floor vehicles to replace VTA's existing 50 light rail vehicles.

- **Improve Caltrain: Double Track to Gilroy and Electrify from Palo Alto to Gilroy**
  
  Extend the Caltrain double track from the San Jose Tamien Station through Morgan Hill to Gilroy. Provide VTA's funds for the partnership with San Francisco and San Mateo counties to electrify Caltrain from San Francisco to Gilroy.

- **Increase Caltrain Service, specifically**
  
  Purchase new locomotive train sets for increased Caltrain service in Santa Clara County from Gilroy to Palo Alto and provide additional facilities to support the increased service.

- **Construct a New Palo Alto Intermodal Transit Center**
  
  In partnership with the City of Palo Alto and Stanford University, design and construct a new parkway and underpass for University Avenue from the campus to downtown Palo Alto to improve bicycle, pedestrian and transit access to the campus, Palo Alto Caltrain station and downtown Palo Alto. Upgrade passenger facilities at the historic Palo Alto Caltrain station, upgrade transit facilities for VTA, SAMTRANS, Dumbarton Express and the Stanford Marguerita and Palo Alto shuttle services.

- **Improve Bus Service in Major Bus Corridors**
  
  For VTA Line 22 (Palo Alto to Eastridge Center) and the Stevens Creek Boulevard Corridor, purchase new low floor articulated buses. Improve bus stops and major passenger transfer points and provide bus queue jumping lanes at intersections to permit buses quick access along the corridors.

- **Upgrade Altamont Commuter Express (ACE)**
  
  Provide VTA's matching funds for additional train sets, passenger facilities and service upgrades for the ACE Commuter Service from San Joaquin and Alameda Counties.
• **Improve Highway 17 Express Bus Service**
  Provide VTA's share of funds for the partnership with the Santa Cruz County Transit District for additional buses and service upgrades for the Highway 17 Express Bus Service.

• **Connect Caltrain with Dumbarton Rail Corridor**
  Provide VTA's share of matching funds for a partnership with Alameda and San Mateo counties for the rebuilding of the Dumbarton Rail Corridor to connect to Caltrain and train sets for this new service conditioned on Alameda and San Mateo County's funding.

• **Purchase Zero Emission Buses and Construct Service Facilities**
  Provide funds to supplement federal funds to expand and replace existing VTA diesel bus fleet from current size of just over 500 vehicles to 750 vehicles with the new zero emission buses and to provide maintenance facilities for this new, clean vehicle propulsion system. All new buses to be low floor for easier boarding by seniors and the disabled.

• **Develop New Light Rail Corridors**
  Provide capital funds for at least two new future light rail corridors to be determined by Major Investment Studies (MIS). Potential corridors include: Sunnyvale/Cupertino; Santa Teresa/Coyote Valley; Downtown/East Valley Connection to Guadalupe Line; Stevens Creek Boulevard; North County/Palo Alto; Winchester/Vasona Junction; and, initial study of BART connection from Santa Clara through Palo Alto to San Mateo County.

• **Fund Operating and Maintenance Costs for Increased Bus, Rail and Paratransit Service**
  Provide revenue to ensure funding, to at least 2014, and possibly longer, of the following: the new Tasman East, Capitol and Vasona Light Rail lines, the commuter rail connection to BART, expanded paratransit services, expanded bus fleet of 750 vehicles, the Downtown/East Valley Light Rail line operations, which can commence in 2008, and the BART extension to San Jose which can commence operations by 2010;

All subject to the following mandatory requirements:

• **The Tax Must Expire 30 Years After Implementation.**
  If approved by the voters, this half-cent sales tax must expire 30 years after implementation. The tax will be imposed for the period commencing April 1, 2006 when current tax expires and terminate on March 31, 2036. The length of this tax cannot be extended without a vote – and the approval – of the residents of Santa Clara County.

• **An Independent Citizen's Watchdog Committee Must Review all Expenditures.**
  The Independent Citizen’s Watchdog Committee will consist of private citizens, not elected officials, who comprise the VTA’s Citizen’s Advisory Committee. Responsibilities of the Citizen’s Watchdog Committee are:
  - Public Hearings and Reports: The Committee will hold public hearings and issue reports on at least an annual basis to inform Santa Clara County residents how the
funds are being spent. The hearings will be held in full compliance with the Brown Act, California’s open meeting law with information announcing the hearings well-publicized and posted in advance.

- Annual Independent Audits: An annual audit conducted by an independent Auditor will be done each fiscal year to ensure tax dollars are being spent in accordance with the intent of this measure.

- Publish results of Audits and Annual Reports: The Committee must publish the results of the Independent Auditor and the Annual Report in local newspapers. In addition, copies of these documents must be made available to the public at large.

such authorization being pursuant to the provisions of Sections 100250 et seq. of the public Utilities Code and Sections 7251 et seq. of the Revenue and Taxation Code.
### Figure 1.3

**Funds Outgoing From Measure A:**
Local Program Reserve Projects Receiving Measure A Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>LPR Funds Allocated By Board (000s)</th>
<th>Expended to Date (000s)</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Status Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>$7,244</td>
<td>$5,706</td>
<td>US 101 Improvements (280/680 to Yerba Buena)</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>$15,030</td>
<td>$14,788</td>
<td>US 101 Improvements (85 to Embarcadero)</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>I-880/I-280/Stevens Creek Interchange</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>$4,900</td>
<td>$4,914</td>
<td>US 101/SR-25 Interchange</td>
<td>Env./PA/ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTA/ACCMA</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$7,998</td>
<td>I-680 Sunol Grade HOV/HOT Lane</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,497</td>
<td>SR-87 HOV North &amp; South - Cost Increase</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>$555</td>
<td>$264</td>
<td>SR-152/SR-156 Interchange - Cost Increase</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>$6,725</td>
<td>$6,725</td>
<td>Gilroy/Arroyo Circle/Arroyo Camino Improvements</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>$524</td>
<td>$524</td>
<td>Mathilda Ave Caltrain Bridge Reconstruction</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCounty</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>$342</td>
<td>ITS Enhancements on Bascom Ave</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>$2,510</td>
<td>$2,510</td>
<td>Batterfield Blvd Extension Project</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCounty</td>
<td>$275</td>
<td>$268</td>
<td>Santa Teresa/Fitzgerald Ave Intersection Signals</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saratoga</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Citywide Signal Upgrade Project Phase 2</td>
<td>Not initiated yet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCounty</td>
<td>$315</td>
<td>$315</td>
<td>Alum Rock School District Area Traffic Calming</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>US101/Mathilda Ave/SR237 IC</td>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>$5,076</td>
<td>$5,076</td>
<td>Julian/St. James Downtown Couplet Conversion</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTA/SBCOG</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$3,737</td>
<td>SR-152 New Alignment</td>
<td>Pre-PA/ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milpitas</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Tasman East LRT Landscaping</td>
<td>Not initiated yet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>$5,876</td>
<td>$3,056</td>
<td>US 101/Capitol Expwy and Yerba Buena Int. Imp.</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>$7,205</td>
<td>$5,894</td>
<td>US 101 Express Lanes</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>$2,550</td>
<td>$1,558</td>
<td>SR 237 Express Lanes-Phase II Extension</td>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>$105</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>SR87 South Landscaping</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>$683</td>
<td>I-80/Foothill Expwy Ramp Imp.</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>US 101 SB Off-Ramp to SR-87</td>
<td>Pre-PA/ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>$54</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>Caltrans PID Work - US 101/De La Cruz/Trimble</td>
<td>Pre-PA/ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>$46</td>
<td>$46</td>
<td>Caltrans PID Work - El Camino Real/SR237</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
<td>$1,175</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>California Ave Transit Hub</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTA/Caltrans</td>
<td>$2,200</td>
<td>$453</td>
<td>Combined Landscape Maintenance</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>$18,950</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Express Lanes: SR237/SR85/US101</td>
<td>PA/ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>I-680 Corridor Study (Calaveras to US 101)</td>
<td>Not initiated yet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>I-280 Corridor Study (US101/I680 IC to Page Mill)</td>
<td>Not initiated yet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>I-280/Winchester Off Ramp Environmental Phase</td>
<td>Not initiated yet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unprogrammed LPR - TBD</td>
<td>Unprogrammed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS** $122,480 $87,536
### Funds Incoming To Measure A: Projects Receiving STIP Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Programmed by Board (000s)</th>
<th>Received to Date (000s)</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Status Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>$57,540</td>
<td>$23,682</td>
<td>Capitol Expressway LRT Extension</td>
<td>ROW/ Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>$50,440</td>
<td>$50,440</td>
<td>VTA BART to San Jose - Berryessa Extension</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>$14,500</td>
<td>$14,500</td>
<td>VTA BART to Silicon Valley - Santa Clara Extension</td>
<td>PA/ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$122,480</strong></td>
<td><strong>$88,622</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>Key Accomplishment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P 0728: VTA’s Silicon Valley Extension Project (C700)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor: Skanska Shimmick Herzog Construction</td>
<td>Approved Budget: $888.06M</td>
<td>Contract Completion: October 2016</td>
<td>During this report period, the BART Silicon Valley Berryessa Extension (SVBX) Line Track Station and System (LTSS) contractor accomplished the following:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designer: Skanska Shimmick Herzog</td>
<td>Estimated Cost: $888.06M</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Achieved Ready For Construction status on 80% of the total drawings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fund Source: Federal, State, Local</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Installed the Union Pacific Railroad Line along the Great Mall in Milpitas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reopened Piper Drive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Completed the trench invert at the Capitol Avenue bridge structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Completed the Montague Expressway Bridge deck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Started concrete placement at the Milpitas Station invert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P 0728: VTA’s Silicon Valley Extension Project (C730)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor: TBD</td>
<td>Approved Budget: $82.3M</td>
<td>Construction Completion: August 2016</td>
<td>The contract for the design and build of the parking structures at Berryessa and Milpitas Stations (C730) was re-advertised on May 1, 2014 and awarded August 7, 2014.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design: WMH Corporation</td>
<td>Estimated Cost: $82.3M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fund Source: Federal, State, Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P 3128: Mission Warren Freight Rail Relocation (C103)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor: RGW Construction Construction</td>
<td>Approved Budget: $51.8M</td>
<td>Construction Completion: April 2015</td>
<td>Warren Avenue was opened in August 2014.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designer: HNTB Corporation</td>
<td>Estimated Cost: $54.5M (Mar-14 VTA Board Meeting)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fund Source: VTA, Federal, State, City of Fremont, ACTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P 0860 – Santa Clara Pocket Track</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor: Stacey &amp; Witbeck Construction</td>
<td>Approved Budget: $24.94M</td>
<td>Construction Completion: January 2015</td>
<td>Construction started in February 2014. Major track work was completed in early August 2014 and systems construction is planned for completion in November 2014.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designer: URS Corporation</td>
<td>Estimated Cost: $24.94M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fund Source: Measure A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P 0784 - Northern Light Rail Express</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designer: URS Corporation</td>
<td>Estimated Cost: $63.03M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fund Source: Measure A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P 0744 - Eastridge Transit Center</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor: Pavex Construction</td>
<td>Approved Budget: $70.35M</td>
<td>Construction Completion: September 2015</td>
<td>Construction of the new loop road was completed in July 2014 and opened to traffic. Construction of Transit Center, Bus Operators Facility and Park &amp; Ride lot to be completed by mid-2015.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designer: Rajappan &amp; Meyer Consulting</td>
<td>Estimated Cost: $68.20M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fund Source: Measure A, Federal, State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P 3203 Caltrain Safety Enhancements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor: Shimmick Construction</td>
<td>Approved Budget: $26.9 million</td>
<td>Construction Completion: July 2011 (Phase 1); Mar 2017 (Phase 2; dependent on decision/funding)</td>
<td>Construction along the JPB segment was completed in July 2011. Construction on the 15 crossings along the UPRR segment is currently on hold pending budget availability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designer: HNTB</td>
<td>Estimated Cost: $31.8 million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fund Source: Measure A; City of Mountain View</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P 3204 Santa Clara Station Pedestrian Underpass Extension</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor: TBD</td>
<td>Approved Budget: $11.4 million (Secured $3.6 million)</td>
<td>Construction Completion: TBD; dependent on funding availability.</td>
<td>Final design is in progress and will be completed in fall 2014. Construction is dependent on funding availability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designer: Biggs Cardoza</td>
<td>Estimated Cost: $11.4 million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fund Source: Measure A, Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P 0475 Santa Clara Alum Rock BRT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor: Goodfellow Top Grade</td>
<td>Approved Budget: $115M</td>
<td>Construction Completion: October 2015</td>
<td>Field work started in March 2014 and is expected to be completed by October of 2015. Utility relocation by AT&amp;T, San Jose Water Company and PG&amp;E are ongoing and is planned for completion by late 2014.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designer: CH2M Hill</td>
<td>Estimated Cost: $115M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fund Source: Measure A, State (Prop 1B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 were 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 Legislature officially adjourned the 2013-14 regular session on August 30. Any bills that were not approved by both the Assembly and Senate, and that were not sent to Gov. Jerry Brown for his consideration died at that time. The purpose of this report is to provide a summary of a number of key transportation-related measures that passed the Legislature before adjournment, and are now awaiting action by Gov. Brown. The Governor has until September 30 to complete his work.

Express Lanes: Several bills dealing with express lanes made it 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. California is in the embryonic stage of what is sure to be a substantial buildout of express lanes around the state in the near future. How these lanes are implemented and operated will likely depend on efforts currently underway within the Brown Administration to develop comprehensive managed lane policies. Discussions with stakeholders during the initial development of these policies raised concerns that local agencies may be called upon to contribute express lane revenues for the grossly underfunded State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP), which covers maintenance and rehabilitation projects on the state highway system. Because of these concerns, AB 2250 was introduced to ensure that local express lane revenues would stay in the transportation corridor where they are generated, and to
prevent Caltrans from diverting these revenues to SHOOP projects located elsewhere in the state.

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 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 lane 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.

**Clean Fuel Vehicles:** SB 1275 (de Leon) establishes the Charge Ahead California Initiative, which would be administered by the California Air Resources Board (CARB). Through a variety of incentive programs, this initiative is intended to increase the availability of zero-emission (ZEV) and near-zero-emission (NZEV) vehicles to California consumers. Under the provisions of SB 1275, the goals of the Charge Ahead California Initiative are to: (1) place in service at least one million ZEVs and NZEVs by January 1, 2023; (2) establish a self-sustaining ZEV and NZEV industry, so that these vehicles become a viable mainstream option for individual vehicle purchasers, businesses and public fleets; and (3) increase access for disadvantaged, low-income and moderate-income communities and consumers to ZEVs and NZEVs. SB 1275 requires CARB to adopt a plan to meet the goals of the initiative commencing in FY 2017. Also of note, SB 1275 makes an important change to the Bureau of Automotive Repair’s existing Enhanced Fleet Modernization Program. This program provides financial assistance to help eligible low-income consumers whose vehicles fail smog check tests to voluntarily retire their vehicles and/or replace them with vehicles meeting certain emissions and model-year requirements. SB 1275 authorizes the use of the program’s funding for “mobility options,” such as vouchers for car sharing and public transit, as an alternative to vehicle replacement.

AB 2013 (Muratsuchi) deals with the state’s Clean Air Vehicle Program. Current state law exempts certain clean air vehicles from the occupancy requirements for using carpool lanes if the vehicle displays a Clean Air Vehicle Program sticker. This exemption is intended to provide an incentive for Californians to purchase such vehicles. Under the program, the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) issues two types of stickers -- white and green. Pure battery electric, dedicated compressed natural gas or liquid petroleum gas, and hydrogen fuel cell vehicles are eligible for white stickers. There is no limit on the number of white stickers that can be issued. Vehicles eligible for green stickers are generally plug-in hybrids. State law caps the number of green stickers at 55,000. To date, the DMV has issued roughly 40,000. AB 2013 raises this cap to 70,000.

**Public Employees’ Retirement:** AB 1783 (Jones-Sawyer) extends an existing exemption for public transit workers from the requirements of the Public Employees’ Pension Reform Act of 2013 (PEPRA) until January 1, 2016, pending a ruling from the courts as to whether the act violates a provision in federal law known as 13(c).
By way of background, shortly after the enactment of PEPRA, several unions representing public transit workers began filing objections with the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) claiming that the changes to public employee retirement benefits in the new law were not negotiated and, therefore, are inconsistent with 13(c). Enacted in 1964 as part of the Urban Mass Transit Act, 13(c) requires DOL to certify that public transit agencies are preserving their employees’ collective bargaining rights as a condition of receiving federal grant funding. Inclined to agree with the contention of the unions, DOL responded by: (1) holding up grant applications submitted by California transit agencies; and (2) urging that legislation be passed to exempt public transit workers from PEPRA. Gov. Brown, however, indicated that he did not agree with DOL’s interpretation of 13(c) relative to PEPRA and said he wanted the issue to be litigated.

After several weeks of negotiations, DOL and the Brown Administration reached an agreement on a strategy for breaking the impasse. First, DOL notified the Sacramento Regional Transit District (SacRT) that it was refusing to certify one of its grants, a decision that provided an avenue for resolving the disagreement between the department and the Governor in court. Second, AB 1222 (Bloom) was enacted to exempt public transit workers from PEPRA until January 1, 2015, while the 13(c) issue got litigated. AB 1222 opened the door for DOL to begin certifying and releasing federal grant funds for California transit agencies.

When AB 1222 was crafted, it was assumed that the federal district court would rule on the SacRT case and thereby resolve the fundamental legal question by January 1, 2015. Unfortunately, the court decision has not yet occurred. Therefore, AB 1783 is needed to extend the PEPRA exemption for public transit workers for another year in order to allow more time for the legal process to play out. Without this bill, it is expected that DOL would begin holding up grant applications submitted by California transit agencies on January 1, 2015.

**Bus Axle Weight Limit:** For more than 35 years, state law prohibited the gross weight on any single axle of a public transit bus from exceeding 20,500 pounds. However, because of numerous state and federal mandates that have been imposed since that weight limit was established in the mid-1970s, including federal Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and mandated emissions reduction equipment, public transit buses may exceed that limit, especially when carrying significant passenger loads. This situation came to a head in 2011 when several public transit agencies in Southern California were ticketed by local police departments for being overweight.

In response, the California Transit Association sponsored AB 1706 (Eng), which was enacted in 2012. This measure offered a partial solution to the problem. It permanently exempted the current bus fleets of public transit agencies from the single axle weight limit, as well as any new buses procured through a solicitation issued before January 1, 2013. After January 1, 2013, and until January 1, 2015, AB 1706 allowed public transit agencies to procure new buses that exceeded the single axle weight limit under the following conditions: (1) if the buses were no heavier than the vehicles that were being replaced; or (2) if the buses were being purchased in order to either incorporate a new fleet class into an agency’s inventory or expand an existing fleet class. Because these buses would fall under the 20,500-pound limit and potentially could be ticketed for being overweight starting January 1, 2015, the Association sponsored AB 1720 (Bloom) to extend the grace period for new buses procured after January 1, 2013, for another
year. This bill passed the Legislature and already has been signed by the Governor.

In the meantime, the California Transit Association is seeking to reach a consensus with the League of California Cities and the California State Association of Counties on a long-term solution to this problem that successfully balances the need for public transit to effectively serve their communities with the interests of cities and counties when it comes to the condition of their local roadway systems. Currently, the Transit Cooperative Research Program is overseeing a national study on public transit bus weight limits because this issue, while urgent in California, does extend beyond the borders of our state. The Association believes this study, when it is completed sometime before the end of this year, will provide the framework for ultimately resolving this issue in California. Therefore, it is expected that the Association will sponsor another bill on this subject in 2015.

**Project Delivery:** SB 785 (Wolk) provides general authorization for all cities and counties, and for most special districts, including public transit agencies, 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 eliminates 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.

SB 785 is a comprehensive and complex bill. As such, it raised numerous issues as it moved through the legislative process. These issues involved the relationship between contractors and subcontractors, as well as labor arrangements for non-union contractors versus contractors with collective bargaining agreements with their skilled workforce. At this time, it is unclear whether Gov. Brown will sign SB 785. Given that the statutory authority to use design-build contracting for public transit projects expires on January 1, 2015, the Legislature also sent SB 1433 (Hill) to the Governor as a fallback. If Gov. Brown decides to veto SB 785, then it is expected that he would sign SB 1433, which extends the authority for local agencies to use design-build contracting for public transit projects until January 1, 2017. If SB 785 is signed into law, then public transit would be covered, and it is assumed that the Governor would veto SB 1433.

**Caltrans Reform:** SB 486 (DeSaulnier) modifies various processes used by Caltrans for developing and adopting a number of its long-range planning and programming documents. First, this legislation requires Caltrans to develop and submit to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) for its approval an Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan directed at achieving a high-functioning and balanced interregional transportation system. Second, SB 486 requires Caltrans to prepare an asset management plan to document the condition of the state highway system and to guide the selection of projects for inclusion in the SHOPP. In connection with this plan, the CTC would be responsible for: (1) adopting targets and performance measures reflecting state transportation goals and objectives; and (2) reviewing and approving
the plan. Finally, SB 486 requires projects included in the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP) to be consistent with the Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan. The bill also requires the CTC, when approving the ITIP, to evaluate the extent to which the program is consistent with statutorily established funding priorities.

The genesis of SB 486 is largely a recently released report prepared by the State Smart Transportation Institute (SSTI). This report was commissioned by the California State Transportation Agency to assess the performance of Caltrans and to make recommendations for improvements. The legislation seeks to remedy the following perceived problems identified in the SSTI report: (1) Caltrans lacks a strong performance management approach; (2) the programming documents prepared by Caltrans, namely the SHOPP and ITIP, are not sufficiently in line with the department’s long-term planning efforts; and (3) the SHOPP and ITIP are developed in an insular environment and, therefore, fall short of reflecting broader state goals.

**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 Gov. Brown signs this legislation, 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:** There are several measures dealing with bicycles that have reached the Governor’s desk. AB 2707 (Chau) allows public transit agencies to install three-position bike racks on their 40-foot buses. Public transit agencies in California, including VTA, have been experiencing increased ridership from bicyclists who want to use buses for some portion of their trip. However, these passengers may find themselves in a situation where they are unable to board a bus because the two-position bike rack mounted on the front of the vehicle is full. As a result, an increasing number of public transit agencies in the state want to make use of a bike rack that can accommodate three bicycles to meet this need. AB 2707 opens the door for this to occur.

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 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.

Finally, AB 1193 (Ting) was introduced to encourage the implementation of innovative bicycle facilities that have been shown to dramatically increase bicycling and improve safety in other
metropolitan areas around the country. The bill contains a number of key provisions. First, AB 1193 establishes “cycle tracks” as a fourth class 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. Second, similar to the existing three classes of bikeways defined in state law (bike paths, bike lanes and bike routes), AB 1193 requires Caltrans, by January 1, 2016, to establish minimum safety design criteria and standards for the planning and construction of cycle tracks. Finally, the bill allows cities and counties to use either the minimum safety design criteria and standards developed by Caltrans for cycle tracks and the other three classes of bikeways defined in state law, or their own criteria, if those criteria: (1) have been reviewed and approved by a qualified engineer; (2) are adopted by resolution at a public meeting; and (3) adhere to guidelines established by a national association of public agency transportation officials, such as the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO).

AB 1193 seeks to modernize bikeway design practices 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 similar 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.

Prepared By: Kurt Evans, Government Affairs Manager
Memo No. 4342
### 2014 Regular Session Calendar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>JANUARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Statutes signed into law in 2013 take effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Legislature reconvenes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Budget must be submitted by the Governor to the Legislature on or before this date.</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>
</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Last day to submit bill requests to the Legislative Counsel’s Office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Last day for bills introduced in 2013 to be passed out of their house of origin.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>APRIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Spring Recess begins upon adjournment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Legislature reconvenes from Spring Recess.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>MAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Last day for policy committees to hear and report fiscal bills introduced in their house of origin in 2014.</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>
</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Last day for bills introduced in 2014 to be passed out of their house of origin.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>JUNE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Budget must be passed by midnight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>27</td>
<td>Last day for policy committees to hear and report bills introduced in the other house.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>JULY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Summer Recess begins upon adjournment, provided that the Budget Bill has been enacted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>AUGUST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Legislature reconvenes from Summer Recess.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>22</td>
<td>Last day to amend bills on the Assembly and Senate floors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
<tr>
<td>State Assembly Bills</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 25</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Campos)&lt;br&gt;Public Employment: Social Media</td>
<td>Prohibits a public employer from requiring or requesting an employee or applicant for employment to do any of the following: (1) disclose a username or password for the purpose of accessing personal social media; (2) access personal social media in the presence of the employer; or (3) divulge any personal social media, unless it is reasonably believed to be relevant in an investigation of allegations of employee misconduct, or employee violation of application laws and regulations. Prohibits a public employer from discharging, disciplining, threatening to discharge or discipline, or otherwise retaliate against an employee or applicant for not complying with a request or demand by the employer that violates the provisions of this bill. Makes an exception by allowing law enforcement agencies to access the social media accounts of a new hire applicant or lateral transfer applicant once during the background check for a position as a sworn peace officer, if specified requirements are met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 26</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Bonilla)&lt;br&gt;Payment of Prevailing Wages</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 69</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Perea)&lt;br&gt;Cap-and-Trade: Transportation Fuels</td>
<td>Delays the inclusion of suppliers of transportation fuels in the cap-and-trade system administered by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) from January 1, 2015, to January 1, 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 194</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Campos)&lt;br&gt;Open Meetings: Public Criticism and Comment</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assembly Bills</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assembly Bills</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 243</strong> (Dickinson) <strong>Infrastructure and Revitalization Financing Districts</strong></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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 278</strong> (Gatto) <strong>Low-Carbon Fuel Standard: Food Supply Sustainability</strong></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 global 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. No later than December 2015, 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) provide incentives for sustainable fuels produced without food stock or the displacement of food crops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 471</strong> (Atkins) <strong>Infrastructure Financing Districts</strong></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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assembly Bills</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 515</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Dickinson)&lt;br&gt;CEQA: Peremptory Writ of Mandate</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 543</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Campos)&lt;br&gt;CEQA: Translations</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 716</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Quirk-Silva)&lt;br&gt;State Infrastructure Plan</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 840</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Ammiano)&lt;br&gt;Driver’s License Application Requirements</td>
<td>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 or after January 1, 2014, and at each reprinting thereafter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1046</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Gordon)&lt;br&gt;Innovative Delivery Team Demonstration Program</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1081</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Medina)&lt;br&gt;Goods-Movement-Related Infrastructure</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assembly Bills</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **AB 1193**  
(Ting)  
Bikeways | Establishes “cycle tracks” as a four class of bikeways under state law. 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 class of bikeways 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 publish 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. Allows such local agencies to use either the minimum safety design criteria and standards established by Caltrans or their own, if the criteria: (1) have been reviewed and approved by a qualified engineer with consideration for the unique characteristics and features of the proposed bikeway and surrounding environs; (2) are adopted by resolution at a public meeting; and (3) adhere to guidelines established by a national association of public agency transportation officials. | 8/21/14 | Governor’s Office | Support |
| **AB 1330**  
(J. Perez)  
Public Meetings: Translations | 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. | 8/22/14 | Senate Rules Committee | |
| **AB 1333**  
(Hernandez)  
Local Agency Contracts: Automatic Renewal Clauses | 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. | 6/26/13 | Senate Governance & Finance Committee | |
| **AB 1447**  
(Waldron)  
Cap-and-Trade Auction Proceeds: Signal Synchronization Projects | 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. | 7/1/14 | Governor’s Office | |
| **AB 1501**  
(Patterson)  
High-Speed Rail: Federal Funding | 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. | 3/13/14 | Assembly Transportation 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 1522</strong> (Gonzalez)</td>
<td>Employment: Paid Sick Leave</td>
<td>8/18/14</td>
<td>Governor’s Office</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 within a year from the commencement of employment 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 day of employment. Authorizes an employer to limit an employee’s use of paid sick days to 24 hours or three days in each year of employment. Does not require the employer to provide additional paid sick days if the employer has a paid leave policy or paid time off policy, the employer makes available an amount of leave that may be used for the same purposes and under the same conditions as specified in this bill, and the policy does either of the following: (1) satisfies the accrual and use requirements of this bill; or (2) provides no less than 24 hours or three days of paid sick leave for employee use for each year of employment. 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 from the date of separation, 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>8/18/14</td>
<td>Governor’s Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1536</strong> (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>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Public Employees, Retirement &amp; Social Security Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1620</strong> (Rodriguez)</td>
<td>California Emergency &amp; Disaster Preparedness Commission</td>
<td>4/22/14</td>
<td>Governor’s Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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>Governor’s Office</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 1639**  
(Grove)  
Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund: High-Speed Rail | 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. | 4/22/14 | Assembly Natural Resources Committee |  |
| **AB 1646**  
(Frazier)  
Electronic Wireless Communication Devices | Commencing July 1, 2015, requires the driver’s license examination administered by the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to include at least one question to test an applicant’s knowledge and understanding of the distractions and dangers of handheld cellular phone use and text-messaging while operating a motor vehicle. Commencing July 1, 2015, assesses a violation point for a conviction for driving a motor vehicle while using: (1) a wireless telephone; or (2) an electronic wireless device to write, send or read tax-based communications. | 8/5/14 | Governor’s Office |  |
| **AB 1684**  
(Chavez)  
North San Diego County Transit District: Three-Position Bike Racks | 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. | 3/28/14 | Assembly Transportation Committee |  |
| **AB 1705**  
(Williams)  
Public Contracts: Retention Amounts | Requires any finding by a public agency that a project is “substantially complex” and, thus, warrants a retention amount higher than 5 percent to include: (1) a description of the specific project; and (2) why it is a unique project that is not regularly, customarily or routinely performed by a public agency or by licensed contractors. | 8/11/14 | Governor’s Office |  |
| **AB 1720**  
(Bloom)  
Public Transit Bus Weight Limit | 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. | 6/10/14 | Signed into Law: Chapter #263 | Support |
| **AB 1721**  
(Linder)  
Express Lanes: Clean Air Vehicles | Authorizes a local agency administering express lanes to either: (1) allow single-occupant, low-emission and fuel-efficient vehicles to use the lanes for free; or (2) charge them a discounted toll. | 8/6/14 | Governor’s Office |  |
<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 1724 (Frazier) 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>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1783 (Jones-Sawyer) PEPRA/13(c)</td>
<td>Extends an existing exemption for public transit employees from the requirements of the Public Employees’ Pension Reform Act of 2013 (PEPRA) until January 1, 2016, pending a ruling from the courts as to whether the act violates a provision in federal law known as 13(c).</td>
<td>8/18/14</td>
<td>Senate Public Employment &amp; Retirement Committee</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1799 (Gordon) 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>
<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>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 1813</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Quirk)&lt;br&gt;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><strong>AB 1864</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Daly)&lt;br&gt;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><strong>AB 1970</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Gordon)&lt;br&gt;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>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 1992</strong></td>
<td>(Quirk) Very Low Carbon Liquid Transportation Fuels</td>
<td>6/5/14</td>
<td>Senate Transportation &amp; Housing Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1998</strong></td>
<td>(Grove) Vehicle Registration Fees</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Transportation Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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>5/7/14 Signed into Law: Chapter #88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 2008</strong></td>
<td>(Quirk) Transit Village Plans: Goods Movement</td>
<td>8/7/14 Governor’s Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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 Signed into Law: Chapter #88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 2013</strong></td>
<td>(Muratsuchi) HOV Lanes: Low-Emission and Fuel-Efficient Vehicles</td>
<td>6/17/14 Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increases the number of green stickers that can be issued by the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to allow certain low-emission and fuel-efficient vehicles to use high-occupancy vehicle lanes regardless of the number of occupants from 40,000 to 70,000.</td>
<td>8/7/14 Governor’s Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 2021</strong></td>
<td>(Gordon) San Mateo County Transit District: CMGC Contracting</td>
<td>6/17/14 Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>6/17/14 Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 2030</strong></td>
<td>(Campos) Employees: Time Off</td>
<td>As Introduced Assembly Labor &amp; Employment Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</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>AB 2036 (Mansoor) Orange County Toll Facilities: Voter-Approval Requirement</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>4/9/14</td>
<td>Assembly Transportation Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2040 (Garcia) Public Official Compensation</td>
<td>Requires a local agency to report to the Controller’s Office the annual compensation of its elected officials, officers and employees in accordance with reporting instructions developed by the Controller’s Office in consultation with the affected local agencies. Requires a local agency to post this information in a conspicuous location on its Internet Web site.</td>
<td>8/12/14</td>
<td>Governor’s Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2050 (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>AB 2053 (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>Governor’s Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2090 (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>Governor’s Office Co-Sponsor</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 2119 (Stone)</td>
<td>County Taxes</td>
<td>5/14/14</td>
<td>Signed into Law:</td>
<td>Chapter 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2135 (Ting)</td>
<td>Local Agencies: Surplus Land</td>
<td>8/4/14</td>
<td>Governor’s Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2170 (Mullin)</td>
<td>Joint Powers Authorities: Common Powers</td>
<td>6/17/14</td>
<td>Governor’s Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2197 (Mullin)</td>
<td>Vehicles: Temporary License Plates</td>
<td>4/23/14</td>
<td>Assembly Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</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>AB 2202 (Logue)</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Natural Resources Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2250 (Daly)</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td>Governor’s Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2280 (Alejo)</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. Provides that a community revitalization and investment authority formed by a city or county that created a redevelopment agency that was dissolved shall not become effective until the successor agency or designated local authority for the former redevelopment agency has adopted certain findings of fact. 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, beginning in the calendar year in which a community revitalization and investment authority has allocated a cumulative total of more than $1 million in tax increment revenues, including any proceeds of a debt issuance, requires the authority to contract for an independent audit with respect to the maintenance and replacement of affordable housing.</td>
<td>8/18/14</td>
<td>Governor’s Office</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 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>Governor’s Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2312 (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., unless the institute requires payment for the use of this system. 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. Specifies that this requirement does not apply if the Institute of Scrap Recycling Industries, Inc., requires payment for the use of the system. 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 selling subscribers’ information to third parties.</td>
<td>8/5/14</td>
<td>Governor’s Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2313 (Nestande) Metal Theft Task Force Program</td>
<td>Requires the Department of Justice to establish a Metal Theft Task Force Program to enhance its capacity to serve as the lead law enforcement agency in deterring, investigating and prosecuting illegal recycling operations, metal theft and related recycling crimes. Also allows the Department of Justice to expend funds under this program to enter into partnerships with local law enforcement agencies, regional task forces or district attorneys for the purpose of achieving the goals of the program. 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 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. Sunsets the provisions of the bill on January 1, 2020.</td>
<td>8/4/14</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2355 (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>Governor’s Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.21.a
<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 2398 (Levine)</td>
<td>Vehicles: Pedestrians and Bicyclists</td>
<td>Until January 1, 2020, establishes penalties for a driver convicted of violating any statutory rule of the road that is punishable as an infraction and, as a result of that violation, proximately causes bodily injury or great bodily injury to a “vulnerable road user.” Defines “vulnerable road user” as: (1) a pedestrian, including a highway construction or maintenance worker; (2) a person on horseback; (3) a person operating equipment other than a motor vehicle, including a bicycle, in-line skates, roller skates, a scooter, or a skateboard; (4) a person operating or using a farm tractor; (5) a person on an electronic personal assistive mobility device, such as a Segway; or (6) a person in a wheelchair.</td>
<td>8/19/14</td>
<td>Governor’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2445 (Chau)</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2447 (Cooley)</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2471 (Frazier)</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: (1) the extra work is performed; and (2) the original contractor has submitted documentation setting forth the reasons and providing sufficient support that a fair and equitable adjustment in the contractor’s compensation or time for performance, or both is warranted. Requires an original contractor to respond promptly to a request from an authorized representative of a public entity for documentation necessary to warrant 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 setting forth the reasons and providing sufficient support to warrant that the change order be issued. 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>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 2565 (Muratsuchi)</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 a parking space allotted for the lessee 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>8/19/14</td>
<td>Governor’s Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2650 (Conway)</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Transportation Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2651 (Linder)</td>
<td>Effective January 1, 2016, prohibits vehicle weight fee revenues from being used to pay debt service on transportation general obligation bonds.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Transportation Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2652 (Linder)</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>3/28/14</td>
<td>Assembly Budget 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>
</tbody>
</table>
| **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 | Governor’s Office | Support |
| **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 or revise the Constitution. Permits a proposed amendment or revision to the state Constitution to be approved by a simple majority vote if its sole effect is to reverse one or more changes that were made to the Constitution by a previous amendment or revision that was adopted by a simple majority vote. | 8/21/14 | 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 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 |  |
<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>HR 29 (Gomez) Outsourcing of Public Services and Assets</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>4/3/14</td>
<td>Adopted by the Assembly</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 1 (Steinberg)</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><strong>SB 11</strong> (Pavley) 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>
<td>Support</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>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 263 (Monning)</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>SB 391 (DeSaulnier)</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>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 486**  
(DeSaulnier)  
Caltrans:  
Interregional  
Transportation  
Strategic Plan and  
SHOPP Asset  
Management Plan | Commencing with the update to the California Transportation Plan that is required on or before December 31, 2020, authorizes the California Transportation Commission (CTC), in cooperation 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 June 30, 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 Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan to be consistent with the California Transportation Plan. In consultation with the CTC, requires Caltrans to prepare a robust asset management plan to guide the selection of projects for the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP). Defines “asset management plan” to mean a document assessing the health and condition of the state highway system with which Caltrans is able to determine the most effective way to apply the state’s limited resources. In connection with the asset management plan, requires the CTC to: (1) adopt targets and performance measures reflecting state transportation goals and objectives; and (2) review and approve the plan. Requires Caltrans to prepare the SHOPP based on the asset management plan. At a minimum, requires Caltrans to specify for each project included in the SHOPP the capital and support budget, as well as a projected delivery date for each of the following project components: (1) completion of project approval and environmental documents; (2) preparation of plans, specifications and estimates; (3) acquisition of right-of-way; and (4) construction. Requires projects included in the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (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. When approving the ITIP, requires the CTC to evaluate the extent to which the program is consistent with statutorily established funding priorities. Prohibits projects from being included in the ITIP without a project study report or major investment study. | 8/21/14 | Governor’s Office |
| **SB 556**  
(Padilla)  
Contractor  
Disclosures | Prohibits a non-governmental entity that contracts to perform public health and safety labor or services 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. Applies to such labor or services provided pursuant to a contract entered into on or after January 1, 2015. Prohibits a public agency from requiring an employee of a non-governmental entity providing public health and safety labor or services under contract with the public agency to wear a badge containing the logo of the public agency. Prohibits a non-governmental entity contracting to perform public health and safety labor or services for a public agency to require its employees to wear a badge containing the logo of the public agency. Defines “public health and safety labor or services” to mean fire protection services, rescue services, emergency medical services, hazardous material emergency response services, and ambulance services. | 8/21/14 | 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 592</strong> (Lieu)</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 605</strong> (Lara)</td>
<td>Short-Lived Climate Pollutants</td>
<td>By January 1, 2016, requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to complete a comprehensive strategy to reduce emissions of short-lived climate pollutants in the state. In developing this strategy, requires CARB to do all of the following: (1) complete an inventory of sources and emissions of short-lived climate pollutants in California based on available data; (2) identify research needs to address any data gaps; (3) identify existing and potential new control measures to reduce emissions from any sector identified by CARB; (4) prioritize the development of new measures for short-lived climate pollutants that offer co-benefits by improving water quality or reducing other air pollutants that impact community health and benefit disadvantaged communities; and (5) coordinate with other state agencies and air districts to develop and implement measures identified as part of the comprehensive strategy.</td>
<td>8/18/13</td>
<td>Governor’s Office</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>Eliminates numerous existing individual agency statutes. Instead, enacts one general statute providing local agencies with the authority, until January 1, 2025, to utilize design-build contracting for any public works project exceeding $1 million in cost, except for projects on the state highway system. Prohibits design-build-operate contracts. Defines “local agency” to mean the following: (1) a city or county; (2) a special district that operates wastewater facilities, solid waste management facilities, water recycling facilities, or fire protection facilities; or (3) any transit district, including municipal operators, county transportation commission, or any other local or regional agency that is responsible for the construction of transit projects. Establishes 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 proposals; and (3) award the design-build contract by using either low bid or best value. Requires a local agency to develop guidelines for a standard organizational conflict-of-interest policy in connection with design-build projects. Prohibits a design-build entity from being prequalified or shortlisted unless it provides an enforceable commitment to the local agency that the entity and its subcontractors at every tier will use a skilled and trained workforce to perform all work on the project that falls within an apprenticeable occupation in the building and construction trades. Requires the design-build entity to provide payment and performance bonds for the project in the form and in the amount required by the local agency, and issued by a California admitted surety. Prohibits the amount of the payment bond from being less than the amount of the performance bond. Requires a design-build contract to provide errors and omissions insurance coverage for the design elements of the project. Prohibits retention proceeds withheld by a local agency from the design-build entity from exceeding 5 percent if a performance and payment bond, issued by an admitted surety insurer, is required in the solicitation of bids.</td>
<td>8/13/14</td>
<td>Governor’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 792 (Padilla)</td>
<td>Public Contracts: Corrosion Prevention and Mitigation Work</td>
<td>By January 1, 2016, requires the Department of Industrial Relations, in consultation with the Department of Toxic Substances Control, to adopt standards for the performance of corrosion prevention and mitigation work on public projects that reflect industry best practices. Requires such industry best practices to include all of the following: (1) use of trained and certified personnel for surface preparation and application of preventive coatings and linings to steel and concrete surfaces; (2) use of inspectors to ensure best practices and standards are met; and (3) a plan to prevent environmental degradation, including careful handling and containment of hazardous materials such as lead paint. Provides that a public entity that awards a contract for construction, alteration, demolition, installation, repair, or maintenance work after January 1, 2017, that is paid for in whole or in part with state funds must require all contractors and subcontractors performing corrosion prevention and mitigation work to comply with the standards adopted by the Department of Industrial Relations.</td>
<td>8/30/14</td>
<td>Governor’s Office</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 893 (Hill) Automated License Plate Recognition Systems</td>
<td>Requires an operator of an automated license plate recognition (ALPR) system to do all of the following: (1) make sure that the information collected is protected with reasonable operational, administrative, technical, and physical safeguards to ensure its confidentiality and integrity; (2) implement and maintain reasonable security procedures and practices appropriate for the nature of the information collected in order to protect it from unauthorized access, destruction, use, modification, or disclosure; and (3) implement and maintain a usage and privacy policy in order to ensure that the information collected is consistent with respect for individuals' privacy and civil liberties. Prohibits an operator of an ALPR system from collecting license plate data when a license plate number is not in public view. In addition to any other sanctions, penalties or remedies provided under current law, allows an individual who has been harmed by a violation under the provisions of this bill to bring a civil action in any court of competent jurisdiction against a person who knowingly caused that violation.</td>
<td>5/29/14</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 901 (Vidak) 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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 902 (Vidak) 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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 903 (Vidak) 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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 904 (Vidak) 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>
<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 918</strong></td>
<td>Caltrans: Asset Management, Records Retention and Claims</td>
<td>5/7/14</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 935</strong></td>
<td>Minimum Wage</td>
<td>5/27/14</td>
<td>Assembly Labor &amp; Employment Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 969</strong></td>
<td>Megaprojects</td>
<td>8/19/14</td>
<td>Governor’s Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(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. Specifies that the provisions in the bill related to risk management and a peer review group are deemed to have been satisfied if the public agency is required to undertake similar activities for a megaproject by a federal or state entity.</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 983 (Hernandez) Express Lanes</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>8/4/14</td>
<td>Assembly Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 990 (Vidak) Transportation Funds; Disadvantaged Small Communities</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>4/21/14</td>
<td>Senate Transportation &amp; Housing 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 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>Governor’s Office</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 1077**  
(DeSaulnier)  
Road Usage Charge Pilot Program | In consultation with the secretary of the California State Transportation Agency, requires the chair of the California Transportation Commission (CTC) to create a technical advisory committee 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 technical advisory committee to study road usage charge (RUC) alternatives to the gas tax. Requires the technical advisory committee to make recommendations to the secretary of the Transportation Agency on the design of a pilot program to test alternative RUC approaches, and the criteria to be used to evaluate the program. In developing these recommendations, requires the technical advisory committee 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; and (8) public and private agency access, including law enforcement, to data collected and stored for purposes of the RUC to ensure individual privacy rights are protected pursuant to the California Constitution. Based on the recommendations of the technical advisory committee, requires the 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 RUC 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 June 30, 2018, requires the Transportation Agency to prepare and submit a report of its findings based on the results of the pilot program to the technical advisory committee, 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. | 8/21/14 | Governor’s Office | Support |
| **SB 1079**  
(Vidak)  
Cap-and-Trade: Transportation Fuels | Delays the inclusion of suppliers of transportation fuels in the cap-and-trade system administered by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) from January 1, 2015, to January 1, 2020. | 8/12/14 | Assembly Rules Committee |
| SB 1121  
(De Leon)  
California Climate Technology and Infrastructure Financing Act | In consultation with the California Air Resources Board (CARB), requires the California Infrastructure & Economic Development Bank to develop and administer the California Climate Solutions Accelerator Account 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 bank. Allows the bank to accept applications for financial assistance under the California Climate Solutions Accelerator Account on an ongoing and open solicitation basis. In consultation with CARB, requires the bank 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, local reliability and resiliency, 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, including the competitiveness of California companies to achieve greenhouse gas emissions reduction. | 8/19/14 | Assembly Floor |
<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 | Governor’s Office |  |
| **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 | Governor’s Office |  |
| **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) California Clean Truck, Bus and Off-Road Vehicle and Equipment Technology Program</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) projects that support greater commercial motor vehicle 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>8/19/14</td>
<td>Governor’s Office</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>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>7/2/14</td>
<td>Assembly 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 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 allocate 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 the extent that revenues from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund are transferred to the TCIF, requires projects funded with these revenues to be subject to all of the requirements of existing law applicable to the expenditure of money appropriated from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund. 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. | 8/19/14     | Governor’s Office |               |
| **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     | Signed into Law: Chapter #253 |               |
<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 1253**
(Steinberg)
Initiative Measures | 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 are reasonably germane to the theme, purpose or subject of the initiative measure as originally proposed. 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. | 8/21/14 | Governor’s Office |
| **SB 1260**
(DeSaulnier)
Infrastructure Financing Districts: Affordable Housing | 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. | 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 1275 (De Leon) Charge Ahead California Initiative</td>
<td>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, including cars, trucks and buses, by January 1, 2023; (2) to establish a self-sustaining zero-emission and near-zero-emission vehicle market 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) light-duty zero-emission and near-zero-emission vehicle deployment projects eligible under the Alternative and Renewable and Vehicle Technology Program; and (3) programs that further increase access to and direct benefits for disadvantaged, low-income and moderate-income communities and consumers from electric transportation. Requires the plan to be updated at least every three years through January 1, 2023. Allows Enhanced Fleet Modernization Program funding to be used for “mobility options,” such as vouchers for car sharing and public transit, as an alternative to vehicle replacement.</td>
<td>8/18/14</td>
<td>Governor’s Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1298 (Hernandez) LA Metro: Express Lanes</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>8/19/14</td>
<td>Governor’s Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1312 (Steinberg) CTC: Annual Report to the Legislature</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Governor’s Office</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 1360 (Padilla)</td>
<td>Rest and Recovery Periods</td>
<td>Provides that a rest or recover period mandated pursuant to state law shall be counted as hours worked.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Signed into Law: Chapter #72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1365 (Padilla)</td>
<td>California Voting Rights Act: District-Based Elections</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>8/7/14</td>
<td>Governor’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1368 (Wolk) Park-and-Ride Lots</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>6/16/14</td>
<td>Governor’s Office</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1418 (DeSaulnier)</td>
<td>Vehicle Weight Fee Revenues</td>
<td>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 &amp; Protection Program (SHOPP).</td>
<td>5/1/14</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1433 (Hill) Design-Build Contracting: Public Transit Projects</td>
<td>Extends the authority to use design-build contracting for public transit capital improvement projects to January 1, 2017.</td>
<td>8/22/14</td>
<td>Governor’s Office</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1451 (Hill) 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>
<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>SCA 4</strong> (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><strong>SCA 6</strong> (DeSaulnier)</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCA 8</strong> (Corbett)</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; 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>
</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>SCA 9</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Corbett)&lt;br&gt;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><strong>SCA 11</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Hancock)&lt;br&gt;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><strong>SCR 2</strong>&lt;br&gt;(DeSaulnier)&lt;br&gt;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: Acting Chief Financial Officer, Ali Hudda

SUBJECT: Amended and Restated Ordinance 98.1, Vehicles and Facilities – First Reading

Policy-Related Action: Yes  Government Code Section 84308 Applies: Yes

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

(a) Introduce Amended and Restated Ordinance 98.1, Vehicles and Facilities, in the form
    attached hereto as Attachment A, which updates references to relevant California statutes,
    adds restrictions that align with current issues faced by the VTA, updates references to
    the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority’s name, and clarifies the conditions
    under which third parties may use transit vehicles, transit facilities and administrative
    facilities;

(b) Consider the proposed Amended and Restated Ordinance 98.1; and

(c) Direct that Amended and Restated Ordinance 98.1 be placed on the agenda for the next
    regularly scheduled Board meeting for adoption.

BACKGROUND:

VTA staff is submitting the proposed Amended and Restated Ordinance 98.1 for a first reading
by this Board. The second reading and proposed adoption of the Amended and Restated
Ordinance 98.1 is scheduled for the November 6, 2014 Board meeting.

Originally adopted on October 1, 1998, Ordinance 98.1 served to repeal a number of prior
ordinances relating to transit security and replaced them with a single, comprehensive ordinance
regulating conduct on transit vehicles and facilities. Concurrently, the Board adopted Resolution
98.10.23 regulating vehicles operated or parked on VTA property. These were supplemented on
November 10, 1998, when the General Manager approved Regulation No. 98.11.1 (Entry Upon
and Use of VTA Administrative Facilities), Regulation No. 98.11.2 (Traffic and Vehicles
Operated or Parked on VTA Facilities), and Regulation No. 98.11.3 (Bicycles Onboard VTA Buses, Light Rail Vehicles and Transit Facilities). The regulations were amended on April 30, 1999 to correct the regulation titles by changing the word “ordinance” to “regulation.” Collectively, these documents serve as the legal foundation for regulating use and conduct on VTA’s transit vehicles, transit facilities and administrative facilities.

VTA staff is proposing the Amended and Restated Ordinance 98.1 (“Ordinance”) for a number of reasons. First, there has been a gradual increase in permitted and unpermitted third party uses of VTA properties, including private commuter shuttle operations on VTA lots and transit centers. While the current ordinance could be interpreted as covering these uses, a clearer statement relating to third party uses would be helpful. Second, certain revisions made to the California Penal Code relating to fare evasion and enforcement necessitate a corresponding update to the Ordinance. Third, System Safety and Security requires the Ordinance to align with current issues faced by VTA and to highlight certain applicable California statutes through their express addition to the Ordinance’s enforcement sections. Lastly, the Ordinance needs to reflect current System Safety and Security operating policies regarding persons with disabilities, baby strollers, charter vehicles and other similar categories.

DISCUSSION:

The proposed Ordinance is enclosed as Attachment A, and a redlined version showing the proposed changes is enclosed as Attachment B.

The following is a summary of the key provisions included in the proposed Ordinance:

Section 2. General. This section sets forth the definitions which apply to the Ordinance.

- (a)(1) defines “District.” The definition has been updated to refer to “District” as “VTA”, and to “Santa Clara County Transit District” as “Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority.”

- (a)(3) defines “Transit facility.” The definition has been broadened to include bus, trolley and rail vehicle facilities, as well as operating facilities. Reason for update: This is intended to cover the broadest category of vehicle facilities which VTA currently uses, or may use in the future. In addition, operating facilities exist, but were not captured in either “transit facility” or “administrative facility” definitions.

- (a)(4) defines “Transit vehicle.” The definition has been broadened to include rail cars and any vehicles under contract with VTA. Reason for update: This is intended to cover the broadest category of vehicles which VTA currently operates, or may operate in the future. In addition, VTA Outreach vehicles did not fall under the previous definition, and this update rectifies the omission.

- (a)(5) defines “Administrative facility.” The definition has been broadened to include property legally controlled by VTA. Reason for update: VTA leases, licenses and controls a number of properties under various real estate or operating agreements, and this new language reflects that fact.
Section 3. Conditional Permission to Use: Revocation. This section conditions permission to use transit vehicles, transit facilities and administrative facilities upon compliance with this Ordinance and applicable laws. The section has been updated to specify that the requirement applies to both permission to enter upon and permission to use. In addition, the conditions now specifically include compliance with VTA’s rules, regulations and policies. **Reason for update:** If a third party does not satisfy VTA’s requirements, then that party should not have permission to enter upon VTA property, let alone use a property. It also makes clear that a third party must follow any VTA-specific rules, regulations and policies, since those are common mechanisms by which VTA establishes requirements.

Section 4. Conditions for Passage on Transit Vehicles and Entry Upon and Use of Transit Facilities. This section lists the specific conditions for use of transit vehicles and transit facilities. The section has been updated to specify that the requirement applies to both permission to enter upon and permission to use. In addition, the following conditions have been updated:

- (b)(7) prohibits eating or drinking or possession of open food or drink containers where such acts are prohibited by sign or written notice. The subsection has been updated to provide an exception for medical conditions. **Reason for update:** Federal guidance was issued allowing passengers to eat and drink while using transit services and facilities, when in response to a medical need.

- (b)(8) prohibits the consumption of alcoholic beverages on transit vehicles and transit facilities, except in a chartered transit vehicle when authorized by VTA regulations. The subsection has been updated to prohibit the possession of open containers of alcoholic beverages as well. Furthermore, the exception for chartered transit vehicles has been deleted. **Reason for update:** Open containers and consumption of alcoholic beverages often occur together, and this update aims to prevent both. Also, VTA no longer permits alcohol on chartered transit vehicles, and this update reflects current practice.

- (b)(11) prohibits unfolded baby strollers and utility carts on transit vehicles, unless the operator determines space is available. The subsection has been updated to delete baby strollers from the prohibition. **Reason for update:** VTA operators currently permit unfolded baby strollers on transit vehicles, therefore this update reflects current practice.

- (b)(15) prohibits the transport of any animal on a transit vehicle, except for certain categories of animals. The subsection has been updated to exclude service animals in training from this prohibition. **Reason for update:** California Civil Code Section 54.2 states that service animals in training have a right to accompany their trainers on public transit.

- (b)(17) is a new subsection which prohibits urination or defecation at a transit facility or on a transit vehicle, except in a lavatory, unless the incident is a result of disability, age or medical condition. **Reason for update:** This provision exists in Penal Code Sec. 604(d)(3), and inclusion in this Ordinance is intended to highlight its applicability to
VTA transit vehicles and facilities.

- (b)(18) is a new subsection which prohibits smoking, vaping or using e-cigarettes, or carrying a lit cigar, pipe or cigarette of any type. **Reason for update:** The Penal Code contains a prohibition on smoking which applies to public transit, and inclusion in this Ordinance is intended to highlight its applicability to VTA transit vehicles and facilities. While vaping or using e-cigarettes are not currently prohibited by law on public transit, it is a growing public concern and VTA is pro-actively addressing the issue of passenger comfort through this Ordinance.

- (b)(19) is a new subsection which explicitly prohibits line-jumping to ensure that this problem can be addressed at special events where VTA passengers must wait in long lines to access transit vehicles.

- (b)(20) [currently (b)(17)] prohibits violation of any VTA notice, prohibition, instruction or direction set forth on “any District sign” which is intended to provide for the safety or convenience of transit passengers, or the efficient operation of the transit system. The subsection has been updated to prohibit the violation of notice, prohibition, instruction or direction set forth on VTA notices or signs. In addition, the prohibition applies to violations of VTA notices or signs intended to provide for the management of VTA’s transit vehicles and transit facilities. **Reason for update:** This allows VTA to not only post signs, but also provide other forms of notices regarding its requirements, so that such requirements reach the largest audience possible. The update also allows VTA to post signs or notices which are intended to maintain and secure VTA’s rights as a property owner and manager.

- (d) is a new subsection which states that no person shall knowingly give false identification to a VTA fare inspector, security officer or law enforcement officer engaged in the enforcement of any applicable federal, state or local ordinances, rules or regulations, or any applicable VTA rules, regulations or policies. Furthermore no person shall obstruct the enforcement of or citation for any violation described in this subsection. **Reason for update:** VTA fare inspectors routinely come across passengers with false identification, and currently have no recourse for this practice. This update provides fare inspectors a tool to deter such false identifications.

- (e) [currently (d)] states that transit facilities are provided solely for VTA patrons to access transit vehicles, and that no one shall obstruct or interfere with this purpose, or otherwise impede the safe boarding and alighting of passengers. The subsection has been updated to explicitly state that third parties may not otherwise enter upon or use any transit facilities without VTA’s express permission. **Reason for update:** This makes it clear that third parties, including any category of vehicles (such as private commuter shuttles), may not enter upon or use VTA property without express permission.

- (f) is a new subsection which directs the General Manager to promulgate rules, regulations and policies that govern the conditions under which persons, entities or vehicles may enter upon and use transit facilities. **Reason for update:** This allows VTA to
establish requirements which are intended to maintain and secure VTA’s rights as a property owner and manager, in particular to address commuter shuttles and illegal parking on VTA property.

Section 5. Conditions for Entry Upon and Use of Administrative Facilities. This section directs the General Manager to promulgate rules and regulations that govern the use of administrative facilities. It also conditions permission to enter upon, or use, administrative facilities upon compliance with such rules and regulations. This section has been updated to include promulgation of policies, and related compliance with policies. Reason for update: VTA requirements are often established via VTA policy. In addition, the following conditions have been updated:

- (e) this new subsection directs the General Manager, where applicable, to promulgate rules, regulations and policies that govern the conditions under which persons, entities or vehicles may enter upon and use administrative facilities. This mirrors subsection 4(f) of the Ordinance.

- (f) this new subsection prohibits the violation of any notice, prohibition, instruction or direction, on any VTA notice or sign that is intended to provide for the safety or convenience of transit passengers, the efficient operation of the transit system, or management of VTA’s administrative facilities. This mirrors subsection 4(b)(18) of the Ordinance.

Section 6. Delegation of Enforcement Authority. This section delegates enforcement authority for the Ordinance to persons regularly employed or contracted as inspectors, supervisors, law enforcement officers or security officers for VTA, and provides an updated list of applicable California statutes to be enforced. The applicable California statutes are:

- Penal Code Sections 602 and 602.1 (trespass), 640 (transit offenses), 640.5 (graffiti), 647 (disorderly conduct), and 853.5 (fingerprinting)
- Public Utilities Code Section 99170 (passenger safety and conduct)
- Vehicle Code Sections 21113 (traffic and parking), 22519 (local authority), 22521 and 22656 (parking near light rail), 22500 (prohibited stopping, standing or parking), and 22651 (vehicle towing)

This Ordinance will be submitted for a second reading at the November 6, 2014 Board of Directors meeting. Provided the Ordinance is approved, two implementation documents will be submitted for Board approval at the November 6, 2016 Board Meeting. The first document is an Amended and Restated Regulation 98.11.3, and the second document is a Policy for Third-Party Use of VTA Property. The draft regulation and policy are included as Attachment C and Attachment D, respectively, and are presented for informational purposes only. The documents will undergo additional review and comment by the Executive Team, applicable Advisory Committees and Standing Committees, before being submitted to the Board for approval on November 6, 2014.

Section 10. Minor Modifications. This new section states that for efficiency, the General
Manager, in consultation with General Counsel, is authorized to make minor corrections and adjustments to this Ordinance, including changes to reflect legislative updates and amendments. Reason for update: Makes process for making minor changes more efficient, since such changes will not require a full ordinance amendment process.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The VTA Board of Directors could decide not to amend the Ordinance, or request staff to provide additional information or re-evaluate certain aspects of the Ordinance.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

There is no direct fiscal impact that will result from the first reading of the proposed Ordinance.

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

This item was also on the Regular Agenda as an Action Item at the September meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) and Policy Advisory Committee (PAC). The item was approved by unanimous vote by both the CAC and PAC, after a brief question and answer period.

CAC committee members asked about the extent of the commuter shuttle problem, and how VTA planned to address the problem. Staff referred to the proposed Policy for Third-Party Use of VTA Property, which was attached to the item as an informational document. Staff then briefly described the current operational and liability problems relating to commuter shuttles, and outlined the proposed process for permitting commuter shuttles, and for licensing passenger parking at VTA properties.

PAC committee members noted the widespread use of commuter shuttles in the Bay Area, and asked whether there were state or other regulations regarding the idling of bus or shuttle vehicles. Staff acknowledged the growth of the commuter shuttle problem, and stated that there are regulations relating to idling of VTA buses which VTA complied with.

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

This item was approved with recommendations at the September meeting of the Administration and Finance Committee. Chairperson Chavez, Member Carr and Member Esteves recommended VTA examine ways to address loitering at VTA bus stops, via a legal framework, memorandum of understanding with the Sheriff’s Office, coordination with local jurisdictions, or other methods. VTA staff will research the options and, in consultation with System Security & Safety and General Counsel, implement the recommended option.

Chairperson Chavez and Member Carr also made recommendations regarding the draft Policy for Third Party Use of VTA Property, on the subject of commuter shuttles. Chairperson Chavez suggested an evaluation of a commuter shuttle bus company’s safety record, as well as a review of the company’s driver training methods. These conditions were incorporated into the commuter shuttle permitting provisions in the Policy for Third Party Use of VTA Property. Lastly, Member Carr requested that there be an evaluation of the commuter shuttle permitting
program after a period of implementation. VTA staff will monitor the progress and success of VTA’s commuter shuttle permitting program on an ongoing basis.

Prepared by: Kathy Bradley
Memo No. 4629
ATTACHMENT A
SANTA CLARA VALLEY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
AMENDED AND RESTATED ORDINANCE NO. 98.1
VEHICLES AND FACILITIES

Summary

This amended and restated ordinance updates references to relevant California statutes, updates references to the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority’s name, and clarifies the conditions under which third parties may use transit vehicles, transit facilities and administrative facilities.

The Board of Directors of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority ordains as follows:

Section 1. Amendment and Restatement

Ordinance 98.1 is hereby amended and restated in its entirety as hereinafter set forth.

Section 2. General

(a) The following definitions apply to this ordinance:

(1) “VTA” means the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority;
(2) “Operator” means the person who drives or is in actual physical control of a transit vehicle;
(3) “Transit facility” means any and all bus, trolley, rail and light rail operating facilities, transit centers, stations, platforms, parking lots, and areas used for transit system access;
(4) “Transit vehicle” means a bus, trolley, rail car, light rail car, or other vehicle owned by VTA or otherwise operated by, or under contract with, VTA for the purpose of providing transportation services to the public;
(5) “Administrative facility” means all buildings, structures, parking lots, and property, owned, operated, contracted by or controlled by VTA, except transit facilities;
(6) “Violate” or “violation” includes failure to comply.

(b) Any provision of this ordinance prohibiting an act shall include causing, procuring, aiding, abetting, directly or indirectly, the prohibited act, and shall include permitting a minor in the custody of any person to perform such act.

(c) For purposes of this ordinance, the singular number includes the plural and the plural includes the singular.

Section 3. Conditional Permission to Use; Revocation

(a) Permission to enter upon or use transit vehicles, transit facilities or administrative
facilities, is conditioned upon compliance with this ordinance, all applicable federal, state and local laws, ordinances, rules and regulations, and all applicable VTA rules, regulations and policies.

(b) All rights and privileges express or implied, for the use of transit vehicles, transit facilities and administrative facilities are revocable and cancelable by violation of this ordinance or violation of any applicable federal, state or local laws, ordinances, rules or regulations, or any applicable VTA rules, regulations or policies.

Section 4. Conditions for Passage on Transit Vehicles and Entry Upon and Use of Transit Facilities

Permission to enter upon or use a transit vehicle or transit facility is conditioned upon compliance with the following rules and regulations, the violation of which shall be cause for removal of a passenger from the transit vehicle or transit facility, in addition to any other penalty imposed by law:

(a) All fare media issued by VTA provide passage upon a transit vehicle in revenue service from a boarding point to the final scheduled stop at the end of the transit vehicle’s route. No passenger shall remain on a transit vehicle beyond such final scheduled stop without the operator’s express consent.

(b) No passenger on a transit vehicle, or person or entity in or on a transit facility shall:

1. Interfere with the Operator or operation of a transit vehicle.
2. Ride upon the outside or roof of any transit vehicle.
3. Throw any object from a transit vehicle.
4. Extend a hand, arm, foot, leg or other portion of the body through any window opening of a transit vehicle.
5. Place a foot on any seat of a transit vehicle.
6. Commit any act or engage in behavior that could, with reasonable foreseeability, cause harm or injury to any person or property.
7. Eat or drink or possess an open food or drink container where eating or drinking or possession of open food or drink containers is prohibited by sign or written notice, unless necessitated by a medical condition.
8. Consume an alcoholic beverage or possess an open container of alcoholic beverage.
9. Discard litter, except in receptacles provided for that purpose.
10. Take an unfolded wheelchair on a bus with an inoperable wheelchair lift.
11. Take an unfolded utility cart on a transit vehicle, unless the operator determines space is available.
12. Take a bicycle on a transit vehicle, except as permitted under VTA rules and regulations.
13. Ride a bicycle in or on a transit facility, except when bicycling in or out of a parking lot.
14. Skateboard or roller-skate in or on a transit facility.
15. Transport any animal on a transit vehicle unless: (a) the animal is a guide, service or signal animal (or a service animal in training) that has been specially trained to assist persons with disabilities and is on a leash; or (b) the animal is in a completely enclosed and secured cage or carrying case which is small enough to fit on the
passenger’s lap and the animal does not otherwise endanger or annoy other person.
16. Transport any package, bundle, object, or baggage whose contents, size, bulk, shape or nature may be dangerous, or interfere with the safe operation of the transit vehicle.
17. Urinate or defecate at a transit facility or on a transit vehicle, except in a lavatory, unless the incident is a direct result of disability, age or medical condition.
18. Smoke, vape or use an e-cigarette, or carry a lit cigar, pipe or cigarette of any type.
19. Step, jump or push into lines ahead of others who are waiting, or to evade payment of fare.
20. Violate a notice, prohibition, instruction, or direction on any VTA notice or sign that is intended to provide for the safety or convenience of transit passengers, the efficient operation of the transit system, or management of VTA’s transit vehicles and transit facilities.

(c) Transit vehicles are provided solely to transport VTA patrons, and the following activities are prohibited in or on vehicles because they interfere with passengers’ privacy or the safe, pleasant, convenient, or efficient provision of transit services:

1. Posting or distributing notices, flyers, brochures or other materials, without VTA authorization.
2. Exhibiting or displaying any merchandise or object for sale or lease or other transaction.
3. Holding meetings, performing ceremonies, or making speeches or orations.

(d) No person shall knowingly give false identification to a VTA fare inspector, security officer or law enforcement officer engaged in the enforcement of any applicable federal, state or local laws, ordinances, rules or regulations, or any applicable VTA rules, regulations or policies. Furthermore, no person shall obstruct the enforcement of or citation for any violation described hereunder.

(e) Transit facilities are provided solely for VTA patrons to access transit vehicles, and parties who are not accessing transit vehicles may not otherwise enter upon or use any transit facilities without VTA’s express permission. No one shall obstruct or interfere with this purpose, or otherwise impede the safe boarding and alighting of passengers.

(f) Where applicable, the General Manager shall promulgate rules, regulations and policies that govern the conditions under which persons, entities or vehicles may enter upon and use transit facilities.

Section 5. Conditions for Entry Upon and Use of Administrative Facilities

The General Manager shall promulgate rules, regulations and policies that govern the use of administrative facilities. Permission to enter upon, or use, administrative facilities is conditioned upon compliance with such rules, regulations and policies. The rules, regulations and policies shall:

(a) Specify persons or entities authorized to enter or use an administrative facility;
(b) If appropriate, limit the purpose for which the administrative facility may be entered or used;
(c) Establish the hours of service for the administrative facilities.
(d) If appropriate, set equipment or attire that persons entering or using the administrative facility shall have; and
(e) Where applicable, promulgate rules, regulations and policies that govern the conditions under which persons, entities or vehicles may enter upon and use administrative facilities.
(f) Prohibit violation of any notice, prohibition, instruction, or direction on any VTA notice or sign that is intended to provide for the safety or convenience of transit passengers, the efficient operation of the transit system, or management of VTA’s administrative facilities.

Section 6. Delegation of Enforcement Authority

Subject to Penal Code section 830.7(e), persons regularly employed or contracted as inspectors, supervisors, law enforcement officers or security officers for VTA shall have the duty and authority to apply and enforce this ordinance as well as applicable sections of the Penal Code, Public Utilities Code, and Vehicle Code in and around VTA’s transit vehicles, transit facilities and administrative facilities. Penal Code provisions to be enforced include, but are not limited to, Sections 602 and 602.1 (trespass), 640 (transit offenses), 640.5 (graffiti), 647 (disorderly conduct), and 853.5 (fingerprinting). Public Utilities Code provision to be enforced, include but is not limited to, Section 99170 (passenger safety and conduct). Vehicle Code provisions to be enforced include, but are not limited to, Sections 21113 (traffic and parking), 22519 (local authority), 22521 and 22656 (parking near light rail), 22500 (prohibited stopping, standing or parking), and 22651 (vehicle towing). Where permitted by law, persons regularly employed as inspectors, supervisors, or security officers for VTA are authorized to arrest persons and/or tow vehicles (as applicable) for violations of these statutes.

Section 7. Enforcement Procedures

The General Manager shall establish procedures for the enforcement of this ordinance consistent with the provisions contained herein.

Section 8. Severability

The provisions of this ordinance are severable. If any provision or portion thereof is held invalid, it shall be deemed an independent provision or part, so that its invalidity shall not affect the remaining portions of this ordinance.

Section 9. Effective Date

This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after the date of its passage.

Section 10. Minor Corrections

For efficiency, the General Manager, in consultation with the General Counsel, is authorized to make minor, non-substantive corrections and adjustments to this ordinance, including changes to reflect legislative updates and amendments.
ATTACHMENT B

SANTA CLARA VALLEY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

AMENDED AND RESTATED ORDINANCE NO. 98.1

VEHICLES AND FACILITIES

AN ORDINANCE OF THE SANTA CLARA COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT REPEALING ORDINANCES TD-4, TD-4.1, TD-5, TD-6, TD-6.1, TD-6.2, TD-6.3, TD-6.4, TD-6.5, TD-6.6, TD-6.7, TD-7, AND TD07.1, RELATING TO TRANSIT SECURITY, AND ADOPTING NEW RULES AND REGULATIONS PROVIDING STANDARDS AND ENFORCEMENTS OF CONDUCT ON TRANSIT VEHICLES AND FACILITIES

Summary

This amended and restated ordinance updates references to relevant California statutes, updates references to the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority’s name, and clarifies the conditions under which third parties may use transit vehicles, transit facilities and administrative facilities, repeals ordinances TD-4, TD-4.1, TD-5, TD-6, TD6.1, TD6.2, TD-6.3, TD-6.4, TD-6.5, TD-6.6, TD-6.7, TD-7, and TD7.1, which provide for transit security, and replaces them with a single, comprehensive ordinance regulating conduct on transit vehicles and facilities.

The Board of Directors of the Santa Clara Valley Transit District ordains as follows:

Section 1. Repeal of Prior Ordinances Amendment and Restatement

Ordinances TD-4, TD-4.1, TD-5, TD-6, TD-6.1, TD-6.2, TD-6.3, TD-6.4, TD-6.5, TD-6.6, TD-6.7, TD-7, and TD-7.1 are hereby repealed. 98.1 is hereby amended and restated in its entirety as hereinafter set forth.

Section 2. General

(a) The following definitions apply to this ordinance:

(1) “District” means the Santa Clara Valley Transit District;
(2) “Operator” means the person who drives or is in actual physical control of a transit vehicle;
(3) “Transit facility” means any and all bus, trolley, rail and light rail operating facilities, transit centers, light rail stations, light rail platforms, and parking lots, and areas used for transit system access;
(4) “Transit vehicle” means a bus, trolley, rail car, light rail car, or other vehicle owned by VTA or otherwise operated by, or under contract with, the
District VTA and which is used for the purpose of providing transportation services to the public;

(5) “Administrative facility” means all buildings, structures, parking lots, and property, owned, operated, contracted by or controlled by the District VTA, except transit facilities;

(6) “Violate” or “violation” includes failure to comply.

(b) Any provision of this ordinance prohibiting an act shall include causing, procuring, aiding, abetting, directly or indirectly, the prohibited act, and shall include permitting an minor in the custody of any person to perform such act.

(c) The For purposes of this ordinance, the singular number includes the plural and the plural includes the singular.

Section 3. Conditional Permission to Use; Revocation

(a) Permission to enter upon or use transit vehicles, and transit facilities, and to enter upon or use administrative facilities, is conditioned upon compliance with this ordinance, all applicable federal, state and local laws, ordinances, rules and regulations, and all applicable VTA rules and regulations of the District.

(b) All rights and privileges express or implied, for the use of transit vehicles, and transit facilities and administrative facilities are revocable and cancelable by violation of this ordinance or violation of any applicable federal, state or local laws, ordinances, rules or regulations, or any applicable VTA rules and regulations or policies of the District, while in or upon said vehicles or facilities.

Section 4. Conditions for Passage on District Transit Vehicles and Entry Upon and Use of Transit Facilities

Permission to enter upon or use a transit vehicle or transit facility is conditioned upon compliance with the following rules and regulations, the violation of which shall be cause for removal of a passenger from the transit vehicle or transit facility, in addition to any other penalty imposed by law:

(a) All fare media issued by the District VTA provide passage upon a transit vehicle in revenue service from a boarding point to a point not beyond the final scheduled stop at the end of the transit vehicle’s route. No passenger shall remain on a transit vehicle beyond such final scheduled stop without the operator’s express consent.

(b) No passenger on a transit vehicle, or person or entity in or on a transit facility shall:

1. Interfere with the operator or operation of a transit vehicle.
2. Ride upon the outside or roof of any transit vehicle.
3. Throw any object from a transit vehicle.
4. Extend a hand, arm, foot, leg or other portion of the body through any window opening of a transit vehicle.
5. Place a foot on any seat of a transit vehicle.
6. Commit any act or engage in behavior that could, with reasonable foreseeability, cause harm or injury to any person or property.
7. Eat or drink or possess an open food or drink container where eating or drinking or possession of open food or drink containers is prohibited by sign or written notice, unless necessitated by a medical condition.

8. Consume an alcoholic beverage or possess an open container of alcoholic beverages, except in a chartered transit vehicle when authorized by District regulations.

9. Discard litter, except in receptacles provided for that purpose.

10. Take an unfolded wheelchair on a bus with an inoperable wheelchair lift.

11. Take an unfolded baby stroller or utility cart on a transit vehicle, unless the operator determines space is available.

12. Take a bicycle on a transit vehicle, except as permitted under District VTA rules and regulations.

13. Ride a bicycle in or on a transit facility, except when bicycling in or out of a parking lot.

14. Skateboard or roller-skate in or on a transit facility.

15. Transport any animal on a transit vehicle unless: (a) the animal is a guide, service animal in training, or signal animal (or a service animal in training) that has been specially trained to assist persons with disabilities and is on a leash; or (b) the animal is in a completely enclosed and secured cage or carrying case which is small enough to fit on the passenger’s lap and the animal does not otherwise endanger or annoy other person.

16. Transport any package, bundle, object, or baggage whose contents, size, bulk, shape or nature may be dangerous, or interfere with the safe operation of the transit vehicle.

17. Urinate or defecate at a transit facility or on a transit vehicle, except in a lavatory, unless the incident is a direct result of disability, age or medical condition.

18. Smoke, vape or use an e-cigarette, or carry a lit cigar, pipe or cigarette of any type.

19. Step, jump or push into lines ahead of others who are waiting, or to evade payment of fare.

20. Violate a notice, prohibition, instruction, or direction on any District VTA notice or sign that is intended to provide for the safety or convenience of transit passengers, or the efficient operation of the transit system, or management of VTA’s transit vehicles and transit facilities.

(c) Transit vehicles are provided solely to transport District VTA patrons, and the following activities are prohibited in or on vehicles because they interfere with passengers’ privacy or the safe, pleasant, convenient, or efficient provision of transit services:

1. Posting or distributing notices, flyers, brochures or other materials, without District VTA authorization.

2. Exhibiting or displaying any merchandise or object for sale or lease or other transaction.

3. Holding meetings, performing ceremonies, or making speeches or orations.

(d) No person shall knowingly give false identification to a VTA fare inspector, security officer or law enforcement officer engaged in the enforcement of any applicable federal, state or local laws, ordinances, rules or regulations, or any applicable VTA rules, regulations or policies. Furthermore, no person shall obstruct the enforcement of or citation for any violation described hereunder.
Transit facilities are provided solely for District VTA patrons to access transit vehicles, and third parties who are not accessing transit vehicles may not otherwise enter upon or use any transit facilities without VTA’s express permission. No one shall obstruct or interfere with this purpose, or otherwise impede the safe boarding and alighting of passengers.

Where applicable, the General Manager shall promulgate rules, regulations and policies that govern the conditions under which persons, entities or vehicles may enter upon and use transit facilities.

Section 5. Conditions for Entry Upon and Use of Administrative Facilities

The General Manager shall promulgate rules and regulations that govern the use of administrative facilities. Permission to enter upon, or use, administrative facilities is conditioned upon compliance with such rules and regulations. The rules and regulations shall:

(a) Specify persons or entities authorized to enter or use an administrative facility;
(b) If appropriate, limit the purpose for which the administrative facility may be entered or used;
(c) Establish the hours of service for the administrative facilities.
(d) If appropriate, set equipment or attire that persons entering or using the administrative facility shall have; and
(e) Where applicable, promulgate rules, regulations and policies that govern the conditions under which persons, entities or motor vehicles may enter upon, use or remain upon parking lots.
(f) Prohibit violation of any notice, prohibition, instruction, or direction on any VTA notice or sign that is intended to provide for the safety or convenience of transit passengers, the efficient operation of the transit system, or management of VTA’s administrative facilities.

Section 6. Delegation of Enforcement Authority

Subject to Penal Code section 830.7(e), persons regularly employed or contracted as inspectors, supervisors, law enforcement officers or security officers for VTA shall have the duty and authority to apply and enforce this ordinance as well as applicable sections of the Penal Code, Public Utilities Code, and Vehicle Code in and around VTA’s transit vehicles, transit facilities and administrative facilities. Penal Code provisions to be enforced include, but are not limited to, Sections 602 and 602.1 (trespass), 640 (transit offenses), 640.5 (graffiti), 647 (disorderly conduct), and 853.5 (fingerprinting). Public Utilities Code provision to be enforced include, but is not limited to, Section 99170 (passenger safety and conduct). Vehicle Code provisions to be enforced include, but are not limited to, Sections 21113 (traffic and parking), 22519 (local authority), 22521 and 22656 (parking near light rail), 22500 (prohibited stopping, standing or parking), and 22651 (vehicle towing). Where permitted by law, persons regularly employed as inspectors, supervisors, or security officers for VTA are authorized to arrest persons and/or tow vehicles (as applicable) for violations of these statutes.

(a) Each operator and transit operations supervisor shall be responsible for informing his
or her passengers of the consequences of violating these rules and regulations.

(b) The Chief of Security shall have the duty and authority to enforce these rules and regulations as well as Penal Code Sections 602 and 602.1 (trespass), 640 (transit offenses), 640.5 (graffiti) and 647 (disorderly conduct) and Vehicle Code Sections 21113 (traffic and parking), 22521 and 22656 (parking near light rail). The Chief of Security is authorized to arrest persons for violations of these statutes.

(c) If the General Manager contracts on behalf of the district with a vendor to provide protective service for the District through persons regularly employed as security officers, those security officers shall have the duty and authority to protect the District’s interests by enforcing Penal Code section 640 and 640.5. The General Manager may conclude a memorandum of understanding with the sheriff, a chief of police, or the California Highway Patrol to provide these security officers with arrest powers under Penal Code section 830.7.

(d) Fare Inspectors shall have the duty and authority to protect the District’s interests by enforcing and Penal Code Sections 640(b)(1), 640(b)(2), and 640(b)(11), relating to the payment of fares. Fare Inspectors are authorized to arrest persons for violations of the foregoing Penal Code provisions.

Section 7. Enforcement Procedures

The General Manager shall establish procedures for the enforcement of this ordinance consistent with the provisions contained herein.

Section 8. Severability

The provisions of this ordinance are severable. If any provision or portion thereof is held invalid, it shall be deemed an independent provision or part, so that its invalidity shall not affect the remaining portions of this ordinance.

Section 9. Effective Date

This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after the date of its passage.

Section 10. Minor Corrections

For efficiency, the General Manager, in consultation with the General Counsel, is authorized to make minor, non-substantive corrections and adjustments to this ordinance, including changes to reflect legislative updates and amendments.
1.0 Purpose:

To establish rules and regulations for use, traffic and vehicles operated or parked at on all property owned, leased or administered controlled by VTA, including but not limited to transit facilities and administrative facilities as defined in VTA Ordinance 98.1.

These rules and regulations are established in the interest of passenger and VTA employee convenience and safety.

2.0 Scope:

These rules and regulations govern use, traffic and vehicles operated or parked on all property owned, leased or administered controlled by VTA, including but not limited to transit facilities and administrative facilities as defined in VTA Ordinance 98.1.

3.0 Responsibilities:

3.1 The Chief of Security Director of System Safety and Security or designee shall be responsible for informing people of the consequences of violating these rules and regulations.

3.2 The Chief of Security Director of System Safety and Security or designee shall be responsible for posting and maintaining appropriate signs informing people of use, traffic and parking restrictions.

3.3 The Chief of Security Director of System Safety and Security or designee shall be responsible for enforcing these rules and regulations.

3.4 Copies of these rules and regulations pertaining to use, parking and traffic regulations shall be available at the VTA Board Secretary’s office located at 3331 North First Street, San Jose, California, 95134-1906 or by calling (408) 321-5680.

4.0 Rules and Regulations:
4.1 General Provisions

4.1.1 Persons and vehicles using facilities owned, leased or operated controlled by VTA shall comply with the State of California Vehicle Code.

4.1.2 VTA is not responsible for loss or damage to vehicles or personal property left in vehicles or on facilities.

4.1.3 Vehicles, which include motorcycles and motor-powered bicycles, shall be parked within designated spaces.

4.2 Speed Limit

4.2.1 The maximum speed limit of any vehicle operating at any facility is 15 miles per hour.

4.3 Parking and Use Limitations

4.3.1 Parking is limited to 72 hours unless otherwise posted or authorized in writing by the General Manager or Chief of Security (or designee).

4.3.2 Use of parking facilities and other VTA properties is limited to parties accessing VTA transit services, unless authorized in writing by the General Manager (or designee). This limitation does not apply to parties meeting with VTA staff or attending an event hosted by VTA, VTA passengers, other transit system passengers, carpools, vanpools, members of the public conducting business with VTA and VTA employees unless authorized in writing by General Manager (or designee).

4.4 Parking Prohibitions

4.4.1 Parking so as to obstruct traffic is prohibited.
4.4.2 Parking in posted Disabled Parking areas is prohibited unless a person with a disability displays a valid license plate or placard.

4.4.3 Parking in posted No Parking areas or where the top and face of the curb is painted red is prohibited.

4.4.4 Parking in posted Limited Parking areas in excess of time indicated is prohibited.

4.4.5 Parking in Reserved Parking areas is prohibited unless authorized in writing by General Manager (or designee).

4.4.6 Parking in posted Loading areas is prohibited unless loading or unloading passengers or materials.

4.4.7 Parking in posted Visitor areas Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., excluding holidays, is prohibited unless a member of the public is conducting business with VTA.

4.4.8 Parking in posted carpool or vanpool areas is prohibited unless authorized in writing by the General Manager (or designee).

4.4.9 Parking within fenced-in areas designated for revenue and non-revenue vehicles (Exempt or E Plates) at all VTA Administrative and Operating Divisions is prohibited.

4.4.10 Parking of vehicles over 20 feet long is prohibited unless authorized in writing by General Manager (or designee).

4.4.11 Parking in more than one parking space or outside of a designated parking space is prohibited unless authorized in writing by the General Manager (or designee).

4.4.12 Parking for the purpose of boarding on/off a private commuter shuttle or similar vehicle is prohibited unless authorized in writing by the General Manager (or designee).
4.4.123 Stopping by a private commuter shuttle or similar vehicle to load or unload passengers is prohibited unless authorized in writing by the General Manager (or designee).

4.4.134 Parking on special event days, when in violation of signage establishing conditions and/or payment for special event parking, is prohibited.

4.4.145 Parking or use in violation of a posted VTA sign which sets restrictions on parking and/or use of a parking facility or VTA property is prohibited.

4.4.16 Tailgating is prohibited. This includes no open container, alcohol consumption, kegs, open flame, or grilling of food, and/or playing loud music.

4.7.17 Soliciting or advertising for employment is prohibited.

4.4.18 Engaging in sales is prohibited unless authorized in writing by the General Manager (or designee).

4.5 Penalty

4.5.1 Violation of these rules and regulations shall be cause for removal from any transit facility, in addition to any other penalty imposed by law.

4.5.2 Noncompliance with these rules and regulations is a violation of Vehicle Code Section 21113 (traffic and parking), or 22521 and 22656 (parking near light rail) and is punishable as provided by Vehicle Code Section 42001.

4.5.3 Vehicles improperly parked may be removed or towed away at the owner’s expense, as provided by Vehicle Code Sections 22519 and 22651.
5.0 Summary of Changes:

Version 3: On 11/6/14 the definition of a VTA property was amended to incorporate definitions in Ordinance 98.1. In addition:

- 4.3.2 was amended to state the conditions for use of parking facilities and other VTA properties.
- 4.4.8 was amended to designate the General Manager (or designee) for authorizing parking in posted carpool or vanpool areas.
- 4.4.11 was added to restrict parking to no more than one parking space.
- 4.4.142 was added to restrict parking by users of private commuter shuttles.
- 4.4.123 was added to restrict stopping by private commuter shuttles to load/unload passengers.
- 4.4.134 was added to restrict parking on special event days.
- 4.4.145 was added to restrict parking or use in violation of a posted sign.
- 4.4.16 was added to prohibit tailgating in park and ride lots/facilities.
- 4.4.17 was added to prohibit solicitation in park and ride lots/facilities.
- 4.4.18 was added to restrict unauthorized sales in park and ride lots/facilities.

Version 2: On 4/30/99 the header of this document was changed from “Ordinance Number” to “Regulation Number.” In addition, a regulation numbering system was implemented referencing the year and month the regulation was adopted and a number indicating the order in which the regulation was adopted that year. In section 4.5.2, the words “Penalty for” were deleted.

6.0 Authority:

Resolution Number 98.10.23, (October 1, 1998).

Amended and Restated Resolution Number 98.10.23, November 6, 2014.
1.0 Purpose:

To set forth the VTA policy for third party use of all property owned, leased or controlled by VTA, including but not limited to transit facilities and administrative facilities as defined in VTA Ordinance 98.1, in order to maintain coordination and operational control over such VTA property.

2.0 Scope:

This policy applies to all third parties who enter upon and use any property owned, leased or controlled by VTA, including but not limited to transit facilities and administrative facilities as defined in VTA Ordinance 98.1, when such entry and use is not for the purpose of accessing VTA transit services. This policy does not apply to third parties entering upon VTA property for the purpose of meeting with VTA staff or attending an event hosted by VTA.

3.0 Responsibilities:

The VTA Property Development and Management Department, known as “VTA Real Estate”, will manage all applications and documents for permits and agreements described in this policy. As needed, VTA Real Estate will coordinate with applicable VTA divisions on the review and processing of the transactions. Each applicable VTA division will be responsible for reviewing and processing applications, agreements, scheduling, permitting, and payments relating to the implementation of this policy.

4.0 Policy:

This policy sets forth the guidelines by which third parties may enter upon and use any VTA property, when such use and entry is not for the purpose of accessing VTA transit services. This policy may be implemented through specific procedures established by VTA staff which are consistent with this policy framework and updated from time to time.

4.1 Compliance With Laws. Permission to enter upon and use VTA property is conditioned upon compliance with VTA Ordinance 98.1 and VTA Regulations 98.11.1 and 98.11.2, as well as with all applicable federal, state, local and VTA laws, ordinances, rules, regulations and policies.

4.2 Administrative Facilities. Any third party entry upon and use of VTA administrative facilities, including but not limited to auditoriums, training centers and meeting rooms, requires written permission from VTA in the form of a written agreement. The form of
agreement shall be determined by VTA Real Estate based upon the specific property and nature of use.

4.2.1. Written Agreement. Written agreements shall be approved as to form by VTA General Counsel. In addition, the VTA Board of Directors will be required to approve any agreements exceeding the maximum amount, or the maximum term, permissible under Section 9-2 (c) of the Administrative Code (which on the date of approval of this policy is an amount of $100,000 and any term exceeding 3 years).

4.2.2. Compensation. VTA will receive fair and reasonable compensation for use of VTA administrative facilities, based on comparable market rates for similar uses, facilities and markets. VTA Real Estate may from time to time establish a set rate schedule for VTA administrative facilities, which will be updated periodically based on current market data.

4.2.3. Term. The term of an individual agreement may vary and shall be based upon VTA Real Estate’s assessment of the specific VTA property.

4.2.4. Insurance. The applicant must obtain insurance pursuant to requirements established by the VTA Risk Manager, which requirements may be updated periodically.

4.3. Commuter Shuttles. This section applies to third party entry upon and use of VTA property for purposes relating to commuter shuttles, including but not limited to: (i) loading/unloading of shuttle passengers and (ii) parking of individual vehicles by shuttle passengers.

4.3.1. Commuter Shuttles – Shuttle Permit Required. Any commuter shuttle which uses one or more VTA properties to load or unload one or more passengers shall be required to have a valid shuttle permit issued by VTA.

a). Shuttle Application and Permit. An applicant must submit a shuttle permit application and non-refundable fee to VTA Real Estate for initial consideration. The submittal will include information on loading/unloading locations, number of shuttles and passengers, contractor names, vehicle types/sizes, schedules, frequency of use, applicant’s safety record, driver training program, and any additional data which is necessary to evaluate the application. VTA Real Estate will route the application for internal review to determine whether the application will be approved. Upon approval, the applicant will pay the annual fee and be issued a shuttle permit. VTA will then provide shuttle permit stickers or similar displays to be placed on the commuter shuttles.
b). **Annual Fee.** VTA will receive fair and reasonable compensation for use of VTA property. VTA will determine the appropriate rate for each shuttle permit based on factors including but not limited to location, dates/times of use and frequency of use. The fee for shuttle permits which are for less than one year may be adjusted by VTA Real Estate on a pro-rata basis.

c). **Term.** The term of an individual permit may vary and shall be based upon VTA Real Estate’s assessment of the specific VTA property.

d). **Insurance.** The applicant must obtain insurance pursuant to requirements established by the VTA Risk Manager, which requirements may be updated periodically.

e). **Compliance and Coordination.** The applicant will ensure that its shuttle bus drivers adhere to any operational and/or scheduling guidelines established by VTA for the efficient and safe use of VTA properties, and coordinate with on-site VTA staff to ensure the same. In addition, the applicant will promptly update VTA Real Estate with any changes to its uses, shuttle schedules and/or routes.

4.3.2. **Commuter Shuttle Passenger Parking – License Agreement Required.** Any passenger who parks an individual vehicle at a VTA property for the purpose of boarding on/off a commuter shuttle may park only if the following two conditions are satisfied: (i) the commuter shuttle is operating under a valid shuttle permit issued by VTA pursuant to this policy, and (ii) there is a valid license agreement with VTA for parking at such VTA property. Since commuter shuttles described in this policy are hired and paid for by businesses or other entities, VTA anticipates the license agreements will be between VTA and the businesses or other entities.

a). **Initial Application.** An applicant must submit a license application and non-refundable fee to VTA Real Estate for initial consideration. The submittal will include information on number of vehicles parked, frequency of use, anticipated schedules and any additional data which is necessary to evaluate the application. VTA Real Estate will route the application for internal review to determine whether the application will be approved. Upon approval, the applicant will enter into a license agreement with VTA and pay the annual fee. VTA may choose to provide stickers or similar displays to be placed on individual passenger vehicles.

b). **License Agreement.** The form of agreement will be based on a standardized, non-exclusive license approved as to form by VTA General Counsel, as amended from time to time. In addition, the VTA Board of Directors will be required to approve any agreements exceeding the maximum amount, or the maximum term,
permissible under Section 9-2 (c) of the Administrative Code (which on the date of approval of this policy is an amount of $100,000 and any term exceeding 3 years).

c). **License Fee.** VTA will receive fair and reasonable compensation for use of VTA properties, based on comparable market rates for similar uses, facilities and markets. VTA Real Estate may from time to time establish a set rate schedule for parking spaces, which will be updated periodically based on current market data. The rate schedule will be used to determine the license fee for each applicant, which fee shall be updated and paid annually. The fee for licenses which are for less than one year may be adjusted by VTA Real Estate on a pro-rata basis.

d). **Term.** The term of an individual agreement may vary and shall be based upon VTA Real Estate’s assessment of the specific VTA property.

e). **Insurance.** The applicant must obtain insurance pursuant to requirements established by the VTA Risk Manager, which requirements may be updated periodically.

f). **Compliance.** The applicant will ensure that shuttle passengers parking at VTA properties adhere to any operational and/or scheduling guidelines established by VTA for the efficient and safe use of VTA properties.

4.3.3. **Concurrent Requests for Shuttle Permit and License Agreement.** If the applicant requests, or VTA requires, both a shuttle permit and a license agreement for the same shuttle route, the applicant shall submit the applications and make payments for both as required by this policy.

Where applicable, issuance of a shuttle permit may be conditioned upon the execution of a license agreement per Section 4.3.2 of this policy, and the execution of a license agreement may be conditioned upon the issuance of a shuttle permit per Section 4.3.1 of this policy. The applicant shall provide the necessary information for VTA Real Estate to perform due diligence on this matter.

In situations where both a shuttle permit and license agreement have been issued for the same VTA property, VTA reserves the right in its sole discretion to terminate a shuttle permit upon termination of the related license agreement, or to terminate a license agreement upon termination of the related shuttle permit.

4.4. **Special Event Parking.** This section applies to third party entry upon and use of VTA property for special event parking.
4.4.1. Special Event Dates. VTA will designate the specific dates which qualify as special event parking days, to which this policy shall apply. VTA may in its sole discretion designate and periodically update its list of special event parking days.

4.4.2. Special Event Parking Locations. VTA Real Estate will maintain a list of VTA properties which are available for special event parking, and update such list periodically. VTA may in its sole discretion designate the VTA properties which may be used for special event parking on any one or more special event dates.

4.4.3. Parking Management Contractor. From time to time, VTA may issue a request for proposals (RFP) seeking one or more parking management contractors to manage special event parking at one or more VTA properties. Based upon RFP responses, VTA in its sole discretion may choose to enter into direct negotiations with one or more RFP respondents for one or more assets, reissue the RFP, take no further action, or take other action as VTA deems appropriate. In the event one or more RFP respondents are selected to enter into negotiations with VTA for special event parking management, the following will apply:

   a). Written Agreement. A written agreement between VTA and the parking management contractor, approved as to form by VTA General Counsel, shall be required prior to the commencement of any management duties by said contractor. In addition, the VTA Board of Directors will be required to approve any agreements exceeding the maximum amount, or the maximum term, permissible under Section 9-2 (c) of the Administrative Code (which on the date of approval of this policy is an amount of $100,000 and any term exceeding 3 years).

   b). Compensation. VTA will receive fair and reasonable compensation for use of VTA properties, based on comparable market rates for similar uses, facilities and markets.

4.5. Wireless Telecommunications Facilities. Entry upon and use of VTA property for wireless telecommunications facilities is subject to VTA Policy No. CMA-RE-PL-0204, entitled “Policy for Placement of Wireless Telecommunications Facilities on VTA Real Estate Assets”.

4.6. All Other Third Party Uses. All other third party entry upon and use of VTA property, when not for the purpose of accessing VTA transit services, requires written permission from VTA in the form of a written agreement. Such uses include but are not limited to the following: construction staging, car-sharing services, farmer’s markets, parking, seasonal sales, storage, billboards and other commercial, retail, industrial or residential...
uses. The form of agreement shall be determined by VTA Real Estate based upon the specific property and nature of use.

4.6.1. **Written Agreement.** Written agreements shall be approved as to form by VTA General Counsel. In addition, the VTA Board of Directors will be required to approve any agreements exceeding the maximum amount, or the maximum term, permissible under Section 9-2 (c) of the Administrative Code (which on the date of approval of this policy is an amount of $100,000 and any term exceeding 3 years).

4.6.2. **Compensation.** VTA will receive fair and reasonable compensation for use of VTA properties, based on comparable market rates for similar uses, facilities and markets. VTA Real Estate may from time to time establish a set rate schedule for VTA properties, which will be updated periodically based on current market data.

4.6.3. **Term.** The term of an individual agreement may vary and shall be based upon VTA Real Estate’s assessment of the specific VTA property.

4.6.4. **Insurance.** The applicant must obtain insurance pursuant to requirements established by the VTA Risk Manager, which requirements may be updated periodically.

5.0 **Enforcement:**

VTA may enforce this policy by any means available to VTA in its regulatory or proprietary capacity. Furthermore, the VTA Board of Directors may adopt enforcement measures for this policy as needed.

6.0 **Definitions:**

**Administrative Facility:** The term shall have the definition set forth in VTA Ordinance 98.1. As of the approval date of this policy, VTA Ordinance 98.1 defines “administrative facility” as all buildings, structures, parking lots, and property, owned, operated, contracted by or controlled by VTA, except transit facilities.

**Agreement:** The written agreement by which VTA grants an applicant permission to use a VTA property.

**Applicant:** A third party who seeks to obtain a shuttle permit from VTA, or to enter into an agreement with VTA, for the use of VTA property.

**Commuter Shuttle:** A vehicle which is used to regularly transport commuting passengers to and from VTA transit centers, stations, or park and ride lots to business, employment or educational
locations. For purposes of this policy, a commuter shuttle does not include any shuttle which is i) operated by a public entity or ii) privately-operated on behalf of a public entity.

License Agreement: The written agreement by which VTA grants an applicant license to use a VTA property.

VTA Property: Property owned, leased or controlled by VTA, including but not limited to transit facilities and administrative facilities as defined in VTA Ordinance 98.1.

Shuttle Permit: A permit issued by VTA for commuter shuttles to use VTA property for loading and unloading passengers.

Transit Facility: The term shall have the definition set forth in VTA Ordinance 98.1. As of the approval date of this policy, VTA Ordinance 98.1 defines “transit facility” as any and all bus, trolley, rail and light rail operating facilities, transit centers, stations, platforms, and parking lots used for transit system access.

7.0 Summary of Changes:
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Amended and Restated
Ordinance 98.1
First Reading

Board of Directors Meeting
October 2, 2014
Background

1. Current Ordinance 98.1, adopted October 1, 1998
   • Replaced prior ordinances with single ordinance
   • Regulates conduct on transit vehicles and facilities

2. Ordinance supplemented by Regulations
   • Regulation 98.11.1 – Entry Upon and Use of VTA Administrative Facilities
   • Regulation 98.11.2 – Traffic and Vehicles Operated or Parked on VTA Facilities
   • Regulation 98.11.3 – Bicycles Onboard VTA Buses, Light Rail Vehicles and Transit Facilities
October 2, 2014 Board of Directors Meeting

• Proposed Action: First Reading of Ordinance

• Informational Items (No Board Action): Amended & Restated Regulation 98.11.2 and Policy for Third Party Use of VTA Property
Reason for Amendment

1. Clarify conditions for third party use of VTA properties

2. Mirror updates to California law

3. Align Ordinance more closely with certain applicable California Code sections

4. Reflect current operating policies relating to system safety and security
Summary of Key Changes

- Definitions broadened to incorporate a more comprehensive range of VTA vehicles and facilities
- Prohibitions updated to reflect current operating policies on subjects such as service animals, line-jumping, alcohol and e-cigarettes
- Applicable sections updated from California Penal Code, Public Utilities Code and Vehicle Code
Next Steps

October 2, 2014 Board of Directors Meeting

• Conduct First Reading of Ordinance
• Receive information on draft implementation documents: Amended & Restated Regulation 98.11.2 and Policy for Third Party Use of VTA Property
November 6, 2014 Board of Directors Meeting

- Conduct Second Reading of Ordinance
- Consider adoption of Amended & Restated Ordinance 98.1
- Consider adoption of Amended & Restated Regulation 98.11.2
- Consider adoption of Policy for Third-Party Use of VTA Property

Post-Meeting: Publish adopted Ordinance
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: N/A

FROM: Director of Business Services, Bill Lopez

SUBJECT: Amendment to Employment Contract for General Manager Nuria I. Fernandez, to Change the Performance Evaluation Rating Period

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Amend the employment contract for General Manager Nuria I. Fernandez to change the performance evaluation rating period from a fiscal year to a calendar year term.

BACKGROUND:

The Board of Directors appointed Ms. Fernandez as General Manager of VTA at the October 2013 Board meeting, with an effective date of December 16, 2013. The terms of her employment contract provide for annual performance evaluations, with the rating period based on VTA’s fiscal year; July 1 through June 30. The contract also provides that any compensation adjustments resulting from the performance evaluations shall be effective on the following September 1.

DISCUSSION:

Under the current terms of Ms. Fernandez’s employment contract the rating period for her first performance evaluation would cover only six and one half months of her first year as General Manager. In addition, as currently provided, during any fiscal year rating period several Board members participating in her evaluations would only have worked with her for a number of months, rather than a complete year. This is due to Board member rotation schedules occurring on a calendar year basis.
Upon planning for the scheduled performance evaluation, Board Chairperson Ash Kalra observed this lack of alignment, particularly that some Board members would evaluate Ms. Fernandez’s performance without the benefit of a full year of experience working with her. Chairperson Kalra suggested, and the General Manager has concurred, that to align Ms. Fernandez’s evaluation rating period with the terms of Board members her employment contract could be amended.

The proposed amendment simply changes the dates of the rating period from a fiscal year to a calendar year basis. Any resulting compensation adjustments would be changed from the September following the fiscal year end date (June 30) to the March following the calendar year end date (December 31). No other provisions of the employment contract would be changed.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

There would be no determinable fiscal impact resulting from this amendment.

Prepared by: Bill Lopez
Memo No. 4704
AMENDMENT TO
EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT
BETWEEN
SANTA CLARA VALLEY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
AND
NURIA I. FERNANDEZ

This is an Amendment to the Employment Agreement (AMENDMENT) between the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) and Nuria I. Fernandez (FERNANDEZ).

WHEREAS:

A. VTA and FERNANDEZ entered into an Employment Agreement (AGREEMENT) on October 3, 2013, pursuant to which VTA appointed and employed FERNANDEZ as General Manager of VTA.

B. The term of the AGREEMENT expires on December 17, 2018.

C. VTA and FERNANDEZ desire to amend the AGREEMENT to revise the provision in the AGREEMENT pertaining to the review of FERNANDEZ’s performance and compensation.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual promises and conditions contained herein, the parties agree as follows:

1. Paragraph 8 of the AGREEMENT is amended to read as follows:

“The Board of Directors shall review FERNANDEZ’s performance and compensation annually, on a calendar year basis, for the purpose of providing feedback and policy direction and for consideration of any compensation adjustments. Any compensation adjustments shall be effective March 1st. Compensation may not be decreased without the consent of FERNANDEZ.

2. Except as hereby amended, the AGREEMENT and all actions taken thereunder shall remain in effect.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have approved this Amendment to Employment Agreement as of October 2, 2014.
SANTA CLARA VALLEY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

NURIA I. FERNANDEZ

By ____________________________________________

Ash Kalra, Chairperson
Board of Directors

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

__________________________________________

Rob Fabela, General Counsel
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority

ATTEST:

__________________________________________

Elaine Baltao, Board Secretary
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Audit Committee was called to order at 4:30 p.m. by Vice Chairperson Woodward in Room 157, County Government Center, 70 West Hedding Street, San José, California.

1. ROLL CALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Chavez</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Herrera</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail Price</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry Woodward</td>
<td>Vice Chairperson</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A quorum was not present and a Committee of the Whole was declared.

2. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

There were no public presentations.

3. ORDERS OF THE DAY

There were no Orders of the Day.

CONSENT AGENDA

4. Regular Meeting Minutes of May 1, 2014

On order of Vice Chairperson Woodward and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole deferred the Regular Meeting Minutes of May 1, 2014.

REGULAR AGENDA

5. Annual Financial Audit Services FY 2014

Grace Ragni, Fiscal Resources Manager, introduced Ahmad Gharibeh, Partner, Vavrinek, Trine, Day & Company, LLP (VTD), who presented a brief overview of the staff report.

On order of Vice Chairperson Woodward and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole reviewed and received the scope of work for Annual Financial Audit Services for Fiscal Year 2014.

6. VTA/ATU, Local 265 Pension Plan Program Internal Audit

Patrick Hagan, Auditor General, provided a brief overview of the staff report. He indicated all pension options offered by the VTA/ATU Pension Plan were tested. One hundred percent of all records reviewed were determined to be properly calculated and had accurate payments.
Member Chavez noted support for mandatory training and suggested staff be trained on new products that are introduced to the market.

**On order of Vice Chairperson Woodward** and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole reviewed and received the Auditor General's report on the VTA/ATU, Local 265 Pension Plan Program Internal Audit.

7. **Auditor General's Report on the Trapeze OPS Pre-Implementation Review**

**On order of Vice Chairperson Woodward** and there being no objection the Committee of the Whole deferred the Auditor General’s report on the Trapeze OPS Pre-Implementation Review.

8. **Internal Audit Work Plan**

Cory Saunders, Deputy Auditor General, provided a brief overview of the staff report.

**On order of Vice Chairperson Woodward** and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole received an update from Auditor General Office staff on the status of projects contained in the current Internal Audit Work Plan.

**OTHER ITEMS**

9. **Items of Concern and Referral to Administration**

There were no items of Concern and Referral to Administration.

10. **Review Committee Work Plan**

**On order of Vice Chairperson Woodward** and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole reviewed the Committee Work Plan.

11. **Committee Staff Report**

There was no Committee Staff Report.

12. **Chairperson’s Report**

There was no Chairperson’s Report.

13. **Determine Items for the Consent Agenda for future Board of Directors’ Meetings.**

There were no Items for the Consent Agenda for future Board of Directors’ Meetings.

14. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Mr. Hagan announced he will be attending the American Public Transportation Association (APTA) meeting in October 2014, and will be participating in the Internal Auditors Subcommittee to share ideas and bring information back.

15. **ADJOURNMENT**

**On order of Vice Chairperson Woodward** and there being no objection, the Committee was adjourned at 5:06 p.m.
Respectfully submitted,

Menominee L, Board Assistant
VTA Office of the Board Secretary
Congestion Management Program and Planning Committee

Regular Meeting Minutes of September 18, 2014

WILL BE FORWARDED UNDER SEPARATE COVER
CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Transit Planning and Operations (TP&O) Committee was called to order at 3:04 p.m. by Chairperson Rocha 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>Xavier Campos</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnny Khamis</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail A. Price</td>
<td>Vice Chairperson</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Rocha</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Larsen</td>
<td>Alternate Member</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Alternates do not serve unless participating as a Member.

A quorum was not present and a Committee of the Whole was declared.

2. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

Roland Lebrun, Interested Citizen, provided a handout and expressed concern about Caltrain plans to remove restroom facilities from their vehicles. He highlighted the 1996 agreement stating Joint Powers Board (JPB) may replace SamTrans as Caltrains “Managing Agency,” and suggested VTA be appointed as Managing Agency.

3. ORDERS OF THE DAY

There were no Orders of the Day.

Public Comment

Mr. Lebrun provided a handout for Agenda Item #6., 2000 Measure A Semi-Annual Report Ending June 30, 2014, and expressed concern about the transfer of funds from the Commuter Rail Program to the Light Rail Program, noting Caltrains appropriation has decreased by $24.1 million.

Board Member Khamis took his seat at 3:06 p.m. and a quorum was declared.
CONSENT AGENDA

4. Regular Meeting Minutes of August 21, 2014
   M/S/C (Price/Khamis) to approve the Regular Meeting Minutes of August 21, 2014.


   M/S/C (Price/Khamis) to approve submitting a recommendation to the Board of Directors to receive the 2000 Measure A Transit Improvement Program Semi-Annual Report ending June 30, 2014.

REGULAR AGENDA

7. Upper Penitencia Creek Trail Addendum
   Ann Kalnan, Senior Environmental Planner, provided an overview of the staff report.

   Chairperson Rocha queried about the breakdown of funding for this project. Staff noted VTA will contribute 35% ($400,000); San Jose will contribute 5% ($100,000); and One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) will contribute 60% ($700,000).

   M/S/C (Price/Khamis) to approve submitting a recommendation to the Board of Directors to consider the Addendum to the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) and approve the design changes to the Upper Penitencia Creek Improvement Project (UPC Project) as discussed in the Addendum.

   John Sighamony, Senior Transportation Planner, noted this report discusses the congestion growth in Santa Clara County and identifies steps VTA can take to improve the transportation environment.

   Mr. Sighamony introduced Ratna Amin, SPUR Transportation Policy Director, who provided a PowerPoint presentation entitled “Freedom To Move,” highlighting: 1) Do people have transportation choices; 2) Forces expanding transportation choices; 3) Forces limiting transportation choices; 4) Where Workers Live & Where Jobs Are; 5) VTA Joint Development Sites; 6) SPUR's 7 Strategies to create better transportation options in the South Bay; 7) Strategy #1 - Make the transit network great in places it works best; 8) Strategy #2 - Develop mobility solutions beyond transit; 9) Strategy #3 - Make Streets work for all users and stop expanding roads; 10) Strategy #4 - Shape communities around transit; 11) Strategy #5 - Set clear transportation goals and align resources to meet them;

NOTE: M/S/C MEANS MOTION SECONDED AND CARRIED AND, UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED, THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.
12) Strategy #6 - Increase public engagement and innovation; 13) Strategy #7 - Grow Funding, and; 14) NearTerm Opportunities.

Vice Chairperson Price queried if SPUR was taking this presentation before City Councils, Planning Commissions and other venues such as candidate forums. Ms. Amin noted SPUR is member-supported and currently working with San Jose Staff and other stakeholders. SPUR is hosting their own candidate forum on October 9, 2014, along with other organizations.

Vice Chairperson Price noted the following: 1) the importance of technology and innovation as it applies to transportation and making it readily accessible to the public; 2) the importance of providing information and options; and 3) behavior changes are vital.

Nuria I. Fernandez, General Manager, noted VTA has instituted an Innovation Lab where corporations and local colleges will be invited. This will help VTA create excitement and opportunities. VTA is also hosting a Hackathon at the San Jose Tech Museum on October 25 and 26, 2014.

Member Khamis stated during his recent European trip he took note of how the country had successfully implemented the transit-oriented model of mixed residential and commercial.

**On order of Chairperson Rocha** and there being no objection, the Committee received the report from SPUR on VTA entitled “Freedom to Move.”

9. **Quarterly Marketing Report**

Greta Helm, Director, Business Development, provided a brief overview of the staff report, highlighting: 1) VTA’s focus on increasing awareness and maximizing service to Levi’s Stadium; and 2) VTA’s outreach to local businesses to maximize participation in the new Bay Area Commuter Benefit program.

Ms. Helm also provided a presentation entitled “Quarterly Marketing Report,” highlighting: 1) Levi’s Stadium; 2) Promoting Fares; 3) Promoting Service; 4) EventTIK; and 5) Commuter Benefits Program – SB 1339.

Board Member Khamis expressed support for the program.

**Public Comment**

Mr. Lebrun expressed concern regarding the extended processing time it takes for seniors to receive a Clipper Card. Staff noted the current Clipper Card technology is outdated and inflexible, and indicated VTA worked with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) last year to allow a convenient mail-in application as opposed to an in-person application for seniors.

Ms. Fernandez noted the current Clipper Card contract will expire in 2015 and VTA will hire a consultant to evaluate how to best meet public needs.

**On order of Chairperson Rocha** and there being no objection, the Committee received the Quarterly Marketing Report.
10. **Transit Service Changes – October 2014**

Jim Unites, Deputy Director, Operations Planning, provided an overview of the staff report.

**Public Comment**

Mr. Lebrun commended staff for Line 68, and expressed concern about the transit connection between light rail and Caltrain.

**On order of Chairperson Rocha** and there being no objection, the Committee received a report on the October 2014 Transit Service Changes.

**OTHER ITEMS**

11. **Safety Report**

Steve Keller, Director of System Safety and Security, provided a brief overview of the September Operations Safety Performance Report.

Member Khamis suggested adding a column differentiating “At Fault” accidents from “No Fault” accidents.

Member Khamis queried about drug and alcohol testing. Staff noted VTA is mandated by Federal law to test. All safety sensitive employees are subject to random periodic drug and alcohol testing throughout the year.

Ms. Fernandez noted on October 6, 2014, the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) will conduct its final review of VTA’s safety program.

**On order of Chairperson Rocha** and there being no objection, the Committee received the Safety report.

12. **Ridership Report**

Joonie Tolosa, Operations Analysis Reporting and Systems Manager, provided a handout and brief overview of the August, 2014 Monthly Ridership report, highlighting: 1) overall ridership increased by 1.7%; 2) vehicle loads/routes snapshot of line 22; and 3) maximum peak load.

Member Khamis thanked staff for the report and indicated it provides a much clearer picture of how VTA services are used.

**Public Comment**

Mr. Lebrun commended the Ridership Report.

**On order of Chairperson Rocha** and there being no objection, the Committee received the Ridership report.

13. **Items of Concern and Referral to Administration**

Vice Chairperson Price requested an update on what are the factors considered, and how does VTA improve the connectivity between the Caltrain and light rail so the connection is clear, easy and efficient.
Vice Chairperson Price requested the Transit Operations Performance Report – FY2014 contain a preamble so the public can better understand the correlation in the report.

14. **Review Committee Work Plan**
   On order of Chairperson Rocha and there being no objection, the Committee reviewed the Committee Work Plan.

15. **Committee Staff Report**
   Michael Hursh, Chief Operating Officer, provided the Committee Staff Report.
   On order of Chairperson Rocha and there being no objection, the Committee received the Committee Staff Report.

16. **Chairperson’s Report**
   Chairperson Rocha thanked VTA staff and Jim Lawson for helping the City of San Jose provide the Commuter Benefits Program Eco Pass to employees. Chairperson Rocha thanked the City of San Jose for their help and prompt response.

17. **Determine Consent Agenda for the October 2, 2014 Board of Directors Meeting**
   **CONSENT:**
   Agenda Item #7., Consider the Addendum to the Initial Study/Mitigated NegativeDeclaration (IS/MND) and approve the design changes to the Upper Penitencia Creek Improvement Project (UPC Project) as discussed in the Addendum.
   Agenda Item #8., Receive the report from SPUR on VTA entitled “Freedom to Move.”
   Agenda Item #10., Receive a report on the October 2014 Transit Service Changes.
   **REGULAR:** None

18. **Announcements**
   There were no Announcements.

19. **ADJOURNMENT**
   On order of Chairperson Rocha and there being no objection the meeting was adjourned at 4:33 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Anita McGraw, Board Assistant
VTA Office of the Board Secretary
Citizens Advisory Committee and 2000 Measure A Citizens Watchdog Committee

Regular Meeting Minutes of September 10, 2014

WILL BE FORWARDED UNDER SEPARATE COVER
CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) was called to order at 6:31 p.m. by Chairperson Brinsfield in Conference Room B-104, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), 3331 North First Street, San José, California.

1. ROLL CALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Herman Wadler</td>
<td>City of Campbell</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Wiant</td>
<td>City of Cupertino</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vacant</strong></td>
<td><strong>City of Gilroy</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wes Brinsfield, Chairperson</td>
<td>City of Los Altos</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breene Kerr, Vice Chair</td>
<td>Town of Los Altos Hills</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie Hanssen</td>
<td>Town of Los Gatos</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristal Caidoy</td>
<td>City of Milpitas</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Chaffin</td>
<td>City of Monte Sereno</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Seehafer</td>
<td>City of Morgan Hill</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Purdon</td>
<td>City of Mountain View</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Goldstein</td>
<td>City of Palo Alto</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Bell</td>
<td>City of San José</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Schouten</td>
<td>City of Santa Clara</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vacant</strong></td>
<td><strong>County of Santa Clara</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Stallman</td>
<td>City of Saratoga</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Simons</td>
<td>City of Sunnyvale</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corinne Winter</td>
<td>Ex-Officio, SVBC</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin Heyne</td>
<td>Alternate Ex-Officio, SVBC</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A quorum was not present and a Committee of the Whole was declared.

2. ORDERS OF THE DAY

Chairperson Brinsfield requested that Regular Agenda Items #8 through #11 be heard prior to the Consent Agenda to allow the Committee to reach a quorum.

On order of Chairperson Brinsfield and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole approved the orders of the day.
3. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

There were no Public Presentations.

4. Introduction of VTA Chief of Staff, Inez Evans.

Sandra Weymouth, Acting Chief of Staff, made introductory remarks and introduced Inez Evans, VTA Chief of Staff.

Ms. Evans provided a brief background introduction.

The Agenda was taken out of order.

REGULAR AGENDA

8. Status of Potential Transportation Funding Ballot Measure

Ms. Weymouth provided the staff report, highlighting: 1) potential ballot measure goals, program timeline, and outreach plan; 2) formation of Ad Hoc Committee on Envisioning Silicon Valley; 3) VTA to host an Envisioning Silicon Valley Forum on September 30, 2014 with stakeholders and community partners; 4) the strategic planning process will begin in October 2014; 5) the development of the Valley Transportation Plan 2045 will begin in June/July 2015; and 6) communication plan strategies will include traditional formats and social media tools.

Member Caidoy arrived at the meeting and took her seat at 6:42 p.m. and a quorum was declared.

Member Hanssen arrived at the meeting and took her seat at 6:45 p.m.

Chris Augenstein, Deputy Director of Planning, provided a staff report on existing conditions in Santa Clara County (County), highlighting: 1) origin counties of commuters who work in the County as of 2009; 2) existing congestion in the roadway network; 3) existing transit network, noting key corridors; 4) existing bicycle network, noting gaps in key areas; 5) major development trends, noting clustering of development projects near light rail stations and identified Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) corridors; 6) map representations of existing jobs and housing patterns as of 2013; and 7) local roads pavement condition index, noting downward trend in road conditions in most cities throughout the County.

Member Chaffin arrived at the meeting and took his seat at 7:00 p.m.

Members of the Committee and staff engaged in a discussion covering: 1) funding issue for bicycle projects; 2) how the County’s jobs and housing pattern compare to other areas; and 3) general public sentiment about a potential ballot measure.

On order of Chairperson Brinsfield and there being no objection, the Committee received a report regarding the potential of a transportation ballot measure in 2016.

9. Update on SB 743 Changes to CEQA Transportation Analysis

Robert Cunningham, Transportation Planner, provided a brief background and overview of the report, noting: 1) summary of arguments for and against retaining the use of level of service (LOS) in transportation analysis; 2) the Governor’s Office of Planning and
Research (OPR) proposals for the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) analysis of transportation impacts of land use projects and transportation projects; 3) OPR’s recommendations for mitigation measures and project alternatives; 4) implications for VTA and Member Agencies; and 6) adoption schedule and OPR’s proposed phased implementation process.

Members of the Committee made the following comments: 1) inquired about the regional average vehicles miles traveled (VMT) threshold; 2) queried whether the incentives for dense development in Plan Bay Area are in conflict with the proposed VMT standard; and 3) commented that LOS and VMT standards are inverse in terms of the incentives they provide for the location of development.

Staff clarified that OPR chose the regional average as threshold and could be changed during the regional plan’s update every four years. Staff added that it is still the Lead Agency’s responsibility to choose their threshold. The incentives are intended to align since the areas targeted for dense development in Plan Bay Area would tend to have lower VMT impacts than other areas in the region.

On order of Chairperson Brinsfield and there being no objection, the Committee received a staff presentation on the Preliminary Discussion Draft of Updates to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Implementing SB 743 by the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research.

10. Bicycle and Pedestrian Data Collection Program

Lauren Ledbetter, Sr. Transportation Planner and Staff Liaison, provided a brief report, noting: 1) overview of previous data collection efforts; and 2) goals and rationale of new proposed bicycle and pedestrian count locations.

Upon query of Members of the Committee, staff responded that one of the intent of this new approach is to gain better understanding on how walking varies based on land use typology. The effort will not include counts on trails but will consider weather, accidents and other factors. The program will implement video counts and the corresponding report will include the methodology and results.

Chairperson Brinsfield made the following comments: 1) suggested staff to engage other local agencies or groups with regards to their existing or planned count efforts; and 2) noted some residents may express concern over the installation of cameras in their neighborhood and suggested that residents be made aware of the purpose of the cameras.

Staff noted that count locations will be made available to City staff so that they may choose to inform residents in their jurisdiction as appropriate.

On order of Chairperson Brinsfield and there being no objection, the Committee received a verbal report on the bicycle and pedestrian data collection aspect of the Congestion Management Program's Monitoring and Conformance Report.

11. Expressway Bicycle Accommodation Guidelines

Dawn Cameron, County Transportation Planner, provided a brief overview and update of the County Expressway Bicycle Accommodation Guidelines (BAG). A draft of the BAG was distributed to the Committee for review. Ms. Cameron noted the following: 1) asked the Committee to review the draft and provide their comments at the October 8, 2014, BPAC Regular Meeting; and 2) graphics on the updated BAG will be consistent to the
style of VTA’s Bicycle Technical Guidelines (BTG).

Members of the Committee and County staff engaged in a discussion covering:
1) definition of dashed striping according to Caltrans’ guidelines; 2) “enhanced” versus “simplified” situations and approach on best practices; and 3) current conditions on the Page Mill Road/Interstate 280 intersection.

**On order of Chairperson Brinsfield** and there being no objection, the Committee received a presentation from Santa Clara County Roads and Airports staff on the update of the Expressway Bicycle Accommodation Guidelines.

3. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS (continued)

Chairperson Brinsfield noted a public comment via email from Omar Chatty, Interested Citizen, concerning congestion management during event days at the Levi’s Stadium.

CONSENT AGENDA

5. Regular Meeting Minutes of May 7, 2014.

M/S/C (Wadler/Bell) to approve the Regular Meeting Minutes of May 7, 2014.

6. Valley Transportation Plan 2040: Final Document

M/S/C (Wadler/Bell) to recommend that the VTA Board of Directors approve the Valley Transportation Plan 2040 (VTP 2040) as Santa Clara County’s long-range countywide transportation plan.

7. Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Guidelines

M/S/C (Wadler/Bell) to recommend that the VTA Board of Directors adopt the updated VTA Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Guidelines.

OTHER

12. Committee Staff Report

Ms. Ledbetter provided the staff report, highlighting: 1) VTAlerts smartphone app that transit users can use to report safety and security concerns, suspicious activities, or other emergencies; 2) thanked Committee Members Caidoy, Stallman, and Purdon on their input regarding the design of interior bicycle parking on new Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) buses; 3) extended invitation to the Committee for the September 17, 2014, Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals (APBP) monthly webinar covering optimizing signals for bicyclists and pedestrians; and 4) the announcement of Metropolitan Transportation Commission’s (MTC) staff recommendations for the Regional Active Transportation Program (ATP) grants, noting VTA’s Central and South County Bicycle Plan was awarded funding, however, no other projects from Santa Clara County were selected.

**On order of Chairperson Brinsfield** and there being no objection, the Committee received the Committee Staff Report.
13. **Santa Clara County Staff Report**

There was no Santa Clara County Staff Report.

14. **Chairperson’s Report**

Chairperson Brinsfield provided a brief report and made the following comments: 1) requested more information on MTC’s Regional ATP scoring criteria and selection process; 2) noted SPUR’s report on VTA, “Freedom to Move”, and VTA response to SPUR’s recommendations is forthcoming; 3) Assembly Bill (AB) 1371, requiring California drivers to give bicyclists at least three feet of space when passing, goes into effect on September 16, 2014; 4) advised the Committee of Caltrain’s comment periods on the following topics: a) addition of refurbished cars to Caltrain fleet; and b) design of Caltrain’s new Electric Multiple Unit (EMU) trains; 5) renovation of the Loyola Corners bridge in the City of Los Altos has been delayed; 6) the Bicyclist Anti-Harassment Ordinance is still pending the approval of the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors’ Housing, Land Use, Environment and Transportation Committee, and ultimately the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors.

15. **Reports from BPAC Subcommittees**

There were no updates from the Bicyclist Anti-Harassment Ordinance Subcommittee.

Members Hanssen and Bell provided a brief update of the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Scoring Criteria Subcommittee and noted the following: 1) result of outreach efforts by Subcommittee Members to determine grant application issues by Member Agencies; 2) Member Agencies may submit applications using their own criteria; 3) next call-for-projects period will commence in December 2014; and 4) Subcommittee Members requested that Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) staff be invited to present to the Committee on the TFCA grant application process.

**On order of Chairperson Brinsfield** and there being no objection, the Committee received the Reports from BPAC Subcommittees.

16. **Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) and 2000 Measure A Citizens Watchdog Committee (CWC) Report**

There was no CAC/CWC Report.

17. **BPAC Work Plan**

Staff reviewed items to be discussed at future BPAC meetings.

Ms. Smith noted that SPUR staff will make a presentation to the Committee in November 2014 covering their report, “Freedom to Move”, and recommendations to VTA.

Ms. Ledbetter noted the following items will be included in the Work Plan: 1) Santa Clara County Bicycle Technical Guidelines; 2) update on North San Jose bicycle and pedestrian projects; 3) staff report on ATP grants; and 4) staff report on TFCA follow up.

Member Wadler requested that County staff update the Committee on proposed changes to the San Tomas Aquino Creek Trail.
On order of Chairperson Brinsfield and there being no objection, the Committee reviewed the BPAC Work Plan.

18. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Member Hanssen announced that the Los Gatos Town Council recently approved to raise the importance of the Transportation and Parking Commission to address relevant town issues.

Member Wiant commented that Apple Incorporated made a voluntary contribution to the City of Cupertino and announced that pavement maintenance on Rodrigues Avenue is underway.

Member Simons provided a comment on the Central & Wolfe private development project in the City of Sunnyvale, noting proposed stop signs on Central Expressway.

Alternate Ex-Officio Heyne made the following announcements: 1) the Silicon Valley Bike Summit, co-hosted by the Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition (SVBC) and Stanford Healthcare, will be held on September 30, 2014 in Palo Alto; and 2) SVBC’s office-warming party on September 11, 2014 at their new office location on 96 North Third Street, Suite 375 in San Jose.

Member Purdon made the following announcements: 1) the City of Mountain View recently approved increasing the frequency of its Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee meetings; and 2) a community workshop on the Bicycle Transportation Plan Update, featuring guest speaker Mia Birk, will be held on September 15, 2014 at the Mountain View City Hall.

Member Seehafer made the following announcements: 1) the City of Morgan Hill Parks and Recreation Commission recommended the City Council approve opening a new trail on El Toro Mountain; and 2) a symposium on the downtown design of Morgan Hill will be held on September 19, 2014.

Member Caidoy announced that the City of Milpitas will host a family bike ride on September 20, 2014.

Chairperson Brinsfield made the following announcements: 1) the City of Los Altos is considering merging its Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission and Planning and Transportation Commission together; and 2) the City of Los Altos is in the process of soliciting comments from pertinent Parent-Teacher Associations as part of its Pedestrian Master Plan, updating suggested routes to schools.

19. ADJOURNMENT

On order of Chairperson Brinsfield and there being no objection, the Committee meeting was adjourned at 8:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Michelle Oblena, Board Assistant
VTA Office of the Board Secretary
CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was called to order at 1:32 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>City of Santa Clara</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl Bjarke</td>
<td>City of Morgan Hill</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Creer</td>
<td>City of Morgan Hill</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timm Borden</td>
<td>City of Cupertino</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Capurso</td>
<td>City of Campbell</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cherbone</td>
<td>City of Saratoga</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Chiu</td>
<td>Town of Los Altos Hills</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Collen</td>
<td>County of Santa Clara</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Kim</td>
<td>City of Mountain View</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Moneda</td>
<td>City of Milpitas</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Chan</td>
<td>City of Milpitas</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Morley</td>
<td>Town of Los Gatos</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedric Novenario</td>
<td>City of Los Altos</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaime Rodriguez</td>
<td>City of Palo Alto</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shahla Yazdy</td>
<td>City of Palo Alto</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Salvano</td>
<td>City of San José</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Servin</td>
<td>City of Gilroy</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo Sharma</td>
<td>City of Monte Sereno</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Saleh</td>
<td>California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Witthaus</td>
<td>City of Sunnyvale</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Shariat</td>
<td>City of Sunnyvale</td>
<td>Present</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

Sandra Weymouth, Acting Chief of Staff, gave opening remarks and introduced VTA’s new Chief of Staff, Inez Evans.

Ms. Evans stated she looks forward to working with the Committee.

5. Chairperson’s Report

There was no Chairperson’s Report.

6. TAC Working Groups Report

- Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Working Group
  
  Marcella Rensi, Transportation Planning Manager, noted there was no meeting of the CIP Working Group in August, 2014.

- Systems Operations & Management (SOM) Working Group
  
  Eugene Maeda, Senior Transportation Planner, provided a brief report from the August 27, 2014, meeting, highlighting the following: 1) received update on Senate Bill 743; 2) reviewed 2014 Congestion Management Program (CMP) Monitoring Draft Work Scope and Data Collection Schedule, and; 3) reviewed the Draft 2014 Transportation Systems Monitoring Report.

  Mr. Maeda stated the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) Workshop is tentatively scheduled for December 11 and 12, 2014, at San Jose City Hall.

  In lieu of an October meeting, the SOM Working Group will attend Caltrans E-76 Training Workshop scheduled for September 24, 2014 at 9:00 a.m.

- Land Use/Transportation Integration (LUTI) Working Group

  Robert Swierk, Senior Transportation Planner, noted there was no meeting of the LUTI in August, 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 August 14, 2014**

   M/S/C (Batra/Salvano) to approve the Regular Meeting Minutes of August 14, 2014.

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

   Recommend that the VTA Board of Directors approve the Valley Transportation Plan 2040 (VTP 2040) as Santa Clara County’s long-range countywide transportation plan.

9. **Legislative Update Matrix**

   M/S/C (Batra/Salvano) to review the Monthly Legislative Update Matrix.

10. **Programmed Project Monitoring – Quarterly Report**

    M/S/C (Batra/Salvano) to receive the Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report for April to June 2014.

11. **I-280 Ramp Metering After Study**

    M/S/C (Batra/Salvano) to receive an update on the I-280 ramp metering study.

REGULAR AGENDA

   **The Agenda was taken out of order.**

8. **Valley Transportation Plan 2040: Final Document**

   Member Collen noted the language may be confusing and requested the Valley Transportation Plan (VTP) 2040 recommendation be continued one month to give member agencies an additional month to review and comment.

   Chris Augenstein, Deputy Director, Planning, noted VTA welcomes comments, and noted there is nothing new in the document. He stated the project list has not changed, and that this matter has been before the TAC Committee twice before but was delayed due to Michael Burns’ departure and VTA would like to move forward.

   Vice Chairperson Servin arrives and takes his seat at 1:43 p.m.

   Member Batra requested Mr. Collen forward his comments to the Committee members for review.

   **M/S/C (Collen/Borden) to recommend that the VTA Board of Directors approve the Valley Transportation Plan 2040 (VTP 2040) as Santa Clara County’s long-range countywide transportation plan. Further, the Committee requested that comments from the County of Santa Clara and/or other local agencies be considered before the document is forwarded to the Board.**

   **NOTE:** M/S/C MEANS MOTION SECONDED AND CARRIED AND, UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED, THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.
12. **Status of Potential Transportation Funding Ballot Measure**

Ms. Weymouth provided the staff report, and noted VTA has been discussing the possibility of a proposed sales tax initiative to help address the growing congestion in Santa Clara County. VTA is developing a toolbox of funding solutions which would include: 1) a potential 2016 ballot measure; 2) evaluating VTA’s funding sources – both from the state and federal level; and 3) public/private partnership opportunities. The VTA Board of Directors has developed an Ad-Hoc Committee on “Envisioning Silicon Valley” with representatives from each of the six city groupings. VTA also scheduled a September 30, 2014, forum for stakeholders.

Ms. Weymouth presented the “30 in 15” Moving Silicon Valley Forward document, highlighting: 1) in October, 2014, VTA will begin the strategic planning process; 2) in June/July, 2015, VTA will have the Valley Transportation Plan (VTP) call for projects; 3) develop a robust communication plan; 4) develop a financing plan; 5) engage stakeholder and community groups, and; 6) bring a potential ballot measure before the voters in 2016.


Member Batra queried why state facilities are not included in the Pavement Index. Staff indicated VTA would research the matter and provide the information.

**On order of Chairperson Capurso** and there being no objection, the Committee received a report regarding the potential of a transportation ballot measure in 2016.


John Sighamony, Senior Transportation Planner, noted the report discusses the congestion growth in Santa Clara County and identifies steps VTA can take to improve the transportation environment.

Mr. Sighamony introduced Ratna Amin, SPUR Transportation Policy Director, who provided a PowerPoint presentation entitled “Freedom To Move,” highlighting: 1) Do people have transportation choices; 2) Forces expanding transportation choices; 3) Forces limiting transportation choices; 4) Where Workers Live & Where Jobs Are; 5) VTA Joint Development Sites; 6) SPUR's 7 Strategies to create better transportation options in the South Bay; 7) Strategy #1 - Make the transit network great in places it works best; 8) Strategy #2 - Develop mobility solutions beyond transit; 9) Strategy #3 - Make Streets work for all users and stop expanding roads; 10) Strategy #4 - Shape communities around transit; 11) Strategy #5 - Set clear transportation goals and align resources to meet them;
12) Strategy #6 - Increase public engagement and innovation; 13) Strategy #7 - Grow Funding, and; 14) Near-Term Opportunities.

Members of the Committee discussed the following: 1) safety and public education; 2) trip studies with data-driven results; 3) target peak commute traffic; 4) road expansion; 5) land use policy; 6) safe expressway crossing and Lawrence Grade Separation Project videos are located at www.countyroads.org; 7) changing the time of peak commute traffic and thinking outside the box, and 8) Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) pilot project that maximizes the use of park and ride facilities and encourages moving forward through a public/private partnership.

On order of Chairperson Capurso and there being no objection, the Committee received the report from SPUR on VTA entitled “Freedom to Move”.

14. Adopt the Updated VTA Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Guidelines

Robert Swierk, Senior Transportation Planner, provided a PowerPoint presentation, entitled “VTA Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Guidelines Update: Adopt the Updated TIA Guidelines,” highlighting: 1) Executive Summary; 2) Presentation Outline; 3) Background; 4) Themes of VTA TIA Guidelines Update; 5) Update Process and Outreach Efforts; 6) Themes and Major Changes in Guidelines; 7) Key Comments on Draft Documents; 8) Key Comments from August Committees, and; 9) Benefits of the Updated Guidelines.

Members of the Committee discussed the following: 1) trip reduction; and 2) calculating level of service (LOS).

Vice Chairperson Servin stated City staff would like to have a comparison of what a TIA would look like under the new guidelines versus under the current ones to see how this may affect the way Gilroy processes development applications. Vice Chairperson Servin indicated he was not clear on exactly how to apply the new process.

M/S/F (Batra/Capurso) on a vote of 8 Ayes to 0 Noes to 4 Abstentions to recommend that the VTA Board of Directors adopt the updated VTA Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Guidelines. Members Collen, Cherbone, Vice Chairperson Servin and Alternate Member Shariat abstained.

Members of the Committee made the following suggestions: 1) the process should be clear and fully vetted; and 2) provide a workshop where the Committee can take a real project and walk it through the new process and compare it to the traditional method.

Staff indicated VTA will offer a special workshop of the existing working groups and TAC members with specific questions and concerns should attend. The matter will be brought back before the Technical Advisory Committee at a later date.

NOTE: M/S/F MEANS MOTION SECONDED AND FAILED.
15. **Update on SB 743 Changes to CEQA Transportation Analysis**

Robert Cunningham, Transportation Planner III, provided a PowerPoint presentation, entitled “Update on SB 743 Changes to CEQA Transportation Analysis,” highlighting: 1) SB 743: Introduction; 2) SB 743 Changes to CEQA Transportation Analysis: Overview; 3) Level of Service in Transportation Analysis; 4) Level of Service: Arguments For and Against; 5) Preliminary Discussion Draft: Analysis of Land Use Projects; 6) Preliminary Discussion Draft: Analysis of Transportation Projects; 7) Preliminary Discussion Draft: Mitigations and Alternatives; 8) Implications for VTA and Member Agencies; 9) Adoption Schedule and Phased Implementation; 10) Update on SB 743 Changes to CEQA Transportation Analysis, and 11) Definitions of Major Transit Stop & High Quality Transit Corridor.

Members of the Committee inquired about the impacts of SB 743 to the Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) and the Transportation Impact Fund (TIF). Staff responded these will be evaluated after the new CEQA guidelines are adopted.

On order of Chairperson Capurso and there being no objection, the Committee received a staff presentation on the Preliminary Discussion Draft of Updates to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Implementing SB 743 by the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research.

16. **Update on Regional Tolling Policies on Express Lanes**


On order of Chairperson Capurso and there being no objection, the Committee received an update on regional tolling policies on express lanes.

**OTHER**

17. **Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Activities and Initiatives**

Therese Trivedi, Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), reported that Planning Grant Program Projects awarded earlier in the year are now getting underway in San Jose, Sunnyvale, Mountain View, Milpitas, and Morgan Hill.

Caltrans released the Fiscal Year 2015-2016 round of federal and state planning grants on September 2, 2014. Applications are due to Caltrans on October 31, 2014.

Ms. Rensi noted that California Transportation Commission (CTC) met in San Jose in August. The CTC approved the last increment of The State’s Traffic Congestion Relief (TCRP) funding for the BART project and adopted projects for the first round of the Active Transportation Program (ATP). The Bay Area and Santa Clara County did not do as well as hoped for the ATP. MTC took their
initial recommendations for the regional ATP to one of their commission committees in September. VTA plans to have a debriefing discussion regarding this matter at the October TAC and Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) meetings.

18. **Caltrans Activities and Initiatives**

Nick Saleh, Caltrans Program District Division Chief – South Region, reported that on January 17, 2014, the Governor declared a drought emergency. Caltrans now has a District Manager specifically working with the drought resistant guidelines. Mr. Saleh recommends all projects in the planning stage plan to use drought resistant plants. The department has committed to a 50% reduction in water consumption. Smart controllers have been installed to monitor water use.

19. **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 Batra announced Levi’s Stadium is in operation, and the City of Santa Clara is in a learning process. He thanked neighboring cities and VTA for their support and help, and noted traffic suggestions are welcomed.

Vice Chairperson Servin announced Gilroy is filing several Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) applications to grow Gilroy boundaries by one third its size - both north and south.

Ms. Rensi announced the month of September is dedicated to preparedness and awareness for safety and security. Safety is VTA’s number one priority. There is a VTA Alerts Flyer describing the mobile app where the public can report safety concerns, suspicious activities and other emergencies. VTA encourages everyone to download and use the app.

22. **ADJOURNMENT**

*On order of Chairperson Capurso*, and there being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 3:34 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Anita McGraw, Board Assistant
VTA Office of the Board Secretary
Policy Advisory Committee

Regular Meeting Minutes of September 11, 2014

WILL BE FORWARDED UNDER SEPARATE COVER
NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Downtown East Valley Policy Advisory Board Meeting scheduled for 4:30 p.m. on Thursday, September 4, 2014, has been cancelled.

Michelle Oblena, Board Assistant
VTA Office of the Board Secretary
NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Diridon Station Joint Policy Advisory Board meeting scheduled for 3:00 p.m. on Friday, September 19, 2014, has been cancelled.

The next meeting of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Diridon Station Joint Policy Advisory Board is scheduled for 3:00 p.m. on Friday, November 21, 2014, in Wing Room 120, San José City Hall, 200 E. Santa Clara Street, San José, California.

Anita McGraw, Board Assistant
VTA Office of the Board Secretary